

**WORKING PAPERS**  
**IN**  
**LINGUISTICS**

The notes and articles in this series are progress reports on work being carried on by students and faculty in the Department. Because these papers are not finished products, readers are asked not to cite from them without noting their preliminary nature. The authors welcome any comments and suggestions that readers might offer.

Volume 34(1)

2003  
(September)

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI‘I AT MĀNOA  
HONOLULU 96822

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

## DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS FACULTY

2003

Victoria B. Anderson  
Byron W. Bender (Emeritus)  
Benjamin Bergen  
Derek Bickerton (Emeritus)  
Robert A. Blust (Graduate Admissions Chair)  
Kenneth W. Cook (Adjunct)  
Emanuel J. Drechsel (Adjunct)  
Patricia J. Donegan  
Michael L. Forman  
George W. Grace (Emeritus)  
Roderick A. Jacobs (Emeritus)  
Gregory Lee  
Patricia A. Lee  
Anatole Lyovin  
Howard P. McKaughan (Emeritus)  
William O'Grady (Chair)  
Yuko Otsuka  
Ann Marie Peters (Emeritus, Graduate Chair)  
Kenneth L. Rehg (Acting Chair)  
Lawrence A. Reid  
Amy J. Schafer  
Albert J. Schütz, (Emeritus, Editor)  
David L. Stampe  
Laurence C. Thompson (Emeritus)  
Andrew Wong



# THE SYNONYMY VS. NONSYNONYMY HYPOTHESIS FOR CAUSATIVES IN KOREAN

JAE YEON KIM

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

<http://www.ling.hawaii.edu/research/workingpapers.html>

It is well known that there are two types of causatives in Korean, i.e., morphological and syntactic causatives. For quite a while linguists have debated whether these two types of causatives are semantically the same or different. On one front, there is a minority, represented by Yang among others, who argue that morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean are synonymous. On the other front, however, there are those, such as Shibatani, who believe that these two types of causatives are different, i.e., they are nonsynonymous. Despite continuous research on this issue, unfortunately it is still unclear as to what extent they resemble and/or differ from each other. This paper examines Haiman's Iconicity Principle, according to which conceptual unity/independence is reflected by linguistic closeness/separateness. The present paper argues that although Haiman's Iconicity Principle cannot account for Korean causatives as such, the general view of the semantic difference between morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean should remain intact, i.e., the former causatives are related to direct causation and the latter to indirect causation.

**1. INTRODUCTION.** The fact that there are two distinct types of causatives in Korean, morphological and syntactic, has interested many linguists for several decades with respect to their semantic and syntactic differences and/or similarities. For example, based on the fact that both morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean can express both direct and indirect causation, Yang (1974) claims that the two types of causatives are synonymous. Moreover, he argues that morphological causatives are derived from syntactic causatives. According to him, the different use of the two causative forms is related more to the context or situation than to the degree of causation of the act, namely direct versus indirect causation.

In contrast to Yang, Shibatani (1975) claims that if there are two different forms of causatives in a language, they cannot be the same. In English, for example, the syntactic form expresses a more general mode of causation than the lexical causative form, which expresses a specific mode of causation. He further argues that the relationship between the two forms is that of inclusion: the range of the meaning of the more general syntactic form includes that of the more specific lexical causative form. As for Korean and Japanese causatives, he claims that morphological causatives in these languages do not imply what is expressed by the corresponding syntactic forms.

According to Shibatani, the main semantic difference between the morphological causative and the syntactic form in Korean lies in the role of the causer to bring about the caused event. In a situation in which the causee is seen as a nonvolitional agent, the causer must physically manipulate the causee in bringing about the caused event. It is this situation involving manipulative causation that the morphological causative usually expresses. Thus, forms such as *iphi-ta* 'dress' or *meki-ta* 'feed' are appropriate in a situation in which the causer physically manipulates the causee. Another mode of causation involves a situation in which the causee is a volitional agent, and the causer just gives directions to the causee. The syntactic *-key ha-ta* form normally expresses this situation.

This paper explores the synonymy vs. nonsynonymy hypothesis of Korean causatives. In order to determine the semantic difference between the two types of causatives in Korean, Haiman’s Iconicity Principle is employed. The question revolves around the extent to which this principle holds for Korean causatives. Specifically, the question is whether this principle is accountable for morphological causatives in Korean, since the iconic relation between conceptual and linguistic distance has been more clearly exemplified in syntactic causatives. In other words, syntactic causatives in Korean show the conceptual independence between cause and result, which is manifested by the linguistic separateness between words for the cause and the caused event. For this reason, only sentences involving morphological causatives are included in this study.

The paper is divided into five sections. The first section involves the main idea of Haiman’s Iconicity Principle. This principle is adopted to account for the semantic difference between the two distinct types of Korean causatives. The second section presents the design of the study, e.g., subjects, task, etc. Test results are included in the third section. The fourth section discusses test results and problems related to Haiman’s Iconicity Principle in explaining the semantic difference between morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean. The final section covers concluding remarks and suggestions for future research.

**2. HAIMAN’S ICONICITY PRINCIPLE.** The Iconicity Principle put forward by Haiman (1983:781) states that the linguistic distance between expressions corresponds to the conceptual distance between them. In other words, “... the linguistic dimension is that of distance between linguistic expressions—which corresponds directly to, and in this sense is motivated by, a variety of conceptual dimensions.”

This principle is described more precisely as follows (1983:782):

Where X, A, and Y are morphemes, the linguistic distance between X and Y decreases along the following scale (# represents a word boundary, + represents a morpheme boundary):

- a. X # A # Y
- b. X # Y
- c. X + Y
- d. Z

According to Haiman 1983, the linguistic distance between expressions is least when they are fused in a morph Z; greater when they are distinct but bound morphemes; still greater when they are separate words; and greatest of all when they are separated by one or more other words. As this principle applies to causative constructions, it can be interpreted as follows: if there are two different types of causatives in a language, such that they correspond to structures given in (a)-(d) above, and they show semantic difference with respect to the conceptual distance between cause and result, then this conceptual distance will correspond to the formal linguistic distance.

In this respect, Haiman further contends that in the syntactic causative construction, cause and result do not necessarily happen at the same time or at the same place, nor is there any physical contact between the causer and the causee. For example, in Korean, direct causation is iconically expressed by the morphological fusion of the cause and the result morphemes, while indirect causation is in the same way iconically expressed by their separateness. Moreover, it is claimed that if a language distinguishes between V # Cause vs. V + Cause constructions, and if cause entails result for only one of these constructions, entailment is characteristic of V + Cause, not of V # Cause.

The idea of one event vs. two for different types of causative constructions, put forth by Ritter and Rosen (1993), also illustrates the semantic difference between morphological and

syntactic causatives in Korean. Comparing *have* with the lexical causative verb *make* in English, Ritter and Rosen (1993:529) argue that “there is syntactic evidence that the CAUSE denoted by true causative verbs is a distinct and independent event, whereas with *have*, the cause and result are part of the same complex event.”

- e.g. 1.a. The teacher didn't make Bill write the article, but he did it anyway.  
 b. ??The teacher didn't have Bill write the article, but he did it anyway.  
 2.a. Pat didn't make Terry cheat on the test, but she did it anyway.  
 b. ??Pat didn't have Terry cheat on the test, but she did it anyway.

Ritter and Rosen (1993:529) explain this distinction as follows: when *make* is negated, as in (1a), the causing event has not taken place. However, the writing event may still occur, as shown by the fact that the *but*-clause can be added, indicating that the writing took place without force. This is because *make* and *write* represent two distinct events. However, this is not the case for *have*. The ungrammaticality of the *but*-clause in (1b) results from the fact that *have* and the embedded verb *write* represent a single event. Therefore, the writing must be negated along with the causation.

The relation of entailment or the idea of one vs. two events in Korean causatives was recognized earlier by Patterson (1974), who noted a contrast between Verb # *ha* and Verb + *I* in Korean, such that, although both *ha* and *I* are causative morphemes, only the latter entails result (the morphological causative morpheme *I* represents several allomorphs in Korean, such as *i*, *hi*, *li*, *ki*, among others):

- e.g. a. Ku-ka na-eykey kimchi-lul mek-key ha-ess-una,  
 he-Sub I-Obl -Obj eat-Comp Caus-Pst-adversative  
 ‘He caused me to eat kimchi, but ...’  
 b. Ku-ka na-eykey kimchi-lul mek-I-ess-una,  
 he-Sub I-Obl -Obj eat-Caus-Pst-adversative  
 ‘He fed me kimchi, but ...’

The first, but not the second, may be continued without contradiction by the following.

- Na-ka mek-ci an(i)-ha-ess-ta.  
 I-Sub eat-Comp not-do-Pst-Dec  
 ‘I didn't eat kimchi.’

According to Patterson, the conceptual independence of the result clause is signaled in Korean by its physical separation from the causative morpheme *ha*; its conceptual dependence, by its fusion with the causative morpheme *I*.

However, the relation of entailment distinguished by *V # ha* and *V + I* turns out to be very controversial among Korean speakers. Thus, the above example given by Patterson is problematic in the sense that not only syntactic but also morphological causatives can be negated, obscuring the semantic distinction between these two causatives. This observation leads to the present experiment, whose goal it is to determine to what extent morphological causatives in Korean can be followed with a negation without contradiction. The following is a description of the current experiment.

### 3. EXPERIMENT.

*Subjects.* Twelve native speakers of Korean were recruited for this experiment. They are in their twenties and thirties, and are all graduate students at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.

*Material.* The first part of the test material consists of eight control sentences. These sentences are given to see whether subjects are capable of recognizing contradicting vs. non-contradicting statements in Korean. The second part of the test material, which is the main part of the experiment, contains fourteen sentence types involving different morphological causatives in Korean. Each sentence type has two examples: the first example is a plain declarative sentence with a morphological causative, while the second one consists of the same sentence followed by negation. Appropriate contexts are provided for both examples in each type (see Appendix I for more detail).

*Procedure.* Subjects are asked to indicate whether they think the given sentence can or cannot be expressed in the given context, by marking O or X (O for acceptance and X for non-acceptance). Contexts and example sentences are shown to subjects in Korean. The second part of each sentence type adopts Patterson’s negation test. Subjects are also instructed not to spend too much time judging the acceptability of each sentence. The following is an example of the first sentence type (see Appendix I for more detail):

Context 1-1: Mother is worried that her child has not eaten well recently. She has made things her child likes. She tries hard to make the child eat rice.

- a. Emma-ka ai-eykey pap-ul ekcilo mek-i-ess-ta.  
 mother-nom child-dat rice-acc with force eat-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘Mother made the child eat rice.’

Context 1-2: The child says that he doesn’t want to eat right now. Mother tells him to eat a little bit at least. However, no matter how hard mother tries to make the child eat rice, he refuses to eat by not opening his mouth.

- b. Emma-ka ai-eykey pap-ul ekcilo  
 mother-nom child-dat rice-acc with force  
 mek-i-ess-una, ai-ka mek-ci anh-ass-ta.  
 eat-caus-pst-but child-nom eat-comp not-pst-dec  
 ‘Mother tried to make the child eat rice, but he didn’t eat.’

### 4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS.

*Results.* Tables A and B show how subjects responded to the experimental sentences (see Appendices II and III for more detail). (The English translations for the B-type sentences might sound illogical to native speakers of English, for whom the causing event *make* and the caused event *eat* for (1-2), for example, represent a single event, so that it is impossible to negate only the caused event. In Korean, however, the corresponding expressions can be used because they represent two distinct events instead of one, so that only the caused event can be negated.)

TABLE A. SENTENCES WITH A MORPHOLOGICAL CAUSATIVE WITHOUT NEGATION

Sentences	Answers	Yes	No
1-1 Mother made the child eat.		12	
2-1 Grandmother dressed her granddaughter.		12	
3-1 Father made his daughter starve.		11	1
4-1 Teacher took off his student's hat.		12	
5-1 Mother made her child accept to be held by grandmother.		10	2
6-1 Father made the brother sit on the chair.		12	
7-1 Teacher made students walk.		7	5
8-1 John made Mary laugh.		12	
9-1 Mother made her child wash her hair.		11	1
10-1 Sister made her brother urinate.		12	
11-1 Teacher made Youngswu read.		12	
12-1 The housemaid made Minho play.		8	4
13-1 Youngswu made ice melt.		12	
14-1 Minho made a kite fly.		12	

TABLE B. SENTENCES WITH A MORPHOLOGICAL CAUSATIVE WITH NEGATION

Sentences	Answers	Yes	No
1-2 Mother made the child eat, but she didn't eat.		11	1
2-2 Grandmother dressed her granddaughter, but she didn't put it on.		9	3
3-2 Father made his daughter starve, but she didn't starve.		8	4
4-2 Teacher took off his student's hat, but he didn't take it off.		6	6
5-2 Mother made her child accept to be held by grandmother, but she didn't accept to be held.		9	3
6-2 Father made the brother sit on the chair, but he didn't sit.		9	3
7-2 Teacher made students walk, but they didn't walk.		5	7
8-2 John made Mary laugh, but she didn't laugh.		12	
9-2 Mother made her child wash her hair, but she didn't wash her hair.		8	4
10-2 Sister made her brother urinate, but he didn't urinate.		9	3
11-2 Teacher made Youngswu read, but he didn't read.		9	3
12-2 The housemaid made Minho play, but he didn't play.		7	5
13-2 Youngswu made ice melt, but it didn't melt.		11	1
14-2 Minho made a kite fly, but it didn't fly.		12	

*Analysis.**A. Sentences with a morphological causative without negation*

As expected, subjects accepted the majority of sentences with a morphological causative. They would have accepted them even if they had not been aided by a context. Sentences with nine morphological causatives were judged to be acceptable without any opposition. Among five sentences which did not receive full acceptance, sentences with the causative *kel-li-ta* ‘make walk’ had the least acceptance, i.e., five subjects out of twelve rejected the sentence. Sentences with the causatives *nol-li-ta* ‘make play’ and *an-ki-ta* ‘make accept to be held’ had four and two rejections each, respectively. Sentences with the causatives *kwulm-ki-ta* ‘make starve’ and *kam-ki-ta* ‘make wash hair’ had one rejection each. Subjects in this study seem to dislike sentences with the morphological causatives *nol-li-ta* ‘make play’ and *kel-li-ta* ‘make walk’. They would rather use syntactic causatives *nolkey hata* ‘make play’ and *ketkey hata* ‘make walk’, for example. One of the subjects who rejected the sentence with the causative *nol-li-ta* said that she would not use it herself, but would not necessarily consider it to be wrong if she heard somebody say it. All in all, it can be argued that the subjects at hand accepted sentences with a morphological causative used in this study.

*B. Sentences with a morphological causative with a negation*

The sentences under consideration now are those in which a clause with a morphological causative has negation added to it. According to Haiman’s Iconicity Principle, it should not be possible for a clause with a morphological causative to be followed by negation of that clause, since in a morphological causative cause and result are fused, and therefore just negating the result would end in contradiction. However, the results shown in this study strongly suggest that this principle does not hold for morphological causatives in Korean. For example, subjects showed a perfect to near perfect acceptance for the majority of sentences tested in this study, which had a negating clause after a clause with a morphological causative. For example, sentences with the morphological causatives *wus-ki-ta* ‘make laugh’ and *nal-li-ta* ‘make fly’ received a perfect acceptance from all of the subjects. Sentences with the causatives *mek-i-ta* ‘feed’ and *nok-i-ta* ‘make melt’ each received an almost perfect acceptance, i.e., eleven subjects out of twelve accepted them. Sentences with the causatives *ip-hi-ta* ‘dress’, *an-ki-ta* ‘make accept to be held’, *anc-hi-ta* ‘make sit’, *nwu-i-ta* ‘make urinate’, *ilk-hi-ta* ‘make read’ were accepted by nine subjects. Eight subjects accepted sentences with the causatives *kwulm-ki-ta* ‘make starve’ and *kam-ki-ta* ‘make wash hair’; seven subjects the sentence with the causative *nol-li-ta* ‘make play’; six subjects the sentence with the causative *pes-ki-ta* ‘take off’; and five subjects the sentence with the causative *kel-li-ta* ‘make walk’.

It is interesting to see that the subjects who rejected sentences with a morphological causative without negation also rejected sentences with the same morphological causative with negation. Thus, those who rejected the sentence with the causative *kwulm-ki-ta* ‘make starve’ without negation also rejected the same sentence with negation. The same is true of sentences with the causatives *an-ki-ta* ‘make accept to be held’, for which two subjects rejected the sentence without negation, as well as the same sentence with negation. Similarly, five subjects who rejected the sentence with the causative *kel-li-ta* ‘make walk’ also rejected this sentence, which was followed by negation. Additionally, one subject who rejected the sentence with the causative *kam-ki-ta* ‘make wash hair’ also rejected the same sentence followed by negation. The only exception involves the sentence with the causative *nol-li-ta* ‘make play’, for which four

subjects rejected the sentence without negation. Interestingly, one of these subjects accepted this sentence, although it was followed by negation.

**5. DISCUSSION.** Haiman's Iconicity Principle with regard to causative constructions in Korean can be stated as follows: morphological causatives consisting of linguistically fused expressions show conceptual unity between cause and result, whereas such conceptual closeness is absent in syntactic causatives. In other words, the correlation between grammatical separateness of an expression and the conceptual independence of the proposition represented by that expression is demonstrated in Korean causative constructions: the entailment relation is characteristic of morphological causatives, but not of syntactic causatives.

In the same vein, in the following examples, Haiman's Iconicity Principle predicts something different for a morphological and a syntactic causative in Korean [(a) is a morphological causative and (b) is a syntactic causative]:

1. (a) Emma-ka ai-eykey pap-ul ekcilo  
mother-nom child-dat rice-acc with force  
mek-i-ess-una, ai-ka mek-ci anh-ass-ta.  
eat-caus-pst-but child-nom eat-comp not-pst-dec  
'Mother tried to make the child eat rice, but he didn't eat.'
- (b) Emma-ka ai-eykey pap-ul ekcilo  
mother-nom child-dat rice-acc with force  
mek-key-ha-yess-una, ai-ka mek-ci anh-ass-ta.  
eat-caus-caus-pst-but child-nom eat-comp not-pst-dec  
'Mother tried to make the child eat rice, but he didn't eat.'
2. (a) John-i Mary-lul yelsimhi us-ki-ess-una,  
-nom -acc with effort laugh-caus-pst-but  
Mary-ka us-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
-nom laugh-comp-not-pst-dec  
'John tried to make Mary laugh, but Mary didn't laugh.'
- (b) John-i Mary-lul yelsimhi us-key-ha-yess-una,  
-nom -acc with effort laugh-caus-caus-pst-but  
Mary-ka us-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
-nom laugh-comp-not-pst-dec  
'John tried to make Mary laugh, but Mary didn't laugh.'

According to Haiman's Iconicity Principle, the above examples should show the following results in Korean: the morphological causative becomes contradictory after being combined with the *but*-phrase, resulting in an ungrammatical sentence, while there is no such contradiction for the syntactic causative. This is because it is impossible for the morphological causative to have only a part of the clause negated, since cause and result are fused in this construction. On the other hand, the syntactic causative has no such restriction, based on the independence of cause and result in this construction. In other words, only morphological, and not syntactic, causatives entail result.

However, as shown in this study, Haiman’s Iconicity Principle turns out to have some limitations in accounting for causative constructions in Korean. For example, subjects showed a perfect to a near-perfect acceptance for most of the sentences with a morphological causative, even when they were combined with a *but*-clause. This means that the conceptual unity between cause and result related to the linguistic fusion for a morphological causative is absent in these causatives.

Morphological causatives used in this study involve *an-ki-ta* ‘make accept to be held’, *anc-hi-ta* ‘make sit’, *kel-li-ta* ‘make walk’, *us-ki-ta* ‘make laugh’, *pes-ki-ta* ‘make take off’, among others, in which there are both a causer and a causee. Sentences with the morphological causatives that involve a causer and a causee are accepted by the majority of the subjects, even when they are followed by negation. There are, however, sentences with certain morphological causatives that are rejected by some subjects when they are followed by negation; those causatives include *kel-li-ta* ‘make walk’, *pes-ki-ta* ‘make take off’, and *nol-li-ta* ‘make play’. As noted above, however, subjects who rejected the sentences when they were followed by negation also rejected them even when they were not followed by negation. Thus, for these subjects the question is not whether they accept or reject a sentence with a morphological causative when it is negated afterwards, but whether they accept or reject a sentence with a certain morphological causative at all.

Two test examples out of fourteen are those morphological causatives in which there are a causer and an object in place of a causee, such as *nok-i-ta* ‘make melt’ and *nal-li-ta* ‘make fly’. Nearly all subjects accepted sentences with these two causatives which were followed by negation (all twelve subjects accepted the sentence with the causative *nal-li-ta* ‘make fly’, and eleven subjects accepted the sentence with the causative *nok-i-ta* ‘make melt’).

It seems that subjects more often accepted those causatives with a causer and an object rather than those with a causer and a causee, when they are followed by negation. Based on the limited number of test sentences which involve a causer and an object, however, it is difficult to argue whether the acceptance of a causative depends on its internal structure, i.e., whether subjects accept a causative involving a causer and an object more than a causative with a causer and a causee, when it is followed by negation.

The Iconicity Principle proposed by Haiman was also explored by Song (1992), who attempted to determine whether this principle is accountable for Korean causatives. Although he definitely argued against this principle, based on the fact that it does not hold for many languages, he seemed at least to acknowledge the validity of this principle for Korean causatives. His opposition came mainly from examining other languages, such as Kammu, a Mon-Khmer language, and Malagasy, an Austronesian language; both show the opposite pattern—namely that the morphological causative is nonimplicative (lack of entailment), and that the syntactic causative is implicative (entailment relation).

However, as shown in this paper, the Iconicity Principle, based on the entailment relationship, cannot account for the semantic difference between morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean. Most of the causative constructions used in this study can be combined with the *but*-phrase, showing the independence of cause and result in these constructions. However, although the Iconicity Principle does not hold for causative constructions in Korean as such, it might be wrong to argue that morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean are synonymous, since it is still the case that the former are more likely used for direct causation, whereas the latter are more appropriate for indirect causation.

In this regard, Bratt (1996) claims that morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean are certainly not synonymous, although they share certain semantic properties. Thus, a complete semantic representation of causatives in Korean should indicate that, in general, morphological causatives represent direct causation, while syntactic causatives represent indirect causation. It should also include variations from this prototype. The fact that morphological and syntactic causatives are not synonymous can be seen in the following example, in which syntactic causatives have a reading of enabling, while morphological causatives lack this meaning [(a) is a morphological and (b) a syntactic causative].

e.g. a. Uysa-ka cangayca-lul kel-li-ess-ta.  
 doctor-nom disabled-acc walk-caus-past-dec  
 ‘The doctor made the disabled person walk.’

b. Uysa-ka cangayca-lul ket-key ha-yess-ta.  
 doctor-nom disabled-acc walk-caus-past-dec  
 ‘The doctor made the disabled person walk.’ or ‘The doctor made it possible for the disabled person to walk.’

Both (a) and (b) have the reading that the doctor caused the disabled person to walk. However, only the syntactic causative, and not the morphological, has the meaning of permission or enabling. Thus, the assumption that morphological and syntactic causatives have identical semantics would fail to account for contrasts such as those above. However, some morphological causatives can have the meaning of enabling, in addition to the causative meaning, as shown below:

e.g. Uysa-ka cwukekanun salam-ul tasi sal-li-ess-ta.  
 doctor-nom dying person-acc again live-caus-past-dec  
 ‘The doctor made the dying person be alive again.’ or ‘The doctor made it possible for the dying person to be alive again.’

Still, it should be noted that, in general, in contrast to a syntactic causative, a morphological causative lacks a permissive and/or enabling interpretation. The question is, then, what the precise semantic difference between these two distinct causatives is.

Besides the different scope of meaning which is assigned to a morphological and syntactic causative in Korean, i.e., the former has mainly a causative meaning, and the latter a permissive and/or enabling meaning in addition to the causative meaning, there are also contexts in which these two different causatives have distinct meanings. This involves a different scope of adverbial modification in morphological and syntactic causatives, as shown below [(a) is a morphological and (b) a syntactic causative]:

e.g. a. John-i mul-ul cacwu el-li-ess-ta.  
 -nom water-acc often freeze-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘John often froze the water.’

b. John-i mul-ul cacwu el-key ha-yess-ta.  
 -nom water-acc often freeze-comp caus-pst-dec  
 ‘John often froze the water or John made the water freeze often.’

When *cacwu* ‘often’ is used in the morphological causative, it modifies the whole event solely as a single event, providing only one interpretation, whereas in the syntactic causative, it

modifies two distinct events, namely the verb of causation and the base verb, allowing two interpretations. This confirms, therefore, the claim of one event vs. two for different types of causatives proposed by Ritter and Rosen (1993): in Korean, morphological causatives are assigned only one event, while two distinct events are involved in syntactic causatives.

In addition, time adverbials also behave differently for morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean. For example, in contrast to syntactic causatives, morphological causatives in general cannot have different time adverbials for the time of the causation and the time of the caused event. The following example is from Bratt 1996 [(a) is a morphological and (b) a syntactic causative].

e.g. a. \*Nay-ka haksayng-eykey hwayoil-ey kumyoil-ey  
 I-nom student-dat Tuesday-dat Friday-dat  
 chayk-ul ilk-hi-ess-ta.  
 book-acc read-caus-past-dec  
 ‘I made the student read the book on Tuesday on Friday.’

b. Nay-ka haksayng-eykey hwayoil-ey kumyoil-ey  
 I-nom student-dat Tuesday-dat Friday-dat  
 chayk-ul ilk-key ha-yess-ta.  
 book-acc read-caus-past-dec  
 ‘I made the student read the book on Tuesday on Friday.’

However, the Iconicity Principle does not stand alone in being problematic—as shown in this study, which is based on an entailment relationship—in accounting for the semantic difference between morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean. Indeed, the traditional assumption that morphological causatives are related to direct causation and syntactic causatives to indirect causation is also problematic. For example, Patterson 1974 shows the following example, in which the morphological causative has either direct or indirect readings, whereas the syntactic causative has only an indirect reading.

e.g. a. Emeni-ka Yenghi-eykey say-os-ul ip-hi-ess-ta.  
 mother-nom -dat new-cloth-acc wear-caus-past-dec  
 ‘Mother caused Yenghi to wear new clothes.’ or ‘Mother dressed Yenghi in new clothes.’

b. Emeni-ka Yenghi-eykey say-os-ul ip-key ha-yess-ta.  
 mother-nom -dat new-cloth-acc wear-caus-past-dec  
 ‘Mother caused Yenghi to wear new clothes.’

In this regard, Shibatani and Chung (2002) also acknowledge that Shibatani’s original framework (1973), based on the manipulative-directive (or direct-indirect) contrast in which only one agent (the causer) is assigned to the former causative, needs correction, because it cannot explain those cases in Korean in which lexical causatives express situations clearly involving two agents.

e.g. a. Emeni-ka khun ai-lul kel-li-ko cakun ai-nun  
 mother-nom big child-acc walk-caus-conj small-child-top

tung-ey op-ko cang-ey ka-ss-ta.  
 back-loc carry-conj market-loc go-past-dec  
 ‘Mother went to the market making the big child walk and carrying the younger child on her back.’

b. Emeni-ka ai-eykey kulca-lul hanchanca  
 mother-nom child-dat letter-acc one by one

ciphe-ka-mye chayk-ul ilk-hi-ess-ta.  
 point-go-while book-acc read-caus-past-dec  
 ‘Mother made the child read the book by pointing to the letters one by one.’

Shibatani and Chung (2002), however, consider these expressions not a case of indirect causation, but another category of causative situation that is intermediate between direct and indirect causative situations. For example, some Korean lexical forms do express situations involving an agentive causer and an agentive causee, which, however, can easily be distinguished from the typical indirect causative situation, in which the causing event and the caused event need not be overlapping in space and time.

**6. CONCLUSION.** This study started out with the question as to what extent the Iconicity Principle, whose realization can be found in many facets of language, holds for Korean causatives (morphological causatives specifically), i.e., whether there is an iconic relation between conceptual and formal entities in morphological causatives in Korean. As noted above, although it is shown that the Iconicity Principle does not hold for causative constructions in Korean as such, it might be incorrect to say that morphological and syntactic causatives in Korean have the same semantics, since the former causatives are still more likely used in relation to direct causation, whereas the latter are more appropriate for indirect causation.

Furthermore, in order to determine whether the internal structure of a causative plays any role for people in accepting a morphological causative when it is followed by negation, future research should employ more test examples involving those causatives with a causer and an object in place of a causee.

Considering the fact that a morphological causative in Korean can also have two agents, thus expressing indirect causation, and manifest conceptual independence between cause and result, all of which are characteristic of syntactic causatives, the question is then what the precise semantic nature of morphological causatives is. Unfortunately, there has as yet been no conclusive answer to this question. Therefore, continuing research in this matter should explore characteristics of morphological causatives that clearly distinguish them from syntactic causatives, thus helping to determine the exact semantic nature of morphological causatives in Korean. This could be accomplished by investigating various linguistic phenomena in which morphological causatives definitely differ from syntactic causatives in terms of meaning, such as adverbial (or a negative particle) modification, and case marking of the causee, among others.

APPENDIX I (EXAMPLE SENTENCES)

*Situations in which there are a causer and a causee*

Context 1-1: The mother is worried that her child has not eaten well recently. She made things her child likes. She tries hard to make the child eat rice.

- a. Emma-ka ai-eykey pap-ul ekcilo mek-i-ess-ta.  
 mother-nom child-dat rice-acc with force eat-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘The mother made the child eat rice.’

Context 1-2: The child says that he doesn’t want to eat right now. The mother tells him to eat a little bit at least. However, no matter how hard the mother tries to make the child eat rice, he refuses to eat by not opening his mouth.

- b. Emma-ka ai-eykey pap-ul ekcilo mek-i-ess-una,  
 mother-nom child-dat rice-acc with force eat-caus-pst-but  
 ai-ka mek-ci anh-ass-ta.  
 child-nom eat-comp not-pst-dec  
 ‘The mother tried to make the child eat rice, but he didn’t eat.’

Context 2-1: The granddaughter says that she does not like to wear the clothes her grandmother put out for her. The grandmother talks her granddaughter into wearing them by saying that she would look beautiful in those clothes. The grandmother is trying to make her granddaughter put them on.

- a. Halmeni-ka sonnyettal-eykey os-ul ekcilo ip-hi-ess-ta.  
 grandmother-nom granddaughter-dat clothes-acc with force put on-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘The grandmother made her granddaughter put on the clothes.’

Context 2-2: The granddaughter keeps saying that she hates those clothes her grandmother wants her to wear and she wouldn’t look beautiful in those clothes. So, no matter how hard the grandmother tries to make her granddaughter wear the clothes, she refuses to wear them by holding her hands tight.

- b. Halmeni-ka sonnyettal-eykey os-ul ekcilo  
 grandmother-nom granddaughter-dat clothes-acc with force  
 ip-hi-ess-una, sonnyettal-i os-ul ip-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 put on-caus-pst-but granddaughter-nom clothes-acc put on-incho-not-pst-dec  
 ‘The grandmother tried to make her granddaughter wear the clothes, but she did not wear them.’

Context 3-1: The father is mad at his daughter because she lied about her school record. The father says that she should not have dinner. He tells her to go to her room and study until bedtime.

- a. Apeci-ka pel-lo ttalay-lul cenyek-ul kangceylo kwulm-ki-ess-ta.  
 father-nom punishment-as daughter-acc dinner-acc with force starve-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘As punishment, the father made his daughter starve.’

Context 3-2: Even if the mother is also angry with her daughter’s lying about her school record, she is not happy about the father’s decision that their daughter should not have dinner.

The mother waits and brings her daughter something to eat while the father is talking on the phone.

- b. Apeci-ka pel-lo ttalay-lul cenyek-ul  
father-nom punishment-as daughter-acc dinner-acc

kangceylo kwulm-ki-ess-una, ttalai-ka cenyek-ul kwulm-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
with force starve-caus-pst-but daughter-nom dinner-acc starve-incho-not-pst-dec  
'As punishment, the father made his daughter starve, but she did not starve.'

Context 4-1: The teacher is annoyed because one of his students is wearing a hat in class. He tells the student several times to take the hat off, but the student does not comply. The teacher gets so mad that he takes off the hat from the student's head.

- a. Sensayngnim-i haksayng-ul moca-lul kangceylo pes-ki-ess-ta.  
teacher-nom student-acc hat-acc with force take off-caus-pst-dec  
'The teacher took off the hat his student had on.'

Context 4-2: The student insists that there is no such rule which prohibits students from wearing a hat at school. He also says that it's an intrusion of privacy if there is such a rule. The teacher gets furious and tells the student that he should not get smart with him. After several warnings, the teacher tries to take off the hat from the student, but he isn't successful since the student is holding on to the hat with all his might.

- b. Sensayngnim-i haksayng-ul moca-lul kangceylo pes-ki-ess-una,  
teacher-nom student-acc hat-acc with force take off-caus-pst-but  
haksayng-i moca-lul wumkhyecapko pes-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
student-nom hat-acc holding tight take off-comp-not-pst-dec  
'The teacher tried to take off the hat the student had on, but by holding it tight, the student didn't take it off.'

Context 5-1: The child does not like to be held by people other than her mother. Since the mother should go to work, she is trying hard to get the child to accept being held by her grandmother.

- a. Emma-ka ai-lul halmeni-hanthey ekcilo an-ki-ess-ta.  
mother-nom child-acc grandmother-dat with force hold-caus-pst-dec  
'The mother made the grandmother hold the child.'

Context 5-2: The mother tries several times to get the child to accept being held by her grandmother. However, each time the child strongly refuses to be held by her grandmother by moving her body frantically.

- b. Emma-ka ai-lul halmeni-hanthey ekcilo an-ki-ess-una,  
mother-nom child-acc grandmother-dat with force hold-caus-pst-but  
ai-ka halmeni-hantey an-ki-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
child-nom grandmother-dat hold-caus-comp-not-pst-dec  
'The mother made the grandmother hold the child, but she didn't get held.'

Context 6-1: Father is annoyed about my brother since he spends too much time watching TV. Father tells my brother to go to his room and study. Afterwards, Father looks in my

brother’s room to check if he is studying. Seeing that he is just lying on his bed, Father gets mad and grabs his shoulder to make him sit on the chair to study.

- a. Apeci-ka tongsayng-ul uyca-ey ekcilo anc-hi-ess-ta.  
 father-nom brother-acc chair-dat with force sit-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘Father made my brother sit on the chair.’

Context 6-2: My brother says that he has been studying until Father came in his room. He also says that he should go out now to practice basketball with his team members. Father doesn’t believe my brother and tries to make him sit on the chair. My brother reacts fast and is already out of his room.

- b. Apeci-ka tongsayng-ul uyca-ey ekcilo anc-hi-ess-una,  
 father-nom brother-acc chair-dat with force sit-caus-pst-but  
 tongsayng-i uyca-ey anc-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 brother-nom chair-dat sit-comp-not-pst-dec  
 ‘Father made my brother sit on the chair, but he didn’t sit.’

Context 7-1: [The](#) P.E. teacher tells his students that they are going to walk around the school ground twenty times today. He starts walking in front of the students, making them walk along with him.

- a. Cheyyuk sensayngnim-i haksayngtul-ul wuntongcang-ese  
 P.E. teacher-nom students-acc school ground-in  
 yelsimhi kel-li-ess-ta.  
 with effort walk-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘P.E. teacher made students walk on the school ground.’

Context 7-2: As time passed, students were walking slowly and started complaining that it’s too exhausting to walk around the school ground twenty times. They all stopped walking; they were either standing or sitting down on the ground.

- b. Cheyyuk sensayngnim-i haksayngtul-ul wuntongcang-ese  
 P.E. teacher-nom students-acc school ground-in  
 yelsimhi kel-li-ess-una, haksayngtul-i ket-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 with effort walk-caus-pst-but students-nom walk-comp-not-pst-dec  
 ‘P.E. teacher tried to make students walk on the school ground, but the students didn’t walk.’

Context 8-1: Mary had a bad day. Her alarm didn’t go off, so she got up late. While taking a shower, she slid in the bathtub. To make the day worse, her jacket was caught in the elevator door when she wanted to get out. Everybody at her work looked at her when she struggled to pull off her jacket from the elevator door. After listening to all the bad things that happened to Mary today, John wants to cheer her up. He tries to make her laugh by telling her jokes.

- a. John-i Mary-lul yelsimhi us-ki-ess-ta.  
 -nom -acc with effort laugh-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘John tried to make Mary laugh.’

Context 8-2: Mary might have laughed if John had told her such funny jokes on other days. Today nothing could make her laugh, since she could not help thinking of the embarrassing moment when her jacket was caught in the elevator and she struggled in vain to pull it off.

- b. John-i Mary-lul yelsimhi us-ki-ess-una,  
 -nom -acc with effort laugh-caus-pst-but  
 Mary-ka us-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 -nom laugh-comp-not-pst-dec  
 ‘John tried to make Mary laugh, but Mary didn’t laugh.’

Context 9-1: The mother is annoyed because her child has not washed her hair in a long time. She is making the child wash her hair.

- a. Emma-ka ai-lul meli-lul ekcilo kam-ki-ess-ta.  
 mother-nom child-acc hair-acc with force wash-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘The mother made the child wash her hair.’

Context 9-2: The child says that she is going to wash her hair when she comes back from school. The mother doesn’t give in and takes her child into the bathroom. However, no matter how hard the mother tries to put her child’s head in the tub to wash her hair, the child resists putting her head in water by holding her head straight.

- b. Emma-ka ai-lul meli-lul ekcilo kam-ki-ess-una,  
 mother-nom child-acc hair-acc with force wash-caus-pst-but  
 ai-ka meli-lul kam-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 child-nom hair-acc wash-comp-not-pst-dec  
 ‘The mother made the child wash her hair, but the child did not wash her hair.’

Context 10-1: When walking home from school, the brother says to his sister that he has to pee. Seeing that there is no public bathroom around, the sister talks her brother into peeing on the street corner. Since she is worried about getting scolded by the mother if her brother pees in his pants, she tries hard to make him pee on the street.

- a. Nwuna-ka kilka-ese tongsayng-ul ocwum-ul ayssese nwu-i-ess-ta.  
 -nom street-in brother-acc urin-acc with effort pee-caus-past-dec  
 ‘The sister tried hard to make her brother urinate on the street.’

Context 10-2: The sister tells her brother that the mother will be very mad at him if he pees in his pants. Even though he is worried about getting scolded by the mother, the brother refuses to pee on the street, since he is afraid that people might see him.

- b. Nwuna-ka kilka-ese tongsayng-ul ocwum-ul ayssese nwu-i-ess-una,  
 -nom street-in brother-acc urin-acc with effort pee-caus-past-but  
 tongsayng-i ocwum-ul nwu-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 brother-nom urin-acc pee-comp-not-past-dec  
 ‘The sister tried hard to make her brother urinate on the street, but he didn’t urinate.’

Context 11-1: Among twenty students in his class, Youngswu is the only one who can’t read yet. While other students are reading to themselves, the teacher is trying to help Youngswu read the book aloud by pointing to the letters one by one.

- a. Sensayngnim-i Youngswu-eykey kulca-lul hanahana  
 teacher-nom -dat letter-acc one by one

cipekamye chayk-ul ilk-hi-ess-ta.  
 point-comp book-acc read-caus-past-dec

‘The teacher made Youngswu read the book while pointing out the letters one by one.’

Context 11-2: Seeing that everybody is looking at him, Youngswu gets embarrassed and stops reading the book aloud.

- b. Sensayngnim-i Youngswu-eykey kulca-lul hanahana  
 teacher-nom -dat letter-acc one by one

cipekamye chayk-ul ilk-hi-ess-una,  
 point-comp book-acc read-caus-past-but

Youngswu-ka chayk-ul ilk-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 -nom book-acc read-comp-not-past-dec

‘The teacher made Youngswu read the book while pointing to the letters one by one, but Youngswu didn’t read it.’

Context 12-1: The mother just went to work. Since Minhø was so upset about being left alone without his mother, the housemaid took him to the park. She tries to make him play by putting him on the swing, going on the slide with him, etc.

- a. Ilhanun acwumma-ka Minhø-lul kongwen-ese aysseese nol-li-ess-ta.  
 housemaid-nom -acc park-dat with effort play-caus-past-dec

‘The housemaid tried to make Minhø play at the park, but he didn’t play.’

Context 12-2: No matter how hard the housemaid tries to make Minhø play at the park, he refuses to play by just sitting on the swing.

- b. Ilhanun acwumma-ka Minhø-lul kongwen-ese aysseese  
 housemaid-nom -acc park-dat with effort

nol-li-ess-una, Minhø-ka nol-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 play-caus-past-but -nom play-comp-not-past-dec

‘The housemaid made Minhø play at the park, but he didn’t play.’

*Situations in which there are a causer and an object in place of a causee*

Context 13-1: Youngswu is doing his science project to determine whether it takes only a few seconds to completely melt a two-inch cube of ice under the sun. He is trying to melt a two-inch cube of ice under the sun.

- a. Youngswu-ka hayspyetalayse elum-ul yelsimhi nok-i-ess-ta.  
 -nom sunshine-under ice-acc with effort melt-caus-pst-dec

‘Youngswu tried to melt the ice under the sun.’

Context 13-2: After trying to melt a two-inch cube of ice under the sun within a few seconds, Youngswu finds out that, different from the expectation, it takes more than a few seconds to completely melt an ice cube of that size under the sun.

- b. Youngswu-ka hayspyetalayse elum-ul yelsimhi  
 -nom sunshine-under ice-acc with effort

nok-i-ess-una, elum-i nok-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 melt-caus-pst-but ice-nom melt-incho-not-pst-dec  
 ‘Youngswu tried to melt the ice under the sun, but the ice did not melt.’

Context 14-1: Minho tries to fly a kite, although there is no wind outside the house. The kite keeps falling down. He tries several times.

a. Minho-ka cipaph madang-ese yen-ul yelsimhi nal-li-ess-ta.  
 -nom in front of house ground-in kite-acc with effort fly-caus-pst-dec  
 ‘Minho tried hard to fly a kite outside the house.’

Context 14-2: No matter how hard he tries, it is impossible for Minho to fly a kite, because there is absolutely no wind outside.

b. Minho-ka cipaph madang-ese yen-ul yelsimhi  
 -nom in front of house ground-in kite-acc with effort  
 nal-li-ess-una, yen-i nal-ci-anh-ass-ta.  
 fly-caus-pst-but kite-nom fly-incho-not-pst-dec  
 ‘Minho tried hard to fly a kite outside the house, but the kite didn’t fly.’

APPENDIX II (COMPLETE RESULTS)

Sentences	Answers	Yes	No
1-1 Mother made the child eat.		12	
1-2 Mother made the child eat, but she didn't eat.		11	1
2-1 Grandmother dressed her granddaughter.		12	
2-2 Grandmother dressed her granddaughter, but she didn't put it on.		9	3
3-1 Father made his daughter starve.		11	1
3-2 Father made his daughter starve, but she didn't starve.		8	4
4-1 Teacher took off his student's hat.		12	
4-2 Teacher took off his student's hat, but he didn't take it off.		6	6
5-1 Mother made her child accept to be held by grandmother.		10	2
5-2 Mother made her child accept to be held by grandmother, but she didn't accept to be held.		9	3
6-1 Father made the brother sit on the chair.		12	
6-2 Father made the brother sit on the chair, but he didn't sit.		9	3
7-1 Teacher made students walk.		7	5
7-2 Teacher made students walk, but they didn't walk.		5	7
8-1 John made Mary laugh.		12	
8-2 John made Mary laugh, but she didn't laugh.		12	
9-1 Mother made her child wash her hair.		11	1
9-2 Mother made her child wash her hair, but she didn't wash hair.		8	4
10-1 Sister made her brother urinate.		12	
10-2 Sister made her brother pee, but he didn't urinate.		9	3
11-1 Teacher made Youngswu read.		12	
11-2 Teacher made Youngswu read, but he didn't read.		9	3
12-1 The housemaid made Minho play.		8	4
12-2 The housemaid made Minho play, but he didn't play.		7	5
13-1 Youngswu made the ice melt.		12	
13-2 Youngswu made the ice melt, but it didn't melt.		11	1
14-1 Minho made a kite fly.		12	
14-2 Minho made a kite fly, but it didn't fly.		12	



REFERENCES

- BRATT, ELIZABETH OWEN. 1996. Argument composition and the lexicon: Lexical and periphrastic causatives in Korean. Stanford University Ph.D. dissertation.
- COMRIE, BERNARD. 1980. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- HAIMAN, JOHN. 1983. Iconic and economic motivation. *Language* 59:781–819.
- KIM, KYUNGHWAN. 1994. The syntax and semantics of causative constructions in Korean. University of Chicago Ph.D. dissertation.
- LEE, KEEDONG. 1975. Lexical causatives in Korean. *Language Research* 11:17–24.
- PARK, JEONG-WOON. 1994. Morphological causatives in Korean: Problems in grammatical polysemy and constructional relations. University of California at Berkeley Ph.D. dissertation.
- PATTERSON, BETTY SOON JU. 1974. A study of Korean causatives. University of Hawai‘i M.A. thesis.
- RITTER, ELIZABETH, and SARA THOMAS ROSEN. 1993. Deriving causation. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 11(3):519–555.
- SHIBATANI, MASAYOSHI. 1972. Three reasons for not deriving ‘kill’ from ‘cause to die’ in Japanese. *Syntax and Semantics* 1, ed. by J. Kimball, 125–37. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1973. Lexical versus periphrastic causatives in Korean. *Journal of Linguistics* 9:281–297.
- . 1975. On the nature of synonymy in causative expressions. *Language Research* 11:267–274.
- , and SUNG YEO CHUNG. 2002. Japanese and Korean causatives revisited. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10:32–49.
- SONG, JAE JUNG. 1992. A note on iconicity in causatives. *Folia Linguistica* 26:333–338.
- . 1996. *Causatives and causation: A universal-typological perspective*. London & New York: Longman.
- YANG, IN-SEOK. 1974. Two causative forms in Korean. *Language Research* 10:83–117.

[jaekim@hawaii.edu](mailto:jaekim@hawaii.edu)