

Werk

Titel: Causatives in Uyghur

Autor: Kurban, Umarjan

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2015

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0019 | LOG_0028

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Causatives in Uyghur

Umarjan Kurban

Kurban, Umarjan 2015. Causatives in Uyghur. *Turkic Languages* 19, 213–239.

The present study is intended to provide a descriptive analysis of canonical causative constructions in modern Uyghur. Lexical, morphological and analytic causative constructions are employed in modern Uyghur. Lexical causative is less productive, and its use seems to be restricted to very specific domains without a morphological marker. By contrast, morphological causatives are undoubtedly the most frequent means of expressing causatives, and they are highly productive with both transitive and intransitive verbs. These productive single causatives are mostly regular; the choice of the suffixes is phonologically determined. Double causatives derived from intransitive and transitive bases in Uyghur result in different surface realizations. No more than two different causative morphemes can be iterated in the causative construction. Therefore, Uyghur does not permit any iteration of the triple causative. In this sense, the double causative in Uyghur is different from that of genetically related languages (for example Turkish) with respect to the nature and amount of causative morpheme reduplication. This study shows that the morphological causatives in Uyghur share universal tendencies in terms of causative devices and valence increasing operations in the argument structure of causative verbs in canonical situations. Although the scope of this paper is limited to one individual language, its findings would be relevant for studying causative constructions in other languages.

Umarjan Kurban, College of Humanities, Xinjiang University, Urumqi, 830046 Xinjiang, China. E-mail: tarim333@hotmail.com

0. Introduction

Causatives have been the subject of intense study in linguistic literature and have long been discussed on the basis of cross-linguistic investigations in terms of functional typology (Comrie 1975, 1976, 1981, 1985, 1989, 1993; Haspelmath 1993; Dixon 2000), morphological and syntactic classification (Nedjalkov & Silnitsky 1973; Shibatani 1975, 1976; Aissen 1979; Givon 1980, Foley & Van Valin 1984; Haiman 1985; Song 1996), semantic types of causatives (Shibatani 1975, 1976; Talmy 1976; McCawley 1976; Dixon 2000; Pylkkänen 2000; Haspelmath 2008; Schaffer 2009), grammatical and semantic relations (Dowty 1972, 1979; Shibatani 1975, 1976, 2001; Comrie 1975, 1976, 1981; Foley and Van Valin 1984; Baker 1988; Levin and Hovav 1995, 2009; Chierchia 2004; Harley 2008), and argument structure and mapping (Alsina 1992; Pesetsky 1995; Baker 1997; Pinker 1989; Dowty 1991; Grimshaw 1990; Reinhart 2002; Pylkkänen 2008; Schafer 2008; Harley 2013; Croft 2012). Comrie (1981: 158–177) characterizes causative events in terms of two (or more) micro-events, perceived as making up a macro-event, that are encoded in a

single expression (of varying size and form). He makes a three-way typological distinction between lexical, morphological, and analytical causatives. This three-way categorization forms a continuum from lexical to morphological and analytical, and corresponds to the continuum from indirect to direct causation. In other studies, causative constructions are classified according to a number of semantic contexts. Shibatani (1975) presents four pairs of semantic factors that determine the semantic types of causatives in specific contexts. These pairs are referred to as: Coercive vs Noncoercive, Directive vs Manipulative, Direct vs Indirect, Ballistic vs Controlled.

This paper provides an overview of causative constructions in Uyghur analyzed on the basis of a number of syntactic and semantic aspects such as suffixation rules and their restrictions, argument structures and their syntactic realization, case marking, and animacy restrictions of obligatory arguments. The paper is divided into three parts. Part one deals with distinctive semantic and syntactic properties of lexical causatives. In part two, the semantic features and syntactic manifestations of arguments of single causatives derived from intransitive and transitive verbs in Uyghur are examined in terms of argument coding, animacy properties of core arguments in causal chains, and the case marking of obligatory arguments. In part three, distinctive semantic properties and syntactic realizations of double causatives derived from transitive and intransitive bases through iteration of causative suffixes in modern Uyghur are briefly discussed. Finally, a brief comparison is made between lexical and morphological causative alternations in Uyghur and a general conclusion is drawn concerning the correlation between productive and nonproductive causative constructions. The data used in this study were taken from the Uyghur Language Database collected in the Laboratory of Xinjiang Multilingual Information Technology, founded at Xinjiang University in 2008, and from my Ph.D. thesis (Kurban forthcoming).

1. Lexical causatives

As in many other languages, lexical causative in Uyghur is manifested through a group of morphologically irregular, stem-specific, non-productive, transitive verbs with specific idiosyncratic meaning. These are transitive verbs which do not undergo morphological change or derivational processes when they denote a causative situation. Unlike productive causatives, they are not productive in formation, and semantically bear the causative meaning inherent to them. These are considered to be the most compact causatives by Dixon (2000: 74ff). For example, Uyghur transitive verbs like *qaz-* ‘to dig’, and *yirt-* ‘to tear’ are not formed through an overt derivational process; nevertheless they indicate a causal-resultant relationship in the causative event structure.

Hopper and Thompson (1980: 251) write: “Transitivity is understood to be about an activity being carried over or transferred from an agent to a patient. Transitivity in this traditional view necessarily involves at least two participants”. Based on this prototype approach, the prototypical transitive event involves two core participants

which are conceptualized as agent (causer) and patient (causee) respectively. Hence, lexical causative verbs are dyadic (bivalent) transitive verbs and thus bear relationship with dominative agent and affected patient in their argument structure. “The notions ‘agent’ and ‘patient’ can be defined in terms of the starting point and end-point respectively, of the prototypical event; they are natural delimiters: an event with an agent and patient is maximally delimited” (Croft 1994: 39).

- (1) a. *Adil bögün çirayliq bir nâqış oy-di.*
 Adil today beautiful a engraving make^{CAUS3}-DI.PST.3SG
 ‘Adil made a beautiful engraving today.’
- b. *Bala-lar dârizâ-ni çaq-iwât-ti.*
 child-PL window-ACC broke^{CAUS}-ASP-DI.PST.3SG
 ‘The children broke the window.’

As exemplified in (1a, b), the lexical causatives in Uyghur are expressed by a bare verb (a simple verb root) without any suffixation, yet by themselves they can indicate a causal-resultant event structure: the agent’s activity (causing event) and the patient’s change of state (resulting state) in mono-clausal structure.

The two core participants in lexical causatives display distinctive semantic properties. The prototypical lexical causative construction in Uyghur is characterized by an eventuality in which the agentive participant is often encoded as willful and animate entity which directly manipulates the patientive participant. In such cases, the volitional agent transfers physical energy directly and intentionally onto the patient which, in turn, undergoes a change of state. In this sense, the semantic role of the agent can be encoded as an “*Actor* that expresses the participant which performs, effects, instigates, or controls the situation denoted by the predicate”, while the patient can be encoded as an “*Undergoer* that expresses the participant which does not perform, initiate, or control any situation, but is affected by it in some way” (Folley & Van Valin 1984: 29). What is indicated by (1a, b) is that there is a direct causal relationship between the causing and caused event in this mono-clausal event structure; i.e., the patient is intentionally manipulated by the direct presence of the agent without intervening of a third party in the causal event denoted by the underlying clause.

The subject choice in lexical (as well as morphological and periphrastic) causative sentences is determined by the respective roles of the arguments in the causal-resultative event structure. According to Comrie’s Case Hierarchy (1981: 169; 1985: 337–340), the most agent-like argument, the Actor, which is an animate, high volitional and intentional entity, maps to nominative subject position, as exemplified in (2a, b), while the most affected argument, the Undergoer or patient, which is generally an inanimate entity, is often realized as object in the accusative; see as (2a, b).

- (2) a. *Kona öy-ni buz-du-q.*
 old house-ACC destroy^{CAUS}-DI.PAST-1PL
 ‘We destroyed the old house.’
- b. *Iščilar qädimiy buyum-lar-ni qaz-iwal-di.*
 workers ancient relics-PL-ACC excavate^{CAUS}-ASP-DI.PST.3PL
 ‘Workers excavated the ancient relics.’

A cross-linguistic generalization in the literature devoted to causative structure is that mono-clausal (lexical) causatives tend to express direct causation, while bi-clausal (periphrastic) causatives may express indirect causation (Shibatani 1976, 2001; McCawley 1978; Pinker 1989; Levin & Hovav 1995; 2009; Wolff 2003). Direct causation involves a (relatively) direct interaction between the subject and the object, which represent the initiator and the endpoint of the causal chain respectively, thus excluding any kind of intermediary factors. The complete physical involvement of the agent with the patient is viewed as the canonical example of direct causation. Shibatani (1976: 3) claims that “in both Japanese and Korean the productive causative expresses directive causation and the lexical causative manipulative causation”. However, “when a lexical causative sentence expresses a situation that is associated with a conventionalized purpose, the sentence allows directive interpretation” (Shibatani 1976: 38). As indicated by (2a, b) above, the prototypical (transmission of force) relation between the participants encoded as subject and object in Uyghur lexical causatives is also expressed by direct manipulation of the patient by the agent without the intervention of any type of mediating entity in lexical causative construction. Wolff (2003) shows that speakers are more willing to use lexical causatives to describe causal chains yielding intended results than chains yielding non-intended results.

Unlike periphrastic causatives, lexical causatives in Uyghur are not productive and occur only in a particular class of verbs, namely, those denoting externally caused change of state. The verb (root) used in causatives is intrinsically transitive and indicates an externally caused event which involves the external causer of an action (the causer), and the recipient of the action (the causee), which are represented by the subject and object in causal-resultant event structure. Levin and Rappaport (1995) state that externally caused change-of-state events imply the existence of an external causer with immediate control. For instance, what is described by (1a, b) is that the agent’s action (external force) affects the state of the patient. The agents, *Adil* and *balilar* ‘children’, are volitional animate entities, and the action denoted by the transitive verbs *oy-* ‘to make’ and *čaq-* ‘to break’ are directly completed by the external manipulation and control of *Adil* and *balilar* ‘children’ respectively in the causal event. “Direct causation is at issue when the agent controls the final result, whereas indirect causation holds when the agent controls the input situation but not all intervening stages” (Wunderlich 1997: 38). The agent’s volition in the event

comes both from the context and our shared knowledge. In this sense, a lexical causative transitive verb denotes an externally caused eventuality.

2. Morphological causatives

Morphological causatives, universally considered one of the most productive strategies for forming causative constructions, result in the introduction of a new causer argument that is absent from the syntax of the non-causative counterpart. A distinctive characteristic of morphological causatives lies in their productivity (Comrie 1989, Dixon 2000, Shibatani 2001). In Uyghur morphological causatives, the causing event and the caused event are encoded in a mono-clausal structure by attaching a set of causative suffixes to an intransitive or transitive verb root along with appropriate argument adjustment. The specific condition for these causative suffixes are as follows.

(1) The causative suffixes *-dur/-tur/-dür/-tür* or *-γuz/-quz/-güz/-küz* are attached to monosyllabic verb stems ending in a consonant (excluding those ending in *y* or in a vowel). They yield semantic interpretations of “permission” or “coercion” when they are attached to monosyllabic verb stems. The distinctive meaning conveyed by the causatives with these suffixes depends on the specific situation as well as the speaker’s perspective. Therefore, they are partially interchangeable in most cases, but in some cases they cannot substitute for one-another. The choice of these two types of suffixes is made according to semantic and phonological properties of the given verb. Some verbs with transitive and intransitive properties (for example: *sun-* ‘to snap’, ‘to stretch’) place restrictions on the selection of these suffixes.

<i>yaz-</i> ‘to write’	+ <i>-dur/-γuz</i>	‘to make (sb) write’
<i>bar-</i> ‘to go’	+ <i>-dur/-γuz</i>	‘to make (sb) go’
<i>mañ-</i> ‘to move, go’	+ <i>-dur/-γuz</i>	‘to make (sb) move/go’
<i>yat-</i> ‘to lie down’	+ <i>-quz</i>	‘to make (sb) lie down’
<i>yä-</i> ‘to eat’	+ <i>-güz/-dür</i>	‘to make (sb) eat’
<i>qil-</i> ‘to do’	+ <i>-dur/-γuz</i>	‘to make (sb) do’
<i>siz-</i> ‘to draw’	+ <i>-dur/-γuz</i>	‘to make (sb) draw’
<i>tur-</i> ‘to stand’	+ <i>-γuz</i>	‘to make (sb) stand’
<i>eyt-</i> ‘to say’	+ <i>-quz</i>	‘to make (sb) say’
<i>bär-</i> ‘to give’	+ <i>-güz/-dür</i>	‘to make (sb) give’
<i>tap-</i> ‘to find’	+ <i>-tur/-quz</i>	‘to make (sb) find’
<i>täp-</i> ‘to kick’	+ <i>-küz/-tür</i>	‘to make (sb) kick’
<i>köm-</i> ‘to bury’	+ <i>-güz/-dür</i>	‘to make (sb) bury’
<i>öl-</i> ‘to die’	+ <i>-tür</i>	‘to kill (sb)’
<i>äm-</i> ‘to suck’	+ <i>-güz/-dür</i>	‘to make (sb) suck’
<i>käl-</i> ‘to come’	+ <i>-güz/-tür</i>	‘to make (sb) come’
<i>kät-</i> ‘to leave’	+ <i>-küz/-tür</i>	‘to make (sb) leave’
<i>or-</i> ‘to scythe’	+ <i>-dur/-γuz</i>	‘to make (sb) scythe’

<i>käs-</i> ‘to cut’	+ <i>-güz/-tür</i>	‘to make (sb) cut’
<i>tik-</i> ‘to sew’	+ <i>-küz/-tür</i>	‘to make (sb) sew’
<i>sun</i> (v.t.)- ‘to snap’	+ <i>-dur</i>	‘to make (sb) snap’
<i>sun</i> (v.i.)- ‘to stretch’	+ <i>-yuz</i>	‘to make (sb) stretch’
<i>qon-</i> ‘to stay over’	+ <i>-dur/-yuz</i>	‘to make (sb) stay over’
<i>min-</i> ‘to ride’	+ <i>-güz/-dür</i>	‘to make (sb) ride’
<i>bil-</i> ‘to know’	+ <i>-dür/-güz</i>	‘to make (sb) know’

(2) The suffix *-t* is attached to polysyllabic verb stems ending in *y*, *r* or a vowel.

<i>taray-</i> ‘to become narrow’	+ <i>-t</i>	‘to make narrow’
<i>köpäy-</i> ‘to increase’	+ <i>-t</i>	‘to make increase’
<i>aqar-</i> ‘to become white’	+ <i>-t</i>	‘to make white/whiten’
<i>sämir-</i> ‘to become fat’	+ <i>-t</i>	‘to make fat’
<i>eri-</i> ‘to melt’	+ <i>-t</i>	‘to make melt’
<i>oyna-</i> ‘to play’	+ <i>-t</i>	‘to make/let play’

(3) The suffixes *-ar/-är/* or *-ur/-ür* are attached to monosyllabic verb stems ending in *č* or *š*.

<i>köč-</i> ‘to move’	+ <i>-ür/-är</i>	‘to make move/copy’
<i>ič-</i> ‘to drink’	+ <i>-ür/-är</i>	‘to make drink’
<i>uč-</i> ‘to fly’	+ <i>-ur/-ar</i>	‘to make fly’
<i>piš-</i> ‘to ripe’	+ <i>-ur/-ar</i>	‘to make ripe’
<i>čüš-</i> ‘to descend’	+ <i>-ür/-är</i>	‘to make descend’
<i>aš-</i> ‘to increase’	+ <i>-ur</i>	‘to make increase’

(4) The suffixes *-it/-ut/-üt* are attached to some monosyllabic stems ending in *q* or *k*.

<i>aq-</i> ‘to flow’	+ <i>-it</i>	‘to make flow’
<i>qorq-</i> ‘to fear’	+ <i>-ut</i>	‘to make sb afraid of’
<i>ürk-</i> ‘to startle’	+ <i>-üt</i>	‘to cause to be startled’

These productive forms above are entirely regular—the choice of the suffixes is phonologically determined. Thus, the relevant suffixes are chosen according to the rule noted above, and removing the causative suffixes yields well-formed non-causative expressions. There are, however, certain forms in which this regularity is obscured.

<i>kör-</i> ‘to see’	+ <i>-sæt</i>	‘to show’
<i>qayt-</i> ‘to go back’	+ <i>-ar/-ur</i>	‘to return’
<i>čiq-</i> ‘to go up’	+ <i>-ar</i>	‘to cause to go up / come out of, to extract’

The causative forms of these verbs are unique and should be individually memorized. The forms involve suffixes, which can be easily segmented, and they qualify as morphological causatives, but they are irregular and functionally more similar to unanalyzable lexical causatives than to productive morphological forms. On the basis of the Japanese data discussed by Shibatani (1976a) Comrie (1981: 170) recognizes the possibility that certain non-productive morphological causatives may align with lexical causatives in their function.

In Uyghur, all transitive and intransitive verbs can undergo causative changes. These two types of verbs, however, give rise to different semantic and syntactic structures. Chomsky (1965: 189) maintains that a causative transformation can account for the derivation of a transitive verb from its intransitive one, as in *Jane dropped the pen*, which can be derived from *The pen dropped*. Transitive and intransitive verbs differ in terms of the number of arguments they require; i.e., intransitive verbs generally take a single argument which is encoded as subject, while transitive verbs require two arguments encoded as the subject and the object respectively. When an intransitive verb is causativized, the subject of the intransitive verb gets the accusative case in the object position whereas the newly introduced causer occupies the subject position and is in the nominative (3b, 4b).

- (3) a. *Mašina mañ-di.*
 car move-DI.PST3SG
 ‘The car moved.’
- b. *Tursun mašina-ni mañ-dur-di.*
 Tursun car-ACC move-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 ‘Tursun made the car move.’
- (4) a. *Bala yığla-di.*
 child cry-DI.PST3SG
 ‘The child cried.’
- b. *Adil bala-ni yığla-t-ti.*
 Adil child-ACC cry-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 ‘Adil made the child cry.’

- (5) a. *Tursun saät-ni yasa-di.*
 Tursun watch-ACC repair-DI.PST3SG
 'Tursun repaired the watch.'
- b. *Tursun-ya saät-ni yasa-t-ti-m.*
 Tursun-DAT watch-ACC repair-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I had Tursun repair the watch.'

When a transitive verb is causativized, the transitive verbs becomes ditransitive in (5b), and the newly introduced causer occupies the subject position and is in the nominative. The original object is maintained as an affected patient in the accusative (5b). Here I wish to draw attention to a distinction found in Uyghur between two types of morphological causatives, namely the single causatives derived with one causative suffix, and the double causatives derived with two causative suffixes.

2.1. Single causatives

Single causatives in Uyghur can be derived from both intransitive and transitive verbs. For convenience, I will call the former Type A, and the latter Type B.

Type A

Causativization is actually a transitivity process (Comrie 1981; Shibatani 1975, 2002; Alsina 1992; Dixon 2000 and others) by which an agent argument is introduced into the underlying intransitive clause producing a transitive clause. Morphological causatives in Uyghur, as in many other Turkic languages, are characterized by distinct morphological suffixation that can give rise to increased valence in the argument structure. In Type A causatives, the causative suffix not only introduces a new argument into the underlying clause by transforming the monovalent intransitive verbs into bivalent transitive verbs (Kratzer 1996; Marantz 1997; Pytkkanen 2008), it also changes the syntactic environment by placing certain requirements on the surrounding arguments. Thus, derived transitive verbs have two core (obligatory) arguments in the mono-clausal event denoted by the underlying clause. The two obligatory arguments of bivalent transitive verbs are encoded as causer and a causee in the mono-clausal event, and they display universal tendencies as well as language specific characteristics when they are syntactically realized. The syntactic realization of the argument structure in causative constructions can be explained with Comrie's Case Hierarchy (1975, 1976: 263) schematized in (6).

- (6) subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique > genitive

Based on this universal reflecting a scale of thematic prominence, the logical subject role is assigned by default to the external argument (the most prominent or highest argument). Comrie (1985) holds the view that many causativized base-transitive

constructions mark the new argument as belonging to the leftmost available slot in the hierarchy. The marking of the new argument can thus, to a certain degree, be crosslinguistically predicted by the marking of the core arguments in the non-causativized counterpart of the same clause.

- (7) a. *Bala-lar oyna-di.*
 child-PL play-DI.PST3SG
 ‘The children played.’
- b. *Biz bala-lar-ni oyna-t-tu-q.*
 we child-PL-ACC play-CAUS-DI.PST-1PL
 ‘We had the children play.’

As seen in (7), the newly introduced external argument *biz* ‘we’ occupies the subject slot as causer (8b) in the derived structure, while the nominative-marked original subject argument *balilar* (7a) becomes the accusative-marked direct object (7b) in the derived structure of the bivalent causative verbs, resulting in a canonical transitive clause. The original subject argument must be demoted one step to the direct object position in the Case Hierarchy, since the subject position has already been occupied by the new causer.

In Type A causative constructions in Uyghur, both animate and inanimate entities can function as causer and causee, yielding distinctive semantic readings. The causer, being an external force or trigger, brings about the change in the state of the causee through direct or indirect participation in the event as a volitional entity. “The change of state in the patient follows directly and immediately from the action carried out by the agent in canonical transitive events” (Comrie 1989[1981]: 165). Under such an interpretation, the causer should at least be an animate entity with its own volition.

When both the causer and the causee are animate entities in Type A causatives, high intentional volition on the part of the causer and submissive volition as well as resistance on the part of the causee are implied. This yields two possible semantic interpretations:

(i) The causee possesses a degree of autonomy in carrying out the caused event; thus the causer’s role is limited to supplying oral directions or instructions (indirect) to the causee (8a), rather than getting physically involved in the execution of the caused event. It can also imply that the caused event *saqla-* ‘to wait’ may be completed by the intervention of other means, such as conveying the message either by phone or through other persons. There may also be some spatial distance between the causer and the causee when the causer is giving orders or instructions. Such cases can be ascribed to Directive, Indirect Coercive and Ballistic causation (Shibatani 1975).

(ii) When the causer’s influence on the causee is not merely restricted to oral directions or instructions, but includes active physical involvement in the caused event

(8b), the causer acts volitionally, either trying to get direct control over the causee (8c) or helping the patient to complete the causative event process (8d) in spite of the fact that the causee is also a volitional entity with submissive volition as well as resistance. Wolff (2003: 5) holds that direct causation is present between the causer and the final causee in a causal chain in the following cases:

(a) If there are no intermediate entities at the same level of granularity as either the initial causer or final causee.

(b) If any intermediate entities that are present can be construed as an enabling condition rather than an intervening causer. In this sense, this type of causative denotes Ballistic, Directive, Direct and Coercive/Permissive readings.

- (8) a. *Sän biz ni bäk saqla-t-ti-ŋ.*
 you we-ACC very wait-CAUS-DI.PST2SG
 ‘You have kept us waiting long.’
- b. *Bala-lar-ni oyna-t-tuq.*
 child-PL-ACC play-CAUS-DI.PST1PL
 ‘We had the children play.’
- c. *Bala-lar yılan+ ni öl-tür-di.*
 child-PL snake-ACC die-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 ‘The children killed the snake.’
- d. *Sestra ayal-ni tugh-dur-di.*
 nurse woman-ACC bear-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 ‘The nurse made the woman give birth (to her baby).’

It should be noted here that Type A causatives in Uyghur are ambiguous, allowing for a permissive and a coercive reading. It is apparent that different verbs give rise to different readings, and even the same verb might present different readings in different contexts. In this sense, (8a, c) indicate coercive while (8b, d) are either coercive or permissive depending on context as well as the speaker’s perspective.

In cases where the causer is inanimate, causative verbs—mostly stative—involve a mental state or condition. In such cases, the causer does not have volition and can only trigger the causee by passive participation in the event by exerting influence in a direct or indirect manner without any intention and awareness. In this sense, the change of state of the causee might be conceived as the result of the causee’s affectedness by the event. In other words, psychic verbs used in morphological causatives denote a sense of obligation or an affectedness imposed on the causee (Kayne 1994, Guasti 1996, Folli & Harley 2007). As indicated in (9a, b), the inanimate causer *iş* ‘matter’ and *muzika* ‘music’ stimulate the occurrence of a change in the mental state of the causees *bala* ‘child’ and *Alim*. In this sense, the influence of the causers *bu iş* and *muzika* can be conceptualized as the instigator of the change of state, whereas

the causees *Alim* and *bala* can be interpreted as the experiencers of the change of condition or state in the caused event. Besides, (9a) implies that the causee undergoes the change of mental state either by directly participating in the caused event or by other indirect means. Therefore, (9a) allows for direct or indirect readings depending on the implication denoted by the event in the given context. However, (9b) implies that the causee is directly affected by the causer without the intervention of other factors in the process of changing the state. So it can be conceived as a direct causation.

- (9) a. *Bu iş Alim-ni bāk terik-tür-di.*
 this matter Alim-ACC very angry-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 ‘This matter made Alim extremely angry.’
- b. *Muzika axiri bala-ni uxla-t-ti.*
 music at last child-ACC sleep-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 ‘The music made the child sleep at last.’

On the other hand, when the causee is an inanimate entity without any volition, the execution of the caused event is wholly dependent on the causer’s active participation (10a, b) while the causee is characterized only by affectedness. However, the sentences have slightly different readings. In (10a), the causee is under the control of the causer when the event is viewed as a whole. It also implies either that the causer directly participates in the event or that other factors are involved, excluding the causer’s direct involvement, although the causer has continuous control over the causee. By contrast, (10b) denotes that the causee is in a state of being accompanied by, or under continuous direct control of the causer from the beginning until the end. It also indicates the causee’s physical manipulation of the causee, which is an inanimate entity without volition and resistance. In such non-volitional situation, the inanimate causee is unable to begin, continue or end the action or state of affairs. “Only the accusative coding of the causee is allowed” in describing such event (Kozinsky & Polinsky 1993: 202). In other words, the coding of the inanimate causee as an accusative direct object indicates that the inanimate causee’s volition is completely suppressed such that this causee has no control over the situation, but only performs the action directed by the causer. In this sense, it is the causer, rather than the causee, who controls the situation. Hence, the causative with inanimate causee, illustrated by (9a, b), can be interpreted as a controlling and manipulative causation (Shibatani 1975).

- (10) a. *Qar-ni eri-t-tu-q.*
 snow-ACC melt-CAUS-DI.PST-1PL
 ‘We made the snow melt.’

- b. *Tursun mašina-ni mañ-dur-di.*
 Tursun car-ACC move-CAUS-PST3SG
 ‘Tursun made the car move.’

There are also some Type A causatives in which both causer and causee are inanimate entities. In such cases, the causer’s influence on the causee is rendered directly or indirectly regardless of causee’s active or passive participation in the caused event (11a, b). Hence, in Uyghur the causer does not necessarily have to be an animate entity to be able to exert influence on the patient. On the contrary, it is common for an inanimate causer to bring about changes in the state of a causee, even though it does not have volition.

- (11) a. *Içki uruñ dölä-t-ni ajizla-t-iwät-ti.*
 civil war country-ACC become weak-CAUS-ASP-DI.PST3SG
 ‘Civil war weakened the county.’
- b. *Qar-şiwiryan hawa-ni xelila sowu-t-ti.*
 snow-storm weather-ACC rather become cold-CAUS-PST3SG
 ‘The snowstorm made the weather rather cold.’

Here the correlation and distinction between the morphological causative and inchoative verbs has to be mentioned. The relationship between the causative (transitive) and inchoative (intransitive) verbs can be understood from semantic and morphological perspectives. The derivational relationship between them has been controversial but it could be generalized as follows:

(i) Some argue that causative verbs are derived from inchoative verbs and use the term Causativization (Perlmutter 1978, Dowty 1979, Burzio 1986, Parsons 1990; Harley 2008; Marantz 2009).

(ii) Others hold that inchoative verbs are derived from causatives and call this Anticausativization or Decausativization (Levin & Hovav 1995: 108, Chierchia 2004, Reinhart 2002: 241, Koontz-Garboden 2009; Horvath & Siloni 2011).

(iii) Others still argue that each member is derived independently from a common stem, which is called Equipollence (Harley 1995, 2008, Pesetsky 1995: 70).

In Uyghur, as in other Turkic languages, the inchoative variant (with intransitive verbs) of the causative alternation is basic, and morphological causative variants (with transitive verbs) are derived from an inchoative counterpart which is the root form. Erdal (1991: 709) states that in Old Turkic “causatives formatives can, in principle, be added both to intransitive and to transitive bases”. This also holds true for Mongolian causative and inchoative verb alternations “in which the causative member is marked and derived from the inchoative member” (Haspelmath 1993: 89). Here it should be noted that, in Uyghur, not only the causative form, but also other voice alternations are derived from intransitive or transitive verb root like *öl-* ‘to die’, *yaz-* ‘to write’. In this sense, the assertion that the causative alternation

(transitive) is derived from its inchoative (intransitive) counterpart seems justified for Uyghur.

- (12) a. *Yılan öl-di.* (öl- basic root form)
 snake die-DI.PST3SG
 'The snake died.'
- b. *Yılan-ni öl-tür-dü-m.* (öl-tür- causative)
 snake-ACC die-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 'I killed the snake.'
- c. *Maqalä tünügün yaz-il-di.* (yaz-il- passive)
 essay yesterday write-PASS-DI.PST3 SG
 'The essay was written yesterday.'
- d. *U-lar maqalä yaz-iş-ti.* (yaz-iş- reciprocal)
 He/she-PL essay write-REC-DI.PST3SG
 'They wrote an essay together.'
- (13) a. *Kemä čök-ti.*
 boat sink-DI.PST3SG
 'The boat sank.'
- b. *Alim kemä-ni čök-tür-di.*
 Alim boat-ACC sink-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 'Alim made the boat sink.'
- (14) a. *Bolka piş-ti.*
 bread be baked-DI.PST3SG
 'The bread is baked.'
- b. *Bolka-(ni) piş-ur-du-m.*
 bread-(ACC) bake-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 'I baked (the) bread.'

The syntactic distinction between the causative and inchoative verb alternations in Uyghur is that the former are labeled with a morphological marker (12b, 13b, 14b) on the causative while the latter are characterized by a verb root without a morphological marker (13a, 14a, 15a). In other words, the inchoative form of a verb is often called the basic, unmarked voice form, while the causative is conceived of as the marked, derived voice form, due to its morphological complexity and the way it affects the argument structure of the verb by increasing it with a new obligatory argument. The semantic difference between the causative and inchoative verbs is

that the former involve a syntactically expressed controlling initiator (causer) as a subject in addition to a theme object (causee), while the latter do not involve an existentially bound external argument, i.e. lack a causer in their semantic representation.

Type B

Type B causatives in Uyghur also represent a mechanism to increase valency. Bivalent transitive verbs are converted into trivalent ditransitive verbs through causativization. Thus, ditransitive verbs involve three core (obligatory) arguments in the causal event denoted by the underlying clause. This clearly constitutes the main pattern of Type B causatives. The valence-increasing operation adds a causer argument which acts upon a causee to perform an event (Dixon 2000: 30). However, languages vary significantly in terms of the semantic role of arguments and syntactic realization (Dixon 2000: 62–74). Zubizarreta (1985) claims that the argument structure of a causative verb has three slots which are satisfied by the causer, the causee, and, possibly, the internal argument of the causativized predicate. Alsina (1992) holds that the three arguments saturating a causative verb are the causer, the causee, and the caused event, which in its turn may include an internal argument (IA). According to some other scholars (Burzio 1986, Guasti 1996, Folli and Harley 2007), however, a causative verb only has two argument slots which are satisfied by the causer and by the caused event which involves the causee and, eventually, IA. As for Turkic languages, Erdal (1991: 710) asserts that “causative verbs derived from transitive bases can allot three participant tasks: the Instigator, the Subject, and the (ultimate) Object”.

The three obligatory arguments of trivalent ditransitive causative verbs in Uyghur are encoded as causer, causee, and patient in the embedded clause, and are similar to other languages with respect to the readjustment of the core arguments in ditransitive causative structure, but differ from them in terms of the syntactic realization of each obligatory argument as well as the semantic role of causee in particular. According to the Thematic Hierarchy (Fillmore 1968: 33; Bresnan & Kanerva 1989: 23–24), the most prominent (highest) argument is identified as the logical subject. The newly introduced argument (causer) is regarded as the most prominent argument in the Thematic Hierarchy; thus the logical subject role is naturally assigned to this highest argument by default. As also pointed out by Comrie (1989: 191) in his Case Hierarchy, the causee is assigned the leftmost available position. Since the subject and direct-object positions are already occupied in a causative based on a transitive verb, the causee occupies the indirect object position.

- (15) a. *Tursun ayaq-ni yama-di.*
 Tursun shoes-ACC mend-DI.PST3SG
 ‘Tursun mended the shoes.’

- b. *Tursun-γa ayaq-ni yama-t-ti-m.*
 Tursun-DAT shoes-ACC mend-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 ‘I had Tursun mend the shoes.’

As mentioned above, causativization usually signals some rearrangement of argument structure. The most usual scenario is for the causee and the patient argument to retain all the semantic properties that are found in the basic non-causative construction, while the causer is understood as an external instigator or bearer of the volitional component. As seen in (15), the newly introduced external argument *mān* (covert in syntactic structure) occupies the subject slot as a causer in the derived argument structure, while the accusative-marked patient *ayaq* (16a) still retains its role as the patient and is assigned to the slot of the accusative-marked direct object (15b). The nominative-marked subject argument *Tursun* in the basic construction (15a) cannot rise to subject position since the latter has been occupied by the new causer, so it has to be demoted to the dative-marked indirect object position as causee in the derived argument structure of trivalent causative verbs (15b), which produces a canonical transitive clause.

The three core participants of the ditransitive causative exhibit distinctive semantic properties. The causer, an external force or trigger rather than the real performer of the action or event, promotes or stimulates an action or event, and produces changes in the state of the causee through indirect participation rather than physical involvement. However, in some instances the causer’s direct involvement in the event can be found in Uyghur ditransitive causatives as well.

- (16) a. *Oquyıcı-lar muāllim-gä hikayä eyt-quz-di.*
 students-PL teacher-DAT story tell-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 ‘The students had the teacher tell stories.’
- b. *Muāllim bala-lar-γa resim siz-γuz-di.*
 teacher child-PL-DAT picture draw-CAUS-PST3SG
 ‘The teacher made the children draw pictures.’
- c. *Aygül qonçaq-qa kiyim kiy-güz-di.*
 Aygül doll-DAT clothes put on-CAUS-PST3SG
 ‘Aygül put the clothes on the doll.’

As illustrated in (16a), the first subevent is the causer’s causal event, which is carried out by the causer directly in terms of verbal interaction; and the second subevent is the causee’s performance of the caused event. In such cases, the causer is an initiator or trigger rather than the actual agent of caused event. It is the causee that functions as an actual agent. This is not always the case, however. In some cases, the causer either verbally or physically participates in the caused event, as in (16b). In such situations, (16b) might have two different semantic readings:

(i) The causer does not participate physically in the execution of the caused event; his role is confined to verbal instructions.

(ii) Not only the causee but also the causer are viewed as the agent of the caused event; i.e. it is the causer himself that shows the children how to draw. In (16c), the causer, rather than the causee, carries out the caused event, and has total control over the causee from the beginning to the end, because the causee is an inanimate entity without volition. In this sense, it can account for direct, manipulative and controlling causation.

The causee is always required to be animate in Type B constructions in Uyghur. For example, with an animate causer, transitive verbs such as *sal-* 'to build', *yasa-* 'to repair', *yaz-* 'to write', *eyt-* 'to tell/recite', *teri-* 'to till the land', *üz-* 'to pick' express (after their conversion into ditransitive verbs) a situation where the causer gets something done with a tangible beneficial effect. Thus, it can be viewed as a Benefactive (Babby 1993: 344) causative, in terms of the beneficiary of the consequences generated in the caused event. In this type of causatives, two conditions must be met so as to yield a benefactive reading:

(i) A strict animacy requirement is placed by the ditransitive verbs on the causer and causee who must possess intentional volition to be able either to perform an action or receive the benefit from the caused event (18a, b).

(ii) There should be a patientive object that is transferrable, either verbally (17b) or physically (17a), to the causer. By contrast, if the causer is an inanimate entity, it does not have any intention and ability to receive the benefit from the caused event, and the verb fails to be categorized as benefactive causative (17c).

- (17) a. *Tursun-ya resim siz-yüz-du-m.*
 Tursun-DAT picture draw-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I made Tursun draw a picture.' (coercive, benefactive, transferrable physically)
- b. *Tursun-ya öy sal-dur/ghuz-du-m.*
 Tursun-DAT house build-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I made Tursun build a house.' (coercive, benefactive)
- c. *Kälkün dehqanlar-ya qaytidin öy sal-dur/yüz-di.*
 flood farmer-PL-DAT again house build-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 'The flood made the farmers build the house again.'
 (Coercive, not benefactive, due to inanimate causer.)

As seen in (17), the ditransitive causative in Uyghur, irrespective of the animacy of the causer, denotes a coercive situation by nature. In (17a, b), the animate causer with intentional volition exerts influence on the causee, by verbally or physically triggering the event. However, in (17c), the inanimate causer (a natural force) does not affect the causee as directly as the animate causer does. The only difference is

that the ditransitive causative with an animate causer expresses a direct causation, while that with an inanimate causer indicates indirect causation.

On the other hand, in Turkic and Mongolic languages the causer in ditransitive causatives tends to suffer a disadvantage rather than getting a benefaction—at least in Uyghur, though it might be unintentional in other Turkic languages, see Johanson (1998: 56)—as illustrated in (18a, b). Therefore, this type of causative can be accounted for semantically as a passive causative, in striking contrast to the benefactive causatives.

- (18) a. *Čiš-im-ni tart-quz-du-m.*
 teeth-POSS1SG-ACC pull-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 ‘I had my teeth pulled.’
- b. *Bu ayal bala-si-ni al-dur-iwät-ti.*
 this woman child-POSS3SG-ACC take-CAUS-ASP-DI.PST3SG
 ‘This woman had an abortion.’

The causee in Uyghur ditransitive causatives is always an animate entity that is the actual performer of the action in the caused event, though it is influenced by the causer in the execution process of the caused event. It is always marked with dative case in the syntactic structure, but it may be covert. Many languages place restrictions on the number of overt arguments in the syntactic realization, especially languages with ditransitive causatives. In this type of causative, one of the obligatory arguments (generally causee) of ditransitive verbs may remain covert in the syntactic realization. With regard to the suppression and extraction of the causee argument, Kozinsky and Polinsky (1993: 230) propose the following two regularities:

- (19) a. The causee nominal can be extracted, passivized and/or suppressed only in the presence of the overt patient nominal.
- b. The patient nominal can be extracted, passivized and/or suppressed only if the causee/recipient nominal is not overtly expressed.

This is particularly true for the languages like Uyghur in which ditransitive causatives are one of the prominent categories. The three core arguments of ditransitive verbs in Uyghur can be overtly mapped in a canonical syntactic structure. The causee, however, remains covert unless it has to be overt. Even when it is omitted, its absence from the syntactic manifestation does not necessarily alter the meaning of the causative sentence because its identity is recoverable from the context. If it is necessary to express it overtly in the syntactic structure, then it is put in the dative.

- (20) a. *Saät-im-ni yasa-t-ti-m.*
 watch-POSS1SG-ACC repair-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I had my watch repaired.'
- b. *Tursun-ya saät-im-ni yasa-t-ti-m.*
 Tursun-DAT watch-POSS1SG-ACC repair-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I had Tursun repair the watch.'

As pointed out above, according to Comrie's *Case Hierarchy*, the causee is assigned to the indirect object position on the condition that the patient of the base construction still retains its position as direct object in the derived argument structure. In many languages, the causer mainly stimulates or triggers the causee through verbal commands or instructions—although there are some instances in which the causer gets partially physically involved in the caused event—but it is the causee, rather than causer, that is the actual executor of the action (under the influence of the causer) in the ditransitive causative construction. In this sense, the semantic role of the causee is similar to that of the agent to a greater extent, at least in Uyghur. The only difference between the semantic role of the causee in Type A and Type B causatives is that in the former, the causee, being a subject, is viewed as a high volitional agent with total control over the patient without the intervention of an external force in the performance of the caused event. In the latter, the causee is also considered a high volitional agent-like entity with flexible control over the patient, even if it is more or less influenced by an external force (causer) in the execution of the caused event. This means that the causee has the ability to control the action or state on his own by resisting the causer's instructions or demands in the given situation. Thus, the causee resembles the subject, rather than the object in terms of semantic function, and can be encoded as an agentive entity (Shibatani 1976: 33).

Being one of the obligatory argument in the ditransitive causatives, the patient (direct object) is usually an inanimate entity. As mentioned above, the causee can be left out of ditransitive causative constructions in Uyghur when it is retrievable from the context. In addition, even the causer can be covert in the causative structure. It can also be inferred from the personal suffix of predicate verbs, as the verbs always preserve agreement with the subject in the syntactic structures. The direct object is a prerequisite for the existence of the causal relationship between the causer and the causee. The canonical syntactic framework of ditransitive causative verbs in Uyghur could not be established without the participation of the patient in the causal event structure (21c). Therefore, the patient is viewed as an indispensable part of the ditransitive causatives in Uyghur. For example, the patient *maqale* 'essay' and *räsım* 'picture' in (21a, b) could not be omitted in the ditransitive causatives construction.

- (21) a. *Muällim Tursun-ya maqalä yaz-dur-di.*
 teacher Tursun-DAT essay write-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 'The teacher had Tursun write an essay.'

- b. *Rässam-γa räsım-im-ni siz-γuz-du-m.*
 painter-DAT picture-POSS1SG-ACC draw-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 ‘I had the painter draw my picture.’
- *c. *Muällim yaz-dur-di.* (incomplete)
 teacher write-CAUS-PST.3SG
 ‘The teacher had ??? write ???.’
- d. *Räsım-ni män rässam-γa siz-γuz-du-m.*
 picture-ACC I painter-DAT draw-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
- *e. *Räsım män rässam-γa siz-γuz-du-m.*
 picture I painter-DAT draw-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG

The core arguments of ditransitive causative verbs in Uyghur take different forms when they are syntactically realized. The causer maps to the subject position in the nominative (21a, b), while the causee is always manifested in the dative (21a), and the direct object is realized in the accusative (21b). The direct object can only be moved to the head of the sentence when the accusative case marker is assigned and it is the focus of information (21d), and it is regarded as ungrammatical without the case marker (21e).

2. 2. Double causatives

In this section, I will briefly discuss double causative constructions, which have been dealt with in the literature (Comrie 1989, Zimmer 1976, Aissen 1979, Kulikov 1993, Kural 1996), and are referred to as “Second Causative” (Kulikov 1993: 121). Double causatives in Uyghur are formed by adding the causative suffixes *-GUz* to a stem which already has a causative suffix.

- (22) a. *Alım yılan-ni öl-tür-di.*
 Alım snake-ACC die-CAUS-DI.PST3SG
 ‘Alım killed the snake.’
- b. *Alım-γa yılan-ni öl-tür-güz-düm.*
 Alım-DAT snake-ACC die-CAUS-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 ‘I had Alım kill the snake.’
- (23) a. *Tursun-γa saat-im-ni yasa-t-ti-m.*
 Tursun-DAT watch-POSS-1SG-ACC repair-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 ‘I had Tursun repair the watch.’

- b. *Adil-ya dāp Tursun-ya saāt-im-ni*
 Adil-DAT say-CONV Tursun-DAT watch-POSS-1SG-ACC
yasa-t-quz-du-m.
 repair-CAUS-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
- c. *Adil-ni čaqirip Tursun-ya saāt-im-ni*
 Adil-ACC CALL-CONV Tursun-DAT watch-POSS-1SG-ACC
yasa-t-quz-du-m.
 repair-CAUS-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
- d. *Adil-arqiliq Tursun-ya saāt-im-ni*
 Adil.NOM-POST Tursun-DAT watch-POSS-1SG-ACC
yasa-t-quz-du-m.
 repair-CAUS-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 ‘With the help of Adil, I had Tursun repair the watch.’
- e. *Tursun-ya saāt-im-ni yasa-t-quz-du-m.*
 Tursun-DAT watch-POSS-1SG-ACC repair-CAUS-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 ‘I had Tursun repair the watch.’
- *f. *Adil-ya Tursun-ya saāt-im-ni yasa-t-quz-du-m.*
 Adil-DAT Tursun-DAT watch-POSS-1SG-ACC repair-CAUS-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 ‘I made Adil make Tursun repair the watch.’

As seen in (22, 23), the double causatives derived from an intransitive or transitive base in Uyghur result in different surface realizations. Subject, direct and indirect objects cannot be doubled. In (22b), there is only one causee argument marked with the dative. In contrast, in (23b, c, d), there are apparently two causees in the surface structure. Since the direct and indirect object positions are already occupied and marked with the accusative and the dative, the second causee is either demoted to oblique with a postposition (23d), is included in a construction based on a converb (23b, c) or is omitted (23e). Therefore, (23f) is not acceptable due to the occurrence of two dative causees in the same sentence.

In morphological causatives, the causative morphemes are iterative, so double (or even triple) causatives are licensed in many languages. For example, Turkish has been claimed to permit up to three iterations (Çetinoğlu et al. 2009) or to have no upper limit (Kural 1996). Kulikov (1993:124) also states that double (or triple) causatives are frequent in Turkish. In Uyghur, however, both intransitive and transitive bases can be causativized only twice; that is, the limit on iteration of causative morpheme is two (23b, 24b, c, d, e). In this respect, Uyghur is different from genetically related languages, for example Turkish.

Causative suffixes in the double causative construction in Uyghur are subject to strict ordering. The causative suffix in *-DIR* obligatorily precedes the causative suffix *-GUz*; see (24b). The reverse is not acceptable (24c).

- (24) a. *Rässam-ya räsım siz-dur/-yuz-du-m.*
 painter-DAT picture draw-CAUS-PST.1SG
 'I had the painter draw a picture.'
- b. *Rässam-ya räsım siz-dur-yuz-du-m.*
 painter-DAT picture draw-CAUS-CAUS -PST.1SG
 'I made (someone made) the painter draw the picture.'
- *c. *Rässam-ya räsım siz-yuz-dur-du-m.*
 painter-DAT picture draw-CAUS-CAUS -PST.1SG

The coercive reading is a common prototypical interpretation of double causatives in many languages. Zimmer (1976: 412) points out that Turkish double causatives denote a single act of causation with emphasis on its forcefulness. The double causative suffixes in Uyghur can optionally or obligatorily be deleted without any change in meaning when the causative is derived from a transitive base. In such cases, the single causative morpheme may be used instead of the double causative morpheme without any change in causative meaning (25b). In this sense, the double causative derived from a transitive base may yield an intensified reading. In the case of an intransitive base, however, the deletion of double causative suffixes gives rise to the omission of the causee argument in surface structure (26b). Therefore, the deletion of double causative suffixes in Uyghur results in distinctive semantic readings in the surface structure of causative constructions derived from transitive and intransitive bases respectively.

- (25) a. *Alim-ya mašina-m-ni yasa-t-quz-du-m.*
Alim-DAT car-POSS-1SG-ACC repair-CAUS-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
- b. *Alim-ya mašina-m-ni yasa-t-ti-m.*
Alim-DAT car-POSS-1SG-ACC repair-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I had Alim repair the watch.'
- (26) a. *Alim-ya bolka piš-ur-yuz-du-m.*
Alim-DAT bread.NOM bake-CAUS-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I had Alim bake the bread.'
- b. *Bolka piš-ur-du-m*
 bread.NOM bake-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I baked the bread.'

On the contrary, in Uyghur causative suffixes may be iterated without adding further cause events or arguments to the single causative constructions when the double causative is derived from transitive base (25a). In such cases, an increase in morphological complexity does not necessarily mean an increase in semantic complexity. Thus, there is no one-to-one correlation between the number of suffixes and the number of events. In this sense, the double causative construction derived from a transitive base in Uyghur may produce vacuous semantic readings. However, in the case of a double causative based on an intransitive base, increasing the number of causative suffixes definitely leads to an increase in the number of cause events or arguments (26a).

Double causatives in Uyghur may also have a permissive reading in addition to the coercive and intensive readings mentioned above. The permissive reading is not as straightforward and obvious as the coercive and intensive readings indicated in the double causative construction derived from both intransitive (27a) and transitive (27b) bases. The distinction between the permissive and the intensive reading derived from the double causative construction usually depends on the specific context and the speaker's perspective.

- (27) a. *Alim-ya bala-lar-ni oyna-t-quz-du-m.*
Alim-DAT child-PL-ACC play-CAUS-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I caused Alim to let the children play.'
- b. *Bala-lar-ya räsım siz-dur-yuz-du-m.*
Child-PLU-DAT picture draw-CAUS-DI.PST-1SG
 'I caused (someone) to let the children draw the picture.'

3. Conclusion

The present article has attempted to provide a descriptive analysis of lexical and morphological causative constructions employed in modern Uyghur from semantic, syntactic and diathetic perspectives.

Lexical causatives in Uyghur are manifested through a group of morphologically irregular, stem-specific, non-productive, bivalent (dyadic) transitive verbs without particular morphological markers. Lexical causatives in Uyghur involve two core participants in their argument structures, and which are encoded as the external causer and the internal causee in the causative event. The external causer invariably occupies nominative subject position while the internal causee is realized as an accusative-marked object in canonical lexical causatives in modern Uyghur.

Morphological causatives are undoubtedly the most frequent means of expressing the causative in Uyghur, and their high productivity is characterized by almost unrestricted derivation from both transitive and intransitive verbs via distinctive morphological suffixation, which in turn leads to an increase in valence-number by converting monovalent (monadic) intransitive verbs into bivalent (dyadic) transitive verbs, and bivalent transitive verbs into trivalent (triadic) ditransitive verbs in the

argument structure. Both animate and inanimate entities can function as causer and causee in the single causative construction, but they produce distinct semantic readings. The morphological causatives derived from intransitive verbs in Uyghur are ambiguous, allowing for a permissive or a coercive reading depending on the semantic and syntactic properties of the causative verb. The striking characteristics of morphological causatives derived from transitive verbs in Uyghur lie in the covert manifestation of the causee in specific situations. Even it remains covert in a particular situation, its absence from the syntactic manifestation does not necessarily alter the meaning of a causative sentence, as its identity can be recovered from the context.

Double causatives derived from intransitive and transitive bases in Uyghur result in different surface realizations. Both intransitive and transitive base can be causativized twice at most; that is, no more than two different causative morphemes can be iterated in a causative construction. Thus Uyghur does not permit any triple causative. In this sense, Uyghur is different from that of certain genetically related languages (for example Turkish). Besides, there is strict restriction as to the suffixation ordering of double causatives in Uyghur. The deletion of double causative suffixes in Uyghur results in distinct semantic readings in the surface structure of causative constructions derived from transitive and intransitive bases respectively.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by grants for scientific research from (1) National Social Science Foundation of China (Project No: 12CYY063); (2) Humanities and Social Sciences Foundation of the Ministry of Education (Project No: 10XJJC 740003); (3) Xinjiang University Doctoral Science Foundation (Project No: 07020 428065)

This paper was originally drafted and completed while I was a visiting scholar at the Center for Languages of the Central Asian Region (CeLCAR) at Indiana University (February 2015, February 2016). I am grateful to Öner Özçelik for facilitating my visits to CeLCAR. I wish to thank anonymous reviewers for their comments and valuable suggestions. I am also thankful to Turghun Ibrahim of Laboratory of Xinjiang Multilingual Information Technology for providing me with relevant linguistic data.

Abbreviations

AC	actor	NUM	number
ACC	accusative	OBJ	object
AD	adverb	PASS	passive
ADJ	adjective	PL	plural
CAUS	causative;	POSS	possessive
CAUS	lexical causative	POST	postposition
DAT	dative	PST	past

DEF	definite	REC	reciprocal
DO	direct object	SG	singular
GEN	genitive	SUBJ	subject
IA	internal argument	UN	undergoer
NEG	negative	V	verb
NOM	nominative	VN	verbal noun

References

- Aissen, J. 1979. *The syntax of causative constructions*. New York: Garland.
- Alsina, A. 1992. On the argument structure of causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 517–555.
- Alsina, A. 1997. A theory of complicate predicates: Evidence from causatives in Bantu and Romance. In: Alsina, A. & Bresnan, J. & Sells, P. (eds.) *Complex predicates*. Stanford: CSLI Lecture Notes 64, 203–246.
- Babby, L. H. 1993. Hybrid causative constructions: Benefactive causative and adversity passive. In: Comrie, B. & Polinsky, M. (eds.) *Causatives and transitivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 343–367.
- Baker, M. 1988. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Baker, M. 1997. Thematic roles and syntactic structure. In: Haegeman, L. (ed.) *Elements of grammar: Handbook of generative syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 73–137.
- Bresnan, J. & Kanerva, J. M. 1989. Locative inversion in Chicheŵa: A case study of factorization in grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 1, 1–50.
- Burzio, L. 1986. *Italian syntax: A government and binding approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Çetinoğlu, Ö. & Butt, M. & Oflazer, K. 2009. Mono/biclausality of Turkish causatives. In: Ay, S. & Aydın, Ö. & Ergenç, İ. & Gökmen, S. & İşsever, S. & Peçenek, D. (eds.) *Essays on Turkish Linguistics*. (Turcologica 79.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. 43–52.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Mass: MIT Press.
- Chierchia, G. 2004. A semantics for unaccusatives and its syntactic consequences. In: Alexiadou, A. & Anagnostopoulou, E. & Everaert, M. (eds.) *The unaccusativity puzzle: Explorations of the syntax-lexicon interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 22–59.
- Comrie, B. 1975. Causative and universal grammar. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1974, 1–32.
- Comrie, B. 1976. The syntax of causative constructions: Cross-language similarities and divergences. In: Shibatani, M. (ed.) *The grammar of causative constructions*. New York: Academic Press. 261–312.
- Comrie, B. 1981. *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 158–177.
- Comrie, B. 1985. Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. In: Shopen, T. (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description* 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 309–348.
- Comrie, B. 1989². *Language universals and linguistics typology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Comrie, B. 2006. Transitivity pairs, markedness and diachronic stability. *Linguistics* 44, 303–318.

- Comrie, B. & Polinsky, M. 1993. *Causatives and transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Croft, W. 1994. The semantics of subjecthood. In: Yaguello, M. (ed.) *Subjecthood and subjectivity: The status of the subject in linguistic theory*. Paris: Ophrys. 29–75.
- Croft, W. 2012. *Verbs: Aspect and argument structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2000. A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. In: Dixon, R.M.W. & Aikhenvald, A. (eds.) *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 30–83.
- Dowty D. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The semantics of verbs and times in generative semantics and in Montagues PTQ*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Dowty D. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67, 547–619.
- Erdal, M. 1991. *Old Turkic word formation: A functional approach to lexicon*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1968. The case for case. In: Bach, E. & Harms, R. T. (eds.) *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1–88.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1977. The case for case reopened. In: Peter C. & Jerrold M. S. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics: Grammatical relations* 8, New York, San Francisco & London: Academic Press. 59–81
- Foley, W.A. & Valin, V. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Folli, R. & Harley, H. 2007. Causation, obligation, and argument structure: On the nature of little v. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38, 197–238.
- Givon, T. 1980. The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements. *Studies in Language* 4, 333–377.
- Grimshaw, J. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Guasti, M. 1996. Semantic restrictions in Romance causatives and the incorporation approach. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27, 294–313.
- Haiman, J. 1985. *Natural syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harley, H. 1995. Subjects, events, and licensing. Ph.D thesis, MIT.
- Harley, H. 2008. On the causative construction. In: Miyagawa S. & Saito M. (eds.) *Oxford handbook of Japanese linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 20–53.
- Harley, H. 2013. External arguments and the Mirror Principle: On the distinctness of voice and v. *Lingua* 125, 34–57.
- Haspelmath, M. 1993. More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations. In: Comrie, B. & Polinsky, M. (eds.) *Causatives and transitivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 87–120.
- Haspelmath, M. 2008. Causatives and anticausatives. Handout for the Leipzig Spring School on Linguistic Diversity.
- Hopper, P. J. & Thompson S. A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56, 251–299.
- Horvath, J. & Siloni, T. 2011. Causatives across components. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29: 3, 657–704.
- Hovav, M. R. & Levin, B. 2012. Lexicon uniformity and the causative alternation. In: Martin E. & Marelj, M. & Siloni, T. (eds.) *The theta system: Argument structure at the interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 150–176.
- Johanson, L. 1998. The structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, L. & Csató, É. Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. London: Routledge. 30–66.

- Kayne, R. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Koontz-Garboden, A. 2009. Anticausativization. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27, 77–138.
- Kozinsky, I. & Polinsky, M. 1993. Causee and patient in the accusative of transitive: Coding conflict or doubling of grammatical relations. In: Comrie, B. & Polinsky, M. (eds.) *Causatives and transitivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 177–240.
- Kratzer, A. 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb. In: Rooryck, J. & Zaring, L. (eds.) *Phrase structure and the lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic. 109–137.
- Kural, M. 1996. *Verb incorporation and elementary predicates*. Doctoral dissertation. UCLA.
- Kurban, U. (forthcoming) A contrastive study of verbal valence in Chinese and Uyghur. (PhD Dissertation) College of Humanities, Xinjiang University, Urumqi.
- Levin, B. & Hovav, M. R. 1994. A preliminary analysis of causative verbs in English. *Lingua* 92, 35–77.
- Levin, B. & Hovav, M. R. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the syntax-lexical interface*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Levin, B. & Hovav, M. R. 2005. *Argument realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levin, B. 2009. Further explorations of the landscape of causation: Comments on the paper by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 49, 239–266.
- Lewis D. 2004. Causation as influence. In: Collins, J. & Hall, N. & Paul, L. (eds.) *Causation and counterfactuals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 75–106.
- Marantz, A. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. In: Dimitriadis, A. et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium. Working Papers in Linguistics* 4: 2, 201–25.
- Marantz, A. 2009. Root, re-, and affected agents: can roots pull the agent under little v? [Paper presented at Roots 2 Workshop, Stuttgart].
- McCawley, J. 1976. Remarks on what can cause what. In: Shibatani, M. (ed.) *The grammar of causative constructions*. New York: Academic Press. 117–129.
- McCawley, J. 1978. Conversational implicature and the lexicon. In: Cole, P. (ed.) *Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press. 245–59.
- Nedjalkov, V. P. & Silnitsky, G. G. 1973. The typology of morphological and lexical causatives. In: Kiefer, F. (ed.) *Trends in Soviet theoretical linguistics*. Dordrecht: Reidel. 1–32.
- Parsons, T. 1990. *Events in the semantics of English: A study in subatomic semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Perlmutter, D. 1978. Impersonal passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. In: *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 157–189.
- Pesetsky, D. 1995. *Zero syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pinker, S. 1989. *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, L. 2000. On stativity and causation. In: Tenny, C. & Pustejovsky, J. (eds.) *Events as grammatical objects*. Stanford: CSLI Lecture Notes 100, 417–445.
- Pylkkänen, L. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, T. 2002. The theta system: An overview. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28: 3, 229–290.
- Schäfer, F. 2008. *The syntax of (anti-)causatives. External arguments in change-of-state contexts*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Schäfer, F. 2009. The causative alternation. *Language and Linguistic Compass* 3: 2, 641–681.

- Shibatani, M. 1973a. A linguistics study of causative constructions. P.hD thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
- Shibatani, M. 1973b. Semantics of Japanese causativization. *Foundations of Language* 9, 327–373.
- Shibatani, M. 1975. *A linguistic study of causative constructions*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Shibatani, M. 1976. The grammar of causative constructions: a conspectus. In: Shibatani M. (ed.) *The grammar of causative constructions*. New York: Academic Press. 1–42.
- Shibatani, M. & Pardeshi, P. 2001. The causative continuum. *Kobe Paper in Linguistics* 3, 136–177.
- Song, J. J. (ed.) 1996. *Causatives and causation: A universal-typological perspective*. London: Longman.
- Talmy, L. 1976. Semantic causative types. In: Shibatani, M. (ed.) *The grammar of causative constructions*. New York: Academic Press. 43–116.
- Talmy, L. 1988. Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Science* 12, 49–100.
- Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics* 1–2. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Wolff, P. 2003. Direct causation in the linguistic coding and individuation of causal events. *Cognition* 88, 1–48.
- Wunderlich, D. 1997. Cause and the structure of verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 1, 27–68.
- Zimmer, K. 1976. Some constraints on Turkish causativization. In: Shibatani, M. (ed.) *The grammar of causative constructions*. New York: Academic Press. 399–412.
- Zubizarreta, M. L. 1985. The relation between morphophonology and morphosyntax: The case of Romance causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 247–289.