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ABSTRACT: In spite of the huge investigations on causative constructions in other languages, this kind of surveys in Azeri Turkish were just confined to the addition of causative morpheme /-dir/ to the stem of verb; such as/qâçdirmâq/’cause to run’ and /yâtdîrmâq/’cause to sleep’. This paper endeavors to probe into semantic, syntactic and pragmatic characteristics of lexical causatives (root, morphological and helping ones) on the base of Role and Reference Grammar for their significance as a part of universality. The important results of this survey show that lexical causatives which may imply direct causation will have predicate focus in unmarked form but in marked form they may have narrowed and sentence focused forms and verb classes in most cases are accomplishments and achievements types.
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INTRODUCTION

In this paper semantic, syntactic and pragmatic characteristics of simple causatives (root, morphological and helping causatives) will be discussed in Role and Reference Grammar. These kinds of constructions are sentences in which a person, an event or a phenomenon called actor which as a motivator or stimulator constructs another person or thing called undergoer that in this paper accepts or remains in a given status. In addition to the abstract and introduction, main corpus of present paper consists of four sections. In the second section related literatures is brought, in the third part methodology of paper for data analysis is represented, in the fourth section data analysis is discussed and finally in the fifth section results of data analysis is argued.

Review of related literature

Iranian and also non–Iranian writers of Persian grammar for many years before have noticed that a morpheme adding to the verb valency, often dealt as the one which changes intransitive verbs to their transitive peers. Abdul-Azim Garib, et. al. (1991) introduced addition of /-ând/ and /-ânid/ to intransitive verbs as a method of transitive verb making process. They have also stated that besides intransitive verbs, transitive ones sometimes are changed into transitive forms in the same way. For example, /xorândan/eating/changes to/xorânidan/’cause to eat’ (Garib and et. al, 1991).

According to Zarsanj, besides adding /â-nd/ and /-ânid/, a prevalent form in Old Persian, like/šekoftan/opening ’ changing to/šekâftan/unseaw/insertion of /-â-â/ as an infix in intransitive verbs was used to form transitive ones in Old Persian (Zarsanj, 1983).

Consider the following sentences:

(1) a.Gol šekoft.
Flower.SUBJ shot.PAST.S3G
‘A flower shot.’

b.?u lebâsaš râ šekâft.
s/he .SUBJ cloth-his/her-D.OBJ.M unseaw.PAST.S3G
‘She unsewed his/her dress.’
Traditional grammarians such as Filat, Lambton, Elwell-Sutton and Rubin Chik had a short description on lexical causative verb formation which was extracted from their non-causative peers. They were sufficed to just some examples (Dabir Mogadam, 2005).

Meshkatudini (2007) also did the same evaluation on morphological causative constructions, claiming that causative verbs are made with adding causative suffix /-ân/ to the verbbase, considering these suffixes as the ones of low prevalence which on contrary to other suffixes are just joined to some bases such as /xorândan/ causative eat. Causative verbs semantically indicate that actor or subject causes another person to perform an action or accept a status such as:

\( \text{Mother:SUBJ drug-D.OBJ,M child-to IN.OBJ eat,CAUS.3SG} \)

'I made child to drink a drug' (Meshkatudini, 2007).

Behzadi has considered causative verbs as obligatory ones, stating a person performs an action by another person. He calls /-dir/, /-dîr/ and /-dûr/ causative verb formation suffixes in Turkish language. Some of these suffixes sometimes may come together such as, /Yâzdirt/ have it written’ (Behzadi, 2007).

Dehganì investigated constrains of Persian and Turkish causativization. He believes that all Persian verbs can be causativized in syntactic form. In this kind of construction causative verbs are put in complement clause of complex verbs such as /ba?es şodan/to cause'.

\( \text{(2)Mâdar dârû ræ be kudak xorând.} \)

Mother.SBJ drug-D.OBJ,M child-to IN.OBJ eat,CAUS.3SG

'I made child to drink a drug' (Meshkatudini, 2007).

\( \text{(3) a.Ali xâb-id} \)

Ali-SBJ sleep-PAST-3SG

‘Ali slept.’

b. Man bâ?es şod-am (ke) Ali be-xâb-ad

\( \text{I –SUBJ cause become. PAST-1SG Ali- SUBJ-SUJ-sleep-3SG} \)

‘I caused Ali to sleep.’

This way of causativization was borrowed by Azeri speakers and used by educated people, now consider the following sentences:

\( \text{(4) a.Ali yât-dî} \)

Ali-SBJ sleep-PAST.S3G

‘Ali slept.’

b. Man bâ?is ol-dumki Ali yâtâ

\( \text{I-SUBJ cause-become -1SG COMP Ali sleep.3SG} \)

‘I caused (that) Ali to sleep’ (Dehganì, 2008).

Falk (1991) proposed two approaches in surveying of inflectional causative constructions: Morphological analysis and Syntactic one. Syntactic analysis assumes morphological causative constructions as syntactic phenomena. Baker’s Incorporation and Marantz’s Morphological Merger theories are good examples of syntactic approach. In Baker’s theory, the processes performing grammatical rules such as making causative and passive forms are considered as automatic phenomenon of head (X) movement. Park (1991) supporting morphological approach suggests that causative morphemes must be added to verb stem in lexicon making derived predicate acts as a single unit. Falk (1991) restated the same evaluation and claimed another derivation relating to morphological analysis in which addition of causative morpheme is considered as a process where a lexical unit is added to another lexical unit and its characteristics are predictable through verb’s base and affixes’ characteristics.

According to Park, Justifications of morphological approach over how causative morpheme is considered differ for example, Miyagawa proposed causative morphological role according to Arnowff (1976) who was in this belief that affixes do not need to be placed in lexicon. On the other hand, Farmer (1980) proposed constrain features of causative morphemes on the base of morphological sub-categories of affixes. Alsia (1992), one of the advocates in morphological analysis of inflectional causative formation process opposed syntactic incorporation over Chichewa verbs and stated that theories presuming syntactic discipline such as Baker (1998) and Lee (1990), claiming their own suitability in justifying causative constructions, are not only capable of describing their generalization but also they cannot justify θ-synthetic characteristics of the main causative object. It is noticeable that causative constructions include syntactic argument holding θ-relation with causative predicate and another relation with embedded predicate not being able to justify incorporation light (Falk, 1991).

Park had a study on Korean causatives on the base of Role and Reference Grammar. He puts causative constructions into two complex and simple lexical causatives. Complex causative constructions in this language are productive since they may be built from any verbs. Even previously causative made verbs; that is, lexical causative
ones may be changed into causative forms again. Complex causative verbs using causative verb /ha/ literary meant ‘doing’, accompanying inflected verb complement, includes /ke/ indicates result. Lexical causative constructions are not as productive as complex ones, though many causative verbs can be built with suffix /-i/. In Korean, lexical causative constructions indicate direct causative meaning considering causative predicate (verb + /-i/) takes object as direct object. In this language, there are some cases that show causative characteristics although they are not. These kinds of constructions may be easily justified, according to Role and Reference Grammar on the base of lexical representation of verbs, without syntactic methodological approaches. Categorization of verbs and logical structure (Ls) in Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) pictures Korean speakers’ intuition precisely (Park, 1993).

Noticing universality aspect of causative constructions, Heidy studied causative constructions from generative linguistic prescriptive. Being focused by generative grammarians, Japanese is one of the languages that include morphological causatives. So its effect on linguistics theories in whole and its principles and parameters is specifically considerable. Causative constructions in Japanese are formed by adding two-syllabic morpheme /s/ ase-/ to verb.

(5) Taroo ga Hanako Ik Ase Ta
Subjective case
Go Causative affix Past

‘Taroo made Hanako go.’

All combinations show the same morphophonemic characteristics. However, specific sub-classes of these combinations may show separate morphological and syntactic characteristics. This affix makes two causative constructions in Japanese; that is, Non productive lexical causative and productive syntactic causative constructions. Syntactic one may be classified into two groups; obligatory and permissive causative constructions. Obligatory causatives include /- o-/ while permissive holds /- ni-/.

Consider the following sentences:

**A) Obligatory Causative Construction**

(6) Hanako wa Yoshi O ik ase ta
Objective case
Go Causative affix Past

‘Hanako made Yoshi go.’

**B) Permissive Causative Construction**

(7) Hanako wa Yoshi ni ik ase ta
Objective case
Go Causative affix Past

‘Hanako permitted Yoshi to go.’

According to scope, control and binding tests these group of causatives are mono-clausal, which holds animative causee (Heidy, 2005).

Nargo Studied morphological and lexical causative constructions in Modern Japanese. He also did some precise diachronic research over causative forms from old to new Japanese, indicating changes on causative forms, noticed remaining forms from ancient Japanese. He states that formation of morphological causative constructions from lexical forms is not noticed in studies yet, although it is a reliable source for evolution of productive causative formation process. There is a specific relation between causative and transitive formation processes since causative formation of transitive verbs is formed in specific way and sometimes lexical forms of transitive verbs change as an affix. There are some causative forming suffixes which show politeness. Using lots of information from various time periods supported Nargo, in his most important achievement which dealt with filling of evolution of the lexical causatives into morphological ones (Narog, 2005).

Buenger evaluated mapping between perceptual forms of events and its entailment in acquiring of causative events on two-years-old children and learning of them on their parents. Children represent causative events in a way that includes some minor events comprising a hierarchy range being in taxonomic and partonomic relation to one another. Linguistics’ representing of events basically depends on one’s mental perception of those events that affects their sentence structures. His studies represent a clear image of meaning representation of causative
sentences which shows how learners encode meaning of new causative verbs. He performed some experiments on two-years-old children and adults related to simple causative sentences. He found out that children like adults categorize causative events into various sub-events with various grammatical categories. Both children and adults use syntactic framework that includes new verb to understand the meaning. Even when they face a new verb parallel with a complicated causative event, syntactic characteristics inform them of different sub-classes of that causative event. Also they interpret verbs as labels for those sub-events. If syntactic characteristics do not present ample information on the meaning of the new verbs, other information sources are used to obtain the ultimate meaning of causative ones (Bunger 2006).

Sinhale forms morphological causative constructions with productive change in form of verb. Since causative form is distinguished by bound suffix, on the base of Haimans continuum, a causative form is direct. Semantically, unmarked causative form in this language is the most direct form of causative construction, formally holds the least linguistic distance. In this case, valency of causative verb is added one more. Holding nominatives are unmarked and animate accusatives are marked with /-wa/. In Sinhale either participant in a caused event can be animate or inanimate. The only existing limitation is that inanimate causes must be used with non-volitional verb in past tense, but there is no limitation for any of the causatives clause types. Past tense causative forms have two different inflections for volitional and non-volitional forms. The other causative form with low degree of directness is made by adding post-position/lauwa/"through ". In this kind of causative constructions cause is anoblique rather than the patient and theca user uses causee as an instrument to accomplish the caused event(Mathieu-Reeves2006).

Lotfi (2008) had a description over causative constructions in modern Persian on the base of Sang(1996) causative construction typology. Using results in acknowledging cognitive base of causative constructions, he studies Persian causative constructions according to their formal and functionalterms. He deals with three types of causatives:1-Compact, 2-AND and3-PURP type constructions in Persian, pointing to their sub-constructions.

**Compact Type**

A) Compact Type (Lexical causative)
In these kinds of causative constructions including morphological and lexical ones, verb cause and verb effect are presented as a single lexical unit.

(8)a.Armin umad xune
Armin.SUBJ come.PAST.S3G home
‘Armin came home’.

   b.Mo?allem Armin –o feresâtd xune
TeacherArmin.D.OBG.M send.PAST.S3G home
‘Teacher sent Armin home.’

B) CompactType (Morphological causative)
“The morphological type, on the other hand, involves a process of suffixation through which the causative –an(-un in spoken Persian) is directly attached to the verbal base (the imperative root) before adding tense/agreement inflection, as illustrated in(4)”(Lotfi 2008:3).

(9)a.Man xand -id –am
I smile-PAST-1SG
‘I smiled’

   b.Unâ man -o xand -un -d and
They.SUBJ me-D.OBJ,M smile-CAUS.PAST.3PL
‘They made me smile.’

C) Compact Type(Compound Verbs)
“ The morphological causative type is not productive anymore as the majority of verbs in Modern Persian are compound ones where a light verb-usuallyšödan’become’, dadan’give’ or kardan’make/do’is usually inserted in order to make the verb causative”(Lotfi2008:4).

(10)a.Ma xaste şod –im/
We tired became 1PL
‘We got tired’

   b.Unâ mâ -ro xaste kard –aend
They we D.OBJ,M tired-make-PAST.3PL
‘They tired us.’

D) COMPACT Type(Morphological Causative for a humorous effect)
The causative suffix is only very marginally productive in contexts where the speaker intends to produce certain humorous effect.

(11a) Noxost vazir estefā dād
Prime Minister. SUBJ resignation give-PAST.3SG
‘The Prime Minister resigned’.

(11b) Noxost vazir estefā-un →and
Prime Minister-D.OBJ.M resignation-CAUS-PAST.3PL
‘They made The Prime Minister resign.’

**AND Type**

These kinds of causatives hold two clauses: one cause and the other effect which holds fixed sequences. The term AND is mnemonic of cover mark of the conjunction.

(12) Man goftam (o) (un) mašqšā →o nevešt
I.SUBJ told-1SG ands/he. SUBJ homework-his/her-D.OBJ.M write-PAST.3SG
‘I made him/her do his/her homework.’

**PURP Type**

“The perception of some desire or wish and a deliberate attempt to realize the desire or wish are highlighted while the accomplishment of the desire or wish is suppressed. Verbal markers of PURP, such as subjunctive future tense, irrealis, incomplete aspect (…), etc., share asense of non-factuality. This is supposed to explain why causative marked with what Givon (1994) collectively calls the IRREALIS modality are purpose; [A] goal or purpose is, by definition, something that is yet to be realized, that is to say, future-projecting or nonfactual’ (Lotfi, 2008)

(13) Man goftam (una) be-r-an
I tell-PAST-1SG they SUGJ-go-3PL
I told them to go.’

He then evaluates these causative constructions on the base of Talmic-Force-dynamic, presenting the following results: causative constructions’ origin is in human cognition and their whole formal and functional characteristics can be defined on the base of specific cognition of human being (Lotfi, 2008).

**METHODOLOGY**

After collecting data from spoken language semantic, syntactic and pragmatic analysis on the base of Role and Reference Grammar is done.

**Theoretical Framework of Role and Reference Grammar**

Among linguistics theories, necessarily there are two fundamental ones on what language is made of. The first dominant theory is Formalists’. Formalists just deal with formal aspect of language, insisting on linguistic as the only valuable aspect in language studies. This theory nowadays is mostly associated with Government and Binding theory, defining other generative theories of language as a collection of sentence structures, formal role evaluations and also its relevant principles. This theory studies language apart from pragmatics, semantics and cognitive procedure on the whole (Chomsky, 1977, 1981).

The second theory denies any relevance to formal aspect of language. It is related to excessive theory of functionalism such as Hooper (1975). In this theory, grammar is confined to speech. Any structural system is considered as representation of prevalent patterns of speech and formulated utterances.

Among these two excessive formalist and functionalist theories, there are other theories that deal with formal and functional aspects of language.

Kuno’s Syntactic functional grammar (1975) may be considered as a functional grammar between two so-called theories since he just adds some justifying functional principals to the theory of formalists. So those aspects of language, not justifiable with formal evaluations, can be dealt with semantic and functional studies.

Like Kuno’s Syntactic functional grammar, Role and Reference Grammar also makes its structures that are considered primarily as a means of communication. This means that formal aspect of language may only be justified by referring to semantics and pragmatics. For this mutual relation, Role and Reference Grammar may be considered as Structural-Functional theory, considering just one stratum or layer for language. So there are not any roles like transformational ones and surface structure of real sentences directly related to semantics which mediates speech-pragmatic analysis (Abdoulaye, 1992)
**Verb Classes and logical structures**

"Underlying any system of lexical representation for verbs and other predicators, implicitly or explicitly is a theory of verb classes. RRG starts from the Vendler (1967) Aktionsart-based classification of verbs in to states, achievements, accomplishments and activities, and utilizes a modified version of the representational scheme proposed in Dowty (1979) to capture these distinctions. It would be reasonable to hypothesize that these distinctions are the universal basis of the organization of verbal systems in human language. There is one important non-Vendlerian Aktionsart class, namely semi-factives (Smith 1997). Semi-factives are punctual events which have no result state. These classes can be characterized in terms of four features [+/- state], [+/- dynamic], [+/- telic] and [+/- punctual].

(14) a. State: [+state], [-dynamic], [-telic], [-punctual]
b. Activity: [-state], [+dynamic], [-telic], [-punctual]
c. Achievement: [-state], [-dynamic], [-telic], [+punctual]
d. Semelfactive: [-state], [+dynamic], [-telic], [+punctual]
e. Accomplishment: [-state], [-dynamic], [+telic], [-punctual]
f. Active accomplishment: [-state], [+dynamic], [+telic], [-punctual]

Forexplaining these patterns, lexical representations are used in RRG: verbs are analyzed in terms of a lexical decomposition system in which state and activity predicators are taken as basic and other classes are derived from them. States are represented as bare predicates as in (a). Activity verb representations all contain the element do as in (b). Accomplishments, which are non-punctual changes of state or onsets of activity, are represented as a state or activity predicate plus as BECOME operator as in (c). Achievements, which are punctual changes of state or onsets of activity, are represented as a state or activity predicate plus an INGRessive operator as in (d). Semi-factives likewise can be based on states or activities that contain SEML as in (e).

(15) a. Own HAVE: (x, y)
b. Run [DO: (x, (run: x))]
c. Broke BECOME: broken: (x)
d. Shatter INGR: shatter: (x)
e. Cough SEMI: [do: (x, (cough: x))]
f. Drink DO: (x, (drink: (x,y))) & INGR: consumed(y)

In this logical structure that is claimed universal, marks are used to show these predicators and verbs are universal although they mostly resemble to English words. An important point to be emphasized is that it is necessary to distinguish the basic lexical meaning of a verb e.g. drink as an activity verb, from its meaning in a particular context, e.g. drink a glass of beer as an active accomplishment predicationas (f). Each of these verbs may have causative peer that in this case, CAUSE operator is used (Van Valin, 2008).

**Semantic Roles**

Meaning of argument depends on its semantic place in predicate logical structure and it thematic relations have no role in this theory and only are used as mnemonics for argument position in logical structure. Role and Reference Grammar insists on two semantic roles: Actor and Undergoer. These two semantic roles are the main arguments of transitive predicate. Intransitive predicate holds one argument that depends on predicate characteristics which may be actor or undergoer. It should be noticed that actor and undergoer do not parallel exactly with subject and object in syntax but they may be overlapped. The relation between macro-roles argument and logical structure argument positions is achieved in the actor – undergoer hierarchy. This double hierarchy simply says that the leftmost argument will be the actor and the right most argument will be the undergoer. This is an unmarked situation. Marked assignments to undergoer are possible
Actors
Undergoers:

Argof 1stargof 1stargof 2ndargof Argof state
Do 1SG do (x,y,pred*(x,y)) pred*(x,y)

[--> *increasing of Markedness realization of argument as macrorole]

Figure 1. Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy

It should be noticed that in RRG there is no third macro role-semantic role for three valency predicates. Theoretical label for the third argument in three valency predicates like picture in “Sam showed sally the picture.” is non-macrorole core argument (Van Valin, 1992).

Grammatical Relations
Since traditional descriptions of subject, direct object and indirect object were problematic to modern derivational forms in RRG, ‘Privileged Syntactic Argument’ was proposed. It may be characterized as follows. In all languages there are syntactic constructionsin which there are restrictions on NPs and PP’s (arguments and non-arguments) that can be included in them: these restrictions define a privileged syntactic function with respect to that structure. In Acehnese, these restrictions can be formulated in terms of either the specific semantic macroroles of actor and undergoer or the general syntactic notion of core argument. Hence the privileged syntagmatic function is semantically defined with respect to the constructions in (16-18). In languages like English, Icelandic and Dyribal, on the other hand, there is restricted neutralization of semantic roles with respect to the privileged syntagmatic function in most syntactic constructions. The restriction on arguments which can be involved in them is not characterizable in purely semantic-role terms, as in Acehnese; rather, it must be defined non--semantically, i.e., syntactically. The NP bearing the syntactically defined privileged syntagmatic function is the privileged syntactic argument of the construction. In order for a privileged syntactic argument to exist, there must be a restricted neutralization of semantic roles associated with the privileged function in the construction. If there is no restricted neutralization, as in Acehnese, then there are no grounds for positing specific non-semantic relation like subject or direct object. In Core argument while a syntactic status, does not define a specific argument relation like subject or direct object; it is neutralization without a restriction. In the English, verb agreement examples in (18), the first NP in the core bears the defining syntactic function (it triggers verb agreement) and there is a restricted neutralization associated with it; it is therefore the privileged syntactic. (Van Valin, 2008).

(16)a. Gopnyan geu-mat lon/geu-mat-ion
3SG 3A-hold 1SG/3A-hold-3sgu
’s (s) he holds me. ’
b. (lon lon-mat ) gopnyan
1SG 1SGA-hold 3SG
’I hold him-her.’
c.(Gopnyan)geu-jak./ *Gopnyan jak(- geuh).
3SG 3A-go go(-3u)
’S (s) he goes.’
d.(Lon) lon-jaks./’Lon jak(-lon)
1SG 1SGA-go go(-1SGU)
’I go.’
e.Gopnyan rhet(geuh)/ *Gopnyan geu-rhet
3SG fall (-3u) 3A-fall
’s (s) he falls.’
f.Lon rhet(Lon)/’Lon Lon rhet
1SG fall (-1SGU) 1SGA-fall
’I fall.’
(17)a. Gopnyan geu-tem [(geu- ) jak]. Actor of intransitive v
3SG 3A-want (*3A-) go
’s (s) he wants to go.’
b. Geu-tem [*{(geu-) taguen bu]. Actor of transitive v
3-want (*3A-) cook rice.
‘She wants to cook rice.’
c. *Gopnyan geu-tem [rhet].
3SG 3A-want fall
(S) he wants to fall.
* Undergoer of intrevisive v
d. * Aneuk agam nyan ji-tem [geu-peureksa le dokto]. *Undergoer of transitive v
Child male that 3a-want 3A-examine by doctor
‘That child wants to be examined by the doctor.’

(18) a. Seunang ate lon
Happy liver 2SG
‘I am happy’. (Lit: ‘my liver is happy’) 
b. Lon Seunang-ate
1SG happy-liver
‘I am happy. ’
c. Ka lon-tet rumoh gopnyan.
IN 1SGA-burn house 3SG
‘I burned her house.’
d. Gopnyan ka lon-tet-rumoh
3SG IN 1SG-burn-house
‘I burned her house.’, or ‘she had her house burned by me.’
e. *Gopnyan ka aneuk-woe
3SG 3A child-return
‘His/her child returned.’

(19)a. The teacher has read the words.
b. The teacher has sung.
c. The teacher has fainted.
d. The teacher has read the words.
e. The words have been read by the teacher.

On privileged syntactic arguments, it can be simply defined as restricted neutralization of semantic relations and pragmatic roles for syntactic purposes. Languages use PSA selection hierarchy in PSA determinism, resulting below diagram (2):

\[
\text{Arg.of Do}>\text{1st arg.of do}>\text{1st arg.of pred}(x,y)>\text{2nd arg.of pred} (x,y)>\text{arg.of pred} (x)
\]

Figure 2. Choice hierarchy of PSA

Accessibility to privileged syntactic argument principles

A) Accusative Structures
An argument that holds highest ranking core in terms of (default) in (2).

B) Ergative structure
An argument that holds the lowest direct core rank in terms of (default) in (2).
In languages like English, PSA is the actor of AUH while in languages such as Dyirbal it will be undergoer. It should be noticed that these are choices of defaults. Undergoer may be as PSA in passive structures and actor may be as PSA in anti-passive ergative structures. It should be noticed that pragmatic have significant role in here(Van Valin, 2008).

Information structure manifestation of sentence
Morpho-syntactic method in describing discourse pragmatic units in a sentence is called focus structure. Method used to describe focus structure in RRG is on the base of Lambrecht scheme. Lambrecht (1994) believes there are occurring patterns for forming information which is cross-linguistically called focus pattern. There are three focus structures in this framework; 1. Predicate focus, 2. Sentence focus and 3. Narrow focus, respectively presented in (19), (20) and (21).
Predicate focus is in suit with traditional distinction of topic and comment. In other words, it is the most unmarked focus default structure. Sentence focus is a structure that excludes any topics in which the whole sentence is focused. Narrow focus structures impose focus on single constituents.

There is an important distinction between marked and unmarked narrow focus structures. All languages have unmarked focus place in the clause. In English language, it is the last constituent of the core, whereas in other languages which hold terminal verb, its place is immediately before verb. Information structure is manifested by additional projection of clause; focus projection structure (Van Valin, 2005).

Accordingly it can be found out that focus structure that is a part of discourse and pragmatics mediates semantics and syntax, using it all (Van Valin, 2008).

Data Analysis

This part deals with syntactic, semantic and pragmatic analysis of simple causative constructions on the base of RRG. Simple causatives in this paper are constructions whose causative act and its result are presented in a single or a simple clause on the whole. The verbs used in causative constructions according to their morphological structures are delivered into three groups: root, morphological, and helping causatives.

Root causatives are the verbs which semantically have causative meaning that exclude any dividable morpheme concordant to causative meaning. Non-causative relation between verbs such as /getmâq/g\"o\ limbs/, transitive verb /âpârmâq\"taking\", intransitive verb /ot tutmâq\"getting fired and transitive verb /ot vurmâq\"setting fire\" respectively show in-equal root and non-equal complex causatives.

Morphological causatives are verbs whose present intransitive, transitive and semi-transitive\(^2\) stems that are made by addition of suffix /dir/ or its allomorphs such as /di\?r/, /li/, /dir/ and /dûr/\(\) or their collocations. Causal, non-causative relation between intransitive verb /ölmek\"dying\" and /öldûrmek\"killing\", transitive verb /örgradirmâq\"getting it taught\" and semi-transitive verb /yemâq\"eating\" and /yedirmâq\"make eat\".

Helping causatives are built by an adjective or a noun plus helping verb /?elamâq\"doing \". Causative, non-causative relation between /?aji olmâq\"being bitter\" and /?ajielamâq\"making bitter\", /davat olmâq\"being invited\" and /davat elamâq\"making inviting\" can represent this group.

Sections 1-4, (2-4), and 3-4 deal with root, morphological and helping causatives respectively. Data from spoken language are collected, transcribed and then analyzed. Since all the causatives show the same structure, for each group a tree diagram is drawn.

---

1 Core in Role and Reference Grammar means a head (predicate) and the macro and non-macro roles. (Abdulay, 1992).
2 Semi-transitive or effectives are verbs whose subjects are actor of an action which the verb refers to and also affective from the result of that action. In other words, subject of the verbs such as eating, drinking, wearing, and understanding is not only the actor of these verbs but also they themselves benefit results of verb (Dabirmogadam, 2005).
Root causatives

Root causatives which are very limited in Azeri Turkish are placed into two groups:
1. In-equal causative.
2. Complex in-equal causative.

(23) in-equal forms

Non-causative
/dūšmak/'falling'
/getmak/'going'
/gâlmâq/'staying'
/vârliq/'having'

Causative
/ātmâq/'throwing'
/gōndarmâq/'sending'
/apârmâq/'taking'
/sâxlämâq/'keeping'
/vermâq/'giving'

(24) in-equal compound forms:

Non-causative
/ot tutmq/'getting fired'
/kôtak yemâq/'being beaten'
/tağır yapmâq/'being changed'
/dâliya dušmak/'being postponed'
/radd olmâq/'being passed'
/görmâq/'seeing'

Causative
/ot vurmâq/'setting fire'
/kôtak vurmâq/'beating'
/tağır vermak/'changing'
/dâliya sâlmâq/'delaying'
/radd elamâq/'passing'
/nişân vermak/'showing'

Simple of in-equal root causatives

Elnâz-SUBJ fall-PAST -S3G
‘Elnâz (undergoer) fell.’

Logical structure:
[INGR Fallen’ (Elnâz)]
Achievement process

b. Qâdir Elnâz-i ât-di
Qâdir-SUBJElnâz -i DirectOBJ,Mthrow-PAST.S3G
‘Qâdir (actor) threw Elnâz -i (undergoer).’

Logical structure:
[do’ (Qâdir, 0)] CAUSE [INGR Fallen’ (Elnâz)]
Causative achievement verb
Figure 4. Tree diagram of (25a and b) sentences.

(26)a. Ęyppayrhaghál-di  
aypara-SUBJ remain-PAST. S3G  
‘aypara (actor) remained.’  
[do’ (?aypágá, (remain’aypara)]  
Activity verb  
b. Mahtaj Ęyppárá-ni sáxlah-di  
ahtaj-SUBJ aypara-D.OBJ.M keep-PAST. S3G  
‘Mahtaj (actor) kept aypara (undergoer).’  
Logical structure:  
(do’ (Mahtaj, ø) CAUSE [do’ (aypara (remain’ (aypara)]])  
Causative activity verb  

**Compound non-equal causatives**  

(27)a. Meša ot tut-di  
Jungle-SUBJ fire-PAST.S3G  
‘Jungle (undergoer) fired.’  
Logical structure:  
[INGR Fired’ (meša)]  
Achievement verb  
b. Šigárci meša-ni ot vur-di  
Hunter-SUBJ meša- ni D.OBJ.M fire- PAST. S3G  
‘Hunter (actor) fired jungle (undergoer).’  
Logical structure:  
[do’ (šigárci, ø) CAUSE [BECOME Fired’ (meša]]]  
Causative accomplishment verb
(28) a. Ustād kōtak ye-di
Professor-SUBJ beating being-PAST.S3G
'The Professor (undergoer) was beaten.'
[BECOME beaten' (ustād)]
Accomplishment verb
b. Dnişgāh usātd-i kōtak vur-di
University-SUBJ professor-D.OBJ.M beating being-PAST.S3G
'University (actor) hit professor (undergoer).'
Logical structure:
[do' (dnişgāh, ø)] CAUSE [BECOME hit' (ustād)]
Causative accomplishment verb
(29)a. Mandāliyā duşdum
I-SUBJ delayBECOME -PAST.S1G
'I (undergoer) delayed.'
Logical structure:
[BECOME postponed' (Man)]
Accomplishment verb
b. Noxošlug mani dāliyā sā l-di
Illness-SUBJ me-D.OBJ.M delay
'An illness (actor) delayed me (undergoer).'
Logical structure:
[do' (Noxošlug, ø)] CAUSE [BECOME delayed' (man)]
Causative accomplishment verb
(30)a. Çây-dân radd ol-duğ River-from.ADV.P pass become-PAST.S1P ‘We(Actor) passed a river (Periphery)’.

Logical structure:
[do’ (PRO, (passed’ (PRO)) & BECOME notbe-at’çây (PRO)])

Accomplishment verb

b. ?âbiz-i çâidân radd ela-di Horse.SUBJ us.D.OBJ.M river-from.ADV.P pass become-PAST.S1P ‘The horse (actor) passed us (Undergoer) over river (periphery) ’.

Logical structure:
[do’ (at, ø)] CAUSE (do’ (Biz (passed’ (Biz)) BECOME not-be in(çay)])]

Causative active accomplishment verb

**Morphological causatives**

In comparison to root causatives, the number of morphological causatives are more since in Azeri Turkish except for some verbs, causative morpheme /dir/ and its allomorphs /diʔr/, /t/ and /dûrût/ may be attached to all verb stems.
Morphological causatives of automatic language

Ice-SUBJmelt-PAST.S3G
‘Ice(undergoer) melted.’
Logical process:
[BECOMEmelted(buz)]
Accomplishment verb
b. ?isti buzi ari-t-di
Heat-SUBJ ice-D.OBJ.M melt-CAUSS-PAST.S3G
‘Heat (actor) melted the ice(undergoer).’
Logical structure:
[do [isti, ø]] CAUSE [BECOME melted(buz)]
Causative accomplishment verb

Figure 6. tree diagrams of (31a and b) sentences.

(32) a. ?ahmad äğlä-di
Ahmad-SUBJ cry-PAST.S3G
'Ahmad (actor) cried.'

Logical Structure:

[do (Ahmad, cry (Ahmad))]

Activity verb

B. Dədağ Ahmad-i ağla-tdur-di

Court-SUBJ Ahmad-D.OBJ.M cry-CAUS-PAST.S3G

'ACourt (actor) cried Ahmad (undergoer).'

Logical Structure:

[do (dadğah, o)) CAUSE [do (Ahmad, (cry (Ahmad))]]

Causative activity verb

(33)  a. Nəzim fərs-lərgan-ir

Nazim-SUBJ farsi D.OBJ learn-PROG.S3G

'Nazim/ (actor) is learning farsi (undergoer).'

Logical structure:

[BECOME known (Nazim, frasi)]

Accomplishment verb

b. Madrasa nəzimə fərsi-organisation

School-SUBJ nazima-organize

'A school (actor) is learning nazima (non-macrodirect role argument) farsi (undergoer).'

Logical structure:

[do (madrasa, ø)] CAUSE (BECOME known (Farsi, Nazim))]

Causative accomplishment verb

(34)  a. Roya-kitəbi əl-di

Roya-SUBJ book-D.OBJ.M buy-PAST.S3G

'Roya (actor) bought a book (undergoer).'

Logical structure:

[do (Roya [buy (kitabi)])]

Activity verb

And also:

[do (Roya, ø)) CAUSE [BECOME have (kitab, Roya)]]

Causative accomplishment verb

b. Qudrat Roya-yəkitəbi-əl-di

Qudrat-SUBJ Roya-organize

'Qudrat (actor) made Roya (undergoer) to buy the book (undergoer).'

Logical structure:

[do (Qudrat, ø)] CAUSE [do (Roya, [buy (Royə)]) & [BECOME have (kitab, Qudrat)]]

Causative accomplishment verb

Helping causatives

Helping causatives, the most productive ones in Azeri Turkish, are built by combination of an adjective anda noun with helping verb /emələq/. Non-causative peer of helping causative /emələq/ is /olməq/ meant /being/ or /becoming/.

Helping causative and non-causative verbs of automatic language

(35)  a. Gazəji ol-di

Food-SUBJ bitter become-PAST.S3G

'Food (undergoer) became bitter.'

Logical Structure:

[BECOME bitter (Gaza)]

Accomplishment verb

b. Bəbar qazə-ni əji ela-di

Pepper-SUBG food-D.OBJ bitter-PAST.S3G

'A pepper (actor) made bitter the food (undergoer).'

Logical structure:

[do (Bəbar, ø)) CAUSE [BECOME bitter (gaza)]
Causative accomplishment verb

Figure 7. Tree diagrams of (35a and b) sentences.
A( Since Azeri Turkish is agglutinating language, it has no equal root causative constructions and the number of complex equal and in-equal root causatives in this language are low. In Azeri Turkish, different constructions are made by adding affixes to the root form. Morphological causatives are made in the same way so the number of root causatives is low. Subject of root causatives are generally patient and some verbs of this group for example /ge?tmâq/'going', /qâlmâq/'remaining' have agent subject, /qormâq/'seeing' have expericterand vârlîg 'owing' has benefactor subject.

Related point to previous paragraph is that mostly inequal causative except /varliq/'owing' accept inanimate causee and /fâtmâq/'throw' can take inanimate oranimate causee or undergoer. Complex root causative has similar behavior but /dâlıya dusmâq/'becomelayed' can accept either animate and inanimate causee or undergoer or /taqyr vermâq/'make changing' always need inanimate causee or undergoer.

B) Causative verbs have one more valency in comparison to their non-causative peers, that is the verb of one valency changes into two valency verb and two valency verb changes into three-valency verb. For example, /ge?tmâq/'going' is one valency verb whereas /?âpârmâq/'taking' is two-valency, /vârlîq/'having' is two-valency and /vermâq/'givingis three-valency, /?âlmâq/'dying' is changed into two-valency verb by adding affix /dir/ such as /?ôldurmâq/'cause to die' and /?âpârmâq/'taking', adding the same suffix changes into three-valency verb /?âpârdirmâq/'cause to carry', this feature is predicted by Comerî(1980). So causative verbs necessarily hold one more argument in comparison to noncausative verbs, which is causer:

NONCAUSATIVE: N ------------------ CAUSATIVE: N+1
N: the number of argument

The verb /vermâq/'giving', /?âlmâq/'getting' and /?âllâtmâq/'deceiving' are naturally causative on their own. These two-valency verbs may be changed into three or four-valency verbs by adding causative affix /dir/. The constructions holding these verbs may have covert subject. For example,
(38)  a. Sanâ midâ-ı ver-di
Sanâ-SUBJ pencil-D.OBJ give-PAST.S3G
'Sana (actor) gave the pencil(undergoer).'

b. Sanâmidâ-ı Solmâz-â ver-di
Sana-SUBJ pencil-D.OBJ Solmâz-toIND.OBJ give-PAST.S3G
'Sana (actor) the pencil(undergoer) toSolmâz (non- macroroledirect core argument).'

c. Sanâmîdâ-ı Solmâz-â ver-di
di
Sana-SUBJ pencil-D.OBJ Solmâz-IND.OBJ give-CAUS-PAST.S3G
'Sana(actor) made someone to give the pencil (undergoer)toSolmâz (non-macroroledirect core argument).'

Since ‘causer’ or actor is manifested as subject in causative sentences, causee or undergoer of noun phrases may not preserve their subject relation in noncausative sentences such as (25) and (32). So in Azeri Turkish, case hierarchy is the same as Comeri’s prediction.

Subject>direct object>indirect object>preposition phrase

Actor  -------------------------------------------------- ➔ Undergoer

Agent Effector Experiencer Location Theme Patient

C) Since Turkish is an accusative language, macroroles arguments act as PSA. So in causative sentences, actor acts as the highest ranked core and sometimes in its non-causative peer, actor and sometimes undergoer act as PSA and also Turkish is a topic prominent language in which actor acts as PSA without intervening of pragmatic principles.

D) Causative affix /dir/ is added to transitive, semi-transitive and intransitive roots. This affix may be added more than once such as, /yemâq/’eating’, /yedîrmâq/’cause to eat’, /yedîtîrmâq/’somebody cause someone else to eat’ but this affix may not be added to the roots of /getmâq/’going’, /gondarmâq/’sending’ and /bâxmâq/’looking’.

E) Morphological and helping causatives are productive but helping causatives are more productive than morphological causatives because approximately 600 simple verbs and a lot of derived verbs may be used with this affix whereas the number of helping causatives since they are built by combination of nouns and adjectives and helping verbs, it makes this group the most productive one.

F) In Turkish language, there are not any marks to show nominative case but there are marks to show accusative and dative cases. These marks are preserved in spite of their displacement like (39b) and (35b), direct and indirect objects may be displaced easily in each form. So Turkish is a language that holds variable undergoer and this displacement is done for a kind of narrow focus on constituents. This displacement is the result of pragmatic factors, which makes marked focus.

In causative sentences, the choice of default form for nominative position is actor. On the other hand, one of effective factors in choosing syntactic arguments is pragmatics. Since this language has predicate focus on unmarked forms, syntactic argument holds topic focus. So this kind of topic is unmarked and in all of the causative sentences actor appears as topic.

(39)  a. Mankitâb-i Hasan-a verd-im
I-SUBJ book-D.OBJ.MHasan-toIND.OBJ give-PAST.S1G
'I (actor) gave the book(undergoer) to Hasan (non-macroroledirect core argument).'

b. Man Hasan-a kitâb-i verdim
I=SUBJ hasan-IND.OBJ book-D.OBJ.M give-PAST.S1G
'I(actor) gave Hasan(non-macro direct core argument) the book(undergoer).'

Figure8: Linking algorithm of macroroles and semantic roles
Sentence (a) is a default form in Turkish but sentence (b) is affected by focus structure and is different from default form. In this case, a kind of marked form is made.

G) Causative verbs accept both animate and inanimate actors. In other words, Turkish language has variable (+/- animate) actor. This language also has (+/- variable animate) undergoer.

H) In previous studies about causative structures in Azeri Turkish, all the scholars believe causative form is just made by adding causative affix/dir to verb root. All of these scholars consider only morphological causatives as simple ones whereas this paper involves in-equal causatives, complex in-equal causatives and helping causatives as simple ones.

I) The most observed verbal groups in simple causatives are accomplishments and achievements.

J) All causative sentences show declarative illocutionary force so focus will be on a part which will be asserted in the sentence. The most unmarked focus is on predicate that equals traditional distinction of topic-comment. We may have a narrow focus on one of constituents because while collecting data from spoken language, the researcher found out that Turkish speakers use marked focus. They may have a narrow focus on different noun phrases.

(40) /?âydin sohrâb-î irân-nân âpârdî/  
Aydin-SUBJ sohrab-D.OBJ.M Iran-from-ADV.P take-PAST.S3G  
‘Aydin(actor) took sohrab(undergoer) from Iran(periiphery).’

Unmarked focus form: /âpârdî/  
Focus domain: verb

With marked focus we may have focus one time on /?âydin/ and another time on /sohrâb/ or /Irân/. It should be noticed that even in Azeri Turkish, we may have focus on the whole sentence. In this case, focus will be a type of marked one.

Sentence: /?âydin sohrâb-î irân-nân âpârdî  
Default form: ø  
Focus: /?âydin sohrâb-î irân-nân âpârdî  
Focus domain: clause

Azeri Turkish speakers use prosody, displacement of constituents and cleft to make a focus structure, but the main focus means accentuation.

(4) a. ?ali hasani öl-dür-di  
Ali killed Hasan

b. Hasan ali öl-dür-di  
Hasan was killed by Ali. (English Equivalent)

c. Alidiki hasani öl-dür-di  
It was Ali that killed Hasan.

K) In Azeri Turkish language according to back-grounding hierarchy nominative form has the least back-grounding degree.

Nominative>indirect accusative>direct accusative
In Role and Reference Grammar, there are two causative structures;

1. Making a series of events directly under another series of events’ effect.
2. Occurring a series of events through separate actions or events (Van Valin, 2008).

The first one equals direct causative so all of the simple causatives in Azeri Turkish can be put in group (1).

In direct causative, effectiveness of causer or actor on causee or undergoer is direct and face to face whereas in indirect causative, causee and causer are face to face (Dabir Mogadam, 2005).

In analyzed data, there are ordinal, categorized and distance iconicity. That is the relation between morphemes and words which reflects logical relation between signified and signifier. In evaluated sentences, causer or actor is always placed before cause or undergoer. In categorized iconicity, concepts placed in similar grammatical categories are cognitively similar. So, grammatical subject and object intend to relate to actor and undergoer. In distance iconicity events that are mentally close and immediate reflected of linguistic structure related to it. This principle may be observed in lexical causative structure /apârmâq/ ‘taking’ in comparison to its analytic causative peer/apârdirmâq/ ‘cause someone to carry something’. In the first one, cohesion of the structure represents kind of direct causative relation between causer or actor and cause or undergoer, whereas in the second one, formal disjunction of structure represents kind of indirect relation between causative structures’ elements. Simple causatives have the strongest semantic and syntactic relation in inter-clausal hierarchy since the first causatives have one core. Because of this, simple causatives are encoded as a clause. The following factors play role in this encoding.

1. Temporal hierarchy:
   Phases of a single event > simultaneous events > sequential events > Unspecified.

2. Causal hierarchy:
   Physical>verbal>underspecified [non-defeasible]>inferred [defeasible].

3. Participant mental disposition
   Intention > perception > belief > knowledge.

4. Necessarily shared participant:
   Yes > no (van valin, 2008)

According to the first factor, simple causatives all show a simultaneous event relating to the second characteristic, they show both the first and the second feature participants intentionally participate in causatives events and the fourth factor cannot be applied to simple causatives. So, semantic and syntactic cohesion reaches to the highest degree.

Root causatives generally entail ‘controlled’ meaning as in/sâxlâmâq/‘keeping’ and /taqyir vermâq/ ‘changing’. Presentation of causer or actor in implementation of causative event is continuous but some verbs of this collection such as /gondarmâq/ ‘sending’ convey ‘ballistic’ meaning. Morphological causatives again generally show the same characteristics. For example in /qâçdirmâq/ ‘cause to run’ and /sindirmâq/ ‘cause to break’ the role of causer or actor is ‘controlled’ but in /qorütdirmâq/ ‘cause to dry’ is ‘ballistic’. Helping causatives, according to ‘ballistic’, against to ‘controlled’ feature forms two regular patterns: verbs have animate undergoer such as a /delielamâq/ ‘make mad’ and /axmâq elamâq/ ‘make fool’ shows ‘ballistics’ feature and verbs have inanimate undergoer as in /qeyd elamâq/ ‘to stipulate’ and /taškil elamâq/ ‘to form’ convey ‘controlled’ feature.

Subject of morphological causative verbs are generally agent and some of them have patient subject such as /jösdirmâq/ ‘cause to boil’ and /çürüdirmâq/ ‘cause to torn’ and others can just have experiencer subject for instance /?istadirmâq/ ‘cause to love’ /?rqatmâq/ ‘cause to learn’ and in some of cases subject of some verbs at same time are agent and experincer for example /dadizdirmâq/ ‘cause to taste’ /kiydirmâq/ ‘cause to put on’.

Abbreviations
A actor
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