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1. Introduction

The goal of this study is to describe the causative alternations in Acehnese and to propose an analysis of their syntactic structures. Acehnese causatives and anticausatives are illustrated in (1).

(1) a. Hasan geu-\textit{peu-reubah} aneuq nyan. (causative)
   H 3-Caus-fall child Dem
   ‘Hasan caused the child to fall.’

   b. Pintô nyan \textit{teu-buka}. (anticausative)
      door Dem Acaus-open
      ‘The door opens/opened.’

(1a) illustrates a case of morphological causativization by prefixation of the causative morpheme \textit{peu}-to an unaccusative root \textit{reubah}. (1b) illustrates a case of detransitivization by prefixation of the anticausative morpheme \textit{teu}- to a transitive verbal root \textit{buka}. Thus, basically, this paper explores the distributional, derivational, functional, and syntactic properties of these morphemes in detail.

Empirically, this study will contribute to the field, especially, to the Austronesian linguistics, with its new data of a relatively lesser-known but typologically highly-relevant language. Although Acehnese once triggered a big debate on the notion of ‘subject’ and ‘agreement’ a few decades ago (Lawler 1977, Perlmutter 1982, Durie 1987, 1988; cf. Legate 2007, 2008), there are not many works on any particular aspects of Acehnese syntax. Thus, along with recent works of Legate (2007, 2008) and Zhiguo (2009), I hope this paper call other linguists’ attention to Acehnese. Theoretically, this study supports the basic assumptions of a theory of the syntactic decomposition of predicates (Hale and Keyser 1993) and Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993). In particular, in line with a growing body of works (Alexiadou et al. 2006 et seq.; Harley 2007; Pylkkänen 2000; Travis 2000, 2005), it supports a division of agentivity and causation into two distinct functional projections.

1.1. Acehnese language

Acehnese, also called or spelled Aceh, Atjeh, Atjehnese, Achinese, and Achehese, is a Malayo-Polynesian language spoken by approximately three million people, mainly in the costal area of Aceh Province, the northern tip of Sumatra, Indonesia. (Ethnologue online \url{http://www.ethnologue.com}. See also Durie 1985 and references therein for more details.) Its major regional dialects include West Aceh, South Aceh, North/East Aceh, Pidie, and Greater Aceh (Durie 2001, Asyik 1987).

---

1 The abbreviation used in this paper is summarized below: 

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
| Acaus | anticausative & Perf  | perfect aspect & Sg  | singular |
|-------|--------------|-------|----------------|-----|----------|
| Caus  | causative    & Pfv   | perfective aspect & 1 | 1st person agreement marker |
| Dem   | demonstrative & Prog  | progressive aspect & 2 | 2nd person agreement marker |
| Neg   | negation     &       |                 | 3  | 3rd person agreement marker |
\end{tabular}
Most of the data presented in this study were elicited during Field Methods course offered at Cornell University, the spring semester 2007, and following-up elicitations in October 2007 and May 2008.

The orthography that I use to present Acehnese data basically follows that used in Daud & Durie’s (1999) Acehnese-Indonesian-English Thesaurus. The information given in parentheses on the right side of examples indicates how to refer to the elicitation notes which were taken in collaboration during the course.

The language consultant Saiful Mahdi, a Ph.D. graduate student at Cornell University, was born in a rural area of Pidie and grew up in Sigli, the capital of Pidie, until he went to an elementary school in Banda Aceh. He lived there until he moved to Surabaya, East Java to enter a college. After his BA, he returned to Banda Aceh. Both his parents come from Pidie. It is unclear, even to Saiful himself, which dialect he speaks, Banda Aceh or Pidie. He can also speak Javanese and Bahasa Indonesian. Dian, Saiful’s wife, was born in Jakarta, the capital city of Indonesia, and grew up in the suburbs of Banda Aceh. Both her parents were born in Aceh Besar.

1.2. Theoretical background2: causative alternation

Change-of-state verbs in languages like English participate in the causative alternation, being either a causative (transitive) verb or an anticausative/inchoative (intransitive) verb. 3 This causative alternation is illustrated in (2) with English, German, and Italian data (Schäfer 2007).

---

2 The discussion on the theoretical background in this subsection is basically benefited from Aretemis Alexiadou’s lectures on the unaccusativity at the 2007 LSA summer institute, Stanford University.

3 I follow Alexiadou (2006) in using the term ‘anticausative’ for ‘change of state without an external argument.’ Compare Haspelmath (1993) where anticausative is used to refer to an intransitive verb derived from a transitive one.
(2) The (anti-)causative alternation (Schäfer 2007:10)

   i. **English**
      a. John broke the window.  *Transitive*  *Causative*
      b. The window broke.  *Intransitive*  *Anticausative/Inchoative*

   ii. **German**
      a. Hans zerbrach das Fenster
         ‘John broke the window.’
      b. Das Fenster zerbrach
         ‘The window broke.’

   iii. **Italian**
      a. Gianni ha rotto la finestra
         ‘John has broken the window.’
      b. La finestra si è rotta
         ‘The window REFL is broken.’

Schematically, the basic relationship between the two variants can be represented as follows (Schäfer 2007:11):

(3) a. agent  V-transitive  theme  (causative)
    b. theme  V-intransitive  (anticausative)

In many previous studies on the causative alternation, the relationship between the two variants has been accounted for in a derivational manner: one of the variants is assumed to be basic, being listed in the lexicon, while the other one is derived from the basic one. There are two logical possibilities in the direction of derivation.

(4) Schema for two possible directions in the causative alternation

a. Intransitive Form:  V  *basic*  
   Transitive Form:  V-X  
   **Causativization:** intransitive → transitive

b. Intransitive Form:  V-Y  
   Transitive Form:  V  *basic*  
   **Detransitivization:** transitive → intransitive

Some scholars proposed ‘causativization’ approaches (e.g., Dowty 1979) and others ‘detransitivization’ approaches (e.g., *lexical binding* in Levin and Rappaport 1995, *expletivization* in Reinhart 2002). See Alexiadou et al. 2006, Alexiadou 2007, Schäfer 2007, Bhatt and Embick 2004 (need permission to cite) for more discussion.

Both directions of derivation are actually quite common across languages, as illustrated by the Russian and Mongolian examples in (5). This situation makes it difficult to favor one direction over the other.

(5) Variation in the direction of formal derivation (Haspelmath 1993:89)
a. Russian: inchoative derived from causative
   causative: rasplavit’ ‘melt (tr.)’
   inchoative: rasplavit’-sja ‘melt (intr.)’

b. (Khalkha) Mongolian: causative derived from inchoative
   causative: xajl-uul-ax ‘melt (tr.)’
   inchoative: xajl-ax ‘melt (intr.)’

Furthermore, in non-directed alternations shown in (6) below (Haspelmath 1993:91-92), it is hard to tell one verb is derived from the other. Thus, neither causativization nor detransitivization approaches can handle these non-directed alternations properly.

(6) Non-directed Alternations (Haspelmath 1993:91-92)
   a. **Equipollent**: both are derived from the same stem
      Japanese    atum-aru ‘gather (intr.)’
                  atum-eru ‘gather (tr.)’
   b. **Suppletive**: different verb roots are used.
      Russian    goret’ ‘burn (intr.)’
                  žėč ‘burn (tr.)’
   c. **Labile**: the same verb is used both in the inchoative and in the causative sense.
      Modern Greek svino 1. ‘go out’
                        2. ‘extinguish’

The Acehnese causative alternation shows more interesting cases, where both causativization and detransitivization are involved.

(7) **Acehnese**
   a. ngop ‘to sink (intr.)’
   b. peu-ngop ‘to sink (tr.)’
   c. teu-peu-ngop ‘to be in the state of having been sunk; sunken’

In (7), there are three different syntactic constructs all sharing the same verbal root ंngop: a non-derived unaccusative intransitive form ngop which is zero-marked (7a), a derived causative form peu-ngop marked with a causative morpheme peu- (7b), and a derived unaccusative intransitive form teu-peu-ngop marked with an anticausative morpheme teu- (7c). The causativization in Acehnese is the topic of the first half of the paper and the detransitivization, i.e., anticausativization, is that of the second half. Following Schäfer (2007), I distinguish two types of anticausatives, calling one type, i.e., unaccusative verbs without any special morphology like ngop in (7a), unmarked anticausatives and the other type, i.e., intransitive verbs detransitivized with special morphology like teu-peu-ngop in (7c), marked anticausatives, respectively.

Throughout the paper, I follow the general assumptions of Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993, Marantz 1997, Embick and Noyer 2006), one of which is that every word is formed by syntactic operations, Merge and Move. A root obtains its categorical status from a category-defining functional head it combines with: for example, a verb means a root associated with a nearest c-
commanding \( v \). Thus, a verb is syntactically decomposed into a number of layers stacked on top of an acategorical Root. These syntactic categories are considered to be purely abstract, having no phonological content, and Vocabulary Items are inserted after syntactic derivation (Late Insertion).

Under this framework, neither form in causative alternations is basic. Rather what is basic is the root that all they share. This is clear in Acehnese causative-anticausative alternation: all three forms in (7), unmarked anticausatives, causatives, and marked anticausatives, share a root and the difference among them is their syntactic structures associated with the shared root.

In particular, I adopt the view in Alexiadou et al. (2006) and Schäfer (2007) that the causative alternation is indeed a Voice alternation. The basic idea is that the only difference between causatives and anticausatives is the presence vs. absence of an external argument: the former has an external argument, while the latter lack such an external argument. Assuming the external argument is introduced by a Voice projection (Kratzer 1996), this means that causatives involve a Voice projection that unmarked anticausatives lack. Marked anticausatives, as opposed to unmarked anticausatives, do have a Voice projection, but it is an ‘expletive’ Voice.

1.3. Outline
The organization of the rest of the paper is as follows. Section 2 introduces passives and thematic subject agreement markers. This might look digressive, but will help us locate the causative and the anticausative morpheme in appropriate syntactic structures. The subsequent sections describe the morphological causatives (section 3), the periphrastic causatives (section 4), and the anticausatives (section 5), respectively, with a proposal of a syntactic structure for the relevant construction.

2. Passive and Agreement in Acehnese
Before we start to look in detail at the data of causative alternation, let us briefly introduce Acehnese passive and agreement in this section, which I believe are essential to understand causatives and anticausatives later.

2.1. Passive in Acehnese
Voice alternations in Acehnese, illustrated in (8), have drawn much attention since Lawler (1977).

\[(8)\]  
Active/passive alternation in Acehnese (Lawler 1977:224-225)

\[a. \text{Gopnyan \ ka \ geu-cöm lôn. \ (active)}\]
\[3\text{sg Perf 3-kiss 15g}\]
\[\text{‘She (already) kissed me.’}\]

\[b. \text{Lôn \ ka \ \text{geu-cöm (lé gopnyan). \ (passive)}}\]
\[1\text{5g Perf 3-kiss by 3\text{sg}}\]
\[\text{‘I was kissed (by her.)’}\]

(8) is the active/passive alternation in Acehnese presented in Lawler (1977), which shows that the agreement marker on the verb always agrees with the ‘thematic’ subject: the agreement marker \textit{geu}-cross-references the same thematic argument, \textit{gopnyan ‘she’}, in both ‘active’ (8a) and ‘passive’ (8b).
Especially in (8b), the verb does not agree with the first person singular pronoun lôn, even though it seems to be the ‘subject’ in this passive sentence.

Claiming that the agreement on the verb is triggered by the ‘underlying’ subject, Lawler (1977) triggered the well-known controversy over the status of ‘subject’ and ‘agreement’ (Lawler 1977 and Perlmutter 1982 among others). Contra Lawler (1977), Durie (1988) claims that Acehnese has no passive and the purported passive is simply a word order variant of the active with a topicalized object and a postverbal agent marked by an ergative case marker lé.

Recently, presenting newly collected data, Legate (2007, 2008) shows that the thematic object like lôn in (8b) is not in an A-bar position (e.g., topic in Durie 1988) but actually occupies an A-position and that the lé DP behaves like a PP (by-phrase in English) in many respects. These lead us to conclude that Acehnese indeed has a passive construction with an agentive PP headed by lé. Then, how can we explain the peculiarity of Acehnese agreement patterns?

### 2.2. Thematic Subject Agreement

Acehnese has a set of proclitic agreement markers: lôn- (first person singular), ta- (first person, inclusive plural), meu- (first person, exclusive plural), neu- (second person), geu- (third person, polite), and dîji- (third person, impolite). I will call these ‘thematic subject’ agreement marker (cf. Legate 2007), although geu- will sometimes be used as an umbrella designation for the whole class of thematic agreement markers.\(^4\)

\[(9)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{lôn ka leueh lôn-jaq u blang.} \\
& 1\text{Sg Pfv 1-go to field} \\
& \text{‘I went to the field.’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Droeneuh ka leueh neu-jaq u blang.} \\
& 2\text{Sg Pfv 2-go to field} \\
& \text{‘You went to the field.’} \\
\text{c. } & \text{Gopnyan ka leueh geu-jaq u blang.} \\
& 3\text{Sg Pfv 3-go to field} \\
& \text{‘S/he went to the field.’} \\
\text{d. } & \text{Asee nyan di-kap aneuqnyan.} \\
& \text{dog: that 3-bite child that} \\
& \text{‘The dog bit the child.’} \\
\text{e. } & \text{Tanyoe ka leueh ta-jaq u blang.} \\
& \text{we(incl.) Perf 1pl.incl-go to field} \\
& \text{‘We (incl.) went to the field.’} \\
\text{f. } & \text{Kamoe ka leueh meu-jaq u blang.} \\
& \text{we(excl.) Perf 1pl.excl-go to field} \\
& \text{‘We (excl.) went to the field.’} \\
\text{g. } & \text{Awaqnyan ka leueh geu-jaq u blang.} \\
& \text{they Perf 3-go to field} \\
& \text{‘They went to the field.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^4\) This may be mnemonically helpful, since in the following sections we will focus on peu- (causative prefix) and teu- (anticausative prefix) which form a minimal triple with geu-.
Legate (2008) analyzes the thematic subject agreement marker as the morphological reflex of semantically interpretable features such as person, relative position in the social hierarchy, and inclusiveness on the little $v$ that introduces the external argument. For instance, the little $v$ di- in (9d) expresses not only that the DP in its specifier is an agent, but also that this DP is a low-ranking third person.

This analysis explains various characteristics of the thematic subject agreement in Acehnese very well. First, it explains the ‘agent agreement’ in passives (with or without a by-phrase), as seen in (8). Second, it correctly locates the agreement with respect to higher modal or aspectual markers. Third, it explains patterns of ‘agreement omission’ such as the obligatory absence of agreement in the ‘object voice’ construction. Refer to Legate (2008:(23)-(29)) for relevant data. Finally, but most relevantly, it explains the lack of agreement in unaccusatives.

If we adopt Legate’s (2008) analysis of Acehnese agreement, we predict anticausatives will have no agreement marker since they have no external argument. This prediction is borne out: unlike unergative and transitive verbs, unaccusative verbs (= unmarked anticausatives) like reubah ‘fall’ cannot have a thematic subject agreement marker.5 We will see that marked anticausatives are also incompatible with this agreement marker, but for different structural reasons.

(10) **Unaccusativity Diagnostics** (cf. Durie 1987:366)
An unaccusative verb does not allow a thematic subject agreement marker, unlike others.

a. Gopnyan **geu**-poh lôn. (transitive)
   3Sg 3-hit 1Sg
   ‘S/he hit me.’

b. Ureueng agam nyan **geu**-plueng. (unergative)
   person male Dem 3-run
   ‘The man runs.’

c. Lôn **ka** (*lôn*)-reubah. (unaccusative)
   1Sg Perf (*1)-fall
   ‘I fell.’

We can identify two classes of intransitive verbs structurally, making a distinction between unaccusative and unergative verbs. The impossibility of prefixing an agreement marker can be thought of as one of the reliable diagnostics of unaccusativity in Acehnese.6 Below are more examples which show the diachotomy of verb classes in terms of (in)compatibility with the thematic subject agreement.

(11) Agreement in transitive verbs

5 In Durie’s term (1987:366), “Actors are cross-referenced but Undergoers are not.”
6 Another potential diagnostic of unaccusativity is the perfective aspect marker ka leueh: as illustrated below, it may be the case that unergative verbs can co-occur with ka leueh, whereas unaccusative verbs cannot. However, this is yet to be confirmed with more data.

i. Unergative verbs
   Lôn **ka** leueh lôn-gisa dari blang. (W8-2, #40)
   1Sg PfV 1-return from field
   ‘I already returned from the field.’

ii. Unaccusative verbs
   Aneuq nayn **ka** (*leueh) rhët dari bubông. (W8-2, #48, 49)
   child Dem Perf fall from roof
   ‘The child fell from the roof.’
a. Mie nyan *di-kap* aneuq miet nyan. (W09-2, #1)
   cat Dem 3f-bite child small Dem
   ‘The cat bit the child.’

b. Fatimah *geu-taguen* bu. (W11-1, #31)
   Fatimah 3-cook rice
   ‘Fatimah cooked rice.’

c. Gopnyan hana *geu-pajöh* boh mamplam nyan lom. (W09-2, #32)
   s/he Neg 3-eat mango Dem yet (again’ in Daud and Durie 1999)
   ‘He didn’t eat the mango yet.’

d. Gopnyan *geu-hoi* lôn Hasan. (W10-p-S, #9)
   s/he 3-call 1SG Hasan
   ‘He called me Hasan.’

e. Hasan *geu-kalon* rumoh nyan. (W10-p-S, #16)
   Hasan 3-see house Dem
   ‘Hasan saw the house.’

f. Hasan *geu-pasoe* glah nyan ngon ie. (W11-1, #15)
   Hasan 3-fill glass Dem with water
   ‘Hasan filled the glass with water.’

g. Ureueng inong nyan *geu-tingkue* aneuq miet nyan. (W11-1, #41)
   person female Dem 3-carry child small Dem
   ‘The woman carries the baby.’

h. Hasan *geu-buka/geu-top* pintô nyan. (W12-p-S, #5,6)
   Hasan 3-open/3-close door Dem
   ‘Hasan opened/closed the door.’

i. Fatimah *geu-rhah* jaroe droe-geuh. (Ellicitation notes, p4, Oct 21, 2007)
   Fatimah 3-wash hand herself
   ‘Fatimah washed her hands.’

j. Lôn *lôn-tët* rumoh lôn. (Ellicitation notes, p19, Oct 21, 2007)
   1SG 1-burn tr house 1SG
   ‘I burned my house.’

(12) Agreement in unergative verbs

   Hasan 3f-cry after.that 3f-laugh
   ‘Hasan cried and laughed.’

b. Mata uroe *di-teubiet* dari timu. (W11-p-S, #1)
   eye day 3f-exit from east
   ‘The sun rises in the east.’

c. Asee nyan *di-éh* ateueh tanoh. (W11-p-S, #5)
   dog Dem 3f-lie above earth
   ‘The dog was lying on the ground.’

   child small Hasan Perf 3f-go.out from house
   ‘Hasan’s child left home.’ (lit. ‘Hasan’s child went out from the house.’)

e. Lôn ka leueh *lôn-gisa* dari blang. (W8-2, #40)
I already returned from the field.’

Hasan geu-döng keu droe di minyup rumoh. (080515, #14)
Hasan 3-stand alone under house
‘Hasan stood under a house.’
(NB: The structure of traditional Acehnese houses makes it possible to stand ‘under’ the house.)

(13) No agreement in unaccusative verbs [Check a-d with Saiful!]

a. Aneuq miet nyan (ka) (*di)-tröq u rumoh. (W09-3)
child small Dem Perf (*3f)-arrive to house
‘The child arrived home.’

b. Rumoh Hasan ka (*di)-tutong. (W13-p-S, #26)
house Hasan Perf (*3f)-burn
‘Hasan’s house burned.’

boat Dem Perf (*3f)-sink
‘The boat sank.’

flower Dem early (*3)-blossom
‘The flower blossomed early.’

e. Laptop lôn (*di)-rhët dari jaoe lôn, watee lôn meu-Pök jih. (E-notes, p19, Oct 21, 2007)
laptop my (*3f)-fall from hand my, when 1Sg meu-butt with 3Sg
‘My laptop dropped from my hands, when I ran into him.’

f. Adek lôn (*di)-lahe baroe. (080514, #7)
younger.sibling 1SG (*3)-be.born yesterday
‘My brother/sister was born yesterday.’

The two structures in (14) show the structural difference between unaccusative verbs and other verbs. Unaccusative verbs lack VoiceP, while unergative and transitive verbs have this projection. Adapting the proposal in Legate (2008) that the thematic subject agreement marker is not ‘agreement’ but rather interpretable features on v, I analyze it as an overt realization of Voice head (not v head) as in (14b). This slight modification is due to my assumption of two distinct projections, VoiceP and vP, for agentivity and causation, respectively. The incompatibility of geu- with unaccusative verbs is simply attributed to the lack of VoiceP in the unaccusative structure in (14a).

(14) a. unaccusative verbs

```
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{VBE, or BECOME} \\
\sqrt{ } \\
\text{DP} \\
\end{array} \right]
```

*geu-unaccV due to lack of VoiceP


b. unergative and transitive verbs

```
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{Voice’} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{geu-} \\
\sqrt{ } \\
\text{v’} \\
\text{v} \\
\sqrt{ } \\
\text{P} \\
\end{array} \right]
```

3. Morphological Causatives in Acehnese

A language can simply use a different lexical item to indicate a causative form: for example, *rise* vs. *raise*, *eat* vs. *feed* in English. Acehnese also shows some unpredictable pairs of a non-causative and a causative lexical item like the followings:

(15) a. Glah nyan **peunoh** ngon ie.
    glass Dem full with water
    ‘The glass was full of water.’

b. Hasan **geu-pasoe**7 glah nyan ngon ie.
     H 3-fill glass Dem with water
     ‘Hasan filled the glass with water.’

(16) a. Mie di/ji-**pajöh** eungkôt.
    cat eat fish
    ‘Cats eat fish.’

b. Lôn **suleueng** eungkôt nyan keu mie lôn.
     1Sg feed fish Dem to cat 1Sg
     ‘I fed the fish to my cat.’

(17) a. Adék lôn (**di/ji)-**lahë baroe.
     younger.sibling 1Sg (**3)-be.born yesterday
     ‘My brother/sister was born yesterday.’

b. Mak lôn ka **geu-madeueng** adék lôn baroe.
     mother 1Sg Perf 3-give.birth.to younger.sibling 1Sg yesterday
     ‘My mother gave birth to my brother/sister yesterday.’

However, this type of causative alternation seems to be limited to small number of cases. Rather, Acehnese exploits other types of productive causatives, namely morphological and analytic/periphrastic causatives, which are our particular interest in this and the next section, respectively.

In many languages, causative morphemes are used to make corresponding causative forms. For instance, Japanese has a causative suffix -(s)ase-: ik-*u* ‘to go’ → ik-ase-ru ‘to make someone go’ and tabe-ru ‘to eat’ → tabe-sase-ru ‘to make someone eat, to feed’.8 These have been called morphological causatives. On the other hand, instead of causative morphemes, causative verbs like English *make* or *have* can be used to form causative constructions: e.g., *I cry. → She made me cry.* and *John built the house. → I had John build the house.* These have been called analytic or periphrastic causatives.

Acehnese has both morphological and periphrastic causative constructions. The former involve a causative prefix **peu**- and the latter a causative verb **peu-gêt**, which will be described in turn.

---

7 The causative form in (15) can be analyzed as a morphological derivative from **asoe** ‘content; flesh’ by the affixation of the causative prefix **peu**- and a subsequent contraction of the prefix and the base word (Cowan 1981:536).

8 Refer to Jacobsen 1992 for various classes of inchoative/causative verb pairs.
3.1. Causative prefix *peu-* and its derivational possibilities

The meaning of the transitive verb *madeueng* ‘to give birth to’ in (17b) can be expressed by the affixation of the causative morpheme *peu-* to its intransitive counterpart *lahé* in (17a): *peu-lahé* in (18) below is an example of morphological causatives.

(18) Mak lôn ka geu-*peu-lahé* adék lôn baroe. (080514, #6)
mother 1Sg Perf 3-Caus-be.born younger.sibling 1Sg yesterday
‘My mother gave birth to my brother/sister.’

The causative prefix *peu-* has a wide range of derivative possibilities: it can be attached to a verb, an adjective, and even a noun.

3.1.1. Derivation from verbs

The causative prefix *peu-* can derive a causative form from another verb, for example, a transitive verb from an unaccusative intransitive verb as in (19).

(19) **Derivation from an unaccusative intransitive verb**
*reubah* ‘to fall’ → *peu-reubah* ‘to cause to fall’
   a. Aneuq nyan ka *reubah*.
      child Dem Perf fall
      ‘The child fell.’
   b. Hasan di/geu-*peu-reubah* aneuqnyan.
      H 3-Caus-fall child Dem
      ‘Hasan caused the child to fall.’

The causative prefix *peu-* can also derive a transitive verb from an unergative intransitive verb.

**Derivation from unergative intransitive verbs**

(20) *moe* ‘to cry’ → *peu-moe* ‘to make cry’
   a. Hasan di/geu-*moe*.
      H 3-cry
      ‘Hasan cried.’
      F 3-Caus-cry H
      ‘Fatimah caused Hasan to cry.’

(21) *khém* ‘to laugh’ → *peu-khém* ‘to laugh at; sneer at’
   a. Hasan di/geu-*khém*.
      H 3-laugh

---

9 Note that *peu-khém* usually has an idiomatic meaning of ‘to laugh at; sneer at’ rather than a compositional meaning of ‘to make someone laugh.’ The latter is not impossible, but more likely to be expressed by a periphrastic causative sentence.
b. Fatimah di/geu-{	extit{peu}}-khém Hasan. (W13-p, #6)
   F 3-Caus-laugh H
   i. ‘Fatimah laughed/sneered at Hasan.’
   ii. ‘Fatimah caused Hasan to laugh.’

(22) 
\textit{duek} ‘to sit’ \rightarrow \textit{peu-duk} ‘to seat’

a. Lôn lôn-duék ateueh kursi. (W11-p-S, #11)
   1Sg 1sg-sit above chair
   ‘I sat on the chair.’

b. Lôn-peu-duék aneuq miet lôn ateueh kursi. (W11-p-S, #12)
   1-Caus-sit child small my above chair
   ‘(I) seated my child on the chair.’

(23) \textit{teubiet} ‘to go out; exit’ \rightarrow \textit{peu-teubiet} ‘to pull out; take out’ (cf. ‘to publish’ in the D&D 1999)

a. Mata uroe di-teubiet dari timu. (W11-p-S,#1)
   sun(eye+day) 3-exit from east
   ‘The sun rises in the east.’

b. Fatimah di{-peu-teubiet} jaroe. (W11-p-S,#4)
   F 3-Caus-exit hand
   Fatimah pulled out her hand (e.g., from the pockets).’

The causative prefix \textit{peu-} can also derive a ditransitive verb from a transitive verb.

\textbf{Derivation from transitive verbs}

(24) \textit{pajóh} ‘to eat’ \rightarrow \textit{peu-pajóh} ‘to make eat; feed’

a. Hasan geu-pajóh boh mamplam. (W10-1)
   H 3-eat mango
   ‘Hasan ate a mango.’

b. Fatimah geu-p-peu-pajóh (keu) Hasan boh mamplam. (W13-p-S, #7)
   F 3-Caus-eat to Hasan mango
   ‘Fatimah fed Hasan a mango.’

   F 3-Caus-eat mango to H
   ‘Fatimah fed a mango to Hasan.’

(25) \textit{bloe} ‘to buy’ \rightarrow \textit{peu-bloe} ‘to sell’

b. Hasan geu-peu-bloe (keu) Ibrahim rumoh gopnyan. (W11-p-S, #13)
   H 3-caus-buy to Ib house 3Sg/p
   ‘Hasan sold Ibrahim his house.’

a. Hasan geu-p-peu-bloe rumoh gopnyan keu Ibrahim. (W11-p-S, #13)
   H 3-caus-buy house 3Sg/p to Ib
   ‘Hasan sold his house to Ibrahim.’

(26) \textit{reunoe} ‘to learn’ \rightarrow \textit{peu-reunoe} ‘to teach’
a. Aneuq miet nyan di-*meu*-reunoe basa Acèh di sikula. (W11-2, #20)
   ‘Children learn Acehnese language at school.’

b. Fatimah geu-pee-reunoe (keu) aneuq miet basa Acèh di sikula. (W11-2, #21)
   F. 3-Caus-learn to child small lang. Aceh at school

c. Fatimah geu-pee-reunoe basa Acèh *(keu) aneuq miet di sikula. (W11-2, #21)
   F. 3-Caus-learn to lang. Aceh *(to) child small at school
   ‘Fatimah teaches children Acehnese language at school.’

3.1.2. Derivation from adjectives

The derivational possibilities of pea- are not limited to verbs. It can also derive a transitive or
ditransitive verb from an adjective11 to express causation of the acquisition of a certain quality or the

---

10 The meaning and function of meu- is unclear. Although Cowan (1981:534) claims that it is a morpheme meaning
‘plurality’ of subject or action, the sentence with a single subject and a single action, Hasan di-*meu*-reunoe si krak basa
di sikula. ‘Hasan learned a new word at school’ (E-notes 080919), still requires meu-. The language consultant
mentioned that meu-reunoe is a single, indivisible word. However, note that the causativized form is not *
meu-meu-
reunoe but pea-reunoe.

11 Since there is no inflectional morphology, it is difficult to distinguish adjectives from unaccusatives. According to
Asyik (1987:107-8), however, adjectives such as raya ‘big’, seunang ‘happy’, meu’ai ‘expensive’, sakét ‘ill’, and putéh
‘white’ are different from verbs in that they can be used in comparatives (with leubèh ‘more’) and superlatives (with
paléng ‘most’).

---

i. Adjectives:
      3 more clever. than 1pl.incl
      ‘He is cleverer than us.’

   ii. (Unaccusative) Verbs:
       a. *Hasan leubèh reubah nibak lôn. (E-notes 080515 #68)
          Hasan more fall than 1SG
          ‘Hasan fell more than me.’
       b. *Peuraho nyan leubèh ngop nibak peuraho nyoe. (E-notes 080515 #69)
          boat this more sink than boat that
          ‘That (type of) boat sank more than this (type of) boat.’
       c. Peuraho nyan leubèh bagah ngop nibak peuraho nyoe. (E-notes 080515 #70)
          boat this more fast sink than boat that
          ‘That (type of) boat sank faster than this (type of) boat.’

One puzzling fact in this regard is that marked anticausatives, which is assumed to have more structure than
unmarked anticausatives (=unaccusatives), seem to pattern together with adjectives.

iii. a. Pinto nyoe leubèh teu-buka nibak pinto nyan. (E-notes 080515 #71)
     door this more Acæs-open than door that
     ‘This door is more (widely/easily) open than that door.’ (the degree of openness)

     cf. Pinto nyoe leubèh mudeh teu-buka nibak pinto nyan. (E-notes 080515 #72)
     door this more easy Acæs-open than door that
     ‘This door is more easily opened than that door.’

change of state: e.g., raya/rayeuk ‘big’ \(\rightarrow\) peu-raya/rayeuk ‘to enlarge’, seunang ‘happy’ \(\rightarrow\) peu-seunang ‘to make (someone) happy’, deuh ‘visible’ \(\rightarrow\) peu-deuh ‘to show (something) to (somebody)’.

### Derivation of transitive verbs from adjectives

(27) \(\text{raya/rayeuk ‘big’} \rightarrow \text{peu-raya/rayeuk ‘to enlarge’}\)

a. Rumoh Hasan raya.  
   house H big  
   ‘Hasan’s house is big.’  

b. Hasan geu-peu-raya rumoh gopnyan.  
   H 3-Caus-big house s/he  
   ‘Hasan enlarges his house.’

   cf. [The house enlarged.]

(28) \(\text{luwah ‘wide’} \rightarrow \text{peu-luwah ‘to widen’}\)

Hasan geu-peu-luwah rumoh gopnyan.  
H 3-Caus-wide house 3Sg/p  
‘Hasan widens his house.’

(29) \(\text{seunang/gatu ‘happy’} \rightarrow \text{peu-seunang/peu-gatu ‘to make happy’}\)

a. Hasan seunang that baroe.  
   H happy very yesterday  
   ‘Hasan was very happy yesterday.’

b. Fatimah geu-peu-seunang (*keu) Hasan baroe.  
   F 3-Caus-happy (*to) H yesterday  
   ‘Fatimah made Hasan happy yesterday.’

c. Fatimah geu-peu-gatu Hasan baroe.  
   F 3-Caus-happy H yesterday  
   ‘Fatimah made Hasan happy yesterday.’

(30) \(\text{beukah ‘broken, torn’} \rightarrow \text{peu-beukah ‘to break’}\)

a. Glah nyan beukah/bicah.  
   glass Dem broken  
   ‘The glass is broken.’

b. Lôn peu-beukah glah nyan.  
   1Sg Caus-broken glass Dem  
   ‘I broke the class.’

(31) \(\text{teungeut ‘asleep’} \rightarrow \text{peu-teungeut ‘to put to sleep’}\)

a. Bayi nyan teungeut.  
   baby Dem asleep  
   ‘The baby is asleep.’

b. Fatimah geu-peu-teungeut bayi nyan.  
   F 3-Caus-asleep baby Dem

The meaning of teu-V in (iii) can be something like ‘can be done’ (Asyik 1987:113), but I will leave this issue unexplained due to lack of data.
'Fatimah put the baby to sleep.' (lit. ‘Fatimah made the baby asleep.’)

**Derivation of ditransitive verbs from adjectives**

(32) *deuh* ‘visible’ → *peu-deuh* ‘to show’

a. Rumoh nyan deuh keu/baq Aisyah. 
   house Dem visible to/at A
   ‘The house is visible to Aisyah.’

b. Hasan (geu)-peu-deuh (keu) Aisyah rumoh nyan. 
   H (3)-Caus-visible (to) A house that
   ‘Hasan showed Aisyah the house.’

   H (3)- Caus-visible house that *(to) A
   ‘Hasan showed the house to Aisyah.’

### 3.1.3. Derivation from nouns

A causative verb can also be derived from a noun: *nan* ‘name’ → *peu-nan* ‘to name’, *aceh* ‘Aceh’ → *peu-aceh* ‘to acehnize’, *ubat* ‘medicine’ → *peu-ubat* ‘to treat’.

(33) a. Soe *nan* droeneuh? 
   who name 2Sg
   ‘What’s your name?’

b. Lôn *peu-nan* bayi lôn Fatimah. 
   1Sg Caus-name baby 1Sg F
   ‘I named my baby Fatimah.’

(34) Jaq, ta-*peu-aceh* teuma aneuq miet nyan. 
   go 1pl.incl-Caus-Aceh back child small Dem
   ‘Let’s acehnize the kids back.’

(35) a. Doto geu-*peu-ubat*12 aneuq miet nyan. 
   doctor 3-Caus-medicine child small Dem
   ‘The doctor is treating/treated the child.’ cf. *ubat* ‘medicine, drugs’

b. Aneug miet nyan geu-*peu-ubat* lé doto nyan. 
   child small Dem 3-Caus-medicine by doctor Dem
   ‘The child is being/has been treated by the doctor.’

Other examples include *lhee* ‘three’ → *peu-lhee* ‘to make something three; triplicate’, *abang* ‘elder brother’ → *peu-abang* ‘to call someone elder brother’ (E-notes 081017), *ie* ‘water’ → *peu-ie* ‘to put/add water’, *sira* ‘salt’ → *peu-sira* ‘to add/make salt’ (Asyik 1987:85).

### 3.1.4. Derivation from other categories?

---

12 Note that *peu-ubat* does not require the use of *ubat* ‘medicine.’ It does not necessarily involve ‘medication.’
The causative morpheme *peu-* also seems to be attached to those elements whose syntactic category is not quite clear. For example, *peu-jeuet* ‘to enable; make’ in (36) is derived from *jeuet* ‘can, may’ which is usually used as a modality particle as in (36a).

(36) a. Gopnyan jeuet geu-pajôh boh mamplam nyan. (W09-1, #7) 3Sg may 3-eat mango Dem ‘He may eat the mango.’

b. Hasan geu-peu-jeuet Fatimah (keu) po rumoh. (W10-2, #14) H 3-Caus-can F (to) owner house ‘Hasan made Fatimah his wife,’

However, the usage of *jeuet* ‘may; can’ as a modal head in (36a) may be the result of a grammaticalization of *jeuet* ‘able’ in (37a). This view is supported by (37b) which has the compositional meaning of causative *peu-jeuet* ‘to enable (Caus+able)’

(37) a. Lôn jeuet basa inggreh. (W11-2, #20) 1Sg able language English ‘I can speak English.’

b. Muto ji-peu-jeuet tanyoe meu-grak leubeh bagah. (080513, #4) car 3-Caus-able 1pl ?-move more more fast ‘Car enables us to move faster.’

Together with *ka, lheueh* is used as a perfective aspect particle as in (38a). But, the derived verb *peu-lheueh* in (38b) means ‘to finish.’

(38) a. Lôn ka lheueh lôn-gisa dari blang. (W08-2, #40) 1Sg Pfv 1-return from field ‘I have already returned from the field.’

b. Lôn jeuet lôn-peu-lheueh taguen bu. (W11-1, #25) I can 1-Caus-Pfv cook rice ‘I was able to finish cooking rice.’

Again, it might be the case that *peu-lheueh* in (38b) is derived from an adjectival lexical item *lheueh* ‘finished’, not from a functional/aspectural particle *lheueh* in (38a). The perfective aspect particle *lheueh* can also be viewed as the result of a zero-derivation or a grammaticalization from the adjective *lheueh*.

The following derivational possibility of the prefix *peu-* is described in Cowan (1981:538), according to which even a ‘short’ sentence can be causativized as in (39viii).

(39) Seven subtypes of *peu-* derivations and examples (Cowan 1981:537-538)
   i. those derived from verbal base-words
   ii. those derived from nouns
   iii. those derived from adjectives
   iv. those derived from numerals: e.g., *lheè three* → *peu-lhè* ‘to make three; triplicate’

13 The types (iv) and (v) of (39) can be thought of as subtype of (ii).
v. those derived from personal pronouns:
e.g., peu-gopnyan ‘to address or refer to with gopnyan ‘he; she’
vi. those derived from adverbial expressions:
e.g., meunan ‘in that manner’ → peu-meunan ‘to treat in that manner’

vii. those derived from short sentences
e.g., hana roh ‘not fitting; it does not fit’ →
peu-hana roh ‘state, decide that something does not fit’

(40) ??Lôn pequ-hana seunang Fatimah. (W15-p-S, #6ii)
1Sg  Caus-Neg happy F
‘I made Fatimah not happy = I made Fatimah unhappy.’

However, peu-hana seunang in (40) which has the same structure as peu-hana roh in (39iii) sounds marginal to my consultant at best\(^{14}\) and, even if (40) is acceptable, it may be that hana seunang is a derived adjective, not a sentence. It can be simply of the type (iii) of (39), if Neg is negating the adjective to form a negative adjective (Molly Diesing, p.c.). It is not likely that peu-causative forms can be derived from other types of (negative) sentences (41a). A periphrastic causative construction rather than a morphological one will be used to express the intended meaning, as in (41b).

1Sg  1-Caus-Neg-3-cry child male Dem.

b. Lôn lôn-peu-gêt aneuq agam nyan hana di/ji-moe.
1Sg  1-Caus-okay child male Dem Neg 3-cry
‘I made the boy not cry.’

All these data suggest that the Caus head peu-combines with category-neutral Roots, as proposed in Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993, Marantz 1997, Embick and Noyer 2006 among others).

3.3. Structures of MCs

From all the observations made above, I propose a general structure for the causative morpheme peu-in (42).

(42)  Structure for the causative morpheme peu-

\(^{14}\) Given the English translation first, my consultant presented the following sentence instead:
lôn-peu-seudeh Fatimah.
1-Caus-sad F
‘I made Fatimah sad.’
Basically, the Caus little v head takes a category-neutral Root (√P) as its complement, yielding a (lexical) causative structure as in (43b).

(43) morphological causatives: v head takes as its complement a category-neutral Root.

a. reubah ‘to fall’

b. peu-reubah ‘to cause to fall; drop’

(Arneq nyan reubah.  
child ‘Dem fall
‘The child fell.’)

(Hasan geu-peu-reubah arneq nyan. 
H 3-Caus-fall child ‘Dem
‘Hasan caused the child to fall.’)

(43) shows the ‘derivation’ from a verbal Root. The derivation from an adjectival or a nominal Root is considered to be identical to this. This is best explained by Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993, Marantz 1997, Embick and Noyer 2006 among others). For example, if n takes a category-neutral Root √ubat as its complement, the whole nP structure behaves as a noun ubat ‘medication’. If Caus little v takes √ubat as its complement, the whole vP structure becomes a verb peu-ubat ‘to treat; cure’.

Following Harley (2006), I assume that it is not a vP_BECOME but a bare √P that the causative v head embeds, though this might not be as crucial as in case of Japanese lexical causatives (Harley 2006:§3.5).

3.2. Applicatives

In this subsection, I will explore the possibility that Acehnese have sub-classes of morphological causatives, i.e., ‘lexical’ vs. ‘syntactic’ causatives, based on the discussion in Harley (2006) and Travis (2000). I will show that there seems to be no such a distinction (contra Ko 2008) and, rather, the assume-to-be ‘syntactic’ causatives may have the structure of applicatives.

Japanese has two different sub-classes of morphological causatives: the ‘lexical’ (unproductive) causative in (44a) and the ‘syntactic’ (productive) causative (44b). Despite the morphological similarity, these two causatives have distinct syntactic and semantic properties.
(44) Lexical and syntactic causatives in Japanese (Harley 2006:3)
   a. *Lexical causatives*
      Taroo-ga  zisyoku-o  niow-ase-ta  
      Taro-Nom  resignation-Acc  smell-Caus-Past
      ‘Taro hinted at resignation.’ (lit. ‘Taro made resignation smell.’)
   b. *Syntactic (productive) causatives*
      i. *Make-causatives*
         Hanako-wa  Yoshi-o  ik-ase-ta  
         Hanako-Top  Yoshi-Acc  go-Caus-Past
         ‘Hanako made Yoshi go.’
      ii. *Let-causatives*
         Hanako-wa  Yoshi-ni  ik-ase-ta  
         Hanako-Top  Yoshi-Dat  go-Caus-Past
         ‘Hanako allowed Yoshi to go/Hanako had Yoshi go.’

Lexical causatives and syntactic causatives in Japanese differ from each other in many respects: lexical causatives are ‘monoclausal’, whereas syntactic causatives are ‘biclausal’\(^\text{15}\) by at least some tests (scope, adverbial control, binding, disjunction); lexical causatives can have idiomatic interpretations, while syntactic ones cannot. (See Harley 2006 and references therein for further distinctions.)

The distinction between the lexical and the syntactic causative is not unique to Japanese. Travis (2000) provides lexical and syntactic causative data in Malagasy and Tagalog.

(45) Malagasy (-amp- = an + f) (from Travis 2000:157 (14) with minor adaptation)
   a. misitrika  ‘X hide’
   b. manitrika  ‘Y hide X’
   c. mampisitrika  ‘Z make X hide’
   d. mampanitrika  ‘Z make Y hide X’
   e. m + an + f + an + sitrika
      m + PC + E + LC + root (PC: productive causative, LC: lexical causative)

Note that the causative morpheme in Malagasy can iterate, although an intervening Aspect morpheme is required (represented by E in (45e) above). If we assume that a causative morpheme is a little \(v\) head, this means that there are iterative \(v\)Ps.

Since Acehnese is also a language with morphological causatives, we can ask if Acehnese has a distinction between lexical and syntactic causatives as in Japanese or Malagasy/Tagalog. If Acehnese has such a distinction, it would be like the following as tentatively proposed in Ko (2008).

(46) Is there a distinction between lexical vs. syntactic causatives in Acehnese?
   a. lexical causatives with one VoiceP/\(v\)P?
      i. *peu* + unaccusative base  ex. *peu-reubah* ‘to drop’
      ii. *peu* + adjective base  ex. *peu-raya* ‘to enlarge’

---

\(^{15}\) This term is misleading in that a clause usually means a TP or CP, while a syntactic causative in Japanese does not embed a TP or CP (Legate, p.c.). I cite the term ‘biclausality’ from Harley (2006), understanding it as similar meaning to ‘bieventivity’ in Pylkkänen (2000).
iii. *peu* + noun base  
   ex. *peu-ubat* ‘to treat’
iv. simple unergative/transitive Vs  
   ex. *kap* ‘to bite’, *sipak* ‘to kick’

b. syntactic causatives with iterative VoiceP/vPs?
i. *peu* + unergative base  
   ex. *peu-jaq* ‘to make go’
ii. *peu* + transitive base  
   ex. *peu-kalon* ‘to show’, *peu-pajóq* ‘to feed’

Note that the hypothesized distinction between lexical and syntactic causatives in (46) is highly relevant to the *Split Intransitivity*. Since unergative and transitive verbs already have a VoiceP/vP in their structures proposed in (14), the prefixation of the causative morpheme *peu-* to these verbs would result in a doubly-stacked VoiceP/vP structure, if this structure is available. In contrast, the prefixation of *peu-* to unaccusatives (adjectives and nouns as well) without any VoiceP/vP by assumption would result in a structure with one VoiceP/vP like simple unergatives and transitives.

However, careful investigation reveals that this is not true. First of all, unlike Malagasy data in (45), Acehnese does not allow the sequence of *‘peu-peu-*, a morphological manifestation of doubly-stacked v. Secondly, there is no clear difference between the assumed-to-be ‘lexical’ causatives and ‘syntactic’ causatives in terms of idiosyncrasy. It is well-known that lexical causatives show idiosyncratic behaviors (non-compositional meaning, idioms, adversity reading (Japanese, Harley 2006), etc), whereas syntactic causatives are predictable, compositional in their meaning in principle (Travis 2000:158). The following cases show that the assumed-to-be ‘lexical’ causatives can have idiomatic meanings as expected.

(47) Non-compositional meaning  
   a. *ubat* ‘medicine’ ~ *peu-ubat* ‘treat; cure’ (does not have to involve medication)  
   b. *dada* ‘breast’  
      *peu-dada* ‘to push forward strongly, intr’ (Durie 1985:80)

(48) Idioms: simple transitive / lexical causative + an internal argument

a. *Ibrahim*  
   *geu-peu-teupat rhueng*  
   atueh kasô.  
   (W11-p-S, #7)  
   ‘*Ibrahim lay down on the mattress.*’ (lit. ‘*Ibrahim made his spine straight on the mattress.*’)

b. *Lôn*  
   *ka lôn-rah jaroë*  
   dari/nibak buet-buet nyan.  
   (080513, #5)  
   1sg Perf 1-wash hand from (bad) deeds Dem  
   ‘*I am through with those (bad) deeds.*’ (lit. ‘*I washed hands from those (bad) deeds.*’)

c. *Mak lôn*  
   *ka geu-koh/cokgaki lôn*  
   jadi lôn han jeuet lôn-jak keunan lée.  
   mother 1 Perf 3-cut/take foot 1 so 1sg Neg able 1-go to.there anymore  
   ‘*My mother took my method of transportation (bike, car, etc) away so that I …*’  
   (lit. ‘*My mother cut/take my feet so that I cannot go there anymore.*’)  
   (080513, #6)

Contrary to the expectations, the meaning of the assumed-to-be ‘syntactic’ causatives is not always the predictable meaning of ‘cause to V.’ For example, the pervasive meaning of *peu-khém* (Caus + *peu* ‘to laugh’) is ‘to laugh at; sneer at’ rather than ‘to make someone to laugh.’ In case of *peu-jaq* (Caus + *jaq* ‘to go’), it means something like ‘to accompany/attend someone to some place’ not just ‘to make someone go to somewhere.’

---

16 Recall that the agent-selecting vP has been thought of as the boundary of a domain for idiomatization (cf. Kratzer 1996, Marantz 1984, 1997).
Thirdly, if we adopt Harley’s (2006) structure for Japanese syntactic causatives where a VoiceP is stacked on top of another, there will be two positions assigning Agent thematic role, Spec of higher VoiceP and Spec of lower VoiceP, as illustrated in (49). Then, we would expect to have ambiguity of agent-oriented adverbials, depending on which ‘agent’ is modified by the adverbial expression.

(49) \[ \text{VoiceP (\textit{patiently})} \]

Indeed, Japanese syntactic causatives show this ambiguity with an agent-oriented adverbial as in (50a). Note that there is no ambiguity in a ditransitive sentence in (50b).

(50) Ambiguous reading of agent-oriented adverbials in Japanese syntactic causatives
- syntactic causatives:
  - Fatimah-san-wa Hasan-san-ni ano ie-o \textit{tsintyakuni} mi-sase-ta.
  - Fatimah-title-Top Hasan-title-Dat that house-Acc composedly see-Caus-Past
  i. ‘Fatimah composedly made Hasan see the house.’ (F = composed)
  ii. ‘Fatimah made Hasan composedly see the house.’ (H = composed)
- ditransitives:
  - Fatimah-san-wa Hasan-san-ni ano ie-o \textit{tsintyakuni} mi-se\textsuperscript{17}-ta.
  - Fatimah-title-Top Hasan-title-Dat that house-Acc composedly see-Caus-Past
  i. ‘Fatimah composedly showed Hasan the house.’ (F = composed)
  ii. No reading similar to a-ii (H ≠ composed)

In contrast to the case of Japanese syntactic causative in (50a), Acehnese does not show such ambiguity in the following sentence with an Agent-oriented PP modification, which is rather similar to the case of the ditransitives in (50b).

(51) Agent-oriented PP modification:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Fatimah} & \text{ geu-peu-kalon Hasan rumoh nyan } \textit{ngon saba}. \\
F & \text{ 3-Caus-see H house Dem with patience}
\end{align*}
\]

i. ‘Fatimah, with patience, showed Hasan the house.’
ii. cannot mean ‘Hasan saw the house patiently and Fatimah caused it.’

\textsuperscript{17} This ø/se pair in \textit{mi-g-ru} ‘to see’ and \textit{mi-se-ru} ‘to show’ is one of the sixteen classes of inchoative/(lexical) causative pairs of verbs with overt causativizing morphology attached to a common root (Harley 2006 based on Jacobsen 1992)
The impossibility of the meaning (ii), no matter where the PP is placed, implies that there is no Agent in the embedded event.

Finally, let us consider the productivity of lexical and syntactic causatives. Japanese lexical causatives are non-productive, while syntactic causatives are highly productive. This is why they are often called lexical and productive causatives. However, unlike Japanese and Turkish (Aissen 1974), the assumed-to-be syntactic causatives in Acehnese are not productive at all. Rather, only highly limited number of unergative and lexical (zero-driven) transitive verbs can combine with seu- to form its causative counterpart. Those verbs listed below are used only as a simple transitive verb: they cannot be prefixed with the causative morpheme seu-. The causativization of these verbs is performed by the periphrastic causative construction which I will introduce in the next section. Note that the most productive causative construction in Acehnese is periphrastic one.18

(52) **non-productivity of Acehnese assumed-to-be syntactic causatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>simple transitive</th>
<th>seu-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to open (tr.)'</td>
<td>buka *peu-buka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to close (tr.)'</td>
<td>top *peu-top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to hit/beat'</td>
<td>poh *peu-poh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to kick'</td>
<td>sipak *peu-sipak (see (xx) below) cf. Durie 1985:85 (4-167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to carry'</td>
<td>mè *peu-mè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to move (tr.)'</td>
<td>pinah *peu-pinah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to load'</td>
<td>pasoe *peu-pasoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to read'</td>
<td>baca *peu-baca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to burn'</td>
<td>tôt (cf. D&amp;D têt) *peu-tôt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to bring'</td>
<td>me *peu-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to change'</td>
<td>ganto/uba *peu-ganto/peu-uba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to cut'</td>
<td>koh *peu-koh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to cover'</td>
<td>bungko *peu-bungko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to cook'</td>
<td>taguen *peu-taguen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to dig'</td>
<td>kueh *peu-kueh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to find'</td>
<td>teumee *peu-teumee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to help'</td>
<td>tulong *peu-tulong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the observations made so far, I conclude that there is no syntactic causative construction in Acehnese.

Although unproductive, there are limited number of cases where a transitive verb is causativized by the prefix seu-. We have already seen pajôh ‘to eat’ ~ seu-pajôh ‘to feed’ (24), bloe ‘to buy’ ~ seu-bloe ‘to sell’ (25), (meu)reunoe ‘to learn’ ~ seu-reunoe ‘to teach’ (26) as cases that belong to the Also, I have collected the following data.

(53) **kalon ‘to see’ ~ seu-kalon ‘to show’ [cf. deuh ‘visible’ ~ seu-deuh ‘to show’ (32)].**

a. Hasan geu-kalon rumoh nyan. (W10-p-S, #16)

H 3-see house Dem

---

18 This situation is very similar to that of Korean: Korean has both morphological and periphrastic causatives, but Morphological causatives, including syntactic causatives, are not productive. Refer to Park (1986) and Yeon (2003).
‘Hasan saw the house.’

b. Fatimah geu-**peu-kalon** (keu) Hasanrumoh nyan.  
   F 3-Caus-see (to) H house Dem  
   ‘Fatimah showed Hasan the house.’

c. Fatimah geu-**peu-kalon** rumoh nyan *(keu) Hasan.  
   F 3-Caus-see house Dem to H  
   ‘Fatimah showed the house to Hasan.’

(54)  
**deungō** ‘to hear; listen’ ~ **peu-deungō** ‘to cause someone to listen’

a. Hasan geu-**deungō** lagu nyan.  
   Hasan 3-hear song Dem  
   ‘Hasan heard the song.’

b. Hasan geu-**peu-deungō** aneuk-geuh lagu nyan.  
   Hasan 3-Caus-hear child-3 song Dem  
   ‘Hasan let his child listen to the song.’ [recheck the meaning!]

c. Hasan geu-**peu-deungō** lagu nyan *(bak) aneuk-geuh.  
   Hasan 3-Caus-hear song Dem at child-3  
   ‘Hasan made his child listen to the song.’

(55)  
**sok** ‘to wear; put on cloth’ ~ **peu-sok** ‘to dress someone in’

a. Mak nyan geu-**peu-sok** aneuk nyan bajee/leuweu/gleueng.  
   mother Dem 3-Caus-wear child Dem shirt/pants/bracelet  
   ‘The mother dressed the child in a shirt/pants/bracelet.’

b. Mak nyan geu-**peu-sok** bajee/leuweu/gleueng aneuk nyan.  
   mother Dem 3-Caus-wear shirt/pants/bracelet child Dem  
   ‘The mother dressed the child in a shirt/pants/bracelet.’


(56)  
**mat** ‘to hold’ ~ **peu-mat** ‘to cause to hold’

a. Hasan geu-**mat** jaroe Fatimah.  
   Hasan 3-hold hand Fatimah  
   ‘Hasan holds Fatimah’s hand.’

b. Hasan geu-**peu-mat** Fatimah jaroe Ibrahim.  
   Hasan 3-Caus-hold Fatimah hand Ibrahim  
   ‘Hasan made Ibrahim’s hands held by Fatimah’

   cf. **mat-jaroe** ‘shake hands in greeting; lit. hold hands’ (Durie 1985:51)

      Hasan 3-Caus-hold hand Ibrahim at Fatimah  
      ‘Hasan made Fatimah hold Ibrahim’s hands.’

(57)  
**sipak** ‘to kick’ **peu-sipak** ‘to make someone kick (in teaching how to kick a ball)’

a. Hasan geu-**peu-sipak** aneuk droegeuh bola nyan.  
   Hasan 3-Caus-kick child his/her ball Dem

---

19 My impression is that **sok** + bajee/leuweu/gleueng is an example of incorporated nominals (See Durie 1985:50) which may be the reason why there is no preposition before **aneuk nyan** in (55b). I have no piece of direct evidence for this impression, though.

20 According to my consultant, **peu-sipak** in ditransitive contexts can be used only in this special meaning.
‘Hasan made his son kick the ball (in teaching how to kick).’
b. Hasan geu-{	extit{peu-sipak}} bola nyan bak/le aneuk drogeuh.
   Hasan 3-Caus-kick ball Dem at/by child his/her
   ‘Hasan made the ball kicked by his son (in teaching how to kick).’

Semantically, all the above examples seem to belong to ditransitive (or ‘bi-transitive’) verbs in Givón’s (2001) sense that prototypical ‘bi-transitive’ verbs code events in which a deliberate agent (the subject) causes the movement of the patient (direct object) to or from some location/dative/benefative (indirect object). There are two possible word orders between the Goal/Location and the Theme as in (58), although the particular preposition required by a verb can vary.

\[(58)\]
a. Fatimah geu-{	extit{peu-kalon}} (keu) Hasan rumoh nyan. (W16-p-S, #20)
   F 3-Caus-see (to) H house Dem
   ‘Fatimah showed Hasan the house.’
b. Fatimah geu-{	extit{peu-kalon}} rumoh nyan *(keu) Hasann.
   F 3-Caus-see house Dem to H
   ‘Fatimah showed the house to Hasan.’

Let us compare these ‘derived’ ditransitives with ‘non-derived’ ones. Examples in (59)-(60) show the patterns of {	extit{jōq}} ‘to give,’ {	extit{kirém}} ‘to send,’ and {	extit{suleueng}} ‘to feed.’

\[(59)\] \textbf{Ditransitive pattern (1): } \textit{V (P) Goal Theme}
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Hasan (geu)-jōq (keu) Aisyah boh mamplam. (W09-p-S, #6)
    Hasan 3-give to Aisyah mango
    ‘Hasan gave Aisyah the mango.’
  \item b. Hasan (geu)-kirém (keu) Aisyah hadiah. (W09-p-S, #27)
    Hasan 3-send to Aisyah gift
    ‘Hasan sent Aisyah the gift.’
  \item c. Lôn sulueung (keu) mie lôn eungkôt nyan. (W11-1, #20)
    1SG feed to cat 1SG fish Dem
    ‘I fed my cat the fish.’
\end{itemize}

\[(60)\] \textbf{Ditransitive pattern (2): } \textit{V Obj *(P) Goal}
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Hasan (geu)-jōq boh mamplam *(keu)Aisyah. (W09-p-S, #5)
    Hasan 3-give mango to Aisyah
    ‘Hasan gave the mango to Aisyah.’
  \item b. Hasan (geu)-kirém hadiah *(keu) Aisyah. (W09-p-S, #28)
    Hasan 3-send gift to Aisyah
    ‘Hasan sent the gift to Aisyah.’
  \item c. Lôn sulueung eungkôt nyan *(keu) mie lôn. (W11-1, #20)
    1SG feed fish Dem to cat 1SG
    ‘I fed the fish to my cat.’
\end{itemize}

The ‘derived’ and ‘non-derived’ ditransitives seem to share basic syntactic properties: the two
possible word orders and the behavior of the preposition. In particular, the prepositional goal marker *keu* is optional in both (58a) and (59a,b,c) (when the goal comes right after the verb), while it is obligatory in both (58b) and (60a,b,c) (when the goal is separated from the verb by the object inbetween). Therefore, I assume the two types of ditransitives share the same syntactic structures.

Ditransitives in (58)-(60) will be better analyzed as the following:

(61) Two structures of ditransitives

a. Double object construction:  \[ V \quad \text{Goal} \quad \text{Theme} \]

b. OBJ+PP construction:  \[ V \quad \text{Theme} \quad (\text{keu}) \quad \text{Goal} \]

In (61b), *keu* + Goal NP is a PP, which has relatively free word order in Acehnese. Thus, seemingly optional *keu* in (58a) and (59) is actually not optional at all: without *keu* it is the applicative object, whereas with *keu* it is the PP.

I propose below the structures of OBJ+PP construction (62) and double object construction (63), respectively. In (62) and (63), the only difference between ‘derived’ and ‘non-derived’ double object construction is the presence vs. absence of the overt causative morpheme *peu* in the little Vcaus.

(62) OBJ+NP construction

a. Non-derived

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Hasan} \\
\text{Nom} \\
\text{Voice} \quad \text{geu} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{VCAUS} \\
\emptyset \\
\text{mango} \\
\text{v} \quad \text{give} \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{keu} \quad \text{Aisyah}
\end{array}
\]

\[ \text{Hasan} \text{ geu-}jôq \text{ boh mamp}lam \text{ keu Aisyah.} \]

b. Derived

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Fatimah} \\
\text{Nom} \\
\text{Voice} \quad \text{geu-} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{VCAUS} \\
\text{peu-} \\
\text{house} \\
\text{v} \quad \text{see} \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{keu} \quad \text{Hasan}
\end{array}
\]

\[ \text{Fatimah} \text{ geu-}peu-kalon \text{ rum}oh \text{ nyan keu Hasan.} \]

(63) Double object construction

a. Non-derived

b. Derived

---

21 It seems that the degree of optionality of *keu* varies depending on the ditransitive verb in question. For example, when the verb is ‘to give’ or ‘to send,’ the one with *keu* sounds more natural. By contrast, if the verb is ‘to show,’ then the one without *keu* is better. Our consultant’s intuition is that it is probably because ‘to give’ or ‘to send’ in its basic meaning implies that something is physically transferred to the receiver, while ‘show’ doesn’t imply such a physical transferring, which I interpret as difference in possessive meaning.

22 According to the consultant, ‘*keu* is optional, but the sentence without *keu* sounds more natural’ in the order of V(P) Goal Theme.
Double object construction is analyzed as asymmetric applicatives, especially ‘high’ applicatives in Pylkkänen’s (2002) term (see also Son (2007) for similar analysis of the causatives of ‘put-on’ type verbs in Korean), although this analysis is not quite standard (cf. Marantz 1993, Pesetsky 1995, Beck & Johnson 2004 among others). This asymmetric applicative analysis is supported by the following facts (Legate 2007):

In the double object construction (64a), the applicative object can be raised for passivization. In the PP dative construction (64b), only the Theme can be raised.

(64) a. Aisyah geu-jôq boh mamplam lé Hasan. (W09-p-S, #12)
    Aisyah 3-give mango by Hasan
    ‘Aisyah was given the mango by Hasan.’

    b. Boh mamplam geu-jôq *(keu) Aisyah lé Hasan. (W09-p-S, #11)
       mango 3-give to Aisyah by Hasan
       ‘The mango was given to Aisyah by Hasan.’

(65) shows that PPs but not DPs can precede a DP which precedes Agr-V (Legate 2007).

(65) a. PP DP Agr-V (Legate 2007:(3))
    Dari blang lôn ka lôn-gisa.
    from field 1Sg Perf 1-return
    ‘From the field, I retruned.’

    b. *DP DP Agr-V (Legate 2007:(1))
       *Ibrahim dokto ka geu-peu-ubat.
       Ibrahim doctor Perf 3-Caus-medicine
       ‘The doctor treated Ibrahim.’

Likewise, the examples in (66) show that only the PP with keu in Obj+PP construction can be moved:
keu-Aisyah in (66) behaves as a PP.

(66) a. *(Keu) Aisyah, Hasan geu-jôq boh mamplam. (W09-p-S, #7)
            to Aisyah Hasan 3-give mango

‘To Aisyah, Hasan gave the mango.’

   mango, Hasan 3-give to Aisyah
   ‘The mango, Hasan gave to Aisyah.’

A possible explanation would be that there is only one topic position in a CP and this is already occupied by the pre-verbal subject (especially when the verb is marked with the agreement marker, which indicates that the subject is extracted from its original position, cf. Doubly-filled Voice Filter in Object Voice Construction, Legate 2008), which thus blocks the additional topicalization of the object DP. In contrast, a PP like keu Aisyah can adjoin the CP, without causing any problem.

Also, there is animacy restriction: Amerika in (67c), which is an inanimate location, cannot be the subject of a HAVE relation which is expected between the Goal and the Theme (Beck and Johnson 2004).

(67) Animacy restriction on the Goal of double object construction. (cf. Legate 2007:(41))
   a. Lôn kirém si ôn surat *(u) Amerika.\(^{23}\) (W11-1, #22)
      15g send one-CL letter to A
   b. Lôn kirém *(u) Amerika si ôn surat.
      ‘I sent a letter to America.’
   c. *Lôn kirém Amerika si ôn surat.
      ‘*I sent America a letter.’ (Possible if America is a person.\(^{24}\))

Note that the preposition "to" in (67b) is not optional but obligatory, which indicates that (67b) is just a word order variation of the NP+PP construction (95a).

4. Periphrastic Causatives

In this section, I will describe the basic pattern of another type of causative construction in Acehnese, the periphrastic causative construction, and compare it with the morphological causative construction. We will see that this ‘productive’ periphrastic causative construction emerges as a default causative construction where the morphological causative construction is not available for any structural reasons.

4.1. The basic pattern

The causative auxiliary verb peu-gèt, which itself is a derived causative form of gèt ‘okay, fine’, is used to make periphrastic causative constructions. (68c) below is of this type, while (68b) is a morphological derivative from a lexical transitive verb (68a) by the prefixation of peu-.

---
\(^{23}\) Note that "to" is used in place of keu ‘to’.
\(^{24}\) In this case, the preposition should be keu, not u.

Lôn kirém (keu) Amerika si-ôn surat.
15g send to A one-CL letter
‘I sent a letter to America.’ (‘Amerika’ = a name of a person)
(68)  a. Hasan geu-**kalon** rumoh nyan.  
    H 3-see house that  
   ‘Hasan saw the house.’

   b. Fatimah geu-**peu-kalon** Hasan rumoh nyan.  
    F 3-Caus-see H house that  
   ‘Fatimah showed Hasan the house.’

   c. Fatimah geu-**peu-gèt** Hasan geu-**kalon** rumoh nyan.  
    F 3-Caus-okay H 3-see house that  
   ‘Fatimah made Hasan see the house.’

(69) shows examples in which *gèt* itself is used to mean ‘fine; okay.’

(69)  a. Lôn (*lôn)~**gèt-gèt** mantong uroe nyoe.  
     (080514)  
   ‘I’m just fine today.’ (*mantong*, which literally means ‘still’, means ‘just’ here.)
   cf. ??Lôn **gèt** mantong uroe nyoe.

   b. Jih aneuk yang **gèt** that akai.  
     (080514)  
   3 child Rel good very mind/personality  
   ‘He is a very good child.’ (lit. ‘He is a child such that the personality is very good.’)

Note that *peu-gèt* can be used in non-periphrastic context as a morphological causative verb either with a (nearly) compositional causative meaning ‘to make something fine/okay’ (70) (cf. Asyik 1987:91, ‘to make look good’) or with a non-compositional meaning ‘to creat’ (71).

(70)  Lôn **peu-gèt** teuma glah nyan.  
     (W12-p-S, #20)  
     1Sg Caus-okay back glass Dem  
   ‘I fixed the glass.’

(71)  a. Cek lôn geu-**peu-gèt** laying keu lôn  
     uncle 1Sg 3-Caus-okay kite to 1Sg  
   ‘My uncle made me a kite

   b. Po geu-**peu-gèt** alam nyoe .  
     (05/13/2008 #1)  
     god 3-Caus-okay universe Dem  
   ‘God created this universe.’

Ditransitive verbs in (72) seem to be causativized only by periphrastic causatives as in (73), which is quite common in natural languages where a verb with more than three arguments is quite rare (cf. Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000), if we regard causativization as a valency-increasing process. (74) shows that the prefixation of *peu-* to a ditransitive verb is blocked.

(72)  Ditransitive verb: jôq ‘to give’
    a. Hasan (geu)-**jôq** (keu) Aisyah boh mamplam.  
       H (3)-give (to) A mango  
   ‘Hasan gave Aisyah the mango.’

    b. Hasan (geu)-**jôq** boh mamplam *(keu)Aisyah.  
       H (3)-give mango *(to) A  

29
‘Hasan gave the mango to Aisyah.’

(73) Periphrastic causative constructions for a ditransitive verb (W10-p-S, #20)
a. Ibrahim geu-**peu-gèt** Hasan geu-**jòq** (keu) Fatimah boh mamplam.
   Ib 3-Caus-fine  H 3-give  (to)  F  mango
b. Ibrahim geu-**peu-gèt** Hasan geu-**jòq** boh mamplam *(keu) Fatimah.
   Ib 3-Caus-fine  H 3-give  mango *(to)  F
‘Ibrahim made Hasan give Fatimah a mango.’

(74) Blocking of derivation of a morphological causative from a ditransitive verb (W16-p-S, #29)
*Ibrahim (geu)-**peu-jòq** Hasan boh mamplam keu Fatimah.
Ib 3-Caus-give  H  mango  to  F
‘Ibrahim made Hasan give Fatimah a mango.’

Recall that there is another blocking effect: derived transitive causative verbs by affixation of *peu-* can be causativized only by periphrastic causative construction. In other words, *peu-* (a double *peu* is not allowed. Thus, the morphological causativization for the derived transitive verb *peu-beukah* ‘to break’ (75b) is impossible (*peu-*beukah) as illustrated in (75c), while the periphrastic one in (75d) is possible.

(75) **Blocking of *peu-*:**  **beukah** ‘torn, broken’ → *peu-beukah* ‘to break (tr.)’ -/> *peu-*beukah

a. Glah nyan  **beukah**/bicah.  T <beukah 'torn, broken'> (W12-p-S, #17)
   glass Dem  broken
   ‘The glass is broken.’

b. Lôn  **peu-beukah**  glah nyan.  (W12-p-S, #18)
   1Sg  Caus-broken  glass Dem
   ‘I broke the glass.’

c. *Hasan  geu-**peu-peu-beukah**  keu lôn  glah nyan.  (W16-p-S, #30)
   H  3-Caus-Caus-broken  to 1Sg  glass Dem
   ‘Hasan made me break the glass.’

d. Hasan  geu-**peu-gèt** lôn  **peu-beukah**  glah nyan.  (W16-p-S, #30)
   H  3-make  1Sg  Caus-broken  glass Dem
   ‘Hasan made me break the glass.’

In general, it seems that recursive prefixation of *peu-* is blocked; there seems to be no case with *peu-*peu-.

(76) a. **peu-ubat**  ‘to treat; to apply medicine to (someone)’
   *peu-*ubat  ‘to make (a doctor) treat (someone)’ (W16-p-S, #32)
b. **peu-khém**  ‘to laugh’
   *peu-khém  ‘to laugh at’
   *peu-*khém  ‘to make (someone) laugh at’ (W16-p-S, #34)
Causative Alternation and Voice Morphology in Acehnese  Seongyeon Ko

March, 2009

The two blocking effects seem to be independent, though they overlap in, e.g., pajoh ‘to eat’ → peu-pajoh ‘to feed’ → peu-peu-pajoh ‘to cause to feed’.

‘Recursive causative formation’ is realized in different ways across languages. According to Yeon 2004, following Wachowicz 1976 who cites from Kholodovich 1969), there are three types of languages: Type I allows the sequence of two identical causative morphemes as in Quechua (hua-nu ‘die’, hua-nu-chi ‘kill’, hua-nu-chi-‘ make kill’) and Kashmiri (also cf. Tagalog and Malagacy in Travis 2000); Type II uses a different causative morpheme in a secondary causative derivation as in Turkish (öl- ‘die’, öl-dür ‘kill’, öl-dür-t ‘make kill’) (also cf. Japanese in Harley 2006); Type III exploits a combination of morphological causative plus analytic causative. For example, Korean does not allow a causative morpheme, e.g., –i-, to be used twice on a verb: cwuk- ‘die’, cwuk-i- ‘kill’, *cwuk-i-i- ‘make kill’ (instead, cwuk-i-ke ha- (MC+PC) is used.) By contrast, there is no such limitation on iterativity in periphrastic causatives in general (Dixon 2000:59).

It seems that, like Korean, Acehnese belongs to Type III. It is interesting that morphological causatives are not productive in both Korean and Acehnese. There might be some correlation between the availability of periphrastic causatives and the (non-)productivity of morphological causatives.

4.2. Differences between morphological vs. periphrastic causatives

4.2.1. Semantic difference: ‘contact’ versus ‘distant’ causation

Let us first consider a semantic difference between morphological causatives and periphrastic causatives: the distinction between contact (direct) and distant (indirect) causation which depends on the conceptual distance between cause and effect (Yeon 2004:83-87). ‘Stronger influence by the causer, less independence on the part of the cause, and a greater amount of manipulation’ are the characteristics of contact (direct) causation.

The semantic distinction is reflected ‘iconically’ in many languages (see Yeon 2004:83-87 and references therein for examples in languages like Cebuano, Hindi, Nivkh (or Gilyak), Newari, Saksena, and Korean): recall the iconic and semantic difference, for example, kill and cause to die, and redden and cause to become red in English. In particular, contact causation is expressed by morphological causatives, whereas distant causation is expressed by periphrastic causation, when these two types are both available in a language (Haiman 1993).

Acehnese, like Korean (Yeon 2004:85-87), seems to be exactly of this type: the distinction between morphological vs. periphrastic causatives in Acehnese corresponds to the semantic difference between contact vs. distant causatives.

(77) a. morphological causative: contact causation

Fatimah geu-peu-kalon Hasan rumoh nyan.
F  3-Caus-see  H   house that
‘Fatimah showed Hasan the house.’

b. periphrastic causative: distant causation

Fatimah geu-peu-get Hasan geu-kalon rumoh nyan.
F  3-Caus-okay  H   3-see  house that
‘Fatimah made Hasan see the house.’

My consultant intuitively explains the difference in meaning between (77a) and (77b) that (77a)
means ‘Hasan forced Fatimah to eat the mango against her will’ (which implies Fatimah is a volitional agent in this case), whereas (77b) means ‘Hasan favorably put the mango into her mouth so that she could eat it’ (which implies Fatimah in this case is a location or a benefactive rather an Agent).

Now we turn to various syntactic differences between the two types of causatives: the crucial difference between the morphological causative (MC, hereafter) and the periphrastic causative (PC, hereafter) is that the former is monoclusal, while the latter is biclasual.

(78) a. Morphological causative (MC): monoclusal
   b. Periphrastic causative (PC): biclasual

4.2.2. Aspect/tense
The monoclusal vs. biclasual property can be confirmed by aspectual particles or temporal adverbs. In periphrastic causatives (79), both the causing and caused act/event can be specified with a perfect/perfective aspect particle.

(79) a. Fatimah ka (lheueh) geu-peu-gèt Hasan geu-kalon rumoh nyan. (W16-p-S, #23i)
   F  Perf  3-Caus-okay H  3-see house Dem
   ‘Fatimah has already made Hasan see the house.’
   b. Fatimah geu-peu-gèt Hasan ka (lheueh) geu-kalon rumoh nyan. (W16-p-S, #24i)
   F  3-Caus-okay H  Perf  3-see house Dem
   ‘Fatimah made Hasan have already seen the house.’

However, in morphological causatives, only the causing act/event can be marked with aspect particles.

(80) Intended meaning: ‘Fatimah has already showed Hasan the house.’
   a. Fatimah ka (lheueh) geu-peu-kalon Hasan rumoh nyan. (W16-p-S, #23ii)
      F  Perf  3-Caus-see H  house Dem
   b. *Fatimah geu-peu-kalon ka (lheueh) Hasan rumoh nyan. (W16-p-S, #23ii)
      F  3-Caus-see Perf  H  house Dem
   c. *Fatimah geu-peu-ka (lheueh)-kalon Hasan rumoh nyan. (W16-p-S, #23iii)
      F  3-Caus-Perf-see H  house Dem

I tested the biclasuality of PC using a temporal difference between the causing and the caused act/event. The perfect aspect particle ka and the temporal adverb singoh ‘tomorrow’ seem to conflict to each other in both MC (81a) and PC (82a), making the entire sentence ungrammatical (or unnatural). However, a PC sentence can be saved by putting a future-oriented25 deontic modality particle beu as in (82b), whereas a MC sentence cannot as in (81b).

(81) Morphological causatives:
    Intended meaning: ‘Fatimah showed Hasan the house tomorrow.’
   a. *Fatimah ka geu-peu-kalon Hasan rumoh nyan singoh. (W16-p-S, #27)
      F  Perf  3-Caus-see H  house Dem tomorrow

25 Beu means ‘must; should’ and is used only for something which hasn’t happened yet.
b. *Fatimah ka geu-peu-beu-kalon Hasan rumoh nyan singoh.  (W16-p-S, #27)
   F Perf 3-Caus-should-see H house Dem tomorrow

(82) Periphrastic causatives:
    Intended meaning: ‘Fatimah made Hasan see the house tomorrow.’
   a. ?Fatimah ka geu-peu-gèt Hasan geu-kalon rumoh nyan singoh.  (W16-p-S, #28i)
      F Perf 3-Caus-okay H 3-see house Dem tomorrow
   b. Fatimah ka geu-peu-gèt Hasan beu geu-kalon rumoh nyan singoh.  (W16-p-S, #28ii)
      F Perf 3-Caus-okay H should 3-see house Dem tomorrow

4.2.3. Negation

_Hana_ is the most general negative particle which is used as a sentential negation. I assume that _hana_ is a functional head which heads NegP.

A PC sentence can be negated by _hana_ in two different ways (84b & 85b) whereas an MC sentence can be negated by _hana_ only in one way (84a but not 85a), which implies again that a PC is biclausal but an MC is monoclausal.

(83) Affirmative  (W15-p-S, #1)
   a. Lôn lôn-peu-moe aneuq agam nyan.
      1Sg 1-Caus-cry child male Dem
   b. Lôn lôn-peu-gèt aneuq agam nyan di/ji-moe.
      1Sg 1-Caus-okay child male Dem 3-cry

‘I made the boy cry.’

(84) Negation of causing act/event  (W15-p-S, #2)
   a. Lôn _hana_ lôn-peu-moe aneuq agam nyan.
      1Sg Neg 1-Caus-cry child male Dem
   b. Lôn _hana_ lôn-peu-gèt aneuq agam nyan di/ji-moe.
      1Sg Neg 1-Caus-okay child male Dem 3-cry

‘I didn’t make the boy cry.’

(85) Negative causation: cause someone _not_ to do something  (W15-p-S, #3)
      1Sg 1-Caus-Neg-cry child male Dem
   b. Lôn lôn-peu-gèt aneuq agam nyan _hana_ di/ji-moe.
      1Sg 1-Caus-okay child male Dem Neg 3-cry

‘I made the boy not cry.’

4.2.4. Agent-oriented adverbials

With the so-called agent-oriented adverbials such as _meu teugoh teugoh_ ‘cautiously, carefully,’ and _ngon saba_ ‘patiently,’ MC has only one reading, whereas PC has two possible readings: for example, Hasan is the only one who is patient in (86a), while both Hasan and Fatimah can be patient in (86b).

(86)  a. Only one reading in MC:
Fatimah geu-peu-kalon Hasan rumoh nyan ngon saba.
F 3-Caus-see H house Dem with patience
(i) ‘Fatimah, with patience, made Hasan see the house.’
(ii) cannot mean ‘Hasan saw the house patiently and Fatimah caused it.’

b. Two readings in PC:
Fatimah geu-peu-get Hasan geu-kalon rumoh nyan ngon saba.
F 3-Caus-okay H 3-see house Dem with patience
(i) ‘Fatimah, with patience, made Hasan see the house.’
(ii) ‘Hasan saw the house patiently and Fatimah caused it.’

4.2.5. Passivization
In periphrastic causatives, passivization of the embedded event is possible: (87b) below is a passive counterpart of a periphrastic causative (PM) sentence (87a) where only the lower verb is passivized.

(87) Passivization of the ‘inner’ verb in a periphrastic causative sentence
a. Fatimah geu-peu-gêt Hasan geu-kalon rumoh nyan. (W13-p-S, #11)
   F 3-Caus-okay H 3-Caus-see house Dem
   ‘Fatimah made Hasan see the house.’

b. Fatimah geu-peu-gêt rumoh nyan geu-kalon lé Hasan. (W13-p-S, #12)
   F 3-Caus-okay house Dem 3-see by H
   ‘Fatimah made the house seen by Hasan.’
   cannot mean ‘Fatimah was made to see the house by Hasan’

As is expected, the passivization of the whole matrix clause is also possible. The possibility of two types of passivization in periphrastic causatives indicates that the periphrastic causative is biclausal.

(88) Passivization of the ‘outer’ verb in a periphrastic causative sentence
a. Hasan geu-peu-gêt teu-kalon rumoh nyan lé Fatimah. (080513, #10)
   ‘Hasan was made to see the house by Fatimah.’

   ‘Hasan was made to see the house by Fatimah.’

Note that when the subject of the embedded clause is extracted to the subject position of the matrix clause by passivization, the embedded verb should be marked with the anticausative morpheme teu-(88b) (see section 5 for teu-) instead of the thematic subject agreement marker (88a). Interesting as it is, I will leave this unanalyzed here.

In contrast, there is only ‘matrix’ passivization available in morphological causatives: (89a) and (89b). (89c) which is intended to have similar structure to (87b) is not synonymous any more: the causer-seer relation is dramatically changed.

(89) Passivization of a morphological causative sentence
a. Fatimah geu-peu-kalon Hasan rumoh nyan. (W13-p-S, #9)
   F 3-Caus-see H house Dem
   ‘Fatimah showed Hasan the house.’

b. Hasan geu-peu-kalon rumoh nyan lé Fatimah.
This impossibility of ‘inner’ passivization strongly implies that morphological causative sentences are monoclausal.

4.2.6. Case marking

MC (90b) can have only one geu-, whereas PC (90c) can have two geu-s: this indicates the number of Agents in MC and PC, respectively. (Recall the analysis of geu- in Legate 2008 introduced in section 2.)

Note also that the overt realization of both the external argument Hasan and the agreement marker geu- in the PC (90c) indicates that the embedded structure is bigger than VoiceP (cf. Obj Voice and Doubly-filled Voice Filter in Legate 2008).

The two causative constructions in (90) above also differ from each other with respect to case marking of causee. While the causee Hasan can be optionally marked with dative case (keu ‘to’) in MC (90b), it must be zero-marked in PC (90c). There is no overt nominative marker, but a zero-marked DP in preverbal position can usually be interpreted as subject, although this is controversial (cf. Lawler 1977, Durie 1988, and Legate 2007, 2008).

4.3. Structure of periphrastic causatives

Periphrastic causatives involve a special verb ROOT item gèt ‘okay’ which takes a TP as its complement within the general structure of peu- proposed in section 3.2. This TP complement is the key to understand the biclausal property of periphrastic causatives. The relevant structure is illustrated by the following example:

(91) Structure of periphrastic causatives
Fatimah geu-**peu-get** Hasan kalon rumoh nyan.

‘Fatimah made Hasan see the house.’
5. Anticausatives

As mentioned before (footnote 3), I use the term *anticausative* in this paper as defined rather broadly in Alexiadou (2006): ‘change of state without an external argument.’

There are two types of anticausatives crosslinguistically (Alexiadou et al. 2006, Schäfer 2007): *unmarked anticausatives* as in English (92) and *marked anticausatives* with special morphology (e.g., a reflexive) as in Italian (93): all languages seem to have the first type that we call *unaccusatives*.

Two types of anticausatives crosslinguistically (Alexiadou et al. 2006, Schäfer 2007):

(92) Unmarked anticausative: English
a. John broke the window.
b. The window broke.

(93) Marked anticausative: Italian (Schäfer 2007:11)
a. Gianni ha rotto la finestra
   ‘John has broken the window.’
b. La finestra si è rotta
   ‘The window REFL is broken.’

The special morphology of marked anticausatives is Voice morphology, which explains the striking resemblance between passives and marked anticausatives in many languages (Schäfer 2007).

5.1. A typology of Voice (Schäfer 2007)

Schäfer (2007) investigates possible typological variations associated with Voice and proposes four types of Voice. The first two types are typical active and passive Voice. Both types of Voice head have a thematic feature [agent], thus called ‘thematic’ active and passive respectively, but only the active Voice is assumed to project a specifier and have a categorical D-feature to be checked by a DP (external argument) in Spec, VoiceP. These two Voice heads are illustrated in (94).

(94) Active vs. Passive Voice (Schäfer 2007:218)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a. thematic active Voice} \\
\text{b. thematic passive Voice}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{VoiceP}
\]

\[
\text{DP Voice'}
\]

\[
\text{Voice[agent,D]}...
\]

\[
\text{With those two features on Voice, [agent] and [D], there are two more possible feature combinations that result in two types of anticausative Voices like the following.}
\]

(95) Anticausative Voices (Schäfer 2007:218)
a. non-thematic active Voice  
\[ \text{VoiceP} \]
\[ \text{DP} \quad \text{Voice'} \]
\[ \text{Voice}_{(j,d)} \quad ... \]

b. non-thematic passive Voice  
\[ \text{VoiceP} \]
\[ \text{Voice}_{(j)} \quad ... \]

Both lack the thematic feature, thus non-thematic Voice, but are realized with special morphology associated with VoiceP. An instantiation of the type (95a) is German ‘sich’ and of the type (95b) is Non-active in Greek and Albanian.

If Voice is totally absent, we get those unmarked anticausatives. Thus, we have five possible structures with or without different Voice types as in (96).

(96)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation:</th>
<th>Syntax:</th>
<th>Spell-out:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active:</td>
<td>[Agent [Voice^{D,agent} [v [Root]]]]</td>
<td>(active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive:</td>
<td>[Voice^{agent} [v [Root]]]</td>
<td>(non-active)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anticausative-I</td>
<td>[Expl. [Voice^{D,(j)} [v [Root]]]]</td>
<td>(sich)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anticausative-II</td>
<td>[Voice^{j} [v [Root]]]</td>
<td>(non-active, clitic-si)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anticausative-III</td>
<td>[v [Root]]</td>
<td>(unmarked)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Schäfer 2007:217-220)

Acehnese has both types of anticausatives: unmarked one like *ngop* in (97a) and marked one like *teu-peu-ngop* in (97b). Following Schäfer (2007), I analyze (i) Acehnese unmarked anticausatives as anticausative-III without any Voice projection and (ii) Acehnese marked anticausatives as anticausative-II in which *teu-* is an overt realization of the functional head of expletive VoiceP.

(97) Unmarked and marked anticausatives in Acehnese  

a. Peurahô nyan *ngop*.  
boat Dem sink  
‘The boat sank.’

b. Peurahô nyan *teu-peu-ngop*  
boat Dem Acaus-Caus-sink  
‘The boat has been sunk.’

c. Hasan geu-*peu-ngop* peurahô nyan  
H 3-Caus-sink boat Dem  
‘Hasan sank the boat.’

d. Peurahô nyan geu-*peu-ngop* lé Hasan  
boat Dem 3-Caus-sink by H  
‘The boat was sunk by Hasan.’

In (98) above, there are four different constructions with an identical verbal root *ngop* ‘to sink’:  
(a) unmarked anticausative, (b) marked anticausative, (c) causative, and (d) passive. The structural comparison with causatives/passives will help us understand the nature of two types of Acehnese anticausatives.
Although our main concern in this section is the marked anticausative, I will also pay considerable attention to unmarked anticausatives and passives. Provided the two types of anticausatives are structurally different (anticausative-II and –III), we predict that they behave syntactically differently, still maintaining the overall difference between anticausatives and passives. I show that marked anticausatives behave differently from unmarked anticausatives as well as from passives in several respects, eventually revealing the presence of Caus component and the lack of Agentiveness in marked anticausatives. Thus, it will provide further empirical evidence of splitting VoiceP and vP in anticausative structure (Alexiadou et al. 2006) and in general (Harley 2007).

5.2. Anticausative prefix: teu-

In Acehnese, the prefix teu- is used to derive a marked anticausative:

(98) a. Hasan geu-buka pintô nyan. (W12-p-S, #5)
   H 3-open door Dem
   ‘Hasan opened the door.’

b. Pintô nyan teu-buka. (W12-p-S, #1)
   door Dem Acaus-open
   ‘The door opened.’

The teu-V form means usually the state or the result of the patient/experiencer affected by the event (preceding state and resulting state, Durie 1985:72): it means something like ‘having become ... or got into a situation ... without an active cause or without emphasizing a possible active cause’ (Cowan 1981:532).

Durie (1985) differentiates four different types of non-controlled meanings that can be expressed with teu- (marked anticausatives).

(99) Four different types of non-controlled meanings of teu- (Durie 1985:532)

a. accidental actions (actual event): there is an initiating participant who corresponds to an Agent, but the result of this participant’s initiative is not fully what was intended.

b. involuntary events or states (actual event or state): there is a suspension or a complete absence of the normal control exercised by the Agent – the participant corresponding to the Agent is not in full control or has no control at all.

c. states of ability (preceding state): a state of ability is described, not an actual event or state and no reference is made to an Agent.

d. resultant states (resulting state): a state resulting from an event is described and no reference is made to an Agent.

The first two types of meanings will be explained later. The third and fourth types of meanings are found in the following example:

(100) Pintô nyan teu-buka ngôn gunci nyoe. (080515, #39)
   i. ‘That door was opened with this key.’ (resultant state)
   (e.g., if the door is open now)
   ii. ‘That door can be opened with this key.’ (state of ability)
Unmarked anticausatives also can mean either ‘ability’ or ‘result.’

(101) Peuraho nyan ngop ngőn bom nyan. (080515, #38)
   i. ‘The boat sank with the bomb.’
   ii. ‘The boat can be sunk with the bomb.’
   iii. cf. ‘The boat sank together with the bomb.’

Although Asyik (1987) describes this usage of teu- as ‘mostly used in negatives and questions’ (p.113), (101) and (102) shows this ‘able’ meaning can easily be found in declaratives. How anticausatives obtain the meaning of states of ability is beyond the scope of this paper that will be left for future research.

Here are other examples of marked anticausatives derived from kap ‘to bite’, poh ‘to beat’, and bōh ‘to fly; throw away’, all of which are simple transitive verbs.

(102) a. Hasan teu-kap. (W13-p-S, #16)
    H Acaus-bite
    ‘Hasan has been bitten.’ ‘Hasan is in the state of having been bitten.’

   b. Hasan teu-poh. (W13-p-S, #18)
    H Acaus-beat
    ‘Hasan has been beaten.’ ‘Hasan is in the state of having been beaten.’

   c. Hasan teu-bōh. (W13-p-S, #19)
    H Acaus-throw.away
    ‘Hasan has been thrown away.’ ‘Hasan is in the state of having been thrown away.’

5.3. Differences between anticausatives and passives

Several important observations have been made on the difference between anticausatives and passives (Bhatt & Embick 2004 (need permission), Alexiadou et al. 2006).

First of all, anticausatives require only one Theme/Undergoer argument: buka ‘to open’ in the passive (103a) requires two arguments, the Agent Hasan and the Theme the door, while its anticausative counterpart in (104b) needs just one, the Theme the door. Passives retain the Agent argument whether it is explicit or implicit.

(103) a. Pintō nyan geu-buka (lé Hasan). \( ^\text{\check{\text{passive}}} \) (W15-p-S)
    door Dem 3-open (by H) and (W16-p-S, #1)
    ‘The door is/was opened by Hasan.’

   b. Pintō nyan teu-buka (*lé Hasan). \( ^\text{\check{\text{anticausative}}} \) (W15-p-S)
    door Dem Acaus-open by H
    ‘The door has been opened.’

Secondly, in anticausatives, there is no marker of (or implication of the existence of) the underlying agent. Unlike passive constructions, anticausative constructions do not usually introduce the agent of the event. Generally speaking, by-phrases or agent-oriented adverbs are found in passives, but not in anticausatives. Thirdly, by itself can be found in anticausatives, but not in passives.
Basically, all these observations made on the difference between passives and anticausatives crosslinguistically seem to hold in Acehnese. However, recall that Acehnese has two types of anticausatives with different structures assumed. I compare the two types of anticausatives with passives below to show the agenthood/agentlessness and structural complexity/simplicity of each construction.

5.3.1. lé DP phrase
In Acehnese, no lé DP phrase (agent of the verb) is introduced in an anticausative construction (104b,c), whereas its existence is preferred in a passive construction (104a).

\[ lé \text{ DP phrase: } \text{found in passives}\text{, but not in anticausatives} \]

(104) a. Peuraho nyan **geu-peu-ngop** lé Hasán. \(\checkmark\) passive \(080513, \#11\)
   boat Dem 3-Caus-sink by H
   ‘The boat was sunk by Hasán.’

   b. Peuraho nyan **ngop** (*lé Hasán.*) \(^*\)unmarked anticausative
   boat Dem sink by H
   ‘The boat sank.’

   c. Peuraho nyan **teu-peu-ngop** (*lé Hasán.*) \(^5\)marked anticausative
   boat Dem Acaus-Caus-sink by H
   ‘The boat was sunk by Hasán (unintentionally/non-volitionally).’

\[ \checkmark: \text{grammatical, } *: \text{ungrammatical, } ^5: \text{acceptable in a special meaning/condition} \]

The marked anticausative in (104c) is interesting because it allows lé DP. However, it has a special meaning that the action was performed in an accidental/unintentional manner or the doer Hasán was non-volitional: possible situations are when Hasán did it by accident or when the speaker does not want to blame or specify Hasán as the person responsible for the result of the action. These meanings are already introduced in (99) as accidental actions and involuntary events or states (Durie 1985), and will be investigated in more detail in §5.4. Without any special meaning, lé DP is usually not preferred in anticausatives.

This might tell us that both unmarked and marked anticausatives lack Agent, but marked anticausatives have more projection than unmarked causatives which licenses unintentional or non-volitional actor.

5.3.2. Agent-oriented adverbs
Anticausatives, in contrast to passives, cannot be modified by agent-oriented adverbs such as singaja ‘on purpose’.

Anticausatives cannot be modified by **agent-oriented adverbs**

\[ ^{26} \text{Although lé DP phrase is optional in principle, it seems to be strongly required in some cases that may be ambiguous without it: e.g., if both agent and theme are human that can be cross-referenced by the same geu-, a sentence like ‘Fatimah geu-peu-ubat’ may sound like an incomplete ‘active’ (Fatimah treated (someone)), not like a ‘passive’ with the by-phrase omitted (Fatimah was treated). Refer to Lawler (1977:224, fn.11) who mentions that ordinarily the lé-phrase cannot be deleted unlike an English by-phrase, although Lawler’s observation does not seem to hold: Asyik (1987:225-6) who is Acehnese native speaker writes, “This agent phrase is often omitted in context, or if the agent is unknown or not important.” Also see Durie (1988:108 fn.8). \]
(105) *singaja* ‘on purpose’

a. Pintô nyan *singaja* geu-buka lé Hasan. \(\checkmark\) passive (W16-p-S, #4)
   door Dem on.purpose 3-open by H
   ‘The door was opened on purpose.’

b. *Pintô nyan singaja* teu-buka. \(\ast\) anticausative (W16-p-S, #5)
   door Dem on.purpose Acaus-open
   ‘The door opened on purpose.’

(106) also shows that anticausatives cannot be modified by agent-oriented adverbs like *singaja* ‘on purpose’.

(106) a. Peurahô nyan *singaja* geu-peu-ngop (lé Hasan.) \(\checkmark\) passive (080513, #12)
   boat Dem on.purpose 3-Caus-sink (by H)
   ‘The boat was sunk on purpose (by Hasan).’

b. *Peurahô nyan singaja* ngop. \(\ast\) unmarked anticausative
   boat Dem on.purpose sink
   ‘The boat sank on purpose.’

c. Peurahô nyan *singaja* teu-peu-ngop. \(\ast\) marked anticausative
   boat Dem on.purpose Acaus-Caus-sink
   ‘The boat sank on purpose.’

Unlike unmarked anticausatives, marked anticausatives can be modified by *singaja* ‘on purpose’ as in (106c). Again, this requires a special meaning: (106c) is okay when it is ‘our intention’ or ‘collective will’, not a specific individual’s.

Although marked anticausatives can be modified by *by-phrase* (105c) or *on purpose* (107c) with special meanings, the combination of these two is not allowed.

(107) a. Peurahô nyan *singaja* geu-peu-ngop lé Hasan. \(\checkmark\) passive (080514, #25)
   boat Dem on.purpose 3-Caus-sink by H
   ‘The boat was sunk by Hasan on purpose.’

b. *Peurahô nyan singaja* teu-peu-ngop lé Hasan. \(\ast\) anticausative
   boat Dem on.purpose Acaus-Caus-sink by H
   ‘The door opened slowly / cautiously.’

Unlike pure manner adverbs which can modify both, agent-oriented manner adverbs cannot modify anticausatives.

*(pure) manner adverb vs. agent-oriented manner adverb*

(108) a. Pintô nyan geu-buka \{bacut bacut / meu teugoh teugoh\} (lé Hasan.) passive
   door Dem 3-open slowly / cautiously
   ‘The door is/was opened (by Hasan) slowly / cautiously.’

b. Pintô nyan teu-buka \{bacut bacut / *meu teugoh teugoh\} anticausative
   door Dem Acaus-open slowly / *cautiously
   ‘The door opened slowly / *cautiously.’
(109) a. Hasan *geu-duuck* keu droe di ateuh rangkang *(seungap-seungap/meu-teugoh-teugoh).*
    H 3-sit alone on top of bench quietly/carefully
    ‘Hasan sat alone on a bench quietly/carefully.’
  b. Hasan *teu-duuck* keu droe di ateuh rangkang *(seungap-seungap/*meu-teugoh-teugoh).*
    H Acaus-sit alone on top of bench quietly/carefully
    ‘Hasan was in the state of sitting alone on a bench quietly/*carefully.’

(110) a. Hasan *geu-dong* keu droe di minyup rumoh *(seungap-seungap/meu-teugoh-teugoh).*
    H 3-stand alone under house quietly/carefully
    ‘Hasan stood alone under a house quietly/carefully.’
  b. Hasan *teu-dong* keu droe di minyup rumoh *(seungap-seungap/*meu-teugoh-teugoh).*
    H Acaus-stand alone under house quietly/carefully
    ‘Hasan was in the state of standing alone under a house quietly/*carefully.’

Marked and unmarked anticausatives behave the same in this respect.

(111) a. Peurahô nyan *geu-peu-ngop* *(bacut-bacut / meu-teugoh-teugoh)* *(lé Hasan.)* passive
    boat Dem 3-Caus-sink slowly / cautiously by H
    ‘The boat was sunk slowly / cautiously (by Hasan).’
  b. Peurahô nyan *ngop* *(bacut-bacut / *meu-teugoh-teugoh.)* unmarked anticausative
    boat Dem sink slowly / cautiously
    ‘The boat sank slowly / *cautiously.’
  c. Peurahô nyan *teu-peu-ngop* *(bacut-bacut / *meu-teugoh-teugoh.)* marked anticausative
    boat Dem Acaus-Caus-sink slowly / cautiously
    ‘The boat sank slowly / *cautiously.’ (080513, #13)

5.3.3. by itself: *keu droe(-jih)*

In general, by itself (unlike agent-oriented adverbs) can modify anticausatives, but not passives. Acehnese *keu droe(-jih) ‘by itself’* can be present in unmarked anticausatives and (only marginally) in marked anticausatives, but cannot appear in passives.

**Anticausatives but not passives can be modified by by itself**

(112) *keu droe(-jih) ‘by itself’* (080513, #14)

a. *Peuraho nyan di/ji-peu-ngop* keu droe(-jih) *passive*
    boat Dem 3-Caus-sink to self(-3Sg)
    ‘The boat was sunk by itself.’
  b. Peuraho nyan *ngop* keu droe(-jih) \(\checkmark\) unmarked anticausative
    boat Dem sink to self(-3Sg)
  c. *’Peuraho nyan teu-peu-ngop* keu droe(-jih) ?? marked anticausative
    boat Dem Acaus-Caus-sink to self(-3Sg)
    ‘The boat sank by itself.’

Although the marked anticausatives with *keu droe(-jih) ‘by itself’* in (112c) is judged marginal, it might be used (if possible) when the speaker is trying to hide the one who caused the sinking of the
boat. (112c) may indicates that in case of marked anticausatives the changing of state is not spontaneous but caused externally.27

5.3.4. so-that construction: supaya
In supaya ‘so that’ constructions, marked anticausatives pattern together with passives, not with unmarked anticausatives.

(113) so-that construction

a. ✓passive
   Mandum peurahô nyan geu-peu-ngop supaya ureueng hana/beq geu-tinggai pulo nyan.
   all boat Det 3-Caus-sink so-that people Neg 3-leave island Dem
   ‘All the boats were sunk so that people cannot leave the island.’

b. *unmarked anticausative
   *Mandum peurahô nyan ngop supaya ureueng hana/beq geu-tinggai pulo nyan.
   all boat Det sink so-that people Neg 3-leave island Dem

c. ✓marked anticausative
   Mandum peurahô nyan teu-peu-ngop supaya ureueng hana/beq geu-tinggai pulo nyan.
   all boat Det AntiC-Caus-sink so-that people Neg 3-leave island Dem
   ‘All the boats have been sunk so that people cannot leave the island.’

The tests and results are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unmarked anticausatives</th>
<th>marked anticausatives</th>
<th>passives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meu teugoh teugoh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘carefully/cautiously’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singaja ‘on purpose’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le DP ‘by’-phrase</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supaya ‘so-that’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keu droe(-jih) ‘by itself’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marked anticausatives pattern together with anticausatives in some cases, and with passives in other cases. Basically, the test with agent-oriented adverbials such as ‘carefully’ and ‘on purpose,’ and by-phrase show that anticausatives are distinguished from passives in terms of ‘agentiveness.’ Other tests such as supaya ‘so-that’ and keu droe(-jih) ‘by itself’ reveal that marked anticausatives have more structure than unmarked anticausatives. We have also seen some special cases where, contrary to the

27 An anticausative might sound better if it has no overt realization of the causative morpheme peu-:

i. Pintô nyan teu-ø-buka (keu droe-jih). (W12-p-SY, #1)
   door Dem Acaus-Caus-øopen by itself
   ‘The door opened (by itself).’

   There might be some correlation between the overtness of causative morpheme and the judgment on the naturalness/grammaticality of keu droe(-jih) in anticausatives.
general tendency, *singaja* ‘on purpose’ and *lé* DP (*by*-phrase) are allowed in marked anticausatives with exceptional meanings.

5.4. Implicit causer in marked anticausatives

In previous section, we saw that an implicit ‘agent’ argument is present in passives, but absent in anticausatives. However, we also saw that there are exceptions to this generalization, in case of marked anticausatives in particular: an unintentional/non-volitional causer (cf. ‘non-volitional cause argument’ in Travis 2000, ‘implicit causer’ in Alexiadou et al. 2006) is possible in marked anticausatives in the form of *lé* DP phrase comparable to *by*-phrase.

*lé* DP phrase is allowed in marked anticausative sentences if the DP is an *inanimate* cause such as wind or film.28

(114) *Inanimate* cause of the event

a. Pintô nyan **teu-buka lé* angen.  
   door Dem Acaus-open by wind  
   ‘The door has been opened by the wind.’  
   (W12-p-S, #3)

b. Pintô nyan **teu-buka* sabap angen.  
   door Dem Acaus-open because of wind  
   ‘The door has been opened because of the wind.’  
   (W12-p-S, #2)

c. Hasan **teu-peu-moe* lé filom nyan.  
   H Acaus-Cau-cry by film Dem  
   ‘Hasan has been made to cry by the movie.’  
   (W14-p-S, #15)

Interestingly, when anticausatives with *teu-* are used to express that the action was made *unintentionally*, there might be no valency-reducing change.

Unintentional act can be expressed with anticausatives without changing the valency

(115) a. Lôn **teu-kap** bibi droe.  
   1Sg Acaus-bite lip self  
   ‘I bit my lip (unintentionally).’  
   (W14-p-S, #1)

b. cf. Lôn **lôn-kap** bibi droe.  
   1Sg 1-bite lip self  
   ‘I bit my lip (intentionally).’  
   (W14-p-S, #2)

This is not due to *inalienable possession*.

(116) a. Lôn **teu-kap** bibi gopnyan.  
   1Sg Acaus-bite lip 3Sg  
   ‘I bit her lip (unintentionally).’  
   (W14-p-S, #5)

b. cf. Lôn **lôn-kap** bibi gopnyan.  
   1Sg 1-bite lip 3Sg  
   ‘I bit her lip (intentionally).’  
   (W14-p-S, #6)

---

28 According to John Whitman (p.c.), this is true in Japanese anticausatives too [examples?].
The unintentional causer in (115) and (116) can also be expressed with *lê* DP as predicted.

(117) a. Bibi lôn **teu-kap** lé lôn. (W16-p-S, #15)
    lip 1Sg Acaus-bite by 1Sg
    ‘My lip has been bitten by me (unintentionally).’

b. Bibi gopnyan **teu-kap** lé lôn. (W16-p-S, #16)
    lip 3Sg Acaus-bite by 1Sg
    ‘Her lip has been bitten by me (unintentionally).’

Anticausative constructions for unintentional action are not limited to the case of 1st person subject, but can be used in a very general fashion.

(118) a. Fatimah teu-kap **bibi** Hasan. (W16-p-S, #17)
    F Acaus-bite lip H
    ‘Fatimah bit Hasan’s lip (unintentionally).’

b. Fatimah teu-poh **Hasan.** (W16-p-S, #18)
    F Acaus-beat H
    ‘Fatimah hit/beated Hasan (unintentionally).’

Thus, we cannot say that passives and anticausatives are distinguished simply by the presence or absence of implicit arguments. Although anticausatives lack an ‘agent’ argument, they still have a ‘cause’ component which licenses inanimate or unintentional/non-volitional ‘causer’ argument. These Acehnese data supports Alexiadou et al. (2006)’s suggestion that agentivity and causation should be syntactically represented by distinct functional heads, namely, VoiceP and vP. See also Pylkkänen 2000 (Japanese and Finnish), Travis 2000 (Malagasy and Tagalog), and Harley (2007, Hiaki) for similar approaches.

5.5. The distribution of **teu**-

The anticausative prefix **teu**- is the key to understand the nature of marked anticausatives which contrast with passives on the one hand and with unmarked anticausatives on the other hand. I assume the three-way contrast among marked/unmarked anticausatives and passives is a reflection of their syntactic structures. Thus, it is important to look at the distribution of the anticausative morpheme **teu**- in order to locate it within a fine structure of verbal projection.

5.5.1. The complementary distribution of **teu**- and **geu**-

First of all, the anticausative prefix **teu**- is restricted in its distribution: unlike the causative prefix **peu**- which can be attached to all kinds of verbs (except for ditransitive verbs), it can be attached only to those verbs which have the potential of having external argument, such as unergative, transitive, and ditransitive verbs, but cannot be attached to unaccusative verbs and non-verbals. This distributional restriction of **teu**- coincides with that of the agent agreement marker **geu**-. Recall that all the agentive verbs are assumed to have VoiceP, under my analysis in (14).

_Unergative intransitives to anticausatives:_

(119) a. Fatimah **geu-peu-moe** Hasan. (W14-p-S, #12)
    Fatimah 3-Caus-cry Hasan
‘Fatimah made Hasan cry.’

b. Hasan ka teu-moe. (W16-p-S, #14ii)
   Hasan Perf Acaus-cry
   ‘Hasan is in the state of crying.’

c. Hasan ka teu-peu-moe. (W16-p-S, #14iii)
   Hasan Perf Acaus-Caus-cry
   cf. (W14-p-S, #14iii)
   ‘Hasan has been made to cry.’

(120) a. Hasan di/ji/geu-khém. (W13-p, #2)
   Hasan 3-laugh
   ‘Hasan laughed.’

b. Fatimah di/ji/geu-peu-khém Hasan. (W13-p, #6)
   Fatimah 3-Caus-laugh Hasan
   ‘Fatimah laughed/sneered at Hasan.’

c. Fatimah geu-peu-get Hasan di/ji/geu-khém. (W13-p, #5)
   F. 3-Caus-okay H. 3-laugh

d. Fatimah geu-peu-get Hasan teu-khém. (W13-p, #5)
   F. 3-Caus-okay H. Acaus-laugh
   ‘Fatimah made Hasan laugh.’

(121) a. Hasan (*singaja) teu-duek keu droe di ateuh rangkang. (E-notes 080515, #9)
   H on.purpose Acaus-sit alone on top of traditional bench
   ‘Hasan was in the state of sitting alone on a bench (*on purpose).’

b. Hasan (singaja) geu-duek keu droe di ateuh rangkang.
   H on.purpose 3-sit alone on top of traditional bench
   ‘Hasan sat on a bench.’

(122) a. Hasan (*singaja) teu-dong keu droe di minyup rumoh.
   H on.purpose Acaus-stand alone under house
   ‘Hasan was in the state of standing alone under a house (*on purpose).’
   cf. Recall that the structure of Acehnese houses makes it possible for someone to stand
   ‘under’ the house.

b. Hasan (singaja) geu-dong keu droe di minyup rumoh.
   H on.purpose Acaus-stand alone under house
   ‘Hasan stood under a house (on purpose).’

Transitive to anticausative

(123) a. Hasan geu-buka pintô nyan. (W12-p-S, #5)
   H 3-open door Dem
   ‘Hasan opened the door.’

b. Pintô nyan teu-buka. (W12-p-S, #1)
   door Dem Acaus-open
   ‘The door has been opened.’

Ditransitive to anticausative
Hasan (3)-give (to) Aisyah mango  
‘Hasan gave Aisyah the mango.’
b. Hasan (geu)-jôq boh mamplam *(keu)Aisyah.  
Hasan (3)-give mango * (to) Aisyah  
‘Hasan gave the mango to Aisyah.’
c. Aisyah teu-jôq boh mamplam.  
Aisyah Acaus-give mango  
‘Aisyah was given the/a mango.’
mango Acaus-give *(to) Aisyah.  
The/a mango has been given to Aisyah.

The following data show that teu- the anticausative prefix cannot be attached to unaccusative verbs, adjectives, and nouns. Note that this distributional restriction is the same as that of the thematic subject agreement marker geu- illustrated in the second example of (126)-(128).

(125) Unattested/impossible cases
a. * teu-UnaccusativeV:  
   * teu-reubah (reubah ‘to fall’)  
b. * teu-Adj:  
   * teu-beuhë (beuhë ‘brave’)  
c. * teu-N:  
   * teu-ubat (ubat ‘medicine’)  

(126) * teu-UnaccusativeV  
‘Hasan tumbled down/fell yesterday.’
a. Hasan (ka) reubah baroe.  
b. * Hasan (ka) geu-reubah baroe.  
c. * Hasan (ka) teu-reubah baroe.  
d. Hasan (ka) reubah-(geuh) baroe.

(127) * teu-Adj  
‘My father was brave/lazy/clever.’
a. Abu lôn beuhë/beuö/caröng.  
b. * Abu lôn geu-beuhë/beuö/caröng.  
c. * Abu lôn teu-beuhë/beuö/caröng.  
d. Abu lôn beuhë/beuö/caröng-(geuh).

(128) * teu-N  
a’. Hasan si droe mured. (080514)  
‘Hasan is a student.’  
b’. * Hasan geu-si droe mured.  
c’. * Hasan teu-si droe mured.  
d. Hasan mured-geuh.  
‘Hasan is his/her student.’  
NOT ‘Hasan is a student.’

29 The unacceptability of (128a) is probably due to lack of specificity (Legate, p.c.).
Also, it is very important to note that teu- cannot co-occur with the thematic subject agreement marker geu-, though both can occur independently at the same position as a pre-verbal prefix.

(129) teu- cannot co-occur with the subject agreement marker geu-
   a. *Hasan geu-teu-kap.  (W16-p-S, #11i)
   H 3-Acaus-bite
   b. *Hasan teu-geu-kap.  (W16-p-S, #11ii)
   H Acaus-3-bite
   ‘Hasan has been bitten.’

Thus, we can conclude that teu- and geu- are in complimentary distribution. Recall that, in section 2 (14), we locate geu- in VoiceP as a Voice head.

5.5.2. Teu- is higher than peu-
There is another syntactic element with fixed location that we proposed in previous sections: the causative morpheme peu- is assumed to be located in the little vcaus. Thus, co-occurrence restriction and relative order between teu- and peu- will help us locate teu- in syntactic structure. I will show teu- is in syntactically higher position than peu-.

The anticausative prefix teu- can co-occur with the causative prefix peu-. However, the prevailing order between the two is Acaus-Caus (teu-peu-), not Caus-Acaus (peu-teu):

(130) a. Hasan teu-peu-moe lé filom nyan.  (W14-p-S, #15)
   H Acaus-Caus-cry by film Dem cf. (W16-p-S, #14)
   ‘Hasan has been made to cry by the movie.’

(131) a. Lôn peu-seunang Fatimah.  (W15-p-S, #4)
   1Sg Caus-happy Fatimah
   ‘I made Fatimah happy.’
   b. Fatimah teu-peu-seunang.  (W15-p-S, #7)
   Fatimah Acaus-Caus-happy
   ‘Fatimah has been made happy.’

(132) Aneuq lôn ka teu-peu-kawén.  (W15-p-S, #13)
   child 1Sg Perf Acaus-Caus-marriage
   ‘My child has been made to get married.’

(133) a. Boh mamplam nyan teu-peu-pajôh keu Hasan.  (W14-p-S, #24)
   mango Dem Acaus-Caus-eat to H
   ‘The mango has been fed to Hasan.’
   b. Hasan teu-peu-pajôh boh mamplam.  (elicit?)
   H Acaus-Caus-eat mango
   ‘Hasan has been fed on the mango.’
The following examples show that the order Caus-Acaus (*peu-teu*) is not allowed.  

(134) `kap ’to bite’ \(\rightarrow\) teu-kap ’bitten’ \(\rightarrow\) *peu-teu-kap ‘to make bitten’ 

\ *Lôn (lôn)-peu-teu-kap \ bibi lôn. \hfill (W14-p-S, #4) 
1Sg (1)-Caus-Acaus-bite \ lip 1Sg 
‘I made my lip bitten (by someone unintentionally).’

(135) buka ‘to open’ \(\rightarrow\) teu-buka ‘to be in the state of having been opened’ 
\(\rightarrow\) *peu-teu-buka ‘to make open’ 

a. *Hasan (geu)-peu-teu-buka \ pintô nyan. \hfill (080515, #1-2) 
H \ (3)-Caus-Acaus-open \ door Dem 

b. Hasan geu-peu-gêt \ pintô nyan \ teu-buka. 
H \ 3-Caus-okay \ door Dem Acaus-open 
‘Hasan made the door open.’

(136) a. *Pintô nyan geu-peu-teu-buka \ lé Hasan. \hfill (080515, #5) 
door Dem \ 3-Caus-Acaus-open \ by H 

b. Pintô nyan teu-buka \ lé Hasan. \hfill (080515, #7) 
door Dem \ Acaus-open \ by H 
‘The door was opened by Hasan (unintentionally).’

Note that the intended meanings were expressed by a periphrastic causative (135b) and a marked anticausative (136b) instead of the peu-teu-V patterns in (135a) and (136a).

More data of the incompatibility between peu- and teu- in that order (*peu-teu-V) are given in (137).

(137) No *peu-teu-V in general: \hfill (080515, #8) 

a. unacc. \ rhët ‘to fall’, \ reubat ‘to fall’, \ ngop ‘to sink’, 
*peu-rhët, \ *teu-reubah, \ *teu-ngop 
*peu-teu-rhët, \ *peu-teu-reubat, \ *peu-teu-ngop 

b. unerg. \ jaq ‘to go’, \ plueng ‘to run’, \ duék ‘to sit?’, \ dong ‘to stand?’ 
?teu-jaq, \ ?teu-plueng, \ teu-duék, \ teu-dong 
*peu-teu-jaq, \ *peu-teu-plueng, \ *peu-teu-duék, \ *peu-teu-dong 
cf. peu-teu-jaq-teu-dong 

c. trans. \ tôp ‘to close’, \ poh ‘to hit’, \ sipak ‘to kick’, \ kap ‘to bite’ 
teu-tôp, \ teu-poh, \ teu-sipak, \ teu-kap 
*peu-teu-tôp, \ *peu-teu-poh, \ *peu-teu-sipak, \ *peu-teu-kap

The asymmetry of the order between peu- and teu- implies that the two morphemes are in different morpho-syntactic status. Specifically, anticausative teu- is higher than causative peu-. Marked anticausatives have more structure on top of vcausP. Considering the parallelism between the anticausative morpheme teu- and the thematic subject agreement marker geu-, I propose that this structure should be VoiceP.

---

30 Unfortunately, I elicited two examples of peu-teu-V sequences: peu-teu-khem (khem ‘to laugh’) and peu-teu-moe (moe ‘to cry’). I need to recheck if these examples are really grammatical. For the time being, I will leave them unexplained.
There are seemingly counter examples with the order \textit{peu-teu-V} to the above generalization, although I found only a few so far as follows:

(138) \textit{moe} ‘to cry’ $\rightarrow$ \textit{teu-moe} ‘to be about to cry/on the verge of tears’
$\rightarrow$ \textit{peu-teu-moe} ‘to cause to be on the verge of tears’

a. Hasan (singaja) \textit{geu-moe}.
   H on.purpose 3-cry
   ‘Hasan cried (on purpose.)’

b. Hasan (*singaja) \textit{teu-moe}.
   H on.purpose Acaus-cry
   ‘Hasan was about to cry/on the verge of tears (*on purpose.)’

c. Fatimah (hana ampon) \textit{geu-peu-teu-moe} Hasan.
   F (relentlessly) 3-Caus-Acaus-cry H
   ‘Fatimah relentlessly caused Hasan to be on the verge of tears.’

(139) \textit{khém} ‘to cry’ $\rightarrow$ \textit{teu-khém} ‘to be about to laugh/on the verge of bursting into laughter’
$\rightarrow$ \textit{peu-teu-khém} ‘to cause to be on the verge of bursting into laughter’

a. Fatimah \textit{geu-peu-teu-khém} Hasan.
   F 3-Caus-Acaus-laugh H
   ‘Fatimah made Hasan on the verge of bursting into laughter.’

cf. Fatimah \textit{geu-peu-gèt} Hasan \textit{teu-khém}.
   F 3-Caus-okay H Acaus-laugh
   ‘Fatimah made Hasan laugh(in the state of laughing).’

These examples seem to share the structure of \textit{peu-teu-}unergative verb root. However, other unergative verb roots do not allow this structure.

(140) *Fatimah \textit{geu-peu-teu-jaq} Hasan.
   F 3-Caus-Acaus-go H
   Intended meaning: e.g., ‘Fatimah made Hasan in the state of being about to go.’

(141) a. ??Lôn \textit{peu-teu-duk} Hasan di ateuh rangkang.
   1SG Caus-Acaus-sit H on bench
   Intended meaning: e.g., ‘I made Hasan in the state of sitting on a bench.’

cf. Lôn \textit{peu-duk} Hasan di ateuh rangkang.
   1SG Caus-sit H on bench
   ‘I made Hasan sit on a bench.’

b. ??Lôn \textit{peu-teu-dong} Hasan di minyup rumoh.
   1SG Caus-Acaus-stand H under house
   Intended meaning: ‘I made Hasan in the state of standing under a house.’

cf. Lôn \textit{peu-dong} Hasan di minyup rumoh.
   1SG Caus-stand/stop H under house
   ‘I made Hasan stand under a house.’
Typical transitive verbs do not appear in this context, either.

(142) *peu-teu-TrV root:
   a. ?Hasan geu-peu-teu-tôp pintô nyan.  (080515, #22)
      H 3-Caus-Acaus-close door Dem
   cf. Hasan geu-peu-gêt pintô nyan teu-tôp.  (080515, #21)
      H 3-Caus-okay door Dem Acaus-close
      ‘Hasan made the door closed.’
   b. *Hasan geu-peu-teu-poh pintô nyan.  (080515, #23)
      H 3-Caus-Acaus-hit door Dem

The peculiarity of moe ‘to cry’ and khém ‘to laugh’ will become clearer if we consider the following idiom: teu-jaq in (140) and teu-dong in (141) cannot be causativized with peu- separately, but as a combined idiomatic expression, teu-jaq-teu-dong can be causativized. This is shown in (143) below.

(143) teu-jaq-teu-dong ‘doubtful/in the state of doubtfulness’\(^{31}\) \(\rightarrow\) peu-teu-jaq-teu-dong
   a. Hasan (ka) teu-jaq-teu-dong sipanyang uroe.  (080514, #74)
      H Perf doubtful along day
      ‘Hasan was in the state of not being able to decide what to do all day long.’
   b. Fatimah geu-peu-jaq-teu-dong Hasan.  (080514, #79)
      F 3-doubtful H
      ‘Fatimah made Hasan unclear what to do.’
   c. Fatimah geu-peu-gêt Hasan teu-jaq-teu-dong.  (080514, #73)
      F 3-Caus-okay H doubtful
      ‘Fatimah caused Hasan to be in the state of doubtfulness.’
      [jaq ‘to go’, dong ‘to stop; stand’]

I tentatively conclude that the order teu-peu-V, not the other order peu-peu-V, is structurally conditioned, assuming that teu-moe and teu-khém in (138-9) have similar status as idiomatic expressions like teu-jaq-teu-dong whose structure will remain unexplained.

5.6. Structures of anticausatives

Following Alexiadou et al (2006), I propose a VoiceP analysis of anticausatives. Sharing the basic assumptions with Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993), Alexiadou et al. (2006) proposes an analysis based on a syntactic decomposition of change of state verbs into a Voice, a CAUS, and a ROOT component, where Voice introduces the external argument (Kratzer 1996) and v introduces an event (Pylkkänen 2000). See also Harley (2007) for Hiaki data in favor of the splitting vP and VoiceP.

(144) a syntactic decomposition of change of state verbs (Alexiadou et al. 2006:(50))
   [Voice [CAUS [ Root ]]]

---

\(^{31}\) According to the consultant, this could be used to mean ‘to wander around.’
Alexiadou (2006) propose two options for anticausative structures: one for unmarked anticausatives where Voice is totally absent and the other for marked anticausatives with special morphology.

(145) Two available anticausative structures:

a. Anticausative structure I:
   unmarked – (unaccusatives)
   \[ \text{vP} \]
   \[ \text{v\_BE or \_BECOME} \]
   \[ \text{\_open DP} \]
   \[ \text{the door} \]

b. Anticausative structure II:
   with special morphology
   \[ \text{VoiceP} \]
   \[ \text{-ext. arg} \]
   \[ \text{Voice' -AG} \]
   \[ \text{v -v'} \]

Along the lines of the VoiceP analysis in Alexiadou et al. (2006) and the typology of Voice in Schäfer (2007), I propose that the unmarked anticausatives and the marked anticausatives in Acehnese correspond to (145a) and (145b) respectively.

As for the anticausative prefix teu- in marked anticausatives, two positions are potentially available: the Spec of VoiceP and the Voice head itself.

(146) Spec-analysis vs. Head-analysis

a. Spec-analysis:
   teu- is in Spec of VoiceP.
   \[ \text{VoiceP} \]
   \[ \text{teu-} \]
   \[ \text{Voice' -vP} \]
   \[ \text{vCAUS} \]
   \[ \text{\_v} \]

b. Head-analysis:
   teu- is an overt realization of Voice head.
   \[ \text{VoiceP} \]
   \[ \text{teu-} \]
   \[ \text{vCAUS -vP} \]
   \[ \text{\_v} \]

Without evidence that Acehnese teu- is a reflexive like German sich, and in favor of a unified analysis about geu- and teu-, I take the Head-analysis in which teu- is analyzed to be an overt realization of Voice head with [-agent, -D] feature as illustrated in (147).
(147) *Head-analysis* of the anticausative morpheme *teu-*

a. *teu-* with ø little v

\[
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{-ext.arg} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{teu-AG} \\
\text{vCAUS} \\
\emptyset \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{\textbackslash kap} \\
\text{DP}
\]

*e.g.* *teu-kap*

Acaus-bite

b. *teu-* with *peu-

\[
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{-ext.arg} \\
\text{Voice'} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{teu-AG} \\
\text{vCAUS} \\
\emptyset \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{\textbackslash pajôh} \\
\text{DP}
\]

*e.g.* *teu-peu-pajôh*

Acaus-Caus-eat Acaus-Caus-eat

This analysis captures the parallelism between the anticausative marker *teu-* and the agreement marker *geu-*. Note that, semantically, they are just the opposite with respect to the presence/absence of the Agent. Also, recall that they are in complementary distribution: neither *geu-* nor *teu-* can co-occur with unaccusative verbs, adjectives, and nouns; they cannot co-occur with each other, either. Thus, they are in the same position with opposite values for relevant features: *geu-* is analyzed to be [+agent] equivalent to the anticausative *teu-. Specified [+agent], *geu-* takes Agent DP; specified [-agent], *teu-* suppresses the external argument.

This VoiceP analysis has several advantages. First of all, the incompatibility of *teu-* with unaccusative verbs receives a syntactic explanation: it requires as its complement a *vP* headed by *vCAUS* which cannot be satisfied with a *vP* headed by *vBE/BECOME*.

It also provides a non-volitional/unintentional/inanimate Causer argument with a position to merge (cf. Travis 2000, 2005).

(148)

\[
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{\rightarrow Agent licensed} \\
\text{\textbackslash Voice'} \\
\text{\textbackslash Voice} \\
\text{\textbackslash vP} \\
\text{\textbackslash v' } \\
\text{\textbackslash v } \\
\text{\textbackslash \sqrt{v}}
\]

Cause licensed

For example, the unintentional causer DP sentence in (116a) *Lôn teu-kap bibi gopnyan* ‘I bit her lip (unintentionally).’ is analyzed as shown in (149): unintentional causer *lôn* ‘I’ is base-generated in Spec/vP, then moves to a higher position, probably the ‘core topic/subject’ position (Legate 2007, 2008, cf. Lawler 1977, Durie 1988).

(149)
6. Conclusion

Throughout the paper, we have explored various constructions related to the causative alternation in Acehnese: active and passive, two types of causatives, applicatives, and two types of anticausatives, although the main topic is the causative alternation. Most of all, I aimed to provide ample amount of newly collected data for future research on the syntax of this relatively understudied language.

A theoretical contribution of this paper is that it provides empirical grounds of the splitting of agentivity and causation into two functional levels, VoiceP and vP. The necessity of doing this was illustrated by the three-way contrast between passives, marked anticausatives, and unmarked anticausatives.
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