Lexical Causatives in Korean

Keedong Lee
(Konkuk University)

O. Quite a few studies have already been made on causativization in Korean. But most of the studies are concerned with relating periphrastic causatives with lexical ones, pointing out their similarities and postulating a common deep structure. Consequently the differences between the lexical causatives and their simple noncausative counterpart are hardly touched upon. Herein lies a small justification for the existence of the present paper. The purpose of this paper is twofold: one is to show the differences between lexical causatives and their simple noncausative counterparts in terms of caseframe features, and another is to show that Korean lexical causatives are not so simple as Shibatani pictures.

Shibatani (1973: 283) made the following observation with regard to Korean causativization: "the periphrastic causative often involves action on the part of the 'causee' (i.e. the patient that undergoes the change in the causative situation) while this is not generally the case with the lexical causative." To illustrate, in sentence (la) the periphrastic causative construction is used and the actant *ai-eke* is the causee who puts on clothes. In sentence (1b) the lexical causative verb is used and the actant *ai-eke* does not put on clothes.

(1) a. ki-nin ai-eke os -il ip-ke haessta.
he-TM child-to clothes-OM clothe- cause
'He caused (or made) the child to put on the clothes.'

b. ki-nin ai- eke os -il ip-hi-ass-ta.
he-TM child-DM clothes-OM clothe-CS-past-DS 'He put the clothes on the child.'

Note: TM=Topic Marker, DM=Dative Marker, OM=Object marker,
CS=Causative Suffix, DS=Declarative Sentence Marker.

Shibatani's observation is correct as far as the given data are concerned. However, there is another type of lexical causatives in which the causee actually carries out a certain action, which we will see immediately below in sections I and II.

Through the process of causativization, another actant is added to the transitive verb caseframe. Suppose a transitive verb has the following caseframe, (+XY___), its corresponding causative verb will have the following caseframe, (+WXY___). W is a new actant which results from the splitting of either X or Y. There are at least two different patterns of causative verbs in terms of relations between the newly added actant

and the original actants of the transitive verbs. In what follows, we will observe the two patterns one after another.

I. PATTERN 1

The causative verb *ip-hi-* 'to put something on (somebody else)' is derived from the transitive verb *ip-* 'to put something on (oneself).' In (2a) the transitive verb *ip-* is used and in (2b) its causative counterpart is used.

(2) a. Na- nin setha- lil ip- ass- ta.
I-TM sweater-OM clothe-past-DS 'I put on a sweater.'
b. Na-nin ki- eke setha- lil ip-hi- ass- ta.
I-TM him-DM sweater-OM clothe CS-past-DS 'I put a sweater on him.'

In (2a) the one who put on the sweater is *na* 'I' and the one on whom the sweater is put is also *na* although it cannot be explicitly expressed in the sentence. On the other hand, in (2b) the one who put on the sweater is *na* 'I' but the one on whom the sweater is put is *ki* 'him.'

When the Pattern 1 causative verbs are used, the one who does an action and the one who is affected by the action must not be identical in reference. On the other hand, when the corresponding transitive verbs are used, the one who does an action and the one who is affected by the action must be identical in reference. Sentences in (3) are all ungrammatical. Sentence (3a) below in which a simple transitive verb is used is ungrammatical because the object of washing is not identical in reference with the doer of washing. On the other hand, sentence (3b) in which a causative verb is used is ungrammatical because the object of washing is identical with the doer in reference.

(3) a. *Na-nin con- ii məli-lil kam- ass- ta.
I-TM John- of hair-OM wash- past- DS 'I washed John's hair.'
b. *Na-nin na-ii məli-lil kam- ki-ass-ta.
I-TM I of hair-OM wash- CS- past-DS 'I washed my hair.'

On the basis of the observation we have made above, the difference between the transitive verbs and their corresponding causative verbs will be captured in terms of their difference in caseframes. In representing caseframes, Starosta's lexicase model will be used. In his model, both the surface case marker and the underlying case relation of each actant are marked in the surface structure as features of lexical items. Surface case markers are represented by two capital letters such as NM for nominative, AC for accusative and DM for dative marker. Underlying case relations are marked by three capital letters such as AGT, OBJ or INS. For example, the case features (+NM, + DAT) meant that its surface case is Nominative but the underlying case relation is Dative (Fillmore 1968). The case features (+DM, +AGT) means that the surface case is Dative but the underlying case relation is Agentive.

Now returning to the caseframe of the transitive verbs such as *ip-* 'to clothe' and

kam- 'to wash (hair),' conceptually the caseframe of these verbs can be generalized in the following way.

(4) $\begin{bmatrix} +\,V \\ + \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +NM \\ +AGT \\ @ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +DM \\ +DAT \\ @ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +AC \\ +OBJ \end{bmatrix} \_\_\_$

The symbol @ indicates that AGT and DAT case relations are identical in reference. However, the DAT case relation never shows up overtly. The following sentence in which the DAT case appears is clumsy at best.

(5) ?Na-nin na-eke məli-lil kam-ass-ta.
I-TM I-DM hair-OM wash-past-DS

The underlying AGT and DAT cases seem to have merged into one. The following caseframe is formulated to capture this generalization.

(5) $\begin{bmatrix} +\,V \\ + \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +NM \\ +AGT=DAT \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +AC \\ +OBJ \end{bmatrix} \_\_\_$

The equal sign between AGT and DAT is used to imply that the nominative actant is a complex one incorporating DAT in AGT case relation. The caseframe (5) may help to predict that verbs that can have the caseframe (5) may not have overt DAT case and that verbs that can have overt DAT case cannot undergo causativization. Verbs such as *cu-* 'to give' or *tili-* 'to present' which the nominative of cannot incorporate the DAT cannot undergo causativization.

The caseframe of the causative verbs derived from transitive verbs with caseframe (5) will have the following caseframe.

(6) $\begin{bmatrix} +\,V \\ + \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +NM \\ +AGT \\ +@ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +DM \\ +DAT \\ -@ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +AC \\ +OBJ \end{bmatrix} \_\_\_$

The symbols$\pm$@ are used to indicate that the AGT case and the DAT case are not identical in reference.

The two caseframes presented above are exemplified in the following sentences.

(7) Na-nin os- il ip- ass- ta.
I TM clothes-OM clothe past- DS

$\begin{bmatrix} +NM \\ +AGT= \\ DAT \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +AC \\ +OBJ \end{bmatrix}$

(8) Na-nin ki-eke os- il ip- -hi- ass- ta.
I-TM he-DM clothes-OM clothe-CS- past- DS

$\begin{bmatrix} +NM \\ +AGT \\ +@ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +DM \\ +DAT \\ -@ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} +AC \\ +OBJ \end{bmatrix}$

The transitive verbs listed below have the caseframe (5) and their corresponding causative verbs have the caseframe (6).

(9)

Transitive verbs		Causative verbs	
pəs-	'to take off'	pəs-ki-	'to take off'
sin-	'to wear (shoes)'	sin-ki-	'to put on (shoes)'
ssi-	'to cover'	ssi-iu-	'to cover'
ci-	'to burden'	ci-u-	'to burden'
kam-	'to wrap'	kam-ki-	'to wrap'
chi-	'to tie (garters)'	chi-i-	'to tie (garters)'
me-	'to place on the shoulders'	me-u-	'to place on the shoulders'
ssis-	'to wash'	ssis-ki-	'to wash'
kam-	'to wash (hair)'	kam-ki-	'to wash (hair)'
pis-	'to comb'	pis-ki-	'to comb'
kulm-	'to starve'	kulm-ki-	'to starve'
math-	'to take charge of'	math-ki-	'to put in charge of'
mək-	'to eat'	mək-i-	'to feed'

The list above is not an exhaustive one and some of the verbs listed above such as *ssis-* 'to wash' and *kam-* 'to wrap' can be used in the sense of Pattern 2, which will be discussed in section III.

II. PATTERN 2

The causative verb of the transitive verb *ssi-* 'to write' is *ssi-iu-* 'to make one write.' In (10) the transitive verb *ssi-* 'to write' is used and in (11) its causative counterpart *ssi-iu-* is used.

(10) ki- ka phyənci- lil ssi- ass- ta.
he- SM letter- OM write-past- DS
'He wrote (a) letter.'

(11) Nae- ka ki- eke phyənci- lil ssi-iu- ass- ta.
I SM he- DM letter- OM write-CS-past- DS
'I made him write the letter.'

In (10) the one who wrote the letter is *ki* 'he' (nominative) but in (11) the one who wrote the letter is not *nae* 'I' (nominative). The actual writing is done by *ki* 'he' in (11). The nominative *nae* in (11) only did something to bring about the writing of a letter.

The transitive verb *ssi-* 'to write' might have the caseframe (12) and its causative counterpart the caseframe (13)

(12) $\begin{bmatrix} +\text{V} \\ + \quad \begin{bmatrix}+\text{NM} \\ +\text{AGT}\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}+\text{AC} \\ +\text{OBJ}\end{bmatrix} \_\_ \end{bmatrix}$

(13) $\left[\begin{array}{l}+V \\ +\left[\begin{array}{l}+NM \\ +AGT \\ +Inst \\ -perf\end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{l}+DM \\ +AGT \\ -Ins \\ +perf\end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{l}+AC \\ +OBJ\end{array}\right] \_\_\_\end{array}\right]$

One of the basic assumptions of the case grammar is that there is only one occurrence of any deep case per sentence. Caseframe (13) above directly goes against that assumption. There seem to be several different approaches available. One is to proliferate deep cases: one can postulate another deep case, let us say, CAUSE besides the AGT case. Another approach might be deriving the lexical causatives from sentential sources. In this paper, both of them are avoided.

Instead, the following assumption is made. The deep cases are not atomic entities, but entities which can be analyzed into semantic primes. The AGT case, for example, can be further analyzed with the binary features (±inst(igator)) and (±perf(ormer)). With these features the AGT case can be classed into three different types: (+AGT, +Inst, +perf), (AGT, +Inst, −perf) and (+AGT, −Inst, +perf).

Now, returning to caseframe (13), the first AGT case is marked as (+Inst, −perf) and the second AGT as (−Inst, +per). The first one is an instigator but not a performer, of an action whereas the second one is a performer but not an instigator, of an action. The AGT case in (12) is both an instigator and a performer of an action, which might be an "unmarked" instance of the AGT case relation. The two caseframes (12-13) are exemplified in the following sentences.

(14) Nae- ka si- lil ilk- ass- ta.
I SM poem-OM read- past- DS

$\left[\begin{array}{l}+NM \\ +AGT\end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{l}+AC \\ +OBJ\end{array}\right]$

'I read a poem.'

(15) ki- ka na- eke si- lil ilk- hi- ass- ta.
he- SM I- DM poem-OM read- CS- past- DS

$\left[\begin{array}{l}+NM \\ +AGT \\ +Inst \\ -perf\end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{l}+DM \\ +AGT \\ -Inst \\ +perf\end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{l}+AC \\ +OBJ\end{array}\right]$

'He made me read a poem.'

The transitive verbs listed below have the caseframe (12) and their corresponding causative verbs have the caseframe (13)

(16)

Transitive verbs		Causative verbs	
pul-	'to blow'	pul-li-	'to have one blow'
ssi-	'to write'	ssi-iu-	'to have one write'
til-	'to hold'	til-li-	'to have one hold'
ttit-	'to tear'	ttit-ki-	'to have one tear'

ilk-	'to read'	ilk-hi-	'to have one read'
kal-	'to plough'	kal-li-	'to have one plough'
kam-	'to wind'	kam-ki-	'to have one wind'
nu-	'to urinate'	nu-i-	'to have one urinate'
ppal-	'to wash'	ppal-li-	'to have one wash'
phum-	'to brood'	phum-ki-	'to have one brood'
ttali-	'to follow'	ttal-li-	'to have one follow'
po-	'to look at'	po-i-	'to show'
ssis-	'to wash'	ssis-ki-	'to have one wash'

The list above is not an exhaustive one. There may be some more transitive verbs that have their corresponding causative verbs.

III. AMBIGUOUS CASES

In section I, it was pointed out that verbs such as *ssis-* 'to wash' and *kam-* 'to wind' can be used both in the sense of Pattern 1 and Pattern 2. In such an ambiguous case, the meaning seems to be determined primarily by the relationship between the DAT case and the OBJ case. When the OBJ case denotes a body part of the DAT case, the causative form is used in the sense of Pattern 1. Observe the following sentence.

(17) ki- nin con- eke son- il ssis- ki- ass- ta.
he- TM John- DM hand- OM wash- CS- past-DS
[+DAT] [+OBJ]
'He washed John's hand.'

In (17) the hand is a body part of John or it is interpreted as such and the causative verb is interpreted in the sense of Pattern 1.

When such a relationship does not hold between the DAT case and the OBJ case, the causative verb is used in the sense of Pattern 2. In (18) the OBJ case is not a body part of the DAT case and the meaning of the causative verb is that of Pattern 2.

(18) ki- nin con- eke ssal- il ssis- ki- ass- ta.
he- TM John-DM rice- OM wash- CS- past-DS
[+DAT] [+OBJ]
'He had John wash the rice.'

In the case of *kam-* 'to wind' or 'to wrap', when the OBJ case denotes something that human beings can wear for protection or decoration, the causative verb is used in the sense of Pattern 1. Otherwise, it is used in the sense of Pattern 2. Compare the following two sentences. In (19) *moktoli* 'muffler' stands for something that human beings can wear for protection or decoration. In (20) *sil* 'string' does not stand for something for protection or decoration. Consequently, the causative verb *kam-ki-* is interpreted in two distinct ways.

(19) ki- ka ai- eke moktoli- lil kam- ki- ass- ta.

he- SM child-DM muffler- OM wind- CS- past- DS
[+DAT] [+OBJ]
'He wound the muffler around (the neck of) the child.'

(20) ki- ka ai- eke sil- il kam- ki- ass- ta.
he- SM child-DM string-OM wind-CS- past- DS
[+DAT] [+OBJ]
'He had the child wind the string.'

In this section we have observed that some causative verbs can be interpreted in two different ways, depending upon the relationship between the OBJ case and the DAT case.

IV. COMPARISON BETWEEN PATTERN 1 AND PATTERN 2

In the preceding sections we have examined two different patterns of lexical causatives. In Pattern 1 (cf. caseframe 6), the actant which appears as Dative has DAT case relation to the verb and the actant which appears as Nominative has an AGT case relation to the verb. On the other hand, in Pattern 2 (cf. caseframe 13), the actant which appears as Dative has an AGT relation to the verb and the actant which appears as Nominative also has an AGT relation. But the two AGT relations are differentiated with the features (±instigator) and (±performer).

The difference between the two patterns comes out very clear when the following two interrogative sentences are used.

(21) nə- nin ki- eke muəs- il hae- cu- ass- ni?
you- TM he- DM what- OM do give-past- Q
'What did you do to (or for) him?'

(22) nə- nin ki-eke muəs-il sikhi- ass- ni?
you- TM he- DM what- OM force- past Q
'What did you force him to do?'

As an answer to sentence (21), sentences in (23) in which causative verbs of Pattern 1 are used can be used, but not those in (24) in which causative verbs of Pattern 2 are used.

(23) a. na- nin ai- eke sin- il sin- ki- ass- ta.
I- TM child- DM shoes-OM put- CS- past- DS
'I- put the shoes on the child ('s feet).'

b. na- nin ai- eke os- il pəs- ki- ass- ta.
I- TM child- DM clothes-OM take off-CS-past-DS
'I took the clothes off the child.'

(24) a. na- nin ai- eke chaek- il ilk- hi- ass- ta.
I- TM child-DM book- OM read- CS- past- DS
'I made the child read the book.'

b. na- nin ai- eke ppalle-lil ppal- li- ass- ta.
I- TM child-DM wash -OM wash- CS- past-DS
'I made the child wash the washes.'

On the other hand, sentences in (24) can be used as an answer to sentence (22), but those in (23) cannot.

V. To summarize, we have observed two patterns of causative verbs which are derived from transitive verbs. The two patterns are clearly distinct from each other and the distinction has been indicated in terms of different caseframes in sections I and II. In section IV the distinction has been shown in terms of different contexts in which they can be used.

Shibatani seems to have observed causative verbs belonging to Pattern 1 but not those belonging to Pattern 2.

REFERENCES

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. In Universals in Linguistic Theory. ed. by Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Lee, H. B. 1970. A Study of Korean Syntax: Performatives, Complementation, Negation and Causation. Seoul: Pan Korea Book Corp.

Park, B.S. 1972. A Study of the Korean Verb Phrase and Noun Phrase Complementation with Special Reference to the Verb *ha*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1973. Lexical versus periphrastic causatives in Korean. Journal of Linguistics. 9, 281-297.

Song, S. C. 1967. Some Transformational Rules in Korean. Ph. D. dissertation, Indiana University.

Starosta, Stanley. 1973. Causative verbs in Formosan languages. A paper presented at the First International Conference on Comparative Austoronesian Linguistics.

Yang, I. S. 1972. Korean Syntax: Case Markers. Delimiters, Complementation and Relativization. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.