

CASE MARKING IN KIMARAGANG CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Paul R. Kroeger

1. INTRODUCTION

Kimragang is a Dusunic language spoken by approximately 10,000 people living in the Kota Marudu and Pitas districts of Sabah, East Malaysia. This paper discusses the morphology of causative constructions in Kimragang in relation to Comrie's proposed hierarchy of case marking.

Comrie (1981:169) proposes the following hierarchy of accessibility for the case marking of the Causee in clauses involving morphological causatives:

(A) Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique Object

The accompanying rule, which Comrie states as a strong cross-linguistic tendency, is that "the causee occupies the highest (leftmost) position on this hierarchy that is not already filled" (i.e. not filled in the corresponding non-causative clause).

In Kimragang, the case marking of the nominals associated with a morphological causative, as reflected by the focus marking of the causative verb, operates along a very similar hierarchy:

(B) Nominative > Accusative > Translative/Locative¹ > Dative

However, the rule governing the operation of the hierarchy in Kimragang is very different from that described by Comrie. Hierarchy (A) relates only to the case marking of the Causee, while hierarchy (B) operates like a push-down stack involving all the arguments of the causative verb. The basic pattern in Kimragang is that the Causer takes Nominative Focus (NomF). This forces the demotion of the Agent from Nominative to Accusative Focus (AccF), as Causee. The Patient in turn is demoted from Accusative to Translative Focus (TF); and further demoted from Translative to Dative Focus (DatF) in secondary (indirect) causation.

These shifts are illustrated here with the transitive root *akan eat*. Notice that the clause constituents are labelled in capitals above each example. The Pivot (to be defined in section 1.1 below) is indicated by the tag PIV- before the constituent label, as well as by the P in the morpheme-by-morpheme gloss underneath. Non-Pivot constituents are followed by a case tag in parentheses which indicates the focus type which that constituent would take if it were in focus. The case marking of the Pivot, as explained below, is shown in the focus affix on the verb to which it relates.

Papers in Western Austronesian linguistics No.3, 241-276.
Pacific Linguistics, A-78, 1988.

© Paul R. Kroeger

AGENT: NOMINATIVE TO ACCUSATIVE

- (1) Mangakan (m-poN-akan) poh | PIV-AGENT
 NomF-trans-EAT yet | ih Jaiwan.
 P.def Jaiwan
Jaiwan is still eating.
- (2) Pa-akan-on | CAUSER (Nom) | poh | PIV-CAUSEE | tu wilton.
 caus-EAT-AccF I (nonP) | yet | ih Jaiwan | because hungry.
 P.def Jaiwan
I'll give Jaiwan something to eat, he's hungry.

PATIENT: ACCUSATIVE TO TRANSLATIVE TO DATIVE

- (3) PIV-PATIENT | ot akan-on | AGENT (Nom)
 Nunuh | dit tanak nuh?
 what | P.indef EAT-AccF | nonP.def child your
What will your child eat?
- (4) PIV-PATIENT | ot i-pa-akan | CAUSER (Nom) | CAUSEE (Acc)
 Nunuh | nuh | do tanak dot
 what | P.indef TF-caus-EAT | you (nonP) | nonP.indef child REL
 s-um-usu poh?
 NomF-MILK yet
What will you feed a child that is still nursing?
- (5) Ong waro | PIV-PATIENT | pa-akan-an |
 if exist | ot oolu nuh mangakan, | caus-EAT-DatF |
 P.indef remainder your NomF.trans.EAT
 CAUSEE (Acc)
 dialo.
 him (nonP)
If there is any left when you are done eating, let him eat it.

Intransitive and ditransitive stems also follow this pattern for Causer (Nominative) and Causee (Accusative). The case marking of other participants is discussed below.

1.1 Focus and case

The Dusunic language family is classified by Dyen (1965) as belonging to the Philippine Hesion of North-west Austronesian. Like most Philippine-type languages, verbs in Kimaragang carry affixes which signal what is generally referred to as the focus of the clause. Focus corresponds roughly to voice, but with a richer set of possibilities than is typical of voice systems: seven focus types in Kimaragang, vs. two voices in English (active and passive).

The focus affixes of Kimaragang are described in detail in my other paper in this volume. As pointed out there, while focus in Kimaragang is in one sense parallel to voice in English, the grammatical and pragmatic functions of the two systems are quite different. Focus can best be viewed as a displaced case marking system. Schachter (1976) describes the focus affixes of Tagalog as

"case marking affix(es) on the verb, which (indicate) the case role of the topic noun phrase."

Without rehashing the terminological arguments, I will adopt the term *Pivot* for the NP which Schachter (and many others) call *Topic*: the one noun phrase in a clause whose grammatical case is indicated by the focus marking of the verb. The *Pivot* of a clause is marked by a special determiner (ih/it for definite NPs, oh/ot for indefinite), or by *Pivot* forms of pronouns and deictics.

There are seven focus possibilities in Kimaragang: Nominative (marked by the verbal prefix *m-*); Accusative (marked by *-on* in the non-past, $-\emptyset$ in past tense); Dative (*-an*); Translative (*i-*); Locative (*-on*); Instrumental (*poN-*); and Setting (*poN- -an*). Note that Locative Focus is homophonous with Accusative, but is not deleted in the past tense; moreover, Locative Focus occurs only with intransitives.

Focus affixes on the verb indicate the grammatical case of only one NP, the *Pivot*. Non-*Pivot* NPs are marked for case,² but with a reduced set of possible cases: Actor, Undergoer, Referent and Oblique. Actor includes Agents, Experiencers, etc. which would take Nominative Focus as *Pivot*. Undergoer includes the following semantic roles: the Patient of a transitive verb, which generally takes Accusative Focus, but for some verb stems takes Dative Focus; the Theme of a ditransitive verb, which takes Translative Focus when marked as *Pivot*; and Benefactive, which takes Dative Focus. Referent includes the Location of an intransitive verb, which takes Locative Focus, and the Goal or Recipient of a ditransitive, which takes Dative Focus.

While only one NP in a given clause could be indicated by any one focus type, Kimaragang does allow more than one Undergoer in some clauses (cf. section 3.4).

It is the focus marking on causative verbs that will primarily concern us here. When we refer to a Causee taking the accusative case, it is a shorthand way of saying that, when the Causee is marked as *Pivot*, the verb takes the Accusative Focus affix.

1.2 Causative verbs

As Comrie (1981) points out, a causative situation involves two events; the cause and its effect (or result). The result, viewed as a separate event, involves a particular number of participants: one for intransitive verbs, two for transitives, etc. In causative constructions, an additional participant is introduced, namely the Causer. The Actor of the result-event becomes the Causee of the cause-event.

The valence³ of a causative verb is one higher than the valence of the corresponding non-causative, due to the addition of the Causer. The Causer is generally encoded as the subject of the causative verb. The Causee, which would normally be subject of the corresponding non-causative verb, must be demoted to some other position. How this is handled has proved to be a fruitful area for cross-linguistic comparison.

Kimaragang causative verbs are formed by adding the prefix *po-* to the verb stem. When the Causer is marked as *Pivot*, the verb carries no overt focus marker. However, when the Causer is not *Pivot*, it is marked as Actor. This fact, together with semantic considerations, indicates that the bare causative form which occurs when the Causer is *Pivot* should be identified with Nominative Focus. In other words, these forms are considered to carry a zero allomorph of the

Nominative Focus marker. Notice that the Nominative prefix *m-* also reduces to \emptyset - in non-finite forms such as imperatives.

The Causee is demoted from Nominative (as original Actor) to Accusative. There are two possible forms of the verb when the Causee is in focus, depending on the affectedness of the Causee (see section 2.2 below); but both of these forms include the Accusative Focus suffix.

2. CASE ASSIGNMENT PATTERNS

2.1 Causer, Causee and Patient

As stated in section 1.2, the causative verb takes the zero allomorph of the Nominative Focus marker when the Causer is in focus. Note the following examples:

- (6)
- | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| \emptyset -Po-suwang NomF-caus-ENTER | PIV-CAUSER okuh I(P) | CAUSEE(Acc) do nonP.indef | parai rice | LOCATION(Dat) sid kadut. in sack |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
- I am putting rice in sacks.*
- (7)
- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|------------|---|
| Ogom poh sinoh, sit yet there | \emptyset -po-odop NomF-caus-SLEEP | PIV-CAUSER okuh I(P) | poh yet | CAUSEE(Acc) ditih tanak. this(nonP) child |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|------------|---|
- Have a seat while I put the baby to sleep.*
- (8)
- | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Kadung aa if not | PIV-CAUSER kou you(P.pl) | pendakod (\emptyset -po-indakod), NomF-caus-CLIMB | tibas-on SLASH-AccF |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|
- tekoo (kuh-ikoo)
 I(nonP)-you(P.pl)
If you don't let me up there, I'll slash you all to pieces!

When the Actor of the result event (Causee of the causative event) is in focus, Nominative Focus is no longer available. The Causee is "demoted" from Nominative to Accusative Focus, as in the following examples:

- (9)
- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|---|--|---------------|
| Po-odop-on caus-SLEEP-AccF | poh yet | PIV-CAUSEE inoh tanak that(P) child | om mituturan (m-pi-tuturan) and NomF-recv-STORY | nogi. then |
|-------------------------------|------------|---|--|---------------|
- Put the baby to sleep first, then we'll talk.*
- (10)
- | | | | | |
|------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Amu not | PIV-CAUSEE okuh I(P) | po-ongoy-on caus-GO-AccF | CAUSER(Nom) dih moleeng kuh nonP.def parents my | ong amu if not |
|------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|
- ka-talib poh it mogondi.
 able-PASS yet P.def sacrifice
My parents won't let me go until the ritual period is over.
- (11)
- | | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| PIV-CAUSEE ilo sawo nuh that(P) spouse your | poolion (po-uli-on) caus-RETURN-AccF | CAUSER(Nom) yah we(nonP.excl) | noh. already |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
- We have already let your wife go home.*

- (12)
- | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Potolibo (po-talib-o) poh caus-PASS-AccF.imper | PIV-CAUSEE yalo, him (P) | po-suwang-o caus-ENTER-AccF.imper |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
- CAUSER (Nom)
dikoo.
you (nonP.pl)
- Let him past, let him go in!*

All of the above examples involve intransitive verb stems. When causatives are formed from transitive stems, the same case marking (Accusative) is used to indicate that the Causee is in focus. However, the normal causative prefix po- is replaced by the transitive marker, poN-, producing forms like the following:

- (13)
- | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Nokuroh.tu pong-omot-on why trans-HARVEST-AccF | CAUSER (Nom) nuh you (nonP) | PIV-CAUSEE yalo he (P) | dot kakal poh REL still yet |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
- s-um-akit?
*-NomF-SICK
Why do you make him harvest rice when he is still sick?
- (14)
- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|
| Pangalapako (poN-lapak-o) trans-SPLIT-AccF.imper | PIV-CAUSEE yalo he (P) | PATIENT (TF) dinoh niyuw. that (nonP) coconut |
|---|------------------------------|---|
- Get him to split those coconuts.*
- (15)
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| PIV-CAUSEE lsai who | ot pong-owit-on P.indef trans-BRING-AccF | CAUSER (Nom) nuh you (nonP) | PATIENT (TF) dit surat nonP.def letter |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
- pa-ka'a sid dih James?
caus-ARRIVE to nonP.def James
Who will you get to take the letter to James?

The Patient of (most) transitive verbs takes Accusative marking in simple (non-causative) constructions. When a causative verb is formed, Accusative is assigned to the Causee, displacing the Patient to the next lower level on hierarchy B, Translative Focus (TF). Note the following examples:

- (16)
- | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| l-po-omot TF-caus-HARVEST | CAUSER (Nom) dit tidi kuh nonP.def mother my | CAUSEE (Acc) do tulun do sokid nonP.indef person of hill |
|------------------------------|--|--|
- PIV-PATIENT
it parai yah.
P.def rice our
My mother will get some people from the hills to harvest our rice.
- (17)
- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
| N-i-pa-lapak past-TF-caus-SPLIT | CAUSER (Nom) kuh I (nonP) | CAUSEE (Acc) dih ama nonP.def father | PIV-PATIENT it niyuw P.def coconut |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|
- tu, amu l-in-apak-Ø dih iyai.
because not *-past-SPLIT-AccF nonP.def mother
I got Dad to split the coconut, because Mum wouldn't split it.

- (18)
- | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--|
| N-i-po-owit past-TF-caus-BRING <i>I had Janama deliver the letter.</i> | CAUSER (Nom) kuh I (nonP) | CAUSEE (Acc) dih Janama nonP.def <i>Janama</i> | PIV-PATIENT inoh surat. <i>that (P) letter</i> |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--|
- (19)
- | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
| lpapatai (i-po-patai) TF-caus-KILL tu, minanabpo (-in-m-poN-tabpo) dit peyak yah. <i>because *-past-NomF-trans-CATCH nonP.def chick our</i> <i>I will have Janama kill that dog, because it killed our chicks.</i> | CAUSER (Nom) kuh I (nonP) | CAUSEE (Acc) dih Janama nonP.def <i>Janama</i> | PIV-PATIENT ilo tasu P.def <i>dog</i> |
|--|---------------------------------|--|---|
- (20)
- | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| N-o-tutud-an past-stat-BURN-DatF CAUSER (Nom) kuh I (nonP) | Agent (Nom) nuh <i>you (nonP)</i> CAUSEE (Acc) dikau <i>you (nonP)</i> | noh <i>already</i> oi? Q | PIV-PATIENT it n-i-po-tutud P.def past-TF-caus-BURN |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|
- Did you burn what I told you to burn yet?*

Notice that in example (20), the causative verb nipotutud itself functions as the Pivot of the main clause: *that which I caused you to burn* (the root tutud *burn*, assigns its Patient to the dative). This method of using verbs as nouns, usually by inserting a determiner (in this case *it*), is quite common in Kimaragang. It is a process of nominalisation, rather than relativisation, as there is no head noun to be relativised. This phenomenon makes it difficult to distinguish categorically between nouns and verbs when dealing with many derived forms; see the discussion in my other paper in this volume relating to the oblique focus types, Instrumental and Setting.

2.2 Affected vs. non-affected Causee

In the preceding section, we noted that the affixation of the causative verb with the Causee in focus depends on whether the verb stem is transitive or intransitive. The possible forms are *po-* -on for intransitives, and *poN-* -on for transitives. However, example (2) above offers a counter-example to this rule: the transitive root *akan eat*, takes the *po-* -on form. Some other transitive verbs also take the "intransitive" affixation, e.g.:

- (21)
- | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Po-sigup-o caus-SMOKE-AccF.imper <i>Give me a cigarette.</i> | PIV-CAUSEE okuh I (P) | poh! <i>yet</i> |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|
- (22)
- | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Poopugo (po-apug-o) caus-LIME-AccF.imper <i>Give me some lime, please.</i> | PIV-CAUSEE okuh I (P) | poh! <i>yet</i> |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|
- (23)
- | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|
| Penumon (po-inum-on) caus-DRINK-AccF | PIV-CAUSEE ih tanak nuh P.def <i>child your</i> | PATIENT (TF) ditih tubat, <i>this (nonP) medicine</i> | iso <i>one</i> |
|---|---|---|-------------------|

oh sonduk tokodok.
 P.indef spoon small
Give your child one teaspoonful of this medicine.

- | | | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| (24) | Pentongo (po-intong-o) poh caus-LOOK.AT-AccF.imper yet <i>Show Janama your pictures!</i> | PIV-CAUSEE ih Janama P.def <i>Janama</i> | RANGE(TF) ⁴ do gambar nuh. nonP.indef <i>picture your</i> |
|------|--|--|--|

Examples (21)-(24) make it clear that the variation of po- with poN- is not conditioned by simple transitivity. What is involved here is a contrast between affected vs. non-affected Agent as Causee.

Saksena (1980) has described how the case marking of the Causee-Agent in Hindi causatives depends on whether or not the Agent is affected by the action. The Agent is affected with verbs like *see, drink, run away, learn, run, jump*, etc. The Agent is unaffected with verbs like *tear, scour, wash, ask, look for, plant*, etc. In non-causative clauses, the agent always takes the same case marking (Agentive), whether or not it is affected. However, in causative constructions, affected agent Causees take one case marker (which Saksena calls "dative-accusative"), while non-affected agent Causees take another (instrumental). Some Hindi verbs allow the use of either case marking to signal such semantic distinctions as direct vs. indirect causation, or contrastive intentions of the Causer.

In Kimaragang, the Accusative case is used whenever the Causee is in focus. When that Causee is an affected Agent, the normal causative prefix po- occurs. When the Causee is a non-affected Agent, as in examples (13)-(15) above, the causative prefix is replaced by the transitivity marker, poN-.

This use of the transitivity marker is consistent with Saksena's claim that transitive verbs prototypically involve an affected Patient and a non-affected Agent. Verbs involving non-affected Agents are higher in transitivity than those involving affected Agents, and carry explicit transitive marking in Kimaragang causatives.

As in Hindi, there are various secondary uses of the affected Agent causative form in Kimaragang. Some of these are not strictly causative in meaning; see section 4 below.

A few Kimaragang verbs allow a contrast between affected and non-affected Agent marking. Sometimes the distinction corresponds to transitive vs. intransitive senses of the root, as in the following examples:

- | | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|----------------------------------|
| (25) | PIV-CAUSEE Isai <i>who</i> tasu nuh? <i>dog your</i> <i>Who will you get to kill your dog?</i> | oh pamatayon (poN-patai-on) P.indef trans-KILL-AccF | CAUSER (Nom) nuh <i>you (nonP)</i> | PATIENT (Acc) dit nonP.def |
| (26) | Papatayon (po-patai-on) -i caus-DIE-AccF <i>Just let him die!</i> | PIV-CAUSEE yalo dinoh! -emph <i>he (P) that</i> | | |

Examples (25) and (26) illustrate the contrast between the transitive and intransitive senses of the root patai. The corresponding simple (non-causative)

Nominative Focus forms are mamatai (m-poN-patai) *kill*, and matai (m-patai) *die*.

- (27)
- | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Ong obongol <i>if naughty</i> | (PATIENT) ilo tanak nuh, <i>that(P) child your</i> | PIV-CAUSEE isai <i>who</i> | ot P.indef |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---------------|
- pangarasangon (poN-rasang-on)
trans-ANGER-AccF
Who do you get to scold your child when he is naughty?
- | | |
|--|--|
| | CAUSER (Nom) nuh? <i>you(nonP)</i> |
|--|--|
- (28)
- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Pa-rasang-o poh caus-ANGER-AccF <i>yet</i> | PIV-CAUSEE yalo! <i>he(P)</i> |
|---|-------------------------------------|
- Make him angry!* (e.g. a fighting cock)

The parentheses around the tag "PATIENT" in example (27) indicate that the corresponding NP (*your child*) is not an explicit element of the clause for which the label applies. The child is explicit subject of the stative predicate *naughty*, and implicitly the Patient of the causative verb *cause to scold*. The semantic distinction in examples (27)-(28) corresponds to the difference between the intransitive form *rumasang angry*, and the transitive form *mangarasang to scold*.

The intransitive root *tu'un* (Nominative Focus form *tumu'un*) means to jump or leap down from a high place. This root has no transitive form, but in causative forms with the Causee in focus, there is a distinction between the affected and non-affected Agent markings. The affected Agent form (example (29)) indicates that the Causer physically pushes or forces the Causee over the edge. The non-affected Agent form (example (30)) signals merely verbal causation, e.g. a request or command to jump.

- (29)
- | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Po-tuun-on caus-DROP-AccF | CAUSER (Nom) kuh <i>I(nonP)</i> | PIV-CAUSEE ikau <i>you(P.sg)</i> | silol <i>there</i> |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
- I am going to push you over the edge.*
- (30)
- | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Ponuunon (poN-tuun-on) trans-DROP-AccF | CAUSER (Nom) kuh <i>I(nonP)</i> | PIV-CAUSEE ikau <i>you(P.sg)</i> | silol <i>there</i> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
- I am going to send you down there (over the edge).*

The Agent of the transitive verb *akan eat*, is generally affected by the act of eating. Causatives derived from this root mark the Causee as an affected Agent (as in example (2) above) when the Patient (that which is eaten) is a full meal or a form of medicine: something which affects the Agent by making him full or by healing him. When the Patient involved is some particular item of food, rather than a complete meal, the Causee is marked as a non-affected Agent:

- (31)
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Amu <i>not</i> | CAUSER (Nom) kuh <i>I(nonP)</i> | pang-akan-on trans-EAT-AccF | PATIENT (TF) do gula-gula nonP.indef <i>candy</i> | PIV-CAUSEE ilot <i>that(P)</i> |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
- tanak kuh.
child my
I don't let my children eat candy.

A second use of this distinction is when the thing eaten is something harmful or repulsive, in which case the non-affected Causee-focused form *panganan* carries the meaning *forced to eat*. Similarly, the non-affected form *pongnumon* may mean *forced to drink*, as in the following examples:

- (32)
- | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|------------|------------------|
| Pang-akan-o | poh | PIV-CAUSEE | PATIENT(TF) |
| trans-EAT-AccF.imper | yet | yalo | do tana! |
| | | he(P) | nonP.indef earth |
- Make him eat dirt!*
- (33)
- | | | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------|
| Ara'at | (CAUSER) | | PIV-CAUSEE |
| bad | it nokotoonok dogon, | pong-inum-on | okuh |
| | P(def) <i>step.mother me</i> (nonP) | trans-DRINK-AccF | I(P) |
- PATIENT(TF)
do rasun.
nonP.indef *poison*
My stepmother is horrible, she tried to force me to drink poison.

While drinking poison clearly affects the Agent, this use of the prefix *poN-* is consistent with its general meaning of increased transitivity. The Causer in example (32) has more complete control of the situation than the Causer in example (2); thus the form *panganan* is higher in transitivity than the form *paakanon*.

2.3 Location

The Locative Focus morpheme, *-on*, signals the Location of non-causative intransitive verbs as being in focus. As indicated in hierarchy B, in causative constructions the Location takes Dative Focus. Note the following example:

- (34)
- | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Siomboh | PIV-LOCATION | | CAUSER (Nom) | CAUSEE (Acc) |
| where | ot piroong | po-tuun-an | kuh | ditih |
| | P.indef <i>cliff</i> | caus-DROP-DatF | I (nonP) | this (nonP) |
- korita?
car
Which cliff should I drive this car over?

The verb *ogom sit*, is generally used as an intransitive, but there is a corresponding transitive form, *mongogom to sit on*. When the Location of sitting (in the intransitive sense) is in focus, the verb is marked for Locative Focus:

- (35)
- | | | |
|--------------|------------------|-------------|
| PIV-LOCATION | | ACTOR (Nom) |
| Siomboh | ot ogom-on | kuh? |
| where | P.indef SIT-LocF | I (nonP) |
- Where shall I sit?*

The patient of a transitive verb normally takes Accusative Focus. However, the Patient of the transitive action *sit on* takes Dative rather than Accusative marking:⁵

- (36) Nagaman (n-ogom-an) | AGENT (Nom) | PIV-PATIENT
 past-SIT-DatF | kuh | it tupi nuh.
 I(nonP) | I sat on your hat.
 P.def hat your

In causative constructions based on *ogom*, the case marking patterns summarised in hierarchy B and discussed in section 2.1 above preserve the distinction between the transitive and intransitive senses. The Location of the intransitive (*where* someone is caused to sit) takes the Dative, while the Patient of the transitive (*what* someone is caused to sit on) takes Translative Focus:

- (37) PIV-LOCATION | CAUSER (Nom) | CAUSEE (Acc)
 Siomboh | paagaman (po-ogom-an) | tokou | dih
 where | caus-SIT-DatF | we(nonP.incl.pl) | nonP-def
 Y.B.?
 assemblyman
 Where shall we seat his honour the Assemblyman?

- (38) PIV-PATIENT | CAUSER (Nom) | CAUSEE (Acc)
 It bangku kuh | n-i-po-ogom | kuh | dih Janama.
 P.def chair my | past-TF-caus-SIT | I(nonP) | nonP.def Janama
 I made Janama sit in my chair (save my seat).

The verb *odop sleep*, behaves similarly. The transitive form of the verb, *mongodop*, means *to guard (a place) at night by sleeping there*. Again, Dative Focus is used for the Undergoer of the transitive verb, the place guarded, while Locative Focus marks the Location of the intransitive sense.

- (39) Adapan (odop-an) | BENEFACTIVE | PIV-PATIENT |
 SLEEP-DatF | dogo | itih walai kuh | tu, kapayig
 | me(nonP) | this (P) house my | because go.out
 okoi.
 we(P.excl)
 Come sleep in my house for me because we are going away.
- (40) PIV-LOCATION | ACTOR (Nom)
 Sid disai | ot odop-on | nuh?
 at who(nonP) | P.indef SLEEP-LF | you(nonP.sg)
 Whose house will you sleep at?

The causative *poodop* can mean either *put to sleep*, e.g. a baby (as in example (7) above), or *invite to sleep*, e.g. at one's house, as in the following example:

- (41) Mobpongodop (m-poG-poN-odop) mari | PIV-ACTOR | LOCATION
 NomF-??-trans-SLEEP | surely | ih Mejit | sid dih
 | | P.def Mejit | at nonP.def
 Pangadap, | aso p-in-o-odop.
 Pangadap | not.exist *-past-caus-SLEEP
 Mejit just decided to sleep over at Pangadap's house, no one invited him.

When the Causee (the sleeper) is in focus, he or she may be marked as either affected or non-affected Agent. Affected Agent marking (as in example (9) above) corresponds to the intransitive sense, indicating that the Causee is being put to sleep. Non-affected Agent marking corresponds with the transitive sense, one who is asked to guard something.

- (42)
- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Ong ka-payig <i>if able-GO.OUT</i> | koh <i>you (P.sg)</i> | PIV-CAUSEE isai <i>who</i> | ot pong-odop-on P.indef trans-SLEEP-AccF |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
- CAUSER(Nom) | PATIENT(TF)
 nuh | dilot walai nuh?
you (nonP) | that (nonP) house your
Who will you get to watch your house while you are gone?

A third possibility for marking the Causee as Pivot is the use of simple (non-causative) Translative Focus. This corresponds to the sense of *invite to sleep*, e.g. invite to spend the night. Translative Focus signals a lower degree of control on the part of the Causer, as compared with the affected Agent form ("invite" rather than "put to sleep"); but less agency on the part of the Causee as compared with the non-affected Agent form (focusing on the night watchman).

- (43)
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| N-i-odop past-TF-SLEEP | CAUSER kuh <i>I (nonP)</i> | PIV-CAUSEE yalo <i>him (P)</i> | LOCATION sid dagai. <i>at us (nonP)</i> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
- I invited him to sleep at our house.*

Causative uses of Translative Focus will be discussed further in section 4.2 below.

2.4 Ditransitive causatives

Ditransitive verbs typically involve three participants: an Agent-Source, a Theme, and a Recipient or Goal. When causative verbs are formed from ditransitive stems, the valence increases from three to four, and the Agent-Source becomes the Causee. The case marking shifts accompanying this change in valence are partially similar to those described above for transitive verb stems. They are illustrated here with two roots: *taak give*, and *isu smear*.

In non-causative forms, the Agent-Source takes Nominative Focus (examples (44)-(45)), the Recipient or Goal takes Dative Focus (examples (46)-(47)), and the Theme takes Translative Focus (examples (48)-(49)):

- (44)
- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| Minanaak (-in-m-poN-taak) *-past-NomF-trans-GIVE | PIV-AGENT ih kamaman kuh P.def <i>uncle my</i> | THEME (TF) do pe'es nonP.indef <i>knife</i> |
|---|--|---|
- GOAL (DatF)
sid dogon
to me (nonP)
My uncle gave me a knife.
- (45)
- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| PIV-AGENT lsai <i>who</i> | minongisu (-in-m-poN-isu) *-past-NomF-trans-SMEAR <i>you (nonP.sg)</i> | GOAL (DatF) dikau nonP.indef <i>soot</i> | THEME (TF) dot popou? nonP.indef <i>soot</i> |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
- Who smeared soot all over you?*
- (46)
- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| T-in-aak-an *-past-GIVE-DatF | PIV-GOAL okuh I (P) | AGENT (Nom) dih kamaman kuh nonP.def <i>uncle my</i> | THEME (TF) do pe'es. nonP.indef <i>knife</i> |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
- I was given a knife by my uncle.*

- (47) N-isu-an | PIV-GOAL | THEME (TF) | AGENT (Nom)
 okuh | do | tubat | do | bobolijan.
 past-SMEAR-DatF | I(P) | nonP.indef medicine | nonP.indef priestess
The priestess rubbed medicine on me.
- (48) PIV-THEME | AGENT (Nom) | GOAL (DatF)
 ltih pe'es | n-i-taak | dih | kamaman kuh | sid dogon.
 this (P) knife | past-TF-GIVE | nonP.def uncle my | to me (nonP)
This knife was given to me by my uncle.
- (49) AGENT (Nom) | PIV-THEME | GOAL (Dat)
 Nokuroh.tu n-i-isu | nuh | inoh | tinasak | sid buuk kuh?
 why | past-TF-SMEAR | you (nonP.sg) | that (P) oil | to book my
Why did you smear that oil on my book?

Note that in rare circumstances, the Goal of *isu* may take accusative rather than dative marking. The use of Accusative Focus (*isu'on*) would mark the Recipient as being totally affected by the action, e.g. covered from head to toe with medicine. The dative form generally implies local application.

As with Agents of transitive verbs, the Agent-Source of a ditransitive causative verb is demoted from Nominative to Accusative, and marked as a non-affected Agent.

- (50) Panaako (poN-taak-o) poh | PIV-CAUSEE | THEME (TF)
 trans-GIVE-AccF.imper yet | yalo | do | panambang (poN-tambang)
 he (P) | nonP.indef IF-FARE
 | tu, magago okoi.
 | because hurry we (P.pl.excl)
Make him pay his fare, we are in a hurry!
- (51) Nokuroh.tu pong-isu-on | CAUSER (Nom) | PIV-CAUSEE | THEME (TF)
 why | trans-SMEAR-AccF | nuh | yalo | dot
 you (nonP.sg) | he (P) | nonP.indef
 popou | GOAL (Dat)
 soot | sid baju kuh?
 | to shirt my
Why are you getting him to smear soot on my shirt?

The root *isu* exhibits a contrast between the non-affected Agent form (as in example (51) above) and the affected Agent form. The affected Agent form, *pesuon*, carries a reflexive sense, signalling that the Agent is also the Goal of the action, as in example (53) below. Notice the contrast of meaning with the non-causative dative form in example (52), which also signals that the Goal is in focus.

- (52) Isu-an | PIV-GOAL | THEME (TF)
 okuh | poh | dit | tubat | nuh.
 SMEAR-DatF | I(P) | yet | nonP.def medicine your
Please rub some of your medicine on me.
- (53) Pesuon (po-isu-on) | PIV-CAUSEE | THEME (TF)
 okuh | poh | dit | tubat | nuh.
 caus-SMEAR-AccF | I(P) | yet | nonP.def medicine your
Let me rub some of your medicine on myself.

This contrast between the reflexive sense of example (53) and the purely transitive sense of example (51) fits quite naturally into the general pattern of affected vs. non-affected Agent distinctions. Another usage of the affected Agent form *pesuon* is discussed in section 4 below.

The Goal of the ditransitive takes the Dative case in causatives, just as it does in non-causative forms. Since Dative is the lowest position in hierarchy B, the Goal cannot be demoted.

- (54) PIV-GOAL | | THEME (TF)
 Isai | ot pa-taak-an | do siin?
who | nonP.indef caus-GIVE-DatF | nonP.indef *money*
Who is collecting the contributions? (e.g. at a funeral)
- (55) | (PIV-GOAL) | | CAUSEE (Acc) |
 Ong oruol | inoh takod nuh, | pesuan (po-isu-an) | do dorisa |
if hurt | *that(P) leg your* | caus-SMEAR-DatF | nonP.indef *dresser* |
 THEME (TF)
 dot tubat.
 nonP.indef *medicine*
If your leg hurts, get the dresser to rub medicine on it.

The Theme of a ditransitive verb in causative constructions takes Translative Focus, just as in non-causatives. In terms of hierarchy B, with the Goal in the Dative position, there is no place for the Theme to be demoted to.

- (56) | CAUSEE (Acc) | CAUSER (Nom) | PIV-THEME |
 l-pa-taak | dogon | dit sawo kuh | itih tanak yah |
 TF-caus-GIVE | *me*(nonP) | nonP.def *spouse my* | *this(P) child our* |
 GOAL(DatF) | | | |
 sid tobpinee yoh | nga, amu kuh koyu'u.
to sibling his | *but not I(nonP) can.part.with*
My husband wants me to give this child of ours to his brother, but I can't bear to part with it.

It will be helpful to summarise our discussion to this point with a simple chart. In Figure C, the top line (containing the column labels) is a restatement of hierarchy B.

The chart summarises the case assignments of clause constituents for non-causative intransitive, transitive and ditransitive clauses. The labels S for Subject of an intransitive, A for Agent of a transitive, and P for Patient of a transitive, are from Comrie 1981, modifications of labels used by Dixon (1979).

The arrows show the shifts in assignment for causative constructions. These shifts may be summarised in the following rule, a more precise formulation of the rule stated for hierarchy B in the introduction:

Rule: All constituents shift one position to the right unless blocked by another constituent.

Figure C: Summary of focus shift in direct causatives

| | NomF (m-) | AccF (-on) | TF (i-) | LocF (-on) | DatF (-an) |
|---|--------------|---------------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Intrans. | S → - | - | - | Loc. → - | - |
| Trans. | A → P | → - | - | * | Ben. |
| Ditrans. | A → - | - | Theme | * | Goal |
| *LocF available only to intransitive verbs. | | | | | |

For non-causative intransitive verbs, the Subject takes NomF and the Location takes LocF. In causative constructions, the Subject becomes Causee and shifts according to the rule stated above, to AccF. The Location shifts to DatF.

For transitive clauses, the Agent takes NomF, the Patient takes AccF, and the Benefactive takes DatF. In causative constructions, the Agent becomes Causee and shifts to AccF. The Patient shifts one position from AccF to TF. The Benefactive can not move to the right, and remains in DatF (as in example (127)).

For ditransitive clauses, the Agent takes NomF, the Theme takes TF, and the Goal takes DatF. Neither Theme nor Goal can move to the right, since the LocF position is available only to intransitives. So the only shift in causative constructions is that of the Causee-Agent to AccF.

3. SECONDARY (INDIRECT) CAUSATION

Indirect causation in the simplest terms means that one person gets a second person to cause a third person to do something. We can label the first participant (the initiator of the causal chain) as Causer₁; the second participant (the intermediary) as Causee₁-Causer₂; and the third participant as Causee₂. If the action to be performed by Causee₂ (corresponding to the meaning of the verb stem) is transitive, there is a fourth participant, the Patient.

Morphological double causatives (i.e. forms bearing two causative prefixes, po-po-STEM) are very rare in Kimaragang. Only a few roots can be affixed in this way, e.g. *popoodop* *cause to put to sleep*, and *popelo* (po-po-ilo) *cause to inform* (lit. *cause to cause to know*). Note that these examples seem to involve lexicalised causative forms; but not even all lexicalised causatives can take double causative marking.

However, the case marking patterns for single-causative verbs do reveal a morphological distinction between direct (simple) and indirect (or mediated) causation. The patterns for intransitive, transitive and ditransitive verb stems are different. But in each case, the distinction is marked only when the nuclear⁶ participant occupying the position lowest on hierarchy B is in focus: Actor-Causee for intransitives, Patient for transitives, and Goal for ditransitives.

3.1 Intransitive stems

Indirect causatives with intransitive stems can be formed only when the Causee₂ is in focus. Indirect causation is signalled by the use of Translative Focus,

rather than the Accusative Focus form used for direct causatives when the Causee is in focus.

- (57)
- | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | CAUSER ₁ | CAUSEE ₁ CAUSER ₂ | PIV-CAUSEE ₂ | LOCATION (Dat) |
| l-po-suwang TF-caus-ENTER | dialo he(nonP) | dogon me(nonP) | inoh wogok that(P) pig | sid tinsod. to pig.pen |
- He wants me to get that pig into its pen.*
- (58)
- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------------------------|
| | CAUSER ₁ | CAUSEE ₁ CAUSER ₂ | PIV-CAUSEE ₂ |
| N-i-po-odop past-TF-caus-SLEEP | nuh you(nonP.sg) | dih sawo nuh nonP.def spouse your | it tanak. P.def child |
- You told your wife to put the baby to sleep.*
- (59)
- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------|
| | CAUSER ₁ | PIV-CAUSEE ₂ | CAUSEE ₁ CAUSER ₂ | |
| lpelo (i-po-ilo) TF-caus-KNOW | kuh I(nonP) | ikau you(P.sg) | dit tanak kuh nonP.def child my | ong if |
- m-uli okuh noh.
NomF-RETURN I(P) already
I will have my son inform you when I am going home.

Examples (57)-(59) show that the Causer₁ is marked as Actor while the Causee₁-Causer₂ is marked as Undergoer. Compare the non-Pivot Actor pronoun kuh in (59) with the non-Pivot non-Actor form dogon in (57). These examples also show that the valence of the indirect causative verb is three, as compared with two for the direct causative (cf. examples (6)-(12)) and one for the corresponding non-causative intransitive verb.

Note that the Translative Focus form is identical to that used for direct transitive causatives when the Undergoer is in focus. This means that for stems which have both a transitive and an intransitive sense, the Translative Focus causative form would be ambiguous. However, it appears that in every case the direct transitive sense takes precedence over the indirect intransitive sense, as in the following example (repeated from (38) above):

- (60) PIV-PATIENT
- | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| lt bangku kuh P.def chair my | n-i-po-ogom past-TF-caus-SIT | CAUSER kuh I(nonP) | CAUSEE dih Janama. nonP.def Janama |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
- I made Janama sit in my chair (save my seat).
(not *I made Janama cause my chair to sit.)*

Another such stem is uli return. The intransitive sense *go home* is the most common use of this stem, either in Nominative (muli) or Locative (ulion) Focus. The transitive form monguli means to return something that has been borrowed, or to return a person's change after a purchase.

As expected, the affected Agent accusative form po-uli-on corresponds to the intransitive sense (*cause to go home* as in example (11)), the non-affected form poN-uli-on to the transitive (*cause to give back*). The Translative Focus causative marks direct causation with the Undergoer of the transitive sense in focus, rather than mediated causation in the intransitive sense:

- (61)
- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| lpooli (i-po-uli) TF-caus-RETURN | CAUSER kuh I(nonP) | CAUSEE dih James nonP.def James | PIV-UNDERGOER it teep kuh P.def <i>tape.recorder my</i> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
- tu ara'ag dati.
because spoiled likely
I am going to make James give back my cassette player before he spoils it.

Interestingly, the Dative Focus causative form is ambiguous. The meaning corresponding to the transitive sense (example (62)) indicates indirect causation, according to the pattern described in section 3.2 below. The meaning corresponding to the intransitive sense (example (63)) should signal Location as being in focus, but seems to have neither a Causer nor any possible explicit Pivot (the implicit Pivot is *home*). The best translation for this form is something like *on the way home*.

- (62)
- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Poolian (po-uli-an) poh dinoh caus-RETURN-DatF n-olos-∅ past-BORROW-AccF | yet that dialo he(nonP) at me(nonP) | CAUSEE ₂ dih Janama nonP.def Janama | PIV-UNDERGOER it buuk dit P.def book REL.def |
|---|---|--|--|
- Tell Janama to return the book he borrowed from me.*
(speaker = Causer₁; hearer = Causee₁-Causer₂)
- (63) Poolian (po-uli-an) noh dati dialo irih.
caus-RETURN-DatF *already likely he(nonP) this*
He must be on his way home.

3.2 Transitive stems

When the Patient of a transitive causative verb is in focus, as described in section 2.1 above, the verb normally takes Translative Focus. However, when the causation is indirect or mediated, the verb takes Dative Focus. This pattern is illustrated in the following examples:

- (64)
- | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Papatayan (po-patai-an) caus-KILL-DatF | CAUSER ₁ dialo he(nonP) | CAUSEE ₂ dikau you(nonP.sg) | PIV-PATIENT it tasu yoh, P.def dog his |
|---|--|--|--|
- it minanabpo (-in-m-poN-tabpo) dit manuk nuh.
REL.def *-past-NomF-trans-CATCH nonP.def *chicken your*
He wants you to kill his dog that caught your chicken.
(speaker = Causee₁-Causer₂)
- (65)
- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Pa-lapak-ai caus-SPLIT-DatF.imper | CAUSEE ₂ dih tama nuh nonP.def father your | PIV-PATIENT inoh niyuw. that(P) coconut |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
- Get your father to split that coconut.*
(speaker = Causer₁; hearer = Causee₁-Causer₂)
- (66)
- | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Peduan (po-idu-an) caus-REMOVE-DatF | CAUSER ₁ dih Jaiwan nonP.def Jaiwan | mari surely | CAUSEE ₂ dikau you(nonP) | PIV-PATIENT it tali P.def rope |
|--|--|----------------|---|--------------------------------------|

dit nokosogilit.
 REL.def wrapped.around.stake
Jaiwan wants you to go free the rope that (the buffalo) has wound around the stake.
 (speaker = Causee₁-Causer₂)

(67) Po-owit-an | BENEFACTIVE | CAUSEE₂ | PIV-PATIENT
 caus-BRING-DatF | dogo | dit tobpinee kuh | it dangol
 | me(nonP) | nonP.def sibling my | P.def bush.knife
 kuh.
 my
Have my brother bring me my bush knife.
 (speaker = Causer₁; hearer = Causee₁-Causer₂)

Compare the indirect Dative Focus forms used in these examples with the direct forms (ipapatai, ipalapak, ipoowit) in examples (17)-(19).

The Causee₁-Causer₂ is most commonly either the speaker or the hearer, as in all four of the above examples, and so can be inferred from the pragmatic context. Imperative causatives with the Patient in focus are apparently always marked as indirect, since they necessarily involve mediated or secondary causation: the speaker tells the hearer to cause some third participant to act.

It is apparently impossible for the intermediary (Causee₁-Causer₂) to appear as an explicit element of a clause involving transitive or ditransitive verb stems. For this reason, there is no direct evidence of an increase in valence in the indirect causative as opposed to the corresponding direct causative form. However, there is some indirect evidence of increased valence which will be discussed in section 3.4 below.

The semantic distinction between the direct and indirect causative forms is shown in the following example:

(68) PIV-PATIENT | | CAUSER(Nom) |
 Tongoh | ot {i-po-owit / *po-owit-an} | nuh
 what | P.indef TF-caus-BRING / caus-BRING-DatF | you(nonP.sg)
 CAUSEE(Acc)
 dogo?
 me(nonP)
What do you want me to bring?

Since there can be no intermediary between the second person Causer and first person Causee, the indirect form poowitan is impossible.

There are some contexts where the semantic distinction between direct and indirect causation does not involve the presence or absence of an intermediary (Causee₁-Causer₂). In such cases, when the Patient of the transitive verb is in focus, the direct and indirect causative forms may be equally grammatical, and the semantic contrast hard to pin down.

Mohanan (1983) describes indirect causation as being non-agentive, while direct causation is agentive. This distinction is helpful for understanding the uses of indirect causative forms which do not involve mediated causation, as in the following examples:

- (69) Ong amu omot-on dikoo, {(a) i-po-omot / (b) pa-amat-an}
if not HARVEST-AccF you(nonP.pl) TF-caus-HARVEST caus-HARVEST-DatF
- | | |
|----------------|-------------------|
| CAUSER (Nom) | CAUSEE (Acc) |
| yah | do tulun. |
| we (nonP.excl) | nonP.indef person |
- If you won't harvest (our rice), we'll (a) get someone else to do it;
 (b) let someone else do it.*

The Translative Focus form (a) (corresponding to direct causation) implies that the owner of the field will keep the harvested rice; the harvesters will work for wages or shares. The dative form (b) (corresponding to indirect causation) implies that the harvesters will be free to keep what they harvest, if they want it. The Translative Focus form is more agentive and entails greater control on the part of the Causer than the Dative Focus.

A further semantic complication is that the Dative Focus (indirect causative) form may also be used when the Causee is in focus:

- (70) PIV-CAUSEE | CAUSER (Nom) | PATIENT (TF)
- | | | | | |
|------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| lsai | po-owit-an | nuh | m-uli | dinoh |
| who | caus-BRING-DatF | you (nonP.sg) | NomF-RETURN | that (nonP) |
- sada nuh?
fish your
Who will you ask to take your fish home for you?
- (71) PIV-CAUSEE | PATIENT (TF)
- | | | | | | |
|------|------------------|-------------|-----------|------|--------|
| lsai | pong-owit-on | ditih | dialo | do | tayad? |
| who | trans-BRING-AccF | this (nonP) | he (nonP) | poss | share |
- Who can we send to take his share to him?*

The semantic difference between forms like (70) and (71) involves difficulty of selection. The dative indicates that many possible Causees are available, or that the choice of Causee is irrelevant, while the normal accusative (non-affected Agent) form may indicate that it is hard to find a suitable or willing causee. Again, the dative form here seems to signal reduced agency rather than mediated causality.

3.3 Ditransitive stems

Ditransitive causatives normally assign Translative Focus to the Theme and Dative Focus to the Goal or Recipient. But when the Goal/Recipient is in focus, Translative Focus can be used to signal indirect causation.

- (72)
- | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------|
| l-pa-taak | BENEFACTIVE | CAUSEE ₂ | THEME |
| TF-caus-GIVE | dogon | dit sawo kuh | dot gaji |
| | me (nonP) | nonP.def spouse my | nonP.indef wages |
- PIV-GOAL
- | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| it moongomot | tu, aso siin kuh. |
| P.def harvester | because not.exist money my |
- Ask my husband to give the harvesters their wages for me, because I don't have any money.*
 (speaker = Causer₁; hearer = Causee₁-Causer₂)

(73)

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| l-pa-taak TF-caus-GIVE | CAUSEE ₂ dih Maji nonP.def Maji | THEME do siin nonP.indef money | PIV-GOAL it tanak yoh P.def child his | tu, because |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|

aso noh siin yoh.
not.exist already money his
Tell Maji to give his son some money, he's broke.
 (speaker = Causer₁; hearer = Causee₁-Causer₂)

Again, some instances of the indirect causative form do not involve mediated causation. The precise semantic distinction between the (indirect) Translative Focus form in the following example and the corresponding (direct) Dative Focus form in example (55) above is not known. It presumably relates to the agency of the Causer, e.g. *ask him to rub medicine on it* vs. *let him rub medicine on it*.

(74)

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Ong oruol <i>if hurt</i> | (PIV-GOAL) inoh takod nuh, <i>that(P) leg your</i> | ipesu (i-po-isu) TF-caus-SMEAR | CAUSEE do dorisa nonP.indef dresser |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|

THEME
dot tubat.
nonP.indef medicine
If your leg hurts, get the dresser to rub medicine on it.

As stated above, indirect causation is morphologically marked only when the nuclear clause constituent lowest on hierarchy B is in focus: Causee-Actor for intransitives, Patient for transitives, and Goal/Recipient for ditransitives. To express mediated causation when other elements are in focus, explicitly bi-clausal constructions must be used, such as the following:

(75)

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| N-i-pa-taak past-TF-caus-GIVE | CAUSER ₁ kuh I(nonP) | CAUSER ₁ CAUSER ₂ dit tanak nuh nonP.def child your | PIV-THEME itih siin <i>this(P) money</i> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|

| | | |
|---|------------------------|--|
| CAUSEE ₂ -GOAL ₁ sid dih Janama <i>to nonP.def Janama</i> | pa-ka'a caus-ARRIVE | GOAL ₂ sid dih Jaiwan. <i>to nonP.def Jaiwan.</i> |
|---|------------------------|--|

I asked your son to have Janama give this money to Jaiwan.

(76)

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| PIV-CAUSEE ₁ CAUSER ₂ Isai <i>who</i> | ot s-in-uu-Ø P.indef *-past-SEND-AccF | CAUSER ₁ nuh <i>you (nonP)</i> | popelo (po-po-ilo) caus-caus-KNOW |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|
| CAUSEE ₂ -CAUSER ₃ dih sawo nuh nonP.def spouse your | po-po-odop caus-caus-SLEEP | CAUSEE ₃ dit tanak? nonP.def child |
|--|-------------------------------|---|

Who did you send to tell your wife to put the baby to sleep?

To summarise the shifts involved in indirect causation, a revised version of Figure C is repeated here.

Rule 1 (direct causation): All constituents shift one position to the right unless blocked by another constituent (i.e. no doubling).

Rule 2 (indirect causation): The rightmost nuclear constituent in each row shifts, regardless of doubling. Shift right one position, but from lowest (rightmost) position in hierarchy shift left one position.

Figure D: Summary of focus shift in causatives

| | NomF (m-) | AccF (-on) | TF (i-) | LocF (-on) | DatF (-an) |
|----------|--------------|---------------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| Intrans. | S | → - | --→ - | Loc. → - | - |
| Trans. | A | → P | → - | → - | Ben. |
| Ditrans. | A | → - | Theme ← * | → - | Goal |

*LocF available only to intransitive verbs.
 → = Rule 1 (direct causation)
 --→ = Rule 2 (indirect causation)

3.4 A note on doubling

Comrie (1976, 1981) stated his Case Hierarchy in terms of grammatical relations (see Hierarchy A above). In Dusunic languages, neither the morphological cases (i.e. focus types) nor the syntactic cases (Actor, Undergoer, Referent, Oblique) correspond precisely to the grammatical relations Subject, Direct Object, Indirect Object, etc.

This paper deals with shifts in focus assignment involved in causative formation, which parallel Comrie's hierarchy in interesting ways. The shift in non-Pivot (i.e. syntactic) case assignment is also consistent with Comrie's paradigm, though far simpler than the shift in focus types: the Causer is marked as Actor, while Causee is "demoted" to Undergoer.

Comrie (1976) showed that the syntax of causativisation in a given language depends to a great extent on the possibility of doubling on certain syntactic positions. It appears that in Kimaragang, the process of causative formation itself affects the acceptability of doubling, both in focus types and in syntactic case assignment.

In non-causative constructions, no doubling of focus types is possible. The same is true for direct causatives, which explains why the Theme of a ditransitive verb is "blocked" from shifting to Dative Focus (see Figure C above). DatF is assigned to the Goal, which cannot shift, being at the lowest position on the hierarchy. Thus the constraint against double assignment of focus types forces the theme to remain in Translative Focus.

However, in indirect causation, this constraint is weakened. For both transitive and ditransitive stems, indirect causation is marked by a focus type already assigned to another element of the clause. The Patient of a transitive verb takes DatF in indirect causatives, merging with the Benefactive; and the Goal or Recipient of a ditransitive shifts to Translative Focus, merging with the Theme.

Even in non-causative constructions, there is a limited form of doubling allowed on the syntactic case Undergoer. One such instance was seen in example (45), where the Goal and Theme of the ditransitive verb are both marked as Undergoer. Transitive and ditransitive verbs may also take a Benefactive NP, which is

marked as Undergoer when not in focus. Since the Patient of a transitive and the Theme of a ditransitive are also marked as Undergoer, there is a potential double assignment here.

However, it is very rare for both Benefactive and Patient to occur as non-Pivot elements of the same clause. Only non-Pivot NPs are marked for syntactic case, and the rules of focus assignment prevent the Agent of an independent transitive verb from being selected as Pivot if there is another definite NP in the clause. Under normal circumstances when both Benefactive and Patient are present, one of them would almost certainly be definite, and thus selected as Pivot.

In causatives, the Causee is marked as Undergoer when not in focus, creating three potential Undergoers in a transitive causative construction (Causee, Patient, and Benefactive).

In indirect causatives formed from intransitive roots, the Causee₁-Causer₂ is also marked as Undergoer (Causee₂ is always in focus, hence not marked for syntactic case). This may explain why the Causee₁-Causer₂ is never an explicit element of an indirect causative construction involving a transitive stem - its presence would introduce a fourth potential Undergoer.

Even though the Causee₁-Causer₂ cannot appear explicitly with transitive stems, the process of indirect causative formation does seem to affect the potential for explicit doubling (or tripling) of Undergoer in a single clause. It is easier to insert a Benefactive into an indirect causative construction than the corresponding direct causative construction. Compare the following examples:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------------|---------------------|---------------|
| (77) | | BENEFACTIVE | CAUSEE ₂ | PIV-PATIENT |
| Po-owit-an | dogo | dih | Majudil | it tompa kuh. |
| caus-BRING-DatF | me (nonP) | nonP.indef | Majudil | P.def shoe my |
| | <i>Have Majudil bring me my shoes.</i> | | | |

| | | | |
|---------------|--|--------------|---------------|
| (78) | | CAUSEE (Acc) | PIV-PATIENT |
| l-po-owit | (??dogo) | dih | Majudil |
| TF-caus-BRING | (me) | nonP.indef | Majudil |
| | | | it tompa kuh. |
| | | | P.def shoe my |
| | <i>Have Majudil bring (me) my shoes.</i> | | |

The presence of dogo in example (78) is at least highly unnatural, if not ungrammatical. If accepted as grammatical, it seems to imply that the Causee (Majudil) already knows about the request. The presence of dogo in example (77), however, is entirely natural and carries no such implication.⁷

Further evidence relating to potential for doubling of Undergoers is seen in the following two examples:

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------------|---------------------|----------------|---------|
| (79) | | BENEFACTIVE | CAUSEE ₂ | PIV-PATIENT | |
| Po-owit-an | dogon | dih | Janama | itih siin | i-taak |
| caus-BRING-DatF | me (nonP) | nonP.def | Janama | this (P) money | TF-GIVE |
| | <i>sid tanak kuh.</i> | | | | |
| | <i>to child my</i> | | | | |
| | <i>Please have Janama bring this money to my son for me.</i> | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|----------------|---------|
| (80) | | CAUSEE (Acc) | CAUSER (Nom) | PIV-PATIENT | |
| N-i-po-owit | dogon | dih | Janama | itih siin | i-taak |
| past-TF-caus-BRING | me (nonP) | nonP.def | Janama | this (P) money | TF-GIVE |

sid dikau.
 to you(nonP.sg)
Janama asked me to bring you this money.

The non-focus elements dogon and dih Janama are identical in the two sentences, but the interpretation varies depending on the form of the verb. In example (79), the indirect causative form is used. This makes it possible for both non-Pivot elements to be interpreted as Undergoers: dogon as Benefactive and dih Janama as Causee₂. However, the direct causative form in example (80) allows for only one Undergoer. Since dogon (∩ dogo) is a non-Actor pronoun form, it must be the Undergoer, and dih Janama must be interpreted as the Actor, i.e. Causer. Thus dogon is interpreted as the Causee.

It may be that this phenomenon relates to a constraint on the number of clausal elements (i.e. valence) rather than a constraint on doubling as such. Consider the following ditransitive examples involving direct causation:

(81)

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------|
| | CAUSEE ₂ | PIV-THEME | RECIPIENT | |
| l-pa-taak | dih Maji | itih siin | sid tanak yoh | tu, |
| TF-caus-GIVE | nonP.def Maji | this(P) money | to child his | because |

aso noh siin yoh.
not.exist already money his
Tell Maji to give his son some money, he's broke.

(82)

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------|--|
| | BENEFACTIVE | CAUSEE ₂ | PIV-THEME | |
| l-pa-taak | dogon | dit tanak nuh | itih siin | |
| TF-caus-GIVE | me(nonP) | nonP.def child your | this(P) money | |

| | | |
|-------------|--------------------|--|
| | RECIPIENT | |
| pa-ka'a | sid dih Janama. | |
| caus-ARRIVE | to nonP.def Janama | |

Please ask your son to give this money to Janama for me.

In example (81), the Recipient is encoded as Referent, a nuclear clause element marked by the particle sid to. However, when a Benefactive (dogon) is inserted, as in example (82), the Recipient must be shifted to a subordinate clause by the insertion of the verb paka'a. Apparently the total number of explicit non-oblique elements of a simple clause must not exceed three.

However, note that in indirect causation it is possible for four explicit elements to occur in the same simple clause, as in example (72) above. This would support the hypothesis that the greater acceptability of Benefactives in indirect causative constructions as opposed to direct causatives is a consequence of the increase in valence associated with the shift from direct to indirect causation.

4. INSTRUMENT AND THEME

4.1 Instrumental causatives

Instrumental Focus on non-causative verbs is indicated by the prefix poN-, as in the following examples:

- (83) PIV-INST
 Tongoh | ot pomoli (poN-boli), aso siin kuh ditih.
what P.indef IF-BUY not.have money my this
What can we buy it with, I don't have any money.
- (84)
 Mongowit (m-poN-owit) | PIV-AGENT | | PATIENT/(PIV-INST) |
 okuh | poh | do dangol | tu
 NomF-trans-TAKE | I(P) | yet | nonP.indef bush.knife | because
 pangalapak (poN-lapak) do niyuw.
 IF-SPLIT nonP.indef coconut
I'll take a bush knife along to split coconuts with.

Generally speaking, only transitive verbs with non-affected Agents involve the use of Instruments. With causative forms of such verbs, the Causee-Agent will be marked as non-affected when it is in focus. When the Instrument is in focus, it takes the affected Agent marking. This provides further examples of contrast between affected vs. non-affected Agent forms such as the following:

- (85)
 Pomoliyo (poN-boli-o) poh | PATIENT (TF) | PIV-CAUSEE |
 do tasin | ih Wati | tu,
 trans-BUY-AccF.imper yet | nonP.indef salt | P.def Wati | because
 aso noh tasin tokou.
non.exist already salt us(pl.incl)
Send Wati to buy some salt, we are all out.
 (Causee = non-affected Agent)
- (86)
 Po-boli-o poh | PATIENT (Acc) | PIV-INST |
 dot kuui | it siin nuh!
 caus-BUY-AccF.imper yet | nonP.indef cake | P.def money your
Spend (the rest of) your money on cakes!
 (Instrument = affected Agent)
- (87)
 Ong koo-titip | (PIV-INST) | |
 do dangol, | kada'ai pa-lapak-o |
 if imm-FORGE | nonP.indef bush.knife | don't caus-SPLIT-AccF.imper |
 PATIENT
 dot niyuw.
 nonP.indef coconut
Don't try to split coconuts with a newly forged bush knife.
 (Instrument = affected Agent)
 (cf. example (14))
- (88)
 Po-omot-on | AGENT | | PIV-INST |
 kuh | petih (poh itih) | linggaman nuh |
 caus-HARVEST-AccF | I(nonP) | yet | this (P) harvest.knife your |
 ditih, | ong atarom ko amu.
 this | if sharp or not
I will try harvesting with your knife to see whether it is sharp.
 (Instrument = affected Agent)
 (cf. example (13))

Semantically, the Instrumental case carries an inherently causative component of meaning: the Agent causes the Instrument to affect the Patient. The Instrument is, in this analysis, a kind of Causee-Agent, but with little or no volitionality or control over the event. Thus it seems perfectly natural to mark the

Instrument as an affected Causee-Agent, while the true Agent is marked as non-affected Causee.⁸

Notice that examples (86)-(88) above are formally causative, but do not convey an explicitly causative meaning. Semantically, no new participants are introduced by the causative form - the Agent does not become a Causee - though syntactically the valence is altered by incorporating the oblique Instrument into the clause nucleus.

The primary usage of the po- -on form, i.e. for focusing on an affected Agent Causee, is semantically as well as morphologically causative. The secondary, non-causative usage in examples (86)-(88) will be referred to as the *instrumental causative*, to distinguish it from the true causative (affected Agent) sense.

The Theme of ditransitive clauses, which normally takes Translative Focus, may also take the instrumental causative form when it is in focus, as in the following example:

- (89) PIV-THEME
 Nunuh sontubat | ot pesuon (po-isu-on)?
what a.medicine | P.indef caus-SMEAR-AccF
Which medicine do you want rubbed on?

This example is part of a more general pattern which will be discussed in the following section.

4.2 Translative Focus and causativity

Many intransitive verbs take on an explicitly causative sense when they are marked for Translative Focus, even without the use of the causative prefix po-. Such Translative Focus forms are often equivalent to the intransitive (i.e. affected Agent) Causee-focused forms:

- (90) Ong taak-an okuh dikau do siin, {potolibon (po-talib-on)
if GIVE-DatF me (P) you (nonP.sg) nonP.indef money caus-PASS.BY-AccF
- | | | |
|--------------|---------|------------|
| / i-talib} | CAUSER | PIV-CAUSEE |
| / TF-PASS.BY | kuh | ikau. |
| | I(nonP) | you (P.sg) |
- If you give me money I will let you go past.*
- (91)
- | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|------------|-------------|
| {l-suwang / po-suwang-on} | CAUSER | PIV-CAUSEE | LOCATION |
| TF-ENTER caus-ENTER-AccF | kuh | it wogok | sid tinsod. |
| | I(nonP) | P.def pig | to pig.pen |
- I'll put the pig into his pen.*
- (92)
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-----------------|
| {l-tuun / po-tuun-on} | CAUSER | PIV-CAUSEE | |
| TF-DROP / caus-DROP-AccF | kuh | itih korita | silod piro'ong. |
| | I(nonP) | this (P) car | there-at cliff |
- I am going to drive this car over that cliff.*

Examples (93) and (94) below are extracted from a folktale. Notice the equivalence of the causative form posowito in (93) with the Translative Focus nisawit in (94). The root sawit is an intransitive, meaning *to hang* (as a picture hangs). Again, the parentheses around the constituent tag "PIV-CAUSEE" indicate

that the label relates to the clause following the one of which the labelled NP is an explicit element.

- (93)
- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|--|--------------|--|----------|------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Kobobos | nopoh | yalo | mongimpuros | | (PIV-CAUSEE) | | dit | roo | dit | kanas, |
| <i>satisfied</i> | <i>only</i> | <i>he</i> (P) | <i>examine</i> | | | | nonP.def | <i>jaw</i> | <i>of</i> | <i>wild.pig</i> |
-
- | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------------|--|------------------|--|----------------|
| posowito | (po-sawit-o) | noh | | CAUSER | | LOCATION |
| caus-HANG-AccF.nonfin | <i>already</i> | <i>he</i> (nonP) | | dialo | | sid tayup. |
| | | | | <i>he</i> (nonP) | | <i>on post</i> |
- When he was tired of examining the jawbone of the pig, he hung it on the post of his trap.*
- (94)
- | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|--|--------------|--|----------|-------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Jadi, | pamanau | noh | dirih | mogintong | | (PIV-CAUSEE) | | dit | tulang | dit | roo | dit |
| <i>so</i> | <i>walked</i> | <i>already</i> | <i>this</i> | <i>look.at</i> | | | | nonP.def | <i>bone</i> | <i>of</i> | <i>jaw</i> | <i>of</i> |
-
- | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------|--------------|--|----------|--|--------------------|
| kanas, | it | n-i-sawit | | CAUSER | | LOCATION |
| <i>wild.pig</i> | REL.def | past-TF-HANG | | dih | | sid tayup yoh. |
| | | | | nonP.def | | <i>on post his</i> |
- So they went to look at the jawbone of the wild pig, which the man had hung on the post of his trap.*

When the Causee is animate, the contrast between Translative Focus and the affected Agent form may reflect the degree of agency on the part of the Causer. For instance, in examples (9) and (43) above, the causative form poodopon (*put to sleep*) is more agentive than the Translative Focus form niodop (*invited to sleep*).

Notice that semantically all of the above Translative Focus examples involve an element of physical motion. If there is no such semantic component in the basic meaning of the stem, e.g. with *sleep* and *hang*, the use of Translative Focus introduces it.

In the same way, transitive stems which normally mark their Patients in the accusative (or, like *tutud burn*, in the dative) take on an added sense of motion when the Patient is marked with Translative Focus.

- (95)
- | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--|---------------------|------------|-----|-------------------|
| Mamanau | (m-poN-panau) | | (PIV-PATIENT-THEME) | | ong | i-tatud. |
| NomF-trans-WALK | | | itih | pen | | <i>if</i> TF-BURN |
| | | | <i>this</i> (P) | <i>pen</i> | | |
- This pen will work if you hold the point in a flame.*
- (96)
- | | | | | | | |
|------------|-------------|--|---------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------|
| Intang-an | tinoo | | (PIV-PATIENT-THEME) | | dit | n-i-sidang |
| WATCH-DatF | <i>soon</i> | | P.def | <i>cloth</i> | | REL.def past-TF-DRY |
| | | | | | | |
- Check on the clothes (I) put out to dry.*
- (97)
- | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|-----------------|--|-------------------|--------------|-----------|--------|------------------------------|
| N-i-suun | | AGENT | | PIV-PATIENT-THEME | | tu | aralom | ilo |
| past-TF-CARRY | | kuh | | it | tanak | kuh | | |
| | | <i>I</i> (nonP) | | P.def | <i>child</i> | <i>my</i> | | <i>because deep that</i> (P) |
- bawang.*
river
I held my child up over my head because the river was so deep.

For stems that do not generally involve an Instrument, the instrumental causative form may be equivalent to the Translative Focus form. Compare the instrumental causative in the following example with the synonymous Translative Focus in example (97):

- (98)
- | | | | | |
|------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| | AGENT | | PIV-PATIENT-THEME | |
| Nan | kuh | po-suun-o | it tanak kuh | tu |
| <i>did</i> | <i>I(nonP)</i> | caus-CARRY-AccF.nonfin | P.def <i>child my</i> | <i>because</i> |
- aralom ilo bawang.
deep that(P) river
I held my child up over my head because the river was so deep.

As seen in example (95) above, the Translative Focus form *itutud* merely entails poking something into the fire. However, the instrumental causative form of *burn*, *potutudon*, definitely involves setting fire to an Instrument of some type: something that gives light or something to transmit the fire with.

- (99)
- | | | | | |
|----------------------|------------|--|----------------------|--|
| | | | PIV-PATIENT-INST | |
| Po-tutud-o | poh | | itih lampu! | |
| caus-BURN-AccF.imper | <i>yet</i> | | <i>this (P) lamp</i> | |
- Light this lamp!*
- (100)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | AGENT | | PIV-PATIENT-INST | |
| Po-tutud-on | nuh | | inoh poring | om owit-on sitih. |
| caus-BURN-AccF | <i>you(nonP.sg)</i> | | <i>that(P) bamboo</i> | and BRING-AccF here |
- Light that bamboo and bring it over here.*

As discussed above, non-causative Translative Focus forms of some intransitive stems can be used to convey an overtly causative meaning. The converse is true for ditransitive stems: the Theme may sometimes be marked as an affected Causee, even when no causation is involved. Again, the instrumental causative in the following example is synonymous with the Translative Focus form in example (49).

- (101)
- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| | AGENT | | PIV-THEME | GOAL |
| Nokuroh.tu pesuon (po-isu-on) | nuh | | inoh tinasak | sid |
| <i>why</i> | caus-SMEAR-AccF | <i>you(nonP.sg)</i> | <i>that(P) oil</i> | <i>on</i> |
- buuk kuh?
book my
Why did you smear that oil on my book?
 (cf. example (49) above)

However, the following two examples are not quite perfect synonyms:

- (102)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| | BENEFACTIVE | | PIV-THEME | GOAL |
| Pa-taak-on | dogo | | itih siin | sid dih Maralin. |
| caus-GIVE-AccF | <i>me(nonP)</i> | | <i>this (P) money</i> | to nonP.def <i>Maralin</i> |
- Give this money to Maralin for me.*
- (103)
- | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| | AGENT | | GOAL | |
| PIV-THEME | nuh | | sid dih Maralin. | |
| Itih siin | <i>you(nonP.sg)</i> | | to nonP.def <i>Maralin</i> | |
- Give this money to Maralin for me.*

The use of a causative form in example (102) instead of simple Translative Focus as in example (103) functions as a softened command. *Pataakon* in example (102) sounds like a polite request, while *itaak* sounds rude and possibly even suspicious ("Be sure you give this money to Maralin and don't steal it!").

To summarise, there is a general tendency for Translative Focus forms and affected Causee forms to be equivalent. For intransitive stems, this means that

Translative Focus forms take on causative meanings. For ditransitive verbs, the instrumental causative form can be substituted for the simple Translative Focus form, both forms conveying non-causative senses. For transitive verbs not involving an Instrument, both Translative Focus and affected Causee forms convey non-causative senses involving change of position. In all of these cases, the object whose location is affected is in focus.

5. CONVERSIVES

Lexicalised causatives are causative forms which have taken on idiomatic non-causative meanings. A special type of lexicalisation of causative forms in Kimaragang involves the words for *borrow* and *buy*, and their converse actions, *lend* and *sell*.

5.1 'Borrow' and 'lend'

The root *olos* means *borrow*. It is used for things like tools, clothing, etc. which can be returned, as opposed to money and rice, which must be repaid and so take the Malay loanword *utang owe*, rather than *olos*.

The converse action, *lend*, is expressed by the causative form *poolos*, literally *cause to borrow*.

| | | | | |
|-------|--|------------------|--|----------------|
| (104) | | PIV- BORROWER | THEME | |
| | Mongolos (m-poN-olos) NomF-trans-BORROW | okuh I(P) | dit tompa dih Jaiwan nonP.def shoe of Jaiwan | tu, because |
| | pakay-on kuh mibola. WEAR-AccF I(nonP) play.ball I will borrow Jaiwan's shoes to wear when I play soccer. | | | |

| | | | | |
|-------|---|-------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| (105) | | PIV-LENDER | THEME | |
| | Po-olos caus-BORROW | koh-i you(P.sg)-emph | dit tompa nuh nonP.def shoe your | ong olos-on if BORROW-AccF |
| | kuh? I(nonP) Would you loan me your shoes if I asked you? | | | |

In the non-causative forms meaning *borrow*, the borrower (as Agent) takes Nominative Focus, as in example (104). The borrowed items (the theme) takes Accusative Focus as in the second clause of example (105) and both clauses of example (106). The Source (or lender) appears in a possessive form, as in examples (104) and (106), or in Setting Focus, as in example (107) below.

| | | | | | |
|-------|---|----------------|---------------|---|-------------|
| (106) | | BORROWER | | PIV-THEME | |
| | Olos-on BORROW-AccF | kuh I(nonP) | dara would | it korita dih Tosong P.def car of Tosong | nga, but |
| | n-o-olos-Ø dih Jaiwan. past-stat-BORROW-AccF nonP.def Jaiwan I would borrow Tosong's car, but Jaiwan has borrowed it. | | | | |

- (107) | PIV-SOURCE | | BORROWER | THEME
 | lsai | pinangalasan (-in-poN-olos-an) | nuh | ditih
 | who | *-past-SF-BORROW-SF | you(nonP) | this(nonP)
- gampa ditih?
bush.knife this
Who did you borrow this bush knife from?

Dative Focus is possible when a Benefactive is in focus, i.e. someone on whose behalf a thing is borrowed:

- (108) | | PIV-BEN | | THEME
 Ong amu koh maalan, alas-an okuh poh dot
if not you(P.sg) lazy BORROW-DatF me(P) yet nonP.indef
- dangol | SOURCE |
 | sid dih Pangadap.
bush.knife at nonP.def Pangadap
If you are not too lazy, go borrow a bush knife for me from Pangadap.

Viewing the event as a lending, rather than a borrowing, the lender is encoded as Causer. The bare causative form (considered an allomorph of Nominative Focus) is used when the lender is in focus, as in example (105) above. The lendee (borrower), formally encoded as Causee, takes Accusative Focus, and is marked as an affected Agent (by the use of the prefix po- rather than poN-):

- (109) | LENDER | | PIV-LENDEE | THEME |
 Amu kuh po-olos-on ih Jaiwan ditih tompa kuh
not I(nonP) caus-BORROW-AccF P.def Jaiwan this(nonP) shoe my
- tu, ara'ag dati.
because ruined likely
I won't loan my shoes to Jaiwan because he would probably spoil them.

- (110) | | PIV-LENDEE | | THEME |
 Po-olos-o okuh poh dot gampa nuh.
 caus-BORROW-AccF.imper I(P) yet nonP.indef *bush.knife your*
Please loan me your bush knife.

The loaned item takes simple (non-causative) Translative Focus, contrasting with the accusative marking of a borrowed item. Note the TF marking in the following example, in contrast to the AccF marking in example (106) above, even though the Theme is in focus in both cases.

- (111) | LENDER | | LENDEE | | THEME |
 N-i-olos kuh dih Janama it baju kuh.
 past-TF-BORROW I(nonP) nonP.def *Janama* P.def *shirt my*
I loaned Janama my shirt.

In the previous section, we discussed the tendency for simple Translative Focus forms to have (or allow) meanings equivalent to affected Agent causative forms. Indeed, a secondary use of iolos is possible which seems equivalent to pooloson; compare the following example with example (110) above.

- (112) | | PIV-LENDEE | | THEME |
 Ara'at ih Jumin, amu n-i-olos it tanak kuh do
bad P.def Jumin not past-TF-BORROW P.def child my nonP.indef

gampa.
bush.knife

Jumin is a nasty person, he wouldn't loan my son a bush knife.

The affected Agent form pooloson used when the lendeer is in focus ((109)-(110) above) marks the lendeer as filling the Causee slot formally. The non-affected Agent form pongoloso is used for a true Causee, someone who is literally caused (i.e. sent) to borrow something:

- (113)
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|--------------|----------------|-------------|
| Pong-olos-on | poh | PIV-CAUSEE | THEME | SOURCE |
| trans-BORROW-AccF | yet | ih Janama | dot korita | sid dih |
| | | P.def Janama | nonP.indef car | at nonP.def |
- Tosong | tu, saka'an (sako-an) tokou t-um-alob.
Tosong | because MOUNT-DatF we(incl) *-NomF-MARKET
Have Janama borrow a car from Tosong for us to go to market in.

The Translative Focus and Dative Focus causative forms, ipoolos and paalasan, can both be used to focus on the item loaned. They seem to signal varying degrees of volitionality and control on the part of the lender. In the following examples, the non-causative form niolos (example (114)) implies that the borrower requested the loan, and the lender merely agreed; the causative form nipoolos (example (115)) implies that the borrower did not request the loan, but the lender spontaneously offered it:

- (114)
- | | | | |
|----------------|---------|-----------------|------------------|
| N-i-olos | LENDER | LENDEE | PIV-THEME |
| past-TF-BORROW | kuh | dih Jaiwan | itih korita kuh. |
| | I(nonP) | nonP.def Jaiwan | this(P) car my |
- I lent Jaiwan my car.*
- (115)
- | | | | |
|---------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------|
| N-i-po-olos | LENDER | LENDEE | PIV-THEME |
| past-TF-caus-BORROW | kuh | dih Jaiwan | itih korita kuh. |
| | I(nonP) | nonP.def Jaiwan | this(P) car my. |
- I offered to loan Jaiwan my car.*

The contrast is seen even more clearly if the result is negated. In the causative form, the negation implies that the offer was refused. In the non-causative form, the negation implies that the borrower changed his mind or was somehow prevented from using the car:

- (116)
- | | | | | |
|----------------|---------|-----------------|------------------|-----|
| N-i-olos | LENDER | LENDEE | PIV-THEME | |
| past-TF-BORROW | kuh | dih Jaiwan | itih korita kuh, | nga |
| | I(nonP) | nonP.def Jaiwan | this car my | but |
- amu n-olos-Ø dialo.
not past-BORROW-AccF he(nonP)
I agreed to let Jaiwan borrow my car, but he didn't get to use it.
- (117)
- | | | | |
|---------------------|---------|-----------------|------------------|
| N-i-po-olos | LENDER | LENDEE | PIV-THEME |
| past-TF-caus-BORROW | kuh | dih Jaiwan | itih korita kuh, |
| | I(nonP) | nonP.def Jaiwan | this(P) car my |
- nga amu n-olos-Ø dialo.
but not past-BORROW-AccF he(nonP)
I offered to loan my car to Jaiwan, but he refused.

The semantic distinction in these examples is roughly *agree to lend* (iolos) vs. *offer to lend* (ipoolos). A third possible form focusing on the loaned item is the Dative, paalasan. This seems to imply even higher volitionality on the part of the lender. In the following example, the Dative form implies: "I'm going to loan him my shoes whether he wants them or not!"

- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|---------|-------|----------|---------|-----------|-----|
| (118) | | LENDER | | LENDEE | | PIV-THEME | |
| | Pa-alas-an | kuh | poh | dialo | itih | tompa kuh | ong |
| | caus-BORROW-DatF | I(nonP) | yet | he(nonP) | this(P) | shoe my | if |
| | r-um-ilik | noh | yalo. | | | | |
| | *-NomF-CLEAR.BRUSH | already | he(P) | | | | |
| | <i>I am going to loan him my shoes when he goes to clear brush.</i> | | | | | | |

This example also carries the sense of a loan with no strings attached, no matter if the shoes are damaged, lost, or stolen by the borrower.

5.2 'Buy' and 'sell'

There are two words for *buy* in Kimaragang, *boli* and *dagang*. In non-causative forms, the two seem to be perfect synonyms, and have the same focus properties. For both roots, Accusative Focus is used for the item purchased (example (119)), and Dative Focus for the Benefactive (example (120)):

- (119) Nunuh oh {boli-on / dagang-on} nuh?
what P.indef BUY-AccF BUY-AccF you(nonP)
What are you going to buy?
- (120) {Boli-ai / dagang-ai} okuh poh do tasin!
 BUY-DatF.imper me(P) yet nonP.indef salt
Buy me some salt!

However, in the causative forms there is a definite semantic distinction. *Poboli* means *cause to buy*, e.g. persuade or coerce someone to buy something. It implies that the person doing the persuading, the Causer, is not the person selling the item being purchased. *Padagang*, on the other hand, means simply *to sell*.

A related difference emerges in the Translative Focus forms of these two verbs. The Translative Focus form *iboli* (or the equivalent instrumental causative *pobolion*) marks the money which is spent as Pivot, as in example (121). *Idagang*, on the other hand, marks that which is sold as Pivot, as in example (122).

- (121) N-i-boli kuh it siin kuh dot tasin.
 past-TF-BUY I(nonP) P.def money my nonP.indef salt
I spent my money on salt.
 (cf. example (86) above)
- (122) {I-dagang / pa-dagang-on} dialo ih kuda yoh.
 TF-BUY / caus-BUY-AccF he(nonP) P.def horse his
He is selling his horse.

In causative constructions, *boli* seems to follow the transitive pattern while *dagang* follows the ditransitive pattern. In both cases the Causee is marked as non-affected Agent (see example (85) above).

Translative Focus is used for both the item purchased (as Patient of a transitive; ipoboli, (123)) and the item sold (as Theme of a ditransitive; ipadagang, (124)).

(123) Amu kuh boli-on dara itih sada ditih nga, n-i-po-boli
 not I(nonP) BUY-AccF *would this(P) fish this but past-TF-caus-BUY*
 dih Akub.
 nonP.def Akub
I wouldn't have bought this fish, but Akub made me buy it.

(124) l-pa-dagang dih Janama ilot karabau odih.
 TF-caus-BUY nonP.def Janama that(P) buffalo over.there
Tell Janama to sell that buffalo over there.

The dative causative form padagangan focuses on the person to whom something is sold, as the Goal of a ditransitive (example (125)). Poboliyan has two uses. It may mark the Pivot as being the Benefactive of a purchase (example (126)); or it may mark the Patient (item purchased) in an indirect causative form (example (127)), according to the transitive pattern discussed in section 3.2 above.

(125) Isai pa-dagang-an kuh ditih kuda kuh?
 who caus-BUY-DatF I(nonP) this(nonP) horse my
Who can/should I sell my horse to?

(126) Po-boli-an kuh dih Paul do jaam ih Sarah nga, amu
 caus-BUY-DatF I(nonP) nonP.def Paul nonP.indef watch P.def Sarah but not
 b-in-oli-an dialo.
 *-past-BUY-DatF he(nonP)
I asked Paul to buy Sarah a watch, but he wouldn't.

(127) Po-boli-an dogon dih apa ilo jaam dilo nga, amu
 caus-BUY-DatF me(nonP) nonP.def father that(P) watch that but not
 kuh b-in-oli-Ø.
 I(nonP) *-past-BUY-AccF
Dad asked me to buy that watch, but I didn't buy it.

The verb tu'un *jump down* (see examples (29)-(30) and (34) above), has an interesting idiomatic sense. The causative form potuun may be used as a synonym for padagang *sell*. However, potuun is used only for produce sold by the sackfull, especially rice, rice powder and copra.

As noted above, tu'un is an intransitive root. However, in this secondary sense, tu'un (like dagang) follows the ditransitive pattern in causative forms. Translative Focus marks the Theme (that which is sold) (example (128)), Dative Focus marks the Goal (example (129)).

(128) l-po-tuun kuh dialo it parai yoh tu aso siin
 TF-caus-DROP I(nonP) he(nonP) P.def rice his because not.exist money
 dialo nga, amu dialo n-i-tuun.
 he(nonP) but not he(nonP) past-TF-DROP
I told him to sell his rice because he is out of money, but he didn't sell it.

- (129) Sid disai do kadai po-tuun-an ditih parai?
at whose poss shop caus-DROP-DatF this (nonP) rice
Which shop should we sell this rice to?

6. CONCLUSION

The changes in focus marking associated with morphological causatives in Kimaragang are quite complex. However, the basic patterns discussed above make it clear that Kimaragang does not fit the pattern described by Comrie (1981), i.e. with the Causee filling the highest available level on hierarchy A. In Kimaragang, the Causee always takes accusative marking, while other participants (Patient, Theme, Goal, Location) are distributed between Dative and Translative Focus.

In the preceding discussion, it has proved essential to classify verb stems as intransitive, transitive or ditransitive (while recognising that some stems have distinct transitive and intransitive senses). For non-causative constructions, such a classification is much less helpful, leaving as much variation unexplained as it accounts for. Indeed, the classification of verb stems in Philippine-type languages in general is a very difficult problem. However, based on the causative data discussed here, the distinction between intransitives, transitives and ditransitives seems to be an important starting point for Kimaragang.

Two instances have been noted where case distinctions marked in non-causative verb morphology are lost in causative constructions. The Location of an intransitive and the Goal of a ditransitive are distinct in non-causative verbs (Locative vs. Dative Focus); but both take Dative Focus in causatives. In the same way, Patients of transitives (Accusative or Dative Focus in non-causative forms) shift to Translative Focus in causatives, merging with the Themes of ditransitive verbs.

This loss of case distinctions is natural, in view of the valence changes associated with causative verbs. When Nominative Focus is assigned to the Causer, there are fewer possible forms to which the other participants can be assigned.

The reduced set of focus possibilities for causative verbs is isomorphic with the set of non-oblique syntactic cases described in section 1.1, except for the addition of the Causer in Nominative Focus. Accusative Focus causatives focus on the Causee, and correspond to Actor of the non-causative (result) event. Translative Focus, marking Patients of transitive causative verbs and Themes of ditransitive causatives, corresponds to non-causative Undergoer. Dative Focus, marking Location of intransitive causatives and Goal of ditransitive causatives, corresponds to the non-causative Referent.

This set of correspondences is summarised in Figure E below.

Figure E: Focus marking of causatives in relation to the non-causative event

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|-----------|----------|
| Focus morpheme: | ∅- | -on | i- | -an |
| Intrans. | Causer | Causee | --- | Location |
| Trans. | Causer | Causee | Patient | --- |
| Ditrans. | Causer | Causee | Theme | Goal |
| Non-causative constituent: | --- | ACTOR | UNDERGOER | REFERENT |

Finally, the possible focus types for both causative and non-causative verbs are summarised in the following matrix. The top row shows the focus-marking affixes, while the left-most column lists the prefixes discussed in this study: poN- 'transitive', and po- 'causative'.

Figure F: Summary of focus-marking affixation for Kimaragang verbs

| | ∅ | m- | -on | i- | -an |
|------|-------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| ∅ | - | m- Nominative Focus (intr.) | -on 1. Acc.Focus (trans.) 2. Loc.Focus (intr.) | i- Translative Focus | -an Dative Focus |
| poN- | poN- Instrumental Focus | m-poN- Nominative Focus (trans.) | poN- -on Causee (non- affected) | - | poN- -an Setting Focus |
| po- | po- Causer | - | po- -on 1. Causee (affected) 2. instr. causative | i-po- 1. secondary caus. (intr.) 2. Patient (trans.) 3. Theme/ secondary caus. (ditran.) | po- -an 1. Location (intr.) 2. secondary caus. (trans.) 3. Goal (ditran.) |

NOTES

¹Translative case in Kimaragang is roughly equivalent to the semantic case-role Theme. Translative Focus is used when the Pivot is the Theme of a ditransitive verb or otherwise undergoes a change of location due to the action of the verb.

Translative and Locative are considered to occupy the same position on hierarchy B, but cannot be ordered with respect to each other; see Figure C below.

²The case marking devices used for non-Pivot NPs are described in my other paper in this volume. They include: Actor vs. Undergoer forms of first and second person (non-Pivot) pronouns, both singular and plural; different non-focus determiners (dih/do for Actor and Undergoer, sid for Referent); and word-order (a preference for Actor to precede Undergoer, which precedes Referent; however, other ordering principles take precedence over this one, e.g. pronouns occur before nouns).

The case marking system for non-focused NPs could be referred to as *syntactic case*, in contrast to the focus system, which could be said to mark *morphological case*. Kimaragang grammar distinguishes four syntactic cases but, in non-causative constructions, seven morphological cases (or focus types).

³The *valence* of a verb is the number of nuclear participants associated with that verb: one for intransitives, two for transitives, three for ditransitives.

⁴The verb *intong look at*, is another transitive which assigns the Undergoer (in this case the Range, that which is seen) to the Dative in non-causative forms. In causatives, *intong* follows the regular transitive pattern of assigning the Undergoer to Translative Focus.

⁵Since the Locative suffix is homophonous with Accusative Focus, the use of the dative here serves to maintain the transitive-intransitive distinction which would be lost if the Patient of the transitive verb *to sit on* took Accusative Focus. Dative Focus is used in the same way with other transitive verbs derived from intransitive roots, e.g. the transitive verb *sleep at; guard* discussed below.

⁶The term *nuclear* is used here to refer to the obligatory constituents of the simple clause, i.e. those which define the valence of the verb. Thus Agent and Patient are nuclear constituents of a transitive clause, while Benefactive is not.

The concept of a clause nucleus, used by Pike and Pike (1982) and Dik (1978, cited in Foley and Van Valin 1984), is comparable to the term *core* used by Foley and Van Valin. However, it is not yet clear whether a simple two-way distinction between the nucleus (or core) and periphery of a clause is possible in Kimaragang.

There is a clear distinction between what I have called here *oblique* constituents, which must be governed by a subordinate verb or verbal preposition, and the *non-oblique* constituents, which are elements of the simple clause. However, the status of the non-oblique, non-nuclear constituents Location (of an intransitive) and Benefactive (of a transitive) remains in question. There seems to be no morphosyntactic distinction between these elements and those I have classed as nuclear, except for the fact that the nuclear elements are obligatory while Location and Benefactive are optional.

⁷Although examples (77)-(78) are glossed as having equivalent meanings, there is a semantic distinction between the direct and indirect causative forms. Example (77) (the indirect form) carries the sense of, "*Go find Majudil and*

have him bring my shoes to me". Example (78), on the other hand, is based on the assumption that Majudil will be going to the hearer's house: "Send my shoes back with Majudil, when/if he comes to see you". Thus in (77), the hearer is both Causee₁ (being sent to find Majudil), and Causer₂ (getting Majudil to carry the shoes). In example (78), the hearer is more nearly a simple Causer.

⁸The semantic analysis outlined above also finds a parallel in non-causative verb morphology. When the Agent of a non-causative transitive verb is in focus, the verb carries the Nominative Focus morpheme, *m-*, plus the transitivity prefix, *poN-*. When the Instrument is in focus, the verb carries only the transitivity prefix; Instrument carries the same marking as Agent, except for the Nominative affix. We could interpret this to mean that Instrument is marked as an Agent but not an Actor, hence an Agent without volitionality.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED

| | | | | | |
|--------|---|--------------------|-------|---|---|
| able | = | habilitative | nonP | = | non-Pivot |
| AccF | = | Accusative Focus | P | = | Pivot |
| CAPS | = | verb root | part | = | particle |
| caus | = | causative | past | = | past tense |
| DatF | = | Dative Focus | pl | = | plural |
| def | = | definite | poss | = | possessive |
| dup | = | reduplication | Q | = | question marker |
| emph | = | emphasis marker | recip | = | reciprocal |
| excl | = | exclusive | REL | = | relative clause linker |
| IF | = | Instrumental Focus | SF | = | Setting Focus |
| imm | = | immediate past | sg | = | singular |
| imper | = | imperative | stat | = | stative |
| incl | = | inclusive | TF | = | Translative Focus |
| indef | = | indefinite | trans | = | transitivity marker |
| LocF | = | Locative Focus | *- | = | initial consonant of stem split by infix |
| NomF | = | Nominative Focus | ∅ | = | zero allomorph |
| nonfin | = | non-finite mood | | | |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

COMRIE, Bernard

1976 The syntax of causative constructions: cross-language similarities and divergences. In M. Shibatani, ed. *Syntax and semantics*, vol.6: *The grammar of causative constructions*, 261-312. New York: Academic Press.

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

DIK, Simon

1978 *Functional grammar*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

DIXON, R.M.W.

1979 Ergativity. *Language* 55/1:59-138.

DYEN, Isidore

- 1965 *A lexicostatistical classification of the Austronesian languages.*
Memoir 19, IJAL 31/1. Baltimore: Waverly Press.

FOLEY, William A. and Robert D. VAN VALIN

- 1984 *Functional syntax and universal grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.

KROEGER, Paul R.

- 1988 Verbal focus in Kimaragang. pp.217-240 in this volume.

MOHANAN, K.P.

- 1983 Move NP or lexical rules? Evidence from Malayalam causativization.
In L. Levin, M. Rappaport and A. Zaenen, eds *Papers in lexical-
functional grammar*, 47-111. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University
Linguistics Club.

PIKE, Kenneth L. and Evelyn G. PIKE

- 1982 *Grammatical analysis* (2nd edition). Arlington, Texas: Summer
Institute of Linguistics.

SAKSENA, Anuradha

- 1980 The affected agent. *Language* 56/4:812-826.

SCHACHTER, Paul

- 1976 The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, actor-topic, or
none of the above. In Charles N. Li, ed. *Subject and topic*, 491-
519. New York: Academic Press.