Chapter 6

Periphrastic causative constructions in Mehweb

Daria Barylnikova
National Research University Higher School of Economics

In Mehweb, periphrastic causatives are formed by a combination of the infinitive of the lexical verb with another verb, originally a caused motion verb. Various tests that Mehweb periphrastic causatives do not qualify as fully grammaticalized. But the constructions are not compositional expressions, either. While a clause usually contains either a morphological or a periphrastic causative marker, there are instances where, in a periphrastic causative construction, the lexical verb itself may carry the causative affix, resulting in only one causative meaning.

Keywords: causative, periphrastic causative, double causative, Mehweb, Dargwa, East Caucasian.

1 Introduction

The causative construction denotes a complex situation consisting of two component events: (1) the event that causes another event to happen; and (2) the result of this causation (Comrie 1989: 165–166; Nedjalkov & Silnitsky 1973; Kulikov 2001). Here, the first event refers to the action of the causer and the second explicates the effect of the causation on the causee.

Causativization is a valency-increasing derivation which is applied to the structure of the clause. In the resulting construction, the causer is the subject and the causee shifts to a non-subject position. The set of semantic roles does not remain the same. Minimally, a new agent is added. With a new argument added, we have to redistribute the grammatical relations 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 their control over the situation and "pulls

Daria Barylnikova. 2019. Periphrastic causative constructions in Mehweb. In Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina & Dmitry Ganenkov (eds.), *The Mehweb language: Essays on phonology, morphology and syntax*, 167–187. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.3402064

the trigger"). At the same time, there is someone who is, willingly or not, involved in the situation induced by the causer. With two-place predicates there is also another, undergoer participant who does not interact with the causer directly and does not play a role in the redistribution of grammatical relations. This participant retains the marking that it had in the original sentence. The following English examples illustrate these options:

a. *The professor made his student work hard.* (originally intransitive)
b. *The professor made his student drop a course this semester.* (originally transitive)
c. *The professor made his student laugh at his joke.* (originally intransitive with an oblique object)

Mehweb has a morphologically productive category of causative (Ageeva 2014; Daniel 2019). The aim of this study is to identify and investigate the means of building periphrastic constructions with causative semantics, with a verb that functions as a separate cause predicate in the construction ("causative verb" below). As noted in Harris & Campbell (1995: 151–194), biclausal structures may undergo simplification over the history of a language and end up as a fused clause. In this paper I shall briefly discuss the degree of grammaticalization of periphrastic causative constructions in Mehweb by considering their clause structure.

I propose the following research questions:

1. Are there any grammaticalization effects in constructions with causative verbs?
2. What are the meanings these constructions express, in addition to causation?
3. What is the syntactic structure of periphrastic causatives? Are there any syntactic constraints on building such constructions?
4. Is there any difference between constructions involving animate or inanimate causees?

The paper is divided into five sections. They present the results of syntactic tests applied in order to detect whether these constructions are periphrastic causatives or not. §2 surveys possible ways of non-periphrastic expression of the causative meaning, including synthetic and suppletive causatives. §3 introduces lexical verbs participating in periphrastic causative constructions. §4 considers the syntax of such constructions in more detail, in particular, what types of verbs are allowed to be used with each causative verb. In §5, some aspects of forming negative causative clauses are discussed. Finally, §6 provides some evidence on the double causative construction.

2 Synthetic and suppletive causatives

There are three possible ways of expressing causative meaning in Mehweb: synthetic (morphological), suppletive (lexical) and analytic (periphrastic).

Synthetic causatives are formed by adding an affix to the verbal stem. Synthetic means of expressing causation usually produce monoclausal structures, with no lexical 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.

(1) *abaj-ni* *urši-li-ze* *kung* ***b-aˁld-aˁq-ib.***
mother-ERG boy-OBL-INTER(LAT) book **N-hide:PFV-CAUS-AOR**
'Mother made her son hide a book.'

This way of causative derivation is highly productive in Mehweb. The causative affix can be added to all kinds of verbs. For further discussion of morphological causative formation see Ageeva (2014) and Daniel (2019).

Suppletive causatives are also called "covert" causatives (Kulikov 2001), since they share no morphological material with their non-causative equivalents. The English pair *kill* and *die* is commonly treated as an example of suppletive causativization. In Mehweb, the pair CL[1]-*aˁbʔas* 'to kill' and CL-*ebk'es* 'die' is also an example of lexical causativization.

3 Periphrastic causativization

The constructions considered in this paper (originally) represent complementation with several matrix verbs[2]:

- *aʔas* 'drive:PFV' – *ʔes* 'drive:IPFV' (cause to move, for sheep)
- CL-*aqas* 'leave:PFV' – CL-*irqes* 'leave:IPFV' (leave something, let stay)
- CL-*aq'as* 'do:PFV' – CL-*iq'es* 'do:IPFV'

Compare the two causative constructions in (2). Ex. (2a) illustrates the synthetic causative expression. (2b) conveys the causative meaning, but involves two verbs. The main predicate is the verb *aʔib* 'drove', and its dependent argument is the verb of caused action (CL-*aˁldes* 'hide').

[1]Here and further I will use glossing CL- to refer to a gender agreement slot (on verb agreement morphology, see Daniel 2019 [this volume]).

[2]Further, verbal forms from the list will be given with the perfective stem as a quotation form.

(2) a. *abaj-ni* *urši-li-ze* *kung* ***b-aˁld-aˁq-ib.***
mother.OBL-ERG boy-OBL-INTER(LAT) book N-hide:PFV-CAUS-AOR

b. *abaj-ni* *urši* *kung* ***b-aˁld-es*** *aʔib.*
mother.OBL-ERG boy book N-hide:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Mother made her son hide a book.'

The lexical meaning of the verb *aʔas* 'drive, cause to move' involves caused motion, describing the action of driving e.g. a herd. The lexical meaning of the verb CL-*aqas* is 'leave', 'leave behind', 'let stay where it is' and expresses the permissive caused motion. Consider examples of non-causative uses of these verbs:

(3) *adaj-ni* *aʔ-ib* *maza* *ɬaˁjne.*
father-ERG drive:PFV-AOR ram yard.IN(LAT)
'Father drove ram into the yard.'

(4) *adaj-ni* *b-aq-ib* *inc* *ustuj-če-b.*
father-ERG N-leave:PFV-AOR apple table.OBL-SUPER-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 impact. It has two 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 the lobby boy carry the bags on his own* the predicate of cause is the verb *make* and *carry* is the predicate of effect. Below, I follow this terminology.

I will discuss the causative constructions produced by combining cause and effect predicates. Note that the verbs used as predicate of cause continue to be used in their lexical meaning, and this meaning involves an element of causation. The question is thus whether these verbs should be considered grammaticalized expressions of causation. Below, I argue that there is linguistic evidence to conclude that they are, to some extent, grammaticalized.

3.1 The structure of the periphrastic construction

In Mehweb the syntactic structure of causative constructions requires using a finite predicate of cause and a non-finite predicate of effect. The predicate of cause functions as the predicate of a simple transitive sentence, with its A (the causer) in ergative case and the causee in the absolutive case. The effect predicates are

represented by infinitives, either perfective or imperfective (see (5a–b)). Other verbal forms are ungrammatical, either finite or non-finite; cf. examples (5c–e) with the aorist, imperfective past and perfective converb, respectively.

(5) a. *adaj-ni kung urši* ***b-elč'-es*** *a?-ib.*
father-ERG book boy **N-read:PFV-INF** drive:PFV-AOR
'Father made his son read the book.'

b. *adaj-ni kung urši* ***luč'-es*** *a?-ib.*
father-ERG book boy **read:IPFV-INF** drive:PFV-AOR
'Father made his son be reading the book.'

c. **adaj-ni kung urši* ***b-elč'-un*** *a?-ib.*
father-ERG book boy **N-read:PFV-AOR** drive:PFV-AOR
'Father made his son read the book.'

d. **adaj-ni kung urši* ***luč'-ib*** *a?-ib.*
father-ERG book boy **read:IPFV-IPFT** drive:PFV-AOR
'Father made his son be reading the book.'

e. **adaj-ni kung urši* ***b-elč'-i-le*** *a?-ib.*
father-ERG book boy **N-read:PFV-AOR-CVB** drive:PFV-AOR
'Father made his son read the book.'

The word order is not strict, but there is a preference for SOV. Considering the clausality of the whole construction, we may expect the object 'book' of the embedded verb 'read' to be adjacent to it, but it is not. This is, however, not a good criterion for postulating biclausal structure. Native speakers do not seem to be very sensitive to changing word order of the direct and indirect object in the examples above. The finite verb is typically in the final position, and the infinitive immediately precedes it. These two forms cannot be separated by an additional phrase, e.g. by a temporal adverb (see (6c); the rule is only relevant in case if both verbal forms are located at the end of the phrase).

(6) a. *abaj-ni rasul q'ar* ***iˤšq-es*** ***i?-an*** *har barħi.*
mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass MOW:IPFV-INF drive:IPFV-HAB every day

b. *har barħi abaj-ni rasul q'ar* ***iˤšq-es*** ***i?-an.***
every day mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass MOW:IPFV-INF drive:IPFV-HAB

c. **abaj-ni rasul q'ar **iˤšq-es** har barħi*
mother.OBL-ERG Rasul grass mow:IPFV-INF every day
***iʔ-an**.*
drive:IPFV-HAB
'Mother makes Rasul mow the lawn every day.'

The scope of the temporal phrase depends on the context. Sometimes the temporal or adverbial phrase belongs to the main clause, sometimes it belongs to the subordinate clause. Both readings are available when the temporal phrase is placed at the border between the two clauses. Consider the next example:

(7) a. *adaj-ni urši aʔ-ib har barħi mašina as-es.*
father-ERG boy drive:PFV-AOR every day car take:PFV-INF
b. *adaj-ni urši aʔ-ib har barħi mašina is-es.*
father-ERG boy drive:PFV-AOR every day car take:IPFV-INF
'Every day the father made his son buy a car.'
'The father made his son buy a car every day.'

In (7), even though the cause predicate has perfective aspect, there are no restrictions on the aspect of the effect predicate. The same is observed in constructions with the cause predicate in the imperfective, where either imperfective or perfective effect predicates are allowed. In other words, aspectual categories of the cause and effect predicates are mutually independent.

Causative semantics has two major subtypes: (a) something is made/urged to be done/happen (factitive causative), and (b) something 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 (English constructions with *make*, *force*, *get* or *have* someone (to) do something) are formed by means of the verb *aʔas* 'drive'. The causee usually is an animate object. Inanimate objects are incompatible with the semantics of coercion. They can be urged to do something, but due to their lack of volition, they cannot comply (see below for exceptions). The causer is marked with the ergative, while the causee carries the absolute. Consider examples (8–10):

(8) *pat'imat-ini anwar uˤq'-es aʔ-ib.*
Patimat-ERG Anwar M.go:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Patimat made Anwar go away.'

(9) *sovet-ini* *direktur* *uškul* *q'-aˤb-es* *a-ib.*
administration-ERG principal school PV-close:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Administration made the principal close the school.'

(10) **anwal-li-ni* *inc* *b-erħ-es* *a-ib.*
Anwar-OBL-ERG apple N-rotten:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Anwar made the apple rot.'

The causer is typically an animate agent. However, it is also possible to have an inanimate causer. These uses seem to be explained through personification, attributing control to natural forces.

(11) *izaj-ni* *abaj-la* *beč'* *ulč'-es* *a-ib.*
illness.OBL-ERG mother.OBL-GEN head be.bald:IPFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'The illness made mother grow bald.'

(12) *izaj-ni* *anwar* *balnica-le-ħe* *uˤq'-es* *a-ib.*
illness.OBL-ERG Anwar hospital-OBL-IN(LAT) M.go:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'The illness caused Anwar to go to hospital.'

In (13a) the snow appears as a human causer, not a natural force. In a more realistic situation, for instance after a meltdown in the mountains, the sentence would be as in (13b).

(13) a. *doˤʜi-li-ni* *ħark'ʷ* *χʷala* *b-aq'-as* *a-ib.*
snow-OBL-ERG river big N-do:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Snow has made a river become [*lit.* to be done] bigger.'

b. *doˤʜi-li-ni* *ħark'ʷ* *χʷala* *b-aq'-ib.*
snow-OBL-ERG river big N-do:PFV-AOR
'Snow has made the river big.'

Examples with an inanimate causee are not common, but not very difficult to construct. The consultants produce them freely and do not have troubles in identifying the participants' roles. More about the third kind of causative with 'do' see in §3.5.

(14) *ʔali-ni* *adaj-la* *sune-če-l* *naˤʁ* *aq b-aq'-as*
Ali-ERG father-GEN self.OBL-SUPER(LAT)-EMPH(LAT) hand up
a-ib.
N-(do):PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Ali made his father raise a hand against him.'

The causative construction with the verb *a?as* is, thus, flexible. It allows using an inanimate as well as an animate causer. The same applies to the causee. In particular, in example (11), the illness is presented as something physically real which functions as a living creature (fairy tale style). While consultants allow such uses, they do not produce them as first answer in the elicitation task but simply accept a constructed sentence. In any case, it is important that there are no strict constraints on animacy of the participants.

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 absolutive. Consider some examples with different effect predicates (15–17):

(15) *sovet-ini* *direktur* *uškul* *q'-aˁb̄-es*
administration-ERG principal school PV-close:PFV-INF
w-aq-ib.
M-leave:PFV-AOR
'Administration let the principal close the school.'

(16) *adaj-ni* *dursi* *urši* *qum-art-es* *d-aq-ib.*
father-ERG girl boy forget-LV:PFV-INF F1-leave:PFV-AOR
'Father let his daughter forget the boy.'

One of the main contexts for the permissive is a positive response to request. For instance, in (17), it is entailed that, before kissing Patimat, Anwar actually asked permission for this action.

(17) *pat'imat-ini* *anwar* *w-aq-ib* *umma* *d-aq'-as.*
Patimat-ERG 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:

(18) *rasuj-ni* *šin* *rurq-es* *d-aq-ib.*
Rasul.OBL-ERG water flow:IPFV-INF NPL-do:PFV-AOR
'Rasul let the water flow.' (did not prevent this from happening)

(19) *rasuj-ni* *uq'laha* *abx-es* *b-aq-ib.*
Rasul.OBL-ERG window open:PFV-INF N-leave:PFV-AOR
'Rasul let the window open.' (did not prevent this from happening)

Examples like (18) and (19) can be described in terms of a physical situation in which the causer does not interfere with what is happening to the causee. There are some other effect predicates that denote natural processes. For instance, verbs like *ulč'es* 'become bald', *mi? a?^{w}as* 'freeze', CL-*ic'es* 'melt' in causative constructions usually are found in combination with the cause predicate CL-*aqas* 'leave'. Cf. the following examples:

(20) a. *anwal-li-ni* *di?* *mi? a?^{w}-as* *b-aq-ib.*
Anwar-OBL-ERG meat freeze:PFV-INF N-leave:PFV-AOR
b. **anwal-li-ni* *di?* *mi? a?^{w}-as* *a?-ib.*
Anwar-OBL-ERG meat freeze:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Anwar froze the meat.'

(21) a. *anwal-li-ni* *k'^{w}ama* *b-ac'-es* *b-aq-ib.*
Anwar-OBL-ERG butter N-melt:PFV-INF N-leave:PFV-AOR
b. **anwal-li-ni* *k'^{w}ama* *b-ac'-es* *a?-ib.*
Anwar-OBL-ERG butter N-melt:PFV-INF 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 leaves the causee on its own without taking any part in the change of its state. This is especially visible when the causer is an inanimate object (18–21). In cases where the causee is a person (17), the permissive element is evident. The permissive is then understood in a metaphorical sense of not preventing someone's action. I interpret the construction with CL-*aqas* 'leave' as a permissive causative.

3.4 Agreement in permissive causative construction

The relation between case assignment and gender agreement is relevant only for the verb CL-*aqas* 'leave', because *a?as* 'drive' does not carry any gender markers. Periphrastic causative constructions allow two agreement patterns. The first one apparently prevails, with the causee retaining the absolutive case (22a). Note that gender agreement on the verb is controlled by the absolutive participant (the masculine gender marker appears on the verb 'leave'). The second pattern shows

marking of the causee by inter-lative[3] case; the gender agreement changes (from masculine to neutral). There is no absolutive participant in the matrix clause to agree with. What we observe is distant agreement between the matrix predicate and the absolutive argument of the dependent clause. Consultants translate both (22a) and (22b) in the same way.

(22) a. *sovet-ini* ***direktur*** *uškul* *q'-aˤb̄-es*
administration-ERG principal school PV-close-INF
w-aq-ib.
M-leave:PFV-AOR

b. *sovet-ini* ***direktur-li-ze*** *uškul* *q'-aˤb̄-es*
administration-ERG principal-OBL-INTER(LAT) school PV-close-INF
b-aq-ib.
N-leave:PFV-AOR
'The administration let the principal close the school.'

In (23), the causative verb shows plural agreement with the absolutive argument in the dependent clause.

(23) *pat'imat-ini* *urši-li-ze* ***d-aq-ib*** *d-ix-es*
Patimat-ERG boy-OBL-INTER(LAT) NPL-leave:PFV-AOR NPL-put:PFV-INF
heš-di *karawatu-ne* *caj-li* *quli.*
(prox)-PL bed-PL one-OBL room.IN(LAT)
'Patimat let the boy carry these beds to another room.'

3.5 Adjectival causative

Adjectives form causatives by means of 'do'-periphrasis, adding the verb CL-*aq'as* 'do' (24b). In Mehweb, this is one of the rare contexts where the adjective cannot be used with the attributive affix (cf. 24b and 24c).

(24) a. *musa* *zuba-l.*
Musa blind-ATR
'Musa is blind.'

b. *χaj-ni* *musa* *zuba* *w-aq'-ib.*
khan.OBL-ERG Musa blind M-do:PFV-AOR
'Khan blinded Musa.'

[3]See Chechuro (2019) on the use of the form.

c. **χaj-ni musa 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 apparently biclausal. This means that they have a main clause that contains the causative predicate that introduces the causer and the dependent clause that describes the caused event. The causee also belongs to the matrix clause. In Mehweb, the dependent clause is headed by an infinitive (25).

(25) *anwal-li-ni rasul abaj-ze b-arx-le*
Anwar-OBL-ERG Rasul mother.OBL-INTER(LAT) N-be.right-CVB
b-urh-es a?-ib.
N-tell:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Anwar made Rasul tell mother the truth.'

In order to prove that there are two syntactic clauses in periphrastic causative constructions, I use several tests. The first test is based on the case of the causee. In (26), two agentive participants are present. It is impossible to have two ergative arguments in one clause. The verb CL-*erh^{w}es* 'slaughter' also requires an ergative agent, but only the verb *a?as* 'drive' assigns the ergative to its agent. The case of the causee is absolutive and is thus assigned by the predicate of cause.

(26) a. *rasuj-ni uzi maza b-erh^{w}-es a?-ib.*
Rasul.OBL-ERG boy ram N-slaughter:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
b. **rasuj-ni uzi-ni maza b-erh^{w}-es a?-ib.*
Rasul.OBL-ERG boy-ERG ram N-slaughter:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Rasul made his son slaughter the ram.'

The second test is based on agreement. The verb agrees in gender with the absolutive participant of its clause. If the analytic causative constituted only one clause, it would be possible for a verbal form which is marked with a gender marker to agree with the sole absolutive argument. In (27), the predicate of cause agrees with the absolutive argument (i.e. the causee) in the main clause, whereas the predicate of effect agrees in gender with the other absolutive argument. Changing agreement so that the predicate of cause agrees with *kung*

'book' is ungrammatical. Based on §3.4, one could expect that distant agreement from the embedded clause is available, because, in principle, the matrix verb may agree with the embedded absolutive argument.

(27) a. *adaj-ni urši kung b-elč'-es i?-uwe le-w.*
father-ERG boy book N-read:PFV-INF drive:IPFV-CVB.IPFV AUX-M

b. **adaj-ni urši kung b-elč'-es i?-uwe le-b.*
father-ERG boy book N-read:PFV-INF drive:IPFV-CVB.IPFV AUX-N
'Father made his son read the book.'

The periphrastic causative construction contains two absolutive arguments. Only one of them controls the agreement of the causative verb. The other triggers agreement on the predicate of effect. It is thus biclausal.

4.2 Types of predicates of effect

The predicate of effect fills the valency of the causative verb. In all periphrastic causative constructions the causer gets ergative marking, while the causee appears in the absolutive or inter-lative case. All other arguments preserve their case marking. Below, different possible types of effect predicates with the verb *a?as* 'drive' (factitive causatives) are discussed. The permissive causative verb CL-*aqas* 'leave' behaves in exactly the same way.

4.2.1 A-intransitive verbs and P-intransitive verbs

In general, intransitive verbs are more frequently causativised. An agentive intransitive verb takes one lexical subject in the absolutive case and represents an action, as *duc'* CL-*uqes* 'run' in (28).

(28) a. *anwar duc' uq-un.*
Anwar run M.LV:PFV-AOR
'Anwar ran.'

b. *učitej-ni anwar duc' uq-es a?-ib.*
teacher.OBL-ERG Anwar run M.LV:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'The teacher made Anwar run.'

The difference between A- and P-intransitive verbs is the degree of control of the subject. While the subject of A-intransitive controls the situation they are involved in, the subject of P-intransitive does not. cf. (29):

(29) a. *inc b-erħ-ib.*
apple N-rotten:PFV-AOR
'The apple has rotten.'

b. *anwal-li-ni inc b-erħ-es b-aq-ib.*
Anwar-OBL-ERG apple N-rotten:PFV-INF N-leave:PFV-AOR
'Anwar let the apple rot.'

4.2.2 Experiential verbs

In East Caucasian, subjects of experiential verbs are non-canonical subjects and take non-core case marking. In Mehweb, they are coded with the inter-lative case (30a), or with a dative with the verb CL-*iges* 'want'. Under causativization, the causee switches from inter-lative to absolutive, according to the general scheme causee case marking in analytic causative constructions.

(30) a. *dursi-li-ze urši qum-art-ur.*
girl-OBL-INTER(LAT) boy forget-LV:PFV-AOR
'The girl forgot the boy.'

b. *adaj-ni dursi urši qum-art-es a?-ib.*
father-ERG girl boy forget-LV:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Father made his daughter forget the boy.'

c. **adaj-ni dursi-li-ze urši qum-art-es*
father-ERG girl-OBL-INTER(LAT) boy forget-LV:PFV-INF
a?-ib.
drive:PFV-AOR
'Father made his daughter forget the boy.'

With morphological causatives of experiential effect predicates, the causee retains its inter-lative case. Consider the following example, quoted from Ageeva (2014: 8):

(31) a. *ʔali-ze χabar arʁ-ib.*
Ali-INTER(LAT) tale hear:PFV-AOR
'Ali heard a tale.'

b. *pat'imat-ini ʔali-ze χabar arʁ-aq-ib.*
Patimat-ERG Ali-INTER(LAT) tale hear:PFV-CAUS-AOR
'Patimat told Ali a tale.'

Unlike what happens in morphological causatives, in the analytic causative construction the original marking of the causee as non-canonical subject is ungrammatical (see 30b).

4.2.3 Transitive verbs

With originally transitive constructions, case marking of the causee changes. In analytic causatives, the causer takes the ergative, leaving the absolutive slot to the causee (32b). Having two ergative arguments in one utterance is not allowed (32c).

(32) a. *uzi-li-ni* *maza* *b-erh-un.*
boy-OBL-ERG ram N-slaughter:PFV-AOR
'The son slaughtered the ram.'

b. *rasuj-ni* *uzi* *maza* *b-erh^{w}-es* *a?-ib.*
Rasul.OBL-ERG boy ram N-slaughter:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR

c. **rasuj-ni* *uzi-ni* *maza* *b-erh^{w}-es* *a?-ib.*
Rasul.OBL-ERG boy-ERG ram N-slaughter:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Rasul made his brother cut the ram.'

4.2.4 Ditransitive verbs

Ditransitive verbs take three arguments that correspond to the subject, the recipient and the theme. As with causativization of transitive verbs, analytic causativization of ditransitive verbs does not license two ergative arguments. The causee is coded by inter-lative.

(33) a. *urši-li-ni* *abaj-ze* *arc* *g-ib.*
boy-OBL-ERG mother-INTER(LAT) money give:PFV-AOR
'The boy gave his mother the money'

b. *anwal-li-ni* *urši* *abaj-ze* *arc* *g-es*
Anwar-OBL-ERG boy mother-INTER(LAT) money give:PFV-INF
a?-ib.
drive:PFV-AOR
'Anwar made his son give his mother the money.'

Causativization of transitive and ditransitive verbs thus follows the same scheme, with the causer in ergative and the causee in a peripheral case.

5 Negation

Formation of a negative clause is one of several possible ways for testing the degree of grammaticalization of causative constructions. The negation in constructions with *aʔas* 'drive' is only allowed on the matrix predicate, that is, the predicate of cause. The dependent infinitive cannot take the negation prefix *ħa-*.

(34) a. *abaj-ni* *rasul* *qʼar* *iˤšq-es* *aʔ-ib* *har*
mother-ERG Rasul grass mow:IPFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR every
barħi.
day
'Mother made Rasul mow the lawn every day.'

b. *abaj-ni* *rasul* *qʼar* *iˤšq-es* ***ħa****-ʔ-ib* *har*
mother-ERG Rasul grass mow:IPFV-INF NEG-drive:PFV-AOR every
barħi.
day

c. **abaj-ni* *rasul* *qʼar* ***нa****ˤ-šq-es* *aʔib* *har*
mother-ERG Rasul grass NEG-mow:IPFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR every
barħi.
day

d. **abaj-ni* *rasul* *qʼar* ***нa****ˤ-šq-es* ***ħa****-ʔ-ib*
mother-ERG Rasul grass NEG-mow:IPFV-INF NEG-drive:PFV-AOR
har *barħi.*
every day
'Mother did not make Rasul mow the lawn every day.'

Examples (34c) and (34d) are considered ungrammatical by consultants no matter what meaning is implied (whether the negation scopes over the embedded predicate 'makes not to mow' or the matrix verb 'does not make mow'). Another example shows the same effect.

(35) a. *učitel-t-ini* *nuša* *meħʷe-la* *mezi-sum*
teacher-PL-ERG we in.Mehweb-GEN language-REPL
b-uн-aˤqʼ-as ***ħ****-aʔ-ib.*
HPL-talk-LV:IPFV-INF NEG-drive:PFV-AOR
'Teachers do not make us speak Mehweb [at school].'

b. *učitel-t-ini nuša meħʷe-la mezi-sum
teacher-PL-ERG we in.Mehweb-GEN language-REPL
ħa-b-uʜ-aˁq'-as a?-ib.
NEG-hpl-talk-LV:IPFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'The teachers make us not speak Mehweb [at school].'

On the other hand, in constructions with CL-*aqas* 'leave' it is possible to use the negative prefix both on the predicate of effect and on the predicate of cause, with different resulting meanings.

(36) *adaj-ni urši zul kak* ***ħa-b-iq'-es***
father-ERG boy in.the.morning pray NEG-N-do:IPFV-INF
w-aq-ib.
M-leave:PFV-AOR
'Father let his son not to do the morning prayers.'

(37) *adaj-ni urši zul kak b-iq'-es*
father-ERG boy in.the.morning pray N-do:IPFV-INF
ħa-q-ib.
NEG-M.leave:PFV-AOR
'Father did not let his son do the morning pray.'

The next pair of examples illustrates the same.

(38) *abaj-ni urši* ***ħa-q-ib*** *uškuj-ħe*
mother.OBL-ERG boy NEG-M.leave:PFV-AOR school.OBL-IN(LAT)
w-aš-es.
M-go:IPFV-INF
'Mother did not let her son go to school.'

(39) *abaj-ni urši w-aq-ib uškuj-ħe*
mother.OBL-ERG boy M-leave:PFV-AOR school.OBL-IN(LAT)
ħa-š-es.
NEG-M.go:IPFV-INF
'Mother let her son not to go to school.'

The examples above show the possibility of placing the negative prefix on either the causative or the effect predicate. On the other hand, it is considered ungrammatical to use the negative form of the infinitive of the verb dependent on *a?as* 'drive'. The verb CL-*aqas* 'leave' forms a looser connection with its predicate of effect and, thus, seems to be less grammaticalized than *a?as* 'drive'.

6 Double causative

Morphological and periphrastic causatives 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 (40a) and (40b), 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.

(40) a. *adaj-ni urši kung b-elčʼ-aq-es aʔ-ib.*
father-ERG boy book N-read:PFV-CAUS-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Father made his son read a book'

b. *adaj-ni urši kung b-elčʼ-es aʔ-ib.*
father-ERG boy book N-read:PFV-INF drive:PFV-AOR
'Father made his son read a book.'

Constructions with inanimate causees show the same effect.

(41) a. *anwal-li-ni inc b-erħ-es b-aq-ib.*
Anwar-OBL-ERG apple N-rotten:PFV-INF N-let:PFV-AOR
'Anwar let an apple rot.'

b. *anwal-li-ni inc b-erħ-aq-as b-aq-ib.*
Anwar-OBL-ERG apple N-rotten:PFV-CAUS-INF N-let:PFV-AOR
'Anwar let an apple rot.'

Examples (40) and (41) illustrate a double causative construction. Ageeva (2014: 10) points out that it is possible to build a double morphological causative by adding a second causative affix (cf. CL-*arʔaˤqaqib* 'freeze'). The meaning of the form remains the same, with no (clear) semantic change as compared to the (simple) morphological causative. Here, a similar phenomenon is observed in periphrasis. Constructions with double causative marking sound natural to native speakers and are produced spontaneously during elicitation. Consultants easily derive double analytic causatives from all analytic causatives discussed previously in the paper.

7 Conclusions

Periphrastic causative constructions co-exist in Mehweb with synthetic causatives. There is no difference in meaning between analytic and morphological markers. It does not matter what syntactic type the predicate of effect is; verbs

of all morphosyntactic classes are allowed. There are however some structural limitations on periphrastic causative formation.

There is a semantic division of labor between the causative predicates. Factitive causativization is expressed by means of the verb *a?as* 'drive'. The permissive meaning is expressed by CL-*aqas* 'leave'. Both predicates introduce an infinitive expressing the predicate of effect. In adjectival causativization, the CL-*aq'as* 'do' is used.

Cause predicates also show other differences. The verb *a?as* 'drive' only allows animate causees. The verb CL-*aqas* 'leave' also allows inanimate causees. In both factitive and permissive constructions, the negation marker may attach to the matrix predicate. However, the verb CL-*aqas* 'leave' also allows negation on the infinitive.

These differences are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of the causative predicates.

	causer		causee		negation	
	animate	inanimate	animate	inanimate	on the matrix predicate	on the dependent predicate
a?as 'drive:PFV'	+	+ (personification)	+	+ (rare)	+	
CL-*aqas* 'leave/let:PFV'	+		+	+	+	+

In terms of case assignment, arguments other than the causee behave identically with all morphosyntactic types of predicates. The causer is always marked with the ergative. Other arguments retain their original case marking. As to the causee, the intransitive causee keeps its original absolutive marking and the transitive causee is marked with the inter-lative. No causative construction seems to allow two ergative arguments, marking both the causee and the causer with the ergative. This is similar to what happens under morphological causativization. Morphological and analytic causativization, however, become different if one compares what happens to the causee of experiential predicates with originally non-canonical subjects. Under morphological causatives, the causee keeps its original peripheral case marking (dative or inter-lative, depending on the verb). In analytic causative constructions, however, it obligatorily changes to the absolutive.

Causative constructions in Mehweb may combine morphological and analytic causative strategy together. Apparently, the meaning of such constructions is not different from the usual causative construction with either a synthetic or an analytic causative alone. Double causatives seem to be semantically redundant.

The tests discussed in the paper reveal some divergences between the constructions under consideration. The results of the negation test show that the factitive causative construction, apparently, is more grammaticalized than the permissive causative. It is not possible to apply negation to the dependent verb form in constructions with the verb *a?as* 'drive', while CL-*aqas* 'leave' allows the negation either on the main verb or on the infinitive.

The negation test and agreement tests diverge. While the negation test in factitive causatives indicates a monoclausal structure, gender agreement indicates two separate clauses. Only negative constructions support grammaticalization of periphrastic causatives in Mehweb.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to all Mehweb consultants who agreed to help in this research. I also thank Nina Dobrushina, Michael Daniel, Dmitri Ganenkov, Denis Creissels and Samira Verhees.

List of abbreviations

AOR	aorist
ATR	attributivizer
AUX	auxiliary
CAUS	causative
CL	gender (class) agreement slot
CVB	converb
EMPH	emphasis (particle)
ERG	ergative
ESS	static location in a spatial domain
F1	feminine (unmarried and young women gender prefix)
GEN	genitive
HAB	habitual (durative for verbs denoting states)
HPL	human plural (gender agreement)
IN	spatial domain inside a (hollow) landmark
INF	infinitive

INTER	spatial domain between multiple landmarks
IPFT	imperfect
IPFV	imperfective (derivational base)
LAT	motion into a spatial domain
LV	light verb
M	masculine (gender agreement)
N	neuter (gender agreement)
NEG	negation (verbal prefix)
NPL	non-human plural (gender agreement)
OBL	oblique (nominal stem suffix)
PFV	perfective (derivational base)
PL	plural
PV	preverb (verbal prefix)
REPL	replicative (nominal case)
SUPER	spatial domain on the horizontal surface of the landmark

References

Ageeva, Ekaterina. 2014. Kauzativy v megebskom jazyke [Causatives in Mehweb]. In E. M. Devjatkina, D. S. Ganenkov, Ju. V. Mazurova, D. V. Makhovikov & A. B. Shluinskij (eds.), *Problemy jazyka: Sbornik naučnyx statej po materialam tret'ej konferencii-školy "Problemy jazyka: Vzgljad molodyx učenyx"*. Moscow: Institut jazykoznanija RAN.

Barylnikova, Daria. 2015. *Quasi-causative constructions in Mehweb*. Working papers by NRU HSE, series WP BRP "Linguistics" 26. HSE.

Chechuro, Ilya. 2015. *Nominal morphology of Mehweb Dargwa*. Working papers by NRU HSE, series WP BRP "Linguistics" 32. HSE.

Chechuro, Ilya. 2019. Nominal morphology of Mehweb. In Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina & Dmitry Ganenkov (eds.), *The Mehweb language: Essays on phonology, morphology and syntax*, 39–72. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Daniel, Michael. 2019. Mehweb verb morphology. In Michael Daniel, Nina Dobrushina & Dmitry Ganenkov (eds.), *The Mehweb language: Essays on phonology, morphology and syntax*, 73–115. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Harris, Alice C. & Lyle Campbell. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective* (Cambridge studies in linguistics 74). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kulikov, Leonid. 2001. Causatives. In Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook*, vol. 2, 886–898. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir & Viktor Litvinov. 1995. The St Petersburg/Leningrad Typology Group. In Masayoshi Shibatani & Theodora Bynon (eds.), *Approaches to language typology*, 215–271. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir & Georgij Silnitsky. 1973. The typology of morphological and lexical causatives. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Trends in Soviet theoretical linguistics*, 1–32. Dordrecht: Springer.

Song, Jae Jung. 2001. *Linguistic typology: Morphology and syntax*. Harlow: Longman.