Causativization in Asuriní of Xingu

Antonia Alves **PEREIRA***

* PhD in Linguistics at the State University of Campinas - Unicamp (2009). Professor at the Federal University of Pará - UFPA. Contact: antonia@ufpa.br

Abstract:

This article aims to discuss causativization in the Asuriní of Xingu language, a Tupí-Guaraní language spoken by the Asuriní people who live in the municipality of Altamira in the Brazilian state of Pará. Based on theoretical assumptions from typological-functional linguistics, the article discusses the formation of causative predicates, the types of causativization found in the language, and the effects they cause in the sentence. Morphological causativization is the predominant type in this language, with the morphemes {*mu-*}, {*eru-*} and {*-ukat*} being responsible for it. The analysis shows that the morpheme {*eru-*} plays a causative role in this language, as it does in the related Kamayurá and Emerillon languages. At the same time, Asuriní of Xingu is distinguished from other languages of the Tupí-Guaraní family, such as Guajá and Tenetehára, where which this morpheme is described as an applicative. Research results show that the morphemes {*mu-*} and {*eru-*} are affixed to intransitive verb stems, while the morpheme {*-ukat*} is affixed to transitive stems. After affixing the causative morpheme to the verb, the sentence undergoes structural and functional changes.

Keywords:

Causatives. Morphology. Syntax.

Causativization in Asuriní of Xingu

Antonia Alves Pereira

INTRODUCTION

Causativization is a recurrent phenomenon in languages. Fillmore (1976, p. 182), among other authors, sees causality as a universal linguistic phenomenon. Causativization is linked to the semantic, morphological, and syntactic components, causing changes in the meaning and configuration of the sentence and affecting the participation structure, valence, and other mechanisms directly related to the causativization phenomenon. In this work, we aim to describe and analyze the causativization strategies found in the Asuriní of Xingu language, which belongs to group V of the Tupí-Guaraní family, Tupí group, as classified by Rodrigues (1985). We discuss how causative predicates are formed, the types of causativization, and the effects they cause in the sentence. At the morphosyntactic level, causativization, among its other effects, gives rise to a new argument in the sentence structure. Semantically, a causer appears that leads a *causee* to carry out the event in the predicate. The *causee* may or may not participate in the event, depending on the type of causativization.

This work is based on the theoretical assumptions of typological-functional linguistics. Data were collected by the author during our research with the Asuriní group and come from elicitations, mythical narratives, personal experience narratives, and conversations in natural contexts, and were later tested with the help of native speakers. Authors whose works served as theoretical support for this work are: Comrie (1989), Dixon (2000), Haspelmath e Müller-Bardey (2004), Kemmer e Verhagen (1994), Kulilov (2010), Shibatani (2002), Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002), Song (2014) and Velupillai (2012).

The article begins by focusing on causativization as a phenomenon present in languages in general, starting with a typological view of its conception, characteristics, and effects on the sentence. Next, the text deals with the description and analysis of causativization in Asuriní of Xingu, discussing the types of causativization and their morphosyntactic and semantic effects, and commenting on similarities and differences with other languages, especially those of the same genetic affiliation. Final considerations are presented at the end of the article.

1. CAUSATIVIZATION IN LINGUISTIC TYPOLOGY

Causative constructions represent a complex linguistic situation involving two events: a) a causative event in which the causer does or initiates something to trigger the caused event, and b) a caused event in which the causee performs an action or undergoes a change of condition or state as a result of the causer's action (COMRIE, 1989, p. 165). This type of construction involves the semantic, morphological, and syntactic components of a language, giving rise to new constructions, affecting the meaning of the sentence, the verbal valence, and, consequently, the entire sentence at the syntagmatic, functional, and argument levels. As such, it constitutes a category of paramount importance in the analysis and description of a language.

The causative derivation, according to Kulikov (2010, p. 386), adds the meaning 'cause' to a proposition and adds a new participant, the causer, who obligatorily assumes the position of the subject. Faced with its expulsion from the subject position, the causee is demoted in the hierarchy of grammatical relations: Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique Object, and is then able to occupy the highest free position.

There are a number of ways to express causation in languages, according to Comrie (1989, p. 166), including: a) the use of causative or resulting conjunctions (because, so that) or prepositions ("because of",

"thanks to"); b) the use of a separate causative predicate (e.g., a verb meaning to cause or make something happen); c) a predicate that includes within itself the notion of cause, as in *John killed Bill*. Also, according to Dixon (2000, p. 33-34), a causative construction can be marked by the following morphological processes: "(a) internal change, e.g., in vowel quality, or consonant mutation; (b) repeating a consonant; (c) lengthening a vowel; (d) tone change; (e) reduplication; or various processes of affixation, with (f) a prefix, (g) a suffix, or (h) a circumfix".

Comrie (1989, p. 159), based on formal parameters, establishes three typological distinctions for causative constructions: a) analytical (syntactic or periphrastic) causatives; b) morphological causatives; and c) lexical (or synthetic) causatives. Analytical causative constructions, according to the author, are those in which the notion of cause and the notion of effect are expressed by different predicates (e.g., *I made John fall*). In the same line of thought, Kemmer and Verhagen (1994, p. 117) describe this type of causative in the following manner: "An analytic causative is a two-verb structure that expresses a predicate of causation and a predicate of effect", citing constructions in English such as: *I made him leave and Seeing him again caused her to lose her composure* (KEMMER; VERHAGEN, 1994, p. 117).

On the other hand, as noted by Dixon (2000), morphological constructions are obtained by means of a morpheme, as an affix or another form. Comrie, quoted above, gives an example from Turkish where the suffixes *-re*, and *-dir* (the latter with vowel harmony variants) can be added to virtually any verb to give its causative equivalent, e.g., *öl* 'die', *öl-dür* 'kill', *góster* 'show', *góster-t* 'cause to show'. Furthermore, according to this author, this type of causativization relates causal and non-causal predicates, being quite productive. In theory, any predicate can form a causative construction using appropriate morphological means. This feature is also widely used in Brazilian languages of different genetic affiliations, such as Ikpeng (Caribe) (PACHECO, 2001), Timbira (Jê) (ALVES, 2004), Mekens (Tupari) (GALÚCIO, 2009), Munduruku (Tupí) (GOMES, 2006).

With regard to lexical causative constructions, these are constructions in which the causative and non-causative predicate are expressed by lexical forms that are not morphologically related. These are supplementary forms like the pair *die/kill* in English. According Kemmer and Verhagen (1994, p. 118) these are "verbs that are discernibly semantically causative, but are not formally analyzable into two morphemes".

For Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000, p. 13), the main characteristics of a prototypical causative are: a) it applies to a basic intransitive sentence, forming a derived transitive sentence; b) the argument in function S (the causee) of the intransitive sentence transfers to function O (object of transitive sentence) in the causative sentence; c) the introduction of a new argument (the causer), which in the derived sentence performs the function of subject of the transitive sentence (A); and d) there is some explicit formal marking of the causative construction.

Semantically, Comrie (1989) and Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002) distinguish direct causativization from indirect causativization. In the work of the latter, a third intermediate type is added: sociative causativization. These three semantic types represent a continuum of relations of the three types of causatives obtained by formal criteria: the morphological, the syntactic, and the lexical. According to Comrie (1989, p. 172), the type of formal distinction found between languages is identical: the continuum from analytic causative to morphological causative to lexical causative correlates with the continuum from least direct to most direct cause. That is, lexical and morphological causatives, as a rule, tend more to direct causativization, and syntactic causatives toward indirect causativization.

In indirect causativization, the causer is not physically involved in the execution of the caused event. In addition, Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002, p. 90) distinguish direct and indirect causation as follows:

> The notion of direct causation emanates from conceptualization of a causative situation as involving the same spatiotemporal profile for the causing-event segment and the caused-event segment […]. Indirect causation, on the other hand, refers to conceptualization of a causative situation as involving two relevant sub-events that have two distinct temporal profiles and two potentially distinct spatial profiles.

These authors also propose that it is possible to represent the causal situation as indirect when the event caused with a patient causee is considered to have a space-time profile distinct from that of the causative event or causer. They cite as examples the phrases in English, *John caused the metal to melt and John melted the metal*, as expressing the distinction between indirect causation and direct causation, respectively. However, distinguishing these two semantic types of causativization can be difficult. According to Comrie (1989, p. 173):

> the distinction between direct and indirect causation is one of degree along a continuum. It is very difficult, and perhaps even impossible, to construct examples which clearly allow only a direct causation or only an indirect causation interpretation. But when one contrasts different causative constructions that differ on the analytic - morphological - lexical continuum, then it becomes clear that the construction closer to the analytic end is more appropriate for the distant (indirect) causative, while the one closer to the lexical end is more appropriate for the direct causative.

Sociative causativization is a mixed type with characteristics of direct and indirect causativization, presenting subtypes according to the causer's degree of control or participation in the causative construction. Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002, p. 100-101) distinguish sociative causativization from indirect causativization in the following terms:

> Two features distinguish sociatives from indirect causatives. First, when a language allows alternative marking of the causee nominal, the accusative version generally conveys sociative causation, whereas the dative or other oblique marking signals indirect causation. […]. Second, the interpretation of the aspectual form differs between sociatives and indirect causatives. In the former, the progressive form is interpreted either as expressing the progressive meaning, i.e., an on-going activity, or a generic activity. In the case of indirect causatives, the progressive form conveys only the generic sense.

In this way, both Comrie (1989) and Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002), when analyzing the causative constructions from the semantic point of view, propose that they be seen on the basis of a continuum of relations established between the different types of causative constructions, that is, they propose that morphological, syntactic, and lexical causative constructions are related to direct, indirect, and sociative types[1] within a continuum.

2. Causative Constructions in Asuriní of Xingu

In the Asuriní of Xingu language, morphological causativization is quite productive. Three causative morphemes are found: {*mu-*}, {*eru-*}, and {*-ukat*}. The first two attach to intransitive verbs, and {*-ukat*} attaches to a transitive predicate. In this language, lexical causative constructions are also found. With regard to syntactic or periphrastic causative constructions, we did not find data that would allow a determinate analysis of their functionality, thus confirming the idea of Comrie (1989) that pure periphrastic causatives are rare in languages.

Next, we will analyze each of these constructions in the light of linguistic typology, verifying their degree of productivity and seeking to confirm or refute typological hypotheses for this phenomenon.

2.1. Lexical causatives

The notion of lexical causativization is expressed by the semantics of the verb, with no formal similarity between the part that expresses cause and the part that expresses effect. Song (2014, p. 260) refers to this type of causative as follows:

---

[1] The term sociative appears in Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002), but not in Comrie (1989).

The lexical causative type involves suppletion. There is no formal similarity between the basic verb and the causative counterpart. In other words, the formal fusion of the predicate of cause and that of effect is 'maximal' with the effect that the causative verb is not formally analyzable into two separate morphemes. This causative type is thus fusional or inflectional in nature.

In Asuriní of Xingu, the process of causativization can be identified, as seen in the following data:

a) *djuka* 'die' x *manu* 'kill'

(1a)　　*anyra*　　*u-manu*
　　　　bat　　　3²-die
　　　　'the bat died'

(1b)　　*kudjema'e*　　*ka' i*　　*u-djuka*
　　　　men　　　　monkey　　3-kill
　　　　'the man killed the monkey'

b) *kai* 'burn' x *rapy* 'be burned'

(2a)　　*aka*　　*u-kai*
　　　　home　　3-burn
　　　　'the house burned down'

(2b)　　*ene*　　*ga*　　*reapy*
　　　　2SG　　3SG.M　　be.burned
　　　　'he was burned by you'

(2c)　　*ga*　　*pene*　　*reapy*
　　　　3SG.M　　2PL　　be.burned
　　　　'you were burned by him'

(2d)　　*kudjema'e*　　*avatxi*　　*u-apy*
　　　　men　　　　corn　　　3-burn
　　　　'the man burned the corn'

As observed in the data above, there is an intransitive verb in which a cause semantically resides, and whose effect is obtained in a transitive verb without any causative morphology. There is only one distinct verbal form that expresses the consequence of another verb; that is, the semantic effects are perceived in an intransitive verbal form that has no formal relationship with the transitive verb that provoked that result.

Lexical causatives semantically express direct causativization, and cause and result occur in the same temporal lapse. In this type of construction, the causer carries the semantic traits [+human] and [+agentive] in most cases. In contrast, in this situation, the causee does not resist the efforts of the causer.

---

² Abbreviations and conventions:
　A = Subject of transitive verb, CAUS = Causative, NPR = Proper name, M = Masculine, NMLZ = Nominalizer/nominalization, N = Nominal suffix; O = Object, OI = Indirect object, PAS = Past tense, PL = Plural, POSP = Postposition, REFL = Reflexive, REL = Relational prefix, SG = Singular, SOC = Social causative, V = Verb, 1 = 1st person, 2 = 2nd person, 3 = 3rd person.

In Asuriní of Xingu, this type of causative presents the typical characteristics of lexical causativization pointed out in the literature, such as: has idiomatic interpretation; cannot be divided into one counterpart with cause and another with effect; can be nominalized, as seen below, although the process is not productive because the lexical causatives themselves are not.

(3a)   *i-djuka-pyr- er-a*
         3-kill- NMLZ -PAS -N
         'what they killed'

(3b)   *u-manu-ma'e*
         3-die-NMLZ
         'what is dead'

The presence of this type of causative in the language confirms the typological premise according to which the presence of lexical causatives in languages is very common: "It is extremely common, if not universal, for languages to have at least some lexical causative" (VELUPILLAI, 2012, p. 261). However, it should be noted that this process of causativization is not productive in Asuriní of Xingu. The explanation for this lies in the fact that the morphological causatives are extremely productive, as seen in the present article. This corroborates what Shibatani (2002, p. 1) maintains: that the lexical causative modality is common in languages which lack a productive causative morphology and which therefore have a considerable number of transitive verbs with causative meaning. That is, the high productivity of the morphological causative modality in this language may explain the low productivity of the lexical causative modality.

2.2. Morphological causative constructions

In Asuriní do Xingu, morphemes are widely used in the formation of causative constructions. The morphological causative is attached to a verbal stem, causing a construction to be causativized and presenting typical characteristics of this type of construction, such as semantic and morphosyntactic alterations.

Our studies of the language, up to the present stage of the research, reveal the presence of three causative morphemes, as mentioned above, thus demonstrating that morphology is a very relevant field for the expression of causativization. In what follow, we deal with morphological strategies to express causativization, discussing the factors that condition the use of causatives and the effects that each causative provokes in the structural and functional arrangements of sentences, especially with regard to semantic-syntactic roles.

2.2.1. Causative {*mu-*}

The causative morpheme {*mu-*} attaches to active or inactive intransitive verbs. The verbal stems to which it is attached can express, among other notions, process, movement, and state. It is a very frequent morpheme in the language, as can be seen from its versatility in attaching itself to stems of different semantics. In (4), we have the expression of process, in (5) motion, and in (7) state. Syntactically, after affixing this morpheme, the verb gains one more argument, increasing its valence and becoming, with this operation, transitive. In this situation, the use of this causative gives rise to a new core argument. The data below illustrate this situation.

(4a)   *u-ep*
         3-go out
         'went out' (as, for example a fire)

(4b) *tata   a- mu- ep*
      fire   1- CAUS- delete
      'put out the fire'

(5a) *kudjema'e   u- jĩn*
      man   3-run
      'the man ran'

(5b) *djawara   kudjema'e   u-mu-jĩn*
      jaguar   man   3-CAUS-run
      'the jaguar made the man run'

(6a) *kunumi   u-kyt*
      boy   3-sleep
      'the boy slept'

(6b) *dje   kunumi   a- mu-kyt*
      1SG   boy   1-CAUS-sleep
      'I made the boy sleep'

(7a) *dje   marin*
      1SG   be sick
      'I am sick'

(7b) *ka   ga   bola   dje= mu-marin*
      DEM   3SG.M   ball   1SG= CAUS-be.sick
      'that ball made me sick/hurt me'

      As we can observe in (5a) and in (6a), the verbs *-jĩn* and *-kyt*, respectively, select only one argument that is found in the function S; whereas in (5b) and in (6b) – after the affixation of the morpheme {*mu-*} – the causativization of the construction occurs. The immediate syntactic effect is to make the verb transitive, via derivation; and the verb starts to display two nuclear arguments, *djawara* and *kudjema'e* in (5b), and *dje* and *kunumi* in (6b). Thus, a new argument appears in the sentence and starts to play the role of subject in the derived sentence, causing the original subject to be demoted to the function O. This operation corresponds to what, typologically, is a known syntactic effect of the causative in languages, that is, an increase in valence, according to Haspelmath and Müller-Bardey (2001).

      At the semantic level, the new arguments, respectively, *dje* and *djawara*, are the causer, and the arguments that were the original subjects in the primitive sentences are the causee. Note that the new participant that has been introduced leads the original participant of the sentence to perform the event, this latter being both patient and affected. Although the lack of capacity for control on the part of the causee is well known in linguistic typology – that is, the causer is often found to be in control of the situation semantically – when we compare data such as those appearing in (5b) *djawara kudjema'e u-mu- jĩn*, and (7b) *ka ga bola dje mu-marin*, we realize that in the first case, for the situation to occur satisfactorily, it is necessary that there be cooperation from the causee. However, in situations with predicates like the one that appears in (6b) this possibility does not exist or is reduced, the causer having a greater degree of control over the causee. In (3b), the causee carries the features [-human] and [-animate], which in itself already favors the control of the causer over the causee, the fact is that this situation can also be verified with the [+human], and therefore [+animate], causee. This can be seen in the data below, where the causee does not cooperate at all for the event to occur satisfactorily,

showing that the causer is in control of the situation, which seems to show that the type of predicate or verbal type is directly related to the degree of control of the causer in relation to the causee. Even if it is already clear that the causee tends, in constructions in general, not to have control over the situation, what is seen here is that there are cases in which its cooperation is necessary and that there are other cases in which the event will occur regardless of its cooperation. In the latter cases, the predicate formed by a descriptive verb seems to be an excellent source for the causee's lack of cooperation in the realization of the event, as can be seen in (8).

(8)   *tximakare*   *ene=mu-kajỹm*   *- tarikumỹ*   *ẽ*   *upe*
       NPR   2SG= CAUS-charm   NPR   3SG.F   POSP
       'Tximacaré is bewitching you (is making you sick with a spell)- Tarikumỹ told her'.

2.2.2. Causative {*eru-*}

Rodrigues (1947) wrote a pioneering work on the category of voice in Tupí in which he classified {*ro*} as a morpheme that expresses comitative-causative voice. According to the author, when this morpheme is used in a construction, the subject makes others perform the action, while also doing it him or herself. In Asuriní of Xingu, we classify the morpheme {*eru-*} as a causative that attaches to intransitive verbal stems and semantically expresses sociative causativization. Other Tupi-Guarani languages have a correlate morpheme, including Kamayurá (SEKI, 2000) and Emerillon (ROSE, 2003); the two cited authors refer to it as causative-comminative. This causative morpheme is placed before the verb stem, and the event expressed in the predicate is realized jointly by the causer and causee participants.

On the morphosyntactic level, a new argument appears in the structure of the sentence, which takes on the function A, demoting the original A to O. In this way, there is an increase in verbal valence. Observe the data below:

(9a)   *ga*   *u-kyt*
        3SG.M   3-sleep
        'he slept'

(9b)   *dje*   *kunumi*   *a-ru- kyt*
        1SG   boy   1-CAUS.SOC- sleep
        'I made the boy sleep, sleeping together'

(10a)   *kudjema'e*   *u-furai*
         men   3-dance
         'the man danced'

(10b)   *kudjema'e*   *kujĩ*   *u-eru-furai*
         men   woman   3-CAUS.SOC-dance
         'the man made the woman dance with him'

(11a)   *kunumi*   *u-jĩn*
         boy   3-run
         'the boy ran'

(11b)   *kujĩ*   *kunumi*   *u-eru- jĩn*   *djawara*   *i*
         woman   boy   3-CAUS.SOC-run   jaguar   POSP
         'the woman made the boy run from the jaguar, running together'

After affixing {*eru-*} to the construction, causativization takes place. The grammatical relations in the above data can be explained as follows: in (9a), (10a), and (11a), we have a subject S: *ga*, *kudjema'e* and *kunumi*, respectively; in (9b), (10b), and (11b), after the affixation of {*eru-*}, which causativizes the predicate, a new participant is introduced in the discourse. This participant assumes the role A, and the original S becomes object, the events described in the predicates being jointly realized by causer and causee.

Comparing (9b) above with (12), below, it is clear that the causative {*eru-*} functions in the sentence analogously to {*mu-*}, inducing causativization and giving rise to a new argument in the sentence. However, the former differs from the latter insofar as the new participant that is introduced, the causer, provokes a sociative causativization in the sentence, that is, it participates in the event with the causee, different from the causativization caused by the causative {*mu-*}, in which the causer does not participate directly in the event.

(12)   *kunumi*   *a- ru- kyt*
        boy   1-CAUS.SOC- sleep
        'I made the boy sleep, sleeping together'

The causativization expressed by {*eru-*} is sociative in the typological terms proposed by Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002), constituting itself as a mixed type, that is, with characteristics of direct causativization and indirect causativization in which causer and causee act together for the realization of the predicted or described event in the causative predicate. This is also in accord with what Guillaume and Rose (2010, p. 384, authors' emphasis) describe regarding the distinction between regular causativization and sociative causativization:

> Sociative causation differs from regular causation in that the causer not only makes the causee do an action, but also participates in it, which is usually paraphrased with sentences like *make someone do something by doing it with them or help someone do something.*

It is common in Asuriní of Xingu for arguments to be deleted in constructions derived by causativization. The data below illustrates this.

(13)   *dje*   *a- ru- kyt*
        1SG   1-CAUS.SOC-sleep
        'I made (the boy) sleep, sleeping together'

(14)   *ere-eru-*   *djeki*
        2SG-   CAUS.SOC -enter
        'you made (him) enter, entering together'

As observed in the data above, there is a deletion of the causee. The reason for this lies in the small relevance that this participant has for the discourse in these situations, because what is being focused on in these constructions is the coercion of the causer over the causee, demonstrating the former's power over the latter. This resource is used to deal with the increase in valence in the construction and is in accord with Comrie (1989, p. 175). According to this author, a predicate with morphological causativity normally has a higher valence than its non-causative counterpart, because in addition to the arguments of this non-causal predicate there is also a causer. The arguments of both semantic predicates need to figure in a single predicate. Thus, the omission of the causee in the causative construction, according to this author, is a solution to the issue, and one which is particularly frequent as an interlinguistic possibility when dealing with causatives of transitive verbs. Semantically, the morpheme {*eru-*} is used in those situations where there is inducement or manipulation; the causee is compelled to participate in an event jointly with the causer.

Verbs like *kyt* 'sleep', when used with the causative {*eru-*}, gain strong connotations that the event was carried out against the will of the *causee*, or at least under strong pressure, through the use of some mechanism that provoked sleep.

As can be seen in the examples above, the morpheme {*eru-*} occurs in verbs with a variety of semantics, contrary to what occurs in Guajá, where according to Magalhães (2014) it is restricted to movement verbs.

Some data provide indications that it is possible that the morpheme {*eru-*} is undergoing a process of variation of function in some verb forms, thus performing a double function: causative for one for a group of verbs, and applicative for another group. However, only a deeper investigation that verifies the conditioning factors of the use of this morpheme as a causative or as an applicative will be able to provide a satisfactory answer to this question.

It should be noted that both causativization and applicativization consist of an increase in valence. However, their effects are very different. Syntactically, in the causativized construction an argument A is added; when constructed with an applicative, an object appears. Semantically, in the causativized construction there is the notion of manipulating the causer so that the causee participates in an event together with it; in an applicative construction this notion does not seem to exist – or, if it does, it is there to a lesser extent.

However, given the nature and extent of the present work, we will not discuss this phenomenon here, leaving the issue to be analyzed at another time. We maintain, however, that in Asuriní of Xingu the morpheme {*eru-*} still functions as a causative, contrary to what occurs in other languages of the family such as Tenetehára (CAMARGOS, 2017), Guajá (MAGALHÃES, 2014), Guaraní, and Tupinambá (VIEIRA, 2010), languages for which this morpheme has been described as an applicative.

2.2.3. Causative {*-ukat*}

The causative {*-ukat*}, similar to the causatives {*mu-*} and {*eru-*}, gives rise to a new participant in the argument structure of the sentence. However, unlike the latter two, {*-ukat*} is only attached to transitive stems, whether primarily transitive or transitive by derivation; moreover, its position in the verbal complex is immediately after the stem.

	A	O	a-V	
(15a)	*paje*	*yvyrapara*	*u-apa*	
	shaman	bow	3-make	
	'the shaman made a bow'			

	A	O	a-V	OI	
(15b)	*kudjema'e*	*iara*	*u-apa-ukat*	*kunumi*	*upe*
	men	canoe	3-make-CAUS	boy	POSP
	'the man ordered the boy to make a canoe'				

The verb *-apa* in the above data is transitive, displaying two core arguments – subject and object – corresponding to the agent and patient semantic roles, respectively. When the causative {*-ukat*} is affixed to this verb, it gives rise to a new argument, changing the predicate from bivalent to trivalent. Asuriní of Xingu does not accept two direct objects in the same sentence. In this situation, the language attributes to the new argument the role of IO (indirect object), being marked in the dative and functioning in accordance with the hierarchy of grammatical relations proposed by Comrie (1989): subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique object. In example (9b) above, the following arguments appear: *kudjema'e*, argument A, participant *causer*; *iara*, argument O, affected participant; and *kunumi*, argument OI, participant causee, the executor of the event.

The data below show that in situations where the causee is known – inferred in discourse or even irrelevant to the realization the event – its codification can be omitted without prejudice to the understanding of the sentence.

	A	O		a-V
(16)	*ẽ*	*r-uva*	*ga*	*r-u'yva*	*u-apa-ukat*
	3SG.F	REL-father	3SG.M	REL-arrow	3-make-CAUS

'her father ordered his (another's) arrow to be made'

	A	O	a-V
(17)	*miravu*	*u-yru*	*u-apa-ukat*
	NPR	3-clothes	3-make-CAUS

'Miravu had her clothes made (her own)'

	O	a-V
(18)	*t-yru*	*a-futuka-ukat*
	3GN-clothes	1-wash-CAUS

'I ordered the clothes to be washed'

The data in (16) to (18) form predicates with the transitive verbs *-apa* 'make' and *futuka* 'wash', respectively, verbs whose nature already requires two participants. When the morpheme {*-ukat*} is affixed to the verb complex, a third participant appears, the causee, whose grammatical relationship with the other members of the sentence is OI. However, this participant is not encoded in the sentence for the reasons listed above: it is either known, or irrelevant in the discourse, and can therefore be omitted.

The use of this morpheme expresses indirect causativization. The above data show that when {*-ukat*} is attached to the predicate, a causee appears, the third nuclear argument, which will be responsible for the execution of the event under the pressure of the causer, as in this type of causativization there is no involvement of the causer in its execution. In addition, the events occur in different temporal lapses. These typical characteristics of this type of causativization can be seen in the examples below:

(19a)	*ẽ*	*r-uva*	*ga*	*r-u'yva*	*u-apa-ukat*
	3SG.F	REL-father	3SG.M	REL-arrow	3-make-CAUS

'her father had the arrow (of another) made'

(19b)	*ẽ*	*r-uva*	*ga*	*r-u'yva*	*u-apa*
	3SG.F	REL-parent	3SG.M	REL-arrow	3-make

'her father made his (another's) arrow'

A comparison of (19a) with (19b) shows that the event *ordered the arrow to be made* and the event *made the arrow*, respectively, are opposed in terms of the type of causation, it being indirect in (19a) and direct in (19b).

Thus causativization in the language reveals important changes in the structural and functional levels of the derived sentence, with the increase in valence being an aspect of great relevance. The addition of the *causer* significantly alters the valence pattern, as we have seen, by assuming the function of the subject and demoting the original subject to an object, corroborating what Kulikov (2010) argues is one of the major functions of the causative.

3. Grammatical Aspects of the Sentence in the Causativized Predicate

As we have already seen, one of the functions of the causative is to increase the valency of the sentence, making a monovalent predicate a bivalent one and a bivalent predicate a trivalent one. In such cases, the derived verb functions with the same person encoding as a does the verb in its basic form, that is, the arguments are marked in the same way as in simple non-causativized constructions, including the same restrictions imposed by the person hierarchy. This may be seen below in (20a), (20b) and (21).

(20a)   *anĩga*   *u- djeki*
        anĩga   3-enter
        'anĩga entered'

(20b)   *kujĩ*   *kunumi*   *u-eru-djeki*
        woman   boy   3-CAUS-enter
        'the woman made the boy enter, entering together'

(21)   *tximakare*   *ene=mu-kajỹm*   *tarikumỹ*   *ẽ*   *upe*
        NPR   2SG=CAUS-bewitch   NPR   3SGF   POSP
        'Tximacare is bewitching you (is making you sick with a spell)- Tarikumỹ told her'.

Example (20b) shows a derived transitive verb with the causative {*eru-*} functioning with the same prefix series of the intransitive verbform which it was derived, which is a series I prefix. According to Pereira (2015), such prefixes are used in active transitive and intransitive verbs when there is no rupture of the agentivity hierarchy; (21), on the other hand, shows a derived verb with the causative {*mu-*} functioning as a personal pronoun because this hierarchy has been broken.

In Asuriní of Xingu, there is a split in the class of intransitive verbs: active intransitives are marked with series I prefixes and descriptive intransitives are marked with personal pronouns with a clitic function (PEREIRA, 2021). However, when there is causativization of the predicate, this distinction does not exist. The data below illustrate this situation:

(22)   *kawĩ*   *iruỹn*
        porridge   be.cold
        'the porridge is cold'

(23)   *myra*   *kawĩ*   *u-mu-ruỹn*
        NPR   porridge   3-CAUS-cold
        'Myra caused the porridge to be cold'

Therefore, a derived transitive predicate, obtained with the resource of causative morphology, will function with the same person index used in active transitive and intransitive verbs, that is, with series I prefixes, regardless of whether they are derived from an active intransitive verb or a descriptive intransitive verb.

Final Considerations

In this article we have investigated causative constructions in the Asuriní of Xingu language. We verified that morphological causativization is the predominant type in the language, being expressed by three morphemes, {*mu-*}, {*eru-*}, and {*-ukat*}, which express direct, indirect, and sociative causativization in accordance with typological standards.

Constructions derived by causativization present structural and functional alterations in relation to the non-derived constructions that gave rise to them. The emergence of a new participant expels the subject from its original position, giving rise to a causer. In this way, the sentence gains one more core argument, increasing the valence of the predicate and changing its participant structure.

We further found that causativization in a predicate formed by a descriptive verb seems to favor greater control of the causer compared to other predicates, regardless of the semantic traits [+human] or [-human] of the causee; that is, despite this participant having a propensity to be controlled in the causativized predicate (which is in accordance with the literature), it seems that with descriptive verbs the event described in the predicate tends to occur regardless of the causee's cooperation, demonstrating that it is the causer who fully controls the realization of the event.

In this analysis, we classify of the morpheme {*eru-*} as a causative, in accord with other analyses of Tupí-Guaraní languages such as Kamayurá (SEKI 2000), and Emerillon (ROSE, 2003). This is in contrast, at least in part, with analyses of other languages in according to which this morpheme is described as an applicative, among them Tenetehára (CAMARGOS, 2017), and Guajá (MAGALHÃES, 2014). However, Asuriní of Xingu, in certain verbal forms, provides evidence that this morpheme may be altering its causative-sociative function, and may in some contexts be functioning as an applicative. This change, which is being investigated, highlights an ongoing change that needs to be analyzed in depth before issuing any conclusions about the real status of {*eru-*} in the language.

REFERENCES

ALVES, Flávia de Castro. *O Timbira falado pelos Canela Apãniekrá*: uma contribuição aos estudos da morfossintaxe de uma língua Jê. 2004. 192 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) - Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2004.

CAMARGOS, Quesler Fagundes. *Aplicativização, causativização e nominalização*: uma análise unificada de estruturas argumentais em Tenetehára-Guajajára (Família Tupí-Guaraní). 2017. 256 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) - Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2017.

COMRIE, Bernard. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

DIXON, Robert Malcolm Ward. A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. *In*: DIXON, Robert Malcolm Ward; AIKHENVALD, Alexandra Yurievna (ed.). *Changing Valency*: case studies in transitivity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. p. 30-83.

DIXON, Robert Malcolm Ward; AIKHENVALD, Alexandra Yurievna. Introduction. *In*: DIXON, Robert Malcolm Ward; AIKHENVALD, Alexandra Yurievna (ed.). *Changing Valency*: case studies in transitivity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. p. 1-29. Disponível em: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511627750.002. Acesso em: 20 maio 2022.

FILLMORE, Charles J. Algunos problemas de la gramática de casos. *In*: SÁNCHEZ DE ZÁVALA, Víctor (comp.). *Semántica y sintaxis en la lingüística transformatoria*. Madrid: Alianza, 1976. p. 171-200. (v. 2).

GALÚCIO, Ana Vilacy. Causativização na língua Mekens. *Revista Moara*, Belém, n. 32, p. 171-188, 2009.

GOMES, Dioney Moreira. *Estudo morfológico da língua Mundurukú*. 2006. 320 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) - Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2006.

GUILLAUME, Antoine; ROSE, Françoise. Sociative causative markers in South-American languages: a possible areal feature. *In*: FLORICIC, Franck (ed.). *Essais de typologie et de linguistique générale*: melanges offerts a denis creissels. Lyon: ENS Editions, 2010. p. 383-402.

HASPELMATH, Martin; MÜLLER-BARDEY, Thomas. Valence change. *In*: BOOIJ, Geert Evert; LEHMANN, Christian; MUGDAN, Joachim; SKOPETEAS Stavros (ed.). *Morphology*: An international handbook on inflection and word-formation. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Mouton, 2004. p. 1130-1145. (v. 2).

KEMMER, Suzanne; VERHAGEN, Arie. The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive Linguistics*, Germany, v. 5, n. 2, p. 115-156, 1994.

KULIKOV, Leonid. Voice typology. *In*: SONG, Jae Jung (ed.). *The oxford handbook of linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. p. 368-398.

MAGALHÃES, Marina Maria Silva. Os diferentes processos de causativização na língua Guajá. *In*: QUEIXALOS, Francesc; TELLES, Stella; BRUNO, Ana Carla dos Santos (org.). *Incremento de valencia en las lenguas amazónicas*. 21. ed. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 2014. p. 71-83.

PACHECO, Frantomé Bezerra. *Morfossintaxe do verbo Ikpeng (Karíb)*. 2001. 290 f. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) - Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2001.

PEREIRA, Antônia Alves. Aspectos da hierarquia de pessoa em Asuriní do Xingu. *Revista Educação e Linguagens*, Campo Mourão, v. 4, n. 6, p. 97-106, 2015.

PEREIRA, Antônia Alves. Marcação de caso e funções sintáticas em Asuriní do Xingu. *Revista Moara*, Belém, n. 58, p. 79-102, 2021. Disponível em: http://dx.doi.org/10.18542/moara.v0i58.10851. Acesso em: 20 maio 2022.

RODRIGUES, Aryon Dall'Igna. A Categoria de Voz Em Tupi. Curitiba: *Logos*, v. 6:50-53, 1947.

RODRIGUES, Aryon Dall'Igna. Relações internas na família linguística Tupi-Guarani. *Revista de Antropologia*, São paulo, n. 28, p. 33-53, 1985.

ROSE, Francoise. *Morphosyntaxe de l'emerillon*: language tupí-guaraní de Guyane française. Tese (Doutorado em Linguística) - Université Lumière Lyon II, Lyon, 2003.

SEKI, Lucy. *Gramática do Kamaiurá*: Língua Tupí-Guarani do Alto Xingu. Campinas: Unicamp, 2000.

SHIBATANI, Masayoshi (ed.). *The Grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2002.

SHIBATANI, Masayoshi; PARDESHI, Prashant. The causative continuum. *Typological Studies in Language*, Netherlands, v. 48, n. 18, p. 85-126, 2002.

SONG, Jae Jung. *Linguistic Typology*: morphology and syntax. New York: Routledge, 2014.

VELUPILLAI, Viveka. *An Introduction to Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012.

VIEIRA, Márcia Maria Damaso. Os núcleos aplicativos e as línguas indígenas brasileiras, *Revista de Estudos da Linguagem*, Belo Horizonte, v. 18, n. 1, p. 141-164. 2010.