Salience of subevents and participants in Adyghe causative constructions
Alexander Letuchiy

Adyghe, a language of the West Caucasian family, has a grammaticalized causative derivation, just as many other Caucasian languages (see Nichols et al. 2004 where Caucasian languages are proved to be transitivizing languages). In Adyghe, causative is expressed with the causative prefix *ʁe-* which occupies the slot immediately preceding the verbal root (or the marker of negation *mə-* if there is one).

Causativization in Adyghe follows the rule formulated by Comrie (1976): the causer occupies the subject position, the initial subject (causee) occupies the highest vacant position, the marking of all other arguments does not change. It means that in causatives of transitive verbs, the causee occupies the indirect object position (and the IO morphological slot in the verb form) and is marked with the ergative (in other terms, oblique) case ending *-m*. The initial object retains its absolutive marking (*-r*). The agent slot is occupied by the new agent (causer)

However, there is a difference between Adyghe and many other languages where causative is grammaticalized. Though, according to Kulikov & Sumbatova (1993), in many of these languages the caused situation is more salient than the causing one (causation), in Adyghe the degree of salience of the caused situation and the causee, too, is even higher than in most languages, which is reflected in their privileged syntactic status. In the paper we propose some tests proving the high salience and syntactic status of the caused situation and the causee.

High salience of the causee
1. reciprocalization

In Adyghe, according to Rogava, Keraševa (1966), there are two reciprocal markers: *zere-* and *ze- / zə-*. The former is used to mark reciprocity between A (ergative agent of transitive verbs) and DO (absolutive object of transitive verbs), while the latter is employed for all the other cases.

An exception is represented by causative constructions of transitive verbs. Though the causee, as I have said, becomes an indirect object marking with *-m*, reciprocity between the causer (A) and the causee (IO) is marked with *zere-*, though in non-causative verbs, the A=IO co-reference is marked with *ze- / zə-*:

(1)   ʔ̫efŝaḳ̫e-xe-m   čəg̫ə-r   ja-zere-ʁe-pχə
        worker-PL-ERG   field-ABS   3PL.IO-REC-CAUS-plough
        'The workers make each other plough the field'.

This allows us to propose that the causee, though marked as an indirect object, is more salient than an indirect object: it rather has the properties of a privileged argument, such as A and DO of transitive verbs.

2. constructions with phasal verbs

Normally, in Adyghe constructions with phasal verbs the agent of the phasal verbs must be co-referent to the A of embedded transitive verbs or S of embedded intransitive verbs, as in most European and Caucasian languages (cf. *I began to lead you*).

However, this rule can be violated in causative constructions. The agent of the phasal verb can be co-referent not to the causer (the agent) of the causative verb, but also to the causee (indirect object) – this variant is rare, though possible, in the Abzakh dialect (3), and frequent in the Shapsug dialect (4):

(3)   sjate   meʔerəse-xe-r   qə-s-jə-ʁe-šəpə-n-ew
        1SG.father   apple-PL-ABS   DIR-1SG.IO-3SG.AG-CAUS-gather-MSD-CONV

        je-z-ʁe-ž'a-ʁ
        3SG.IO-1SG.AG-CAUS-begin-PAST
        'I began to gather apples, because my father makes me'.

In (3), the agent of the inchoative verb is **I,** whereas the agent (the causee) of the embedded clause is **father**.

 This fact also allows us to propose that the causee in causatives of transitive verbs has some properties of a privileged argument, similar to the subject / agent argument.

High salience of the caused situation
1. causative marker + lexical causative
First of all, the causative marker and a causative verb (lexical causative) can be combined in the same clause. The meaning is far from being compositional:

(4) se   č'ale-r   je-z-ʁe-zə-ʁ   məʔerəse
     I   boy-ABS   3SG.IO-1SG.AG-CAUS-make-PAST   apple

     q-je-z-ʁe-wəʁ_wejən-ew.
     DIR-3SG.IO-1SG.AG-CAUS-gather-CONV
        'I made the boy gather apples' (the causative verb is finite).

(4) literally means 'I made the boy me to make him gather apples'. However, the real meaning of the sentence is just 'I made the boy gather apples'. This points (though it is only a hypothesis) that in the morphological causative, the causation can be less pragmatically salient than the caused situation. To make the causation more salient, the lexical causative is used – in this case the construction bears no meaning of 'double causation', the causative verb only emphasizes the causation and makes it more salient.

2. omission of the second causative marker
We find another typologically peculiar phenomenon in Adyghe: in double causative forms, one of the causative markers can be omitted. For instance, in (5), either one or two causative prefixes can be present, though semantically, the form bears the double causative meaning (-*čan*- 'sharp' → 'sharpen' → 'make sharpen'):

(5) se   s-jə-thamate ŝež'əje-r   Ø-s-jə-ʁe-(ʁe)-čan-əʁ.
     I   1SG-POSS-boss   knife-ABS   3SG.S/O-1SG.IO-3SG.AG-CAUS-sharp-PERF.
        'My boss made me sharpen the knife'.

However, when the causer is focused (for instance, in constructions like 'It was his boss who made the worker sharpen the knife'), the omission does not take place. This allows us to conclude that without a focus, when the omission takes place, the causer and the causing situation are not highly salient – which is reflected in the omission of one of the causative markers denoting the 'second' causing situation ('make sharpen' in (5)).[1]

Thus, different criteria allow us to propose that the caused situation and the causee are more (or at least not less) salient and syntactically privileged than the causer and the causing situation (causation), though morphologically it is the causer which occupies the morphological slot of the agent in the verb form. In my paper I will discuss this fact and its typological parallels.

References

Comrie, Bernard. The Syntax of Causative Constructions: Cross-Language Similarities and Divergences. In Shibatani M. (ed.), *The grammar of causative constructions (Syntax and Semantics 6).* New York: Academic Press, 1976, 261-312.

Kulikov, Leonid I., and Nina R. Sumbatova. 1993. Through the looking-glass, and how causatives look there. In Comrie B. & Polinsky M. (eds.), *Causatives and Transitivity (Studies in Language Companion Series 23)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 327-342.

Nichols, Johanna, David A. Peterson and Jonathan Barnes. 2004. Transitivizing and detransitivizing languages. *Linguistic Typology* 8, 149-211.

Rogava, Georgi V., and Zejnab I. Keraševa. 1966. *Grammatika adygejskogo jazyka*. Krasnodar & Majkop: Adygejskoje knižnoe izdatel'stvo.

---

[1] I do not analyze here the interpretation of temporal modifiers – however, they also prove that the caused situation is more salient than the causation. For instance, modifiers like *njepe* 'today' are obligatorily interpreted as taking the caused situation into their scope, but do not always include there the causation.