

TYPES OF VERBS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE CAUSATIVE SUFFIX *-k* IN NEWAR*

Kazuyuki Kiryu

Mimasaka Women's College

1. INTRODUCTION

In previous studies of the Newar language, at least two types of functions of the productive causative suffix *-k* have been discussed: one is a function to form canonical causative clauses, where a new causative agent is introduced into the embedded core event frame, as in (1), and the other is, as discussed in Hargreaves (1991), a function to give a meaning of control and a “middle voice interpretation”, without increasing participants of the core event, as in (2):

- (1) a. *khicã: wa ma:ma: nala.*
dog.ERG that dumpling.ABS eat.PD
'A dog ate the dumplings.'
- b. *macã: khicã-yãta wa ma:ma: na-k-ala.*
child.ERG dog-DAT that dumpling.ABS eat-CAUS-PD
'The child made a dog eat the dumplings.'
- (2) a. *ji-ta jãmãn lumana.*
1SG-DAT promise.ABS remember.PD
'I remembered the promise.'
- b. *jĩ: jãmãn lumã:-k-ã.*
1SG.ERG promise.ABS remember-CAUS-PC
'I recalled the promise.'

A more careful inspection of the distribution of the suffix with various semantic types of verb, however, has revealed some more semantically different functions of it, which have not been recognized so far in the literature.

In this short paper, I will discuss functions of the suffix from a descriptive point of view, and argues that what Hargreaves (1991) calls “affective causatives” should be further divided into two sub-classes in terms of verb types and syntactic behaviors.

2. CANONICAL CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTION

As discussed in the previous works, the suffix *-k* forms canonical causative clauses, introducing a causative agent to a non-causative event. In the case of intransitive verbs which take an inanimate subject, the causativized verbs express transitive events, typically caused by an animate external causer, as in (3).

- (3) a. *cwāpu nāla.*
snow.ABS melt.PD
'The snow melted.'
- b. *Rām-ā cwāpu nāe-k-ala.*
Ram-ERG snow.ABS melt-CAUS-PD
'Ram melted the snow.'

On the other hand, in the case of intransitive verbs which take an animate subject, the causativized versions express manipulative causative events, as in (4).

- (4) a. *macā myec-e phetu-ta.*
child.ABS chair-LOC sit-PD
'The child sat on the chair.'
- b. *Rām-ā: macā-yāta myec-e phetui-k-ala.*
Ram-ERG child-DAT chair-LOC sit-CAUS-PD
'Ram seated the child on the chair.'

Types of verbs which enter into the canonical causative are verbs of action, such as *lālakāye* 'to swim', *nyāsiwane* 'to walk', *naye* 'to eat', and *bwane* 'to read'; verbs of inherently-directed motion, such as *wane* 'to go', *waye* 'to come' and compound verbs with these verbs; and verbs of change of state, such as *nāye* 'to melt' and *luye* 'to get found'.

In canonical causatives, animate causees are marked with dative whereas inanimate causees are marked with absolutive, and the clauses mean coercive/manipulative causation. In the case of causatives with animate causees, coercive/manipulative causation and permissive causation are distinguished by an auxiliary verb *biye* and the conjugations. The former requires the main verb to be in the *ā*-form, which is the same as Past Conjunct form, while the latter requires it to be in the *e*-form, which is the same as Non-Past Conjunct form (Poteet, 1988):¹

- (5) a. *jī: Rām-yāta ma:ma: na-k-ā biyā.* (manipulative)
1.SG.ERG Ram-DAT dumpling eat-CAUS-PC give.PC
'I fed Ram dumplings.'
- b. *jī: Rām-yāta ma:ma: na-k-e biyā.* (permissive)
1.SG.ERG Ram-DAT dumpling eat-CAUS-NPC give.PC
'I let Ram eat dumplings.'

Though a causative clause without *biye* can also express a manipulative causation,² the difference between the two is in that a causativized verb alone expresses a simple manipulative causation whereas a causativized verb in the *a*-form plus *biye* expresses a causation in a benefactive sense. Therefore, a typical context for (5a) is when Ram could not eat by himself: for instance, he had got his arms injured, and the speaker helped him eat by putting the dumplings in his mouth. On the other hand, the causative form alone expresses a simple manipulative causation.

Unlike verbs with animate subjects, the addition of *biye* to causative clauses with an inanimate causee does not further distinguish such a difference of causations, but rather they are interpreted as a benefactive construction, and *biye* can only take a verb in the *ā*-form, not in the *e*-form, as in (6):

- (6) a. *Latā: macā-yālagi cwāpu nāe-k-ā bila.*
Lata.ERG child-for snow.ABS melt-CAUS-PC give.PD
'Lata melted the snow for her child.'

- b. **Latã:* *macã-yãlagi cwãpu* *nãe-k-e* *bila.*
 Lata.ERG child-for snow.ABS melt-CAUS-NPC give.PD

This, of course, shows that permissive causative requires an animate causee.

3. CAUSATIVES WITHOUT VALENCE INCREASE

Hargreaves (1991) argues that what he calls an “affective causative” receives a “middle voice interpretation” or “reflexive-like interpretations.” He illustrates this point with the following examples [Newar transliteration and glosses are changed to mine]:

- (7) a. *jĩ:* *khã:* *si-la.*
 1.SG.ERG matter know-PD
 ‘I (just) learned this matter.’

- b. *jĩ:* *khã:* *si:-k-ã.*
 1.SG.ERG matter know-PD
 ‘I discovered this matter.’

(Hargreaves 1991: 154)

- (8) a. *wa-yãta* *ciku-la* (*thẽ:*).
 3.SG-DAT cold-PD (like)
 ‘(It looks like) S/he’s cold’

- b. *wã:* *cikui-k-ala.*
 3.SG cold-CAUS-PD
 ‘He shivered/shook with cold.’

(Hargreaves 1991: 152)

The b-examples in (7) and (8) do not have a new causer, and they are interpreted as Control-verbs. (7a) depicts a spontaneous event which does not involve the subject intention and control, whereas (7b) indicates that the subject made an effort to figure out about the matter and, as a result, became to know about the matter. Along the line of his argument for “middle voice”, Hargreaves would argue that the subject affects oneself to control his or her cognitive state. As well, (8a) takes a dative experiencer subject and means one’s spontaneous state of physical sensation, whereas, regarding (8b) he says that it ‘can be interpreted as a Control intransitive verb (Hargreaves 1991: 152).’ His argument for the “middle voice” interpretation will be rejected in the following sub-section.

3.1 Verbs of emotion and bodily sensation

Hargreaves tries to capture the distribution of the above examples in a uniform way by means of the notion of “middle voice” or “reflexive-like”. In reality, however, Hargreaves’ affective causatives should be further divided into at least two types based on their syntactic behavior and semantic interpretation. First of all, there is a person restriction on subjects with them. The causativized form of the verb in (7), *si:ke*, can occur with a first, second or third person subject. On the other hand, the one of the verb in (8) cannot take a first person subject, and only occur with a second or third person subject in affirmative sentences, as shown in (9):

- (9) a. **jĩ:* *cikui-k-ã.*
 1.SG.ERG cold-CAUS-PC
 ‘I shivered/shook with cold’

- b. *chā: cikui-k-ā.*
 2.SG.ERG cold-CAUS-PC
 ‘You shivered/shook with cold.’

Secondly, it is true that *cikula*, the non-causativized form of *cikuye*, can be used without an evidential marker, *thē:*, like (8a), but it is not always the case. Consider (10) now.

- (10) a. **Rām-yāta ciku-la. waita gā ha-yā byu.*
 Ram-DAT cold-PD 3.SG.DAT showl.ABS bring-PC give.IMP
 ‘Ram is cold. Bring him a showl.’
- b. *Rām-yāta ciku-la thē: cwā: waita gā ha-yā byu.*
 Ram-DAT cold-PD like stay.ST 3.SG.DAT showl.ABS bring-PC give.IMP
 ‘It seems that Ram is cold. Bring him a showl.’
- c. *Rām-yāta cikui-k-ala. waita gā ha-yā byu.*
 Ram-DAT cold-CAUS-PD 3.SG.DAT showl.ABS bring-PC give.IMP
 ‘Ram is cold. Bring him a showl.’

In the context where the speaker is observing Ram, it is not acceptable to say *cikula* without an evidential marker like *thē:*. Without one, *cikuikala*, the causativized form, must be used. In the same context with a first person subject, the verb must be in the non-causativized form *cikula*, not the causativized one, and no evidential marker follows it, as illustrated in (11):

- (11) *jita ciku-la. gā ha-yā byu.*
 1.SG-DAT cold-PD showl.ABS bring-PC give.IMP
 ‘I’m cold. Bring me a showl.’

As I mentioned above, it is possible to say *cikula* with a third person subject, but this case is restricted to a story-telling, in which the physical sensation is told from the viewpoint of the protagonist in question. At least, when the speaker talks about someone’s emotion/feeling, we cannot use a simple form.

Furthermore, although Hargreaves interprets *cikuikala* as a control verb, the actual interpretation should be simply ‘be cold.’ The interpretation of shivering/shaking with cold can be said with a different verb *khāye*.

- (12) *ji/wa thuruthuru khāta.*
 1/3.SG.ABS trembling shiver.PD
 ‘I/He shivered very much.’

There is no person restriction imposed on this verb because it is not a verb of bodily sensation and describes the movement of the body.

The similar thing holds true with other verbs of emotion and bodily sensation, such as *tānwaye* ‘to feel hot’, *nhyāipuye* ‘to feel fun’, *nhyarwaye* ‘to feel sleepy’, *tyānuye* ‘to get tired’, and *syāye* ‘to feel pain’, and the function of the causative suffix here is to mark a higher degree of transitivity to capture the event which is observable by others. The simple form of verbs of emotion and bodily sensation presupposes that they are internally perceived emotions or sensations of the body and mind, and that others cannot observe them directly. This is why verbs of emotion and bodily sensation require an evidential marker with a third person subject. If such an emotion is observable by others, some kind of effect is brought about by the source of emotion to them, and in this sense, such an event is interpreted as higher in transitivity. It might be possible to argue that the ergative case on the subject required in the case of causativized version expresses source, rather than agent because the subject is much less agentive.

3.2 Verbs of cognition and mental state and other Non-Control verbs

The other type of affective causative does not have such restrictions as those imposed on verbs of emotion and bodily-sensation. The verbs that enter into this type are verbs of mental state, such as *lumane* ‘to remember’, *lwamane* ‘to forget’, *siye* ‘to know’, *khane* ‘to see’ and *thuye* ‘to understand’, and other Non-control verbs such as *thyene* ‘to arrive’ and *libāye* ‘to be late’. Since these verbs are Non-Control verbs, they do not take the conjunct form but the disjunct form even with a first person subject, and are semantically interpreted as spontaneous. On the other hand, the causativized forms take on an interpretation of intentional control over the event. The function of the causative suffix here also increases the degree of transitivity in the sense of control and kinesis. We will see a simple contrast, as in (13):

- (13) a. *Rām khu-tā ila-e thyen-a.*
 Ram.ABS six-CL time-LOC arrive-PD
 ‘Ram arrived at six o’clock.’
- b. *Rām-ā: ālapā: khu-tā ila-e thyā:k-ala.*
 Ram-ERG intentionally six-CL time-LOC arrive-CAUS-PD
 ‘Ram intentionally arrived at six o’clock.’

In Newar, the event of arriving somewhere is regarded as a non-control event, but when someone tries to arrive at the time he intends, the verb must be in the causative form, as in (13b).

The distribution of this subtype of affective causative includes purpose clauses introduced by a purpose marker *-ta*, and possibility contexts headed by an auxiliary verb *phaye* ‘to be able’, as in (14):

- (14) *si:gu dha-i-gu si:k-e-ta cha-kwa: si-nā ma-swa:-se*
 die.NPD-NL say-NPD-NL know-CAUS-NPC-PURP one-time die-PC NEG-look.ST-ADV
si:k-e pha-i ma-khu.
 know-CAUS-NPC be.able-NPC NEG-COPULA.ST
 ‘To know how it is to die, it is impossible to know it without trying dying once.’

4. INVOLVEMENT TO AN EVENT

Although the suffix is a single productive causative morpheme in modern Newar, causative verbs are formed in another way. The other type of causative is based on a phonological correspondence with simple forms and is restricted to certain verbs. The character of this phonological derivation is that the first consonant of the root syllable in simple form is voiced/non-aspirated whereas that in causative form is voiceless/aspirated. Malla (1985) has a good list of these verbs. The pair of verbs *guta* and *khuta* in (15) is one of them. The verb *guye* is a simple intransitive verb and the verb *khuye* is the causative version.

- (15) a. *wasā: gu-ta.*
 clothes.ABS get torn-PD
 ‘My clothes tore.’
- b. *Rām-ā: wasā: khu-ta.*
 Ram-ERG clothes.ABS tear-PD
 ‘Ram tore my/his clothes.’

In the previous works—as far as I am concerned—no one has examined the possibility to attach the causative suffix *-k* to the intransitive verbs of the non-productive causative pairs. It

is in fact possible to attach the causative suffix to them, but the interpretation is not the same as the non-productive causative counterpart, and usually it seems to be difficult to use it as a finite verb. My database contains those forms typically in serial verb constructions. Now let us consider the examples in (16):

- (16) a. *macā: saphu: khu-ta.*
 child.ERG book.ABS get.torn-PD
 ‘The child tore the book.’
- b. *macā: saphu: gu-k-ā: lihā wa-la.*
 child.ERG book.ABS get.torn-CAUS-CP back come-PD
 ‘The child came with a book torn.’

(16a) means that the child tore the book by himself, whereas the causativized version (16b) will be uttered in such a situation that the book got torn incidentally on the way he came. The latter sentence implies that the child did not do anything to tear the book and did not realize that the book was torn. Chances are that someone torn his book and put it back in his bag, or that when he put something in his bag, it got stuck with the book and the book got torn accidentally.

The difference between the non-productive causative form and the *k*-causative form lies in that the former implies a manipulative causation whereas the latter implies a non-volitional involvement to the event described by the intransitive verb. Although *khuta* in (16b) allows a non-volitional interpretation, it usually entails the subject’s contact with the book. *Gukā*, however, does not entail it.

In a serial verb construction, it is also possible to have a simple form as in (17), but the situation is different from (16b).

- (17) *saphu: gu-nā: macā lihā wa-la.*
 book.ABS get.torn-CP child.ABS back come-PD
 ‘The book got torn and so the child came back.’

The difference is more clearly illustrated by the sentences in (18).

- (18) a. *ji gyā-nā: chē:-e lihā wa-yā*
 1.SG.ABS get.scared-CP house-loc back back-come-PC
 ‘I got scared and came back home.’
- b. *ji gyā-k-ā: chē:-e lihā wa-yā*
 1.SG.ABS get.scared-CAUS-CP house-loc back come-PC
 ‘I came home, feeling scared.’

The verb *gyāye* means *to get scared* and the non-productive causative form is *khyāye*, which means *to scare* someone else. (18b), however, does not mean such a situation, and does not introduce a new agent. In this sense, it is similar to the affective causative pattern, but it is neither subject to the person restriction. This point is obvious from the fact that *gukā* occurs with a first person subject in (18) and does not have the subject’s control over the event. The interpretation of (18a) is such that when the speaker was walking down the street, he saw a very scary place ahead of him and felt scared, and that then he walked back the way he had come along and came back home. On the other hand, (18b) is construed as such that the speaker went down a very scary road on the way back home, feeling scared until he came back home.

The difference is that the former serial verb construction depicts the two events as taking place in a sequence, while the latter presents the first event in causative form as a sub-event taking place during the occurrence of the main event depicted by the finite verb.

5. CONTRAST BETWEEN SELF AND OTHERS

Most transitive verbs do not distinguish in form whether the action is directed toward others or toward the agent itself. Look at the sentences in (19):

- (19) a. *jĩ: Shyām-yāta dā-yā.*
 1.SG.ERG Sham-DAT hit-PC
 ‘I hit Sham.’
- b. *jĩ: tha:ta thamā: dā-yā.*
 1.SG.ERG self-DAT self.ERG hit-PC
 ‘I hit myself.’

With certain types of transitive verbs, however, this distinction is morphologically made by the causative suffix, marking the action depicted by the verb as directed toward a different participant, not to the agent. This is the case with verbs of reflexive actions, like a variety of verbs of dressing such as *phiye* ‘to put on a shirt’ and *puye* ‘to put on a cap’; verbs of body-washing like *mhwai:lhuye* ‘to wash body’. These verbs unmarkedly express reflexive action toward the agentive subject. On the other hand, the causativized forms express a ‘transitive’ action toward a different participant, as in (20):

- (20) a. *jĩ: wasa: punā.*
 1.SG.ERG clothes.ABS wear-PC
 ‘I put on the clothes.’
- b. *jĩ: macā-yāta wasa: pũ:k-ā.*
 1.SG.ERG child-DAT clothes.ABS wear-CAUS-PC
 ‘I dressed my child.’
- (21) a. *Gitā: swā:mā kwakhā-la*
 Gita.ERG flower.chain hang-PD
 ‘Gita hung the flower chain (around her own neck).’
- b. *Gitā: wa manu:yāta swā:mā kwakhāe-k-ala.*
 Gita.ERG that man-DAT flower.chain hang-CAUS-PD
 ‘Gita hung the flower chain on the man.’
- (22) a. *jĩ: mwa:lhu-yā.*
 1.SG.ERG head.wash-PC
 ‘I washed myself.’
- b. *jĩ: macā-yāta mwa:lhui-k-ā.*
 1.SG.ERG child-DAT head.wash-CAUS-PC
 ‘I washed my child.’

In these examples, the simple form is used when the action is directed toward the agent itself, but when it is directed toward someone else, the causativized form must be used. In these instances—unlike canonical causative clauses—a coercive sense does not necessarily exist; they simply function as transitive verbs. This means that the simple form of reflexive verbs are originally supposed to express a middle-voice-like event. Due to this, it is necessary to mark the action which is directed to others with the causative suffix. This situation is the exact opposite of Greek middle voice, and suggest that the unmarked conceptualization pattern in Newar is based on a reflexive/spontaneous event.

6. SUMMARY AND TYPOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCE

We have discussed functions of the causative suffix *-k* in Newar. They are summarized as follows:

- (23)
1. to mark an canonical causative event, introducing a new external causative agent.
 2. to mark an affective causative event in which the internal effect/action is controlled by the agent.
 3. to mark an affective causative event in which the internal event is observable by external observers.
 4. to mark a sub-event involved in or accompanied by the main event.
 5. to mark a transitive event which is directed toward others, not to the agent.

As a final remark, I would like to discuss a typological consequence of the causative suffix and types of verbs in Newar. As we have seen in the examples, Newar causatives are sensitive to the distinction between Self and Others. It may be possible to argue that Newar is different from English in that it pays attention to the distinction between Self and Others. In addition to the evidential features of verb conjugations in Control verbs, as discussed in Hargreaves (1991), the second type of affective causatives with verbs of emotion and bodily sensation in Section 3.1 and the simple/causative distinction observed in verbs of reflexive actions in the previous section are closely related to the distinction between Self and Others. At the level of conceptualization, Newar seems to employ Self-oriented type of events as unmarked and to express Others-oriented type of events as marked. The distinction between Conjunct and Disjunct dichotomy seems to be based on such a distinction to a great extent. At least at the level of transitivity, the distinction is clearly made. The distinction between Self and Others also leads to the distinction between spontaneous and externally-controlled events. Spontaneous events are self-completed but externally-controlled events are not self-completed, but transitive in the sense that more than one participant is expected in the event frame.

Self and Others distinction is also found in Japanese adjectives which express emotion and bodily sensation, and to our surprise, to depict a third person subject's emotion, the adjective must be verbalized by suffixation of a verbal suffix *-garu*, or verbs which semantically corresponds to the adjectives must be used. Verbs are considered to be higher in transitivity than adjectives, and this coincides with the appearance of the Newar causative suffix in the same situation. Consider examples in (24) and (25):

- (24) a. (*watasi wa*) *samui*.
 1.SG TOP cold.PRES
 'I am cold.'
- b. *Taroo wa samu-gatte-iru*.
 Taro TOP cold-*garu*-stay.PRES
 'Taro is cold.'
- (25) a. *watasi wa uresii*.
 1.SG TOP happy.PRES
 'I'm happy.'
- b. *Taroo wa yorokonde-iru*
 Taro TOP get.pleased-stay.PRES
 'Taro is happy.'

Even in English, the distinction between Self and Others is found, although it is not the case with adjectives and verbs of emotion and bodily sensation, and restricted to a certain type of expression which is idiosyncratic but still related to emotion. In Postal (1971) we find such an example. Look at the following examples:

- (26) a. It strikes me that you are unfriendly.
 b. *It strikes Pete that you are unfriendly.

Typologically speaking, Newar encodes the distinction between Self and Others in a wide range of grammatical expressions, including the contrast between the Conjunct and Disjunct dichotomy. English shows such a contrast to a very limited extent, and Japanese goes between English and Newar, since it is only seen with emotion and bodily sensation.

NOTE

*This paper is based on my presentation at Sixth Himalayan Languages Symposium, The University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. The abbreviations used in this paper are: ABS– absolutive, ADV – adverbial, CAUS– causative, CL– classifier, CP– connective participle, DAT– dative, ERG– ergative, IMP– imperative, LOC– locative, NPC– non-past conjunct, NPD– non-past disjunct, PC– past conjunct, PD– past disjunct, PRES– present, SG– singular, ST– stative

1. It seems to be the case that the derived causative forms are difficult to occur with some verbs, such as *bwane* ‘to read’, *cwaye* ‘to write’, etc. I need to do some more work on it.

2. As for some examples of double causative with *biye*, see Kansakar (1990).

REFERENCES

- Hargreaves, D. J. (1991). *The concept of intentional action in the grammar of Kathmandu Newari*. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Oregon.
- Kansakar, T. R. (1990). Lexical and Syntactic Causatives in Newari. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*. CANS, Tribvan University, Kathumandu.
- Kiryu, K. (2000). *Newaarugo Kihon Dooshi Yooreeshuu* (A Collection of Examples of Basic Verbs in Newari and Their Usages), a report of a project ‘A Contrastive Study of Basic Predicates between Japanese and Newari’, supported by the Ministry of Education’s Grant-in-Aid of Scientific Research..
- Malla, K. P. (1985). *The Newari Language: A Working Outline*. Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo.
- Postal, P. (1971). *Cross-over Phenomena*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Poteet, S. R. (1988). Causative constructions in Newari. In Cook, K. & Poteet, S. (Eds.), *Linguistic Notes from La Jolla: Newari Issue*, No. 14, pp. 108–146. UC, San Diego.
- Teramura, H. (1982). *Nihongo no Shintakusu to Imi [Japanese Syntax and Semantics] I*. Kuroshio Publishers, Tokyo.