A Typology of Causatives, Pragmatically Speaking

Nancy Bishop

The purpose of this paper is to give a brief overview of the typology of causative constructions and to suggest that in addition to the syntactic and semantic factors governing causative constructions, explicit pragmatic explanations are needed to adequately account for their behavior. Prior to looking at some of the pragmatic considerations involved in language usage of causative constructions, a brief summary of linguistic typologies, specifically of causative constructions, is necessary. Linguistic typologies are the classification of languages into different types on the basis of their variation from one another. More than just a simple taxonomy of languages, typologies serve to explain the nature of languages as well as provide proof of language universals.

Not all typologies are of great interest or significance, but those that interact with implicational universals usually are. For example, Greenberg (1966) found a number of implicational universals stemming from the word order typology. He found correlates in the order of the genitive constituent as well as adjectives following the noun it modifies, and the existence of prepositions within the basic word order of VO languages (1966 : 62,67).

The causative typology to be described in more detail later is based upon prototypes, suggested by Givón (1984). He proposes that languages fall along a continuum, forming non-discrete boundaries between actual types. The prototypes can be determined by a bell curve where the most typical qualities and the most frequent occurrence of those qualities occur. As a result, the prototypes are sometimes more ideal than real, but serve as a basic model of a given type.

Causality presupposes two conditions : the dependency of the effect event on the causing event and the required sharing of certain referential points, such as time, space, agency, etc. The scope of causality in this paper will not include interclausal constructions, instrumental causatives or permissive cause per se.

Comrie (1981) and Shibatani (1975) have extensively described the typology of causative constructions. To a lesser extent Syeed (1984) has also described the causative typology in terms of affectivity. My own work has simply been to combine all three of these descriptions and to test their validity on a wide sample of languages taken from secondary sources, as well as to have introduced pragmatic consideration.

Languages typically use one or more of three causative prototypes : morphological, analytical and lexical causatives. Examples of each type are shown below :

1) MORPHOLOGICAL Kewa, Papua New Guinea

nipú - mí onáá ma -píraa -
3 sg - AG people CAUSE -sit-3- sg

ria
PAST (alo)
' He made the people sit down. '
(Franklin 1971 : 73)

2) ANALYTICAL Thai

sǎakhǎa tham dɛɛŋ rɔ́ɔŋhaây
Saka cause Daeng cry
' Saka caused Daeng to cry. '
(Vichit-Vadakan 1976 : 468)

3) LEXICAL
She shoved her sister off the cliff.

The causative typology interrelates with two other typologies, morphological and word order. The mor-

phological typology divides languages into isolating, agglutinating, inflecting and polysynthetic types. A language's morphological type will govern in part the type of causative construction most favored. A continuum can be made with isolating languages to the left while polysynthetic ones are to the right. Analytical and lexical causatives co-occur with isolating languages while morphological causatives co-occur with polysynthetic languages :

Isolating	Agglutinating	Inflecting	Polysynthetic
Lexical/Analytical	Analytical/Morphological		Morphological

The word order typology is concerned with the normal order of the subject (S), verb (V), and object (O) constituents. It has been found that VO languages are usually more isolating, therefore, they usually use analytical causatives. OV languages generally are more agglutinating in nature, so morphological causatives are more prevalent. This is explained on the premise that causative constructions are underlyingly made up of two predicates, which when they undergo transformation come into closer proximity bringing about agglutination in the case of OV languages.

In addition to interaction with other typologies, causative constructions are sensitive to a number of semantic contexts. Shibatani (1975) presents four pairs of sematic factors that determine the use of languages' causatives in specific contexts. These pairs are referred to as : coercive vs. non-coercive, directive vs. manipulative, direct vs. indirect, ballistic vs. controlled.

Coercive causation has to do with the amount of (physical) force exerted by the causer on the causee. It implies resistance on the part of the causee, which usually requires the causee to be animate. Non-coercive is oftentimes permissive in nature.

4) COERCIVE : ' I made the doctor come. '

5) NON-COERCIVE : ' I had the doctor come. '
(Shibatani 1975 : 41)

Directive causation implies the submissive volition of the causee. Directives are frequently verbal instructions or demands, so that an animate causee is required that can volitionally and physically respond. Manipulative causation frequently involves inanimate causees which must be physically manipulated and cannot volitionally resist. If a language can use more than one strategy, it will generally use the lexical form to express manipulation while the morphological form will be used for directive causation.

6) DIRECTIVE : Japanese

Boku	wa	kodomo	ni	tat - ase - ta
1sg	NOM	child	DAT	stand up-CAUSE-TNS

' I had the child stand up. '

7) MANIPULATIVE :

Boku	ga	boo	o	tate	- ta
1sg	NOM	stick	ACC	stand up	- TNS

' I stood the stick up. '
(Shibatani 1975 : 55)

Sentence (7) becomes ungrammatical if ' child ' is substituted for ' stick '.

Direct causation implies a straightforward means of bringing about the effect event, while indirect causation makes use of a secondary or intermediary means. Both direct and indirect causation can be accomplished by physical or verbal acts. Direct causation is frequently expressed by lexical causatives ; there is some evidence that the lexical form represents the perception of the speaker of the caused event. That is, lexical causatives represent only one event in the speaker's mind, rather than two. Indirect causation entails a secondary means of achieving the effect event, usually a human causee who retains a degree of control. Analytical causatives are generally used to express indirect causation.

8) DIRECT : Blackfoot, U.S. & Canada

nitsiikstakiipiaawa	nitana	mamiiksi
I-count-intro-cause-ANT	my daughter-ANT	fish-pl

' I made my daughter count the fish. '

9) INDIRECT:
nitsiikstakiattsaawa nitana mamiiksi
I-count-intro-cause-ANT my daughter-ANT fish-pl
' I had my daughter count the fish. ' (by some intermediary means)
(Frantz 1971 : 66)

Ballistic and controlled causation might better be understood as instigating and accompanying causation. The implication is that in ballistic causation the causer instigates a cause event which will bring about the effect event, but the causer is not involved beyond the initial control of the causee. In controlled causation, there is accompaniment or continuous control exerted by the causer from the moment of inception until the final effect event is accomplished.

10) BALLISTIC:
The explosion made the building shake.
(McCawley 1976 : 119)

11) CONTROLLED
John dressed the child in five minutes.
(McCawley 1976 : 117)

The correspondence of the three types of causative constructions with the four pairs of semantic factors can be summarized by saying that lexical causatives generally convey the meaning of manipulation, directness, coercion and at least in English, ' ballisticness '. Analytical and morphological causatives generally express the meanings of directive, indirect, non - coercive and permissive causation. There is overlap of these semantic features in almost every example, e.g., if there is direct causation, there is likely to be manipulation and coercion as well.

Lastly, the impact of affectivity on the choice of causative constructions should be given a cursory examination. Affective causative verbs are ones that have a benefactive effect on the causee, such as receiving or benefiting from the action of the verb. The following examples demonstrate affective/non - causative, affective/causative and non - affective/non - causative constructions:

12) AFFECTIVE/NON - CAUSATIVE Kashmiri

me	h'oč	ar‡t‡bî	tas	niš
1 sg	learn	Arabic	3 sg	near

' I learnt Arabic from him. "

13) AFFECTIVE/CAUSATIVE
tem hechinōvus bi ar‡bī
3sg learn-CAUS 1sg Arabic
' He taught me Arabic. '

14) NON-AFFECTIVE/NON-CAUSATIVE
me tsot kul tas niš
1sg cut tree 3sg near
' I cut the tree near him. '
(Syeed 1985 : 57, 8)

So far the briefest of sketches has been given to describe the causative typology and factors which govern its usage. In the remaining time, we will look at pragmatic conditions which may also regulate a speaker's choice of causative constructions. Pragmatics will be defined in accordance with the International Pragmatics Association's Working Document 1 which posits that it is a perspective on language, rather than a separate discipline or theory that examines the objects, levels, stages, degrees and functions of adaptation that are made by speakers (Verschueren : 1987).

First, the intent of the speaker of a causative construction would seem to be of tremendous significance in determining the strategy used. What the speaker is trying to accomplish through his statement of causality affects the way in which he will express it. Specifically, it seems that causative statements are frequently used for one of two speech events. One event or purpose is the speaker's desire to boast or take the credit for an action; in that situation, the speaker is the causer and via the expressive means available to him in a specific language, he emphasizes his own role in causing an event (or state). An English example could be:

15) I defeated the incumbent candidate by a landslide vote !

English relies on both the fronting of the causer and the intonation pattern to place emphasis on the speaker. Note that a lexical causative construction is used to express an event which was non - coer-

cive, more directive than manipulative, and indirect in nature.

The second common event or purpose of causative constructions is evaluation, specifically shifting the blame for something onto someone else. Franklin (1986 : personal communication) comments that the morphological causative construction is only used in Kewa when the speaker intends to emphasize the causer's responsibility for bringing about something. Using English again as an example:

16) He made me flunk the test!

The speaker's intent in similar constructions to (16) is to express, however metaphorically, the coercion, manipulation, and directness of the causer's actions upon the causee. Note that the causee is animate, retaining control and volition. A lexical causative could be substituted in this construction, but only if the causer has the authority to carry out the action, such as ' He flunked me on the test '. The implication, however, of the analytical causative (16) is that the causer's action is unjust and demands restitution. The blame or responsibility is clearly placed on the causer. The parallel lexical causative can have two interpretations, one of blame and injustice or another of factivity, implying that the causer's action was probably warranted, although not desired.

The importance of these observations is that the typology of causatives would not explain the occurrences of lexical and analytical causatives in these sentences. The reason appears to be that the choice of causative constructions in these two situations is pragmatically determined, rather than solely syntactically and semantically determined.

A second pragmatic factor to consider is the social setting in which the causative statement is being made. Within my own Western culture, unless the intention of the speaker is to defame someone, he will use an indirect means to express causation when he is in a public social setting. Figurative speech such as the use of innuendos, euphemisms, passive constructions, and unspecified causers is prevalent:

17) They *strongly encouraged* me to find another job.

18) I was *fired* from my job last week,

19) *Someone* revealed my ' mid - morning cocktails ' to my boss.

In contrast to the public setting, the speaker will probably use more overt expressions of causality in a private setting, such as in his home or among his closest companions. Contrast the previous examples with:

20) *Bob* (my boss) sacked me yesterday.

21) Bob *fired* me last week.

22) That ' goodie - two - shoes ' Sally squealed to my boss that I *drink* on the job.

The social setting, whether public or private, plays a role in determining how a speaker will express causation, especially if for the purpose of shifting responsibilities. How much of this difference is due to a public vs. private setting as compared to shared referential information is difficult to ascertain. Either motivation could prompt the same type of results in English.

A third pragmatic consideration is the social relationship of the speaker to the hearer. Constructions that parallel those used in different social settings are used in formal and informal social relationships. The more indirect expressions of causality are normally used in English if speaking to someone of a higher rank or of a greater social distance. In social relationships that are more intimate, the direct means of causal expression are frequently used; likewise, if the social rank of the hearer is equivalent to or lower than the speaker's, the normative expression is similar to those found in (20) - (22).

The final factor to be considered in this paper is the cultural or referential framework of the speaker. The existence of cause and effect is a universal quality of man, but its perception, scope, and conditions are culturally based. What can cause what is defined by a culture's world view. The animacy of something, which relates to its ability to be a causer and a causee, is specific to the culture of the speaker. Franklin (1986) notes that animacy is attributed to ambient entities or forces by the Kewa. To some degree, English allows elements, such as the wind or rain, to function as causer, but it seems it is more figurative than literal in meaning.

Another culturally defined quality is what is considered coercion or manipulation. In English, we imply coercion in statements like (17). Coercion, as well as manipulation, have extended their meanings in Eng-

lish to include situations in which the speaker *feels* as though he is being physically coerced or manipulated. This extended meaning is not necessarily universally held; Shibitani (1975) demonstrates that a cultural expression of manipulation may exclusively refer to an inanimate causee being physically acted upon by an agentive causer. (See (6) and (7))

These pragmatic factors may help to explain some language data that otherwise seems inconsistent with the typology. For example, the use of two different instigative causatives in Blackfoot (see examples (8) and (9)) could possibly be attributed to social setting or relationship factors, as much as to direct or indirect causation.

Hawaiian and Ponapean both utilize stative verbs extensively; when the causative affix is added, the verbs become inchoative. However, they are understood to be causative. Perception of causality culturally is probably being expressed in that type of construction.

23) Ponape, Micronesia

Adjectives	Intransitive Verbs	Transitive Verbs
ketiket 'to be numb '	kaketiket 'to become numb ', ' to cause numbness '?	kaketiketih ' to cause numbness '?
mer ' to be rusty '	kamer ' to become rusty ', ' to cause to rust '?	kamere ' to cause to rust '?

(Rehg 1981 : 216)

Angas is a Chadic language that is similar to Hausa, both languages using an analytical causative. Angas, however, always employs the subjunctive mood (Burquest 1986 : personal communication). It would seem that this expresses something about the culture's concept of causality, perhaps its uncertainty.

Finally, Dixon's decision to label the *-ŋal* controlling construction as ' controlling ' probably reflects the speaker's purpose or something about the culture's perception of causality, animacy, etc. In his description of Yidin, Dixon states:

> The important point here is that the only way a man can ' control ' a woman's coming (from point A to point B) is to COME WITH her; the semantic structuring... is, in essence ' the man controls (the woman comes). ' That is, a *-ŋa-l* form in Yidin can NOT mean that someone MADE someone do something by TELLING them to do it. The sense of *-ŋa-l* involves control of a physical nature... (Dixon 1977 : 316)

Specifically in Yidin, the obligatory controlling of a woman's travels by another human agent to ensure her arrival at a destination is a very different cultural view than that of the West, at least among women !

In conclusion, I would like to suggest that the above pragmatic parameters be considered within the framework of the causative typology in order to make it a truly integrated typology. It goes without saying that further cross-linguistic research is needed to validate these suggestions. Certainly other factors remain to be unearthed.

REFERENCES

Aissen, Juddith. 1979. *The syntax of causative constructions.* New York, NY: Garland Publishing.

Burquest, Donald. 1982. Language universals. Research Papers of the Texas SIL. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

_____. 1986. Personal communication.

Butterworth, Brian, Bernard Comrie, and Östen Dahl (eds.). 1984. *Explanations for language universals.* New-York, NY: Mouton.

Cole, Peter. 1982. *Lingua descriptive studies: Imbabura Quechue.* 5. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co.

Comrie, Bernard. 1975. Causatives and universal grammar. *Transactions of the Philological Society.* 1 - 32. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

_____. 1976. The syntax of causative constructions: cross - language similarities and divergences. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics.* 6 : 264 - 311. New York, NY: Academic Press.

_____. and Norval Smith. 1977. Lingua descriptive studies : questionnaire. *Lingua.* 42.1. Amsterdam: North - Holland Publishing Co.

_____. 1981. *Language universals and linguistic typology.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1985. Causative verb formation and other verb-deriving morphology. In Timothy Shopen (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description.* 3 : 309 - 48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1977. *A grammar of Yidin.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 1980. *The languages of Australia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elbert, Samuel and Mary Pukui. 1979. *Hawaiian grammar.* Honolulu, HI: The University Press of Hawaii.

Fodor, J.D. 1970. Three reasons for not deriving ' kill ' from ' cause to die '. *Linguistic Inquiry.* 4 : 429 - 35.

Franklin, Karl. 1971. *A grammar of Kewa, New Guinea.* Pacific Linguistics, series C, 16. Canberra, Australia: Pacific Linguistics.

_____. 1986. Personal communication.

Frantz, Donald. 1971. *Toward a generative grammar of Blackfoot.* Norman, OK: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Givón, Talmy. 1975. Cause and control: On the semantics of interpersonal manipulation. In John Kimball (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics.* 4 : 59 - 88. New York, NY: Academic Press.

_____. 1984. *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

_____. 1985. Iconicity, isomorphism, and non-arbitrary coding in syntax. In John Haiman (ed.). *Iconicity in Syntax,* 187 - 219. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966a. Language universals with specific reference to feature hierarchies. *Janua Linguarum,* Series Minor 59. The Hague: Mouton.

_____. 1966b. *Universals of language.* 2nd Ed. 62 - 7. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

_____, Charles Ferguson, and Edith Moravcsik (eds.) 1978. *Universals of human language.* 1 - 4. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hyman, Larry. 1984. Form and substance in language universals. In Brian Butterworth, Bernard Comrie, and Östen Dahl (eds.). *Explanations in language universals,* 67 - 86. New York, NY: Mouton.

Itkonen, Esa. 1983. *Causality in linguistic theory.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Lehmann, Winfred P. (ed.). 1978. *Syntactic typology and studies in the phenomenology of language.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Mallinson, Graham, and Barry Blake. 1981. *Language typology: cross-linguistic studies in syntax.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co.

McCawley, James. 1976. Remarks on what can cause what. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics.* 6 : 117 - 29. New York, NY: Academic Press.

_____. 1978. Language universals in linguistic argumentation. Linguistics in the 70's: Directions and Prospects. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences,* Special Issue, 205 - 19. Urbana, IL: Dept. of Linguistics, University of Illinois.

McCawley, Noriko. 1976. On experiencer causatives. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics.* 6 : 181 - 20. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Rehg, Kenneth L. 1981. *Ponapean reference grammar.* Honolulu, HI: The University Press of Hawaii.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1972. Three reasons for not deriving ' kill ' from ' cause to die '. In John Kimball (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics.* 1. (In Japanese) New York, NY: Academic Press.

_____. 1975. *A linguistic study of causative constructions.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

_____. 1976. The grammar of causative constructions: a conspectus. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics.* 6 : 1 - 39. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Shopen, Timothy (ed.). 1985. *Language typology and syntactic description.* 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Syeed, Sayyid. 1985. *Morphological causatives and the problems of the transformational approach.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Talmy, Leonard. 1976. Semantic causative types. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics.* 6 : 43 - 115. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Vershueren, Jef. 1987. *Pragmatics as a theory of linguistic adaptation.* International Pragmatics Association Working Document 1. Belgium: University of Antwerp.

Vichit-Vadakan, Rasami. 1976. The concept of inadvertence in Thai periphrastic causative constructions. The grammar of causative constructions. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics.* 6 : 460 - 71. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Wachowicz, Krystyna. 1976. *Some universal properties of morphological causatives.* Working Papers on Language Universals. 20. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.