

*N. M. Zaika*

## ADDITIONAL MEANINGS OF CAUSAL MARKERS IN POLYPREDICATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

The paper deals with the semantics of causal markers in polypredicative constructions; it is based on an areally and genetically balanced sample of 100 languages (Africa – 14 languages, Eurasia – 8 languages, Southeast Asia & Oceania – 13 languages, Australia & New Guinea – 27 languages, North America – 18 languages; South America – 20 languages; where the number of languages taken from each family depends on its size). The research is based on typologically oriented grammars, language descriptions, corpus data and consultations with language experts.

It turns out that apart from their basic causal meaning, causal markers can express other additional meanings in the Reason clause, in the Result clause or in both of them. To my knowledge, a number of these parameters have never been mentioned in typological studies of polypredicative causal constructions. The most frequently mentioned additional meaning was evaluation, widely attested in European languages. Both positive and negative evaluation usually refers to the Reason clause and the Result clause at the same time, but in some cases, it can refer to only one of the clauses. The other parameters include: the degree of control of the Reason and Result; conformity or non-conformity of Result to the hearer's expectations; the reality/objectivity of Reason; emphasis on the Motive vs. the Causer; greater or smaller temporal distance between the propositions; degree of causal relationship between the propositions; and critical attitude toward the causal relationship in polypredicative constructions. Causal markers can combine two additional meanings as well. The fact that most of the additional meanings were attested in languages of Eurasia and Southeast Asia & Oceania can be explained in two ways. First, the languages of these Macroareas are well-described, and, second, both Macroareas possess a larger number of causal markers, typical of written texts, sometimes having additional semantic features.

**Key words:** *polypredicative constructions, semantics, reason, motive, consequence, evaluation, control, reality.*

### *Introduction<sup>1</sup>*

Polypredicative causal constructions can be classified according to a number of morphological, syntactic, and semantic parameters, some of which have been analysed in (Martowicz, 2011, Diessel, Hetterle, 2011, Galán Rodríguez, 1995), and many other works. This study addresses some semantic parameters, partially mentioned in (Zaika, 2019: 21–23), relying on a reasonably representative language sample.

The focus is on polypredicative causal constructions, namely, direct causal constructions immediately denoting the relation of causation between two situations:

- (1) [I've bought her a present]<sub>RESULT</sub>, [because today is her birthday]<sub>REASON</sub>.

Beyond the scope of this paper are inferential causal constructions, where the causal clause states the reason for asserting the proposition in the main clause (2), and illocutive causal constructions with “a relation between the propositional content of one clause in a polypredicative construction and illocutionary modality of the other” (Pekelis, 2015) (3).

---

<sup>1</sup> The research is supported by the Russian Science Foundation (Grant № 18-18-00472 “Causal Constructions in World Languages: Semantics and Typology”). I would like to thank Emma Geniušienė, Maksim Fedotov, Ildar Ibragimov, Kazuhiro Kawachi, Viktor S. Khrakovsky, Sergei Klimenko, Elena Kolpachkova, Svetlana Kramarova, Ramazan Mamedshahov, Daria Mischenko, Sofia Oskolskaya, and Viktor Stegnyy for their help with sentential examples and their useful remarks. All errors that remain in the paper are my own.

- (2) [*Liz left*], [*since her coat is not on the rack*] = ‘<I suppose / know that> Liz left, because her coat is not on the rack’. (Charnavel, 2019)
- (3) *Qu’est-ce qu’il vaut ce bouquin, parce que je voudrais l’acheter?*  
‘How much is the book, since I want to buy it’ = <I ask> how much the book is, since I want to buy it (Colson, 1993: 57)

The rest of the article addresses: the languages and sources of my sample (Section 1); the additional meanings (evaluation, control, speaker’s attitude, emphasis, temporal distance, etc.) of poly-predicative causal constructions (Section 2); and conclusions.

### 1. Languages and Sources

The research is based on two overlapping<sup>2</sup> language samples. The first is a reasonably balanced sample of 100 languages where the geographical distribution follows the Genus-Macroarea sampling method (Miestamo et al., 2016: 256–260) with slight modifications based on (Oskolskaya et al., 2019) (while in the former, big linguistic families are underrepresented, the latter also takes family size into account). Basically, a proportional number of languages from each Macroarea (Africa – 14,2% = 14; Eurasia – 8,3% = 8; Southeast Asia & Oceania – 12,7% = 13, Australia & New Guinea – 26,9% = 27; North America – 17,7% = 18; South America – 20,3% = 20) were taken from the 521 genera mentioned in (WALS), with big families represented by more than one genus. The selection of the languages is mine. The existence of searchable grammars was crucial for the study, though other relevant sources (dictionaries, language descriptions, corpora, elicitation) were also used. The languages of the sample are listed below.

Africa (14 languages): **Arabic**<sup>3</sup>, Ganja, Lunda, Yoruba, Gban, Koyra Chiini, Hdi, Bagiro (Furu), Lumun, Gaahmg (Gaam), Sheko, Ngulak (Ik), Sandawe, Ts’ixa.

Eurasia (8 languages): **Basque**, **Lithuanian**, Pashayi, **Tatar**, **Lezgian**, Nenets, **Korean**, **Japanese**.

Southeast Asia & Oceania (13 languages): **Chinese**, Yao'an Lolo (Lolopo), Atong, Lha'alua (Saaroa), Ughele, **Tuwali Ifugao**, **Tagalog**, Ambel, **Indonesian**, Lao, White Hmong, Khmer, Kasong.

Australia & New Guinea (27 languages): Oksapmin, **Skou**, Manambu, Siwai (Motuna), Wambaya, Kayardild, Worrorra, Ngiyambaa, Bardi, Moskona, Abui, Enindhilyakwa, Gooniyandi, Guragone (Gurr-Goni), Wardaman, Lavukaleve, Ambulas, Urama (Kiwai), **Daga**, Umbu Ungu, Nankina, Fuyug, Mauwake, **Konai**, Ternate, Waris, Kamasau.

North America (18 languages): Crow, Ute, Nahuatl, Musqueam (Halkomelem), Choctaw, Nez Perce, Seneca, **Arapaho**, Aleut, Mixe, Tzeltal, Zoogocho Zapotec, Chinantec, Seri, Wappo, Yuchi (Euchee), Nuu-chah-nulth, Miskito.

South America (20 languages): Jarawara, Mapuche (Mapudungun), Guaraní, Yauyos Quechua, **Paya Kuna**, Karajá, Apurinã, Paresi, Ye'kwana (Maquiritari), Matses, Ese Ejja, Wampis (Huambisa), Wanano (Guanano), Mosetén, Bora, **Dâw**, Movima, Wari', Mamaindê, **Epena Pedee**.

---

<sup>2</sup> Basque, Lithuanian, Lezgian, and Tatar are included in both samples.

<sup>3</sup> The languages, where some additional meanings in causal markers were attested (for a more full discussion see Section 3), are in bold. If a language is not in bold, this means that the relevant information concerning additional meanings in causal markers was not found in the sources consulted by the author, rather than that no additional meanings can be found in it.

My language sample by the macroareas  
Google Maps was used to display geographic information



The second sample includes 44 major European languages listed below.

Indo-European (Slavic: **Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Polish, Czech, Slovak**, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbian, Slovene; Baltic: Latvian, **Lithuanian**; Germanic: Swedish, Norwegian, **Danish**, Icelandic, German, Dutch, English; Romance: Portuguese, **Spanish, Catalan, Occitan, French, Italian**, Romanian; Italic: **Latin**; Celtic: Welsh, Irish, Breton; Albanese; Greek, **Old Greek**; Latin); Uralic (Finnish, Estonian, Moksha, Hungarian); Altaic (**Turkish, Chuvash, Tatar**); Kartvelian (Georgian); Nakh-Daghestanian (**Lezgian**); isolates (**Basque**).

## 2. Additional meanings of causal markers

### 2.1. Evaluation

In this section, different types of positive and negative evaluation in polypredicative causal constructions will be analysed, neutral evaluation naturally being the most common case. While positive or negative evaluation can logically refer to either only the Reason or the Result, in actual reality, it often refers to both clauses at the same time:

- (4) *Estas tarjetas, **gracias a que** aparecí, serán salvadas.*  
'These cards, now, **thanks to** me showing up, will be saved'. [context]

Positive evaluation of Reason (often involving positive evaluation of Result) is attested in many European languages. It is attested in several languages of some groups of the Indo-European family, such as Slavic, Baltic, or Romance. In some Indo-European languages, such as Germanic, causal markers expressing positive evaluation are attested, though their use is often not as natural as in the above mentioned groups, cf. English *thanks to the fact that* and Swedish *tack vare att*. Some of the causal markers expressing positive evaluation of Reason are listed below<sup>4</sup>:

<sup>4</sup> The source of the data is mostly dictionaries; some data were communicated by my colleagues.

Russian: *blagodarja tomu, chto*, Ukrainian: *zavdjaky tomu shcho*, Byelorussian: *dzjakujuchy tamu shto*, Polish: *dzięki temu, że*, Czech: *díky tomu že*, Slovak: *vd'aka tomu, že*; Lithuanian: *dėka to, kad*; Spanish: *gracias a que*, Occitan: *mercé que, Dieu-mercé que*, French: *grâce à ce que*, Italian: *grazie a quello che*.

Evaluative causal markers in European languages tend to derive from adpositions and inherit their evaluative meaning (cf. French *grâce à* + NP vs. *grâce à ce que* + clause).

While my grammar search suggests that the evaluative meaning of causal markers seems to be more typical of the Standard Average European (evaluative causal markers are attested in at least 18 languages out of the 44 languages of the European sample), it might not actually be the case, due to the fact that other languages may be underdescribed in this respect. In fact, positive evaluations are attested in other regions as well. Thus, a number of Chinese causal markers (*duōkuī, kuīdé, xìngkuī*) can refer to positive reasons (Elena Kolpachkova, p. c.):

- (5) *Wǒ dēi chéngrèn, wǒ yǒudiǎn gǎnjī tā le,*  
 1SG MOD admit 1SG some grateful 3M.SG PTCL
- duōkuī tā zài Dézhōu mǎi-le zhǐ shāojī,*  
 CONJ 3M.SG PREP PN buy-PRFV CLSF fried\_chicken
- wǒ cái yǒu-le zhòngyào xiànsuǒ*  
 1SG only have-PRFV important evidence
- ‘I have to admit that I am grateful to him up to a point: it is only due to the fact that he had bought the fried chicken in Dézhōu that I got the important evidence’.

Another example of a marker referring to a usually positively (but sometimes, negatively, in ironic contexts) evaluated Reason is Japanese *okage de* (< benefit DAT.LOC), which can be preceded by a clause or a genitive noun phrase (Kazuhiro Kawachi, p. c.).

Positive evaluation of Result as a tendency is attested in Daga (< Dagan, Trans – New Guinea, Papua New Guinea), cf. “[t]hen the Effect is desirable, the reason marker is more likely to occur” (Murane, 1974: 192) (6) and Tuwali Ifugao (< Austronesian, Philippines) (Hohulin, Hohulin, 2014), cf. (7):

- (6) *ma baigan bar-eta iwa Rupna dagin irine yaw-an*  
 here peace put-3S/F because Rupna smoke which/they/burnt see-3P/P
- ‘He will make peace here because they saw the smoke which the Rupna people burned’.  
 (Murane, 1974: 192–193)

- (7) *Man-uke kana-k hidi ya adalon-da-n mumbaki nah*  
 reason say-me that TOP study-they-LK do\_rituals DET.OBL
- e-da pundongdongollan ya<sup>1</sup> abu<sup>2</sup>.*  
 go-they listen only<sup>1,2</sup>
- ‘The reason I say that is that they learn to recite the rituals and prayers by listening only.’

Negative evaluation of Reason implying negative evaluation of Result is found with the Indonesian causal marker *akibat* (2) (Svetlana Kramarova, p. c.), the Russian *iz-za togo, chto* (9a-b) (Boguslavskaya, Levontina, 2004: 74), or the Japanese *sei de* (Mastrangelo et al., 2006: 261).

- (8) *Dia mangkat pada tahun 1292 akibat istana di-serang army Mongol.*  
 he pass\_away PREP year 1292 because palace PAS:3-attack army Mongol
- ‘He passed away in 1292, because the palace was attacked by the army of Mongols’.

(9a) \**On* *postupi-l* *v* *institut* *iz-za<sup>1</sup> togo<sup>2</sup>, chto<sup>3</sup>*  
 he[NOM] enter-PST[M] in institute REAS<sup>1,2,3</sup>  
*mnogo* *zanima-l-sya.*  
 much study-PST[M]-REFL  
 ‘He entered the institute, because he had studied a lot’.

(9b) <sup>ok</sup>*On* *provali-l-sya* *na* *ehkzamen-ah* *iz-za<sup>1</sup> togo<sup>2</sup>, chto<sup>3</sup>*  
 he[NOM] fail-PST[M]-REFL on exam-LOC.PL REAS  
*malo* *zanima-l-sya.*  
 little study-PST[M]-REFL  
 ‘He failed the exam, because he had studied very little’. (Boguslavskaya, Levontina, 2004: 74)

According to (Boguslavskaya, Levontina, 2004: 74), (9a) is impossible, because the Russian causal marker under consideration implies that the consequence is unexpected and it is likely to be undesirable.

Taken all together, while neutral evaluation of the Reason and Result is naturally the most common case, positive and negative evaluation of both Reason and Result is attested in several languages of the sample, especially in Eurasia.

## 2.2. Control of Reason and Result

Control (the agent-like behaviour of the most prominent argument of the clause) is another typological parameter which can be applied either to the Reason clause or to the Result clause. Sometimes, the terms Reason and Result are only applied to causal constructions, where the Agent’s behavior in the main clause (Result) is conditioned by the situation in the subordinate clause (Reason) (2), otherwise the terms Cause and Effect are used:

- (1’) [*I’ve bought her a present*]<sub>RESULT</sub>, [*because today is her birthday*]<sub>REASON</sub>.  
 (10) [*He fell*]<sub>EFFECT</sub> [*because the floor was wet*]<sub>CAUSE</sub>.

In most languages from our sample, such constructions are coded in the same way, though rare exceptions occur; cf. examples from Paya Kuna (< Chibchan, South America) with a grammatical opposition between Reason-Result and Cause-Effect Constructions, cf. (11) and (12): in (11) the reason clause is marked by the nominalizing suffix *-d/-t*, followed by the marker *ulgin*. In (12) the effect clause is marked by *ulal* ‘the cause of’ preceded by the demonstrative *a* (Foster, 2011: 173).

- (11) *Jaime pe chogzhad ulgin nad.*  
 ‘Jaime left/went **because of** what you said’.  
 (12) *Telefono iskus. A ulal keg an pebak chunma.*  
 ‘Telephono is out of order. **That is why** I can’t talk with you’.

Grammaticalized control of Reason is attested in Konai (< East Strickland, Trans–New Guinea). If no control is involved in the reason clause (13), the causal marker *dege-* is used, in other cases, *ka-ha dege-* is preferred (14) (Årsjö, 2016: 201):

- (13) *Sabi e kulio hiye-do dege-mou,*  
 lizard 3S coldness big-INT do.FUT-PFV REASON  
  
*e aso difi ha tila*  
 3S sun heat get.warm lie.down RESULT  
 ‘The lizard, because it is very cold, is lying in the sun to get warm’.

- (14) *Yona-ha tobo-u, koû-me a kasagai*  
 Jonah-GEN say-NFUT this-TOP 1S bad RESULT  
*A Godi-ha ta du-l-i mei ka-ha dege-l-i*  
 1s God-GEN talk hear-IRR-NFUT NEG that-GEN do-IRR-NFUT REASON  
 ‘Jonah said, “this is my fault. Because I did not obey/hear God’s talk”’.

Thus, while the degree of agentivity is quite important cross-linguistically in many respects, only two languages of our sample are sensitive to this typological parameter.

### 2.3. Meeting/not meeting the hearer’s expectations

While both Reason and Result can be expected or unexpected in causal constructions, in our sample a difference in coding expected vs. unexpected situations is observed only for the Results.

In Mishar Tatar, causal clauses contradicting the presupposition of the question admit only one of the two basic causal strategies (while the clausal conjunction *čenki* is possible here, the perfect converb *-gan-ga* is not).

- (15a) *sineŋ čaškr-ŋ juk, čenki sin a-nr üze-ŋ wat-tr-ŋ.*  
 you.GEN cup-2SG not\_exist REAS you it-ACC yourself-2SG break-PST-2SG

- (15b) \**sin a-nr üze-ŋ wat-kan-ga (kür-ä)*  
 you it-ACC yourself-2SG break-PFCT-CAUSE (see-ST.IPFV)

*sineŋ čaškr-ŋ juk.*  
 you.GEN cup-2SG not\_exist  
 {– Where is my cup?} – ‘Your cup is not there any more, as you have broken it yourself’.  
 (Tatevosov et al., 2017: 488)

In Tawali Ifugao (< Austronesian, Philippines), the marker *man-upo* “expresses the reason for an unexpected result”:

- (16) *Inila-k an ad\_uwani-y poppog di biyag-ku.*  
 know-me LK now-nom end GEN life-my  
*hidiye tuwali-y maat amɔin hi tatagu.*  
 that indeed-NOM happens all OBL people  
 ‘I know now the end of my life. The reason is because that is certainly what happens to all people’.  
 (Hohulin, Hohulin, 2014)

While the violation of the presupposition in (15) and the reason for an unexpected result are not exactly the same, these parameters are similar up to a point, both of them implying not meeting the hearer’s expectations.

### 2.4. The reality and objectivity of Reason

While most causal markers refer to a real cause, a number of “false” causal markers are attested in languages. In some “false” causal constructions, the participant the reason to be false (cf. French *sous (le) prétexte que*, Breton *digar, war zigarez*, Russian *pod predlogom togo, čto*, Chinese *yǐ wèi jièkǒu, jiègù, jiātuō* ‘under the pretext that’). Such constructions are often less grammaticalised, more formal compared to other causal constructions, and derive from a word denoting pretext; they are often found in Europe, but can be attested in other areas as well, cf. Chinese<sup>5</sup>:

<sup>5</sup> Both the example and the gloss were provided by Elena Kolpachkova.

- (17) *zài wánchéng-le rènwù hòu, yǐ qīzi shēngbìng*  
 PREP finish-PRFV task LOC INSTR wife fall\_ill

*wèijièkǒu, Xiǎo Wáng líkāi dānwèi le*  
 as\_a\_pretext PN leave company PTCL

‘Having completed the task, Xiǎo Wáng left the company under the pretext that his wife had got ill’.

A number of clausal connectors denoting fictitious reason are found in Arabic (*biḍariifatin ḥanna*, derived from a noun meaning ‘pretext’ – Ramazan Mamedshahov, p. c.) and Indonesian (cf. the marker *dengan dalih bahwa*, grammaticalized from the preposition *dengan* ‘with, with the help of’, the noun *dalih* ‘pretext’, and the conjunction *bahwa* ‘that’ – Svetlana Kramarova, p. c.).

In other “false” causal constructions, the participant believes the reason to be true, cf. Basque – *delakoan* ‘in the belief that’) (Rijk, 2008: 463). A similar meaning is attested in Turkish: a “kind of reason expressed by a *diye* clause is one which exists in the perception of the subject of the main verb” (Göksel, Kerslake, 2005: 400):

- (18) [Çocukları getir-ir-ler diye (bring-AOR-3PL SUB)] *porselen eşyayı ortadan kaldırmıştı.*  
 ‘[Thinking they would bring the children], she had put the china pieces away.’

A similar distinction in causal constructions can be based on the objectivity/subjectivity of the Reason. Thus, in Korean, *-(e)se* expresses objective and impersonal cause, while *-nikka* “expresses a speaker’s emphatic attitude” (Sohn, 1993: 88).

- (19) *pi-ka wa-se nuc-ess-eyo*  
 rain-NOM come-SE late-PST-DEC  
 ‘I was late, because it is raining’.

- (20) *pi-ka o-nikka nuc-ess-eyo*  
 rain-NOM come-NIKKA late-PST-DEC  
 ‘(You know/I believe) I was late, because it is raining’.

In Latin, *quod, quia, quoniam* ‘because’ and some other conjunctions introduce indicative dependent clauses where the speaker views the Reason as objective. If the causal relation reflects somebody else’s opinion/motive, the same conjunctions introduce subjunctive dependent clauses (Pennington, 2010: 172)<sup>6</sup>:

- (21a) *Amicus me-us discessit quod iratus*  
 friend my-NOM.SG.M leave:PRF.IND.ACT.3SG because angry  
*erat*  
 be:IPF.IND.ACT.3SG  
 ‘My friend left, because he was angry’ [as claimed by the speaker/writer].

- (21b) *Amicus me-us discessit quod iratus*  
 friend my-NOM.SG.M leave:PRF.IND.ACT.3SG because angry  
*esset*  
 be:IPF.CONJ.ACT.3SG  
 ‘My friend left, because [as he said] he was angry’ [the reason is given not by the speaker but by the friend himself].

Different markers for subjective (*luhuz/lahana*) vs. objective (*kiligna*) reasons are also attested in Lezgian (Haspelmath, 1993: 389–390).

<sup>6</sup> I would like to thank Ildar Ibragimov for glossing the Latin examples.

As we can see, the only Macroarea where the reality and objectivity of Reason turns to be a relevant typological parameter is Eurasia, and we can find it in different parts of the Macroarea.

## 2.5. Emphasis on the Motive vs. the Causer

Different causal markers can be used depending on the emphasis on different constituents. Thus, in Dâw (< Nadahup, Brazil) “[t]he first causal construction *fě?* emphasizes the motive that causes the event, while *xad* emphasizes the provoker of the event” (Martins 2004: 466; 102):

- (22) *woh wɔj<sup>2</sup> tum j<sup>2</sup>ãmxu? bɛj wan bɛj dɔw -ũj<sup>2</sup>/*  
 PN see two jaguars repete follow ITER Dâw AFET  
*dɔw jũt fě?*  
 Dâw kill CONJ  
 ‘Woh saw two jaguars head for Dâw again, because Dâw killed [their companions]’.

- (23) *j<sup>2</sup>ãmxu? fɔ pud jed/ ʔa dɔw xad*  
 jaguar die be.intensif INTSI this Dâw CONJ  
 ‘A lot of jaguars died because of Dâw’.

While the causal construction in (22) may be analysed as a nominal one, the author provides some examples of polyredicative causal constructions as well:

- (24) *bohõ bax e? bi-gid dɔw xad maj*  
 fire appear -PAS by\_itself Dâw CONJ not.be  
 ‘The fire caught accidentally, it was not for Dâw’. (Martins, 2004: 102)

It is also worth noting that in a number of European languages some causal markers can combine with emphatic particles, while other cannot (cf. the discussion about Russian causal markers in (Pekelis, 2015) and French causal markers in (Colson, 1993: 60)), but using different markers to emphasize different constituents seems to be exceptional, as there is only one example in my general sample.

## 2.6. Temporal distance

The use of some causal markers can depend on greater/smaller temporal distance between the propositions. Thus, in Skou (< Western Skou, New Guinea) the reason marker *te*, unlike *wa ko te*, is used if “the time reference of the first clause significantly precedes that of the second clause” (Donohue, 2004: 497–498). Unfortunately, the author of the Skou grammar does not provide an example there the first marker is used, but this typological parameter deserves to be mentioned for the sake of completeness.

## 2.7. More or less strong causal relationship

The opposition between a direct and indirect reason implying more or less strong causal relationship is a well-known typological parameter with nominal causal constructions attested in some European languages (Boguslavskaya, Levontina, 2004: 83). The same opposition in polypredicative causal constructions is much less studied. Though I was not able to find any examples of this opposition in Europe, it is attested both in South and North America.

In Epena Pedee, clauses marked by *-pa* ‘cause’ “relate a stronger causal relationship to the main clause than do the other reason clauses” than clauses marked by *-irã* or *pérã* ‘because’<sup>7</sup> (Harms, 1994: 161–162). Though no minimal pairs can be found in the work, I will quote two examples here:

- (25) *bi* *čóma* *čĩ* *é* *ni-bĩ-pa* *bi* *tʰo-da-čĩ*  
 belly big be^HON laugh DUR-be-cause belly burst-CMP-PST  
 Because the one that was big-bellied laughed so much, his belly burst. (Harms, 1994: 168)
- (26) *ĩru* *če-hĩ* *áčĩ* *kʰáwa* *pʰana-da-pʰedáa* *pérã*  
 he come-PST they-+ know be^PL-PST-PL because  
 He came because they had known him. (Harms, 1994: 162)

The distinction between the causal markers /tɪh/ and *hookóh* in Arapaho (<Algic) seems to reflect a similar opposition: “[t]he distinction between the two [causal markers] is not entirely clear, although generally, /tɪh/ seems to be used when the connection between reason and resulting action is more immediate or prototypical, and especially more involuntary” (Cowell, Moss, 2008: 388).

Interestingly enough, the opposition between more or less strong causal relationship in poly-predicative causal construction does not imply the same opposition in nominal causal constructions and vice versa.

## 2.8. Critical attitude to the causal relationship

The use of some causal markers can imply critical attitude to the causal relationship between the propositions in the main and subordinate clauses, cf. an example from Tagalog (Sergey Klimenko, p. c.):

- (27) *Porket* *gusto-ka* *ni* *Cherry ay* *ganyan-ka-na!*  
 because wanted-2SG.NOM PRS.SG.ACT PN TOP like.MED-2SG.NOM-already  
 ‘Just because Cherry likes you, you are like this now!’

A similar additional meaning is attested in the Indonesian causal marker *mentang-mentang* (Svetlana Kramarova, p. c.)

- (28) *Dia itu sombong sementang-mentang anak orang kaya.*  
 he that arrogant just\_because child person wealthy  
 ‘He behaved arrogantly, just because he was a son of wealthy people’.

A causal marker can combine two additional meanings implying critical attitude to the causal relationship and a negative Result, cf. the Indonesian marker *gara-gara* (Kramarova, p. c.):

- (29) *Sekeluarga di-larang terbang gara-gara anak*  
 all\_the\_family PAS:3-forbid fly just\_because child  
*tak pakai sepatu.*  
 NEG use shoes  
 ‘All the family was not allowed to fly, just because the children were not wearing shoes’.

Quite interestingly, the only two languages of our sample where causal markers implying critical attitude to the causal relationship (Tagalog and Indonesian) belong to the same Macroarea (South-east Asia & Oceania). Though it can seem that we deal with an areal feature, the grammars of the

<sup>7</sup> The complementary distribution depends on tense.

other languages of the Macroarea in question do not provide us with examples of this typological distinction. On the other hand, it is possible that the grammars do not contain enough data on the distribution of causal markers (the two above-mentioned examples were obtained from language experts).

### Conclusions

A wide range of additional meanings can be attested in polypredicative causal constructions. While some of them refer to the Reason clause, others refer to the Result clause; some additional meanings can take the whole sentence in their scope. In addition to the meanings mentioned in (Zaika, 2019), new typological parameters, found in my present sample, include: the degree of control of the Reason and Result (3.2), emphasis on the Motive vs. the Causer (3.5), degree of causal relationship (3.7), and critical attitude to the causal relationship (3.8).

Most of the additional meanings are attested in languages of Eurasia and Southeast Asia & Oceania. Two explanations can be proposed for this result. The first is that the languages of these Macroareas are well-described, and I often could get more evidence by consulting respective linguists. Another explanation is that these languages may show a larger number of causal markers, typical of written texts, which sometimes have additional semantic features. Although a considerable number of additional meanings in polypredicative constructions were found in my sample, their list is hardly complete, and other additional meanings may be identified both in well-described languages (using their grammars), and in insufficiently described languages (via elicitation).

### Abbreviations

1 – 1 person; 2 – 2 person; 3 – 3 person; ACC – accusative; ACT – active voice (in Latin), actor pronoun (in Tagalog); AFET – affected; AOR – aorist; CAUSE – cause; CLSF – classifier; CMP – completed; CONJ – conjunctive (in Latin), conjunction (in Dâw); DAT – dative; DEC – declarative; DET – demonstrative determiner; DUR – durative; FUT – future; GEN – genitive; IND – indicative; INSTR – instrumental; IRR – irrealis; IPF, IPFV – imperfective; INT – intensifier; INTSI – intensifier I; ITER – iterative; HON – honorific; LK – linker; LOC – locative; M – masculine; MED – medial; MOD – modal; NEG – negation; NFUT – non-future; NOM – nominative; OBL – oblique; PAS:3 – impersonal passive; PFV, PFCT, PRFV – perfective; PL – plural; PN – personal name; PREP – preposition; PRF – perfect; PRS – present; PST – past; PTCL – particle; REAS – reason; REFL – reflexive; S, SG – singular; SUB – subordinator; ST – derived stem; TOP – topic.

### References:

- Årsjö Britten.** Konai Reference Grammar. – SIL, 2016.
- Boguslavskaya Olga Yu. and Levontina Irina B.** Smysly 'prichina' i 'cel' v estestvennom yazyke [The meaning of 'cause' and 'goal' in natural language]. Voprosy yazykoznanii 2. – 2004. – P. 68–88.
- Colson Jacques.** Bonnes raisons et causes douteuses: les propositions de cause en anglais et en français. Palimpsestes 7. – 1993. – P. 55–71.
- Charnavel Isabelle.** Perspectives in causal clauses. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 37(2). – 2018. – P. 389–424.
- Cowell Andrew and Moss Sr. Alonzo.** The Arapaho Language. – Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2008.
- Donohue Mark.** A grammar of the Skou language of New Guinea. – Singapore: National University of Singapore, 2004 (draft).
- Foster D. Keith.** Paya Kuna. An introductory Grammar. – SIL International, 2011.
- Galán Rodríguez Carmen.** Las oraciones causales. Propuesta de clasificación. Anuario de estudios filológicos XVIII. – 1995. – Pp. 125–158.
- Göksel Asli and Kerslake Celia.** Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar. – London; New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Harms Phillip Lee.** Epena Pedee Syntax. Studies in the Languages of Colombia 4. – [Dallas, Texas]: Summer Institute of Linguistics; [Arlington]: University of Texas at Arlington, 1994.
- Haspelmath Martin.** A Grammar of Lezgian. – Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993.

- Hohulin E. Lou and Hohulin Richard M.* Tuwali Ifugao Dictionary and Grammar. – Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. 2014.
- Martins Silvana Andrade.* Fonologia e Gramática Dâw. – Utrecht: Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics, 2004.
- Mastrangelo Matilde, Ozawa Naoko and Saito Mariko.* Grammatica Giapponese. – Milano: Ulrico Noelpli Editore, 2006.
- Miestamo Matti, Bakker Dik and Arppe Antti.* Sampling for variety. Linguistic Typology 20(2). – 2016 – P. 233–296.
- Murane Elizabeth.* Daga Grammar. – SIL, 1974.
- Oskolskaya Sofia, Fedotov Maksim, Zaika Natalia.* Language sample for the typological study of the caritive. A talk presented at workshop Language Sampling: Issues and challenges (Saint-Petersburg, December 20, 2019). (available online: [https://8758c237-04fb-44bd-ad99-f82f173b80ae.filesusr.com/ugd/752339\\_82d53d3b0fc44210beebd44e2ecbe75pdf](https://8758c237-04fb-44bd-ad99-f82f173b80ae.filesusr.com/ugd/752339_82d53d3b0fc44210beebd44e2ecbe75pdf), accessed on 2020-02-03).
- Pekelis Olga.* Prichinnye konstrukcii. 2015. (available online at [www.rusgram.ru/](http://www.rusgram.ru/) Придаточные\_причинные accessed on 2020-02-03).
- Pennington Joseph Allen.* A study of purpose, result, and causal hypotaxis in early Indo-European Gospel versions. – Ph.D. diss. – Athens (GA): University of Georgia, 2010.
- Rijk Rudolf P.G. de.* Standard Basque: A progressive grammar. – Cambridge, Mass., London, 2008.
- Sohn Sung-Ock S.* Cognition, Affect, and Topicality of the Causal Particle *-nikka* in Korean. In: Patricia M. Clancy (ed.), Japanese/Korean Linguistics. –Vol. 2. – Stanford: Stanford University, 1993.
- Tatevosov Sergey G., Lyutikova Ekaterina A., Bonch-Osmolovskaya Anastasiya A.* (eds.). Elementy tatarskogo yazyka v tipologicheskom osveshchenii. Misharskiy dialect [Elements of Tatar in a typological perspective. The Mishar dialect]. – Moscow: Buki Vedi, 2017.
- WALS*— Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.). The World Atlas of Language Structures Online. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. 2013. (available online at <http://wals.info>, accessed on 2020-02-03).

Natalia Mikhailovna Zaika, Kandidat Nauk in Philology, Senior researcher.

**Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.**

Tuchkov per., 9, Saint-Petersburg, Russia.

E-mail: [zaika.nat@gmail.com](mailto:zaika.nat@gmail.com)

Материал поступил в редакцию 10 февраля 2020 г.

**Н. М. Заика**

### ДОПОЛНИТЕЛЬНЫЕ ЗНАЧЕНИЯ ПРИЧИННЫХ ПОКАЗАТЕЛЕЙ В ПОЛИПРЕДИКАТИВНЫХ КОНСТРУКЦИЯХ

В статье рассматриваются семантические параметры типологического варьирования полипредикативных причинных конструкций. Результаты исследования основаны на двух выборках: ареально и генетически сбалансированной выборке из 100 языков (Африка – 14 языков, Евразия – 8, Юго-Восточная Азия и Океания – 13, Австралия и Новая Гвинея – 27, Северная Америка – 18, Южная Америка – 20; из более крупных семей отбиралось большее количество языков) и выборке из 44 языков Европы. В качестве материала используются типологически ориентированные грамматики и языковые описания, корпусные данные, консультации со специалистами по конкретным языкам.

В результате исследования было обнаружено значительное количество типологических параметров, связанных с семантикой, характеризующих либо причинную клаузу, либо клаузу следствия, либо всю полипредикативную причинную конструкцию в целом, часть из которых, насколько нам известно, ранее не упоминалась в теоретических работах по причинным конструкциям. Чаще всего в языковых описаниях упоминался оценочный компонент значения, особенно характерный для языков Евразии. Положительная и отрицательная коннотация, как правило, характеризуют причину и следствие одновременно, однако в некоторых случаях могут относиться лишь к одной из соответствующих клауз. Кроме того, были обнаружены такие параметры, как степень контроля в главной или зависимой клаузе, соответствие или несоответствие ожиданиям слушателя пропозиции, соответствующей причине или результату, реальность / нереальность и субъективное или объективное восприятие причины, акцент на мотиве или каузаторе действия,

временное расстояние между пропозициями главной и зависимой клаузы, более или менее сильная каузирующая связь между этими пропозициями и критическое отношение к причинной связи в полипредикативной конструкции. Некоторые причинные конструкции входят в более чем одну из упомянутых выше оппозиций. Тот факт, что в Евразии и Юго-Восточная Азии и Океании семантически обусловленная вариативность в причинных конструкциях фиксировалась нами чаще, чем в других макроареалах, может быть связан как с меньшей описанностью языков других ареалов и доступностью источников, так и тем, что для языков с письменной традицией характерно большее количество маркеров причинных отношений.

**Ключевые слова:** *полипредикативные конструкции, семантика, причина, мотив, следствие, оценка, контроль, реальность.*

Наталья Михайловна Заика, канд. филол. наук, старший научный сотрудник.  
Институт лингвистических исследований Российской Академии наук,  
Тучков пер., 9, Санкт-Петербург, Россия.  
E-mail: zaika.nat@gmail.com