Additional meanings of causal markers in polypredicative constructions
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The paper deals with semantics of causal markers in polypredicative constructions; it is based on a reasonably balanced sample of 74 languages. It turns out that apart from their basic causal meaning, causal markers can express other additional meanings.

1. Evaluative component. While neutral evaluation is typical of most causal markers under consideration (cf. Spanish porqué 'because'), they can express positive or negative evaluation as well (cf. Spanish gracias a que ‘thanks to the fact that’ and por culpa de que ‘because of’, where the cause is perceived as negative). Besides, some of the causal markers can imply negative evaluation of the consequence in the main clause, cf. a Russian causal marker iz-za togo, chto from [Boguslavskaya & Levontina 2004: 74].

It seems that evaluative meaning is more typical of Standard Average European, though the other language may be underdescribed in this respect.

2. The reality of cause. Some languages can not only express real cause, but use false causal markers as well. Some of them imply that the participant believes the reason to be false (cf. French sous (le) prétexte que ‘under the pretext that’), while others refer to a situation where the participant does not know that the reason is false (cf. Basque -delakoan ‘in the belief that’) [Rijk 2008: 463].

3. Temporal distance. In some languages, different causal markers can express greater or smaller temporal distance. Thus, in Skou (Western Skou, Indonesia) the reason marker te-, unlike wa ko te, is used if “the time reference of the first clause significantly precedes that of the second clause” [Donohue 2004: 497-498].

4. Conformity or non-conformity to the hearer’s expectations. In Mishar Tatar dialect causal clauses violating the presupposition of the question admit only one of two basic causal strategies (while clausal conjunction čenki is possible here, perfect verb –gan-ga is not) [Tatevosov et al. 2017: 488].

(1a) sinen čaškř-ŋ juk, čenki sin a-mr ůze-ŋ wat-tr-ŋ.
you.GEN cup-2SG not_exist REAS you IT-ACC yourself-2SG break-PST-2SG
(1b) *sin a-mr ůze-ŋ wat-kan-ga (kür-ä) sinen čaškř-ŋ juk.
you IT-ACC yourself-2SG break-PFCT-CAUSE (see-ST.IPV) you.GEN cup-2SG not_exist
{-Where is my cup?} – ‘Your cup is not there any more, as you have broken it yourself’.

5. Objective vs. subjective cause. In some languages the opposition between the objective and subjective reason is possible, cf. the Korean examples, where -e/ese expresses objective and impersonal cause, while -nikka “expresses a speaker’s emphatic attitude” [Sohn 1993: 88]:

(2a) pi-ka wa-se nuc-ess-eyo
rain-NOM come-SE late-PST-DEC
‘I was late because it is raining’.

(2b) pi-ka o-nikka nuc-ess-eyo
‘(You know/I believe) I was late because it is raining’.
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