

### Bi-Eventive Approach to Amis Causative *ma-ka-*

Starosta (1974) took *ma-ka-* as one means of Amis causative (see (1)), whereas Wu (2006) rejected this for the voice pattern “mismatch[es] the case-making patterns” (p.221). Indeed, *ma-ka-* is different from canonical causatives, where *pa-* is realized with typical case-assignment (nominative to causer and dative to causee). In favor of Starosta (1974), this study proposes *ma-ka-* is a realization of two [-Actor] on two Event heads as in (2).

- (1) Ma-ka-nugdu            n-u            alumna-ay            kaku  
 UV-KA-humble            Gen-Cn    many-Fac            1<sup>st</sup>.Sg.Nom  
 ‘I am respected by many people.’ (Wu, 2006, p. 221)

(1) can be decomposed into ‘I make many people respect me’ where the actor of the causing event is also the theme/patient of the affected event. To render (1), the verb first merges with the theme/patient and *v* introduces the stimulus. The [-Actor] featured in E2 triggers the theme/patient to move to Spec of EP2, through which *ka-* is realized. The actor is not assigned any case so it’s by default genitive marked. The causing event is introduced by *pa-* in *v*. Then, [-Actor] shows up in E1, enabling the theme/patient in Spec of EP2, an edge position, to move to Spec of EP1. Since the causer remains *in situ*, *pa-* is not realized and the causer is deleted (Travis, 2005). Thus, the theme is marked with a nominative case and the causee is still marked with a genitive case. Assuming the movement to the edge is covert, the theme/patient is spelled out in its base-generated position. These explain why *ma-ka-* renders causative reading while *pa-* isn’t present and why the case assignment pattern isn’t canonical. In short, the difference between *pa-pi/ka-* and *ma-ka-* stems from [+/- Actor] feature in E.

(2)

