If the causal and the plain verbs have the same shape (=if a language has causal ambitransitives), the plain is always patientive/unaccusative, never agentive/unergative.
(hinted at in Hale & Keyser 1993:99; see also Kazenin 1994)

PLAIN VERB CAUSAL VERB ≠
(Hale 2000:159)

(10) The water boiled. We boiled the water.
The shirt dried. The sun dried the shirt.
The ice melted. The heat melted the ice.
The glass cracked. The high note cracked the glass.
The baby cried. *The noise cried the baby.
Loretta sang. *We sang Loretta

Universal 24: [unrestricted]
If the causal and the plain verbs have the same shape (= if a language has causal ambitransitives),
the plain is always patientive/unaccusative, never agentive/unergative.
• This universal follows directly from the deductive universal 34.
I know of no alternative explanations.
12 exceptions: (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995:111)
(24) a. The soldiers marched to their tents.
b. The general marched the soldiers to their tents.
(25) a. The horse jumped over the fence.
b. The rider jumped the horse over the fence.

Causative Verbs

A causative form is, in linguistics, (a) an expression of an agent causing or forcing a subject to perform an action or to be in a certain condition--salient cause, (b) an expression of a subject involved in a non-volitional event that registers the changes of its state--salient effect, (c) an expression of a grammatical modality in perfective (sequential) or subjunctive (hypothetical) or realize (non-hypothetical) state--perceptual salient.

All languages have ways to express causation, but they differ in the means. In some languages there are morphological devices (such as inflection) that change verbs into their causative forms, or adjectives into verbs of "becoming". Other languages employ periphrasis, with idiomatic expressions or auxiliary verbs. All languages also have lexical causative forms (such as English rise → raise).

The causative is a common structure in English. Causative verbs show that somebody or something is indirectly responsible for an action. The subject doesn't perform the action itself, but causes someone or something else to do it instead. Simply, do you cut your own hair? Probably not. Yet you are in control - you go to
the hairdresser and tell him what you want. You don't do it, but you control it - you are the cause. That's the idea behind it. This paper will explain the syntactic and semantic properties of causatives in English and Arabic. This will cover the construction of these verbs and their use in the two languages.

**Basic causative structures in English.**

There are two basic causative structures. One is like an active, and the other is like a passive. These examples use the causative verb "have :"

I had Bill fix the van.

I arranged for the van to be fixed by Bill -- I caused him to fix it.

I had the van fixed.

I arranged for the van to be fixed by someone. We don't know who, so this is like a passive.

**The active causative structure**

This is the basic structure of the active form, along with examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Causative verb</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Action verb</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>her sister</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>her home assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>the suspect</td>
<td>stop</td>
<td>his motorbike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>the joiner</td>
<td>fix</td>
<td>our window.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The passive causative structure**

In the passive form, the subject is replaced with the object. The action verb is in the past participle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Causative verb</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Action verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>our car</td>
<td>fixed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatma</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>her hair</td>
<td>cut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belal</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>the windows</td>
<td>cleaned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other causative verbs**

Many other verbs can be used in causatives rather than have in examples above. However., In the active form, some of these verbs require the action verb to have "to" before it. Consider the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Form of Action Verb</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>make</td>
<td>force, compel</td>
<td>plain form</td>
<td>The soldiers made us lie on the floor. (No passive form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get</td>
<td>same as &quot;have&quot; &quot;to&quot; form</td>
<td>I got Belal to pick me up in the car.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let</td>
<td>allow</td>
<td>plain form</td>
<td>I'll let you borrow my book.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[No passive form]


There are many other causative verbs, these are like: help, allow, have, require, motivate, convince, hire, assist, encourage, permit, employ, and force.
The most very common causative verbs of those mentioned above are: Make, Get, Have, Let, Help. Thus these verbs are to be explained in more details as appears in the following lines:

Get (FORM: GET + PERSON + to + VERB)

This construction usually means ‘to convince someone to do something’ or ‘to trick someone into doing something’. Consider:

'I will GET my car maintained before this winter'.
'How can teachers GET their students to read more‘?
'Al-Aqsa TV commercials are trying to GET people to stop smoking'.

Have (FORM: HAVE + PERSON + VERB)

This construction means ‘to authorize someone to do something.’

Here are some examples:
'the doctor HAD his nurse take the patient's temperature.’
'Please HAVE your secretary forward me the e.mail.’
'I HAD the technician check the photocopy machine.’

Get vs. Have
Sometimes ‘get someone to do something’ is interchangeable with ‘have someone do something,’ but these expressions are not semantically the same thing. For convenience consider the examples below:
He GOT the mechanic to check his brakes.
(At first the mechanic didn't think it was necessary, but he convinced him to check the brakes.)

I HAD the mechanic check my brakes .
(I asked the mechanic to check the brakes.)

Make (FORM: MAKE + PERSON + VERB)

This construction means ‘to force someone to do something’.

Here are some examples:
'My dad MADE me apologize for what I had done ‘
'Did somebody MAKE you wear that ugly pant‘?
'She MADE her kids tidy their beds‘.

Let (FORM: LET + PERSON + VERB)

This construction means ‘to allow someone to do something‘. Consider the following examples:
'Mary LET me use her new laptop’.
'Will your parents LET you go to the festival‘?
'I don't know if my boss will LET me take the day off‘.
Periphrastic causativity

There are no regular causative inflections in English, nor in any of the major European languages, which resort to idiomatic uses of certain verbs like English *make* or *have*, French *faire* or *laisser*, or German *lassen*. For example:

- She made me eat the vegetables.
- I had John build the house.
- I had the posters taken down.

Note that this type of structure is more complicated than the inflectional causative form exemplified in Sanskrit, since it has two verbs and three arguments: the first is the subject of the first verb; the second is the object of the first verb but also the subject of the second; and the third is the object of the second verb. These arguments can be exchanged using passive voice (in either verb), but the result can be cumbersome or even ungrammatical.

Lexical causativity

In many cases, a language simply uses a different lexical item to indicate a causative form. For example, the causative of English *rise* is *rear*, and the causative of *eat* is *feed*. English allows a notable freedom in verb valency, resulting in verbs like *break*, *burn* or *awake*, which may be causative or not (*he burns it = he causes it to burn*). Causativeness is therefore zero-marked in many English verbs.

Changes of state

In languages with stative verbs (equivalent to English adjectives), the acquisition of a quality, or changes of state, can be expressed with causatives in the same way as with regular verbs. For example, if there is a stative verb *to be large*, the causative will simply mean *to enlarge, to make grow*. The reflexive form of this causative can then be used to mean *to enlarge oneself*, or even as a middle voice, *to grow*.

Causative syntax

A causative form or phrase can be thought of as a valency-increasing voice operation, which adds one argument. If the original verb is intransitive, then the causative construction as a whole is transitive: *to fall → to make (sbdy./sthg.) fall, to topple (sbdy./sthg.),* or indeed, *to fell*, a fossilised form from when causatives were an inflexional part of English grammar. If the original verb is transitive, the causative is ditransitive: *to eat (sthg.) → to make (sbdy.) eat (sthg.), to feed (sthg.) to (sbdy.).*

For the purpose of syntax, a derivation that turns an adjective or noun into a "verb of becoming" works the same as a causative construction for intransitive verbs. For example, in English the derivational suffixes -(i)fy can be thought of as a causative:

- *simple → simplify = "to make simple", "to cause (sthg.) to become simple"*
• object → objectify = "to make into an object", "to cause (sthg.) to become an object" (figuratively, that is)

2.

Morphological causativity

In most Semitic languages there is a causative form of the verb. It is postulated that in Proto-Semitic the causative verbal stem was formed by the š- prefix, and this has become ḥ-, hi- or ḥ- in different languages.

- Syriac: Ḫəθ̣a’v "he wrote" → ḫאֱט̪ェ Xml “he composed"
- Arabic: ṣālima "he knew" → ḥašlama "he informed"
- Hebrew: tsaxak "he laughed" → hitṣik "he made sb. laugh"

Two morphological processes form causative verbs in Arabic, ablaut and gemination. The properties of these alternations are discussed in turn below. Section 3 presents an analysis of their behavior.

Derivations

An investigation of causative Form derivations will be somewhat easier if we begin with Forms II and IV, addressing the causative variety of Form I last. All causatives are derived directly from a basic, Formless triliteral root, a string of three consonants with no specified short vowels. Proof of this is provided later. In the longstanding tradition of Arab grammarians, the verb ُل ُثُلُث, or /f-ʕ-l/, meaning ‘to do’, is used to demonstrate the patterns of the derived Forms. At least until the grammar requires us to do otherwise, we shall adopt the assumption that higher Forms are all derived from the ‘basic’ Form I. Form II is derived by doubling or geminating the middle consonant through use of the shadda, (“strengthening”) and assigning a standard short vowel pattern of a-a-a.1 Thus, Form II can be expressed as

Form IV is derived in the same manner. From Form I, an /ʔa-/ prefix is added, and the short vowel of the first consonant is deleted. The short vowel pattern becomes a-a-a.

2.1 Ablaut

Causative verbs may be formed from unaccusatives by changing the stem vowel to /a/ (Kurylowicz, 1957; Fassi Fehri, 1987), illustrated in (10). The stem vowel in the base is one of the three phonemic (short) vowels of Arabic, /i/, /a/ or /u/. The vowel /u/ is quite rare in unaccusative/causative pairs and /i/ quite common. Note that if the stem vowel in the base is /a/, ablaut has no net morphological effect (10i-k).

(10) a. ḥażina (be sad) ⇒ ḥāzana (make sad)
b. hadima (fall to ruin) ⇒ hadama (ruin)
c. waḡira (be scared) ⇒ waḡara (frighten)
d. kariba (be worried) ⇒ karaba (worry s.o.)
e. xariba (be destroyed) ⇒ xaraba (destroy)
f. hazi’a (be ridiculed) ⇒ haza’a (ridicule)
g. naḡiza (be implemented) ⇒ naḡaza (implement)
h. xafiya (be hidden) ⇒ xafā (hide s.t.)
Ablaut is a restricted process. It only applies to unaccusative bases, never to unergative bases (11), transitive bases (12), or ditransitive bases (13).

(11) a. ḍaḥika (laugh) ⇒ *ḍaḥaka (cause to laugh)
b. nāma (sleep) ⇒ *nāma (cause to sleep)
c. ṭāṣa (sneeze) ⇒ *ṭaṣa (cause to sneeze)
d. bakā (cry) ⇒ *bakā (cause to cry)

(12) a. darasa (study) ⇒ *darasa (cause to study)
b. fahima (understand) ⇒ *fahama (cause to understand)
c. ʿalima (know) ⇒ *ʿalama (cause to know)
d. ẓariba (drink) ⇒ *ṣaraba (cause to drink)

(13) a. manaḥa (give) ⇒ *manaḥa (cause to give)
b. ḥalā (award) ⇒ *ḥabā (cause to award)
c. ʿaraḍa (submit) ⇒ *ʿaraḍa (cause to submit)
d. wahaba (donate) ⇒ *wahaba (cause to donate)

2.2 Gemination

Causative verbs may also be formed in Arabic by gemination of the middle radical of the root, commonly described as the template C1aC2C2aC3, as illustrated in (14).

Geminate causative forms are found for many of the same roots that form ablaut causatives, as in (14a-d) (cf. (10ad)).

(14) a. ḥaṣima (be sad) ⇒ ḥazzana (make sad)
b. hadima (fall to ruin) ⇒ haddama (ruin)
c. xariba (be destroyed) ⇒ xarraba (destroy)
d. nağiza (be implemented) ⇒ nağgaza (implement)

e. waṣala (arrive) ⇒ waṣṣala (accompany)
f. xalā (be vacant) ⇒ xallā (vacate)
g. šariha (proceed freely) ⇒ šarraha (grant leave)
h. našīta (be lively) ⇒ naššaṭa (enliven)
i. samina (be fat) ⇒ sammana (fatten)

But gemination is less restricted than ablaut. Unergative verbs may show a geminate causative counterpart, as in (15) (cf. (11)), as may transitive verbs, as in (16) (cf. (12)).

(15) a. ḍaḥika (laugh) ⇒ ḍaḥḥaka (make s.o. laugh)
b. nāma (sleep) ⇒ nawwama (make s.o. sleep)
c. ṭāṣa (sneeze) ⇒ ṭaṭṣa (make s.o. sneeze)
d. bakā (cry) ⇒ bakkā (make s.o. cry)

(16) a. darasa (study) ⇒ darrasa (teach s.o. s.t.)
b. fahima (understand) ⇒ fahhama (make s.o. understand s.t.)
c. ʿalima (know) ⇒ ʿallama (inform s.o. of s.t.)
d. Šariba (drink) ⇒ šarraba (offer s.o. s.t. to drink)
e. ḥamala (carry) ⇒ ḥammala (make s.o. carry s.t.)
f. kataba (write) ⇒ kattaba (make s.o. write s.t.)

When a transitive verb is causativized, the resulting construction is ditransitive; both objects bear accusative case.
The teacher taught the children the lesson.

Although gemination is a freer process than ablaut, gemination is restricted in two important ways. First, like ablaut, gemination may not apply to a ditransitive base.

(18) a. manaḥa (give) ⇒ *mannaḥa (cause s.o. to give s.o. s.t.)  
b. ḥaḥa (award) ⇒ *ḥabbā (cause s.o. to award s.o. s.t.)  
c. ‘araḍa (submit) ⇒ *‘arraḍa (cause s.o. to submit s.t. to s.o.)  
d. wahaba (donate) ⇒ *wahhaba (cause s.o. to donate s.t. to s.o.)

Second, although gemination may apply to transitives in general, it may not apply to those transitive verbs that are themselves derived by ablaut. I.e., the terms on the right hand side in (10) do not have geminate counterparts (though the terms on the left hand side may); ablaut bleeds gemination (Fassi Fehri, 1987).

(19) a. ḥażana (make sad) ⇒ *ḥazzana (cause s.o. to make s.o. sad)  
b. hadama (ruin) ⇒ *haddama (cause s.o. to ruin s.t.)  
c. waḡara (frighten) ⇒ *waḡغا (cause s.o. to frighten s.o.)  
d. karaba (worry s.o.) ⇒ *karraba (cause s.o. to worry s.o.)  
e. xaraba (destroy) ⇒ *xarraba (cause s.o. to destroy s.t.)  
f. haza’a (ridicule) ⇒ *hazza’a (cause s.o. to ridicule s.o.)  
g. falata (release) ⇒ *fallata (cause s.o. to release s.o.)  
h. faraša (spread s.t. out) ⇒ *farraša (cause s.o. to spread s.t. out)
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long vowels and specific consonantal affixes render different Forms of this basic root—a total of ten in common Arabic use—that are logically and systematically related to the underlying root (Scheindlin, 2007). This system of derivations is highly productive and extremely regular. Three of these Forms render causative constructions—or at least render verb meanings that can be interpreted as such. However, few Arabic grammars regularly address all three varieties in a discussion on the causative. Most focus on Forms II and IV, and do not address the ability of Form I to take on a causative meaning, at least not in the same discussion. Hallman (2006) addresses a comparison of the causative of Form I and Form II, but does not address Form IV at all. This paper brings all three Forms together for a concise comparison of all possible ways to form a causative in MSA. It examines the derivations and proposes Word Formation Rules, compares meaning patterns of the Forms and considers transitivity and semantic restrictions that are involved.

Derivations

An investigation of causative Form derivations will be somewhat easier if we begin with Forms II and IV, addressing the causative variety of Form I last. All causatives are derived directly from a basic, Formless triliteral root, a string of three consonants with no specified short vowels. Proof of this is provided later. In the longstanding tradition of Arab grammarians, the verb /ʃɪʕl/, or /ʕ-ʃ-l/, meaning 'to do', is used to demonstrate the patterns of the derived Forms. At least until the grammar requires us to do otherwise, we shall adopt the assumption that higher Forms are all derived from the 'basic' Form I. Form II is derived by doubling or geminating the middle consonant through use of the shadda, ("strengthening") and assigning a standard short vowel pattern of /a-a-a/. Thus, Form II can be expressed as

Form IV is derived in the same manner. From Form I, an /ʔa-/ prefix is added, and the short vowel of the first consonant is deleted. The short vowel pattern becomes /ø-ɑ-a/. The Word Formation Rule for Form IV (initial glottal stop omitted): Now to turn to the third version of the Causative. This is a more complex issue, because this causative is a variant of Form I; the causative Form I is derived from itself, so to speak, because the basic, non-causative is Form I as well. The difference lies in the middle vowel pattern. In the basic Form I, the short vowel on the second consonant can be any of the short vowels in Arabic, /a/, /u/ or /i/. This basic Form can be intransitive or transitive. For select verbs, namely those that are unaccusative intransitives in Form I, a variant of the Form can be derived that has a causative meaning. This is done by regularizing the middle short vowel as /a/. Hallman labels this derived Form I as the Ablaut causative; a mutation marked by a change in vowel quality (Kroeger 2005). To avoid confusion between varieties of Form I, we shall use the terms Basic and Ablaut to distinguish. /faʕala/, being a transitive root, cannot properly demonstrate derivation of the ablaut. Below are intransitive examples that properly demonstrate this derivation.

6) /hazina/ ‘to be sad’ → /hazana/ ‘to make s.o. sad’  
/ḥaruма/ ‘to be prohibited’ → /ḥaruma/ ‘to prohibit s.t.’  
/falata/ ‘to be released’ → /falata/ ‘to release s.o.’

As example 3 of 6) shows, one cannot necessarily tell from isolation whether a Form I verb with middle vowel /a/ refers to a basic intransitive or a derived ablaut. While a middle vowel /u/ on the Basic invariably denotes intransitivity, /i/ and /a/ may occur with either transitive or intransitive verbs; though the generalization is that /a/ denotes transitivity, there is no uniform pattern of transitivity manifested by the short vowels. A Form I verb with middle vowel /a/ cannot be guaranteed to simply be the transitive form of a Basic root that contains an /i/ or /u/.

The Word Formation Rule for the Ablaut causative is given in 7). All three varieties of the causative construction in Arabic are morphological causatives; the causative meaning is derived from the basic through the regular morphological processes of derivation through the use of different, consistent Forms. As far as research shows, the language does not have any standard way of expressing
causation through periphrastic causatives, and certainly it does not possess a lexical causative, because the causative meaning is built into the very system of verb derivation through the use of the verb Forms. Though we will not concern ourselves greatly with describing how deviant varieties of the Arabic verb are handled—those that do not correspond to the standard triliteral root—a few words should be said on this matter. Irregular, or “unsound” triliteral roots are divided into three classes:

a) Those for which one of the three radicals is a “weak” letter. These consist of waw and ya—the glides or semivowels, /w/ and /j/.

b) Those for which one of the three radicals is a hamza, a glottal stop.

c) Those for which the second and third radicals are identical—the doubled verb.

Additionally, the language has a relatively small number of quadriliteral roots, which must be derived in a different manner to the triliteral. It is not the concern of this paper to investigate how all possible varieties of the verb are derived, and we need only concern ourselves with the standard variety in the discussion, which Arab grammarians consider to represent the standard pattern for all verbs.

**Meaning Patterns**

Form II can render multiple meanings; the causative is only one meaning pattern of the Form II verb. Two other meaning patterns are the intensive, which renders a stronger connotation to the meaning of the verb, and the estimative, in which the subject’s belief about the truth value of the verb is expressed. Form II has denominative verbs as well, rendering the idea of making, dealing with, or collecting the noun (Haywood & Nahmad 1965). This multitude of functions means that one cannot derive a correct meaning from derivational rules alone, at least not for Form II. There is no overt way of deducing whether callama, derived from ‘alima ‘to know’, would mean A) ‘to inform; to cause to know/learn’; B) ‘to rigorously learn; study’; C) ‘to consider to have learned’, from derivational patterns alone. 8) demonstrates some Form II verbs that take the causative sense. A Form IV verb derived from a basic root has a default causative meaning to it. Another, apparently rarer class of verbs is estimative in function, comparable to Form II. Form IV also contains a large class of denominatives; Form IV verbs may be formed from select nouns, usually with the sense of “becoming” that noun (Haywood & Nahmad 1965). 9) gives examples of some Form IV verbs. The meaning patterns of Form I has already been largely addressed. The ablaut is a special derived form of a basic intransitive root, which creates a transitive verb and applies a causative sense to the meaning. Few writings on Form I, save Hallman, have identified the derivational capacity that seems to be encompassed within this Form.

**Transitivity**

Foundational to a discussion on the causative is the issue of transitivity. The Causative is, of course, a valency-increasing operation, and as such there are likely to be natural restrictions on what types of verbs may undergo this operation. We can find regular and systematic differences, in regard to transitivity, in the restrictions and productivity that distinguish the ablaut from the Form II and IV causatives. A causative derived from an intransitive base makes the base transitive. In this basic respect, the three varieties behave alike. Thus, all three of the following derivations are grammatical words: However, a closer investigation reveals that even for intransitive bases, there are differences in the restrictions that the different Forms make on which verbs may be grammatically derived. Hallman claims that Arabic has a split-S system, dividing intransitive verbs into unaccusative and unergative classes. In the former are stative verbs, in the latter the active. The unaccusative verbs Hallman gives as examples all logically fit as states; they may all either be rendered as ‘to beL’ the verb, or are active happenings that happen to the person without his deliberate acting. These all may be turned into an ablaut. In contrast, those verbs in the unergative class may not, yet they may well accept a Form II or IV derivation. For example, the unergative verb ‘to laugh’ patterns as shown in 11): Hallman proposes a simple explanation for the unaccusative/unergative split for the ablaut. Quoting Hale and Keyser 1993, he suggests that unergative verbs, such as ‘to laugh’, ‘to sleep’, ‘to sneeze’, ‘to cry’, etc. are “hidden” transitives, of which the internal argument is incorporated into the verb stem. In other words, though it is not overtly specified, these verbs imply a direct object that is a result of the action, such as sneezing a sneeze. Thus, the ablaut possesses
selectional restrictions that are based on the inherent transitivity of the verb alone. The unaccusative class is the only class of “true” intransitives, and the unergative class syntactically functions like a transitive, though this is not apparent in the surface structure of the sentence. Forms II and IV accept the unergative derivations because they accept the valency increasing of transitive clauses to ditransitive. Like its effect on intransitives, the valency-increasing operation of the causative makes transitive clauses ditransitive. This operation may be performed to render the Form II and IV verbs, but is prohibited for the ablaut. 12) demonstrates the possible derivations of a transitive verb. Ditransitive verbs may not be causativized in any of the three Forms. The resulting clause would be tritransitive, and sound unnatural in trying to express a single, causative action. Examples are given in 13):

Basic vs. Derived Roots
One very important selectional restriction on all causative Forms is that the input, from which the causative is derived, must be a basic root; the input cannot itself be a derived causative, and the transitivity of the verb may only be increased once from the basic Form. Before addressing this issue in depth, let us address the question: How we know what the ‘basic’ form actually is? Apart from logical reasoning that tells us the causative is more complex and therefore must be derived from the simple, basic Form I, what proof is there that the basic is not derived from the Causative? Hale and Keyser (n.d.) address this very issue. They found the necessary proof in the alternation between what I have termed the Basic and Ablaut. In 6), it was shown that the middle vowel of the Basic was unpredictable; it could potentially be any of the three short vowels /a/, /u/, or /i/. In contrast, the Ablaut consistently has an /a/ as its second vowel. This alternation is taken to be proof that the Basic is, in fact, basic, because it is the form whose vowel alternation would need to be memorized by the speaker. To derive the Ablaut from it, a speaker only needs to apply a standard lexical rule to derive the correct Form with the correct vowel marking. The reverse could not be true; a lexical rule cannot predict the alternation from the standard /a/ of the Ablaut to any of the three vowels in the intransitive. The same would be true of Forms II and IV; only the Basic contains the variant vowel information. Thus, the label of Basic is correct for this Form, and the direction of derivation is from intransitive to transitive. In actual fact, I feel that causative derivations actually come from the vowelless triliteral root, and not from the Basic Form I. This is because not all existing Form II and IV verbs have a corresponding Form I from which they could have been derived. Most do, but not all. An example of this is the root /s-l-tʕ/, which exhibits the following relevant Forms (V being the unspecified second vowel):

One point of interest is that many of the Form I gaps seem to have originally existed in Classical Qur’anic Arabic but have since been lost. According to Lane (1877), the Form I salutʕa did in fact exist in the lexicon of early Islamic-era Arabic. 14) demonstrates not only that some verbs have no Basic Form I, but also that not all verbs necessarily possess both a Form II and a Form IV if they accept one of the pair. In this case, Form IV is absent; other verbs have a Form IV without a Form II. These appear to be arbitrary gaps in the lexicon; no known logical explanation for these gaps exists, since the meanings of Forms II and IV can often be identical. Gaps in the Ablaut are also possible, but are harder to track down by nature of the fact that one cannot overtly detect alternation from any basic Form that has /a/ as the second vowel. One example of an ablaut gap appears to be found in the intransitive verb kariʃa, meaning ‘to be wrinkled’. It exhibits the following relevant Forms:

Despite apparent evidence for derivation straight from the triliteral root itself, I hold the position that it will suffice to write our lexical rules on the assumption that a derivation can be made from the Basic Form I. This position is primarily taken because the Basic Form I is the only Form without totally predictable vowel assignment. By making this Form the default lexical entry, we capture the information of that unpredictable middle vowel that cannot be found anywhere else. For those verbs that have no basic Form I, we can easily create a hypothetical Form I with unknown vowel quality that can be used to correctly derive higher Forms from it.
We now return to the issue of the causative derivations themselves. Hale and Keyser cite Fassi Fehri, who in his 1987 paper formulated the generalization for Modern Standard Arabic that "Derivational causativization is limited to one application." A causative cannot be derived from what is already a derived causative verb, which means that double causative constructions are prohibited in this language. The derivational system of the language is broad, but in terms of depth only allows for one application. Proof of this limitation is found in examining the transitivity allowed by a verb in its various Forms.

Recall that in (10), all three causative constructions could be derived from the basic intransitive verb ħazina, ‘to be sad’. All three causative Forms bear the meaning ‘to make s.o. sad’; all three causative constructions are transitive. According to the generalization above, it is prohibited to apply a causative derivation to any one of the non-basic Forms. Hallman shows that this is true. For example, even though Form II and IV can render ditransitive constructions, they do not accept the ablaut form of this verb as the input, because the resulting construction has too many arguments due to multiple increases in transitivity.

This is summarized in (16):

The chart in Figure 1 summarizes the possible causative derivations allowed by each Form, based on transitivity.

6 Case Marking

Arabic does not have an elaborate bank of case forms, so case marking is quite simple. The subject of a causative construction, marked in nominative case, is the causer. Both the causee and the patient/theme are marked with the accusative case as objects. There is no difference in case marking between the different causative Forms. In ditransitive constructions, both basic and causative, this means that the construction contains two accusative arguments. Below is an example from Hallman illustrating the ditransitive case marking on a Form II causative construction. This system of case marking is the same for a basic ditransitive verb as it is for a derived causative; case marking does not differ depending on whether the verb is an original or derived Form.

Arabic has quite free word order, and in most circumstances, arguments can occur in any order, though the default unmarked order is usually VSO. Variation in word order can easily occur in transitive clauses, because the different case markings overtly distinguish the subject from the object. It may also be possible for varied word order to occur in a ditransitive sentence like (17). Even though there is no case differentiation between the two objects, the meaning of the sentence can clearly be understood from semantics; the lesson, as an inanimate theme, cannot be caused by the teacher to do something, nor can the children be considered factual material that someone else is learning. The immediate incorrect interpretation is distinguished as easily as the ill-formedness of the English sentence, “The teacher taught the lesson the children.”

However, when the semantics fail to adequately distinguish the arguments of a construction, whether basic or causative, word order becomes crucial as the only way to eliminate ambiguity. In example (18), for instance, the verb razaqa can easily take two human entities. Their case marking is identical. It may not easily be apparent which argument is being provided with whom. In this example, the default word order, in which causee occurs as the primary object, closer to the verb than the patient/theme, is obligatory. Reversing the order of object arguments would inherently switch their semantic roles.

Of particular interest is that when it comes to causative constructions, it seems that the lexicon does its own job at eliminating potential ambiguity and keeping word order free. Most volitional transitive verbs that have been sampled—the type that would easily allow for and expect two human objects when causativized—appear to be almost systematically banned from accepting a causative derivation. This gapped category, including verbs like ‘to hit’; either does not have a causative Form, or that Form takes one of the non-causative meanings only (Wehr 1994). It is likely that there are some exceptions to this pattern, but there is enough evidence to support this principle as a generalization. (19) demonstrates how a ditransitive causative construction with such a volitional verb would be ungrammatical, and would have to be rewritten into something like (20):

However, a second category of transitive verbs, particularly sensory verbs, can accept either human or nonhuman arguments as the secondary object, but do not inherently expect that an ambiguous human argument will be there. Verbs such samiʕa ‘to listen/hear’ thus allow causative Forms. Strict word order is enacted in order to unambiguously render the intended
meaning. Thus, (21) is grammatical (though perhaps mildly odd to have a human entity rather than a sound as the theme):
The Arabic causative construction, with its two undistinguished objects, clearly falls in the Swahili category according to the two patterns observed by Baker 1988. Default word order suggests that the causee, typically placed closer to the verb, is always assigned the Grammatical Relation of Object, rather than following the more common Turkish pattern of assuming the next available Grammatical Relation on the Relational Hierarchy.
A causative construction may also take an oblique prepositional phrase, whose object is marked in the genitive case. This construction is quite straightforward, since there is no ambiguity of meaning. As (22) demonstrates, when there is no ambiguity, two animate entities may occur as predicate arguments, since they may be distinguished by case.

Semantic Restrictions
As discussed in the previous section, the semantics are of central importance to the Arabic causative, because they are the sole means of distinguishing the causee from the theme or patient. Much of the semantics has already been introduced above, and this section will merely summarize that discussion. The causer, as the subject, is naturally an agent, an animate entity. The causee must likewise be an animate entity, but as indicated by limitations on volitional verbs such as *hīr*, does not seem to typically accept an agentive role on transitive inputs. This is supported by Fischer (1999), who briefly notes that “the causative is usually not used if an action is carried out by an agent,” and cites qatala *to kill* as an example of another transitive verb that does not allow for a causative interpretation.

Comparison of Meaning
The multiple ways of creating a causative construction in Arabic raises the question of whether there is some predictable difference in meaning between the various causatives, if the lexicon allows for multiple Forms to be derived from the same root. The answer is, not necessarily. Sometimes there is a difference in meaning, usually minor and related to precise connotations. In other cases, there is no apparent difference in meaning at all. Perhaps in certain cases, there are minute differences that cannot be succinctly expressed in English dictionary translation. Wright (2005) and Haywood/Nahmad (1965) both cite some basic examples comparing Forms II and IV to illustrate this: In personal correspondence on the topic, F. P. Ford (p.c.) mentioned a classic illustration of meaning contrast from Qur’anic Arabic. The basic verb nazala means *to fall; to descend*, and may be used in reference to revelation from God. Qur’anic literature reveals a consistent difference of meaning between the Form II and Form IV causatives. Form II, nazzala, has the sense of revelation being sent down gradually, such as the entire Qur’an over the course of 23 years of ministry by the prophet Muhammad. *ʔanzala*, the corresponding Form IV, has a much more immediate connotation, of being sent down all at once, and would be used to refer to one specific revelation from one occasion. The Form I causative displays identical meaning patterns, or rather lack of any specific pattern. We demonstrated in (10) that it can sometimes have identical meaning to the other causatives. Minor differences in meaning certainly exist, but it is difficult to determine clear indications of different meaning from a dictionary alone.

Conclusion: Lexical Rules and Summary of Findings
To summarize the findings of this paper, we now propose complete lexical rules, adding to the Word Formation Rules proposed at the beginning that integrate issues of case, transitivity, semantics and derivational restrictions. Because the causative is a meaning-changing process, we will use the argument-structure format proposed in Kroeger 2004. The three lexical rules are given below, followed by a brief summary of the features of the Arabic causative. These lexical rules illustrate the following properties of the Arabic causative:
* All causative Forms must be derived from the same input, a basic Form I; thus, they cannot apply to any verb that has already undergone one of these derivations.
There is no overt difference in meaning between any one of the Forms; the output will mean roughly ‘to cause to X,’ though precise differences in meaning between different causative Forms may occur. For Forms II and IV, the meaning will not necessarily be causative; the Form may be intensive or estimative.

The parentheses for the Form II and IV rules indicate that they may take either an intransitive or transitive verb as their input; the Ablaut may only take intransitive input.

The output, allowing for only one subject, is monoclausal, as is typical of most causative constructions.

The derivations follow the Swahili pattern of causative case marking, consistently making the cause as an object. The input object will occur farther from the verb than the causee, and it thus gets demoted to secondary object due to its distance from that verb.

Not able to be illustrated in a lexical rule is the semantic restrictions, which in general deny causative constructions to be derived from a transitive verb that assumes an agentive subject.
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The **causative form** is used when we speak about a professional service which someone has done for us.

She is having her typewriter repaired.

We make the causative form:

{subject} + {have} + {object} + {past participle}

I had my hair cut.
She will have her house decorated.
They are having their garden landscaped.
He is going to have his car resprayed.

We can use the same pattern to talk about an often bad experience:

She had her house burgled.
We had our money stolen.
We had our car vandalized.

We can also use get instead of have but this is informal.


**Unit 70 - Causative Verbs**

Causative verbs show that somebody/something is indirectly responsible for an action. The subject doesn't perform the action itself, but causes someone/something else to do it instead. For example:

- Yesterday I **had** my hair cut.
I didn't cut my own hair, but I made someone else do it for me instead - I "caused" them to cut my hair.

**Have**

Have is a common causative verb. Instead of doing something ourselves, we "have" someone else do it instead. It has the following form:

The verb "to have" + object + past participle. For example:

- I **had** my jacket cleaned yesterday.
- Did you have your computer fixed?

Sometimes we use have as a causative verb when we intend to perform the action ourselves. For example:

- When will the report be ready? I'll do it by tomorrow morning. >>
- When will the report be ready? I'll **have** it done by tomorrow morning.
By using the causative the second sentence takes attention away from the doer of the action, and gives more attention to the action being done. It sounds polite and professional.

**Get**

Get is often used instead of have. For example:
- I got my computer fixed - I had my computer fixed. These two sentences mean the same thing.
- I got my jacket cleaned. - I had my jacket cleaned. These two sentences mean the same thing.

Causative verbs are often used with negative experiences. In these situations it's more common to use have. For example:
- I had my wallet stolen. (I didn't actually cause my wallet to be stolen - someone stole my wallet from me)
- She had her window smashed.

[Causatives](http://web2.uvcs.uvic.ca/elc/studyzone/410/grammar/caus.htm)

**Introduction**


**Let / Make / Have / Get**

The following is a mini-tutorial on the use of the causative verbs "let," "make," "have," and "get." After you have studied the tutorial, complete the associated
exercises. If you already know how to use these verbs, you can skip the explanation and go directly to the exercises.

Let

**FORM**

[let + person + verb]

**USE**

This construction means "to allow someone to do something."

**Examples:**

- John let me drive his new car.
- Will your parents let you go to the party?
- I don't know if my boss will let me take the day off.

Make

**FORM**

[make + person + verb]

**USE**

This construction means "to force someone to do something."

**Examples:**

- My teacher made me apologize for what I had said.
- Did somebody make you wear that ugly hat?
- She made her children do their homework.

Have

**FORM**

[have + person + verb]

**USE**

This construction means "to give someone the responsibility to do something."

**Examples:**

- Dr. Smith had his nurse take the patient's temperature.
• Please **have your secretary fax** me the information.
• I **had the mechanic check** the brakes.

**Get**

**FORM**

[get + person + to + verb]

**USE**

This construction usually means "to convince to do something" or "to trick someone into doing something."

**Examples:**

• Susie **got her son to take** the medicine even though it tasted terrible.
• How can parents **get their children to read** more?
• The government TV commercials are trying to **get people to stop** smoking.

**Get vs. Have**

Sometimes "get someone to do something" is interchangeable with "have someone do something," but these expressions do not mean exactly the same thing.

**Examples:**

• I **got the mechanic to check** my brakes.
  *At first the mechanic didn’t think it was necessary, but I convinced him to check the brakes.*

• I **had the mechanic check** my brakes.
  *I asked the mechanic to check the brakes.*

**EXERCISES AND RELATED TOPICS:**

• [Let / Make / Have / Get Exercise 1](http://www.eslgold.com/grammar/causative_verbs.html)

**Causative Verbs**

Causative Verbs

See also: Free-English-Study: Causative Verbs.

Click for Audio

Certain verbs can be used to express a causal relationship between the subject and object in a sentence. Some of them require a "to" while others do not. Note the following patterns:

**With "to"**

- S + V + O + to V (O)
- I *allowed* Jim *to* clean up the mess.
- I *asked* Jim *to* clean up the mess.
- I *told* Jim *to* clean up the mess.
- I *persuaded* Jim *to* clean up the mess.*

*Other verbs which use this pattern are require, command, force, order, remind, and urge. The verb help can be used with or without "to": Help Jim (to) clean up the mess.

**Without "to"**

- S + V + O + V (O)
- I *let* Jim *clean* up the mess.
- I *had* Jim *clean* up the mess.
- I *made* Jim *clean* up the mess.

*Other verbs which can be used with this pattern are ask, require, request, and demand.

Some verbs use the pattern, S + V *that* S + V (the second verb is in the base form)

- I *insisted* that Laura *do* her homework. (not "does")
- I *suggested* that Laura *do* her homework.
- I *recommended* that Laura *do* her homework.

*Other verbs which can be used with this pattern are ask, require, request, and demand.

The most common error with causatives is using "to" unnecessarily. For example,

- We made Kevin *to* finish his supper. (Incorrect)
- We made Kevin *finish* his supper. (Correct)
- They suggested Irene *to* take music lessons. (Incorrect)
They suggested that Irene take music lessons. (Correct)

If you have questions or comments about this page, please contact us.
Be sure to include the title of this page in the Subject line of your e-mail.
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