Sergey SAY (St. Petersburg)

Kalmyk causative constructions: case marking, syntactic relations and the speaker's perspective[1]

This study is primarily concerned with the syntactic organisation of Kalmyk clauses headed by verbs that contain a morphological causative marker. The data reported here have been compiled during the summers between 2006 and 2008 in the Republic of Kalmykia. The fieldwork was organised by St. Petersburg State University and the Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences.

This fieldwork has been conducted in several villages in the North-Western part of the Republic of Kalmykia. This region is supposed to be the area where the Dörböt dialect of the Kalmyk language is spoken; however, there is no clear indication that the data discussed below are different from the facts found in standard Kalmyk in any relevant respect.

The main objective of the study reported here is two-fold. First, there is a descriptive goal. Available descriptions of Kalmyk causatives are mostly concerned with morphological issues and case assignment in canonical causative constructions, whereas a deeper analysis of syntactic properties of causative constructions, especially of their non-canonical uses, is generally lacking. The present study is intended to partially fill this gap.

Second, there is a more theoretical goal. It will be shown that there are essential properties of Kalmyk causatives that can be hardly captured by the usual derivational approaches to causatives. Rather, causative verbs in Kalmyk will be viewed as a device for establishing a more or less direct correspondence between an event's participants and syntactic slots. Although the scope of this paper is limited to one individual language, its findings can have broader typological relevance. In particular, I believe that taking the speaker's perspective into account can deepen our understanding of causative constructions in other languages as well.

The paper is organised as follows: In Section 1, the notion of the canonical causative construction is established for Kalmyk; this section contains an overview of morphological causative markers and a brief comparison of morphological causative constructions with other structures that are used for expressing the features of causative semantics. Section 2 discusses case-marking of arguments in canonical causative constructions. Section 3 discusses the problem of the mono- or biclausal nature of

causative constructions; the analysis in this section is based on word order patterns and subjecthood properties. In Section 4, some non-canonical uses of causative morphology are discussed; it is argued that such uses reflect the speaker's perspective on the event. Conclusions are summarised in Section 5.

1.   Causative morphology in Kalmyk and other means of expression of causative semantics

The properties of causative verbs in Kalmyk are most clearly seen if constructions with such derived verbs (2) are compared to the clauses headed by corresponding non-causative verbs (1):

(1)   *ködəlməščə   xö   alə-v*[2]
       labourer   sheep   slaughter-PST
       'The labourer slaughtered the sheep.'

(2)   *ezə-n   ködəlməšč-är   xö   al-ulə-v*
       master-EXT   labourer-INS   sheep   slaughter-CAUS-PST
       'The master made the labourer slaughter the sheep.'
       (or 'the labourer slaughtered the sheep by order of the master')

The structure in (2) is a **canonical causative construction**. This construction differs from its non-causative counterpart in at least three aspects: **event structure**, **role structure** and **syntactic structure**. These aspects can be briefly analysed one by one.

(i) The sentence in (2) conveys a bi-eventive semantics: the causing event (e.g. verbal order) and the caused event (the labourer's slaughtering of the sheep); the caused event roughly corresponds to the meaning of the non-causative construction in (1). The caused event is, by definition, dependent upon the causing event: the occurrence of the latter somehow triggers or facilitates the occurrence of the former. However, the relation between the two subevents in a canonical causative construction is not always similar to the one observed in (2); its exact nature is often established based on the semantic and pragmatic content of the sentence. In (2), the action in question (the slaughtering of a sheep) is volitional and the social relationships between "the master" and "the labourer" are such that "the master" has the authority to give orders to the "the labourer". Hence, the most natural interpretation for (2) is that there was verbal order. However, this is not obligatorily so (see examples below), and what is expressed grammatically here is merely the fact that there is some sort of causal relation between the two subevents.

---

2.   The Kalmyk examples cited in this article are transcribed and glossed according to the system that has been established collectively during our project on the Kalmyk language. The technical details are discussed at length in the published volume based on this project (see Say et al. 2009). Some information about the project can also be found at <http://pole.iphil.ru/kalmyk> (retrieved on July 31, 2013).

(ii) The number of semantic arguments (or numerical valency) in (2) is by one higher than that in (1): the difference is the introduction of "the master" that is viewed as the bearer of the "causer" role in (2) and that is absent from the role structure in (1).

(iii) Finally, in terms of syntactic structure, the causer occupies the subject position in (2), while the erstwhile subject – the "executor" – occupies a non-subject position (it is marked by the instrumental case in this example).

In the case of canonical causative constructions, the changes in the event structure, in the role structure and in the syntactic structure are in a straightforward relation to each other. There is extensive discussion in the typological literature as to whether any of these facets must be seen as basic to the other viewpoints under debate (see e.g. Nedjlakov, Sil'nickij 1969a; Shibatani 1976; Pylkkänen 2002; Dixon 2000).

The degree to which the two subevents expressed by a causative construction are intermingled is the crucial criterion that allows one to distinguish between the two major semantic types of causation, viz. **direct** and **indirect** causation (see Nedjalkov, Sil'nickij 1969a; Shibatani 1976; Kulikov 2001). In both cases, there is some rearrangement of the agentive properties between the causer and the subject of the noncausative construction, but the exact scenarios are different. Thus, in (1), the event involves a full-fledged agent itself; causative constructions related to such clauses typically express the meaning of **indirect** (also labelled distant, mediated, causee-controlled) causation, as in (2); here, the causer is the bearer of the volition, while the executor displays all other properties of actual control. In such cases, the two subevents may be separated from each other both spatially and temporally: in (2), the verbal order 'to slaughter a sheep' could have taken place some time prior to the caused event of actual slaughtering and in a different location.

However, in causatives derived from non-agentive verbs (e.g. change-of-state verbs), the two subevents are typically more closely integrated in space and time. In such uses, the causer is often the only bearer of agentive properties in the causative construction. Such constructions are used to convey the meaning of the **direct** (also labelled manipulative, contact, immediate, causer-controlled) causation, as in (4), which can be compared to the intransitive structure in (3):

(3) *xora-də kerosi-n-ä   lamp   šat-ča-na*
     room-DAT kerosene-EXT-GEN lamp   burn-PROG-PRS
     'A kerosene lamp is burning in the room.'

(4) *bi   kerosi-n-ä   lamp   šat-a-la-v*
     I.NOM   kerosene-EXT-GEN lamp   burn-CAUS-REM-1SG
     'I lit the kerosene lamp.'

In this example, there is only one agent (the speaker) who is likely to be physically involved in the instigation of the caused event: the most natural interpretation is that the agent used a burning match in order to light the lamp; thus, the two subevents are both temporally and spatially inseparable.

The nature of causation (direct vs. indirect) is not always fully predictable based on the meaning of the causativised verb. Moreover, some causative verbs can have various interpretations depending on the context of use, as in the following two examples:

(5) *ekə   xotə   id-ül-xär   ür-än   suu-lʁ-əv*
     mother   food   eat-CAUS-CV.PURP child-P.REFL sit-CAUS-PST
     'The mother sat her child down in order to feed him/her.'

(6) *bagšə   surʁulʲč-nər-igə   suu-lʁ-əv*
     teacher   pupil-PL-ACC   sit-CAUS-PST
     'The teacher made the pupils sit down.'

Both (5) and (6) contain the causative verb *suulq-* derived from *suu-* 'to be seated, to sit down'. However, its most natural interpretations in these two sentences are different. In (5), the likeliest interpretation is that of direct causation: the mother is physically involved in the event of seating her child down. In (6), it is most likely that the teacher only commanded the pupils to sit down without direct physical involvement in the caused event (there could also be a temporal gap between the command and its fulfillment). Not surprisingly, the nature of causation is related to the degree of the causee's control over the event. In (5), the child has a very low degree of control; it can well be the case that volition and energy flow are entirely the mother's. By contrast, in (6), it is only a social convention that forces the pupils to obey their teacher, and ultimately the caused event depends upon their physical effort.

For many issues, it can be also relevant to differentiate between several subtypes of indirect causation. The subtype which is often regarded as central is the so-called **factitive** (cf. English constructions with *make*, *force*, *get*, *have*). Here, the causer is the sole volitional agent, the initial point in the causal chain of events. Examples (2) and (6) both belong to this type. Indeed, in (6) for example, the pupils might have lacked any intention to sit down before the intervention of the teacher.

However, there are also other types of indirect causation, most notably **permissive** causation (cf. constructions with *let* and *allow* in English). In permissive causative constructions, the role of the causer is weaker than in factitive constructions and can be defined in rather negative terms: the causer does not prevent or impede the event which is actually brought about by the causee (or by some natural forces). Permissive causative constructions are not frequent in Kalmyk discourse, but sometimes causative verbs do have such an interpretation as in the following example:

(7) *axlačə   ǯolach-an   Elst-ür   jov-ulə-v*
     director   driver-P.REFL Elista-DIR go-CAUS-PST
     (Situational context: The driver$_i$ told his employer that his$_i$ daughter is
     getting married in Elista). 'The director allowed his driver to go to Elista.'

In this example, the caused event (going to Elista) is primarily instigated by the "driver", that is, the volitional causee. The role of the causer is limited to non-impediment, most likely, verbal permission to implement what the driver was intending to do. To the best of my knowledge, there is no causative verb in Kalmyk that can only have a permissive interpretation without being able to be used as a factitive causative in other contexts (the reverse is not true). In particular, the context coerces the permissive interpretation of 'allow to go, let go' to the verb *jovul-* in (7), but in other contexts, this verb can have the factitive meaning 'to send'.

Semantic types of causation (and causatives) are widely discussed in the literature (see Nedjalkov, Sil'nickij 1969a,b; Shibatani 1976; Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002). It is now a widely held view that the opposition between direct and indirect causatives is gradual[3]. However, there is no doubt that this distinction plays a crucial role in the syntax of causative constructions in various languages. In particular, there is a well-known hierarchy of possible means of expressing the causative meaning:

lexical causatives → morphological causatives →
periphrastic causative constructions

Whenever available in a particular language, the structures closer to the left pole in this hierarchy tend to code more direct causation than those closer to its right pole (Comrie 1981: 165; Comrie 1985: 333; DeLancey 1984). This typological prediction is supported by the Kalmyk data. Thus, e.g., if one compares a lexical causative (that is, a morphologically simplex verb with a causative meaning) such as *al-* 'kill' and a derived morphological causative such as *ük-ül-* (die-CAUS) 'kill', it may be observed that the former option is the only one available in many direct situations (such as killing by way of stabbing with a knife); in some less direct situations (such as unintentionally cooking a poisonous meal that causes someone's death), there is an optional choice between a lexical and morphological causative; and finally, in some least direct situations, the morphological causative is preferred to the lexical non-derived verb (e.g. in some non-curative situations, when the causer simply does not prevent the man-slaughter for some reason).

Kalmyk also provides some evidence corroborating the rightmost part of the hierarchy: morphological → analytic causatives. In fact, in Kalmyk, there are no generalised causative verbs such as English *make* or French *faire*. Their closest analogues are causative matrix verbs that take sentential complements, such as *zövə ögə-* 'permit', literally 'give the right (to do something)' or *zakə-* 'order' as in the following example:

---

3. "[T]he categories of direct vs. indirect causation are examples of construct categories, i.e. they have no immediate semantic interpretations but represent clusters of features that may, in principle, vary from language to language" (Daniel, Maisak, Merdanova 2012: 98).

(8) *bagšə*   *küükt-än*   *škol-in*   *dvor-tə*
     teacher   children-P.REFL school-GEN   yard-DAT
     güü-x-igə   *zakə-v*
     run-PC.FUT-ACC   order-PST
     'The teacher ordered the children to run in the schoolyard.'

All the matrix verbs of this type are semantically specialised, that is, they convey not only the meaning of causation itself, but also the mode of causation (verbal order in this case) and syntactically, they head clearly biclausal sentences. Thus, the structures of this kind cannot be considered periphrastic causative constructions *sensu stricto*. However, these structures, too, conform to the essence of the aforementioned typological correlation: Kalmyk matrix verbs that include the semantics of causation all code rather indirect kinds of causation, that of primarily interpersonal verbal communication.

As follows from the discussion above, morphological causatives have some distributional overlaps with both lexical causatives and biclausal constructions with matrix verbs related to causation. Morphological causatives are undoubtedly the most frequent means to express the meaning of causation in Kalmyk. Causative morphology in Kalmyk is characterised by almost unrestricted productivity: a causative verb can be derived from almost any verbal lexeme, including sometimes verbs that are causative derivatives themselves, hence double causatives. A count from a minor corpus of spontaneous texts showed that roughly 4.5% of verbal tokens (127 out of 2,820) contain a causative morpheme.

In the rest of this paper, we will be only concerned with morphological causatives. For operational purposes, I will employ the following language-specific two-step definition of the "causative construction in Kalmyk". First, I delimit the set of **causative morphemes** in Kalmyk: these are those morphemes that can derive verbs that head a **canonical** causative construction, that is, a construction that displays all those properties that were discussed above with respect to example (2). In this sense, the following morphemes are causative morphemes in Kalmyk: *-ul, -a, -lʁə, -ʁə, -xə* (all of these morphemes have allomorphs whose use is conditioned by vowel harmony)[4]. Second, I conventionally define a causative construction in Kalmyk as a clause that is headed by a verb containing a causative morpheme, that is, by a causative verb. It should be stressed that thusly understood causative verbs may often be used in constructions that are **not** canonically causative in some respect, that is, do not display some of the properties discussed in i) to iii) with respect to example (2) (see Section 4 for details).

The distribution of the five causative morphemes is a complex matter (see Xarchevnikova 2002; Nedjalkov 1976 for extensive discussion). It is partially

---

4. Several not quite regular derivatives will also be viewed as causatives, such as *avxul-* 'to make someone bring or take something', which functions as the causative derivative from *av-* 'to take', but is not easily segmentable into regular morphemes, see (30).

conditioned by morphonological and partially by semantic factors.[5] In some cases, two different causative derivatives can be derived from a single non-causative verb. The latter fact could be an argument against treating causativisation as a unitary phenomenon in Kalmyk; nevertheless, in the remainder of this paper, no differentiation between the various causative morphemes will be drawn and all these morphemes will be uniformly glossed as CAUS throughout.

2.   Case marking in canonical causative constructions

As discussed above, there is a causer in canonical causative constructions that is introduced in the semantic and syntactic structure of the clause if compared to the basic, non-causative construction. Thus, canonical causativisation leads to the increase of the verb's numerical valency by one. The causer is invariably placed in the subject position and, accordingly, gets a nominative case marking unless there are external factors that trigger different case marking[6]. Under canonical causativisation in Kalmyk, the non-subject arguments of the non-causative clause generally retain their syntactic positions, cf. the following two examples:

(9)   *eckə   nan-də   utə   bičəg   biča-v*
      father   I-DAT   long   letter   write-PST
      '(My) father wrote me a long letter.'

(10) *ekə-m   eck-är   nan-də   utə bičəg   bič-ülə-v*
      mother-P.1SG father-INS I-DAT   long letter write-CAUS-PST
      'My mother made my father write me a long letter.'

In both (9) and (10), there is a created object ("the letter") and the addressee ("I"), and their syntactic positions and morphological coding remain unaffected by causativisation.

Thus, the most problematic issue is the syntactic position of the causee (which corresponds to the subject of the basic non-causative construction). Its syntactic position and morphological marking crucially depend on the transitivity of the non-causative verb. A widespread typological pattern for the coding of the causee is to place

---

5.   These semantic factors do not yield a straightforward pattern, though. In most cases, they can be formulated in terms of constraints upon an affixation process that block some possibilities but cannot unequivocally predict the choice of the affix. For example, causatives with affixes *-a*, *-ʁə* and *-xə* are mostly used to derive causatives with direct meaning from intransitive verbs. Thus, causatives from transitives can be generally derived with the help of suffixes *-ul*, and *-lʁə* only (the choice between these two is straightforwardly conditioned by morphonology). However, this constraint is not without exception; moreover, it does not regulate the choice of affixes for intransitive verbs.

6.   For example, Kalmyk subjects take a genitive case-marking in relative clauses (Krapivina 2009) and accusative case-marking in some types of complement clauses (Knjazev 2009, Serdobol'skaja 2009).

it in the direct object position for causatives derived from intransitive verbs, and to put it in a more peripheral position for causatives derived from transitives (in this latter case, the direct object position is occupied by the direct object of the causativised verb). This pattern is usually claimed to be motivated by a tendency to avoid two competing direct objects in one clause and, more generally, to reflect the hierarchy of syntactic relations (see e.g. Comrie 1976; Comrie 1981: 169; Comrie 1985: 337–340 for some typological discussion).[7]

Although in general this pattern is corroborated by Kalmyk data, at least in its higher part – as can be seen from examples (2) and (4) – there is some variation that needs discussion.

Causativisation of intransitives is a simpler matter. The causee is almost always placed in the position of the direct object of such causative verbs, a fact which conforms to an almost universal tendency. We must bear in mind that, similarly to most other Mongolic (as well as Turkic and many Uralic) languages, Kalmyk is characterised by the so-called "differential object marking" (DOM). It means that direct objects in Kalmyk can be either marked by an accusative marker or left unmarked.[8] As in many other languages with DOM, objects that rank high in the hierarchies of animacy and individuation – e.g. proper names, as in (11), or personal pronouns – tend to be marked, whereas objects that are low in these hierarchies often go unmarked, as in (2) above.

(11) *či   juŋgad   Badma-gə   inä-lʁ-ǯä-nä-č*
      you.NOM   why   Badma-ACC laugh-CAUS-PROG-PRS-2SG
      'Why are you making Badma laugh?'

The interplay between factors affecting the (non-)marking of direct objects is a complex matter (see Konoshenko 2009 for a detailed discussion), but these factors seem to be the same for causatives of intransitives and for non-derived transitive verbs and need not concern us here.

However, there is one class of intransitive verbs whose causatives are not always transitive: these are verbs of non-controlled sound emission. The causatives of such verbs can either put the causee in the direct object position or code it by the instrumental case (see also a brief discussion in Nedjalkov 1976: 53):

---

7.   In a nutshell, Comrie's hypothesis predicts that the causer occupies the subject position, so that the erstwhile subject, the causee, is demoted to the highest vacant position in the following hierarchy of grammatical relations: subject → direct object → indirect object → oblique.

8.   In Kalmyk, the unmarked form does not always coincide with the nominative: the latter can have a special "extension" to the stem, cf. *asxə-n* 'evening-EXT' functioning as the nominative form and *asxə* as the unmarked object (at the same time "extension" cannot be viewed as the nominative affix, because it is also found in many other nominal forms). There is controversy as to whether unmarked objects should be treated as nouns without any case feature or as special accusative forms with zero case affixes (cf. "unmarked accusative" and similar terms). This analytical problem is generally beyond the scope of this paper. However, in my glosses, only overt morphemes are taken into account, so that direct objects without overt case morpheme are glossed as bare stems.

(12) *bi   xoŋx-ar / xoŋxə   ǯiŋn-ül-ü-v*
I.NOM bell-INS / bell   ring-CAUS-PST-1SG
'I made the bell ring.' (literally 'I rang with the bell' in the first option)

The choice between the two alternatives is not unmotivated. Thus, for example, if the causer is non-human (and lacks volition), this object in the causative construction is placed in the direct object position, e.g. in 'the cow made its bell ring (by way of moving)'. By contrast, objects such as telephones, which are used by humans not just for producing sounds but rather as instruments in other types of activities, are invariably coded with the instrumental case. It is thus clear that the choice of position of the causee in such cases reflects the semantics of the whole causative event rather than purely structural properties of the "underlying" verb. In other words, the instrumental coding of a sound-emitting object in such a construction is only possible if it can be construed as an instrument rather than as an affected entity.

It is worth mentioning that causatives of intransitives are known to display a similar variation in case-marking in some other languages. It is often claimed that the instrumental-like coding of causees reflects a higher degree of control on its part (Comrie 1981: 175). In Kalmyk, this is clearly not true: sound-emitting devices lack any control, in any case. It is noticeable, however, that the choice of the instrumental in Kalmyk reflects a higher degree of control in the situation **as a whole**. This theme will be reverberated below.

While variation in the coding of causees for causatives of intransitive is a marginal phenomenon available only to a minor group of verbs, the situation with the coding of causees for causatives of transitives is notoriously more complex. As already discussed in some previous studies, there are three major options here: the instrumental (13), the dative (14) and the accusative (15) (Sanzheev 1983: 198–199; Xarchevnikova 2002: 83).

(13) *Badma   Bajərta-qar bij-än   üms-ülə-v*
Badma   Bajrta-INS   body-P.REFL kiss-CAUS-PST
'Badma_i forced Bajrta to kiss him_i.'

(14) *ekə-ny   küükə-n-d-än   monda   bär-ülə-v*
mother-P.3 girl-EXT-DAT-P.REFL ball   hold-CAUS-PST
'The mother handed the ball to her child (sic!).'

(15) *bagšə   madn-igə   škol-də   kögǯmə   soŋs-ul-na*
teacher   we-ACC   school-DAT music   listen-CAUS-PRS
'The teacher made us listen to the music.'

It is sometimes claimed that the basic option for Kalmyk is the dative with the other two options only marginally possible.[9] This view is not corroborated by our field data, in which it is the instrumental that is used as a basic option with the other two options being definitely less frequent. Evidently, there is an on-going shift in this domain of the grammar of Kalmyk.[10]

In any event, for the Kalmyk idiom that is analysed here, it is appropriate to consider instrumental coding as the default option and to briefly discuss those conditions when the causer can be coded with the dative or accusative.

In the relevant literature, it is sometimes claimed that the choice of the dative correlates with the permissive interpretation of the construction (Sanzheev 1983: 198). However, as already observed, the dative in the idiom under discussion is a relatively rare option. It appears that this is not due to the functional widening of the applicability of the instrumental pattern, but rather to the fact the permissive interpretation itself became only marginally possible in this idiom. Indeed, in the process of elicitation, our consultants were willing to use morphological causatives when translating sentences with such verbs as 'force', 'make', 'order' etc. However, when translating sentences with the meaning of permissive causation ('allow', 'not to prevent from' etc.), they preferred using complex constructions with matrix verbs, most notably *zövə ögə-* 'allow', literally 'give the right (to do something)'. In such constructions, the permittee is coded with the dative, but it is the indirect object of the matrix verb. When presented with a ready-made construction containing a morphological causative verb and the causee coded by the dative, our consultants did interpret it as semantically permissive but found these structures somewhat awkward:

(16) *ʔbi   kövü-n-d-än   en   kenčər-är   širä   bürk-ül-ü-v*
      I.NOM   boy-EXT-DAT-P.REFL   this tissue-INS   table   cover-CAUS-PST-1SG
      'I allowed my son to cover the table with this tablecloth.'

However, there are contexts where dative coding of the causee is fully acceptable and is clearly preferred to instrumental coding. This is the case of those causative constructions where the causee is not only viewed as the executor of the caused subevent, but is simultaneously bearing the role of recipient (17), addressee (18) or experiencer (19) in the **whole causative event**:

---

9.   Cf. also discussion of a similar distribution for other Mongolic languages in Sanzheev (1963: 38).
10.   The mechanisms and reasons for this shift are not quite clear. An explanation that suggests itself is the influence of Russian contact, where demoted arguments are often coded by an instrumental case. However, this explanation is to be taken with caution for two reasons. First, there is no causative construction in Russian that could have directly influenced the structure in Kalmyk. Second, similar fluctuations are observed in the Mongolic languages not in contact with Russian; e.g. a discussion of the facts from Khalkha Mongol can be found in Kuz'menkov (1984). Thus, I favour an alternative explanation, related to the decline of permissive uses (see below in the main text).

(17) *ekə   ürə-n-d-än   xašə   id-ül-ǯä-nä*
     mother   child-EXT-DAT-P.REFL porridge eat-CAUS-PROG-PRS
     'The mother is feeding the child porridge.'

(18) *nan-də   Badmə   evr-änn^j   toolvr-an   med-ülə-v*
     I-DAT   Badma   self-GEN.P.3 thought-P.REFL   know-CAUS-PST
     'Badma let me know what he thought '

(19) *Badma   gerg-n-änn^j   zurəg   nan-də   üz-ülə-v*
     Badma   wife-EXT-GEN.P.3 picture I-DAT   see-CAUS-PST
     'Badma showed me (lit.: made me see) a picture of his wife.'

Thus, the choice between the dative and the default instrumental coding of the causee is not determined by the structural properties of the underlying transitive verb, nor by the type of semantics of causation itself (permissive vs. factitive) but rather by the overall semantic construal of the whole causative event: the dative is chosen in those cases when the causee bears the semantic role of recipient, adressee or experiencer, that is, one of the roles that are associated with the dative case in other, non-causative, constructions. This pattern is in accordance with the understanding of the semantics and syntax of causation expressed in Kemmer and Verhagen (1994). A possible generalisation is that in all those situations that trigger the dative coding of the causee it is construed as either a real recipient of a physical object or as a metaphoric recipient of some abstract entity (e.g. some knowledge or sensation). Bonch-Osmolovskaja (2007: 152) discusses a similar generalization proposed for the Mishar dialect of Tatar. This is further related to the semantics of the intention on the part of the causer; in cases such as (17) through (19), the aim of the causer is to somehow affect the causee rather than the underlying direct object. For example, the mother's goal in (17) is to make her child satisfied rather than to get rid of the porridge; in this latter (less natural but possible) situation ('The mother is feeding the porridge to the child'), the causee would be coded by the instrumental.

Let us now briefly discuss the third option for the coding of the causee in causatives derived from transitives, namely, its accusative coding. This option is generally infrequent. The natural explanation of its marginal character is probably the tendency to avoid two accusative objects in one clause (also reported for many other languages). If this tendency is indeed at work, it must be understood as a tendency to avoid two accusative syntactic **positions** rather than two accusative noun phrases as such. Indeed, discourse subjects and objects in Kalmyk can easily be omitted for various reasons; however, even when the genuine direct object of the "underlying" transitive verb is omitted, the causee in the causative construction is usually coded by the instrumental (or the dative, as discussed above):

(20) *axlačə   širä   xuld-ad   av-čk-ad,   stenk   tal*
director   table   sell-CV.ANT   take-COMPL-CV.ANT   wall   towards
*bagš-mud-ar / *bagš-mud-igə   täv-ülə-v*
teacher-PL-INS / teacher-PL-ACC   put-CAUS-PST
'The headmaster bought a table and made the teachers place (it) near the wall.'

Although there is no overt direct object in the second clause, which is headed by the causative verb, this zero syntactic expression is textually understood as referring to "the table" from the previous clause; hence, the causee is coded by the instrumental as typical of causatives of transitives.

However, there is one class of situations in which the accusative coding of the causee is allowed although the causativised verb is itself transitive, as in the following examples:

(21) *ekə-n^j   Badma-gə   giič-nər-tə   duduul-ulə-v*
mother-P.3   Badma-ACC   guest-PL-DAT   song sing-CAUS-PST
'The mother made Badma sing a song to the guests.'

(22) *egčə-m   čamagə   ärkə   čaʁər-asə   cer bär-ül-nä*
elder.sister-P.1SG   you.ACC   vodka   wine-ABL   ban hold-CAUS-PRS
'My older sister prohibits you to drink alcohol.'
(lit.: 'makes you hold a ban from vodka and wine')

The structures of this kind are noticeable, because unlike all other constructions discussed in this paper, causativisation of this type yields argument structures that are not attested for non-derived verbs. Indeed, while causatives of intransitives are similar to plain transitives, and the usual causatives of transitives are similar to extended transitives with dative or instrumental arguments, here we see constructions that look like double transitives (that is, there are two arguments that seem to be direct objects): this is a pattern that is otherwise not attested in Kalmyk.

There are some specific properties of the two putative direct objects in this pattern: i) the direct object that is inherited from the underlying transitive verb is usually linearly found immediately to the left of the verb; ii) this object is inanimate and never has an accusative marker;[11] iii) most importantly, this inherited object is usually in a very special relationship to the verb: it is either a pleonastic (often cognate) object as in (21), or forms an idiomatic expression as in (22), or is otherwise defective in terms of its status in the information structure of the clause. It might be prematurely argued that such objects form a close semantic and syntactic unit with the underlying verb so that the whole combination behaves as a complex intransitive predicate rather than a

---

11. In examples (21) and (22), the inherited direct object is thus morphologically distinct from the causee: the former is unmarked, whereas the latter is marked with the accusative case. Whether it is theoretically possible to use a construction with both objects unmarked unfortunately has not been explored, but such structures are not attested in our materials, and this option seems to be very unlikely.

full-fledged verb phrase consisting of a verb and a genuine direct object. A diachronic pattern of the development of intransitive predicates from combinations of transitive verbs and their semantically impoverished, stripped objects is well documented for many languages (see Lazard 2001: 876). If such a pattern of development can indeed be posited for Kalmyk, then the behaviour of such complex predicates under causativisation is readily explainable: they behave as ordinary intransitives and hence trigger the accusative marking of the causee when causativised.

3.   Mono- vs. biclausality and subjecthood
   properties in canonical causatives

Although the morphological causative is a single word form, in some languages, constructions headed by such verbs are reported to display syntactic properties hinting at their biclausal nature, which reflects their bi-eventive semantics (see Alpatov et al. 2008: 143–150 for Japanese and Ljutikova et al. 2006: 131–136 for Karachay-Balkar). In such cases, a part of the syntactic structure that corresponds to the caused subevent may have some properties of a separate clause and the causee may retain some subjecthood properties. In this section, we will discuss whether and to what extent such phenomena are attested in Kalmyk. Quite naturally, bi-clausality is more typical of indirect causatives, where the two subevents are less integrated into a single whole. Hence, we will mostly be concerned with indirect causatives: most direct causatives syntactically and semantically behave as ordinary (monoclausal) plain transitives.

   The first problem to be discussed is **word order**. In general, Kalmyk has a strong preference for having the verb in the final position of the clause. The basic linear pattern for the arguments of non-derived verbs is to place the subject at the beginning of the clause and the direct object in the position immediately before the verb, while other arguments and adjuncts are located somewhere in between (although deviations that are due to the communicative organisation are possible). Thus, the basic word order pattern may be schematically represented as S(Obl)OV.[12]

(23) *küükə-n   karandaš-ar   bichəg   bič-ǯä-nä*   (Ochirov 1964: 158)
    girl-EXT   pencil-INS   letter   write-PROG-PRS
    'The girl is writing a letter with a pencil.'

Causative constructions often deviate from this pattern; the causee is almost invariably found in the clause-second position (that is, after the causer-subject, but before all other arguments of the verb) in causative constructions. This is most clearly seen

---

when the causee is realised as the direct object and coded by the accusative. We have already discussed this peculiar pattern for double-object constructions, as in (21) and (22), but it is also frequently attested for the causatives derived from extended intransitives:

(24) *či   evr-änn^j   xöö-gə   mana*
     you.NOM self-GEN.P.3 sheep-ACC   we.GEN
     xöö-d-t-än   xaša-də   or-ul-čkə-Ø
     sheep-PL-DAT-P.REFL yard-DAT   enter-CAUS-COMPL-IMP
     'Drive your sheep into the yard, where our sheep are!'

The tendency to place the causee to the left of all other arguments inherited from the non-causative verb is also maintained by obliquely marked causees of transitive verbs. The fact that these causees precede genuine direct object conforms to the general S(Obl)OV pattern of the language, but the causee typically precedes all other oblique arguments as well (although in other cases, the relative order of oblique arguments is rather free):

(25) *milicioner xulxač-ar karandaš-ar bičəg   bič-ülə-v*
     policeman   thief-INS pencil-INS   letter write-CAUS-PST
     'The policeman made the thief write the letter with a pencil.'[13]

Word order phenomena per se do not indicate that there is a clause boundary in the indirect causative constructions at hand, but it is still remarkable that the causee is linearly located in the same position that is typical of **subjects of embedded clauses**: to the right of the matrix subject, but to the left of all arguments of the dependent clause; this pattern is maintained irrespective of the case marking of the causee.

Provided that the causee is linearly different from the arguments of plain verbs that are marked with the same case marker, one might expect that we will also find some manifestations of the clausal nature of the syntactic structure corresponding to the caused event. One area where such manifestations could be found is the behaviour of various semantic operators whose usual scope is a clause. One such operator is **tense**, such as the present progressive marker *-ǯa-na* (PROG-PRES), which, when used in the episodic meaning, marks simultaneity of the action to the moment of speech. Importantly, this marker might have variable scope with causative constructions. Thus, we saw in (11) an example where its scope necessarily encompasses the causing event (the addressee of this sentence is performing some actions that might

---

13.   It was mentioned above that the fact that the verb undergoing causativisation is a verb with a cognate object correlates with accusative coding of the causee, cf. discussion concerning (21). Although this tendency is not a strict rule (so that instrumental coding of the causee, as in (25), is usually also possible by default), it is probably worth noting that *bičəg* 'letter' is indeed a cognate object (it is etymologically related to *bič-* 'to write'), but it is not pleonastic (as many other cognate objects): letters are not the only kinds of objects that can be written.

cause Badma's laughter) and only potentially the caused event as well (whether Badma is actually laughing is irrelevant). However, the present progressive marker affixed to the causative verb can also have the caused event alone in its scope; see the second interpretation of the following sentence:

(26) *bagšə küükt-är   kelvər umš-ul-ǯa-na*
teacher children-INS story   read-CAUS-PROG-PRS
a. 'The teacher is (at this moment) making the children
read the story.' (e.g. declares instruction)
b. 'The children are (at this moment) reading the
story (as instructed by the teacher)'

Thus, the caused subevent is available for the clause-level operator despite the fact that the causative clause is headed by a single causative verb. I examined similar scope possibilities for a number of various causative verbs and various clause-level operators, such as temporal adverbials (e.g. *ʁurvən minutdan* 'for three minutes'), repetitive adverbials (e.g. *xojər däkǯə* 'two times'), and negation. These adverbials do not behave uniformly. Negation, for instance, is almost always associated with the causing event, or the two events together, while the caused event alone can only marginally fall within its scope; thus, the scope of negative markers does not point at the biclausal nature of causative constructions. The other operators tested display scope ambiguities more frequently.

Due to space limitations, the details of the analysis cannot be described here (see Say 2009 for this discussion). Suffice it to say, that it appears that the causative constructions do not fall straightforwardly into two mutually exclusive types, viz. monoclausal vs. biclausal. However, if we assume that operators usually take **constituents** as their scope, then we have to conclude that there are some traces of biclausality in at least some causative constructions in Kalmyk.

Provided that causative constructions in Kalmyk both in terms of word order and in the behaviour of scope-taking operators do not necessarily behave as simplex transitive constructions, one might expect that the **causee** can retain some properties associated with **subjects:** this is reported for many languages with morphological causatives (see e.g. the discussion in Alpatov et al. 2008: 143–150 for Japanese). However, this prediction does not hold true for Kalmyk: all semantic and syntactic subject-oriented phenomena in Kalmyk, when tested for causative constructions, are **uniformly** associated with the **causer** argument; this is true for the use of reflexive pronouns, subject-oriented converbs, subject-oriented adverbials (such as 'with joy', 'silently'), etc. Thus, for instance, in the following example, the goal participant ('grandfather') contains a possessive-reflexive marker; the only interpretation available for this sentence is that in which the possessor of that argument is understood as co-referential with the causer (not causee):

(27) *bi   čamagə   aav-urn*   *jov-ul-ǯa-na-v*
     I.NOM   you.ACC   grandfather-DIR.P.REFL   go-CAUS-PROG-PRS-1SG
     'I have sent you to my / *your grandfather.'

It should be added that subject-oriented phenomena are not directly linked to nomina-
tive marking: in terms of control and binding, the non-nominative subjects of many
types of embedded clauses behave in the same way as canonical nominative subjects
in independent clauses. However, the causees never have any properties associated
with subjects: in all causative constructions these properties are exclusively associ-
ated with causers.

       We are now in a position to provide an interim summary. There are some cases
when case-marking and word-order patterns attested in Kalmyk causative construc-
tions are different from patterns found in other types of structures. These deviations
can be explained if one assumes that morphological causative constructions have
some syntactic properties associated with bi-clausality which is also reflected in the
behaviour of some scope-taking operators. However, whatever the clausal organisa-
tion of causative constructions, their subjects are clearly the causers while the causees
have no structural properties associated with the subjects. This finding calls for a
hypothesis that causers have a prominent discourse status in all causative construc-
tions and that, moreover, the very essence of causativisation in Kalmyk is the assign-
ment of this high status to a new argument. This premature hypothesis is further
elaborated in the following section based on the analysis of non-canonical causative
constructions.

4.   Non-canonical uses of causative morphology
    and the speaker's perspective

The two crucial properties of the canonical causative construction are i) that the
causer is a newly introduced argument that is not present in the basic non-causative
construction and ii) that the semantic relations between the arguments of the basic
construction are not changed under causativisation. However, in many constructions
with morphological causatives, these assumptions are not met; in such cases, we are
dealing with non-canonical causatives.

       In order to understand these phenomena, we have to introduce the notion of the
speaker's perspective (Fillmore 1977). The essence of this notion is the fact that
syntactic structures often reflect not the properties of external reality as such but
rather the speaker's way of thinking about a particular situation. With respect to argu-
ment structure, perspective-taking is manifested in both argument **selection** (which
participants are thought by the speaker to be worth mentioning in a particular clause)
and argument **ranking** (or argument linking) that is responsible for the assignment
of hierarchised syntactic positions to those arguments that are taken into perspective.

The fact that the first aspect is relevant for the use of causative morphology in Kalmyk is easily demonstrated by the fact that it is theoretically possible to use contextual (unmarked) causatives in Kalmyk, as in the following example:

(28) *aavə   neg ǯil-in   turšartə šinə   gerə   **bär-və***
    grandfather one year-GEN   during   new   house build-PST
    'The grandfather built a new house in one year.'

This sentence can be used both if the grandfather implemented the building himself or if there were some labourers involved so that "the grandfather" is merely the building owner. However, when using the sentence in (28) in this latter meaning, the speaker does not perceive the executors in the expression. The speaker could otherwise choose to use a morphologically causative verb so that it is explicitly stated that there was some labour power employed.

In the following discussion, we will be mostly concerned with another facet of perspective-taking, namely, with the **ranking** of participants. In order to see the machinery of this mechanism, we have to briefly discuss the decomposition of the role semantics of arguments in causativization.

It was noted in the beginning of this paper that causativisation usually signals some rearrangement of agentive properties. The most usual scenario is such that the causee retains all its 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. However, this scenario is not the only one available for Kalmyk causative constructions (cf. Shibatani and Pardeshi 2002 for the typological discussion of other possible scenarios). For example, with causativization of such verbs as *ögə-* 'give' and *av-* 'take', there is a split of semantic properties associated with their subjects. In both cases, the subject of the non-causative verb is not only understood to be the agent, it is also the holder / possessor of a certain object (initial for 'give' and final for 'take'). When these verbs are causativized, the causee remains the actual performer of the action (as in non-causative constructions). However, the property of being the possessor is taken over by the causer:

(29) *bi   (Baatr-ar)   Badma-də / Badma-ʁur möŋg ög-ülə-v*
    I.NOM   Batyr-INS   Badma-DAT   Badma-DIR   money give-CAUS-PST.1SG
    'I passed (my) money on to / for Badma through Batyr.'
    *'I made Batyr give (his) money to Badma.'

Regardless of whether or not the causee (the transmitter) is overtly stated, this sentence can only be understood in such a way that it is the speaker's money that is intended to be given to Badma. The interpretation that would be expected in a strictly canonical derivation (the speaker being an external causer of the non-causative event in which Batyr is giving his own money to Badma) is banned. Thus, we see that the

semantics of the causative event is construed in such a way as if the causer were already present in the basic non-causative structure. The semantic construal of the whole event on the part of the speaker is also responsible for the fact that the goal participant can be coded here with the directive and not only the dative case: the causative construction does not necessarily convey the meaning of actual successful transfer, since the actual transfer is out of the causer-subject's control. In this respect, the causative construction is different from the basic non-causative construction with the verb *ögǝ-* 'give' where the actual transfer **is** implied, and the goal participant can only be coded by the dative case.

A mirror image of this situation is observed for the verb *av-* 'take': under causativisation, the causer is construed not only as such, but also takes over the role of the intended holder ("final possessor") of the object, thus depriving the causee of this semantic component:

(30) *mini   eckǝ-m   eeʒ-är   aaʁǝ   avxul-dǝg   bilä*
      I.GEN   father-P.1SG grandmother-INS cup   take.CAUS-PC.HAB be.REM
      'My father used to ask granny to bring **him** the cup.'

The phenomena exemplified in (29) and (30) seem to be marginal at first glance, but they hint at a significant potential feature of Kalmyk causative constructions: the causer in the causative construction is not always a "new" participant which is super-imposed upon the caused event. Rather, if we decompose participants' roles in the event into semantic components, the "causer" can take over some of those semantic components that are associated with the "underlying subject", that is, with a partici-pant that is already present in the basic non-derived construction. For example, the causer in (30) inherits the component 'being the intended holder' from the causee. Such a split of the role of the original agent (some components predictably remain associated with the causee, whereas other are taken over by the causer) has a notice-able consequence: the caused event in (30) ('granny brings the cup to father') **cannot** be described by the basic non-derived verb *av-* 'to take'.

A similar but more fully pronounced pattern of this kind is a situation in which the causer is fully **identified** with one of the participants of the basic non-causative structure. Let us discuss this pattern for the verb *ää-* 'fear, be frightened'. With this verb, the experiencer is coded in the subject position, while the stimulus is coded by the ablative case:

(31) *mini   dü   küükǝ-n   noxa-ʁasǝ   ää-nä*
      I.GEN   younger.sibling   girl-EXT dog-ABL   fear-PRS
      'My younger sister is afraid of (the) dog(s).'

A possible effect of causativisation of this verb is that all the original participants retain their roles and that there additionally is an external causer that is introduced in the subject position:

(32) *bi   xulxač-igə   noxa-ʁar   ää-lʁ-ü-v*
    I.NOM   thief-ACC   dog-INS   fear-CAUS-PST-1SG
    'I frightened the thief with the dog.'

As a side note, it can be noted that that the oblique argument of the underlying verb in Kalmyk (as in English) is construed as an instrument rather than a stimulus *sensu stricto* (note its instrumental coding). This syntactic pattern reflects the fact the causer has some control over the behaviour of the dog, whereas direct control over the emotional state of the experiencer is impossible.

    What is more relevant for the current discussion is that when there is no oblique argument, the causer is understood as also being the stimulus:

(33) *enə noxa   mini   dü   küük-igə ää-lʁə-v*
    this dog   I.GEN   younger.sibling   girl-ACC fear-CAUS-PST
    'This dog frightened my younger sister.'

The subject argument of this construction is interpreted as the stimulus by default (see Kuz'menkov 1984: 41–42 for the same pattern in Khalkha Mongol). Moreover, in this type of structure, unlike that in (32), the subject argument of the construction must not necessarily be active and volitional (the dog might have frightened the girl without behaving in any specifically frightening fashion). Thus, if this structure is compared to the non-causative construction in (31), there appears to be no increase in the numerical valency, nor any necessary rearrangement in the role structure of the event as such. In fact, the crucial difference between (31) and (33) is a difference in the **speaker's perspective**: while the actual event in the external world might be the same, the speaker chooses to put the experiencer into the prominent subject position in (31), but it is the stimulus that is found in this position in (33).

    A similar pattern is also typical of some other emotional predicates in Kalmyk: *inä-* 'laugh (about something)' → *inä-lʁə-* 'make laugh', *bajərl-* 'rejoice (at something)' → *bajərl-ul-* 'gladden someone' etc. Verbs of emotion have been reported to show similarly non-canonical patterns of causativization in some other languages (see Ljutikova et al. 2006: 58; Bonch-Osmolovskaja 2007: 153–154).

    However, in Kalmyk, this rearranging pattern of causativisation is by no means limited to emotional predicates. For example, it is also typical of some verbs related to motion, such as *čiv-* 'to sink'. In (34), which is a noncausative construction, the trajector is put into the subject position, while in the causative construction (35), this prominent position is occupied by the landmark:

(34) *čolu-n   usə-n-də   čiv-nä*
    stone-EXT   water-EXT-DAT   sink-PRS
    'The stone sinks in the water.'

(35) *usə-n*   *čolu*   *čiv-ä-nä*
     water-EXT   stone   sink-CAUS-PRS
     'The stone sinks in the water.' (literally: 'Water makes the stone sink')

Clearly, there could be no difference between (34) and (35) in terms of volition, control, etc. The only difference is the way in which the speaker prefers to think about the situation (cf. also *düür-* 'be filled with something' → *düür-gə-* 'fill something').

The rearranging pattern of causativisation can even be seen in at least one transitive verb: *daxə-* 'follow (someone)' → *dax-ul-* 'lead someone'. Here again, the trajector is put into the subject position in the non-causative construction, while causativisation allows the speaker to assign this syntactic status to the landmark as can be seen in the following examples:

(36) *noxa*   *namagə*   *dax-na*
     dog   I.ACC   follow-PRS
     'The dog is following me.'

(37) *či*   *Badma-gə*   *dax-ul-u-č*
     you.NOM   Badma-ACC   follow-CAUS-PST-2SG
     'You led Badma.' (≈ 'You made Badma follow
     (you)', ≈ 'You were followed by Badma')

It can be observed that the causee occupies the position of the direct object of the causative verb *daxul* 'be followed', lit. 'make someone follow'. It was discussed in Section 2 that this is not the usual pattern with causatives of transitives: normally, direct objects are inherited from non-causative transitives. Thus, it might be argued that there is no other argument position in (37) except for those occupied by overt noun phrases (the causer can occupy the direct object position because it is otherwise vacant). This is a manifestation of the semantic merger of the two semantic entities: the causer and the landmark ('the one being followed') of the underlying non-causative verb.

Semantic and syntactic patterns exemplified in (33) through (37) are an appropriate background for the discussion of the most noticeable non-canonical use of causative morphology in Kalmyk, namely, of its passive functions:

(38) *tuula*   *čon-də*   *id-ülə-v*
     hare   wolf-DAT   eat-CAUS-PST
     'The hare was eaten by the wolf.'

Vydrina (2009) describes this pattern at length and it has numerous and widely discussed typological parallels (Nedjalkov, Sil'nickij 1969b; Kazenin 1994; Nedyalkov 1991; Galjamina 2001). In particular, Vydrina describes semantic properties of such constructions, the various constraints on the applicability of this kind of

derivation and its competition with passives marked by the specialised passive morpheme -*gdə*. It may, however, be observed as a side note that the "true" passive and causative are mutually related in a number of respects.[14]

An important question to ask is how can passive uses of causatives emerge diachronically. A hypothesis that is well-established typologically (Haspelmath 1990) and also maintained for Kalmyk (Vydrina 2009) holds that an important diachronic role is played by causative-reflexive uses, as in (39), and that they constitute an intermediate stage in their development:

(39) *aavə   bij-än   Sibir-tə   orša-lɤə-v*   (Vydrina 2009)
       grandfather self-P.REFL Siberia-DAT   bury-CAUS-PST
       'Grandfather was buried in Siberia.' (literally:
       'grandfathered made (others) bury himself in Siberia')

Upon encountering a structure like (39), the speaker faces a causative derived from a transitive (hence, bivalent) verb. The expected patient-like argument of non-causative verbs is not expressed (the direct object of *orša-* 'bury' in (39)). In order to interpret this sentence, the hearer has to identify the causer with this syntactically unexpressed[15] argument. Thus, a crucial step in the development of passive uses of causative morphology is the mechanism that allows the hearer to infer this type of identity. Although passive use is often treated as an extremely specialised pattern that is deviant from all other uses of the causative morphology, it is now clear that in Kalmyk, at least, it is a part of a larger family of patterns. The feature that all these patterns have in common is that causative morphology does not necessarily signal the introduction of a separate causing subevent as such, but rather is used to shift the prominent status of subject to a participant that is already present in the basic construction (which is, of course one of the basic functions of the passive as well). It is then clear that the omnipresent function of causative morphology is the manipulation of the subject status in the clause that is closely related to the perspective-taking on the part of the speaker. In this respect, the semantically-driven uses of causative morphology and its pragmatically-driven uses appear to ultimately be two facets of a wider discourse phenomenon.

---

14.   For instance, the subject in both causative and passive constructions is demoted and the options for coding the demotee in the two types of structures are the same. Moreover, descriptions available mention the dative as the preferred option for the demoted subject in both passive constructions and in causative constructions derived from transitives, whereas there is a clear prevalence of instrumental coding for both processes in our data.
15.   Constructions in which one and the same referent would be expressed twice, first in the position of the causer and then in the position of the direct object of the causative verb, are not attested.

5.   Conclusions

Morphological causatives in Kalmyk cover a wide range of meanings stretching from direct causation to various situations where the meaning of causation as such is weakened. While morphologically causative verbs are always derivatives of some "basic" non-causative counterparts, the syntactic organisation of causative clauses cannot always be directly deduced from the structural properties of the underlying construction. In particular, the choice of case-marking of the causee (accusative, instrumental or dative) is, in many cases, triggered by the event schema of the whole causative event rather then derived from its component parts.

In some respects, the syntax of morphological causative constructions can reflect their complex semantic structure, and many causative constructions have manifestations of their bi-clausal nature. However, these complications do not concern the syntactic status of the causer: however weak it can be in terms of volitionality and control, the causer has a full range of syntactic properties associated with subjects in Kalmyk.

Moreover, the assignment of the prominent status of subject to a different semantic argument seems to be a uniting factor behind the various uses of causative morphology. While in the canonical causative structures it is a new argument that is introduced in the event schema, there are several types of non-canonical causative structures that signal the rearrangement of syntactic positions of those arguments that are already present in the non-causative "basic" construction (hence, causativisation does not increase the numerical valency of the verb).

The basic function of the assignment of the prominent discourse-syntactic status of subject to a different semantic argument has been discussed in this paper with respect to isolated clauses where it reflects the process of perspective-taking on the part of the speaker. There is no surprise that causativisation is also a vigorous tool for the organisation of complex constructions, and, ultimately, both canonical and non-canonical causative constructions are used for reference-tracking and maintenance of coherence in natural discourse (roughly similar to voice phenomena). However, these facets of causativisation in Kalmyk fall beyond the scope of the present article and are discussed elsewhere (see Say 2009).

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3	person markers	DIR	directive	PC.FUT	future participle
ABL	ablative	EXT	extension	PC.HAB	habitual participle
ACC	accusative	GEN	genitive	PL	plural
CAUS	causative	IMP	imperative	PROG	progressive
COMPL	completive	INS	instrumental	PRS	present
CV.ANT	anterior converb	NOM	nominative	PST	past
CV.PURP	purpose converb	P	possessive	REM	remote past
DAT	dative	REFL	reflexive	SG	singular

References

Alpatov V. M. & Arkadjev P. M. & Podlesskaja V. I. 2008: *Teoreticheskaja grammatika japonskogo jazyka*. Tom 2. Moskva: Natalis.

Bonch-Osmolovskaja A. A. 2007: Semantika aktantnyx derivacij. – E. A. Ljutikova & K. I. Kazenin & V. D. Solovjov & S. G. Tatevosov (eds), *Misharskij dialekt tatarskogo jazyka*. Kazan': Magarif. 143–191.

Comrie, Bernard 1981: *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Comrie, Bernard 1985: Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. – Timothy Shopen (ed.). *Language typology and syntactic description, III. Grammatical categories and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 309–348.

Daniel, Michael A. & Maisak, Timur A. & Merdanova, Solmaz R. 2012. Causatives in Agul. – Pirkko Suihkonen & Bernard Comrie & Valery Solovyev (eds), *Argument Structure and Grammatical Relations. A crosslinguistic typology*. Studies in language companion series 126. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 55–114.

DeLancey, Scott 1984: Notes on agentivity and causation. – *Studies in language* 8, 2: 181–213.

Dixon, R. M. W. 2000: A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. – R. M. W. Dixon & A. Yu. Aikhenvald (eds), *Changing valency: case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 30–83.

Fillmore, Charles 1977: The case for case reopened. – Peter Cole & Jerrold M. Sadock (eds), *Syntax and semantics, Vol. 8. Grammatical relations*. New York, San Francisco & London: Academic Press. 59–81.

Galjamina, Ju. E. 2001: Akcessivno-recessivnaja polisemija pokazatelej zaloga i aktantnoj derivcii. – V. A. Plungjan (ed.), *Issledovanija po teorii grammatiki. Vol. 1. Glagol'nye kategorii*. Moskva: Russkie slovari. 178–197.

Haspelmath, Martin 1990: The grammaticization of passive morphology. – *Studies in language* 14, 1: 25–72.

Kazenin, K. I. 1994: On the lexical distribution of agent-preserving and object-preserving transitivity alternations. – *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 17, 2: 141–154.

Kemmer, Suzanne & Verhagen, Arie 1994: The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive linguistics* 5, 2: 115–156.

Knjazev, M. Ju. 2009: Sentencial'nye dopolnenija v kalmyckom jazyke. – Say et al. (eds). 525–580.

Konoshenko, M. B. 2009: Differencirovannoe markirovanie objekta v kalmyckom jazyke. – Say et al. (eds). 42–75.

Krapivina, K. A. 2009: Prichastie v roli skazuemogo otnositel'nogo oborota v kalmyckom jazyke. – Say et al. (eds). 497–524.

Kulikov, Leonid 2001: Causatives. – Martin Haspelmath & Ekkerhard König & Wulf Oesterreicher & Woldgang Raible (eds), *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook. Vol. 2*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 886–989.

Kuz'menkov, E. A. 1984: *Glagol v mongol'skom jazyke*. Leningrad: LGU.

Lazard, Gilbert 2001: Le marquage différentiel de l'objet. – Martin Haspelmath & Ekkehard König & Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds), *Language typology and language universals. An international handbook. Vol. 1*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 873–885.

Ljutikova, E. A. & S. G. Tatevosov & M. Yu. Ivanov & A. G. Pazel'skaja & A. B. Shluin-skij 2006: *Struktura sobytija i semantika glagola v karachaevo-balkarskom jazyke*. Moskva: IMLI RAN.

Nedjalkov, I. V. 1967: Intranzitivy i tranzitivy v kalmyckom jazyke (morfologija, sintaksis, semantika). – *Uchënye zapiski Samarkandskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Novaja serija* 314: 37–54.

Nedyalkov, I. V. 1991: Recessive-accessive polysemy of verbal suffixes. – *Languages of the world* 1: 4–31.

Nedjalkov, V. P. & Sil'nickij, G. G. 1969a: Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. – A. A. Xolodovich (ed.), *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. Morfologicheskij kauzativ*. Leningrad: Nauka. 5–19.

Nedjalkov, V. P. & Sil'nickij, G. G. 1969b: Tipologija morfologicheskogo i leksicheskogo kauzativov. – A. A. Xolodovich (ed.), *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. Morfologicheskij kauzativ*. Leningrad: Nauka. 20–50.

Ochirov, U. U. 1964. *Grammatika kalmyckogo jazyka. Sintaksis*. Elista: Kalmgosizdat.

Pjurbeev, G. C. 2005: O sintaksicheskix osobennostjax "Mongol'skogo slovarja Mukaddimatal-Adab". – *K 100-letiju so dnja rozhdenija T. A. Bertagaeva. Sbornik statej*. Elista: KIGI RAN. 165–169.

Pylkkänen, Liina 2002: *Introducing arguments*. PhD dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Sanzheev, G. D. (ed.) 1963: *Sravnitel'naja grammatika mongol'skix jazykov. Glagol*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoj literatury.

Sanzheev, G. D. (ed.) 1983: *Grammatika kalmyckogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Elista: Kalmyckoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.

Say, S. S. 2009: Argumentnaja struktura kalmyckix kauzativnyx konstrukcij. – Say et al. (eds), 387–464.

Say, S. S. & V. V. Baranova & N. V. Serdobol'skaja (eds). 2009: *Issledovanija po grammatike kalmyckogo jazyka*. Acta linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy instituta lingvisticheskix issledovanij RAN, Vol. V, Part 2. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka. Also available online at <http://iling.spb.ru/pdf/alp/alp_V_2.pdf>. (Retrieved on July 31, 2013.)

Serdobol'skaja, N. V. 2009. Akkuzativ subjekta v zavisimoj predikacii: za i protiv pod"ëma argumenta v kalmyckom jazyke. – Say et al. (eds). 581–621.

Shibatani, Masayoshi 1976: The grammar of causative constructons: a conspectus. – Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causative constructions*. New York: Academic Press. 1–40.

Shibatani, Masayoshi & Prashant Pardeshi 2002: The causative continuum. – Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.). *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 85–126.

Vydrina, A. V. 2009: Upotreblenie pokazatelja passiva v kalmyckom jazyke. – Say et al. (eds). 347–386.

Xarchevnikova, R. P. 2002: Kategorija zaloga: struktura zalogovyx konstrukcij v sovremennom kalmyckom jazyke. – E. R. Tenishev (ed.), *Voprosy teoreticheskoj grammatiki kalmyckogo jazyka*. Elista: KGU. 70–89.