Ivan A. Stenin

NON-CAUSATIVE EFFECTS OF CAUSATIVE MORPHOLOGY IN CHUKCHI

Ivan A. Stenin[1]

NON-CAUSATIVE EFFECTS OF CAUSATIVE MORPHOLOGY IN CHUKCHI[2]

The paper discusses the main uses of a synthetic causative marker in Chukchi with special reference to non-causative effects of causative morphology. The causative morpheme expresses general causation when attached to patientive intransitive and some agentive intransitive predicates, namely verbs of directed motion, change of posture and ingestion. Other agentive predicates, intransitive as well as transitive, resist causativization and receive some non-causative interpretation if they form causatives. Such causative verbs usually have applicative-like or rearranging functions.

JEL Classification: Z.

Keywords: causative, applicative, transitivization, rearranging function, Chukchi.

[1] National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Linguistics. Senior Lecturer; E-mail: ystein88@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

The paper discusses non-causative effects of causative morphology in Chukchi, a Chukotko-Kamchatkan language spoken in the Russian Far East. According to the Russian Census of 2010, there are about 5,100 native speakers of Chukchi, while the whole number of the Chukchi people is approximately 15,900. The language is endangered, since its intergenerational transmission is in the process of being broken, the number of speakers is gradually decreasing, and the most Chukchis now speak Russian. Chukchi is predominantly an agglutinative, polysynthetic language with an extensive use of incorporation. It exhibits morphological ergativity in nominal case marking. The system of verbal inflection is rather complicated; in most forms of Indicative and in other moods, transitive verbs index both A- and O-arguments, while in Perfect and Stative (which are diachronically "adjectival" forms) they fail to do so. Cross-reference markers are split between prefixes and suffixes, usually both of them are present. The word order is rather free; however, SOV and SVO dominate.

The Chukchi language is relatively well described. There are two main book-length grammars, namely (Skorik, 1961; Skorik, 1977), which is a detailed description of a literary standard of Chukchi based primarily on the dialect of the coastal Chukchis, and the Ph.D. dissertation (Dunn, 1999), which features the Telqep variety. The main data for the present study were collected during two fieldwork sessions in the village Amguema (Iultinsky District of Chukotka Autonomous Okrug) in summer 2016 and 2017. The Amguema variety is a typical representative of the dialect of the reindeer Chukchis. On the whole, the grammatical differences between dialects are small. However, one will see that the present data differ from the previous accounts of Chukchi causatives in some aspects, presumably because of a dialectal variation.

2. Previous studies of Chukchi causatives

The main paper which deals with a causative in Chukchi is (Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, & Xolodovič, 1969). The article focuses on a synthetic (morphological) causative marked by the prefix *r-* (*n-* in non-initial positions) usually used together with one of the following suffixes: *-et*, *-ew* or *-ŋet*[3]. It is argued there that the suffixes (the null suffix is also listed) are in complementary distribution. At least for the idiom described here it is not totally true.

---

[3] Chukchi has a vowel harmony system largely based on height. One group of vowels contains *i*, e_1 and *u*, another one — e_2, *a* and *o*. The schwa (*ə*) is neutral, and *e* participates in vowel harmony in two roles: in the first case, its "strong" correlate is *a*, in the second one, its "weak" correlate is *i*. Morphemes which have vowels from the second group are dominant. Furthermore, there are also lexically specified dominant morphemes which do not have any vowel, or have only *ə*. If a word contains a dominant morpheme, all "weak" vowels alternate with their "strong" correlates (*i* > e_2, e_1 > *a*, *u* > *o*). According to these rules, the suffixes given above in the main text have regular allomorphs *-at*, *-aw* and *-ŋat*.

Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, and Xolodovič (1969) state that the causative verbs in Chukchi differ from their non-causative counterparts in many ways. They list the following semantic oppositions[4]: 1) "comitative" (*рагт-ык* 'to go home'[5] → *ры-рагт-ат-ык* 'to bring smth. or smb. home'; *рачвыӈ-ык* 'to compete in a race' → *ры-рачвыӈ-ав-ык* 'to compete in a race with smb.'); 2) "anti-absolutive" (*мигчир-эт-ык* 'to work' → *ры-мигчир-эв-ык* 'to treat smth.'; *ванэ-к* 'to sew' → *ры-ванэ-в-ык* 'to sew smth.'); 3) "benefactive" (*ранӈат-ык* 'to carry a yaranga' → *ры-ранӈат-ав-ык* 'to carry a yaranga for smb.' (in particular, to help smb. to carry a yaranga)); 4) "instrumental" (*кэли-к* 'to write' → *ры-кэли-в-ык* 'to write with smth.'); 5) "stimulus" (*ӄылгилю-к* 'to pity' → *ры-ӄылгилю-в-ык* 'to feel pity for smb.'); 6) "anti-reflexive" (*кэргып-ык* 'to put a kerker[6] on oneself' → *ры-кэргып-ав-ык* 'to put a kerker on smb.'); 7) "congruent"[7] (*паа-к* 'to cease to do' → *ры-паа-в-ык* 'to cease to do smth.'); 8) "intensive" (*энатр-ык* 'to press down' → *р-энатр-ав-ык* 'to press down' (intensively)).

The first observation which can be made on the base of this list is that it does not include any proper causative usages. Nevertheless, the discussed article is abound with such examples: *эрэт-гъи* 'he fell' → *р-эрэн-нин* 'he dropped it'; *пъа-гъэ* 'it dried' → *ры-пъа-в-нэн* 'he made it dry' etc. Thus, one should not doubt that a synthetic causative in Chukchi can express causation.

The second observation is that many usages of a causative given in (Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, & Xolodovič, 1969) look like examples of an applicative, at first glance at least. One can distinguish between comitative, benefactive and instrumental applicatives. As a result of such derivation, the predicate gets one more argument, namely the Co-Agent, the Beneficiary or the Instrument, which appears in the "direct object" position. In Chukchi, such a noun phrase is always marked by the nominative case (or in another tradition — absolutive). In case of "anti-absolutive" the object position is filled with the Theme noun phrase. Usually such examples are not considered to presuppose applicativization, rather simply transitivization (Polinsky, 2013). Nevertheless, in a number of unrelated languages, introducing the Theme into the object position requires the same verbal marking as adding of the Beneficiary or the Instrument. For example, the Javanese verbal affix *-ake*, according to (Nurhayani, 2012), adds the Beneficiary, the Instrument or the Theme to the direct object position, and at the same time it has proper causative uses. Then, this case can also be counted as an applicative. The fifth case differs from it only in that it introduces the Stimulus as an

---

[4] It is difficult sometimes to translate the labels they have used. I will give therefore also original Russian terminology (sometimes rather different): 1) комитативность; 2) приложительность, или антиабсолютивность; 3) адресатность; 4) инструментальность; 5) аффрицированность; 6) рефлексивность; 7) конгруэнтивность; 8) интенсивность.

[5] I will use standard orthography based on a Cyrillic script for citing examples from other works, but the data from Amguema Chukchi will be in a Latin script.

[6] Kerker is a woman's dress (one-piece suit) made of reindeer skin.

[7] On my view, this is not a semantic opposition at all; see details below.

object. An "anti-reflexive" use presupposes that a given predicate has some argument which is co-referent with the Agent, whereas after causativization this argument is definitely different from the Agent.

The third observation concerns transitivity of non-causative verbs. The vast majority of examples given in (Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, & Xolodovič, 1969) shows causativization of intransitive verbs. Transitive verbs which form causative derivatives are found only in the three last types — "anti-reflexive", "congruent" and "intensive". Moreover, the "congruent" type, which presupposes that a phasal matrix predicate requires causativization in case of a transitive embedded clause, consists probably of only one verb. The last type is not also numerous, there are only two examples in the article.

According to the data in (Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, & Xolodovič, 1969), the most frequent type is the first. In addition to causativization, the "anti-absolutive", "benefactive", "anti-reflexive" and "congruent" oppositions can be expressed just through the change of a set of agreement markers[8]. In an intransitive construction, the verb is in the form of the so-called subjective conjugation and indexes only S-argument. In a transitive construction, the verb is in the form of the subjective-objective conjugation and indexes both A- and P-arguments. The proper causativization can be also expressed through the change of a conjugation, although such examples are very rare: *мыле-гъи* 'it broke' — *мыле-нин* 'he broke it'.

Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, and Xolodovič (1969) state that Chukchi has also the analytic causative construction which consists of the *-йгу(т)*-converb and the verb *рыт-ык* 'to have'. The analytic causative is possible only if a subject is human. Furthermore, a synthetic causative expresses general causation while an analytic one — speech causation. The analytic causative will not be discussed here.

3. A synthetic causative: accessibility for causativization

A synthetic causative can be freely derived from intransitive patientive predicates. In (1a) there is an intransitive verb 'to break', in (1b) it is causativized. The noun phrase *kojŋən*, which is S-argument in (1a), and O-argument in (1b), is marked by the nominative (absolutive) case in both sentences. The Causer (Agent) gets instrumental (ergative) marking in (1b). The same holds for the examples (2a)–(2b) where one can see the intransitive verb 'to open' and the causative verb derived from it.

---

[8] In the last case, we deal with a long-distance agreement when a matrix verb agrees with an object of an embedded clause.

(1a)   *kojŋə-n*   *sim-et-ɣʔ-i*

         mug-NOM.SG   break-VB-TH-2/3SG.S[9]

         'A mug broke'.

(1b)   *wasʲa-na*   *kojŋə-n*   *rə-sim-ew-ni-n*[10]

         Vasya-INS   mug-NOM.SG   TR-break-CS-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O

         'Vasya broke a mug'.

(2a)   *qerɣəsʔə-n*   *sinit*   *wentə-ɣʔ-i*

         window-NOM.SG   self   open-TH-2/3SG.S

         'A window opened itself'.

(2b)   *ɣəm-nan*   *qerɣəsʔə-n*   *tə-n-went-et-ɣʔe-n*

         I-INS   window-NOM.SG   1SG.S/A-TR-open-VB-TH-3SG.O

         'I opened a window'.

Apart from patientive verbs, there are some agentive intransitive verbs which form causatives, and causatives from them have a proper causative meaning. First of all, these are verbs of directed motion (3b), change of posture (4b), and ingestive verbs (5b).

(3a)   *mətə-pkir-mək*

         1PL.S/A-arrive-1PL.S

         'We arrived'.

(3b)   *ʔəttʔə-qej-e*   *ŋan*   *jara-k*   *ne-re-nə-pkir-et-ɣət*

         dog-DIM-INS   DEICT   yaranga-LOC   LOW.A-FUT-TR-arrive-VB-2SG.O

         'The dog will definitely bring you to the house'.

(4a)   *nenenə*   *wakʔo-ɣʔ-e*

         child.NOM.SG   sit.down-TH-2/3SG.S

         'A child sat down'.

(4b)   *ətɬəɣ-e*   *rə-wakʔo-w-ne-n*   *nenenə*

         father-INS   TR-sit.down-CS-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O   child.NOM.SG

         'A father seated a child'.

---

[9] The prefix of 2nd and 3rd person subjects in both intransitive and transitive indicative verb forms is null and is not glossed here.
[10] The causative marker is glossed as TR throughout the paper.

(5a)   *ekək*   *qametwa-ɣʔ-e*

        son.NOM.SG   eat-TH-2/3SG.S

        'A son ate up'.

(5b)   *ɣəm-nan*   *tə-n-qametwa-wə-n*   *ekək*   *erʔe-te*

        I-INS   1SG.S/A-TR-eat-CS-3SG.O   son.NOM.SG   boiled.meat-INS

        'I fed a son with a boiled meat'.

In all cases above the synthetic causative expresses immediate causation, i. e. the causing event comprises the whole causal chain which leads to the caused event, including the caused event itself; cf. the definition of I-CAUSE in (Kratzer, 2005). The fact that a synthetic causative can be freely derived from these types of verbs may indicate their special status among agentive intransitive predicates. The first two classes, i. e. verbs of directed motion and change of posture, constitute the core of agentive intransitive predicates which specify the resulting state. For such verbs, the most natural, if not the only, actional interpretation in the most perfective form (so-called Aorist) is entry into a state. To refer to the resulting state 'to be in a sitting posture' in (4a) one cannot use the verb *wakʔo-* but should use the verb *wakʔo-twa-* 'to sit' derived from *wakʔo-* with the resultative affix *-twa*. It is well known that verbs of directed motion and change of posture behave differently from all other agentive verbs in many languages, and they have often been claimed to be unaccusative; cf. (Levin & Rappaport Hovav, 1992). As for ingestive verbs, their exceptional morphosyntactic behaviour has also been the constant topic in the literature. The usual explanation for their peculiarities is that their subject, apart from some agentive properties, has also clear patientive ones; cf. the notion of 'affected Agent' in (Næss, 2007).

Other agentive intransitive verbs, which mainly denote agentive processes, do not form causatives so freely, and if they have a causative counterpart, it usually does not receive a proper causative meaning. For example, the sentence (6b) is accepted by most speakers but only in a sense like (6b.1) implying that the Agent takes part in the process denoted by the non-causative predicate (cf. (6a)). Thus, one can observe some kind of assistive interpretation in such a case. Some speakers can also interpret (6b) as an instance of comitative interpretation ('The girl is / was dancing with children') although it is highly marginal. The crucial thing is that this sentence cannot denote general causation (6b.2).

(6a)   *ŋewəsqet*   *nə-puture-qin*

        girl.NOM.SG   ST-dance-ST.3SG

        'A girl is / was dancing'.

(6b) %*ŋewəsqet-e*   *n-ine-n-puture-w-qine-t*   *nenene-t*[11]

      girl-INS   ST-INV-TR-dance-CS-ST.3SG-PL   child-NOM.PL

      1. 'A girl is / was setting children an example by dancing, or is / was showing children how to dance'.

      2. Expected meaning: *'A girl is / was making children to dance'.

The example (7b) can have some of the (quasi-)applicative interpretation (see (7b.1) and (7b.2)) but the interpretation of general causation (7b.3) is impossible for most speakers. However, there is an important difference between the causatives derived from the verbs *puture-* 'to dance' and *miɣsir-et-* 'to work'. The causative from the last verb has also a configuration with an inanimate object (7c), and it is accepted always. One can say that it is actually the proper way to use the causative verb *rə-miɣsir-ew-*. The causing event is not added in this case, but the Theme is introduced into the object position, and the causative marker has a transitivizing function here.

(7a)   *ətłəɣə-n*   *nə-miɣsir-et-qin*

      father-NOM.SG   ST-work-VB-ST.3SG

      'A father is / was working'.

(7b)   %*ətłəɣ-e*   *n-ine-n-miɣsir-ew-qine-t*   *nenene-t*

      father-INS   ST-INV-TR-work-CS-ST.3SG-PL   child-NOM.PL

      1. 'A father is / was working with children on something'.

      2. 'A father is / was working upon children'.

      3. Expected meaning: ??'A father is / was making children to work'.

(7c)   *ɣəm-nan*   *n-ine-n-miɣsir-ew-iɣəm*   *panra-t*

      I-INS   ST-INV-TR-work-CS-NP.1SG   reindeer.leg.skin-NOM.PL

      'I am / was treating (e. g. softening) reindeer leg skins'.

The causative can also be derived from experiential predicates; cf. the verb of emotional state *korɣ-aw-* 'to be glad' in (8a) and its causative in (8b).

(8a)   *ŋe-ekke-qej*   *korɣ-ak-wʔ-e*

      FEM-boy-DIM.NOM.SG   be.glad-CS-TH-2/3SG.S

      'A girl rejoiced'.

---

[11] I will use the following markers of grammatical and semantic acceptability: * — totally unacceptable, ?? — highly marginal, ? — not fully grammatical, # — grammatically correct but pragmatically odd in the intended meaning, % — an example is accepted by most speakers (in at least one sense) although some of them consider it unnatural.

(8b) *ŋinqej-e*   *ŋe-ekke-qej*   *rə-korɣ-aw-an-ne-n*

boy-INS   FEM-boy-DIM.NOM.SG   TR-be.glad-CS-VB-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O

'A boy made a girl happy'.

The causative can also be derived from transitive experiential predicates, in particular *ɬʔu-* 'to see'. However, speakers of the Amguema dialect use the verb *rə-ɬʔu-ŋet-* only in the very special meaning 'to take out (e. g. from the pocket) and show'. In most contexts, instead of *rə-ɬʔu-ŋet-* another causative verb *rə.kaɬro.w-* 'to show' (9) is used, but its derivational history is unclear.

(9) *ɣəm-nan*   *tə-n.kaɬro.wə-n*   *ənə-ka-ɣtə*   *waɬə*

I-INS   1SG.S/A-show-3SG.O   he-OBL-DAT   knife.NOM.SG

'I showed a knife to him'.

One of the few transitive verbs which allow proper causativization in Chukchi is *ɣjuɬ-et-* 'to study; to learn' (10a). One can see that the Causee is marked by the dative (10b) while the initial direct object (the noun phrase *ɬəɣʔorawetɬʔen jiɬəjiɬ*) retains its nominative marking.

(10a) *n-ine-jɣuɬ-en-muri*   *ɬəɣ-ʔorawetɬʔ-en*   *jiɬəjiɬ*

ST-INV-know.how-VB-NP.1PL   AUTH-man-POSS   language.NOM.SG

'We are learning the Chukchi language'.

(10b) *torɣə-nan*   *rə-ɣjuɬ-ewə-rkəni-tkə*   *morə-kə*

you.pl-INS   TR-know.how-CS-IPFV-2PL.A.3.O   we-DAT

ɬəɣ-ʔorawetɬʔ-en   *jiɬəjiɬ*

AUTH-man-POSS   language.NOM.SG

'You (many) are teaching the Chukchi language to us'.

The verb *ɣjuɬ-et-* denotes agentive activity but is similar to mental experiential predicates in many respects. Verbs which have such a meaning are often considered ingestive (in a broad sense) (Masica, 1976) because they express situations in which the subject undergoes change of state, i. e. has not only agentive but also patientive properties. It has been stated in the literature that such transitive verbs form causatives in the first place, if a language permits causativization of transitive verbs at all (Nedjalkov & Sil'nickij, 1969).

Thus, Chukchi allows causativization of intransitive predicates (and only in some cases — transitive ones), mainly patientive and experiential ones. Most agentive intransitive verbs also form causatives but only some of them, namely verbs of directed motion, change of posture and

9

ingestion, introduce the agentive subevent. In the next section, non-causative effects of causative morphology will be discussed more closely.

4. Non-causative effects of causative morphology

4.1. Applicative-like and rearranging uses

Let us look at the verb *wetɣaw-* 'to speak' in (11a) and the causative verb derived from it in (11b).

(11a)   *ətła*   *nə-wetɣaw-qen*   (*morə-kə*   /   *murə-ɣ*   *reen*)

         mother.NOM.SG   ST-speak-ST.3SG   we-DAT   we-LOC   with

         'A mother was speaking (to us / with us)'.

(11b)   *ətłʔa-ta*   *rə-wetɣaw-an-ne-n*   *ŋe-ekək*

         mother-INS   TR-speak-VB-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O   FEM-son.NOM.SG

         1. 'A mother talked to a daughter'.

         2. 'A mother persuaded a daughter (to do something)'.

         3. Expected meaning: *'A mother made a daughter to speak'.

In the usual case, the causative verb *rə-wetɣaw-at-* describes situations of communication (11b.1) and differs from the non-causative verb in the number of obligatory participants (it has one more of them) and transitivity. In (11b.1) the causative morpheme behaves like an applicative — it does not add the causing subevent but introduces the Co-Agent into the direct object position. This function can be called a comitative applicative. The non-causative verb can also express this participant by the dative case (like an Addressee) or by the *reen* 'with' (like a Co-Agent) but it is absolutely optional (11a). The causative verb *rə-wetɣaw-at-* can also describe situations of oral causation as in the example (11b.2) where its meaning is close to 'to persuade'. The causative morpheme changes the lexical meaning of the verb but again there is no causativization, i. e. no causing subevent is added. There are, however, some differences between (11b.1) and (11b.2). The interpretation (11b.2) describes only such situations in which the mother pursues some goal[12] while she is talking to her daughter (for example, she wants her to do or not to do something). Therefore, the daughter is more like a Patient than a Co-Agent, and the most important thing is that there is change of Patient's mental state (the daughter comes to a decision which satisfies her mother). Nevertheless, the verb *rə-wetɣaw-at-* cannot have a proper causative interpretation (11b.3).

---

[12] The goal can be expressed with an infinitive or a finite dependent clause which contains the conjunction *iŋqun* 'in order to'.

In almost all cases where a causative can be derived from a transitive verb there is also some non-causative interpretation. For example, the verb *keɬi-*, according to the dictionaries, can only be used as a transitive verb which has meanings like 'to write', 'to draw' and so on. See (12a) where the noun phrase *kojŋən* decribes the created object (a drawing). The causative verb *rə-keɬi-w-* in (12b) has the same number of arguments, and they all retain their case marking, but the noun phrase *kojŋən* already describes the existing object which undergoes change of state. In (12a), the Location is not an argument of the predicate and is not expressed while the Image is in the absolutive (direct object) position. In (12b), on the contrary, the Image is not expressed, and the absolutive position which became free is filled in with a new object[13]. In order to give this derivation some label, one needs to know whether unexpressed participants in (12a) and (12b) have argument or adjunct status. In the first case, it would make sense to speak about permutative[14] in terms of (Mel'čuk, 1998). In the second case, which seems more likely, it is again a (quasi-)applicative use of the causative, and the redistribution of objects is just one of its side effects. It might be the case that applicativization is preceded by unmarked antipassivization in examples like this, but I will not consider this option here. However, it should be noted that sentences like (12c) are not accepted by all speakers.

(12a) *ɣəm-nan*   *tə-keɬi-ɣʔe-n*   *kojŋə-n*   (*pujʔet-e*)
       I-INS   1SG.S/A-write-TH-3SG.O   cup-NOM.SG   soot-INS
       'I painted a picture of a cup (with a soot)'.

(12b) *ɣəm-nan*   *tə-n-keɬi-wə-n*   *kojŋə-n*   (*pujʔet-e*)
       I-INS   1SG.S/A-TR-write-CS-3SG.O   cup-NOM.SG   soot-INS
       'I painted the cup (with a soot)'.

(12c) *ʔɣəm*   *kojŋə-tkənə-k*   *tə-keɬi-ɣʔe-k*
       I   cup-TOP-LOC   1SG.S/A-write-TH-1SG.S
       'I painted something on the cup'.

It is noteworthy that *keɬi-* still can be used in an intransitive clause, first of all in quasi-reflexive[15] contexts (13a). If there is a noun phrase which expresses an animate participant in the object position, as in (13b), then such a sentence has two interpretations one of which is similar to the meaning of the non-causative verb in (12a), and another one is similar to the meaning of the

---

[13] In (12a), one can add 'on a paper', and this constituent will be expressed by a noun marked with the locative or both spatial derivation *-tkən* (TOP) and the locative. However, I do not know whether it is possible to add something like 'with a pattern' in (12b).

[14] In fact, there is a permutative in Chukchi, and in pairs like *to spread the butter on the bread ~ to spread the bread with butter* the verb is transitive in both cases, but in the last case it is marked by the prefix *ine-*, which coincides with the antipassive marker and the so-called inverse agreement marker.

[15] In core reflexive contexts, there is a phrase *sinit-kin uwik* (self-REL body) or *sinit-uwik* (self-body) in the absolutive position, and the verb agrees with it, i.e. takes a marker of the subject-object agreement set. The intensifying pronoun *sinit* shows the same polysemy as modifiers like *by itself* in many other languages — 'alone' and 'no particular cause'.

causative verb in (12b). The use of the causative verb with an animate participant in the object position is not accepted by some speakers (13c.1), and is considered synonymous to (13b.1) by other speakers. In such a case, the causative morpheme does not influence either syntax or semantics of the sentence in any obvious way. The proper causative interpretation in this case is unavailable (13c.2). The instrumental applicative meaning, which was noted for this causative verb in (Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, & Xolodovič, 1969), has not been observed in the Amguema dialect.

(13a) *Ɂəwequs*　　　　*kełi-ɣɁ-i*　　　　*sinit*
husband.NOM.SG　　　write-TH-2/3.SG.S　　self
'A husband plastered himself' (e. g. with a soot, for a special ritual).

(13b) *ɣəm-nan*　　*tə-kełi-ɣɁe-n*　　　　*Ɂəwequs*
I-INS　　　　　1SG.S/A-write-TH-3SG.O　　husband.NOM.SG
1. 'I plastered a husband' (e. g. with a soot, for a special ritual).
2. 'I painted a picture of a husband'.

(13c) %*ɣəm-nan*　　*tə-n-kełi-wə-n*　　　　*Ɂəwequs*
I-INS　　　　　1SG.S/A-TR-write-CS-3SG.O　husband.NOM.SG
1. 'I plastered a husband' (e. g. with a soot, for a special ritual).
2. *'I caused a husband to write / paint / plaster'.

The next pair of examples describes probably the same situation in the actual world. The only difference between them is that of a speaker's perspective (and it may cause them to have different implicatures). In the initial non-causative diathesis, the absolutive position is occupied by the Location (or the Goal) (14a), while in the causative diathesis it is occupied by the Instrument (14b). If these participants are not in the priority (absolutive) position, they are expressed in the most natural way — by the locative and the instrumental case. This rearranging function of causatives can be again labelled as a permutative or an instrumental applicative, depending on the argument status of the involved participants, although it might be not a first question that should be answered in this connection.

(14a) *ənan*　　　*keŋuneŋe-te*　*nute-sqə-n*　　　*tənpə-ne-n*
he.INS　　　stick-INS　　　land-SURF-NOM.SG　stab-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O
'He stuck a stick into a soil' (and probably, took it out) (lit. he stabbed a soil with a stick).

(14b) *ənan*　　　*keŋuneŋ*　　*nute-sqə-k*　　　*rə-tənp-an-ne-n*
he.INS　　　stick.NOM.SG　land-SURF-LOC　　TR-stab-VB-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O
'He stuck a stick into a soil' (and probably kept it there).

4.2. 'Anti-reflexive' use

Some naturally reflexive verbs, in particular verbs of dressing, and their causative derivatives constitute an opposition illustrated with the following examples.

(15a)   *epe-qej*   *sinit*   *ker-ɣəp-ɣʔ-e*

grandfather-DIM.NOM.SG   self   kerker-dress-TH-2/3.SG.S

'A grandmother put a kerker (= woman's overall made of reindeer fur) on herself'.

(15b)   *ɣəm-nan*   *epe-qej*   *tə-n-ker-ɣəp-at-ɣʔa-n*[16]

I-INS   grandfather-DIM.NOM.SG   1SG.S/A-TR-kerker-dress-VB-TH-3SG.O

'I put a kerker on a grandmother'.

In (Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, & Xolodovič, 1969), this contrast is called an opposition of reflexivity because in sentences like (15a) the Agent acts on himself, while in sentences like (15b) — on some other animate participant but the action is actually the same. It should be noted that not only intransitive verbs like *ker-ɣəp-* in (15a) (a compound derived as a result of incorporation of the noun *kerker* 'kerker' into the transitive verb *jəp-* 'to dress') but also transitive ones like the verb *jəp-* itself can form such causatives.

(16a)   *nenene-te*   *jəm-ne-na-t*   *om-awerʔə-t*

child-INS   dress-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O-PL   warm-leather.clothes-NOM.PL

'A child put warm leather clothes on himself'.

(16b)   *ətɬʔa-ta*   *nanana-ɣtə*   *rə-jpə-ŋan-ne-na-t*

mother-INS   child-DAT   TR-dress-SF-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O-PL

om-awerʔə-t

warm-leather.clothes-NOM.PL

'A mother put warm leather clothes on a child'.

At first sight, the examples (15b) and (16b) look like a normal causative: the number of syntactic arguments becomes one more, it seems that there is a new Agent, the initial Agent is expressed by the noun phrase in the nominative in (15b) where the causative is derived from the intransitive verb, and in the dative in (16b) where the causative is derived from the intransitive verb, and in the former case the clause is also transitivized. However, from the point of view of event structure, the causative pattern is not so obvious. Thus, the event of dressing in both (16a) and (16b)

---

[16] My consultants reject the causative verb *rə-ker-ɣəp-aw-*, which is given in (Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, & Xolodovič, 1969), and use instead of it the verb *rə-ker-ɣəp-at-*.

should apparently include three subevents: the agentive activity (the Agent puts the clothes on the Patient), the process in the Patient (the Patient is being covered with the clothes more and more), and the resulting state (it starts to exist when all the clothes is on the Patient). No new subevent is added as it is presupposed by causativization. The main difference between non-causative and causative verbs is that in (15a) and (16a) the Agent and the Patient are co-indexed and correspond just to one syntactic argument, while the causative verbs in (15b) and (16b) presuppose more canonical correspondence — the Agent and the Patient are two different arguments.

4.3. Other effects: an overview

There are no clear cases of a benefactive[17] or locative[18] applicative in my data, and just a few examples of a stimulus applicative[19]. It seems that these cases are very peripheral in Chukchi. However, in general applicative-like interpretations of causative morphology are numerous in Chukchi, and the very causative-applicative polysemy or homonymy is quite widespread in the languages of the world; see, for example, (Austin, 2005) for Australian languages, (Nurhayani 2012; Hemmings, 2013) for Javanese, (Jerro, 2017) for the causative and instrumental applicative syncretism in Kinyarwanda, just to name a few. What other non-causative effects of causative morphology can also exist? In the literature (Kittilä, 2009; Aikhenvald, 2011), one can find the following functions mentioned: increasing of intentionality (of an A-argument), increasing of intensity (of an action), increasing of affectedness (of a P-argument).

At first sight, the causative derived from the verb *pela-* 'to leave' seems to be an example of increased intentionality of the Agent. The causative marker does not add any new arguments in this case, but the causative verb is regularly treated by the speakers as denoting an intentional action, while the non-causative verb is treated as denoting an accidental action (17a). At least in case of an

---

[17] Nevertheless, sometimes one can observe some kind of an assistive interpretation illustrated above.

[18] Some of my consultants accept the example (iv) where the absolutive position is occupied by the Location argument, while other consultants reject it and use the verb *rə-kupre-tku-* only in the assistive meaning (v).

(iii) *ətłon*   *ŋoten-ɣətɣə-k*   *nə-kupre-tku-qin*
       he   this.INC-lake-LOC   ST-net-ITER-ST.3SG
       'He sets a fishing net in this lake'.

(iv) %*ŋotqen*   *ɣətɣə-n*   *ənan*   *rə-kupre-tku-w-ni-n*
       this   lake-NOM.SG   he.INS   TR-set-ITER-CS-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O
       'He set a fishing net in this lake'.

(v) %*epe-ne*   *ətłəwjo*   *rə-kupre-tku-w-ni-n*
       grandfather-AN.INS   grandson.NOM.SG   TR-set-ITER-CS-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O
       'A grandfather helped a grandson to set a fishing net / showed him how to set a fishing net'.

[19] Cf. the verb *ɣəlo-* 'to be bored; to be sad' and its causative. The Stimulus can be expressed as a noun phrase in the dative case in a non-causative sentence and as a direct object in a causative one.

(i) *ətła*   *ɣəlo-rkən*   (*akka-ɣtə*)
       mother.NOM.SG   be.bored-IPFV   son-DAT
       1. 'A mother was bored / sad'.
       2. 'A mother missed a son'.

(ii) %*ətʔa-ta*   *n-ena-n-ɣəlo-w-qen*   *ekək*
       mother-INS   ST-INV-TR-be.bored-CS-IPFV-ST.3SG   son.NOM.SG
       'A mother missed a son'.

inanimate Causee, this contrast seems to be rather an implicature, which disappears in a specific context. For example, one can express the Recipient (or the Beneficiary) in both causative and non-causative sentences (17b)[20], and this indicates the intentional character of the action.

(17a) *ɣəm-nan*   *tə-peɫa-ɣʔa-n*   /   *tə-n-peɫa-wə-n*   *saj-kok*
       I-INS   1SG.S/A-leave-TH-3SG.O   1SG.S/A-TR-leave-CS-3SG.O   tea-pot.NOM.SG
       'I left a kettle' (by chance / on purpose).

(17b) *ɣəm-nan*   *tə-peɫa-ɣʔa-n*   /   *tə-n-peɫa-wə-n*
       I-INS   1SG.S/A-leave-TH-3SG.O   1SG.S/A-TR-leave-CS-3SG.O
       saj-kok   *ɣənə-ka-ɣtə*
       tea-pot.NOM.SG   you.sg-OBL-DAT
       'I left a kettle for you'.

If the Causee is animate, the contrast between the non-causative and causative verbs is more evident. In the example (18), the verb *rə-peɫa-w-* is considered by the speakers as pragmatically unacceptable.

(18) *rojərʔə-n*   *tə-peɫa-ɣʔa-n*   /   #*tə-n-peɫa-wə-n*[21]
      family-NOM.SG   1SG.S/A-leave-TH-3SG.O   1SG.S/A-TR-leave-CS-3SG.O
      'I abandoned a family'.

Increasing intentionality as the only effect of causative morphology seems to be very rare in Chukchi. As for increasing intensity, Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, and Xolodovič (1969) give only two examples: *ойп-ык* 'to thread' → *р-ойпы-ӈат-ык* 'to thread (intensively)', *энатр-ык* 'to press against' → use *р-энатр-ав-ык* 'to press against (intensively)'. Most of my consultants do not know these verbs, and there is no evidence that this use of a causative is common in Chukchi.

Finally, there is one more special use of causative morphology. This is the case of the matrix verb *paa-* 'to cease'; cf. (19) where the intransitive verb *ʔejŋeɫʔetku-* 'to swear' is used in the embedded clause. The verb *paa-* belongs to the group of the matrix verbs which obligatorily demonstrate a long-distance agreement with an object of an embedded infinitival clause but it seems to be the only matrix verb which needs to be causativized in that case because it cannot be used itself as transitive (20).

---

[20] The more obvious way to cancel this implicature could be to add explicit adverbs like 'deliberately' and 'by chance', but I have no evidence that such unambiguous adverbs exist in Chukchi, at least, *ʔərʔe* and *ʔekwərɣa* do not look like that.
[21] The causative verb *rə-peɫa-w-* can be combined with an animate Causee, but in such a case it can only mean 'to leave alive'.
(i)   *tə-n-peɫa-wə-na-t*   *ətrʔes*   *mətɫəŋ-en*   *ʔattʔə-qeɣ-ti*
       1SG.S/A-TR-leave-CS-3SG.O-PL   only   five-POSS   dog-DIM-NOM.PL
       'I left only five dogs alive'.

(19)　　*ətɬəɣə-n*　　　　　*paa-ɣʔ-e*　　　　　*ʔejŋeɬʔetku-k*

father-NOM.SG　　　　cease-TH-2/3SG.S　　scold.ITER-INF

'A father ceased swearing'.

(20a)　　*ətɬəɣ-e*　　　　*rə-paa-w-ne-n*　　　　　　/　　　**paa-ne-n*

father-INS　　　　TR-cease-CS-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O　　　　cease-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O

ʔejŋeɬʔetə-k　　*ekək*

scold-INF　　　　son.NOM.SG

'A father ceased to swear a son'.

(20b)　　*ətɬəɣ-e*　　　　*rə-paa-w-ne-na-t*　　　　　　*ʔejŋeɬʔetə-k*　　*ekke-t*

father-INS　　　　TR-cease-CS-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O-PL　　scold-INF　　　son-NOM.PL

'A father ceased to swear sons'.

4.4. Additional remarks

It is interesting to note that the question word *req-* 'what', which can be used also as a verb in Chukchi (21a), forms the causative with an applicative interpretation (21b.1, 22), and not the causative one, even in the case when there is a human object (21b.1, 23). It is possible to think that this fact indicates only that *req-* substitutes mainly predicates of agentive activities, and the causative derived from it behaves like causatives made of agentive predicates. On this view, its behavior may look quite expectable.

(21a)　　*reqə-rkəni-tək?*

what-IPFV-2PL.S/O

'What are you doing here?'.

(21b)　　*rə-req-ew-ni-n?*

TR-what-CS-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O

1. 'What did he do to it / him?'.

2. *'What did he cause him to do?'.

(22)　　*wasʲa-na*　　　　　*rə-req-ew-ni-n*　　　　　　　*orwoor?*

Vasya-AN.INS　　　　TR-what-CS-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O　　　sledge.NOM.SG

məɬe-ni-n

break-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O

'— What has Vasya done to the sledge? — He has broken it'.

(23)   *ɣajmaŋen*   *ne-re-n-req-ew-ŋə-n*

      it.is.possible   LOW.A-FUT-TR-what-CS-FUT-3SG.O

      (Although he is an experienced hunter,) 'he might be in danger' (lit. it is possible that they can do something to him).

Nevertheless, it should be noted that in some cases a causative verb derived from an agentive intransitive verb (which is not a verb of directed motion, change of posture or ingestion) still can have more or less causative-like interpretations; cf. the next example. There is a new Agent in (24b), and he is somehow contributing to the situation that the Causee would take part in the race competitions although he should not take part in the race himself. The interpretation of a benefactive applicative (24b.4) is unavailable, and the interpretation of a comitative applicative (24b.3) is not accepted by most speakers, as opposed to the observations made in (Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, & Xolodovič, 1969). However, such examples are rare, and I will not dare to make any assumptions about what can determine this possibility.

(24a)   *tumɣə-t*   *nə-raswəŋ-qena-t*

       friend-NOM.PL   ST-race-ST.3SG-PL

       'Friends are racing'.

(24b)   *ɣəm-nan*   *tə-n-raswəŋ-awə-rkə-na-t*   *tumɣə-t*

       I-INS   1SG.S/A-TR-race-CS-IPFV-3SG.O-PL   friend-NOM.PL

       1. 'I am organizing race competitions for friends'.

       2. 'I am asking friends to take part in race competitions'.

       3. ??'I am racing with friends'.

       4. *'I am racing for friends'.

Another remark that should be also done is that there seems to be a 'repair' strategy for causatives which are derived from agentive verbs and have only an applicative-like meaning. Under this strategy, a causative is combined with the so-called lexical affix (or 'affixal verb', in another terms) *te-...-ŋ* 'MAKE', which results in a causative interpretation. It has been shown in the example (7b) above that the causative verb *rə-miɣsir-ew-* cannot have a meaning 'to cause to work'. However, in combination with the affix *te-...-ŋ* as in the next example it receives an interpretation of speech causation.

(25)   *ətɬəɣ-e*   *ekək*   *te-n-miɣsir-ew-ŋə-ni-n*

      father-INS   son.NOM.SG   MAKE-TR-work-CS-MAKE-3SG.A.3.O-3SG.O

      'A father ordered a son to work'.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, the main uses of a synthetic causative in Chukchi, with a special attention to the non-causative effects of causative morphology, have been very briefly considered. If a causative is derived from an agentive intransitive predicate (which is not a verb of directed motion, change of posture or ingestion), it usually gets some applicative-like interpretation, and a clause is transitivized. In most cases, the absolutive position is occupied by the Co-Agent or the Theme arguments. There is no evidence that benefactive[22], locative or instrumental applicative functions of are typical for Chukchi causatives, at least they are not observed in the Amguema dialect.

Transivite verbs rarely form causatives in Chukchi. Causative verbs usually have some rearranging function in such a case, i. e. forming a causative helps to change a speaker's perspective on the described situation, in particular, to redistribute two participants between direct object and oblique positions. In some cases, one can observe effects which resemble increasing of intentionality of an A-argument. Causativization of verbs of dressing leads to an "anti-reflexive" effect: the Agent and the Patient should refer to two distinct participants, while in a non-causative construction they are obligatorily co-indexed.

The paper is mainly descriptive in its nature, and there are a lot of questions for a future research. Can any of the non-causative readings of a causative in Chukchi be regarded as a separate meaning? How these readings can be derived if they are not separate meanings? How the Chukchi data fit into the typology of non-causative effects of causative morphology?

Abbreviations

1 — first person, 2 — second person, 3 — third person, A — A-argument, ADJ — adjectivizer, AN — high animate declension, AUTH — 'authentic', CS — verbal affix, DAT — dative, DEICT — discourse particle, DIM — diminutive, FEM — feminitive, FUT — future, INC — incorporated form, INF — infinitive, INS — instrumental, INV — inverse, IPFV — imperfective, ITER — iterative, LOC — locative, LOW.A — low agent, MAKE — 'make', NOM — nominative, NP — set of agreement markers used in nominal predication, O — O-argument, OBL — oblique stem, PL — plural, POSS —

---

[22] Cf., however, an assistive reading in the example (6b) above, but it can be hardly regarded as an instance of applicativization. In their article, Inenlikej, Nedjalkov, and Xolodovič (1969) mention the pair *raŋŋat-ək* 'to carry a yaranga' → *rə-raŋŋat-av-ək* 'to carry a yaranga for smb.' (in particular, to help smb. to carry a yaranga). In the Amguema dialect, in similar cases the Beneficiary becomes a core argument as a result of unmarked applicativization; cf. the next examples.

(i)   *ŋen-sʔa-akka-ɣtə*   *tə-ta-ra-ŋə-k*
        young-ADJ-son-DAT   1SG.S/A-MAKE-dwelling-MAKE-1SG.S
        'I built a yaranga for the youngest son(s)'.

(ii)   *ŋin-sʔe-t*   *ekke-t*   *tə-ta-ra-ŋə-na-t*
        young-ADJ-NOM.PL   son-NOM.PL   1SG.S/A-MAKE-dwelling-MAKE-3SG.O-PL
        'I built a yaranga for the youngest sons'.

possessive, S — S-argument, SF — verbal affix, SG — singular, ST — stative, SURF — 'surface', TH — thematic affix, TOP — 'top', TR — transitivizer, VB — verbal affix

References

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2011). Causatives which do not cause: Non-valency-increasing effects of a valency-increasing derivation. In A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon, *Language at large: Essays on syntax and semantics* (pp. 86–142). Leiden; Boston: Brill.

Austin, P. (2005). Causative and applicative constructions in Australian Aboriginal languages. University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.431.1627&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

Dunn, M. J. (1999). *A grammar of Chukchi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Australian National University, Canberra.

Hemmings, C. (2013). Causatives and applicatives: The case for polysemy in Javanese. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics, 16*, 167–194.

Inenlikej, P. I., Nedjalkov, V. P., & Xolodovič, A. A. (1969). Kauzativ v čukotskom jazyke [Causative in Chukchi]. In A. A. Xolodovič (Ed.), *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. Morfologičeskij kauzativ* [Typology of causative constructions: A morphological causative] (pp. 260–269). Leningrad: Nauka.

Jerro, K. (2017). The causative-instrumental syncretism. *Journal of Linguistics, 53*(4), 751–788.

Kittilä, S. (2009). Causative morphemes as non-valency increasing devices. *Folia Linguistica, 43*(1), 67–94.

Kratzer, A. (2005). Building resultatives. In C. Maienbaum & A. Wollstein-Leisen (Eds.), *Event arguments in syntax, semantics, and discourse.* Tubingen: Niemeyer, 177–212.

Levin, B., & Rappaport Hovav, M. (1992). The lexical semantics of verbs of motion: the perspective from unaccusativity. In I. M. Roca (Ed.), *Thematic structure: its role in grammar* (Linguistic models, 16) (pp. 247–269). Berlin; New York: Foris Publications.

Masica, C. P. (1976). *Defining a linguistic area: South Asia.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mel'čuk, I. A. (1998). *Kurs obščej morfologii. Tom II. Čast' vtoraja: Morfologičeskie značenija* [A course in general morphology. Vol. II. Part 2: Morphological meanings]. Moskva; Vena: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury; Wiener Slawistischer Almanach.

Næss, Å. (2007). *Prototypical transitivity* (Typological studies in language, 72). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nedjalkov, V. P., & Sil'nickij, G. G. (1969). Tipologija morfologičeskogo i leksičeskogo kauzativov [Typology of morphological and lexical causatives]. In A. A. Xolodovič (Ed.), *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. Morfologičeskij kauzativ* [Typology of causative constructions: A morphological causative] (pp. 20–60). Leningrad: Nauka.

Nurhayani, I. (2012). Javanese applicative construction. In *Coyote Papers: Working Papers in Linguistics, Linguistic Theory at the University of Arizona.* Vol. 19: D. Brenner (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Arizona Linguistics Circle 5 (Oct., 2011).* Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Linguistics Circle. Retrieved from http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/231151.

Polinsky, M. (2013). Applicative Constructions. In M. S. Dryer & M. Haspelmath (Eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online.* Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Retrieved from http://wals.info/chapter/109.

Skorik, P. Ja. (1961). *Grammatika čukotskogo jazyka. Čast' pervaja: Fonetika i morfologija imennyx častej reči* [A grammar of Chukchi. Part 1: Phonetics and morphology of nominal parts of speech]. Moskva; Leningrad: Izdatel'svo Akademii nauk SSSR.

Skorik, P. Ja. (1977). *Grammatika čukotskogo jazyka. Čast' vtoraja: Glagol, narečie, služebnyje slova* [A grammar of Chukchi. Part 2: Verb, adverb, and auxiliary words]. Leningrad: Nauka.

Example of contact details and disclaimer:

Ivan A. Stenin
National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). School of Linguistics. Senior Lecturer
E-mail: ystein88@gmail.com, istenin@hse.ru

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.