

Two Routes to Indirect Causation
 LÉA NASH, *Paris 8/CNRS*
 (joint work with Rajesh Bhatt, Amherst)

1. Introduction

Two distinct ways to define indirect causation:

- Fodorian: potential temporal distinctness of the causing event and the caused (Fodor 1970)
 - Wolffian: presence of some intervening causer argument between the agent of the causing event and the caused event. (Wolff 2003)
 - Event separation characterizes *faire/fare*-causatives in French and Italian.
1. a. Le vent a fait dissiper les nuages
 the wind HAVE.PST made dissipate the clouds
 ‘The wind dispersed the clouds’
 b. Le vent a dissipé les nuages
 the wind HAVE.PST dissipate the clouds
 ‘The wind dispersed the clouds’
 - Requirement of an intermediate agent in Turkish, Georgian and Hindi-Urdu indirect causatives. No way to create an indirect causative of an unaccusative in these languages.
 - **a...-in** causatives in Georgian [**a-** CAUS_Land **-in-** CAUS_R]
 2. kar-ma ga-a-pant’-in-a ğrubleb-i
 wind-ERG PV-CAUS_L-disperse-CAUS_R-AOR.3sg clouds-NOM
 ‘The wind caused someone to disperse the clouds’
 ≠the wind dispersed the clouds

Claim: two linguistic routes to indirect causation

a. Periphrastic Causatives in Romance: *Complex predicate/light verb route*

[DP [Voice_[ACTIVE] [v V [VoiceP ...]]]]

- Voice_[ACTIVE] + v + V = FA(I)RE
- no restrictions on embedded VoiceP
- two events: FA(I)RE introduces one and embedded verb another

b. Morphological Causatives in Hindi-Urdu and Georgian: *Voice recursion route*

[DP [Voice_[ACTIVE] [VoiceP Voice_[PASS] [. . .]]]]

- Voice_[ACTIVE]+Voice_[PASS] = **-va-** in Hindi and as **a...-in-** in Georgian.
- Voice_[ACTIVE] and Voice_[PASS] introduce their own agents
- the two agents must be disjoint. Two disjoint agents entail two events

2. Causative Constructions in Romance

Temporal separation in indirect causatives: causing and caused events can be independently modified by temporal and manner adverbs. (Fodor 1970)

3. a. Floyd caused the glass to melt on Sunday by heating it on Saturday.
- b. *Floyd melted the glass on Sunday by heating it on Saturday.

Ruwet (1972): periphrastic FAIRE-causatives pattern with (4a) and express indirect causation, while lexical causatives pattern as in (4b) and express direct causation.

4. a. Le médecin a fait accoucher Madeleine dimanche en lui donnant
the doctor HAVE.PST made give.birth Madeleine Sunday in her giving
un médicament samedi
a medication Saturday
'The doctor made Madeleine give birth on Sunday by giving her a medication on Saturday.'
- b. *Le médecin a accouché Madeleine dimanche en lui donnant un
the doctor HAVE.PST delivered Madeleine Sunday in her giving a
médicament samedi
medication Saturday
'The doctor delivered/helped Madeleine to give birth on Sunday by giving her a medication on Saturday'

While temporal modification of each eventuality is indeed a clear proof for the presence of two separate eventualities, it does not follow that two eventualities need to be temporally separate.

- FAIRE-causatives can denote two temporally contiguous eventualities.

5. J'ai fait monter la température du réchaud
I-HAVE.PST made rise the temperature of.the camping.stove
'I raised the temperature of the camping stove.' (two temporally overlapping events)

- direct causatives are felicitous with readings involving a chain of temporally separate events.

6. Madame Dupont est le médecin qui m'a accouchée. Elle
Mrs. Dupont is the doctor who me.HAVE.PST delivered she
m'a donné un truc le dimanche matin et j'ai commencé à
me.HAVE.PST given a thing the Sunday morning and I.HAVE.PST started to
avoir les contractions 24 heures après
have the contractions 24 hours after
'Mrs. Dupont is the doctor that delivered me. She gave me something on Sunday and I started having contractions 24 hours later.'

- Event separability rather than temporal separation distinguishes indirect and direct causatives
 - Two Romance strategies of causativisation: FA(I)RE-causatives and lexical causatives (transitive change of state verbs without any special causative morphology)
 - The two strategies are only available for certain types of unaccusative verbs: inchoative verbs that participate in (anti-)causative alternation of the *melt* type.
 - Unergative, transitive verbs, unaccusative verbs that denote telic change of locatum, can only be causativised by the periphrastic FA(I)RE strategy.
 - In causatives of transitives the causee surfaces as a prepositional phrase headed by *à* or *par* in French (*a* and *da*, in Italian), giving rise to two constructions coined in Kayne (1975) as FAIRE-À and FAIRE-PAR. Both strategies come with restrictions (Guasti 1996, Folli & Harley 2007, Nash 2020).
 - Most causatives of transitives can also surface without causee: FAIRE-0 strategy is closely related to FAIRE-PAR (Kayne 1975).
7. a. Marie a cassé une branche
Mary HAVE.PST broke a branch
'Mary broke a branch.'
- b. Marie a fait casser une branche à Laure/ par Laure
Mary HAVE.PST made break a branch to Laure/ by Laure
'Mary made Laure break a branch.'
- c. Marie a fait casser une branche
Mary HAVE.PST made break a branch
'Mary had a branch broken (by someone).' [But also: Mary caused a branch to break]
- Unergative verbs are uniformly causativised by FA(I)RE
8. a. Les enfants ont travaillé/couru/marché
the children HAVE.PST.3PL worked/run/walked
'The children worked/ran/walked.'
- b. Laure a fait travailler/ courir/ marcher les enfants
Laure HAVE.PST made work/run/walk the children
'Laure made the children work/run/walk.'

3. Causatives of Unaccusatives in French (and in Italian)

Many unaccusative verbs can only be causativized by peripheral strategy: *tomber* 'fall', *venir* 'arrive', *rester* 'stay', or (dis)appearance e.g. *apparaître* 'appear'.

9. a. Laure est venue/arrivée/tombée/ apparue/restée
Laure BE.PST came.F/ arrived.F/ fell.F/ appeared.F/ stayed.F
'Laure came/arrived/fell/appeared/stayed.'

- b. Laure a fait venir/ arriver/ tomber/ apparaître/ rester le medecin
 Laure HAVE.PST made come/ arrive/fall/appear/stay the doctor
 ‘Laure made the doctor come/arrive/fall/appear/stay.’
- c. *Laure a venu/arrivé/tombé/ apparu/resté le medecin
 Laure HAVE.PST came/ arrived/ fell/appeared/ stayed the doctor
 intended reading: ‘Laure made the doctor come/arrive/fall/appear/stay’
- change of state unaccusatives can be causativized by FA(I)RE and by lexical causatives.

Labelle’s (1992) classification: three types of inchoative predicates:

- Class 1 **no** special marking;
 Class 2 **obligatory** marked with reflexive-nonactive clitic **SE**; (the only productive process, Zribi-Hertz (1987:51)
 Class 3 **optionally** marked with reflexive-nonactive clitic **SE**

Class 1: *cuire* ‘cook’, *durcir* ‘harden’, *éclater* ‘burst’, *fondre* ‘melt’, *grandir*, ‘grow’,
 Class 2: *s’alléger* ‘become lighter’, *s’agrandir* ‘become bigger’, *s’assécher* ‘to dry out’,
s’humidifier ‘become humid’, *s’amaigrir* ‘become thinner’, *s’améliorer* ‘improve’,
 Class 3: *(se) noircir* ‘blacken’, *(se) rougir* ‘become red’, *(s’)épaissir* ‘thicken’,
(se) gonfler ‘inflate’, *(s’)enfler* ‘swell’

- SE in Class 3 affects the sense of the inchoative verb and is correlated to the expression of process vs. result
- SE unaccusatives denote telic eventualities and non-marked inchoatives denote autonomous processes
- Labelle’s three classes are not structured alike

- i) Result Unaccusative (with SE)
 $[VoiceP\ SE\ Voice_{[EXPLETIVE]} [vP\ v\ [V\ DP_{theme}]]]$
- ii) Process Unaccusatives (without SE)
 $[VoiceP\ Voice_{[PROCESS]} [vP\ DP_{holder}\ v\ [V]]]$

Result and Process Unaccusatives can be causativized by FAIRE

10. Paul a fait fondre le beurre dans une casserole *Class 1*
 Paul HAVE.PST made melt the butter in a pot
 ‘Paul made the butter melt in a pot’
11. L’accumulation de vols fait s’alourdir la facture *Class 2*
 the.accumulation of thefts make.PRS CL.become-heavy the bill
 ‘The accumulation of thefts made the bill heavier’
12. *Class 3 without SE*
 a. La maïzena a fait épaissir le lait en le laissant comme une a crème
 the cornflour HAVE.PST made thicken the milk in it leaving like a cream
 ‘The cornflour made the milk thicken leaving it like a cream’

Class 3 with SE:

- b. L'exposition au soleil fait s'épaissir la peau
the.exposure to.the sun make.PRS CL.thicken the skin
'Exposure to the sun makes the skin thicken.'

Class 3

- UNACC with SE are more frequent than UNACC without SE
- FAIRE+UNACC without SE are far more frequent than FAIRE+UNACC with SE in French.
- FARE+UNACC with SE are impossible in Italian (including Class 2).

Class 2

In FAIRE causatives of Class 2 with obligatory SE, the clitic can be absent (cf. Ruwet 1973, Martin 2023 and Zubizarreta 1985)

13. a. La croissance économique a fait **s'améliorer** les indicateurs
the growth economic HAVE.PST made CL.improve the indicators
sociaux
social
'The economic growth made the social indicators improve.'
- b. Le volontariat a fait **améliorer** ma façon de vivre au
the volunteering HAVE.PST made improve my way of living in.the
quotidien
daily
'Volunteering made my daily way of life improve.'

What structure is embedded under FAIRE in (13b) and under FARE in all Italian Result Unaccusatives?

14. a. Le nubi si dissipano *SI is obligatory*
the clouds CL dissipated
'The clouds dispersed.'
- b. *Le nubi dissipano
the clouds dissipated
intended: 'The clouds dispersed.'

- under FARE, *si dissipare* is illicit: the embedded unaccusative must be stripped of SI

15. Il vento ha fatto dissipare le nubi.
the wind HAVE.PST made disperse the clouds
'The wind made the clouds disperse.'

- in Italian, SI unaccusatives are banned under FARE. The embedded structure is vP and not Voice_[EXPLETIVE]P.
- The vP and Voice_[EXPLETIVE]P involve the causee that has Theme role.

16. Two ways of causativizing Result Unaccusatives in Romance

- i. FAIRE + [_{VoiceP} SE Voice_[EXPLETIVE] [_{vP} v [V DP_{theme}]]] FRENCH
 ii. FA(I)RE+ [_{vP} v [V DP_{theme}]] ITALIAN, and marginally FRENCH

4. Lexical causatives in Romance

Labelle's 3 Classes of inchoatives have corresponding lexical causatives

17. Class 1:

- a. La bronze a fondu unacc. *fondre* 'melt'
 the bronze HAVE.PST melted
 'The bronze melted.'
 b. Laure a fondu la bronze trans. *fondre* 'melt'
 Laure HAVE.PST melted the bronze
 'Laure melted the bronze.'

18. Class 3:

- a. La soupe a refroidi /s'est refroidie unacc. (*se*) *refroidir* 'cool'
 the soup HAVE.PST cooled /CL.BE.PST cool.fem
 'The soup cooled (down).'
 b. Laure a refroidi la soupe trans. *refroidir* 'cool'
 Laure HAVE.PST cooled the soup
 'Laure cooled the soup.'

- The causer of peripheral causatives is indirectly involved in bringing out the result, as it is not the immediate or the only causer.
- The causer of lexical causative is the only initiator of the eventuality.

19. a. Laure a fait fondre le chocolat dans une petite casserole
 Laure HAVE.PST made melt the chocolate in a small pot
 'Laure made the chocolate melt in a small pot.'
 b. Laure a fait refroidir la soupe au balcon
 Laure HAVE.PST made cool the soup on.the balcony
 'Laure made the soup cool (by placing it) on the balcony.'

- lexical causatives are structured as regular transitive verbs:
 $[VoiceP DP_{agent} Voice_{[ACTIVE]} [vP v [V DP_{theme}]]]$
- lexical causatives can further be causativized with FA(I)RE

20. a. Marie a fait refroidir la soupe à Laure/ par Laure
 Mary HAVE.PST made cool the soup to Laure/ by Laure
 'Mary made Laure cool the soup.'
 b. Marie a fait refroidir la soupe
 Mary HAVE.PST made cool the soup
 (FAIRE+unaccusative) 'Mary made the soup cool.'
 (FAIRE+transitive) 'Mary had the soup cooled (by someone).'

- two distinct structures for (20b)

21. a. FAIRE+unaccusative:
 faire- [_{VoiceP} Voice_[PROCESS] [_{VP} DP_{holder} [v [_{VP} V]]]]
- b. FAIRE-0 transitive:
 faire -[_{VoiceP} Voice_[PASS] [_{VP} v [_{VP} V DP_{theme}]]]

Conclusions:

- a sentence expressing indirect causation without an explicit causee and a labile embedded verb are ambiguous in Romance:
 - i. causation of internally/autonomously caused eventuality
 - ii. causation of the eventuality with implicit agent disjoint from the causer
- causative FA(I)RE can embed in Romance
 - i. expletive VoiceP(unaccusatives with SE in French),
 - ii. passive VoiceP (faire-0 or faire-par constructions),
 - iii. process VoiceP (unergatives, change of location unaccusatives, Class 1 unaccusatives)
 - iv. vP (Result unaccusatives in Italian, and marginally, in French)

5. Morphological Causatives

In Hindi and Georgian, indirect causativization of unaccusatives is not possible. Many unaccusatives do combine with causative morphology but what this yields is simply the corresponding transitive.

- Indirect causativization limited to transitive predicates.
- Causativization is morphological in Hindi-Urdu (Bhatt & Embick 2003/2017 and Ramchand 2008)

22. a. maka:n jal raha: he *unacc.*
 house.M burn PROG.MSG BE.3.PRS.SG
 ‘The house is burning.’
- b. Mina bhu:sa: jal-a: rahi: he *trans. (=causative of unacc.)*
 Mina.F hay burn-CAUS1 PROG.F BE.3.PRS.SG
 ‘Mina is burning hay.’
- c. zami:nda:r (Mina=se) bhu:sa: jal-va: raha: he indirect causative
 landlord.M Mina=INST hay burn-CAUS2 PROG.MSG BE.3.PRS.SG
 ‘The landlord is having the hay burnt through Mina.’

- -a: –Direct Causative (CAUS1) morpheme
- -va: –Indirect Causative (CAUS2) morpheme
- CAUS1 and CAUS2 introduce an external argument.
- CAUS1 and CAUS2 involve a head that licenses an external argument.
- The argument introduced by CAUS1 can be interpreted as an agent or an instrument.

23. cha:bhi:=ne/*naye ilza:mõ=ne darwa:za: khol-**a**:
key=ERG/ new.M.OBL allegations=ERG door.M open-PFV.MSG
'The key/*the new allegations opened the door.'
- The argument introduced by CAUS2 can be an agent or a cause. It cannot, however, be an instrument (Bhatia 2016a, b).
24. naye ilza:mõ=ne/ *cha:bhi:=ne darwa:za: khul-**va**:-ya:
new.M.OBL allegations=ERG/ key=ERG door.M open-CAUS2-PFV.MSG
'The new allegations/the key caused the door to be opened.'
(keys * as instrument/OK as a cause)
- CAUS1 and CAUS2 share the following structure:
[DP [CAUS1/CAUS2 [. . .]]]
 - CAUS1 and CAUS2 do not embed the same structure

5.1. What CAUS2 embeds

- CAUS2 embeds a passive verbal projection i.e. a VoiceP headed by a passive voice head Voice_[PASS].
 - Voice_[PASS]
 - does not syntactically project the external argument,
 - the external argument is realized as an implicit argument
 - the external argument can be realized overtly but only as an instrumental adjunct. CAUS2 predicates are similar to FAIRE-PAR configurations in French
 - CAUS2 cannot embed unergatives and unaccusatives
25. a. zami:nda:r bhu:sa: jal-**va**: raha: hε
landlord.M hay burn-CAUS2 PROG.MSG BE.3.PRS.SG
'The landlord had the hay burned'
≠ 'The landlord caused the hay to burn'
- b. Mina=ne Ramu=se ro-ti: hui: bacci:=ko has-**va**:-ya:
Mina=ERG Ramu=INST cry-IMPV.F BE.PFV.F girl=DOM laugh-CAUS2-
PFV.MSG
'Mina got the crying girl to laugh through Ramu.'

CAUS2 is actually embedding the passive of the transitive of the corresponding unaccusative burn and unergative *laugh*

26. a. Mina hās rahi: hε *unergative*
Mina.F laugh PROG.F BE.PRS.3SG
'Mina is laughing.'

- b. Tina Mina=ko hās-a: rahi: he CAUS1 of unergative
 Tina.F Mina=DOM laugh-CAUS1 PROG.F BE.PRS.3SG
 ‘Tina is making Mina laugh.’
- c. Tina (kisi=se) Mina=ko hās-va: rahi: he CAUS2 of unergative
 Tina.F someone=INST Mina=DOM laugh-CAUS2 PROG.F BE.PRS.3SG
 ‘Tina is getting Mina to laugh through someone.’

- Intransitive verbs that do not have transitive counterparts do not combine with CAUS2 e.g. motion verbs *a:* ‘come’ and *ja:* ‘go’, as well as reduplicative onomatopoeic verbs like *bilbila:* ‘cry out in pain’, *mimiya:* ‘bleat, like a sheep’ etc.
- CAUS2 embeds passive VoiceP

27. [DP [CAUS2 [VoiceP Voice_[PASS] [vP . . .]]]]

5.2. What CAUS1 embeds

- CAUS1 -a: combines with vPs that do not take an external argument, cf. 22b.
- Potential challenges to this claim come from CAUS1 embedding unergatives and ingesto-reflexives.

28. a. Mina=ne (*Ramu=se) ro-ti: hui: bacci:=ko
 Mina=ERG Ramu=INST cry-IMPV.F BE.PFV.F girl=DOM
 has-a:-ya:
 laugh-CAUS1-PFV.MSG
 ‘Mina made the crying girl laugh.’
- b. Mina=ne (*astronomer=se) bacce=ko Mars dikh-a:-ya:
 Mina=ERG astronomer=INST child=DAT Mars.M show-CAUS1-PFV.MSG
 ‘Mina showed the child Mars (*through the astronomer).’

What is embedded in these cases is a non-agentive structure. (Neu 2024 for Hindi-Urdu unergatives, Bhatt & Embick 2003/2017 for Hindi-Urdu ingesto-reflexives, Nash 2020 for Georgian unergatives and ingestive/perception verbs)

- CAUS1 causatives are direct causatives: an intermediate agent is not possible.
- Neither CAUS1 nor CAUS2 embed the following structure:
 [DP [CAUS [VoiceP DP [VoiceP Voice_[ACTIVE] [vP . . .]]]]]

Why? Cf. English *Mary made Bill do the work*

CAUS and Voice_[ACTIVE] are the same and recursion of this sort is blocked: Voice_[ACTIVE] cannot embed a Voice_[ACTIVE] complement.

- No recursion on active Voice:

29. *_{[VoiceP DP [Voice_[ACTIVE] [VoiceP DP [VoiceP Voice_[ACTIVE] [vP . . .]]]]]}

5.2. Building direct/indirect causation contrast into the meanings of CAUS1 and CAUS2

CAUS2 takes the complement with implicit agent and itself introduces an agent. This means that the CAUSING event and the CAUSED event have to be distinct. This delivers at least part of the meaning of indirect causation.

CAUS1 combines only with verbs that do not take an agent. CAUS1 is not associated particularly with direct or indirect causation. It just introduces agent to the embedded event. Voice_[ACTIVE] = CAUS1=-a:

- Indirect Causation:

{[VoiceP DP [Voice[ACTIVE] [VoiceP Voice_[PASS] [vP v [V DP]]]]]}

- Direct Causation:

{[VoiceP DP [Voice[ACTIVE] [vP v [V DP]]]]]}

Why can't CAUS1 yield indirect causation semantics with unaccusatives, unergatives and ingesto-reflexive roots? Why do we only get direct causation semantics here? More conceptually, do we have to specify that CAUS2 has the semantics of indirect causation?

Indirect causation reading results from Voice recursion

- the two Voices combine and yield -va:
- -va: is bimorphemic

Voice_[PASS] is realized as -v- and Voice_[ACTIVE] is realized by its elsewhere form -a:

- CAUS2 is the combination of Voice_[ACTIVE] with Voice_[PASSIVE]. It consists of two instances of CAUS1

Can Voice_[ACTIVE] embed a Voice_[EXPLETIVE] (unaccusative) complement? Akin to **faire SE+unacc?**

29. _{[VoiceP DP [Voice_[ACTIVE] [VoiceP Voice_[EXPLETIVE] [vPV [V DP]]]]]}

Perhaps the presence of unaccusatives with expletive Voice needs to be morphologically motivated; such motivation is arguably available for Romance *se* unaccusatives but is absent in Hindi.

Can Voice_[ACTIVE] embed a Voice_{[PROCESS]P}?

30. _{[VoiceP DP [Voice_[ACTIVE] [VoiceP Voice_[PROCESS] [vP DP_{holder} v [V]]]]]}

Voice_[PROCESS] does not introduce an Agent (initiator), so the structure cannot be read as expressing two initiated events.

- The presence of two distinct agents forces two distinct events. In a number of neo-Davidsonian analyses (Ramchand 2008, Borer 2005) the agent is considered to be the initiator of an eventuality. Having two initiating points entails two events.

Do we need distinct marking for indirect causation?

Turkish reflects on the surface decompositional treatment of **-va:** in Hindi-Urdu as consisting of two instances of Voice (31b). But if the embedded transitive is not itself a direct causative (e.g. *open*, 31c), only CAUS1 is spelled, and CAUS2 is null. Turkish, unlike Hindi-Urdu or Georgian, does not expone Voice_[PASSIVE] in indirect causatives by special morpheme.

31. Turkish (F. Akkus, p.c.)

- a. Leyla mum-u sön-**dür**-dü *direct causation*
 Leyla candle-ACC blow.out-CAUS-PAST
 YES: ‘Leyla blew out the candle.’
 NO: ‘Leyla made someone blow out the candle/Leyla caused the candle to be blown out.’

- b. Leyla mum-u sön-**dür-t**-tü *indirect causation*
 Leyla candle-ACC blow.out-CAUS-CAUS-PAST
 ‘Leyla caused the candle to be blown out (by someone).’

- c. Müdür kapı-yı aç-**tır**-dı *indirect causation*
 director door-ACC open-CAUS-Past
 YES: ‘The director had the door opened (by someone).’ [Key 2013:187]
 NO: ‘The director opened the door’

- A common crosslinguistic pattern – morphological means for marking indirect causation are more complex than the marking of direct causation
- In many languages, **the marker of direct causation is a subset of the marking of indirect causation.**

32.	Georgian	Hindi	Amharic	Kinande
CAUS1	a-	-a:	a-	-i-
CAUS2	a-...-in-	-va:	as-	-is/ik-...-i-

- CAUS1 combines with intransitives
- CAUS2 combines with transitives

6. Overview

- Indirect causation is not a basic primitive; it is built in the syntax.
- Indirect causation is configurational: it is the interpretation we get when a Voice head combines with another Voice head, directly or via a verbal head.

- One way of building an indirect causative is analytical and involves using a verb like FA(I)RE: the embedding verb and the embedded verbal projection both come with their own event variable.
 - With morphological causatives, unless the embedded projection has an external argument, we do not have indirect causation
 - With morphological causatives, indirect causatives cannot be formed on unaccusatives.
 - Allowing for indirect causatives of unaccusatives does not seem to be a general property of the periphrastic route.
 - Sigurdsson & Wood (2021) show for Icelandic that periphrastic indirect causatives cannot embed unaccusatives.
33. a. * þær létu koma fangana.
they.NOM let.PST arrive.INF prisoners.the.ACC
‘They made prisoners arrive.’
- Further evidence that unaccusatives cannot be embedded under ‘let’ comes from verbs which allow for both transitive and unaccusative/anticausative uses.
34. a. þær dýpkuðu holuna.
they deepened hole.the.ACC
‘They deepened the hole.’
- b. Holan dýpkaði.
hole.the.NOM deepened
‘The hole deepened.’
- c. þær létu dýpka holuna.
they let.PST deepen.INF hole.the.ACC
‘They made someone deepen the hole.’ / *‘They made the hole deepen.’

There is a connection between the form of the linguistic item expressing causation: verb vs. morpheme. Verbs obligatorily introduce an event variable while morphemes don’t have to. Hence, the requirement that indirect causation involve event separation is satisfied even in cases of causative verbs embedding unaccusative structures but not in cases of causative morphemes embedding such structures.

In order to express indirect causation, having two event variables is a necessary condition but there are at least two routes to getting two event variables: FA(I)RE route and the morphological route where the causative head introduces a distinct event variable only when its complement has an agent of its own.