

A ROLE OR REFERENCE DOMINATED LANGUAGE? (CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN KARTVELIAN)

Nina R. Sumbatova

Research Assistant

Institute of Oriental Studies

USSR, 103031 Moscow, Rozhdestvenka, 12

1. Introduction.

The opposition of reference vs. role dominated languages was primarily proposed by R. Van Valin and W. Foley (1980, 1984). A language is said to be role-dominated if oppositions of basic semantic roles are directly expressed in its surface structure. Otherwise the language turns out to be reference-dominated. To identify a language as a reference vs. role dominated one a number of tests including relativization, conjunction reduction, etc. can be used. In this paper I will argue that causativization may be viewed as an additional test of this kind. The paper is organized as follows: in the second section the application of the opposition of reference vs. role domination to the syntax of causative constructions is sketched; in the third and main section the syntax of causative constructions in Kartvelian is discussed: after a short summary of the causatives in Georgian, case-marking patterns of causative verbs in Svan are presented. In the last section the data of Svan are given an interpretation in terms of Role and Reference Grammar.

2. Role vs. reference domination in causativization.

Causativization has often been described as a kind of verbal derivation which consists in embedding the "original" clause in the position of the second argument of the predicate CAUS, the first argument of CAUS being a NP referring to as **causer**. Case-marking of the causative verb is therefore presented as determined by that of the original non-causative verb.

One of the most popular and explanatory theories claiming to formulate universal rules of causative derivation was proposed by B. Comrie (1976). Comrie's hypothesis, based on a hierarchy of syntactic positions (the Case Hierarchy: subject < direct object < indirect object < oblique objects), claims that "in the most

typical case, the embedded subject is demoted stepwise down the hierarchy until it can slip into an empty position. Thus, the embedded subject of the causative of an intransitive verb always turns up as a direct object, that of the causative of a transitive verb with much greater than chance frequency as an indirect object, while the subject of the causative of a transitive verb with an indirect object often turns up as one of the other oblique constituents" (Comrie 1976: 306). See the following examples from Soyot belonging to the Turkic language family (these examples as well as the data of the Lentekh dialect of Svan are kindly presented by L. I. Kulikov):

- (1) *ool dongan*
 boy: NOM freeze: PAST
 "The boy froze"
- > *ašak ool-du don-ur-gan*
 old man: NOM boy-ACC freeze-CAUS-PAST
 "The old man made the boy(DO) freeze"
- (2) *ašak ool-du etteen*
 old man: NOM boy-ACC hit: PAST
 "The old man hit the boy"
- > *Bajyr ašak-ka ool-du ette-t-ken*
 Bajyr: NOM old man-DAT boy-ACC hit-CAUS-PAST
 "Bajyr made the old man hit the boy"
- (3) *Bajyr Saryg-ool-ga bižek-ti bergen*
 Bajyr: NOM Saryg-ool-DAT knife-ACC give: PAST
 "Bajyr gave Saryg-ool a knife"
- > *ašak Bajyr-dan Saryg-ool-ga bižek-ti ber-gis-ken*
 old man: NOM Bajyr-ABL Saryg-ool-DAT knife-ACC
 give-CAUS-PAST
 "The old man made Bajyr give a knife to Saryg-ool"
- Comrie's rule (sometimes with certain modifications) adequately describes the syntactic process of causativization in a large number of languages including Romance, Turkic, Finno-Ugric, etc. Below the languages of this group are referred to as "Comrie's languages".

But there exists another group of languages where case-marking in causative constructions may be determined by the semantic type of causation (direct/indirect, volitional / non-volitional, permissive/factitive, etc.) as in Kannada:

- (4) *Nānu snānavannu mādide*
 I bath: ACC do: PAST
 'I bathed'
- (5) *Avanu nanage snānavannu mādisidam*
 He me: DAT bath: ACC do: CAUS. PAST
 'He bathed me'

- (6) *Avanu nanninda snānavannu māḍisidam*
 He me: INSTR bath: ACC do: CAUS. PAST
 'He caused me to bathe'

(Cole 1983: 120-121)

The examples above clearly demonstrate that the case-marking in causative constructions is "split" according to the semantics of causation: dative affix is used when the causee is viewed as nonagentive while instrumental case indicates a higher degree of agentivity.

Similar examples may be drawn from many other languages (Quechua, Kannada and other Dravidian, Hebrew, Japanese, etc., see Cole 1983); semantic types of causation opposed in a particular language may be considerably different, but it seems to be true that in this group of languages (which I shall call "Cole's languages") it is always semantic role of the causee that determines its case-marking in the causative sentence.

As far as I know, all attempts to spread a universal theory over both types of causative constructions mentioned above have failed at least up to now, and this is because the factors determining syntactical properties of causative constructions in these groups of languages are principally different: in the case of Comrie's languages case-marking of the causee is determined by the valency (roughly speaking, by transitivity/ intransitivity) of the verb the causative is derived from; for Cole's languages, it depends on the causee's semantic role (agentivity) in causative situation. It seems to be evident that there is an engaging parallelism between the opposition of two major types of causative constructions and the opposition of reference vs. role domination: Cole's languages tend to code the semantic role of at least one argument of the causative verb (the causee) directly in their surface structure, so they show an evidence for role domination. It is clear that the languages of this group may differ as to whether semantic roles of arguments other than the causee are expressed overtly; as to the size and productivity of the group of verbs with variable case-marking; as to the number and membership of semantic roles opposed in causative constructions, etc. That means that role vs. reference domination of even a particular type of syntactic constructions is a scale rather than a binary opposition.

3. Causative constructions in Kartvelian.

3.1. Georgian

As to causative constructions in Georgian, there exists already a tradition of analysing them in terms of relational grammar (Harris 1981). The causativization in Georgian places the original subject of an intransitive in the syntactic position of a direct object, while the subject of a transitive goes into the position of a dative object (see Gecadze, Nedjalkov, and Xolodovič 1969; Comrie 1976).

The process of causativization in Georgian follows Comrie's hypothesis with the only violation concerning bitransitives: the "initial" subject of a bitransitive verb does not become an oblique NP as predicted by Comrie's rule, but usurps the occupied position of the indirect (dative) object causing the original indirect object being demoted to the status of an oblique NP (marked by the postposition *tvis* "for"), cf. Gecadze, Nedjalkov, and Xolodovič 1969: 146.

Nevertheless, case-marking in Georgian causative constructions is adequately explained in terms of syntactic relations. The same applies to a part of Svan dialects, see examples (7), (8), (9) from Lentekh:

- (7) *mare-d žangan*
 man:ERG stand up: AOR
 "The man stood up"
- > *eže-m žanagene mare*
 he-ERG stand up: CAUS: AOR man: NOM
 "He made the man(DO) stand up"
- (8) *dena-d čwak'är k'or*
 girl-ERG open: AOR door: NOM
 "The girl opened the door"
- > *dede-d katak'ärne dena-s k'or*
 mother-ERG open: CAUS: AOR girl-DAT door: NOM
 "The mother made the girl(IO) open the door"
- (9) *dena-d kalaxwem mare-s diar*
 girl-ERG give: AOR man-DAT bread: NOM
 "The girl gave bread to the man"
- > *eže-m kalaxawodnune dena-s diar mare-š-t'*
 he-ERG give: CAUS: AOR girl-DAT bread: NOM man-GEN-for
 "He caused the girl(IO) to give bread to the man"

Both Georgian and the Lentekh dialect of Svan do not show any evidence for role domination in the syntax of causative constructions.

3.2. Svan

In this section the data on causative constructions in the Upper-Bal dialect of Svan are