CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN KALMYK AND THE SPEAKER’S PERSPECTIVE

1. Introduction

1.1. The design of the study
⇒ data-driven;
⇒ theory-neutral;

1.2. The language
⇒ Kalmyk < Mongolic < Altaic (?).
⇒ Spoken in the steppe regions adjacent to the North-West shore of the Caspian Sea.
⇒ The language remains in relatively active use in the area, although some speakers show a good deal of interference with Russian in their use of syntactic constructions.

1.3. The data
⇒ three expeditions organized by Saint-Petersburg State University (2006-2008);
⇒ see http://www.iling.spb.ru/kalmyk for more information on the project;
⇒ Dörböt dialect of the Kalmyk language (the data were collected in several villages in the Republic of Kalmykia, Russia);
⇒ Mostly elicitation, but also a minor corpus of glossed oral texts (see section 9).

2. The notion of the speaker’s perspective [Fillmore 1977 et al.]

(1) Mary sold John that book for $20.
(2) John bought that book from Mary for $20.
⇒ The two sentences have the same propositional semantics (truth values),
⇒ Commercial Transaction Frame, whose elements include seller, buyer, goods, and money.
⇒ The difference is that of the perspective.
⇒ «Meanings are relativized to scenes» [Fillmore 1977: 84].
⇒ At least two sides of the perspective-taking:
  ➢ Argument selection: what are the participants that are taken into perspective
  ➢ Argument linking: which argument is put into which syntactic position)

1 The research is support by a grant from the RFFI (Russian foundation for fundamental research, grant № 07-06-00278 “elaboration of glossed corpora for minor languages of Russia: Nanai, Udege, Kalmyk”).
2 Kalmyk is also spoken by a small minority of speakers in Kyrgyzstan (near the Issyq-Kul lake) and in the Xinjiang autonomous region of China.
3. Possible approaches to the study of causative constructions

3.1. **Causative constructions in terms of their formal marking**

[Nedjalkov, Sil’nitskij 1969]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of causative</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Kalmyk</th>
<th>Verb Derivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical causatives</td>
<td><strong>to die</strong></td>
<td>ük-‘to die’</td>
<td>ük-ül ‘to kill’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological causatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>ük-ül ‘to kill’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic causative constructions:</td>
<td></td>
<td>to laugh</td>
<td>to make laugh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ The discussion to follow is primarily concerned with **morphological** causatives in Kalmyk.

3.2. **Causative constructions in terms of their role structure**

«The types of valency-increasing operations are distinguished depending on the semantic role of the newly introduced participant. One of the most widespread cases is the introduction of a new participant with the role of Agent (or Cause); these cases are referred to as derived causative verbs» [Plungjan 2003: 210; only verb-deriving **morphology** is discussed].

3.3. **Causative constructions in terms of the event structure**


⇒ Most causative constructions are characterised by some degree of intermingling the two subevents. Hence, **degrees** of directness (cf. [Daniel et al.; in preparation].

⇒ The crucial property that underpins the direct vs. indirect opposition is the degree of **control**.

- Direct causations: the least control on the part of the Causee;
- Indirect causation: higher preservation of control on the part of the Causee.

3.4. **Causative constructions in terms of the relational structure**

“The characteristics of a prototypical causative are:

…

(c) A new argument (the causer) is introduced, in A function” [Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000: 13].

There usually is some rearrangement of the relational structure of the underlying verb (e.g. the underlying S argument goes into the O position, etc.).
3.5. **An interim summary**

⇒ In this canonical view on causatives there is **not** much space left for the factor of **speaker’s perspective**: the **linking** of semantic arguments to their syntactic positions is viewed as more or less **straightforward**.

### 4. Causative verb derivation in Kalmyk: an overview

- Like other Mongolic languages, Kalmyk enjoys extensive use of causative morphology on verbs.
- Causativisation is almost unlimitedly productive (almost every verb can be causativised);
- Several causative morphemes (at least 5), the choice between them is patterned morphotactically, semantically and lexically (idiosyncratic).
- Roughly 4% of verbs in texts are causative verbs (our counts).
- Double and even triple causatives are possible.
- The newly introduced argument of the derived causatives is always coded in the subject position.

⇒ **The “canonical” pattern:**

(3) \(ködəlməshchə \ xö \ al-əv.\)

labourer   ram   slaughter-PST

‘The labourer slaughtered a / the ram’.

(4) \(ezən \ ködəlməshch-ər \ xö \ al-ul-əv.\)

master   labourer-INSTR   ram   slaughter-CAUS-PST

‘The master made the labourer slaughter the ram’ (or ‘the labourer slaughtered the ram by order from the master’).

- Valency-increase;
- The newly introduced argument is the Causer;
- It occupies the subject position;
- There are two subevents (the causing subevent and the caused subevent).

### 5. Problem I: argument selection and causative derivation

⇒ Despite almost unlimited productivity of the causative derivation in Kalmyk, the very dissociation of the Instigator and the actual Performer of the action is not a guarantee for the use of the causative.

{Grandfather divides the harvest into three parts and sends his grandchildren to sell it in three different places. Thus, …}

(5) \(aavə \ sääńär oruta-qar \ urqc-an \ xuld-na \ / \ xuld-ul-na.\)

grandfather well bargain-INSTR harvest-P.REFL sell-PRS / sell-CAUS-PRS

‘Grandfather sells the harvest with a good bargain’.
My parents <…> would go to the knowing people, show (them) their children, (they) were (thus) healing (their children).

⇒ Note the lack of the causative in the last clause, despite indirectness of the performance of the action (it was the ‘knowing people’ who healed the children).
⇒ The speaker has a certain degree of freedom as to whether the Performer should be taken into perspective.

6. Problem II: the syntactic position of the causee

6.1. Causatives of intransitives

➢ The usual pattern: the S-argument of the underlying intransitive verb is coded in the position of the direct object of the causative verb.
➢ The only deviation known so far (cf. [Nedjalkov 1967: 53]): verbs of sound emission. The cause can be coded by the Instrumental case if it is construed as an instrument:

(7) Bi xoŋx-ar / xoŋxə / xoŋx-igə dhiŋ-ü₂l-ʊ-v.  
I bell-INSTR / bell / bell-ACC ring.INTR-CAUS-PST-1SG
‘I rang (lit. with) the bell’

(8) Chi telefo-qar dhiŋ-ül-chkə-∅!  
you phone-INSTR ring.INTR-CAUS-PRF.TR-IMP
‘Call on the phone!’

(9) Ükrə xoŋx-igə / *xoŋx-ar dhiŋ-ü₂l-nä.  
cow bell-ACC / *bell-INSTR ring.INTR-CAUS-PRS
‘The cow made the bell ring’ (*rang the bell).
Speaker’s comment: xoŋxar would sound funny, as if the cow deliberately moved her neck in order to make the bell ring.

6.2. Causatives of transitives

➢ In causatives derived from transitives, the underlying O-argument preserves its syntactic status of the direct object.

---

3 Henceforth examples introduced with the reference line of this type are examples taken from recorded texts, not elicited examples.
The “underlying” A-argument is either non-overt or demoted to an oblique position: Instrumental, or, less frequently, Dative, Accusative, [Sanzheev 1983, Ochirov 1964] and also Ablative.

6.3. **Causatives with less direct reading: Instrumental causees (default pattern)**

(10) *Ekə-m eck-ār nan-də uʃə bichəg bich-ül-əv.*

mother-1SG.P father-INSTR I.DAT long letter write-CAUS-PST

‘My mother made the father write me a letter’.

⇒ The dative is sometimes possible in the permissive reading:

{Teacher left the classroom. The boys are all noisy, except for one pupil who wants to write the exercise}.

(11) *Neg kövü-n kel-və: nan-də daalqər bich-ül-ton!*

One boy-EXT say-PST I.DAT exercise write-CAUS-BENED

‘One boy said: “let me write the exercise”’

⇒ The Ablative is also possible in some cases, e.g. in the abessive reading:

(12) *Susanin xortn-asə xaalq-iny gee-lq-əv.*

Susanin enemy-ABL road-ACC.P.3 lose-CAUS-PST

‘Susanin made enemies lose their road’ (lit. ‘from enemies’).

6.4. **Causatives with more direct reading**

⇒ Generally, this type of reading is problematic for underlying transitive verbs.

⇒ The subjects of some verbs of cognition are put into the Dative case under causativization. NB: they are construed as addressees / recipients:

(13) *nandə bədmə evränny toolvr-an med-ül-üv.*

I.DAT Badma of.himself mind-P.REFL know-CAUS-PST

Badma told me his mind (Lit. Badma made me know his mind).

(14) *Badma sän zäng-igə cuqara-d-ny soŋs-x-əv.*

Badma good news-ACC all-DAT-P.3 hear-CAUS-PST

Badma told everybody a good news (Lit. Badma made everybody hear a good news).

6.5. **Summary**

⇒ The choice of the syntactic position of the causee is only partly determined by the syntactic properties of the underlying verb. **The construal** on the part of the speaker might play a significant role in this choice.
7. Problem III: “Rearranging” causatives

The argument that bears the Causer role in the causative construction is in fact semantically and syntactically represented in the underlying non-causative construction as well, although it occupies a non-subject position and is not construed as the Causer.

7.1. Verbs of emotion (‘psych’-verbs)

This pattern is cross-linguistically typical of verbs of emotion and semantically similar verbs (‘be afraid of’, ‘be pleased’, ‘laugh’ etc.) [Ljutikova et al. 2006: 58-59]:

Bajrta husband-GEN.P.REFL letter-DAT rejoice-PROG-PRS
‘Bajrta is glad because of her husband’s letter’.

(16) Zalu-qinny bichəg Bajrta-gə bajrl-ul-əv.
husband-GEN.3.P letter Bajrta-ACC rejoice-CAUS-PST
‘The husband’s letter (lit. her husband’s letter) made Bajrta glad’.

7.2. Other verbs (e.g. two-place verbs of motion: trajector + landmark)

In Kalmyk some 5 to 10 other verbs from the sample of 100 verbs are characterised by this pattern:

(17) Cholun usən-da chiv-nā
stone.NOM water-DAT sink-PRS
‘Stone sinks in water’.

(18) Usən cholu chiv-ə-nā
water.NOM stone sink-CAUS-PRS
‘Stone sinks in water’ (lit. ‘Water sinks stone’).

(19) örā cevər aqar-ar düür-əv.
room clean air-INSTR get.filled-PST
‘The room filled with fresh air’.

(20) usən shuluqar suulq düür-g-əv / düür-g-ul-əv.
water.NOM rapidly bucket get.filled-CAUS-PST / get.filled-CAUS-CAUS-PST
‘Water rapidly filled the bucket’.

father-P.3 boy-P.REFL behind follow-CAUS-CV.IPFV go-PRS
‘The father makes his son follow him’ (≈ ‘leads’, but non-contact interpretation).

⇒ No increase in valency!
⇒ The ‘causer’ is construed as the primarily responsible participant.
⇒ The syntactic ‘causer’ typically lacks many of the usual agentive properties.
7. It might be insightful to consider such “deviations” in term’s of “the speaker’s perspective”. Causative may be used as a morphosyntactic device that allows the speaker to adjust the number of arguments taken into perspective as well as their syntactic weights to the current communicative tasks.

7.3. The choice between valency-increase vs. rearrangement interpretations

⇒ This choice depends on the presence of the underlying verb’s second argument in the causative construction:

(22) Noxa xulxach-igə ää-lq-əv.
dog thief-ACC be.afraid-CAUS-PST
‘The dog frightened the thief’.

(23) Ekə-m nama-gə kədəlmsh-ər ää-lq-üə-v.
Mother-P.1SG I-ACC work-INS be.afraid-CAUS-CAUS-PST
‘My mother threatened (frightened) me with work’.

7.4. Summary

⇒ The use of the causative does not necessarily introduce a new causer argument, it might signal a different perspective on an event with the same number of arguments and roles.

8. Causative verbs in dependent clauses

8.1. Purpose clauses: the two strategies

⇒ The converb in -xar is a dedicated “purpose converb”.

⇒ This device works strictly on the same-subject basis:

a. I [sleep-CV.PURP] they-ACC send.back-PRF.TR-PST-1SG
 ‘I have sent them back home in order for me to sleep’.
b. *I [sleep-CV.PURP they-ACC] send.back-PRF.TR-PST-1SG
 *‘I have sent them, back home [_____i to sleep]’.

⇒ In the different-subject environment another strategy must be used in dependent purpose clauses:

I [they-ACC sleep-TXA GIQÄD] send.back-PRF.TR-PST-1SG
 ‘I have sent them back home in order for them to sleep’.
8.2. **Causatives in dependent same-subject purpose clauses**

- There is an alternative and more economic way of expressing the meaning of (25), which is *central for further discussion*. It is not described in the traditional grammars of Kalmyk [Sanzheev 1983, Ochirov 1964]:

  \[ Bi [ \_ i tedn-ig\_ unt-ul-xar] xärül-chk-ü-v. \]

  ‘I [they-ACC sleep-CAUS-CV.PURP] send.back-PRF.TR-PST-1SG
  ‘I have sent them back home in order for them to sleep’. (Cf. 8 and 9).

- The same-subject constraint is not violated, since the dependent verb is causativized, which makes the A-participant of the main event also the subject of the embedded clause. Thus syntactically, causativization in these contexts is a mechanism that introduces a new argument to the embedded verb, which is semantically external to the event itself (the sleeping of ‘them’ in (26)).

- It is crucial that out of this context, the normal reading of the causative verb *unt-ul-* would imply **direct causation**:

  \[ Bi tedn-ig\_ unt-ul-u-v. \]

  ‘I lulled them to sleep’ (lit.: ‘made them sleep’)

- Thus, the A-participant of the embedded clause in (26) is not a prototypical Agent. It is **volitional**, like a prototypical Agent, but lacks implication of actual bringing about the event caused.

8.3. **Temporal ordering of events and the use of causative verbs in dependent purpose clauses**

- Normally, the action denoted by the dependent purpose clause can only take place after the action denoted in the main clause (24).

- When the embedded verb is causativized, it is the **event caused** that takes place after the action described in the main clause, not the **very event of causation** (26).

8.4. **Summary so far (somewhat simplified)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>independent clauses</th>
<th>dependent clauses (complements or purpose adjuncts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factitive component</td>
<td>(X actually <strong>brings</strong> about the event P) YES (possible)</td>
<td>(possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volitional component</td>
<td>(X <strong>wants</strong> that the event P take place) (possible)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8
NB! It looks as if the uses of causative verbs in the dependent clauses discussed can be described as partially syntactically-driven and might seem to be desemanticized: the use of causative morphology does not make any evident semantic contribution to the meaning of the sentence (volition is inherent to these construction).

8.5. The use of causatives in some other syntactic environments: e.g. clause union constructions

⇒ Leftward transitivity assimilation in clause union constructions. If the clause-final (semi)auxiliary verb is transitive, preceding verbs must be transitive as well:

(28) felix_sasha.004

Neg dägchə, kövün berə or-ul-dhə av-chə.

one time boy.NOM daughter.in.law enter-CAUS-CV.IPFV take-RES

‘One day the boy married (lit. brought took a daughter-in-law)’.

⇒ No rightward transitivity assimilation, however:

(29) elzata_avtobiografija.005

Däkäd qaza av-ch qar-ad, <… > xova-v.

more outside take-CV.IPFV go.out-CV.ANT, divide-PST

‘Then (they) brought (us) outside (lit. took and went out = made go out), and divided’.

8.6. Some typological parallels

❖ For many languages it has been claimed that voice alternations and other argument-determined constructions can be used for purely syntactic reasons, first of all, for purposes of further clause combining.

(30) The boy milked the cow and Ø sneezed. OK!

(31) *The boy milked the cow and mooed. *

(32) The cow was milked by the boy and mooed. OK!

❖ Though rarely, some typological parallels to the syntactic uses of causative Kalmyk can be found, e.g. in Yup’ik Eskimo [Mithun 2000: 104-107], and in some Formosan languages:

Kavalan (<East Formosan < Austronesian)

(33) mərinana=iku tu sunis pa-rusit

persuade=1S.NOM ACC child CAUS(AGENT.VOICE)-leave

lit.: ‘I persuade my child such that I cause him/her to leave’.

(34) ?? mərinana=iku tu sunis m-rusit

persuade=1S.NOM ACC child ACTOR.VOICE-leave

for ‘I persuade my child to leave’ [Chang & Tsai 2001: 3].
Only the Actor of the main clause can control PRO in the dependent clause. Thus (34) is problematic. A possible way out is causativization of the embedded clause (33), which makes the co-reference relations felicitous.

9. Causative verbs in Kalmyk: counts from texts

It was preliminarily shown above that the use of the Kalmyk causative can be determined by information packaging in discourse. Hence, a study of the use of causative morphology in natural texts. A minor corpus:
- 20 texts,
- mostly narratives
- overall duration appr. 1 hour,
- 78 doubtless instances of causatives

9.1. The causative in finite vs. non-finite forms (some counts from texts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>overall no. of verb forms</th>
<th>causative verbs</th>
<th>the ratio of causative verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>converbs</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participles</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finite forms</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The causatives tends to be used in non-finite (= syntactically-dependent) verb forms.

9.2. Expression of the causer and the causee in causatives clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Causer</th>
<th>Causee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-overt</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexical expression of both the causer and the causee is attested rarely. It is especially true of Causers (and, more generally, of transitive subjects, cf. DuBois’ Preferred Argument Structure Hypothesis [DuBois 1987 et al.]). Only three instances of the overt expression of Causee in causative from transitive verbs, out of which two are represented by the verb ‘to show’ (see-CAUS) with the Dative ‘causee’ (the person being shown something). Not a single example of the Instrumental coding of the overt Causee (the so-called ‘default’ pattern).
9.3. **Givón’s continuity measures: referential distance for the causer**

Referential distance – the number of clauses between the causative clause and the last clause where the referent was used as an argument. RD = 1 means that this referent was an argument of the preceding clause.

**The referential distance (RD) for causers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RD</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Non-subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 or ∞</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ In the vast majority of cases (49 examples, 64%) the **causer is the subject** of the preceding clause.
⇒ Only 22 (29%) instances of Causers **are not subjects** in the proximate left contexts.

**Causers that are not subjects in the proximate left context:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causer Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech act participants (1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized subjects (‘people’, ‘they’)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of relativization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Only one instance of referential and non-inherently topical causer!
⇒ Causativization reflects the adjustment of a particular event into the textual perspective (topic chain) established in the previous discourse.

\(^4\) One of the causative clauses was not analyzable in terms of referential distance.
9.4. **Givón's continuity measures: the causee**

The referential distance (RD) for causees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RD</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Out of which the following syntactic positions on last appearance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 or ∞</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ Causees are, expectedly, less continuous topics than causers;
⇒ What is less expected is that when causees are used in the left context, they are mostly found in the position of the direct object in that left context!

Explicit mentioning of the causee for various types of previous mentions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overt (explicit) causee</th>
<th>Zero (implicit) causee</th>
<th>Σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct object</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned in the left context</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⇒ The figures obtained are certainly rather scarce.
⇒ Expectedly, continuous causees are left implicit more often than those that are newly introduced;
⇒ What is, however, unexpected, is that causees that had been previously mentioned as subjects pattern with those that have not been mentioned at all, while those causees that had been previously mentioned in oblique positions pattern with those mentioned in the direct object position.
⇒ It is not topic-continuity itself that plays a role in the choice between zero and overt referential expression for the Causee
⇒ The data imply that the unity of the perspective in the coherent discourse does not only affect the choice of the subject, but also influences the behaviour of causees!
9.5. Causatives and the unification of the perspective in the narrative: some examples

{Left context: In our village there was a healer whose name was Namka.}

(35) qolbemb_celiteli.017

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qol} & \text{- cuqar od-chə,} \\
\text{bijän} & \text{ üzüläd,} \\
\text{many all} & \text{ leave-CV.IPFV SELF.ACC see-CAUS-CV.ANT} \\
\text{domn-ul-ad,} & \text{ nom-dony or-ad <…> } \\
\text{treat-CAUS-CV.ANT} & \text{ knowledge-DAT.P.3 enter-CV.ANT}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Many people went (to him), showed themselves to him, made (him) treat (themselves), trusted his knowledge <…>’

{ Left context: Mother and son encountered evil forces.}

(36) felix_sasha.021

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tegäd} & \text{ geləŋ-üd av-chə} \text{ ir-chk-äd,} \\
\text{thus} & \text{ sage-PL take-CV.IPFV come-PRF.TR-CV.ANT} \\
\text{ishkä} & \text{ gerin ömnäqür suu-lq-chk-ad, nomə} \\
\text{mat} & \text{ house-GEN in.front sit-CAUS-PRF.TR-CV.ANT prayer} \\
\text{umsh-ul-dh} & \text{ ad-əch.} \\
\text{read-CAUS-CV.IPFV leave-RES}
\end{align*}
\]

‘They brought wise people, made (them) sit on a mat in front of the house, made (them) read the prayer’.

(37) Zinaida_Markelovna_avtobiografija.002

\[
\begin{align*}
<…> & \text{ Sivirtə od-ad, madnigə avad odad,} \\
\text{Siberia-DAT leave-CV.ANT 1PL.ACC take-CV.ANT leave-CV.ANT} \\
\text{mana ekə-ekə xojr, xojr küük-än qazor-tə üld-ə-qäd,} \\
\text{1PL.GEN mother-father two, two girl-P.REFL earth-DAT remain-CAUS-CV.ANT} \\
\text{mini eckə Sivir-tə basə üld-əv.} \\
\text{1SG.GEN father Siberia-DAT also remain-PST.}
\end{align*}
\]

‘They went to Siberia, they took us, my mother and father, two of their children died (lit. they made two their children remain in the earth), then my father died (lit. remained in the earth) as well’.
9.6. Summary

⇒ In Kalmyk discourse, it is natural to maintain the same subject-non-subject perspective throughout consecutive clauses. Causativization is (one of) the major morphosyntactic mechanisms to achieve this end.
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