

Estonian causatives from the construction grammar perspective

Ilona Tragel and Kairit Tomson
University of Tartu
ilona.tragel@ut.ee, kairit.tomson@ut.ee

Keywords: causative, construction grammar, Estonian

Causation is considered to be a basic cognitive domain that has fundamental importance to both grammatical structure and the lexicon (cf. Langacker 1991; Talmy 2000). Rich morphology and presence of both morphological and constructional means of expression in Estonian gives us a great chance to tackle a rich inventory of different possibilities to express phases of causative chain. In the present paper we focus on the conceptualization of the realization phase in the causative chain in Estonian.

There are three main ways to express causality in Estonian:

- (1) analytic causative constructions (cf. *aja-b naer-ma* - drive-3SG laugh-INF2, lit. '(he/she/it) drives someone to laugh'),
- (2) morphological causatives (cf. *naeru-ta-b* - laugh-CAUS-3SG '(he/she) makes someone laugh more time'),
- (3) lexical causatives (e.g. *tapa-b* 'kills').

In addition, depending on the situation and context, a cause-effect relation can also be expressed by other means, for example by adposition constructions (e.g. [N:GEN + *tõttu* 'because of' / *mõjul* 'due to' / *läbi* 'through']), cases (illative, elative, inessive or comitative), or adverbial clauses, such as BECAUSE-clause (e.g. *sellepärast* 'because', *kuna* 'when; whereas').

Our data consist of spoken descriptions of video clips depicting causative situations. Clips come from the Causality Across Languages project (Bellingham *et al*, under review). The experiments were run with 32 Estonian speaking participants.

We have closer look at two types of constructions. First type is conceptualized by speech act verbs and its complement in the 1st infinitive (e. g. *palu-b istu-da* – 'asks (someone) to sit (down)') where the resulting event is not usually explicitly conceptualized. The second is an analytic construction with a locative expression, e. g. *kaussi löö-ma* 'to crack (lit. 'hit' into the bowl', where the result of the causative event is construed by locative expression (e. g. *kaussi* - bowl:ILL 'into the bowl').

We also tackle the question of what makes the speaker to choose morphological or analytical way of expression. As an example of this, there is a difference in the continuation of the CAUSER's control over the result event (cf. examples of *ajab naerma* 'drives someone to laugh' and *naerutama* 'makes someone to laugh more time or more than once' above). In this type of constructions the realization phase of the causative situation is included in the meaning of the construction, and thus the speaker does not need to mention the result of the scene explicitly.

Our paper contributes to the main idea of the construction grammar (e.g. Goldberg 1995, 2006): based on the Estonian data we see that the usage of specific causal chain types derive from the constructional meaning. If time allows, we will also introduce some causative expressions, which are not included in the list of means of causality in Estonian so far.

References

- Bellingham, E., Evers, S., Kawachi, K., Mitchell, A., Park, S., Stepanova, A., & J. Bohnemeyer. (Under review). Exploring the representation of causality across languages: integrating production, comprehension and conceptualization perspectives. In E. Siegal & N. Boneh (eds.), *Papers from Linguistic perspectives on causation*. Springer.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at Work. The nature of generalization in language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Descriptive application, Volume II*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Talmy, Leonard 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics, Volume I: Concept structuring systems*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, The MIT Press.