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1. AIM

The aim of the present work is to investigate causative constructions in the Udmurt language within the framework of the Minimalist Program and Distributed Morphology.

The dissertation investigates causative constructions containing lexical (or synthetic) and syntactic (or productive) causatives, periphrastic causative constructions and their word formation properties, as well as the internal structure and argument structure of causatives.

My aim with this dissertation is to present an account of causative constructions in the Udmurt language based on Miyagawa’s (1998) *The same-component hypothesis* for Japanese. This theory claims that all verbs that have the meaning component CAUSE are formed in the same component of the grammar. I adopt this claim in the present study, arguing that this component of the grammar in Udmurt, similarly to Miyagawa’s (1998) account for Japanese causatives, is the syntax.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The dissertation investigates a syntactic phenomenon in the Udmurt language.

Udmurt is a minority language from the Permic branch of the Uralic language family, spoken in the Volga-Kama Region of the Russian Federation. The closest related languages are the Komi and the Komi-Permyak languages. According to the 2010 census the number of native speakers is 552,299 and the Udmurt population became bilingual in the 20th century (Salánki 2007). In addition to the Russian language, Udmurt has a permanent contact with other Uralic languages such as Mari, Komi and Turkic languages such as Bashkir and Tatar. While the language has an official status in the Republic (it is the second official language of the Udmurt Republic since 1994), the language is mostly used in domestic spheres (Speshilova 2008).

It is a well-known fact that from a syntactic perspective, Udmurt is an under-studied language; even descriptive syntactic works are rare. However, more and more theoretical and typological studies have been published in recent years that consider narrower or wider...
topics of Udmurt syntax (e.g. Edygarova 2009, 2010 on possessive case in Udmurt and Edygarova 2015 on negation; Asztalos 2010 on passive constructions; Georgieva 2012 on non-finite subordination; F. Gulyás 2013 and F. Gulyás & Speshilova 2014 on impersonal constructions; and Horváth 2013 on aspect markers, among others).

When detailed syntactic descriptive works are lacking, syntacticians’ aim is always twofold: i) to collect relevant data with the help of surveys and questionnaires and ii) to analyze this collected material. This work has also been written in accordance with this double aim.

The data in the dissertation come from two sources. The first and larger group comes from the material collected during my fieldwork trips (in three distinct periods between 2012 and 2013). My informants are all Udmurt-dominant native speakers living in the territory of the Udmurt Republic and their age ranges from 20 to 50. All the example sentences presented here are based on their judgments.

The judgments were collected in a written form. The native-speakers got sentences in minimal pairs and they had to rate the sentences with numbers between 1-5, where 1 stood for ‘ungrammatical’ and 5 stood for ‘correct’. The examples for which no source is indicated come from my fieldwork.

The second group of the examples comes from descriptive grammars of the Udmurt language; here the main sources of the data are two works of Winkler (2001, 2011).

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The present dissertation is written in the generative transformational grammar framework.

This framework originates from Chomsky’s seminal works (e.g. Chomsky 1965, 1981, 1986).

In the theory of Distributed Morphology, which is a theory of the syntax-morphology interface (Halle & Marantz 1993, 1994), morphemes are syntactic entities, and similarly to phrases and sentences, words are also combined in a hierarchical structure all the way down. Word-internal and word-external structures are built in the same way, and morphology (in the traditional sense of word-
formation) does not exist as a generative component separate from syntax.

In her theory of causatives, Pylkkänen (2002, 2008) argues for a unified account of all causatives: she suggests that they are all formed compositionally in the syntax.


4. THE STRUCTURE AND THE MAIN THESES OF THE DISSERTATION

The Chapters of the dissertation are organized as follows.

Chapter 1 presents an overview of the most important morphological and syntactic properties of the Udmurt Language, the theoretical framework applied to the Udmurt data, the typological classification of causatives and the terminology used in the dissertation.

Chapter 2 investigates the causative/non-causative alternation in Udmurt. The main research questions concentrate on the morphological marking of the alternation and the internal structure of verbs taking part in the alternation.

The causative alternation always involves two verbs, a transitive and an intransitive one, ordered in pairs. The classification of these verb-pairs is based on the absence or presence of a transparent morphological derivation and the direction of this derivation.

In their typological work Nedyalkov & Silnitsky (1973) discovered four different oppositions, and used these oppositions to classify the verb-pairs into different groups. This classification has been followed by e.g. Comrie (1981) and Haspelmath (1993), as shown in (1a-d).

(1) a. causative alternation: the inchoative verb is the basic verb and the causative is marked by an affix, a causative auxiliary or stem modification
b. **anticausative alternation**: the causative verb is the basic verb and the inchoative is marked by an affix, an anticausative verb or stem modification

c. **labile alternation**: the same verb is used both in the inchoative and in the causative sense

d. **equipollent alternation**: both the causative and the inchoative are derived from the same stem which expresses the basic situation by means of different affixes, different auxiliary verbs or different stem modification

e. **suppletive alternation**: both have different verb roots

In Udmurt the suffix -s’k- is the productive noncausative suffix. Any root can combine with the non-causative suffix unless the root is not compatible with the non-causative meaning or the root takes a non-productive non-causative suffix. Similarly to the non-causative suffix, the productive causative marker, which is -t- in Udmurt, can attach to any root if the root is compatible with the causative meaning and there is no marked causative verb formation.

(2) a. *Pinaljos sajka-zy.*

Пиналъёс сайка-зы.

child.PL.NOM wake.u-PST.3PL

‘The children woke up.’

b. *Anaj pinaljosyz sajka-t-iz.*

Анай пиналъёсыз сайка-т-йз.

mother.NOM child.PL.ACC.3SG wake.up-CAUS-PST.3SG

‘The mother woke up the children.’

The argument structures of the alternating verbs are related in the sense that the nominative argument of the non-causative variant with a patient or theme thematic role is always the Accusative marked argument of the transitive causative variant. This means that noncausative verbs are all unaccusative verbs with a deep object in their ‘subject’ position. Unergative verbs do not take part in the alternation in Udmurt.
For the syntactic structure of the alternating verbs I adopt Alexiadou et al.’s (2006) assumption that bare and morphologically marked causative and non-causative verbs have the same structure. This is schematically illustrated in (3):

(3) [ (Voice) [ CAUS/v [ Root + Theme ]] ]

The structure is built on a category-neutral root which is merged either with a verbalizer head (v) or a causative-verbalizer head (CAUS). Voice is a lexical head that introduces the external argument for any predicate (see Kratzer 1996, 2003) and merges with a vP/CAUSP layer.

As for the internal structure of non-causative verbs, I follow Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer (2006), Schäfer (2008) and Schäfer at al. (2014). In their proposal non-causative verbs are not uniform and their internal structure may differ. They argue that non-causative roots can have the requirement to appear in the presence of Voice (e.g. non-causative verbs with extra morphology (sich) in German), even if they express a non-causative event. In this case, a special kind of Voice is involved with no semantic content. The different syntactic structures are illustrated in (4):

(4)
non-causative: [ V [ RootA + Theme ]] Ø
non-causative: [DPexpl. [Voice{D, Ø } [ V [ RootB + Theme ]]]] sich
causative: [DP [Voice{D, Agent} [ V [ RootA/B + Theme ]]]] transitive

(Schäfer et al. 2014)

Alexiadou (2010) argues that in the case of non-causatives with special Voice morphology, the Voice projection is specified as [–external argument] and [–agentivity].

(5) [Voice (–ext. arg. –AG) [v [Root]]]

Since in Udmurt non-causative verbs can optionally license a causer argument with a [±agentive] feature, I assume that Voice appears also in the internal structure of non-causative verbs, similarly to the structure of German non-causatives with extra
morphology (*sich*), and the specifier position of VoiceP hosts the causer DP with a [–external argument] feature.

Based on the empirical data, I propose that non-causative verbs have two different structures.

(6) a.

```
VoiceP
   [-ext. arg. Voice']
               Voice
                  Ø/-s'k
```

b.

```
VoiceP
   [-ext. arg. Voice']
               Voice
                  Ø/-s'k
```

I propose the following syntactic structure for the causative variants of the alternation.
Causative verbs are associated with a Cause head that hosts the causing event. Adopting Pylkkänen’s (2002, 2008) approach to causatives, it is the Selection parameter which regulates which head is selected by Cause. It is obvious that in the case of lexical causation Cause selects a vP containing only an internal argument and no external argument. In the case of causative verbs, the external argument is the causer, and following Kratzer’s (1994) assumption that the external argument always appears in the [Spec, VoiceP] position, I propose that the causer argument sits in [Spec, VoiceP] and it can have either a [+Agentivity] or a [–Agentivity] feature.

Chapter 3 focuses on the productive, morphologically marked causative constructions (factitives).

In contemporary Udmurt, external causative predicates are marked with the causative morpheme -t-. This morpheme can be attached to unergative and transitive verbs to form factitives (GSzUJa 1962, Kozmács 1994).

In the case of both unergative and transitive verbs, the complex verbal form with the causative morpheme involves an additional argument: the causer of the causing event, which is a non-core argument. In the case of (1a), the base intransitive verb has become transitive and the original argument – the external argument – is marked as a direct object with Accusative case, following the direct
object marking rule in Udmurt. This is a universal property of the causative form of an intransitive verb. Transitive based factitives have some special properties which are observed by Kozmács (1994). These are the following:

i) the coding of the causee with ACC case,
ii) the fact that ACC case appears on both definite and indefinite causees (as opposed to regular objects)
iii) the invariable order of [+animate] arguments.

(8) b.  

Masha   Sasha-jez   kniga-jez lydzhy-t-iz.  
Masha.NOM Sasha-ACC book-ACC read-CAUS-PST.3SG

‘Masha made Sahsa read the book.’

iv) case-marking pattern on the causee argument

(9)  

Sasha   kyrzhan-en pinal-ez babyty-t-iz.  
Sasha.NOM song-INST baby-ACC rock.to.sleep-CAUS-PST.3SG

‘Sasha made the baby rock to sleep with a song.’

Syntactically factitives contain an extra Causer layer merged on top of the structure of the factitive causing event. The Cause head contains the causative morpheme -t-. The external argument of the factitive event, similarly to the external argument of inner causatives, is introduced in another Voice projection in the sense of Kratzer (1994).

A syntactic approach is presented for these properties based on Pylkkänen (2002, 2008). In the syntactic structure of factitives in Udmurt, similarly to lexical causative verbs, the causing event is associated with the CauseP, and the factitive causative morpheme -t- occurs in the head position of this projection. The external argument, the causer, is introduced in the specifier position of VoiceP, in the sense of Katzer (1996).
In addition to these crucial properties, this chapter investigates the domain and event properties of productive causatives, too.

On the basis of Horváth & Siloni’s (2010) and Bartos’ (2011) tests I propose that factitives are monoclausal but bi-eventive in Udmurt.

Chapter 4 deals with periphrastic causatives. Udmurt has two different verbs that have an important role in analytic causative constructions: kosyny ‘to order’ and lez’yny ‘to let’. The Chapter investigates the distribution and the syntactic properties of these light verbs.
(11) a. Masha Sasha-jez kniiga-jez lydzhyny
    Маша Саша-ез книга-ез лыдӳыны
    Masha.NOM Sasha.ACC book.ACC read.INF
    kosiz.
    косӥз.
    order.PST.3SG
    ‘Masha ordered Sasha read the book.’

    b. Masha Sasha-jez kniiga-jez lydzhyny.
    Маша Сашаез книгаез лыдӞыны
    Masha.NOM Sasha.ACC book.ACC read.INF
    lez’iz
    лэзиз.
    let.PST.3SG
    ‘Masha let Sasha to read the book.’

The complement clause selected by the two lexical causative verbs can be either non-finite or finite. The finite clauses are CPs and the finite verb occurs in subjunctive mood.

Applying tests I propose that the non-finite complements of causative verbs are ECM constructions.

(12) NP_NOM [NP_ACC V_INF] V_FIN ECM

In the case of a non-finite complement, similarly to morphologically marked causatives, the causee argument is encoded with ACC case.

Syntactically both structures contain a vcauseP projection in the matrix clause which hosts the causative light verb. Depending on the finiteness of the complement clause, the light verb selects CP in the case of finite subordination or TP if the embedded clause is nonfinite.
In Pylkkänen’s (2002, 2008) assumption causative light verbs are phase-selecting. In Udmurt this assumption is correct if the complement of the light verb is finite since finite embedded clauses are CPs and CPs are phases. It is, however, not true for the nonfinite complement clauses, which are TPs, as TPs are never phases.

Chapter 5 summarizes the main research questions and results proposed in this work and contains the conclusions. This chapter also lays out the potential directions for further investigations. In the course of this thesis I proposed that traditionally called lexical, morphological and syntactic causatives are all formed in the syntax with a functional projection CauseP. This projection is responsible for the causing event, as argued by Pylkkänen (2002, 2008). In the Udmurt language the head of this projection can be filled or it can be phonetically null. If it is filled then it is always filled with the morpheme -t-, which is the phonological realization of the causing event in this language.

Causative constructions in Udmurt are similar to causatives in other languages, though all of the three types (i.e. lexical, factitive and analytic causatives) show some special syntactic properties which are not attested in any other language.

In the case of lexical causatives, in the causative/non-causative alternation there are some non-causative verbs which allow an agentive causer as an adjunct. This property has not been observed for non-causatives cross-linguistically.

Factive causatives in Udmurt also show some special syntactic properties, namely the appearance of the suffix -ez/jez both on the causee argument and on the theme argument, and the case-marking alternation of the causee argument. In the latter case the case-marking pattern of the causee is based on the degree of the control on the causee argument. If the causative activity is direct then the causee bears ACC case, while if it is indirect then the causee is encoded with INST case. Contrary to the case-pattern alternation observed in other languages, where the causee is always [+human], Udmurt features a case alternation even when the cause is [–human]. The possible appearance of a [–human] argument as a causee in factitives is also a special property of the language.

In addition to the investigation and analysis of causative constructions in Udmurt, the dissertation also proposes an alternative account for the use of the suffix -ez/jez appearing in all of the three
main chapters. The main idea of the analysis is that the suffix -ez/jez occurs when two entities are in an associative relation in the sentence.
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