The Causative in Wappo: A Special Case of Doubling*

Charles N. Li
University of California, Santa Barbara

Sandra A. Thompson
University of California, Los Angeles

Wappo is a Yukiian language of Northern California. In this paper, we would like to sketch a few basic facts about Wappo, present the causative data, and then discuss their typological implications.

I. Introduction

Wappo is an SOV language with a fairly rich case system. For nouns, the accusative is morphologically unmarked and all other cases are formed by adding suffixes to this unmarked root. For pronouns, there is a suppletive form in the subject case (S). Representative examples include:

- [illegible]

Two noteworthy facts about Wappo cases which will figure prominently in our discussion of causatives are:

a. Subjects become unmarked in subordinate clauses of all types, e.g.,

- (4) ʔah naw-taʔ [ce hol ʔotikh]
I(S) see-past that tree fall down
I saw the tree fall down
- (5) ʔah [ce k'ew chica ʔol-ukh] čuʔi-taʔ
I(S) that man bear catch-imp. tell-past
I told the man to catch the bear
- (6) [te ʔopaʔe šuʔuh] ʔah čo-siʔ
he eat after I go-fut.
After he eats, I'll go

b. While there are a number of tests for subjecthood (see Li, Thompson, and Sawyer (1977) for discussion), we have been unable to uncover any tests for direct objecthood other than the lack of

superficial case marking. In other words, there is no evidence of a distinction between a superficially accusative NP and a noun bearing the grammatical relation "direct object". Nor are there any tests known to us which would reveal an NP to be a "chômeur" in Wappo. We will return to each of these points below.

2. Wappo Causatives

There are three causative constructions in Wappo, all productive.

1. ʔoh-

ʔoh- is the causativizing prefix for adjectival roots:

- (7) a. ce ʔchuya-ʔi chipe-khi?
that house-(S) red-predicator
The house is red
- b. ce k'ew-i ce ʔchuya ʔoh-chipi-ta?
that man-(S) th. house caus.-red-past
The man made the house red

2. Periphrastic

The periphrastic causative is formed with the verb mes- 'make' and the infinitival form of the verb:

- (8) a. ce poleʔ-i luč poʔ-ta?
th. boy-(S) cig. smoke-past
The boy smoked a cigarette
- b. ce k'ew-i [ce poleʔ luč poʔ-ukh] mes-ta?
th. man-(S) th. boy cig. smoke-inf. make-past
The man made the boy smoke a cigarette

3. Suffixal

The suffixal causative (=SC), with which we will be concerned in this paper, involves a causative suffix:

- (9) ce k'ew-i ce poleʔ luč poʔ-is-ta?
th. man-(S) th. boy cig. smoke-caus.-past
The man made the boy smoke a cig.

This suffixal causative thus parallels what has been called in the literature the "PR-causative" (in Aissen (1974), because of her assumption that these forms were derived by a rule of Predicate Raising) and "clause union" causative (in Cole (1976)). We will use the more **neutral** term "suffixal" causatives here. An excellent discussion of the typological properties of these constructions can be found in Comrie (1976).

The suffixal causative raises two related questions which are of interest to cross-linguistic studies:

- (1) What is the grammatical relation of the semantically embedded subject?
- (2) Is the suffixal causative a simplex or a complex construction?

3. The Grammatical Relation of the Embedded Subject (ES)

Comrie (1976) points out that there are (with minor variations) essentially two types of affixal causative languages with respect to the role of the ES:

(a) those in which the case of the ES is demoted to (typically) the next "available" position on the case hierarchy.

Sub. > D. Obj. > I. Obj. > Obliq.

That is, the subject of a causativized intransitive verb will show up in the direct object case, the subject of a transitive verb in the indirect object case, and the subject of a three-argument verb in an oblique case.

(b) those in which the ES "doubles up" and appears in a case already represented by some other NP in the sentence.

Wappo is a clear case of doubling on the accusative case: the ES in the affixal causative always appears in the accusative, no matter how many arguments the causativized verb takes or what cases they are in. Compare (10), (11), and (12). The (a) and (b) examples in each pair are the simple and causative versions of a 1-argument, a 2-argument, and a 3-argument verb, respectively:

- (10) a. ce pole?-i ʔolol-ta?
th. boy-(S) dance-past
The boy danced
- b. ce k'ew-i ce pole? ʔolol-is-ta?
th. man-(S) th. boy dance-caus.-past
The man made the boy dance
- (11) a. ce pole?-i ce me'te-thu taka? mahes-ta?
th. boy-(S) th. wom.-dat. basket give-past
The boy gave the basket to the woman
- b. ce k'ew-i ce pole? ce me'te-thu taka? mahes-is-ta?
th. man-(S) th. boy th. wom.-dat. basket give-caus.-past
The man made the boy give the basket to the woman
- (12) a. ce pole?-i luč po?-ta?
th. boy-(S) cig. smoke-past
The boy smoked a cigarette
- b. ce k'ew-i ce pole? luč po?-is-ta?
th. man-(S) th. boy cig. smoke-caus.-past
The man made the boy smoke a cigarette

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

Two suggestions can be found in the literature regarding the status of affixal causatives exhibiting this kind of doubling.

(1) Aissen (1974: p. 35) claims that

the only languages in which both subject and object of the embedded verb will both be accusative are languages which allow double accusatives to simple verbs.

Wappo does allow double accusatives in simple sentences, but only with an extremely restricted number of verbs; most three-argument verbs require each argument to be in a different case. An example of a simple sentence with two accusatives is:

- (13) ?ah kuči-ya? ce kew tuš-ta?
 I (S) knife that man take-past
 I took the knife from that man

(2) Both Hebrew and Swahili show doubling on the accusative case. Comrie (1976), in discussing Swahili, and Cole (1976), in discussing Hebrew, argue that in each of these languages, the "embedded direct object" in the affixal causative construction simply loses its grammatical relation altogether and becomes a "chomeur", leaving the ES as the only real direct object. As we have pointed out above, such a solution is not available for Wappo since there are no criteria according to which an NP can be shown to have lost its grammatical relation.

The doubling we observe in Wappo suffixal causatives, then, cannot be accounted for either by appealing to the "precedent" of widespread doubling in simplex sentences of the language or by dismissing one of the accusative NP's as a "chômeur". It appears that we must look elsewhere for an explanation of this phenomenon in Wappo. The direction in which we propose to look brings us to the second of the two questions we posed in our introductory remarks.

4. Wappo Suffixal Causative: Simplex or Complex

The terms "Predicate Raising" and "clause union", referred to above, were chosen to capture the essential property of suffixal causative constructions: they are semantically complex and syntactically simplex.

Aissen (1974) discusses a number of respects in which such sentences can be shown to be syntactically simplex in Turkish. When we turn to Wappo, we find that the evidence weighs heavily in the other direction. Let us look at two facts:

(1) The fact of case-marking. The syntactic doubling which we observe in the suffixal causative is precisely the same as that found in instances of ordinary complementation. Recall that the ES in any subordinate clause becomes an accusative NP in terms of the case-marking system. (cf. examples (4), (5), (6), (8)). This fact alone argues very strongly that the Wappo suffixal causative is much closer to being taken as a complex construction than as a simplex one.

(2) Reflexive. Reflexivization is subject-controlled and generally clause-bounded in Wappo. The invariant reflexive morpheme is maɣ; (14) shows its impossibility in ordinary complements:

- (14)
ʔah	{ may*
self
ʔi
I(acc.)
me	šawo	hakšeh	hah-taʔ	
I(nom.)		bread	want	say-past	
I said I		wanted	bread		

Yet in suffixal causatives the ES can show up as *may'*, as in:

- (15) ʔah maɪ kama-is-taʔ
 I (S) self cry-caus.-past
 I made myself cry

This fact would seem to argue strongly for the suffixal causative being a simplex construction. However, two further facts render such an interpretation less plausible. First, precisely the same situation obtains for the periphrastic causative. That is, while (14) shows that reflexivization is, in general, clause-bounded, the ES in the periphrastic causative, which is obviously complex, may also show up as a reflexive:

- (16) cephi [ma² hučewis] mes-ta'
 he (S) self happy make-past
 He made himself happy

Second, an "embedded direct object" in the suffixal causative which is co-referential with the causer may never appear as a reflexive:

- (17) $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{may} \\ \text{self} \\ \text{'i} \end{Bmatrix}$?owath-tis-ta?
 ?ah_i te_j I him(acc.) me(acc.) hit-caus.-past
 I him hit $\begin{Bmatrix} \text{himself} \\ \text{me} \end{Bmatrix}$

In (17) may 'self' could only refer to te 'him' and never to ah 'I'. Both of these facts suggest that we cannot simply interpret (16) as evidence that the suffixal causative in Wappo is simplex.

What we have seen, then, is that both the case facts and certain reflexive facts support the hypothesis that the Wappo suffixal causative is a complex construction, while one reflexive sentence type suggests that it is simplex. In the next section we suggest an explanation for these facts.

5. An Explanation

The synchronic intermediate status of suffixal causatives between complex and simplex can safely be assumed to reflect an actual historical shift from a complex construction with a full main causative verb to a simplex construction with a causative suffix. Although we have no historical or comparative evidence for Wappo, this general development is so well attested as a mechanism of syntactic change that we can be confident in assuming its operation here (see, for example, Givón (1971 a, 1971 b), Jacobs (1975), and Munro (1976)). If we can show that Wappo made this

shift relatively recently, we can explain all the facts we have just observed.

The crucial independent evidence showing that this shift is recent is that the suffixal causative is still both morphologically and semantic transparent. That is, there has been neither widespread phonological distortion of the causative suffix nor semantic spreading (idiomatization) in causative verb forms.²

The recent emergence of the shift from a complex to a simplex construction, then, provides an explanation for the facts we have discussed. The synchronic result is that Wappo suffixal causatives are closer to the complex end of the continuum than to the simplex end, and can thus be expected to show more properties of complex constructions than of simplex ones. In particular, the facts concerning case markings can be explained in the following way. The suffixal causative in a language in which it has become more like a simplex construction would be expected to manifest grammatical relations similar to those shown by ordinary simple sentences of the language; most of the examples discussed in the literature are of this type. Thus Aissen (1974) has claimed that the case of the causative ES will be correlated with the behavior of simplex sentences: it will "double" on the accusative if there are double accusative simple sentences in the language, and it will be a "chômeur" or appear in the dative or another oblique case if any of those typically characterize the "second" object in simplex sentences. The Wappo suffixal causative behaves exceptionally with respect to Aissen's claims because it has only recently come from being a complex construction; its case-marking is therefore precisely that of complex sentences.

Concerning reflexivization, once again we can see that the behavior of the suffixal causative is identical to that of the complex periphrastic form (cf. sentences (15) and (16)). The fact that the reflexive can occur in the complex periphrastic causative but not in the complex sentence (14) where the matrix verb is "say" suggests that reflexivization in Wappo is more or less clause bounded depending on semantic factors determining the "closeness" of the matrix and embedded clause (see Timberlake (1977) for a persuasive demonstration of the role of these factors in Russian).

6. Conclusion

The suffixal causative in Wappo, then, displays properties characteristic of complex sentences rather than simplex sentences. The morphology and semantics of causative verb forms reveals that the historical shift from complex to simplex has been relatively recent, with the result that typologically, Wappo suffixal causatives are closer to the complex end of a synchronic continuum than other languages with suffixal causatives such as Turkish and Hindi. In terms of this fact the apparently anomalous behavior of NP's in such constructions with respect to both their case roles and their markings for co-referentiality can be seen to fall neatly into place.

FOOTNOTES

- * We are grateful to Jack Hawkins, Paul Schachter, and Arnold Zwicky for helpful discussion.
1. For a fuller discussion of the Wappo case system and its interaction with word order and subordination, see Li, Thompson, and Sawyer (1977).
 2. Our thanks to Paul Schachter for calling our attention to this fact; he reminds us that the Hindi suffixal causative, for example, is much more opaque both morphologically and semantically than Wappo.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aissen, J. (1974). *The Syntax of Causative Constructions*. Harvard University Ph.D. dissertation.
- Cole, P. (1976). "A Causative Construction in Modern Hebrew: Theoretical Implications", in Cole (1976).
- Cole, P. (ed.) (1976). Studies in Modern Hebrew Syntax and Semantics. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co.
- Comrie, B. (1976). "The Syntax of Causative Constructions: Cross-linguistic Similarities and Divergences", in Shibatani (1976).
- Givón, T. (1971a). "Historical Syntax and Synchronic Morphology: An Archeologist's Field Trip", in Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Givón, T. (1971b). "On the Verbal Origin of the Bantu Verb Suffixes", Studies in African Linguistics 2.2:145-163.
- Jacobs, R. (1975). Syntactic Change: A Cupan (Uto-Aztecan) Case Study. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U.C. Press.
- Li, C., S. Thompson, and J. Sawyer (1977). "Subject and Word Order in Wappo", to appear in IJAL.
- Munro, P. (1976). "Subject Copying, Auxiliarization, and Predicate Raising: the Mojave Evidence", IJAL 42.2:99-112.
- Shibatani, M. (ed.) (1976). The Grammar of Causative Constructions. Volume 6 of Syntax and Semantics, New York: Academic Press.
- Timberlake, A. (1977). "Reflexivization and the Cycle in Russian". UCLA ms.