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Analytical causatives pose challenges and present testing grounds in respect to topics ranging from semantic and syntactic theory to language change, linguistic description and language acquisition. Because of this, causatives have long attracted interest from linguists working in different frameworks and against different backgrounds. In many approaches to analytical causatives, the focus is largely on factitive causation (such as en. make / have / get), with permissive causation (en. let) being seen as something related, but separate. In some traditions, however, notably in the tradition of the Leningrad typological school, factitive causation and permissive causation are seen as two main modes of causation, in some sense as the counterparts to the main modal operators of necessity and possibility (e.g., Nedjalkov 1976:23).

A treatment of analytical causatives that takes both permissive and factitive causation (or causation proper, as it has been called) into account is called for, among other things, by the fact that in many European languages, e.g. most Germanic languages, Finnish, Estonian, Czech, the most prominent analytic causative formants express both permissive and factitive causation. The Swedish verb låta is a case in point:

(1) Kungen lät fången gå. (Swedish, permissive)
    king-DEF let-PST prisoner-DEF go
    ‘The king let the prisoner go’

(2) Kungen lät halshugga fången. (Swedish, factitive)
    king-DEF let-PST behead prisoner-DEF
    ‘The king had the prisoner beheaded’

Permissive causation has not been extensively studied in previous work. Therefore, many of the papers in this volume focus on the relationship of permissive and factitive causatives, as
well as on permissives themselves. The theme of the volume is not, however, limited to these topics.

From a historical point of view, the development of permissive to factitive or underspecified causative formants (or vice versa) in some of these languages remains to be fully understood. Both contact-based and independent accounts have been suggested for different languages. There are considerable similarities as well as divergences in the expression of these functions in the European languages yet to be put into perspective.

The nine articles included in the present volume look at and analyze a selection of analytical causative constructions in a number of languages, mostly within Europe but extending to creoles and including several non-Indo-European languages. Together, the articles show that an even closer look at analytical causatives is in place. Rather than trying to give a proper synthesis of the field, the book as a whole aims to provide the interested reader with typologically and theoretically useful data of several languages and to bring forth a part of the wonderful spectrum of phenomena and variability found in analytical causatives even in such a modest set of languages.

The book is the result of a process which started as an outgrowth of a workshop organized at the 22nd Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics. The book is not a collection of conference proceedings in the traditional sense, however. Rather, it brings together ideas presented at the conference and unites them with articles written by independent researchers as well as novel ideas of the workshop participants.

The ideas and research results of each individual researcher have not been forced into any one coherent theoretical framework. Each author brings in not only their views of analytical causatives in their respective languages but also their theoretical views of the syntax, semantics, and typological properties of analytical causatives. There is something of a bias towards cognitively-oriented frameworks, but not all of the papers subscribe to that bias, and even those which do differ quite a lot in their exact theoretical flavor.

The book thus aims to look at analytical causatives from several different points of view. These include different theoretical frameworks as well as different semantic and lexical aspects (e.g. ‘permitting’ vs. ‘instigating’, different causative verbs within a given language, etc.), different languages (English, Swedish, Finnish, Estonian, Russian, etc.), different levels of proficiency (native vs. second language learner), etc. The overall picture achieved through these different but related approaches is more complex than coherent, but it goes to show that analytical causatives are well worth further studies in that they prove to be a fruitful object of study for such a wide selection of approaches.
It has been a delight for the authors to note that different theories (and, of course, their real-life proponents) can join forces and concentrate on discussing a topic of common interest without the need to argue about the adequacy of theoretical assumptions. We believe that such a polytheoretical approach is capable of a broader and less biased view of language than any theoretical framework alone. We also believe that the present volume provides the interested reader with novel insight and relevant findings concerning analytical causatives in respect to both individual languages as well as cross-linguistically. Above all, we hope the ideas presented in the book to give rise to new ones and to serve as motivation for further research in the realm of analytical causatives.
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Abstract

Causative formation in the family of Afro-Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles (AECs) can be ordered along a continuum with an “African” and a “European” pole. On one end we find biclausal structures: A causative main verb takes a clausal complement marked for subjunctive mood. These structures appear to conform to a West African areal pattern in which subjunctive mood, instantiated in a modal complementizer, appears in a range of deontic contexts, including causatives. At the other end, causative formation involves English-style “raising”, hence reduced clauses. The prevalence of either pattern strongly correlates with the contact trajectory of an individual AEC. Languages that have been in continuous contact with English generally feature a more fragmented modal system in which causative formation follows idiosyncratic strategies. AECs that have been insulated from English for a longer period, and the African AECs in general, feature more unitary modal systems in which causative constructions are formally part of a larger functional domain of deonticity.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of causative formation in the family of Afro-Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles and Pidgins (henceforth AECs) that spans the Atlantic basin from West Africa to the Caribbean. A closer look at causatives in the AECs reveals a fascinating range of typological variation across the family. To my knowledge, this is the first comparative study of causative formation in the AECs.

* I gratefully acknowledge the help of my language informants in West Africa, the Caribbean and Suriname. I am also grateful for comments by an anonymous reviewer.
In terms of speaker numbers and geographical distribution, the chain of often mutually intelligible AECs must be counted as one of the largest lectal continua of the Western hemisphere. The AECs form a comparatively young family. They arose during the European slave trade from the 16th century onwards, crystallized as stable linguistic systems and native languages to the enslaved and free African-descended population of the colonial Caribbean, have since then differentiated along the political and geographical fragmentation of the territories they have been spoken in, and have seen a massive expansion in speaker numbers, particularly in West Africa in the wake of nation-building in the post-independence period since the 1960s.

A consensus is beginning to emerge about the genesis of the AECs and the roles of the colonial, superstrate language English, which provided the bulk of the lexicon of the AECs, and the African substrate languages, spoken by the enslaved African-descended peoples of the colonial Caribbean, have played in this process. According to a growing number of scholars of the field, the AECs are types of mixed languages that combine lexical, grammatical and phonological features from English and the relevant African languages in innovative ways, mediated by general cognitive principles of language acquisition (cf. e.g. Mufwene 2008; Aboh 2006, also the collection of articles in Ansaldo, Matthews & Lim 2007).

There appears to be a certain degree of difference between the linguistic scenario involving an English-lexicon creole with English as the current superstrate language, and one with a different superstrate, e.g. Spanish with Pichi in Equatorial Guinea or Dutch with Sranan in Suriname. A large body of work in creole linguistics points to the possibility that after an initial creolization period of varying length, the lexical, and in some cases structural similarity between the creole and its lexicon-providing superstrate, compounded by socio-political factors, may make the creole more susceptible to lexical and grammatical transfers from the superstrate than in cases where the superstrate is not the lexicon-providing language (cf. e.g. Whinnom 1971; Dillard 1972; Bickerton 1975).

The ease of transferability of words and structures between lexically and grammatically akin languages has also been argued for in the contact literature (Muysken 2000: 122ff.). The data assembled here seems to support this hypothesis, at least with respect to the grammar of causative-formation. A second purpose of this paper is therefore to show in how far causative formation in the AECs reflects the typological spread found between the Indo-European lexifier English and the West African substrate and adstrate languages of the Niger-Congo phylum.

1 This can be extrapolated from speaker numbers in the largest AEC-speaking countries, i.e. Nigeria, ~80M (Ihemere 2006), Ghana ~5M (Huber 2012); Sierra Leone ~5M (Finney 2011); Jamaica ~3M.
This paper is structured as follows: In section 2, I provide a brief case study of causative formation within its systemic context in Pichi, an African AEC spoken in Equatorial Guinea. In section 3, I look at causative formation in representative AECs on both sides of the Atlantic. The picture is complemented by an analysis of causative formation in relevant adstrate and substrate languages of the AECs in section 0. In section 5, I sum up the principal findings. Section 0 concludes this paper. All unreferenced examples stem from my field data gathered in West Africa and the Caribbean between 2007-11. The corpus consists of a diverse range of naturalistic and elicited text types, with a total of about 100’000 words.

2. Causatives in Pichi

In this section, I present an overview of causative formation in Pichi. I will show that Pichi represents a type of AEC that is close to the West African pole of causative formation. Pichi is also interesting in the degree of formal unity of the entire functional domain to which the expression of causative belongs and is therefore an example for a neat form-function isomorphism. We will see that the coding of causative suggests that in functional-semantic terms, it is firmly integrated into a modal meta-domain of deontic modality in the AECs.

Pichi belongs to the African group of the family of Afro-Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles and is spoken on the island of Bioko, Equatorial Guinea (Yakpo 2009a). Equatorial Guinea was colonized by Spain, hence Pichi is the only African AEC that has not been in direct contact with English for at least hundred and fifty years. Pichi therefore shows very few, if any traces of contact with English. In contrast, its sister languages, Krio (Sierra Leone), Nigerian and Ghanaian Pidgin, all of which are covered in section 3, have been in direct, uninterrupted contact with English since their creation or implantation in West Africa and have thereby invariably been affected and shaped by English.

Pichi factitive (i.e. ‘making’) causatives (called causatives “proper” in Comrie 1985) are periphrastic (henceforth referred to as “analytic”); they are biclausal and involve the use of subordinating predication. The subordinate clause of effect is a subjunctive clause introduced by the modal complementizer and subjunctive marker mek ‘SBJV’. This strategy of causative formation can be seen as a representative of the “purposive type” (Song 1996: 49–67). The main clause event is carried out for the purpose of realizing the subordinate clause event, which accordingly receives modal (in this case subjunctive) marking. Such a goal orientation
may also be seen to permeate the entire modal domain of deonticity which the causative forms a part of in the AECs:\(^2\)

\[(1) \quad \text{è \ bìn \ mek \ mek \ à \ gi \ dì \ gel \ dì \ plàntì.}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
3\text{SG.SBJ} & \text{PST} & \text{make} & \text{SBJV} & 1\text{SG.SBJ} & \text{give} \quad \text{DEF} & \text{girl} \quad \text{DEF} & \text{plantain} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘He made me give the plantain to the girl.’ (Pichi)

Three aspects of the causative construction in (1) are particularly noteworthy: (1) the subordinate effect clause is introduced by a modal element, namely the subjunctive complementizer *mek* ‘SBJV’; (2) the subjunctive complementizer is homophonous with and diachronically related to the (lexical) causative verb *mek* ‘make’; (3) the causee is expressed as the subject of the subordinate clause of effect. The analyticity of the Pichi causative construction is evident in certain characteristics. First, the causative event is expressed in two finite clauses rather than via a main clause and a more reduced structure involving a non-finite predicate (cf. e.g. Hans-Bianchi, this volume for Standard German). Second, there is no argument-merging or sharing of the “raising”-type, in which a causee is at once a syntactic argument of the main verb while functioning as a notional argument of the subordinate clause (cf. e.g. Dalmi, this volume for Hungarian, and Leino, this volume for Finnish). Third, the subjunctive complementizer alone caters for the expression of mood in the construction, i.e. there is no additional overt mood marking on the effect verb. Finally, the subjunctive complementizer is fully grammaticalized and there are no intermediate stage effects such as distributional restrictions on the cooccurrence of *mek* ‘SBJV’ and *mek* ‘make’ in the same clause.

When turning to the lexical class of labile verbs in Pichi, we see that the construction in (1) above is analytic in a fifth way. With labile verbs, the causative can also be expressed derivationally (by “null derivation”, if you wish). Example (2) illustrates the two options for rendering causative meaning with labile verbs within a single sentence:

\[(2) \quad \text{à \ dròngo=àn, \ à \ mek \ mek \ è \ dròngo.}\]
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
1\text{SG.SBJ} & \text{be/get.drunk=} & 3\text{SG.OBJ} & 1\text{SG.SBJ} \quad \text{make} \quad \text{SBJV} & 3\text{SG.SBJ} \quad \text{be/get.drunk} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I made him drunk, I got him drunk.’ (Pichi)

\(^2\) In view of the functional distribution of subjunctive marking in Pichi and the other languages that follow, I employ the traditional label “deontic” modality rather than “speaker-oriented” vs. “agent-oriented” (e.g. Bybee & Fleischman 1995: 6) or “dynamic” modality (e.g. Palmer 1990). The three latter labels cut across the formal-semantic unity of the subjunctive domain in a way that is not relevant for the distribution of this modal category in Pichi and the other languages treated in this paper.
Before the comma, the labile verb *drɔŋo* ‘be/get drunk’ is used as a transitive and causative verb followed by the patient object pronoun =àn ‘3SG.OBJ’. In the second half of sentence (2), causative meaning is expressed periphrastically through the *mek* causative construction. When the second option is used, the speaker may optionally want to express that causation is less direct. Meanwhile, the use of the transitive variant of a labile verb implies a direct, possibly even physical implication of the causer.

The subjunctive marker *mek* also introduces the complement clauses of other main verbs that induce deontic modality over their subordinate clauses. This includes other strong deontic verbs, e.g. a verb of ordering in indirect imperatives like *tel* ‘tell (to)’ in (3), the desiderative verb *want*, as in (4), and the permissive verb *lef* ‘let, allow’, as shown in (5):

(3)  

\[
\text{dèn tel=àn se mek è go.}
\]

\[
\text{3PL tell=3SG.OBJ QUOT SBJV 3SG.SBJ go}
\]

‘They told him to go.’ (Pichi)

(4)  

\[
\text{us=say yù want mek dì smok kòmòt?²}
\]

\[
\text{which=side 2SG want SBJV DEF smoke come.out}
\]

‘Where do you want the smoke to come out?’ (Pichi)

(5)  

\[
\text{à lef mi pikín mek è go Pànyá.}
\]

\[
\text{1SG.SBJ leave 1SG.POSS child SBJV 3SG.SBJ go Spain}
\]

‘I let my child go to Spain.’ (Pichi)

Note that (3) above contains the complementizer sequence *se mek* ‘QUOT SBJV’ featuring the general complementizer/quotative marker *se*. Contrary to *mek* ‘SBJV’ whose use is obligatory in the complements of deontic verbs, the presence of *se* ‘QUOT’ is optional with this class of verbs. Owing to its core function of quotation, the additional use of *se* is, however, particularly common in the subjunctive complements of deontic speech verbs like *tel* and rather uncommon with modal deontic verbs like *want* or the causative verb *mek*.

Weak deontic verbs expressing a preference, aversion, fear, intent and other volitional nuances also induce subjunctive mood over their complements. An example follows with the verb *fia* ‘fear’:

\[
\text{3 The use of biclausal structures involving subjunctive clauses is very common with same-subject want-complements and obligatory with different-subject complements of want. Same-subject complements may alternatively be expressed via a more reduced serial verb structure, e.g. à want go ‘I want to go’. This distribution of subjunctive clauses holds for all the African AECs covered in this paper.}
\]
Kofi Yakpo

(6) ̀̀dè ̀fìà ̀mek è ̀no ̀gi ̀mi ̀dì ̀mò̀ní ̀tumara.
    1SG.SBJ IPFV fear SBJV 3SG.SBJ NEG give 1SG.INDP DEF money tomorrow
    ‘I fear that he should not give me the money tomorrow.’ (Pichi)

Besides that, ̀mek ‘SBJV’ may introduce directive main clauses throughout the entire person paradigm and thereby renders categories traditionally referred to as imperative, jussive (7), optative and cohortative (8):

(7) ̀mek è ̀no ̀fìdò̀n ̀nà ̀gù̀n!
    SBJV 3SG.SBJ NEG fall LOC ground
    ‘Don’t let it fall to the ground!’ (Pichi)

(8) ̀mek ̀wì ̀go!
    SBJV 1PL go
    ‘Let’s go!’ (Pichi)

The subjunctive marker also introduces purpose clauses when the subjects of the main and subordinate clause are co-referential (where it is optional), when the subjects have disjoint reference (where it is obligatory) and when the purpose clause verb is negated (where it is also obligatory), cf. (9):

(9) ̀nà ̀in ̀dèn ̀tài=àn ̀mek è ̀no ̀kòmò̀t.
    FOC 3SG.INDP 3PL tie=3SG.OBJ SBJV 3SG.SBJ NEG go.out
    ‘That’s why they tied it [the dog] so that it wouldn’t leave.’ (Pichi)

Givón (1995) suggests the existence of a functional continuum in the domain of modality. In this continuum, the use of subjunctive mood in complement clauses is associated with the presence of a deontic meaning component (i.e. “manipulation”) in the main verb. Givón suggests a cut-off point in the use of subjunctive forms in the transition zone from weak deontic main predicates denoting subtle volitional nuances such as aversion coupled with weak epistemic certainty (e.g. (to) fear) and predicates that only denote a weak epistemic certainty (e.g. be possible) (cf. Givón 1995: 125ff.). This is confirmed by the Pichi data. The expression of weak epistemic certainty involves the use of the potential mood, marked by the preverbal particle ̀gò ‘POT’ rather than the subjunctive mood, expressed by a complementizer.
Compare (10) below featuring the epistemic predicate fit ‘can’ with the subjunctive complement of jia ‘fear’ in (6) above:

(10) è fit bi se è gò gi mi di mòni tumara.

3SG.SBJ can COP QUOT 3SG.SBJ POT give 1SG.INDP DEF money tomorrow

‘It’s possible that he might give me the money tomorrow.’ (Pichi)

The functional distribution of subjunctive marking in Pichi presented so far is representative of all the AECs and African adstrate/substrate languages covered in this paper. It possibly qualifies as an areal-typological trait common to a West African linguistic area and its Caribbean extension in the AECs. Non-West-African languages, amongst them both English and Pichi’s superstrate language Spanish, show a different functional distribution of the subjunctive mood. While English employs reduced clauses with many strong deontic verbs (e.g. I told him to go), uses of the Spanish subjunctive extend into the realm of epistemic modality (e.g. es posible que se vaya mañana ‘it’s possible that he might leave tomorrow’).

3. From African unity to Caribbean fragmentation

We have seen that the causative and the entire deontic domain show a neat form-function overlap in Pichi. I now turn to three other AECs of West Africa for a further discussion of causative formation in its systemic context. I shall show that in Krio, Nigerian Pidgin and Ghanaian Pidgin, the general picture is one of African unity in the formation of causatives. I then pick out three exemplary Caribbean AECs in order to show that causative formation and the organization of the relevant part of the modal systems is more fragmented in the Caribbean AECs. I argue that this fragmentation is on the one hand a consequence of varying degrees of intensity of contact with English. On the other hand, it is due to the absence of West African adstrates in the Caribbean that could have continually reinforced “African” features of causative formation in the Caribbean AECs. However, all the Caribbean AECs still show systematic correspondences with the African AECs in causative formation. Even in Trinidadian Creole, the most anglicized AEC in my corpus, causative formation manifests similarities with at least one pattern that is present in virtually all the AECs covered in section 2 and 3, as well as in some of the substrates discussed in section 4.
The first of the three African creoles covered in this section is Krio, an AEC of Sierra Leone. It was transplanted from its homeland to other parts of West Africa during the 19\textsuperscript{th} century and played an important role in the rise of national AEC varieties like Nigerian Pidgin (Faraclas 1996: 2f.) and Ghanaian Pidgin (Huber 1999: 59ff.). Krio also shows a high degree of lexical and grammatical similarity with Caribbean AECs (Jamaican Creole and Sranan in particular, cf. Hancock 1969), with which it also shares direct historical links. Krio features all three patterns of causative formation attested in the other AECs covered in this study. Krio thereby shows the largest range of alternative strategies of causative formation of all AECs, a possible result of the accretions inherited from the complex circumstances of its genesis.

One pattern of causative formation in Krio parallels the one seen with Pichi in (1) above: The causative construction is biclausal, the causative verb is directly followed by a subordinate clause introduced by a subjunctive complementizer and the causee is coded as the subject of the subordinate clause, compare (11). Contrary to Pichi and all other African AECs, Krio makes use of a second subjunctive complementizer next to \textit{mek}, namely \textit{le} (\textit{let(‘s)}). Both these modal complementizers may be used interchangeably to introduce the subordinate clauses of strong deontic verbs without an appreciable difference in meaning. We will encounter the subjunctive complementizer \textit{le} again further below in Tobagonian Creole, a fact that speaks to the partial Caribbean lineage of Krio.

\begin{equation}
(11) \begin{array}{c}
\text{à} \quad \text{mek} \quad \text{mek/le} \quad i \quad \text{kömòt} \quad \text{Amerika} \quad \text{km}.
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
1SG.SBJ & make & SBJV/SBJV & 3SG.SBJ & exit & USA & come.
\end{tabular}

‘I made her leave the USA (and) come (back).’ (Krio)

A second strategy of causative formation shares all the features of the structure in (11), with one notable exception: The subjunctive complementizer is absent, as indicated by the underscore in (12) unterhalb. We will see in due course that this structure has the widest distribution among the AECs on both sides of the Atlantic:

\begin{equation}
(12) \begin{array}{c}
\text{à} \quad \text{gò} \quad \text{mek} \quad _{i} \quad \text{kömòt} \quad \text{Amerika} \quad \text{km}.
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
1SG.SBJ & POT & make & 3SG.SBJ & exit & USA & come
\end{tabular}

‘It’s me (who) will make her leave the USA (and) come (back).’ (Krio)

I interpret the structure in (12) as a complementizer-less subjunctive clause. TMA marking in the subordinate clause can be adduced as evidence: While the main clause is future-referring
(as indicated by the presence of the potential mood/future tense marker go ‘POT’) the subordinate clause verb kɔmɔt has no marking for future tense; it appears stripped of TMA marking as verbs in subjunctive clauses introduced by mek ‘SBJV’ normally do (cf. (11)). Hence the absence of TMA marking could be seen as a diagnostic of subjunctive clauses just as much as the presence of a modal complementizer. Alternatively, the causative construction in (12) above could be analyzed as a type of resultative serial verb construction (SVC), hence a form of verb sequencing rather than embedding. Resultative SVCs are indeed a common form of event integration in all African AECs, save Pichi, and in the historically most important substrate languages covered in section 0 (Akan, Ewe and Yoruba). A common diagnostic test for SVCs involves checking for negation. Like in many languages with SVCs, the events designated by each verb in the series cannot be negated individually (cf. e.g. Hale 1991 for Misumalpan, Ameka 2006 for Ewe). Hence the SVC in (13) must be negated in its entirety by placing the negator before the first verb in the series, cf. (14):

(13) dì human fray plàntì sel.
    DEF woman fry plantain sell
    ‘The woman fried plantain (and) sold it.’ (Krio)

(14) dì human no fray plàntì (∗no) sel.
    DEF woman NEG fry plantain NEG sell
    ‘The woman didn’t fry plantain (and) sell it.’ (Krio)

In all the AECs covered in more detail below including Krio, the causative verb and the verb of effect can however be negated individually in causative constructions in which the subjunctive complementizer is absent. The following examples from Ghanaian Pidgin are representative:

(15) no mek i bring mi dè glas.
    1SG.SBJ NEG make 3SG.SBJ bring 1SG.INDP DEF glass
    ‘I didn’t make him bring me the glass.’ (Ghanaian Pidgin)

(16) mek i no bring mi dè glas.
    1SG.SBJ make 3SG.SBJ NEG bring 1SG.INDP DEF glass
    ‘I made him not bring me the glass.’ (Ghanaian Pidgin)
A second argument for viewing complementizer-less causatives as biclausal structures is that we find them in Pichi and Trinidadian Creole (see (36) unterhalb). The former language makes little use of SVCs and has no resultative SVC (Yakpo 2009a: 17), and the latter language makes only very limited use of SVCs, and in ways that I would classify as idiomatic (e.g. in the expression tel see [tell say] ‘tell that’). Thirdly, complementizer-less subjunctive clauses are also found with other deontic main verbs in the AECs surveyed for this study even if some of these languages feel more comfortable with such structures than others. The biclausal complementizer-less structure in (17), from Pichi, involves two clauses that are syntactically quite independent from each other and features the deontic main verb want:

(17) ë no want _ in màmà nak=àn.
    3SG.SBJ NEG want 3SG.POSS mother hit=3SG.OBJ

‘He doesn’t want his mother to beat him.’ (Pichi)

The third type of causative formation attested in Krio involves an English-style “raising” structure. In (18), the notional subject (the causee) of the subordinate clause of effect is “raised” into the main clause, where it functions as an object to the causative main verb. I see the clause of effect to be more reduced in such structures than in the subjunctive clauses encountered above because they involve argument merging or sharing. An argument could probably also be made in favour of analyzing the embedded verb as less finite. Due to its wide currency, I will continue using the term “raising” when referring to this kind of construction, without necessarily subscribing to its theoretical underpinnings. In morphosyntactic terms, the Krio “raising” construction maps one-to-one onto the corresponding English structure:

(18) à mek=àm go Amerika.
    1SG.SBJ make=3SG.OBJ go USA

‘I made her go to the USA.’ (Krio)

As to subjunctive use, Krio shows exactly the same functional distribution as its close relative Pichi. For want of space, I will not go into details on this matter in Krio, but I will provide examples with other, more distantly related AECs that follow, in order to show how pervasive the use of a subjunctive complementizer throughout the modal domain of deonticity is within the entire family.
With such diversity in the formation of Krio causatives, it would be unusual if there were no semantic and usage-related differences between the three Krio strategies of causative formation. I have not been able to put my finger on these differences based on the intuitions and comments of my informants, however. This certainly warrants further investigation at a later point.

I now turn to Nigerian Pidgin, where the “raising” construction, as shown in (19), appears to be the more central means of expressing the causative for many speakers of Nigerian Pidgin. However, my language informants, all of whom hail from the Yoruba-speaking South West of Nigeria, also produced the subjunctive pattern as a possible means of expressing causative, albeit with two alternative causative verbs, namely du ‘do’ and mek ‘make’:

(19) à mek=ànèm bay dis klɔt fɔ mì.
1SG.SBJ make=3SG.OBJ buy PROX cloth PREP 1SG.OBJ
‘I made her buy this (piece of) cloth for me.’ (Nigerian Pidgin).

(20) à mek/do mek im bay dis klɔt fɔ mì.
1SG.SBJ make/do SBJV 3SG.SBJ buy PROX cloth PREP 1SG.OBJ
‘I made her buy this (piece of) cloth for me.’ (Nigerian Pidgin).

Nigerian Pidgin also features the complementizer-less causative construction that we have already seen in Krio (cf. (12) above). But it appears to be less central compared to the “raising” and the subjunctive clause structures in the two examples above:

(21) à mek im bay dis klɔt fɔ mì.
1SG.SBJ make 3SG.SBJ buy PROX cloth PREP 1SG.OBJ
‘I made her buy this (piece of) cloth for me.’ (Nigerian Pidgin).

Beyond the expression of causative, Nigerian Pidgin shows the same kind of indicative-subjunctive opposition in subordinate clauses along the deonticity cline as the other African AECs. Compare example (22) involving the permissive verb let ‘let, allow’. Note that here too, “raising” is an option:
Nigerian Pidgin therefore features the same range of biclausal and “raising” causatives as Krio. There appears to be some micro-variation with respect to the frequency of the different constructions however.

The third African AEC treated in this section is Ghanaian Pidgin. This language diverges slightly from the patterns of causative formation established for Krio and Nigerian Pidgin. With deontic modality-inducing main verbs other than the causative verb *mek ‘make’*, we find the usual pattern of subjunctive marking via the modal complementizer *mek ‘SBJV’*. Compare (23), featuring subjunctive mood in the complement of the desiderative main verb *wɔnt ‘want’*:

(23) à *wɔnt mek dèm sit dè bak.*

1SG.SBJ want SBJV 3PL sit DEF back

‘I want them [the children] to sit (at) the back [of the car].’ (Ghanaian Pidgin)

The use of *mek* as a causative verb may trigger the use of two types of constructions. One is the “raising” construction involving argument sharing that we have already seen in Krio and Nigerian Pidgin, compare (24):

(24) à *mek=ât am bring mi dè glas.*

1SG.SBJ make=3SG.OBJ bring 1SG.INDP DEF glass

‘I made him bring me the glass.’ (Ghanaian Pidgin)

However, the alternative, and with my informants preferred variant is given in (25). It involves a complementizer-less subjunctive clause:

(25) à *gô mek (*mek) ì bring mi dè glas.*

1SG.SBJ POT make SBJV 3SG.SBJ bring 1SG.INDP DEF glass

‘I’ll make him bring me the glass.’ (Ghanaian Pidgin)
A sequence of the homophonous causative verb and the subjunctive complementizer is not normally accepted by Ghanaian Pidgin speakers. I hypothesize that Ghanaian Pidgin features an “Obligatory Contour Principle” (henceforth OCP) (Leben 1973) in contexts like (25) above. The OCP disallows adjacent identical morphemes and thereby disallows the appearance of a *mek mek* ‘make SBJV’ sequence in causative constructions. Evidence comes from the likely existence of a similar OCP in Akan and Ewe, two major adstrate languages of Ghanaian Pidgin (see (37)-(44) unterhalb). Ghanaian Pidgin therefore differs from Krio and Nigerian Pidgin in that it features a “gap” in the coding of deontic subordinate clauses: Causative constructions are excluded from the use of the subjunctive mood.

At the same time, Krio, Nigerian Pidgin and Ghanaian Pidgin differ from Pichi in that they allow the “raising” construction. Other than that, all four African AECs feature biclausal causative constructions. Except for Ghanaian Pidgin, these biclausal causatives may involve overt subjunctive complementizers. We will see that the presence of biclausal causatives and the prolific use of subjunctive complementizers place the African AECs closer to the “African” pole of causative formation patterns (cf. section 0). Additionally, the circumstance that most African AECs allow sequences of the homophonous causative verb and the subjunctive complementizer, speaks for an advanced stage of grammaticalization of the subjunctive complex in these languages..

I now move on to the Caribbean AECs, where the functional domain of deonticity is more fragmented in the way it is encoded, in some languages more, in some less. Tobagonian Creole (Trinidad & Tobago) has been described as a conservative Caribbean AEC that has thrived in isolation from the much larger and far more English-like Trinidadian Creole for the past two centuries or so (cf. James & Youssef 2002). In this language, we find a more unitary system of subjunctive marking along the functional network established for the African AECs. This includes the use of the subjunctive complementizer in the subordinate clauses of strong deontic main verbs like *want* ‘want’. However, contrary to the African AECs, the use of subjunctive complements does not appear to represent the majority pattern.

Examples (26)-(27) show the possible permutations of functional elements involved in the formation of *want*-complements in Tobagonian. It is noteworthy that Tobagonian Creole (henceforth “Tobagonian”) features two subjunctive complementizers, namely the ubiquitous reflex of ‘make’, here *meek*, as well *le*, a form that we have already encountered in the African AEC Krio in (11) above. Krio and Tobagonian are the only two languages of my corpus to use *le* ‘SBJV’:
Despite the grammaticality of the possibilities in (26) above, the use of the preposition and modal element _fo_ in the slot before _kam_ as in (27) unterhalb is the preferred option in Tobagonian. This construction, which is ungrammatical for all African AEC speakers that I consulted, is structurally equivalent to the English “raising” construction, i.e. _I want him to come home._

This hints towards the possibility that even a conservative AEC like Tobagonian has actually been converging towards English. This impression is confirmed with respect to the formation of causatives. The Tobagonian causative main verb _meek_ is the only strong deontic verb that may not take subjunctive complements. Instead, an English-style “raising” construction represents the canonical way of expressing causative. Contrast this with the African AECs where the “raising” construction is optional:

The use of a subjunctive complement to the causative verb is not accepted by my informants, nor is the use of Ghanaian-Pidgin like, biclausal structure in which the subjunctive complementizer remains unexpressed, and in which the causee is coded as subject (cf. (25) above):
Moving out of the insular Caribbean to Suriname, we find causative constructions that approximate those of the African AECs more closely. Sranan Tongo (henceforth “Sranan”) has been insulated from direct English influence since the mid-17th century, when Suriname became a Dutch colony. Since then, the superstrate language has been Dutch. Sranan features the use of the subjunctive complementizer meki, a cognate of mek, in the usual deontic-modality contexts. Amongst them is the use of the subjunctive marker as a purpose clause introducer, as shown in (30):

(30) *sma musu man piki den ini Sranan meki den ferstan.*

person must be.able answer 3PL in Sranan SBJV 3PL understand

‘One should be able to answer them in Sranan so that they understand.’ (Sranan)

The only strategy of causative formation attested in my Sranan corpus is the one already identified for Ghanaian Pidgin in (25) above: The Sranan causative construction features a complementizer-less subjunctive clause; a sequence of the homophonous causative verb and subjunctive complementizer is not accepted. The “raising” pattern common to all the other AECs save Pichi is not attested either.

(31) a sa meki _ a/*en nyan.

3SG POT make 3SG/3SG.INDP eat

‘She might make him eat.’ (Sranan)

The absence of sequences of the causative verb and the homophonous subjunctive complementizer in Tobagonian and Sranan might be due to the operation of the same OCP in these two languages that we have already encountered in Ghanaian Pidgin. It seems then that the two Caribbean AECs Tobagonian and Sranan represent an intermediate type situated somewhere between the “African” and the “European” poles of causative formation. Both languages feature “un-English” unitary subjunctive complexes. At the same time, we find a “gap” in the form-function mapping with respect to the coding of deontic modality: Tobagonian causatives are exclusively formed via “raising” and Sranan employs the biclausal complementizer-less causative construction.

I now turn to Trinidadian Creole (henceforth “Trinidadian”), a heavily anglicised AEC spoken in Trinidad. This language generally displays the same kind of fragmented coding of
the functional domain of deonticity as English, albeit with important language-specific differences.

Consider the following three examples from Trinidadian. The use of equivalent predicates would require the presence of subjunctive complements in all African AECs. And in Sranan and Tobagonian, the use of subjunctive complements in these three contexts is at least possible. Contrast this with Trinidadian, where want-complements with different subjects can appear without an overt complementizer, as in (32). Other strong and weak deontic verbs take complements introduced by tu ‘to’, as in (33), and the complement of an evaluative predicate like ‘not good/bad’ may be introduced by the clause linker wen ‘when’, as in (34):

(32) shii doon wont noobodi sii shii.
3SG.F NEG want nobody see 3SG.F
‘She doesn’t want anybody to see her.’ (Trinidadian)

(33) shii perens fos shii tu wosh di dish.
3SG.F parents force 3SG.F to wash DEF dishes
‘Her parents forced her to wash the dishes.’ (Trinidadian)

(34) is nat gud (*dat/) wen Koosi du dat, yu noo.
COP NEG good (that) when Koosi do that 2SG know
‘It’s not good for Koosi to do that/when Koosi does that, you know.’ (Trinidadian)

Turning to the causative, we however encounter a pattern that may be indicative of a residual form of subjunctive marking. In Trinidadian, two personal pronouns may be employed to express 3SG object case with a masculine referent. The first form, im is specified for masculine gender and object case. The second pronoun, hii, is also specified for masculine gender. However, this form is case-neutral and may appear in both the subject and object positions. Hence, both alternatives separated by the slash in (35) are in order:

(35) a sii hii/im yestadee.
1SG.SBJ see 3SG.M/3SG.M.OBJ yesterday.
‘I saw him yesterday.’ (Trinidadian)
In causative constructions featuring the causative verb *meek* ‘make’, however, some of my informants express a preference for the use of the case-neutral pronoun *hii* when referring to a causee with masculine gender, compare (36) unterhalb. The causee is best seen to be the subject of the subordinate clause of effect in the Trinidadian Creole structure in (36). This sentence could therefore be seen as another manifestation of the complementizer-less biclausal structure encountered in all the other AECs. The alternative featuring a causee encoded by the object pronoun *im* was commented on by one of my informants as “you’re trying to sound more like the Standard (i.e. English)”. All the same the “raising” pattern is preferred in other, less basilectal registers and is accepted as grammatical by all speakers. Thus, there seems to be a variational space in Trinidadian Creole that reflects the interaction of more English-like and more “African”-like lectal features in this AEC:

(36)  
\[
\text{a} \quad \text{meek} \quad \text{hii(~/im)} \quad \text{bay} \quad \text{mii} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{kaa}.
\]

\[
1\text{SG.SBJ} \quad \text{make} \quad 3\text{SG.M}/3\text{SG.OBJ.M} \quad \text{buy} \quad 1\text{SG.OBJ} \quad \text{INDF} \quad \text{car}
\]

‘I made him buy me a car.’ (Trinidadian Creole)

In sum, Trinidadian appears to be closest to the “European” pole of causative formation. It features the most English-like, formally fragmented modal domain and employs “raising”. Nevertheless, we also encounter a pattern of causative formation that is reminiscent of the biclausal, complementizer-less strategy, even if it is only expressed in a tendency rather than an either-or pattern.

A final observation that can be culled from the data presented in this section is that all African and Caribbean AECs that have been in direct contact with English for a considerable time (ranging from about one and a half to four centuries) whether African or Caribbean, feature an English-style “raising” construction. In contrast, the only two AECs that have had no direct contact with English for a long time (about one and a half centuries in the case of Pichi and three and a half for Sranan) do not employ “raising”.
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4. Causative formation in West Africa

I now turn to the question of the origins of AEC causative constructions. I suggest that the West African substrates and adstrates provide(d) the model for the biclausal analytic causative construction (with or without overt subjunctive marking) found in the AECs covered in the previous two sections. In this section, I show the existence of typologically identical constructions in a cross-section of West African languages. My argument rests on the observation that English, neither in its contemporary nor historical forms, employs biclausal constructions as a central strategy of causative formation. English can therefore not have provided a template for AEC analytic causatives of the biclausal type.

The importance of West African substrate languages in the formation and development of the AECs has been argued for in a large body of literature. Large parts of West Africa, where the majority of enslaved Africans were deported from during the European slave trade, form a linguistic area in which a substantial number of traits are shared across genealogical groupings (cf. Güldemann 2008; Brauner 2000; Zima 2000; Kastenholz 2006; Vossen & Ermisch 2006 for recent discussions). A substratist argument for the existence of a particular trait in the AECs should therefore provide evidence that substrate features found in the AECs indeed show an areal distribution. The Kwa languages of the West African coastal belt are seen to have played a particularly important role as substrates to the AECs (cf. e.g. Alleyne 1980; Boretzky 1983; Migge 2003 for systematic studies).

There is an important difference between the contact scenarios of which the Caribbean AECs form part and those in which the African AECs participate. The Caribbean AECs have not had large-scale contact with African languages for centuries. Meanwhile, the African AECs have been in continuous contact with West African languages, with which they interact in complex patterns of multilingualism. For the Caribbean AECs, West African languages are therefore exclusively historical substrate languages, while for the African AECs, West African languages are at once (historical) substrates and present-day adstrates. We will see in the following that continuous contact with West African adstrates has exposed the African AECs to the transfer of West African grammatical and lexical material in ways that surpass the degree of West African substrate influence on all AECs. In the remainder of this section, I will draw on examples from Akan, Ewe, Yoruba, Susu and Hausa, hence a genealogically diverse cross-section of West African languages.

In Akan (Niger-Congo, Kwa, Tano), as spoken in Ghana, we find analytic causative constructions featuring the causative verb mà ‘cause’. In the Asante Twi dialect of Akan, the
Causatives in the English-lexicon creoles of West Africa and the Caribbean

clause of effect is a reduced structure, in which the causee is realized as a “raised” argument, see (37):

(37) papa no má-á no sú-i.
    man DEF cause-COMPL 3SG.OBJ cry-COMPL
    ‘The man made him cry.’ (Asante Twi; Osam 2003: 21)

In contrast, causative constructions in the Fante dialect of Akan feature a biclausal structure, in which the causee is coded as the subject of the subordinate clause of effect, cf. (38):

(38) papa no má-á ó-sú-i.
    man DEF cause-COMPL 3SG.SBJ-cry-COMPL
    ‘The man made him cry.’ (Fante; ibid.)

A third possibility, namely the cooccurrence of the causative verb and the subjunctive complementizer (i.e. má má ‘cause SBJV’) is not attested in the data from Fante and Asante Twi but I have been told that it exists in some Akan varieties (Osam, p.c.). I will come back to the peculiarity of this distribution in due course, when treating causatives in Ewe.

Akan therefore offers the same range of possibilities as the AECs, and the African AECs in particular, albeit in the form of dialectal rather than intralectal variation. Another similarity is that Akan subjunctive complementizers introduce the subordinate clauses of a comparable range of strong and weak deontic verbs as the AECs. In (39), the modal verb pene ‘agree’ is followed by a subjunctive clause.

(39) Kofi pene-e so má o-noa-a nam nô
    Kofi agree-PST upper.surface SBJV 3SG.SBJ-cook-PST fish DEF
    'Kofi agreed to cook the fish.' (Akan; Osam 1998)

We also find the subjunctive marker in directive main clauses, compare the cohortative in (40) unterhalb with that in Pichi in (8) above. But also note micro-variational specificities: In (40), the predicate is additionally marked for optative mood, while the subjunctive marker now bears a high tone when it introduces a directive main clause (39): 4

4 The difference in tonal specification between má (low tone) and má (high tone) when the element introduces clausal complements and directive main clauses respectively causes Osam (1998) to attribute different function labels to each form. I suggest a monosemous analysis of the form.
We find another parallel with AEC biclausal causative constructions. There is good reason to assume that the Akan subjunctive complementizer is diachronically related to a lexical verb, in this case the Akan verb *má* ‘give’, shown in (41). Both forms have the same segmental shape, they only differ in their tonal specification: While the complementizer bears a low tone, the lexical verb carries a high tone, compare (37) above. The causative verb is therefore the end-point of a widely attested grammaticalization path for *give* (von Waldenfels this volume; Heine & Kuteva 2002: 152).

Apart from the difference between the AECs and Akan in the lexical source of the causative verb and subjunctive complementizer (‘make’ vs. ‘give’), Akan therefore features a similar functional network as the AECs: A lexical verb simultaneously functions as a causative verb, and is diachronically related to the subjunctive complementizer. The latter element, in turn, appears as a clause introducer in a similar range of contexts featuring deontic main verbs.

Ewe (Niger-Congo, Kwa, Gbe), spoken in Ghana and Togo, also shows significant correspondences with the pattern observed for Akan and the AECs. For one thing, the Ewe causative construction also features a causative verb derived from a lexical verb meaning ‘give’, namely the element *ná*. Secondly, there is good reason to assume that the Ewe modal complementizer *né* is diachronically related to the lexical/causeative verb *ná*. Thirdly, the Ewe causative construction is biclausal and the causee is instantiated as the subject of the subordinate clause of effect, as shown in (42). The “raising” pattern is, however, unattested, at least in the Ewe varieties of the Ghanaian interior that I am familiar with, cf. (43):

(40) *má* ye-n-kɔ!
    SBJV 1PL-OPT-go
    ‘Let’s go!’ (Akan; ibid.)

(41) *Kwadwo* *de* *sika* *má-a* *Kofi*
    Kwadwo take money give-PST Kofi
    ‘Kwadwo gave money to Kofi’ (Asante Twi)

(42) *mè-ná* wò-vá áfì
    1SG.SBJ-cause 3SG.SBJ-come here
    ‘I made him come here.’ (Ewe)
The expression of causative in Ewe follows an idiosyncratic pattern, just as it does in Akan above. The use of a modal complementizer in the subordinate clause of effect is not attested. We do, however, find the subjunctive complementizer with deontic main verbs other than the causative verb, as shown in example (44) featuring the main verb lɔ ‘like, allow’, and in sentence (45), which features a directive (jussive) main clause:

(44) mè-lɔ nà nyɔnù bè né-dzó.
  1SG.SBJ-allow DAT woman QUOT SBJV.3SG.SBJ-leave
  ‘I allowed the woman to leave.’ (Ewe)

(45) né wó-vá!
  SBJV 3PL-come
  ‘Let them come!’ (Ewe)

The peculiar distribution of the modal complementizer in Akan and Ewe leads me to the conclusion that an OCP constraint is once more at work in these two languages. The cooccurrence restriction of the causative verb and a (near-)homophonous subjunctive complementizer in Ewe and Akan is possibly due to intermediate-stage effects along the grammaticalization path. Evidence for this analysis comes from causative constructions in other languages of the region, in which the causative verb is not formally (near-)identical to the subjunctive complementizer. In these languages, the causative construction has no idiosyncratic marking properties and the subjunctive complementizer appears in subordinate clauses of effect as well as in the subordinate clauses of other deontic main verbs.

Yoruba (Niger-Congo, Benue-Congo, Yoruboid) is the major adstrate of the South Western variety of Nigerian Pidgin that my informants speak. Yoruba also had a substantial influence on Krio during its formative period (cf. Hancock 1971). In Yoruba, causative constructions are biclausal and the clause of effect is introduced by the subjunctive complementizer ki ‘SBJV’. With respect to the realization of the causee, Yoruba shows a familiar pattern: The causee is expressed as the subject of a finite subordinate clause, cf. (46):
In Yoruba, the subjunctive complementizer introduces the subordinate clauses of the entire range of deontic-modality inducing main verbs already identified for the West African AECs, e.g. in permissives involving the use of the verb gbà ‘get, accept’, as in (47):

(47) mo gbà kí ó lọ sì Ìbádàn.
    1SG.SBJ accept SBJV 3SG.SBJ go LOC Ibadan
    ‘I allowed her to go to Ibadan.’ (Yoruba)

The subjunctive complementizer is also found with indirect imperatives, as in (48). The modal complementizer is also present in purpose clauses, compare (49). Note the presence of the quotative-modal complementizer sequence in (48), a characteristic that we have already seen in the West African AECs (see (6) as well as in Ewe (see (44) above:

(48) mo sọ jùn un pé kí ó wá.
    1SG.SBJ say GIVE 3SG.OBJ QUOT SBJV 3SG.SBJ come
    ‘I told her to come.’ (Yoruba)

(49) ó lọ sì Ìbádàn kí ó lè gbà itójù
    3SG.SBJ go LOC Ibadan SBJV 3SG.SBJ be.able get care
    ‘She went to Ibadan in order to (be able to) get a treatment.’ (Yoruba)

Susu (Mande, Western), a major language of Guinea, also features subjunctive marking in the clausal complements of deontic main verbs. This language does not, however, make use of a subjunctive complementizer. Instead, (affirmative) subjunctive mood is expressed via the preverbal particle kha ‘SBJV’, as shown in the causative in (50):

(50) n a nyè-mà i kha siga.
    1SG 3SG make-IPFV 2SG SBJV leave
    ‘I will make you leave.’ (Susu)
I should mention for the sake of completeness that contrary to the other Niger-Congo languages featured so far, Susu also has a derivational causative formed by means of bound morphology, as shown by the use of the prefix ra- in (51). The causative prefix is however not fully productive and renders unpredictable meanings with many verbs other than siga ‘leave’ in (51):

(51)  m   bara a   ra-siga  
     1SG  PRF  3SG  CAUS-leave  
     ‘I made her leave.’  (Susu)

The Susu subjunctive does not fit in in formal terms into the pattern observed so far, since it is instantiated in a preverbal particle rather than a complementizer. However, it falls very neatly into the pattern in terms of its functional range. The distribution of the particle kha ‘SBJV’ parallels that of the maximal system of Pichi and Yoruba with their neat form-function isomorphism. Beyond its use in clauses of effect as in (50) above, the subjunctive is also found in directives (including cohortatives), in the complements of strong and weak deontic verbs, and in purpose clauses. Example (52) should suffice for illustration. Here the subjunctive particle appears in the complement of the permissive main verb lu ‘let (go)’:

(52)  m   bara a   lu a   kha   siga.  
     1SG  PRF  3SG  let  3SG  SBJV  leave  
     ‘I let/allowed him to leave.’  (Susu)

There is good reason to assume that the subjunctive marker kha is the result of a grammaticalization process from complementizer to verbal particle. We still find a homophonous kha as a general complementizer with a diverse range of complement-taking verbs including utterance and cognition verbs. Example (53) shows the optional cooccurrence of the complementizer and the subjunctive particle in a complement clause of wama ‘want’. A scenario is therefore imaginable in which a modal complementizer kha migrated into the predicate. Its subsequent use as a verbal particle then allowed the source form to take on a more general complementizer function, while preverbal kha retained its modal function.5

---

5 A grammaticalization scenario from clausal to phrasal modal element has also been documented for the irrealis marker bai in the Pacific English-lexicon Creole language Tok Pisin (Papua New Guinea) (see Romaine 1995).
So far I have only provided evidence for causative formation within the subjunctive complex in languages of the Niger-Congo phylum, even if some of the examples given stem from languages that are only very distant relatives (e.g. Susu and Ewe). But we also find biclausal causative constructions plus subjunctive mood in the subordinate clause of effect in West African languages outside of the Niger-Congo phylum. In Hausa (Afro-Asiatic, Chadic, West), analytic causative constructions involve the use of subjunctive mood in the clause of effect. A central strategy of causative formation involves coding of the causee as the subject of the clause of effect, which is marked for subjunctive mood, as in (54):

(54) nǎ sâ yâ shiryâ ìbinci.
   1SG.PFV cause 3SG.M.SBJV prepare food
   ‘I made him prepare (some) food.’ (Hausa; Jaggar 2001: 553)

In the absence of a systematic areal survey, I can only speculate that a larger sample might reveal that more, genealogically diverse, West African languages employ biclausal structures as a primary strategy of causative formation, even if we should encounter considerable individual variation in tense-mood-aspect marking and argument realization patterns.

In summary, we have identified two large patterns of analytic causative formation in West Africa, both in formal and semantic terms. In one pattern, we find a neat form-function mapping of subjunctive marking in subordinate clauses along a continuum of (main verb) deontic force (e.g. Yoruba and Susu). Here, the causative verb behaves like any other deontic main verb and accordingly, induces the use of the subjunctive complementizer in the subordinate clause of effect. In most of the languages that feature such unitary systems, the subjunctive mood is instantiated in a modal complementizer. The other pattern is characterized by a defective distribution of subjunctive marking in subordinate clauses. We find the same kind of deontic force continuum as in the first pattern, instantiated in the use of subjunctive marking with the usual range of strong and weak deontic verbs, as well as in directive main clauses and purpose clauses. However, the causative construction sheers out of line, and we find two types of idiosyncratic structures with respect to the expression of the effect event. One involves a “raising” structure (e.g. Akan), the other involves a biclausal
structure in which the subjunctive complementizer is absent (e.g. Ewe). These two broad patterns, including the further sub-differentiation of the second pattern were also identified in the AECs in section 3.

5. Language contact and AEC causatives

We have seen that AEC causative formation involves diverse strategies found in the adstrates/substrates as well as in English. These strategies can be situated along a continuum with “European” and “African” strategies at the opposing ends. I now argue that three interdependent language-contact related factors may be seen as responsible for the observed differences in patterns of AEC causative formation: (1) the amount of contact that an AEC has (had) with English; (2) the amount of contact that an AEC has (had) with West African adstrates; (3) the degree of paradigmatic levelling and grammaticalization of subjunctive use in causative constructions (which may be reinforced by contact). These factors combine to produce a specific scenario for each AEC, and may provide explanations for the trajectory of causative formation in each language.

The following table provides an overview of relevant features of causative formation in the African and Caribbean AECs treated in this paper. The last row contains information on the contact scenario for each language, and implicitly offers a hypothesis on the relevance of language contact in the differentiation of causative formation strategies in the AECs. When a language is in contact with English or other relevant languages this is indicated via the plus sign and the language name, absence of contact via the minus sign; a higher degree of attested contact is indicated by two plus signs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature/Language</th>
<th>Pichi</th>
<th>Krio</th>
<th>NigP*</th>
<th>GhaP</th>
<th>Tob</th>
<th>Sran</th>
<th>Trin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBJV COMP</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicausal CAUS -SBJV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicausal CAUS +SBJV</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Raising”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scenario
+adstrates +adstrate +adstrates +adstrates
levelling

*NigP: Nigerian Pidgin, GhaP: Ghanaian Pidgin, Tob: Tobagonian, Sran: Sranan, Trin: Trinidadian, Engl: English
The Table above shows that all AECs except Trinidadian feature subjunctive complementizers. This is expected, since this feature was shown to be thoroughly “African” and Trinidadian is the most anglicized AEC through extensive contact with English. The other AECs that have subjunctive complementizers are either in contact with African adstrate languages (from Pichi to Ghanaian Pidgin), have been relatively insulated from contact with English (Tobagonian) or have been insulated altogether from contact with English (Sranan).

All AECs also feature biclausal causatives, if we accept that in Trinidadian causative constructions, the preference for a case-neutral personal pronoun in the expression of the causee is sufficiently indicative of “biclausality”. Again, since biclausal causatives have been shown to be an “African” rather than a “European” (i.e. English) feature, the divergence of Trinidadian is not surprising.

Paradoxically, complementizer-less biclausal causatives might also be seen to result from contact with English (or another European superstrate). This is because the absence of a modal complementizer makes these structures slightly less “African” in their typological make-up. Biclausal CAUS –SBJV structures might therefore well be the result of convergence of African adstrate/superstrate languages and English influences in the AECs. The fact that Pichi is the only AEC that exclusively makes use of biclausal CAUS +SBJV structures is a good argument for such a convergence scenario. This is because biclausal causative structures that additionally feature subjunctive complementizers move us furthest towards the “African” pole of causative formation, since neither “biclausality” nor modal complementizers are attested in English (nor Spanish and Dutch) causatives. This is why we find biclausal CAUS +SBJV structures only in the African AECs. Ghanaian Pidgin has been shown to diverge from the pattern, possibly due to an OCP constraint also found in Akan, Ewe and other Ghanaian languages (where we also find CAUS –SBJV structures).

But adstrate/substrate influence may also have been responsible for the opposite result in Nigerian Pidgin and Krio. Yoruba, a major adstrate of Nigerian Pidgin and a major historical substrate of Krio has a neat, unitary subjunctive complex that includes causative formation. It is well possible that the rise of CAUS +SBJV structures in these two languages has been driven by extensive contact with Yoruba, and the etymological relationship and formal similarity between causative verb and subjunctive complementizer has been obfuscated or has become irrelevant in Krio. Being a direct offshoot of Krio, the presence of CAUS +SBJV structures in Pichi might have the same cause. At the same time, Table 1 shows that Pichi is also the only AEC to have nothing but the CAUS +SBJV pattern of causative formation.
attribute this characteristic to two circumstances that follow from the very different course that Pichi has taken in comparison to its West African sister languages.

Firstly, isolation, i.e. the absence of contact with English led to the lack of reinforcement of other strategies more compatible with English, principally “raising”. Secondly the complex interaction of factors such as koineization involving other AECs (but not with English), language shift to Pichi from Bubi and other Bantu languages, as well as extensive contact with Spanish have led to paradigmatic levelling and innovation in many parts of the linguistic system (cf. e.g. Yakpo 2009b). These factors have contributed to extending the subjunctive complex to all deontic main verbs and eliminating idiosyncratic patterns of causative formation.

The final observations with respect to Table 1 concern “raising”. Its distribution across the languages in Table 1 strongly suggests that its presence is a consequence of continued contact with English after the creolization phase. This is so because Sranan and Pichi, the two AECs without “raising”, are the only languages that have not had direct contact with English for centuries. Among the languages that employ “raising”, we can also identify gradations in the centrality of this strategy. It seems to be a default pattern for Tobagonian and Trinidadian. This is so because these two languages have been in continuous contact with English for a long time, albeit with differing intensity. At the same time “raising” is only one of three patterns for the African AECs Nigerian Pidgin and Krio. Pichi does not feature “raising” at all, for reasons already given above. For speakers of Ghanaian Pidgin, “raising” is merely one of two available patterns. But for this AEC, we have also established that the (Akan) substrate makes use of “raising” as well. Hence “raising” in Ghanaian Pidgin might also be the consequence of convergence between Akan adstrate and the English superstrate strategies of causative formation.

All in all, we can therefore establish that the amount of contact with English and with African adstrates is a good predictor of patterns to be found in each individual AEC. Amongst the African AECs, an additional factor that co-determines the presence of particular patterns of causative formation are the specific patterns found in the adstrate languages. This is particularly so when the influence of a specific adstrate has been or is disproportionately strong, as is the case with Yoruba for Nigerian Pidgin, and possibly Krio, as well as with Akan for Ghanaian Pidgin.
6. Conclusion

Causative formation in the Afro-Caribbean English-lexicon Creoles is typologically diverse. It includes “African” and “European” strategies. A pattern that involves fully biclausal structures and the use of a subjunctive complementizer has been shown to be the most “African” one while “raising” was identified to be the most “European” pattern. Nevertheless, one circumstance points towards the enduring pervasiveness of “African” features in the AECs. It is the use of a reflex of ‘make’ not only as a causative verb, as in English, but also as a subjunctive complementizer in the clausal complements of deontic main verbs apart from the causative verb, in directive main clauses and in purpose clauses. This is a feature shared by all the AECs covered, save the most anglicized one (Trinidadian Creole). This feature may in fact be seen to constitute an areal trait that provides further evidence for the genealogical continuities and deep linguistic affinities between the Caribbean AECs, the African AECs and the languages of West Africa.

Abbreviations:  CAUS = causative (construction); COMP = complementizer; COMPL = completive aspect; COP = locative-existential copula; COREL = corelative pronoun; DAT = dative; DEF = definite marker; DIST = distal demonstrative; F = feminine gender; INDF = indefinite article; INDP = independent/object personal pronoun; INF = infinitive; IPFV = imperfective aspect; LOC = locative preposition; M = masculine gender; MOD = modal element; NAME = personal name; NEG = negator; OBJ = object; OCP = Obligatory Contour Principle; OPT = optative mood; PL = plural; PLACE = place name; POSS = possessive; POT = potential mood; PRF = perfect marker; PROX = proximate demonstrative; PRS = present tense; PST = past tense; Q = question particle; QUOT = quotative marker; REFL = reflexive pronoun; REL = relative pronoun; SG = singular; SBJ = subject; SBJV = subjunctive mood.
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Abstract

This paper seeks to describe foreign learners’ use of English periphrastic causative constructions, by comparing data from the International Corpus of Learner English with similar data from the British National Corpus. While the frequency of the constructions and the syntactic errors found in the learner corpus are briefly discussed, the focus of the study is on collostructions, the combination of particular constructions with certain verbs in the non-finite verb slot. After showing that the non-finite verb slot displays strong lexical preferences in native English, the technique of distinctive collexeme analysis is used to compare native speakers’ and learners’ lexical choices and quantify the degree of overlap between the two groups. The analysis reveals that learners’ causative constructions are often unidiomatic in that they contain verbs which are unlikely to occur in native English with that particular construction. Three possible explanations are provided to account for these lexical infelicities, namely lack of register awareness, transfer from the mother tongue and inadequacy of teaching materials. The article concludes by emphasising the necessity of explicitly teaching phraseological aspects of language.

1. Introduction

Most learners of a foreign language will be familiar with the experience of being told that a particular sentence is perfectly grammatical in the language but that a native speaker would never use it (cf. Allerton 1984: 39). Such problems belong to the field of phraseology, that is, “the study of word combinations” (Howarth 1998: 24). Thanks to the advent of corpus linguistics and the use of large collections of authentic texts searchable at the click of a mouse, the importance of prefabricated units and lexical preferences (collocations) has been
widely recognised. It has been shown that “much language use is routine” (Stubbs 1993: 19) and that, although they may only be perceived at a subliminal level (Sinclair 1991: 116), collocations are an integral part of language.

This paper examines the phraseology of English periphrastic causative constructions and the problems it poses to foreign learners. More precisely, it investigates the lexical preferences displayed by the non-finite verb slot of the ten constructions listed and exemplified in Table 1, with particular emphasis on [X MAKE Y V\text{inf}] and [X MAKE Y V\text{pp}]. By means of a technique known as distinctive collexeme analysis, it compares the lexical choices made by learners from various mother tongue backgrounds with those of native speakers of English, highlighting the verbs that are more distinctive for learner writing or more distinctive for native writing. The analysis shows that learners have difficulty producing combinations of a construction and a non-finite verb (so-called “collostructions”) that are likely to occur in native language, which results in grammatically correct, but unidiomatic causative constructions. This problem appears to be at least as important as the problem of syntactic inaccuracy (a problem regularly acknowledged in the literature; cf. among others the error note on make in the Longman Dictionary of Common Errors (Turton & Heaton 1996), which indicates that make sb/sth do sth does not take any to) or that of over- or underuse (see section 3 on these two notions), which will also be briefly examined in the analysis.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2, it is demonstrated that, contrary to a common assumption, English periphrastic causative verbs display strong lexical preferences in terms of the non-finite verb with which they occur. The existence of such “felicitous” choices opens the door to “infelicitous” choices, once constructions are used with unusual verbs. Section 3 presents the technique of collostructional analysis, and in particular distinctive collexeme analysis, which makes it possible to measure the degree of resemblance between native speakers’ and learners’ lexical choices. It also describes the learner corpus used in the study and the native corpus serving as a baseline. The following section reports the main results of the corpus analysis, briefly considering the frequency of the constructions in native and learner English and the syntactic errors made by learners, and focusing on the collostructions distinctive for the two varieties of English. In section 5, three possible explanations are provided to account for learners’ lack of awareness of the lexical preferences displayed by causative constructions. Section 6, finally, offers some concluding remarks.
Lexical infelicity in English causative constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[X MAKE Y V_{inf}]</th>
<th>This made the accident appear reasonable, something which even they could have done. &lt;BNC:A5Y 1310&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X BE made V_{to-inf}]</td>
<td>It was usually supposed that teaching should follow the order of discovery, for then the student is made to begin with familiar things. &lt;BNC:ABM 138&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X MAKE Y V_{pp}]</td>
<td>Shortages of foodstuffs and consumer goods were also making themselves felt. &lt;BNC:ADD 358&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X GET Y V_{to-inf}]</td>
<td>British Prime Ministers may have to work extremely hard to get them [the departments] to change course. &lt;BNC:A6F 723&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X GET Y V_{pp}]</td>
<td>They are often an inaccessible but important target group in agricultural extension efforts to get conservation methods accepted. &lt;BNC:APN 1038&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X GET Y V_{pp}]</td>
<td>Yet there is little doubt that in most countries a good deal more could be done to get people talking and thinking about proposed changes. &lt;BNC:BLY 1742&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X HAVE Y V_{inf}]</td>
<td>In my own research into books and reading I have had classes of 15-year-olds write essays on the subject of how they would feel about working in a bookshop. &lt;BNC:B25 599&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X HAVE Y V_{pp}]</td>
<td>Eventually we end up with samples of people who have had children baptized at two Anglican churches. &lt;BNC:B25 246&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X HAVE Y V_{pp}]</td>
<td>After the day’s work we had all the colony drilling for an hour or two in the yard, which formed a spacious square. &lt;BNC:A64 952&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X CAUSE Y V_{to-inf}]</td>
<td>As the central circle rotates, it causes the rolling circle to give point P a reciprocating action. &lt;BNC:ADX 66&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. English periphrastic causative constructions

2. Lexical preferences in causative constructions

While it is usually assumed that periphrastic causative constructions are “always safe” (Stocker 1990: 61) and can therefore be used with any verb in the non-finite verb slot, a close look at authentic data of native English reveals that periphrastic causative verbs actually display strong preferences for certain verbs. Thus, a construction such as (1), where make is construed with the infinitive feel, is more likely to occur than (2), where the infinitive talk is used.

---

1 The examples in Table 1 are native sentences extracted from the British National Corpus (see later on this corpus). In these and the following examples, the causative is in bold and the non-finite verb in italics. The code between angle brackets is the reference of the sentence in the corpus, British National Corpus (BNC) or International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE).
That’s right, if it makes you feel good inside I think you should go for it. <BNC:FL8 212>

He always makes people (...) talk about these mad things that they probably wouldn’t talk about that often. <BNC:KC7 516>

Tables 2 to 4, based on Gilquin (2010), show the absolute and cumulative frequencies of the non-finite verbs in [X MAKE Y V\text{inf}], [X GET Y V\text{prp}] and [X MAKE Y V\text{pp}], respectively, as evidenced in a written and spoken subset of the *British National Corpus, World Edition* (Burnard 2000). With [X MAKE Y V\text{inf}], the most frequent verb, *feel*, accounts for over 12% of all the occurrences of the construction, and a cumulative frequency of 50% is reached after nine verbs only. If we consider [X GET Y V\text{prp}], we see that the lexical preferences are even stronger, with the verb *going* representing almost 57% of the data. With [X MAKE Y V\text{pp}], finally, the top verb, *known*, accounts for as many as 60% of all the occurrences of the construction, and the top three verbs, *known*, *felt* and *understood*, represent a cumulative frequency of some 83%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Abs. freq.</th>
<th>Cum. freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feel</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugh</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
<td>29.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>34.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
<td>38.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>42.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wonder</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appear</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>47.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seem</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>50.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>52.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Absolute and cumulative frequencies of the non-finite verbs in [X MAKE Y V\text{inf}] (based on Gilquin 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Abs. freq.</th>
<th>Cum. freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>going</td>
<td>56.72%</td>
<td>56.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>60.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>running</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>64.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Absolute and cumulative frequencies of the non-finite verbs in [X GET Y V\text{prp}] (based on Gilquin 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Abs. freq.</th>
<th>Cum. freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>known</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>76.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understood</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>83.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Absolute and cumulative frequencies of the non-finite verbs in [X MAKE Y V\text{pp}] (based on Gilquin 2010)

Not only do periphrastic causative constructions display strong lexical preferences, but they also display lexical preferences which are largely specific to each construction (see Gilquin 2006). [X HAVE Y V\text{pp}], for example, favours verbs from the frame of service (e.g. *build,*...
shave or repair), whereas \( X \text{ GET } Y \text{ V}_{pp} \) is often associated with verbs of organisation like sort out, organise or set up. Constructions with the same causative verb but distinct patterns tend to display different preferences too. Thus, unlike \( X \text{ GET } Y \text{ V}_{pp} \), \( X \text{ GET } Y \text{ V}_{pp} \) is strongly associated with verbs of (literal or metaphorical) motion (go, run, move, etc). These preferences are illustrated by the following examples:

(3) He’s **had** his hair **cut** this morning, reckons on having it cut short, really short.  
<BNC:KCE 3494>

(4) Cos I want to try and **get** things **sorted out** <pause> round there.  
<BNC:KBE 3793>

(5) We **get** a game of cards **going** just to stop the rot and the boredom.  
<BNC:KCP 4712>

The fact that such lexical preferences are often ignored in the literature\(^2\) and can only be brought to light by a careful examination of authentic language data seems to suggest that they escape speakers’ conscious attention. They are therefore challenging for foreign learners, who, in their search for felicitous lexical choices, can neither rely on their intuitions, nor on appropriate reference tools. In the next section, we will see how the method of collostructional analysis can be used to assess the extent to which learners approximate to native speakers’ choices in the non-finite verb slot of causative constructions.

3. Collostructional analysis and learner corpora

The method of collostructional analysis, developed by Gries and Stefanowitsch and relying on the notion of collocation and the theory of Construction Grammar,\(^3\) seeks to investigate the interaction between words and constructions, as evidenced in corpus data, by measuring the association strength that exists between a particular construction and the lexemes occurring in a given slot of this construction, i.e. its “collexemes” (see Stefanowitsch & Gries 2003, Gries & Stefanowitsch 2004a, 2004b). While collostructional analysis includes different techniques, it is the technique of distinctive collexeme analysis that interests us here. Originally, distinctive collexeme analysis studies one slot in two or more constructions. Thus, Gries & Stefanowitsch (2004a) employed this technique to compare the verbs occurring in the

---

\(^2\) The preferences of \( X \text{ MAKE } Y \text{ V}_{pp} \) are a notable exception. See e.g. Van Ek & Robat (1984: 327), who note that the construction occurs with verbs “denoting the exercise and recognition of influence in the widest sense”.

\(^3\) Construction Grammar considers that constructions are the basic units of language and that they carry a meaning of their own, independently of the words they are made up of. For more information on this theoretical framework, see Goldberg (1995, 2006) and, for an acquisitional approach, Tomasello (2003).
ditransitive construction with those occurring in the to-dative construction, and in Gilquin (2006) it was used to establish the collexemes that are the most distinctive for the non-finite verb slot of different periphrastic causative constructions. For the present purposes, however, distinctive collexeme analysis was applied to the comparison, not of two constructions, but of one construction (each of the ten periphrastic causative constructions listed in Table 1) in two language varieties, namely native English and learner English. This way, it was possible to identify the verbs that are more distinctive for one or the other variety of English in a given causative construction, in other words, the “collostructions” (i.e. combinations of a construction and a collexeme) favoured by native speakers and neglected by learners, and vice versa.

The analysis was performed by means of Coll.analysis 3 (Gries 2004) which, on the basis of a list of the verbs occurring in the construction(s) under investigation, computes the observed and expected frequencies and, through a binomial test, the (log-transformed) probability of a particular observed frequency given the expected frequency. The “distinctiveness value” resulting from this calculation indicates which verbs are significantly associated with a given construction, that is, are distinctive collexemes of this construction.⁴ In the present case, the higher the distinctiveness value, the more distinctive the verb is for the construction in a particular language variety (native or learner). The threshold level of significance is 1.30103, which means that any distinctiveness value higher than 1.30103 is statistically significant, with \( p < 0.05 \).

Distinctive collexeme analysis (or any type of collostructional analysis, for that matter) presupposes the use of authentic language data. While corpora of native language have been in use for quite some time now (the Brown Corpus, for example, was started in the early 1960s), learner corpora, that is corpora made up of texts produced by language learners, are more recent, with the first academic learner corpus, the International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE), released in 2002 (Granger et al. 2002). Yet, the numerous studies that have analysed data from this and other learner corpora over the last few years have demonstrated the usefulness of such corpora, both on their own and in comparison with native corpora. Not only do they give access to authentic learner errors in context but, when exploited in conjunction with a reference corpus of native language, they also make it possible to highlight cases of over- and underuse, that is, cases where learners use significantly more or significantly less of a particular phenomenon than native speakers (e.g. underuse of the passive voice or overuse of amplifying adverbs). In addition, by comparing corpus data

⁴ For more information on the computation of distinctive collexeme analysis, see the help files accompanying Coll.analysis 3 (Gries 2004) or, for concrete applications, Gries & Stefanowitsch (2004a) or Gilquin (2006).
produced by learners with different mother tongues, one can distinguish between the problems that are specific to learners from a given mother tongue background (and are therefore likely to be transfer-related) and those that are common to most or all learners, whatever their mother tongues (and are therefore more likely to be developmental).

This study is based on data from the second version of ICLE (Granger et al. 2009), consisting of academic essays written by learners from sixteen different mother tongue backgrounds,6 for a total of over 3.5 million words. The causative constructions were extracted by means of WordSmith Tools 3 (Scott 1999), using a combination of automatic extraction (a form of the causative verb followed, within one to five words, by an infinitive, past participle or present participle)6 and manual post-editing (in order to discard irrelevant hits). Because some causative constructions are very infrequent and because collostructional analysis (like any type of phraseological analysis) requires a sufficient amount of data for its results to be relevant, no distinction was made between the different learner populations and the possible influence of the mother tongue was therefore not investigated. The learner data were compared with native data extracted from part of the academic component of the British National Corpus, World Edition (Burnard 2000), henceforth BNCw, consisting of 5 million words equally distributed over the different genres of the academic component (humanities, medicine, natural sciences, politics/law/education, social & behavioural sciences, and technology/computing/engineering). The search strings were similar to those used in ICLE,7 but the text retrieval software employed was BNCweb (Lehmann et al. 2002). Although the focus of the analysis was on the collostructions distinctive for learner English, as opposed to native English, the frequencies of the different constructions were also compared in the two corpora, and the syntactic errors made by learners were examined. The main results are presented in the next section.

6 The sixteen mother tongue backgrounds are: Bulgarian (BU), Chinese (CH), Czech (CZ), Dutch (DU), Finnish (FI), French (FR), German (GE), Italian (IT), Japanese (JP), Norwegian (NR), Polish (PO), Russian (RU), Spanish (SP), Swedish (SW), Tswana (TSW) and Turkish (TU).

7 Note that the search strings allowed for the retrieval of non-standard patterns, such as the use of a present participle with cause ([X CAUSE Y V prp]) or the positioning of the causee after the non-finite verb slot (e.g. [X MAKE V inf Y]). In what follows, these constructions are classified together with their standardised variants, e.g. [X CAUSE Y V pre] with [X CAUSE Y V to-inf] and [X MAKE V inf Y] with [X MAKE Y V inf].
4. Causative constructions in learner English

4.1. Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rel. freq. BNCw (per million w.)</th>
<th>Rel. freq. ICLE (per million w.)</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>Overuse (+), underuse (-) or non-significant (ns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X MAKE Y V&lt;sub&gt;inf&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>50.77</td>
<td>403.93</td>
<td>1316.54</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X BE made V&lt;sub&gt;to-inf&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X MAKE Y V&lt;sub&gt;pp&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X GET Y V&lt;sub&gt;to-inf&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X GET Y V&lt;sub&gt;pp&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X GET Y V&lt;sub&gt;prp&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X HAVE Y V&lt;sub&gt;inf&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X HAVE Y V&lt;sub&gt;pp&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X HAVE Y V&lt;sub&gt;prp&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X CAUSE Y V&lt;sub&gt;to-inf&lt;/sub&gt;]</td>
<td>36.98</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Relative frequency of causative constructions in BNCw and ICLE

A comparison of the frequencies of the different causative constructions in native and learner English reveals some significant differences. The most striking one concerns [X MAKE Y V<sub>inf</sub>], which is highly significantly overused by learners (X² = 1316.54, p<0.001). This result confirms studies such as those by Wong (1983) or Liu & Shaw (2001), who note an overuse of the make causative construction among Chinese-speaking learners, or Altenberg & Granger (2001), who found such an overuse in Swedish-speaking learners’ production.8 One may hypothesise, as Wong (1983: 152) does for Chinese learners, that the overuse of [X MAKE Y V<sub>inf</sub>] is due to learners’ tendency to fall back on make when they need to express causation, to the detriment of other devices. This, however, would imply that the other causative constructions are all underused by learners. But as appears from Table 5, only the infinitive construction with get is significantly underused (X² = 5.51, p<0.05). By contrast, three other constructions are overused, namely [X MAKE Y V<sub>pp</sub>] (X² = 11.22, p<0.001), [X HAVE Y V<sub>pp</sub>] (X² = 6.51, p<0.05) and [X GET Y V<sub>pp</sub>] (X² = 5.96, p<0.05), and the remaining constructions do not display any significant difference in frequency between BNCw and ICLE.

---

8 Altenberg & Granger (2001) found a (non-significant) underuse of the construction among French-speaking learners. However, it should be underlined that they used a corpus of novice writing as their reference native corpus (Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays, made up of essays written by American and British university students). This is to be contrasted with the reference corpus chosen here, BNCw, which represents expert writing and in comparison to which all learner populations overuse [X MAKE Y V<sub>inf</sub>].
4.2. Syntactic errors

The data from ICLE also present a number of syntactic errors. Among these, a distinction may be drawn between errors related to the non-finite verb and errors having to do with the causee. The former are illustrated by (6), where make is used with a to-infinitive, or (7), where get is followed by a bare infinitive. The latter are found in examples like (8), where the causee is misplaced, or (9), where it is missing.

(6) It is good practice to use English every day. That makes us not to forget English grammar or words. <ICLE-JP>
(7) To sum up, doing everything which could contribute to get our university degree be really worthy of its name. <ICLE-SP>
(8) Compensation orders could make feel parents more responsible for their sons and daughters. <ICLE-IT>
(9) It causes to lose their good emotions such as love, mercy and the other good ones. <ICLE-TU>

Some learner constructions combine these two problems (which explains why the two columns in Table 6 below do not necessarily add up), as exemplified by the following two sentences:

(10) Since the first hints of the birth of industrialization man has been inmersed in a world of new and fascinating technologies that have made of him to be more and more apart from the world he comes from. <ICLE-SP>
(11) It may reduce the free time between the couples, causes losing the sweet and romatic feeling. <ICLE-CH>

In (10), the wrong choice of complement (to-infinitive instead of bare infinitive) is combined with the wrong form of the causee (of + NP instead of simple NP). In (11), cause is used with a present participle and the causee is missing. While it is not always easy to determine whether the learner really had the causative pattern in mind when producing sentences such as these (in [11], for example, s/he may have had the transitive pattern of cause in mind), the fact that the two types of errors occur individually (cf. absence of the causee in [9] and use of a present participle with cause in [12]) suggests that the causative interpretation is tenable.
The ease payment of credit card cause the students buying too much and too quickly. <ICLE-CH>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Errors with verb</th>
<th>Errors with causee</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>13.68%</td>
<td>14.53%</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKE</td>
<td>14.07%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>14.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GET</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Proportion of syntactic errors in ICLE

Table 6, which gives the proportion of errors with respect to the overall number of causative constructions with the specific verb, shows that the highest number of errors is found with cause, followed by make. Proportionally, errors in have and get constructions are not so common. Except for cause constructions, where the two types of errors, verb-related and causee-related, represent similar percentages, errors with the non-finite verb are more frequent than errors with the causee. As pointed out by Wong (1983: 153), it is to a large extent an arbitrary matter which non-finite verb is permitted in which construction, so that learners are likely to have some difficulty with the choice of an appropriate form. Particularly common is the confusion between to-infinitives and bare infinitives (77% of all verb-related errors), but the erroneous use of a present participle also occurs (22% of all verb-related errors), especially in cause constructions, where all the verb-related errors are of this type. As for causee-related errors, they are predominantly due to the absence of the causee (52% of all causee-related errors) and, somewhat less frequently, to the postposition of the causee (41% of all causee-related errors), as exemplified by (9) and (8) above, respectively. Notably, the postposition of the causee is often found in the Italian and Spanish components of ICLE, which is probably due to the fact that in Romance languages, the causee normally comes after the non-finite verb (cf. Italian Maria fa scrivere Gianni, lit. “Mary makes write Johnny”).

---

9 Some authors, however, have tried to find a rationale behind these complementation patterns, see e.g. Adamczewski & Delmas (1982: 13ff) on the difference between to-infinitives and bare infinitives in causative constructions.

10 The use of a to-infinitive with active make accounts for some 80% of all verb-related errors with make, which confirms the relevance of the error note found in the Longman Dictionary of Common Errors (Turton & Heaton 1996).
4.3. Collostructions

In addition to syntactic errors such as those described in the preceding section, the data from ICLE contain constructions which, though syntactically correct, somehow sound non-native-like. Consider (13) to (16) below. In (13), the correct idiom is *make (both) ends meet*, not *have both ends meet*. Example (14) illustrates a case of decomposition (see Altenberg & Granger 2001): the learner uses a causative construction where a native speaker would prefer a more synthetic alternative (here, the lexical causative verb *support*). In (15), the verb *help* would sound more natural than the verb *cause*, and in (16), *make their products known* would be a more normal option.

(13) The appearance of “new Russians” has given a terrible imprint on common people, who lead a quiet life, earn their living at establishments and **have both ends meet**. <ICLE-RU>

(14) They just want to earn money and **make** the family **live**. <ICLE-FR>

(15) First, reducing smokers to smoke in restaurants can make the environment in restaurants and bars better. This can **cause us** *(to)* **avoid** (…) to breath secondhand smoke and be threaten by the bad environment to affect our health. <ICLE-CH>

(16) Secondly, many companies like to advertise their products on the television because they find it easy to **get** their products **known** to everybody as people of different ages watches television. <ICLE-CH>

While such lexical infelicities have on occasion been dealt with in the literature (cf. Wong 1983, Altenberg & Granger 2001 or Liu & Shaw 2001), it is in the form of scattered observations rather than a comprehensive account of learners’ lexical problems when using causative constructions. One reason for this is certainly that lexical infelicities are thought to be, in Wong’s (1983: 160) words, “not amenable to simple quantification”. Using the technique of distinctive collexeme analysis, however, and applying it to the comparison of native and learner corpora, it is possible, precisely, to identify and quantify the lexical idiosyncrasies found in learners’ causative constructions.11

---

11 It should be pointed out that the distinctive collexeme analysis carried out here is based on the occurrences of the non-finite verbs, not the causative verbs. Thus, a construction like (i), which contains two non-finite verbs (*supply* and *cooperate*), counts as two in the collostructional analysis.

(i) The great affair not to relate, but to **make** the reader **supply, cooperate**. <BNC:A6B 1107>
Table 7. Proportion of collexemes in the non-finite verb slot shared by BNCw and ICLE (%)

As a rough approximation of the overlap between the collocations used by native speakers and those used by learners, Table 7 shows the proportion of collexemes in the non-finite verb slot of causative constructions shared by native speakers (BNCw) and learners (ICLE). It emerges from this table that the degree of overlap is relatively low. The highest proportion is with \([X \text{MAKE} \ Y \ V_{pp}]\) and \([X \text{GET} \ Y \ V_{prp}]\) and amounts to 20% only. Half of the constructions display a percentage of shared collexemes of under 10%, and with \([X \text{HAVE} \ Y \ V_{prp}]\), no collexemes at all are shared by native speakers and learners.

### 4.4. Make and its collexemes

In what follows, we will specifically focus on causative make, and more particularly, on the collexemes of \([X \text{MAKE} \ Y \ V_{inf}]\) and \([X \text{MAKE} \ Y \ V_{pp}]\). Table 8 lists the collexemes of \([X \text{MAKE} \ Y \ V_{inf}]\) that are significantly more distinctive for native English (upper part of the table) and those that are significantly more distinctive for learner English (lower part). The observed and expected frequencies are given, together with the distinctiveness value of the collexeme.
What is striking in the upper part of the table is that it contains four copular verbs, viz. *seem*, *appear*, *sound* and *look*, as illustrated by (17) and (18). These verbs belong to the functional category of relational verbs, as opposed to mental and material verbs (see Halliday 2004 on this threefold distinction), which seems to confirm Altenberg & Granger’s (2001: 183) point that learners tend to underuse relational verbs with causative *make* (they were referring to Swedish- and French-speaking learners).

(17) For families who can afford to pay the fees, the poor record of state schools *makes* private education *seem* attractive, even if in reality its quality is poor. <BNC:B12 1322>

(18) There are many aids to *make* plots *look* more professional. <BNC:B16 795>

\[\text{Table 8. Distinctive collexemes of } [X \text{ MAKE} Y \text{ V}_{\text{inf}}] \text{ in BNCw and ICLE (significant values only)}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collexemes</th>
<th>Obs. freq. BNCw</th>
<th>Obs. freq. ICLE</th>
<th>Exp. freq. BNCw</th>
<th>Exp. freq. ICLE</th>
<th>Distinctiveness</th>
<th>Preferred variety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>seem</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>14.2331</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appear</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>13.7779</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.4853</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>3.0650</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vanish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>2.9959</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conform</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.5207</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ask</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.6790</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.6790</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jump</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.6790</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.6790</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.6790</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.6192</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>30.78</td>
<td>1.5673</td>
<td>BNCw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>53.87</td>
<td>3.2833</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>38.48</td>
<td>2.1547</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>38.48</td>
<td>2.1547</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go round</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>1.7127</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>1.6437</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>181.27</td>
<td>1.6205</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>47.03</td>
<td>1.5091</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>1.5058</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>1.3680</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{12 While a verb such as } \text{look} \text{ may also be used as a non-copular verb (e.g. } \text{look through the window}, \text{ it is almost always used as a copula in the } \text{make} \text{ causative construction (see Gilquin in preparation on the interplay between verb senses and collexemes).}\]
However, the situation is slightly more complex than that. It is not so much that learners underuse relational verbs, but rather, they use relational verbs which are unlikely to be used by native speakers. This transpires from the lower part of Table 8, which shows that verbs like *be, become, feel* or *have*, which are all relational verbs, are distinctive for learner English. In native English, on the other hand, these verbs tend to be relatively rare (one occurrence of *be* and *become*, and no occurrences of *have*). A close examination of the sentences produced by learners with one of these verbs reveals their unidiomatic nature. Consider the following examples:

(19) He passed through hardships and sufferings in order to **make** their dreams **become** true. <ICLE-RU>
(20) That will **make** it **be** more popular. <ICLE-TSW>
(21) This **made** women **become** increasingly aware of their rights. <ICLE-NR>
(22) This change also **makes** auditors **be** in a difficult situation. <ICLE-JP>

In (19), *make their dreams come true* would be the normal expression. In (20) and (21), the non-finite verb is redundant and a native speaker would probably use an adjectival construction instead (*make it more popular, made women increasingly aware*). This “preference for verbosity”, highlighted by Liu & Shaw (2001: 180) for Chinese-speaking learners, partly explains learners’ general overuse of \[X \text{MAKE} Y \text{V}_{\text{inf}}\]. It also seems to go hand in hand with an underuse of the adjectival (and nominal) causative construction among certain learner populations (see Altenberg & Granger 2001 for French-speaking learners and Liu & Shaw 2001 for Chinese-speaking learners). As for (22), native speakers may find the sentence more natural with the verb *cause* (and a *to*-infinitive). This is because, as appears from a distinctive collexeme analysis of all ten causative constructions in native English, the verb *be* (and *become*) is more distinctive for \[X \text{CAUSE} Y \text{V}_{\text{to-inf}}\] than for any other construction (see Gilquin 2006).

Another verb that figures prominently among the most distinctive collexemes of \[X \text{MAKE} Y \text{V}_{\text{inf}}\] in learner writing is *believe*, as in (23). While this verb is possible in native

---

13 Liu & Shaw (2001: 179), using a simple frequency-based approach, note a similar predilection for *feel* and *become* among Chinese-speaking learners. While they attribute this behaviour to the influence of the mother tongue, pointing out that \[X \text{MAKE} Y \text{feel}\] and \[X \text{MAKE} Y \text{become}\] have word-for-word equivalents in Chinese, it looks as if a more general tendency is at work here, since the former collostruction is found in all the components of ICLE and the latter, in ten components.

14 \[X \text{CAUSE} Y \text{V}_{\text{to-inf}}\] is the only construction that has a relation of attraction, rather than repulsion, with *be* and *become*. This attraction is statistically significant, and *be* and *become* are the first and third most distinctive collexemes of the construction, respectively.
writing, it is not very frequent (just one occurrence in BNCw). Again, it is a verb that is more distinctive for another causative construction, namely [X HAVE Y V<inf>], as exemplified by (24). When used in [X MAKE Y V<inf>], it is normally in the (causeless) expression make believe, meaning “to pretend”, cf. (25).

(23) The socialists made us believe in the close bound between higher education and success in life. <ICLE-BU>
(24) The bulletin is not a wide ranging, objective, scientific review as De Melker would have us believe. <BNC:FSY 1369>
(25) This is direct experience, but it is not drama -- not until there is some pretence involved, some symbolic representation, some intention to make believe. <BNC:AM6 126>

Let us now turn to one of the only causative constructions whose collexemes have attracted some attention in the literature, [X MAKE Y V<pp>], and examine Table 9, which provides a complete list of the collexemes distinctive for native English (upper part) and learner English (lower part). In native English, the construction is highly restricted in terms of lexical preferences. Only four verbs are distinctive, viz. known, felt, recognised and swallowed, and of the 19 tokens represented by these verbs, 12 correspond to an occurrence of known, as in (26). Two other verbs are found in BNCw with [X MAKE Y V<pp>], although they are not distinctive for native English, namely understood and heard. It will be noticed that, with the exception of swallowed, all these verbs back up Van Ek & Robat’s (1984: 327) claim that the construction is used with verbs “denoting the exercise and recognition of influence in the widest sense”.

(26) The exercise was regarded by the then minister for health in Scotland, Michael Forsyth, as a piece of “action” research, the results of which would be made known at intervals during the evaluation. <BNC:FT3 859>

---

15 Believe is the third most distinctive collexeme of [X HAVE Y V<inf>], with a significant distinctiveness value of 3.53 (Gilquin 2006).
In learner English, by contrast, there is a greater variety of collexemes occurring in the non-finite verb slot of \( [X \text{ MAKE } Y \ V_{pp}] \): 16 distinctive collexemes, most of which occur only once in the data, and 18 different verbs, for a total of 39 tokens. Calculating the type/token ratio, we obtain a result of 0.4615 in ICLE, against 0.2727 only in BNCw, which means that the lexical variation of the construction is much higher in learner English than in native English. Learners seem to be unaware of the strong lexical preferences of \( [X \text{ MAKE } Y \ V_{pp}] \). They use a whole series of verbs which do not belong to the semantic class of “exercise and recognition of influence” and, consequently, would be unlikely to occur in native English, e.g. undone, broken, fallen or stuck. The use of these verbs results in infelicitous constructions, as illustrated by (27) and (28).

(27) Often fundamentalists try to affect society and make their norms legalised. <ICLE-FI>

(28) Usually it automatically makes your dreams based on your experience. <ICLE-CZ>
The analysis presented in this section has shown that, while phenomena of over- and underuse and syntactic errors do pose problems for learners who want to use periphrastic causative constructions in English, another major stumbling block, largely ignored in the literature, is learners’ lack of awareness of the lexical preferences displayed by the different constructions, which may result in awkward and unidiomatic usage. The next section offers three possible explanations for the discrepancies found between native and learner collostructions, viz. lack of register awareness, transfer from the mother tongue and inadequacy of teaching materials.

5. Explanations for learners’ lexical infelicities

5.1. Lack of register awareness

Learners’ lack of register awareness has been underlined by several linguists. More precisely, it has been demonstrated that learner writing tends to exhibit characteristics of informal, spoken English (see e.g. Altenberg & Tapper 1998 on the use of adverbial connectors or Gilquin & Paquot 2008 on language functions). This tendency seems to be at work in collostructions too. Thus, learners use quite a few instances of the [X GET Y done] collostruction, as in (29). The collostruction does occur in native written English, cf. (30), but it turns out to be much more common in a corpus of native spoken English (BNCs), e.g. (31). This situation is represented by Figure 1.

(29) It is a good thing if we manage to get more done in the same time. <ICLE-SW>
(30) While on his own home ground he knows how to do things, or how to get them done, beyond the boundaries of his home ground he knows, at best, only that he should comply with the rules without necessarily understanding why or precisely what all of the relevant rules are: he may simply go through the motions. <BNC:BMP 714>
(31) Well you get it done on the insurance, your insurance covers that. <BNC:KBB 6967>

The same tendency for learners to use collostructions more typical of speech than of writing is found with [X MAKE Y feel] which, as already mentioned, is distinctive for learner English. Table 10, however, shows that the distinctiveness only exists if one compares the

---

16 BNCs is made up of 5 million words from the spoken component of the British National Corpus, World Edition (Burnard 2000) and includes conversations, TV and radio discussions, and live sports commentaries and discussions (see Gilquin 2010).
Figure 1. Proportion (%) of [X GET Y done] in native written English (BNCw), native spoken English (BNCs) and learner English (ICLE) data from ICLE with native written data (BNCw). In this case, the collexeme feel appears to be more frequent than expected in learner English (191 vs. 181.27), which explains the significant distinctiveness of the collocation in ICLE. If, on the other hand, one compares the learner data with native spoken data (BNCs), feel turns out to be less frequent than expected in learner English (191 vs. 196.22), and the collocation, more distinctive for native English – but not significantly so. In other words, while feel is significantly more distinctive for learner English when compared with native written English, there is no significant difference between learner English and native spoken English, which means that statistically the frequency of [X MAKE Y feel] in learner English is closer to its frequency in native speech than in native writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obs. freq.</th>
<th>Obs. freq.</th>
<th>Exp. freq.</th>
<th>Exp. freq.</th>
<th>Distinctiveness</th>
<th>Preferred variety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BNC</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
<td>BNC</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNCw</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>181.27</td>
<td>1.6205</td>
<td>ICLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNCs</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>115.78</td>
<td>196.22</td>
<td>0.5596</td>
<td>BNCs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Distinctiveness of [X MAKE Y feel] in ICLE vs. BNCw and ICLE vs. BNCs

These two examples suggest that learners have difficulty distinguishing between collocations that are likely to be found in an academic essay and those that are more likely to occur in a conversation. This could explain why there is so little overlap between the collexemes used by learners and native speakers in their writings. However, not all cases of discrepancy between ICLE and BNCw can be explained by means of a difference in register.
5.2. Transfer from the mother tongue

Another possible explanation for the lexical infelicities found in learner writing is transfer from the mother tongue. While in the present study no distinction has been made between the different learner populations, it was shown in Gilquin (2000/2001) that the overuse of dynamic, as opposed to stative, verbs in the non-finite verb slot of causative constructions with *make* by French-speaking learners may be due to the influence of French, where the equivalent causative construction, \([X FAIRE V_{inf} Y]\), usually contains a dynamic verb (cf. Table 11). As a result, the high frequency, in French-speaking learners’ essays, of sentences like (32), which are comparatively rare in native writing, may be related to the presence of similar sentences in native French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US</th>
<th>ICLE</th>
<th>FR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Dynamic and stative verbs in the non-finite verb slot of the *make/faire* causative construction in native American English (US), learner English (ICLE) and native French (FR) (based on Gilquin 2000/2001: 110)

(32) There are only two subjects on earth that have the power to pervert people and to make them do anything crazy, those two subjects are love and money. <ICLE-FR>

5.3. Inadequacy of teaching materials

Finally, the inadequacy of teaching materials may also be blamed for learners’ lack of awareness of the lexical preferences displayed by English periphrastic causative constructions. For one thing, as already noted, information about such preferences is conspicuously absent from the literature, let alone from the reference tools available to learners. Grammars, both pedagogical and scientific, tend to focus on syntactic issues, in particular complementation and passivisation (see Gilquin 2010), and textbooks often deal with periphrastic causative verbs in a section on verb patterns, together with other verbs that can be used in the same structure (see, require, believe, etc). For another thing, the examples that are used in teaching materials to illustrate the different causative constructions often
sound artificial, using collexemes which are very unlikely to occur in authentic English. Examples (33) to (35), collected from various grammars, illustrate this tendency.

(33) They **made** me **do** it. (Murphy 1985: 110)
(34) She didn’t **have** him **kill** the rat. (Cupers & Loriaux 1977: 26)
(35) As soon as our guests arrived, we **had** them **peeling** potatoes and **slicing** beans. (Gusdorf & Lewis 2002: 536)

With no adequate resources to turn to and no native-speaker intuitions to rely on, no wonder learners are at a loss to make felicitous lexical choices when using causative constructions.

6. Conclusion

In this article, we have seen that English periphrastic causative constructions display strong lexical preferences for certain non-finite verbs, which, with rare exceptions, are not recorded in the literature, let alone in pedagogical grammars and textbooks. Foreign learners, with no native-speaker intuitions and no appropriate tools to rely on, tend to produce unidiomatic constructions, as the analysis of a learner corpus reveals. While such constructions are unlikely to hinder communication, they contribute to the foreign-soundingness of learners’ production and should therefore be eradicated if one wants to attain native-like proficiency. This eradication implies at least two steps. The first step, which has been carried out here for causative constructions, involves establishing the lexical preferences found in native language and comparing them with learners’ preferences, using corpus data and appropriate statistical methods. The second step would be to bring these findings (or at least, some of them) into the classroom. Howarth (1998: 30) notes that “teachers and materials writers are paying increasing attention to the necessity of learners to acquire knowledge of collocations and are aware that this component of competence should be addressed explicitly”. However, it has been demonstrated that there is still room for substantial improvement (e.g. Biber et al. 2004, Meunier & Gouverneur 2007). Presenting learners with authentic and typical examples and drawing their attention to the most frequent and relevant collocations/collostructions is a sine qua non for “phraseologically improved” teaching materials. Until learners have such resources at their disposal, one can hardly blame them for being unaware of phenomena that partly escape the conscious attention of native speakers themselves.
A study such as this one could also have implications on a more theoretical level. Thus, constructionists claim that during the acquisition of a second language, learners increasingly rely on constructions (cf. Goldberg 2006). One could wonder whether such a quantitative increase goes hand in hand with a qualitative improvement, namely the use of increasingly idiomatic constructions, closer in their lexical features to the preferences displayed by native speakers. A longitudinal corpus, representing the production of learners at different developmental stages, combined with the method of distinctive collexeme analysis applied here, would make it possible to answer this question and hence go one step further in our understanding of the mechanisms underlying the acquisition of constructions and, more generally, of language. This, in turn, could inform more pedagogical decisions, thus resulting in mutual enrichment between theory and practice.
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Analytic permissives in Present-day English
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Abstract

This paper investigates possible meaning differences between analytic permissive constructions containing the English verbs ‘let’ and ‘allow’. The data for the study were taken from the British National Corpus. Two types of permission, and two types of prohibition, are distinguished. The results of the corpus study show that there are significant differences between the two verbs in their occurrence with the various types. The paper also addresses the question of whether the complement event in permissive constructions is best interpreted as occurring subsequent to or concomitant with the time of the matrix verb. Finally, an explanation is offered as to why the various types of permission and prohibition are more likely to be coded by one or other of the constructions.

1. Introduction

Discussing complement constructions in English, Wierzbicka writes “Grammar is not semantically arbitrary. On the contrary, grammatical distinctions are motivated (in the synchronic sense) by semantic distinctions; every grammatical construction is a vehicle of a certain semantic structure; and this is its raison d’être, and the criterion determining its range of use” (Wierzbicka 1988: 3). Hudson, Rosta, Holmes and Gisborne (1996) maintain, however, that this is not the full story. They argue that, although most syntactic constructions may be semantically motivated, there is still a residue of exceptions, of instances which require purely syntactic knowledge on the part of the language learner and user. They focus on pairs of synonyms, or near-synonyms, which behave differently syntactically. Of these

1 I wish to thank the editors and two anonymous referees for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.
they state “our data are still relevant to theories of the syntax-semantics interface even if our putative synonyms turn out to be subtly different in style or even in referential meaning. Our case is that the examples at least seem to be synonymous, so the onus is on those who think otherwise not only to demonstrate the differences in meaning but also to show why the syntactic differences follow from them” (Hudson et al. 1996: 440).

One of the pairs of synonyms cited by Hudson et al. is let/allow. This pair is investigated in this paper, in which I present the results of a usage-based study of non-finite complement constructions in which they occur in Present-day British English. I address the two questions posed by Hudson et al.: (1) Are there differences in meaning between constructions containing let, on the one hand, and allow on the other? and (2) (How) are the syntactic differences in complementation form related to these differences in meaning? Having presented in section 2 the corpus data on which the paper is based, I turn in section 3 to the question of whether the constructions containing let and allow encode what Talmy (1986) calls onset or extended letting. In section 4 I consider the second question posed by Hudson et al., dealing with the relationship between the syntactic form of the constructions and their semantics. Finally section 5 contains a short summary and a conclusion.

2. The corpus

The data for the study were taken from the British National Corpus. As there are almost 30,000 tokens of the verb let and over 30,000 of allow in the corpus, it was impossible within the scope of this study to investigate all tokens. I decided to restrict my investigation to a certain number of randomly chosen utterances containing each matrix verb, and to examine this subset of utterances for tokens containing bare and to-infinitive complement clauses. From the BNC I downloaded sets of tokens that varied in size from 100 to 2,000, before ending up with 1,000 as a number which seemed to give a reasonable guarantee of accuracy in the sense that a selection of different random samples of tokens of the same matrix verb yielded very similar results with regard to the incidence of the various types of complement clause. No appreciable increase in accuracy was achieved by increasing the sample to 1,500 or 2,000 tokens. Thus 1,000 randomly selected tokens of let and allow were downloaded from the corpus and the tokens containing non-finite complements were extracted from the two databases. Then tokens containing active voice matrix verbs were extracted. Totals for these active voice constructions are contained in Table 1, which also contains projected totals for the corpus as a whole. The reason for excluding passive matrix verbs was the wish to restrict
the study to constructions in which both the permitter and permittee are encoded explicitly. In Table 1 the second column contains the total number of tokens of the verbs in question in the BNC. Columns 3 and 4 contain the number of occurrences of the various constructions in question in the downloaded sample, and columns 5 and 6 total numbers of tokens projected for the BNC as a whole on the basis of the figures in columns 2, 3 and 4.

Table 1: Real and projected totals for constructions containing active voice matrix verbs *allow*, *permit* and *let* and *to*- and bare infinitive complements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix verb</th>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>Totals per sample</th>
<th>Projected totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to</td>
<td>bare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>allow</em></td>
<td>33222</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>let</em></td>
<td>28678</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>16460</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both *allow* and *let* are polysemous and both may be used in senses that do not encode permission as such. Before proceeding to compare the constructions containing *allow* and *let*, it is therefore necessary to weed out from our data tokens which do not encode permission. These include (1) in which *allow* means *admit* or *consider* rather than *permit*. Also excluded are tokens which do not contain an explicit complement clause subject, such as (2), the single token of ‘*allow* x bare *infinitive*’, cited as (3), and one token, (4), which is not an example of actual language usage, but a made-up example from a monograph on the infinitive (Duffley 1992).

(1) We can apply the test to the technical and technological subjects, and not only those, but the professional subjects also; and the boundary line will run now on this side, now on that; but the things that it divides are different in kind, and only on one side of that line lies what we *ought to allow to be* education. (BNC A69 383)

(2) The transcription start sites for the P A2b and P A3 promoters analyzed by S1 mapping (4) indicated three contiguous possible start sites for each promoter that *did not allow to determine* which was the first nucleotide incorporated by the RNA polymerase, a problem frequently found with S1 mapping analysis. (BNC FTE 1006)

(3) A Fresco ‘canvas’ on to which gliffs can be ‘painted’ will *allow developers create*
things like two-dimensional geometric figures: like X it has some difficulty with three
dimensions at the moment. (BNC CSP 167)

(4) He proposes the following contexts to illustrate the contrast between the way let
represents permission and the manner in which allow evokes it: (216a) I allowed him
to do it, but he didn’t do it. (BNC HXG 1001)

Having removed the tokens in question we are left with 462 tokens of ‘allow x to-infinitive’
that clearly encode permission or its negative counterpart, prohibition. The let construction is
more versatile than the allow construction. It is therefore necessary to weed out rather more
tokens containing let. These include tokens of the two multi-word verbs ‘let x know’
(= ‘inform ‘X) and ‘let x have’ (= ‘give ‘X), illustrated in (5) and (6). Also excluded are first-
person plural suggestions, of the sort illustrated in (7), hortatives as in (8), and what the
Cambridge Grammar refers to as “open let imperatives”, as in (9) (Huddleston and Pullum
2002: 925). Finally, tokens of the construction in (10), which is restricted to scientific and for
the most part mathematical discourse, are also excluded. Common to all these let
constructions is the absence of parallel constructions containing allow.

(5) And we let her know from the start that we trusted her. (BNC G35 1029)
(6) I will let you have a list of his customers and I want them contacted, in the first
instance by telephone. (BNC HWP 1159)
(7) Let’s assume one of your employees drinks too much both at work and at home.
(BNC A05 29)
(8) But most of all, let brick be your inspiration. (BNC CFN 312)
(9) Let Clan Diarmaid rue the day they ever raised hand against Clan Gillian!’
(BNC APW 144)
(10) For: Let U denote the subset of N comprising all those positive integers n for which
the statement S(n) is true. (BNC EV9 566)

The total number of let tokens to be excluded amounts to 285, leaving us with 490 tokens
which clearly encode either permission or prohibition. The discussion in the remainder of this
paper is based on these 490 tokens of let and the 462 tokens of allow that encode permission
or prohibition. In the next section we consider the two constructions in terms of force
dynamics.
3. **Barrier-removal versus non-imposition**

In an influential paper on causation, Kemmer and Verhagen characterise permissives as encoding the removal of a barrier preventing the permittee from realising some goal.

A fourth type [of causation], *enablement/permission*, involves not the exertion of force on an entity to bring about an event that otherwise would not have happened, but the removal by the causer of a conceived barrier that was preventing the causee from carrying out or undergoing the effected event. *Enablement* refers to the case where the barrier is physical […] and *permission* to the case where the barrier is social or sociopolitical in nature […]; we can thus consider enablement and permission as subvarieties of one type. (Kemmer & Verhagen 1994:120)

Figure 1 illustrates this type of permission (or enablement), wherein the matrix verb subject, the permitter (S1), removes a barrier which was blocking the path of the complement verb subject, the permittee (S2), permitting the latter to continue unimpeded on his or her way.

![Figure 1: Barrier-removal by the permitter (S1) enabling the permittee (S2) to pass](image)

Figure 1, however, illustrates only one of two main forms of permission described by Talmy (1986), who distinguishes between what he calls *onset letting* and *extended letting* as follows: "onset letting correlates with the cessation of impingement and extended […] with its nonoccurrence" (Talmy 1986: 76: see also Talmy 2000: 418). While accepting Talmy’s distinction between these two types of permission, I prefer to use the term *barrier-removal*, based on Kemmer and Verhagen, rather than *onset-letting*. For the concept which Talmy calls *extended letting* I will use the term *non-imposition* (of any barrier). I will also eschew
Talmy’s terminology (*agonist* and *antagonist*) for the participants in the act of permission, preferring the more specific terms *permitter* and *permittee*. The form of permission which I term *non-imposition* is illustrated in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Non-imposition of barrier by the permitter (S1) enables the permittee (S2) pass](image)

### 3.1 Tokens with positive polarity matrix verbs

This section deals with tokens containing positive polarity matrix verbs. It is only matrix verbs with positive polarity that encode *barrier-removal* or *non-imposition*. Negative polarity matrix verbs encode *barrier-retention* or *imposition*. These will be the topic of section 3.3. Table 2 contains details of the number of positive and negative polarity matrix verbs in the downloaded samples.

**Table 2: Constructions containing positive and negative polarity active voice matrix verbs, *allow* and *let* with horizontal percentages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix verb</th>
<th>BNC</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Percentage totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>allow</em></td>
<td>33222</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>let</em></td>
<td>28678</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All positive polarity tokens were examined with a view to determining whether they encoded *barrier-removal* or *non-imposition*. The two types of permission were taken to comprise mutually exclusive categories – either a barrier existed or it did not. Distinguishing between the two sometimes involved a considerable amount of trawling in the co-text in an effort to ascertain the possible prior existence of barriers. In other cases the immediate co-text contained sufficient information to conclude that such a barrier existed. One possible source of such information is the presence of a temporal adverbial like *later* in (11) or an adjective like *new* in (12).

(11) The US pilots *later* allowed an Iraqi search-and-rescue helicopter to fly to the crash site and then return to its base. (BNC CBE 784)

(12) In an attempt to remedy this the SLORC introduced *new* banking laws in July 1990 which *allowed foreign banks to open* branches in Myanmar. (BNC HLD 4402)

The adverbial *later* in (11) indicates that the permitter in question had previously forbidden the permittee to carry out the flight in question. Similarly in (12) the use of the adjective *new* implies the earlier existence of laws prohibiting the operation of foreign banks.

It is not only in the case of utterances containing adverbials and adjectives in the matrix clause, as in (11) and (12) that it is possible for us to infer the prior existence of barriers. In many cases we can make a similar inference based on other sorts of information in the immediate co-text, as in (13), or using our general world knowledge as in (14) and (15).

(13) She *allowed herself to feel* all the pain she’d denied herself for so long. (BNC HGM 851)

(14) Claudia relaxed her fingers, *letting the pencil drop* to the desk. (BNC H8J 2708)

---

3 One anonymous reviewer writes on this point: “Was it possible to actually tell that it existed? Or was it possible that it was imposed on earlier occasions but not now?” I would argue that if a barrier was imposed on earlier occasions but not now then that barrier must have been removed. The exact time of its removal is not at issue. What is relevant is whether S1 is responsible for its removal thus facilitating the realisation of the complement situation by S2. The syntax in example (11) tells us that it is S1 that is responsible for its removal. Whether the barrier in Figure 1 is removed when the permittee reaches it, or whether it is removed when the permitter sees the permittee approaching, or even whether it is removed in advance of the permittee’s coming into the permitter’s view is not material to the distinction between *barrier-removal* and *non-imposition* as operationalised in this study.
(15) WHEN that grand old man of the turf Jim Joel died last spring at the age of 97, a condition in his will allowed the Queen Mother to choose any horse she wished from his estate. (BNC K97 13871)

In (13) it is the presence of the adverbial “for so long” in the relative clause that allows us to infer the previous self-imposed barrier to the feeling of pain. In (14) our knowledge of the function of taut fingers as a container of objects allows us to see the force-dynamic relationship between the action of relaxation and the falling of the pencil. We know that prior to their being relaxed the fingers constituted a barrier to the pencil’s falling. In interpreting (14) we make use of our knowledge of the physical world. In (15) we employ our cultural knowledge. We know that people are not entitled to choose items from another person’s estate unless permission to do so has been expressly given.

A final locus for inference involves cases where the permitter is encoded by a *sine qua non* condition, as in (16) - (17).

(16) If you recall back in nineteen eight five Tony the Government brought in the transport bill which let operators compete. (BNC KM8 236)

(17) The two centre holes allow a retaining wire to be fitted. (BNC HH6 1902)

(16) is similar to example (11) in that it contains a temporal adverbial, “back in nineteen eight five”. A natural inference is that it was the introduction of the bill which allowed the operators to compete. (In the ‘real world’, of course, it was the passing of the bill into law, not its introduction, that conferred the permission on the operators in question.) However, the presence of the adverbial is not necessary for us to make the requisite inference. The very fact that it is the bill that is the permitter implies the prior impossibility of competition, in other words the existence of an earlier impediment. Similarly in (17) without the presence of the two centre holes a wire could not have been fitted. Thus the presumed absence of these two holes amounts to a prior barrier.

Examples (11) - (17) all encode situations of *barrier-removal*. To categorise them as such it is sufficient to identify the prior existence of a barrier, which may either be implicit or explicit. The prior non-existence of a barrier is less easy to stipulate, for obvious reasons. We may sometimes draw on our world knowledge, as in the case of (18). More often we must trawl the co-text before we can conclude that no such barrier existed.
We can infer from (18), without searching the co-text, that the officials in question had the power to alter the result but chose not to exercise this power. In other words (18) is an instance of non-imposition. In (19) an extensive search of the text in did not reveal any prior wish on the part of Ben to assume the task of rowing. In this case a paraphrase without a verb of permission, such as ‘Meg handed the oars to Ben’ would be more felicitous than one implying a previous desire on his part to take over. Similarly (20) does not imply a prior prohibition on the descent of “the blacks”. It merely states that the permiters did not themselves make any effort to seek them out.

Tokens such as (18) – (20) may appear at first sight to be ambiguous. However, this sort of ambiguity usually evaporates when one conducts a thorough examination of the co-text. Whenever such an investigation revealed no clue as to the previous existence of a barrier to the realisation of the situation encoded in the complement clause, the token in question was labelled as encoding non-imposition. Thus all tokens containing positive polarity matrix verbs were assigned to one of two semantic classes. One might object that the overall picture yielded by this analysis is too black-and-white. However, the question of the presence or absence of a barrier is a black-and-white question. Either such a barrier existed, or it did not. If it existed one may expect it to have been either explicitly mentioned or at least implied by the speaker.

Having distinguished between barrier-removal and non-imposition, and described the criteria used to classify tokens as instantiating one or other of these two types of permission, we will now proceed to consider the extent to which the two constructions encode both types of permission. We have already seen some examples showing that both constructions can encode situations of barrier-removal and of non-imposition. (21) - (23) are three more examples of barrier-removal encoded by ‘allow x to-infinitive’.

(21) Once safe in the haven of the kitchen, she allowed George to slip from her grasp and ran, sobbing, to her mother. (BNC C98 823)
However, in September 1988, the Secretary of State for Education announced proposals to allow certain people with no teaching training to become ‘licensed teachers’ at the discretion of local employers. (BNC H8D 1269)

Police and MPs have strongly criticized an Old Bailey verdict which allowed a teenage vandal to walk free after he’d admitted stabbing a neighbour to death. (BNC FXT 588)

(21) is similar to (14). We make use of our world knowledge of the act of grasping to infer a prior barrier to George’s being on the ground. (22) is similar to (16). Before the introduction of the proposals there existed a barrier to the licensing of teachers without pedagogical qualifications. In (23) the vandal in question had been in custody prior to the court’s reaching its verdict.

*Barrier-removal* can also be encoded using *let*, as in (14) and (24) - (26).

The handshake was a stupid idea as she was still holding Darren, but she let him slide down to the floor and we shook. (BNC A0F 1148)

FOR three years Irene Macaulay pleaded with the Army to let her visit the spot where her son Donald was murdered by the IRA. (BNC K97 14600)

‘I had to plead with you to let her come to the party,’ Mother said. (BNC KPG 4382)

(24) resembles (21) in so far as both encode the holding of a child in a woman’s arms and her subsequent relaxation of her grip. (25) resembles (11) in containing a time adverbial, in this case one of duration, “for three years”, denoting the period during which the barrier has been in place. In (26), on the other hand, we make use of our knowledge of epistemic modality to infer the existence of the barrier from the phrase “I had to”.

Just as both *allow* and *let* may both encode *barrier-removal*, they may both encode *non-imposition*. (27) - (29) exemplify *non-imposition* encoded by *allow*.

A pub landlord in Oxford has been charged with allowing his customers to smoke cannabis on his premises. (BNC KIE 3653)

Race starter Captain Keith Brown was also criticised for allowing the horses to line up too close to the start line which led to the tape twice being broken. (BNC K45 1259)

On the other hand, he said ID cards were ridiculous and confirmed what fans had known for years that they were ill-treated by uncaring clubs who were allowing grounds to fall into disrepair. (BNC K52 3366)
All three tokens (27) - (29) encode ‘sins of omission’, as it were. There is no need to trawl the text in order to ascertain that in each case a breach of duty is being referred to. Even if our cultural knowledge did not include the information that a pub landlord is obliged to hinder his customers from smoking cannabis, the fact that the landlord in (27) has been charged with an offence would allow us to infer that this is the case. In (28) it is the duty of the race starter to prohibit the horses from approaching the starting tape before being signalled to do so. Even if we are not familiar with the world of national hunt racing we can infer as much from the use of the word “criticised” and the fact that the tape was breached twice. Our knowledge of the duty of football clubs to provide decent facilities for their players and supporters allows us to conclude that (29) encodes negligence, in other words non-imposition.

Some more tokens where non-imposition is encoded by let are (30) - (33).

(30) Darling Mother, I have let too much time pass without writing, but I haven’t forgotten you. (BNC ANF 1081)
(31) Have they all let their membership lapse? (BNC HHV 24488)
(32) With the fish in a bucket of tank water (aerated) stir up the substrate and let the mess settle. (BNC CLT 899)
(33) I know for a fact she’s had her eye on my mother’s matinée jacket collection for years and when I once, in passing, said I wondered what happened to those old prosthetic devices in the estates of deceased senior citizens, Madge let it slip that she knew a way of turning a Zimmer frame into an attractive lamp!’ (BNC ARJ 1736)

In (30) the subject does nothing to interrupt the passing of time by way of writing to his mother. In (31) we can infer from the form of the inquiry that the organisation in question is one in which members have to renew their membership if they wish to retain that status. In (32) the addressee is explicitly instructed to refrain from doing anything to interfere with the settling process. (33) instantiates another form of non-imposition, one to which we have not previously referred. It involves a non-agentive human permitter. Barrier-removal by a human permitter presupposes a conscious decision on his or her part.

Having now ascertained that both barrier-removal and non-imposition may be encoded using both allow and let, we turn to the question of how often the two constructions are actually used to encode the two sorts of permission. The answer is shown in Table 3 in which we see that while allow is employed to encode barrier-removal in almost nine cases out of ten, let favours non-imposition by a margin of almost four to one. Figure 3 contains figures for the corpus as a whole projected on the basis of the results in the random sample.
Table 3: Constructions containing positive active voice matrix verbs *allow* and *let* encoding *barrier-removal* or *non-imposition* with horizontal percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Totals per sample</th>
<th>Percentage totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barrier-removal</td>
<td>non-imposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>allow to-inf.</em></td>
<td>365</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>let bare inf.</em></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Projected number of tokens encoding *barrier-removal* versus *non-imposition* with positive matrix verbs *let* and *allow*

The totals in Table 3 and Figure 3 are striking to the naked eye. The difference between the two constructions with respect to encoding *barrier-removal* or *non-imposition* is, as one might expect, statistically significant (p<0.0001). We can therefore safely conclude that the fact that *allow* and *let* in our data predominantly encode *barrier-removal* and *non-imposition* respectively is not a matter of mere chance.
3.2 The overlap between the two constructions

Figure 3 is an eloquent illustration of the fact that there is a considerable difference in how the two constructions are used. Nevertheless, there is, as we have already noted, a certain degree of overlap between them. Exactly how much overlap is there? We have seen, for instance, that *let* encodes *barrier-removal* in examples (14), (16), (24), (25) and (26). Of 81 tokens of *let* encoding *barrier-removal*, as many as 25 contain the predicate *go*, as in (34) - (35). Of 365 tokens of *allow* encoding *barrier-removal*, on the other hand, just one, cited as (36) contains the predicate *go* (there are two tokens of *non-imposition* ‘allow x to go’).

(34) At last he *let her go*, and, puffing happily, she straightened her kerchief and skirt. (BNC CDN 274)
(35) We went on a few yards, then I held back to *let her go ahead* of me where the path was narrowest. (BNC GV2 3746)
(36) ‘It’s the number of Africans the UN *allows to go* into space,’ he said. (BNC HH3 4323)

Although (36) is clearly an instance of *barrier-removal* rather than *non-imposition*, it does not encode the *release* sense, which is the most common meaning of ‘let x go’, as in (34). There is thus no overlapping between the two constructions with the complement predicate *go*.

Of the remaining 56 examples of *barrier-removal* encoded by *let*, another 27 contain motion verbs, such as *drop* in (14), *slide* in (24), *visit* in (25) and *come* in (26). There are 27 occurrences of motion verbs other than *go* among the 382 tokens with *allow*. Table 4 contains details of the motion complement predicates in both constructions.

As shown by Table 4 there are eight predicates that collocate with both *allow* and *let* in my material. One should, however, note that the BNC as a whole also contains tokens with *allow* containing all the motion complement predicates that occur with *let*. The fact that they did not all surface in the randomly downloaded databases merely serves to indicate that they are not particularly common. The eight predicates in Table 4 common to both constructions are *go*, *come*, *move*, *leave*, *fall*, *enter*, *flow* and *fly*. (37) - (40) exemplify the latter two predicates in both constructions.

---

4 There were also 29 examples of the ‘let go of’ construction, as in “He let go of Leila who rubbed her wrist, holding it close to her chest.” (BNC AD9 4023) among the 1,000 downloaded tokens of *let*. 
Table 4: Motion complement predicates in barrier-removal encodings with \textit{let} and \textit{allow}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of tokens</th>
<th>Complement Predicates</th>
<th>allow</th>
<th>let</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>move</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>drop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>leave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>drive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>fly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of each of</td>
<td>get next to, lead, overfly, race, slip, spread, swim, weave</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of each of</td>
<td>park, run, slide, trickle, turn; visit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(37) Many of the people on my courses on dying, for example, had never really come to terms with the inevitability of death in their own lives, and many a time we had to stop to allow distressed and upset people to leave the room. (BNC CCE 1552)

(38) The East German government’s decision to let the refugees leave across their own country came as a surprise to many, including some West German diplomats. (BNC A1G 399)

(39) You can unhook by taking the weight of the rig back on to your arms, thereby allowing the rope to fall out of the hook. (BNC AT6 905)

(40) She let her cloak fall back from her head in surprise. (BNC FRE 328)

The predications in (37) and (38) seem very similar in meaning. In this case there would appear to be a genuine overlap between the use of the two constructions. The same point does not apply to (39) and (40) for reasons pointed out in connection with example (33). If one were to substitute allow for let in (40) one would be ascribing a greater degree of agentivity to the permitter than is implied by the utterance with let. This pair of sentences is, however, unusual in this respect. The majority of tokens encoding the permission of motion with predicates other than go resemble (37) and (38) with respect to the meaning equivalence of the two constructions.
One can also detect the same sort of meaning equivalence (or rather it is hard to detect any substantive semantic or pragmatic difference) between the barrier-removal constructions containing *let* with non-motion predicates and similar tokens containing *allow*. There are only 29 instances of such tokens with *let* among the 81 tokens encoding barrier-removal. Only two complement predicates occur more than once in my data, *listen*, of which there are three examples, and *take*, with two. Other predicates encoding physical or mental action include *dress, drink, seize, think, wear* and *write*. Two others, *borrow* and *buy*, involve transfer, either physical or legal. (41) and (42) exemplify the *let* and *allow* constructions with *buy*.

(41) They should *let them buy* more land and do more council building. (BNC KCG 807)
(42) ‘The rents-to-mortgage scheme would *allow tenants to buy* at least half their property from day one by paying the existing rent.’ (BNC K55 6748)

The predications in (41) and (42) seem very close in meaning. The same point applies to the *let* tokens containing the other non-motion complement predicates and utterances containing *allow* which may be found in the BNC as a whole, if not in the randomly downloaded samples.

To sum up the question of overlap between the two constructions in cases where *let* encodes barrier-removal, we can conclude that, although a certain amount of overlap certainly exists, there is less than might at first appear to be the case given the figures in Table 4. This is because of a tendency to avoid using *go* with *allow*, at least in the sense of release, presumably a by-product of the degree of entrenchment of the ‘let x go’ construction. We turn now to the other case of overlap, instances where *allow* overlaps with *let* in encoding non-imposition.

According to Table 3, there are 49 instances of non-imposition encoded by *allow*. In contrast to the case of barrier-removal encoded by *let*, there does not appear to be a single category of complement predicate that stands out among the various utterances. Predicates used include verbs of motion such as *go, move* and *walk*, non-motion activity verbs like *work* and *demonstrate* and accomplishment verbs like *cool* and *wilt*. (27) - (29) are typical examples of *allow* used to encode non-imposition. Further examples are given in (43) - (44).

(43) *Allowing birth parents to express* their emotions can be an important part of confronting their grief. (BNC EE8 218)
(44) When the carrots are tender, *allow the soup to cool* slightly, then purée it in batches in a blender or food processor. (BNC CDR 449)
In the case of (43) and (44), as indeed in (27) - (29), it would be possible to construct minimal pairs containing *let* which would be extremely difficult to distinguish either semantically or pragmatically from the originals. We are thus again faced with real overlap in usage here. As an indication of the extent to which the *non-imposition* tokens containing *allow* resemble those containing *let*, we can consider the type of permitters and permittees we find in the two constructions. Figure 4 contains details of the animacy of permitters (S1) and permittees (S2) in both *let* and *allow* constructions encoding *barrier-removal* and *non-imposition*.

![Figure 4: Percentage of animate permitters (S1) and permittees (S2) in constructions with *let* and *allow* encoding *non-imposition* and *barrier-removal.*](image)

Figure 4 clearly shows that when the *allow* construction encodes situations of *non-imposition*, it is more likely to occur with animate permitters and permittees than when it encodes *barrier-removal*. The difference between the two types of permission is less marked in the case of *let*. This is because of the restricted type of situation prototypically encoded by barrier-removing *let*, i.e. situations involving *release*, where both the releaser and the released are typically human.

To sum up this section on the degree of overlap between the two constructions, there is no doubt that such overlap exists, but it is not as extensive as may at first appear from Table 3, and certainly by no means as great as implied by Hudson *et al* (see section 1). We would seem justified, on the basis of the evidence presented in this and the previous section, and the projected totals for the two constructions contained in Table 1, in concluding that:
• situations encoding *barrier-removal* are likely to be encoded by *allow*, unless
• they encode situations of *release*, when they are likely to be encoded by *let*.
• In the case of situations involving motion other than *release*, it is impossible to predict which of the two constructions will be employed.
• Situations encoding *non-imposition* are likely to be encoded by *let*.
• In a minority of cases such situations may be encoded by *allow*. It is not possible to predict which situations are likely to be encoded by *allow*.

3.3 Matrix verbs with negative polarity

Hitherto we have been concerned with positive polarity matrix verbs in constructions encoding *barrier-removal* and *non-imposition*. Constructions containing negative polarity matrix verbs *let* and *allow*, on the other hand, encode either *barrier-retention* or *barrier-imposition*. These two forms of (refusal of) permission are illustrated in Figures 5 and 6.

![Figure 5: Retention of barrier by S1 hinders S2 from passing](image_url)
The criteria for distinguishing between *barrier-retention* and *barrier-imposition* are similar to those used to distinguish between *barrier-removal* and *non-imposition* presented in section 3.1. These will not be enumerated again here. We begin by looking at *barrier-retention* as encoded by *not allow*.

(45) It is our interests, rather than those of a degenerate and selfish minority, that the police should protect; and if the law *at present does not allow them to do so* then the law must be changed. (BNC C88 1105)

(46) After all we *don’t allow employers to take money out of our bank accounts* and they have no right to take money out of our pension funds! (BNC HDP 175)

(47) In the Wedgwood Benn Case 1961 the House of Commons *refused to allow Tony Benn to take his seat* although he had been duly elected. (BNC EVK 872)

In (45) the adverbial *at present* refers to a barrier that has been in existence for some time – in other words it encodes the extended rather than the instantaneous sense of the simple present. If one were to omit the adverbial, the sentence would still be understood to encode *barrier-retention*. This is because of the generic nature of the prohibition referred to. (46) also encodes a generic prohibition, the barrier in question being of a permanent nature. (47), on the other hand, refers to a specific act of prohibition. In its case, we must make use of our world knowledge to interpret it as encoding *barrier-retention* rather than *imposition*. The reason why Benn was not allowed take his seat was because of a general prohibition in existence at the time against members of the nobility sitting in the Commons.
Situations involving *barrier-retention* may also be encoded by *not let*, as in (48) - (50).

(48) They *don’t let women drive* cars, let alone fly an aircraft. (BNC BNV 987)
(49) The Foreign Office promises the EC ‘*is not going to let this drop*’. (BNC CAG 1347)
(50) Photography *wouldn’t let him go*, however, and after serving out his apprenticeship with various studios he went freelance, working to commission and supplying picture libraries with travel shots. (BNC CRP 474)

(48) and (49) resemble (45) and (46) in encoding general validity predications. In (48) the authorities impose a general prohibition on driving by women, and in (49) the EC a general prohibition on the dropping of the idea in question. (50) contains the *release* sense of ‘let x go’, metaphorically extended to the domain of the mind. The prohibitor, in this case “photography”, has already a strong grip upon the mind of the participant whom we may term the ‘prohibitee’. This grip takes the form of a barrier blocking the way for the prohibitee to entertain alternative careers.

While *not let* may encode *barrier-retention*, it is more common for it to encode *barrier-imposition* as in (51) – (54).

(51) ‘*I am not letting anyone have my car,*’ I said. (BNC ED9 1298)
(52) ‘*Don’t let her get away,* Tim!’ he shouted. (BNC B0B 478)
(53) On the way home in the taxi (Nigel was indulging them for once - he *couldn’t let Gina use her bike under the circumstances*) he took delight in telling her she had a spot on her backside. (BNC AC3 2043)
(54) I’m right behind you, but you *mustn’t let the parents hear*. (BNC H8Y 906)

The use of the present progressive in (51) indicates that the prohibition is being imposed at the time of speaking. Similarly, the imperative in (52) encodes the *imposition* of a prohibition. (53) and (54) both contain modalised matrix verbs. In (53) the adverbial “under the circumstances” implies that the prohibition in question was not a permanent one. This is thus an instance of *barrier-imposition* rather than *retention*. (54) is similar in meaning to the imperative (52), differing from it in that the illocutionary force of the prohibition is buttressed by the implications of the existence of an obligation on the part of the prohibitee.

The fourth and final combination of form and meaning, *barrier-imposition* encoded by *not allow*, is exemplified by (55) – (57).
After the feud he refused to allow Jamila to visit her parents. (BNC A6V 790)

Unlike his predecessor, he has told Mrs Rees she cannot allow her toys to be sold. (BNC ACR 2289)

He could not allow himself to fall in love with a girl so obviously a part of the world of wealth and consequence which he had abandoned. (BNC HE 2369)

In (55) the time adverbial “after the feud” implies that there was no prior barrier to the girl’s visiting her parents. The contrastive adverbial “unlike his predecessors” in (56) serves a similar function. Finally, the self-imposed prohibition in (57) refers to a particular girl rather than girls in general, and there is no implication that the prohibitor was generally reluctant to engage in affairs of the heart.

We have now seen that, just as both barrier-removal and non-imposition may be encoded by constructions containing positive matrix verbs let and allow, both barrier-retention and imposition may be encoded by constructions containing negated matrix verbs let and allow. Table 5 and Figure 7, which may be compared to Table 3 and Figure 3, contain details of how often the two constructions are used to encode the two types of prohibition.

Table 5: Constructions containing negated active voice matrix verbs allow and let encoding barrier-retention or imposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix verb</th>
<th>Totals per sample</th>
<th>Percentage totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barrier-retention</td>
<td>imposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allow</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The totals in Table 5 and Figure 7 indicate that there is a greater degree of overlap between the two constructions with negated matrix verbs than was the case with positive ones, as shown in Table 3 and Figure 3. Nevertheless, the difference between the two constructions with respect to encoding barrier-retention or imposition is still significant statistically (p<0.001), indicating that the two are by no means always interchangeable.

Taken together, Tables 3 and 5 provide eloquent testimony to there being a clear difference of meaning between the permissive constructions containing let and allow. The former prototypically encodes non-imposition or imposition: the latter prototypically encodes barrier-removal with positive matrix verbs but is equally likely to encode barrier-retention or imposition with negated matrix verbs. The evidence of the present section thus allows us to answer in the affirmative the first of the two questions posed by Hudson et al. referred to in section 1, to wit: Are there differences in meaning between constructions containing let, on the one hand, and allow on the other? The next section will address the second question: (How) are the syntactic differences in complementation form related to these differences in meaning?
4. Why ‘allow x to-infinitive’ but ‘let x bare infinitive’?

In this section I will attempt to relate the fact that allow and let differ with respect to the form of infinitive they govern (or co-occur with) to the general sense of these two complement forms. As it happens, there is no agreement in the literature about the sense of the forms. Indeed, some linguists would go so far as to deny that they have any meaning whatsoever.\(^5\) If, however, we are to explain the motivation behind the use of one form with allow and the other with let, we must assume that they do indeed have some meaning, if only at the most schematic level.

In Egan (2008), a study of over 300 non-finite complement constructions, those containing the bare infinitive form of the complement are assigned to one of two classes. They are categorised either as Same-time constructions, i.e. constructions in which the complement situation is profiled as occurring (or not-occurring) simultaneously with the time of the matrix verb, or Forward-looking constructions, i.e. constructions in which the complement situation is profiled as occurring (or not-occurring) after the time of the matrix verb. The complement clause situations in Forward-looking constructions are located in what may be termed the projected future. I use this term to refer to the ontological domains called “potential reality” and “projected reality” by Langacker in his “dynamic evolutionary model” (Langacker 1991: 277). It encompasses the future as a subject or speaker might expect it to evolve, given their knowledge of the present and experience of the past. Forward-looking matrix verbs do not necessarily entail the occurrence (or non-occurrence) of their complement situations.

All complement constructions containing the to-infinitive are assigned in Egan (2008) to one of three classes. One of these is the Forward-looking class. The second is the class of what Langacker (1999: 249) calls general validity predications, i.e. situations profiled as likely to occur at more or less regular intervals. General validity predications do not encode any particular occurrences of the situations encoded in the complement clause, but rather a higher-order predication of the possibility of such occurrences under certain conditions, referred to as “enabling conditions” by Langacker (1997: 207). The third type encodes mental acts. Labelled Judgement constructions, these involve the formulation of hypotheses about some situation or some participant in a situation. The four classes of construction containing

---

\(^5\) For instance Chomsky in *Syntactic Structures* (1957: 100) argued that the to of the to-infinitive does not have any independent meaning, that it is merely a sort of ‘marker’ of the following infinitive.
the bare and \textit{to}-infinitive are defined and exemplified below.\textsuperscript{6} S stands for ‘subject’, Sp for ‘speaker’.

\textbf{Same-time constructions:} A situation is profiled as occurring simultaneously with the matrix verb:
\begin{itemize}
\item e.g. \textit{He watched her trot away down the road…} (BNC AT4 1315)
\end{itemize}

\textbf{General constructions:} A situation is profiled as as likely to occur on a more or less regular basis:
\begin{itemize}
\item e.g. \textit{God’s own country, as the Canadians delight to call it.} (BNC A0P 217)
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Judgement constructions:} Either Sp or S hypothesises that a certain situation is true:
\begin{itemize}
\item e.g. \textit{Theodora judged her to be in her early forties….} (BNC HA2 802)
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Forward-looking constructions:} A situation is profiled as likely to occur after the time of the matrix verb:
\begin{itemize}
\item e.g. (a) \textit{A gruff male voice bade them enter.} (BNC HH1 3841)
\item (b) \textit{He then requested Lucy and Jean to come into the kitchen.} (BNC HHB 4158)
\end{itemize}

In Egan (2008) both ‘allow x \textit{to}-infinitive’ and ‘let x bare infinitive’ are classified as Forward-looking constructions. This view is not shared by all scholars. Duffley (1992), for example, classifies ‘let x bare infinitive’ as a Same-time construction. He writes: “\textit{Let} represents permission as non-intervention, i.e. as not obstructing the accomplishment of the event expressed by the infinitive, and so letting cannot be conceived as coming before the event permitted (indeed one cannot say that one has let someone do something until they have actually done it)” (Duffley 1992: 88). We saw, however, in the previous section that \textit{let}, although it prototypically encodes non-intervention (\textit{non-imposition}), may also encode \textit{barrier-removal}, and that \textit{allow}, although it prototypically encodes \textit{barrier-removal}, may also encode \textit{non-imposition}. There are two questions that need to be addressed at this point. Firstly, does permission encoded as non-intervention (\textit{non-imposition}) necessarily involve the imposition of a same-time perspective on the relationship between the act of permission and the situation in the complement clause? Secondly, if \textit{non-imposition} is analysed as involving a Same-time predication and \textit{barrier-removal} a Forward-looking predication, does this mean

\textsuperscript{6} Same-time and Forward-looking predications may also be encoded by constructions containing gerund complements. In addition there are two classes, labelled Backward-looking and Contemplation in Egan (2008), which contain gerund constructions but no other type of non-finite complement.
that both *let* and *allow* should be categorised as Same-time or Forward-looking depending on what type of permission they encode? These questions will be addressed in section 4.1. Section 4.2 addresses the question of whether *let* and *allow* differ in terms of implicativity. Section 4.3 considers the maximally schematic senses of bare infinitives and *to*-infinitives and section 4.4 looks at some other relevant questions requiring discussion.

### 4.1 ‘let x bare infinitive’: Same-time or Forward-looking?

Before looking at the two constructions encoding inaction on the part of the permitter or prohibitor (*non-imposition* and *barrier-retention*), I will first briefly consider the two constructions that encode a positive action on the part of the matrix verb subject (*barrier-imposition* and *barrier-removal*). To begin with *barrier-removal*, there can be little doubt that the granting of permission in (58) – (60) precedes in time the realisation of the situation in the complement clause.

(58) The court heard that Ellis was happy *to allow police to inspect* his personal finances. (BNC CFC 2081)

(59) The Hussites held out successfully until, in 1436, an agreement was reached which *allowed them to consolidate* their achievements. (BNC AE8 1314)

(60) They *should let them buy more land* and do more council building. (BNC KCG 807)

Thus, in (58) Ellis’s removal of the legal barrier to the authorities’ examining his financial records paves the way for the police to look into these. Similarly in (59) the agreement reached by the Hussites removed a barrier to their subsequent consolidation of their achievements. In (60) the removal of a prohibition on land purchase would enable the permittees subsequently to purchase more land. In all three examples the removal of a barrier by the permitter opens the way for the later realisation of the situation by the permittee. The constructions in question are thus Forward-looking in the sense in which this term is employed in the present paper.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) Note that classifying constructions as Forward-looking does not imply that the relevant complement situation will always be realised. Realisation may be excluded as in the ‘avoid –*ing*’ construction or postponed as in the ‘defer –*ing*’ construction. The complements in these constructions are nevertheless located in the projected future, in that they are encoded as expected by the speaker to come about if the subject had not taken steps to preclude their realisation.
Tokens encoding *barrier-imposition*, exemplified here by (61) – (64) resemble those encoding *barrier-removal* in that the situation in the complement clause, which in this case is not realised, is also situated in the projected future.

(61) Last year, after a fortnight’s holiday in California, his first for two years, he complained, ‘My wife wouldn’t let me take any work with me’. (BNC CBV 1172)

(62) And Gill gave her job to go and work in the shop and he wouldn’t let her go and work in it. (BNC KBF 10976)

(63) The same kind of yelping small-mindedness was shown when Thatcher refused to allow Roy Jenkins to take part in the Cenotaph service. (BNC B7D 1719)

(64) She would not allow his insults to touch her. (BNC HH1 1654)

(61) encodes a prohibition imposed by the speaker’s wife on the occasion of their going to California. She refused him permission to bring along work before their leaving home. In (62) the activity of working in the shop which is precluded by the prohibitor would have been expected to take place after the expression of the prohibition. In (63) Roy Jenkins’ participation in the memorial service would have been expected to have been realised in the period after Thatcher refuses to allow it, and in (64), which encodes free indirect thought, the eventual effect of the insults on the permitter would have been realised after she has forbidden this to happen. Thus *barrier-imposition* resembles *barrier-removal* in encoding the complement situation as taking place, or not taking place, as the case may be, in the projected future.

We turn now to the trickier question of constructions encoding *non-imposition* and *barrier-retention*. The problem we are faced with here in assigning tokens to *either* the Forward-looking *or* the Same-time category is grounded in the difficulty of assigning the non-action encoded by both matrix verbs to a specific moment in time. If the permitting or the prohibiting cannot be assigned to such a moment in time, how can we possibly determine whether the complement situation is realised at the same time or subsequently? In other words, are permission in the sense of *non-imposition*, and prohibition, in the sense of *barrier-retention*, to be viewed as activities or as achievements? (65) – (68) are all examples of *non-imposition* with a past tense matrix verb.

(65) Charity let Mandy chatter on and on, offering no comment, her feelings frozen somewhere deep within her. (BNC JY6 2815)
She let him suffer a bit longer, then said: ‘You and Sabine had a row, I heard it.

(BNC GV2 192)

They had pleaded with the bankruptcy judge to close down Eastern last autumn, but instead he allowed it to remain airborne and continue to run down its cash resources.

(BNC ABH 2183)

Numbly Rory allowed him to lead her to the dance floor, moving automatically into his arms as though she’d always belonged there. (BNC JY5 2642)

(65) – (68) all clearly encode non-imposition. In each example the permitter abstains from hindering the permittee’s realisation of the situation in the complement clause. The question is whether in (66), for example, his suffering is subsequent to, or simultaneous with, her letting, and whether in (68) Rory’s being led is subsequent to, or simultaneous with, her allowing this to take place. A case can be made for both viewpoints. Figures 10–11 illustrate two possible interpretations of (66), Figures 12 – 13 two possible interpretations of (68).

---

Letting … suffering ……………………………. saying

Figure 8: Illustrating the Forward-looking interpretation of (66) in which the letting is seen to precede the suffering which lasts until the saying.

………………letting ………………………saying

……………… suffering …………………….saying

Figure 9: Illustrating the Same-time interpretation of (66) in which the letting is seen as simultaneous with the suffering which lasts until the saying.
allowing … leading ………………. reaching floor

Figure 10: Illustrating the Forward-looking interpretation of (68) in which the allowing is seen to precede the leading which lasts until the dance floor is reached.

..................... allowing....................... reaching floor

..................... leading ......................... reaching floor

Figure 11: Illustrating the Same-time interpretation of (68) in which the allowing is seen as simultaneous with leading which lasts until the dance floor is reached.

Figure 8 illustrates a Forward-looking interpretation of (66). In it the permitter abstains from stopping the permittee from suffering and the latter subsequently continues to suffer until the former decides to call a halt. Similarly, Figure 10 illustrates a Forward-looking interpretation of (68) in which Rory first permits (by not refusing the invitation to dance) and then is led to the dance floor. Note that in both cases the complement situation is profiled as starting to be realised almost immediately after permission is granted. Givón (1990: 520) discussing implicativity and co-temporality states that ‘co-temporal’ is to be understood as ‘tightly sequential’. It is this sort of tight sequentiality that is illustrated in Figures 8 and 10. Figures 9 and 11 illustrate a Same-time interpretation of the two utterances. In Figure 9 all the time he is suffering, she is permitting this to happen. In Figure 11 all the time Rory is being led, she is allowing herself be led.

Barrier-retention, exemplified here by (69) – (72), may also be illustrated in a similar fashion to non-imposition in Figures 8 - 11.

(69) ‘We have no intention of letting him go and I would like him to stay on after his present contract expires.  (BNC CBG 9108)

(70) ‘The strictest autonomy governs the ghetto; no German would dare touch my prerogatives, and I shall never let any do so.’  (BNC HNU 1378)
Another of Polgar’s battles is *his refusal to allow his girls to play* in women’s tournaments, with the exception of the Olympics, where Zsuzsa triumphed. (BNC A89 373)

There was a big picture of him dressed in a fancy cowboy suit and Stetson hat, riding the pony Buddie had bought from a circus because it *wouldn’t allow the big men to ride* on its back. (BNC ACW 1425)

In (69) a decision has been reached not to lift the barrier on the prohibitee’s going and his not going may be viewed as subsequent to this not letting, in a manner analogous to that illustrated in Figure 8. Alternatively one could interpret the not letting as continuing alongside the not going in the manner of Figure 9. One could adopt similar interpretations of (70) – (72).

I find it difficult to decide between these two interpretations of *non-imposition* and *barrier-retention*. Note, by the way, that the question is not which of these interpretations is most appealing from a logical-philosophical point of view. Rather it is a question of which is embedded in the folk philosophy of the language community. Clearly, however, whatever interpretation one chooses, *it must be the same in the case of both matrix verbs*. Either *non-imposition* is viewed as Forward-looking or as Same-time in the case of both. There is no semantic difference between them that would warrant placing *let* and *allow* in different classes, as is done by Duffley (1992). Two considerations incline me towards choosing to class both of them as Forward-looking rather than Same-time. The first consideration is that, as we have already seen, both are undoubtedly Forward-looking when encoding both barrier-removal and barrier-imposition. The second is that there is no evidence of any (other) matrix verb used in present-day English to encode Same-time predications using to-infinitive complements. Neither of these considerations is weighty enough to be decisive, but all other things being equal, they do tip the scales in my view in the direction of the Forward-looking interpretation.

### 4.2 Do let and allow differ in terms of implicativity?

In the passage cited in the previous section from Duffley (1992: 88) he not only maintains that “letting cannot be conceived as coming before the event permitted” but also that “one cannot say that one has let someone do something until they have actually done it”. This may well be
true of *let* encoding *non-imposition*, but is it equally true when it encodes *barrier-removal*? Consider example (73).

(73) They *let me wear* a maternity dress then, because I hadn’t worn one up till then. The thing that upsets me when I see all these pregnant people walking around is that I didn’t do it. I never really was officially pregnant. I didn’t wear maternity clothes. (BNC FU1 1095)

(73) is an example of the *barrier-removal* sense of *let*, as indicated by the adverbial *then*. There is no implication that the girl donned the garment in question at the moment permission was given. Indeed quite the opposite was the case. As is made clear by the co-text she had no such garment in her possession. (73) may be therefore taken as evidence against Duffley’s contention cited above that that “one cannot say that one has let someone do something until they have actually done it”. In (73) not only does the permission precede the actualisation of the situation permitted, but this situation may in fact never have been actuated.\(^8\) If this is the case it would serve as evidence against Duffley’s contention that while *allow* may open for the non-realisation of the situation permitted, *let* never does so. He writes: “As Cotte [1982] points out, *allow* and *let* evoke permission in different ways, the latter seems incapable of evoking the giving of permission without evoking at the same time the realization of the action permitted […], whereas *allow* is not subject to this restriction” (Duffley 1992: 85). Mittwoch makes the same point, going so far as to maintain that “the contrast between *let* and *allow* or *permit* is particularly striking in this respect” (Mittwoch 1990: 117). However my data contains, in (73), one token in which the situation encoded by *let* appears not to be realised. An obvious question to ask, then, is whether the implication or otherwise of the definite realisation of the complement situation is a property of the two matrix verbs as such or of the two types of permission which they prototypically encode. Does *non-imposition* imply definite realisation irrespective of whether it is encoded by *let* or *allow*? Consider (27) – (32), repeated here for convenience.

(27) A pub landlord in Oxford has been charged with *allowing his customers to smoke* cannabis on his premises. (BNC KIE 3653)

(28) Race starter Captain Keith Brown was also criticised for *allowing the horses to line up* too close to the start line which led to the tape twice being broken. (BNC K45 1259)

\(^8\) This depends on our interpretation of the statements “I didn’t do it” and “I didn’t wear maternity clothes”, whether we understand them as preterite or pluperfect.
(29) On the other hand, he said ID cards were ridiculous and confirmed what fans had known for years that they were ill-treated by uncaring clubs who were allowing grounds to fall into disrepair. (BNC K52 3366)

(30) Darling Mother, I have *let too much time pass* without writing, but I haven’t forgotten you. (BNC ANF 1081)

(31) Have they all *let their membership lapse*? (BNC HHV 24488)

(32) With the fish in a bucket of tank water (aerated) stir up the substrate and *let the mess settle*. (BNC CLT 899)

In (27) the customers were allowed to smoke cannabis and it is implied that they did so. Had they not done so there would hardly have been need of a court case! In (28) the starter allowed the horses to get too close to the starting tape and the horses did so. In (30) the speaker let time pass and time did just that, and in (32) the members did nothing to hinder their membership lapsing and it duly lapsed. We may conclude that both *allow* and *let* when employed to encode *non-imposition* function as implicative verbs in the sense of Karttunen (1971: 341).

We now turn to *barrier-removal* as encoded by the two constructions. In the first place we should note that there are many tokens where the realisation of the complement situation is strongly implied, if not entailed. This is the case in (21) and (24), repeated here for convenience.

(21) Once safe in the haven of the kitchen, she *allowed George to slip from her grasp* and ran, sobbing, to her mother. (BNC C98 823)

(24) The handshake was a stupid idea as she was still holding Darren, but she *let him slide down* to the floor and we shook. (BNC A0F 1148)

There is no doubt that both (21) and (24) encode *barrier-removal*. Equally there is no doubt that in both cases this removal leads to the definite realisation of the complement situation. However, unlike the case of *non-imposition*, it is possible for tokens encoding *barrier-removal* to leave open the question of the eventual non-realisation of the complement situation. Consider in this respect (74) - (79).

(74) Apart from an interval for lunch, the meeting continued until 3.30 p.m. and then adjourned until 7.00 p.m. *to allow representatives to report* to their parties and organisations. (BNC CCC 985)
(75) Sharpe had stopped at the ford to let the horses drink. (BNC CMP 1414)
(76) While waiting for this money to come through, he asked the owners if they would allow him to order goods for the coming summer season. (BNC B17 762)
(77) Well if they would let us borrow it, that’s a different matter to buying it from them because we then wouldn’t make any money on it. (BNC D97 649)

In (74) even though the barrier to the representative’s reporting to their respective parties has been removed by the meeting’s being adjourned, there is no guarantee that they will actually do so. Similarly in (75) even though Sharpe removes the barrier to the horses’ drinking by stopping there is no guarantee that they will do so. As is well known, one can lead a horse to the water…..! (76) - (77) may be analysed in a similar fashion. Again we see that the tokens containing let and allow are so similar that, irrespective of how one analyses these tokens in terms of the likelihood of realisation of the complement situation, there can be no justification for adopting a different stance in the case of let than of allow. There is, on the other hand, a distinction between the category of non-imposition which implies the realisation of the complement situation and that of barrier-removal which may leave open the question of its eventual realisation.

4.3 Bare infinitive versus to-infinitive complements

I stated in section 4.1 that, rather than define both let and allow as instantiating Same-time predications when encoding situations of non-imposition and as Forward-looking when encoding situations of barrier-removal, I prefer to classify them both as Forward-looking, with the complement situation in the case of non-imposition following immediately upon the act of permission, whereas in the case of barrier-removal it may either follow it at an interval or possibly not at all. The fact that both constructions are Forward-looking does not however mean that they are synonymous. The projected future is a domain that allows for a variety of forms of complementation. In addition to bare and to-infinitive complements we find complementation with gerunds. Indeed, some matrix verbs, such as agree and aspire, also occur with a fourth type of non-finite complement, a to -ing clause. Furthermore, one can in many cases also encode situations in the projected future by means of finite complement clauses. The number of profiling options available to the speaker wishing to refer to future events is presumably related to the variety of ways in which speakers can choose to construe these events. I would argue that constructions containing the bare and to forms of the
infinitive open for two different modes of construal of situations in the projected future. These two modes of construal are related to the schematic meaning of the two complement forms. In Egan (2008: 142) these schematic meanings are stated to be as follows:

- bare infinitive complements: a situation, viewed as a whole, is profiled as certain to occur in some specified domain.
- to-infinitive complements: a situation, viewed as a whole, is profiled as the more/most likely of two or more alternatives in some specified domain.

The definition of the bare infinitive complement form as profiling a situation as a whole and as likely to occur in some domain holds for both Same-time and Forward-looking constructions. The phrase ‘viewed as a whole’ is intended to denote the lack of such aspectual contours as are encoded by the gerund. The only Same-time constructions with bare infinitive complements are Perception constructions, exemplified here by (78). In these the complement situation is always profiled as actuated. In the domain of the projected future we find bare infinitive complements with some Communication verbs, such as bid or beseech, the Enablement verb help and Causatives have and make, in addition to Permissive let.

(78) Trevor Sharpe, 16, saw his dad Roger fall to the ground 40 minutes into the under-18s game. (BNC CH2 4459)
(79) A gruff male voice bade them enter. (BNC HH1 3841)
(80) And so he leaned his weight on my shoulder and I helped him walk to his horse. (BNC FR6 743)
(81) He looked surprised when everyone laughed, then joined in himself, with very hoarse, loud laughter which made everyone start laughing all over again. (BNC G12 2052)

In the Same-time construction in (78), the seeing and falling take place simultaneously. There is, in other words, no question of the possible non-realisation of the complement clause situation. In the Forward-looking constructions in (79) - (81) the complement situations would appear to follow immediately and inevitably from the action of the matrix verb subject. Certainly the matrix verbs in (80) and (81) entail the realisation of their respective complements. In the case of bid in (79) it is at least theoretically possible that the person who was asked to enter would not do so, but in reality this never appears to be the case. There were fifty-nine occurrences of ‘bid x bare infinitive’ among 1,000 tokens of bid downloaded at random from the BNC (Egan 2008: 202). Of these over twenty of the complement clause
predicates encode actions of either sitting or rising, and another thirty acts of motion, or lack thereof, such as coming, going or staying, as in (79). In all of these cases it is clear that the matrix verb subject confidently expects the complement subject to realise the complement situation, which is both trivial and, no doubt, in the latter’s own interest.

Duffley (1992) also makes the point that the bare infinitive construction presupposes the realisation by the complement clause subject of the complement situation. However, he sees the contrast between the two forms in terms of immediacy and futurity. He writes:

The contrast between the bare and to infinitive constructions with bid can therefore be stated in terms of whether compliance is taken for granted or not. When it can, no room is left for the non-realization of the infinitive event, and so the concurrent representation evoked by the bare infinitive is appropriate. When compliance is not taken for granted, to is used in order to ‘futurize’ the infinitive event’s actualization, i.e. to evoke it as something which the person receiving the request may or may not decide to do. (Duffley 1992: 82-83)

The approach taken here differs from that of Duffley in that both constructions are taken to be Forward-looking, though one of them profiles the complement situation as being more certain of realisation in the (near) projected future than the other.

To sum up, in all Forward-looking constructions containing the bare infinitive form of complement the situation in the complement clause is profiled as (almost) certain of realisation in the projected future. This is also true of the let construction. Figure 2 illustrates non-imposition as encoded by let. In it the permittee (S2) progresses past the barrier without any interruption. This progression is automatic. In other words the employment of the bare infinitive in the case of let, at least when encoding non-imposition, is motivated by the schematic sense of this complement form.

The to-infinitive differs formally from the bare infinitive in the obvious sense that it contains the morpheme to. Any difference in meaning between the two forms must therefore be sought in the meaning of this morpheme. There is a broad consensus among scholars that the to of the infinitive is historically derived from the preposition to. Fischer writes: “It is generally acknowledged in the literature that the allative preposition to (or its equivalent in other Germanic languages) developed into an infinitival marker when it became combined with an infinitive” (2003: 451). Given its historical provenance, it has been assumed by various scholars that the to of the infinitive also instantiates a ‘path towards goal’ schema. As Bailey puts it: “In the to V construction, to, conserving its original sense of ‘movement
towards’, indicates that the event referred to by the verbs is seen as potential or ‘in the offing’. The point of view from which the event is considered is situated before the event” (1992: 186). Now the end-point of a path-goal schema is just one of several theoretically possible end-points. Indeed the path-goal schema is only appropriate in cases where there either exist several possible goals or several possible paths towards a given goal. The target of the preposition \textit{to} does not, however, encode just any possible end-point, but the highlighted of several possible targets. Similarly, the situation in a \textit{to}-infinitive complement clause is one of several possible situations, but not just any one: it is the \textit{targeted alternative}, with normally one or more latent alternatives lurking in the background, as it were. There is no space here to illustrate the various types of matrix verb that collocate with \textit{to}-infinitive complements. For purposes of contrast, I will confine the exemplification to tokens containing the same or similar matrix verbs to those in (78) – (81).

(82) As they approached, Reni rose from his seat at a table near the large rectangular pool which was the centrepiece of what - as Huy now \textit{saw it to be} - was an unconventionally asymmetrical garden. (BNC H84 2027)

(83) On these walls were none of the usual posters \textit{bidding young mothers to drink} milk in pregnancy \textit{and bring} their toddlers for a twice-yearly check-up. (BNC A73 2038)

(84) And if we can get all of those five right it \textit{helps all of us} within the group \textit{to hopefully get} it right first time. (BNC H48 806)

(85) Coming out of Beckley a wandering Triumph Herald \textit{forced us to check} the anti-lock brakes (they work, and well). (BNC ED9 1741)

(82) is an instance of the rather unusual ‘see \textit{x to be}’ construction, which may be subsumed under a more general schema of Perception verbs followed by a \textit{to}-infinitive clause. Common to the semantics of these constructions is an element of perception revised. They are Judgement rather than Same-time Perception constructions and encode a clearing of the mists, so to speak. Thus ‘I perceived \textit{x to be y}’ means something like ‘I perceived that \textit{x was actually y} (not \textit{z})’. In other words they always imply the existence of a more-or-less latent (mis)perception. In (83), as opposed to (79), the activity requested of the target of the bidding, in this case the “young mothers”, is far from trivial or routine. Nor is there any reason to assume that they will automatically comply with the request. There is a real possibility that they will not do so. Similarly, in (84) there is no guarantee that the group in question will succeed in their endeavours. The possibility of failure is highlighted by the adverbial \textit{hopefully}. Finally, the causee in (85) could, at least in theory, have chosen not to brake,
although in that case this may have been the last choice he or she was called upon to make! Causes in the ‘force x to-infinitive’ construction differ from those in the ‘make x bare infinitive’ construction in that the former tend to be agentive, although, of course, they are by no means free agents. Data in Egan (2008: 271) show that over 93% of causees in the force construction are agentive as opposed to just 30% of the causees in the make construction. Although the causee in the case of force is always profiled as actually realizing the situation in the complement clause, the very fact that this situation calls for conscious decisive action on his or her part foregrounds the possibility of his or her not doing so. There is no such implication in the case of make.

What (82) – (85) have in common is the implication of a possible alternative to the situation in the complement clause. This is also the case with the ‘allow x to-infinitive’ construction. We saw in section 4 that this construction prototypically encodes barrier-removal, as illustrated in Figure 1. In cases of barrier-removal there is a very real contrast between the situation pertaining before and after the lifting of the barrier. The alternative of the barrier’s not being lifted is implied in a way that is not the case with non-imposition. It is the implication of this alternative, I would suggest, that motivates the employment of the to-infinitive to encode situations of barrier-removal.

4.4 Some outstanding questions

The interpretation of the rationale behind the use of the two different forms of complement with let and allow advanced in the previous section begs three questions. The first is why some tokens of barrier-removal are encoded by let. The second is why some tokens of non-imposition are encoded by allow. The third is why barrier-imposition, which resembles barrier-removal in the foregrounding of an alternative situation, is normally encoded by let rather than allow. To begin with the third question, there is no doubt that barrier-imposition carries an implication of an alternative situation in a way that barrier-retention does not. One might therefore expect it to be encoded by a to- rather than a bare infinitive clause. In fact barrier-imposition patterns syntactically with non-imposition as shown in Table 6, which contains details of the ratio of tokens of let and allow in the four types of predication, based on the projected tokens shown in Figures 3 and 7.
Table 6: Ratio of tokens of *let* and *allow* in tokens encoding *barrier-removal*, *non-imposition*, *barrier-imposition* and *barrier-retention* based on projected totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Active S1</th>
<th>Inactive S1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active S2</td>
<td><em>barrier-removal</em></td>
<td><em>non-imposition</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>let:allow = 18:82</td>
<td>let:allow = 86:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passivised S2</td>
<td><em>barrier-imposition</em></td>
<td><em>barrier-retention</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>let:allow = 78:22</td>
<td>let:allow = 54:46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that there is a somewhat greater likelihood of *allow* being employed to encode *barrier-imposition* than *non-imposition*. Nevertheless, *let* is by far the more popular option in both cases. It would appear that the negation in the *not let* construction is interpreted as external to the whole predication in the complement clause, in the sense that *barrier-imposition* is interpreted as *not (non-imposition)*; in other words it appears that there is an implication that S1, in this case the prohibitor, may have been expected to have remained inactive rather than blocking the realisation of the complement situation by S2. (86) – (88) are three tokens of *barrier-imposition* encoded by *let*. In each case they are cited with some of their immediate co-text, the better to enable the reader to judge whether or not the prohibitor might have been expected to remain inactive.

(86) ‘You’re here, next to James.’ Claudia guided her to the seat on the host’s left. ‘*Don’t let him drink too much,*’ she whispered. It was an astonishing thing for a wife to say about her husband to a woman she’d met for the first time. (BNC CDY 1208)

(87) Penry got to his feet very slowly, standing over her in a way which made Leonora long to back away, but she stood her ground, *refusing to let him intimidate her*. (BNC JYC 2486)

(88) ‘Ah!’ said Ari, brightening, as if things were beginning to fall into place in her mind. Tammuz *didn’t let her speak*. (BNC AD9 3679)

The question here is whether the relevant predication in (86) is better paraphrased by ‘Stop him from drinking too much’ or ‘Don’t be a passive witness to his drinking’. Similarly, one can ask whether (87) is better paraphrased by ‘stopped him from intimidating her’ or ‘did not stand idly by when he attempted to intimidate her’. And is (88) better paraphrased by ‘stopped
her speaking’ or ‘did not refrain from interfering with her effort to speak’? In the case of (86) there is no doubt that the prohibitor, for one, would not normally have expected to take on the role she has been allotted by her hostess – she thought it astonishing to be asked. There are 24 negative barrier-imposition imperatives in this study encoded by not let as opposed to just one encoded by not allow, and the majority of these resemble (86) in that they encode a plea by the speaker to the prohibitor not to stand idly by. In (87), too, there is a clear implication that Leonora would have permitted and not prohibited the act of intimidation. The situation is less clear-cut in (88). Any inference of an expectation that Tammuz would have been expected to abstain from refusing to permit the girl to speak must be grounded on our world knowledge, rather than on any contextual hints to that effect. On the basis of these and similar examples such as (52), (53), (61) and (62) a not (non-imposition) or ‘not stand idly by’ reading of barrier-imposition may in many cases be defended.

If we look again at Table 6 and ask whether there are any other factors that are common to both non-imposition and barrier-imposition, we can point to the number of active participants in both types of predication. In both cases there is one, and only one, active participant. In the case of non-imposition the permittee is active, while the permitter is inactive. The roles are reversed in the case of barrier-imposition. In the case of barrier-removal, on the other hand, both participants are active, the permitter removing the barrier and the permittee realising the complement situation. Finally, in the case of barrier-retention neither participant is active. Table 6 shows that the predication with the greatest number of active participants is likely to be encoded in this case by the most explicit form, consisting of two morphemes, to and allow. The two predications with only one active participant are likely to be encoded by the less explicit form, consisting of only one morpheme, let. The predication with no active participant whatsoever is split fairly evenly between the two constructions. It is possible that some sort of iconic principle is at work here, whereby the number of active participants is reflected in the number of morphemes used to link the two predications. However, adjudicating on this matter would take us well beyond the confines of the present paper.

The next question that needs to be addressed is how the fact that ‘let x bare infinitive’ sometimes encodes barrier-removal harmonises with the thesis advanced here that the to-infinitive form is more suited to express this sense, implying as it does the existence of a latent alternative to the situation in the complement clause. We saw in section 3.2 that two-thirds of the barrier-removal occurrences of the ‘let x bare infinitive’ construction encode situations involving motion. Most of the tokens of ‘let x go’ encode a situation involving the sudden release by the permitter of the permittee. If we think in terms of Figure 1, the
permittee (S1) has his or her nose right up against the barrier, so to speak, prior to the permitter’s lifting it. As soon as the barrier is lifted, the permittee is on his or her way. The bare infinitive form of complement was said above to encode a situation that is profiled as certain to occur in some domain. In force dynamic terms the lifting of the barrier in the ‘let x go’ construction normally guarantees the occurrence of the situation permitted. Thus the employment of the bare infinitive complement with let in this type of situation is motivated by the meaning of the complement form. This is not to deny that a to-infinitive construction would be equally well suited to encode the situation in question. However, when it comes to situations involving release, it would appear that the possible use of go with allow is preempted by the degree of entrenchment of the ‘let x go’ construction. There is, on the other hand, a certain degree of overlap in the encoding of situations involving release with other complement predicates, such as leave and fall in (37) - (40). It is exactly in cases where there exist several motivated possibilities for encoding a situation that one would expect to encounter overlap in usage. And it is in just these areas that overlap actually exists, as was shown in section 3.2.

The third and final question to be addressed is why the ‘allow x to-infinitive’ construction, which prototypically encodes barrier-removal, is occasionally used to encode non-imposition. As was pointed out in 3.2 there is no single type of complement predicate that stands out in these cases. The schematic sense of the to-infinitive construction was stated above to carry an implication of the existence of a latent alternative to the situation encoded in the complement clause. This alternative may be more or less foregrounded. In the case of the allow construction the alternative may be focused upon, as in cases where the existence of a previous barrier is implied by a temporal adverbial, such as in (11), or an adjective, as in (12), or it may be defocused, as it is when allow encodes non-imposition. In the prototypical instances encoding barrier-removal the sense of an alternative tends to be more present, closer to the surface, as it were, than in the case of more peripheral instances, encoding non-imposition.

To sum up this section, the fact that ‘let x bare infinitive’ prototypically encodes non-imposition and ‘allow x to-infinitive’ prototypically encodes barrier-removal may be related to the schematic sense of these two complement forms. We have also seen that more peripheral uses of the two forms can be explained with reference to the existence of alternative motivations for the encoding of certain situations by one form or the other.
5. Summary and conclusions

I have argued in this paper, contrary to the assertion in Hudson et al. (1996) that let and allow are to all intents and purposes interchangeable, that there are, indeed, clear differences in meaning between the constructions in question, although such differences do not necessarily preclude their employment in similar contexts. There are differences in meaning both between the matrix verbs and between the two complement forms. While the matrix verb let prototypically encodes non-imposition, allow prototypically encodes barrier-removal. And while the bare infinitive prototypically encodes a situation as certain to occur in some specified domain, the to-infinitive prototypically encodes a situation as the more/most likely of two or more alternatives in some domain. In the case of both let and allow the domain in question is argued to be that of the projected future. We have also seen how the meaning proposed for the two complement forms motivates their employment with the two matrix verbs. Thus in the case of one of the pairs of constructions listed by Hudson et al. their objections to the thesis of Wierzbicka (1988) that grammar is not semantically arbitrary have been shown to be unfounded.
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Abstract

In modern Swedish, analytical causative constructions are most commonly realised by the causal predicates få, komma, ha, förmå and låta followed by an infinitival complement. This paper investigates the underlying syntactic and semantic factors that determine the actual choice of one causal predicate over another in a particular (socio)linguistic context. The approach is corpus-based and the data are analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative analysis shows that the verbs få and låta are the most frequent causal predicates occurring in this type of construction. In the qualitative part of the research the semantic patterns of these constructions are examined within the theoretical framework of functional grammar according to Dik (1997a, 1997b). An extension of Dik’s functional model is used to describe the semantic properties of the main participants in these constructions, viz. causer, causee and affectee. It will be shown that various causation types in the different analytical causative constructions are determined by the semantics of the participants in combination with the nature of the verbs involved.

1. Introduction

Analytical causative constructions have a twofold syntactic structure consisting of a matrix clause plus an infinitival complement. The central verb in the matrix clause is called the causal predicate and the main verb in the complement the effected predicate (e.g. Comrie 1985, Verhagen & Kemmer 1997). The patterns of analytical causative constructions can vary according to the type of causal predicate (a full lexical verb or a grammaticalized verb) and according to the type of complement (a subclause or an infinitival complement). This paper focuses on analytical causative constructions where the causal predicate is a grammaticalized verb followed by an infinitival complement. In Swedish the causal predicates that can occur
in this type of construction are få ‘make, get’ (lit. ‘get, receive’), komma ‘make, get’ (lit. ‘come’), ha ‘make, get’ (lit. ‘have’), förmå ‘make, get’ (lit. ‘induce, persuade’) and låta ‘make, get’ (lit. ‘let’). The literal translations indicated represent the meanings of these verbs as non-causatives. The syntactic patterns of the analytical causative constructions featuring these verbs are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
NP_1 & + Vfå + NP_2 + (till) + att + V_{inf} + (NP_3) \\
NP_1 & + Vkomma + NP_2 + (till) + att + V_{inf} + (NP_3) \\
NP_1 & + Vha + NP_2 + (till) + att + V_{inf} + (NP_3) \\
NP_1 & + Vförmå + NP_2 + (till) + att + V_{inf} + (NP_3) \\
NP_1 & + Vlåta + (NP_2) + V_{inf} + (NP_3)
\end{align*}
\]

NP\(_1\) indicates the noun phrase that functions as the subject referent of the causal predicate and that takes the semantic role of causer. In example (1) the noun phrase det höga kaffepriset ‘the high coffee price’ features as the subject of the causal predicate få. Within the causal chain of events it functions as the causer. Central in the infinitival complement is the effected predicate att plantera ‘plant’. NP\(_2\), viz. allt fler brasilianska odlare ‘more and more Brazilian growers’ in the same example, indicates the noun phrase that functions both as the object referent of the causal predicate and as the implicit subject of the effected predicate. Its semantic role is causee. A third noun phrase NP\(_3\) is optional depending, for instance, on the transitivity of the effected predicate. Syntactically it functions as the direct object of the effected predicate and takes the semantic role of affectee, as mer kaffe ‘more coffee’ in the same example. Within the causal chain of events the causer and the causal predicate make up the causing event (E1), whereas the effected predicate, the causee and the affectee make up the caused event (E2).

1. Det höga kaffepriset få allt fler brasilianska odlare att plantera mer kaffe. (Press95)
   the high coffee price makes more and more Brazilian growers to plant more coffee
   'The high coffee price makes more and more Brazilian growers plant more coffee.'

At the semantic level the verbs komma, ha and förmå can be seen as an alternative to få, but their frequency is very low due to a number of restrictions (SAG 1999, Rawoens 2004) – cf below. These four verbs, however, are not interchangeable with låta since this latter verb
covers a slightly different scale of meanings ranging from purely causative to permissive. Even at the syntactic level låta is different from the other four verbs. It has for instance more auxiliary-like features in that it combines with a bare infinitive whereas the other four verbs combine with an att- (‘to’) infinitive. It is also different in that the effected predicate cannot be preceded by the preposition till ‘to’. In the constructions with the other four verbs this preposition is optional although its presence is rather exception than rule.

2. Research questions

This study will try to account for the frequency discrepancies between the different causal predicates by analysing the semantic factors that determine the occurrence of one particular verb instead of another.\(^1\) The investigation starts from an analysis of the verbs and their nuclear arguments in E1 and E2. As for E1, a description will be given of the types of subject referent (causer) the different causal predicates typically combine with and the types of aktionsart expressed by the different causal predicates. The E2 will be described in terms of a description of the aktionsarter expressed by the effected predicate and of the semantic features of the causee and the affectee. Animacy and control are central parameters in discerning different semantic types among the nuclear arguments, while dynamism and control are central in the description of the aktionsarter of the verbs. In the present context control is defined in terms of agentivity implying deliberate and conscious action.

The basic assumption is that each analytical causative construction is unique and expresses a different causation type, where causation is to be understood as the underlying semantics in the causal chain of events. The underlying idea is that a high degree of control and dynamism in the sub events E1 and E2 implies a high degree of dynamism and intensity in the force relations within the causal chain of events in its whole (see also e.g. Stefanowitsch 2002:347). The general theoretical framework for this study is Functional Grammar (FG) according to Dik (1997a, 1997b).

3. Causation types

As stated above, causation reflects the semantics in the causal chain of events as represented by the relation between E1 and E2 in terms of dynamism and control. In other words, the different causation types are the result of interplay of varying degrees of control and

\(^1\) The study presented here is part of a more extensive investigation on analytical causative constructions (Rawoens 2008).
dynamism that characterize the central verbs and participants in the analytical causative constructions. A number of causation types previously elaborated by Talmy (1976), Shibatani (1975), Lakoff (1987), Langacker (1991a) and Shibatani (2002) have served as a source of inspiration for the causation types used in the current investigation.

A prototypical type of causation is so-called direct causation. It means that there is an agent (causer) who does something and a patient (causee) who experiences a change. In this model the causer is normally animate and has control (DeLancey 1984:185, Lakoff 1987:54–55, Langacker 1991a:285 and Croft 1992:155). The causee, however, has no control and is either animate – typical patient role – or inanimate. This model is defined as direct causation since the animate causer has direct and total control of the causee. In some cases the relation can even be physically direct (Shibatani 1975:31ff).

A similar model with the same type of causer but where the causee is agentive reflects a somewhat different force relation: since the causee is animate and has control over the action expressed by the effected predicate, more exertion is needed from the causer to get the causee to carry out the action expressed by the effected predicate. The causee has more autonomy and a higher degree of freedom to offer resistance. Such a setup reflects indirect causation: the causer does not have full control of the causal chain and the caused event is harder to bring about because more effort from the causer is needed (Shibatani 2002:7).

Less prototypical according to Lakoff (1987:55) is the so-called billiard ball model because it does not meet all the requirements that characterize a prototypical causal chain of events (i.e. direct causation). Nevertheless, this type of causal relation appears most often in physics and because of that, many still consider it as fairly prototypical (see e.g. Itkonen 1983:19). The model is sometimes also called physical causation (Talmy 1976). It implies that an inanimate causing entity (no control) brings about the causal chain of events (see also Langacker 1991a:13–14, 1991b:209). The causee can either be animate or inanimate, and have control or not.

In the last model the causer is animate but has no control of the causal chain of events and does not have the intention to bring about these events. As such, the animate causer functions rather as a passive cause than as an active initiator of the causal chain of events. In other words, the causer’s animacy is not directly relevant in that the actual cause is rather something peripheral to the animate causer, such as something in the causer’s behaviour or appearance. This type is called involuntary causation (Lakoff 1987:55). The causee can either be animate or inanimate and have control or not.

---

2 The term billiard ball model originates from Humes theory on causal events (White 1990:9–10).
4. Data and frequencies

The empirical investigation is based on a selection of the Språkbanken ‘the Swedish Language Bank’ corpora containing monolingual Swedish press material from the 1960s until the 1990s, in total forty million words. Table 1 gives an overview of the frequencies of the analytical causative constructions with få, komma, ha, förmå and låta related to the total number of words in the corpus. It should be noted that the frequency number of låta mentioned in the table only reflects the occurrences of the verb in its causative reading. The occurrences of låta with a permissive meaning were sorted out from the corpus prior to the actual analysis, thereby using a number of semantic and syntactic criteria as defined by Dik (1980:76ff) and SAG (1999). One criterion is related to the aktionsarter expressed by the effected predicate – cf below (see also Rawoens 2008).

Table 1 Absolute and relative frequencies of the analytical causative constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolute frequencies (n)</th>
<th>Relative frequencies (per 100,000 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>få</td>
<td>5,860</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komma</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>förmå</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>låta</td>
<td>4,906</td>
<td>12.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,246</td>
<td>28.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One observation from these quantitative data is that the verbs få and låta are by far the most frequent causal predicates occurring in this type of construction. The other three verbs komma, ha and förmå, however, have a rather marginal appearance, of which especially komma and ha have an extremely low frequency rate.

Prior to the qualitative analysis, a selection was made of the total number of analytical causative constructions in order to slightly reduce the total number of sentences. Especially for låta the total number of sentences was drastically reduced to 1080 following the results of a pilot study showing recurring patterns (cf Rawoens 2008).

For a description of the Språkbanken corpora see <http://sprakbanken.gu.se>. The corpora are also accessible via this web page.
5. Qualitative analysis

In the qualitative part of the analysis the underlying factors explaining these discrepancies will be accounted for. As indicated above, the main aim of the qualitative part of the research is to determine the types of causation expressed by each of the analytical causative constructions. As said, the analysis takes its starting point in an analysis of the causing event E1 and the caused event E2 thereby focusing on the causal predicate, the effected predicate and their nuclear arguments: the causer, the causee and the affectee.

For a description of the verbs, Dik’s model for the states of affairs is used (Dik 1980, 1981, 1997). In FG, as in many other theories or models, the factors dynamism and control are central in distinguishing different states of affairs as presented in Table 2.

Table 2 States of affairs following Dik (1980:7, 1981:34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+Dynamic</th>
<th>–Dynamic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Controlled</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Controlled</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The causing event

Causal events are by definition dynamic events. This means that a causal predicate can either be Action or Process depending on whether the subject referent has control or not. Prior to a discussion of the types of subject referents an overview of the aktionsarter of the causal predicates as they occur in the corpus is given in Table 3.

Table 3 Aktionsarter of the causal predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fä</th>
<th>komma</th>
<th>ha</th>
<th>förmå</th>
<th>låta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As these data reveal, the verb *få* expresses Process in more than half of the occurrences and Action in about a third of the cases. The aktionsart of *få* cannot be determined in roughly a tenth of the total number of instances due to the absence of the subject referent (indicated as Ø in the table). The causal predicate *komma* appears only as Process-verb and *ha* expresses exclusively Action. Both *förmå* and *låta* express mainly Action and to a much lesser degree Process.

Defining the aktionsart of the causal predicate is of course the result of an analysis of the causer as well due to interplay between the verb and its subject referent. I will now move on to describing the characteristics of the causers that combine with the different causal predicates.

Following the FG model, the subject referent of a causal predicate can be either AGENT with the semantic features [+hum] and [+contr] (the causal predicate then expresses Action) or FORCE with the features [-hum] and [-contr] (the causal predicate then expresses Process).\(^4\) In Dik’s model, however, there is no room for animate entities that are not agentive, i.e. without control. In the extended functional model used in the present study, animacy does not necessarily imply control. Animate referents acting consciously and deliberately – implying control – are the initiators of a causal chain of events and are called AGENT, in analogy with FG’s AGENT, as *vi* ‘we’ in example (2). The causal predicate then expresses Action.

(2) Det enda vi kan göra är att *förmå* trafikanterna att ta den nya linjen 521.

the only we can do is to get passengers-DET to take the new line 521

’The only thing we can do is to get the passengers to take the new line 521.’ (DN1987)

If the animate causer, however, is not agentive – i.e. no control involved – the semantic role AUTHOR is attributed (cf AUTHOR in Talmy 1976), as *de* [=barnen] ‘they [=the children]’ in example (3). In this case the causal predicate expresses Process.

(3) Hon är stolt och glad över dem, *de* *får* henne att känna att livet

sjuder. (DN1987)

she is proud and happy about them, they make her to feel that life-DET

simmers

’She is proud of them and pleased with them, they make her feel that life is simmering.’

\(^4\) PROCESSED which besides FORCE is another possible subject referent of Process-verbs, is excluded from being a possible subject referent of causal predicates since PROCESSED per definition undergoes some event, it can never be its initiator.
In analogy with FG inanimate causers are defined as FORCE, as *rökbomb* ‘smoke bombs’ in example (4). The causal predicate then expresses Process.

(4) Rökbomb *fick* Carlsson att fly. (DN1987)
smoke bombs make-PST Carlsson to flee
'Smoke bombs made Carlsson flee.’

Instances where no causer is expressed get the label Ø, as in sentence (5). In these cases the aktionsart expressed by the causal predicate is undetermined except for a few cases where an implicit causer can be defined resulting in the marking of the causal predicate as Action or Process.

(5) Toresson tror att det kommer att bli allt svårare att få folk att ta ledande politiska uppdrag i framtiden. (DN1987)
Toresson thinks that it will to become more and more difficult to make people to take leading political assignments in future-DET
'Toresson thinks it is going to become more and more difficult to make people take leading political assignments in the future.’

Table 4 represents the distribution of the semantic roles of the subject referents of the different causal predicates as found in the corpus material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 The semantic roles of the causers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>få</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the corpus analysis show that there is most variation for the subject referents of the verb *få*. This causal predicate can take both animate and inanimate subject referents,
and among the animate causers both agentive and non-agentive causers are possible. In the majority of the cases (52%) få combines with inanimate causers (FORCE) as resultatet ‘the result’ in example (6).

(6) **Resultatet** fick vetenskapsmännen att baxna. (Press65)

result-DET got scientists-DET to be astounded

'The scientists were astounded by the result.'

Animate causers that have control (AGENT) occur in 34% of the cases as *de som kämpar mot cancer i USA* ‘Those who are fighting against cancer in the USA’ in example (7).

(7) **De som kämpar mot cancer i USA** har lyckats på ett område: De har fått tobaksindustrin att engagera sig i ”ofarligare cigaretter”. (Press76)

those who fight against cancer in USA have succeeded in one area: They have made tobacco industry-DET to commit itself in “less dangerous cigarettes”

'Those who are fighting against cancer in the USA have been successful in one area: They have made the tobacco industry commit itself to “less dangerous cigarettes”.'

Animate causers that have no control (AUTHOR) occur in 3% of the cases as han ‘he’ in example (8). Moreover, AUTHOR occurs only with the verb få and with none of the other verbs.

(8) **Han** har hög hatt försedd med fjädrar och guldring i örat och får mig att tänka på en trollkarl. (Press97)

he has high hat provided with feathers and goldring in ear-DET and makes me to think on a magician

'He has a high hat with feathers and a goldring in his ear and makes me think of a magician.'

In 11% of the cases the causer is not expressed and could not be identified from the context, as illustrated in sentence (9).

(9) **Men att få båda att gå på samma kurs är nog omöjligt.** (Press65)

but to make both to go on same course is probably impossible

'But to make both follow the same course is practically impossible.'
The fact that *få* has the highest frequency as a causal predicate, and the rich variation in the patterns of its subject referents, could imply that this verb is the most common or general causal predicate allowing for different types of causation.

As for the verb *komma* all the causers are inanimate (FORCE), as illustrated in sentence (10) where the subject referent of *komma* is *klassisk musik* ‘classical music’.

(10) Men det skall vara *klassisk musik* som *kommer* honom att känna denna lycka. (Press76)
    but it must be classical music that makes him to feel this happiness
    ’But it must be classical music that gives him this feeling of happiness.’

The fact that the subject referent of *komma* in all cases is inanimate seems to indicate that the causer generally functions as the natural cause of the action expressed in the complement. There are no traces of any kind of human intervention.

Despite the extreme low number of hits for the verb *ha*, i.e. three, the data confirm the statement in SAG (1999) that the subject referent of *ha* is usually human and agentive, as *fotografen* ‘the photographer’ in example (11).

(11) Gerda är åtta år, lite trött på *fotografen* som ska *ha*
    henne att sitta där på väskan med Vera i famnen. (Press98)
    Gerda is eight years, a bit annoyed on photographer-DET who will have
    her to sit there on suitcase-DET with Vera in arms-DET
    ’Gerda is eight years old, a bit annoyed with the photographer who makes her sit on the
    suitcase holding Vera in her arms.’

The fact that the causers combining with *ha* are normally AGENT could indicate that causative constructions with *ha* generally express either direct or indirect causation.

In causative constructions with *förmå* the subject referent is predominantly (in 63% of the cases) AGENT as *jag* ‘I’ in example (12).

(12) Under en kortare period var Ronnie i Sverige. *Jag* ville *förmå* honom att stanna här. (Press97)
    during a shorter period was Ronnie in Sweden. I wanted make him to stay here
    ’For a short period of time Ronnie was staying in Sweden. I wanted to make him stay here.’
In roughly a quarter of the occurrences (26%) the causer is not expressed. This is mainly where the causal predicate is passivized. Only in 11% of the cases the causer is inanimate (FORCE).

In causative constructions with förmå, extra emphasis seems to lie on the causer’s role as a participant in the causal chain of events. Its persuasive power seems to be accentuated, which gives the causative construction an overall coercive meaning.

Even with låta the subject referent is AGENT in the majority of the cases (75%), as de flesta artister ‘most artists’ in example (13).

(13) **De flesta artister låter en revisor kolla skivbolagen** för att hitta pengar.

(Press96)

the most artists let a reviser screen record companies for to find money

'Most artists have a reviser screen the record companies in order to find money.'

Contrary to what is generally presumed, the analysis of the empirical data reveals that the causal predicate låta can also combine with inanimate subject referents, FORCE. However, these constitute only a minority of the total amount of occurrences (3%), as illustrated in example (14) where teknisk utveckling ‘technical development’ features as the subject referent of låta. In roughly a fifth of the cases no causer can be identified in constructions with låta.

(14) **Teknisk utveckling låter fler äta sig mätta och känna trygghet.**

(Press96)

technical development lets more eat themselves satisfied and feel security

'Technical development causes (lit.: lets) more people to stuff themselves and feel secure.'

On the whole, analytical constructions with låta seem to express causation of a ‘softer’ nature compared to those with ha or förmå where causers are also exclusively or predominantly human and agentive. The key to this claim seems to lie in the nature of the relation between the causer and the causee which does not seem to be as direct or coercive.

7. The caused event

In order to get a better understanding of the relationship between E1 and E2 and of the types of causation expressed by the different constructions, an analysis of the E2 will now be
discussed. This analysis includes a description of the aktionsarter of the effected predicates and of the characteristics of the causees and the affectees.

Theoretically, all types of aktionsarter can occur in the complements of the analytical causative constructions, viz. Action, Position, Process and State, with an exception for State with the verb låta (cf below). Table 5 gives an overview of the distribution of the different aktionsarter of the effected predicates as they occur in the corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aktionsarter of the effected predicates in the complements of the causal predicates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>få</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown by the corpus data there is a majority for Action whereas Position has the lowest number of occurrences. If the proportion between the aktionsarter where control is involved – i.e. Action and Position – versus those where no control is involved – i.e. Process and State – is taken into consideration, it appears that there are more aktionsarter involving control in the complements of få, ha, förmå and låta, contrary to the complements of komma.

As for the verb förmå there is a striking and interesting unequal distribution between the effected predicates involving control (93%) and those not involving control (7%). The majority expresses Action, that is events involving a high degree of control and a high degree of dynamism, as att flytta ‘to move’ in example (15).

And for to solve problems-DET travel recruiters to Norrland for to try get sauna staff to move to Stockholm
'And in order to solve the problems staff recruiters are travelling to Norrland to try to get the sauna staff to move to Stockholm.'
A somewhat remarkable result for *låta* is the appearance of State in its complement. Even though the number of occurrences is rather low, viz. 55 instances representing only 5% of the total number of instances, the appearance of State in the complement of the causal predicate *låta* is unexpected since it is generally assumed that State only occurs in the complement of *låta* in its permissive meaning as in (16). In this example a situation is described in which the causer does not interfere. In other words, the causer does nothing to alter the situation, which implies the permissive reading of *låta*. In (17), however, it appears from the context that the causer has control of the situation expressed in the complement, viz. the causer decides on the nature of the painting, which generates a causative reading.

(16) Två av fem *lät* radion eller TV-n *stå* på och vändte på att *ljudet* skulle komma tillbaka. (DN1987)

Two of five left the radio or the tv on and waited for that noise would come back

'Two of five left the radio or the tv on and waited for the noise to come back.'

(17) Jag försöker *låta* målningen *vara* något mitt emellan något existerande och icke-existerande; något som förändras. (Press97)

I try let painting be something in between something existing and non-existing; something that changes

'I try to make the painting be something between something existing and non-existing; something changing.'

The characteristics of the subject referents of the effected predicates, viz. the causees, will now be discussed. The semantics of the causee are first of all determined by the aktionsarter expressed by the effected predicate, or rather, there is interplay between the causee and the effected predicate. Important parameters that come back here are animacy and control.

The labeling model for the causees as represented in Table 6 is based on the labels used in FG. CEAgent indicates the subject referent of an effected predicate expressing Action. If the effected predicate expresses Process or Position, its subject referent is labeled as CEProcessed or CEPositioner respectively. The subject referent of a State verb is labeled as CEØ. Finally, the label Ø indicates instances where the causee is left unexpressed.
Table 6 The semantic roles of the causees in the complements of the causal predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>få</th>
<th>komma</th>
<th>ha</th>
<th>förmå</th>
<th>låta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEAgt</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEProc</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPos</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the data in Table 6 show, the most common type of causee in the complements of each of the causal predicates is the agentive causee, viz. CEAgt, which corresponds to the observations for the aktionsarter of the effected predicate where Action occurs most frequently. In particular in constructions with the verbs förmå and ha there is a striking majority of agentive causees. In many cases the context shows that the action is somehow enforced in that the causee offers resistance. Furthermore, about half of the agentive causees indicate persons or institutions situated on a higher level in the social hierarchy, as statsmakten ‘the state power’ in (18). This seems to confirm the assumption that extra impact or power of persuasion is needed for the causer to persuade the causee to perform the action described by the effected predicate.

(18) Sveriges folk fortsätter att tillhöra sin statskyrka, alltmedan olika lobbyister försöker förmå statsmakten att göra slut på statskyrkosystemet. (Press95)

Sweden’s people continue to belong their state church, whereas various lobbyists try get state power-DET to make an end on state church system-DET 'The Swedish people continue to belong to the state church, while various lobbyists are trying to get the state power to put an end to the state church system.'

In constructions with the verb få there is a fairly even distribution between causees that have control and those that do not, 52% versus 48% respectively. Even in constructions with låta the number of causees involving control versus those not involving control is fairly well balanced, viz. 42% versus 39% respectively. An element distinguishing causative constructions with låta from the other constructions is that the causee in many cases is
omitted. In such cases the implicit causee indicates a non-specific human referent. The corpus analysis shows that the causee is non-overt in roughly a fifth of the total number of occurrences (19%), as in example (19):

(19) Och Gary Cooper själv lät bygga sig en hydda i hotellets trädgård.
   (Press95)
   and Gary Cooper himself let build himself a cabin in hotel-DEF-GEN garden
   ’And Gary Cooper himself let build a cabin in the hotel garden.’

As for constructions with komma the majority of the causees have no control (57%), as CEProcessed julgransglittret ovanför Kristusbilden ‘the christmas tree decorations above the picture of Christ’ in example (20). This seems to confirm the assumption that the caused event can be seen as the direct result of the causing event.

(20) Vinden från lagunen kommer julgransglittret ovanför Kristusbilden att vaja, alla lyssnar när talesmannen tar till orda.
   (DN1987)
   wind-DEF from lagoon-DEF makes christmas tree decorations-DEF above picture-DEF of Christ to sway, everybody listens when spokesman-DEF takes the floor
   ’The wind from the lagoon makes the christmas tree decorations above the picture of Christ sway, everybody is listening when the spokesman takes the floor.’

If the effected predicate is transitive there appears one more participant, that is the affectee which functions as the direct object of the effected predicate. The presence of an affectee means that the causal chain can be considered as more dynamic. What is more, the presence of an affectee means that the causal chain of events is harder to bring about since more effort is needed from the causer to get the causee to bring about a transitive than an intransitive event (Shibatani 2002:7).

The distribution of the affectees occurring in the complements of the different causal predicates is represented in Table 8. Amongst the affectees a distinction is made between human (AE[+hum]) and non-human (AE[−hum]) affectees. The instances where no affectee occurs are marked by AEØ.
Table 7 The affectees in the complements of the causal predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>få</th>
<th>komma</th>
<th>ha</th>
<th>förmå</th>
<th>låta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEØ</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE[+hum]</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE[–hum]</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In more than half of the complements of the causal predicates få and komma there is no affectee, as illustrated in example (21) with få where the effected predicate att falla sönder ‘fall apart’ does not take a direct object.

(21) Kraftiga regn få den dåligt bundna jorden att falla sönder. (Press95)
    heavy rains make the loose earth-DET to fall apart
    'Heavy rains make the loose earth fall apart.'

In the complements of the verbs ha, förmå and låta, the presence of an affectee seems to be more common. The frequency of affectees is especially high in constructions with ha and förmå. This links up with the supposition that causative constructions with ha and förmå express causal chains of events that are more difficult to bring about and that are more dynamic. Sentence (22) illustrates an analytical causative construction with förmå where the effected predicate att släppa ‘release’ takes the affectee gisslan ‘the hostage’.

(22) Tjänstemän från invandringsmyndigheterna förhandlade med fångarna på telefon för att förmå dem att släppa gisslan. (DN1987)
    officials from immigration departments-DET negotiated with prisoners-DET by phone for to make them to release hostage-DET
    'Officials from the immigration departments negotiated with the prisoners by phone to make them release the hostage.'

For all verbs, most of the affectees that are found in the material are non-human referents. This is in line with the tendency in language in general that inanimate direct objects are more common than animate ones (Kemmer 2001:808).
8. Different causation types for different causative constructions

From the analyses of both the E1 and E2 it can be gathered that the verb få is the most common causal predicate occurring in the type of analytical causative constructions discussed in this study. Not only does it have the highest frequency, but it also allows for a great spectrum of semantic patterns reflected by the many possibilities for combining various participants and aktionsarter. These varying patterns imply that causative constructions with få can convey different types of causation, direct and indirect causation, involuntary causation and causation following the billiard ball model.

As stated earlier, the verbs komma, ha and förmå can occur as an alternative to få. However, their use is bound by a number of semantic restrictions. The verb komma exclusively combines with inanimate causers. As such, the causal chain expresses causation according to the billiard ball model implying a rather physical kind of causation where E2 can be seen as an unavoidable result of E1. The verbs ha and förmå express rather coercive types of causation, that is indirect causation, where a high degree of control of the causer and a high degree of autonomy and resistance of the causee is involved, especially in the case of förmå. As such, these three verbs are confined to certain contexts expressing a limited range of causation types.

The verb låta stands out from the other verbs in a number of ways, e.g. in that its scale of meanings ranges from purely causative to permissive. Its permissive meaning even shines through in its causative meaning which seems to imply a kind of ‘soft’ causation. Analytical causative constructions with låta express mainly indirect causation, but also direct causation and to a lesser degree causation following the billiard ball model.

9. Conclusion

In this paper the syntactic and semantic features of analytical causative constructions with an infinitival complement in Swedish have been discussed. As the frequency data have shown the verbs få and låta are the most frequent causal predicates occurring in this type of construction.

The aim of the qualitative part of the study has been to analyse the semantic and syntactic characteristics of the causal predicates and of the central participants in those constructions. The analysis has been conducted with a number of parameters among which the control factor has proven to be the most important one. Not only the degree of control and activity of the causer, but also of the causee, has shown to influence and determine the degree of directness in the causal chain of events. In other words, the more active the causee is and
the more control the causee has, the less direct is the causal chain of events. It is also true that the higher the degree of activity and control in E2, the higher the degree of resistance with the causee, which in its turn implies more effort from the causer and more difficulties to bring about the caused event.
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Abstract

The verb lassen combined with an infinitive form (reparieren lassen, gehen lassen, stehen lassen) represents the most common type of analytic causative constructions in modern Standard German. The verb lassen can express a variety of causative meanings going from the permissive to the coercive interpretation (viz. English let, make and have). How has the causative construction with lassen developed such a wide meaning range in the German language, and why there is no other causative verb currently used today in such constructions? In order to formulate some substantiated hypothesis, a pilot study analysing data from a sample of causative constructions in Early New High German texts will be presented. This early period will give some important insights into the nexus between semantic aspects of (causative) verbs and their grammaticalisation.

1. Introduction

The present paper is concerned with analytical causatives in Early New High German period (ENHG), a label given to the totality of High German varieties spoken and written, approximately, from the late 14th to the early 17th century (Reichmann & Wegera 1993:5). ENHG is heterogeneous due to the absence of a generally accepted standard variety (Reichmann & Wegera 1993:7), the normalisation of a New High German Standard is yet to come. In contrast to earlier times of Old High German (ca. from 700 to 1050 AD) and Middle

1 Parts of the present paper have been first published in German (Hans-Bianchi 2011, Hans-Bianchi & Katelhön 2011). For stylistic revision I warmly thank my friends Elaine Goldstein and Victoria Robinson.
High German (ca. from 1050 to 1350 AD), for which we can find some important research on causative constructions, there are, to my knowledge, no systematic studies about this issue for the ENHG period. Therefore, attention will be focussed on this “experimentation period” for the purpose of tracing an important part of the evolution of the causative construction under study.

The present investigation will centre around one particular kind of analytic or syntactic causative construction, i.e. the complex predicates of the formal type: finite causative verb plus infinite lexical verb. These complex predicates are to be considered constructions in the sense of Construction Grammar (e.g. Fischer & Stefanowitsch 2008, Stefanowitsch & Fischer 2008, Lasch & Ziem 2011). This is to say that the construction as a complex formal unit is provided with a semantic value in its own right and can be filled with different lexical items. Looking at the whole construction and not just the single causative verb will guarantee the necessary guidelines when retracing the evolution paths to the ENHG period and beyond, where the same causative construction appears but with different lexical fillings.

Our starting point is the present-day situation. The modern German causative construction (CC) uses the causative verb lassen as exemplified below:

(1) Wir lassen ihn das Haus rot streichen.
We let-PRS:1PL him-ACC the house-ACC red paint-INF
‘We let/make/have him paint the house red’

The English translation possibilities make us immediately aware that the German lassen covers a wider range of causative meanings than each of the English causatives to let, have and make. Consequently, after an introduction which focusses on the concepts of causation and causativity (section 2.), the investigation into determining the semantic space covered by today’s causative lassen will commence (section 3.). Subsequently, I will go back in time to compare the different causative verbs used in the Early New High German period within the same causative-plus-infinitive construction, such as heißen ‘to tell’, tun ‘to do’, and machen ‘to make’ amongst others (section 4.). The question as to whether there are semantic or other motivations for the choice of the verb lassen as an (almost) unique modern causative verb instead of these other competing verbs will be addressed and I will demonstrate that there are good reasons for supposing, in the case of the German CC, a strong link between functional-

---

2 Cf. Achard (2002:127): “[...] in addition to the meaning of the individual lexical items that compose an analytic causative, the construction itself provides its own semantic import, independently from its component parts.”

3 I’m using the Leipzig Glossing Rules, see http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php. ‘PPC’ stands for Past Participle.
semantic flexibility, the frequency in use, and the evolution towards a more grammaticalised status (section 5.).

2. Causation and causativity

The human capacity of interpreting real world events as complex sequences of cause and effect is acquired in early childhood (Vázquez Rozas 2007:19) and represents a fundamental category of classifying and analysing all kinds of situations.

Every human language seems to possess a means of expressing the notion of causation, and this ubiquity, in turn, indicates the fundamental nature of this cognitive category (Shibatani 2002:1).

When applied to the grammatical-semantic domain of language, we speak about causativity which can be expressed by manifold means within the linguistic representation of events. Causativity is thus the linguistic-conceptual relationship between two events, where the first one is interpreted as the cause for the existence or the persistence of the second one.

Looking at causativity in general, I will refer to already well-established classifications, concentrating the attention on the main aspects which constitute what we may call the “causative semantic space”. Alongside this, the terminology worked out by Ide (1994) will be introduced as it is followed here for the sake of comparability to my own ENHG data, both with the former periods investigated by Weiss (1956) and Ide (1994) and with the modern German situation (see section 2.4.).

2.1. Directness

Analytic CCs are commonly classified on the basis of the degree of directness they express: the causer appears as subject participant and “acts on” the causee affecting the resultant situation by means of a causative event.

---

5 The distinction between direct and indirect causation can be found in many authors, for example in Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002; cf. in particular the “semantic continuum”, pp. 96ff.) and in Song & Wolff (2005). Nedjalkov uses the terms “Contact Causation” as opposed to “Non-Contact Causation” (Nedjalkov 1976:28ff.).
Lexical causatives express both the causing and the caused situation altogether\(^6\), and typically in these verbs the action carried out by the causer brings about the result directly, without any intermediate agentive element\(^7\):

\(2\) Der Vater \textit{setzt} das Kind \textit{auf den Stuhl}.

The father \textit{set-PRS:3SG the child-ACC on the chair}.

‘The father is seating his child on the chair’

On the contrary, in analytic constructions the causative verb expresses the causing event morphosyntactically separated from the caused situation:

\(3\) Der Vater \textit{lässt} das Kind \textit{im Garten spielen}.

The father \textit{let-PRS:3SG the child-ACC in-the garden play-INF}.

‘The father lets his child play in the garden’

Here, the exact causing action is not specified: we can imagine that the father says something to his child allowing him to play in the garden. But he could also suggest him to do so or he could not do anything at all. The context and the characteristics of the participants are essential in order to narrow down the possible interpretations. In any case, the causer’s influence on the caused situation here is \textit{indirect}, in that he is not acting directly on the child with respect to his playing in the garden.

\(^6\) With regard to this issue, Shibatani and Pardeshi specify: “The tendency for transitive verbs to be unanalyzable lexical units represents this conceptualization of direct causation as a unitary event” (Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002:91). Transferring the concept of unitary event, Lutz Gunkel speaks of “semantic incorporation” in the case of factitive (directive) \textit{lassen}: “[F]aktitives \textit{lassen} [zeichnet] kein eigenständiges Ereignis. Vielmehr dient es dazu ein Agens-Argument einzuführen, das in die semantische Struktur des Basisverbs inkorporiert wird” (Gunkel 2003:250).

\(^7\) Cf. Shibatani (2002:12): “The presence of an explicit or implicit intermediate agent thus appears to be a defining feature of the relevant contrast between direct and indirect causation.” In Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002:90) we read: “The ultimate defining feature of direct and indirect causation is the spatiotemporal configuration of the entire causative event, rather than the nature of the causee.” Comrie (1985:332f) specifies: “[...] relevant parameter is the degree of closeness between the cause (i.e. the causer’s action) and the effect (resultant situation). [...] \textit{John broke the stick} implies an immediate connection between John’s action and the breaking of the stick [...], whereas \textit{John caused the stick to break} suggests rather a mediated chain of events [...] One often finds that, where a language has both analytic and morphological or lexical constructions, the former implies less direct causation than the latter [...]”
2.2. Control and intentionality

Within the indirect causation, a fundamental aspect is the degree of control of the two participants, P1, the causer, and P2, the causee, with regard to the resultant situation. Using Koo’s terminology (Koo 1999), we can call these levels “coercive”, “directive” and “permissive causation” (cf. also the force of causativity in Simone & Cerbasi 2001:446). Within the domain of “interpersonal causation” (Waldenfels 2008:20), which is the most common type in German, both participants have a minimum of control being animate and agentive, but P1 exerts a higher control than P2, being presented as the causer of the final event. Some scholars prefer a twofold classification of indirect causation, distinguishing between permissive and directive causation only (e.g. Gunkel 2003). I will also follow a twofold classification, labelled “COMMAND type” and “LET type”, since the further distinction between coercive and directive/factitive causation is very much a question of contextual and individual interpretations with regard to the causer’s degree of control. In the case of COMMAND, the intentionality for the resultant situation to arise resides in the subject of the causative matrix verb (as in (4)), while in the case of LET, it resides in the subject of the lexical verb (as in (5)). The examples make clear, furthermore, that the ultimate clue to the interpretation of a given causative expression as directive or permissive is the overall context in which it occurs.

- **COMMAND** type: coercive or directive causation

(4) *Die Mutter lässt die Kinder ihre Zimmer selber in Ordnung halten.*

The mother let-PRS:3SG the children-ACC their rooms-ACC themselves in order keep-INF

‘the mother has her children keep their rooms in order by themselves’

- **LET** type: permissive causation

(5) *Petra lässt ihren Freund nicht alleine in Urlaub fahren.*

Petra let-PRS:3SG her boyfriend-ACC not alone on holiday go-INF

‘Petra doesn’t allow her boyfriend to go on holiday without her’

---

8 The concept of control is discussed in Koo (1999:34). A useful approach in describing the difference between directive and permissive causation is Talmy’s concept of force dynamics (Soares da Silva 2004, Leino in this volume).
The *lassen*-construction is used also for the “manipulative causation” (cf. Waldenfels 2008:19), here called “PRODUCE type”, which is an instance of direct causation where the infinitive subject P2 has no control.\(^9\)

\(\text{(6)}\) \begin{align*}
\text{Er} & \quad \text{lässt} & \quad \text{den Käse} & \quad \text{in der Pfanne} & \quad \text{schmelzen.}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
\text{let-PRS:3SG} & \quad \text{the cheese-ACC} & \quad \text{in the pan} & \quad \text{melt-INF}
\end{align*}

‘He makes the cheese melt in the pan’

On the other hand, we can also find the “CAUSE type”, where the causer P1 is inanimate and hence lacks any control. See the following examples:

\(\text{(7)}\) \begin{align*}
\text{Dieser ewige Lärm} & \quad \text{lässt} & \quad \text{mich} & \quad \text{schier} & \quad \text{verzweifeln.}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
\text{let-PRS:3SG} & \quad \text{me-ACC} & \quad \text{nearly} & \quad \text{despair-INF}
\end{align*}

‘This never ending noise makes me almost despair’

\(\text{(8)}\) \begin{align*}
\text{Heftige Regenfälle} & \quad \text{ließen} & \quad \text{die Gefahr} & \quad \text{von Seuchen} & \quad \text{weiter steigen.}\(^{10}\)
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
\text{let-PST:3PL} & \quad \text{the risk-ACC} & \quad \text{of epidemics} & \quad \text{further increase-INF}
\end{align*}

‘Heavy rains made the risk of epidemics increase further’

Waldenfels (2008:20) calls this type “impersonal causation”, where the causer is an inanimate force or an event and the causee can be either animate or inanimate, but in any case non-volitional.\(^{11}\)

### 2.3. Time sequence

Another important facet in the semantics of causativity is the sequence in time of the causing and the caused situation, linked to one another in the complex event construction. Some linguists claim that causativity is given only if the caused state-of-affairs does not precede the causing event (e.g. Koo 1997:41f.).

\(\text{(9)}\) \begin{align*}
\text{Er} & \quad \text{ließ} & \quad \text{das Auto} & \quad \text{in der Garage} & \quad \text{stehen.}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
\text{let-PST:3SG} & \quad \text{the car-ACC} & \quad \text{in the garage} & \quad \text{stand-INF}
\end{align*}

‘He left the car in the garage’

---

\(^9\) Koo stresses that manipulative causation is normally (but not always) expressed by transitive verbs (Koo 1997:147-150).

\(^{10}\) This example is taken from the modern German sample presented in Hans-Bianchi & Katelhön 2011 (shortened sentence N186).

\(^{11}\) Waldenfels (2008:20) further distinguishes the “cognitive causation”, where the causee is an experiencer: “Das ließ mich seine große Nähe spüren”.

---
In sentences like (9), we witness the “LEAVE type”: the car is already in the garage, the *lassen*-subject P1 decides at a certain point in time not to change this state-of-affairs, preceding this decision, i.e. prior to the causing situation. In this case, P1 does not act at all, he is not the true cause of the resultant situation, but nevertheless the event structure follows that of causativity adopting the point of view of a possible – though not accomplished – intervention of the subject participant. Thus, P1 is the causer, not of the initiation, but of the continuation of the resulting state-of-affairs. Therefore, I include this type of *lassen*-constructions in my functional classification of the CC (cf. Fritz 2005:134-135, see also section 4.6.).

2.4. Five causative types

For a better orientation, I will briefly summarise Manshu Ide’s classification that is followed in this paper and is based on the criteria of intentionality, time sequence or duration, and subject characteristics\(^\text{12}\):

- indirect causation (causer is human/animate):
  - a. COMMAND: main intentionality with respect to caused situation resides in causer
    (4) *Die Mutter lässt die Kinder ihre Zimmer selber in Ordnung halten.*
    ‘the mother has her children keep their rooms in order by themselves’
  - b. LET: main intentionality with respect to caused situation resides in causee
    (5) *Petra lässt ihren Freund nicht alleine in Urlaub fahren.*
    ‘Petra doesn’t allow her boyfriend to go on holiday without her’
  - c. LEAVE: causer does not interfere with preceding situation therefore causing its continuation
    (9) *Er ließ das Auto in der Garage stehen.*
    ‘He left the car in the garage’
- direct causation (causer is animate):
  - d. PRODUCE: causer brings about the caused situation directly
    (6) *Er lässt den Käse in der Pfanne schmelzen.*
    ‘He makes the cheese melt in the pan’
- neutral causation, neither direct nor indirect (causer is inanimate):

\(^{12}\) Cf. Ide (1994:37), the terminology has been translated by myself, most of the examples have been glossed above when given first.
e. CAUSE: inanimate causer impacts on animate or inanimate causee

(8) Heftige Regenfälle ließen die Gefahr von Seuchen weiter steigen.  
‘Heavy rains made the risk of epidemics increase further’

3. The modern German causative construction lassen + infinitive

The complex unity built of the causative verb lassen and the infinitive of a lexical verb represents a highly integrated syntactic structure, as we can find with very few German verbs such as modals or perception verbs\(^{13}\). The causative lassen is a so called a.c.i.-verb (accusativus cum infinito), forming a unitary verb complex with two different subjects, P1 and P2, each of which linked to its own verb, V1 (lassen) and V2 (infinitive)\(^{14}\). Thus, we have a structure with at least two participants (P1 = subject of V1 lassen in the nominative case, P2 = subject of the infinitive V2 in the accusative case), and other arguments of the lexical verb may be added, according to its valency (P3, P4 = further participants).

- V2 intransitive:
  (10) Ich lasse euch nicht hier parken.  
  P1    V1  P2        –  V2  
  I    let-PRS:1SG you-PL:ACC not here park-INF  
  ‘I won’t let you park here’

- V2 transitive:
  (11) Ich lasse ihn meinen Rasen mähen.  
  P1    V1  P2  P3        V2  
  I    let-PRS:1SG him-ACC my lawn-ACC mow-INF  
  ‘I let/make him mow my lawn’

- V2 dative:
  (12) Ich lasse dich den Kindern helfen.  
  P1    V1  P2  P3        V2  
  I    let-PRS:1SG you-SG:ACC the children-DAT help-INF  
  ‘I let/make you help the children’

---

\(^{13}\) The construction with a bare infinitive is named “coherent” in the terminology of Gunnar Bech (1955:60-62); the degree of integration is discussed also in Askedal (2006:893ff.) and Poitou (2005).

\(^{14}\) The Reference Grammar of the Institut für Deutsche Sprache IDS calls the construction a “complex verbal group” and diagnoses a “particularly close mono-syntagmatic relation” (Zifonun, Hoffmann & Strecker 1997:1422ff., my translation). The DUDEN Grammar uses the term “Kausativkomplex” (Duden 2006).
Since P2 appears (normally) in accusative case\(^{15}\) being nevertheless the subject of V2 (otherwise expressed in the nominative case), there will be a “direct object doubling” if the lexical verb is transitive (as in (11)). This double accusative can be avoided by means of a prepositional phrase or by outrightly omitting one of the two accusatives (mostly the P2 accusative)\(^{16}\):

- V2 transitive:

  \[(13) \quad \text{Ich} \quad \text{lassen} \quad \text{den Rasen} \quad \text{vom neuen Gärtner} \quad \text{mähen.} \]
  \[
P1 \quad V1 \quad P3 \quad P2 \quad V2
  \]
  ‘I have the lawn mown by the new gardener’

- V2 ditransitive:

  \[(14) \quad \text{Ich} \quad \text{lassen} \quad \text{dem Schüler} \quad \text{mein Buch} \quad \text{bringen.} \]
  \[
P1 \quad V1 \quad P3 \quad P4 \quad V2
  \]
  ‘I have my book brought to the pupil’

Interestingly, these changes in the surface structure do not alter the universally dominant order of the constituent components of the CC: as Simone and Cerbasi (2001:448-449) point out, the order P1+V1 – P2+V2 must be considered “the most typical form of CC [causative constructions] (...) termed the Diagrammatic Ordering of the CC”, because it follows the real time sequence of the complex event in an iconic way. In modern German it is normally found in the main clause\(^{17}\). This definition obviously excludes the LEAVE type, i.e. those cases where the causing event does not precede the caused event. This issue will be further addressed in section 5.

The status of the causative lassen is still a controversial issue. One decisive criterion certainly is the degree of grammaticalisation which is closely linked both to the syntactic structure and to the semantic integration of the whole construction. However, there is no generally accepted definition of grammaticalised auxiliary verbs (cf. Zifonun, Hoffmann & Strecker 1997:1250; Askedal 2006:896). For our purpose, it shall suffice to underline the high degree of grammaticalisation we witness in modern German. As Askedal puts it:

---

\(^{15}\) This phenomenon called “subject demotion” is discussed in a multilingual perspective by Comrie (1976).

\(^{16}\) According to García García (2005:26), the omission of one of the accusative complements is the preferred solution in most languages. In Gunkel (2003:175ff.), we find a detailed discussion of the different syntactic forms in which P2 can appear in modern German.

\(^{17}\) This is true for the unmarked sentence order, not for cases of topicalisation.
Bei lassen mit zusätzlicher Akkusativergänzung wäre aus semantischer Sicht darauf hinzuweisen, dass dieses Verb im gegenwärtigen Deutsch dem Status eines Kausativauxiliars nahe kommt. (Askedal 2006:896, emphasis mine)\(^{18}\)

Nevertheless, if it is true that the verb *lassen* is today unrivalled within the infinitive construction, there are other productive constructions like those built with function verbs and prepositional arguments, the light verb constructions (*Funktionsverbgefüge*):

\[(15) \quad \text{Er bringt mich immer zum Lachen!} \]

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{He bring-PRS:3SG me-ACC always to-the laughing-VBN} \\
\text{‘He always makes me laugh’}
\end{array}
\]

Constructions like these can express causative meanings and are often preferential to the *lassen*-construction in some contexts; although this is another issue that won’t be discussed in this paper\(^{19}\).

In order to express all the different types of causation we have seen above, the meaning of the grammaticalised causative *lassen* itself must be quite general. Ide writes to this regard, that:

\[\text{[d]ie Bedeutung von *lassen* liegt u.E. in seiner prinzipiellen Markierung der indirekten Wirkung und der systembedingten Übernahme der Funktion, die im Prinzip das synthetische Kausativ ausübt [= direkte Wirkung] (Ide 1994:41, emphasis mine)}^{20}\].

With respect to the distribution of the different interpretations of causative *lassen* in present-day Standard German, I refer to a sample analysed recently in Hans-Bianchi & Katelhön (2011). This newspaper sample comprising about 230 sentences shows the following distribution of the different causation types expressed by the *lassen*-construction:

---

\(^{18}\)“With regard to its semantics, we consider *lassen* with an infinitive a near auxiliary causative verb.”

\(^{19}\) The so called *Funktionsverbgefüge*, some of which have causative meaning, are discussed amongst others in: von Polenz 1963, Persson 1975, Koo 1997, van Pottelberge 2001.

\(^{20}\)“[t]he meaning of *lassen*, to our opinion, consists in that it fundamentally signals *indirect causation*, taking over – for system inherent reasons – also the function normally expressed by synthetic causatives [= direct causation].”
The causative construction in Early New High German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>causation type</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMAND</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAVE</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCE</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Distribution percentages of the different causation types expressed by the lassen-construction in present-day Standard German

The main function is thus the coercive or directive causation of COMMAND, which is central to the interpersonal causation type. The less frequent use is that of CAUSE, where the causer is inanimate and the remaining causation types show an almost average rate.

4. The causative construction in Early New High German: a pilot study

The Grammar of Early New High German mentions several verbs that can enter the causative construction with a bare infinitive: lassen ‘to let, leave’, tun ‘to do’, machen ‘to make’, heißen ‘to tell, call’, schaffen ‘to create, accomplish’ (Reichmann & Wegera 1993:403)\(^\text{22}\). In order to get an idea of what the real use of the CC with all these different causatives was in the ENHG period, I have analysed a number of texts written between 1400 and 1600\(^\text{23}\). In these texts, I have collected a pilot study sample\(^\text{24}\) of 169 causative infinitive constructions with the above mentioned causatives: lassen, heißen, machen, tun, schaffen plus the verb gebieten ‘to command’\(^\text{25}\). All of these verbs are able to express at least the one central type of (analytic) causation we call COMMAND (see section 3. above).

The pilot study sample has a limited extension and shows very different proportions of the various causatives (see diagram 1). Therefore the quantitative aspects of the sample won’t

\(^{21}\) This table is taken from Hans-Bianchi & Katelhön (2011:81).

\(^{22}\) Some of these, namely heißen and schaffen, could alternatively combine with the zu-infinitive (Reichmann & Wegera 1993:405). Wells (1990:257) lists the ENHG “causative auxiliaries” lassen, tun, heißen and gebieten (referring to Paul 1881 and Behaghel 1923-1932).

\(^{23}\) The texts are listed in the appendix.

\(^{24}\) This sample does not represent the total amount of CCs in the whole text corpus, but it is a selection aimed at getting examples of all the possible different causatives in ENHG.

\(^{25}\) The English language shows a partially parallel evolution in history: The causative let is attested from Old English till today without reaching the same degree of grammaticalisation as the German counterpart. The causatives hātan (heißten) and dōn (tun) are typical in Middle English until 1400 AD, in the 15th century the causative do is found in dialectal use only. At the same time, the new causatives make and cause come into use (Görlach 1997:83).
be focussed on, rather the qualitative analysis of the examples. Quantitative elicitation of the data will be used mainly to give a complete picture and give some insight to interesting issues.

Through qualitative analysis, I will primarily focus on the semantic space occupied by each of these verbs in terms of the causation types they express in our material. Moreover, the combination preferences between a specific causative verb and a class or group of lexical verbs can be very interesting as they may give us some clues as to tendencies in language change. In fact, none of the five main causatives have restrictions as to the syntactic class of verbs with which it can be combined. Nevertheless, there seem to be some strong preferences to that respect, as we see in table 2. Intransitive motion verbs such as *kommen* ‘to come’ and *gehen* ‘to go’ are quite numerous and behave as a group, distinct from other intransitive verbs and as a result this verb group is listed separately. Finally, very few verbs with dative or genitive arguments are arranged together with the bigger group of intransitive verbs\(^\text{26}\).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
V2 & lassen & heißen & machen & schaffen & tun \\
\hline
transitive verbs & 44 = 54\% & 17 = 44\% & 6 = 29\% & 5 = 38\% & 8 = 62\% \\
intr. motion verbs & 14 = 17\% & 17 = 44\% & 4 = 19\% & 8 = 62\% & 3 = 23\% \\
ineq{n}
intr. verbs (+dat,gen) & 24 = 29\% & 5 = 13\% & 11 = 52\% & – & 2 = 15\% \\
SUM & 82 = 100\% & 39 = 100\% & 21 = 100\% & 13 = 100\% & 13 = 100\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Distribution of the different causatives respect to combined verb classes}
\end{table}

Table 2 shows that four out of five causatives have a strong, over fifty per cent preference for one of the (syntactic) verb classes: *
lassen* and *tun* combine most with transitive verbs, *machen*

\[\text{26\text{ }}\text{Exactly 4 verbs with dative or genitive arguments and 39 intransitive verbs.}\]
occurs most frequently with intransitive verbs, whereas *schaffen* seems quite specialised in intransitive motion verbs. Only *heißen* does not show such a clear preference in our sample.

If we turn it the other way around, looking at the preferred causatives inside the different verb classes (see table 3), we find that *lassen* is favoured with both transitive and intransitive verbs, whereas the intransitive motion verbs are distributed over two or even three causatives: *heißen, lassen, schaffen*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V2</th>
<th>lassen</th>
<th>heißen</th>
<th>machen</th>
<th>schaffen</th>
<th>tun</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transitive V</td>
<td>44 = 55%</td>
<td>17 = 21%</td>
<td>6 = 8%</td>
<td>5 = 6%</td>
<td>8 = 10%</td>
<td>80 = 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr. V of movem.</td>
<td>14 = 30%</td>
<td>17 = 37%</td>
<td>4 = 9%</td>
<td>8 = 17%</td>
<td>3 = 7%</td>
<td>46 = 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intr. V (+dat,gen)</td>
<td>24 = 57%</td>
<td>5 = 12%</td>
<td>11 = 26%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 = 5%</td>
<td>42 = 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>82 = 50%</td>
<td>39 = 23%</td>
<td>21 = 13%</td>
<td>13 = 8%</td>
<td>13 = 8%</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Distribution of the verb classes with respect to the different causatives

These issues will be further developed for the different causatives contained in our sample. The overall aim of this qualitative investigation is to unravel the differences in use and meaning between these causatives in the ENHG period and formulate some hypotheses about the consequences of these differences for the later evolution of the CC, namely the strong grammaticalisation of causative *lassen* to the detriment of the other concurrent causative verbs which become obsolescent.

**4.1. Causative *lassen***

As already stated, *lassen* ‘to let, leave’ is quite flexible as to its possibilities to combine with different syntactic verb classes (Reichmann & Wegera 1993:404). In our sample, we can observe that *lassen* is, without any doubt, the most frequent causative verb and combines without restrictions with any verb class (although combinations with motion verbs are rather untypical, see table 3).

As seen in the examples below, *lassen* can be found in a large number of simple and compound tenses and quite often in imperative mood\(^\text{27}\) (as in (16)). It appears even in quite complex structures, e.g. with modal verbs (as in (17)) and/or with copula plus predicative constructions (as in (18)).

\(^{27}\)In our sample, about 20% of the CCs with *lassen* are imperatives, for the other causatives the imperative mood is much more infrequent with values between 0% and 8%. According to Ide (1994:78), a similar situation is registered for MHG and could have had some influence on the semantic evolution of *lassen*.  
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(16) Fortunatus, laß dich es nit bekümen, (...) [Fortunatus, 25]
Fortunatus let-IMP you-ACC it-ACC not worry-INF
‘Fortunatus, do not worry about it’ lit. do not let it worry you
(17) (er) sich in keinen wege wolte bekeren lassen [Arigo, 38]
(he) himself-RFX in no way want-PST:3SG convert-INF let-INF
‘by no means did he want to let himself be converted’
(18) Da hat dennoch der gnedige und barmherzige Vater (...) Then have-AUX:3SG however the gracious and merciful father-NOM
das arme verderbte menschlich geschlechte nicht wolt lassen verloren
the poor corrupt human race-ACC not want-PPC let-INF lost-PPC
sein und bleiben; [Papista, 4]
be-INF and stay-INF
‘However, the gracious and merciful father did not want the poor corrupt human race to be lost for ever’ lit. he has not wanted to let (them) be and stay lost’

The surface form of the causee can vary, we find it most frequently in the accusative case\(^{28}\), according to the valency of the infinitive verb, we can find a double accusative ((19)), or even, exceptionally, a triple accusative ((20)):

(19) Als nun Jeronimus mit seinem gesynn gehenckt was, ließ der künig
When now Jeronimus with his following hang-PPC be-PST:3SG let-PST:3SG the king
das gemain volck in Jeronimus haüß sackman machen [Fortunatus, 29]
the common folk-ACC in Jeronimus’ house sacking make-INF
‘After Jeronimus was hanged with his following the king allowed the common folk to sack Jeronimus’ house’
(20) Man würd Fürsten finden, die den Mantel bezaleten, unnd sich
One would princes find, who the cloak would-pay, and themselves-RFX
den Bapst liessen bischoff machen [Hutten, 93]\(^{29}\)
the pope-ACC let-IRR bishop-ACC make-INF
‘There would be some princes who would pay the cloak and have themselves made bishops’

\(^{28}\) As Manshu Ide (1994: 58) points out, in Middle High German the accusative was the only possible surface form of the causee.

\(^{29}\) In modern German: ‘...und sich vom Papst zum Bischof machen ließen’.
Sometimes, transitive verbs prefer the use of a prepositional phrase introduced by *von*\(^{30}\) to express the causee:

(21) Warumb sollt ich mein Freiheit lassen urteilen  
Why shall-IRR I my freedom-ACC let-INF judge-INF  
von einer andern Gewissen? [Sachs, 4]  
by an-other conscience?  
‘Why should I let my freedom be judged by someone else’s conscience?’

Exceptionally, the causee can be expressed in the dative case\(^{31}\):

(22) Und Ulenspiegel hat ein Sak, (...) und lies ihm daz Brot  
And Ulenspiegel had a bag and let-PST:3SG him-DAT the bread-ACC  
in den Sack zählen [Ulenspiegel, 22]  
in the bag count-INF  
‘And Ulenspiegel had a bag and made him count the bread into the bag’

Quite often, the infinitive subject is completely omitted, being implicit or deducible from the context.

(23) der König Nebucadnezar lies ein gülden Bilde machen  
the king Nebucadnezar let-PST:3SG a golden painting-ACC make-INF  
‘King Nebucadnezar had a golden painting made’ [Luther,Daniel 3:1]

The five causation types found for the modern *lassen*-constructions (see section 2.4.) will now be used as a reference point to measure the semantic space covered by the ENHG examples\(^{32}\).

- **COMMAND**

(24) Do die botten das horten, liessen sy all küsten vnd kalter vnd  
As the messengers that hear-PST:3PL let-PST:3PL they all cases, lockers and  
truhen auffprechen. [Fortunatus, 26]  
chests-ACC break-open-INF

---

\(^{30}\) This passive-like prepositional agent arises with transitive verbs in the late MHG period and remains marginal till the 15th century (Reichmann & Wegera 1993:404).

\(^{31}\) Reichmann & Wegera (1993:404) put this phenomenon, which becomes more frequent in the 17th century, in relation to the general decline of the double accusative in trivalent verbs like *lehren, kosten, heißen*. They don’t exclude an influence of French in this regard.

\(^{32}\) Two sentences remain uncertain as to their correct interpretation as COMMAND or LET-causation.
‘As the messengers heard that, they had all the cases, lockers and chests broken up’

- **LET**

(25) *Rahel beweinet jre Kinder vnd wolt sich nicht*

Rahel beweep-PST:3SG her children-ACC and want-PST:3SG herself-REFX not

trösten lassen [Luther, Matthäus 2:18]

comfort-INF let-INF

‘Rahel bewept her children and did not want to be comforted’ lit. she did not want to let herself be comforted

- **PRODUCE**

(26) *Als der edel Gabriotto seinen vatter gehört, (...) einen schweren seüfftzen*

As the noble Gabriotto his father-ACC hear-PPC a heavy sigh-ACC

von seinem hertzen gon ließ [Gabriotto, 192]

from his heart go-INF let-PST:3SG

‘As the noble Gabriotto had heard his father, a heavy sigh came from his heart’ lit. he made go a heavy sigh from his heart

- **LEAVE**

(27) *unnd wurden des überein das wir das kind leben*

and become-PST:1PL that-GEN agreeing-ADV that we the child-ACC live-INF

ließen [Römer, 103]

let-PST:1PL

‘and we agreed to let the child live’

The sentences (24) to (27) exemplify four out of five causation types, the missing one being the CAUSE type, which presents inanimate causers. It does not occur at all in our sample of 82 CCs built with *lassen*[^33]. It will be shown further on, that this missing type is not totally nonexistent, but is expressed by another causative, instead of *lassen*. Interestingly, we find both the indirect (COMMAND, LET, LEAVE) and the direct causation (PRODUCE). Diagram 2 visualises the proportions of these different types in the ENHG sample.

[^33]: But Manshu Ide has registered some occurrences of the CAUSE type in his MHG corpus, as we will see below.
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Diagram 2: The proportions of the different causation types in the lassen-CC

As Ide (1994) has convincingly shown on the basis of a very large corpus of data, during the Middle High German period (MHG: ca. from 1050 to 1350 AD) the cognate verb läzen was used as one of several causatives, each of which covered a specific area of the total semantic space of analytic causativity\textsuperscript{34}. Namely, he finds out that läzen, on behalf of its lexical content, was mainly used for the causation types of LET and LEAVE, with very few examples expressing the PRODUCE and CAUSE types\textsuperscript{35}. What is most surprising with regard to the ENHG situation is Ide’s result, that the COMMAND causation type was not part of the semantic functions of MHG läzen, and was instead entirely implemented by the competing causative heizen (heißen). The COMMAND causation must thus have been partly taken over by lassen at the turning point from MHG to ENHG (between the late 13\textsuperscript{th} and the late 14\textsuperscript{th} century), although it may have been latent for a longer period\textsuperscript{36}. This would in fact provide evidence for a functional expansion of causative lassen towards the COMMAND causation which is fundamental in our sample\textsuperscript{37}. Though the functions were less numerous at MHG times, we should bear in mind that lassen was already a multifunctional causative, since it was able to express more than the original LET causation type, and had become even more multifunctional in the ENHG period.

\textsuperscript{34} The historic development of lassen as a means of expressing indirect causation goes back to the Germanic forerunner verb letan. A more detailed description of the evolution of this verb with a number of examples for illustration can be found in Hans-Bianchi (2011:35ff).

\textsuperscript{35} Cf. Ide 1994:72-75; 80; 120. The presence of the CAUSE type in MHG is somewhat surprising, if we compare it to the ENHG sample which does not contain any such lassen-CCs.

\textsuperscript{36} Some few examples for a possible directive interpretation of lassen can be found in Old High German, but also in other Germanic languages as Old English and Old Icelandic, cf. Hans-Bianchi 2011:36-37.

\textsuperscript{37} The critical context for re-interpretation of lassen as command instead of permission could be given with those verbs that permit both meanings, such as er ließ sie gehen, kommen, reiten, trinken, essen, singen... Only the context can make it clear whether the initiative for the infinitive event resides in the causer or in the causee.
4.2. Causative *heißen*

The causative *heißen* ‘to tell, call’ has a long history too, being found as early as in the Gothic Bible of Wulfila, in the form *haitan* plus infinitive, and in Old German texts. In the Middle High German period, *heizen* is frequently used, occupying a central role in the expression of causativity: it is the almost exclusive way to express the COMMAND type of causation (Ide 1994:53-67).

In the ENHG period, which is our concern here, the causative *heißen* is still frequent, but less central than it used to be. As we have just seen, it has ceased to be the nearly exclusive causative for the COMMAND function, with *lassen* becoming a serious contender for this purpose. However, it still continues to hold the favoured position in this specific semantic area of causativity.

Our sample comprises 39 sentences containing a CC with *heißen* and few examples may illustrate the narrow semantic reach of this causative, confined only to the COMMAND causation:

(28) *Hies tancredus das selb hercz in ainen guldin becher der tochter*

Tell-PST:3SG Tancredus the same heart-ACC in a golden cup the daughter-DAT

*bringen* [Wyle, 145r]

bring-INF

‘Tancredus had that heart brought to his daughter in a golden cup’

(29) *der Hertzog den Ritter mit im gon hies [Galmy, Kap. 27]*

the duke the knight-ACC with him go-INF tell-PST:3SG

‘The duke commanded the knight to go with him’

(30) *das sigismunda deß selben tags gwisgardun zu ir hat*

that Sigismunda the same day-GEN Gwisgardus-ACC to her have-AUX-PST:3SG

*haissen kommen* [Wyle, 140v]

tell-INF(PPC) come-INF

‘that Sigismunda on that day had made Gwisgardus come to her’

(31) *dasz er sein weib wolt heiszen ins becken springen*

that he his wife-ACC want-PST:3SG tell-INF into the basin leap-INF

[DWB, Buch der Liebe 288c]

‘that he wanted to tell his wife to leap into the basin’

38 Cf. DWB, entry “heiszen”.
39 DWB = Deutsches Wörterbuch of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, see references.
The causative *heissen* appears primarily in the simple past tense (as in (28) and (29)), other tenses are much less frequent (e.g. in (30)). The imperative mood is rare, and also the more complex combinations with modals (as in (31)). On the whole, it displays a limited range of morphosyntactic variability in our sample.

As the examples demonstrate, the typical context is that of a social or other absolute authority like a king, a lord, or an angel commanding servants or other people obliged to be obedient. The lexical content of ‘order’ and ‘command’ is so strong, that this verb remains monofunctional throughout its history. That’s why the causee remains often implicit (as in (28)), being that the situational context of giving orders to subordinate people is clear enough. When the causee becomes explicit, it always assumes the accusative case (Reichmann & Wegera 1993:405): there is no syntactic variability as in the case of the causative *lassen*.

### 4.3. Causative *machen*

The creation verb *machen* ‘to make’ enters the CC in a more recent period: as Emil Weiss has set forth, it first appears during the 13th century becoming more frequent in the 14th century (Weiss 1956:202). The construction with infinitive, though, will never get as popular as the construction with adjective (Weiss 1956:203), as in *etwas bunt machen* “to colour something” (lit. to make something colourful).

According to Weiss, the increase of *machen* plus infinitive is due to the decline of the CC with *tun* in the same period (Weiss 1956:203; cf. also Ide 1994:104). In the present sample, though, we count only 21 CCs with causative *machen*.

Most of the examples are in the present or present perfect tense, sometimes in combination with a modal verb (as in (36)). There are no imperative forms in the sample. The causee appears almost exclusively in accusative case, only once we find a dative causee in our sample (see (34)).

We will now have a look at the functional array of causative *machen*:

- **PRODUCE** (12 examples):

  (32) *wie Ulenspiegel zu Peyne in einem Dorff ein kränck Kind scheissen macht*

  how Ulenspiegel to Peyne in a village an ill child-ACC shit-INF make-3SG

  [Ulenspiegel, 49]

  ‘how Ulenspiegel in a village near Peyne makes an ill child shit’

---

40 The Duden Reference Grammar of contemporary German (Duden 2006:§577) still indicates *machen* as a “Kausativverb” with a.c.i.-construction beside *lassen* (and even *heissen*, referred to as “lofty style”): *vergessen machen* ‘to make forget’, *lachen machen* ‘to make laugh’. But the real use frequency seems to be almost at zero, as has been shown in Hans-Bianchi & Katelhön (2011:81).
The causative semantic area covered by causative machen, as it emerges from our data, comprises three functions: PRODUCE, CAUSE and – not very often – COMMAND (see diagram 3). Machen seems, therefore, quite specialised in the expression of direct causation (PRODUCE) and inanimate causer categories (CAUSE). Since this functionality is unique amongst the ENHG causatives and, in particular, quite different from the one described for the causative tun (see section 4.4.), I do not share Weiss’ hypothesis about a gradual substitution of causative tun by machen, since machen and tun are, to a large extent, functionally complementary.
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Diagram 3: The proportions of the different causation types in the machen-CC

4.4. Causative tun

_Tun_ ‘to do’ appears as a causative within the infinitive CC from the Old High German (OHG) period on. The huge investigation presented by Emil Weiss brings to proof that during this first period of the written German language the CC with _tuon_ was “relatively frequent” in all (written) dialects (Weiss 1956:64, my translation). Weiss’ data witness that this CC occurs precisely in those texts that follow most closely the Latin language structure. He concludes that OHG _tuon_ plus infinitive bears a Latin syntactic character (Weiss 1956:65), conforming to the Latin infinitive construction with _facere_:

(37) íh tuon íyvuih úuesan manno fiscara [DWB, Tatian 19, 2]


‘I make you fishers of men’

(lat.: faciam vos fieri piscatores hominum)

---

41 The existence of the _tun_-construction before 1000 AD in several Western Germanic languages like Old English and Early Netherlandish, on the other hand, could hint at a common Germanic origin of this CC (Langer 2001:38). According to Verhagen, “[t]his usage has apparently been present in the Western Germanic languages since early times” (Verhagen 1998:104).

42 If the Latin pattern actually served as a starting point for the German CC with _tun_, we can hypothesise a process of “contact-induced grammaticalisation” defined as a process of “grammaticalization that [has] been triggered by interlingual identification of linguistic signs or categories” (Gast & van der Auwera 2012: 48). See also the interesting considerations in Bisang 1998.

In the Middle High German period, the CC with *tun* is not infrequent, but – according to some scholars – it remains somewhat linked to the dialectal region of the North-West (Schmitt 1970:379)\(^{44}\). Weiss declares however, that causative *tun* plus infinitive “dominated almost without limits” (Weiss 1956:65, my translation) from the 9\(^{th}\) century onwards, although its decline begins as early as the late Middle High German period:


Causative *tun* will definitely disappear from the written usage around 1700 (Fischer 1998:123).

Looking at the data contained in our ENHG sample we find 13 occurrences, with the causative verb mostly appearing in simple tense forms and mainly in the simple past tense (except for the compound past in (40)). There are neither imperative nor complex modal forms.

- **COMMAND**: (11 examples)

  (38) *Aber tancredus nach vil grossem und ellendem wainen(...), tet er (…)*
  *But Tancredus after much big and woeful weeping do-PST:3SG he*
  *sie bedesament in ain grab vergraben. [Wyle: 147r]*
  *they-ACC together in one tomb bury-INF*
  *‘But Tancredus, after long and bitter weeping, made them bury together in one tomb’*

  (39) *Er ir nicht auf ir weiches leiblein steyge, sunder sy*
  *He her-DAT not on her smooth body climb-PST:3SG but her-ACC*
  *auf den seinen steigen thet [Arigo, 48]*
  *on the his climb-INF do-PST:3SG*

---

\(^{44}\) Examples can be found in the DWB, under the entry “thun”, and in Reiffenstein & Scheutz 1998.

\(^{45}\) “At least in two huge dialect regions causative *tun* in the infinitive construction has ceased to exist, Bavarian-Austrian and Alemannic-Swabian [...]. According to the evidence, this is the closing phase of an evolution that began around 1300 AD: the decline of causative *tun* and the victory of the periphrastic *tun*. The term “periphrastic” means here the mere auxiliary use of *tun*, without causative meaning, i.e. the so called *do*-support. In the present paper, I won’t go into the matter of this new grammaticalisation path of the verb *tun*, the interested reader may refer to Hans-Bianchi (2011:29ff.).
‘He shall not climb on her smooth body, but he made her climb on his’

(40) herre ich möchte nit (...) das holcz das ich hette
Lord I would-like-3SG not the wood-ACC that I have-AUX:PST:1SG
abe slahen tün prengen [Arigo, 46]
off-ADV chip-INF do-INF(PPC) bring-INF

• PRODUCE: (2 examples)

(41) (ich) musz in die kirche gehen, das glöcklein läuten thun
(I) must-PRS:1SG in the church go-INF the little bell-ACC ring-INF do-INF
[DWB, Wunderhorn 1,28]

‘I must go to the church and sound the little bell’ lit. make the bell ring

In our corpus, only two texts present the CC with tun: Arigo and Wyle; both are translations of Boccaccio’s Decameron from Italian (or Latin), both reproduce the Romance (or Latin) construction fare (facere) plus infinitive\(^\text{46}\). Mostly, the Italian construction is used to indicate the COMMAND function, going from directive to coercive causation. The permissive causation, instead, is normally expressed by the Italian causative lasciare\(^\text{47}\). Interestingly, the Italian CC, which is very frequent, was not always translated by tun plus infinitive, but in most cases the translator chose the same infinitive construction, possibly alternating the specific causative. We encounter all of the causatives in use at that time as a translation of fare plus infinitive. This result shows that the translators often reproduced the structure of the original language in terms of syntactic-semantic constructions, adapting if necessary the lexical filling\(^\text{48}\).

In spite of the decline of causative tun in the ENHG period, the translators are induced to use it, supported by the high prestige and archaic Latinising character of the construction. In the other texts of our sample, causative tun is no longer used. We witness here a last offshoot of the contact-based history of causative tun.

Our few examples show that the functional range of the causative tun is not very extensive, the core meaning is the COMMAND type of causation, but there is also some

---

\(^{46}\) 7 out of 9 occurrences of tun + inf. in these texts translate the Italian fare + inf. Only two examples are independent translation solutions (cf. Hans-Bianchi 2011:25-29).

\(^{47}\) The Italian permissive causative lasciare is translated by lassen. The original text is viewable in internet: http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Italian_Studies/dweb/texts/

\(^{48}\) To my knowledge, there are no analyses regarding the specific semantic functions of the causative tun during the MHG and ENHG period; cf. Ide (1994:106-107): „Die Frage, ob es zwischen tuon, machen und lâzen irgendeine komplementäre Aufgabenteilung gibt, [...] läßt sich wegen der ungünstigen Belegsituation nicht beantworten.“ (The question whether the verbs tuon, machen and lâzen were in some respect complementary in their functions cannot be answered due to the little evidence available.)
example of the direct causation type (PRODUCE). It is possible, though, that in the specific Middle Franconian area, where the use of *tun* was more frequent\(^{49}\), its semantic space became wider, as the examples (42) and (43) produced by Annette Fischer could suggest (without the context the function is not unambiguous)\(^{50}\):

(42) *ich will dich sie thun sehen* [Karrenritter, 34]

I want-PRS:1SG you-ACC her-ACC do-INF see-INF

‘I want to make/let you see her’

(43) *sie (...) die mich leben du(o)t* [Karrenritter, 50]

she who me-ACC live-INF do-PRS:3SG

‘she who makes/lets me live’

To my knowledge, these semantic aspects of *tun* within the causative construction and their evolution in different dialectal areas have not been investigated systematically yet, but could shed some light on the issue.

### 4.5. Causatives *schaffen* and *gebieten*

The verb *schaffen* ‘to create, accomplish’ seems to enter the infinitive construction only in the ENHG period, prior to this it governs either a secondary clause or an infinitive clause introduced by *zu* (cf. DWB, entry “schaffen”, II.C.1.c). Our sample contains 13 occurrences of causative *schaffen*. All the examples are in simple tenses (present and past), but interestingly we find both the strong form of the Simple Past “schuf” and the weak form “schaffte”, even in the same author’s work. There is one occurrence of the imperative mood (see (47)), but no complex structures like combinations with modal verbs.

(44) *der richter(...)in palde schuffe an das seile pinden* [Arigo: 72]

the judge him-ACC soon command-PST:3SG to the rope tie-INF

‘The judge made him soon tie to the rope’

---


\(^{50}\) This text in prose is intitled *Der Karrenritter* (1430). Another text from the same area, called *Königin Sibille* (1430-1440), contains 59 CCs: 24 *tun*, 23 *heissen*, 7 *machen*, 5 *lassen*. I have not found any indication about possible semantic differences between these causatives (Fischer 1998:123-124).
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(45) *Dar nach sie schafte komen guete frische kuele wein unn*  
That after she accomplish-PST:3SG come-INF good fresh cool wine-ACC and  
*mancherley confectione* [Arigo: 102]  
various sweets-ACC  
‘After that, she had good fresh cool wine and manifold sweets brought’ lit. she had wine come

(46) *und den jungling schaffet (er) hinziehen* [DWB, Lindener Rastbüchl. 16]  
and the sapling-ACC command-PRS:3SG (he) move-on-INF  
‘and he makes the young man move on’

(47) *Darumb (...) schafft mir komen ein gunten seligenn weisen man*  
Therefore accomplish-IMP:PL me-DAT come-INF a good blessed wise man-ACC  
[Arigo: 29]  
‘Therefore, send to me a good, blessed and wise man’ lit. make come to me

The functional range is similar to that of causative *heissen: schaffen* expresses a COMMAND function, the causee often remains implicit (as in (44) and (45)), which is a typical trait of the coercive causation. We observe that causative *schaffen* occurs with an unusually high frequency in combination with the infinitive *kommen*, namely in 7 sentences out of 13. Therefore, we may reasonably hypothesise that we are in front of a partially lexicalised collocation. Indeed, *kommen* hardly ever occurs combined with one of the other causatives: once we find *kommen heissen*, and once *kommen tun*. The most frequent causative, *lassen*, however, is never linked to *kommen* in our sample.

The causative *gebieten* ‘to command’ occurs alternatively with or without *zu* introducing the infinitive (DWB, entry “gebieten”, II.5.d-e)). The use of the bare infinitive construction goes back at least to the 10th century51, but apparently could not gain acceptance. Our sample presents only one CC with *gebieten*52, which expresses the COMMAND function:

(48) *In dem der salemaister das wasser zu den henden nemen gebote* [Arigo: 57]  
In that the supervisor the water-ACC to the hands take-INF command-PST:3SG  
‘In that the supervisor had the water taken to the hands’

---

51 An example is given in Grimm’s Dictionary (DWB, Notker 132, 3).
52 There are also two occurrences of *gebieten* within the *zu*+Inf.-construction, but I do not number them among the CC investigated here.
4.6. Summary

Comparing the different causatives contained in our sample with regard to their functional range within the semantics of causativity, we obtain the following picture:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>causation type</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>lassen</th>
<th>heißen</th>
<th>machen</th>
<th>schaffen</th>
<th>tun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMAND</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAVE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Proportions of the different causatives within the causation types in ENHG period\textsuperscript{53}

\textit{Lassen} is not only the most frequent causative in our ENHG sample, it is, rather more noteworthy, the one causative with the widest functional array. Only the CAUSE function is never expressed by \textit{lassen}, for all the other causation types \textit{lassen} is either one of the preferred causatives (COMMAND and PRODUCE) or even the only possible one (LET and LEAVE). The COMMAND type of causation must be considered the core function of the whole causativity system: it is the most frequently expressed causative situation and the one which allows the highest variability as to the choice of the causative. Being that the COMMAND causation is a continuum which comprises different degrees of the causers control going from directive to coercive causation, slight nuances in meaning are probably linked to the use of these different causatives. \textit{Heißen} and \textit{schaffen} are clearly monofunctional, whereas \textit{machen} and \textit{tun} cover more than one causation type. The causative verb \textit{tun}, however, is a very particular case of contact-driven construction, heavily influenced by Latin and a Latinised language structure throughout its history, and, as we have seen, our ENHG sample confirms these characteristics even in this current state of its evolution. Our qualitative analysis has further revealed that the causative \textit{machen} plays a special role in the system of the CC in the ENHG period: it is the only causative that can express the CAUSE function, identified by inanimate causers.

\textsuperscript{53} Two occurrences of \textit{lassen} are uncertain as to their precise function (LET or COMMAND), and have been left aside in the present overview. The sign (*) hints at the evidence found outside our sample (see (42) and (43)).
5. Conclusion: The hidden link between semantics and grammaticalisation

Starting from the more formal aspect of the surface order in which the constituent parts of the CC appear in the sentences, an interesting fact should be stressed. As we have seen in section 3., modern German unmarked main clauses respect the so called “Diagrammatic Ordering of the CC”: the surface sequence P1+V1 – P2+V2\textsuperscript{54} reproduces the time sequence of the complexe causative event (Simone & Cerbasi 2001:448-449). On the contrary, this iconic, and therefore universally typical, order does not seem to be very common in the ENHG causative constructions. In our sample, we found many different surface sequences in the main clause, a few examples are repeated here for illustration (for glossing see above)\textsuperscript{55}:

- P1+V1 – P2+V2 “Diagrammatic Ordering”
- P1+V1 – V2+P2
- P1 – P2 – V1 – V2
- P1 – P2 – V2 – V1
- P2 – P1 – V2 – V1
- P1+V1 – V2+P2
- P2 – P1 – V2 – V1

In most cases, the causer P1, as the most salient participant, is mentioned first, followed either by the causative V1 or the causee P2. However, it can also happen that P2 precedes P1 if it is particularly stressed. The two verbs V1 and V2 can occur in any order. Overall, the sequence

\textsuperscript{54} I recall the abbreviation conventions used here: P1 = first participant: subject of the causative matrix verb; V1 = causative matrix verb; P2 = second participant: subject of the infinitive lexical verb; V2 = infinitive lexical verb.

\textsuperscript{55} The ordering scheme is a somewhat simplified abstraction, since the complex verb forms may be more intricated, e.g. in compound tense forms. For the sake of clearness, I have not taken into account auxiliaries or modals, if there were any.
P1+V1 – P2+V2 is far from being general. This syntactic variability is due to a more general fluctuation in the sentence order (particularly the position of the finite and infinite verb parts) at this time\textsuperscript{56}. What our sample clearly shows, is that on the way to a more grammaticalised CC in modern German – in parallel with the development of a normalised sentence order – the sequence of the constituent parts has evolved according to the iconic principle of the “Diagrammatic Ordering” in the unmarked main clause.

At this point, it may be interesting to have a look at the distribution of the different causation types inside the CC system in comparison with the situation in present-day Standard German (see table 5)\textsuperscript{57}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>causation type</th>
<th>ENHG</th>
<th>Modern NHG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMAND</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAVE</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCE</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Comparison causation types of ENHG and modern NHG

The most striking differences are the heavy decrease of the COMMAND function and the considerable increase of the CAUSE type of causation (although it remains the most infrequent type). The LET and LEAVE causation types have also become more relevant and for the issue of the choice of different causation types, it is fundamental to note that it depends to a large extent on how people interpret and categorise events:

[…] the typical connection between direct causation and a patientive causee and between indirect causation and an agentive causee […] is basically due to our perception of the world (Shibatani & Pardeshi 2002:90, emphasis mine).

The kind of society people lived and acted in, and the power relations that were significant in that historical period may have contributed to such a clear supremacy of COMMAND causation in the ENHG causative system. But this hypothesis is hardly more than a conjecture and cannot be controlled here.


\textsuperscript{57} These proportions should be verified in a more heterogeneous corpus, since the text type is certainly relevant in determining the results.
While the CAUSE type in ENHG – standing to our sample – was expressed exclusively by causative *machen*, the increased modern CAUSE type draws on causative *lassen*.

Nowadays, the CC with *lassen* constitutes a highly integrated semantic unity where it is often hard to disentangle the causing from the caused event (see section 3.). But even in the more straight-forward interpersonal causation types, the precise kind of action meant by *lassen* is highly underspecified and can be identified only against the backdrop of the overall situational context. The qualitative analysis proposed here shows that this typical semantics of the modern causative is not applicable to the ENHG causative verbs to the same extent: the causatives with a strong lexical meaning of command, *heiß*en and *scha*ffen, refer to a commanding speech act and cannot be used for other purposes. The causatives *machen* and *tun*, on the other hand, have a more general meaning and for that reason are suitable for different types of causation⁵⁸. Why, then, was *lassen* “chosen” to become the main and then even the unique near-auxiliary verb in the infinitive CC?

*Lassen* has a very long history as a causative, namely permissive verb and this is probably an important circumstance. The main competing verbs *machen* and *tun* are younger and in the case of *tun* there is a lack of acceptance and assimilation due to its Latinising character. Relating mostly to the work of Ide (1994), we have seen that in the previous Middle High German period, *lassen* was mainly used for its lexical core meaning, LET and LEAVE, however, it had already gained other causation types not inscribed in its lexical semantics (CAUSE and PRODUCE). In the ENHG period under study, it has been observed that the functions of *lassen* comprise now also the COMMAND causation, which can be considered somewhat contrasting with its lexical meaning of permission. This evolution path shows a rather slow and gradual expansion of the causative meaning of *lassen*, thus confirming the so called “Theorie der leichten Übergänge” (easy passage theory), where the contexts of use expand step-by-step (Fritz (2006: 54; 49-50). After all, the semantic expansion of *lassen* from

---

⁵⁸ Szczepaniak (2011:113): „Das Verb *tun* ist generell ein sehr geeigneter Kandidat für Grammatikalisierungen. Es bezeichnet ein Basiskonzept, eine unspezifische Tätigkeit. Solche elementaren Wörter dienen aufgrund ihrer allgemeinen Bedeutung häufig als Grammatikalisierungsspendern.“ (The verb *tun* is generally an optimal candidate for grammaticalisations. Its meaning is a basic semantic concept, an unspecified activity.) The same can be said about the verb *machen*, and in general the so called „generalised action verbs“, cf. Schultze-Berndt (2008). Grammaticalisation has been investigated by many authors, for detailed discussion please refer to the following works: Traugott (2003), Heine & Kuteva (2007), Diewald (2008), Haspelmath (2008), Traugott & Trousdale (2010).
the original permissive meaning to the COMMAND-function and other causation types is not a German lone hand but is attested in many languages\(^{59}\).

We may ask, then, how the original lexical concept of permission and allowance\(^{60}\) has been bleached to the point of expressing all the other causation types as well. The clue for this grammaticalisation path lies, in my opinion, in the embedding construction. *Lassen* has been able to take over new causative functions building on the ground prepared by other causatives inside the same CC\(^ {61}\): In the ENHG period, the COMMAND function has already been taken over to some extent from the competing causative *heissen*, and on the way to the modern New High German Standard, *lassen* will absorb the CAUSE function formerly reserved to *machen* (see section 4.3.). The constructional frame in which all these causatives occur gives them a common ground on which the functionality of each causative is negotiated and re-adjusted through longer periods.

Our results have clearly shown the complexity of the interaction between the word level and the construction level. Both levels of semantic-formal complexity have to be taken into account, in order to get insight in the complicated web of relations by which they interact. As we have seen, changes in the use of one causative bring about changes in the whole semantic area of the CC: under the pressure of language use principles like economy and analogy and under the subsequent effect on frequency we register trends towards grammaticalisation (*lassen, machen*), lexicalisation (*kommen schaffen*) or the cut-off of a grammaticalisation path (*tun*).

The picture that has emerged from this pilot study will certainly need further investigation on the basis of a larger data corpus; nevertheless, through the qualitative approach, it has allowed for some interesting insight in the complex issues of causative constructions and grammaticalisation in the German language.

---

\(^{59}\) In cross-linguistic comparison, Augusto Soares da Silva defines the semantic space of *verbs of letting* – to which the German *lassen* belongs – in the following way: “the ‘letting’ category covers a continuum of non-opposition and agent involvement in the event, which goes from non reflected passivity [...] through a strong committed sense of granting permission to a voluntary ceasing of opposition and even to cases of affectedness [...]” (Soares da Silva 2007:176).

An interesting case of polisemy or multifunctionality of a verb of letting in Estonian is witnessed by Anne Tamm in the present volume.

\(^{60}\) A detailed discussion of the semantics of permission and allowance (with regard to English) is proposed by Thomas Egan in the present volume.

\(^{61}\) We may see here a case of “Nutzung von Präzedenzen” (exploitation of precedencies) in the terminology of Gerd Fritz (\(^\text{2006:51-52}\)). See also the discussion in Weiss (\(^\text{1956:203}\)).
Appendix

The sample of 169 CC was collected in the following 17 texts of the ENHG period (last access February 2011)\(^\text{62}\):


**Arigo** = Arigo [Heinrich Schlüsselfelder?], *Decameron*. Translation from Italian [Ulm, ca. 1476] http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de; Persistent Identifier: urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb00034141-1

**Brant** = Sebastian Brant, *Das Narrenschiff* [Basel, 1494] http://www.zeno.org/


**Fortunatus** (anonymous author) [Augsburg, 1490/1509] http://www.zeno.org/


**Luther** = Martin Luther, *Die gantze Heilige Schrifft*. Translation from Hebrew (AT) and from Ancient Greek (NT) [Wittenberg, 1545] http://www.lutherbibel.net/


\(^{62}\) Moreover, a few examples are taken from the apparatus given in DWB, see references.
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Abstract

This paper argues that in Hungarian, dative causative constructions pattern with accusative causative constructions insofar as they both show Control properties. One good reason for the proposed analysis is that the ECM vs. Control account of causatives (Tóth 1999) cannot explain why dative causatives do not accept intransitive infinitival clause complements. This transitivity restriction is derived here from the requirement that the object agreement features of the causative verb must be checked. The proposed analysis can also account for focussed and quantified expressions appearing in the infinitival C-domain, a fact that neither the restructuring account (Guasti 1996, 1997) nor the clause union account (Den Dikken 1999 (2004)) can handle. Part 1 introduces the Hungarian data and discusses some previous accounts. Part 2 shows that accusative causatives pattern with dative causatives in their syntactic behaviour, which is taken to be an indication of their structural identity. In Part 3 some advantages of the proposed analysis are discussed. Part 4 is a summary of the paper.

1 Introduction

Causative constructions cross-linguistically come in two types. In Type 1 the causative verb is a three-place predicate and the causee argument bears the accusative case. In Type 2, the causative verb is assumed to take only two arguments, the causer and the event. In many languages, the performer of the action (causee) in Type 2 is expressed by an oblique NP (Baker 1988, Alsina 1992, Burzio 1986). In Type 2 causatives the infinitival verb describing the event must be transitive (this has become known as the ‘transitivity restriction’ since Jaeggli 1986), whereas no such requirement holds for Type 1.

* This paper has benefited considerably from discussions with Gabriella Tóth and Ágnes Bende-Farkas, as well as from comments made by the editors of this volume, Ruprecht von Waldenfels and Jaakko Leino. I express my gratitude to them here. I am also indebted to the participants of the SCL-22 Workshop on Analytic Causatives, held at the University of Aalborg in June 2006, for their useful remarks and questions. All remaining errors are mine.
Traditional analyses of causative constructions usually identify the oblique NP in Type 2 as the “by-adjunct” of the infinitival predicate because it can be suppressed while its accusative counterpart in Type 1 cannot. The difference between Type 1 and Type 2 is therefore often attributed to the change in the number of the arguments. As the Hungarian data presented in this paper show, the accusative/oblique case alternation of the causee is not necessarily a consequence of the dyadic vs. triadic nature of the causative verb. In dative causative constructions in Hungarian, the dative causee is just as much an argument of the causative verb as its accusative counterpart is in accusative causatives. There exists a third type of causative construction labelled here as by-causative, sharing the syntactic properties of by-causatives with passive force in other languages, where the by-causee is an adjunct.

1.1 The data

Analytic causative constructions in Hungarian can be formed by either of the two causative verbs hagy ‘let’ and enged ‘let’, invariably expressing the permissive reading (Tompa 1965). For the “factive causative” interpretation, the causative suffixes -at/-et and -tat/-tet must be used (see Komlósy 1999 for details).¹ I will use hagy ‘let, allow’ as the paradigm case of the causative verb here because enged ‘let, allow’ does not differ from hagy ‘let, allow’ in its argument structure, the differences being mostly stylistic. Analytic causative constructions may appear in 3 syntactic patterns (Ackerman 1992, Komlósy 1999). In Type 1 Accusative causative constructions, the causative verb (hagy/enged ‘let, allow’) is a three-place predicate taking a nominative causer, an accusative causee and a propositional argument, expressed by an infinitival clause:

Type 1 Accusative causative

(1a) Marij hagytaz anyós-tk [alud-ni PROk].
Mary let the mother-in-law-ACC sleep-INF
‘Mary let the mother-in-law sleep.’

¹ Hungarian is a morphologically rich language, in which the verb shows person and number agreement with the subject and also person and definiteness agreement with the object (see Bartos 1995 for details). In addition, it is a null argument language, where the omitted arguments can then be reconstructed from verbal morphology (see E.Kiss&Kiefer 1994 and E.Kiss 2005 on the syntactic structure of Hungarian in general).
Type 2 causatives are further divided into dative causatives and by-causatives (Ackerman 1992), both of which are subject to the so-called transitivity restriction. In Type 2, the causative verb shows definiteness and person agreement with the object of the infinitival clause\(^2\), to be discussed in 3.1:

**Type 2A Dative causative**

(2a) *Mari\(_i\)j hagyott-0 az anyós-na\(_k\)k [alud-ni PRO\(_k\)].
Mary let-PAST-3SG[-DEF]the mother-in-law-DAT sleep-INF
'Mary allowed the mother-in-law-DAT to sleep.'

(2b) Mari\(_i\)j hagy-t-a az anyós-na\(_k\)k [ki-fizet-ni PRO\(_k\)
Mary let-PAST-3SG[DEF] the mother-in-law-DAT PFX-pay-INF
a számlá-t].
the bill-ACC
'Mary allowed the mother-in-law-DAT to pay the bill.'

**Type 2B By-causative**

(3a) *Mari\(_i\)j hagy-t-a a ruhák-at\(_k\) [áz-ni t\(_k\)
Mary let-PAST-3SG[DEF] the clothes-ACC soak\(_v\)i-INF
(az anyós által)].
the mother-in-law by
'Mary let the clothes be soaked\(_v\)i by the mother-in-law.'

---

\(^2\) The square brackets in the glosses are used to indicate \([±\text{definite}]\) object agreement. Morphologically it is not separable from subject agreement therefore it is represented as an abstract feature.
The dative causee in the example in (2b) is an argument of the matrix causative verb, just like the accusative causee in (1b). The by-causee in (3b), however, is an adjunct, hence it is optional. The informal chart in (4) shows how the arguments in these three types of causative construction pattern. Other instances, where the causative verb takes a finite clause complement or a third NP argument, are not discussed in this paper as they are not instances of the analytic causative construction investigated here (but see Tóth 1999 for details).

(4) Causative constructions in Hungarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSATIVE</th>
<th>ARG1</th>
<th>ARG2</th>
<th>ARG3</th>
<th>ADJUNCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>NP1 nominative causer</td>
<td>NP2 accusative causee</td>
<td>CP [-Fin] proposition</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>NP1 nominative causer</td>
<td>NP2 Dative causee</td>
<td>CP [-Fin] proposition</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-agent</td>
<td>NP1 nominative causer</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>CP [-Fin] proposition</td>
<td>(NP2) by-causee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Previous accounts

Analytic causatives in Hungarian have received various syntactic analyses. Tóth (1999) argues that the causative verb in accusative causative constructions is a dyadic ECM-predicate while dative causatives are either Dative Control or Dative ECM. In the latter case, the dative NP is the subject of the infinitival clause receiving its dative case via exceptional case marking from the causative verb. This “exceptional dative subject” analysis of dative causatives is also accepted by Den Dikken (2004). I will return to his analysis in 3.1, where I will offer an alternative account of the object agreement facts. In 4, I will show that the clause
union account cannot explain the behaviour of postverbal but pre-infinitival quantified expressions and foci in causative constructions.

The analysis proposed by Tóth (1999) is based, among others, on the observation that accusative causatives may take an idiomatic expression as their infinitival complement, while dative causatives cannot. She takes this to be indicative of the ECM-property of accusative causatives:

**Idiomatic expression with the accusative causative**

(5a) Mari hagy-ta a szög-et ki-búj-ni a zsák-ból.

Mary let-PAST3SG[DEF] the nail-ACC PFX-thread-INF the sack-ADESS

‘Mary let the cat out of the bag.’

(5b) *Mari hagy-ott a szög-nek ki-búj-ni a zsák-ból.

Mary let-PAST3SG[-DEF] the nail-DAT PFX-thread-INF the sack-ADESS

‘the same’

Idiomatic expressions in Hungarian do not serve as a diagnostic test to distinguish ECM from Object Control for two reasons: (i) their predominant word order is fixed as VSO (Hetzron 1975), so they cannot be successfully deployed to test constituency; (ii) if this order is ruined for some reason or another, the expression loses its idiomatic content. Thus, as soon as the idiomatic expression *veri az ördög a feleségét* “the devil is beating his wife” (meaning that it is raining and shining at the same time) is embedded in either type of causative construction, it loses its idiomatic sense and gives equally good results:

(6a) Péter hagy-t-a a szegény ördög-öt ver-ni a feleség-é-t.

Peter let-PAST-3SG[DEF] the poor devil-ACC beat-INF the wife-his-ACC

‘Peter let the poor chap beat his wife.’

(6b) Péter hagy-t-a a szegény ördög-nek ver-ni a feleség-é-t.

Peter let-PAST-3SG[DEF] the poor devil-DAT beat-INF the wife-his-ACC

‘Peter allowed the poor chap to beat his wife.’

As Tóth (1999) later observes, the ungrammaticality of the dative causative construction in (5b) is due to the so-called transitivity restriction (Guasti 1992, 1996, 1997). For this reason,
the above difference cannot be attributed to the ECM vs. Control properties of the causative verb. If the transitive idiomatic expression *minden pénzt egy lóra feltenni* 'to put all the money on one horse' meaning "to put all the eggs in one basket" is chosen, we get correct results in both types:

(7a) Péterj hagyta Mari-tₖ [az összes pénz-t egy ló-ra fel-ten-ni PROₖ]
Peter let Mary-ACC the all money-ACC one horse-on PFX-put-INF

ostobaság-á-banⱽ/k.
foolishness-POSS3SG-INESS
‘Peter let Mary put all the money on one horse in his/her foolishness.’

(7b) Péterj hagyta Mari-nakₖ [az összes pénz-t egy ló-ra fel-ten-ni PROC₆]
Peter let Mary-DAT the all money-ACC one horse-on PFX-put-INF

ostobaság-á-banⱽ/k.
foolishness-POSS3SG-INESS
‘Peter allowed Mary to put all the money on one horse in his/her foolishness.’

The ambiguous interpretation of the subject-oriented depictive predicate in (7a) and (7b) shows that both accusative causatives and dative causatives show Control properties (see section (ii) of 2.1 for details). This becomes especially clear if we compare the two types of causatives in (7a,b), with a perception verb taking an infinitival clause complement:

(8) Péterj láttja [Mari-tₖ az összes pénz-t egy ló-ra fel-ten-ni
Peter saw Mary-ACC the all money-ACC one horse-on PFX-put-INF

ostobaság-á-banⱽ/k].
foolishness-POSS3SG-INESS
‘Peter saw Mary put all the money on one horse in *his/her foolishness.’

The subject-oriented depictive predicate construes with the closest available subject in (8). The fact that Mary is the only available subject for the subject-oriented depictive predicate, shows that the perception verb in (8) must be analyzed as a dyadic ECM-predicate. Neither the accusative causative nor the dative causative patterns with the ECM construction given in
Dative causatives in Hungarian

(8). Tóth (1999) further argues that the causative verb in the accusative causative is dyadic because it does not accept a third argument, whether it is a clausal complement or an NP:

(9a)  *Peter\textsubscript{j} nem hagyta Mari-\textsubscript{t\textsubscript{k}} [hogy pro\textsubscript{k} az összes pénz-t

Peter not let Mary-ACC that the all money-ACC

fel-tegy-e egy ló-ra].
PFX-put-SBJ3SG one horse-on

'Peter didn’t let Mary that she should put all the money on one horse.'

(9b)  *Péter nem hagyta Mari-t az-t.

Péter not let Mary-ACC it-ACC

'Peter did not let Mary it.'

By contrast, the causative verb in the dative causative type is triadic given that it accepts a finite complement clause or a pronoun as its third argument:

(10a) Péter\textsubscript{j} nem hagyta Mari-nak\textsubscript{k} [hogy pro\textsubscript{k} az összes pénz-t

Peter not let Mary-DAT that the all money-ACC

fel-tegy-e egy ló-ra].
PFX-put-SBJ3SG one horse-on

'Peter did not allow Mary that she should put all the money on one horse.'

(10b) Péter nem hagyta Mari-nak az-t.

Péter not let Mary-DAT it-ACC

'Peter did not allow it for Mary.'

Whether a verb alternatively selects a finite clause complement or not is a lexical property of that verb, therefore, it is immaterial for the present syntactic analysis. The causative verb must be specified in the lexicon in such a way that these properties should follow automatically. Tóth (1999) also uses negative expressions and anaphors to support the ECM-analysis of accusative causatives. Unfortunately, negative expressions in Hungarian do not behave as true NPIs do in the so-called asymmetric negative concord languages (Puskás 2001, Surányi 2002). Therefore, their binding conditions are not conclusive for the syntactic structure of
causative constructions. Pronominal binding cannot be used as a diagnostic test to tell apart Object Control from ECM as it gives equally good results in both. The constituency tests given in Part 2 suggest that accusative causatives pattern with dative causatives insofar as they are both biclausal Control constructions. The difference between them is derived here from the internal organisation of the matrix VP-shell.

While the biclausal analysis proposed by Tóth (1999) is strongly influenced by the standard account of Italian causatives (Guasti 1992, 1996) in taking the causative verb in the accusative causative construction to be dyadic but that of the dative causative construction to be triadic, she makes no mention of by-causatives in her analysis at all. If we systematically compare Hungarian analytic causative constructions (Ackerman 1992, Komlósy 1999) with their Italian counterparts (Burzio 1986, Guasti 1996, 1997), we will discover that the two systems are not coextensive. First of all, the causative verb in the Italian accusative causative constructions accepts only intransitive infinitival verbs, (11a,b), while the causative verb in the Hungarian accusative causative construction occurs both with transitive and intransitive infinitival verbs, (1a,b):

**Italian accusative causative** (examples modelled on Guasti 1997)

(11a) Elena ha fatto lavora-re Gianni.

Elena have-3SG made work-INF Gianni-ACC

‘Elena made Gianni work.’

(11b) *Elena ha fatto ripara-re la macchina Gianni.

Elena have-3SG made repair-INF the car-ACC Gianni-ACC

‘Elena made Gianni repair the car.’

The Italian causative verb fare ‘make’ in the dative causative construction imposes the so-called transitivity restriction on the infinitival verb, just like its Hungarian counterpart does. As will become clear in 3.1, however, the dative causee in Italian functions as the subject of the infinitival verb, hence the Italian causative verb fare is, indeed, dyadic. In this respect, it clearly differs from the dative causative in Hungarian, where it is an argument of the triadic causative verb. Compare (2b), repeated here for convenience, with (12b) below:
Hungarian dative causative

(2b)  Mari\textsubscript{j} hagy-t-a az anyós-nak\textsubscript{k} [ki-\text{fizet-ni} PRO\textsubscript{k} \\
Mary let-PAST-3SG[DEF] the mother-in-law-DAT PFX-pay-INF \\
a számlá-t]. \\
the bill-ACC \\
‘Mary allowed the mother-in-law-DAT to pay the bill.’

Italian dative causative

(12a) *Elena ha fatto [lavora-re á Gianni]. \\
Elena have-3SG made work-INF to Gianni \\
‘Elena made Gianni work.’

(12b) Elena ha fatto [ripara-re la macchina á Gianni]. \\
Elena have-3SG made repair-INF the car to Gianni \\
‘Elena made Gianni repair the car.’

In Italian by-causatives, the da-phrase is an adjunct, so here again, the causative verb is dyadic. Italian da-causatives pattern with by-causatives in Hungarian, and not with dative causatives, as Tóth (1999) claims. Compare (3b) with (13b):

Italian by-causative

(13a) *Elena ha fatto lavora-re da Gianni. \\
Elena have-3SG made work-to by Gianni \\
‘Elena made Gianni work.’

(13b) Elena ha fatto [ripara-re la macchina] da Gianni. \\
Elena have-3SG made repair-INF the car by Gianni \\
‘Elena had the car repaired by Gianni.’
The chart in (14) summarizes these differences:

(14) Transitivity restriction in Italian and Hungarian analytic causative constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSATIVE+ INFINITIVE</th>
<th>IN ITALIAN</th>
<th>IN HUNGARIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSITIVE</td>
<td>INTRANSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-causative</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guasti (1996) proposes that the Italian causative verb "restructures" with the infinitival verb. This means that they form one single VP, hence the construction becomes monoclausal. Guasti (1996) gives the following example in support of her restructuring account, where two temporal adverbials with different time reference appear in the causative construction:

(15) *Ieri ho fatto lavorare Gianni oggi.
    yesterday have (I) made work Gianni tomorrow

Temporal adverbials are normally adjoined to T(ense)P. Locating two temporal adverbials with different time reference leads to ungrammaticality in (15). Guasti (1996) takes this to be evidence that there is only one temporal projection (TP), hence one clause here. Subject-oriented adjunct predicates, on the other hand, have two possible interpretations. They either construe with the matrix subject or with the infinitival subject. This is an indication of the original biclausal structure (example from Guasti 1997):

(16a) Adele, ha fatto cuocere il maiale [con un limone in bocca].
    Adele have-3SG made cook-INF the suckling pig with a lemon in mouth

    ‘Adele (with a lemon in the mouth) made the suckling pig cook (with a lemon in the mouth).’

The subject-oriented adjunct predicate con un limone in bocca ‘with a lemon in the mouth’ can be associated both with Adele and il maiale ‘the suckling pig’. This is only possible if we assume a PRO subject in the infinitival clause at some point in the derivation:
Dative causatives in Hungarian

(16b) Adele ha fatto il maiale [PRO\textsubscript{k} cuoce-re].
Adele have-3SG made the suckling pig cook-INF\textsubscript{intr}

[con un limone in bocca]\textsubscript{j/k}.
with a lemon in mouth

As will be shown in the rest of the paper, Hungarian causative constructions do not undergo restructuring. The object agreement facts in the dative causative construction can be explained by a syntactic well-formedness requirement imposed by the causative verb.

2 Arguments for the Control analysis of accusative and dative causative constructions in Hungarian

Accusative causatives and dative causatives in Hungarian show Control properties. The main difference between them is that in accusative causatives, the object agreement features (person/number/definiteness) of the causative verb are checked locally, by the accusative causee. In dative causatives, on the other hand, the same object agreement features of the causative verb are checked by the object of the infinitival clause via Attract (Chomsky 1995).

Dative causatives cannot accept intransitive infinitival predicates exactly because the causative verb requires that its object agreement features should be checked. Given that the dative causee occupies the intermediate specifier position of the matrix VP-shell, there is no suitable candidate to check the object agreement features of the causative verb within the matrix clause. Luckily, the object of the transitive infinitival verb does have the relevant object agreement features, which are not checked within the infinitival clause. The object of the infinitival clause is therefore attracted to the lowest specifier position of the matrix VP-shell to check the object agreement features of the causative verb by Attract (Chomsky 1995). A more detailed structural account of this construction will be given in 3.1. The proposed analysis is buttressed by the facts listed in (i)-(iv) below.

(i) Syntactic rules reflecting the argument structure of accusative causative constructions
Dalmi (2005) lists a couple of syntactic rules that move the infinitival clause and the accusative NP together as one syntactic unit. Accusative causatives are in sharp contrast with the ECM-constructions built on perceptive and cognitive verbs insofar as in the latter, such
movement rules yield correct sentences, whereas in accusative causatives they always fail. The different syntactic behaviour of perceptive/cognitive vs. causative verbs suggests that they have different syntactic structures.

*Perceptive* verbs are dyadic predicates taking a *perceiver* and a *perceived* as their arguments cross-linguistically. If the second argument is an event expressed by an infinitival clause, the lexical subject of the infinitival clause appears in the accusative case. This has been called the *Exceptional Case-Marking (ECM)* construction since Chomsky (1981).

In the ECM construction in (16a), the whole infinitival clause has been fronted to a position preceding the parenthetical *szerintem* ‘in my opinion’. Parentheticals typically appear on the left periphery of the clause, marking the borderline between the contrastive topic and the topic (Puskás 1997). The borderline is marked by the sharply rising intonation indicated by ‘/’ here. The grammaticality of (17a) suggests that the bracketed elements form a single syntactic unit:

*Contrastive topic with a parenthetical in ECM*

(17a)  
\[T_{Mari-t} \text{ füv-} et \text{ nyír-} ni, \text{ szerintem, } [T_{Kati}]\]  
\[\text{Mary-ACC grass-ACC mow-INF in my opinion Kate}\]  
\[\text{biztosan nem lát-t-a.}\]  
\[\text{surely not see-PAST-3SG[DEF]}\]  
\[\text{‘Mary mowing the grass, in my opinion, Kate surely did not see.’}\]

This is in sharp contrast with the *Object Control* predicates given in (17b):

*Contrastive topic with a parenthetical in Object Control*

(17b)  
\[*[Mari-t \text{ füv-} et \text{ nyír-} ni, \text{ szerintem, Kati biztosan}\]  
\[\text{Mary-ACC grass-ACC mow-INF in my opinion Kate surely}\]  
\[\text{nem hagya} / \text{tíva} / \text{küldte.}\]  
\[\text{not let/ invited/ sent}\]  
\[\text{‘Mary (to) mow the grass, in my opinion, Kate surely did not let/invite/send.’}\]

If the causative verb in (17b) showed the syntactic properties of ECM-constructions, we would get the same results with respect to Fronting as in (17a). The next constituency test
exploits the syntactic property of resumptive pronouns, which also appear at the borderline between the contrastive topic and the topic:

**Contrastive topic with a resumptive pronoun in ECM**

(18a) [Mari-t fűv-et nyír-ni], na azt/ ‘nem lát-t-am.
Mary-ACC grass-ACC mow-INF well that-ACC not see-PAST-1SG
‘Mary mow the grass, well, THAT I didn’t see.’

**Contrastive topic with a resumptive pronoun in Object Control**

(18b) *[Mari-t fűv-et nyír-ni], na azt/
Mary-ACC grass-ACC mow-INF well that-ACC

nem hagy-t-am.
not let-PAST-1SG
‘Mary mow the grass, well, THAT I didn’t let.’

The same contrast is found between (18a) and (18b) as in (17a) and (17b), showing that the accusative causee and the infinitival clause do not form a single syntactic unit. In the next example, the whole infinitival clause is forced to move to the Focus Phrase (FP), which can normally host only a single XP constituent. The infinitival clause of the *perception* verb and the accusative NP can comfortably be accommodated in FP in (19a). If, however, we try to squeeze the infinitival complement plus the *accusative causee* into the FP together as a single constituent in the *accusative causative* construction, we get poor results, (19b):

**Contrastive focus with clause negation in ECM**

Kate only Mary-ACC grass-ACC mow-INF not saw
‘It was only [MARY MOW THE GRASS] that Kate did NOT see.’

(He saw others do various other things.)

---

3 Finite argument clauses in Hungarian are generated under a complex DP, where the case-marked lexical (or empty, pro) referring word and the CP form an expletive-associate chain (Kenesei 1994):

(i) [DP [DP Az-t], [CP hogy Mari férfi-hez ment[]], nem tudtam.
it-ACC that Mary husband-to went not knew (I)
‘That Mary had got married, I did not know.’

Complex DPs cannot be focussed, this explains why (ii) is ungrammatical:

(ii) *[FP AZ-T], [CP hogy Mari férfi-hez ment[]], nem tudtam.
‘Only IT that Mary had got married, I did not know.’
What we can conclude from all this is that in the case of perceptive verbs like lát 'see', the accusative NP and the infinitival clause together form one single syntactic unit, whereas in the case of causative verbs like hagy/enged 'let/allow' and other Object Control verbs, they do not. This indicates that perception verbs take an ECM-infinitival clause complement with a lexical subject, while causative verbs are triadic predicates requiring an agent, a causee plus a Control-infinitival clause complement.

(ii) Split antecedents

Reflexive and reciprocal pronouns do not accept a so-called “split antecedent”, where the antecedent consists of two distinct referents. This has been traditionally used as a test to distinguish between ECM constructions, where the infinitival clause has a lexical subject and Object Control constructions, which have a phonologically empty PRO subject in the infinitival clause (Koster&May 1982). The reason why (20a) is grammatical is that the infinitival clause contains a PRO subject, i.e. it is an Object Control construction. If we were to accept the ECM-analysis for Type 1 Accusative Causatives, the plural reflexive pronoun ought to be bound locally, by the singular causee. The singular causee, however, cannot serve as a potential antecedent for the plural reflexive, as this would cause an interpretation conflict, as in (20b):

(20a) Péterj hagy-ta Mari-tk [le-fényképez-ni PRO_{j+k} maguk-at_{j+k}].
Peter let-past-3SG Mary-ACC PFX-photograph-INF themselves-ACC
‘Peter let Mary take a photograph of themselves.’

(20b) Péterj láttka [Mari-tk le-fényképez-ni maguk-at_{j+k}].
Peter saw Mary-ACC PFX-photograph-INF themselves-ACC
‘Peter saw Mary take a photograph of themselves.’
In (20a) both Peter and Mary are actively involved in the action while this interpretation is unavailable in (20b). This difference follows from the lexical-conceptual structure of Control vs. ECM verbs.

(iii) **Subject-oriented depictive predicates**

Subject-oriented depictive predicates, as their name suggests, construe with the subject and not with the object. In the ECM construction in (21a), the depictive predicate *szórakozottságában* 'in his absent-mindedness' construes only Mary but not with the matrix subject. This indicates that Mary is the lexical subject of the infinitival clause. The same subject-oriented depictive predicate is ambiguous in (21b) i.e. it construes both with Peter and Mary. The source of the ambiguity is that PRO accepts both NPs as its antecedent:

**ECM**

(21a) Péter játta [Mari-tk meg-gyújta-ni a cigarettá-t
Peter saw Mary-ACC PFX-light-INF the cigarette-ACC

*szórakozottságában j/k*.]

in *his/her absent-mindedness

‘Peter saw Mary light the cigarette in *his/her absent-mindedness.’

**Object Control**

(21b) Péter hagyta Mari-tk [meg-gyújta-ni PROk a cigarettá-t
Peter let Mary-ACC PFX-light-INF the cigarette-ACC

*szórakozottságában j/k*.]

in his/her absent-mindedness

‘Peter let Mary light the cigarette in his/her absent-mindedness.’

If we were to analyze the accusative causative in (21b) as an ECM-construction with a lexical subject in the infinitival clause, we would expect a construal similar to that in (21a). The ambiguous interpretation of the subject-oriented depictive predicate indicates that the accusative causative is a Control construction (Thráinsson 1979, Andrews 1982).

**Dative causatives** pattern with accusative causatives with respect to split antecedents and subject-oriented depictive predicates. Such co-variation in grammaticality is taken to be an indication of identical syntactic structure:
Split antecedents with the dative causative

(22a) Péter nem hagyta Marìnakk [le-fényképez-ni PROk maguk-atj+k].
Peter not let Mary-DAT PFX-photograph-INF themselves-ACC

‘Peter did not allow Mary to photograph themselves.’

Subject-oriented depictive predicate with the dative causative

(22b) Péter hagyta Marìnakk [meg-gyújta-ni PROk a cigarettá-t]
Peter let Mary-DAT PFX-light-INF the cigarette-ACC

szórakozottságábanj+k].
in his/her absent-mindedness

‘Peter allowed Mary to light the cigarette in his/her absent-mindedness.’

(iv) Dative causatives vs. Dative Control

It has already been shown that the accusative causative shows Control properties. In the light of the examples in (22a,b), dative causatives cannot be analysed as Dative ECM. Here I will briefly show that they cannot be analyzed as Dative Control either, contrary to Tóth (1999) given that the Dative Control class has different syntactic properties. Dative causatives involve a 3-place causative predicate while Dative Control constructions are built on 2-place unaccusatives (the piacere-class in Belletti&Rizzi 1988). In languages where Dative Control is found, the dative experiencer is required by the dyadic unaccusative predicate describing the physical, mental or psychological circumstances of the dative experiencer. The second argument is either a nominative theme or an infinitival clause:

(23) Marìnakj nem sikerül-t [fel-olvas-ni PROj a sajátj vers-é-t].
Mary-DAT not succeed-PAST3SG PFX-read-INF the own poem-her-ACC

‘Mary didn’t manage to read out her own poem.’

The Dative Control construction in (23), in fact, patterns with Subject Control. In many languages, the dative experiencer in Dative Control shows subject properties (see Cardinaletti 1997, 2004 on Italian dative experiencers, Sigurðsson 2001, 2004 on Icelandic non-nominative subjects, and Dalmi 2000 on Hungarian dative experiencer subjects). In dative causatives, by contrast, the causative verb requires three arguments (just like in accusative causatives), with the dative causee occupying the intermediate specifier position of the matrix VP-shell.
As the coindexation of the subject-oriented possessive reflexive saját 'own' suggests, it can be coreferential both with the nominative causer and with the dative causee. Such ambiguity is not found in dyadic Dative Control constructions.

3  Dative causatives as “double object” constructions

In dative causatives, the dative causee is in the intermediate specifier position of the VP-shell, while the infinitival clause is in the complement position of the verbal head. This construction is similar to the so called “double object construction” given in (25), where the direct object and the indirect object are also accommodated in the intermediate VP-layer, and the verb performs head movement (Larson 1988):

(25a) John sent a letter to Mary.

The existence of such intermediate layers can be verified by conjoining the direct and the indirect object. Conjoining the two NPs that do not normally form a natural syntactic unit is only possible if there is an intermediate VP present in the structure, containing both the direct object and the indirect object:
(26) John $[\text{VP} \text{sent} \ [\text{VP} \text{a letter to Mary}] \text{and} \ [\text{VP} \text{a book to Sue}]]$.

In a similar vein, conjoining the dative causee and the infinitival clause yields a grammatical sentence in (27), so we have good reasons to believe that these two constituents also form an intermediate layer within the VP:

**Conjunction**

(27) Péter $[\text{VP} \text{hagyta} \ [\text{VP} \text{[Mari-nak]} \ [\text{[ki-vasalni a ruhák-at PRO]}]], \text{és} \ [\text{VP} \text{[az anyós-nak]} \ [\text{le-mos-ni a szekrények-et PRO]]}]$.

[Peter let Mary-DAT PFX-iron-INF the clothes-ACC and [VP[the mother-in-law-DAT PFX-wash-INF the cupboards-ACC]]].

‘Peter allowed Mary(dat) to iron the clothes and the mother-in-law(dat) to wash the cupboards.’

### 3.1 Definiteness agreement in dative causatives

Den Dikken (2004) observes that in *dative causatives* the causative verb shows definiteness agreement with the object of the infinitival clause:

(28a) Péter hagy-ott Mari-nak megnéz-ni egy film-et.

Peter let-PAST3SG[-DEF] Mary-DAT watch-INF a film-ACC

‘Peter allowed Mary to see a film.’

(28b) *Péter hagy-ott Mari-nak megnéz-ni a film-et.

Peter let-PAST3SG[-DEF] Mary-DAT watch-INF the film-ACC

‘Peter allowed Mary to see the film.’

(28c) Péter hagy-t-a Mari-nak megnéz-ni a film-et.

Peter let-PAST3SG[+DEF] Mary-DAT watch-INF the film-ACC

‘Peter allowed Mary to see the film.’
(28d) *Péter hagy-t-a Mari-nak megnéz-ni egy film-et.
Peter-let-PAST3SG[+DEF] Mary-DAT watch-INF a film-ACC
‘Peter allowed Mary to see a film.’

This leads him to conclude that in Hungarian dative causatives “clause union” takes place, whereby the original biclausal structure becomes monoclausal. He further assumes that in the original biclausal structure, the infinitival clause has a lexical subject with an exceptional dative case. However, the Hungarian facts show that the dative causee is an argument of the causative verb:

ITALIAN (example from Guasti 1997)
(29a) Elena ha fatto [ripara-re la propria-\textsc{j/k} macchina] a Gianni_{\textsc{j/k}}.
Elena has made repair-INF the own car Gianni-DAT
‘Elena has made Gianni repair *her own/his own car.’

HUNGARIAN
(29b) Mária hagyta Péter-nek_{\textsc{j/k}} [megjavíta-ni PRO_{\textsc{j/k}} a saját_{\textsc{j/k}} autóját].
Maria let Peter-DAT repair-INF the own car
‘Maria allowed Peter to repair his/her car.’

In the Italian example in (29a) the subject-oriented possessive reflexive construes with the dative causee but not with the matrix subject. Reflexives must be bound within their minimal domain. The fact that such construal is possible only with the dative causee in Italian suggests that it must be an argument of the infinitival verb. In the Hungarian example in (29b), however, both interpretations are available, given that PRO can accept both NPs as its antecedents. This clearly shows that (29b) is a Control construction⁴.

Definiteness agreement with the infinitival object in dative causatives is required by the causative verb. Within the VP-shell, the dative causee occupies the intermediate specifier position. In the absence of the relevant object agreement features, the infinitival clause cannot occupy the lower specifier position, so it remains in complement position. Now we have an empty position and a causative verb with active object agreement features. The causative verb attracts the infinitival object to the designated object position of the matrix VP-shell:

---

⁴ Control is used here in the canonical sense, in which PRO has no case and does not move. This is motivated by the facts of Icelandic and Russian (see Sigurðsson 2006 and Neidle 1988 for the facts and arguments).
Dative causative

Dative causatives differ from accusative causatives (i) in showing overt definiteness agreement between the causative verb and the infinitival subject and (ii) in the internal organisation of the matrix VP-shell. The accusative causee occupies the intermediate specifier position within the VP-shell, while the lowest specifier position hosts the infinitival CP. This is due to the fact that the accusative causee itself has the relevant object agreement features that the causative verb requires, which makes the lowest specifier position available for the infinitival clause:
Accusative causative
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Péter hagyta Mari-t lenyírni PRO a füvet t
Peter let Mary-ACC mow the grass

‘Peter let Mary mow the grass.’

1st person subject–2nd person object agreement is marked by the -lak/lek portmanteau morpheme in Hungarian (see Bartos 1997 and Den Dikken 2004 for details). With a 1st person matrix subject and a 2nd person object inside the infinitival clause in dative causatives, this morpheme will show up on the causative verb:

not let-PAST-1SG[2SG] I John-DAT you-ACC PFX-photograph-INF
‘I did not allow John to photograph you.’

Here again the infinitival object moves by Attract overtly or covertly to check the object agreement features of the causative verb.\(^5\) In the present case, where the infinitival object is lexical, it can either move to the lower specifier position of the matrix VP-shell, as it has done in (32), or it can stay within the infinitival clause, as in (33). In the latter case, covert movement to the matrix intermediate specifier position is assumed:

(33) Nem hagy-ta-lak (én) János-nak [le-fényképez-ni PRO (téged)].
not let-PAST-1SG[2SG] I John-DAT PFX-photograph-INF you-ACC
‘I did not allow John to photograph you.’

\(^5\) Notice that Hungarian is a null argument language, where both the subject and the object can be safely dropped (Farkas 1987):

(i) Nem hagy-ta-lak [le-fényképez-ni PROj tkek].
not let-PAST-1SG[2SG] PFX-photograph-INF
‘I did not let you be photographed.’
The analysis proposed in this paper makes no reference to restructuring or clause union. In this way, it does not simply eliminate an unnecessary complication in the grammar of Hungarian but also preserves the C-domain of the infinitival clause, vital for cases when focussed and quantified expressions precede the infinitival verb but follow the causative verb. This will be discussed in the next section.

3.2 The C-domain of infinitival clauses

In the following examples, the capitalized focussed or quantified expression precedes the infinitival verb:

(34) Péter nem hagy-ott Mari-nak [CP a koalák-ról mesél-ni PRO].
    Peter not let-PAST3SG Mary-DAT only the koalas-about talk-INF
    ‘Peter did not allow Mary talk ONLY about koalas.’

(35) Péter nem hagy-ott Mari-nak [CP [QP MINDENKIRE] bátorítólag
    Peter let-PAST3SG Mary-DAT everyone-onto reassuringly
    mosolyog-ni PRO].
    smile-INF
    ‘Peter did not allow Mary smile reassuringly AT EVERYONE.’

The semantic content of the capitalized expressions unquestionably relates them to the infinitival verb mesélni ‘talk about sth’ and mosolyogni ‘smile at sb’, respectively. So we can claim that these expressions appear in the operator field of the infinitival C-domain in both examples (see Puskás 1997 on the C-domain of Hungarian clause structure). If clause union had really taken place, we would expect that the focussed or quantified expression related to the matrix causative verb should be able to freely scramble post-verbally with those related to the infinitival clause:

(36a) Péter nem hagy-ott CSAK Mari-nak [CSAK a koalák-ról mesél-ni PRO].
    Peter not let-PAST3SG only Mary-DAT only the koalas-about talk-INF
    ‘Peter did not allow Mary ALONE talk ONLY about koalas.’

6 The order Nem hagytalak (pro) tégéd János-nak le-fényképez-ni (not let (I) you-ACC John-DAT PFX-photograph-INF), where the infinitival object precedes the dative causee, can only be obtained by remnant VP-movement.
As we see in (36b), the free scrambling of the matrix and the infinitival *focussed expressions* is impossible (on the syntax of post-verbal focus and other operators see É.Kiss (1998). If the same test is applied to (37a), we get grammatical results because in this case the scope of the post-verbal quantified expression is shifted to the infinitival clause, (37b):

(36b) *Péter* nem hagy-ott [CSAK a koalák-ról CSAK Mari-nak]  
Peter not let-PAST3SG only the koalas-about only Mary-DAT

mesélni PROk].  
talk-INF  
‘the same’

(37a) Péter TÖBBSZÖR IS hagy-ott Mari-nak [CP [QP MINDENKI-RE]  
Peter several times let-PAST3SG Mary-DAT everyone-onto

bátorítólag mosolyog-ni PROk].  
reassuringly smile-INF  
‘Peter let Mary SEVERAL TIMES smile reassuringly AT EVERYONE.’  
(Peter’s allowance occurred several times.)

(37b) Péter hagy-ott Mari-nak [MINDENKI-RE TÖBBSZÖR IS  
Peter let-PAST3SG Mary-DAT everyone-onto several times

bátorítólag mosolyog-ni PROk].  
reassuringly smile-INF  
‘Peter let Mary smile SEVERAL TIMES reassuringly AT EVERYONE.’  
(Mary’s smiling reassuringly occurred several times.)

This data argues for an analysis without restructuring or clause union. The definiteness agreement facts follow from the requirement imposed by the causative verb to check its object agreement features by the syntactic operation *Attract*, which explains why intransitive infinitival verbs are unacceptable in *Dative Causatives*. 
4 Conclusion

In this paper I argued that * accusative causatives * and * dative causatives * in Hungarian are both built on a 3-place causative verb and they are both biclausal Control constructions. The two types differ in the organization of the matrix VP-shell. In the first type, the * accusative causee * is in the specifier position of the intermediate VP, and is capable of checking the object agreement features of the causative verb locally. In the second type, the * dative causee * sits in the same intermediate specifier position but it cannot check the object agreement features of the causative verb. The object of the infinitival clause is therefore attracted to the lowest specifier position of the matrix VP, where it can check these object agreement features. The proposed analysis discards restructuring or clause union, on the basis of evidence from the infinitival C-domain.
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Abstract

This paper presents a contrastive analysis of Finnish and Russian causative constructions involving grammaticalized ‘give’, drawing on data from the ParRus parallel corpus of Russian texts and their translations into Finnish (Michailov, 2003). It is shown that in both syntax and semantics, Finnish ‘give’ is more grammaticalized than its Russian counterpart. While both formants primarily express permissive (‘letting’) causation, the Finnish construction also expresses a range of factitive (‘making’) causative meanings. Moreover, the Finnish formant expresses a wider range of permissive meanings than its Russian counterpart. In both languages the imperative of the permissive has a special status expressing what may be called a first person singular imperative following Chrakovskij and Volodin (1986).

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

Treading a grammaticalization path attested in many languages (Newman, 1996; Lord et al., 2002; Heine and Kuteva, 2002), Finnish antaa and Russian davat’ ‘give’ have grammaticalized in analytical causative constructions, e.g.¹

(1) a. Ona ne dala dogovorit’ emu.
   She NEG give-PST:SG finish-speaking-INF him-DAT
   ‘She (Anna) didn’t let her finish speaking.’ (Tolstoj)²:

b. Anna ei antanut hänen puhua loppuun.
   Anna NEG-3SG give-PST:PTCP:SG him-GEN speak-INF end-ILL
   ‘She (Anna) didn’t let her finish speaking.’ (Tolstoj)²:

Despite the apparent similarity, these constructions differ deeply. As I will show in this paper, the Finnish construction is more grammaticalized in several respects: first, unlike its Russian

¹I would like to thank Jaakko Leino and Anna Suter for comments on a previous draft of this paper.  
²Gender and aspect in Russian are only indicated where relevant for the discussion. Departing from tradition, Finnish nouns with genitive or nominative morphology are glossed only according to morphological case and not as accusative if they syntactically function as direct objects. Abbreviations see the appendix.
counterpart, it is used in a dedicated causative construction; second, it has a broader meaning.

The paper is structured as follows. The present section introduces the typology of causatives used as the conceptual tertium comparationis in the comparison. Section 2 is concerned with the range of constructions ‘give’ in Russian and Finnish is used in, involving literal transfer, causative, and imperative functions. Section 3 introduces a study of the use of these formants in the RamRus parallel corpus; section 4 focusses on the usage of causative ‘give’ and translation patterns involved in terms of the typology laid out below.

1.2 Causative constructions

Following Nedjalkov and Sil’nickij (1969) and Shibatani (1976), causatives express complex situations consisting of two subsituations, one which is conceptualized as being a (not necessarily the only) cause for the other. The main actor of the causing subsituation and of the complex situation as a whole is the causer, the main actor of the caused subsituation is the causee. For example, in the causative Peter let/had/made Paul cry, the causing subsituation (whatever Peter did to let, have or make Paul cry) remains largely underspecified, while the caused subsituation is made explicit (Paul cried). Here, Peter is thus the causer and Paul the causee; the different auxiliaries express the type of causative link between the two situations.

Modes. The first main opposition relevant in the comparison below concerns the type of the causative link, distinguishing permissive (‘letting’) and factitive (‘making’) causation (Nedjalkov and Sil’nickij 1969; Comrie 19853). These terms denote what I call principal modes of causation that find reflection in grammaticalized distinctions in the worlds’ languages and that can be interpreted as transitivations of the basic modal operators CAN and MUST (Nedjalkov, 1976:23):

“With factitive causation, the primary or only source of change on the referential level is the causing subject: I ordered him to come […], I closed the door, I frightened him.

With permissive causation, the primary source of these changes is the caused subject and the role of the causing subjects comes down to the admission or hindrance of these changes: I allowed him to come, I (didn’t) let him in, he (didn’t) let the door fall shut.”4

---

3 A third category Nedjalkov and Sil’nickij (1969) mention in this context is assistive causation, which is found much less frequently; this is very close to what Shibatani and Pardeshi (2002) call associative causation and situate on a continuum between direct and indirect causation.

4 “Pri faktitivnoj kauzacii pervoistočnikom ili edinstvennym istočnikom izmenenii na referentnom plane javl-
**Domains.** A second important dimension concerns the *degree of control* (Lehmann, 1991) the causer / the causee has in the resulting macrosituation. Positing control as the relevant category is compatible with approaches taking semantic roles (e.g. Hashimoto, 1989) or the distinction between unaccusative, unergative and transitive verbs (Shibatani and Pardeshi, 2002), as it represents an abstraction over semantic roles as well as verb classes. To see the relevance, consider that it is intuitively clear that causation by a human on a thing (or on a human without control) is quite different from a human telling another human to do something, or a thing being the reason for something to happen. Elaborating on these parameters partly based on Koo (1997), one can distinguish three principle *domains of causation* (von Waldenfels, 2003, 2012:19f); see e.g. Stefanowitsch (2001); Chappell and Peyraube (2006) for similar approaches:

- **Manipulative causation** — only the causer has control: A human agent acts volitionally on a non-volitional patient (*Peter throws the ball*) or a volitional patient without control (*Peter kills Paul* or *Peter lets Paul die*)

- **Interpersonal causation** — causer and causee have control:
  A human agent causes another human agent that is thus also a patient to do something volitionally: *Peter makes/has/lets Paul do the dishes.*

- **Impersonal causation** — the causer is inanimate:
  Something (a force or an event) is the cause for an animate or inanimate agent or patient doing or experiencing something (voluntarily or involuntarily): *This made Paul laugh* or *This ended everything* or *What made you decide to leave me?*

- **Cognitive causation** — the causee is an experiencer:
  Verbs of perception and other cognitive processes constitute a special class of causation since they denote actions that are in a sense involuntary as they happen, but cannot be said to be beyond the control of their experiencer. Cognitive causation is lexicalized in stimulus-experiencer or experiencer-stimulus verbs (En. *to frighten; to show - to see*, Ger. *erschrecken* (trans./intr.), Fi. *nähdä ‘see’ – näyttää ‘show’, etc).

This typology thus presents a selective combination of the parameters of the causer’s animacy and the causee’s control. In the corpus-based analysis reported in section 3 below, animacy, rather than control, will be partly used as an approximation for these types. Before turning to
this section, however, a qualitative assessment of the syntactic constructions in question in the two languages is in order.

2 Constructions involving ‘give’ in Russian and Finnish

2.1 Literal and causative give

In this section, I first introduce the construction in which *davat’* and *antaa* express literal transfer and causation, respectively. I then describe further structures with these verbs in order to assess the position of the causative construction among them.

**Literal giving.** Russian *davat’* and Finnish *antaa* are the canonical verbs denoting transfer in these languages, comparable to English *to give*, German *geben* or (cognate with Russian) Latin *dare*. In both cases, the construction involves standard marking: with the Russian construction, the agent is subject and marked nominative, the recipient an indirect object in the dative and the patient, the thing given, is the direct object marked accusative:

(2) **Ivan dal Petru knigu.**

Ivan give-PST:3SG Petr-DAT book-ACC

‘Ivan gave Petr the book.’

In a similar way, with *antaa*, the agent is expressed as a nominative subject and the patient as a canonical direct object (in either nominative, genitive or partitive case, depending on syntactic context). The recipient takes the allative, the standard case for abstract recipient functions⁵:

(3) **Kalle antaa kirjan Villelle.**

Kalle give-3SG book-GEN Ville-ALL

‘Kalle gives Ville the book.’

**Causative giving.** The surface structure of example (2) is paralleled in the syntax of the *causative* use of *davat’,* as seen in (4):

(4) **My dali emu nemnožko pootdochnut’ . . .**

We give-PST:PL him-DAT a-bit relax-INF

‘We let him relax a bit . . . ’ (Leskov)

---

⁵The Finnish examples in this paragraph are based on Leino (2005).
The syntax of *davat’* in causative usage differs from the basic construction solely in the replacement of the direct object (the patient) by an infinitive denoting the caused action together with its complements. Agent/causer and recipient/causee are coded identically. Together, this constitutes a standard dative object control construction as it is also used with other verbs that take predicates as complements, e.g., with ‘allow’, ‘help’ or ‘command’:

(5) My pozvolili / pomogli / veleli emu ujti.
    We allowed / helped / commanded-PST:PL him-DAT go-away-INF
    ‘We allowed/helped/commanded him to go away.’

In Finnish, in contrast, *antaa* is used in a different construction if used as a causative as opposed to its literal use. The difference lies in the form of the causee, i.e., the participant corresponding to the recipient: in the causative construction, the causee is marked with the genitive, rather than with the expected allative. Like in Russian instead of a the direct object denoting the thing given a non-finite verbal form is present. This non-finite form is called the *first or DA-infinitive* (see Leino, this volume) in the Finnish tradition; for simplicity, I will refer to this form simply as ‘infinitive’ without qualification. Like in Russian, the infinitive and its complements denote the caused event:

(6) Kalle antaa Villen syödä omenan.
    Kalle give-3SG Ville-GEN eat-INF apple-GEN
    ‘Kalle lets Ville eat the apple.’

Unlike the Russian construction, this construction does not fit well into the general marking schemes of core arguments in Finnish; the causee is neither coded like a recipient (i.e., as allative), as in Russian, nor like a direct object (i.e., accusative if pronominal or genitive and nominative otherwise). Rather, the causee is given invariably in the genitive case, the default case for the main actant of non-finite clauses constructed with the first infinitive in Finnish (Koskinen 1998:229f, Hakulinen et al. 2008.§492, 502).

This construction — a clausal complement clause consisting of the first infinitive with the logical subject of the complement clause in the genitive — is called the *permissive construction* in the Finnish linguistic tradition. Three other verbs (not all permissives) appear as the main predicate aside from *antaa: sallia ’allow’, käskeä ’order’, suoda ’grant, allow’:

(7) Kalle sallii/ käskee/ suo Villen syödä omenan.
    Kalle allow-3SG/ order-3SG/ grant-3SG/ Ville-GEN eat-INF apple-GEN
    ‘Kalle allows/orders Ville to eat the apple.’
All of these verbs denote causation. For this reason, I will speak of this construction as the *causative construction* for the purposes of this article.

**Related structural types.** I will now turn to related constructions that show that the status of the Finnish causative construction is rather special and quite different from the status of the Russian one. First, it should be mentioned that an infinitive can serve as a complement of the direct object in the transfer construction, in both languages:

(8) a. Kto dal emu pravo davit’ menja?
   Who-NOM give-PST:SG him-DAT right-ACC pressure-INF me-ACC 
   ‘Who gave him the right to pressure me?’ (Oleša)

In Finnish, this yields a structure that is superficially similar to the causative construction, while in Russian, it is unambiguously an instantiation of literal *giving* by virtue of the allative case coding of the recipient.

In both languages a secondary predicate can be added with the help of a non-finite form. In Russian, it is the infinitive that is used to denote that an action that the recipient performs on the thing transferred. In fact, this construction is systematically ambiguous between literal *giving* and *letting* in Russian:

(9) Ivan dal Petru knigu počitat’.
    Ivan give-PST:3SG Petr-DAT book-ACC read-INF.
    ‘Ivan gave Petr the book to read.’ or ‘Ivan let Petr read the book.’

The conditions that govern causative/non-causative interpretations are not easily formulated. According to Leino (2005:108), the interpretation of *antaa* in Old Finnish could depend on the order of the infinitive and its complements. A similar tendency is plausible for the Russian case, where the above example with the infinitive following its notional object is probably more readily understood as literal *giving* than in reversed word order as in

(10) Ivan dal Petru počitat’ knigu.
    Ivan give-PST:3SG book-ACC Petr-DAT read-INF.

Ambiguity in these sentences rests on the possibility of interpreting an object of the infinitive as an object of giving as well as other contextual semantic factors. The following attestation is, for example, not ambiguous:
In (11), *kopii* cannot be interpreted as the object of *davat* but only as object of *snimatʹ*, the subordinate infinitive, since it is clearly the *letter* which is being passed around, not its copies. The sentence can therefore only be construed as causative.

In contrast to the Russian construction, the Finnish construction is not structurally ambiguous. Secondary predicates are not expressed with the first infinitive that encodes the complement in the causative construction. Rather, a passive participle in translative case is used:

(12) Kalle antaa kirjan Villelle luettavaksi.

‘Kalle gives the book Ville to read.’

Translative case is standard marking for secondary predicates, cf.

(13) Kalle antoi sen lahjaksi/ välipalaksi/ syötäväksi

‘Kalle gave it as a present/to a snack/to eat’

Therefore, the causative construction in Finnish is generally unambiguous by virtue both of causee coding (genitive) and of the coding of the lexical verb of the complement clause (first infinitive).

According to Leino (2005:108-111), the marking scheme of the causative construction was historically that of the transfer construction with a secondary predicate, since what is now the infinitive was formerly a lative case form that could denote a purposive adverbial; the genitive was used in dative function up to early written Finnish. The history of *antaa* constitutes an unorthodox example of a grammaticalization split. Diachronically, not the grammaticalized, but the literal form changed in Finnish; nevertheless, from a synchronic perspective, the grammaticalized meaning was assigned increasingly non-standard marking.

**Conclusions.** Overall, *davatʹ* in causative meaning involves a rather transparent dative control construction also found with other, non-causative verbs. The causee is coded like the recipient in the literal giving construction in the dative. Since secondary predicates are encoded with the infinitive, the same non-finite form as the clausal complement in the causative construction,
there is quite an overlap in surface structure. This leads to some ambiguity.

This construction represents a rather general scheme with what constitutes the default marking of agents, patients and recipients/beneficiaries respectively; it can be supplemented by standard secondary predicates. It is thus little specialized.

In contrast, the Finnish construction is not ambiguous and has lost its synchronic link with the literal giving construction entirely. Causative antaa is used in a dedicated causative construction it shares with only few other verbs. This constitutes a case of grammaticalization both in respect to the construction itself as well as in respect to the the verbs that enter it, which become part of a small paradigm of causative formants.

2.2 Use of give in imperative constructions

The imperfective imperative of give in Russian, davaj ‘Give!’ has developed into a fairly general imperative marker and serves to form a hortative\(^6\) or imperative first person plural, as in

\[(14)\] Davaj(te) spojem (pf)! / (budem) pet’ (ipf)!
Give-IPFV:IMP:2SG(2PL) sing-PFV:1PL! / AUX-1PL sing-IPFV:INF
‘Let’s sing (pf/ipf)’

This development, probably a case of reinforcement (see Barentsen 2003a; von Waldenfels 2012 for more details), does not have a counterpart in Finnish; rather, synthetic forms such as lukekaamme/luetaan ‘let’s read’ are used.

In another construction involving the imperative of give in permissive meaning the parallels between Russian and Finnish are, however, rather conspicuous. In this construction, the second person imperative of antaa or davat’ is continued by a finite verb in the first person singular. The structure is analogous in both languages, e.g.:

\[(15)\] a. Davajte ja pojdu pojišču ognja […]
Give-IMP:2PL I go-1SG look-for-1SG fire-GEN
b. Antakaa minä menen etsimään tulta […]
Give-IMP:2PL I go-1SG look-for-INF3:ILL fire-PAR
‘Let’s I look for fire.’

In a variant, the finite verb clause is introduced with the conjunction kun ‘as, when’ in Finnish; this finds no parallel in Russian:

This use constitutes a first person7 singular imperative – an imperative where the speaker informs the listener that he is going to do something and by doing so tries to cause the completion of this action (Chrkovskij, 1992:7). Such a first person imperative is sometimes found in the paradigm of synthetic imperatives, but generally, it is the ‘least easily grammaticalized’ (van der Auwera et al., 2011) of all persons and it is typically formed with other, more analytical means; in Russian, the particles daj / davaj are a case in point (Chrkovskij, 1992:123 ff.).

The parallels between Russian and Finnish in this domain are striking and it has been suggested that language contact with Russian, perhaps mediated by Carelian, has indeed played a major role in the development of this construction in Finnish (Leskinen 1968:310, see Leino 2003:228f. for further discussion and an overview over the Finnish construction; see Barentsen 2003b, 2006 for Russian). Significantly, this extension of the permissive is not noted in languages closely related to Russian such as Polish or Czech (von Waldenfels, 2012:90 ff.).

2.3 Subjectless third person singular in Finnish

A further, rather peculiar construction is furthermore notable in Finnish. It was met frequently in my corpus:

(17) a. - Davaj! - kriknul on traktoristam.
    - Give-3SG-INFRM PST:SG he tractor-driver-DAT:PL
    b. - Antaa mennä! tämä huusi traktorinkuljettajille.
    - Give-3SG go-INF! DEM:NOM PST:3SG tractor-driver-DAT:PL
    ‘Let’s go! he shouted to the tractor drivers.’ (Šukšin)

(18) a. Spali by sebe da spali na dobroe zdorov’e!
    Sleep-3PL IRR REFL:DAT CONJ sleep-3PL for good health-ACC
    b. Antaa nukkua, omaksi terveydeksenään nukkuvat!
    Give-3SG sleep-INF, own-TRA health-TRA-POSS-EMPH sleep-3PL!
    ‘May they sleep / let them sleep, they sleep for their own health!’ (Čechov)

---

7According to Leino (2003:227f.) third person predicates are also possible, but there were no such cases in my corpus.
This construction is a bit puzzling: for certain phonological reasons \textit{antaa} is clearly third person singular\textsuperscript{8} here, and therefore these constructions look syntactically like the Finnish impersonal construction consisting of a predicate in third person singular without overt subject: In sentences like the following a generic agent is implied:

\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{There-ADE get:3SG good-PAR coffee-PAR} \\
\text{‘One gets good coffee there’}
\end{tabular}

Semantically, though, this analysis doesn’t make much sense. The agent is definite, not generic. These constructions denote the imperative\textsuperscript{9} of the permissive or factitive with various other components added: in (18), this is indifference, in (20), urgency:

(20) a. [... ] ja iz-za tebja golodnym sidet’ budu? Net, ... I because you-GEN hungry-INS sit-INF FUT:AUX:1SG No, vkalyvaj, padlo!
\text{work-IMP2SG, scum!}

b. [... minä istun ] sinun takia nälässä? [...] \textit{antaa} vaan \textit{heilua}!
\text{[...I sit ] you-GEN because hunger-INE [...] give-3SG only swing-INF!}
\text{‘... because (you don’t work) I’m supposed to sit hungry? \textit{Finnish}: let it swing!}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{\textit{Russian}: No, work, scum!’(Solženicyn)}
\end{tabular}

I have not found the syntax of these constructions discussed in the literature. Leino (2003:133-136) mentions them in the context of the lexicalized use of \textit{mennä} and \textit{tulla} without going into syntactic details; however, as the above examples show, this construction is used not only with these verbs (and these verbs are also used with the regular causative construction in a purely compositional way). I consider this structure to be a special type of imperative of \textit{antaa} in the permissive construction with further pragmatic meaning components. The nature of these constructions is left for further research.

\textsuperscript{8}Infinitive and third person singular of \textit{antaa} look identical in writing. But as the infinitive in Finnish ends in a glottal stop not fixed in writing and under certain conditions assimilated to the first plosive of the following word, \textit{antaa}_{inf} \textit{tulla} could be pronounced \textit{antaattulla} if the verb were in the infinitive; this is not the case. I am indebted to Ilmari Hovila, Munich, for kindly pointing this out to me.

\textsuperscript{9}Note that an infinitive would be equally puzzling here, since Finnish does not use the infinitive in imperative function, as does Russian or German.
3 Davat’ and antaa in the parallel corpus

3.1 The data

The contrastive analysis of the use of davat’ and antaa is based on data from the Tampere Par-Rus corpus of Russian literature translated into Finnish. Searches for davat’ and antaa in this corpus produced 3168 and 4363 examples, respectively, which were subsequently categorized according to their semantics and syntax using a variety of criteria refined in successive steps of annotation. The use of this parallel corpus makes it possible to use the translation of davat’ into Finnish as a window into the meaning of the two formants. Note that the data warrant only limited conclusions, since the corpus does not contain Finnish originals or translations from Finnish into Russian.

In the annotation of causative use factitive (‘make’; only noted in Finnish) and permissive causation (‘let’; both languages) was distinguished, as well as the use of cognitive verbs (‘let somebody know’) and ambiguous cases only relevant in Russian (dat’ knigu počitat’ ‘let someone read a book / give someone a book to read’). Instances of causative use were annotated in respect to animacy of causer and causee, polarity, use of the morphological imperative and the complement verb involved. Furthermore, the translation of causative davat’ into Finnish was categorized and annotated. In Finnish, whether or not antaa was used as a translation of davat’ was likewise marked, while only a selection of examples was annotated according to their translational source in Russian.

3.2 Quantitive overview over construction types

The overall profile given in table 1 shows that given the contexts provided by this parallel corpus, antaa is generally more frequent than davat’. This is mainly due to a higher frequency of literal giving and causative use of antaa.

In both languages, the transfer construction is by far the most frequent type. Antaa is used more frequently in this function, which is at least partly due to collocations and light verb constructions; use of give as a light verb seems to be more frequent in Finnish than in Russian. According to a rough search, the light verb construction antaa anteeksi ‘to give excuse = to excuse’ alone may account for up to 500 of the 3500 instances labeled as syntactically belonging to the transfer type.

---

10ParRus: Tampere University School of Modern languages and Translation Studies Corpus of 19th and 20th century Russian literature and its Finnish translation, see Michailov (2003). For further information contact: Michail Michailov (Mihail.Mihailov@uta.fi).
Table 1: Distribution of usage types in the annotated corpus for antaa and davat’, in absolute and relative terms.

Table 1 also shows that the giving-imperative is clearly much more marginal in Finnish than it is in Russian, where it accounts for around a sixth of the total number of occurrences of davat’. This type includes both the Russian hortative (Rs. davaj pet’ ‘let’s sing’) and the first person imperative (both Rs. daj IMP:2SG sdelaju1SG and Fi. anna IMP:2SG minä teen1SG ‘let’s I do it’). The higher frequency of davat in this category is unsurprising since the Russian regular hortative is formed with davaj/te; the Finnish construction is not comparable in its generality.

More unexpectedly, the causative construction is both in absolute and relative terms more frequent with antaa than with davat’. This points to a higher functional load of this construction in Finnish than in Russian, an interpretation we will return to below.

### 3.3 Delimitation to productive types: let it be, let it go and let it come in Finnish

In Finnish, the three most frequent complement verbs of permissive antaa cover 34% of all permissive instances: olla ‘to be’ (91 out of 536 instances), mennä ‘to go’ (84) and tulla ‘to come’ (33). In all cases involving these verbs, antaa was not translated from causative davat’.

The next three verbs were not nearly as frequent: nukkua ‘to sleep’ (15), puhua ‘to speak’ (13) and elää ‘to live’ (8). These verbs were in part translated from Russian davat’.

In Russian there is no such contrast: the 3 most common verbs cover only about 12% of all permissive instances and are not basic verbs but rather more or less brought to the fore by peculiarities of my corpus: opomnit’sja ‘to come to one’s senses’ (13 instances out of 254), spat’ ‘to sleep’ (11), dogovorit’ ‘to finish speaking’ (7).

Antaa olla, mennä and tulla are thus clearly collocations of a special status. It is not clear, however, whether they are to be treated as lexicalizations. The following attestation, for example, is perfectly compositional:
In other cases, some element of permissive meaning is retained, but the pattern of usage and the pragmatic function goes clearly beyond the compositional meaning of *antaa* ‘let’ plus *mennä* ‘go’, ‘to let go’. In Russian, it is the isolated imperative of *davat’* alone that often serves a comparable function of enticement or encouragement, c.f. the following example where these two uses are translational equivalents:

(22) a. Hän [...] antoi tämän sormiin lasin [...] : – Anna
He … give-PST:3SG this-GEN hands-ILL glas-GEN – Give-IMP:2SG
mennä!
go-INF

b. On […] dal emu v palcy stakan […] : – Davaj!
He … give-PST:SG him-DAT in fingers-ACC glas-ACC : – Give-IMP!

‘He put the glas into the other person’s fingers: Let’s go!’

The same is true of *antaa tulla* ‘let come’:

(23) a. Odota, Fedja, […] . No niin, anna tulla...
Wait, Fedja … Now ok, give-IMP:2SG come-INF

b. Pogodi, Fedja, […] . Davaj, davaj...
Wait, Fedja … give-IMP:2SG, give-IMP:2SG

‘Wait, Fedja … now, go on…’

In the case of *antaa olla* ‘let be’, its semantics cannot be derived from a hypothetical complement clause in cases like (24):

(24) a. Ty moix časov ne trogaj!
You my-GEN watch-GEN NEG touch-IMP:2SG!

b. Anna sinä minun kelloni olla.
Give-IMP:2SG you my-GEN watch-GEN:POSS be-INF.

Russian: ‘Don’t touch my watch!’ , Finnish: ‘You let my watch be!’

The corresponding base sentence (*minun kelloni on* ‘my watch is’) is not complete, quite parallel to German and English *etwas sein lassen* / *to let something be*. It is open to speculation whether
Table 2: Distribution of causative *davat’* and *antaa* in terms of animacy of causer and causee. Halflexicalized *antaa tulla, mennä* and *olla* as well as cognitive verbs are listed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>animacy of causer/causee</th>
<th>permissive/factitive</th>
<th>cognitive</th>
<th>Finnish halflex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>both animate</td>
<td>Russian 214</td>
<td>Finnish 333</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animate inanimate</td>
<td>Russian 21</td>
<td>Finnish 109</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inanimate animate</td>
<td>Russian 17</td>
<td>Finnish 5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both inanimate</td>
<td>Russian 3</td>
<td>Finnish 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>255</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 gives an overview over the distribution of causative uses in the corpus according to animacy of causer and causee. In both languages, a combination of animate causer and causee is the most frequent case. This is in line with the selectional constraints characteristic for the transfer construction where both agent and recipient are typically animate. With *antaa*, we see that manipulative causation has a much greater weight than in with *davat’*, at least if we exclude *antaa olla, mennä* and *tulla* as discussed above. Note, that animacy of causer and causee does not map directly to interpersonal vs. manipulative causation, since intransitive unaccusative complement verbs (as e.g. in *let die*) classify the construction as belonging to the domain of manipulative causation even if the causee is animate. However, this difference is neglected here.
### 4.2 Interpersonal causation.

In the interpersonal domain, the most conspicuous difference between the two formants is that *davat'* only expresses permissive causation, while *antaa* also expresses the factitive. However, this is not the full story. The comparison of the use of *antaa* and *davat'* is instructive in showing that there are clear differences in use also in the permissive domain.

#### 4.2.1 Interpersonal permissive causation

Translation statistics of interpersonal *davat'* are given in table 3: in about 65 percent of the cases the Russian auxiliary is translated as *antaa*. Only around 7% involve a translation in a construction with one of the other two permissive verbs, *sallia* and *suoda* ‘allow, grant’; another 3% involve other matrix verbs. This shows that there is no analytic causative construction that can numerically compete with *antaa* in the domain equivalent to the domain of *davat’*.

The expression of permissive causation between volitional agents is clearly the basic and most commonly found usage of both *antaa* and *davat’*. In this domain we find many cases of completely parallel translations, where the causer acts willfully with the aim of permitting the causer to go ahead with whatever he wants to do (which might include continuing an activity already started), e.g. the next examples in positive (25) and negative (26) polarity:


b. Me annoimme him-GEN levähtää hieman […]

We give-PST:1PL relax-INF a-bit […]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>abs.</th>
<th>rel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>causative <em>antaa</em></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free translation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literal giving (transfer)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other causative auxiliaries</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical/morphological causatives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other matrix verbs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not translated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: How interpersonal *davat’* was translated into Finnish. **Transfer** relates to *antaa* in transfer syntax and semantically similar verbs; **other causative auxiliaries** to *sallia* and *suoda* ‘allow, grant’ that have the same marked syntax as *antaa*; **other matrix verbs** to verbs like *estää* ‘hinder’ or *saada* ‘may, be allowed to’ with standard syntax but a second verbal element. **Lexical/morphological causatives** designate univerbal causative expressions with or without causative morpheme, e.g. *päästää* ‘to let go’.
Table 4: Instances of *davat’* and *antaa* with animate causee and causer labeled as permissive: in absolute and relative terms. In addition, the table shows the number of instances where causative *davat’* was translated by causative *antaa*. The absolute number of these instances is supplemented with their relative amount in relation to all instances of *antaa* and *davat’*. *Antaa* in subjectless 3SG listed separately; *antaa olla, tulla* and *mennä* not taken into account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>interpersonal permissive</th>
<th>davat’ abs.</th>
<th>davat’ rel.</th>
<th>antaa abs.</th>
<th>antaa rel.</th>
<th>davat’ translated as antaa abs.</th>
<th>davat’ translated as antaa rel.</th>
<th>of davat’</th>
<th>of antaa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negated</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negated imp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>antaa</em> in SL3SG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘We let him relax a bit’  

(26) a. Ne dajut delat’ kapital’nych vloženij! vozmuščalsja Ostap.  

b. Ei anneta tehdä perussijoituksia! Ostap  
Ei anneta! NEG-3SG give-PASS make-INF capital-investments-PAR! Ostap suuttui. be-angry-PST.3SG NEG give-PASS!  

‘They don’t let you make capital investments! Ostap raged. They don’t!’  

(II’f&Petrov)

However, an example like (25), which is neither negated nor imperative, is much less characteristic of *davat’* than it is of *antaa*. Table 4 summarizes the use of *antaa* and *davat’* in respect to negation and the morphological imperative. It additionally shows to what extent examples labelled as interpersonal permissive in Russian were translated using causative *antaa* for each combination. This allows us a limited contrastive perspective into the use of the two formants.

Let us first focus on negative versus positive polarity. Table 4 shows that in over half the cases, *davat’* is used under negation (note that this is not an artefact of the corpus sample; see a similar finding for a much larger sample in von Waldenfels 2012:54f.). Example (26) is thus rather typical for Russian. For *antaa*, in contrast, negative polarity is much less typical with only 30% of all uses, even though the fact that all Finnish instances in the corpus were translated from Russian results in a bias for the Finnish attestations to use a similar construction like the Russian one. This bias is visible in the fact that 77% of the uses of negative *antaa*
were directly motivated by the use of Russian *antaa*; conversely, only 60% of negative *davat’* was translated into Russian using *antaa*. In other words: if the negated permissive was used in Finnish, this was usually directly motivated by a negated permissive in Russian, but even given this, a rather large proportion (40%) of the Russian negative permissives were not translated by *antaa*. I interpret this to mean that in non-translated texts, the use of negative permissives involving *antaa* is even more unusual. A rather typical example of non-analogous translation, involving a polarity reversal, is shown in (27):


‘Pretty much in the same way that shepherds do not let their bulls fight and cripple each other (Finnish: keep their bulls from fighting)’ (Strugackie)

Conversely, if we look at positive polarity, only 24% of the uses of causative *antaa* were motivated by analogous use of *davat’*. Rather, it was used much more often independently, translating a large variety of Russian formants ranging from explicit speech-act verbs of allowing (28) to the optative particle *pust’* (29):


‘No procurator, my assistant allowed/let him take part in the funeral.’ (Bulgakov)

(29) a. Pust’ poprobujut. I ničego strašnogo s nimi ne OPT try-3PL. And nothing-GEN terrible-GEN with them-INS NEG slučitsja. happen-3SG.

b. Antaa niiden yrittää. Eikä niille mitään kamalaa Give-3SG them-GEN try-INF. NEG-3SG them-ALL nothing terrible-PAR
Ruprecht von Waldenfels

tapahdu.
happen-STEM.
‘Let them try. Nothing terrible will happen to them.’ (Aksenov)

These two examples illustrate that evidently, the range of functions of permissive antaa is larger than in Russian, and a more careful analysis of these functions is called for. For the purposes of this study, suffice it to say that negative not letting is typical for Russian davat’, while other, affirmative uses are more prominent with antaa. These uses seem to encompass both a wider range of permissive meaning (including what would be expressed by speech act verbs in Russian), and other meanings one can call post-permissive, since they have evidently arisen as an extension of the permissive. However, a detailed contrastive assessment of the meaning potential of antaa is beyond the scope of this study.

**Imperative of the permissive.** The last example (29) illustrated the use of antaa in a function comparable to an optative marker in Russian. This brings us to the imperative of the permissive, which, as I would like to propose, has likewise further grammaticalized in a post-permissive domain, namely, in the direction of a first person singular imperative, briefly introduced on page 195 above. I have to restrict myself to a sketch of the argument, since the material used in this study is too restricted for a proper treatment.

Our starting point is the fact that the usage frequency of the permissive imperative is remarkably high in both languages, comprising about one quarter of all cases of causative usage respectively (see above table 2). An example is given in (30):

(30) a. Dajte tolo’ko probeg okončit’.
    Let-IMP:2PL only race-ACC finish-INF.

b. Antakaa minun vain päätää ajoni.
    Let-IMP:2PL me-GEN only finish-INF drive-GEN:POSS

‘Let me just finish my race’ (I’lf & Petrov)

In von Waldenfels (2012:90ff.) I show on the basis of a much more comprehensive data sample that in closely related Polish, a similar prevalence of the imperative of the permissive like in Russian is not found. This is remarkable, since the give-permissives in these languages are otherwise quite similar. The contrast is quite apparent in translations, where the Russian permissive imperative often has a Polish equivalent that involves an analytical first person imperative construction involving the particle niech, rather than the cognate daj, e.g. in a translation from English:
This example illustrates three rather different strategies to express a first person singular imperative, that is, an announcement to the listener that the speaker is about to do something and does not wish to be interfered with. In von Waldenfels (2012:90ff.) I argue that the frequent use of the imperative of permissive *give* in Russian, but not Polish, is linked to its function as a first person singular imperative. In Russian, and it seems, in Finnish, too, the permissive semantics of *give* in the imperative of the permissive has become, so to speak, bleached, and the mere announcement of some action, rather than a real request for permission or non-intervention, is in the foreground in examples such as (31).

One further interesting observation concerns parallels in the use of *anna* and *daj* with infinitive and with a finite clause, as in (30’), a constructed example parallel to (30), only with finite clause:

(30’) a. Dajte toļ’ko probeg okonču.
   Let-IMP:2PL only race-ACC finish-1SG.

   b. Antakaa minä vain päätän ajoni.
   Let-IMP:2PL me-NOM only finish-1SG drive-GEN:POSS
   ‘Let, I’ll just finish my race’

In Russian, the differences between these two constructions are rather subtle. Barentsen (2003b, 2006:27) sees them as consisting in different degrees of autonomy of the speaker; therefore, Barentsen argues, it is not felicitous to use the finite construction with non-controllable actions. For this reason, *dajIMP mneDAT umret’INF* ‘let me die’ is not equivalent to rather questionable 2*dajIMP umru1G* ‘let’s I die’, ‘I propose I’ll die now (actively)’ (my examples). A similar contrast seems to be valid between Finnish *annaIMP minunGEN kuollaINF* ‘let me die’ and *annaiMP minäNOM kuolen1SG* ‘let’s I die’.

Summarizing, I claim that the data point to a far-reaching parallelity of the use of the imperative of *give* as a first person singular imperative in Finnish and Russian, both in the causative construction proper and with a finite clause.

The fact that a) the finite clause construction is used in Russian and Finnish, but neither in Polish, although closely related to Russian, or in Swedish (Staub, p.c.), the most important
contact language of Finnish, together with b) the high frequency of the use of the imperative of the permissive shared by these languages can be seen to support the hypothesis that the Russian and Finnish constructions were influenced by each other (see section 2.2 above). However, a more detailed comparison would need to investigate the use of the imperative of *give* in both the causative and the finite complement construction. Since the present study is primarily concerned with the causative use of *give*, this has to be left to further research.

**Conclusions.** While generally, both *antaa* and *davat’* express permissive causation, the parallel corpus perspective reveals interesting divergences and convergences in use. Generally, it seems safe to say that the domain of causative *davat’* is included in the domain of *antaa*, which goes beyond the Russian formant mainly in the use in affirmative permissive causation. Russian *davat’*, in turn, has its core of use in *negative letting* (see von Waldenfels (2012)); this meaning is likewise notable in Finnish, but generally, it seems less characteristic. Semantically, therefore, we can say that *antaa* is more grammaticalized in the sense that it is more general, i.e., less specific, and extends into post-causative domains.

In both languages, the imperative of the permissive is exceptionally frequent. I attribute this to a functional extension towards a first person singular imperative that is shared with a related construction involving *give* with finite complement found in both languages.

4.2.2 Interpersonal factitive causation

If we find a large overlap between the two languages in the domain of permissive causation, turning to factitive causation in the interpersonal realm we find a much more pronounced contrast. Factitive causation is generally not expressed using *davat’* in Russian. In Finnish, we find several types of factitive causation, which will be only briefly presented here.

**Curative causation.** Of 37 cases of interpersonal factitive use of *antaa*, 22 were of the very pronounced kind exemplified in the following two examples:

    I him-ACC hang-1SG

b. Minä annan hirttää sen mien!
    I give-1SG hang-INF this man-GEN
    ‘I’ll have him (this man) hanged!’ (Puškin)

(33) a. Komentaja antoi heti pidättää aliupseerin ja määräsi
    Commander give-PST:3PL soon arrest-INF officer-GEN and appoint-PST:3SG
    Julain hänen sijaansa.
    Jula-GEN him-GEN place-ILL.
b. Komendant nemedlenno posadil urjadnika pod karaul, a Commander immediately make-sit-PST:SG officer-ACC under arrest-ACC, and
Julaja naznačil na ego mesto.
Jula-ACC appoint-PST:3SG in his place-ACC.

‘The commander had the officer immediately arrested and appointed Jula in his place.’

(Puškin)

Here *antaa* denotes a situation that involves a command to an inferior. However, rather than the interaction of causer and causee, the realization of the caused activity and its effects is foregrounded. *Antaa* in these cases serves to signal that whatever is intended is not performed by the causer in person, but by someone else on the causer’s initiative. Typically, the causee is not important and not mentioned, as in the above examples. In the Russian source text, causation remains implicit; only world knowledge and pragmatic inference make clear that the commander neither hangs nor arrests the respective victim *in persona*, but has this done by others on his behalf.

This very pronounced type constitutes *curative causation* (von Waldenfels, 2012:18), a term originally used in the Finnish tradition to denote any morphological causatives expressing interpersonal causation (Pennanen, 1986:163f). It is well known that this type of causation is often left unmarked. Mainly in respect to Russian, verbs allowing such readings have been labeled service causatives (Lötzsch, 1972; Babby, 1983) or contextual causatives (Nedjalkov 1976:29, Toops 1987); the same phenomenon can be found in languages as diverse as Latin and Japanese (Hashimoto, 1989). In Finnish, morphologically derived causatives (Hakulinen et al., 2008:§313) may be used to express this type; cf. a rephrasing of the above example:

(33) a’ Komentaja heti pidätytti aliupseerin. Commander soon arrest-CAUS-PST:3SG officer-GEN.

‘The commander immediately had the officer arrested.’

The difference between the use of *antaa* and the use of morphological causatives in this function seems to be of a rather stylistic nature; note that the morphological construction is advocated from a prescriptive point of view in Pennanen (1986:165f).

In absolute numbers, the construction with *antaa* was not very frequent in my corpus: there were 22 examples with 18 different verbs; this wide spread points to its productivity. It should be noted that besides unmarked curatives of the type illustrated above, the Russian sources also involved explicit verbs of causation such as *velet* ‘to command’ or *zastavljat* ‘to make, force’, albeit to a much lesser degree.
Other factitive types. There were other uses of *antaa* in factitive interpretation. In the next example, the causee does not play the role of a service provider:

(34) a. [...] ona [...podumala], gde udobnee položit’ spat’ – she [...thought] where more-comfortably lay-INF sleep-INF Katavasova – otdel’no ili vместе s Sergeem Ivanyčem. Katasov-ACC – separately or together with Sergej-INS Ivanyč-INS

b. [...] Kitty mietti [...], olisiko mukavampi antaa [...] Kitty thought – be-CND-INT more-comfortable give-INF KatavasoVIN nukkua samassa huoneessa Sergei Ivanovitšin kanssa Katasov-GEN sleep-INF same-INE room-INE Sergei Ivanyč-GEN together vaiko erikseen. or separate–ILL.

‘She wondered whether it would be more comfortable to put Katasov into (have him sleep in) the same room with Sergej Ivanyč or not’ (Tolstoj)

Here, *antaa* serves as a marker of abstract factitive causation directed at the causees action. In Russian, this is paralleled by the use of a lexical causative (‘where to lay him’); using causative *davat’* in this sentence would suggest that Katasov *wants* to sleep in one room with Ivanyč – which would be misleading. Unlike *davat’,* *antaa* can denote causation of something as undesirable as waiting:

(35) a. [...] kogda Bolgarinov […] zastavil ego dva časa dožidat’šja when Bolgarinov made-PST:SG him-ACC two hours wait-INF […] v priemnoj, emu vdrug stalo nelovko in reception-PREP, he-DAT suddenly became-PST:SG uneasy

b. [...] kun Bolgarinov […] oli antanut hänen when Bolgarinov be-PST:3SG give-PST:PTCP:SG him-GEN odottaa pari tuntia […] vastaanotthuoneessaan, hänestä oli wait-INF few hours reception-room-INE he-ELA be-PST:3SG alkanut tuntua nololta began-PST:PTCP:SG feel-INF uncomfortable-ABL

‘When Bolgarinov had made him wait two hours in the reception, he had suddenly started to feel uneasy’ (Tolstoj)

These instances show that *antaa* does not enforce permissive interpretation, as *davat’* does, which is in this context clearly out of place. The situational context leads to a factitive interpretation of *antaa;* *davat’,* in contrast, is not sufficiently semantically empty for this. Higher specificity – the other side of the coin of lower degree of grammaticalization – is what makes *davat’* semantically different from *antaa.*
Possible links between *give* and factitive causation. There were four cases of overlap where factitive *antaa* was a translation of *davat'*. These cases are interesting in as far as they shed light on one of the ways factitive causation with *give* might have evolved. These examples were annotated as structurally ambiguous with the infinitive being either a secondary predicate or a complement to the auxiliary. They do not reflect factitive use of *davat'*, but rather a large scope of possible interpretations on the situational level:

(36) a. [u nas] inok Gerontij byl, dal on mne odin raz
    [with us] munk Gerontij was, give-PST:SG he me-DAT one time-ACC
    čitat' žitie prepodobnogo Tichona […].
    read-INF life-ACC holy-GEN Tichon-GEN

b. Meillä oli eräs munkki […] Kerran hän antoi minun lukea
    us-ADE was one munk – once he give-PST:3SG me-GEN read-INF
    pyhän Tihon […] elämänkerran.
    holy-GEN Tihon-GEN – life-story-GEN
    ‘There was a munk with us (who) once gave me to read (had me read) the life of
    Tichon.’ (Leskov)

Here the Finnish translation expresses factitive causativity, which is perfectly in line with the depicted situation but not explicitly given in Russian. Cases like these offer a possible starting point for grammaticalization as a factitive: something is given so that the recipient can or should do something with this thing.

A different grammaticalization path is also conceivable. Note that non-curative type of causation, which is oriented not towards something being done by a service provider, but rather towards the complex causation of somebody’s action, is only marginally possible with *give* in Czech, a language closely related to Russian. In Czech, where curative causation is the only productive type of factitive causation expressed with *dávat’* ‘give’ (von Waldenfels, 2012:208ff.).

According to Toops (1985:40f.) *davat’* may actually denote what amounts to curative factitive causation, but only in the case that (a) transfer meaning is in principle a possible interpretation with the object concerned, and (b) the beneficient (or causee) is missing, as in

(37) a. Ja dal pocinit’ mašinku.
    I give-PST:SG fix-INF typewriter-ACC.
    ‘I had the typewriter repaired’
However, this possibility is completely marginal: no such example was found either in this corpus nor in a much larger corpus of over 6000 attestations with infinitive reported in von Waldenfels (2012). Still, this possibility is marginally present. It is this type which grammaticalized in the Slavic languages Czech and Polish.

Since the curative use of give is marginally possible in Russian, the only type in Czech, and the dominant type in Finnish, we can speculate that it is this type of cauasion which lies first in a grammaticalization channel from give to factitive causative. In this view, other types of factitive causation were developed later.

Conclusions. In the realm of interpersonal causation, antaa is clearly a more general causative marker than davat’ is. In contrast to the latter, the Finnish formant encompass both permissive and factitive causation. In addition, it has a more general range of permissive meaning. In the factitive domain, it clearly goes beyond curative meaning, the only factitive type that is marginally present in Russian and that has grammaticalized in other Slavic languages.

4.3 Manipulative causation

Manipulative causation is much less frequent than interpersonal causation with both antaa and davat’, which is well in line with the observation that prototypical causation is expressed with lexical causatives. Many of the instances in the corpus involve metaphors or metonymies with inanimate things depicted as animate:

(38) a. Izredka toľko ona podnimala golovu, čtoby dat’ otdochnut’ seldom only she lift-PST:SG head-ACC, CMP:CND give-INF rest-INF svoej utomivšejšej ľieť her exhausted-DAT neck-DAT

b. Vain harvakseen hän kohotti päätään antaakseen only seldom she lift-PST:3SG head-PAR:POSS give-INF:TRA:POSS uupuneen kaulansa levähtää [. . . ] exhausted-GEN neck-GEN:POSS rest-INF

‘Only seldom did she lift her head to let her exhausted neck rest’ (Čechov)

Permissive manipulative causation. The contrast between factitive and permissive manipulative causation is intrinsically different from the same contrast in the domain of interpersonal causation. In interpersonal permissive causation, the crucial part is the intention of the volitional causee: the causer allows, or does not interfere with, whatever the causer does or wants to do. In the manipulative domain, in contrast, the causee is not volitional, so its intention does not play a
role. Typically, the causer does not interfere with a process that is in some way autonomous, for example, a spontaneous natural process such as falling, drying etc. or some other independent development, e.g.

(39) a. Neznakomec ne dal Stepinomu izumleniju
stranger NEG give-PST:SG Stjopa-POSS:DAT amazement-DAT
razvit’ja do stepeni boleznennoj i lovko nalil
develop-INF to degree-GEN unhealthy-GEN and swiftly poured-PST:SG
emu polstopki vodki.
him-DAT half-glass-GEN vodka-GEN

b. Tuntematon ei antanut Stjopan hämmästyksen
stranger NG-3SG give-PST:PTCP:SG Stjopa-GEN amazement-GEN
kehittyä ylenpalttiseksi, vaan sukkelasti hänelle puoli
develop excess-TRA, but swiftly poured-PST:3SG him-ALL half
lasillista voktaa.
glass-ELA vodka-PAR
‘The stranger did not allow Styopa’s amazement to develop to a morbid degree,
but deftly poured him half a glass of vodka.’ (Bulgakov)

Here, a situation unfolding on its own is interfered with by the causer. Put positively, permissive manipulative causation may involve a causer that simply waits in inaction while the caused situation unfolds, cf. the next example:

(40) a. […] Nastena […] primolkla, davaja tečeniju stjanut’
… Nastena … fell-silent-PST:SG give-CVB current-DAT carry-away-INF
ščitik za derevnju.
boat-ACC behind village-ACC

b. Nastena […] oli hiljaa, antoi virran kuljettaa ruuhen
Nastena … was silent, give-PST:3SG current-GEN lead-INF board-GEN
kylän ulkopuolelle.
village-GEN outside-ALL
‘Nastena fell silent and let the current carry the boat outside of the village.’

A further type of permissive situation is given if a static situation is not interrupted, as in (41).

This type cannot be denoted by davat’ (von Waldenfels, 2003:48ff.):

(41) a. Dolja ego, kak i sledovalo ždat’, kolchoz zabrosil.
Part his, as also had-to-PST:SG:N wait-INF kolchoz let-empty-PST:SG

b. Niin kuin sopi odottaa kolhoosi antoi hänen peltojensa
so as fit-3SG wait-INF kolchoz give-PST:3SG his fields-GEN-POSS
kesannoiuta.
lie-fallow-INF.
‘As was to be expected, the kolchoz had let his lots lie fallow.’ (Rasputin)
Table 5: Instances of permissive manipulative causation (animate causer and inanimate causee).

Generally speaking, the comparison shows that *antaa* is both more freely and more frequently used in the manipulative domain than *davat’* is. There are many collocations in the Finnish sample that would not be constructed with *davat’* in Russian: *antaa asian raueta* ’let a matter rest / drop the matter’, translated from several Russian constructions in the corpus; *antaa partansa kasvaa* ’let one’s beard grow’, as opposed to rs. *otpustit’ borodu* ‘grow a beard, lit. discharge’, and others. Since the data basis is restricted to translations in Finnish, a more detailed comparison is not warranted here. Table 5 suggests that permissive *antaa* is about twice as frequent as permissive *davat’*, and we will see below that since the categorization of permissive vs. factitive causation allows a rather large area of overlap in the manipulative domain, this may actually be too low an estimate. Also note that the amount of negated instances seems to be comparable in the two languages; however, numbers are generally too low and partly skewed by the aforementioned collocational differences.

**Factitive manipulative causation.** Both languages express causations that involve a causer that provides the circumstances for the caused situation and then waits in inaction while the situation unfolds. One such case was in the corpus:

(42) a. Polivat’ ne očen’ obil’no[...] A vode davat’ postojat’ sutki. water-INF NEG very plentiful and water-DAT give-INF stand-INF day. Čtob chlor iz nee... COMP:CND chloride from it-GEN

b. Eikä tarvitse kastella kovin runsaasti. [...] Kasteluveden And-not need-3SG water-INF very plentiful – splinklewater-GEN pitäisi antaa seistä vuorokauden, että kloori need-CND:3SG give-INF stand-INF day, COMP chloride haihtuisi. vanish-CND:3SG ‘Don’t water too much...And let the water stand one day, so that the chloride disappears.’ (Dudincev)
Here, the causer is understood to initiate the caused situation and thereby bring it about; therefore, such a situation can also be viewed as factitive causation. This makes unambiguous categorization of real examples difficult, since to a certain extent not the situation, but the way it is conceptualized plays the decisive role in the interpretation of the sentence. Therefore, the semantic contribution the causative marker *davat’/antaa* makes cannot be deduced from many examples in this domain. The more natural, uncontrollable or otherwise independent the caused process, the more ‘objective permissiveness’ is given; the less this is the case, the more ‘objective factitivity’ is given. Only clear cases lend themselves for diagnostic tests; many intermediate cases cannot be used without introducing circularity.¹¹

The fact that the Finnish formant expresses much more advanced situations on this cline between permissive and factitive causation in the manipulative domain becomes clear when one considers cases of the following type. Here, the causee is not only clearly the only acting participant, but there also isn’t an element of self-induced motion or some other independently initiated process on the causee’s side; therefore, this was considered as factitive and annotated accordingly:

(43) a. Aleša ostanovil svoj vzgljad na čučeleg pticy i zadumalsja.  
    Aljoša stopped his gaze-ACC at puppet-PREP bird-GEN and started-thinking

b. Aljoša antoi katseensa pysähtyyn pintuun ja  
    Aljoša give-PST:3SG eyes-GEN:POSS halt-INF stuffed-ILL bird-ILL and vaikeni.  
    fell-still.

    ‘Aljoša stopped his gaze / let his eyes stop on the stuffed bird and fell silent.’  
    (Čechov)

The situation in (43) cannot be expressed with *davat’*; *davat’ svoemu vzgljadu ostanovit’sja* ‘to let one’s gaze stop’ would presuppose one’s eyes to move independently of their inactive owner. This situation is not in line with the semantics of *davat’* in manipulative use, which is semantically more specific and geared towards the permissive than *antaa*. Cases such as the last were rather typical of the Finnish part of the corpus, often involving body parts and many collocations not used in Russian, e.g. *antaa jotakin pudota* ‘let something fall, drop something’, *antaa päänsä painua* ‘let one’s head sink’, *antaa katseensa kiertää* ‘let one’s eyes go around’. Again, these collocations make it hard to give the limited amount of data available in the corpus a quantitative interpretation.

¹¹Note that this relation may provide a ground for the transition of a marker of permissive causation to one of mediated, i.e., indirect factitive causation.
Table 6: Instances of davat’ and antaa with animate causer and inanimate causee. See above table 4.

While antaa thus also expresses factitive causation, this clearly does not involve clearly direct factitive causation, as it is expressed by morphologically derived causatives like valvoa ‘be awake’ → valvottaa ‘keep awake’, sulaa ‘to melt’ → sulattaa ‘to melt’ (tr.) or pudota ‘to fall’ → pudottaa → ‘to drop’. With antaa, there is usually some autonomous element present in the caused situation, and it does not denote the causation of an event against some inherent tendency.

Since the categorization of manipulative causatives is much more arbitrary than that of interpersonal causatives, in table 6 the frequencies of davat’ and antaa are shown irrespective of mode of causation. Again, the numbers suggest relation of set inclusion: antaa seems to translate davat’ most of the time, but goes far beyond its domain of usage.

Conclusions. We can conclude that in manipulative like in interpersonal use, davat’ is less frequent and semantically more specific than antaa. While the opposition of permissive and factitive causation is less clear in this domain, the Finnish formant clearly covers a wider semantic domain reaching from the permissive well into the factitive. Nevertheless, antaa is clearly restricted in this domain and has not developed into a fully-fledged factitive that can express arbitrary direct factitive causation.

4.4 Cognitive causation

The final type of causation to be discussed here involves the causation of mental states independent of the will of the causee. In these cases, the causer does something in order for the causee to experience something:

(44) a. On otvetil mne tak, davaja ponjat’, čto ja ne
He answer-PST:SG me-DAT so, give-CVB understand-INF, COMP I NEG
arestovan
arrested-PTCP:PST:PSS
This type is discussed here for the sake of completeness. It is evidently linked to giving in a more basic way than permissive or factitive causation in the other domains, and it is quite clearly at least partly lexicalized. In Russian, this is the only type involving unambiguously factitive causation. In both languages there is a clear pattern of a few very frequently used complement verbs on the one hand and other verbs used less frequently, on the other:

Finnish: ymmärtää ‘understand’ (28), kuulua ‘be audible’ (18), nähdä ‘see’ (4), tuntea ‘feel’ (1), päästää ‘arrive (decision)’ (1), maistaa ‘taste’ (1), katsoa ‘look’ (1), aavistaa ‘suspect’ (1)

Russian: znat’ ‘know’ (53), ponjat’ ‘understand’ (19), počuvstvovat’ ‘feel (pf.)’ (11), čuvstvovat’ ‘feel (imp.)’ (4), zametit’ ‘notice’ (1), zaključit’ ‘conclude’ (1)

In Finnish antaa kuulua differs from the other cases, as kuulua ‘to be audible’ does not take a human subject. Technically speaking, it should be included in the manipulative domain. I’ve retained it here, since the main participant of the caused situation is clearly the non-expressed experimenter:

(45) a. Dast o sebe znat’ - soobščite nam.
give-3SG about REFL-PREP know-INF inform-IMP:2PL us-DAT.

b. Ilmoittakaa meille, jos antaa kuulua itsestään
Inform-IMP:2PL us-ALL, if give-3SG hear-INF self-ELA:POSS
‘Inform us if he gives a sign of himself’ (Rasputin)

In the Russian part of the corpus this construction is rather more frequent than in the Finnish part. The numbers given in table 7 show that, unlike in the case of all other modes, davat’ is used here nearly twice as often as antaa. This is quite surprising, given that interference during translation would work to increase the frequency of antaa. The percentage of negated clauses is markedly high for Russian, again. Here, however, this can largely be attributed to a single verb: 14 out of 18 negated instances involve davat’ znat’. The relative amount of davat’ translated as antaa is quite low in comparison, but note that due to the strong impact of individual lexical
Ruprecht von Waldenfels

cognitive

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & \textit{davat'} & \textit{antaa} & overlap \\
 & abs. & rel. & abs. & rel. & rel. to \textit{a} & rel. to \textit{d} \\
\hline
negated & 18 & 19\% & 1 & 2\% & 1 & 100\% & 1\% \\
affirmative & 71 & 76\% & 52 & 93\% & 29 & 56\% & 41\% \\
imperative & 2 & 2\% & 3 & 5\% & - & - & - \\
neg. & \textit{antaa} & - & - & - & - & - & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 7: Instances of cognitive causation; details see above table 4.

verbs the numbers given in this section are likely to be skewed.

5 Conclusions

Summarizing the findings regarding the degree of grammaticalization, we can state that causative \textit{antaa} is further grammaticalized than causative \textit{davat'} because

- as a construction, it is more specialized, sharing a small paradigm of semantically close verbs as opposed to \textit{davat'} that uses less specialized marking schemes.

- as a causative, it has a wider range of causative meanings, i.e., it is less specific. With \textit{davat'} it shares merely a core of meaning. In respect to permissive meaning, \textit{antaa} is used more freely and more frequently than \textit{davat'}. Moreover, in contrast to its Russian counterpart, it also expresses factitive causation. \textit{Antaa} has thus undergone more semantic bleaching than \textit{davat'} has in respect to both interpersonal and manipulative causation.

Several issues could only be touched upon in this study. Most importantly, perhaps, the data basis for this study in relation to Finnish is rather questionable, since only translated texts were taken into account. This means that these results need to be re-examined in the light of non-translated corpus data.

In any case, however, the contrastive perspective has yielded several interesting hypotheses that should be validated on the basis of more comprehensive data. Generally, it would be worthwhile to examine the range of use of the Finnish formant in both the permissive and the factitive domain more closely and confirm the results found here. A comparison to Swedish could shed light on the question to what extent language contact has been a driving factor in the development of \textit{antaa}. The use of the imperative of the Finnish permissive would need to be investigated on the basis of more and better material in order to examine the question whether or not it is really as remarkable as it seems on the basis of the data used in the present study.
Generally, only a more comprehensive, corpus based typological investigation into the use of causative markers can tease apart what are so to speak automatic, purely compositional configurations, and which are functional domains that are covered in the course of rather specific further developments.

Lastly, I would like to point out that many parallels of causative *antaa*, and, to a lesser degree *davat’*, are apparent in respect to permissive constructions in Germanic and other European languages. It is an open question to what extent these parallels reflect universal pathways of further grammaticalization of the permissive, and to what extent they reflect language contact in a European sprachbund. One can expect both factors to play a role, albeit very differently for, e.g., Russian and Finnish, both peripheral languages of Europe in different senses of the word.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADE</td>
<td>adessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>illative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INE</td>
<td>inessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>partitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFL</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA</td>
<td>translative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

As a highly inflectional language, Finnish typically expresses causative meanings through verb derivation. Yet, analytical causative constructions are fairly common as well, especially for expressing broadly speaking ‘permissive’ meanings. This paper presents an overview of a selection of such constructions and their possible meanings in Finnish. The main focus is on the so-called permissive construction (cf. Leino 2003, 2005; von Waldenfels, this volume). The construction exemplifies an ambiguity often found in analytical causatives: it may express both ‘permitting, letting’, as the name implies, and ‘causing, instigating’. Related Finnish analytical causative constructions are analyzed in relation to the main focus. The aim of the paper is twofold. On the one hand, I analyze the force dynamic patterns grammaticalized into the analytical causative constructions under study. On the other hand, I present the versatility of existing constructions and the variation found in those constructions, which has important implications with regard to both morphosyntactic and typological research.

1. Background and building blocks

This section provides some background concepts for the discussion of the Finnish analytical causative constructions in the subsequent sections. I shall briefly discuss the key notions of analytical causative in section 1.1 and permissive causation, specifically in terms of force dynamics (cf. Talmy 1985, 2001), in section 1.2. In section 1.3, I shall present some basic features of Finnish morphosyntax in order to facilitate the discussion of several Finnish analytical causative constructions in subsequent sections.
1.1. Analytical causatives

For the purposes of the present paper, *analytical causatives* may be characterized as expression types which convey either a meaning of ‘causing’ or ‘letting’ in the sense discussed in section 1.1 and which consist of a matrix verb which expresses the event of causing/permitting and a (typically non-finite) verb which expresses the caused/_permitted event. Participants of these two events are typically also present, but their morphosyntactic coding varies, as we shall see. Other things being equal, however, the subject of the matrix verb corresponds to the actor of the event of causing/permitting.

Analytical causatives contrast with synthetic (or morphological) causatives, in which causativity is indicated with a specific morpheme, typically attached to the verb. The two can be thought of as different strategies of expressing causativity, and languages variably employ either one, or both, of the two for expressing various causative meanings. Finnish employs both morphological causatives, as in (2), and analytical causatives, as in (3):

1. *Hiiri juoksee pellolla.*
   
   mouse-NOM run-3SG field-ALL
   ‘The mouse runs on the field.’

2. *Kissa juoksuttaa hiirtä pellolla.*
   
   cat-NOM run-caus-3SG mouse-PAR field-ALL
   ‘The cat makes the mouse run on the field.’

3. *Kissa pakottaa hiiren juoksemaan pellolla.*
   
   cat-NOM force-3SG mouse-ACC run-INF3-ILL field-ALL
   ‘The cat forces the mouse run on the field.’

There is a wide range of meanings which may be (and have been) characterized as “causal-tive”. In the present paper, I shall focus on *permissive causativity*, contrasting it to some extent with *factitive causativity*. I shall not attempt a comprehensive overview of neither causative meanings nor causative constructions; the interested reader is referred to classics like Comrie & Polinsky (1993), Shibatani (1976, 2002).
1.2. Permissive causation

By *permissive causation* I mean a situation in which one participant permits, enables or fails to hinder some action or state-of-affairs. In other words, a permissive event consists, in fact, of two subevents: the act of permitting, henceforth (*the event of*) causing/permitting, and the action or state-of-affairs made possible through this other event, henceforth *the caused/permitt ed event*. In addition, there is at least one participant who controls the overall situation, the *permitter*, and practically always also another participant, the actor of the permitted event. Other participants may or may not be present, particularly in the permitted event:

(4) Anna let the children play [football] [with a pumpkin] [in the attic].

(5) Anna antoi lasten leikkiä [jalkapalloa] [kurpitsalla] [ullakolla].
   Anna-NOM let-PST-3SG child-PL-GEN play-INF1 football-PAR pumpkin-ALL attic-ALL
   ‘Anna let the children play [football] [with a pumpkin] [in the attic].’

In order to facilitate discussion on different permissive expression types in sections 2 and 3, let us build a wireframe model of different basic types of permissive causation. In order to do so, I shall use the notion of force dynamics introduced by Leonard Talmy (e.g. 1985, 1986, 1988, 2001). According to Talmy (1988: 49) force dynamics is interested in ”how entities interact with respect to force”. Crucial aspects of this approach are such things as active use of force, resisting another participants force, overcoming an obstacle, preventing someone or something from using force, removing an existing obstacle, etc. etc.

The basic building blocks of force dynamics are simple. First of all, Talmy speaks of the *agonist*: the element foregrounded for focal attention. Second, there is the antagonist: another element considered for the effect that it has on the agonist. In the basic force dynamic setting, one of these entities is taken to exert a force by virtue of an intrinsic tendency towards either rest or action/motion. These opposed forces have different relative strength, and the entity that is able to manifest its tendency at the expense of its opponent is the stronger one. Talmy uses the following graphic illustrations in his analysis:
### Entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Intrinsic tendency</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agonist (AGO):</strong></td>
<td>towards action: &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antagonist (ANT):</strong></td>
<td>towards rest: •</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Relative strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Resulting state</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stronger entity:</td>
<td>action: ▶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weaker entity:</td>
<td>rest: ▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:** Basic building blocks of force dynamics.

This graphic notation can be used to illustrate different force dynamic settings as in figure 2:

**Figure 2:** Basic force dynamic patterns.

In figure 2, *AGO* stands for the agonist, and *ANT* for the antagonist. In setting (a), the agonist has an intrinsic tendency towards rest, whereas the antagonist has a tendency towards action. Since the antagonist is stronger than the agonist, the resulting state is action. In setting (b), the tendencies of the agonist and the antagonist remain the same, but since the agonist is stronger than the antagonist, the resulting state is rest. Also in setting (c), the agonist is the stronger entity, and the resulting state is the same as the agonist’s intrinsic tendency, i.e. action. In setting (d), the antagonist is the stronger entity, and therefore, despite the agonist’s tendency towards action, the resulting state is rest.

Thus, what these figures show are different settings formed by the agonist and the antagonist, with different relative forces between them, and with different inclinations of the
agonist and with different states as a result of these settings. Each of these basic force dynamic settings can be illustrated by the following (perhaps a bit awkward) sentences, taken from Talmy (1988: 55):

(6) The ball kept rolling because of the wind blowing on it.
   – stronger AGO moving ANT

(7) The shed kept standing despite the gale wind blowing against it.
   – weaker AGO not being able to move ANT

(8) The ball kept rolling despite the stiff grass.
   – weaker AGO not being able to stop ANT

(9) The log kept lying on the incline because of the ridge there.
   – stronger AGO keeping ANT from moving

The force dynamic patterns presented in figure 2 are basic in that in those cases, the overall setting remains the same. However, there may also be a change in the setting—notably, the antagonist may start or stop having an effect on the agonist. This will lead to more complicated settings such as those illustrated in figure 3:

![Diagram of force dynamic patterns](image)

**Figure 3:** Shifting force dynamic patterns.
These settings are illustrated by the following sentences, again taken from Talmy (1988: 57):

(10) The ball's hitting it made the lamp fall.
    – stronger AGO beginning to move ANT

(11) The water's dripping on it made the fire die down.
    – stronger AGO beginning to keep ANT from moving

(12) The plug's coming loose let the water flow out.
    – stronger AGO stopping keeping ANT from moving

(13) The stirring-rod's breaking let the particles settle.
    – stronger AGO stopping moving ANT

Talmy further extends the force dynamics framework in various directions and suggests such concepts as sociodynamics, i.e. force dynamics between human participants, and psychodynamics, where a person is the agonist and some of his/her psychological factors act as the antagonist and as the intrinsic tendency or inclination.

Perhaps more crucially for the present discussion, Talmy also applies force dynamics to causatives and presents a taxonomy of different causative types. For example, the difference between ‘causing’ vs. ‘letting’ in his account eventually boils down to whether an action takes place because of the antagonist (causing) or despite the antagonist (letting). However, in both cases the antagonist is stronger than the agonist: the agonist either causes the resulting event or fails to prevent it. Thus, both causing and letting require a controlling participant strong enough to either instigate or prevent the caused/permitted event.

Talmy also makes a further distinction between extended vs. onset causation. The basis of this distinction is whether the causation is continuous or punctual, i.e. whether the causing itself is a state or a change of state. Thus, the force dynamic settings (a) and (b) in figure 3, as well as the sentences (10) and (11) exemplify onset causing, and the settings (c) and (d) figure 3 and the sentences (12) and (13) exemplify onset letting. In figure 2, the force dynamic settings (a) and (d) exemplify extended causing. Conceivably, extended letting would be a figure in which a stronger antagonist is not on the way of the agonist, i.e. the antagonist continuously doesn’t keep the agonist in motion/action or prevent the agonist from moving/acting.

What I refer to as permissive causation is, first and foremost, what Talmy refers to as ‘letting’. Therefore, a terminological caveat ins in place: permissive causation is only a part of the meaning potential of the Finnish construction exemplified by e.g. (5) and presented in more detail in section 2, conventionally called the permissive construction. The construction
is in fact ambiguous (under suitable circumstances) between ‘letting/permitting’ (i.e. permissive causation) and ‘causing/instigating’ (i.e. factitive causation).¹

1.3. Some features of Finnish morphosyntax

Finnish is a language with a rich inflectional morphology. Notably, complex case marking is a defining feature of Finnish morphosyntax. The Finnish noun inflection paradigm includes 15 cases, and syntactic relations are expressed with case marking rather than e.g. word order. In terms of case marking typology, Finnish is predominantly a nominative–accusative language, although the subject and object case marking system is more complicated than this.² Oblique arguments are typically marked with one of several oblique cases. Thus, morphological case marking is relevant for marking subjects and objects as well as for marking oblique arguments.

Importantly, however, the Finnish non-finite verb inflection also shows great morphological complexity.³ Finnish has several infinitives, most notably, the 1st or TA infinitive, the 2nd or TE infinitive, and the 3rd or MA infinitive, each of which has a defective case inflection paradigm. The most relevant forms for the purposes of this paper are the so-called short form of the TA infinitive⁴ (14) and the illative form of the MA infinitive (15):

(14) Kalle ei halua mennä kouluun.
    Kalle-NOM neg-3SG want go-INFI school-ILL
    ‘Kalle doesn’t want to go to school.’

(15) Kalle meni kirjastoon lukemaan sarjakuvia.

¹ This is not to say that Finnish fails to distinguish between ‘causing’ and ‘letting’: although this and certain other expression types express both, and few if any expression types only express ‘letting’, there are several expression types which only express ‘causing’ and not ‘letting’.

² What complicates the subject and object case marking pattern is the partitive case. The partitive shows ergative features in that it may mark either the object of a transitive sentence or the subject of an intransitive (or, more specifically, existential) sentence. For a more detailed overview, see e.g. Huumo (2005: 114–119) and Karlsson (1999).

³ Many of the forms traditionally labelled as “infinitives” in Finnish grammars are more adequately described as gerunds or converbs, in fact. Each “infinitive” form consists of a stem, one of several infinitive markers, and a case ending. None of the different infinitive markers has a full case paradigm, however. There are roughly 15 conventional combinations of infinitive marker + case ending, and each resulting form is conventionalized to one or few specialized constructions which have their own semantic and pragmatic properties and often highly idiosyncratic morphosyntax.

⁴ Historically, this form is a lative case form. However, the lative case is no longer productive, and the form has been reanalyzed and is interpreted as more or less a nominative form in present-day Finnish.
Finnish also has a fairly complex system of participial forms. Like the infinitives, participles are also inflected for case, and unlike infinitives, they all have a complete case paradigm. Leaving the rest of the participle forms aside, the one form that concerns us is the translative form of the 2nd participle:

(16) Punahilkka vei isoäidille ruokaa syötäväksi.
    Red-hood-NOM bring-PST-3SG grandmother-ALL food-PAR eat-PCP2-TRA
    ‘The Little Red Riding Hood took grandmother food to eat.’

These non-finite verb forms are used in a number of expression types which may be called permissive in the sense discussed in section 1.1. My main focus will be on the permissive construction, but I shall also present several related constructions, partly in order to document the variation in analytical causative constructions in Finnish, and partly for the purpose of comparison with the permissive construction.

2. The permissive construction

The single most notable expression type for conveying a permissive meaning in Finnish is the permissive construction. This construction consists of a matrix predicate and an embedded infinitive clause with a subject of its own. Unlike finite clause subjects, the subject of the infinitive clause is marked with the genitive case. The matrix predicate can be one of only four (or perhaps five) verbs: antaa ‘give’ or ‘let’, käskeä ‘command’, sallia ‘permit’ or suoda ‘grant’ or ‘allow’ (and, marginally and only for some native speakers, luvata ‘promise’):

(17) Anna minun olla!
    give-IMP-2SG I-GEN be-INF
    ‘Let me be!’; i.e. ‘Leave me alone!’

(18) Äiti käsKi pojän siivota huoneensa.
    mother-NOM command-PST-3SG boy-GEN tidy-INF room-POSS3SG
    ‘The mother told the boy to clean up his room.’
(19) En sallinut hänen puhua juhlassa.
not-1SG allow-PC1 he/she-GEN talk-INF party-INE
‘I did not allow him/her to talk at the party.’

(20) Suo meidän tuoda omat lahjamme käyttöösi.
allow-IMP-2SG we-GEN bring-INF1 own-PL gift-PL-ACC use-ILL-2SG
‘Allow us to bring our own gifts to your use.’

(21) Lupasin hänen yrittää.
promise-PST-1SG he/she-GEN try-INF1
‘I promised (i.e. gave permission for) him/her to try.’

These four or five verbs mostly express some kind of granting of permission, letting, or allowing—hence the name permissive construction—but also the sociodynamic instigation verb käskää ‘to command’ commonly appears in the construction. Furthermore, the most common matrix verb in the construction is antaa, which normally means ‘to give’ when used anywhere else than in this construction. In the permissive construction, the verb antaa may express either ‘letting’ or ‘having someone do something’. Thus, the construction in fact expresses not only permitting but also instigating, especially in a sociodynamic context.

Of the four possible matrix verbs, antaa is by far the most common in the permissive construction. A thorough study of the permissive construction (Leino 2003) shows that in different corpora of spoken and written Finnish from different registers and time periods, the percentage of antaa of the occurrences of the permissive construction ranges roughly in the range of 70–80%. Thus, antaa is far more common than the other three verbs put together. Käskää is the matrix verb in roughly 10–20% of the occurrences, sallia in roughly 6% of occurrences in written language but non-existent in dialect data, and suoda is marginal in all corpora.5

2.1. Permissive and factitive antaa

One reason for the high percentage of the verb antaa is that it can be used to convey a wider range of meanings than the other three verbs. Käskää invariably expresses (either concretely or metaphorically) interpersonal ‘commanding’ of some sort, while sallia and suoda always mean ‘permitting’ taken broadly. Antaa, in contrast, may mean either ‘permitting’ in a num-
ber of varieties or ‘instigating’, ‘having someone do something’. The examples (22)–(23) illustrate the use of *antaa* to express a permissive meaning (‘let’ or ‘permit’), and the examples (24)–(25) illustrate the use of the verb *antaa* to express a factitive causative meaning (‘have someone do something’ or even ‘make someone do something’):

5

(22) Presidentti antoi ministerin erot.
    president give-IMP-3SG minister-GEN resign-INF
    ’the president let the minister resign’

(23) Opettaja antoi lasten leikkiä.
    teacher give-IMP-3SG child-PL-GEN play-INF
    ’the teacher let the children play’

(24) Herodes antoi mestata Johanneksen.
    Herodes give-IMP-3SG behead-INF John-GEN
    ’Herodes had John beheaded’

(25) Jumala antoi Onanin kuolla.
    God give-IMP-3SG Onan-GEN die-INF
    ’God put Onan to death’

These permissive and factitive uses of the verb *antaa* may be analyzed in terms of force dynamics, as discussed in section 1.1. Example (26) is an instance where *antaa* expresses a meaning which can be labelled as onset letting—in terms of force dynamics, granting permission by removing an obstacle, i.e. corresponding to pattern (c) in figure 3:

(26) Vartija antoi vangin lähteä.
    guard give-3SG prisoner-GEN leave-INF
    ’the guard let the prisoner go’

In example (27), *antaa* expresses extended letting: granting permission by not preventing something from happening:

(27) Puutarhuri antoi puun kasvaa.
    gardener give-3SG tree-ACC grow-INF
    ’the gardener let the tree grow’

Suoda has a peculiar peak in 19th century texts where it is the matrix verb of over 5% of the occurrences of the permissive construction. In all other corpora, the percentage of *suoda* is well below 1%.

In a cross-linguistic perspective, verbs meaning ‘give’ often acquire meanings of both ‘permitting’ or ‘enabling’ and ‘causing’ or ‘instigating’. For several examples from different languages, see Newman (1996: 171–201). Thus, Finnish *antaa* merely follows a common lexicalization path in this respect.

---

5 *Suoda* has a peculiar peak in 19th century texts where it is the matrix verb of over 5% of the occurrences of the permissive construction. In all other corpora, the percentage of *suoda* is well below 1%.

6 In a cross-linguistic perspective, verbs meaning ‘give’ often acquire meanings of both ‘permitting’ or ‘enabling’ and ‘causing’ or ‘instigating’. For several examples from different languages, see Newman (1996: 171–201). Thus, Finnish *antaa* merely follows a common lexicalization path in this respect.
In example (28), _antaa_ expresses onset causing, which corresponds to pattern (c) in figure 3: it involves the antagonist beginning to exert force which leads the agonist to do something. And, finally in example (29), _antaa_ expresses extended causing, in which the antagonist continuously exerts this kind of force on the agonist:

(28) Kreivi antoi palvelijan valmistaa aterian  
    count give-3SG servant-GEN prepare-INF meal-ACC  
    'the count let a servant prepare a meal’

(29) Herra antoi sataa 40 päivää.  
    Lord give-3SG rain-INF 40 day-PL  
    'the Lord let/made it rain for 40 days’

Thus, all these four kinds of causation—onset letting, extended letting, onset causing, and extended causing—can be expressed with the verb _antaa_. Admittedly, however, examples of _antaa_ expressing extended causing are very rare. Whether this is a property of the verb _antaa_ or whether this is a rare kind of causation more generally is an open question.

As Talmy points out (1988: 51, 2000: 410–411), force dynamic patterns are an important source of grammaticalization and lexicalization. In other words, force dynamic patterns are not only relevant to human conceptualization of the world but also tend to be coded in human languages. The Finnish permissive construction is a case in point. In the history of the construction, a force dynamic pattern (or, more accurately, a set of force dynamic patterns) has been grammaticalized into an expression type in its own right, a full-fledged grammatical construction.

Exactly what force dynamic features have been grammaticalized in the permissive construction, then? Some interesting generalizations can be made over the uses of _antaa_ at least. In all instances of permissive/factitive _antaa_, the antagonist is stronger than the agonist. In more traditional terms, the entity denoted by the subject of _antaa_ has the highest control of the whole situation: this entity either permits or instigates the permitted or caused event, and the event would not take place otherwise.

Moreover, neither the permissive nor the factitive use of _antaa_ distinguishes between a “basic” (i.e. static) and a shifting force dynamic pattern, nor between onset causation and extended causation. With regard to the causer/antagonist, this means that it is not at all crucial in either use of _antaa_ whether what the antagonist does is active or static.

Another generalization is that _antaa_ is also implicative (cf. Karttunen 1971) in both of these uses, in that both _antaa_ ‘let’ and _antaa_ ‘instigate’ entail that the event expressed by the
infinitive actually takes place. This is a consequence of the force dynamic pattern involved: the fact that the antagonist (i.e. the referent of the subject of antaa) is stronger than the agonist (i.e. the referent of the subject of the infinitive) makes the result of the overall setting dependent on the action carried out by the antagonist. This is tantamount to saying that the referent of the subject of antaa has the highest control over the situation.

What distinguishes between the two uses of antaa is also statable in terms of force dynamics. In a setting where the agonist is weaker than the antagonist, the distinction between ‘causing’ and ‘letting’ (i.e. ‘instigating’ and ‘permitting’ in the case of antaa) boils down to the difference vs. identity of the agonist’s inclination and the end result. When AGO’s inclination and the end result are identical, the interpretation is ‘letting’, and when they are different, the interpretation is ‘causing’. In other words, if the inclination of the agonist (i.e. the referent of the subject of the infinitive) is towards rest and the infinitive expresses movement or activity, then the interpretation of antaa is factitive, as in (30). In contrast, if the agonist’s inclination is towards movement or activity, and the infinitive expresses that movement or activity, then the interpretation of antaa is permissive, as in (31):

(30) Annoin palvelijani juosta puolestani kauppaan.
    antaa-1SG servant-ACC-PX1SG run-INF1 behalf-PX1SG store-ILL
    ‘I had my servant run to the store for me [instead of myself].’

(31) Annoin lasten juosta karkkikauppaan.
    antaa-1SG child-PL-GEN run-INF1 candy-shop-ILL
    ‘I let the children run to the candy shop.’

Correspondingly, if the agonist’s inclination is towards movement or activity, and the infinitive expresses rest, then the interpretation of antaa is factitive, as in (32), and if the agonist’s inclination is towards rest, and the infinitive expresses that same sort of rest, then the interpretation of antaa is permissive, as in (33):

(32) Annoin palvelijani jonottaa puolestani.
    antaa-1SG servant-ACC-PX1SG queue-INF1 behalf-PX1SG
    ‘I had my servant wait in the line for me [instead of myself].’

(33) Annoin lasten jäädä karkkikauppaan.
    antaa-1SG child-PL-GEN stay-INF1 candy-shop-ILL
    ‘I let the children stay in the candy shop.’
2.2. Käskeä: explicit ‘instigating’

As the usage of the verb antaa shows, the two meanings discussed here, ‘permitting’ and ‘instigating’, may well lexicalize together. However, this is by no means inevitable. This becomes obvious as soon as we take a look at the other verbs which occur in the permissive construction: käskeä ‘command’, sallia ‘allow’, and suoda ‘grant’.

The verb käskeä ‘command’ semantically resembles the factitive interpretation of the verb antaa in that it expresses a force dynamic setting in which the resulting state does not follow the agonist’s intrinsic tendency. To put it more bluntly, the state of affairs expressed by the infinitive is not what the agonist (the referent of the subject of the infinitive) aims for but what the antagonist (the referent of the subject of the causative verb) aims for. On the other hand, käskeä differs from antaa in that unlike antaa, it is not implicative in the sense of Karttunen (1971). Thus, the verb does not imply that the state of affairs expressed by the infinitive in fact becomes true.

A force dynamic interpretation for the difference between factitive antaa and käskeä is that antaa states that the antagonist is stronger than the agonist, and therefore has control over the situation, whereas käskeä does not make this clear. Consequently, commanding allows for disobedience, whereas factivity does not:

(34) Käskin palvelijani jonottaa puolestani, mutta hän 
     käskeä-1SG servant-ACC-PX1SG queue-INF1 behalf-PX1SG but he-NOM 
     ei jonottanut. 
     not-3SG queue-NEG 

‘I commanded my servant to wait in the line for me [instead of myself], but he didn’t.’

(35) ?? Annoin palvelijani jonottaa puolestani, mutta hän 
     antaa-1SG servant-ACC-PX1SG queue-INF1 behalf-PX1SG but he-NOM 
     ei jonottanut. 
     not-3SG queue-NEG 

‘?? I had my servant wait in the line for me [instead of myself], but he didn’t.’

Thus, in the case of käskeä (and ‘commanding’ in general), ANT may or may not be stronger than AGO. The verb does not make this clear. What the verb states is merely that ANT tries to be stronger and to have AGO act opposite to its intrinsic tendency. In fact, käskeä does not even say that the result state is contrary to AGO’s tendency. For example, the commanded action or state of affairs may equally well be pleasant or unpleasant to the referent of the sub-
ject. Thus, the force dynamic pattern lexicalized in käskeä seems to boil down to ANT’s attempt to control the situation.

Another peculiarity with käskeä is that, aside from the permissive construction, it is also used in a more productive object control construction which includes a different non-finite form, the 3rd infinitive illative:

(36) Kuka käski teitä juomaan itsenne humalaan?
    who-NOM käskeä-PST-3SG you(pl)-PTV drink-INF3-ILL self-ACC intoxication-ILL
    ‘Who told you to get drunk?’

(37) Keisari käski sotilaita jatkamaan ja meni pois.
    emperor-NOM käskeä-PST-3SG soldier-PL-PAR continue-INF3-ILL and go-PST-3SG away
    ‘The emperor commanded the soldiers to carry on and went away.’

The uses of käskeä in the permissive construction and in the object control construction are practically always synonymous and interchangeable. For example, examples (36)–(37) are easy to rephrase with the permissive construction with no obvious change in meaning:

(38) Kuka käski teidän juoda itsenne humalaan?
    who-NOM käskeä-PST-3SG you(pl)-GEN drink-INF1 self-ACC intoxication-ILL
    ‘Who told you to get drunk?’

(39) Keisari käski sotilaiden jatkaa ja meni pois.
    emperor-NOM käskeä-PST-3SG soldier-PL-PAR continue-INF1 and go-PST-3SG away
    ‘The emperor commanded the soldiers to carry on and went away.’

However, the other three “permissive verbs”, i.e. antaa, sallia and suoda, cannot be used in the object control construction. This may be seen as reflecting the underlying force dynamic pattern to some extent: ‘commanding’, i.e. “attempted instigating”, essentially means that the antagonist necessarily exerts a force on the agonist and attempts to either move or stop the agonist against its intrinsic tendency. ‘Permitting’, in contrast, need not involve any action on the antagonist’s part, but may be merely a case of not acting against the agonist’s intrinsic tendency. Therefore, käskeä may be seen as better compatible with the transitive (indeed, due to the path-expressing illative case of the infinitive, “caused motion”) nature of the object control construction. In addition to this iconic motivation, mere convention is needed to explain the difference of distribution of the verbs, however.
2.3. **Sallia and suoda: explicit ‘permitting’**

If *käskeä* unambiguously expresses a meaning of (attempted) instigating, the remaining two verbs, *sallia* ‘allow’ and *suoda* ‘grant’ equally unambiguously express a meaning of permitting or enabling. Both are practically limited to written language, especially formal styles, to the extent that *suoda* is seldom used in non-religious contexts. *Sallia* is by far the more frequent one of the two, comprising roughly 6% of the use of the permissive construction in written language constantly throughout the history of written Finnish (*antaa* and *käskeä* having a percentage of roughly 73% and 20% respectively, and *suoda* being only sporadic).\(^7\)

Rare though these two verbs may be, they still do exist. Therefore, the fact remains that in addition to the ambiguous verb *antaa*, there are several unambiguous verbs that can be used in the permissive construction:

(40) En sallinut hänen puhua juhlassa.
    not-1SG allow-PCP1 he/she-GEN talk-INF1 party-INE
    ‘I did not allow him/her to talk at the party.’

(41) Suo minun kuulla ääntäsi, Herra!
    grant-IMP-2SG I-GEN hear-INF1 voice-PX2SG Lord-NOM
    ‘Let me hear your voice, o Lord!’

We can conclude that ‘permitting’ and ‘instigating’ may or may not lexicalize or grammaticalize together; different aspects of the relevant force dynamic settings pull to different directions in this respect. On the one hand, the two meanings may naturally lexicalize together since in both cases, the overall control of the situation expressed by the infinitive is outside that situation: i.e. the causer/permitter, the antagonist, has the control. This, and other similarities, may lead to a situation in which a language grammaticalizes or lexicalizes these causative types together.

On the other hand, ‘permitting’ and ‘instigating’ may also lexicalize separately. They differ from each other in terms of whether the activity expressed by the infinitive is pleasant or disgusting, natural or unnatural, or something of that sort, to the participant denoted by

---

7 The figures are taken from Leino (2003) and are based on a corpus of over 10,000 occurrences of the permissive construction from the 15th to the 21st Century. The relative frequencies of each of the four verbs have remained essentially the same for the whole time period. These figures only apply to written language data, however: spoken data is even more strongly biased towards *antaa*, and in dialect data *sallia* and *suoda* are used very little if at all.
subject of the infinitive. This, and other differences, may lead to a situation in which a language grammaticalizes & lexicalizes these causative types separately.

Apparently, Finnish is presently making the choice. The verb *antaa* seems to be headed towards the latter option, separate ways of expressing these meanings, but this development is far from complete.

3. Other analytical expressions of permissivity

The permissive construction is by far the most frequent analytical causative construction expressing 'permitting' and 'enabling' in Finnish. As was discussed in section 2, it is also quite versatile in its usage. Still, it is by no means the only analytical expression type conveying such meanings in Finnish. In this section, I shall present several related expression types, all of which are, incidentally, connected with the verb *antaa*.

3.1. Permissive *antaa* with adnominal infinitive

According to the traditional analysis (e.g. Penttilä 1957: 640–641, Siro 1964: 95–96, Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979: 361–362), the permissive construction consists of a matrix verb (*antaa, käskeä, sallia* or *suoda*), its subject, and an infinitive clause which is the object of the matrix verb. There is also a closely related expression type in which the matrix verb has a NP object, and the infinitive clause is, grammatically, a modifier of the head noun of that NP:

(42) Voittajalle annan vallan hallita kansoja.
    winner-ALL give-SG1 power-ACC rule-INF1 people-PL-PAR
    ‘To the winner, I shall give the power to rule peoples.’

(43) Lapsille täytyy sallia mahdollisuus tulla kuulluiksi.
    child-PL-ALL must-3SG allow-INF1 possibility-ACC come-INF1 hear-PASS-PCP2-PL-TRA
    ‘Children must be given the opportunity to be heard.’

(44) Uskonnontapaus suojaa jokaiselle oikeuden valita
    freedom-of-religion-NOM grant-3SG everyone-ALL right choose-INB1
    elämänkatsomuksensa.
    outlook-on-life-PX3SG
    ‘Freedom of religion grants everyone the right to choose their outlook on life.’
(45) Työntekijöille luodaan uusia mahdollisuuksia osallistua
decision-making-ILL

‘New possibilities are created for the workers to participate in decision-making.’

This expression type is more closely related to expressions of concrete ‘giving’ than the permissive construction. Essentially the same main predicates are possible in both, notably verbs of ‘giving’ and ‘creating’. In fact, in most cases the object NP, including the infinitive clause, can be replaced with a more concrete NP, yielding a perfectly normal expression of ‘giving’:

(46) Isä antoi lapsille luvan syödä omenoita.

‘Father gave the children the permission to eat apples.’

(47) Isä antoi lapsille omenoita.

‘Father gave the children apples.’

(48) Yritys tarjoaa asiakkailleen tilaisuuden
eat-INFL apple-PL-PAR

‘The enterprise offers its customers the opportunity to enjoy [their] leisure time.’

(49) Yritys tarjoaa asiakkailleen uusia tuotteita.

‘The enterprise offers its customers new products.’

This expression type is obviously related both to the Finnish “ditransitive” construction exemplified by (47) and (49). It is also obviously related to the permissive construction: the semantics is essentially the same, the infinitive clause is the same, and even the most common matrix verb is *antaa* in both cases. In fact, three of the four matrix verbs occurring in the per-

---

8 The construction in question, labeled *ANTAA-konstruktio* by Leino et al. (2001), is the standard way of expressing ‘giving’ in Finnish. It is, however, problematic to call it ditransitive, since the recipient argument is realized as an adverbial marked with the allative case, rather than a (primary or secondary) object—hence the quotation marks in “ditransitive”.
missive construction, *antaa, sallia* (albeit marginally) and *suoda*, also occur in this expression type, as exemplified by (42)–(44) above, and only *käskää* does not.

Semantically, the adnominal expression type is more limited than the permissive construction in that it only expresses ‘permitting’, ‘enabling’ (as in the examples above) and ‘commanding’ (as in (50), but not ‘instigating’ proper or ‘having someone do something’. Example (51) could conceivably mean ‘The lieutenant gave the platoon the task to shoot’, and (52) could mean ‘The (native) country gives every man the responsibility to get to arms’, but neither one of the two is fully acceptable:

(50) Luutnantti antoi joukkueelle käskyn ampua.
lieutenant-NOM give-PST-SG platoon-ALL order-ACC shoot-INF1
‘The lieutenant gave the platoon the order to shoot.’

(51) Luutnantti antoi joukkueelle tehtävän tuhota vihollinen.
lieutenant-NOM give-PST-SG platoon-ALL task-ACC destroy-INF1 enemy-ACC
(52) Isänmaa antaa joka miehelle velvollisuuden käydä aseisiin.
native-country give-3SG each man-ALL responsibility-ACC get-to-INF1 arm-PL-ILL

Usage related to ‘instigating’ like that in (51)–(52) is rare and only marginally acceptable to most native speakers, but it does occur. Usage related to ‘commanding’, as in (50), is more common, but the vast majority of instances of this expression type convey a meaning of ‘permitting’ or ‘enabling’. Thus, we may think of this expression type as a “construction as a prototype category” in the spirit of Taylor (1998). The construction expresses a force dynamic setting in which, prototypically, the antagonist has control, i.e. is stronger than the agonist, and the intrinsic tendency of the agonist is towards the action expressed by the infinitive clause. This prototype can be extended, however: it can be stretched to cases in which ANT merely tries to have control (i.e. ‘commanding’), and marginally even to cases in which AGO’s intrinsic tendency is not towards the relevant action but in which the action takes place due to ANT’s control (i.e. ‘instigating’).

Formally, this expression type is a “hybrid” of the permissive construction and the “ditransitive” (or *ANTAA*) construction, as discussed above. As will be shown in the next section, the connection to expressions of ‘giving’ may, to some extent, explain the dual meaning of ‘permitting’ and ‘instigating’.
3.2. From ‘giving’ to ‘permitting’ and ‘instigating’

There is a close connection between expressions of ‘permitting’ and ‘giving’ in Finnish, as in a number of other languages. The adnominal expression type discussed in section 3.1 is a case in point. Another such expression type is exemplified by (53)–(55):

(53) Annoin asunnon välittäjälle myytäväksi.
    give-3SG apartment-ACC agent-ALL sell-PASS-PCP1-TRA
    ‘I authorized a [real estate] agent to sell the apartment.’
    (lit. ‘I gave the apartment to an agent to sell.’)

(54) Valmis tuote viedään ulkomaille myytäväksi.
    ready-NOM product-NOM take/bring-PASS abroad-ALL sell-PASS-PCP1-TRA
    ‘The finished product is taken abroad to be sold.’

(55) Isä antoi lapsille omenoita syötäväksi
    father give-PST-3SG child-PL-ALL apple-PL-PAR eat-PASS-PCP1-TRA
    ‘Father gave the children apples to eat.’

The distinctive feature of this construction is the non-finite verb form used. While the permissive construction and the adnominal construction discussed in section 3.1 both include an infinitive clause built around the 1st infinitive, this construction uses a participle form instead, specifically the translative form of the passive 1st participle. This form, apart from being a passive present participle, is a translative form with a purposive ‘in order to be done’ flavor to it.

As it happens, the 1st infinitive used in the permissive construction is, historically, a lative case form. The lative case has disappeared from Finnish, and the 1st infinitive is no longer analyzed as carrying that case, but this makes for an interesting connection between this construction and the permissive construction. Namely, in Proto-Finnic, the lative case also gave the 1st infinitive a purposive interpretation.

I will not go into any detail with the history of the permissive construction. The interested reader is referred to Leino (2005: 106–112), or Leino (2003) for a more comprehensive account in Finnish. However, in order to understand the permissive construction and its relations to similar constructions in Finnish, a brief look at history is in place. Historically, the permissive construction goes back to a situation in which the infinitive was in fact a way to express purpose, and the genitive argument which now serves as the grammatical subject of the infinitive was an adverbial of the main verb, expressing a benefactive participant.
Thus, a sentence like (56), which would now be interpreted as ‘father let the children eat apples’ was interpreted as ‘father gave apples for the children to eat’. In other words, (56) was essentially identical in interpretation to the modern-day sentence (55) above.

(56) Isä antoi omenoita lasten syödä
father give-PST-3SG apple-PL-PAR child-PL-GEN eat-INF1

Historically: ‘Father gave apples for the children to eat.’
Modern interpretation: ‘Father let the children eat apples.’

Due to a number of changes in the Finnish language, notably in the case marking system, sentences like (56) have been reanalyzed. The infinitive, formerly a lative case form, has lost its purposive ‘in order to’ meaning, and the former recipient adverbial, marked with genitive, has been reanalyzed as the subject of the infinitive. This has led to the conventionalization or grammaticalization of the permissive construction.

This reanalysis is reflected not only by the semantic change from ‘father gave apples for the children to eat’ to ‘father let the children eat apples’ but also by a change in (unmarked) word order.⁹ The historical interpretation has an unmarked word order Subject – Main verb – Object – Genitive argument – Infinitive as in (56) or Subject – Main verb – Genitive argument – Object – Infinitive (Isä antoi lasten omenoita syödä). In contrast, the unmarked word order of the grammaticalized permissive construction is Subject – Main verb – Genitive subject – Infinitive – Object as in (57). Aside from information-structural factors, this reflects the reanalyzed structure: the apples are no longer the GIFT in the act of giving, i.e. omenoita is no longer the object of the verb antaa, but rather the object of i.e. the infinitive.

(57) Isä antoi lasten syödä omenoita
father give-PST-3SG child-PL-GEN eat-INF1 apple-PL-PAR

‘Father let the children eat apples’

This development is a natural source for the ambiguity found in the permissive use of the verb antaa in present-day Finnish. When the infinitive was interpreted as expressing purpose, it was ambiguous: purpose may be interpreted as either ‘letting’ or ‘instigating’. For example, the sentence father gave the children apples to eat could be interpreted either as granting the

⁹ Finnish has a “free” word order in the sense that word order is not used to mark grammatical functions like subject and object. On the other hand, word order does have conventional bearings related to information structure—see Vilkuna (1989) for details.
permission or enabling the children to eat—in other words, ‘permitting’ broadly speaking. In contrast, the sentence *father gave the children bad-tasting medicine to eat* would more naturally mean obligation, or having the children take their medicine—i.e. ‘instigating’.

Dialect data and old written sources still show remnants of the earlier interpretation. There are cases where the TA infinitive is used obviously together with a verb expressing concrete ‘giving’ rather than more abstract ‘permitting’ or ‘instigating’, and also with verbs other than the four verbs used in modern-day standard language permissive construction:

(58) Ei heidän pidä muiden waraxi rakendaman/
    not-3SG they-GEN must other-PL-GEN reserve-TRA build-INF3-INSTR
    eikä istuttaman muiden syödä.
    not-3SG-CLIT plant-INF3-INSTR other-PL-GEN eat-INF1

'They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat.'
(Isaiah 65:22, 1642 translation)

(59) tuot tytöi kuvat Mirjan nähä tuo!
    bring-IMP-2SG girl-PL-GEN picture-PL-ACC Mirja-GEN see-INF1 bring-IMP-2SG

'Do bring the pictures of the girls for Mirja to see!' (MA: Lemi)

(60) Hiltä kaateli vettä lehmäj juara.
    Hiltä-nom pour-PST-3SG water-PAR cow-GEN drink-INF1

‘Hilta poured water for the cow to drink.’ (MA: Hausjärvi)

There are also rare instances, notably in dialect data and in early written sources, where the TA infinitive is used with *antaa* together with an allative rather than genitive argument. Allative is the modern-day standard case for recipient arguments, and these examples can only be interpreted as expressing giving together with an infinitive expressing purpose:

(61) Ja he annoit hänelle wija juoda Myrrhalla secoitettua.
    and they-NOM give-PST-3SG he-ALL wine-PAR drink-INF1 myrrh-ADE mix-PASS-PCP2

‘And they gave him to drink wine mingled with myrrh.’ (Mark 15:23, 1642 translation)

(62) Mies antoi hänelle sitte marjan syödä. (Salmelainen)
    man-NOM give-PST-3SG he/she-ALL then berry-ACC eat-INF1

‘The man then gave him/her a berry to eat.’

It seems righteous to say that there is a construction which is very similar to the permissive construction in form but which corresponds to the historical rather than the modern-day inter-
pretation of the permissive construction in meaning. This construction consists of an ordinary structure expressing ‘giving’, and a TA infinitive which expresses the purpose or aim of the act of giving. This construction is a fairly obvious relic, a non-reanalyzed version of the predecessor of the permissive construction.

Examples like (58)–(62) are very rare in present-day standard language, however. Much more typically, the same meaning is expressed with the passive 1st participle translative in modern standard language, as discussed at the beginning of this section—or, indeed the same meanings, since the participle variant shows the same ambiguity that was discussed above: when something is given for someone to be done, this may equally well be enablement or instigation:

(63) Mies antoi koiralle luun pureskeltavaksi.
    man-NOM give-PST-3SG dog-ALL bone-ACC chew-PASS-PCP1-TRA
    ‘The man gave the dog a bone to chew.’ (enablement)

(64) Opettaja antoi oppilaalle vaikean ongelman ratkaistavaksi.
    teacher-NOM give-PST-3SG student-ALL difficult-ACC problem-ACC solve-PASS-PCP1-TRA
    ’The teacher gave the student a difficult problem to solve.’ (instigation)

An expression of ‘giving’ does not make a difference between ‘enablement’ and ‘obligation’ or ‘instigation’—in fact, it does not even contain either one. Whether the non-finite clause in expressions like the ones discussed above should be interpreted as expressing ‘enabling’ or ‘instigating’ is up to contextual inference, world knowledge and other factors which are not, strictly speaking, part of the utterance itself. Yet, these interpretations are readily available with expressions of this type. Therefore, they may be grammaticalized as parts of the meaning of the construction, either one separately or both of the two as alternative interpretations.

4. Observations

In sections 2 and 3, we have seen that Finnish has a variety of different but related analytical causative constructions which express permissive meanings. The selection in sections 2 and 3 is not even comprehensive: other constructions could easily be added to the presentation. For the purposes of this paper, however, this selection is quite sufficient. The selection that we have looked at is enough to show that there are several analytical constructions for permissive
causativity, and that force dynamics is a relevant explaining factor with regard to their "division of labor", similarities, and differences.

Even this rather superficial look at Finnish permissive constructions shows that causative and permissive semantics are not monolithic by nature. They involve a number of potential distinctions—e.g. controlling the situation by ‘permitting’ the agonist’s intrinsic tendency vs. ‘instigating’ an action contrary to the agonist’s intrinsic tendency, or ‘enabling’ by providing a prerequisite through positive action vs. ‘enabling’ by refraining from imposing an obstacle. Such distinctions may or may not end up lexicalized in any given language, and they may or may not also be grammaticalized. In other words, a language may code these distinct meanings differently, be it through lexical means or through different grammatical constructions, by using different non-finite verb forms, or whatever the coding strategy may be.

Perhaps the main issue is that a language will most probably use several different coding strategies to make such distinctions, and consequently will have a number of different lexical and grammatical means of expressing permissive and causative meanings. This presents a challenge not only for a syntactician figuring out the system of causative expressions in that language, but also for a typologist who strives for a simple analysis and a concise overall picture of e.g. permissive expressions in an often large selection of languages. For the typologist, a question like “what kind of an expression does Finnish use to express permissive causation?” is a relevant and useful one; but the syntactician will, inevitably, answer that question in a lot more detail than the typologist would want, given the variation presented in sections 2 and 3 (even though the discussion in sections 2 and 3 only gives a faint and radically simplified picture of the whole spectrum of permissive expression types in Finnish).

Analysis of force dynamics gives the syntactician a very useful toolbox for building a wireframe model of the semantic interpretations of relevant expressions and expression types in a given language. Naturally, an analysis based solely on force dynamics is a gross oversimplification: it only makes visible a narrow selection of the range of meanings expressed by any grammatical construction, including the ones discussed in this paper. Yet, force dynamics makes it possible to address fundamental questions pertaining to analytical causatives and permissive causation in a fruitful way. It is especially useful in that it is language independent and relatively simple. Therefore, it is applicable also for formulating and pinpointing sufficiently precise questions e.g. for the purposes of typological research and cross-linguistic comparison.
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Abstract

This article studies the morphosyntax of argument frames with the Estonian analytical causative laskma ‘let, make, have, allow, permit’. This analytical causative has two readings, the permissive ‘let, allow, permit’, to be understood as: not hinder an event, and the factitive ‘make, have’, to be understood as: make another event happen. The main claim of this article is that the distinction between these two types is also reflected in the morphosyntactic frames laskma is used in. Permissives lack the frame with one of the two non-finites that are possible with factitives, and the range of argument encoding diverges in permissives and factitives as well.

1. Introduction

This paper aims at teasing apart the different analytical causative types of letting: the permissive type, where an event occurs because it is permitted and not prevented, and the factitive one, where an event occurs because of someone or some other event making it happen. The distinction stems from Nedjalkov and Silnitsky (1973). The present article wishes to propose a procedure of systematic testing of form-meaning pairings that is useful for both functional-cognitive and formal linguists. Estonian is a morphologically rich language where analytical causatives formed with laskma ‘let, make, have, allow, permit’

1 Many thanks for the insightful comments of the editors Jaakko Leino and Ruprecht von Waldenfels. The abbreviations, conventions, and signs are at the end of the article. A previous version of this article can be reached at <http://tammacademic.pbworks.com/w/file/51767452/Permissive_subevents%20Estonian.rtf> (accessed 14 April 2012), Tamm (2006).
display permissive as well as factitive readings. The contemporary English ‘let’ does not combine these two readings.

Factitives as well as permissives are special subtypes of causatives; in the prototypical permissive and factitive predicates, there are two agents that interact. The more appropriate English paraphrase for the factitive meaning contains the matrix verb ‘make’ that stands for the causing event. Consider a simple analytical causative with ‘make’ consisting of two subevents in the sentence containing ‘sing’ as the base verb in sentence (1).

(1) Rubbing a bowl makes it sing.²

The example illustrates two subevents, one causing another: rubbing the bowl (the causing event) and the bowl singing (the result or the caused event). The events are expressed by two different forms that do not bear verbal inflection. The causing event is encoded as a nominalization without any explicit causer participant and the caused event is encoded by an uninflected verb form.

In typical factitive and permissive constructions that will be discussed throughout the present article, both subevents have causers in the sense that there are two participants in the sentences that interact in creating a factitive or permissive situation. In permissives, the causer cannot be regarded as a typical causer. Prototypically, it is an agent in both permissives and factitives. In a factitive construction the agent of the causing subevent influences the agent of the caused subevent. In sentence (2), there is an active agent participant (professor) who brings about a change in the situation by influencing another active agent participant (student) to bring about the desired event of the first agent (professor).

(2) The professor made the student work.

In the permissive construction, the agent of the causing subevent influences the agent of the caused subevent passively. In sentence (3), there is a passive agent participant who lets a change in the situation happen by not intervening and by not hindering the other agent in bringing about the desired event of the second agent (student).

(3) The professor let the student work.
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This article will study events where there is an explicitly encoded agent participant who causes another event with an active agent participant, either actively or passively. This study concentrates on events with three overtly expressed participants (professor, student, article) to illustrate the relationship between the two subevents in the factitive (4a) and the permissive (4b).

(4)   a. The professor made the student write an article.
    b. The professor let the student write an article.

The goal of this article is to present an analysis of a linguistic phenomenon of a less accessible language in a way that is more accessible for typological, functional, generative, and cognitive approaches to language. The article presents the forms and meanings that correspond to the sentences (4a) and (4b) in Estonian. The examples that will be tested for their exact properties throughout the article are all variations of sentence (5).

(5)  Professor  lask-is  tudengi-t/tudengi-l  artikli-t/artikli
    professor[NOM]  let-PST.3S  student-PTV/-ADE/  article-PTV/TOT
    kirjuta-da.
    write-DA-INF
    ‘The professor let the student write an article.’
    ‘The professor made the student write an article.’

The terminology is chosen so that it is potentially understood across a wide spectrum of linguists. Most of the following example sentences refer to the three case marked arguments of the verb laskma ‘let’ as follows:
1) what is referred to as the first argument, first agent, or a causer is an agent giving the permission or causing the activity or the matrix event (professor ‘professor’),
2) what is referred to as the second argument, second agent, or a causee is a secondary agent of writing and a patient of letting (tudeng ‘student’) and
3) what is referred to as the third argument is a theme, and in this case, typically an incremental theme, an effected object patient of the base predicate ‘write’ and the caused event (artikkel ‘article’).

The present article examines Estonian constructed sentences with the verb laskma ‘let, make, have, allow, permit’ expressing the meanings as in (4) and (5). The verb is used in various constructions in Estonian. Compared to previous approaches, the article wishes to
provide a more detailed description of the possible and impossible argument frames and more precise syntactic and semantic testing of the data. Several linguistic traditions can benefit from the combination of methods, because the description of the data includes native judgments on the well-formedness and on the pragmatic status of the example sentences. The constructed test sentences give an idea of the possible form-meaning pairings, but they are not likely to be found in this form in native-produced texts (unless produced for grammar books). They are marked with question marks in the present article, while other native-produced, natural examples are unmarked. The list of abbreviations and conventions can be found at the end of this article, preceding the bibliography.

The specific feature that makes the Estonian causatives valuable at the current point of causative research is the visibility of event relationships in the morphosyntax of the causative predicates and their arguments. As a consequence, the event structural factors combine with the thematic roles in determining the encoding of the arguments. However, before any substantial claims can be made about the relationship of events and their expression in language in future literature, the linguistic material should be analyzed more systematically than it is done previously. The model for this analysis is proposed in this article. The paper makes the following claims and observations:

1. The morphosyntax of the argument frames is correlated with permissive versus factitive semantics in Estonian.
2. The morphosyntax of the permissive structures is more varied and the morphosyntax of the factitive structures is more restricted.
3. The choice between the two Estonian nonfinites, that is, different subordinated nonfinite verbal forms, reflects the distinction of permissive and factitive meaning.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses the permissive and factitive senses in the Estonian monolingual dictionary Eesti keele seletussõnaraamat, abbreviated as EKSS (1992), with the aim of showing that the complex question of the interpretation of laskma ‘let’ has not been adequately solved. Section 3 introduces some more sources that deal with the analytical causatives. Section 4 establishes the inventory of analytical causative frames in Estonian by testing. The tests that distinguish permissives and factitives are devised in Section 5. Section 6 presents the results of the categorization of analytical causative frames with the verb laskma ‘let’ into permissives and factitives, and Section 7 is a conclusion. The main part of the data analysis (Sections 4-7) excludes other Estonian analytical causatives and the less central frames with laskma ‘let’, so readers who are interested in the verb, its possible frames, and in other analytical causatives might want to read Sections 2 and 3 more carefully. Sections 4-6 consist of a detailed process of
testing and can be regarded more like a reference work organized in a systematic way for data look-up rather than for a discussion. Since Sections 2 and 3 will provide more detail and further references in the review of previous Estonian sources, the readers who are interested in the methodology of testing the basic frames might wish to skip the verb-specific digressions in the following two sections. The following two sections also wish to do justice to the most important insights that are gathered from previous Estonian sources on this verb and reanalyzed and systematized in the later sections.

2. EKSS 1992

The richest source recording the two separate readings of the verb *laskma* ‘let, make, have, allow, permit’ is the Estonian monolingual dictionary *Eesti keele seletussõnaraamat* abbreviated as EKSS (1992). The permissive and factitive readings are clearly considered as two separate senses of the eight senses recorded under *laskma*, illustrated in Appendix 1. I present the translations of the two relevant senses in (6), and I sketch their place in the sense structure of the entry by providing short translations of the rest of the main senses.

(6)  

laskma

1. allow, enable, not obstruct. a. (in the affirmative imperative, also in the shortened form of *las*) let something do or happen. […] b. allow the entrance or exit from somewhere. […] c. allow the transition to a state. […]

2. enable to fall or sink lower or deeper. […]

3. enable to flow from or to somewhere. […]

4. emit or create a sound (vigorously). […]

5. do something. […]

6. move (walk, run, drive, dance, etc.) (fast, vigorously). […]

7. ask or order someone to do something; give an order for doing something […] transmit a message via a mediator (in case of a wish or an order, the shortened form *las* is used). […]


The first sense is permissive (allow, enable, not obstruct) and the seventh sense is factitive (ask or order someone to do something; give an order for doing something). Both senses are
subdivided further and illustrated with examples that are either constructed by the lexicographers or taken from authentic literature. The organization of the lexicographic material suggests that the permissive meaning is central compared to the factitive one, because the permissive sense is ranked first. The permissive sense has also more fine-grained meaning structure and is illustrated with more numerous examples than the factitive sense, which also proves its centrality. The description of the meaning of the factitive sense is more sketchy in its lexical content. The meaning is defined as issuing a request or an order, and actually does not reflect the obvious fact that follows from the issuing of the order: granting the request and obeying the order. However, surprisingly, the factitive sense displays more complexity in the frames in specifying the participants of the causative event.

Apart from recording the two senses and providing finite example sentences, the dictionary format has disadvantages for further systematic semantic and morphosyntactic study. The example sentences give some but not adequate information about the argument frames, since they represent the frequent patterns of use rather than the whole range of frames. Several examples are, therefore, imperatives, which are not prototypical permissives or factitives, illustrating exactly the same use as the English lines of the motto. In those constructions, the argument corresponding to the first participant of the letting event is not expressed (‘you’), as in (7) and (8) with the permissive ‘Let me go!’ (‘You, let me go’). It is not surprising that the causative sentences gathered from normal discourse, not all participants are expressed. Expressing all of them is not relevant in normal discourse settings, however, the restrictions on the frame form can be shown to exist regardless of the poverty of input. Here come some examples of frames that encode less arguments than necessary for proper testing but that nevertheless give fragmentary evidence about the properties of the participants.

Since the base verb *minema* ‘go’ in (7) and (8) is intransitive, there is no third argument either in example (7) and (8).

(7)  *Lase*  *(min-d)*  *minna.*  
    *let*[IMP.2S]  I-PTV  *go.*DA_INF
    ‘Let me go!’
    EKSS (1992: 61)

(8)  *Lase*  *(mu-l)*  *minna.*  
    *let*[IMP.2S]  I-ADE  *go.*DA_INF

---

3 See von Waldenfels and Leino (both this volume) for more details concerning prototypical permissives and factitives.
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‘Let me go!’

EKSS (1992: 61)

The only overt argument that is marked with case is the causee subject of the base verb minema ‘go’ and the non-subject argument of the permissive verb laskma. The causee argument (the first person singular argument) is either optional or it has alternative encoding in this example. It can be marked with either partitive (mind ‘me’) in (7), which is an object case, or with the adessive (mul ‘at/on/for me’) in (8), which is a case that is comparable to the dative. The nonfinite verb type is that of the -da-nonfinite in these examples.

In example (9), the second argument is marked with the semantic total or the morphological nominative case as the subject of the base verb hullama ‘play’ and the non-subject argument of the permissive verb laskma. The nonfinite type is that of the -ma-nonfinite in this example.

(9) Las-ke laps-ed õue hulla-ma.

let-IMP.2PL child-NOM.PL out play-M_ILL

‘Allow the children go play outside, let the children out to play.’

EKSS (1992: 61)

Some clarifications about the forms used in the frames are in order. Estonian has two types of morphosemantic object cases. Although it seems controversial to say that Estonian has two “accusatives”, as pointed out by the editors, it is also true that the partitive appears more frequently than the total case in the distributional position where the accusative case-marked noun phrase appears in typical Nominative-Accusative languages or even Finnish. Despite its origin as an oblique, the partitive is the most frequent object case in Modern Estonian. In affirmative indicative sentences, Estonian objects are marked either with (a) the partitive case or (b) with the total case, the morphological form of the latter is the nominative (in plural) or genitive (in singular). They are glossed as PTV and TOT. The choice between the two types, the partitive object case and the non-partitive one, is semantically motivated. According to the accounts of the Estonian object case marking that are illuminating for the discussion of causatives at hand, aspect determines the morphological encoding of the object case. The relevant aspectual oppositions are frequently described in terms of telicity, boundedness, perfectivity, resultativity, or durativity (Metslang 1994, Erelt
et al. 1993, Kont 1963). One set of morphosemantic cases appears with one type of aspect and the other set with the opposite aspect.  

For a general reader, the possibility of two nonfinites in the complementation pattern of the causatives may seem confusing; therefore, a brief digression is necessary at this point. Estonian is a typical Finnic language with several nonfinites. The nonfinites are formed with the verb stem, a historical formative for nominalization (-t-, -m-, or the present participle morpheme, -v-), followed by the bleached or somewhat transparent case formatives. The Modern Estonian m-formative nonfinite forms contain the illative, inessive, elative, translatival, and the abessive cases. The m-formative illative nonfinite is referred to as the -ma-nonfinite in the present article, and it is glossed as M_INF. Example (9), an illustrative example from the permissive sense of the monolingual dictionary, records the use of this nonfinite (Laske lapsed õue hullama). This is also the dictionary entry form (as in laskma). The t-formative nonfinite is the other of the two more generally used nonfinites; differently from Finnish, Estonian does not have this form as the canonical dictionary form. It is referred to as the -da-nonfinite in the present article and is glossed as DA_INF. Most of the illustrations contain the -da-nonfinite in the monolingual dictionary entry for this verb, and this holds for the illustrative material of other previous sources as well. In the sections to come, it will be demonstrated that the -da-nonfinite is the nonfinite that is common in the permissive and factitive frames, and that the frame with the -ma-nonfinite belongs to permissives only.

It can be hypothesized on the basis of the argument frames in EKSS 1992 that the factitive sense has less variation in argument encoding. In (10), taken from the factitive example set of the dictionary, the teacher lets the students learn poems by heart. The caused base event has two participants, the students and the poems, and the letting event has two participants as well, the teacher and the students. In the sentence, the participant õpilastel ‘students’ is the shared argument, because it is part of both predicate frames.

---

4 On closer inspection of the data, the picture is not as simple as suggested above. Each of the approaches cited have examples that suggest that the alternation cannot be tied to binary aspectual distinctions (Tamm 2004, 2012b, in press). An epistemic modal account gives a wider coverage of partitive related data than a purely aspectual one (Tamm 2012a).

5 Finnic languages are not unusual in the perspective of the world’s languages in having nonfinite verb forms. These languages are also not completely unique in combining case with verbs. What makes the Estonian system interesting is the extent and regularity of case-marking on the nonfinite semantically hybrid forms and several stages or layers of historical development represented in the system. The t-formative nonfinite form has an inessive case form as well; the instructive appears with this nonfinite in some Finnic languages (e.g., Finnish). The present participle has a partitive nonfinite form. The case marking of nonfinite forms is synchronically unproductive; the internal spatial cases are particularly common in Finnic. More discussion on this issue can be found in Tamm (2011), Leino (2009), and in Ross et al. (2009, 2010).
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(10) Œpetaja lase-b õpilas-te-I [...] luuletus-i pâhe
    teacher[NOM] let-3S student-PL-ADE poem-PTV.PL PRT/head.ILL
õppi-da.
    learn-DA_INF
    ‘The teacher had the students learn poems by heart.’
EKSS (1992: 62)

It is clear that the two subevents and the participants have a certain relation to each other, and that this relationship is encoded in the argument frames. This relation is partly temporal and partly thematic, and the exact thematic relationship cannot be captured easily in terms of affectedness of the object. For instance, the factitive sense in EKSS 1992 contains an instance with a partitive causee where it is implausible that the caused subevent would carry on without the causing subevent, as in (11). Plausibly, the first year recruits would immediately stop crawling in gas masks as soon as the power of the order, that is, the causing subevent ceases.6

(11) Noorsõdure-id las-ti gaasimaski-de-s [...] rooma-ta.
    first.year.recruit-PTV.PL let-IPS.PST gas.mask-PL-INE crawl-DA_INF
    ‘The first year recruits were made crawl in gas masks.’
EKSS (1992: 62)

For the present purposes, the coding of the second argument, the causee, is in the center of interest. In the dictionary, where this example stems from, the goal is to document the meaning of the words and expressions in use; therefore, the illustration of the encoding of the arguments has not been presented in a strictly systematic way in EKSS (1992). The causee, the second argument is frequently missing in the examples of the dictionary. It is not clear if the reasons are structural or discourse-based in the dictionary. Most plausibly, the goal of this monolingual dictionary article is not to establish the reasons for the omission of the complements either, but to illustrate the shades of meaning and relationships between the senses.

A further pattern formed with las ‘let’ in the function of a particle where the second argument is in the nominative and the base verb is finite, as in (12), should be mentioned

---

6 The two subevents are temporally related or detached, and the temporal relatedness of the subevents seems to be dependent on the role of the shared participant in the event. The temporal event factors and the participant role factors cannot be easily teased apart and require a further paper to be dedicated to the phenomenon.
The nominative encoding is a peculiarity of imperatives. This paper confines itself to this only mention this further option of encoding and will not discuss the mood related encoding details any further.

(12)  
\begin{align*}
\text{las} & \quad \text{ta} & \quad \text{räägi-b} \\
\text{let} & \quad \text{she[NOM]} & \quad \text{speak-3S} \\
\end{align*}

‘Let her speak.’

EKSS (1992: 61)

The first argument of this sentence is not overt. As in examples (7) and (8) the particle is based on an imperative with no overt subject. EKSS 2006 has an instance construction without any overt participant argument as well, that is, an example where the second argument is also missing for structural reasons, as in the case of subjectless weather verbs such as sadama ‘rain’ in (13).

(13)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Las} & \quad \text{sada-da.} \\
\text{let} & \quad \text{rain-DA\_INF} \\
\end{align*}

‘Let it rain.’

EKSS (1992: 61)

I refer the reader further to Metslang (2000), which is the source that should be consulted for the use of this regularized use of the particle.

In sum, the semantics of the analytical causatives is thus divided into the factitive ‘let, make, have’ and permissive ‘let, allow, permit’ type, and up to now there is no systematic, test-based study on the combination of the meanings and argument frames. This article will test the combinations of the meanings and argument frames in detail after a short evaluation of the material that can be extracted from some relevant previous scholarly studies.

3. Previous studies

Section 2 has established on the basis of the monolingual dictionary EKSS (1992) that the verb allows for several frames with the -da-nonfinite and the -ma-nonfinite. Further, it has been established that the the second argument can be a partitive or a total object or an
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adessive complement. One is still left wondering about how flexible the observed frames are, and to establish the flexibility is the next step in a systematic study. Luckily, this paper is not the only paper that deals with Estonian causatives, analytical causatives, and the properties of the verb laskma ‘let’ and it is possible to draw upon previous work.7

The Estonian source that makes the encoding and the obligatory nature of the arguments explicit is Rätsep (1978). For instance, in the pattern number 374 (N/nom V1 V2/da KL), where the second argument of the matrix verb is a complement clause with the complementizer et ‘that’ (et Teelga plaani tehti ‘that someone made court to Adele’), as in (14). See footnote 9 for the key to the notation used in Rätsep (1978) and for the list of patterns that are recorded in that source.8 In the ensuing discussion, the form of the frame elements is identified as follows: n – nominative, p – partitive, a – adessive, t – total (this is the case that in some accounts is identified as the accusative, the genitive, or the nominative), da – -da-nonfinite, ma – -ma-nonfinite (in some accounts, referred to as the supine). The information extracted from Rätsep (1978) is identified by the number of the pattern instead of

---

7 Morphological causatives are the subject matter of several articles and books that deal with transitivity, verb classes, or morphological derivation in Estonian, e.g. Vihman (2004), Kasik (2004), and Ereilt et al. (1993, 1995). Causatives are an evergreen topic in the Uralic languages as well, and it is impossible to do justice to the long list of works on this topic. To name some of the most recent approaches, causative structures in Finnish are studied by Paulsen (2011). Argus (2011) studies the acquisition of causatives in Estonian. Let some works be mentioned from different Finno-Ugric languages and approaches to grammar. Gergely and Bever (1986) demonstrate the psychological unreality of decompositional semantic representations for lexical causatives. They propose a bi-level lexical representation of causative verbs, which consists of (i) a decompositional semantic representation articulating their causative status, and (ii) a contextually attached conceptual stereotype specifying their range of application as a function of their context of use. Pylkkänen (1997) studies event structure and the Finnish causatives in a more formal framework, LFG, and the factitive-permissive distinction is made in Hungarian as well in the LFG framework (Komlósy 1992). Analytical causatives of Estonian are the topic of Kasik (2001), which concentrates on corpus evidence and the roles of the participants in the analytical causative structures. Permissives are the topic of the study in Construction Grammar by Leino (2003), and Klettenberg (2004) offers a diachronic study of permissive constructions in older Estonian written language. Compared to those sources, the present approach to the Estonian permissives and factitives is more accessible to a range of linguists of cognitive, generative, and also typological (cf. Comrie 1981) tradition, and it is also more data oriented and aspect-related than any of the previous sources.

8 N1 stands for the first nominal in the noun phrase in a construction in Rätsep (1978). N2 refers to the second nominal in the noun phrase of a pattern. N+ngp is a noun phrase that can be marked with the morphological nominative, genitive, or partitive, that is, it is a case alternating object that may be either total or partitive, in an aspectually bounded or unbounded sentence. N+part is the phrase marked with the partitive. KL stands for complement clause, V1 for the finite verb, V2/da for the -da-nonfinite and V2/ma for the -ma-nonfinite. Other patterns from Rätsep (1978) contain mainly the -da-nonfinite but also an instance of the -ma-nonfinite in a frame with laskma ‘let’: N1/nom V1 (N2/part) V2/da in 275.1., see example (15), N1/nom V1 (N2/ad) V2/da (in 275.5.), see example (16), N1/nom V1 (N2/gen poolt) V2/da in 275.12., see example (17), N1/nom V1 N2/np V2/da in 304.0., see example (18). N1/nom V1 N2/ad V2/da in 309.0., see examples (22) and (23). There is one pattern with the -ma-nonfinite, N1/nom V1 N2/ngp V2/ma 320.0., example (24).
The accounts that discuss Rätsep (1978) traditionally prefer reference to the patterns and there are electronic versions that can be linked to the present discussion only by means of reference to the patterns.
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all poolt postp -da: nominative (causer), allative (the oblique beneficiary argument—presumably—of the base verb), poolt postp (a causee introduced by a by-phrase), and da (the form of the nonfinite).

(17) n all poolt postp -da

\textit{Kapten ei lask-nud enda-le}
\textit{captain[NOM] NEG let-ACT.PST.PTCP himself-ALL}
\textit{vaenlas-te poolt kätte maksta.}
\textit{enemy-GEN.PL by PRT revenge-DA-INF}

‘The captain did not let the enemies revenge on him.’

Rätsep (1978: 275.12.)

Note that the affirmative variant of the same sentence does not have the same argument frame with the by-phrase. Example (18) is a variation of the original source, Rätsep (1978: 275.12.), constructed by me for testing the possibility of this frame. The test fails.

(18) *n all poolt postp -da

\%\textit{Kapten lask-is enda-le}
\textit{captain[NOM] let-PST.3S himself-ALL}
\textit{vaenlas-te poolt kätte maksta.}
\textit{enemy-GEN.PL by PRT revenge-DA-INF}

‘The captain let the enemies revenge on him.’

The encoding with the poolt-agent typically belongs to passive sentences, such as in (19). It is not clear if the poolt-agent appears for semantic or discourse reasons. On the one hand, normal sentences with a poolt-agent are not discourse neutral. In this example, the topic of the discussion is the Soviet Union and the claim that the Soviet Union collapsed without any outer cause. The verb that is used is unaccusative. This claim is contrasted with another claim that there was an outer cause, the enemies, in (19). The information structural presentation is preserved, since the phrase with the Soviet Union is the topic, the verb has the impersonal form and the outer cause is added by means of a by-phrase.
(19) Nõukogude Liit lammuta-ti vaenlas-te poolt
Soviet[NOM] Union[NOM] demolish-IPF.PST enemy-GEN.PL.by

‘The Soviet Union was demolished by the enemies.’

On the other hand, some specific semantic factors about the participation of the agents in the clauses seem to play a role in the choice of the encoding, and these factors have to do with the change in the dynamics of the event if the letting event is negated. The by-phrase would be replaced by the adessive noun phrase in the affirmative, as in example (20), which contains the affirmative counterpart of the sentence pattern na-da: nominative (causer), adessive (causee), allative (the oblique shared beneficiary or maleficiary argument of both verbs), and da (the form of the nonfinite).

(20) n a all-da
Kapten lask-is vaenlas-te-l enda-le
captain[NOM] let-PST.3S enemy-PL-ADE himself-ALL
kätte maksta.
PRT revenge-DA_INF

‘The captain let the enemies take revenge on him.’

The semantics of the negative and affirmative sentences is different. The example demonstrates that the argument encoding cannot be dependent on the lexical features of the causative or the thematic roles assigned to the arguments by the verb or the verb complex (see also Tamm 2008 and 2009 for more discussions on the influence of tense, voice, epistemic modality, and evidentiality on argument encoding and nonfinite choice). In example (17) with the negation of letting, the captain gains from his own action against the enemies; in the affirmative example of letting in (20) he suffers from his own insufficient action against a counterattack. Since the grammatical category of negation can change the role of the causer argument (von Waldenfels 2012), and, in addition, matters for argument encoding, the interaction between the lexicon and syntax must be mediated by other semantic features than the purely lexical ones.

Examples (21)-(23) represent the most typically illustrated uses of laskma ‘let’. In (21), the frame nt-da illustrates the following encoding type: nominative (causer), total

---
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(causee), and da (the form of the nonfinite). The causee subject is a theme argument of both verbs.

(21) nt-da

Nooruk lask-is mõõga lange-da.

youngster[NOM] let-PST.3S sword.TOT fall-DA_INF

‘The youngster let the sword fall.’ Rätsep (1978: 304.)

Sentence (22) is described as an alternative variation of sentence (21). It seems that there is a case alternation on the causee, which has adessive marking in (22), but unfortunately no semantic details are offered. The precise role of the causer or the causee and the optionality of the causee are not recorded in this source. Example (22) contains thus the pattern na-da as in the negative example with the same pattern in (16), but in affirmative: nominative (causer), adessive (causee), da (the form of the nonfinite). The causee in this case is again the theme subject of an unaccusative.

(22) na-da

Nooruk lask-is mõõga-l lange-da.

youngster[NOM] let-PST.3S sword-ADE fall-DA_INF

‘The youngster let the sword fall.’

Rätsep (1978: 309.)

In previous sources it has not been pointed out that the difference between sentence (21) and (22) is aspectual and not specifically related to thematic relations: the frame with the adessive (22) can be combined with the durative adverbial mõnda aega ‘for a while’ but the frame with the total object in (21) cannot.

Example (23) contains the pattern na-da. The frame is identical with the ones in example (22) and example (16). The latter has an example with negation and the same pattern. The frame elements are identical, namely, nominative (causer), adessive (causee), and da (the form of the nonfinite). However, the role of the causee argument is different. The causee in (23), the prisoner, is the agent of the base predicate, not a theme as in the two previous examples with the sword in (21) and (22).
The verb põgenema ‘escape’ is unergative as opposed to the unaccusative langema ‘fall’. Therefore, the unergative-unaccusative difference and the difference in thematic roles is not a factor for argument encoding. Again, it can be established that aspect is relevant for encoding: the frame with the adessive -- regardless of the theme (22) or agent (23) status of it -- can be combined with the durative adverbial mõnda aega ‘for a while’ and the frame with the total case, as in (21), cannot. The evidence from the examples from previous sources thus strongly suggests that the lexically fixed thematic roles of the participants do not fully determine argument encoding. However, the aspectual features or negation are significant factors.

The -ma-nonfinite is also recorded in this source. Rätsep (1978) illustrates a pattern with the -ma-nonfinite with the following frame elements: nominative (causer), total (causee), ma (the form of the nonfinite).

Intuitively, these examples are all permissive. The extracted patterns are np-da, na-da, n all poolt postp - da, nt-da, na-da, and nt-ma. Further discussion will not include postpositional constructions. Example (23) is intuitively ambiguous between permissive and factitive, but encyclopedic knowledge about escaping situations involving prison guards and prisoners excludes the factitive reading. It is not clear if the patterns are permissive just because of the world knowledge about the arguments in the frame or because certain frames are reserved for permissives only.

Kasik (2001) offers an analysis of analytical causatives in Finnish and Estonian following Jackendoff (1983). She includes many translated corpus examples of some other but not all other Estonian analytical causatives: kääsima ‘order’, ajama ‘drive, make’, panema ‘put’, lubama ‘allow’ are discussed at different parts of this source. See examples.
Let me introduce the Estonian analytical causatives (36)-(40) of the present article for the test material with the last two verbs. However, the source does not mention restricted types that appear as permissives in a restricted range of meanings and the argument frames of those verbs can be found in the sources mentioned above, EKSS and Rätsep (1978). An example of an analytical causative with restricted meaning is *andma* ‘let, give’, which appears in idioms and otherwise expresses only one subtype of causation, cognitive causation. Cognitive causation is the causation of mental states independent of the will of the causee (Waldenfel’s, this vol. 189).

Kasik (2001: 105-113) discusses *laskma* ‘let’ as well. The source contains 46 example sentences with *laskma* ‘let’ in constructed and corpus examples. Most of them are variations of the na-da frame with unergative or transitive verbs, but the total and the partitive causees and unaccusative base verbs appear as examples as well. The imperative examples are also discussed.

This source enriches the inventory of frames with an additional, n p ela -da frame for *laskma* ‘let’ as in (25). This is a variation of the *poolt* postp -da frame. This frame has a nominative causer participant (she) and a partitive theme participant (herself) of the letting event. The theme of the matrix predicate (herself) is also the theme participant of the base predicate of being taken or being carried away by the stream of people. The stream of people is the causer of the base event, and it is encoded with the elative. In contrast to the the *poolt-

12 EKSS I, 1. (1988: 104-106) contains several instances of permissive as well as factitive readings under the entry *andma* ‘let, give’. Especially, senses number three and ten record many permissive as well as factitive illustrative examples. Sense number ten is identified with the typical grammar associated with the sense, the impersonal, and the combination with the -da-nonfinite. The subdivisions at the end of sense number three are identified with the impersonal, and the combination with the -da-nonfinite as well and, in addition, the sense has further subdivisions. Some fresh empirical material from the Internet follows to illustrate the semi-idiomatic use of the constructions with *andma* and some epistemic verbs with the content such as know, understand, or guess (i), (ii).

(i) **Teritutud** | **lasikavart** | **kaela** | **juares** | **hoides**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
sharpened | spoon.handle.PTVneck.GEN | at | keeping | 
and-si-d | nad | ta-lle | mõist-a, et | ta
give-PST-PL | they[NOM] | s/he-ALL-know-DA_INF | that | s/he[NOM] on pantvangi võetu.
be.3S hostage.IILL taken ‘By keeping a sharpened spoon handle at his throat, they let him know that he has been taken hostage.’ <http://www.prokuratuur.ee/32849> (accessed 14 April 2012).

(ii) **Pilt** | **anna- b arvata, et** | **ole-d** | **selle-s** | **teo-s**

13 For instance, na/p t da (Kasik 2001: 96), the unaccusative base realized in a frame n t da (Kasik 2001: 107), or in a negative frame, n p da (Kasik 2001: 107), or in the affirmative sentence with a partitive causee as in n p da (Kasik 2001: 110). The frame with the complementizer *et* is also recorded twice (Kasik 2001: 110, 111).
frame, where the secondary causer is a volitional causer (the enemies), the elative secondary causer is closer to a force of nature, in any case it is not a volitional cause.\textsuperscript{14}

(25) \textit{n ela da}

\textit{Ta lase-b ennas-t rahvavoolu-st kaasa viia.}

\textit{She[ NOM] let-3S herself-PTV stream.of.people-ELA together take-DA\_INF}

‘She goes with the flow of people, she lets herself be taken by the stream of people.’

(Kasik 2001:107)

The goals of the primary causer are not obtained, and the goals of the secondary causer are not obtained either, since neither of the causers has any goals in (25).

In sum, previous works include information about analytical causatives in Estonian, including \textit{laskma} ‘let’, but there have been no systematic studies yet about the exact meaning-form relationships. Rätsep (1978) and Kasik (2001) present an inventory of analytical causative frames including the verb \textit{laskma} ‘let’. Rätsep (1978) records a number

\textsuperscript{14}The nominative second argument and a case-alternating first argument are highly relevant data in the discussion of analytical causatives, but it is impossible to systematically test them in the main part of the article. Despite extensive testing of production and comprehension carried out with native speakers, the discussion of the results can be confined to footnotes. It can serve for background information and as the basis of a more exhaustive study. In the frame where the secondary agent is in the nominative and functions as the theme subject, the primary agent encoding alternates between the elative and the \textit{poolt} phrase. The alternation is constrained by factors that are partly pragmatic, partly semantic. More specifically, the morphosyntactic alternatives map to distinct semantic types. While the \textit{poolt} phrase appears with the factitive and permissive reading, the elative phrase appears with the permissive reading only as in (iii), (iv).

(iii) \textit{Teadlane lask-is oponente ?CIA poolt/}

\begin{tabular}{l}
scientist[ NOM] let-PST.3S opponent.PTV.PL CIA.GEN by \\
?kuulujuttu-de-st hirmuta-da. \\
gossip-PL-ELA intimidate-DA\_INF
\end{tabular}

‘The scientist had the CIA frighten his opponents.’ (factitive)
‘The scientist let his opponents get frightened by the gossips.’ (permissive)

(iv) \textit{Teadlane lask-is end CIA poolt/}

\begin{tabular}{l}
scientist[ NOM] let-PST.3S himself CIA.GEN by \\
kuulujuttu-de-st hirmuta-da. \\
gossip-PL-ELA intimidate-DA\_INF
\end{tabular}

‘The scientist let himself be frightened by he CIA/the gossips.’ (permissive)

The \textit{poolt} phrase can appear with the factitive reading and with the total case marking on the patient as well, but the sentence sounds constructed (v).

(v) \textit{CIA laskis võimu-de poolt teadlus-e töölt vallanda-da,}

\begin{tabular}{l}
CIA[ NOM] let-PST.3S power-GEN.PL by scientist.TOT fire-DA\_INF \\
et rahva slimi-s tema usaldusväärsus-t tõst-a. \\
that people.GEN eye-INE he.GEN trust-PTV increase-DA\_INF
\end{tabular}

‘The CIA had the scientist fired by the government in order to increase the trust of the people in him.’
of frames, and Kasik (2001) offers an analysis in terms of roles. The Estonian monolingual dictionary distinguishes the permissive and the factitive lexical senses. However, the factitive is recorded only in the sense of issuing the order and not in the sense of controlling or influencing the execution of the order, which is also possible with this verb. The rest of the sources do not give explicit interpretation of the differences between the frames in terms of permissive and factitive readings. It is unclear which elements in the frames can be omitted and if the omission has any effect on the interpretation.

The novel part compared to any previous sources is the analysis of how the meaning of *laskma* ‘let, make, have, allow, permit’ is divided into the factitive and permissive type, and relating the distinction to the exact morphosyntax of the predicational structures -- argument frames.

4. The inventory of Estonian analytical causative frames

4.1. The goal

The present paper has a syntactic and argument structure related goal. It concentrates on the minimal data in detail and discusses analytical causatives with three arguments. The frames gathered from previous sources are a suitable stating point. However, they should be regarded as evidence for spontaneous language use or evidence about native linguists’ intuitions only. This information is systematically tested in the sections to come. Firstly, it will be established which frames exist and which don’t. Secondly, it will be clarified which of the elements are omittable and which of them can alternate. Thirdly and most importantly, it will be tested what the semantic interpretations are. The present paper illustrates and tests the semantics of the range of possible argument frames abstracting away from the number of grammatical, contextual, and discourse factors that play an important role in the encoding and omission of arguments. It diverges from the typological literature by using explicit tests in minimal pairs to establish the available frames and the distinction between the permissive and factitive frame types.

All the examples are variations of the Estonian translation of *the professor let/had/made the student(s) write an/the article*. Consequently, the nominative NP *professor* ‘professor’ is the subject argument of the verb *laskma* ‘let’ (the causer) and *artikkel* ‘article’ is the object argument of the verb *kirjutama* ‘write’ (the effected object in the causative creation event). The semantic argument that is shared by both *laskma* ‘let’ and *kirjutama*
‘write’ is *tudeng* ‘student’ (the causee). The NP *tudeng* ‘student’ is the agent of the writing event and the causee-lettee of the letting event.

In the following subsections, the variation of the first argument is not considered. This is not self-evident in Estonian, which displays a richer inventory of subject encoding than the unmarked nominative that a general reader might take for granted. Estonian has two or more subject cases, depending on the approach. Some sentences have an alternation between the nominative and the partitive case on an argument that has the same thematic role. However, importantly, in analytical causatives, only the nominative case can mark the first agent and subject.

4.2. Causee encoding in the frame nxp-da: optional, adessive or total

Previous sources have recorded the following case-marking possibilities for the causees: the partitive, total and adessive case. The frame with the by-phrase as the causer of the base event is discussed separately in 4.6. The goal of the test in (26) is to identify the grammatical causee encoding in the frame nxp-da; x stands for the element that is being tested. Sentence (26) contains the matrix verb *laskma* ‘let’ with the subordinate base verb in the -*da*-nonfinite form. The frame includes the nominative (causer) and the partitive (object of the nonfinite) noun phrase as well. The frames that are tested are thus npp-da, nap-da, and ntp-da.

(26) npp-da, nap-da, *ntp-da

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>lask-is</th>
<th>(tudengi-t/tudengi-l/*tudengi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professor[NOM]</td>
<td>let-PST.3S</td>
<td>student-PTV/-ADE/.TOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artikli-t</td>
<td>kirjuta-da.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 A phrase with a complementizer *et* ‘that’ is also a possible option, but it is not discussed further. Suffice it to mention that the frame has permissive as well as factitive readings. The frame with the elative causer of the base event is excluded in the discussion below (see example (25) for more discussion). The main reason is the semantic restriction on the role of the first argument in the elative frame, as in the *stream of people* in example (25), which is translated as *she lets herself be taken by the stream of people*. In a cooperative intellectual creation event such as writing, which has been chosen as the basis of the test, more specifically in the event of getting an article written, the role of the professor differs from the role of the stream of people in its volitionality. Elative is marginally acceptable as the marker of the volitional but negligent agent in an abessive negative construction denoting the event, as in (vi).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>article[NOM]</th>
<th>remain-PST3S</th>
<th>s/he-ELA professor-ELA</th>
<th>write-M_ABEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

‘The professor did not write (up) the article. / The professor failed to write the article.’

The interpretation that can be given to sentence (vi) with the elative *professor* includes an intent of the professor or someone else concerning the writing of the article by the professor, but the plan has failed. There is at least an implicature of negligence in the interpretation of sentence (vi).
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article-PTV write-DA_INF

‘The professor let the student write an article.’

The secondary agent argument (the causee tudeng ‘student’) is partitive or adessian case marked in sentence (26). More specifically, the test in (26) has shown that the causee can be encoded with the partitive or adessian in the frame nxp-da, where the non-finite is of the da type and the object of the non-finite is partitive. Omission of the causee is grammatical in this frame, although it is subject to pragmatic conditioning.

4.3. Causee encoding in the frame nxp-ma: obligatory, partitive or total

Sentence (27) tests identical argument encoding with (26), but the base verb has the -ma-nonfinite form. The frame includes the nominative (causer) and the partitive (object of the nonfinite) noun phrase as well. The goal of the test in (27) is to identify the grammatical causee encoding in the frame nxp-ma.

(27) npp-ma, ntp-ma, *nap-ma

Professor lask-is tudengi/?tudengi-t/*tudengi-l

professor[NOM] let-PST.3S student.TOT/-PTV/-ADE

artikli-t kirjuta-ma.

article-PTV write-M_ILL

‘The professor let the student write an article.’

Sentence (27) illustrates a frame where the secondary agent argument (tudeng ‘student’) displays the partitive or total case marking on the causee, secondary agent argument with the other type of nonfinite, the -ma-nonfinite. The causee is not optional.

4.4. Causee encoding in the frame nxt-da: optional, partitive or adessian

Examples (26) and (27) have demonstrated alternations in the nonfinite choice and the second argument. In addition to the variation of the nonfinites and the second argument, there is another case alternation possible in these frames, namely, between the total and the partitive case on the third argument, the patient NP of the base verb. Sentences (26) and (27) demonstrate the combinations with the partitive third argument, sentences (28) and (29) show the grammaticality judgment about the frames with a total case marked third argument.

(28) npt-da, nat-da, *ntt-da
Anne Tamm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>lask-is</th>
<th>(tudengi-t/tudengi-l/*tudengi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professor[NOM]</td>
<td>let-PST.3S</td>
<td>student-PTV/-ADE/.TOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>artikli</th>
<th>kirjuta-da.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>article.TOT</td>
<td>write-DA_INF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The professor let the student write an article.’

With the omission of the second argument: ‘The professor had an article written.’

The frame in example (28) has an optional second argument, which is either adessive or partitive; the total case is not possible. In case of omission, the intuition is that the reading is factitive and that permissive is excluded. In other frames, the omission of the argument is either odd or ungrammatical. The -da-nonfinite frame allows thus the total case marked third argument only with an adessive and partitive second argument (28).

4.5. The frame nxt-ma does not exist

The -ma-nonfinite does not allow the total case encoding of the third argument at all (29).

(29)  *ntt-ma, *npt-ma, *nat-ma

*/#Professor | lask-is | tudengi/tudengi-t/tudengi-l |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professor[NOM]</td>
<td>let-PST.3S</td>
<td>student.TOT/-PTV/-ADE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

artikli | kirjuta-ma. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>article.TOT</td>
<td>write-M_Ill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intended to mean: ‘The professor let the student write an article.’

The ungrammaticity of (29) (the frame nxt-ma) results from the combination of two facts related to case-marking and event structure. Firstly, the -ma-nonfinite is a cross-categorial goal case form that denotes transition towards another event or a place connected to an event. Secondly, the condition for the total case is the completeness of the event. These two factors constrain the compatibility of the two events and the two grammatical items in one sentence. If a nonfinite has goal case marking (‘to’), then the event denoted by this form is described as potentially starting, but not as going on or as being completed. The total case requires the opposite -- the completion of the event. Consider a parallel from the interaction of goal case marking and event completion on an analogy with English. The ‘goalness’ of events as opposed to locations (‘going to a place’) is comparable to the concept of ‘going to an activity’. The sentence ‘Mary went to school’ does not entail that Mary is at school or that Mary has finished being at school. Transferring ‘goalness’ to events, the sentence ‘Mary
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went to write an article’ does not entail that Mary is writing an article or that Mary has finished writing the article. Adding the permissive and factitive embedding, letting Mary go to school does not entail that Mary is at school or that she has finished being at school. Letting Mary go to write an article does not entail that Mary is writing an article or that she has finished writing an article. For the total case to materialize, however, the entailment of the completion of the event is necessary. Since the -ma-nonfinite and the total object case require conflicting entailments, the combination is ungrammatical. There are two ways of understanding the ungrammaticality in sentence (29): either incompatible semantics causes it, which is marked by the use of the hash mark, or the syntax of such predicates is responsible for the constraints, which is expressed by the asterisk. Depending on the linguistic framework, these two judgments on the grammaticality of the sentence are thus possible.

Note that the frame is possible without the total case-marked object. This possibility is explained by the fact that the aspect is not specified because if there is no case-marked object then the aspect is not constrained. The interpretation defaults to unbounded, atelic, and imperfective in that case.

4.6. The secondary agent is expressed by a by-phrase: n (all) poolt postp t –da

In the frame where a by-phrase stands for the secondary agent, the theme of the matrix predicate and the agent of the base predicate diverge. Therefore, one cannot strictly regard this argument as the causee. The causation events are intuitively more separated as well. Sentence (30) tests the frame with the total object as the third argument, and sentence (31) tests the frame with the partitive object as the third argument. Both sentences test the two types of nonfinites as possible candidates for the encoding of the base predicate. Without the allative phrase, the sentence would be pragmatically odd but marginally acceptable. A translatival phrase would suffice for the same pragmatic purpose, as in reitingu tõstmiseks ‘in order to improve the ranking’. The complement of the phrase headed by poolt is obligatorily in the morphological genitive.

(30) n (all) poolt postp t -da, *n (all) poolt postp t -ma

??Direktor lask-is enda-le artikel tänulike
director[NOM] let-PST.3S self-ALL article.TOT grateful-GEN.PL
alluva-te poolt valmis kirjuta-da/ *kirjuta-ma.
employee-GEN.PL by ready write-DA_INF write-M_ILL
‘The director had his article written up by grateful employees.’
Sentence (30) shows that in the analytical causative with *laskma* ‘let’ and a by-phrase that stands for the secondary agent, the frame can have a total object as the third argument. From the two types of nonfinites, only the *-da-nonfinite* is a possible encoding for the base predicate.

(31) *n all poolt post p -dal-ma

| *Direktor* | *lask-is* | *enda-le* | *artikli-t* |
| director[NOM] | let-PST.3S | self-ALL | article-PTV |
| *tänulike* | *alluva-te* | *poolt* | *kirjuta-da/kirjuta-ma.* |
| grateful-GEN.PL | employee-GEN.PL | by | write-DA-INF/M_ILL |

Intended: ‘The director had his article written up by grateful employees.’

Sentence (31) shows that in the analytical causative with *laskma* ‘let’ and a by-phrase that stands for the secondary agent, the frame cannot have a partitive object as the third argument. Neither of the nonfinites is grammatical in the test with the partitive third argument, both of them are unavailable for the base predicate. The causation events are intuitively more separated. The *poolt* phrase appears with the factitive reading, but it is unclear whose goals are obtained at the end of the day. Intuitively, the article is written to be forwarded further, and that it is written by the grateful employees is part of a cooperative plan where the director has no intellectual input in the creation event.

The by-phrase secondary agents will not be discussed further because they are atypical. Here are the main points of this small-scale study on them:

1) the *-ma-nonfinite* is not possible in a frame with a by-phrase
2) the partitive third argument is not possible in a frame with a by-phrase
3) the events are concrete, and the predicate is intuitively factitive.

4.7. Summary of Section 4

Table 1 summarizes the grammatical and ungrammatical judgments about the combinations. In sum, the following frames are acceptable: nap-da, npp-da, npp-ma, ntp-ma, nat-da, npt-da. The following frames are not acceptable: ntp-da, nap-ma, ntt-da, nat-ma, npt-ma, ntt-ma. Some regularities can be noticed, and questions asked. For instance, why is it not possible to have a *-ma-nonfinite* as the base and the total case marking on the third argument? The sections to come aim at finding out what some of the semantic conditions of
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 acceptability of argument encoding of the analytical permissives and causatives are. More specifically, the goal is to capture the distinction between factitive and permissive frames in a systematic way.

Table 1. The grammatical and ungrammatical frames of *laskma* ‘let’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>frame</th>
<th>example number</th>
<th>possible combination</th>
<th>nonfinite type</th>
<th>arg 2</th>
<th>arg 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nap-da</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>npp-da</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntp-da</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nap-ma</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>npp-ma</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntp-ma</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nat-da</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>npt-da</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntt-da</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nat-ma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>npt-ma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntt-ma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5. Tests for establishing the permissive and factitive reading

5.1. Permissives and factitives

The previous sections have found more analytical causative frames for *laskma* ‘let’ than there were discussed in previous sources. The ungrammatical or less typical but still possible combinations have been ruled out. Previous sources have not identified all verb frames that are possible with a transitive base verb simply because the alternation of the object case of the base verb has not been taken as a relevant indicator for the meaning before. However, in order to gain knowledge about the nature of the events involved in factitive and permissive constructions, which is the goal of this article, it is necessary to have an object in the base verb frame. The encoding of the object tells us additional facts about the structure of the events in the analytical causative. The previous sections have also established that in combination with a base verb *kirjutama* ‘write’, the verb *laskma* ‘let’ allows permissive and factitive readings. The factitive reading is not sufficiently
documented in the dictionary and it is only sporadically covered by grammar and scholarly books. Possibly, this reading is not as frequently found, but there is no clear evidence for frequency either. There is, however, a clear difference in the constraints associated with the arguments of the factitive versus permissive laskma ‘let’. On the one hand, the factitive frame of laskma ‘let’ is more restricted with regard to the features of the participants of the event (e.g., animacy) than the less specialized frames of other analytical factitive verbs (e.g., panema ‘put’). On the other hand, the permissive frame of laskma ‘let’ is less restricted with regard to the participants of the event than the more specialized frames of other analytical permissive verbs (e.g., lubama ‘allow’). The permissive laskma ‘let’ restricts the properties of the event participants less than the factitive does and, therefore, allows for a wider range of uses. The permissive and the factitive are recorded in the monolingual dictionary as separate senses.

In the factitive reading, a situation is described where one agent influences another agent to cause the base event. The influence of the first agent is rather exercised by means of the authority of power. Instead of concrete action, which is the usual object of causative studies, the event starts with an utterance representing an order. The soldiers in the dictionary example ‘The first year recruits were made crawl in gas masks’ (see example (11) of section 2) crawl in gas masks because of the power of an order backed up by authority, not because of any physical impact. In the permissive readings, the situation connects a base event that is permitted with a passive or active event of granting permission for the base event. In case of negation, the permissive construction covers an active event of prevention or resistance.

Once these two readings are clearly distinguished together with a set of possible frames, the following question can be asked: do these two readings correspond to a clearly different set of frames? Only after testing it is possible to establish that there is a clear frame-meaning correspondence that distinguishes the permissive frames from the factitive ones. Before the grammatically acceptable patterns of the two nonfinites and the case encoding of the causee-lettee agent tudeng ‘student’ and the patient artikel ‘article’ can be subjected to categorizing into permissive and factitive, clear semantic tests for the two readings should be found that work independently of the verb laskma. To find the suitable tests, some argument and event related variables need to be clarified. Therefore, questions such as animacy and volition of the arguments and the temporal and spatial distance and overlap between the two subevents will be discussed in the next two subsections.
5.2. Animacy and volition

Apart from the basic alternations, which are discussed in this article, the Estonian permissives and factitives display further differences that should be mentioned. Permissives allow for more flexibility in the argument frame in terms of restrictions on the animacy of the arguments, separated locations of subevents, etc. As part of our encyclopedic knowledge, inanimates or compelling circumstances such as floods or heat cannot give permission, but they can cause an event by involuntarily forcing an agent to perform an event. However, Estonian language does not encode the possibility of inanimate factivity, as shown by example (32) that demonstrates the lack of this option.

(32) #Silmipimestav päike lask-is tudungi-t/tudungi-l
piercing[NOM] sun[NOM] make-PST.3S student-PTV/ADE
päikeseprill-id ette panna.
sunglass-NOM.PL PRT take.on-DA_INF

Intended to mean: ‘Piercing sun made the student take on the sunglasses.’

The factitive meaning cannot emerge with laskma ‘let’ and in the predicate describing the event of the inanimate sun making the student take on his sunglasses (32). The factitive meaning of this verb has not grammaticalized to the extent to allow inanimate subjects.16

In contrast with the factitive meaning that cannot occur with inanimate subjects, the permissive reading is available. In case of a permissive reading, the frame has the adessive or partitive second argument and the -da-nonfinite (33), or the total case and the -ma-nonfinite

---

16 Negation changes the grammaticality judgment with causers. The permissive reading emerges with inanimate causers in this frame (vii). Counter to the information in Kasik (2001: 79, 80), there is evidence that an event can be a causer as well (viii), but this is true in the negated sentence. In the affirmative sentence, the animacy of the subject is a constraint on the construction.

(vii) ??Silmipimestav päike ei lask-nud
piercing[NOM] sun[NOM] NEG permit-PST.3S
student-PTV/ADE sunglass. PTV PRT take.off-DA_INF
‘Piercing sun made the student keep on his sunglasses, did not let the student take off his sunglasses.’

(viii) ??Päikesepaiste tugevnemine ei lask-nud
sunshine.GEN strengthening[NOM] NEG permit-PST.3S
student-PTV/ADE sunglass. PTV PRT take.off-DA_INF
‘The strengthening of sunshine made the student keep on his sunglasses, did not let the student take off his sunglasses.’
(34). Inanimates cannot give permission but can be ‘favorable’ and not hinder the second argument agent in performing the base event. A paraphrase could be ‘enable’. The frame with the -da-nonfinite is more felicitous than the frame with the -ma-nonfinite.

(33) *Soe ilm lask-is ?tudengi-t/tudengi-l*

warm[NOM] weather[NOM] permit-PST.3S student-PTV/-ADE

*hommiku-ni aiapeo-l ölu-t jiu-a.*

morning-TER garden.party-ADE beer-PTV drink-DA_INF

‘Warm weather let the student drink beer at a garden party until morning.’

(34) *Elekrikatkestus lask-is ??tudengi-t/?tudengi puhka-ma.*

power.outage[NOM] permit-PST.3S student-PTV/TOT rest-M_ILL

‘The power outage allowed the student to rest/gave the student some rest.’

The examples (32)-(34) with inanimates demonstrate some important characteristics of Estonian permissives and factitives. Volition or agentivity (and not only external cause, cf. Levin and Rappaport 1995) are necessary for the concept of factitivity, being part of the grammaticalized entailments in the frame with laskma ‘let, make’. However, the capability to utter or to grant permission, which again involves agentivity, volition or sentience, is not part of the grammaticalized entailments of the permissive frame with laskma ‘let, allow’. External cause, more specifically, the lack of direct causation, enables the base event in the Estonian permissives.\(^{17}\) The agentivity-related constraint distinguishes factitives, which have obligatory agents, from permissives, which don’t. The effects of negation require a separate study.

5.3. Spatial separation

Another intuitive difference between factitives and permissives concerns spatial separation. The permissive reading allows different locations for the two subevents, and the factitive reading does not (35).

(35) *(??)Professor lask-is ülikooli-s tudengi-t*

professor[NOM] let-PST.3S university-INE student-PTV

*raamatukogu-s artikli-t kirjuta-da.*

library-INE article-PTV write-DA_INF

\(^{17}\) A note on negation is in order. The total case is not possible with negation, but the other options are improved under negation and should be interpreted without the question marks.
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??‘The professor (who is at the university) had the student (who is in the library) write the article.’
‘The professor (who is at the university) allowed the student (who is in the library) to write the article.’

If the library is understood to be at the university, that is, in the situation where the base event location is contained by the matrix event one, then the sentence becomes difficult to process. This difficulty can be due to the regular polysemy of institutions that have buildings and locations. A university can be understood as an institution, and the library as a building, or vice versa. The identical location and institution seem to be a condition for the emergence of the factitive reading. In case of ambiguity, forcing the factitive meaning solves the ambiguity in the number of locations, in the sense that only the reading of one location is possible. The factitive disappears if the different locations are referred to clearly, for instance by making reference to the University of Tartu versus the library of the University of Tallinn. Locations can be either identical or different in the permissive events. In addition to the illustrated example, the ma-nonfinite variation of the sentence is possible, namely, if the NP that stands for the base event location, the library, is in the illative. In that case, the reading is permissive.

5.5. The two tests

Examples (32)-(35) illustrate some of the many differences between the Estonian permissives and factitives with laškma ‘let’. In the following subsections, each of the identified frames are tested for their factitive and permissive readings. However, the data set is restricted to frames with two agents and two patients.

Since the goal is to establish the semantics-morphosyntax correspondences, and the morphology is visible in the encoding of the cases and nonfinites, the tests are designed to be semantic, not syntactic in their nature. The results of the syntactic tests that failed the combinations ntp-da, nap-ma, ntt-da, nat-ma, npt-ma, and ntt-ma will not be repeated, and the judgments about the sentences are not syntactic or morphological in nature. Only the acceptable frames will be categorized further for their interpretations: nap-da, npp-da, npp-ma, ntp-ma, nat-da, and npt-da. In this morphosyntactically restricted test set, the factitive and permissive distinction can be tested with two tests that are referred to as the ‘matrix event cancellation test’ and the ‘base event cancellation test’.
5.5.1. The 'matrix event cancellation test'. In order to show what can be expected from the effect of the tests, they are illustrated with typical analytical factitive and permissive verbs that realize the factitive and permissive meanings separately, the factitive verb panema ‘put, set, make’ and the permissive verb lubama ‘allow, permit’. The matrix event cancellation test is designed to fail with permissives and to allow factitives. The test is sensitive for the un cancellable entailment of non-hindering in sentences with an animate first argument, such as the agent professor in the examples of sections 4 and 5 above. The entailment of non-hindering is the basis for the test. More specifically, Estonian agentive permissives entail that the primary agent does not hinder the second event via hindering the secondary agent in any way. The continuation ja takistas tudengit ka muul moel ‘and hindered the student in other ways as well’ should yield an odd effect. On the contrary, in case of factitives, the entailment should be cancelable. When the professor makes the student write an article, he may be hindering the student in, for instance, writing the dissertation.

An example of a clear contrast is demonstrated by means of the prototypical factitive verb panema ‘put, set, make, force’, which is compatible with ja takistas tudengit ka muul moel ‘and hindered the student in other ways as well’ in (36), and the prototypical permissive lubama ‘allow’, which is not, as in (37).

(36) ??Professor pan-i tudengi artikli-t professor[NOM] make-PST.3S student.TOT article-PTV
kirjuta-ma ja takista-s tudengi-t ka muu-l
write-M ILL and hinder-PST.3S student-PTV also other-ADE
moe-l.
manner-ADE
‘The professor made the student write the article, (go and) start writing the article and hindered the student in other ways as well.’

(37) #Professor luba-s tudengi-l/tudengi-t artikli-t professor[NOM] allow-PST.3S student-ADE/-PTV article-PTV
kirjuta-da ja takista-s tudengi-t ka muu-l moel.
write-DA_INF and hinder-PST.3S student-PTV also other-ADE manner-ADE
‘The professor allowed the student to write the article (be busy with writing the article, do some article-writing), and hindered the student in other ways as well.’

276
In sum, the cancelability of the causing, matrix event, more specifically, the cancelability of the the non-hindering event entailment, serves as an indicator of factivity. The test fails with permissive frames and allows factitive frames.

5.5.2. *The base event cancellation test.* The base event cancellation test fails with factitives and allows most permssives. The test is based on the following property. In order for a sentence to classify as factitive, the secondary agent should be involved in an event by a primary agent, an event or a fact. As opposed to permissive sentences, factitive sentences entail the existence of the base event (38). In fact, this entailment is among the defining features of factitive sentences. The same prototypical verbs, the factitive *panema* ‘put, set, make’ and the permissive *lubama* ‘allow’ illustrate the difference in the readings that reveals itself in the obligatory nature of the base event.

(38)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>pan-i</th>
<th>tudendi</th>
<th>artikel-t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professor[NOM]</td>
<td>make-PST.3S</td>
<td>student.TOT</td>
<td>article-PTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirjuta-ma, aga</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>haka-nud=ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write-M_ILL but</td>
<td>this[NOM]</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>start-ACT.PST.PTCP=FOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirjuta-ma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write-M_ILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The professor made the student write the article, (go and) start writing the article but he did not even start writing it.’

Permissives, on the contrary, encode the cancellability of the base event (39), as illustrated by the possible continuation of the sentences with *aga see ei hakanudki kirjutama* ‘but he did not even start writing it’, which cancels the second event.

(39)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>luba-s</th>
<th>tudensi-l</th>
<th>artikel-t</th>
<th>kirjuta-da,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professor[NOM]</td>
<td>allow-PST.3S</td>
<td>student-ADE</td>
<td>article-PTV</td>
<td>write-DA_INF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aga</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>haka-nud=ki</td>
<td>kirjuta-ma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>this[NOM]</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>start-ACT.PST.PTCP=FOC</td>
<td>write-M_ILL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The professor allowed the student to write the article (be busy with writing the article, do some article-writing), but he did not even start writing it.’

---

18As opposed to the possibly factitive construction with the verb *laskma* ‘let’, this factitive verb is not compatible with the -da-nonfinite. Therefore, we cannot speak of strictly factitive argument frames that would correspond to clear factitive meaning.
On the other hand, the base event cancellation test shows that there is a further difference between the permissives. The base event can be cancelled with an adessive second argument in the frame (39), however, the base event cannot be cancelled with a partitive second argument in the frame (40).

(40) #Professor luba-s tudengi-t artikel-t
    professor[NOM] allow-PST.3S student-PTV article-PTV
    kirjuta-da, aga see ei
    write-DA-INF but this[NOM] NEG
    haka-nud=ki kirjuta-ma.
    start-ACT.PST.PTCP=FOC write-M_I LL
‘The professor allowed the student to write the article (be busy with writing the article, do some article-writing), but he did not even start writing it.’

In example (40), the base event is obligatory and this fact shows that the permissives with a partitive second argument bear much resemblance to factitives. Example (40) involves more control of the causer agent on the causee agent.

5.5.3. Summary of the tests. This subsection constructed separate tests that tease apart factitive analytical causatives such as *panema* ‘force, put, make’ and permissive analytical causatives, such as *lubama* ‘allow’. The matrix event cancellation test fails with permissives and allows factitives. The cancelability of the base event, more specifically, the optionality of the existence of the base event indicates the presence of the permissive meaning. Some variations of the test are introduced in the ensuing analysis, such as changing the identity of the object in the base event. The matrix and base event cancellation tests can tease apart the factitive and permissive readings in the verb constructions with *laskma* ‘let’ and some further distinctions in the permissive reading. To separate the readings is important in order to establish the exact frames that correspond to the different meanings, which in turn is relevant for finding out the causative relationships in a wider perspective.
6. Testing the frames

6.1. Factitive and permissive frames and readings

The syntactically valid frames have been identified, and semantic tests for teasing apart the permissive and factitive readings are also available now. This section aims at finding out which of the syntactically possible argument frames are permissive and which of them are factitive. If a frame is referred to as factitive or permissive, this means that the constellation of argument encoding has a factitive or a permissive reading, respectively.

6.2. The frames with the -da-nonfinite

6.2.1. nap-da. The nap-da frame is factitive, since the matrix event cancellation test shows that the permissive event can be cancelled (41).

(41) ??Professor lask-is tudengi-l artikli-t kirjuta-da
professor[NOM] let-PST.3S student-ADE article-PTV write-DA_INF
ja takista-s tudengi-t ka muu-l moe-l.
and hinder-PST.3S student-PTV also other-ADE manner-ADE

‘The professor made the student write the article (be busy with writing the article, do some article-writing), and hindered the student in other ways as well.’

However, the base event can also be cancelled (42), since there is also a permissive reading possible with this frame.

(42) ??Professor lask-is tudengi-l artikli-t
professor[NOM] let-PST.3S student-ADE article-PTV
kirjuta-da, aga see ei haka-nud=ki
write-DA_INF but this[NOM] NEG start-ACT.PST.PTCP=FOC
kirjuta-ma.
write-M_ILL

‘The professor let the student write the article (be busy with writing the article, do some article-writing), but he did not even start writing it.’

6.2.2. nat-da. The nat-da frame is factitive, since the matrix event cancellation test shows that the permissive matrix event can be cancelled (43).
Also, the base event can be cancelled, which shows that the frame is permissive. The second test does not apply directly, since total object marking with verbs such as ‘write’ entail the completion of an event. However, changing the exact identity of the object of the base event enables testing, as in example (44).

(44) ??Professor lask-is tudengi-l
    professor[NOM] let-PST.3s student-ADE
    artikli kirjuta-da, aga see kirjuta-s
    article.TOT write-DA_INF but this[NOM] write-PST.3s
    hoopis raamatu.
    instead book.TOT
    ‘The professor let the student write the article, but the student wrote a book instead.’

The event of writing an article can be cancelled if the entailment pertaining to the completion of the event remains unc cancelled (shown by the total case marking, see Tamm 2004, 2007).

6.2.3. npp-da. The npp-da frame is factitive, since the matrix event cancellation test shows that the permissive matrix event can be cancelled (45).19

(45) ??Professor lask-is tudengi-t artikli-t
    professor[NOM] let-PST.3s student-PTV article-PTV

19 As opposed to example (39) with the permissive lubama ‘allow, permit’ that contains partitive second and third arguments in its frame, the verb laskma ‘let’ passes the test. The fact either shows that there is no clear permissive frame, that either laskma ‘let’ or lubama ‘allow, permit’ is a lexical exception or that the semantics of permitting differs in these verbs. This issue will be left for further study.
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cirjuta-da ja takista-s tudengi-t ka muu-l
write-DA_INF and hinder-PST.3S student-PTV also other-ADE
moe-l.
manner-ADE

‘The professor made/had the student write the article (be busy with writing the article, do some article-writing) and hindered the student in other ways as well.’

The base event can be cancelled (46), since there is a possible permissive reading as well. In this frame, however, distinguishing the two readings is complicated.

(46) ??Professor lask-is tudengi-t artikli-t
professor[NOM] let-PST.3S/ make-PST.3S student-PTV article-PTV
kirjuta-da aga see ei haka-nud=ki
write-DA_INF but this[NOM] NEG start-ACT.PST.PTCP=FOC
kirjuta-ma.
write-M_ILL

‘The professor let the student write the article (be busy with writing the article, do some article-writing), but he did not even start writing it.’

6.2.4. npt-da. The npt-da frame is factitive, since the matrix event cancellation test shows that the permissive matrix event can be cancelled (47).

(47) ??Professor lask-is tudengi-t
professor[NOM] let-PST.3S student-PTV
artikli kirjuta-da
article.TOT write-DA_INF
ja takista-s tudengi-t ka muu-l moe-l.
and hinder-PST.3S student-PTV also other-ADE manner-ADE

‘The professor made/had the student write the article (to finish it) and hindered the student in other ways as well.’

Differently from the frame nat-da in example (46), leaving the event completion entailment intact by changing only the identity of the object, from an article to a book, in the event of writing up something, doesn’t lead to a cancelable base event in the test sentence (48).
This result leads to the following options:

1) either the test is unsuitable for testing the permissive/factitive distinction
2) the test is unsuitable for testing some maximally bounded events (events that have a natural endpoint), the identity of the result cannot be changed
3) the test may show a relevant difference between the overlap of the events in the adessive (nat-da) and partitive (npt-da) frames with a total object, third argument
4) the control of the primary causer persists throughout the event of the base predicate.

The first two options are considered below. Since for some reason the details of the base event cannot be cancelled, another test could be applied, using the synonym permissive verb lubama ‘allow’ and the synonym factitive sundima ‘force, make’ to illustrate the emergence of the permissive reading next to the factitive meaning in (49).
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The synonym test shows that both permissive and factitive readings are available. However, in this frame, the permissive element is more difficult to spot than in other frames. Rather, the permissive and the factitive readings blend in this frame. On the one hand, the permissive meaning is present. On the other hand, the base event is not optional; it is optional only with partitive third arguments. The two events, the permission and the base event, are temporally overlapping, and the temporal overlap condition is shared with factives.

6.3. The frame with the -ma-nonfinite: ntp-ma

The frame ntp-ma is only permissive, since the matrix event cancellation test shows that the permissive matrix event cannot be cancelled (50) and the base event can be cancelled (51).

(50) \#Professor lask-is tudengi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>professor[NOM]</th>
<th>let- PST.3S</th>
<th>student.TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>artikel-t</td>
<td>kirjuta-ma</td>
<td>ja takista-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article-PTV</td>
<td>write-M_ILL</td>
<td>hinder-PST.3S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka muu-l</td>
<td>moel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

also other-ADE manner-ADE

‘The professor let the student write the article (to start writing, go and start writing the article) and hindered the student in other ways as well.’

(51) Professor lask-is tudengi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>professor[NOM]</th>
<th>let- PST.3S, make</th>
<th>student.TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>artikel-t</td>
<td>kirjuta-ma, aga see ei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>article-PTV</td>
<td>write-M_ILL but this[NOM] NEG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haka-nud=ki kirjuta-ma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>start-ACT.PST.PTCP=FOC write-M_ILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The professor let the student write the article (to start writing, go and start writing the article), but he did not even start writing it.’

6.4. Summary of the tests and discussion

This section studied the verb complex of laskma ‘let’ and the verb kirjutama ‘write’ and its factitive and permissive meanings and correspondences with the frame and nonfinite type.
Table 2 summarizes the frames of *laskma* ‘let, make, have, permit, allow’ and their correspondence to the permissive and factitive readings.

Table 2. The frames of *laskma* ‘let’ and the permissive and factitive readings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>frame</th>
<th>permissive</th>
<th>factitive</th>
<th>nonfinite type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nap-da</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nat-da</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>npp-da</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>npt-da</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntp-ma</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>npp-ma</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The factitive-permissive *laskma* ‘let, make, have, allow, permit’ has four frames with the factitive *laskma* ‘let, make, have’ reading: nap/t-da, npp/t-da. The last two rows indicate a relevant distinction. The permissive *laskma* ‘let, allow’ has six frames, including the -da- and -ma-nonfinites. The factitive *laskma* ‘let, make’ has no frames with the -ma-nonfinite. The possible hypothesis is that the lexical semantics of the factitive *laskma* ‘let’ is such that it does not allow for two temporally distinct events; this is why the verb has no factitive frames with the -ma-nonfinite. And why cannot the total case-marked third argument co-occur with the -ma-nonfinite? The puzzling lack of the total case encoding and the -ma-nonfinite could also be explained on event structural basis. Since the event of permissive letting is over when the permission event is over, normally the base event cannot be completed simultaneously with the letting event. In addition, the Estonian -ma-nonfinite is actually an instance of a nonfinite with a cross-categorial illative case, which can denote only the beginning of an event and not its completion. Factitive predicates restrict the subevents to being temporally overlapping.

As a further hypothesis, thus, it is plausible that the choice between the nonfinites reflects the relation between the events. Simultaneous events seem to be encoded by the base predicate with the -da-nonfinite morphology. The -ma-nonfinite occurs probably when the temporal relationship is established between the event or permission described in the matrix predicate and at most the initial sub-event of the base predicate: the beginning of writing the article but not writing or finishing the article. The initial sub-event of the base
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predicate is the result state of the matrix predicate event. These issues are in need of further investigation.

7. Conclusion

The article has proposed a systematic analysis for teasing apart factitive and permissive forms and meanings in languages where the lexical item potentially combines both, and, by extension, a tool for testing these readings in a lexical item. The results are put in a format that is likely to be usable for several schools of linguistics.

The main part of the paper has investigated the analytical causatives in Estonian. Further, it has proposed an analysis of the Estonian analytical causatives with *laskma* ‘let’, where the morphosyntax of their predicational structures (frames) is correlated with the permissive and factitive semantics. The intuitions and the sporadic data gathered from previous sources has been subjected to systematic testing. Several syntactic and semantic tests have been constructed to identify the syntactic patterns and semantic features. The acceptable frames are as follows: nap-da, npp-da, npp-ma, ntp-ma, nat-da, and npt-da. The factitive and permissive semantics has been tested with two tests, the ‘matrix event cancellation test’ and the ‘base event cancellation test’.

The main empirical finding is that the morphosyntax of the argument frames is correlated with the permissive and factitive semantics. The morphosyntax of the permissive structures has proved to be more varied and the morphosyntax of the factitive structures more restricted. The choice between the nonfinites reflects the distinction of permissive and factitive. Only permissive frames contain the -ma-nonfinites, and only permissive frames have the adessive causee argument case marking in the frame with the -da-nonfinite.

**Abbreviations, conventions, and signs**

a. Abbreviations for the glosses.

- **ACT.PST.PTCP** – active past participle
- **ADE** – adessive
- **DA_INF** – -da-nonfinite
- **FOC** – focus or distributive clitic
- **ILL** – illative
- **IPS** – impersonal
- **M_I LL** – -ma-nonfinite (in some accounts, called the supine)
b. Punctuation marks that are used to represent the status of the element or the combination in terms of grammaticality, semantics, pragmatics, and usage in the example sentences.

* a grammatically unacceptable element or sentence, a violation of a syntactic or a morphological rule
# semantically unacceptable sentence
% pragmatically unacceptable utterances
?? a grammatically acceptable sentence that is not likely to be found in native productive texts
? an odd use, rather context-dependent
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