Prepositional versus Verbal Causativizers

In causative constructions of natural languages, a causer argument, which does not originate in a predicate's argument structure, is typically realized as NP/DP. Since NP/DP requires Case, the predicate needs to expand its Case-licensing ability: either by being selected by an independent word as in (1a) or affixed with a bound morpheme as in (1b, c).

(1) a. John made Mary go to New York.
b. John modernized the system.
c. John-wa Mary-o New York-e ik-sase-ta.
TOP ACC to go-SASE-PAST
'John caused Mary to go to New York.'

Made in (1a) is clearly a verb. The conjugation patterns show that the affixed predicates in (1b, c) are also verbs. Like transitive verbs, prepositions can Case-license NP/DPs. It is thus expected that prepositional causativizers exist besides verbal ones. I will argue that *–kan* in Indonesian instantiates an affixal preposition that accommodates the increased Case-requirement of causative constructions and that its categorial status allows non-causative usages that are not shared by verbal causativizers in (1a-c).

As summarized in Sneddon (1996) and Son and Cole (2008, S&C), *-kan* constitutes distinct constructions depending on root predicates; if suffixed with *–kan* (and prefixed with *meN-*), unaccusatives and adjectives become causative as in (2) and (3), while transitive verbs become benefactive as in (4).

(2) a. Cangkirnya pecah.
cup.3 break 'The cup broke/is broken.'
b. Janet memecahkan cangkirnya.
Janet MEN.break-KAN cup.3 'Janet broke her cup.'

(3) a. Wajahnya putih. 'His face is white.'
face.3 white
b. Ia memutihkan wajahnya.
3sg MEN.white-KAN face.3 'He whitened his face.'

(4) a. Tika memanggang roti itu (untuk Erik)
Tika MEN.bake bread the (for Erik)
'Tika baked the bread (for Erik).'
b. Tika memanggangkan Erik roti itu
Tika MEN.bake-KAN Erik bread the
'Tika baked Erik the bread.'
NOT 'Tika caused Erik to bake bread.'

Specifically, *Erik* in (4b) cannot be interpreted as an external argument of the baking event caused by the matrix subject; it can only be a benefactive argument. In contrast, Japanese verbs with *–sase* are interpreted as causative regardless of their transitivity.

(5) a. John-wa Mary-no tame ni pan-o yak-ta.
John-TOP Mary-GEN sake for bread-ACC bake-PAST 'John baked bread for Mary.'
b. John-wa Mary-ni pan-o yak-sase-ta. 'John caused Mary to bake bread.'
John-TOP Mary-DAT bread-ACC bake-SASE-PAST NOT 'John baked Mary bread.'

Like (1c) with an intransitive verb, (5b), involving a transitive verb, has the causative meaning rather than the benefactive meaning expressed by (5a). The same holds true of *make* in (1a).

The contrast exemplified between (4b) and (5b) can be deduced from the assumption that *–kan* is prepositional. S&C refers to the possibility of *–kan* as deriving from the free-standing P *akan*. Moreover, a transitive verb with *–kan* alternates with an intransitive verb or adjective with a PP complement. For instance, the intransitive *berpikir* and the transitive *memikirkan* share the root *pikir* (think), and the former takes a complement headed by the P *tentang* (cf. Sneddon (1996)). It is widely held that auxiliary or functional verbs, including causative verbs, are heads selecting lexical verbs. On the other hand, no evidence has ever been presented on the existence of prepositions selecting bare verbs, while verbs taking prepositional complements are amply attested. I will thus assume that ver-

bal and prepositional causativizers constitute the opposite hierarchical configurations in (6a, b), respectively (linear order irrelevant).

(6) a. [*v*P *v*(-sase) [... (verbal) root ...]] b. [√P (verbal) root [... [P –kan] ...]]

I assume with Kratzer (1996) that an external argument is introduced in the projection of a functional head selecting a verbal root. If *–sase* counts as such a head, it should be able to Case-license an external argument in its projection. On the other hand, if *-kan* appears under the projection of a (verbal) root, it can only Case-license internal arguments. Specifically, *-kan* cannot Case-license the external argument of a transitive verbal root, and this explains the absence of the causative reading in (4b) in contrast to (5b).

As exemplified in (2b), (3b), and (4b), roots with *–kan* are prefixed by *meN-*. Contrary to S&C, I assume *meN-* to function only as a verbalizing head; the ability to check accusative Case comes from a root or *–kan*. This assumption is supported by a highly productive process with *meN-* to derive inchoative verbs from adjective roots (cf. Sneddon (1996)). Besides (3a, b), for example, there is an intransitive verb *menuih* (meN-putih) meaning 'turn pale'; its internal argument is Case-checked in the subject or IP-spec position, just as in (3a). The general pattern is that given a(n adjectival) root R with one internal argument θ_{int}, three constructions are available: (i) θ_{int} R (e.g. (3a)), (ii) θ_{int} meN-R, and (iii) θ_{ext} meN-R-kan θ_{int} (e.g. (3b)). Accusative Case-checking is clearly irrelevant in (ii). It is true that transitive verbs in Indonesian are prefixed with *–meN* as in (4a), but I claim that the verbal roots intrinsically have a potential to check accusative Case and can execute it only when their category is fixed by *–meN* just as √ DESTROY can check accusative Case only after it is put in a verbal context (cf. Marantz (1997)). If a transitive verbal root is suffixed further with *–kan*, it should allow one more NP/DP to be Case-checked. Importantly, this NP/DP cannot be an external argument as *–kan* appears within the root's projection as assumed in (6b). Suppose that transitive verbal roots optionally select a benefactive argument. Suffixing such roots with –k*an* results in the benefactive construction exemplified by (4b). The existence of optionally selected benefactive argument is supported by the fact that those transitive roots that are not usually done for others such as *makan* ('eat') fail to participate in the benefactive construction (cf. Sneddon (1996), Chonan (2009)).

Finally, most of the inchoative-causative pairs in English lack overt morphology; so do the transitive-benefactive pairs. Contrary to the standard view that these alternations involve a higher verbal head, the present analysis assumes an empty affixal preposition on a par with *–kan*; the former alternation is restricted to unaccusatives and adjectives, and 'John baked Mary bread' has no causative meaning just like the Indonesian example in (4b).

References

Chonan, K. (2009) "A study of causatives and applicatives in English, Indonesian, and other languages." ms.

Kratzer, A. (1996) "Severing the external argument from its verb." In J. Rooaryck and L. Zaring (eds.) *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, pp. 109-137. Kluwer.

Marantz, A. (1997) "No escape from syntax: don't try a morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon." *UPenn Working paper in linguistics*, 4(2), 201-225.

Sneddon, J. N. (1996) *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge.

Son, M. and P. Cole (2008) "An event-based account of *–kan* constructions in standard Indonesian." *Language*, 84(1), 120-160.