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Sociative causative markers in South American languages: a possible areal feature

Antoine Guillaume and Françoise Rose

Sociative causation is a particular type of causation, where the causer not only makes the causee do an action, but also participates in it. In the typological literature, sociative causation is typically presented as a possible reading of a regular causative construction and rarely as a specific type.

In the present paper, based on a preliminary survey of this category in the languages of the world, we first show that specific sociative causative markers are very frequent in South American languages. This leads us to put forward the hypothesis that a specific marker for sociative causation could be an areal feature of this part of the world.

A second major finding of our study is that, in addition to being expressed by specific sociative or regular causative markers, the semantics of sociative causation is frequently manifested by applicative morphemes. This suggests an alternative historical origin for the development of the well-known phenomenon of causative/applicative syncretism: while the evolution from causative to applicative is usually postulated in the literature, our data seem to indicate that the evolution path could just as well be from applicative to causative.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1, we provide a short review of the available typological literature on sociative causation. The following
sections present the main results of our study: Section 2 discusses the geographic distribution of specific sociative causative markers, with a particularly high density in South America; Section 3 confirms the well known pattern of extension from regular causative markers to sociative causation, in South America as elsewhere; Section 4 brings to light the generally underestimated pattern of extension from regular applicative markers to sociative causation, noticeable in several South American languages.

1. Sociative causation

Sociative causation differs from regular causation in that the causer not only makes the causee do an action, but also participates in it, which is usually paraphrased with sentences like *make someone do something by doing it with them* or *help someone do something*. The distinction with regular causation is illustrated in the Japanese examples below. In (1a), the causative marker -se has a regular causative meaning – the causer does not participate in the action of “running”. In (1b), however, this marker has a sociative causative meaning – the causer not only makes the causee do the action of “playing”, but also does some “playing” as well.

(1) Japanese (Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002, p. 87, p. 100)

a. non-sociative causation

\[
\text{Taro-ga Ziro-o hasira-se-ta} \\
\text{Taro-NOM Ziro-DAT/ACC run-CAUS-PAST}
\]

‘Taro had / made Ziro run (Taro is not running)’

b. sociative causation

\[
\text{Hahaoya-ga kodomo-o asoba-se-te i-ru} \\
\text{mother-NOM child-ACC play-CAUS-CONJ be-PRES}
\]

‘Mother is making the child play (playing with her)’

Sociative causation is mentioned by Dixon (2000) and Kulikov (2001) in their respective typological studies on causation. It has then been explored by Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002) in a major study devoted to that semantic category. In their study, different semantic nuances of sociative causation are specified, depending on the extent to which the action of the causer is identical to that of the causee. These nuances are exemplified below with more Japanese examples. In joint-action situations, both causer and causee perform the same action, as in (2a) (repeated from (1b)). In assistive situations, the causer helps the causee without performing exactly the same action, as in (2b). Finally, in supervision situations, the causer merely supervises the action performed by the causee (2c).

Kulikov (2001, p. 892) points to the fact that assistive situations do not necessarily participate to the semantics of causation. They are however often treated as such, for being marked with a causative marker.
Sociative causation is usually seen as a possible meaning extension of regular causative markers, as discussed by Kulikov (2001) and Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002). This phenomenon is fairly frequent cross-linguistically. In addition to Japanese, such extensions are attested in languages such as Georgian (Comrie 1985, p. 334, Kulikov 2001, p. 892), Chinese (Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002, p. 102) and Marathi (Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002, p. 97–98):

(3) Georgian (Comrie 1985, p. 334)

\[
\text{Mama} \quad \text{shvil-s} \quad \text{ceril-s} \quad a-\text{cer-ineb-s}
\]

‘Father makes/helps/lets his son write the letter’

As shown by Shibatani & Pardeshi, the existence of such semantic extensions have considerable theoretical interest. First, they provide for a semantic link between the better known subtypes of causatives which are direct and indirect, as shown in the following diagram.

![Diagram showing distribution of different causative forms over the sociative domain](Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002, p. 102)
Second, extensions from causative to sociative causation provide convincing explanations for the widespread phenomenon of causative/applicative syncretism. This term refers to the fact that, in some languages, a single marker can have either a causative or an applicative function, depending on the verb it attaches to (see, for example, Peterson 2007, p. 64-66). For example, this phenomenon is very frequent in Australian languages. As described by Austin (1997), intransitive verbs in these languages often split into two transitivization classes (causative and applied). This case of wide causative/applicative syncretism is illustrated below with examples from Pitta-Pitta:

\[(4) \quad \text{Pitta-Pitta (Blake 1979, cited in Austin 1997)}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. causative -la-} \\
\text{kaṭhi-} & \quad \text{‘to climb up’} \quad \text{kaṭhi-la-} & \quad \text{‘to put up’} \\
\text{kūra-} & \quad \text{‘to fall’} \quad \text{kūra-la-} & \quad \text{‘to drop’} \\
\text{tharka-} & \quad \text{‘to stand’} \quad \text{tharka-la-} & \quad \text{‘to stand it up’} \\
\text{yaṇṭhi-} & \quad \text{‘to burn’} \quad \text{yaṇṭhi-la-} & \quad \text{‘to burn it up’} \\
\text{b. applied -la-} \\
\text{mirṇṭi-} & \quad \text{‘to play’} \quad \text{mirṇṭi-la-} & \quad \text{‘to play with’} \\
\text{tiwa-} & \quad \text{‘to be jealous’} \quad \text{tiwa-la-} & \quad \text{‘to be jealous of’} \\
\text{wiya-} & \quad \text{‘to laugh’} \quad \text{wiya-la-} & \quad \text{‘to laugh at’} \\
\end{align*}\]

Shibatani and Pardeshi analyze such cases of causative/applicative syncretism as a causative marker typically taking an applicative function on active verbs. Sociative causation seems to explain this functional extension. It is because regular causative markers can develop sociative causation meanings that they can also develop regular applicative meanings, by way of entailments, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sociative causative} & \quad > \quad \text{comitative applicative} \\
\text{‘I make him walk by walking with him’} & \quad > \quad \text{‘I walk with him’} \\
\text{‘I make her play by playing with her’} & \quad > \quad \text{‘I play with her’} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Sociative causation can be manifested by specific markers in some languages, although such markers are rarely discussed in the general typological literature. As far as we know, specific sociative causative markers were first identified in the Tupi-Guarani branch of the Tupi family, under the name of comitative causation (Adam 1896, Rodrigues 1953). In Tupinambá, for example, there is a clear contrast between a regular causative prefix bo- ~ mo- and a specific sociative causative prefix ero- ~ eno-:

\[3\quad \text{Recall that both causative and applicative are (at least in their standard acceptance) valency-increasing mechanisms. They differ in that a causative introduces a new A (causer) argument and denotes the original A argument (causee), while an applicative promotes an oblique participant (benefactive, instrumental, comitative, etc.) into O function, leaving the A unaffected.}\]

\[4\quad \text{A quite similar situation is found in Oceanic languages (Lichtenberk 1993).} \]
(5) Tupinambá (Rodrigues 1953, p.136)\(^5\)

a. non-sociative causation

\textit{mo-oryb}

\textit{caus-be.happy}

‘make someone be happy’

b. sociative causation

\textit{ero-oryb}

\textit{caus.soc-be.happy}

‘make someone be happy with oneself’

c. sociative causation

\textit{Xe-r-ykeyr-a xe-r-eno-sém}

\textit{1SG.II-RELN-older.brother-ARG 1SG.II-RELN-CAUS.soc-go.out}

‘My older brother took me out’

Sociative causation has been posited as a special type of causative by Dixon (2000, p. 73), who calls it \textit{causative of involvement} and illustrates it with two South American languages (Nomatsiguenga, an Arawak language, and Kamaiurá, a Tupi language), and Alamblak, a Papuan language. All those languages display, among other causative morphemes, a special causative morpheme used when the causer is also involved in the activity (in addition to the causee).

We will show below that such specific sociative markers are not so rare, at least in South America.

To sum up, the literature on sociative causation posits the three following points:

– specific markers for sociative causation are rare;

– sociative causation is often the result of a semantic extension of a regular causative marker;

– cases of causative/applicative syncretism could be explained via the intermediate category of sociative causation.

Our cross-linguistic survey of sociative causation\(^6\) provided additional information that enables us to discuss each of these three points in the following sections. This survey was conducted on the basis of questionnaires sent to typologists or descriptivists (directly or via mailing lists, such as LingTyp, Etnolinguistica, TypoLing) and the consulting of typological studies on causatives, grammars and works on language families or areas.\(^7\) The sample of languages has therefore not been planned nor calculated, and obviously the authors being both Amerindians, a certain bias is possible, but is probably not enough to explain the strikingly uneven distribution of specific causative markers around the world.

---

\(^5\) The glosses are ours.

\(^6\) Our goal was to determine what kind of morphological devices the languages use to express sociative causation. Cases of periphrasis and complex predication were therefore not taken into account.

\(^7\) We would like to sincerely thank all the colleagues who kindly shared their analyses with us.
2. Specific sociative causative markers: a characteristic of South America

Our study first shows that specific markers for sociative causation are widespread in South America. Several languages show a clear contrast between regular causative morphemes and a specific sociative causative morpheme, as illustrated with Emerillon, a Tupi language spoken in French Guyana, and Cavineña, a Tacanan language spoken in north Bolivia.

In Emerillon, the use of the regular causative marker *bo*- ~ *mõ*- implies that the causer does not participate in the caused event, as in (6b), where the woman does not do any “sleeping”, while the use of sociative causative *ero*- ~ *ero*- implies that the causer does participate in it, as in (6c), where the husband, in addition to making his wife sleep, does sleep as well.

   a. regular intransitive
      Mozepeʔ ʔar-äh̪a  o-ker  koti
      one  day-only 3.I-sleep there
      ‘They slept only one day over there’
   b. regular causative
      Waïwi  o-mõ-ker  ʔīmaʔẽ
      woman 3.I-caus-sleep child
      ‘The woman is putting the child to sleep’
   c. sociative causative (joint action)
      O-er-aho  o-ero-ker
      3.I-caus,soc-go  3.I-caus,soc-sleep
      ‘(The husband) carries (his new wife, who had gotten drunk) and makes her sleep with him’

In Cavineña, the regular causative vs. sociative causative contrast is manifested by the pair of markers -sha ~ -mere and -kere. The pair -sha ~ -mere marks regular causation, as in (7b), where the woman (the causer) is not involved in the event of “eating” while -kere marks sociative causation, as in (7c), where the causer (the 1st person singular), in addition to making the causee (Mr Francisco) eat, also eats as well.

(7) Cavineña (Guillaume 2008, p. 297-301)
   a. regular transitive
      Ebakwa=tu  ara-wa  misi
      child=3SG eat-PERF tamale
      ‘The child ate tamale’

8 Regular causative markers are sensitive to the transitivity of the verb stem: -sha is used with intransitive stems while -mere is used with transitive stems. The sociative causative marker -kere, on the other hand, can be used with either intransitive or transitive verb stems.
b. regular causative

Epuna-ra=tu  ara-mer-e-wa  misi  tu-ja  ebakwa
woman=ERG=3SG  eat-CAUS-PERF  tamale  3SG-GEN  child

‘The woman fed the child with tamale’

c. sociative causative (joint action)

E-ra=tu  ara-kere-chine  torta  Don Francisco
1SG-ERG=3SG  eat-CAUS.SOC-REC.PAST  cake  Mr. Francisco

‘I had / invited Mr. Francisco (to) eat a cake with me’

d. sociative causative (assistive)

Maestro-ra=Ø  a-kere-kware
master=ERG=1SG  make-CAUS.SOC-REM.PAST

‘The master would make it (a canoe) with me (and teach me how to do it at the same time)’

Emerillon and Cavineña differ in that the sociative causative ero- of Emerillon is restricted to intransitive predicates and can only have joint-action meanings, while the sociative causative -kere of Cavineña can also appear on transitive verbs, as in (7c, d), and can convey the assistive nuance, as in (7d).

Consequently, these markers map differently in the semantic continuum defined by Shibatani and Pardeshi, as illustrated in Figure 2. In the case of Emerillon, the three categories of direct, indirect and sociative causation are represented by distinct markers. The situation with Cavineña is less clear since both regular causative markers -sha and -mere can have both direct and indirect meanings.

---

Figure 2

Revised distribution of different causative forms over the sociative domain
(adapted from Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002, p. 102)

In our study, we found specific sociative markers in 15 South American languages belonging to seven different families. They are listed in Table 1 (an illustrative example from each language is provided in the Appendix).9

9 Note that in the sources, the markers are not necessarily labelled as sociative causative
Family | Language | Marker | Reference
---|---|---|---
Araucanian | Ancient Araucanian | -kilo | Valdivia (1606) Adelaar (p.c.)
Quechuan | Cuzco-Collar Quechua | -ysi | Cusihuamán (1976), Adelaar (p.c.)
Tacanan | Cavineña | -kere | Guillaume (2004)
Reyesano | -tsawa | Guillaume (2006, fieldnotes)
Tupi | Emerillon | ero- | Rose (2003)
Kamaiurá | ero- | Seki (2000)
Karo | ta- | Gabas (1999)
Tapiete | ri- | González (2005)
Tapirapé | era- ~ ..., 10 | Praça (p.c.)
Tupinambá | ero- ~ eno- | Rodrigues (1953)
Yuki | ero- ~ ro- | Villafañe (2004)

Table 1
South American languages with attested specific sociative causative markers

By contrast, we found very few examples of specific sociative causative markers in other parts of the world, even in Meso- and North America. As a matter of fact, we only found these types of markers in Wolof (Atlantic family, Senegal) and Alamblak (East Sepik, Papua). This particular distribution of specific markers. However, the way they are described and illustrated (and occasionally the discussion we had with the authors themselves) led us to analyze them as such.

10 ‘...’ stands for the following allomorphs: ra, r, ere, re, wera, wer.
sociative causative markers, i.e. their high concentration in South America – see the map on the preceding page – suggests that they could be seen as an areal feature of South America.

Our hypothesis of an areal feature is strengthened by the fact that within South America, as shown by the map, the languages with specific sociative causative markers tend to cluster in a region which could be defined as South-Western Amazonia. If we note that, on the one hand, more than half of these languages belong to the Tupi family, and on the other hand, this family of languages is said to have originated in that particular area (in the actual Brazilian state of Rondonia to be more precise (Rodrigues 1999, p. 108)), we could imagine that specific sociative causative markers would have developed in Tupi languages first, and would have later been diffused to their neighbors. The fact that these markers are nowadays found in a number of languages that are located far away from Rondonia (whether they belong to the Tupi family or not) would be simply explained by the fact that Tupi languages nowadays have a very wide distribution in the continent.11

3. Extensions from regular causative markers to sociative causation

A second result of our study is that regular causatives with a sociative causation extension are frequent throughout the world, as anticipated. As far as South America is concerned, we found examples of such semantic extensions in the languages listed in Table 2. We actually suspect that this kind of semantic extension could probably be found in other languages where the available descriptions mention only the most prototypical causative meanings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arawak</td>
<td>Trinitario</td>
<td><em>im</em>-</td>
<td>Gill (1957), Wise (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asheninka</td>
<td><em>akag</em></td>
<td>Payne (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caquinte</td>
<td><em>aka</em></td>
<td>Swift (1988, in Peterson 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panoan</td>
<td>Matsés</td>
<td><em>me</em></td>
<td>Fleck (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carib</td>
<td>Kali’na</td>
<td><em>nopi</em></td>
<td>Lescure (p.c.), Hoff (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macushi</td>
<td><em>nipi</em>, <em>pa</em></td>
<td>Abbott (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tupi</td>
<td>Guarani</td>
<td><em>mo</em>-</td>
<td>Velázquez-Castillo (2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
South American languages with attested regular causative markers having sociative causative semantic extensions

11 We thank Sasha Aikhenvald, Ian Maddieson and Marianne Mithun for observations regarding the inner distribution of specific sociative causative markers within South America.
An example from Trinitario is given below: the im- prefix can either convey a regular causative meaning, as in (8b), or a sociative causative meaning, as in (8c):

(8) Trinitario (Rose, fieldnotes 2006)
   a. regular intransitive
      No 'jiro-no t-yon-ono
      ART.PL man-PL 3-go-PL
      'The men went away'
   b. regular causative
      Ma tata t-im-yon-nu-po
      ART.MASC.SG father 3-CAUS-go-1SG-PAST
      'My father sent me (there)'
   c. sociative causative: joint action
      V-im-yon-yore
      1PL-CAUS-go-FUT
      'We will take her with us (on our trip to another village)'

4. Extensions from applicative markers to sociative causation: an alternative origin for causative/applicative syncretism?

The third interesting result of our study is the unexpected number of cases where sociative causation is not expressed by causative markers (whether specific or not) but by applicative markers. This phenomenon is hardly ever discussed in the typological literature; in his recent typological study of applicative constructions, Peterson (2007, p. 65) says that the syncretism between causative and comitative / instrumental applicative is “seemingly […] poorly attested, though […] there is considerable residual evidence for it in a number of languages when we consider how these constructions are related diachronically”.

We will illustrate extensions from applicative markers to sociative causation with examples from Sikuani, a Guahibo language from Colombia (Queixalós 1998, 2000, 2002). In this language, the applicative marker ka- can have, on the one hand, a plain applicative function, with no hint of causation, promoting for instance an instrument into O function, as in (9a). On the other hand, it can convey both comitative and causative meaning, as in (9b), where both God and his wife go back home, and God causes his wife to do so.

12 A possible reason for the scarcity of studies on this type of extension is that, canonically, the semantic roles involved in applicative constructions are beneficiary or instrument, rather than comitative (we thank Sylvie Voisin for pointing this to us).
In South America, we found this type of extension in the languages listed in Table 3.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family/unclassified</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arawá</td>
<td>Jarawara</td>
<td><em>ka-/wa-</em></td>
<td>Dixon (2004), Vogel (p. c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paumarí</td>
<td><em>va-/vi-</em></td>
<td>Chapman &amp; Derbyshire (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arawak</td>
<td>Yine</td>
<td><em>himu-</em></td>
<td>Hanson (forthcoming)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclassified</td>
<td>Movima</td>
<td><em>-le</em></td>
<td>Haude (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclassified</td>
<td>Yurakare</td>
<td>special person prefixes</td>
<td>van Gijn (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we mentioned earlier, the phenomenon of causative/applicative syncretism is sometimes explained by the fact that regular causative markers can develop sociative causation meanings (Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002). For the languages cited in Table 3, the analysis seem to indicate that the other direction of semantic extension would be more appropriate: from the sociative applicative form, a sociative causative meaning could be derived. Using the same examples again, it seems to us that the sociative causative meaning ‘I make him walk by walking with him’ could be derived from the sociative meaning ‘I walk with him’.

- sociative causative  
  ‘I make him walk by walking with him’  
  ‘I make her play by playing with her’  

It is worth mentioning that in the languages we surveyed, the sociative causation extensions manifested by applicative markers are frequently found with verbs of action, and more specifically verbs of motion. An example from Jarawara, an Arawá language from Brazil, is given below. In such cases, it is easy to see how in an action performed by several actors, one of them could have more control, and be reanalyzed as a causer.
(10) Jarawara (Dixon 2004, p. 37, p. 255-256)  
comitative meaning ~ sociative causative meaning  
Kojari to-wa-ki-joma-ma-hare-ka  
paddle away-apply-in-motion-through-gap-back-claim  
’(The child) took the paddle back through the door’

These types of extensions could explain why, in many cases, it is difficult to tease apart a comitative applicative from a sociative causative. For instance, Wise (1990) gives a Machiguenga sentence that has two possible interpretations, a purely causative interpretation and a purely comitative interpretation.

(11) Machiguenga (Wise 1990, p. 95)  
No-panki-t-aj-ak-e-ri  
1-plant-EP-caus/comit-perfv-non-fut-3sg masc  
’I ordered him to plant / I planted with him’

Furthermore, it seems to us that some authors labeled this kind of constructions applicative on the basis that the language displays a large set of applicative markers, or possibly simply because the sociative causative is not yet recognized as a standard category in the typological literature.

The extension from comitative applicative to sociative causative can actually go as far as to express causation only, as in the Sikuani example in (12) (to be compared with (9a,b)).

(12) Sikuani (Queixaló 2002, p. 321)  
causative meaning  
Itsamatakabi Phurunaminali pübü 0-ka-pitsapa-Ø  
OneDay God Ant 3object-caus-GoOut-3subject  
’One day, God made the ants go out’

This leads us to propose a second possible source for causative / applicative syncretism: it does not necessarily have to be the result of a shift from causative to applicative via sociative causation, but can also be the result of a shift from an applicative function to a causative function, via sociative causation also. This hypothesis is corroborated by Payne (2002, p. 501-502) in a discussion of the Asheninka suffix -akag (see Table 2). He shows that this suffix originally comes from a reciprocal verbal suffix that later developed into a sociative applicative, and from there on to a causative. And indeed, Geniušiené & Nedjalkov’s typology of the polysemy of reciprocal markers (2001) indicates that reciprocals often convey sociative meanings.

5. Conclusion

The cross-linguistic study that we conducted on the category of sociative causation asserts the existence of a specific marker for sociative causation in a
certain number of languages, the majority of which are found in South America. This particular distribution suggests that it could be an areal property of South American languages, even though other languages in the area display other means of expression for the sociative causation category. Among those means, we have pointed out the semantic extension of regular causative and the causative/applicative syncretism. Moreover, our data leave open the possibility that the phenomenon of causative/applicative syncretism be not necessarily the result of an extension from causative to applicative via sociative causation, but possibly the other way around, an extension of applicative to causative.

It remains important to reaffirm the fact that this study is still preliminary. As we pointed out, although we have looked at a fair number of languages, our study has nevertheless been biased towards South American languages. Therefore the investigation of the expression of the semantics of sociative causation in a wider range of languages is necessary in order to refine our initial results. Such a study would be aimed at answering at least the following questions: is it really the case that Wolof and Alamblak are the only non-South American languages to display specific sociative causative markers? What are the semantic nuances expressed by specific causative markers in languages which have them? Are the semantic nuances proposed by Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002) – joint-action, assistive and supervision – really at work in these languages? What other means – other than extensions from regular causative or applicative markers – do languages without specific sociative causative markers use in order to express this category (if they do)? Is it possible to establish correlations between the presence of a specific causative marker in a language and other grammatical categories, such as comitative adpositions, coordination constructions, plural marking? Can we predict whether a language with a specific causative marker be of the with- or and-type, according to Stassen (2000) typology?

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1, 2, 3</th>
<th>1st, 2nd, 3rd person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>transitive subject/agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablativ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>anterioty marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL</td>
<td>applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG</td>
<td>argumental case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>boundary marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPL</td>
<td>completive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td>contiguity marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMIT</td>
<td>comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTR</td>
<td>contrastive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix. Illustrative examples of languages

with specific sociative causatives markers (families and languages are presented in alphabetical order)

**Araucanian**

(13) Ancient Araucanian (Chile, Valdivia 1606, p. 44-45)

| a. | i-n | eat-INFINITIVE |
| b. | i-kilo-n | eat-CAUS.SOC-INFINITIVE |
| ‘eat’ | ‘help to eat’ |

**Arawak**

(14) Nomatsiguenga (Peru, Wise 1986, p. 593)

| a. | y-o-gi-monti-è-ri | i-tomi |
| | 3SG+M-CAUS-CROSS.RIVER-NON.FUT-3SG+M | 3SG+M-SON |
| ‘He made his son cross the river (he told him to)’ |
| b. | y-monti-a-hag-an-è-ri | i-tomi |
| | 3SG+M-CROSS.RIVER-EP-CAUS.SOC-ABL-NON.FUT-3SG+M | 3SG+M-SON |
| ‘He made his son cross the river (he helped him across the river)’ |

**Panoan**

(15) Shipibo-Konibo (Peru, Valenzuela 2001 ; 2003, p. 685)

| a. | Yoxaman-ra | bake |
| | bachi-n | jiki-ma-ke |
| old.woman:ERG-ERG | child:ABS | mosquito.net:ALL |
| enter-CAUS-CMPL |
| ‘The old woman made/had the child enter the mosquito net (but she did not enter herself)’ |

---

13 We thank W. Adelaar for helping us glossing these examples.
b. Yoxaman-ra bake bachi-n jiki-kin-ke

old.woman:ERG-EV child:ABS mosquito.net:ALL enter:CAUS.SOC-CMPL

‘The old woman made the child enter the mosquito net (by entering herself)’

‘The old woman accompanied the child into the mosquito net’

‘The old woman helped the child enter the mosquito net’

Quechuan

(16) Cuzco–Collao Quechua (Peru, Cusihuamán 1976, p. 211)¹⁴

a. Haku-yá alla-ysi-mu-wa-nki!

let’s.go:COME.ON dig.up:CAUS.SOC-OVER.THERE:1SG.OBJ-2SUBJ(FUTURE)

‘Come on, let us go then. You will help me dig up (the potatoes) over there!’

b. Alli-chu ri-ra-ysi-ku-wa-y!

well-QUEST go.URGENCY-CAUS.SOC-REFLEXIVE-1SG.OBJ-2SUBJ.IMP

‘Please (lit. Is it all right?), help me go (it is urgent and it is in your own interest)!’

Tacanan

(17) Reyesano (Bolivia, Guillaume 2006, fieldnotes)

a. M-(a)-ade-tsawa(-a) mua eme te iye ejanana

1SG-PAST-walk:CAUS.SOC-PAST CONTR 1SG BM this baby.child

‘I helped this baby child to walk (and now he can walk by himself)’

b. A-padzu-tsawa-ta(-a) pa te ichu punawe te

PAST-bathe:CAUS.SOC-A3-PAST REP BM that young.lady BM

ki ebakwapuna te iye ejanana kwana

1SG.GEN daughter BM this child PL

‘That young lady is said to have helped my daughter bathe these children’

Tupi

(18) Karo (Brazil, Gabas 1999, p. 83–84)

a. wat owã o=ta-ko-t

1SG.POSS mother 1SG=CAUS.SOC-walk:IND

‘My mother made me walk, walking with me’

b. ᵇⁿ wat awe ta-bitëp-t

1SG 1SG.POSS brother CAUS.SOC-CROSS:IND

‘I made my brother cross, crossing with him’

c. ṇa toat owë ta-noqa-t

3SG.FEM 3RELN.POSS baby CAUS.SOC-eat:IND

‘She fed her baby, eating with him’

¹⁴ We thank W. Adelaar for helping us parsing, glossing and translating these examples in English.

¹⁵ For examples of Cavineña, see (7).

¹⁶ For examples of Tupinambá and Emerillon, see (5) and (6), respectively. Note that no good example could be found for Yuki.
(19) Mundurukú (Brazil, Gomes 2006, p. 82)

a. muba’at əm.əm-Ø uk ə-a ə-be
   rain enter.DUR-IPRF house RELN1-NFC RELN1-in
   ‘The rain is entering the house’

b. sariki ə-ta ə-duju-əm.əm-Ø
   tapioca RELN1-NFC RELN1-CAUS.SOC-enter.DUR-IPRF
   i-ta-direm-ap ə-puxim
   RELN2-NFC-be.wet-NMZ2 RELN1-against
   ‘They are taking the tapioca into the house so that it doesn’t get wet’

(20) Kamaiurá (Brazil, Seki 2000, p. 291)

a. kunu’um-a o-jan jawar-a pojy-a wi
   child-N 3-run jaguar-N danger-N ABL
   ‘The child ran away from the danger of the jaguar’

b. kunu’um-a o-mo-jan jawar-a pojy-a wi
   child-N 3-CAUS-run jaguar-N danger-N ABL
   ‘He made the child run away from the danger of the jaguar’

c. kunu’um-a w-ero-jan jawar-a pojy-a wi
   child-N 3-CAUS.SOC-run jaguar-N danger-N ABL
   ‘He made the child run away with him from the danger of the jaguar’

(21) Tapíete (Argentina, González 2005, p. 171-172)17

a. mbi-wata
   CAUS-walk
   ‘make him / her to walk’

b. mbi-ri-wata
   CAUS-CAUS-SOC-walk
   ‘make (him/her) to walk and walk with him/her’

(22) Tapirapé (Brasil, Praça, p.c.)

ã’é rãká wer-öt doze tokonaré-Ø i-pyýk-ã xé=r-opý-Ø
   DC REC.PAST CAUS.SOC-come twelve tucunaré.fish-ARG NONT-catch-GER 1=CNT-father-ARG
   ‘My father brought there twelve tucunaré fish that he caught’

Unclassified

(23) Mosetén (Bolivia, Sakel 2003, p. 246ff.; 2004, p. 308-313)18

Khin’dyera’ mi’wera’ jemoñe’ jaj-khôsh-te
   now there.MASC must CAUS.SOC-sleep-3MASC.OBJ
   ‘Now we will have to accompany (the rice), sleeping (in the plantation)’

Non-South American languages

(24) Alamblak (Papua New Guinea, Bruce 1984, p. 155-156)

a. ka-fkne-më-r-m
   CAUS-enter-PAST-3SG-3PL
   ‘He caused them to enter (something) by physically taking them’

17 Note that in this language, the sociative causative is an increment on a regular causative marker.
18 Note that some of the glosses have been simplified with the help of J. Sakel.
b. *ha-fkne-më-r-m*
\[\text{CAUS.SOC-enter-R.PST-3SG-3PL}\]
‘He caused them to enter (something) by entering with them’


a. *Lëkk-le*  \text{na xale bi}
\[\text{eat-CAUS.SOC P3S child DEF}\]
‘He makes/helps the child eat’

b. *ba ŋu ko tooñëe, xuloo-le*  \text{na ko}
\[\text{when N3P 3S cause.harm-ANT quarrel-CAUS.SOC p3S 3s}\]
‘When somebody caused him harm, he helped him quarrel’
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