Chapter 9
Causative morphology

9.1 Causative morphology: introduction

There are three different prefixes that can be classified in the general category of causatives in Tukang Besi, *hoko*-, *pa*-, and *hepe*-. All of them have slightly different meanings and applications, and they are labelled here FACTITIVE, CAUSATIVE and REQUESTIVE, for ease of discussion.

The factitive prefix *hoko*- has the most limited distribution in that it can only occur with non-dynamic intransitive verbs, and derives a transitive verb.

The more general causative *pa*- can occur on almost any verb base, transitive or intransitive, and adds a causer argument. The only restriction on its occurrence is that the causee of a construction based on a transitive verb must be an [Agent], and not a [Dative] or [Instrument] semantic role. As will be explained, speakers of the Wanci dialect of Tukang Besi, which is the main variety investigated, show different interpretations of the argument structure of the derived verb, depending on their sub-dialectal backgrounds. Speakers of the Wanse-Rupu dialect require the causee to be the object of the derived verb form, but speakers of Lia-Mandati dialect take this argument to be an oblique argument if the underived verb is transitive, and the original object of the underived verb stays as the object of the construction.

Finally, the requestive *hepe*- occurs with active verbs, transitive or intransitive, to indicate that the causer requests someone to carry out an action for the causer’s benefit. Although this is rather different from the other two causative prefixes, it is subject to the same restrictions on the semantic role of a causee as *pa*-.

Some of the semantic and distributional differences between these three causatives are shown in table 14, showing three semantic variables: degree of physical effort required, permanency of resulting effect, and transitivity of the input verb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effort (causer’s)</th>
<th>Permanency</th>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hoko</em>-</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>←---→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pa</em>-</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>←---------------------</td>
<td>←--------→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hepe</em>-</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>←---------------------</td>
<td>←--------→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, another (and different) method of producing a causative reading on many non-Active verbs of the ambitransitive class (see chapter 4) is to simply use object suffixes on an otherwise intransitive verb. In terms of the categories used in the table above, this
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means of causation involves a medium to high degree of effort to achieve a medium level of permanency, and applies only to certain dynamic and non-dynamic non-active intransitive verbs.

An example showing the differences in grammaticality produced by the effort parameter can be seen in (1a) and (1b):

(1) a. Te riirii monda i-sumbele t[um]inti iso no-pa-mate-'e te kene-su.
    CORE duck already OP-decapitate run.SI yon 3R-CAUS-dead-3OBJ CORE friend-1SG.POSS
    ‘The duck that was already running around with its head cut off was killed by my friend.’

    CORE duck already OP-decapitate run.SI yon 3R-FACT-dead-3OBJ CORE friend-1SG.POSS

Whilst the first of the sentences is acceptable, and highly revealing of Tukang Besi attitudes towards death, the second is not. The only effort needed to ‘kill’ a duck which has had its head cut off is to knock it over and stop it running around any more, which is not a major enough physical effort to ‘count’ as part of hokomate, unless the duck had already run off into the scrub and so entails a serious search and effort to track down. The permanency difference is seen in the following different results:

(2) a. No-pa-mate-'e na kene-su mohoo iso.
    3R-CAUS-dead-3OBJ NOM friend-1SG.POSS sick yon
    ‘He killed my sick friend.’
    (not permanently, since a shaman will ‘kill’ a person in order to drive out an intruding spirit, and then resurrect the dead body; the friend is expected to be alive now)

b. No-hoko-mate-'e na kene-su mohoo iso.
    3R-FACT-dead-3OBJ NOM friend-1SG.POSS sick yon
    ‘He killed my sick friend.’
    (permanently, and is now guilty of murder; the friend needs burying)

The difference between causation on an ambitransitive verb using object suffixes, or using a causative prefix can be seen in (3a) and (3b):

(3) a. No-hesowui-'e na ana-no.
    3R-wash-3OBJ NOM child-3POSS
    ‘She washed her children.’
    (physically took the children and washed them herself)

b. No-pa-hesowui-'e na ana-no.
    3R-CAUS-wash-3OBJ NOM child-3POSS
    ‘She got her children washed.’
    (arranged for the children to be washed, either told them to do it themselves, had someone wash them, or did it herself)
One point that all the causative constructions share is that the causer is an argument whose semantic role is [Agent]. The addition of the comitative applicative suffix -ngkene (see 10.2), only possible on verbs with [Agent] roles, is possible with all causative constructions, as seen in (4a) - (4c):

(4) a. No-hoko-leama-ngkene te ikaka-su
3R-FACT-good-COM CORE elder.sibling-1SG.POSS
‘They improved it with my elder brother.’
(it is now perfect, and can be expected to remain in that state)

b. No-pa-leama-ngkene te ikaka-su.
3R-CAUS-good-COM CORE elder.sibling-1SG.POSS
‘They fixed it up with my elder brother.’
(it’s better, but not perfect, and maybe only a temporary job)

c. No-hepe-leama-ngkene te ikaka-su.
3R-REQ-good-COM CORE elder.sibling-1SG.POSS
‘They with my elder brother asked for it to be improved.’

The causee of any of these constructions can be shown to be a Theme/Patient role, as tested by the ability to display possessor ascension (see chapter 7), shown for the different causative prefixes by (4d) - (4f):

(4) d. No-hoko-mobela-aku na bahu-su.
3R-FACT-wound-1SG.OBJ NOM shoulder-1SG.POSS
‘He hurt my shoulder.’
(it’s seriously damaged)

e. No-pa-mobela-aku na bahu-su.
3R-CAUS-wound-1SG.OBJ NOM shoulder-1SG.POSS
‘He hurt my shoulder.’
(it’s not too bad)

f. No-hepe-mobela-aku na bahu-su.
3R-REQ-wound-1SG.OBJ NOM shoulder-1SG.POSS
‘They asked for my shoulder to be hurt.’

Examples of the syntactic restrictions that apply to the different prefixes are dealt with individually in the following sections. In the discussion that follows, I shall follow van den Berg (1989: 200) in using the terms ‘causer’, ‘causee’ and ‘causand’ to refer to the (maximal) three semantically distinct arguments of the derived causative verb. The ‘causer’ is the additional agentive argument added to the clause that becomes the [A] of the combined causative predicate. The ‘causee’ is the subject of the basic predicate, whether that predicate is transitive or intransitive, and the ‘causand’ is the argument that was the object of a transitive predicate before the causative predicate is added (and so necessarily not occurring with derivations involving hoko-, or using an intransitive verbs as the base). To illustrate these terms in English, in the sentence ‘Anna made Basil drink the coffee’, Anna is serving as the causer, Basil is the causee and the coffee is the causand. The basic
sentence from which this causative construction is derived is ‘Basil drank the coffee.’ This sentence is illustrated in the following models, which will be used in the rest of this chapter to illustrate the derivational processes that are found with the different affixes.

Clausal constituents:

\[ \emptyset \quad [Basil \quad \text{drink+tense} \quad \text{the coffee}]_{\text{Base Predicate}} \]

\[ \downarrow \]

\[ [\text{Anna made} \quad [Basil]_{\text{Causative Predicate}} \quad \text{drink} \quad \text{the coffee}]_{\text{Base Predicate}} \]

\[ \]_{\text{Combined Predicate}}

Argument structure:

‘cause \langle [\text{Ag: Anna}], [\text{Pt: Basil}] \quad \text{drink} \langle [\text{Ag: Basil}], [\text{Pt: coffee}] \rangle \rangle’

causer causee causee causand

The restriction on a causative predicate having a maximum of three arguments is consistent with the restrictions found for applicative constructions (see chapter 9.2), and means that constructions such as

(a) \[ \text{No-pa-hu’u-ke te iaku te doe.} \]

\[ 3R-\text{CAUS} \quad \text{give} \quad 3OBJ \quad \text{CORE} \quad 1SG \quad \text{CORE} \quad \text{money} \]

‘They made her give me the money.’

are ungrammatical. A periphrastic construction such as

(b) \[ \text{No-tumpu’-e no-hu’u-aku te doe.} \]

\[ 3R-\text{command} \quad \text{give} \quad 1SG.OBJ \quad \text{CORE} \quad \text{money} \]

is used instead.

9.2 Factitive \textit{hoko-}

The factitive prefix occurs only with non-active intransitive verbs having a Theme/Patient as the semantic role of their argument, and has the meaning of ‘do work in order to make completely (verb)’. This is in contrast to the result of combining the causative \textit{pa-} with a non-active verb, in which case there is not the same implication that the change is so complete or so thorough. The subject of the non-active predicate becomes the object of the combined predicate, and an actor is added as the new subject. This may be expressed in terms of the clausal constituents as follows:

\[ \text{Causee} \quad \text{Causer} \]

\[ s-\text{V} \quad \text{na} \quad S_{[\text{Patient}]} \quad \emptyset \]

\[ \downarrow \]

\[ s-\text{hoko-} \text{V} \quad \text{te} \quad O_{[\text{Patient}]} \quad \text{na} \quad A \]

In terms of the argument structure involved, a better expression is as follows:
The object of the derived structure is treated as a full syntactic object in all ways, subject to the usual tests for object status: object indexing, relativisation in an object relative clause, being subject in a passive verb form and Focussing. The only difference between a verb with *hoko-* and a normal transitive verb is that the verb with the factitive prefix does not allow unspecified object deletion (UOD). Compare *no'ita* in (6), a verb that is inherently transitive and allows UOD, and (7), which attempts UOD with a factitive construction:

(6) Sa-rato-no i iwo, no-'ita.
    when-arrive-3POSS OBL there:lower 3R-see
    ‘When she arrived there, she looked around.’

(7) * No-hoko-mena Ø.
    3R-FACT-hot
    ‘They heated [   ] up.’

Sentence (7) can be made grammatical by the simple addition of an object, either a nominal or object suffixes. The occurrence of object suffixes to indicate the object of the factitive construction has already been seen in (2b). Some of the other tests for objecthood are presented in (8) and (9):

Head of an object relative clause:

(8) Te bangka monda i-hoko-leama no-langke-mo.
    CORE ship already OP-FACT-good 3R-sail-PF
    ‘The ship that had been fixed up has already sailed.’

Be subject if verb is passive:

(9) No-to-hoko-ja’a-mo.
    3R-PASS-FACT-bad-PF
    ‘It has been ruined.’

The restriction that the semantic role of the causee must be [Theme/Patient], and not just an argument of an intransitive verb, can be shown by the ungrammaticality of (10), which attempts to apply *hoko-* to a verb with a single [Dative] argument, *monimpala*. The argument structure of this construction is shown in (10)’:

(10) * No-hoko-monimpala-’e.
    3R-FACT-miss-3OBJ
    ‘They made her feel homesick.’

(10)’ * ‘hoko-  ⟨[Ag], [Pt] PRED ⟨[Dat]⟩⟩’

The restriction already mentioned in table 14, that *hoko-* can only appear with non-dynamic (ie., unaccusative) verbs thus requires further modification: *hoko-* can only appear with a subset of the class of unaccusative verbs, those that take [Theme/Patient] semantic roles.
As already mentioned, *hoko-* is used only to indicate a complete change of state, usually of a permanent nature, that involves a degree of effort on the part of the causee. As such, the use of *hoko-* is rather restricted, with *pa-* being more common. An example of the use of *hoko-* to derive a transitive clause from an intransitive one is seen in (11a), the underived sentence, and (11b), which shows the effect of the addition of the factitive *hoko-*: Further examples of the use of *hoko-* are given in (12) and (13) (object agreement on the verb is not compulsory; *Nohokomatemo te ompusu* is an equally grammatical sentence. There is, however, a strong tendency for the object of the causative construction to be nominative.):

(11) a. *No-mate-mo na ompu-su.*
   3R-dead-PF NOM grandparent-1SG.POSS
   ‘My grandparent is dead.’

b. *No-hoko-mate-‘e-mo na ompu-su.*
   3R-FACT-dead-3OBJ-PF NOM grandparent-1SG.POSS
   ‘They killed my grandparent.’

(12) ‘*Buntu pe’esa-’u bar(a) o-hoko-mate-ko te mia.*’
   as.for self-2SG.POSS don’t 3R-FACT-die-2SG.OBJ CORE person
   ‘And if you (go) alone, watch out that people don’t kill you.’ (WaI:6)

(13) *Te sala ito mbeaka no-leama, toka i komb a meatu’e ai no-hoko-leama-‘e te pamarenta.*
   CORE road that:higher not 3R-good but OBL moon
   REF-that ANA 3R-FACT-good-3OBJ CORE government
   ‘That road to the north isn’t very good, but next month the government’s going to fix it up.’

The prefixes *me-* and *mo-*, which frequently occur with adjectives, are incompatible with the factitive prefix *hoko-*, but can occur with the causative *pa-*. The other ‘adjectival’ prefix, *ma-*, is compatible with *hoko-:

*mandawulu* ‘beautiful’
*pa-mandawulu* ‘make someone look better’

*metangku* ‘close’
*pa-metangku* ‘draw near to’

*motiti* ‘dry’
*pa-motiti* ‘make someone dry’

The other, less frequent, prefix found on adjectives, *ma-*, is not dropped in this context, or when used in the exclamatory construction, indicating a longer history of fusion with the root, and thus lexicalisation. It is worth noting that both *me-* and *mo-* occur as productive prefixes in Tukang Besi (see chapter 10), marking frequentive and resultative, respectively, whilst *ma-* is not productive in this way. The adjectives found with *ma-* tend to show less temporary states than do the *mo-* and *me-* adjectives, though counter examples are rampant. *ma-* is also the least frequent of the adjectival prefixes (only 10% of prefixed adjectives use *ma-*)

The prefix *hoko-* cannot occur with any active verb roots, either transitive or
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intransitive:

(14) * No-hoko-manga-'e na ana-no te ika dawu-no.

3R-FACT-eat-3OBJ NOM child-3POSS CORE fish portion-3POSS

‘She made her child eat its fish dish.’

(15) * No-hoko-wila-'e na ana-no i dao.a.

3R-FACT-go-3OBJ NOM child-3POSS OBL market

‘She made her child go to the market.’

For either of these, the causative prefix pa-, a periphrastic causative using a manipulative verb, or an alternative verb (such as tumpu ‘order’; hoti ‘donate food, give meal’) must be used.

9.3 Causative pa-

The general causative prefix pa- has a wider range of application than the factitive hoko-, and is also subject to two different interpretations by the different dialect areas as far as the argument structure of the derived verb is concerned. Unlike non-dynamic verbs using hoko-, there is not such a complete irreversible change implied when pa- is used.

As mentioned earlier, two groups of Tukang Besi speakers differ in how grammatical function assignment goes in morphological causative constructions. Although the speakers do not live in absolutely separable groups, they will be referred to here as ‘dialect A’ and ‘dialect B’, referring to the Wanse-Rupu dialect and the Lia-Mandati dialect areas respectively. For both of these dialects, the treatment of intransitive verbs is the same: the causee becomes the object of the derived verb, and a new subject causer is added to the argument structure of the verb:

Intransitive base:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{s-V} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{s-pa-V}
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{Causee} \\
\text{Causer}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
s-V \\
\text{na S}_{[\text{Agent/Patient}]} \quad \text{Ø}
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{te O}_{[\text{Patient}]} \\
\text{na A}
\end{array}
\]

The argument structure representing this causative construction is almost the same as that presented for hoko-; the only significant difference is that the single argument of the base predicate is not restricted as to its semantic role, so both dynamic and non-dynamic intransitive verbs may appear with pa- as the causative:

\[
\text{‘pa- } \left\langle \left[ \text{ }, \right[\text{Pt} \right] \text{ PRED} \left[ \left[ \text{ } \right] \right] \right\rangle"
\]

The causee is again the object of the construction, in all senses (see chapter 20) of the causative construction. Examples of the causative pa- on intransitive verbs can be seen in (16) and (17):
When combined with transitive verb bases there are two distinct variants in syntactic treatment, which will be discussed in full one at a time.

In dialect A the causative prefix pa- makes the subject of the basic verb (the causee) the primary object of the derived verb, leaving the base object of the verb, the causand, as a core argument without object properties. In addition to this, a new causer argument is added as the subject of the composite verb.

Transitive base:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Causand} & \text{Causee} & \text{Causer} \\
\text{s-V} & \text{te O}_i & \text{na A}_{[\text{Agent}]} \\
\downarrow & & \text{Ø} \\
\text{s-pa-V} & \text{te O}_i & \text{te O}_j & \text{na A}_k \\
\end{array}
\]

‘pa- 〈[ ], [Pt] PRED 〈[Ag], [ ]〉’

Note that it is the Agent of the base verb that is linked to the second argument position of the causative predicate. This models, correctly, the fact that the causee, and not the causand, is treated as the object of the causative construction. Furthermore, the semantic role of the subject of the base predicate must be [Agent]. Evidence for this comes from the ungrammaticality of verb forms made from transitive verbs taking [Dative] or [Instrumental] subjects (Transitive verbs with a [Theme] or [Patient] subject do not exist in Tukang Besi (and possibly not in any other languages)):

(18) * No-pa-tarima te kene-no te poda.
3R-CAUS-receive CORE friend-3POSS CORE knife
‘They made their friend receive the knife.’

(19) * No-pa-raho-’e na wande te mia pande.
3R-CAUS-affect-3OBJ NOM rain CORE shaman
‘The shaman made the rain wet them.’

In these sentences a morphological causative cannot be added to the verb. If a causative reading is desired, a periphrastic causative may be used:

(20) No-waa-’e na kene-no ako no-tarima te poda.
3R-tell-3OBJ NOM friend-3POSS PURP 3R-receive CORE knife
‘They made their friend receive the knife.’
A minimal pair showing the ungrammaticality of a non-Agent semantic role as causee exists in the verb 'ita 'look at, see', which can have either an [Agent] or a [Dative] interpretation of the semantic role of its subject. With the interpretation ‘look at (intentionally)’, with an [Agent] subject, it may be causativised:

(22) Ku-pa-’ita-’e te boku.
1SG-CAUS-see-3OBJ CORE book
‘I showed them the book.’
(Literally, ‘I made them look at the book.’)

This sentence cannot have the reading ‘I made them see (by chance, non-intentionally) the book.’ This may be tested by the addition of the verb sala ‘do accidentally’, which requires that the subject be non-agentive, and also removes the possibility of morphological causation:

(23) No-sala-’ita te boku.
3R-accident-see CORE book
‘They happened to see the book.’

(24) * Ku-pa-sala-’ita-’e te boku.
1SG-CAUS-accident-see-3OBJ CORE book
‘I made them accidentally see the book.’

Causing someone to unintentionally catch sight of something can be expressed using a periphrastic causative:

(25) Ku-karajaa-’e no-sala-’ita te boku.
1SG-work-3OBJ 3R-accident-see CORE book
‘I arranged for them to happen to see the book.’

As an aside, it is interesting to note the effect of placing sala before the causative morpheme. Serialising with the same sala, but now appearing before the whole causative predicate, shows why the causer of a pa- construction does not have to be an [Agent], unlike the causer in a factitive construction:

(24)' Ku-sala-pa-’ita-’e te boku.
1SG-accident-CAUS-see-3OBJ CORE book
‘I accidentally showed them the book.’

(24)" * Ku-sala-hoko-leama-’e.
1SG-accident-FACT-good-3OBJ
‘I accidentally really improved it.’

The addition of object suffixes on the verb follows a predictable pattern, with the causee, the second argument of the outermost predicate, being the nominative argument indexed on the verb:
The derivation of a causative verb, with and without object suffixes, is illustrated in the examples (26) - (29):

(26)   No-kaha  te  ika  na  ana-no.  
3R-bite  CORE  fish  NOM  child-3POSS

‘The child bit the fish.’

(27)   No-pa-kaha  te  ana-no  te  ika  (na  amai).  
3R-CAUS-bite  CORE  child-3POSS  CORE  fish  NOM  3PL

‘They made their child bite the fish.’

(This sentence is potentially ambiguous between the reading given and
‘They made the fish bite their child.’ This latter reading, however, is
much more implausible than the first. In order to force this reading,
object suffixes would be used on the verb to make the causee and
causand unambiguously distinguished: Nopakahae te anano na ika (te
amai).)

(28)   No-pa-kaha-e  na  ana-no  te  ika  (te  amai).  
3R-CAUS-bite-3OBJ  NOM  child-3POSS  CORE  fish  CORE  3PL

‘They made their child bite the fish.’

(29)   * No-pa-kaha-e  na  ika  te  ana-no  (te  amai).  
3R-CAUS-bite-3OBJ  NOM  fish  CORE  child-3POSS  CORE  3PL

(Grammatical, plausible (with the meaning given in the last footnote),
and also criminal, if ika ‘fish’ is replaced with kodipo ‘shark’.)

Other object related properties, such as the ability to head an object relative clause and to be
passivised uniquely single out the causee argument:

Be head of a object relative clause:

(30)   Te  mia  i-pa-ala-no  nu  wemba  no-kalu.  
CORE  person  OP-CAUS-fetch-3POSS  GEN  bamboo  3R-tired

‘The person who was made to fetch the bamboo is tired.’

(31)   * Te  wemba  i-pa-ala-no  nu  mia  no-moboha.  
CORE  bamboo  OP-CAUS-fetch-3POSS  GEN  person  3R-heavy

‘The bamboo that was made to be fetched by the man is heavy.’

Be subject if verb is passive:

(32)   No-to-pa-ala-no  na  mia  iso  (te  wemba).  
3R-PASS-CAUS-fetch-PF  NOM  person  yon  CORE  bamboo

‘That person was made to fetch bamboo.’
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(33) *No-to-pa-ala-mo na wemba iso (te mia).
3R-PASS-CAUS-fetch-PF NOM person yon CORE person
‘That bamboo was made to be fetched (by the person[causee]).’

In dialect B the causee of a construction based on a transitive verb base is marked as an oblique argument by the oblique article *i*, and the causand (if present) is treated as the sole object of the combined causative predicate. An intransitive predicate is treated in the same way as by speakers of the majority dialect. The formula representing the treatment of a transitive verb base is as follows:

Transitive base:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Causand} & \text{Causee} & \text{Causer} \\
s-V & \text{te } O_i & \text{na } A_{[Agent]} \\
\downarrow \\
s-pa-V & \text{te } O_i & \text{di [Agent]} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘pa- \langle [Ag], [Pt] PRED \langle [Ag], [ ] \rangle \rangle’

OBL

The addition of object suffixes shows that the causand is treated as the object of the verb for this purpose: relativisation, passivisation etc. also single this argument out as the object:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Causand} & \text{Causee} & \text{Causer} \\
s-pa-V & \text{te } O_i & \text{di [Agent]} \\
\downarrow \\
s-pa-V-o & \text{na } O_i & \text{di [Agent]} \\
\end{array}
\]

This pattern, identical to that found with the requestive verbal prefix discussed in the following section, is illustrated as follows:

(34) No-kaha te ika na ana-no.
3R-bite CORE fish NOM child-3POSS
‘The child bit the fish.’

(35) No-pa-kaha te ika di ana-no (na amai).
3R-CAUS-bite CORE fish OBL child-3POSS NOM 3PL
‘They made their child bite the fish.’

(36) No-pa-kaha-’e na ika di ana-no (te amai).
3R-CAUS-bite-3OBJ NOM fish OBL child-3POSS CORE 3PL
‘They made their child bite the fish.’

(37) *No-pa-kaha-’e na ana-no di ika.
3R-CAUS-bite-3OBJ NOM child-3POSS OBL fish
‘They made their child bite the fish.’
(Good for: ‘They made a fish bite their child.’)
Applying the tests of ability to head an object relative clause, and access to being subject in a passive construction, we manage to single out the causand, not the non-core causee:

Head of a object relative clause:

(38) *Te wemba i-pa-ala-no i mia no-moboha.
CORE bamboo OP-CAUS-fetch-3POSS OBL person 3R-heavy
‘The bamboo that was made to be fetched by the man is heavy.’

(39) *Te mia i-pa-ala-no nu wemba no-kalu.
CORE person OP-CAUS-fetch-3POSS GEN bamboo 3R-tired
‘The person who was made to fetch the bamboo is tired.’

Become subject if verb is passive:

(40) No-to-pa-ala-mo na wemba iso (di mia).
3R-PASS-CAUS-fetch-PF NOM person yon OBL person
‘That bamboo was made to be fetched (by the person[Causee]).’

(41) *No-to-pa-ala-mo na mia iso (te wemba).
3R-PASS-CAUS-fetch-PF NOM person yon CORE bamboo
‘That person was made to fetch bamboo.’

Note, however, that speakers of this dialect DO allow an intransitive verb to treat the causee (the single argument of the original predicate) as the object of the construction, just as the majority dialect does:

(42) Te mia iso no-pa-wila’e.
CORE person yon 3R-CAUS-go-3OBJ
‘They sent that person there.’

(43) Te mia i-pa-wila-no no-kalu.
CORE person OP-CAUS-go-3POSS 3R-tired
‘The person who was sent is tired.’

(44) No-to-pa-wila-mo na mia iso.
3R-PASS-CAUS-go-PF NOM person yon
‘That person was sent.’

This is a different treatment from that offered by the requestive prefix. The treatment of arguments of the base verb may be stated in terms of the fact that the [S] or [O] argument of the base predicate (the absolutive argument, if you will) becomes the object of the causative construction, and the [A] of the base predicate becomes an oblique argument marked by ildi (see Baker 1988a: 162-163).

The different treatment of [A] and [S] in this construction shows that anasu is NOT treated as an [S] of an intransitive verb; if manga in (45) was to be considered intransitive when it appears without an object argument, then we would expect the causee to be marked as a core argument of the verb, with te. This is not, however, the case, and it appears as an oblique argument, indicating the transitive status of the verb.
(45)  a. Ku-pa-manga di ana-su mai.
    1SG-CAUS-eat OBL child-1SG.POSS INAL
    ‘I’ll have my daughter eat (it).’

    b. * Ku-pa-manga te ana-su mai.
    1SG-CAUS-eat CORE child-1SG.POSS INAL

9.4 Requestive hepe-

The requestive prefix hepe- adds a new argument, a causer, as the subject and implicit beneficiary of the action that is requested. The direct object of the underived verb root remains as the grammatical object, and the causee is demoted to an oblique *idi phrase (see (51) - (53)) (note that this is NOT the marking that an instrumental would be marked by. Ako and kene are the verbal and prepositional forms associated with instrumental roles, and these may not be used with the demoted subject in this construction). This case marking strategy is different from the treatment that dialect B speakers give to their pa-causative construction, in that the causee argument in a construction based on an intransitive verb is NOT treated as an object with the requestive, unlike the case with the pa-causative, which treats an [S] or [O] of a base predicate identically (see example (47) and the underived (46), and compare with (34) and (35)). The formula representing the derivation of a requestive construction based on an intransitive verb is as follows:

Intransitive base:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
    & \text{Causer} & \text{Causee} \\
    s-V & \emptyset & \text{na } S_i \\
    \downarrow & & \\
    s-hepe-V & \text{na } A_{[\text{Agent}]} & \text{di } O_i \\
\end{array}
\]

The argument structure annotations indicate that an intransitive verb is the output of the combination of hepe- and the base predicate. The single argument of the base predicate is associated with an oblique argument of the requestive predicate, and is not a core argument of the derived verb:

‘hepe- [\{\text{Ag}\} \{\text{Obl}\} \text{PRED} [\{\text{Ag}\}]’

This demotion of the subject in the underived verb to oblique status, and its subsequent inability to be indexed on the verb by object suffixes, can be illustrated with an intransitive example, in (46) - (48):

(46)  No-wila na ana.
    3R-go NOM child
    ‘The child goes.’

(47)  Ku-hepe-wila (na iaku) di ana.
    1SG-REQ-go NOM 1SG OBL child
    ‘I ask the child to go.’
In addition to not being able to be indexed by the object suffixes, all other properties associated with objects are unavailable to the causee of a requestive construction, such as relativisation and passivisation:

(49) * Te ana i-hepe-wila.
    CORE child OP-REQ-go
    ‘The child who was asked to go.’

(50) * No-to-hepe-wila-mo na ana.
    3R-PASS-REQ-go-PF NOM child
    ‘The child was asked to go.’

Transitive verbs behave in the same way as dialect B speakers’ treatment of the pa-causative on transitive verbs, the causee being treated as an oblique argument, and the causand being treated as the object of the derived construction:

Transitive verb:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Causand} & \text{Causee} & \text{Causer} \\
\text{s-V} & \text{te O}_j & \text{na A}_{[\text{Agent}j]} & \text{Ø} \\
\downarrow & & & \\
\text{s-hepe-V} & \text{te O}_j & \text{di } [\text{Agent}j] & \text{na A}_k \\
\end{array}
\]

‘hepe- \langle[A], [Pt]\rangle \langle[ ]\rangle \text{ PRED }\langle[A], [ ]\rangle’

The process of deriving a requestive verb from a normal transitive sentence is illustrated in (51) - (53):

(51) No-’ita te arolojii na ama-no.
    3R-see CORE watch NOM father-3POSS
    ‘His father is looking at the watch.’

(52) No-hepe-’ita te arolojii na ia (di ama-no).
    3R-REQ-see CORE watch NOM 3SG OBL father-3POSS
    ‘He is asking his father to show him the watch.’
    * ‘He is asking his father to show him the watch.’

(53) No-hepe-’ita-e na arolojii (di ama-no).
    3R-REQ-see-30BJ NOM watch OBL father-3POSS
    ‘He is asking his father to show him the watch.’

In addition to the object-affixed version of the verb in (51), further proof of the causand’s status as object of the construction is seen in the tests of access to being head of an object relative clause, and behaviour in a passive construction, seen in (54) and (55):
(54) Te lonsi i-hepe-'ita-no no-ja'o.
CORE watch OP-REQ-see-3POSS 3R-bad
‘The watch that he asked to have looked at is broken.’

(55) No-to-hepe-'ita-mo na aroloji aira (di ama-no).
3R-PASS-REQ-see-PF NOM watch this OBL father-3POSS
‘His father asked (someone) to look at this watch.’
(Glossing literally, ‘This watch has been asked to be looked at by his father.’)

9.5 Causatives: combinations

Combinations of two morphological causatives are rare in Tukang Besi. No causative
prefix may directly precede (/follow) itself. Sentences of the type

(56) * No-pa-pa-moturu te ana.
3R-CAUS-CAUS-sleep CORE child
‘She made him put the child to bed.’

are thus ungrammatical. A concept such as the translation given for (56) is expressed with
a periphrastic causative, using a manipulative complement construction (see chapter 16):

(57) No-waa-'e no-pa-moturu te ana.
3R-tell-3OBJ 3R-CAUS-sleep CORE child
‘She told him to put the child to bed.’

Even with morphologically different causatives, almost all possible combinations are
ungrammatical, such as (58):

(58) * No-pa-hoko-leama-'e.
3R-CAUS-FACT-good-3OBJ
‘She made him fix it.’

When the first of the causative prefixes is hepe-, however, and the base predicate is
intransitive, a series of causative prefixes may occur and still be grammatical, as seen in
(59), illustrating hepe- and pa- (hepe- and hoko- is also a possible double causative
construction). This is the only case in which two causatives may appear on the same verb
root:

(59) No-hepe-pa-wila te ana i 'one.
3R-REQ-CAUS-go CORE child OBL beach
‘She asked him to send the child to the beach.’

The derivational history and argument structure for this kind of construction is seen in
(59)’ and (59)‘: 
The argument structure for (59) would be as shown in (59)'

\[
\text{(59)'} \quad \text{CAUS } \langle [\text{Ag}]_k, [\text{Pt}]_i \rangle \quad \text{CAUS } \langle [\text{Ag}]_l, [\text{Pt}]_i \rangle \quad \text{PRED } \langle [\text{Ag}]_j \rangle \rangle
\]

Unlike (59)', the original [S] of the intransitive predicate is not represented in the outermost layer of the combined predicate. As will be seen in chapter 11, however, this is not a sufficient reason on its own to rule out a sentence’s grammaticality.

9.6 Causatives and ditransitive verbs

Causative prefixes are extremely restricted in their ability to appear with ditransitive verbs. The factitive hoko- would not be expected to be able to appear with ditransitive verbs, since it is restricted to appearing on a subclass of unaccusative verbs. The causative pa-, which has a much wider range of application, may not appear on ditransitive verbs either. Thus (60) is ungrammatical:

\[
\text{(60)} \quad \ast \text{No-pa-hu'u te ana te iai-no} \\
\text{3R-CAUS-give CORE child CORE younger.sibling-3POSS} \\
\text{te an(a) u riirii.} \\
\text{CORE child GEN duck} \\
\text{‘She made the child give the duckling to his brother.’}
\]

This sort of sentence is made with periphrastic causatives involving a complementation construction instead (see chapter 16):

\[
\text{(61)} \quad \text{No-tumpu-'e na ana ako na-} \{m\} o'u \\
\text{3R-order-3OBJ NOM child COMP 3l-give.SI} \\
\text{te iai-no te an(a) u riirii.} \\
\text{CORE younger.sibling-3POSS CORE child GEN duck} \\
\text{‘She told the child to give the duckling to his brother.’}
\]

One possible reason for the ungrammaticality of (61) is that the underived verb already has three core arguments, and that adding an additional causative predicate to the verb over-saturates it, there (apparently) being a restriction such that (complex) verbs with one or two predicates cannot have more than three core arguments. Evidence from the interaction of applicative morphology with ditransitive verbs appears to add support to this suggestion (see chapter 10.6).
9.7 Causatives: summary

The accessibility to different grammatical processes that the causee and causand arguments of the different causative constructions display is summarised in table 15. Information for both dialect A and dialect B speakers is given for the pa-causative. Table 15 includes information that has not been exemplified with sentences, but is included for the sake of completeness.

Table 15. Transitive verbs. Properties of the objects of causative constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hoko-Causee</th>
<th>pa- (dialect A)</th>
<th>pa- (dialect B)</th>
<th>hepe-Causee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>object suffix?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive RC</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+˚</td>
<td>+˚</td>
<td>+˚</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† only if in [Theme/Patient] role.
? not present in the data available.
˚ either may be omitted, but at least one of the two must be present.

An important property of objects of causative constructions that differentiates them from objects of applicative constructions is the ability to be the head of a passive relative clause. In restricted circumstances, the object of a causative construction may appear as the head of a subject relative clause involving a passive verb, as in (62):

(62) Te t[um]o-hoko-ja'o atu no-mowuru.
    CORE PASS.SI-FACT-good that 3R-smell.rotten
    ‘That one there that had been ruined smells rotten.’

This is a property also found with the other causative prefixes:

Causative pa- (dialect B only):

(63) Te mia t[um]o-pa-manga nu sede no-bila-mo.
    CORE person PASS.SI-CAUS-eat GEN taro 3R-full-PF
    ‘The person who was made to eat some taro is already full.’

Requestive hepe-:

(64) Te sede t[um]o-hepe-manga di mia iso no-mobai.
    CORE taro PASS.SI-REQ-eat OBL person yon 3R-hard
    ‘The taro that was asked to be eaten by that person there is hard.’
    (That is, ‘The taro that [someone] asked that person to eat is hard.’)
There is, however, an important restriction as to which objects may appear in this construction: only an object in theme or patient semantic role may appear as the head of a passive relative clause. Compare (56) above with causative constructions involving verbs with an argument that is Dative or Instrument in the base predicate, seen in (57) and (58) respectively:

[Dative] object:

(65) * Te ana t[um]o-hepe-hoti measo’e no-mele.  
CORE child PASS.SI-REQ-donate REF-yon 3R-happy  
‘The child who was requested to be donated food to is happy.’  
(That is, ‘That child that [someone] asked [someone else] to donate food to is happy.’)

[Instrumental] object:

(66) * Te palu hoko-lobu t[um]o-hepe-pake atu no-moboha.  
CORE hammer FACT-straight PASS.SI-REQ-use that 3R-heavy  
‘That straightening hammer that was asked to be used [by someone] is heavy.’  
(That is, ‘That straightening hammer that [someone] asked [someone else] to use is heavy.’) (a palu hokolobu is a particular type of hammer used in the iron working process to straighten out a machete blade)

The reason for the ungrammaticality of (65) and (66) can be explained in terms of the semantic roles of the arguments involved. The causative object (causand in the case of the requestive causative) is a [Patient] of the causative predicate, and may head a passive relative clause only if it is also in [Theme/Patient] semantic role in the base predicate. The argument structures of the grammatical (64) and the ungrammatical (65) are presented in (64)' and (65)', showing this clash of properties:

(64)' ‘hepe- ⟨[Ag], [Pt] manga ⟨[Ag], [Pt]⟩⟩’  
OBL Semantic roles agree

(65)' * ‘hepe- ⟨[Ag], [Pt] hoti ⟨[Ag], [Dat]⟩⟩’  
OBL Semantic roles do not agree

The reason that dialect A speakers do not allow a passive relative clause to be formed on their pa-causative constructions is obvious when we examine the semantic role clash that would be entailed in, for example, (67) and (68):

Causative pa- (Dialect A):

(67) No-pa-manga-’e na mia te sede.  
3R-CAUS-eat-3OBJ NOM person CORE taro  
‘They made that person eat some taro.’
Causative pa- (Dialect A):

(68) *Te mia t{um}o-pa-manga nu sede no-bila-mo.
  CORE person PASS.SI-CAUS-eat GEN taro 3R-full-PF
  ‘The person who was made to eat some taro is already full.’

(68)* ‘pa- 〈[Ag], [Pt] manga 〈[Ag], [  ]〉⟩’

Because the [Patient] of the causative predicate is coreferential with the [Agent] of the base predicate for dialect A speakers, it is impossible for the semantic role clash to be resolved in this construction. Only pa- or hoko- constructions based on non-dynamic verbs with [Theme] or [Patient] arguments will allow a passive relative clause headed by the causee:

(69)  No-pa-moturu-’e na ana-no.
  3R-CAUS-sleep-3OBJ NOM child-3POSS
  ‘She put her child to sleep.’

(69)‘ pa- 〈[Ag], [Pt] moturu 〈[Thm]〉⟩’

(70) Te ana-no t{um}o-pa-moturu mbeaka no-’awa
  CORE child-3POSS PASS.SI-CAUS-sleep not 3R-get
  te kuikui.
  CORE cake
  ‘Her child who was put to sleep didn’t get any cakes.’

(71)  No-pa-mente-’e na ana-no.
  3R-CAUS-surprise-3OBJ NOM child-3POSS
  ‘She surprised her child.’

(71)‘ pa- 〈[Ag], [Pt] mente 〈[Dat]〉⟩’

(72)* Te ana-no t{um}o-pa-mente.
  CORE child-3POSS PASS.SI-CAUS-sleep
  ‘Her child who was surprised.’

Note that this is not a restriction on the ability to be passivised; it is a restriction on the ability to head a passive relative clause. A plain passive verb with a non-[Theme/Patient] object is shown in (73):

[202x763]Dative] object:

(73) Te ana misikini meatu’e no-to-hepe-hoti-mo.
  CORE child orphan REF-that 3R-PASS-REQ-donate-PF
  ‘That orphaned child has been requested to be donated food to.’
  (That is, ‘[Someone] has asked [someone else] to donate [food and/or clothing] to that orphaned child.’)

(73) shows that the restriction is about the argument being the head of a passive relative clause, and not about being the subject of a passive construction itself.