Along with the decomposition analysis of a transitive verb as CAUSE plus an intransitive verb or an adjective (e.g., Lakoff 1965), transitivization (henceforth, Trns) and causativization (henceforth, Caus) have been often used without distinction, and the confusion is especially salient in languages like Korean, which has one morpheme, the I-suffix with phonological variants of -i-, -hi-, -li- and -ki-, for both functions (1, 2). However, there has been no attempt to distinguish between them, and transitivization and causativization have been assumed to be not distinguishable (Baek 1997, Lee 1983, Chung per.com.). With a semantic notion of ‘event-control’, I show both the distinctions and the relationships among transitivization and different types of causation.

Shibatani and Chung (2001) is one of the most recent and well-received semantic approaches to Korean and Japanese causatives. As Figure 1 shows, they argued that there are three kinds of causations, direct (3i, 5), associative (3ii, 6i), indirect (4, 6ii), and these are differentiated by two factors: (i) the degree of the causer’s involvement in the caused/root event (physical, partial, no involvement); (ii) whether the causing event and the root event occur at the same location (L) and time (T). They also showed that the causative semantics covered by ‘lexical’ or ‘productive’ mediums are different between Korean and Japanese (Figure 1). For example, while the ‘associative causation’ is encoded as a ‘lexical causative’ in Korean, it is constructed as ‘productive causative’ in Japanese. According to Shibatani and Chung (2001), a Korean I-causative (3ii) and a Japanese lexical causative (5) are both predicted that the causing event and the root event happen at the same location and time: L1T1. However, native speakers say that these constructions can be used when there is not even an overlap between the LT of the causing event and the LT of the root event.

Thus, Shibatani and Chung’s (2001) descriptions of different causations should be reconsidered. Also, Shibatani and Chung (2001) did not mention what the ‘lexical causative’ morphemes are in Japanese, but Kitagawa (1999) analyses these idiosyncratic-looking morphemes as actually systematic variants of the transitivizers –E and –AS. However, neither ‘lexical causativizer’ nor ‘transitivizer’ has ever been clearly defined though, among examples of them (1, 5, 7), there may be fine-grained semantic difference.

I propose that a continuum of event-control can illuminate both the differences and the relationships among transitivization and different causations. By ‘event-control’, I mean a semantic or pragmatic relation of an NP to the event denoted by the root verb: the force or responsibility of bringing about the root event. For example, in all kinds of causatives (2~6), the NP going through a change, the child, has the ability to achieve the root event (i.e. can have event-control over the root event) no matter whether it actually works for it or not. In contrast, in (1) and (7), there is no way that the NP going through a change, the road or the door, can be considered as having event-control over the root event. However, this is not just because the argument of ‘be wide (Adj)’ or ‘open (Vi)’ is an inanimate argument. Actually, even in a typical transitive with two animate arguments such as ‘Mary kicked Tom’, the NP going through a change Tom has no control over someone else (e.g., Mary’s action (e.g. kicking)). Thus, based on these facts, I present Figure 2 and suggest that the difference between transitivization and causativization depends on whether the NP going through a change, β, can be considered to have event-control over the root event or not.1 Also, to distinguish among different causations, I replace Shibatani and Chung’s (2001) criteria (the causer’s involvement and the location and time) with the degree of the event-control that β has. Though one might say that the distinction between “co-operation” in the associative causation and “taking charge” in the indirect causation is

---

1 I thank Prof. Acrisio Pires at the University of Michigan for his comments/suggestions.

2 This observation agrees with Jacobson (1992): transitivity is about unidirectional or at least asymmetric dominance relationship between 2 arguments.

3 Since the causer’s deeper/bigger involvement implies less even-control on the part of the causee, this aspect can be considered as reflected in Shibatani and Chung (2001). However, in terms of the ‘causer’, the differences among transitivization and diverse causations are not captured uniformly.
vague, an implicature test could serve this purpose; the grammaticality contrast between (8) and (9) shows that the indirect causation does not necessarily imply the achievement of \( \gamma \) (the root event) and that its success depends more on \( \beta \) rather than \( \alpha \) (the NP making the change).\(^4\)

In sum, by the continuum of event-control, both the semantic differences and the relationships among transitivization and different causations are captured in a unified way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Causation</th>
<th>Associative Causation</th>
<th>Indirect Causation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( (A \rightarrow P : L_{1}T_{1}) )(^5)</td>
<td>( (A \rightarrow A' \rightarrow P : L_{1}T_{1}) )(^6)</td>
<td>( (A \rightarrow A' : L_{1}T_{1}. A' \rightarrow P : L_{2}T_{2}) )(^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean lexical (-I- (-i-, -hi-, -li-, -ki-))</td>
<td>productive (-key ha-ta)</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese lexical</td>
<td>productive (-sase-)</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitivity</th>
<th>Direct Causation</th>
<th>Associative Causation</th>
<th>Indirect Causation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(( \beta ) cannot have any control over ( \gamma ). 1, 7)</td>
<td>(( \beta ) neither works for nor resist ( \gamma ). 3i, 5)</td>
<td>(( \beta ) co-operates with ( \alpha ) working for ( \gamma ). 3ii, 6i)</td>
<td>(( \beta ) takes charge of ( \gamma ). 4, 6ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean (-I- (-i-, -hi-, -li-, -ki-))</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese (-E-, -AS)</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(-sase-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2.** (\( \alpha \): NP making the change. \( \beta \): NP going through the change. \( \gamma \): root event).

(1) inpwu-ka cop-un kil-ul nelp-hi-ess-ta. \(–\) Kor.\(^8\)

worker-Nom narrow-Rel road-Acc wide(Adj)-I-Past-Dec
‘The worker widened the narrow road.’

(2) sensayngnim-i cip-ey ka-nun ai-lul uyca-ey anc-hi-ass-ta.

teacher-Nom house-at/to go-Rel child-Acc chair-at/in sit(Vi)-I-Past-Dec
‘The teacher made the child, who was going home, sit down on the chair.’

(3) emeni-ka ai-eykey os-ul ip-hi-ess-ta. \(–\) Kor.

mother-Nom child-Dat clothes-Acc wear(Vt)-I-Past-Dec
 (i) ‘The mother put the clothes on the child (and the child didn’t make any effort).’ – Direct Caus
(ii) ‘The mother helped/supervised the child’s putting on the clothes.’ – Associative Caus

(4) emeni-ka ai-eykey os-ul ip-key-ha-yess-ta. \(–\) Kor.

mother-Nom child-Dat clothes-Acc wear-Comp-do-Past-Dec

\(^4\) Though the achievement of the root event is implied in transitivization and direct and associative causations, these three can easily be differentiated by \( \beta \)’s role.

\(^5\) The causer (\( A \)) is actively and physically involved in achieving the root event, without the causee (\( A' \))’s action involved (P: the patient of the root event). The causing event and the root event occur at the same location/time (\( L_{1}T_{1} \)).

\(^6\) The causer’s physical involvement in partial; the causer accompanies/assists/supervises the causee’s achieving the root event. The causing event and the root event occur at the same location/time (\( L_{1}T_{1} \)).

\(^7\) The causer is not at all physically involved in achieving the root event, and the causee’s\( A' \) works alone on the Patient(P). The causing event and the root event occur at different locations/times (\( L_{1}T_{1}, L_{2}T_{2} \)).

\(^8\) Korean.

\(^9\) The \(-I-\) is the archimorpheme for \(-i-, -hi-, -li- and -ki-, that are treated either as transitivizer/intransitivizer or as causativizer/passivizer.
‘The mother had (e.g., by telling) the child put on the clothes (the mother: no action).’ - Indirect
(5) hahaoya-ga kodomo-ni huku-o ki-se-ru. – Jap.¹⁰
mother-Nom child-Dat clothes-Acc wear(Vt)-AS(Trns)-Infinitive
‘The mother put the clothes on the child (and the child didn’t make any effort).’ – Direct Caus
(6) hahaoya-ga kodomo-ni huku-o ki-sase-ta. – Jap.
mother-Nom child-Dat clothes-Acc wear-SASE(Caus)-Past
(i) ‘The mother helped/supervised the child’s putting on the clothes.’ – Associative Caus
(ii) ‘The mother had (e.g., by telling) the child put on the clothes (the mother: no action).’ – Indirect Caus
(7) Hanako-ga doa-o ak-e-ru.
Nom door-Acc open(Vi)-E(Trns)-Infinitive
‘Hanako opens the door.’
mother-Nom child-Dat clothes-Acc wear-I-Past-but child-Nom wear-not-Past-Dec
‘The mother helped/supervised the child’s putting on the clothes, but the child didn’t put them on.’
(9) emeni-ka ai-eykey os-ul ip-key-ha-yess-una ai-ka
mother-Nom child-Dat clothes-Acc wear-Comp-do-Past-but child-Nom
wear-not-Past-Dec
‘The mother had the child put on the clothes, but the child didn’t put them on.’
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