

Causative Construction: Reduced or Unreduced

Lee Seung Jae

(University of California, San Diego)

Lee, Seung-Jae. 1997. Causative Construction: Reduced or Unreduced. *Linguistics*, 5-1, 197-210. In this paper, I tried a structural and relational grammar approach on the case alternations of causee in Korean causative constructions. I considered the causality of the causative construction with four kinds of cause alternations and explained the Korean causative constructions with the causative clause union under the relational grammar framework. (University of California, San Diego)

1. Introduction

Korean as one of the Ural-Altaic languages, is quite different from the Indo-European Languages. It has some unique characteristics: first, the language order is SOV (Subject-Object-Verb); second, the case is determined by the particles, such as -i, -ka, -el, -lil, -eke, and e. t. c.; third, the subject is omissible. In spite of these unique properties, there are some similarities with respect to the causee encoding; as the Romance Languages, such as French, Italian, especially Spanish, Korean allows the causee alternations. Given that the common causee case alternations are DAT-ACC-OBL in Romance languages, Korean allows one more causee encoding, that is, NOM causee. In this paper, I will consider the causality of the causative construction with four kinds of causee alternations and suggest the diagnostics for the causative construction as a reduced clause.

2. Discussion

2.1 Two Types of Causatives

Korean allows two types of causative forms--the morphological causative and the syntactic causative. The morphological causative is formed by adding a suffix *-I* and the syntactic causative is formed by adding '*-ke -hata*' to the base verb. From the structural perspective, the causative formation process can be explained by the head movement in Travis (1984) or the verb incorporation in Baker (1988), but I will take the relational perspective to explain the causative formation and the causee alternations. In Relational Grammar framework, the causative construction is formed by the clause union of the two predicates, which is called the Causative Clause Union (henceforth CCU). The CCU respects the case revaluation:

- (1) a. If the embedded clause is intransitive, the embedded subject is assigned accusative Case.
- b. If the embedded clause is transitive, the embedded subject is assigned dative Case.

First consider the morphological causative:

- (2) Transitive base verb
 Mary-ka aka-eke/-lel/*-lohaeykem/*-ka pap-el mek-i-ess-ta.
 Mary-NOM baby-DAT/ACC/OBL/NOM food-ACC
 eat-CAU-PST-IND
 'Mary made the baby eat the food.'
- (3) Intransitive base verb
 Mary-ka aka-lel/ *-eke/*-lohaeykem/*-ka ul-i-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-ACC/DAT/OBL/NOM cry-CAU-PST-IND
 'Mary made the baby cry.'

The transitive base morphological causative in (2) allows the Dat and the Acc, but the intransitive base morphological causative in (3) allows only the Acc. This follows the common case pattern of causee encoding.

Noticing that they reject the other causees systematically, let me consider syntactic causatives:

(4) Transitive base verb

Mary-ka aka-eke/-ka/-lel/-lohaeykem pap-el mek-ke ha-ess-ta

Mary-NOM baby-DAT/NOM/ACC/OBL food-ACC

eat-CAU do-PST-IND

'Mary made the baby eat the food.'

(5) Intransitive base verb

Mary-ka aka-lel/-ka/-eke/-lohaeykem ul-ke ha-ess-ta

Mary-NOM baby-ACC/NOM/DAT/OBL cry-CAU do-PST-IND

'Mary made the baby cry.'

For the syntactic causatives, the case alignment is much free. As in (4) and (5), four cases are alternated on the causee. If the three cases on the causee--Acc/Dat/Obl follow the causee alternations, and if we assume the Nom causee as a kind of causee cases as in Gerdts (1990), all four cases on the causee can be subject to the CCU. Before discussing clausality, I will assume four-causee cases in the syntactic causative.

2.2 Reduced vs. Unreduced clause

The basic insight regarding reduced constructions in Romance Languages is that *verbs that allow upstairs cliticization sometimes allow other normally bounded processes to apply in a less bounded manner.* (Moore (1996))¹ Aissen and Perlmutter (1983) develop diagnostics for reduced constructions in their work of Spanish verbs: Upstairs Cliticization, Reflexive Passive, Passive and **Though-Movement**. However, it is difficult to apply these diagnostics directly to Korean, because Korean does not have the phenomenons like the **apparent cliticization**, reflexive passive and **though-movement**. Having established the above diagnostics for reduced construction in Romance language, we can similarly compare it with Korean to develop diagnostics for reduced constructions.²

1 The most dependent indicator for the reduction structure in Romance language is the cliticization. (Moore (1996))

2. Reduced constructions are commonly thought to compromise two major

2.2.1 What is mono-clausal characteristics?

The syntactic causative is controversial about the clausal status, that is mono-clausal, or bi-clausal and it shows ambiguity in many ways. The fact is that many aspects of the syntactic causative in Korean make it a unreduced clause. In spite of this unreduced clausal characteristics, there are still some other aspects that make us wonder if it is a unreduced clause. As one account for this, the distinction between VP and IP is suggested in the GB framework.³ As a diagnostics of the clausal status, I will examine the constituency in Korean.

2.2.2.1 Conjunction

Let me consider the status of the embedded clause. If the embedded clause can make a constituent no matter what it is VP or IP, it can allow conjunction of the same constituents.

- (6)a. Mary-ka aka-eke [_{NP} milk-oa juice-lel] masi-ke-ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-DAT milk-CONJ juice-ACC
 drink-CAU-do-PST-IND
 'Mary made the baby drink milk and juice.'
- b. Mary-ka aka-eke [_{VP} milk-lel masi-ko][_{VP} juice-lel masi]
 -ke ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-DAT [_{VP} milk-ACC drink-CONJ]
 [_{VP} juice-ACC drink]-CAU-do-PST-IND
 'Mary made the baby drink milk and then drink juice.'
- c. ?Mary-ka [[_{XP} aka-eke milk-lel][_{XP} John-eke juice-lel] masi]
 -ke ha-ess-ta

groups: UNION constructions and CLAUSE REDUCTION constructions. Aissen and Permuter (1983) propose that both classes are instances of the same phenomenon. In GB terms, clause reduction constructions can be characterized by the fact that the embedded subject is either a controlled empty category or an NP-trace. The reduction triggers in most of the Romance languages are modal-like verbs, causative verbs, and perception verbs.

3. For the structure of causative constructions, various analyses are suggested such as VP analysis in Moore (1996) and IP analysis in Li (1990).

Mary-NOM [[_{XP} baby-DAT milk-ACC][_{XP} John-DAT
Juice-ACC] drink]-CAU-do-PST-IND

'Mary made the baby drink milk and John drink juice.'

- d. ??Mary-ka [[_{YP} aka-eke milk-lel masi-ko][_{XP} John-eke juice-lel
masi]-ke ha-ess-ta

Mary-NOM [[_{YP} baby-DAT milk-ACC drink-CONJ][_{XP}
John-DAT Juice-ACC drink]]-CAU-do-PST-IND

(i) Mary made John drink milk after the baby had drunk juice.

(ii)*Mary made John drink juice and the baby drink milk.

- e. Mary-ka [[_{ZP} aka-eke milk-lel masi-ke-ha-ko][_{ZP} John-eke
juice-lel masi-ke ha]-ess-ta

Mary-NOM [[_{ZP} baby-DAT milk-ACC drink-CAU-do-CONJ]
[_{XP} John-DAT Juice-ACC drink-CAU-do]]-PST-IND

'Mary made the baby drink milk and John drink juice.'

From the conjunctions in (6), this is the case that NP_s and VP_s are freely conjuncted with the other NP and VP. However, there is a problem in (6c) and (6d). I do not use the constituent label in (6c-e), because their categorial status (XP, YP, and ZP) are not determined but all we know is that they are **larger** than the VP, but smaller than CP. The purpose of this section **being** to determine the status of the embedded category, until we **get** to the result, I will use XP, YP, and ZP to avoid confusion. The **XP** conjunction in (6c) is possible and actually used in conversation, but the researchers are tempted to assume the null verb inside the first XP and to analyze it as IP. However, that is not my position.

Compare (6b) and (6d). The VP conjunction in (6b) is possible but YP conjunction in (6d) is not **acceptable**. Compare XP in (6c) and YP in (6d). The XPs in (6c) **does not** contain an independent verb in its clause, so that it is a kind of NP or an NP larger than the normal NP in (6a) but smaller than VP. Consider YPs. The YPs in (6d) are also a constituent **larger** than VP, because they contain one undecided argument as well as the internal argument and the verb. It is also smaller than IP, because if it is an IP constituent, it should be possible to conjunct another IP. However, it could not as in (6d). Therefore, we can say that YP is smaller than IP and it cannot make a constituent

inside the syntactic causative because the two embedded verbs cannot make a meaning without connecting the suffix '-ke' and the matrix verb '-hata.' If it be a certain syntactic constituent, it should have a certain relation with the matrix verb '-ke-hata' like (6e). From these conjunctions, we can draw a conclusion that the causative construction is not a bi-clausal because the embedded part cannot be detached from the matrix verb and because they have a closer relation than that of the embedded verb and the matrix verb.

2.2.2.2 Clefting

Clefting is another way to test the constituency. If the syntactic causative is bi-clausal, the embedded clause can be clefted making a constituent. Let us consider the examples:

- (7)a [Mary-ka aka-eke ha-n-kes-en] pap-el mek-ke-ha-n-kes-ita
 Mary-NOM baby-DAT do-TOP food-ACC eat-CAU-do-IND
 'What Mary made the baby was to eat the food.'
- b. [Mary-ka ha-n-kes-en] aka-eke pap-el mek-ke-ha-n-kes-ita
 Mary-NOM do-TOP baby-DAT food-ACC eat-CAU-do-IND
 'What Mary did was to make the baby eat the food.'

Song (1996) discusses that (7a) is preferred reading to (7b). The clefted constituent in (7a) is VP. Therefore, we can say that the embedded clause does not make a constituent to be clefted. From this, the categorial status of the embedded clause is not independent category but dependent on the matrix clause.

2.2.2.3 Negation

If the above two examples (6, and 7) are the syntactic method for the constituency test, the negation is said to be rather semantic. The syntactic causative '-ke -hata' seems to allow two negations as in (8). Let me consider the two kinds of negative clause, which could be regarded as another characteristics of the bi-clausality.

- (8) Mary-ka aka-eke os-el ip-ke ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-DAT clothes-ACC
 put on-CAU-do-PST-IND
 'Mary made the baby put on clothes.'

Two negative forms can be supposed for (8).

- (9)a. Mary-ka aka-eke os-el mot ip-ke ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-DAT clothes-ACC NEG
 put on-CAU-do-PST-IND
 'Mary made the baby not put on clothes.'
- b. Mary-ka aka-eke os-el ip-ke mot ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-DAT clothes-ACC
 put on-CAU-NEG-do-PST-IND
 'Mary did not make the baby put on clothes.'

The causative construction in (8) allows two kinds of negation--embedded verb negation and matrix verb negation. *Embedded negation is only compatible with unreduced construction.*⁴ However, the examples (9a) and (9b) are different with respect to the implicature of causation: (9a) negates the action irrespective of the implicature of the causation: (9b) negates the implicature of the causation and it is no more a causation. Therefore, the negation of the causative construction (8) is (9a) but not (9b).

2.2.2.4 Anaphoric Binding

These are the anaphoric bindings of the NOM causee as well as the other causees such as the DAT, the ACC and the OBL:

- (10)a. Max_i-ka [John_j-eke caki-lel_{i/j} po-ke]-ha-ess-ta
 Max_i-NOM John_j-DAT SELF_{i/j}-ACC see-CAU-do-PST-IND
 'Max made John see himself (John, Max).'

4. Both embedded negation and embedded wh-movement are incompatible with reduced constructions (Moore (1996)).

- b. Max_i-ka [John_j-lohaeykem caki-lel_{i/} po-ke]-ha-ess-ta
 Max_i-NOM John_j-Obl SELF_{i/}-ACC see-CAU-do-PST-IND
 'Max made John see himself (John, Max).'

If the anaphoric binding of the matrix subject to SELF is possible, this is a property of the mono-clausality, because the Binding Principle (A) in GB framework says that the anaphor must bind in its governing category, which means that the governing category of the examples in (10) are the whole sentences, although the examples in (10) allow another interpretation of the anaphoric binding of the causee to the SELF.

- (11)a. Maxi-ka [John_j-eke caki_{i/} cak-el po-ke]-ha-ess-ta
 Maxi-NOM John_j-DAT SELF_{i/}-book ACC see-CAU-PST-IND
 'Max made John see John's/Max's book.'
- b. Maxi-ka [John_j-lohaeykem caki_{i/} cak-el po-ke]-ha-ess-ta
 Maxi-NOM John_j-Obl SELF_{i/}-book ACC see-CAU-PAS-IND
 'Max made John see John's/Max's book'

The reflexive interpretations in (10) and (11) show that the subject can be an antecedent to the reflexive, which means that the causative construction is more mono-clausal than bi-clausal.

2.2.2.5 Passive

In spite of many aspects that the syntactic causative in Korean has a property of the reduced clause, there are still some aspects that make us wonder if it is a reduced clause:

- (12) Mary-ka aka-eke os-el ip-ke ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-DAT clothes-ACC
 put on-CAU-do-PST-IND
 'Mary made the baby put on clothes.'

Two passive forms can be supposed for (12):

- (13)a. ?aka-ka Mary-eyhae os-il ip-ke ha-e-ci-ess-ta
 baby-NOM Mary-by clothes-ACC
 put on-CAU-do-PASS-PST-IND
 'The baby was made by Mary to put on clothes.'
- b. *os-i Mary-eyhae aka-eke ip-ke ha-e-ci-ess-ta
 clothes-NOM Mary-by baby-DAT
 put on-CAU-do-PASS-PST-IND
 'Clothes were made the baby to be put on by Mary.'

As the examples in (13) show, two kinds of passive are possible as in (13a) and (13b). It is hard to judge the grammaticality of the passivized causative construction. Gerdts (1990) predicts that (13a) is semi-grammatical, but (13b) ungrammatical respectively. For these passivized causative constructions, Gerdts assumes the entire downstairs clause advancement to the subject before CCU. In this process, the initial Acc advances to Nom and the initial Nom to chomeur by the passive, the downstairs final Nom inherits the upstairs final Nom and the upstairs initial Nom is a cho-Nom. The downstairs final Acc can inherit its relation, because there is no other upstairs Acc. Therefore, she predicts that (13a) is a possible sentence even if many native speakers reject it. As for (13b), where the downstairs final Acc is upstairs final Nom, she predicts it ungrammatical. Anyway neither of the two passives is perfectly grammatical.

From the point of the clausal status, the failure of passivized causative in (13) gives strong support for the bi-clausal characteristics, but I would rather take a position that the ungrammaticality in (13b) is due to the semantic restrictions on the subject--the animacy, because it is natural for the active verb to prefer the animate subject rather than the inanimate subject.

2.2.2.6 Honorification

Korean does not have Agreement feature--subject agreement or object agreement-- on the verb but the honorification is realized on the verb as well as the noun. Actually two kinds of honorification are respected: one is a subject honorification, and the other is an object honorification.

- (14)a. Mary-ka [sensaengnim-kke cinji-lel te-si-ke]-ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM teacher(H)-DAT food(H)-ACC
 eat-H-CAU-do-PST-IND
 'Mary made the teacher(DAT-H) eat(H) the food(H).'
- b. Mary-ka [sensaengnim-kkese cinji-lel te-si-ke]-ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM teacher(H)-NOM food(H)-ACC
 eat-H-CAU-do-PST-IND
 'Mary made the teacher(NOM-H) eat(H) the food(H).'

As we can see from (14), the Dat causee in (14a) controls honorification on the embedded predicate just like the Nom causee in (14b) does. Therefore, the causees of the examples in (14) can control over the embedded predicate regardless of their case difference; it is not necessary to distinguish between DAT causee and NOM causee. They belong to the same construction except case difference. In short, the fact that the Nominative case is realized on the causee does not make any difference from the typical DAT causee and the other causees in the syntactic behavior. Therefore, the presence of the Nominative case marking is not an indicator of the unreduced construction.⁵

2.3 Reduced construction and the causee

These facts we have considered-- conjunction, clefting, anaphoric binding, negation, passive, and honorification-- have led researchers to analyze the causative constructions as mono-clausal, at least at some STRATUM. Nevertheless, reduced constructions do not assimilate completely to other mono-clausal construction. For example, the clause-bounded operation of passive cannot apply uniformly and the same is true of the negation. However, binding facts make the reduced constructions appear more mono-clausal than bi-clausal.

The most important thing to be considered is the thematic structure of the causative construction, because the thematic structure of reduced constructions seems to be identical to related non-reduced constructions.

If a verb is free to provide its external thematic role, the causative construction may have two NPs with the external thematic roles; one it

5. Gerdtz (1990) regards the Nom causee as a chomeur.

acquires from the embedded predicate while occupying the object position (the internal role) and the other from the matrix predicate occupying the subject position (the external role). The question here is whether the causee NP is the external argument or the internal argument, which will be discussed in section 3.

3. Causee Encoding

The proper characterization of encoding of the causee argument in the causative construction has been a long-standing problem. Before discussing the Causative Clause Union in the Relational Grammar, let us consider the predicate merge in Rosen (1990).

3.1 Rosen (1990)

S. Rosen (1990) proposes that languages have a case template for the internal arguments of a predicate. The case template for the Romance language would be Acc>Dat (to be interpreted as: accusative case is assigned first, then dative.), because they disallow biaccusatives. After the external argument is assigned Nominative case from the finite INFL, the internal arguments of the predicate link to the case template one-to-one manner. The encoding of the causee depends crucially upon the transitivity of the base predicate so called transitivity effect (Perlmutter & Postal 1974, among others).

The fact that the Dat causee in French causatives alternates with the Obl in faire-par construction is analyzed by the lexical passivization in Zubizarreta (1985, 1987). This shows a certain possibility of case template extension like Acc>Dat>Obl. This supposed case template is supported by the Comrie's (1976) relational hierarchy as in S>DO>IO>OBL. This can be translated into the case hierarchy: Nom>Acc>Dat>Obl in case assignment. For the discussion of causee case alternation in RG, I will translate it into the RG terms:

- (12) Causee Case Template:
1>2>3> chomeur⁶

6. These are special terms used in Relational Grammar: 1 is for the

3.2 Causative Clause Union and Causees

A Korean causee may show up as a direct object, an indirect object, an oblique or sometimes subject. The first three causee alternation follows the common pattern of the other Romance language's causee alternation, but the last one is a little peculiar to Korean:

- (13) a. Mary-ka aka-eke pap-el mek-ke ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-DAT food-ACC eat-CAU do-PST-IND
 b. Mary-ka aka-lel pap-el mek-ke ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-ACC food-ACC eat-CAU do-PST-IND
 c. Mary-ka aka-lohaeykem pap-el mek-ke ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-OBL food-ACC eat-CAU do-PST-IND
 d. Mary-ka aka-ka pap-el mek-ke ha-ess-ta
 Mary-NOM baby-NOM food-ACC eat-CAU do-PST-IND
 'Mary made the baby eat the food.'

Gerds explains causee alternation on the causatives by means of CCU and Revaluation in the RG. After CCU, the second NP is left as a pivot nominal. This NP get a DAT or ACC either by the revaluation from the inheritance or 3-2 advancement. The result is that this 3 advances to the 2 or the Nom on the case hierarchy.⁷

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have suggested the diagnostics for the causative construction as a reduced construction: conjunction, clefting, passive, negation, honorification and anaphoric binding. I also have mentioned briefly how the causee encodes four-ways in the causative constructions and how they are explained under the Relational Grammar framework.

Nominative or subject; 2 is for the Accusative or direct object; and 3 is for the Dative or indirect object. The chomeur is used for the demoted subject case in passive such as Oblique.

7. This seems to be against the ban on chomeur advancement, however, it is probably not, because Korean allows the cho-1 to be assigned case some other way such as CCU-Without Revaluation of Gerds (1990).

References

- Ackerman, Farrell and John Moore. 1994. "Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Dimensions of Causee Encodings." ms. University of California, San Diego.
- Aissen, J and D. Perlmutter. 1983. "Clause Reduction in Spanish," in D. Perlmutter, ed., *Studies in Relational Grammar*. Vol 1. The university of Chicago Press, Chicago 360-403.
- Gerds, Donna. 1990. "Revaluation and Inheritance in Korean Causative Union." in D. Perlmutter, ed., *Studies in Relational Grammar*. Vol 3. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Gerds, D and C. Youn. 1988. "Korean Psych Construction: Advancement or Retreat?" CLS 24, 155-75.
- Lee, H-B. 1970. *A Study of Korean Syntax*. Seoul: Pan Korea
- Moore, John. 1996. *Reduced Constructions in Spanish* to appear in Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics, Garland Publishing, Inc.
- O' Grady, William. 1991. *Categories and case: the sentence structure of Korean*. Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Permuter, David and Paul Postal. 1974. Lectures on relational grammar. Amherst, MA: Summer Linguistics Institute of the LSA, unpublished notes.
- Rosen, Sara. 1990. *Argument Structure and complex predicates*. Outstanding dissertation in Linguistics, ed. J. Hankamer, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1976. "Causativization." In M. Shibatani (Ed.) *Japanese Generative Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Suh, C.-S. 1975. *Tonsa HA-uy Munpep* (Grammar of the verb HA) Seoul: Hyengsel Press.
- Zubizarreta, M.L. 1985. "The Relation between Morphophonology and morphosyntax: The Case of Romance Causatives." *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 247-289.