

Interdisciplinary Journal of Linguistics
Volume [16] 2023, Pp. 235-248

**THE PROCESS OF CAUSATIVISATION IN
MAITHILI: A MORPHO-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS**

Smriti Choudhary*

ABSTRACT

This paper delves into the process of causativisation in Maithili, presenting a morpho-semantic analysis that unveils the mechanisms governing the formation of various causative forms. Building upon the work of linguists like Comrie, Dixon, and Shibatani, the study explores the interplay between morphological and semantic elements in creating causative constructions. The analysis classifies distinct patterns observed in intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive verbs, with a comparison to Hindi. The paper provides explanation for the verbs in Maithili that cannot be causativised morphologically, and also discusses the formation of false causatives in Maithili with regard to the default form of causative verbs.

Keywords: Causativisation, Maithili, Verb, Morpho-Semantics

1. Introduction

There have been various attempts to categorise the process of causative formation in terms of valency, transitivity, theta roles, syntactic structure, etc. However, it appears as though the debate has settled down to the fact that the above-mentioned factors are not sufficient to understand an overall picture with regard to the types that the processes of causativisation create across the semantic-classes of verbs and, thus, these factors seem to have no relevance when discussed in isolation. It is widely agreed upon that a causative situation involves two components – the event, and the cause of the event (Comrie 1989) (Shibatani 1976: 1). For example,

1. mohən ək^hbar pəṛ^həyɪ č^he
Mohan.NOM newspaper.ACC read.PROG PRS
Mohan is reading the newspaper.’

2. ma mohən-ke ək^hbar
pə ṛ^h.abəyɪ č^he
Mother. NOM Mohan-DAT newspaper. ACC
read. CAUS. PROGPRS

The mother is making Mohan read the newspaper.

* Center for Linguistics, JNU, New Delhi, India

Here, we have the event of Mohan reading the newspaper, but this event is brought on by the mother making Mohan read the newspaper, which becomes the cause of the event. Dixon (2000) presents a different kind of characterization – “a causative construction involves the specification of an additional argument, a causer, onto a basic clause.” In the above example, the addition of the argument ‘ma’ characterizes causativisation.

The primary objective of this study is to unravel the mechanisms underlying causativisation in Maithili, with a focus on how morphological and semantic elements interact to create different causative forms.

According to Yadav (1996), the analysis for causative constructions in Maithili must be able to:

“(i) readjustment of grammatical relations (e. g., subject, direct object, indirect object, oblique object, etc.) in view of the presence of an extra noun phrase (causer) in the corresponding causative sentence; and (ii) determining the case of the causee(s).” This perspective aligns for a need to perform a morpho-semantic analysis of the causative in Maithili.

The following section provides a comprehensive literature review on the morpho-semantic analyses of causativisation that examines the many theoretical approaches that have been pursued to undertake various studies on causativisation. Section 3 discusses the classification of the types of causatives in Maithili, and section 4 delves into a deeper evaluation for the rationale behind the classification.

2. Literature Review

Comrie (1989) emphasizes the existence of two component situations within any causative scenario, distinguishing the cause and its effect or result. He also discusses the characteristics of prototypical morphological causatives, highlighting their productivity and the limitations on iterativity in the causative process. Furthermore, Comrie addresses the semantic parameters of direct and indirect causation, drawing attention to the agency's role in controlling the realization of the effect.

Dixon's (2000) perspective adds an alternative characterization, focusing on the specification of an additional argument, the causer, in causative constructions. This perspective challenges the traditional 'two events' description, proposing a shift in how we conceptualize causative constructions.

Shibatani (2002) probes two important questions on the nature of causativisation, firstly, what are the types of events that are more likely to be lexicalized as an atomic unit, and secondly, how are these verbs related to other types of verbs morphologically and semantically. Shibatani also points out that inactive predicates are more likely to be

causativised than active predicates. This is because an event that has a patient as a subject is easier to causativise morphologically. Based on Shibatani (2002) findings, Launey (2002) offers an explanation for the '-tia' and '-l-tia' causativisation in classical Nahuatl. According to their analysis, since the agent slot is empty, causativisation can easily introduce a new agent argument, and when the agent slot is already filled, an extra step is needed to accommodate a new agent in the case of active and transitive verbs.

Schafer (2009)'s work on causative alternation provides a framework for us to analyze the actual base of a causativised verb. The question that needs to be answered is in a causative alternation, which one is the lexical base, and which is the derived base. It is also imperative to answer where does this derivation occur in our grammar. In Maithili, there are a number of verbs that appear to be the derived causative forms, but as we shall see later in our discussion further, those verbs are actually the lexical forms.

Shibatani's (2002) claim is found to be supported by Hasplemath (1993) by stating that the most important condition on ability of verbs to participate in a causative alternation is the absence of agent-oriented meaning component. Since the verb does not have an agent, it cannot contain agent oriented semantic elements. Verbs like these are classified as inactive, or unaccusative verbs, and as already mentioned before, this criteria does not hold true for Maithili. Therefore, a new approach towards the analysis of causative constructions in Maithili is needed.

Das and Choi (2007) delve into the semantics and morphology of causative verbs in Hindi, dissecting them based on their contextual functions. Through this comprehensive analysis, they introduce a systematic four-way classification for causative verbs in Hindi. Notably, they introduce two new terms to facilitate a clearer understanding of the causativization process: "de-transitivized verbs" and "pseudo-ditransitive verbs." These terms serve to categorize the causative verbs in Hindi, providing a more structured and insightful framework for understanding their usage and behavior within the language.

Saksena (1983) challenges the prevailing notion of causativisation as a merely agent insertion mechanisms, and instead views it as a foregrounding and backgrounding mechanism. This provides a comprehensive account for causativisation in languages where it manifests as subject contrast, and in those where it takes the form of an additional agent contrast.

Saksena (1982) underscores the limitations of the existing notions of first vs. second causative, and causative vs. non-causative, and instead makes generalizations based on direct and indirect causation, which is a largely semantic explanation. A causative paradigm is established where the number and types of permissible contrasts can be presented. In essence, the proposed model becomes

indispensable for achieving explanatory adequacy in our descriptions of causatives. By departing from relative notions like causative vs. non-causative or First vs. Second causative, which lack constant semantic values, and advocating for the use of a model with absolute semantic parameters, this paper argues for a more comprehensive and universally applicable framework for understanding causative semantics.

3. Classification

Verbs in Maithili are causativised in the following manner.

3.1 Intransitives

The intransitive verbs take on the ‘-(y)e’ marker to form direct causatives, and ‘-be’ marker to form indirect causatives.

For example,

3. bəčča k^həsle
Child.NOM fall.PST
The child fell.

4. ram bəčča-ke k^həselke
Ram.NOM child-DAT fall.CAUS.PST
‘Ram made the child fall.

5. ram mohən-sə bəčča-ke k^həsbelke
Ram.NOM Mohan-INSTR child-DAT fall.CAUS2.PST
*Ram made Mohan to fall the child.

In (4), the –e marker indicates the causer of the event is someone else (Ram), and not the subject of the verb, that is bəčča. Similarly, in example (5), the causer of the event is Ram indirectly, and Mohan directly. All intransitive verbs that can form causatives, have been observed to make both forms, C1 and C2². This is similar to Hindi intransitive verb forms. Almost all intransitive verbs in Hindi can be causativised morphologically, and have both C1 and C2 forms.

However, there are some intransitive verbs in Maithili that cannot be causativised at all. Some of these verbs are – ‘məhɪrɑ’ (with), ‘k^hok^hɪyɑ’ (cough), ‘kɑpəyɪ’ (shiver), ‘hərə’ (lose), ‘masal’ (crush).

3.2 Transitive

Transitive verbs with valency two are shown to causativise in three ways. The first are verbs that can show both direct and indirect causation. Verbs in this class include ‘pɑr^həyɪ’ (read), ‘k^hɑyɪ’ (eat), ‘sunəyɪ’ (hear), etc. For example,

6. ram ək^hbar pəɾ^həyɪ ʧ^he
 Ram.NOM newspaper.ACC read.PROG PRS
 ‘Ram is reading a newspaper.

7. ma ram-ke ək^hbar paɾ^habəyɪ ʧ^he
 mother.NOM Ram-DAT newspaper.ACC read. CAUS1.
 PROG PRS
 The mother is making Ram read the newspaper.

8. ma ram-ke rəmes-sə ək^hbar paɾ^habəyɪ ʧ^he
 mother.NOM Ram-DAT Ramesh-Instrnewspaper.ACC
 read.CAUS2.PROG PRS
 The mother is making Ramesh read the newspaper to Ram.

In the above examples, (6) has two arguments by virtue of ‘read’ being a transitive verb. In (7), the verb is causativised, and is presented with an additional dative argument. In (8), with the addition of a new participant in the instrumental role, we have the indirect causative form of the verb.

Next, there are the forms which have only one causative form, apart from the base form.

9. həm boɾɖ miɽəlye
 1SG.NOM board.DAT erase.PST
 I erased the board.

10. həm boɾɖ ram-sə miɽbəlye
 1SG.NOM board.DAT Ram-Instr erase.CAUS2.PST
 I made Ram erase the board.

Then, there are transitive verbs which appear to create both causative forms, however, the first form is more often than not synonymous with the second form. For example

11. həm kəpɾa kaɽəlye
 1SG.NOM cloth.ACC cut.
 I cut the cloth.’

12. həm kəpɾa dəɾʒi-sə kəɽəlye
 1SG.NOM cloth.ACC tailor-INSTR cut.CAUS1.PST.PRF
 I made the tailor cut the cloth.

13. həm kəpɾa dəɾʒi-sə kəɽbəlye
 1SG.NOM cloth.ACC tailor-INSTR cut.CAUS1 .PST.
 PRF
 I made the tailor cut the cloth.

The sentence in (12) is synonymous with the sentence in (13), since there is no difference in the actual meaning of the sentences. Speakers can either say ‘kəṭeliye’ or ‘kəṭbeliye’ and there will be no difference in the meaning between both the sentences. Das (2017) calls these types of constructions in Hindi as false friends. A similar phenomenon can be seen in Hindi with verbs like ‘kaṭna’ (to cut), ‘toṛna’ (to break), ‘p^hoṛna’ (to smash), ‘bāṭna’ (to distribute). They have two physical forms of causatives that mean the same, and occur in similar contexts.

3.3 Ditransitive

The ditransitive verbs show a regular pattern in Maithili. None of the ditransitive verbs form the direct causative, and the addition of an extra participant can only be done through the addition of an instrumental object, since the roles of the direct and indirect object are already fulfilled. However, in Hindi, we find that even the ditransitive verbs appear to create both C1 and C2 form, but all these C1 forms are false causatives. As stated in Das (2017), the verb ‘dena’ (to give) can be causativised in two forms – ‘dīlana’ (C1) and ‘dīlwana’ (C2). However, both these verbs essentially mean the same, since they have the same valency. Maithili makes it impossible for verbs to have a fake causative form for ditransitive verbs:

14. həm okra kɪ č^h kəḥəliye
1SG.NOM 3SG.DAT something say.PST
I told him something.

15. *həm okra mohən-sə kɪč^h kəḥəliye
1SG.NOM 3SG.DAT Mohan-INSTR
something say.CAUS1.PST
I made Mohan tell him something.

16. həm okra mohən-sə kɪč^h kəḥbeliye
1SG.NOM 3SG.DAT Mohan-INSTR
something say.CAUS2.PST
I made Mohan tell him something.

4. Analysis

This section shall deal with an in-depth analysis for the categorization proposed above.

4.1 Intransitives

When it comes to intransitive verbs, most of these verbs can be systematically accounted for. The morphological causativisation of intransitive verbs seems to be a regular productive phenomenon in Maithili, since these verbs have a low valency, and are more susceptible to an increase in valency. The empty space for participants to be added makes it easier for intransitive verbs to be causativised. However, there

seem to be some exceptions to this description. There are some intransitive verbs that can be causativised periphrastically, but not morphologically. Some examples are ‘māhīra’ (wither), ‘k^hok^hiya’ (cough), ‘kāpəyi’ (shiver), ‘həra’ (lost)

It has been observed by Shibatani (2002) that intransitives show variation when it comes to undergoing morphological causativisation. He refers to Perlmutter’s (1978) unaccusative hypothesis to state that the ‘active intransitives’ (unergative) are less susceptible to causative conversion, as compared to the ‘inactive predicates’ (unaccusative). These unaccusative verbs are the ones who have a theme or a patient in place of an agentive subject.

According to Shibatani (2002)’s analysis, verbs that have a subject performing the role of a patient, or an agentless subject, would be easier to causativise since the space for an agent would be empty, that would be then added by the causative form of the verb. It is also observed that in active transitives, since the slot of the agent is already covered, it would require an extra step, to remove the old agent, move it to a patient position, and add a new agent.

However, when we observe evidences from Maithili we find that the opposite of Shibatani’s analysis is true. Verbs like ‘māhīra’ (wither), ‘k^hok^hiya’ (cough), ‘kāpəyi’ (shiver), ‘həra’ (lost), which don’t include an agent in their semantic structure, do not get causativised morphologically. The only way to causativise these verbs is by adding a clause that essentially means X caused Y to happen.

For example

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 17. | həm | | kāpəyi | č ^h i | |
| | 1SG.NOM | | shiver | PRS | |
| | ‘I am shivering.’ | | | | |
| 18. | həm | ṭ ^h əndə | dwəre | kāpəyi | č ^h i |
| | 1SG.NOM | cold | cause | shiver | PRS |
| | ‘I am shivering due to cold.’ | | | | |
| 19. | p ^h ul | | māhīrəl | | č ^h e |
| | flower.NOM | | wither.PRF | | PRS |
| | ‘The flowers have been withered.’ | | | | |
| 20. | gərmī | dwəre | p ^h ul | māhīrəl | č ^h e |
| | heat | cause | flower | wither.PRF | PRS |
| | The heat has caused flowers to wither. | | | | |

As opposed to Shibatani (2002), when it comes to the active intransitives, the ones who already have an agent, it is almost always possible to causativise them. These include verbs like cry, sleep, laugh, etc.

For example, cry

21. həm kənəliye
1SG.NOM cry.PST.PRF

I cried.

22. ram həmra kənəlke
Ram.NOM 1SG.DAT cry.CAUS1.PST.PRF

Ram made me cry.

23. ram bəčča-ke həmra-sə kənbelke
Ram.NOM child-ACC 1SG.DAT-INSTR
cry.CAUS2.PST.PRF

Ram made me make the child cry.

An explanation for this can be based on Schaffer (2009), where he divides English unaccusatives into two: pure unaccusatives, and alternating unaccusatives. The latter are able to undergo causative alternation, that is they can be used as both transitive and intransitive verbs without a change of form. For example,

The vase broke.

John broke the vase.

The verb ‘broke’, in the first sentence, has a patient subject (making it unaccusative), and has then been causativised in the second sentence, to take an agent. The pure unaccusatives are the ones which cannot participate in causative alternation, for example, the verb ‘fell’ in English.

The vase fell.

*He fell the vase

This is because, as proposed by Schaffer (2009), causative alternation requires for the verb to participate in a change of state. The verbs that fall under the category of pure unaccusatives are the ones that do not express a change of state.

The intransitive verbs in Maithili that do not undergo morphological causativisation appear to fall under the pure unaccusative type.

A possible explanation for this is the semantic structuring of these verbs. The verbs that need an agent for the action to be performed, can add another agent to it which initiates the action indirectly. However, verbs like ‘to cough’, or ‘to wither’, that have patients as the subject of the sentence, cannot add an agent. Since, these verbs do not have a place for an agent to be added in their semantic framework in the first place.

4.2 Transitive Verbs

Transitive verbs have two arguments, the subject and the object. When they undergo a causative construction, the number of participants increases, and we have the subject, direct object, indirect object, and in some cases, an oblique object. For example

24. mohən kɪtəb pəɾʰəyɪ ʧʰe
 Mohan.NOM book.ACC read PRS
 Mohan is reading a book.

25. mohən bhyɑ-ke kɪtəb pəɾʰəbəyɪ ʧʰe
 Mohan.NOM brother-DAT book.ACC read CAUS2 PRS
 ‘Mohan is making brother read a book.’

26. mɑ mohən-sə bhyɑ-ke kɪtəb pəɾʰəbəyɪ ʧʰe
 Mother.NOM Mohan-INST brother-DAT
 book.ACC read.CAUS2 PRS

‘The mother is making brother read the book through Mohan.’

‘pəɾʰəyɪ’ (read) goes through both direct and indirect causativisation. In the direct form, it adds a dative participant, and in the indirect form, it adds an instrumental participant.

However, this is not true for all transitive verbs. There are two other classes of transitive verbs – one that have only the indirect causative form, such as ‘jələbəyɪ’ (burn), ‘bənəbəyɪ’ (make), ‘səkʰəbəyɪ’ (dry), and one that appear to have both forms, but both forms actually mean the same, for example ‘kəɾəyɪ’ (cut), ‘toɾəyɪ’ (break), ‘pʰoɾəyɪ’ (smash)

The verb cut, can have the following forms

27. həm pəɾ kəɾəlye
 1SG.NOM tree.ACC cut.PRF
 I cut the tree.

28. həm mohən-sə pəɾ kəɾəlye
 1SG.NOM Mohan-INST tree.ACC cut.CAUS1.PRF
 I made Mohan cut the tree.

29. həm mohən-sə pəɾ kəɾəbelye
 1SG.NOM Mohan-INST tree.ACC cut.CAUS2.PRF
 I made Mohan cut the tree.

30. əɪ sal bəɖ pɛɾ kəɽle
This year many tree cut.PRF

This year many trees were cut.

(27) is straightforward. We have an agent subject, and a patient object. (28) and (29) have been described in the literature as the direct and indirect causative, respectively. However, upon a closer look on the verbs, we see that the so called direct and indirect form of the verbs actually mean the same thing. They lack the distinction that a direct and indirect form of causatives must have – the number of participants. In the first example, we have a nominative subject and an accusative object. However, in the second and third example, we have a causee, an instrumental participant, and an affected participant.

Drawing parallels with the transitive verbs that undergo a regular causative formation such as ‘to read’ –

31. mohən kitab pəɾ^həyɪ č^he
Mohan.NOM book.ACC read PRS

Mohan is reading a book.

32. mohən bhya-ke kitab pəɾ^habəyɪ č^he
Mohan.NOM brother-DAT book.ACC read.CAUS2 PRS

Mohan is making brother read a book.

33. ma mohən-sə bhya-ke kitab pəɾ^habəyɪ č^he
mother.NOM Mohan-INST brother-DAT
book.ACC read.CAUS2 PRS

The mother is making brother read the book through Mohan.

Here, the direct causative verb in (32) has a dative participant, and the indirect causative form in (33) has an additional instrumental participant, along with the dative participant. This is followed in case of other verbs in the category such as ‘k^həɳɪɾ’ (eat). However, the verb ‘kəɽəyɪ’ (cut) cannot take a dative participant, as seen in (28), which tells us that the form kəɽ^helɪe is actually a false causative form. Here, ‘cut’ can only take an additional instrumental participant, and this establishes that ‘kəɽbelɪe’ is the only true causative. However, both these forms are used interchangeably by speakers. This holds true for many verbs of the type, such as ‘bāɽəlɪe’/‘bəɽəlɪe’ (to say), ‘k^holəlɪe’/‘k^hulelɪe’ (to open). A similar phenomenon can be seen in Hindi too, where the direct and indirect forms of some transitive verbs are used interchangeably.

The proposed reason for the creation of these false causatives is the presence of a phonological space in these verbs, and the speakers tend to overgeneralise the morphological rules of causativisation. The long vowel in the first syllable is shortened, and the second vowel is lengthened. The set of verbs that do not create a false causative such as ‘bəneliye’ (to make), do not have that empty space needed for the direct causative marker to be added, since the vowel is already present there. However, we also need to establish that ‘bəneliye’ is indeed the default lexicon, and not ‘bəIn’.

The verb ‘to make’ can take the following forms in Maithili

34. k^henɑɪ bənɑɪ č^he
 food.NOM make PRS
 Food is being made.

35. mōhən k^henɑɪ bənɑbɑɪ č^he
 Mohan.NOM food.ACC make PRS
 Mohan is making the food.

36. mōhən sonu-sə k^henɑɪ bənɑbɑbɑɪ č^he
 Mohan.NOM Sonu-INSTR food.ACC
 make.CAUS2 PRS
 Mohan is making Sonu cook the food

According to the evidences provided by Rheinart (2005) and Chiercha (1989), we propose that the verb ‘bənɑɪ’ in (34) is formed through a process of morphological reduction. The actual verb stored in our lexicon is ‘bənɑbɑɪ’ (35), the transitive verb. It undergoes a process of de-transitivisation to reduce the number of participants, and for removal of the agent from the semantic structure of the verb.

So here, we have a structure as follows –

Intransitive ← Transitive verb → indirect causative

Similarly, in examples (27) and (28), we can conclude that (28) is the default form of the form, and (27) is derived from it.

4.3 Ditransitive

Ditransitive verbs, as explained above, have only the indirect form of causative. Since the verb already has a valency of three, the process of causativisation is able to add only one more participant through an oblique case. This is seen uniformly throughout the language. The way transitive verbs create false forms of direct causatives is not applicable here, since most of these ditransitive verbs

are not able to support the direct causative morphology due to the structure of the sounds, as in the case of transitive verb ‘bənəliye’ (to make). For example, the verbs like ‘pəṭ^helīye’ (to send), ‘delīye’ (to give), ‘kəhəlīye’ (to say), etc. will not be able to support the direct causative morpheme. Therefore, neither the semantic framework of these verbs, and nor the phonetic form of these words, allow them to create a direct form of the causative.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper has delved into the intricate mechanics of causativization in Maithili, focusing on the interplay of morphological and semantic elements in generating diverse causative forms. It is widely acknowledged that causative situations entail two crucial components: the event itself and the cause that precipitates it. Various scholars, including Comrie, Dixon, and Shibatani, have contributed differing yet complementary viewpoints to elucidate the underlying principles governing causativization.

The morphological causativization of intransitive verbs in Maithili demonstrates a systematic and productive phenomenon, primarily due to their lower valency, leaving room for additional participants. However, exceptions do exist, such as the inability of verbs like ‘məhīra’ (wither), ‘k^hok^hiya’ (cough), ‘kāpəyi’ (shiver), ‘həra’ (lost), to be causativized morphologically, which raises intriguing questions about the interplay of valency and causativization. Contrary to the analyses by Shibatani (2002), active intransitive verbs in Maithili, those already possessing an agent, are generally amenable to causativization, as they can easily accommodate another agent.

Transitive verbs in Maithili exhibit a diversity of causative formations, including both direct and indirect causative forms. However, a closer examination reveals that some verbs, like ‘to cut’ produce a false causative, as the direct and indirect forms effectively convey the same meaning, establishing the same semantic structure. Additionally, the presence of false causatives in some transitive verbs suggests the influence of phonological factors and overgeneralization in the morphological rules governing causativization.

As we delve into the complexities of this language's causative constructions, we enhance our understanding of the broader field of linguistics and the intricate mechanisms that underlie the creation and transformation of linguistic structures. Further research and exploration in this area promise to shed more light on the nature of causative processes, not only in Maithili but in language systems more broadly.

References

- Bhatia, S. (2016). Causation in Hindi-Urdu: Care for Your Instruments and Subjects. *Formal Approaches to South Asian Languages*.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Das, P. K. & Jong Chan Choi. (2017). Causativization in Hindi: An Alternative View. *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 22(3):147-182. <https://doi.org/10.21587/JSAS.2017.22.3.006>
- Dixon, R. M. W. (2000). A Typology of Causatives: Form, Syntax and Meaning. In R. M. W Dixon & A. Y. Aikhenvald (Eds.), *Changing Valency* (1st ed., pp. 30-83). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511627750.003>
- Fauconnier, S. (2011). Involuntary Agent Constructions are not Directly Linked to Reduced Transitivity. *Studies in Language*, 35(2): 311-336. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.35.2.03fau>
- Haspelmath, M. (1993). More on the Typology of Inchoative/Causative Verb Alternations. In B. Comrie & M. Polinsky (Eds.), *Studies in Language Companion Series*. (Vol. 23, p. 87). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.23.05has>
- Kulikov, L. (1993). The “Second Causative”: A Typological Sketch. In B. Comrie & M. Polinsky (Eds.), *Studies in Language Companion Series* (Vol. 23, p. 121). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.23.06kul>
- Perlmutter, D. (1978). Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 38.
- Reinhart, T. (2016). The Theta System: Syntactic Realization of Verbal Concepts. In M. Everaert & M. Marelj (Eds.), *Concepts, Syntax, and Their Interface* (pp. 1-112). Cambridge: The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262034135.003.0001>
- Reinhart, T., & Siloni, T. (2005). The Lexicon-Syntax parameter: Reflexivization and other Arity Operations. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36(3): 389-436. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0024389054396881>
- Saksena, A. (1982). Contact in Causation. *Language*, 58(4), 820. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413958>
- Saksena, A. (1983). A Semantic Model of Causative Paradigms.

Lingua, 59(1): 77-94. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024384183\)90018-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024384183)90018-9)

Schäfer, F. (2009). The Causative Alternation. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 3(2): 641-681. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2009.00127.x>

Shibatani, M. (Ed.). (2002). *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation: Based on the 8th Biennial Rice Symposium on Linguistics held in 2000*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Yadav, R. (1996). *A Reference Grammar of Maithili*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter