Coding Conflict or Semantic Contrast? : The Grammatical Encoding of the Causee[1]

Jaehoon Yeon (SOAS)

0. Introduction

One of many issues in which typological linguists have been interested is the grammatical encoding of the causee in causative constructions (Comrie (1975, 1976, 1981/1989), Shibatani (1976), J. Song (1991, 1995, 1996, 2001), Kozinsky and Polinsky (1993), Polinsky (1994), among others). In this paper, we will investigate the morphological encoding of the causee and critically review Comrie's hierarchy account with reference to Korean data. It will be observed that there is a consistent cross-linguistic correlation between alternative case marking and semantic difference. Consequently we will take semantics into consideration in the cross-linguistic study of grammatical encoding of the causee. Finally, we will propose the case hierarchy in the Korean causative construction 'accusative > dative > oblique > nominative', expressing the degree of control exercised by the causee from the lowest to highest.

1. Comrie's Hierarchy

In his seminal articles, Comrie (1975, 1976) tried to determine the cross-linguistic patterns in the grammatical encoding of the causee NP, or the grammatical relation which the causee NP assumes in the causative construction.

On the other hand, Keenan and Comrie (1977) propose an Accessibility Hierarchy on the basis of the relative accessibility of different grammatical relations to relative clause forming strategies. The gist of their observation is as follows: In some languages relative clauses can be formed only on subject NPs. Other languages allow relative clauses to be formed only on subject NPs and direct object NPs. In yet other languages, subject, direct object and indirect object NPs can all be relativized. Based on this kind of cross-linguistic observation, they set up a hierarchy of grammatical relations of the following form:

---

(1) Hierarchy of grammatical relations

Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique > Genitive > Object of Comparison (> = "more accessible than")

This hierarchy predicts that, if a language can form relative clauses on a given position, then it can also form relative clauses on all positions higher (to the left) on the hierarchy.

Comrie (1981/1989: Ch.8) extends this hierarchy to the encoding of the causee in causative constructions, proposing that the grammatical relation which the causee NP will assume in causative constructions can be predicted by reference to a hierarchy of grammatical relations in (2):

(2) Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique object

His theory runs as follows: the causee occupies the highest (leftmost) position on this hierarchy that is not already filled. Comrie cites Turkish as a language that conforms strictly to this hierarchy. He called it 'paradigm case'.

2. Syntactic account of the grammatical encoding of the causee

The grammatical encoding of the causee in Korean, at first sight, seems to be consistent with Comrie's analysis. In cases where the non-causative verb is intransitive, and in the corresponding causative the subject slot is already occupied by the causer, then the causee appears as a direct object in the accusative as in (3).

(3) a. Mary-ka   cwuk - ess - ta.
        Nom   die -Past-Dec
     "Mary died."

   b. John-i   Mary-lul   cwuk - i - ess - ta.
        Nom   Acc   die -Caus-Past-Dec
     "John killed Mary."

Where the non-causative verb is transitive, the causee appears as an indirect object in the dative as in (4):

(4) a. ai - ka   yak - ul   mek - ess - ta.

child-Nom medicine-Acc eat –Past-Dec

"The child took the medicine."

b. emma - ka   ai - eykey   yak - ul   mek - i - ess - ta.

mother-Nom child-Dat medicine-Acc   eat-Caus-Past-Dec

"The mother made the child take the medicine."

Where the non-causative verb already has an indirect object, the causee appears as an oblique object with the complex particle *-lo hayekum* as in (5).

(5) a. Mary-ka   Tom-eykey   ton - ul   cwu - ess - ta.

　　　　　Nom　　　Dat money-Acc give-Past-Dec

"Mary gave the money to Tom."

b. John-i   Mary-lo hayekum   Tom-eykey   ton-ul

　　Nom　　　　Causee　　　　Dat　money-Acc

cwu - key ha - ess - ta[2].

give - Caus - Past - Dec

"John made Mary give the money to Tom."

However, there are many languages that do not conform to this hierarchy. Firstly, according to Comrie (1975, 1976), there are many languages in which the causee NP argument can be marked as an oblique phrase when the case hierarchy predicts that it will be marked as an indirect object. Sanskrit allows both of these possibilities, and Hindi only the latter:

(6) Sanskrit (J. J. Song 1991)

bh<u>u</u>pyam/ bhupyena   katam   k<u>a</u>rayati

servant (IO/Inst)   mat (DO)   prepare-Caus

"He makes the servant prepare the mat."

(7) Hindi (Saksena 1980: 813)

---

[2] This is not a morphological causative. There are no morphological causatives with three arguments in Korean. However, we cite this periphrastic/quasi-morphological causative for the convenience of comparison. It could be argued that Korean periphrastic causatives are monoclausal. This is demonstrated by the fact that the notional verb and *ha-* cannot be separated by any elements (for detailed analysis see Gerdts 1990: 205-212). As far as the complex particle *-lo hayekum* is concerned, it is not a case marker in any way. However, we can regard it as a sort of oblique object marker denoting the causee in a causative sentence. According to Choi (2002: 405), the proportion of usage of this causee marker is 23.9% in transitive causative constructions in Korean corpus data.

mai-nee   raam-see/*koo   peer   kat-aa-yaa.
   I-Agt   Ram-Inst/*Dat   tree   cut-Caus-Past
"I made Ram cut the tree."

Given the case hierarchy account, causees like those in (6) and (7) should have the dative marker, since no other Indirect Object exists in those sentences: however these causees are marked as instrumental. Comrie (1975, 1976) refers to this type of deviation as 'extended demotion'.

     Comrie also notes that it is possible for languages to allow doubling on certain syntactic positions or grammatical relations. This means that instead of taking up the grammatical relation predicted by the case hierarchy, the causee can have the same position as the other (original) argument. According to Comrie (1975), Punjabi and French allow doubling on IO. There are also languages that allow doubling on the DO position. Latin, Southern Lappish, Arabic and Evenki are some of the direct object doubling languages. Korean is another example of doubling on DO. But Japanese is a good example of a language with a strict prohibition against two surface DOs.

     To take just one special case of doubling, Wappo (a Yukian language of Northern California) is a clear example of doubling on the accusative case (Li and Thompson 1977). The causee in the morphological causative in Wappo always appears in the accusative no matter how many arguments the causativized verb takes or what cases they are in. The (a) and (b) examples in each pair in (8) – (10) are the simple and causative constructions of a 1-argument, a 2-argument, and a 3-argument verb, respectively (note that the accusative case has no overt case marking).

(8) a. ce pole?-i   ?olol-ta?
     the boy-Sbj dance-Past
     "The boy danced."

  b. ce kew-i   ce pole?   ?olol-is-ta?
     the man-Sbj the boy   dance-Caus-Past
     "The man made the boy dance."

(9) a. ce pole?-i luce   po?-ta?
     the boy-Sbj cigarette smoke-Past

"The boy smoked a cigarette."

   b. ce kew-i   ce pole? luce   po?-is-ta?
    the man-Sbj the boy   cigarette smoke-Caus-Past
   "The man made the boy smoke a cigarette."

(10) a. ce pole?-i   ce mete-thu   taka? mahes-ta?
    the boy-Sbj the woman-Dat basket give-Past
   "The boy gave the basket to the woman."

   b. ce kew-i ce pole? ce mete-thu taka? mahes-is-ta?
    the man-Sbj the boy   the woman-Dat basket give-Caus-Past
   "The man made the boy give the basket to the woman."

In each (b) sentence the causee *pole?* 'boy' appears in its unmarked (i.e., accusative) form.

     Korean also allows doubling in morphological causatives. It should be noted that Korean permits two direct objects in non-causative constructions such as (11):

(11) a. John-i Mary-lul   son-ul   cap-ass-ta.
        Nom   Acc hand-Acc catch-Past-Dec
   "John caught Mary by the hand."

   b. kay-ka   thokki-lul   tali-lul   mul-ess-ta.
    dog-Nom rabbit-Acc   leg-Acc bite-Past-Dec
   "The dog bit the rabbit in the leg."

This construction has been known as 'possessor-ascension' construction. In Korean the possessor NP can be promoted to the status of direct object marked with the accusative, while the possessed NP still remains marked with the accusative. As a result, we can have 'double-accusative' constructions. Following Palmer (1994), we may call the first accusative-marked NP 'primary object' and the second accusative-marked NP 'secondary object'. Yeon (2003) propose that the concepts of 'affectedness' and 'contiguity' are the most important factors to determine the acceptability of Possessor-ascension constructions in Korean[3].

---

[3] See Yeon (1999, 2003) for the constraints that allow possessor-ascension in Korean.

Similarly, we would also expect it to permit doubling on the DO position[4] in Korean causative constructions, and this is indeed the case:

(12) emma-ka   ai-lul   yak-ul   mek - i - ess - ta. (cf. (4b))
     Mother-Nom child-Acc medicine-Acc   eat-Caus-Past-Dec
     "The mother made the child take the medicine."

It is also possible for Korean to allow doubling on the IO position in quasi-morphological causatives.

(13) John-i Mary-eykey Tom-eykey ton-ul   cwu-key ha-ess-ta[5]. (cf. (5b))
                 Dat   Dat   money-Acc   give - Caus - Past - Dec
     "John made Mary give the money to Tom."

In case of doubling on DO in (12), the causee NP is marked with the accusative and we have doubling on DO. The question is what the grammatical relation of the causee assumes in this case. The possibilities are as follows:

   (i)   both NPs are direct objects
   (ii)   the causee is the direct object, and the original object of the basic verb is not a direct object
   (iii) the original object of the basic verb is the direct object, and the causee is not a direct object

If (i) is the case, it contradicts with Comrie's Hierarchy of grammatical relations represented in (2), as it is doubling on grammatical relations. However, if (ii) or (iii) is the case, it does not contradict with Comrie's Hierarchy as it is not doubling on grammatical relations, but a doubling on case marking or coding feature.

3. Coding conflict or doubling on grammatical relations?

Comrie (1976:276-7) seems to try to justify the notion that doubling is not in itself a counterexample to his hierarchy account in predicting the case of the causee NP. However, we have to ask why doubling is allowed in the first place. What is it

---

[4] What we mean by 'DO position' refers to an NP marked with the accusative marker. What kind of grammatical relation is assumed by this accusative marked NP will be discussed later in due course.
[5] One anonymous reviewer pointed out that (13) was not completely natural to him/her. I think that the oddness is caused from the repetition of the identical 'Dat' marker '-eykey'. If we had replaced one of them with '-hanthey', this would have sounded much natural than (13). '-hanthey' is a more colloquial variant that has the same meaning and function with '-eykey'.

that motivates doubling in causative constructions? Is doubling only allowed in causative constructions or in ordinary non-causative constructions as well? In this connection it is worthwhile to consider Song's (1991: 85) criticism that Comrie has changed his view on doubling over the years[6].

On the other hand, Kozinsky and Polinsky (1993) has defended Comrie's position and renounced the idea of doubling on direct objects in causative constructions. The gist of their argument is that, although they are both marked or coded as direct object/accusative, the real direct object is only one, not both. In other words, either the causee NP or the direct object NP of the basic verb may behave syntactically like a genuine direct object NP.

They argue that, although in Korean quasi-morphological causatives both the causee NP and the direct object NP of the basic verb appear in accusative case, it is only the causee NP that is syntactically a direct object NP, with the direct object NP of the basic verb being an oblique NP.

In short, they conclude that the causative construction in Korean has the following structure as in (14):

(14) ku salam-i   apeci-lul   acessi-lul   ttayli-key hay-ess-ta.
    the man-Nom father-Acc uncle-Acc   hit-Caus-Past-Dec
      Causer   causee   patient
       TS[7]   DO   non-term
    "The man caused my father to hit my uncle."

They claimed that both 'apeci' and 'acessi' appear in the accusative, but only the causee NP 'apeci' is syntactically a DO. Their arguments are based on syntactic tests to determine the direct objecthood. The problem, however, is that the proposed syntactic tests are unreliable.

Kozinsky & Polinsky (hereafter K & P) claim that the following properties are specifically relevant to distinguish the direct object from others. In clauses that contain subject and direct object only, direct object has at least the following diagnostic properties (Kozinsky & Polinsky 1993: 185-187).

---

[6] Song's (1991: 85) criticism runs as follows: "he (1975:25) rejects the simplex underlying hypothesis on the evidence of some languages that may allow doubling only in causative constructions. In a later work he (1976:277) in fact acknowledges that there is a strong tendency in languages toward an exact parallel in doubling between causatives and non-causatives, but claims that it is only a tendency, not an absolute. And finally, he (1981:171) admits that indeed doubling in causatives parallels doubling in non-causatives, when he says: 'It turns out, however, that nearly all languages allowing this possibility [i.e. doubling] in causative constructions are languages that otherwise allow clauses to have two accusative objects.' This means that there is no difference between causative constructions and ordinary non-causative constructions at all in terms of doubling on the direct object."

[7] 'TS' stands for 'transitive subject'.

(i) Control of the resumptive element across the *twuy*-clause: The resumptive element such as *ku* 'that', *ku namca* 'that man', *ku yeca* 'that woman', *ku kes* 'that thing' is interpreted as referring to a direct object in the following clauses.

(15) (K & P's example 11)

ku haksayng$_i$-i   iut$_j$-ul   ttayli-n-twuy ku$_j$ / ku namca$_j$-ka   ttena-ss-ta.
the student-Nom neighbor-Acc hit-Rel-after PRO/the man-Nom leave-Past-Dec
 "The student hit the neighbour and the neighbour left."

However, the resumptive element seems to refer to the subject according to my intuition. At least, the resumptive element can be interpreted as referring to either subject or direct object. The control of the resumptive element seems to be determined pragmatically rather than syntactically. Consider the following example:

(16) John-i   Tom-ul   manna-n-twuy,   ku-ka   ttena-ss-ta.
      Nom   Acc meet-Rel-after, PRO-Nom leave-Past-Dec
      "John met Tom and he heft."

In (16), the resumptive element *ku* is interpreted as referring to John at first hearing without any specific context. It can also be interpreted as referring to Tom if the context is established. The control of resumptive pronoun is potentially ambiguous, and the coreference is determined by the knowledge of the world or pragmatics not by syntax. Pragmatics or the world knowledge seems to play more crucial role in the second diagnostic test they proposed. Now let us move on to K & P's second diagnostic test of direct object property.

(ii) Control of the null copy and resumptive pronoun across the *se*-clause:

(17) (K & P's ex. 12)

       a. ku salam$_i$-i   iut$_j$-ul   ttayli-e-se   [ ]$_{j/*i}$ ttena-ss-ta.
          the man-Nom neighbor-Acc hit-Conn-Causal   leave-Past-Dec
       "The man hit the neighbor and the neighbor left."

       b. ku salam$_i$-i   iut$_j$-ul ttayli-e-se ku$_{j/*i}$-ka ttena-ss-ta.
                                          PRO
       "The man hit the neighbor and the neighbor left."

K & P claim that the control of PRO is determined by DOs. Therefore, in (17b) the PRO is controlled by the DO, not by the transitive subject. The coreference pattern observed in (17b) is claimed to be syntactic, not pragmatic. However, as J. Song (1995:217) rightly points out, in the following example, the PRO is controlled by the transitive subject, not by the DO.

(18) ku salam$_i$-i   iut$_j$-ul   salangha-e-se
     the man-Nom neighbor-Acc   love-Conn-Causal
           [   ]$_{i/*j}$ ku il-ul   cacinhayse   ha-ess-ta.
              the work-Acc voluntarily   do-Past-Dec
"The man loved his neighbour and he voluntarily did the work."

The most plausible interpretation is that those who love others are very likely to do voluntary work. Therefore, the coreference here is determined by the knowledge of the world. Furthermore, observe which argument of the first clause controls the PRO or the resumptive elements in the following example. In this example, we have changed the verb of the second clause used in K & P's examples:

(19) a. ku salam$_i$-i   iut$_j$-ul   ttayli-e-se   [   ] $_{i/*j}$ kamok-ey   ka-ass-ta.
      The man-Nom neighbour-Acc hit-Conn-Causal   prison-Loc   go-Past-Dec
     "The man hit the neighbour and he went to prison."

The controller in (19) is the subject, not the direct object. Clearly, it is part of our pragmatic knowledge of the world that those who hit others, not those who were hit, go to prison. It seems that the coreference phenomenon in Korean is not so straightforward as K & P claim. Thus, K&P's diagnostic tests for DO are highly questionable. We cannot think of the control phenomenon for DO (in Korean) without paying attention to pragmatics. More examples and counter-examples regarding Kozinsky and Polinsky's claims could be discussed, but we will not go into the detail for the limitation of space (see Song (1995) for more discussion).

      K & P's conclusion that there is no doubling on direct object in Korean causatives is not reliable because their arguments on syntactic tests for object-hood

are not acceptable[8]. Despite unreliable arguments and data, K & P's research draws attention to the important distinction between case marking and grammatical relation: identical case marking or coding may not necessarily be paralleled by 'doubling of grammatical relations'. The distinction between case marking and grammatical relation should be maintained whenever possible. Yeon (2003) has also advocated the position that grammatical relations are determined not by morphological marking but by syntactic criteria, although there is a great deal of correspondence between grammatical relations and morphological marking. For example, the grammatical relation 'subject' can be identified in Korean by syntactic rules such as reflexivisation, conjunction reduction and subject honorification[9].

In addition to evidences presented against Comrie's paradigm case, Korean causatives provide a counter-example to Comrie's hierarchy generalization. In Korean, there are cases where the doubling is obligatory. According to Comrie, when we causativize sentence (20a), we expect the causee to appear in the dative case, because the DO position is already occupied in the corresponding non-causative sentence. However, the doubling on the DO position is obligatory, as in (20b), while the expected sentence (20c) is unacceptable.

(20) a. ai - ka   os- ul   pes - ess - ta.
     child-Nom clothes-Acc take off-Past-Dec
       "The child took off his clothes."

   b. emeni-ka   ai - lul   os - ul   pes - ki - ess - ta.
    mother-Nom child-Acc clothes-Acc take off-Caus-Past-Dec
      "The mother undressed her child."

   c.*emeni-ka   ai -eykey   os-ul   pes - ki - ess - ta.
          Nom   Dat   Acc take off-Caus-Past-Dec
      "The mother undressed her child."

---

[8] Perhaps the most common and useful test for identifying objects is passivisation. Only the direct object can be made the subject of a passive sentence in Korean. However, Korean passivisation, unlike English passives, cannot be applied to all transitive constructions, and it is not applicable to quasi-morphological causatives that K & P have discussed. At the moment, apart from the passivisation process, it is difficult to find a syntactic test in Korean that distinguishes the direct object from other grammatical relations. Given this situation, it seems that there is no positive evidence to deny the existence of doubling on DO position in Korean.

[9] See Yeon (2003) for identifying subject-hood in the so-called dative-subject constructions.

Interestingly, we can find a similar example in German (Nedyalkov & Silnitsky 1973):

(21) Er liess seinen Sohn/*von seinem Sohn die Jacke ausziehen.

    he let/had his son *by his son the jacket take off

    "He let/had his son take off his jacket."

In German, like Korean, it is obligatory to have doubling on the direct object position whereas it is unacceptable for the causee to appear as the oblique object.

    Finally, Comrie (1981:171) makes the important observation that doubling occurs freely on oblique positions, with some restrictions on IO, and more restrictions on DO, while doubling on subjects is "unknown" in causative constructions. This claim is based on a strong universal tendency that most languages do not permit two subjects in a single clause. We may note that Korean analytic causatives permit subject doubling as in (22), in which both causer and causee take the nominative marker.

(22) a. Tom - i ka - ass - ta.

        Nom go-Past-Dec

    "Tom went."

   b. John - i Tom - i ka - key ha - ess - ta.

        Nom Nom go - Caus -Past - Dec

    "John caused Tom to go."

It is disputable whether Korean analytic causatives are mono-clausal or bi-clausal[10]. For those who argued that Korean analytic causatives are monoclausal (for detailed analysis see Gerdts (1990: 205-212))[11], Korean analytic causatives permitting two

---

[10] With regard to their mono- or biclausal interpretation, Korean analytical causatives have been discussed in the literature like Gerdts (1990), O'Grady (1991: 171-196).

[11] One of Gerdts's (1990) arguments is that the notional verb and 'ha-' cannot be separated by any elements with clausal scope. Consider the following example:

(a) emeni-ka ai-eykey chayk-ul ilk-key *ecey ha-ess-ta.

   mother-Nom child-Dat book-Acc read-Caus yesterday do-Past-Dec

   "The mother made the child yesterday read the book."

(b) emeni-ka ai-eykey chayk-ul ilk-key *ani ha-ess-ta.

   mother-Nom child-Dat book-Acc read-Caus Neg do-Past-Dec

(c) emeni-ka ai-eykey chayk-ul ani ilk-key ha-ess-ta.

nominatives may be a counterexample to Comrie (1981:171)'s observation. Our position, however, as implied in Yeon (2003: Ch. 4) on the difference between morphological causatives and analytic causatives, is that the Korean analytic causative has a biclausal structure. Thus, we do not regard this as a true counter-example against Comrie.

Most importantly, perhaps, Comrie's hierarchy account fails to explain why, on some causees, case markings are used contrastively. For example, in Hindi, some verbs allow their causees to be marked by either the dative/accusative case marker -*koo* or by the instrumental case marker -*see* (Saksena 1980):

(23) a. mai-nee   raam-see/koo   kitaab   parh-vaa-ii
         I- Agt   Ram-Inst/Dat(Acc) book   read-Caus-Past
      "I had Ram read the book."

   b. mai-nee   raam-koo/see   masaalaa   cakh-vaa-yaa.
       I- Agt   Ram-Dat(Acc)/Inst   spice   taste-Caus-Past
     "I had Ram taste the seasoning."

This contrast in case marking indicates a semantic contrast. According to Saksena (1980:816), when the causee is marked by -*koo* as in (23a), the aim is to get the causee to read the book. When the causee is marked by -*see*, the aim is to get the book read, and the causee is merely an instrument towards that end. Similarly, when the causee of (23b) is marked by -*koo*, the tasting is for his benefit; but when it is marked by -*see*, the tasting is for someone else's benefit.

Comrie's hierarchy of grammatical relations is based on a purely syntactic perspective without considering the semantic function of the case markers. In general, however, there are possible semantic differences between different case markers. If there is a consistent cross-linguistic correlation between alternative markings and different meanings, we should ensure that semantics must play a role in the cross-linguistic study of causative constructions. Having observed this semantic contrast, Comrie (1981/1989) himself also proposed a case hierarchy: instrumental > dative > accusative, as a semantic analysis representing the degree of control exercised by the causee from the greatest to the least. Although Comrie (1981/1989) admits this factor, but his position still favours syntactic account rather than semantic explanation.

---

    mother-Nom child-Dat book-Acc Neg read-Caus do-Past-Dec
     "The mother didn't make the child read the book."

However, as Song (1988: 122ff) remarks, we maintain that "ani" can be inserted between the notional verb and *ha-* in the causative construction.

In the following section, we will outline how a semantic approach to the grammatical encoding of the causee might proceed.

4. A Semantic approach to the grammatical encoding of the causee

One possible question that the functional-typological approach to grammar may pose is whether differences in degree of control find formal linguistic reflection in one or more languages, correlating with the conceptual differences that can be found, e.g., between conscious initiator and mindless initiator, etc. If we take an English sentence like "We fell to the ground", the following different circumstances may have obtained depending on the control exercised by the subject NP (Comrie 1981:53):

(24) a. We deliberately fell down. (full control)
     b. We fell owing to our carelessness. (potential control not exercised)
     c. We inadvertently succumbed to a hostile universe or were pushed. (no control)

In English, there is no grammatical indication of the degree of control exercised by the subject.

In some languages, however, it is possible to express this kind of distinction in certain constructions. For instance, in Bats, a North-Central Caucasian language spoken in the north of Georgia, there are two ways of expressing this situation (Comrie 1981:53):

(25) a. txo   naizdrax   kxitra[12].
        we-Abs to-the-ground   fell
        "We fell to the ground (unintentionally)"

   b. atxo   naizdrax   kxitra.
      we-Erg   to-the-ground   fell
      "We fell to the ground (intentionally)"

(a) has the intransitive subject in the absolute case, (b) in the ergative. The difference in case-marking depends on control, namely, the forms in (b) imply that the subject has more control over the event than it has in (a).

---

[12] English gloss and translations are based on Shibatani (1983:44).

The essential factor we wish to investigate here is the degree of control exercised by the causee in causative constructions. A closely related distinction in English can be seen in the following examples:

(26)   I made him fall.
        I had him fall.

The former implies that the causee fell in spite of himself, while the latter (like 'have' causatives in general) requires that the act of falling be under the causee's direct control (DeLancey 1984)[13].

There is a considerable number of cross-linguistic evidence in support of the case marking of the causee being determined by semantic and/or pragmatic factors relating to agency, control, affectedness between the causer and causee of the causative construction. In Japanese, for instance, there are two ways of encoding the causee.

(27) a. Taroo-ga   Ziroo-o   ik-aseta.
            Nom   Acc go-Caus
        "Taroo made (forced) Ziroo go."

    b. Taroo-ga   Ziroo-ni   ik-aseta.
            Nom   Dat/Inst go-Caus
        "Taroo got (persuaded) Ziroo to go."

In this example, while (a) assigns minimal control to Ziroo, (b) allows Ziroo to retain greater control. A similar distinction with the causative of a transitive verb is found in the following examples, with respect to the semantic contrast of control of the causee:

(28) Bolivian Quechua:
        a. nuqa   Fan-ta   rumi-ta   apa-ci-ni.
            I   Juan-Acc rock-Acc carry-Caus-1sg.
         "I made Juan carry the rock."

        b. nuqa   Fan-wan   rumi-ta   apa-ci-ni.
            I   Juan-Inst   rock-Acc carry-Caus-1sg.
         "I had Juan carry the rock."

---

[13] We admit that like most semantic distinctions, the distinction between volitionally and non-volitionally acting causee is a matter of degree rather than a dichotomy.

(29) Kannada:
  a. Avanu   nanage   bisketannu   tinnisidanu.
     he-Nom me-Dat   biscuit-Acc eat-Caus-Past
  "He fed me a biscuit."

  b. Avanu   nanninda   bisketannu   tinnisidanu.
     he-Nom me-Inst   biscuit-Acc eat-Caus-Past
  "He caused me to eat a biscuit."

(30) Hungarian:
  a. Köhögtettem   a   gyerek-et.
     I-caused-to cough   the boy-Acc
  "I made the boy cough."

  b. Köhögtettem   a   gyerek-kel.
     I-caused-to cough   the boy-Inst
  "I had the boy cough." (by asking him to do so)

In these examples, while (a) implies that the causee retains little or no control, (b) implies that the causer worked indirectly on the causee to get him to do something, for instance by persuading him without the use of force.

Cole (1983) has noted that a common morphosyntactic device for marking this distinction is an alternation of case marking on the causee NP, with volitionally-acting causees marked in ways suggesting some degree of causal force (typically with instrumental case) and non-volitional causees marked as patients (typically with accusative or dative case). In other words, the accusative, as the basic morphological encoding of the patient, typically refers to an entity with a very low degree of control. On the other hand, the instrumental (or whatever case is used for passive agents) is frequently used for an entity with a high degree of control. The dative, as the typical exponent of the experiencer or recipient roles, occupies an intermediate position. We can thus establish a hierarchy: instrumental > dative > accusative, in terms of the degree of control (from greatest to least) as schematized in (31).

(31) Instrumental > Dative > Accusative
  ←---------------------------------------→
   more agentive   more patient-like
   more control   less control

(less affected)　　　　　　(more affected)

This hierarchy of control or agency may be alternatively be interpreted to reflect the degree of affectedness of the causee.

The accusatively marked causee parallels other instances of accusative marking associated with the notion of total affectedness of objects. In the framework of causation, the "total affectedness" is realized in the sense of coercion and direct causation as well as total control over the causee. In causative expressions, the causee marked with accusative case is supposed to be totally affected by the causer, which means the causee has no control or less control over the action in comparison with the causee marked with dative or instrumental case[14].

It is not obvious that this hierarchy is applicable to Korean morphological causatives, because the causee in Korean morphological causatives does not seem to have any control or does have very little control if any. This is one way in which the Korean morphological causative verbs behave just like ordinary transitive verbs. However, we argue that there is a subtle difference between the accusative causee and the dative causee in morphological causatives when both cases are allowed, as in the following examples:

(32) a. emma-ka　　　ai-lul　　　os-ul　　　ip - hi - ess - ta
　　　 mother-Nom　 child-Acc cloth-Acc　put on-Caus-Past
　　　 "The mother dressed the child."
　 b. emma-ka　　　ai-eykey　os-ul　　 ip - hi - ess - ta
　　　 mother-Nom　 child-Dat　cloth-Acc　put on-Caus-Past
　　 "The mother got the child to dress."

Choi (1929/1977) claims that if there is any meaning difference between the accusative causee and dative causee, the former puts emphasis on the person, but the latter on the event. It seems plausible to interpret his observation as indicating that the patient status of the causee is emphasized more with the accusative case

---

[14] Incidentally, the correlation between (accusative-)case marking and affectedness may also be seen to provide support for the view claimed in Yeon (1993, 2003) that the marking for the wholly affected patient is the accusative and the marking for the partly affected patient is usually non-accusative (whether it is locative or dative).

16

than with the dative case. That is, less control is implied. The same can be observed in the following case:

(33) a. emma-ka   ai-lul   i-lul   takk-i-ess-ta.
        Mother-Nom child-Acc tooth-Acc brush-Caus-Past-Dec
     "The mother tooth-brushed the child."

    b. emma-ka   ai-eykey   i-lul   takk-i-ess-ta.
       Mother-Nom child-Dat   tooth-Acc brush-Caus-Past-Dec
     "The mother got the child to brush his tooth."

        The dative marked causee in (b) implies that the causee is persuaded or advised to do the activity by the causer, without use of force by the causer.
        We can go even further and argue that the double accusative case marking (in Korean) causatives may reflect the 'split of objecthood' between the causee and the object of the basic verb. For example, in example (12), both 'ai' and 'yak' are marked by the accusative. It was suggested by Song (p.c) that this sounds like the medicine (or one dose of the medicine) was all consumed by the child, and also like the child was very much under the causer's control. In other words, the causee and the object of the basic verb were both affected, just as the rabbit and its tail were both affected in (11b). The difference, however, is that in (11b) both entities (whole and part) were affected by one agent's action, whereas in (12) the medicine was affected by the causee and the causee by the causer.
        Furthermore, in the case of the analytic causative or quasi-morphological causative, there is an obvious difference between the accusative case and the dative case to mark the causee in Korean as in other languages. As shown in the following, the case marking of the causee gives the crucial clue to the hierarchy of the degree of control and/or affectedness, supporting our claim (H. S. Lee 1985):

(34) apeci-ka   ai - lul   matang - eyse   nol - key ha - ess - ta
     father-Nom child-Acc   yard - Loc   play- Caus -Past-Dec
       "The father forced/ordered the child to play in the yard."

(35) apeci-ka   ai–eykey/lo hayekum matang - eyse   nol - key ha - ess - ta
                    Dat / Oblique
     "The father told/asked the child to play in the yard."

(36) apeci-ka   ai - ka   matang -eyse   nol - key ha - ess - ta

Nom

"The father arranged for/permitted the child to play in the yard."

The above examples differ from each other only in the case marking of the causee. As seen from the translations given, the accusative implies a strong enforcement, the dative a simple order or telling, and the nominative a permission or an arrangement. In other words, the variation in the case marking of the causee in the order accusative, dative, and nominative, correspondingly expresses the degree of control exercised by the causee from least to greatest.

This can also be borne out by the following example where the causee cannot be marked with the dative if the caused activity cannot be controlled at all by the causee.

(37) a. John-i   {Mary-lul *Mary-eykey}   palmok-i   ppi-key ha-ess-ta.
           Nom   Acc   Dat   ankle-Nom   sprain-Caus-Past-Dec
        "John made Mary sprain her ankle."

   b. atul-i   {pumo-lul   * pumo-eykey} nolla-key ha-ess-ta.
        Nom parent-Acc   parent-Dat   surprise-Caus-Past-Dec
        "The son made his parent be frightened."

The action of being wrenched one's ankle or being shocked is not controllable action, therefore the causee in this case has no controllability over the action. Therefore the causee takes the accusative case but not the dative. This implies that the different case marking of the causee has something to do with the degree of control.

It needs to be noted that the causee in the morphological causative in Korean can take accusative or dative case but **not** the nominative, since the causee in the contact (direct) causation has little control. However, the causee in the analytic causative ('-*key ha-*' construction) takes either accusative, dative, oblique or even nominative case depending on how much control the causee has over the situation.

From the discussion given above, we can propose the case hierarchy in Korean "accusative > dative > oblique > nominative" to express the degree of control exercised by the causee from lowest to highest[15].

---

[15] One thing to be noted here is that we are not claiming that the grammatical encoding of the causee in causative constructions is determined solely by the degree of control. It is still mostly true that the causee appears in the accusative when the non-causative verb is intransitive, and the causee appears in the dative when the non-causative verb is transitive, and so on. This fact was also successfully proven in Choi's (2002: 394, 397-404) statistical study. The point we are trying to make is that if there is a consistent correlation between different case markings and different meanings, semantics should be

5. Summary

The main issue that we have investigated in this paper is the morphological encoding of the causee. We have investigated the validity of Comrie's (1981) hierarchy account with data from Korean. We have shown that there are many languages that do not conform to this hierarchy, and which allow doubling on certain grammatical relations. Korean permits doubling on DO, IO and even on subject positions. Most importantly, however, Comrie's hierarchy account fails to explain why, with some causees, case-markings are used contrastively. For example, the case-marking contrast of the causee between the accusative and the dative/oblique indicates a semantic contrast. Basically, Comrie's hierarchy account is formulated from syntactic perspective without reference to the semantic function of case-markers.

We have also established the case hierarchy in the Korean causative construction "accusative > dative > oblique > nominative", expressing the degree of control exercised by the causee from lowest to highest. We have shown that there is a possible semantic contrast between different encodings of the causee in causative constructions. The accusative, as the basic morphological encoding of the patient, typically refers to an entity (causee) with a very low degree of control. On the other hand, the oblique case (or whatever case used for passive agents) is frequently used for an entity with a high degree of control. The dative, as the typical exponent of the experiencer or recipient roles, occupies an intermediate position.

If there is a consistent cross-linguistic correlation between alternative coding and different meanings concerned with degree of control and affectedness, we should take semantics into account in the cross-linguistic study of grammatical encoding of the causee in causative constructions. The point is that "any detailed approach to language typology, or indeed to any aspect of language, must combine formal and semantic viewpoints if it is to uncover all of the relevant factors" (Comrie 1981: 176).

One remaining question is why Korean would use two different types of means to encode different degree of control, i.e. (i) morphological vs. analytic causatives and (ii) different case marking of the causee. This seems rather redundant. With regard to this, Song (2001) claims that different case markings of the causee reflect degrees of affectedness of the causee rather than the causee's control. He also claims that the contrast between distant (analytic) and contact (morphological) causatives is the contrast at the level of events, whereas different case marking of the

---

taken into account in explaining grammatical encoding of the causee. The other point is that the behaviour of different coding can be explained by degree of control and affectedness.

causee reflects the interaction between the causative participants, i.e. causer and causee.

References

Choi, D. J. 2002. "A study on the cause in '-key ha' causative constructions" [in Korean] in Y. Ko et. al. *Grammar and Text*. Seoul National University Press. Seoul.

Choi, H. B. 1929/1977. *Wuli Malpon* (Korean Grammar). Cengumsa. Seoul.

Cole, P. 1983. "The grammatical role of the causee in universal grammar" IJAL 49: 115-133.

Comrie, B. 1975. "Causatives and universal grammar" *Transactions of Philological Society* 1974: 1-32.

------------. 1976. The syntax of causative constructions: Cross-language similarities and divergences. Syntax and Semantics Vol. 6.

------------. 1981. *Language universals and linguistic typology.* Oxford: Blackwell.

------------. 1985. Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. In Shopen, T. (ed) *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol. 3. CUP.

------------. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology.* 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

DeLancey, S. 1984. "Notes on Agentivity and Causation" *Studies in Language*. 8-2: 181-213.

Gerdts, Donna. 1990. "Revaluation and Inheritance in Korean Causative Union" In: Postal and Joseph. (eds.) *Studies in Relational Grammar 3*. University of Chicago Press.

Keenan, E. L. and Comrie, B. 1977. "Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar" Linguistic Inquiry 8: 63-99.

Kozinsky, I. & M. Polinsky. 1993. "Causee and patient in the causative of transitive: Coding conflict or doubling of grammatical relations?" In: Comrie, B. & M. Polinsky (eds.) *Causatives and Transitivity*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Lee, H. S. 1985. Causatives in Korean and the binding hierarchy. *CLS* 21-2: 138-153. Chicago Linguistic Society.

Li, C. N. and Thompson, S. A. 1977. "The causative in Wappo: A special case of

doubling" BLS 3: 175-181.

Nedjalkov, V. P. & G. G. Silnitsky. 1973. "The Typology of Morphological and Lexical
    Causatives", In: Kiefer, F. (ed) *Trends in Soviet Theoretical Linguistics*.
    Dordrecht: Reidel. 1-32. [revised version of a paper which was first published in
    "Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij (Morfologicheskij kauzativ)" (Kholodovich,
    ed.), Izdatel'stvo Nauka, Leningrad. 1969:20-50.]

O'Grady, William. 1991. *Categories and Case: The Sentence Structure of Korean*. John
     Benjamins Publishing Co.

Palmer, F. R. 1994. *Grammatical roles and relations*. Cambridge University Press.

Polinsky, M. 1994. "Double objects in causatives: towards a study of coding conflict"
    Studies in Language 19: 129-221.

Saksena, A. 1980. The affected agent. *Language* 56: 812-826.

Shibatani, M. 1976. (ed.) *The grammar of causative constructions: Syntax and Semantics
    6*. Academic Press. New York.

---------------. 1983. "Towards an Understanding of the Typology and Function of
    Case-Marking", Proceedings of the 13th ICL. Tokyo.

Song, Jae Jung. 1991. "Causatives and Universal Grammar: An Alternative
    Interpretation" *Transactions of the Philological Society*. Vol. 89-1: 65-94.

------------------. 1995. Review of *Causatives and Transitivity*. edited by Comrie and M.
    Polinsky. *Lingua* 97: 211-232.

------------------. 1996. *Causatives and Causation: A Universal Typological Perspective*.
    Longman Linguistics Library.

------------------. 2001. *Linguistic Typology: Morphology and Syntax*. Longman
    Linguistics Library.

Yeon, Jaehoon. 1993. "The degree of transitivity in Korean: A functional-typological
    approach" *Language Research* 29-1: 107-136. Seoul.

------------------. 1999. "A cognitive account of the constraints on possessor ascension
    constructions in Korean" *Language Research* Vol. 35-2.

------------------. 2003. *Korean Grammatical Constructions: Their Form and Meaning*.
    Saffron Books. London.

Jaehoon Yeon
Dept. of Japan and Korea
SOAS,

University of London
London WC1H 0XG
United Kingdom
Email: jy1@soas.ac.uk / yeonjaehoon@yahoo.co.kr

Abstract

In this paper, we have critically reviewed Comrie's hierarchy account on morphological encoding of the causee with special reference to Korean data. The grammatical encoding of the causee in Korean, at first sight, seems to be consistent with Comrie's analysis. However, there are many problems. For example, Korean allows doubling on the direct object position in causative constructions. It contradicts with Comrie's hierarchy account as it is doubling on grammatical relations. On the other hand, Kozinsky and Polinsky (1993) has defended Comrie's position and renounced the idea of doubling on the direct object in causative constructions. We have argued that Kozinsky and Polinsky's conclusion cannot be acceptable because their arguments on syntactic tests for object-hood in Korean are not reliable. Korean causatives provide a counter-example to Comrie's hierarchy generalization. In Korean, there are cases where the doubling is obligatory. We have argued that there is a consistent correlation between alternative markings and different meanings. The semantic difference found in different encoding of the causee can be explained by degree of control and affectedness. Having observed this semantic contrast, we have proposed the case hierarchy in the Korean causative construction 'accusative > dative > oblique > nominative', expressing the degree of control exercised by the causee from the lowest to highest.

Keywords: causatives, causee, grammatical relation, case hierarchy, doubling, direct object, degree of control, affectedness, cross-linguistic study, morphological causatives, analytic causatives.