

Analytic Causative Constructions in English (Viewed in the Light of Cognitive Semantics)



Yelena Mkhitarian



Sophie Sarkissyan

The subject of our analysis is causative constructions of *John made Jack run* type, in which the relation between the nominative part (*John*) and the verb (*made*) is considered to be primary predication, while the relation between *Jack* and *run* secondary predication. Though both the predicative links take a two-sided direction, they are not identical syntactically: the first predication constitutes the nucleus of the sentence, whereas the same cannot be said about the second syntactic bond. On the other hand, the secondary participant of the situation occupies a more privileged syntactic position, thus reducing the status of the nucleus subject to that of the benefactive, instrumental, etc. (Plungyan, 210). This kind of approach prompts us to look at the nature of causative verbs in the light of cognitive semantics. As is known, cognitive linguistics implies that language uses not only linguistic, but also extralinguistic factors to interpret language facts such as our perception of reality, the links between objects and phenomena, etc. When describing analytic causative constructions from the point of cognitive semantics, we will make use of the theory of force dynamics suggested by L. Talmy. This theory was successfully applied by the author in his description of English modal verbs. L. Talmy introduced the concepts of Agonist and

Antagonist while analyzing this class of verbs from the semantic point of view (Talmy, 2-79). Thus, in the sentence *You must go **you*** is used as the Agonist, i.e. the agent of the action (*go*). The Antagonist is present only implicitly: it is the speaker in the referent situation, who induces the Agonist to act in this or that way.

Transferring this theory into the sphere of analytic causative constructions, we will view the subject of primary predication as the Antagonist (Ant), i.e. the inducer of the action expressed by the causative verb (Vc), while the Agonist (Ag) is the subject of secondary predication, i.e. the agent of the action expressed by the resultative verb (Vr).

The role of Vr is very important as it carries the basic semantic charge as different from causative verbs which in these constructions perform the function of auxiliary (functional) verbs. In this sense they are similar to modal verbs which show only the attitude of the speaker to the action expressed by the infinitive.

But unlike modal verbs, causative verbs can be followed not only by the infinitive, but also by other morphological forms and classes such as Participle I, Participle II, gerund, adjective and noun. Consequently, we will single out six models with causative verbs:

1. Ant + Vc + Ag + (to) inf.
2. Ant + Vc + Ag + Part I
3. Ant + Vc + Ag + Part II
4. Ant + Vc + Ag + into (out of) + ger.
5. Ant + Vc + Ag + Adj.
6. Ant + Vc + Ag + N

We will view each model separately as each of them has its own distinctive features.

1. Ant + Vc + Ag + (to) inf

This model is represented by such causative verbs as *make, cause, force, urge, get, have, order, compel, impel, persuade, command* and others, which can occur both in the active and passive form. The Antagonist may be animate or inanimate, but the Agonist is normally animate. For example,

- a) *Your daddy'll make you tell the truth.* (Baldwin, 14)
- b) *His smile forced her to smile.* (Baldwin, 192)
- c) *They are forced to have more than our life.* (Wilde, 166)
- d) *Cathy sensed his misgivings and wanted to believe that they were caused by his own abrasive relationship with his father.* (Segal, 475)

As is seen from the examples, the Antagonist in passive constructions may (d) or may not be expressed explicitly (c).

It is worth mentioning that active and passive constructions are not always identical as it might seem at first sight. This concerns the cases when the infinitive is followed by an object, which brings about a certain semantic shift in the correlative constructions. P.Culicover compares the following constructions: a) *John forced the doctor to examine Bill*, b) *John forced Bill to be examined by the doctor*; and finds that they are not synonymous as John's efforts are applied in different directions: in the first case they are being exerted against the doctor, in the second case against Bill (Culicover, 135).

Some causative verbs (mainly *force, make*) can have the reflexive pronoun to denote the Agonist, which indicates that both the Agonist and the Antagonist belong to the same referent. For example,

- Jennifer forced herself to speak.* (Sheldon, 194)

It must be noted that causative verbs in these patterns are usually found in the affirmative form. One of the forms of expressing negative causation is the use of the

phrase *to bring oneself to do sth.* For example,

Adam could not bring himself to answer. (Sheldon, 223)

Of special interest is the scope of usage of causative verbs in fiction. We have observed that the writers (whose works we have studied for that purpose) give a preference to a particular causative verb (or verbs) besides the verb *make* which takes a dominant position in their works: S. Maugham - *force*; S. Fitzgerald - *get*; A. Hailey - *urge, force*; Ch. Bronte - *force, urge*; W. Saroyan - *get, have*; J. Heller - *force, get, have*; E. Segal - *cause*; S. Sheldon - *force*.

It is notable that O. Wilde in his novel "The Portrait of Dorian Gray" used the verb *make* in 40 cases, *force* - in 3 and *induce* and *have* - in single cases. In D. Lawrence's stories ("Odour of Chrysanthemums") out of 20 causative verbs *make* is used in 16 cases, *force* - in 3 and *cause* - in 1. All this indicates that the verb *make* in analytic causative constructions has the highest frequency of usage.

2. Ant + Vc + Ag + Part I

Both the Antagonist and the Agonist in this model are usually animate. The typical causatives are *have* and *get*. For example,

a) *I won't have you talking like that any more.* (Steffens, 65)

b) *Master Paul would get me talking about racing events, spinning yarns, you know, sir.* (Lawrence, 209)

This pattern has a low frequency of usage.

3. Ant + Vc + Ag + Part II

This pattern is very productive in English. The usual causative verb is *have*, but *get* may also be found here. This model differs from patterns 1 and 2, in which the Agonist is the agent of the Vr expressed by the infinitive or Participle I. Here the Agonist does not find explicit expression; instead, the object is present as it is in passive constructions. This model is analogous to another construction with the verbs *have* and *get*, but their semantic structures are quite different: Cf:

a) *She had her hair cut.*

b) *She had her diamonds stolen.*

c) *He got his arm crushed.*

In (a) the verb *have* is used in causative meaning: something is done at the Antagonist's will. In (b) and (c) we have the opposite: the action is directed against the Antagonist's will. R. Quirk and S. Greenbaum define this meaning of the verb *have* as factual (Quirk and Greenbaum, 367). As the examples show the Antagonist in this model is animate and the Agonist, which corresponds to the deep object, is inanimate.

4. Ant + Vc + Ag + into (out of) ger.

A large number of causatives can be used in this model: *cajole, coax, coerce, inveigle, dragoon, wheedle, goad, bully, delude*, as well as *force, persuade*, etc. For example, *Natalie's coerced me into going by sea from New York.* (Hailey, 8)

The causative verb may be found in the passive voice, in which case the model

changes into Ag + Vc (pass) + by Ant + into (out of) gerund. For example,

Not unexpectedly, he was coerced by the wedding guests into playing the piano.
(Segal, 237)

This pattern is so productive that even those verbs which are not normally considered causatives can function as such. For example,

He tried to talk me into (out of) moving abroad.

In some cases the gerund may be replaced by a noun (often a verbal noun). This is characteristic of the verbs *cajole*, *dragoon*, *wheedle* as well as *force* and *persuade*.

For example,

a) *They dragooned him into retirement.*

b) *At last he stopped forcing his horse into mechanical gallop...* (Lawrence, 206)

Both the Antagonist and the Agonist in this model are usually animate.

5. Ant + Vc + Ag + Adj.

The verb *make* is normally found in this model. As far as the last component is concerned, R. Quirk and S. Greenbaum define the function of the adjective in this model as resulting attribute (Quirk and Greenbaum, 368). This may be accounted for by the fact that it indicates the change of the state of the Agonist, the result of the action. The pattern *I made her angry* may be transformed into *She got angry*. We find it more plausible to define this function of the adjective as resulting predicative. This approach is confirmed by S. Paul's thesis viewing the attribute as weakened predicate (Veikhman, 210).

For example,

a) *You have made the room so charming.* (du Maurier, 79)

b) *... whiskey makes them (dancers) frisky, but sherry makes them merry.*
(Segal, 109)

This model may undergo some modification when the adjective comes immediately after the causative verb as it is in the following example:

Howden decided not to lecture Margaret on the history of Canadian tariffs which had made possible the extremely favourable terms of the Act of Union. (Hailey, 229)

We find the following explanation to this phenomenon: the second nominative element (the Agonist) is overburdened syntactically by the presence of the attributes expressed by the adjective and the prepositional phrase, therefore the shift of a single adjective (*possible*) to the position immediately after the verb *make* is structurally justified.

As the observations show, besides the verb *make* typical of this model, some other verbs not belonging to the class of paradigmatic causatives may also be found here. These are the verbs *leave* and *drive*. For example,

a) *They are sensual with an unashamed violence that leaves you breathless.*
(Maugham, 160)

b) *... when the very tinkle of the ice in my champagne glass drives me mad.*
(Henry, 16)

Such behaviour of the above verbs confirms the thesis of U. Weinrich and M. Bierwisch, who state that dictionary articles may acquire specific meanings in certain contexts (Bierwisch, 29).

As can be seen from the examples, the Antagonist and the Agonist in this model may be both animate and inanimate.

6. Ant + Vc + Ag + N

Like model 5, the typical causative verb here is the verb *make*. For example,

a) *You make me a liar by such language.* (Bronte, 313)

b) *You make Toronto another Chicago; Montreal a New Orleans.* (Hailey, 339)

This pattern is analogous to another construction:

c) *I think we could make you a very attractive proposal.* (Sheldon, 106)

Though identical structurally, they differ on the deep level: in the first case (a) the syntactic relation between *me* and *liar* is that of predication: *I am a liar*: The same is true of (b). But in (c) the relation between *you* and *proposal* is quite different: indirect object + direct object. Thus we see that in the latter case the verb *make* is devoid of causative meaning. This is congruent with Chomski's view in regard to the correlation causativeness - noncausativeness, who holds that their difference can be expressed only on the semantic level, but not on the syntactic level (Jackendoff, 176).

Summing up, we may conclude that the second predicate (Vr) in analytic causative constructions has different morphological expression: infinitive, Participle I, Participle II, gerund, adjective, noun. Each model is characterized by a specific class of causatives and their number in each pattern varies from the maximum (models 1, 4) to the minimum (models 5, 6). Besides, some causative verbs seem to adhere to a particular model: *coerce, cajole, delude, dragoon, bulldoze* - model 4; others enter a number of models: *make* - models 1, 5, 6; *have, get* - models 1, 2, 3. As to the animateness or inanimateness of the nominative parts (the Antagonist and the Agonist), they behave differently in different models. Models 2 and 4 suggest the animate Antagonist and the animate Agonist; model 3 - the animate Antagonist; model 1 - the animate Agonist; in the other models the Antagonist and the Agonist are represented indistinguishably.

References:

1. Плуниган В.А. Общая морфология. Введение в проблематику, М, Эдиториал УРСС, 2000.
2. Bierwisch M. On Classifying Semantic Features. The Hague. Paris, Mouton, 1970.
3. Culicover P.W. Syntax. Academic Press, 1976.
4. Jackendoff R. Semantics and Cognition, The MIT Press, 1990.
5. Quirk R., Greenbaum S. A University Grammar of English, London, Longman, 1978.

6. Talmy L. Force Dynamics in Language and Cognition, University of California, Berkeley, 1988.
7. Veikhman G.A. A New Look at English Syntax, M., ACT, 2002.

**Անգլերենի պատճառական հարադրավոր կառույցները
(իմացաբանական-իմաստաբանական վերլուծություն)**

Հոդվածում քննության են առնվում անգլերենի պատճառական հարադրավոր կառույցները՝ իմացաբանական իմաստաբանության և գործառական լեզվաբանության դիտանկյունից, ինչը հնարավորություն է տալիս առանձնացնել վեց շարահյուսական կաղապար: Յուրաքանչյուր կաղապարն ընդգրկում է երկու ստորոգյալ. առաջինը, որպես կանոն, արտահայտվում է պատճառական բայով, երկրորդը՝ խոսքի տարբեր մասերով կամ բայածևերով (ամորոշ դերբայ, I դերբայ, II դերբայ, գերունդ, ածական, գոյական): Ինչ վերաբերում է գործողության մասնակիցներին (գործողին և հակագործողին /Որան հակադարձողին/), որոնք կաղապարում ներկայացված են որպես անվանական բաղադրիչներ, ապա դրանց դերում հանդես են գալիս տարբեր իմաստային խմբերի գոյականներ (շնչավոր և անշունչ), ինչը պայմանավորված է կառույցի տեսակով և դրանում ընդգրկված պատճառական բայի բնույթով: Վերլուծությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ բացի հարացույցային պատճառականներից՝ տվյալ կաղապարներում կարող են գործածվել նաև բայեր, որոնք սովորաբար չեն դասվում այդ կարգի բայերի շարքը: