



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Remarks on double causatives in Tuvan and other Turkic languages

Kulikov, L.I.

Citation

Kulikov, L. I. (1999). Remarks on double causatives in Tuvan and other Turkic languages. *Journal De La Société Finno-Ougrienne*, 88, 49-58. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16506>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16506>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

SUOMALAIS-UGRILAISEN SEURAN

AIKAKAUSKIRJA

JOURNAL

DE LA SOCIÉTÉ FINNO-UGRIENNE

88

SUOMALAIS-UGRILAINEN SEURA

HELSINKI 1999

Leonid KULIKOV (Leiden)

Remarks on double causatives in Tuvan and other Turkic languages*

Paper presented at the 41st Annual Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference at Majvik, July 1998

1. Introductory remarks

The causative is one of the few derivational categories which can iterate in many languages, applying more than once to one verb. Correspondingly, causative morphemes can be added to a verbal base two or more times. This is also the case in Turkic languages.¹

In fact, there are no quantitative constraints on iteration of causative suffixes in most Turkic languages. Of course, this is not to say that verbs can occur in speech or text with chains of causative markers of any length (*-tIr-t-tIr-t-...*); even triple causatives (i.e. verbs with three causative suffixes) are quite rare. However, unlike languages where the maximum number of causative morphemes (1, 2, 3) is prescribed by morphological rules,² in Turkic languages it is impossible to determine the **maximum** number N (e.g. 4), such that verbs with N causative suffixes are still acceptable to speakers, while those with N+1 (e.g. 5) suffixes are not. We can only state that the more suffixes a verb takes, the more rarely it occurs. It is in this sense that Turkic languages can be said to allow unrestricted iteration of causative morphemes, and for that reason they are of special interest for verifying our *a priori* assumptions on how two (nearly) identical meanings can combine with each other.

In particular, Turkic data provides us with rich evidence for how the meanings of verbs with two (or more) causative suffixes correspond to their form. By examining such verbs, we can easily clarify whether this is one-to-one correspondence (in other words, whether it is **iconic**)³ or whether in some cases the meaning of the double causative shows some idiomatic changes, for instance, two causative suffixes correspond to just one causative meaning and mean the same as the first (simple) causative.

2. Standard and non-standard semantics of double causatives

To begin with, let me discuss a few typical examples of double causatives from a Siberian Turkic language, Tuvan.

As in most other Turkic languages, double causatives typically refer to double causative chains ('X CAUSES Y + Y CAUSES Z to do smth. '), as in (1):

- (1) Tuvan (Isxakov & Pal'mbax 1961: 278f.)
kör- 'to see' — *kör-güs-* 'to show' = 'to make [someone] see' —
kör-güs-tür- 'to make show' = 'to cause [someone] to make
[someone] see'.

However, some double causatives can also be employed without double causative meaning. Instead, they show several specific modifications of the simple causative meaning, as in (2b) and (3b-c):

- (2) a. *ašak ijaš-ti sijil-đir-gan*
old.man tree-ACC break-CAUS-PAST
'The old man caused [someone] to break the tree.'
- b. *ašak ijaš-ti sijil-đir-t-kan*
old.man tree-ACC break-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
'The old man caused [someone] to break the tree [by force].'
- (3) a. *ašak Bajir-ga inek-ti dile-t-ken*
old.man Bajir-DAT cow-ACC look.for-CAUS-PAST
'The old man caused Bajir to look for the cow [one time].'
- b. *ašak Bajir-ga inek-ti dile-t-tir-gen*
old.man Bajir-DAT cow-ACC look.for-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
'The old man caused Bajir to look for the cow [several times].'
- c. *ašak Bajir-ga inek-ti dile-t-tir-t-ken*
old.man Bajir-DAT cow-ACC look.for-CAUS-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
'The old man caused Bajir to look for the cow [many times].'

While Turkish double causatives are dealt with in a number of studies (cf., for instance, Erdal 1991: 827ff. for Old Turkic evidence), a systematic description of this phenomenon in the Turkic languages from a typological perspective does not exist yet.⁴ The present paper is a preliminary sketch of double causatives in Tuvan and other Turkic languages.

3. Semantic types of double causatives

3.1. (Standard) double causative: 'CAUSE' + 'CAUSE'. In the most common and simple case, the semantic iteration of the meaning 'CAUSE' and the morphological reduplication of the causative suffix iconically match each other, that is, double causatives refer to double causative chains, as in (1). Examples of this type can be found in any Turkic language and do not require special discussion. Cf.:

- (4) Uzbek (Kononov 1960: 196)
keč- 'to ford' — *keč-ir-* 'to make ford' — *keč-ir-tir-* 'to cause to make ford'.
- (5) Chuvash (Kornilov & Xolodovič & Xrakovskij 1969: 247f.)
 a. *jux-* 'to flow' — *jux-tar-* 'to pour' — *jux-tar-tar-* 'to ask to pour';
 b. *av-* 'to bend (tr.)' — *av-tar-* 'to let bend (tr.)' — *av-tar-tar-* 'to ask to let bend';
 c. *xir-* 'to shave' — *xir-tar-* 'to ask to shave' — *xir-tar-tar-* 'to cause to ask to shave'.
- (6) Yakut (Xaritonov 1963: 71)
 a. *öl-* 'to die' — *öl-ör-* 'to kill' — *öl-ör-tör-* 'to make kill';
 b. *orguj-* 'to boil' (intr.) — *orgu-t-* 'to boil' (tr.) — *orgu-t-tar-* 'to make boil' (tr.);
 c. *umaj-* 'to burn' (intr.) — *uma-t-* 'to burn' (tr.) — *uma-t-tar-* 'to make burn' (tr.).
- (7) Bashkir (Juldašev 1958: 93)
 a. *bötö-* 'to finish' (intr.) — *bötö-r-* 'to finish' (tr.) — *bötö-r-t-* 'to cause to finish';
 b. *siyi-* 'to go out' — *siy-ar-* 'to take, lead out' — *siy-ar-t-* 'to cause to take out'.
- (8) Gagauz (Pokrovskaja 1964: 176)
ič- 'to drink' — *ič-ir-* 'to give to drink, to water' — *ič-ir-t-* 'to cause to give to drink; to cause to water'.

3.2. Intensive causative: 'CAUSE⁺'. Less frequent are cases of double causatives with intensive or iterative meaning, exemplified by Tuvan sentences (2b), (3b-c). Similar examples can also be found in other Turkic languages, cf.:

(9) Turkish (Zimmer 1976: 411f.)

Müdür-e mektub-u aç-tir-t-ti-m

director-DAT letter-ACC open-CAUS-CAUS-PAST-1SG

'I had someone make the director open the letter.' (standard double causative) or

'I made the director open the letter [forcefully] (perhaps against his wish).' (intensive causative).

(10) Azerbaijani (Sevortjan 1962: 525)

ajj- 'to turn sour' (said of dough) — *ajj-t-* 'to make sour' — *ajj-t-dir-*
'to make exceedingly sour'.

Although in such cases the 'meaning ↔ form' relation is less straightforward than for standard double causatives, the intensive/iterative function of the second causative marker can also be accounted for in terms of iconicity. Unlike standard double causatives, intensive and iterative causatives refer to causative chains consisting of only one member: 'X CAUSES Y'. However, the act of causation is repeated ('X CAUSES Y' + 'X CAUSES Y' etc. several times), or the causation is brought about with special effort. In other words, the more times a causative morpheme applies, the more intensive causation it renders or the more times the act of causation is repeated. Thus, both standard double causatives and intensive/iterative causatives with two causative affixes are perfectly iconic.

Reduplication of the causative suffix can refer to the intensivity of an action also in cases where causative verbs function as passives, as in some Altaic languages of Siberia (Tuvan, Yakut, Mongolian, Manchu, etc.), cf. the following Tuvan examples:

(11) a. *kuš tut-tur-gan*

bird catch-CAUS-PAST

'The bird let catch it.' or 'The bird was caught [easily].'

b. *kuš tut-tur-t-kan*

bird catch-CAUS-CAUS-PAST

'The bird was caught [with great efforts].'

- (12) a. *inek ün-dür-t-ken*
 cow go.out-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
 ‘The cow was led out.’
- b. *inek ün-dür-t-tür-ken*
 cow go.out-CAUS-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
 ‘The cow was led out [by force].’

Note also that a passive interpretation is more likely for double and triple causatives (11b), (12b) than for causatives of lower degree (11a), (12a). The reason is simple: double causation chains would be very unnatural in such situations (??‘The bird made [someone] let catch it’, etc.).

Theoretically, yet another entity which might undergo iteration is the number of causers. Double causatives referring to the plural subject of causation are found, for instance, in Tajik (Iranian), as in (13):

- (13) a. *Ali vazifaro fahmid*
 Ali problem:ACC understood
 ‘Ali understood the problem.’
- b. *mujsafed ba Ali vazifaro fahm-on-d*
 old.man to Ali problem:ACC understood:CAUS
 ‘The old man explained the problem to Ali.’
- c. *mualimon ba Ali vazifaro fahm-on-on-dand*
 teachers:PL to Ali problem:ACC understood:CAUS:CAUS
 ‘The teachers explained the problem to Ali.’

I have been unable to find mentions of similar phenomena in any Turkic language, but it cannot be ruled out that a detailed study of double causative in Turkic languages (for instance, near the area where Tajik is spoken) will reveal evidence for such “plural causatives”.

3.3. Complex causative: ‘CAUSE₂’. Less iconic is the ‘meaning ↔ form’ relation in the case of double causatives referring to indirect (distant) causation, as in (14):

- (14) Nogai (Kalmykova & Sarueva 1973: 213ff.)
iš- ‘to drink’ — *iš-ir-* ‘to give to drink; to water’ (for instance, an animal or a small child)⁵ — *iš-ir-t-* ‘to cause to drink’ (for instance, by asking to do so).⁶

Both direct and indirect causation are two variants of essentially the same type of event, both representing a causative situation. Given the assumption that distant causation is more complex than contact causation, the second causative suffix can be taken as referring to a more complex causation process.

Another interesting type of semantic opposition between first and second causatives is exemplified by Nogai causatives (15–16):

Nogai (Kalmykova & Sarueva 1973: 213ff.)

- (15) *kon-* ‘to stay for the night’ — *kon-dir-* ‘to let stay for the night’ (a permission) — *kon-dir-t-* ‘to cause, to order to stay for the night’ (an order);
- (16) *ojna-* ‘to play’ — *ojna-t-* ‘to amuse [a child], to play [with a child]’ (comitative-causative meaning) — *ojna-t-tir-* ‘to let/allow to play’ (permissive-causative meaning).

While in (14) the semantic difference between simple and double causatives is that between contact and distant causation, oppositions like (15–16) are less regular. The general feature shared by all three causative pairs (14–16) can be tentatively formulated as follows: the double causative (with two causative suffixes) refers to standard (simple) causation, while the simple causatives show several idiomatic meanings and refer to more natural and typical activities or processes than do the standard causatives: ‘play with’ is a more common and frequent situation than standard causative ‘allow to play’; permission to stay for the night is something more natural and frequent than an order to stay for the night, and so on.

Thus, forms with two causative suffixes provide an easy facility to refer to the original (‘standard’) causative meaning in cases where simple causatives (with one causative suffix) lexicalize, as, for instance, in Azerbaijani:

- (17) Azerbaijani (Sevortjan 1962: 527)
bənzə- ‘to be alike, similar to’ — *bənzə-t-* ‘to make alike, similar to’,
 but also ‘to (mis)take for [smb./smth. else]’.

I should mention one more type of morphological opposition between two causatives, quite common in Turkic languages, which is relevant for my discussion, although, strictly speaking, it goes beyond the scope of the present paper. Some verbal roots can take both productive and non-productive (historically, older) causative suffixes, whereby the latter denote a more common type of causation (for instance, contact causation), as in the Nogai examples

above, or idiosyncratically lexicalize. Here again the productive causative may serve to “renew” the prototypical causative meaning lost by the non-productive older causative. Cf.:

- (18) Uzbek (Kononov 1960: 180)
kös- ‘to roam (to another place)’ — *köz-ir-* ‘to transport (to another place)’ / *kös-tir-* ‘to cause to roam (to another place)’ (for instance, by asking to do so).

For examples of lexicalized older causatives in Old Turkic, see Erdal 1991: 833f., cf.:

- (19) Old Turkic (Erdal 1991: 758, 811, 834)
tut- ‘to hold, grasp, keep’ — *tut-uz-* ‘to entrust something to someone; to instruct’ / *tut-dur-* ‘to make hold, keep’.

3.4. Sesqui-causative: ‘CAUSE’. The final semantic type of second causatives is the most idiomatic. In many Turkic languages, there are verbs with two causative morphemes referring, contrary to their form, to a simple causation. In examples (20–25) double causatives have the meaning which one might expect for the corresponding first causatives:

- (20) Turkish (Lewis 1967: 146)
 a. *de-* ‘to say’ — *de-dir-* ‘to make say’ — *de-dir-t-* id.;
 b. *kon-* ‘to settle’ — *kon-dur-* ‘to make settle’ — *kon-dur-t-* id.
- (21) Azerbaijani (Sevortjan 1962: 513)
 a. *šiš-* ‘to swell (intr.)’ — *šiš-ir-* / *šiš-ir-t-* ‘to swell (tr.)’;
 b. *döj-* ‘to hit’ — *döj-dür-* / *döj-dür-t-* ‘to make hit’;
 c. *ič-* ‘to drink’ — *ič-ir-t-* ‘to give to drink’.⁷
- (22) Chuvash (Kornilov & Xolodovič & Xrakovskij 1969: 243)
 a. *šěle-* ‘to sew’ — *šěle-t-ter-* / (*šěle-t-*) ‘to let sew’;
 b. *šüre-* ‘to go’ — *šüre-t-ter-* / (*šüre-t-*) ‘to let go, lead’.
- (23) Khalaj (Doerfer 1988: 120f.)
 a. *toqu-* ‘to hit’ — *toqu-t-* / *toqu-t-tur-* ‘to make hit’;
 b. *uč-* ‘to fly’ — *uč-ur-tur-* ‘to make fly’.

- (24) Tofa (Rassadin 1978: 142)
 a. *iš-* ‘to drink’ — *iš-ir-t-* ‘to give to drink’;
 b. *či-* ‘to eat’ — *či-dir-t-* ‘to feed, to give to eat’.
- (25) Karaim (Musaev 1964: 251f.)
ak- ‘to flow’ — *aγ-iz-dir-* ‘to cause to flow’.

In such cases the corresponding first causative (i.e. the verb with one causative suffix) either means the same as the ‘double causative’ (as in (20, 21a-b, 23a)) or is ousted by the double causative, being more archaic or outright out of use, so that its function is taken over by the corresponding ‘double causative’. Note also that in such cases the first causative suffix is often non-productive (e.g. *-iz-* in Karaim example (25)), whereas the second suffix is always productive and therefore functions as some kind of morphological support for the first, morphologically less regular, suffix. Since in such cases two suffixes render one meaning ‘CAUSE’, one might label this type ‘**sesqui-causative**’.

4. Iconicity in double causatives

The four semantic types of double causatives discussed above can be arranged according to how iconically their semantics corresponds to their form (two suffixes). The hierarchy below ranks these types from the most iconic, standard double causative to the least iconic, sesqui-causative:

I C O N I C I T Y			
max			min
←			
‘CAUSE + CAUSE’	‘CAUSE, CAUSE, ...’	CAUSE	CAUSE
Standard double caus.	Intensive caus.	Indirect caus.	Sesqui-caus.

The fact that most languages have double causatives with non-standard semantics alongside their standard counterparts clearly demonstrates that the doubling up of a single meaning is semantically quite unstable. Originally, all these semantic subtypes may go back to standard double causatives (‘X CAUSES Y’ + ‘Y CAUSES Z’, etc.), but double causative chains are quite a rare phenomenon in every-day life and under the influence of pragmatic parameters such verbs can undergo idiomatic semantic changes, to express pragmatically more frequent situations or even to replace ‘first causatives’.

Notes

- * I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to the audience of the 41st PIAC, in particular, to Marcel Erdal and Jaakko Anhava, for critical remarks and valuable comments. I am also much indebted to Nick Nicholas for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper.
- 1 Cf. Lees (1973: 512) on Turkish causative: "it is the only 'voice' which may double up". See also Erdal 1996: 85f.
 - 2 As, for instance, in Hindi (and most of the other Indo-Aryan languages), which has causatives of first and second degree, in *-ā-* and *-vā-*, respectively, but in which causatives of the third degree are impossible.
 - 3 For iconicity of the 'meaning ↔ form' relation, see e.g. Haiman 1985.
 - 4 For a typological sketch of double and 'second' causatives in the languages of the world, see Kulikov 1993.
 - 5 Contact, or manipulative, causation.
 - 6 Distant, or directive, causation; cf. e.g. the 'curative' causatives ('ask someone to bring about something') in Finnish (Pennanen 1986).
 - 7 The first causative *ič-ir-* is out of use in modern Azerbaijani.

References

- Doerfer, Gerhard 1988. *Grammatik des Chaladsch*. Turkologica 4; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Erdal, Marcel 1991. *Old Turkic word formation: A functional approach to the lexicon II*. Turkologica 7; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- 1996. On applying 'causative' to 'passive', mainly in Turkish. — Berta, Á. et al. (eds.). *Symbolae Turcologicae: Festschrift for L. Johanson*. Transactions of the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul 6; Uppsala. 77–95.
- Haiman, John 1985. *Natural syntax: Iconicity and erosion*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 44; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Isxakov & Pal'mbah = Исхаков, Фазыл Г. & Пальмба, Александр А. 1961. *Грамматика тувинского языка: Фонетика и морфология*. Москва: Издательство восточной литературы.
- Juldašev = Юлдашев, А. А. 1958. *Система словообразования и спряжения глагола в башкирском языке*. Москва: Издательство Академии наук.
- Kalmykova & Sarueva = Калмыкова, С. А. & Саруева, М. Ф. 1973. *Грамматика ногайского языка. I: Фонетика и морфология*. Черкесск: Карачаево-Черкесское отделение Ставропольского книжного издательства.
- Копопов = Кононов, А. Н. 1960. *Грамматика современного узбекского литературного языка*. Москва & Ленинград: Издательство Академии наук.
- Kornilov & Holodovič & Xrakovskij = Корнилов, Г. Е. & Холодович, А. А. & Храковский, В. С. 1969. Каузативы и антикаузативы в чувашском языке. — Холодович, Александр А. (ред.). *Типология каузативных конструкций: Морфологический каузатив*. Ленинград: Наука. 238–259.

- Kulikov, Leonid I. 1993. The "second causative": A typological sketch. — Comrie, Bernard & Polinsky, Maria (eds.). *Causatives and transitivity*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins. 121–154.
- Lees, Robert B. 1973. Turkish voice. — Kachru, Braj B. et al. (eds.). *Issues in linguistics: Papers in honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 504–514.
- Lewis, Geoffrey L. 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Musaev = Мусаев, Кенесбай М. 1964. *Грамматика караимского языка: Фонетика и морфология*. Москва: Наука.
- Pennanen, Esko V. 1986. On the so-called curative verbs in Finnish. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 47 (2–3): 163–182.
- Pokrovskaja = Покровская, Людмила А. 1964. *Грамматика гагаузского языка: Фонетика и морфология*. Москва: Наука.
- Rassadin = Рассадин, Валентин И. 1978. *Морфология тофаларского языка в сравнительном освещении*. Москва: Наука.
- Sevortjan = Севортян, Эрванд В. 1962. *Аффиксы глаголообразования в азербайджанском языке: Опыт сравнительного исследования*. Москва: Наука.
- Харитонов = Харитонов, Лука Н. 1963. *Залоговые формы глагола в якутском языке*. Москва & Ленинград: Издательство Академии наук.
- Zimmer, Karl 1976. Some constraints on Turkish causativization. — Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.). *The grammar of causative constructions*. Syntax and semantics 6; New York: Academic Press. 399–412.

Leonid Kulikov <KULIKOV@pmail.LeidenUniv.nl>
Vakgroep Vergelijkende Taalwetenschappen
Faculteit der Letteren
Rijksuniversiteit Leiden
Postbus 9515
2300 RA Leiden
The Netherlands