

Univerzita Karlova v Praze  
Filozofická fakulta  
Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

BAKALÁŘSKÁ PRÁCE

Michal Auersperger

Anglické kauzativní konstrukce se  
slovesy *have*, *get* a *make* a jejich české  
překladové protějšky

English Causative Constructions with  
the Verbs *have*, *get*, and *make*, and  
their Czech Translation Counterparts

Praha 2012

PhDr. Markéta Malá, Ph.D.

**Prohlášení:** Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vypracoval samostatně, že jsem řádně citoval všechny použité prameny a literaturu a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 14. srpna 2012

Michal Auersperger

## Abstract

The paper analyses the English analytical causative constructions with the verbs HAVE, GET and MAKE and their Czech translation counterparts. The syntactic description of the English constructions considers different complementation of the causative verbs (present and past participle, infinitive), transitivity of the non-finite verb, as well as the in/animacy of the sentence participants. The analysis of data from a parallel corpus of Czech and English revealed associations between these features and the types of English causative constructions differentiated by the three causative verbs. It was also found out that there is a correlation between the English causative constructions and some specific Czech translation types. In Czech, analytical causative constructions and syntactic restructurations appear to be the most frequent type of translation of the English analytical causative constructions.

**Keywords:** causativity, translation counterparts, analytical constructions

## Abstrakt

Předkládaná práce se zabývá anglickými analytickými kauzativními konstrukcemi se slovesy HAVE, GET a MAKE a jejich českými překladovými protějšky. Anglické věty budou popsány z hlediska komplementace slovesa (konkurence minulého příděstí, infinitivu a přítomného příděstí), tranzitivity nefinitního slovesa a ne/životnosti účastníků slovesného děje. Analýza dat z paralelního korpusu češtiny a angličtiny ukázala vztahy mezi těmito charakteristikami a typem anglických kauzativních konstrukcí (rozlišených na základě přítomnosti jednoho ze tří kauzativních sloves). Zároveň byla nalezena korelace mezi anglickými kauzativními slovesy a některými typy českých překladových protějšků. Z pohledu češtiny se zdá, že hlavními překladovými typy anglických kauzativních konstrukcí jsou jejich analytické obdoby v češtině a syntaktické restrukturační.

**Klíčová slova:** kauzativita, překladové protějšky, analytické konstrukce

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1 General view on causative constructions</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Causative Situation . . . . .	7
1.2 Expressing Causation . . . . .	8
1.2.1 Complex sentence . . . . .	8
1.2.2 Simple sentence with an adverbial . . . . .	8
1.2.3 Causative construction . . . . .	9
1.3 Types of Causative Constructions . . . . .	9
1.3.1 Analytical causative constructions . . . . .	9
1.3.2 Morphological causatives . . . . .	10
1.3.3 Lexical causatives . . . . .	10
1.3.4 Language differences . . . . .	11
1.3.5 Semantic Differences . . . . .	11
1.3.6 Semantic Roles . . . . .	12
<b>2 English analytical causative constructions</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1 Syntactic structure . . . . .	14
2.2 Semantics . . . . .	17
2.2.1 Have . . . . .	18
2.2.2 Get . . . . .	20
2.2.3 Make . . . . .	21
<b>3 Causation in Czech</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>4 Method and material</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>5 Results</b>	<b>30</b>
5.1 English causative constructions . . . . .	30
5.1.1 Have constructions . . . . .	31
5.1.2 Get constructions . . . . .	32

5.1.3	Make constructions . . . . .	33
5.1.4	Summary . . . . .	34
5.2	Czech translation counterparts . . . . .	35
5.2.1	Analytical and synthetic counterparts . . . . .	36
5.2.2	Counterparts without a causative verb . . . . .	39
5.2.3	Restructurations . . . . .	40
5.3	Confronting English and Czech constructions . . . . .	41
5.3.1	Translation type and the English causative verb . . . . .	41
5.3.2	Translation type and the complementation of English causative verbs . . . . .	43
5.3.3	Translation type and the animacy of the participants . . . . .	45
5.3.4	Other factors . . . . .	46
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>48</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>52</b>
	<b>Sources</b>	<b>54</b>
	<b>Résumé</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>List of excerpts</b>	<b>60</b>
A.1	MAKE . . . . .	60
A.2	GET . . . . .	70
A.3	HAVE . . . . .	75

# List of Tables

2.1	English periphrastic causative constructions (adapted from Gilquin (2010, p. 20)) . . . . .	15
4.1	The subcorpus of the InterCorp . . . . .	27
5.1	Proportional frequency of HAVE, GET and MAKE categories and their specific subtypes . . . . .	34
5.2	Animacy and transitivity inside causative constructions . . . . .	35
5.3	Frequency of the translation counterparts for HAVE, GET and MAKE . . . . .	42
5.4	Frequency of analytical translation counterparts for HAVE, GET and MAKE . . . . .	43
5.5	Frequency of translation counterparts for different types of complementation . . . . .	44
5.6	Frequency of analytical translation counterparts for different types of complementation . . . . .	44
5.7	Frequency of the translation counterparts with respect to the animacy of the participants . . . . .	46
5.8	Frequency of English causative verbs in each book . . . . .	47
5.9	Frequency of the translation types in each book . . . . .	47
6.1	Syntaktické typy Anglických kauzativních konstrukcí (upraveno z Gilquin (2010, s. 20)) . . . . .	56

# Introduction

Causative constructions seem to have a special status in linguistics and, presumably, in language too. The notion of cause and effect, which lies at their centre, is believed to be fundamental in the whole of human cognition. Lakoff and Johnson, for example, state that it is a “basic human concept” ((Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) cited by Gilquin (2010, p. 1)).

Analytical causative constructions are one of the way a causative situation can be expressed in English. From the point of view of the typology of languages, it utilizes the basic principle of creating meaning in English, i.e. the analytical principle. On the following pages, the structural and semantic differences of the constructions connected with three typical causative verbs, namely HAVE, GET and MAKE, will be discussed.

Firstly, the constructions will be discussed in the context of what real-life matter they actually express and what are some other possible ways of expressing the same information. Then the description of the syntactic and semantic properties of the structures follows. This paper is also concerned with the Czech translation counterparts of the English analytical constructions. We suppose that their comparison with the original sentences may provide a broader picture than when the English constructions would be analyzed on their own.

The classification of the Czech translation types is not as developed as the classification of English causative verbs. Therefore it is one of the aims of this paper to find out criteria that would enable reliable classification of the translation types.

# Chapter 1

## General view on causative constructions

Causative constructions are one of the means how the notion of causation can be expressed in language. For the sake of clear analysis of these constructions, the situation to which they refer will be discussed first.

### 1.1 Causative Situation

By causative situation we understand two events, one of which is interpreted as the result of the other. This interpretation is done by the speaker, who believes that the resulting event would not have occurred were it not for the occurrence of the causing event (Shibatani, 1976, p. 2).

In the following example, two events are described by two separate sentences:

- (1) a. Anna started playing one of Chopin's waltzes.
- b. Everybody was delighted.

If the speaker believes that (1-b) happened as a result of (1-a), i.e. *everybody was delighted* because *Anna started playing*, then both events are parts of a causative situation.



The causative relationship between two events may be inferred from the context itself, but at the same time, languages make it possible to express this relationship explicitly.

## 1.2 Expressing Causation

### 1.2.1 Complex sentence

One of the options to indicate the causative relationship between two events is to form a complex sentence. In the following restatement of example (1), the resulting event is expressed by the main clause, and the dependent clause corresponds to the causing event:

- (2) Everybody was delighted because Anna started playing one of Chopin's waltzes.

While all the information from (1) is preserved here, the subordinate conjunction *because* adds to it by marking one of the events as the result of the other.

### 1.2.2 Simple sentence with an adverbial

To express the same relationship, the speaker may use a simple sentence with an adverbial. In (3-a) and (3-b), the adverbials represent the causing and resulting events respectively:

- (3) a. Everybody was delighted because of Anna's playing.  
b. To everybody's delight, Anna started playing one of Chopin's waltzes.

As seen in (3-a), the causing event, represented by the adverbial, is reduced. The scope and focus of the reduction depends on the speaker's presentation. In any case, the adverbial is an additional, peripheral element in a clause whose core arguments denote only one of the two events forming a causative situation.

### 1.2.3 Causative construction

A causative construction can be seen as a transition between a complex sentence and a simple sentence with an adverbial. In a causative construction, unlike in a complex sentence, the “causing event is not overtly specified” (Kemmer & Verhagen, 1994, p.117), but at the same time, it is still implied within the core arguments of the clause, which distinguishes causative constructions from simple clauses with adverbials:

(4) Anna made everybody dance.

Although we are not told what the exact cause of the dancing is, the causing event is still represented by its agent, *Anna* and the verb, *made*.<sup>1</sup>

## 1.3 Types of Causative Constructions

Generally, three types of causative constructions are distinguished: analytical, morphological and lexical. In terms of structure, the major difference between these types lies in the amount of in/dependence between the elements expressing the cause and the effect. Both elements are always dependent “conceptually” (Kemmer & Verhagen, 1994, p. 117), but the distinguishing factor is the degree to which this conceptual tightness is expressed by formal means (Comrie, 1989, p. 166).

### 1.3.1 Analytical causative constructions

Analytical causative constructions contain two separate lexical items corresponding to the two events of the causative situation. The first lexical item is a periphrastic (also analytical or overt) causative verb expressing the cause, such as English *make* and Czech *dát* in the following example:

---

<sup>1</sup>Linguists have not agreed on whether causative constructions are mono- or bi-clausal (Wolff, Song, & Driscoll, 2002, p.613). In example (4), we see that there are two verbs corresponding to two events. However, only one verb is finite. There is also a related debate on whether the constructions are derived by reduction from complex sentences (Comrie, 1989) or whether they are “built up from simpler structural/conceptual units” (Kemmer & Verhagen, 1994, p.116)

- (5) a. He made her cry.  
b. Dal jsem jí vědět.

The second item is usually the lexical verb expressing the resulting action or state. Although both notions of cause and effect are indicated by two distinct words, these words are inseparable from each other. The first word has all the grammatical properties of a main verb but limited semantics so that it requires the second non-finite verb, which carries the core lexical meaning.

### 1.3.2 Morphological causatives

In morphological causatives, the closeness of the two elements is even more apparent. The lexical verb denoting the resulting event undergoes a morphological change that adds the notion of cause to its meaning. Generally, the morphological change in question is affixation as it is illustrated by the next example from Czech:

- (6) Jeho poznámka všechny roze-smála.

In present-day English, the only highly productive causative suffix is *-ize* as in *modern – modernize* (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985, p.1557). However, it is not a deverbal but a deadjectival suffix.<sup>2</sup>

### 1.3.3 Lexical causatives

In many cases, the notion of cause and effect cannot be broken into two separate elements as we saw above. Both elements are then inherent in the very meaning of a single verb without any formal indications of their distinction. Such a verb then represents “maximal conceptual closeness of the causal and effected predicate” (Kemmer & Verhagen, 1994, p.118) and is called a lexical (or covert) causative. Examples of lexical causatives are plentiful in both Czech (*zamknout, pustit, složit*) and English (*save, send, cook*).

---

<sup>2</sup>Verbs derived in this way are classified not as causative, but as factitive in Czech linguistic tradition (Čermák & Štichauer, 2010, p.1). In English linguistics, the term *factitive* is sometimes used for attributive ditransitive verbs (*They elected him chairman*).

### 1.3.4 Language differences

Comrie (1989) notes that the three types of causative constructions should not be seen as entirely distinct categories but rather as three partly overlapping areas on a continuum. At one pole of the continuum, there are analytical causative constructions, morphological causatives are in the middle, and at the other end, there are purely lexical causatives.<sup>3</sup>

What distinguishes analytical and morphological causatives on the one hand and lexical causatives on the other is the productivity (Shibatani, 1976, p. 2). Ideally, analytical causative verbs such as English *make* and causative affixes such as Czech *roz-* would combine freely with non-causative verbs to form their causative counterparts. On the other hand, forming a new lexical causative means creating a new word (or changing the meaning of an existing one), which happens comparatively rarely.

The choice of using one type of productive causative constructions rather than the other (i.e. analytical or morphological) depends on typological characteristics of the given language (Shibatani, 1976, pp. 2-3). Although the correlation is not perfect, it would be reasonable to expect analytical causatives in English, which is predominantly an isolating language, and morphological causatives in Czech.

However, Čermák and Štichauer (2010) challenge the idea about Czech prefixes being a dominant causative structure in the language. They have shown that the use of causative prefixes in Czech was the least frequent means of translating Spanish and Italian analytical causative constructions. In the light of the findings of this research, we cannot expect the relationship between Czech and English causative expressions to be straightforward either.

### 1.3.5 Semantic Differences

The three basic types of causative constructions do not differ only on formal grounds. When two corresponding constructions may be used (i.e. usually

---

<sup>3</sup>For examples of the transitional states on the analytical-morphological-lexical spectrum, see Comrie (1989, pp. 169-170).

a nonproductive – lexical, and a productive – analytical or morphological causative), the semantic differences between them come to the fore. Shibatani (1976, p. 29) illustrates the non-synonymy of a lexical causative and a related analytical construction by the following example:

- (7) a. I didn't stand the child up, but I had/made him stand up.  
b. I didn't have/make the child stand up, but I stood him up.

The fact that the affirmative and negative forms of one clause can be conjoined in such a manner without any logical contradiction demonstrates that there is a semantic difference present (cf. the logical contradiction when conjoining an active clause with its passivized form). Despite this difference, Gilquin (2010, p. 68) notes that the two variants may be used to refer to the same situation, but even then they represent various conceptual understandings of reality.

The main problem is to define the nature of this semantic difference. Kemmer and Verhagen (1994, p. 120) speak about three types of oppositions universally relevant for the meaning of causative constructions: physical versus non-physical causation, direct versus mediated causation and cause per se versus enablement and permission; Shibatani (1976, p. 31) understands the directive versus manipulative causation opposition to be the most prominent; while Gilquin (2010, p. 68) stresses the contrast between direct and indirect causation. Despite the surface terminological dissimilarities, at the core of these suggestions, there is a common focus on the distinction between a straightforward action (the case of lexical causatives, e.g. *I stood the child up*.) and an action that undertakes some kind of diversion (periphrastic causatives, e.g. *I made the child stand up*.) This opposition will also be relevant in a later discussion of analytical causatives in English.

### 1.3.6 Semantic Roles

As the result of the theoretical attention the causative constructions have won, the constituents of these structures were described in new terms. Within the constructions, three participants are distinguished: CAUSER, CAUSEE

and PATIENT. Kemmer and Verhagen (1994, p. 119) describe the causer as “the entity causing the entire event”, the causee as “the entity carrying out the activity designated by the effected predicate” (i.e. the final focal activity) and the patient<sup>4</sup> as “the entity that is the endpoint of the energy (literal or metaphorical) expended in the entire causative event.” In addition, Gilquin (2010) uses the term EFFECT for the second, lexical verb. With this terminology, analytical causative constructions can be described in the following way:

- (8) The shock made        him        drop the glass.  
CAUSER    *caus. verb* CAUSEE *effect* PATIENT

---

<sup>4</sup>Kemmer and Verhagen (1994, p. 119) use the term *affectee*, but the term *patient* is more widely accepted.

## Chapter 2

# English analytical causative constructions

Since there is no deverbal causative suffix in present-day English (see section 1.3.2), analytical causatives are the only productive means of expressing causation. Although for this study, only the constructions with verbs MAKE, HAVE and GET were used, there are many other verbs that can be classified as periphrastic causatives (Wolff et al. (2002) found 49 such verbs). The three verbs in question here were chosen because they form a prototypical, well-documented group and can be expected to occur relatively frequently in the language. This makes them a good subject matter for a contrastive study.

### 2.1 Syntactic structure

As mentioned in section 1.3.1, the form of the construction consists of two verbs, viz. a finite periphrastic verb designating the causal predicate and a non-finite lexical verb designating the effected predicate. Which non-finite verb form is acceptable in a given context depends on the periphrastic causative since it is the main predicate of the whole construction, the effect being its complement.

[X GET Y V <sub>to_inf</sub> ]	<i>At one time we couldn't <b>get</b> <u>Jessy to talk</u>.</i>
[X GET Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	<i>We'll <b>get</b> <u>everything sorted out</u> <u>this week</u>.</i>
[X GET Y V <sub>prp</sub> ]	<i>Couldn't <b>get</b> <u>these earphones</u> <u>working</u>.</i>
[X HAVE Y V <sub>inf</sub> ]	<i>I <b>had</b> <u>Elsie go</u> <u>on Wednesday night</u>.</i>
[X HAVE Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	<i>Did you <b>have</b> the blades <u>sharpened</u>?</i>
[X HAVE Y V <sub>prp</sub> ]	<i>You better not <b>have</b> that tape <u>working</u>, is it on?</i>
[X MAKE Y V <sub>inf</sub> ]	<i>But I <b>made</b> him <u>put</u> his coat on.</i>
[X BE made V <sub>to_inf</sub> ]	<i>They're being taken to court and <b>made</b> <u>to pay</u>.</i>
[X MAKE Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	<i>They <b>made</b> their voices <u>heard</u> at the conference.</i>

Table 2.1: English periphrastic causative constructions (adapted from Gilquin (2010, p. 20))

In accord with Gilquin (2010), we distinguish the following periphrastic constructions with the verbs MAKE, HAVE and GET: MAKE complemented by a bare infinitive, past participle or – in passive – a to-infinitive; HAVE with a bare infinitive, past participle or a present participle; and GET complemented by a to-infinitive, past participle or a present participle. The constructions and their examples from British National Corpus are summarized in Table 2.1, adapted from Gilquin (2010).

Considering the examples given in Table 2.1 with respect to the three semantic roles described in section 1.3.6, it becomes obvious that the order of the roles may differ from the typical sentences used to illustrate the periphrastic causative structures and that sometimes the participants may remain unexpressed. Below, there are three examples from the table.

- (1) a. At one time we couldn't get Jessy to talk.
- b. They made their voices heard at the conference.
- c. They're being taken to court and made to pay.

Neither of the sentences from (1) fully matches the formula: CAUSER – *causative verb* – CAUSEE – *effect* – PATIENT. In (1-a), there is no patient; in (1-b), the causee is missing and the patient stands between the causative verb and the effect; finally in (1-c), it is the causer and the patient that are not present in the sentence and the causee stands in the subject position. However, the participants are not present in the sentences for different reasons.



While the patient is the only optional element in periphrastic causative constructions (Gilquin, 2010, p. 66) and its presence is determined only by the valency of the verb representing the effect, the causer and causee must always be present in the structure – at least – “at the conceptual level” (Gilquin, 2010, p. 66).

Obviously in (1-c), the causer is not expressed since the sentence is in passive. That is also why the causee, typically in the object position, is moved to the front. (1-b) may be less obvious, but it can be analyzed in a similar manner: the effected predicate represents a passivized clause (*their voices were heard at the conference*), where the same processes took place, viz. subject deletion and object fronting. When the clause was reduced to the effected predicate, the auxiliary BE was omitted.

If one adopts this (generative) approach, further questions arise. For example in (2), there is just one verb and thus the sentence would not be classified as a periphrastic causative construction by many researchers.

(2) All the food around made her hungry.

However, both the notions of cause and effect are present. The causative situation can be expressed in two separate events or states: *there was much food* and *she was hungry*. If we accept *their voices heard* as a reduction of *their voices were heard*, there are not many grounds on which not to accept *she hungry* as a reduction of *she was hungry*. One possible argument against this analogy is the nature of the verb BE. In the first case, it is an auxiliary; in the second, it is a linking verb. However, neither of them has a full semantic content that could be seen as an obstacle for reduction.

We will leave the issue of predicate adjectives and nouns (cf. *they made me a criminal*) aside as its definite resolution is not necessary for the purpose of this work, but one more remark should be made about valency properties within periphrastic causative constructions.

The number of participants is not limited to three, but each predicate keeps its own arguments (Comrie, 1989, p. 175). Thus, if the effect is expressed by a ditransitive verb, there will be four participants in the whole structure as in *I made him send a letter to the editor* (Kemmer & Verhagen,

1994, p. 123). Such sentences are not expected to be found particularly often in English, but at the same time, they may occur.

## 2.2 Semantics

To the description of syntax of analytical causative structures, the domain of semantics is closely related. In fact, the various forms which were shown above stem from the lexical differences between the causative verbs HAVE, GET and MAKE. In some contexts, the specific semantic content of the verbs is apparent, but in some contexts there might be an overlap in their usage. However, even in those cases where more words could be properly used, one should expect some semantic differences between the possible expressions.

Shibatani's (1976) account of the relationship between analytical and lexical causative constructions further complicates the picture. Where both types of expression are possible, the lexical causative usually involves a notion of physical manipulation of a non-volitional causee (the so called manipulative causation) whereas the analytical construction often implies giving some sort of directions to a volitional causee (directive causation). This is illustrated by the following examples from Shibatani (1976, pp. 31-32):

- (3) a. John moved the chair.  
b. John made Bill move.

There is not always a corresponding lexical causative at hand; in such situations the analytical construction can express both directive and manipulative causation as illustrated by the sentence from Shibatani (1976, p. 35):

- (4) I made John fall into the pool.

Although this account might seem too general and simplistic, it points out to an important fact, namely that “the entire range of the meaning of a productive causative form is not predictable by looking at the form alone” (Shibatani, 1976, p. 36). The scope of this work does not allow us to investigate the details of the relationship between productive and nonproductive

causative forms, but one should remember that the meaning of verbs, described below in general terms, might also be influenced by factors out of the scope of a given analytical construction.

The lexical characteristics of the verbs in question also determine certain semantic characteristics of the sentence participants such as in/animacy of the causer and causee, in/voluntarity of the effect as well as more formal aspects of the sentence structure such as the possibility of the passivisation of the causative verb or the lexical verb representing the effect. Thus, although the following description deals predominantly with semantics, some digressions to syntax will be beneficial for understanding the analytical causatives better.

### 2.2.1 Have

Gilquin (2003, p. 125) notes that causative HAVE and GET are often presented as synonyms due to their common syntactic properties. Indeed, both verbs can be complemented by a past or present participle, by a bare infinitive in the case of HAVE and a full infinitive in the case of GET. Moreover, in some sentences, the two verbs seem to be completely interchangeable: *I got/had my hair cut* (Gilquin, 2003, p. 125). In spite of these similarities, we will see that the verbs should be treated separately.

The use of causative HAVE is characterized by Wierzbicka (1998, pp. 120-122) in the following way: the relationship between the causer and the causee implies such a hierarchy that the causee has effectively no way of not performing the action desired by the causer. At the same time it is not implied that the causer would need to put a special effort into achieving the resulting action or state. In other words, the causee is not seen as an obstacle not willing to perform the action for the causer. Furthermore, the ultimate goal of the causer seems not to be primarily associated with the causee. Instead, the causee is seen as “an instrument in achieving some objective” (Wierzbicka, 1998, p. 122).

This analysis brings further implications, as described by Wierzbicka (1998, p. 122): the effected predicate is normally a transitive verb because

intransitive verbs are less likely to correspond with the causer's focus on a goal different from the causee's action per se. The relative unimportance of the causee is further demonstrated by the fact that the HAVE construction does not allow for passivization of the main predicate. If passivization was possible, the causee would be given the topic position in the sentence which would be against the semantics of causative HAVE. On the other hand, the passivization of the effected predicate occurs frequently as its object is often the center of the causer's attention. The behaviour of the two predicates in the HAVE construction with respect to passivization is demonstrated by the following example:

- (5) a. I had a mechanic repair my car.  
b. \*A mechanic was had to repair my car.  
c. I had my car repaired.

In fact, out of the three nonfinite phrases complementing causative HAVE, the past participle is the most common (about 83%), followed by the present participle and the infinitive (each about 9%) (Gilquin, 2010, p. 48).

### 2.2.1.1 sentence participants

Speaking about "causer's desire" or "causee's will" in the preceding overview of the semantic content of HAVE implies animacy of both the causer and the causee. This is indeed the case in the majority of constructions, but there are also examples of inanimate causers or causees. Specifically, when HAVE is complemented by the present participle, inanimate causee is to be found in about 44% of all the instances of the construction, yet "... most of these inanimate causees refer to objects with some energy of their own [such as] computers, cars, tape recorders and dishwashers" (Gilquin, 2010, p. 119) or *boiler* in the following example adapted from Gilquin (2010, p. 119):

- (6) If you've used all your hot water, you can't have that boiler going for an hour or two, can you?

In the other types of complementation, animate causees dominate more clearly: 78% in the case of the infinitive and almost 100% if HAVE is complemented by the past participle (Gilquin, 2010, p. 118). For causers, animacy is even more dominant: 97% in infinitival and present participial complementation, and almost 100% in past participial complementation (Gilquin, 2010, p. 112).

In terms of the category of *effect*, volitionality (i.e. dependence on the causee's will) is to be found in 57% of the constructions with an infinitive, in 49% of the present participle constructions, and 99% of the constructions with the past participle (Gilquin, 2010, p. 128). The percentages for causer, causee and the effect illustrate the relationship between the three types of HAVE constructions. While the most dominant past participle category is the most stable and specialised for interpersonal communication, the meaning of the two other categories is not as strictly defined and is suitable for a larger scale of situations, namely those where the causee is not animate.

### 2.2.2 Get

In contrast to HAVE, causative GET does not imply any hierarchy that would guarantee that the causer's desire will be fulfilled by the causee. On the contrary, the causee is often seen as not initially willing to perform what the causer would like him/her to so that the causer needs to put special effort into persuading the causee to do so. Ultimately, the causee is acting on his or her will (Wierzbicka, 1998, pp. 124-125).

Similarly, with respect to frequency of the three non-finite phrases complementing causative GET, the picture is different from what we saw with the HAVE constructions. The past participle has about 62% share of the constructions with GET, the to-infinitive takes about 28% and the present participle about 10% (Gilquin, 2010, p. 48). The smaller proportion of past participial complement shows that the causee is not demoted as often and that its importance might be higher than in the case of the HAVE constructions. However, the importance of the causee goes not as far as that it could be fronted by the means of main predicate passivization.

### 2.2.2.1 sentence participants

The realization of the causer, causee and effect is to a great extent similar to what we saw in section 2.2.1.1. Although the causee is predominantly animate, here again, we see that the present participial complementation is frequently connected with inanimate causees such as “machines that appear to have will of their own” (Wierzbicka, 1998, p. 124) as seen in the example from Gilquin (2010, p. 119):

(7) Couldn't get these earphones working.

Thus an animate causee is present only in 37% instances of the present participial GET constructions compared to 92% of the infinitive constructions and almost 100% of the past participle constructions (Gilquin, 2010, p. 118). The causer is mostly animate too, but in contrast to causative HAVE, GET allows for about one tenth of its causers to be inanimate. Other types of the GET constructions and the predominant frequency of animate causers (about 99% for both the infinitive and the past participle (Gilquin, 2010, p. 112)) are comparable to the frequencies of the HAVE counterparts.

Not surprisingly, non-volitional effects are found mainly in the present participial GET constructions since these occur frequently with inanimate causees which cannot perform volitional action. Volitional effects in the present participle constructions constitute only about 34% in contrast to 89% of the infinitive and 99% of the past participle constructions (Gilquin, 2010, p. 128). Again, from these statistics we can conclude that causative GET complemented by a past participle exhibits the most specialized and “well-behaved” category while the other two types of complementation are not as strictly semantically limited.

### 2.2.3 Make

The MAKE constructions are quite different from their HAVE and GET counterparts. The first difference is that MAKE is used much more often for situations not dealing with interpersonal communication and therefore we cannot simplify its general description by focusing on animate participants

only, as we did in the preceding sections. In what follows, the meaning of causative MAKE will be presented separately for interpersonal and impersonal causation.

To start with interpersonal causation, MAKE like HAVE implies an unequal relationship between the causer and the causee, but the resulting action is perceived to be performed unwillingly by the causee, which is not the case in the HAVE constructions (Wierzbicka, 1998, p. 121). This is the most traditional account of causative MAKE, but as Gilquin (2010, pp. 129-130) points out, such “coertive” meaning of the verb is not the most frequent one since the conditions necessary for such an interpretation of causative situation (i.e. animacy of the causer and the causee and a volitional effect) are found only in a relatively small number of cases (16% for MAKE + infinitive 47% for passive MAKE + to-infinitive and 7% for MAKE + past participle). Moreover, Wierzbicka (1998, pp. 128-135) distinguishes five other meanings of the interpersonal MAKE constructions based on the semantics of the effect: “make someone feel something”, “make someone think something” and “make someone want something” are closely related yet the notion of unwillingness on the part of the effect is not present. Closer to the coertive MAKE is “the make of involuntary emotional response” (e.g. *He made her laugh/cry*), but such emotional responses do not fall nicely into the semantic category of volitional effects since it is questionable whether they can be evoked willingly. Lastly, even though “making something happen to someone” can have the same structure as other constructions (e.g. *They made me stumble*), it presents the causative situation in a different way as the self-explanatory name suggests.

The impersonal causation types are mostly analogous to the interpersonal ones. Wierzbicka (1998, pp. 138-147) distinguishes, among others, between the “make of subjective necessity,” which is close to the coertive HAVE (*The strike made me stay at home*); and “a mishap blamed on an object or event,” cf. “making something happen to someone” (*It made me stumble*). “make someone feel/think/want something” with inanimate causers falls also into the category of impersonal causation.

Arguably, causative MAKE is semantically more complex than GET and HAVE. Its exceptional status is also illustrated by the types of structures in which it appears and their frequencies. It seems that in some cases, it may be the causee that is in the centre of the causer's attention. Thus topicalization may take place and the main predicate can be passivized as in the following example (Wierzbicka, 1998, p. 122):

(8) He was made to pump tyres every morning.

Although MAKE in passive occurs only in 8% of all the MAKE constructions (Gilquin, 2010, p. 48), unlike in the case of HAVE and GET, it is a possible and natural expression. Further, the relative importance of the causee is also supported by the very low frequency of MAKE with the past participle (2% (Gilquin, 2010, p. 48)), which was the most frequent type of complementation in the constructions with the other causative verbs. For MAKE, the most frequent complementation is the bare infinitive (90%), constituting also the most frequent and the “most flexible” causative construction analyzed by Gilquin (2010).

### **2.2.3.1 sentence participants**

With respect to sentence participants, the flexibility of MAKE becomes also apparent. The animate causer occurs only in about half of the most frequent MAKE + infinitive constructions. It is more characteristic of the constructions with passive MAKE + infinitive (90%) and of the past participial complementation (81%) (Gilquin, 2010, p. 112). The causee is animate in about 71% of the MAKE + infinitive, 48% of the BE MADE + infinitive and occurs always in the limited constructions with the past participle (Gilquin, 2010, p. 118). The effect tends to be non-volitional in all the three types (74%, 66% and 90% (Gilquin, 2010, p. 128)).



## Chapter 3

# Causation in Czech

Compared to the situation in English linguistics, the description of causativity in Czech is much less elaborate. It seems that Czech does not rely to such an extent on one universal method to express causativity. While in English, there is always – or where the semantics allows – an analytical construction at hand, Czech does not have such a highly productive causative structure. Thus, in order to express a causative situation, it uses to a different extent various means, be it lexical causatives, morphological or analytical structures or multi-clause expressions.

In Czech grammars, causative verbs are classified on the basis of their semantics. They form a category called “active mutational verbs”<sup>1</sup>. Mutational verbs encode a change in time from one state to another one while both of the states must be semantically specifiable. In contrast to simple mutation, active mutational verbs take the cause of the change as one of their participants (Karlík, Grepl, Nekula, & Rusínová, 1995, p. 32).

Classification of Czech causative constructions according to formal criteria is best summarized in Karlík, Nekula, and Pleskalová (2002, pp. 412-413). Causative verbs can be divided into two major groups according to whether they are derived by some processes from a corresponding non-causative form (derivational causatives<sup>2</sup>) or whether no such relationship can be found (se-

---

<sup>1</sup>akčně mutační predikáty

<sup>2</sup>slovotvorná kauzativa

mantic causatives<sup>3</sup>). Four types of the word formation causatives are distinguished: deverbally derived forms formed by stem modification (*sedět* → *posadit*); deverbally derived forms formed by prefix *roz-* (*plakat* → *rozplakat*); deadjectival derivatives (*být suchý* → *sušit*) and dereflexive derivatives (*rozbít se* → *rozbít*). Semantic causatives are the verbs that contain the notion of causation inherently, i.e. they do not rely – from a present-day perspective – on morphological markers to encode causation. They are either suppletive (*spadnout* → *shodit*), when two formally unrelated verbs express a corresponding non-causative and causative meaning, or they are syntactic, when both non-causative and causative meaning is expressed by the same verb form differing only in the number of participants it accepts (*Pavel zblbnul* → *Petr zblbnul Pavla*).

In addition, Karlík et al. (2002, p. 413) identify two types of analytical causatives. The first one consists of a verb with categorical meaning of causation and a subordinate clause or a noun phrase expressing the evoked change (*Mrazy způsobily to, že vymrzly ozimy/vymrznutí ozimů*); the second type consists of a verb with categorical meaning of initiation and a nonfinite phrase referring to the desired change (*Otec dal/nechal synovi změřit tlak*). Strictly speaking, only the latter type, with the causative verbs “*nechat, dát*”, seems to correspond to how the analytical causative constructions are described for English since only this type joins the two predicates corresponding to the causing and resulting event into a clause.<sup>4</sup>

When analyzing the Czech translations of English causative constructions, we must expect also other expressions than lexical, morphological, or analytical causatives. Čermák and Štichauer (2010, p. 5) point out to the fact that Spanish and Italian causative constructions are often translated by non-causative structures where the participants have different syntactical roles from the original. They illustrate it by the following example:

---

<sup>3</sup>sémantická kauzativa

<sup>4</sup>In section 1.2.3, it has been noted that the question of whether analytical constructions are mono- or bi-clausal has not been resolved. Here, we understand a clause to be signaled by the main (i.e. finite) verb.

- (1) El manual me hizo ver ...  
The manual I-ACC made see  
*Z příručky jsem vyčetl ...*

Čermák and Štichauer (2010, p. 6) also present the frequency of different structures which appeared as translations of Spanish and Italian causative constructions. The leading structure is the semantic causative<sup>5</sup> (47% for Spanish and 50% for Italian) followed by non-causative structures with changed syntactic roles of the participants (22% for Spanish and 21% for Italian). The third construction in terms of frequency is the analytical causative with verbs “*dát, nechat*” (11% for Spanish and 9% for Italian). The least frequent is the deverbal causative formed by the prefix “*roz-*” (4% for Spanish and 1% for Italian).

It remains to be seen whether similar results will be revealed by the English – Czech comparison. Since we can expect the distribution of Czech translation counterparts to be close to the study by Čermák and Štichauer (2010), we can take a step further and focus on whether specific types of Czech translations correlate with factors such as in/animacy of the participants or the type of syntactic complementation of the causative verb (infinitive, present or past participle). However, the scope of this work does not allow a full representative statistical analysis of the correlation, which might be, after all, better achieved by a research focusing on Czech language only.

---

<sup>5</sup>Čermák and Štichauer (2010) do not distinguish between suppletive and syntactic types of semantic causatives, it is also not clear whether such morphological causatives as deverbal derivatives formed by stem modification are treated as semantic causatives.

# Chapter 4

## Method and material

For the collection of the data, the parallel corpus InterCorp<sup>1</sup> was used. In order to control possible confounding factors, only the books that were written by a British (or Canadian) author in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and belong to the category of fiction were chosen.<sup>2</sup> The books are given in Table 4.1.

book	author/ <i>translator</i>	year of publication/ <i>translation</i>	label
Lucky Jim <i>Šťastný Jim</i>	Kingsley Amis <i>Jiří Mucha</i>	1954 <i>1959</i>	<LJ>
Rendezvous with Rama <i>Setkání s Rámou</i>	Arthur C. Clarke <i>Zdeněk Volný</i>	1972 <i>1984</i>	<RR>
The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy <i>Stopařův průvodce po galaxii</i>	Douglas Adams <i>Jana Hollanová</i>	1979 <i>1991</i>	<HG>
Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone <i>Harry Potter a Kámen mudrců</i>	J. K. Rowling <i>Vladimír Medek</i>	1997 <i>2000</i>	<HP>
The English Patient <i>Anglický pacient</i>	Michael Ondaatje <i>Eva Masnerová</i>	1992 <i>1997</i>	<EP>

Table 4.1: The subcorpus of the InterCorp

<sup>1</sup> *Český národní korpus – InterCorp*. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha. Accessed 12.04.2012, <<http://www.korpus.cz>>.

<sup>2</sup>In June 2012, the parallel corpus InterCorp was extended. However, at the time of excerption of the data, only five books fulfilled the criteria.

The excerption of the causative structures from the data was done semi-automatically. At the first stage, for each of the three causative verbs (MAKE, GET and HAVE) a query was made via the Corpus Query Language. The query searched for the occurrence of the causative verb, followed by 1 to 5 other lexical items and another verb. The number 5 as the maximal distance between the causative and the lexical verb was chosen during experimentation with the search. It seems that with larger distances, the precision of the query drops radically while the increase of the recall is negligible (in other words, the query returns more and more results, but almost none of these is an analytical construction).

The second stage of the excerption was a manual selection of the causative constructions. The automatic selection of the analytical causative construction based only on the part-of-speech tags returned a large number of “false positives”, which had to be discarded. One of the falsely returned results of the query is shown in the example (1):

(1) I'll send the robot down to get them and bring them up here. <HG>

In the query, conjunctions were allowed to stand between the main and the lexical verb in order to allow for coordination of multiple causees (*They made him and all his family leave the town.*) Without any syntactic annotation of the data, it is almost impossible to handle coordination correctly.

Moreover, some constructions allow for more readings as it is illustrated by example (2):

(2) So useful to have him swooping around like an overgrown bat. <HP>

Where more readings were possible, the sentence was not considered to be an instance of a causative construction. The process of manual annotation reduced the amount of the data from 147 to 40 instances in the case of GET, from 399 to 10 instances in the case of HAVE and from 273 to 144 instances in the case of MAKE. The number of causative MAKE constructions was further reduced to the final 102 instances to comply with the usual size of the data for a bachelor thesis.

The first step of the analysis consisted in the classification of the English constructions with respect to the type of the causative construction (the causative verb, the form of the effect verb) the in/animate character of the participants, and the in/transitivity effects. In the second step, the Czech translation counterparts were classified on two levels: firstly, the semantic criteria were considered, specifically, which of the causative construction constituents (causer, causee, effect) were retained in the translation; secondly, the classification was complemented by an analysis from the syntactic perspective.

The size of the data and their distribution is not suitable for a thorough statistical analysis. However, sometimes the statistics was used to determine which of the frequencies encountered during the research were worth interpreting and which were not significant. For detecting the significance of a relationship between variables, the Fisher's exact test was used most often because it is suitable for nominal data with small sample sizes. Once, when the sample size allowed, the  $\chi^2$  test was used because it enables comparison of the encountered and expected frequencies. In accord with many research papers in the Humanities, the significance level was set to  $\alpha = 0.05$ . All the calculations were done with the R programme.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>*R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2012, Vienna. <<http://www.R-project.org>>

# Chapter 5

## Results

### 5.1 English causative constructions

The following section provides a quantitative account of the English causative constructions as they were encountered in the investigated material. Their translation counterparts will be the subject of the next section.

The frequencies of the three basic classes of analytical constructions, characterised by different causative verbs, differ greatly. The most frequent analytical causative verb is MAKE which occurred 144 times in the material.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, GET as a causative verb was encountered 40 times, followed by only 10 hits of HAVE. Thus the ratio of occurrence of the three verbs is about 14 : 4 : 1. This ratio is quite different from that found in Gilquin (2010, p. 46). Her findings provide a more balanced picture with respect to the frequency of the three analytical construction categories with the ratio (for MAKE : GET : HAVE) roughly about 1,5 : 1,6 : 1. However, the study was based on a 10-million-word extract from a BNC corpus, which represented both spoken and written English. Moreover, the category of fiction was excluded from her material. The significance of the genre distinction will reappear when discussing the individual subtypes of the causative constructions.

---

<sup>1</sup>Only first 102 examples were used for further analysis

### 5.1.1 Have constructions

HAVE in the function of a causative verb occurred only 10 times in the data. 7 instances are complemented by a past participle (1-a). 3 instances by a bare infinitive (1-b). There was no present participle complementation.

- (1) a. I'll have you hung, drawn and quartered! <HG>
- b. "Very well," he said, handing it back to Hagrid, "I will have Someone take you down to both vaults." <HP>

Although the limited number of instances does not allow for generalizations, the results seem to support the description of causative HAVE as given in 2.2.1, i.e. the focus of the causer is on the ultimate goal, not on the causee. Thus the most frequent complementation of HAVE is the past participle, which enables the causee not to be expressed. The second condition necessary for the causer's focus to be connected with the goal and not the causee is a transitive effect (the lexical verb representing the final action) since it introduces another participant (the patient) that can become the center of the attention. This is the case in 9 out of 10 instances of the causative HAVE constructions.

In all the instances, both the causer and causee are animate (animate causee is implied in the construction with past participial complementation as in (1-a)), which supports the claim (found for example in Gilquin (2010, p. 119)) that HAVE is primarily associated with interpersonal communication. The only exception to the animacy of the causer is presented in the following sentence:

- (2) "Get off," said Ford, "They're ours," giving him a look that would have an Algolian Suntiger get on with what it was doing. <HG>

In spite of being formally inanimate, the *look* is a noun directly associated with an animate agent. Thus even in (2), the notion of an animate causer is strongly present.

All the three types of analytical constructions with HAVE are more likely to appear in speech than in writing, which leads to the conclusion that caus-



ative HAVE is rather informal (Gilquin, 2010, p. 226). This might be an explanation of the limited number of HAVE construction instances found in the data. Furthermore, the absence of the present participial complementation can also be explained by the method of extraction of the examples. Often, HAVE + present participle allow for more readings as it was described by the example (2) in Chapter 4.

### 5.1.2 Get constructions

Causative GET is represented by 40 instances in the data. The most frequent complementation is again the past participle (22), followed by the to-infinitive (15) and the present participle (3). The different structures are given in the following example:

- (3) a. “Shut up, Peeves – please – you’ll get us thrown out.” <HP>  
 b. “Shall I get Neddy to ask me down for tea at the week-end?” <LJ>  
 c. Disgusted that the Slytherins had lost, he had tried to get everyone laughing at how a wide-mouthed tree frog would be replacing Harry as Seeker next. <HP>

The proportion of the different complementation found in the material supports again the numbers provided by Gilquin (2010, p. 48) and the semantic account by Wierzbicka (1998, pp. 124-125) given earlier in 2.2.2. The causee is demoted less often thus decreasing the share of the past participle in favour of the other two types of complementation. At the same time, the number of intransitive effects is higher (37).

With respect to the animacy of the causer and the causee the results correspond to those of the HAVE constructions. 36 out of 40 instances have both an animate causer and causee. Two of the three present participial constructions contain an inanimate causee (4-a) and there are two past participial constructions with an inanimate causer (4-b)

- (4) a. “It would save us a lot of trouble if we could get it working ...”  
 <RR>

- b. “That’s it,” said Zaphod with the sort of grin that would get most people locked away in a room with soft walls. <HG>

Similarly to (2), in (4-b) the causer is formally an action of an animate agent. However, this is not the case for the second construction with an inanimate causer. The capability of inanimate causees to occur in the present participial constructions was mentioned in 2.2.2. The causee in (4-a) refers to a *shuttle* which may indeed be seen as having “a will of [its] own” (Wierzbicka, 1998, p. 124).

All the three GET constructions are again more common in speech than in written language (GET + past participle is 44 times more likely to occur in speech) classifying GET as a relatively less formal causative verb (Gilquin, 2010, p. 226). In this light, a relatively small number of instances – compared to the following MAKE category – is not surprising.

### 5.1.3 Make constructions

With 102 instances, causative MAKE represents the largest group of causative constructions. However, the distribution of its specific types (based on the complementation) is not more diverse than in the case of the preceding causative verbs. While there are 100 instances of MAKE and an infinitive, there is only one sentence with a past participle and one sentence with MAKE in passive complemented by a to-infinitive.

- (5) a. A rapping on glass made him turn round. <LJ>  
 b. The spin of Rama was starting to make itself felt. <RR>  
 c. She is always made to feel that she is the one who has found him . . . . <EP>

Apart from the frequency of the specific types, the group of the MAKE constructions is far less homogeneous than the groups discussed above. The difference between the number of transitive and intransitive effects is virtually cancelled out (46 and 56 respectively). The majority of causers (79) are inanimate, ruling out the interpersonal communication as the major field for the MAKE constructions. Although most of the causees are animate (82),

there is still about one fifth of inanimate causees. Only in 20 instances, both the causer and the causee are animate such as in (6):

(6) Sometimes for my exam I make them play bridge. <EP>

Even though both MAKE + past participle and MAKE in passive + to-infinitive are the only constructions that occur more often in writing than in speech, they are still one of the least common analytical constructions (Gilquin, 2010, p. 227). On the other hand, MAKE + infinitive is the most frequent type in both speech and writing, with similar frequencies in both forms of language. At the same time, it combines freely with both animate and inanimate causers and causees as well as with transitive and intransitive effects, which makes it the most universal of the causative constructions (Gilquin, 2010, p. 227).

### 5.1.4 Summary

The proportional frequencies of the three main categories, characterised by the causative verb, and the specific types of causative constructions are provided in Table 5.1. The discussed features of the causative construction participants, i.e. the in/animacy of the causer and the causee and the in/transitivity of the effect, are summarized in Table 5.2.

	[X HAVE Y V <sub>inf</sub> ]	[X HAVE Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	[X HAVE Y V <sub>prp</sub> ]	[X GET Y V <sub>to_inf</sub> ]	[X GET Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	[X GET Y V <sub>prp</sub> ]	[X MAKE Y V <sub>inf</sub> ]	[X BE MADE V <sub>to_inf</sub> ]	[X MAKE Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]
overall share	5%			21%			74%		
share within category	30%	70%	0%	38%	55%	8%	98%	1%	1%

Table 5.1: Proportional frequency of HAVE, GET and MAKE categories and their specific subtypes

	animate causer	animate causee	transitive effect
[X HAVE Y V <sub>inf</sub> ]	2 (66%)	3 (100%)	2 (66%)
[X HAVE Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	7 (100%)
[X GET Y V <sub>to_inf</sub> ]	15 (100%)	15 (100%)	11 (73%)
[X GET Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	20 (91%)	22 (100%)	22 (100%)
[X GET Y V <sub>prp</sub> ]	3 (100%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
[X MAKE Y V <sub>inf</sub> ]	28 (28%)	80 (80%)	44 (44%)
[X BE made V <sub>to_inf</sub> ]	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
[X MAKE Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)

Table 5.2: Animacy and transitivity inside causative constructions

Where the frequency of a type of a causative construction is too low, the percentage representation might be misleading. Such data are shaded in Table 5.2,<sup>2</sup> which should suggest that the absolute count is more informative. Ignoring the dimmed values, the tendency towards animate participants in the HAVE and GET constructions becomes evident. This conclusion is also supported by a statistical analysis: Fisher’s exact test establishes the association between the animacy of the participants and the type of causative verb with a p-value  $< 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$ , which is far below any ordinary significance levels.

On the other hand, transitivity of the effect should not be considered a distinguishing factor among MAKE on the one side and HAVE and GET constructions on the other since it corresponds with the specific syntactic types of the constructions. The differences stem mainly from the fact that in HAVE and GET, the past participle is the most dominant complementation. Still, it demonstrates the ambivalent and universal nature of the [X MAKE Y V<sub>inf</sub>] construction.

## 5.2 Czech translation counterparts

In Chapter 4, we defined the realization of the original causative construction constituents to be the basis of the classification of the translation counter-

<sup>2</sup>The threshold was chosen arbitrarily. Those areas are shaded that were counted as a portion of no more than 5 occurrences.

parts. While in the English constructions, there is always a causer, causative verb, causee and an effect, these participants may or may not be retained in the translation. Thus three main categories of the translation counterparts were identified.

### 5.2.1 Analytical and synthetic counterparts

These two syntactically distinct types both express all the four components of the original analytical causative constructions.

#### 5.2.1.1 Analytical counterparts

In some cases, the analytical nature of the English expression of the causative situation is kept in the Czech translation and all the four elements of the analytical causative construction are in some form expressed in Czech:

- (7) Welch suddenly made him switch everything on again by saying: ...  
Welch ho náhle donutil znovu zapnout veškerou pozornost: ... <LJ>

This type of translation is the most faithful to the English original. Apart from the different word-order, there is virtually no structural difference between the English and Czech sentence.

Analytical counterparts may be further classified on basis of syntactic realization of the effect. In (7), the effect was realized by a bare infinitive (*zapnout*) as it is the case in the original sentence. There are, however, other possibilities. The translator may choose to express the effect in a dependent nominal content clause:

- (8) Jimmy never knew what made him stop and look more closely into the metal maze to the south.  
Jimmy nikdy nepochopil, co jej zastavilo a přimělo, aby se pozorněji zahleděl do kovového bludiště na jihu. <RR>

Often, this type of translation can be changed into the one with a bare infinitive (*co jej přimělo, aby se podíval – co jej přimělo podívat se*). However,

the valency of some of the Czech analytical causatives may lead to slightly different syntactic patterns:

- (9) The little victory made him feel much happier;  
Malé vítězství způsobilo, že se cítil mnohem spokojeněji; <RR>

Because the object of the verb *způsobit* is sentential, the causee must be a part of the dependent clause. In spite of this syntactic discrepancy, the presence of all the four necessary components of the analytical causative construction (causer, causative verb, causee, effect) is evident. Moreover, we can paraphrase the sentence (8) using the verb from (9) (*nepochopil, co způsobilo, že se pozorněji zahleděl . . .*) with very little – if any – shift in the meaning. Therefore in this paper, both types are seen as equivalent.

The third form in which the effect can be expressed is a noun phrase. The noun phrase can be a part of the prepositional object:

- (10) This might make Bertrand assail him physically.  
Pravděpodobně by to Bertranda přimělo k fyzickému násilí. <LJ>

or, it can stand on its own as a direct complementation of the verb:

- (11) The sight of their party still, or again, just where they'd been before made him want very much to pitch forward on to the floor and go to sleep.  
Pohled na jejich společnost stále na témž místě v něm vyvolal touhu vrhnout se na podlahu a usnout. <LJ>

Apparently, the nominal expression of the effect took the place of the direct object, a position that, in (10), was reserved for the causee. However, in accord with the discussion of the dependent clause complementation, neither here do we assume the difference between (10) and (11) to be significant since all the participants are expressed in a similar manner and the difference is determined by the valency of the causative verb only.

So far, we have been discussing the analytical counterparts of English causative constructions from the point of view of the syntactic realization of the effect. Considering the analytical verbs (in the translations) on their own,

there are some that occur more frequently than others. These are mainly: *do/nutit*, *přimět* and *způsobit*. Besides these, there are two other frequent verbs – *nechat*, *dát*. As we mentioned in Chapter 3, Karlík et al. (2002, p. 413) establish a special category of analytical causatives based on these two verbs and their categorical meaning of initiation. Their importance for this study lies in the fact that they may be used for expressing a causative situation with an implied causee:

- (12) I'll have you hung, drawn and quartered!  
 Dám vás pověsit, vláčet a rozčtvrtit! <HG>

There are some verbs whose classification as analytical causatives is more problematic. Typically, they are semantically richer than verbs like *nutit* or *nechat* and they may not be associated with the notion of causation in the first place.

- (13) a. Ah, wait a minute; he'd get Barclay to find him a book on medieval music.  
 Moment; může požádat Barclayho, aby mu našel knihu o středověké hudbě. <LJ>  
 b. We can probably get someone to drive you up.  
 Nepochybně někoho seženeme, kdo vás tam zaveze. <EP>  
 c. I will have Someone take you down to both vaults.  
 Pošlu někoho, aby s vámi sjel dolů do obou trezorů. <HP>

The verbs *požádat*, *poprosit* imply a possibility that the desired action will not be fulfilled. Although this is not the case of causative GET, the English verb often contains the notion of persuading the causee to do something that he or she does not initially want to (see section 2.2.2). *Sehnat* and *poslat* seem to be closer to typical analytical causatives although they are also more specific than the English verb. In all the sentences in (13), the four elements of a causative construction are retained (possibly the position of the causative verb is weakened) as well as the two components of verbal action.

### 5.2.1.2 Synthetic counterparts

This type of translation joins the meaning of the causative verb and the effect into one verb:

- (14) a. Mr Prosser was often bothered with visions like these and they made him feel very nervous.  
Podobné vize ho obtěžovaly dost často a silně ho znervózňovaly.  
<HG>
- b. Don't make me laugh.  
Chceš mě rozesmát? <HG>
- c. This, and the shudder she gave, made his head reel the furthest yet;  
Tento pohyb a zachvění, kterým na něj reagovala, mu zamotalo hlavu ještě víc; <LJ>

Formally, this can be done in different ways. Example (14-a) illustrates de-adjectival derivation (*z-nervózní*). De-verbal derivation is shown in (14-b) (*roz-smát*). Apart from these word-formation processes, the causativity may also be inherent in the semantic structure of the verb with no affix that could be described as having exclusively a causative meaning, this can be seen in (14-c) (*zamotat*).

Often, the classification into derivational or semantic (inherent meaning of causativity) causatives is not straightforward due to the polysemy of the affixes. Together with their comparatively low frequency in the data, this is the reason why in this paper, they are all classified together as synthetic counterparts.

### 5.2.2 Counterparts without a causative verb

Sometimes the causative verb may be lost completely. In such cases, the causative relationship may still be implied in the presence of the three other constituents of the causative construction. The causee and the effect form the main clause and the causer is expressed by an adverbial:



- (15) As he felt at the moment, this made him want to cry.  
Ve stavu, v němž byl, mu z toho bylo takřka do pláče. <LJ>

The causative relationship may also be implied by the semantic relationship of the main and a dependent clause:

- (16) She smiled at him in a way that made his head swim more than the kiss had done.  
Usmála se na něj tak, že se mu zatočila hlava ještě víc než při polibku.  
<LJ>

In (16), the causer is in the main clause, while the second verbal event (the causee and the effect) are expressed by a dependent clause of result. However, this representation may also be changed so that the causer is expressed by a dependent reason clause and the causee and the effect form the main clause:

- (17) A falsetto explosion from the coffeeyurn across the room made him start slightly; then he said:  
Trhl sebou, protože se na druhém konci místnosti ozval prudký hvizd, vyluzovaný párou syčící z velkého stříbrně se lesknoucího hrnce s kohoutkem a poklicí, v kterém byla horká káva: <LJ>

### 5.2.3 Restructurations

Often, the difference between the original and the translation is even bigger than that shown in the previous section. Such transformations can keep some of the main constituents of the causative situation (mostly the causee and the effect), but the syntactic structure is much different from the original. At the same time, an explicit expression of the notion of causativity is lost. It may be, however, inferred from the context:

- (18) Too much staring at those blinding bars of light had made his eyes hurt again;  
Díval se do těch oslepujících pruhů světla příliš dlouho a znovu ho rozbolely oči; <RR>

In other cases, not even the context suggests a causative situation:

- (19) You make it sound pretty formidable.  
To zní náramě. <LJ>

The causing event (represented by the causer and the causative verb) is frequently omitted. In other cases, the syntactic restructuring of the original sentence prevents the causative reading even though the participants are in some form retained in the translation:

- (20) What finally made you make up your mind?  
A co u vás nakonec rozhodlo? <LJ>

### 5.3 Confronting English and Czech constructions

As we mentioned in Chapter 4, the amount of the collected material is not large enough to enable full statistical analysis of possible correlations among different variables. Thus in what follows, the trends will be stated rather tentatively. Where possible, the statistic analysis will also be provided.

#### 5.3.1 Translation type and the English causative verb

When comparing English causative constructions and their Czech translation counterparts, the most basic question is whether the type of Czech translation depends on the type of English construction. In other words, whether causative MAKE, GET and HAVE are associated with different translation types. The frequency of the translation counterparts for the three English causative verbs is given in Table 5.3

The Fisher exact test reveals statistically significant relationship between the type of translation and the English causative verb ( $p = 0.005$ ). This means there is only about 0.5% probability that the numbers in Table 5.3 could represent independent variables. If we ignore the verb HAVE because

translation type	have	get	make	$\Sigma$
analytical	8	17	34	59
synthetic	0	2	11	13
no causative verb	0	2	26	28
restructurations	2	19	31	52
$\Sigma$	10	40	102	152

Table 5.3: Frequency of the translation counterparts for HAVE, GET and MAKE

of its low frequency, the relationship between the translation type and the verb is still statistically significant ( $p = 0.011$ ).

The translation types can also be considered individually. In order to measure the association of a specific translation type with the causative verbs, the data are classified into two groups: the instances with the translation type in question and all the others (binary classification). Without the 10 instances of the HAVE constructions, the only type that shows a significant association with the English verbs is the type with no causative verb ( $p = 0.005$ ). If we include the HAVE constructions the association of the analytical translation category also becomes significant ( $p = 0.017$ ) since it is the dominant translation type of the causative HAVE structures. On the other hand, the counts for the synthetic and transformation translation counterparts do not reveal any significant association with the English verbs and their distribution may simply be a result of chance.

It seems that the universality of MAKE is also revealed in the way it is translated into Czech. While HAVE is translated mostly by means of analytical constructions and GET by analytical constructions or restructurations, the distribution of the translation types in the case of MAKE is more even. It is the only group of English analytical causative constructions which is often translated by a sentence with an adverbial or a clause of result/reason (i.e. “no causative verb” category).

In Table 5.4, there is a detailed account of the specific types of analytical constructions as they were discussed in 5.2.1.1. The first three types are distinguished by the type of complementation and are represented by the

analytical construction	have	get	make	$\Sigma$
infinitive	6	5	12	23
clause	2	9	10	21
nominal phrase	0	3	12	15
$\Sigma$	8	17	34	59
<i>nechat/dát</i>	6	4	4	14

Table 5.4: Frequency of analytical translation counterparts for HAVE, GET and MAKE

examples (7), (8) and (10) above. The fourth type, represented by the example (12), is based on lexical criteria and overlaps with the previous three categories.

The association of the specific analytical types with the English verbs is significant in the case of the construction with infinitival complementation ( $p = 0.002$ ) and the construction with the verbs *dát/nechat* ( $p = 1.526 \times 10^{-5}$ ). If the problematic HAVE constructions are omitted, none of the analytical constructions is significantly associated with either GET or MAKE. This suggests that the infinitival and the *nechat/dát* category are probably typical of the HAVE constructions. Moreover, in the case of HAVE, they are identical, which means that every infinitival construction uses the verb *nechat* or *dát*. (Of course, this is only the case of our data, for more general assumptions, more data would be needed).

In spite of this association with the HAVE constructions, which might be supported with a larger sample size, it will be argued that there may be another factor that could describe the distribution of the *nechat/dát* translation types better.

### 5.3.2 Translation type and the complementation of English causative verbs

The type of Czech translation might also be associated with other variables than just the causative verb of the original sentence. The specific translation counterpart might be, for example, influenced by the complementation of the causative verb since not all the translation types might be suitable for

translation type	infinitive	past participle	present participle	passive	$\Sigma$
analytical	46	11	1	1	59
synthetic	12	0	1	0	13
no causative verb	26	2	0	0	28
restructurations	34	17	1	0	52
$\Sigma$	118	30	3	1	152

Table 5.5: Frequency of translation counterparts for different types of complementation

expressing the information encoded in different syntactic structures. Table 5.5 shows the frequencies of translation types for specific complementation of the English causative verbs.

Bare and full infinitives were combined into one category since the choice between the two is determined only by the causative verb they complement. The association between the translation type and the type of complementation is significant again ( $p = 0.003$ ). While the English constructions whose effect is expressed by the past participle are translated by means of analytical counterparts or restructurations, the constructions with the effect in an infinitival form occur frequently with all the types of translation counterparts. Unfortunately, this neutrality of the infinitival constructions is hard to distinguish from the neutrality of MAKE (see section 5.3.1) because 85% of the constructions with an infinitival complementation contain causative MAKE as the main verb.

The frequencies of the analytic translation types for different types of complementation of the main English verb are given in Table 5.6:

analytical construction	infinitive	past participle	present participle	passive	$\Sigma$
infinitive	12	10	0	1	23
clause	21	0	0	0	21
nominal phrase	13	1	1	0	15
$\Sigma$	47	11	1	1	59
<i>nechat/dát</i>	2	11	0	1	14

Table 5.6: Frequency of analytical translation counterparts for different types of complementation

Ignoring again the almost empty categories of the present participle and the passive, the association between the analytical translation type and the type of complementation in the English sentence is statistically highly significant ( $p = 1.34 \times 10^{-4}$ ). If we consider the individual types of the analytical Czech translation counterparts, we also see a strong relationship with the type of the English causative structure. While an analytical verb + infinitive is the most dominant analytical structure for translating English causative constructions with the past participle, the other two syntactical types of analytical counterparts are strongly associated only with the English constructions complemented by an infinitive.

The analytical counterparts with *nechat* or *dát* as the causative verb are also significantly associated with the type of complementation of the English causative verb ( $p = 3 \times 10^{-7}$ ). The significance of this relationship is even higher than the one between the *nechat/dát* construction and the English causative verb. The data suggest that when a past-participial causative construction is translated into Czech without using restructuring, it is translated by means of the analytical *nechat/dát* construction.

### 5.3.3 Translation type and the animacy of the participants

In section 5.1, we saw that verbs HAVE and GET are primarily used when both the causer and the causee are animate. In Table 5.7, the frequency of the translation types are given for the situation when both the causer and the causee are animate (possible interpersonal communication) and for the situation when either of the participants (or both) is inanimate.

The amount of the data enabled the use of the  $\chi^2$  test, which revealed a significant association between the variables,  $\chi^2(3, N = 153) = 19.52$ ,  $p = 0.0002$ . The comparison of the expected and observed frequency revealed the biggest differences in the case of the analytical counterparts and the counterparts with no causative verb. However, these counterparts were shown to be associated also with the type of the English causative verb. Therefore, we may expect that the association between the animacy of the

translation type	animate causer and causee	inanimate causer or causee	$\Sigma$
analytical	36	23	59
synthetic	6	7	13
no causative verb	3	25	28
restructurations	20	32	52
$\Sigma$	65	87	152

Table 5.7: Frequency of the translation counterparts with respect to the animacy of the participants

participants and the translation type is caused by a third variable, namely the English causative verb.

### 5.3.4 Other factors

Finally, it remains to be seen what role some of the less obvious factors play in determining the type of English causative construction and/or its translation. It was mentioned in 5.1 that some analytical constructions are more formal than others. Such “external” factors as the genre or the individuality of the author and the translator can also be responsible for different distribution of the specific types.

Table 5.8 shows the occurrence of the English causative verb in each of the five books from which the data was taken. It is outside the scope of this paper to explain the differences of the distribution in the table. Rather, the table is shown as an illustration of the fact that no far-reaching generalizations about the nature of analytical constructions in literary language can be made based on the data which are collected mostly from two books and that the statistical analysis in this chapter should be taken with caution. (No causative constructions in the Harry Potter book (<HP>) is the result of reducing the number of MAKE constructions from the ordered data.)

Table 5.9 plots the frequency of the translation types against the individual books. Unfortunately, the sample size does not allow us to eliminate other factors, such as different frequency of causative verbs in the data. Therefore the association between the translation types and the book cannot be proved or disproved.

causative verb	EP	HG	HP	LJ	RR	$\Sigma$
make	21	7	0	65	9	102
get	3	3	8	23	3	40
have	1	4	3	2	0	10
$\Sigma$	25	14	11	90	12	152

Table 5.8: Frequency of English causative verbs in each book

translation type	EP	HG	HP	LJ	RR	$\Sigma$
analytical	17	5	5	24	8	59
synthetic	2	2	1	7	1	13
no causative verb	1	2	1	24	0	28
restructurations	5	5	4	35	3	52
$\Sigma$	25	14	11	90	12	152

Table 5.9: Frequency of the translation types in each book

We cannot exclude the possibility that the differences in the frequency of certain translation types are the result of individual preferences of the translators. They may also stem from different genres or degree of formality of the literary works. To investigate all these factors, it would be necessary to consider much larger data.

In spite of these reservations, we believe that in this chapter, some important general trends were illustrated and that although some hidden factors might have slightly skewed the results, their effect was not as large as to devalue the presented work. This belief stems also from the fact that throughout this chapter, some results of other researchers were confirmed.



## Chapter 6

### Conclusion

Analytical causative constructions are a highly productive means of expressing the idea of causative situation in English. It combines the notion of both the causing and the resulting event into one condensed structure that consists of at least four basic constituents: the causer, the causative verb, the causee and the effect. While all these constituents are obligatory and thus they must always be present in a causative construction, some of them, namely the causer and the causee, may not necessarily be expressed on the surface but only implied within the structure.

The differences among English analytical causative constructions stem from the causative verb that is used in the core of the structure. Even though the semantics of the analytical causatives is weakened when compared to lexical verbs, they still carry their own connotations that go hand in hand with different levels of formality and different realizations of the rest of the analytical construction constituents.

From the description of English analytical causatives in Chapter 2 and the results given in Chapter 5, it seems that there is a sharp contrast between causative MAKE on the one hand and HAVE and GET on the other. HAVE and GET are complemented by the same non-finite verbal forms (bare or to-infinitive, past participle and present participle) and they are typically associated with interpersonal communication, which means that both the causer and the causee are animate. The share of the constructions where the

obligatory participants are animate was found to be 90% for both the HAVE and GET constructions in the data. In contrast, causative MAKE cannot be complemented by the present participle, but it can occur in passive. The share of the instances where the causer and the causee are animate is only about 19%.

The analytical causatives HAVE and GET are distinguished from MAKE also by the frequency of their syntactical sub-types. 70% of the HAVE constructions and 55% of the GET constructions occur with the past participle while in the case of causative HAVE the share is only about 1% (i.e. one instance). This syntactic distinction carries important implications on the semantic level of analysis because in the past participial complementation, the causee is usually not expressed and the main focus falls on the patient (i.e. the object of the lexical verb). This supports the description of the English causatives by Wierzbicka (1998), who states that the center of the attention of the causer in the HAVE and GET constructions is not the causee but the final effect (expressed by the lexical verb and the patient); in contrast, in the case of the constructions with causative MAKE, the causee is often the center of the causer's attention (thus the small share of the MAKE constructions with the past participle).

Although the analytical causatives HAVE and GET exhibit common features when contrasted with MAKE, the two verbs are not synonymous. On a smaller scale, we may observe differences similar to those found when the verbs were compared to MAKE. Most importantly, the proportion of the past participial complementation is higher in the case of the HAVE constructions. This is shown not only by the data collected for this paper, where the HAVE constructions are underrepresented, but also by more representative studies (e.g. Gilquin (2010)). This discrepancy in the number of past the participial complementation is again in accord with Wierzbicka (1998, pp. 122, 124-125), who describes the HAVE constructions as expressing the situation where there is a hierarchy between the causer and the causee so that the causee's fulfillment of the final action is almost certain. On the other hand, the causee in the constructions with causative GET is typically more autonomous.

The association of some types of the Czech translation counterparts with specific causative verbs further supports the ideas given above. The MAKE constructions combine freely with any basic translation type (analytical – 33%, synthetic – 11%, no causative verb – 25%, restructurations – 30%). The GET constructions, on the other hand, are mostly translated by analytical counterparts (43%) and restructurations (48%) and for HAVE, it seems that only the analytical counterparts might be typical (80%, i.e. 8 instances out of 10).

From what has been said so far, it seems that the three types of the English analytical constructions might be put on a scale representing different degree of universality or markedness. On one side, there would be the MAKE constructions, which are usually complemented by the infinitive, animate or inanimate causers and causees, and which are frequently translated by all the Czech translation types. On the other side, there would be the HAVE and GET constructions (with GET being slightly closer to MAKE), which are often complemented by the past participle, animate causers and causees, and with respect to translation types, they occur frequently with analytical structures.

From the point of view of the Czech translation counterparts, the paper has supported some findings of Čermák and Štichauer (2010). Although the comparison is problematic because of different classification of the translation types and different original language, it is clear that morphological causatives (*rozplakat*, in this paper classified together with lexical causatives as the synthetic translation type) represent a marginal translation category. On the other hand, restructurations are used frequently as well as analytical structures. The Czech analytical *nechat/dát* construction is strongly associated with the English causative structures with the effect in the form of the past participle. It seems to be a comfortable means of expressing causation with an implied causee.

It would be interesting to see a similar contrastive study with the data large enough to employ full statistical analysis. This would enable elimination of the effects of third variables (such as the effect of the causative verb when investigating the relationship between the translation type and the type of complementation in the English causative construction) and thus

more insightful description of the associations. With the extension of the InterCorp, large parallel data are now available not only for Czech and English. However, for a further research with a larger data size, it would be necessary to devise a more sophisticated method of the automatic excerption of the causative constructions from the corpus. In this paper, the amount of the data allowed manual correction of the automatic annotation, therefore a query with a very low precision was used in order to guarantee the highest possible recall.

## References

- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology* (Second ed.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Gilquin, G. (2003). Causative Get and Have: So close, So Different. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 31 (2), 125–148.
- Gilquin, G. (2010). *Corpus, Cognition and Causative Constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
- Karlík, P., Grepl, M., Nekula, M., & Rusínová, Z. (1995). *Příruční mluvnice češtiny*. Praha: Lidové noviny.
- Karlík, P., Nekula, M., & Pleskalová, J. (2002). *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. Praha: Lidové noviny.
- Kemmer, S., & Verhagen, A. (1994). The Grammar of Causatives and the Conceptual Structure of Events. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 5 (2), 115–156.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman.
- Shibatani, M. (1976). The Grammar of Causative Constructions: A Con-spectus. In *Syntax and semantics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1998). The Semantics of English Causative Constructions in a Universal-Typological Perspective. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure* (p. 113-153). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wolff, P., Song, G., & Driscoll, D. (2002). Models of Causation and Causal Verbs. In *Papers from the 37th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society, Main Session, Vol. I* (pp. 607–622). Chicago: Chicago Linguistics

Society.

Čermák, P., & Štichauer, P. (2010). Španělské a italské kauzativní konstrukce *hacer / fare* + sloveso a jejich české ekvivalenty. In F. Čermák & J. Koček (Eds.), *Mnohojazyčný korpus InterCorp: Možnosti studia* (pp. 70–90). Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.

## Sources

*Český národní korpus – InterCorp*. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK,  
Praha. Accessed 12.04.2012, (<<http://www.korpus.cz>>).

# Résumé

Analytické kauzativní konstrukce v angličtině jsou jedním ze způsobů vyjádření kauzativní situace, který je v současném jazyce velmi produktivní. Smyslem této práce je popsat konstrukce, v jejichž jádru stojí pro angličtinu typická kauzativní slovesa HAVE, GET a MAKE, dále pak také způsob, jakým se tyto konstrukce překládají do češtiny.

Kauzativní situaci můžeme chápat jako sled dvou událostí, kde jedna je mluvčím interpretována jako přímý důsledek té druhé. Událost způsobující je pak v analytické kauzativní konstrukci reprezentována účastníkem slovesného děje, který je (v rámci dané konstrukce) prvotním hybatelem, jelikož veškerý děj iniciuje (anglický termín *causer*); dále pak analytickým kauzativním slovesem, které je v konstrukci nositelem kauzativního významu, jinak je ale jeho lexikální význam oslaben a ve větě plní spíše gramatickou funkci. Událost způsobovanou reprezentují v analytické kauzativní konstrukci také dvě složky: účastník děje, na kterého je nějakým způsobem vyvíjen tlak, pod jehož vlivem pak vykoná nějakou akci, která je právě druhou složkou reprezentující způsobovanou událost. Účastník slovesného děje, který je vlastně zprostředkovatelem mezi účastníkem *causer* a výslednou akcí se nazývá *causee*. Výsledná akce (nebo též *efekt*) je v konstrukci zastoupena lexikálním slovesem v nefinitním tvaru. V závislosti na valenci lexikálního slovesa se pak ještě v konstrukci může objevit jeho předmět – *patiens*.<sup>1</sup> Všechny čtyři složky kauzativní konstrukce ilustruje následující příklad:

---

<sup>1</sup>V kontextu kauzativních konstrukcí se termínu užívá do jisté míry nezávisle na tradičním popisu větněčlenských rolí.



- (1) The shock made            him        drop the glass.  
       CAUSER    *kauz. sloveso* CAUSEE *efekt* PATIENS

Syntakticky se anglické kauzativní konstrukce dělí podle toho, v jakém nefinitním slovesném tvaru stojí efekt. Kauzativní GET se pojí s infinitivem s *to*, minulým nebo přítomným příčestím. HAVE bývá následováno prostým infinitivem nebo také příčestím minulým i přítomným. Struktury se slovesem MAKE se pojí s prostým infinitivem, minulým příčestím nebo je kauzativní sloveso v passivu a efekt je vyjádřen infinitivem s *to*. Příklady jednotlivých struktur ilustruje tabulka 2.1 upravená z Gilquin (2010, s. 20). Pro přehlednost je zde tabulka uvedena ještě jednou:

[X GET Y V <sub>to_inf</sub> ]	<i>At one time we couldn't <b>get</b> <u>Jessy to talk</u>.</i>
[X GET Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	<i>We'll <b>get</b> <u>everything sorted out</u> this week.</i>
[X GET Y V <sub>prp</sub> ]	<i>Couldn't <b>get</b> <u>these earphones working</u>.</i>
[X HAVE Y V <sub>inf</sub> ]	<i>I <b>had</b> <u>Elsie go</u> on Wednesday night.</i>
[X HAVE Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	<i>Did you <b>have</b> <u>the blades sharpened</u>?</i>
[X HAVE Y V <sub>prp</sub> ]	<i>You better not <b>have</b> <u>that tape working</u>, is it on?</i>
[X MAKE Y V <sub>inf</sub> ]	<i>But I <b>made</b> <u>him put</u> his coat on.</i>
[X BE made V <sub>to_inf</sub> ]	<i>They're being taken to court and <b>made</b> <u>to pay</u>.</i>
[X MAKE Y V <sub>pp</sub> ]	<i>They <b>made</b> <u>their voices heard</u> at the conference.</i>

Table 6.1: Syntaktické typy Anglických kauzativních konstrukcí (upraveno z Gilquin (2010, s. 20))

Z příkladů je vidět, že ne každá složka kauzativní konstrukce, ačkoli je obligatorní, musí být nutně realizována ve větě. Jedná se o účastníka slovesného děje *causer*, který nebývá realizován v případě pasivních MAKE konstrukcí, a o účastníka *causee*, který bývá vypuštěn v případě komplementace minulým příčestím. I v druhém případě se v podstatě jedná o pasivizaci aktivní věty (resp. její zbylé části), a tak je jasné, že ačkoli není účastník slovesného děje explicitně vyjádřen, je přesto stále implikován v podpovrchové struktuře věty.

Zmíněná specifika různých typů kauzativních konstrukcí pramení především z výběru analytického kauzativního slovesa. Je pravda, že v porovnání se slovesem lexikálním je význam analytického kauzativního slovesa oslaben, přesto však má každé kauzativum svůj významový odstín, který specifikuje

sloveso (potažmo celou kauzativní konstrukcí) a zároveň do jisté míry podmiňuje realizaci ostatních konstituentů dané konstrukce.

Jako základní materiál pro zkoumání těchto významových odstínů kauzativních konstrukcí a s nimi spojených překladových protějšků, byla v této práci použita data z paralelního korpusu InterCorp<sup>2</sup> a to konkrétně pět knih beletrie z druhé poloviny dvacátého století. Pomocí webového rozhraní a dotazovacího jazyka *Corpus Query Language* byly excerptovány všechny věty, kde se vyskytovalo jedno z anglických analytických kauzativních sloves následováno 1–5 dalšími slovy a dalším slovesem v nefinitním tvaru.<sup>3</sup> Po manuální korekci dat bylo k dispozici 144 konstrukcí s MAKE, 40 konstrukcí s GET a 10 konstrukcí s HAVE. Aby množství dat odpovídalo standardům bakalářské práce, byl ještě počet MAKE konstrukcí snížen na 102

Na základě takto získaných dat byla vypracována klasifikace českých překladových protějšků. Jako základní kritérium byla zvolena realizace konstituentů původní kauzativní konstrukce. Na tomto základě se vyčlenily tři hlavní třídy: protějšky obsahující všechny složky anglické kauzativní konstrukce, protějšky bez kauzativního slovesa a překladové restrukturační. První kategorie je strukturně i významově nejvěrnější originálu. Ze syntaktického hlediska se v této třídě objevují buďto analytické konstrukce, které mají totožnou strukturu s anglickými konstrukcemi (např. *Přiměl ho odejít*), nebo syntetické konstrukce, které kondenzují význam kauzativního a lexikální slovesa do jednoho slova (např. *Zastavila ho*). Druhá kategorie představuje přechodový typ mezi věrným a volným překladem. Jedná se o překlady, kde jsou původní účastníci děje stále identifikovatelní, ale už ne v základní větné struktuře. Analytické kauzativní sloveso chybí a kauzativní vztah je vyjádřen buď příslovečným určením reprezentujícím participanta *causer* (*Přišla kvůli němu*) nebo vztahem vedlejší a hlavní věty (*Byl tak trapný, až se musela smát*). Do třetí kategorie patří volné překlady, kde došlo k záměně sémantických rolí a/nebo se kauzativita zcela vytratila.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Český národní korpus - InterCorp*. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha. Cit. 15.04.2012, dostupný z WWW: <<http://www.korpus.cz>>.

<sup>3</sup> Maximální vzdálenost 5 byla stanovena experimentálně. Větší vzdálenosti už neodhalovaly větší počet kauzativních konstrukcí.

Teoretický popis anglických kauzativních konstrukcí stejně jako výsledky analýzy anglického a českého jazykového materiálu poukazují na zajímavé rozdíly mezi anglickými kauzativními slovesy. HAVE a GET jsou komplementovány stejnými nefinitními slovesnými tvary (kromě typu infinitivu) a většinou vyžadují životné participanty ve své struktuře (90% příkladů, kde *causer* i *causee* jsou životní). Na druhou stranu kauzativum MAKE nebývá spojováno s přítomným přičestím, ale na rozdíl od předchozích sloves se může vyskytovat v pasivním tvaru. Podíl konstrukcí s MAKE, kde jsou oba účastníci slovesného děje životní, je pouze 19%.

HAVE a GET se dále odlišují od MAKE frekvencí svých jednotlivých syntaktických typů. Zatímco kauzativní GET se vyskytuje s minulým přičestím v 55% a HAVE dokonce v 70% případů, v případě MAKE je to jen 1% (tj. jeden výskyt). Tento strukturní rozdíl má důležité důsledky v rovině významu. Konstrukce s minulým přičestím totiž zdůrazňují participanta *patiens* (přesouvají ho do pozice podmětu lexikálního slovesa) a zároveň umožňují nevyjádřit explicitně participanta *causee*. Tyto výsledky jsou v souladu s popisem sémantiky anglických kauzativ (viz. např. Wierzbicka (1998)), které u HAVE a GET zdůrazňují roli výsledné akce (*efekt a patiens*), zatímco u MAKE roli participanta CAUSEE. HAVE se pak má od GET odlišovat především předpokládanou hierarchií mezi participanty *causer* a *causee*, která z druhého participanta činí v podstatě jen pasivního konatele. Zatímco v případě konstrukcí se slovesem GET tato hierarchie není přítomná a *causee* je chápán jako více svébytný účastník slovesného děje (Wierzbicka, 1998, s. 122, 124-125). Tento rozdíl koresponduje s rozdílnou frekvencí GET a HAVE struktur s minulým přičestím.

Závislost některých typů překládových konstrukcí na určitých anglických kauzativních slovesech je také v souladu s již popsány rozdíly mezi anglickými kauzativy. Konstrukce s MAKE bývají často překládány všemi hlavními typy českých protějšků (analytickými – 33%, syntetickými – 11%, konstrukcemi bez kauzativního slovesa – 25% a restrukturacemi – 30%). Oproti tomu konstrukce s GET se překládají hlavně pomocí analytických konstrukcí (43%) a restrukturací (48%) a pro konstrukce s HAVE jsou typické pouze analytické konstrukce (80%, tj. 8 z 10 případů).

Z rozdílů uvedených výše se zdá, že si tři základní typy anglických kauzativních konstrukcí můžeme představit jako kontinuum představující různý stupeň obecnosti nebo příznakovosti daného typu. Na jedné straně této škály pak jsou konstrukce s kauzativním MAKE, které obsahují většinou efekt v infinitivu a nejsou vyhraněné co do životnosti participantů nebo typu překladového protějšku. Oproti nim se staví HAVE a GET (GET patrně o něco blíže k MAKE), které se nejčastěji váží s funkčně vyhraněným minulým příčestím, životnými participanty a často také s analytickými překladovými protějšky.

Z pohledu českých překladových protějšků pak práce podpořila některé závěry podobné práce srovnávající češtinu s románskými jazyky (Čermák & Štichauer, 2010). Morfologická kauzativa typu *rozplakat* (v této práci klasifikována spolu se sémantickými kauzativy jako syntetický typ protějšků) jsou v českých překladech spíše výjimkou. Při překladech se často kauzativita úplně vytrácí (restrukturace) nebo jsou používány analytické konstrukce stejně jako v angličtině. Velmi vyhraněným překladovým protějškem jsou pak analytické konstrukce, kde se jako kauzativní slovesa vyskytují *nechat* nebo *dát*. Výsledky naznačují, že je tento překladový typ úzce spojen s konstrukcemi, v nichž se vyskytuje *efekt* ve formě minulého příčestí. Jedná se totiž o přirozený způsob jak v češtině zachovat kauzativní význam a přitom nevyjádřit participanta *causee*.

# Appendix A

## List of excerpts

### A.1 MAKE

1. Mr Prosser was often bothered with visions like these and they made him feel very nervous.  
Podobné vize ho obtěžovaly dost často a silně ho znervózňovaly. <HG>
2. The contents of Ford Prefect's satchel were quite interesting in fact and would have made any Earth physicist's eyes pop out of his head,  
Fordova brašna obsahoval totiž docela zajímavé věci - každý pozemský fyzik by valil oči. Právě proto se jimi Ford nechlubil. <HG>
3. Wonderful perfect quadrophonic sound with distortion levels so low as to make a brave man weep.  
Úžasně dokonalý kvadrofonní zvuk s tak mizivou mírou zkreslení, že i nebojácny muž by zaplakal. <HG>
4. Somewhere in the deeply remote past it seriously traumatized a small random group of atoms drifting through the empty sterility of space and made them cling together in the most extraordinarily unlikely patterns.  
Kdesi hluboko v minulosti tyto vibrace vážně traumatizovaly malý náhodný shluk atomů, vznášející se prázdným, sterilním prostorem. To způsobilo, že začaly držet pohromadě v pozoruhodně nepravděpodobných seskupeních. <HG>
5. When you're cruising down the road in the fast lane and you lazily sail past a few hard driving cars and are feeling pretty pleased with yourself and then accidentally change down from fourth to first instead of third thus making your engine leap out of your bonnet in a rather ugly mess, it tends to throw you off your stride in much the same way that this remark threw Ford Prefect off his.  
Když člověk jede po silnici v rychlém pruhu a lenivě propluje kolem hezké řádky lopotících se aut a cítí se náramně spokojený sám se sebou, a pak omylem přeředí

ze čtyřky na jedničku místo na trojku, takže motor málem vyskočí zpod kapoty v podobě ošklivé rozplácliny, vyvede ho to z míry asi stejně, jako tahle poznámka vyvedla z míry Forda. <HG>

6. It faintly irritated him that Zaphod had to impose some ludicrous fantasy on to the scene to make it work for him.

Stačilo mu vidět ji takovou, jaká je, trochu ho popuzovalo, že si Zafod musí inscenovat takovou směšnou fantasmagorii, aby z toho něco měl. <HG>

7. Don't make me laugh."

Chceš mě rozesmát?" <HG>

8. The unavailing hoots of a lorry behind them made Dixon look furtively at Welch, whose face, he saw with passion, held an expression of calm assurance, like an old quartermaster's in rough weather .

Marné troubení nákladního auta za nimi přinutilo Dixona, že vrhl kradmý pohled na Welche, na jehož tváři, jak zjistil s nadšením, byl výraz klidné sebejistoty kormidelníka na rozbouřeném moři. <LJ>

9. But whatever the subject for discussion might be, Dixon knew that before the journey ended he'd find his face becoming creased and flabby, like an old bag, with the strain of making it smile and show interest and speak its few permitted words, of steering it between a collapse into helpless fatigue and a tautening with anarchic fury.

Ale ať se stočil rozhovor kam chtěl, Dixon věděl, že dříve než cesta skončí, bude jeho obličej zvrásněný a skleslý jako starý pytel úsilím usmívat se a projevovat zájem a promluvit několik přípustných slov, úsilím udržet se v rovnováze mezi únavnou beznadějností a divokou zuřivostí. <LJ>

10. His thinking all this without having defiled and set fire to the typescript only made him appear to himself as more of a hypocrite and fool.

Že tohle všechno mohl vymyslet a rukopis neroztrhat a nehodit do ohně, mu dokazovalo, že je pravděpodobně daleko větším pokrytcem a bláznem, než myslel. <LJ>

11. What made you leave it on like that?"

Co vás to napadlo, nechat rádio hrát?" <LJ>

12. This made Dixon decide that his apprehensions about the evening had been absurdly out of place.

Dixon usoudil, že jeho obavy, se kterými hleděl vstříc dnešnímu večeru, byly směšně nemístné. <LJ>

13. As Dixon crossed the road, the sight of all this energy made his spirits lift, and somewhere behind his thoughts an inexplicable excitement stirred.

Když Dixon přecházel ulici, vrátil mu pohled na takové množství vybíjející se energie dobrou náladu a kdesi v pozadí jeho myšlenek ho zaplavovalo nevysvětlitelné vzrušení. <LJ>

14. But when I did ask her why...' He looked over at Margaret, who was singing away happily enough - she turned out regularly during the winter with the choir of the local Conservative Association - and wondered what changes in their circumstances and temperaments would be necessary to make the words of the madrigal apply, however remotely, to himself and her.  
Když jsem se však své hvězdy ptal ..." pohlédl na Margaretu která zpívala se zjevným potěšením - vystupovala v zimě pravidelně ve sboru místního konservativního klubu -, snažil se představit si, jak by se musely změnit okolnosti a jejich povahy, aby se slova madrigalu alespoň vzdáleně vztahovala na něj a na ni. <LJ>
15. You make it sound like missionary activity.  
"Říkáte to, jako by šlo o misionářskou činnost. <LJ>
16. Whatever made you think I...?  
Proč jste si myslel, že..." <LJ>
17. The baying quality of his voice, especially in the final query, together with a blurring of certain consonants, made Dixon want to call attention to its defects, also, perhaps, to the peculiarity of his eyes.  
Mečivý přízvuk jeho hlasu, zejména v poslední otázce, spolu s polykáním některých souhlásek vyvolal v Dixonovi přání upozornit ho na vady jeho výslovnosti a možná i na zvláštní vzhled jeho očí. <LJ>
18. This might make Bertrand assail him physically - splendid : he was confident of winning any such encounter with an artist - or would Bertrand's pacifism stop him?  
Pravděpodobně by to Bertranda přimělo k fyzickému násilí. Výtečně : byl přesvědčen, že by ze střetnutí vyšel vítězně. Nebo by se mu postavil v cestu Bertrandův pacifismus? <LJ>
19. Your accent made it sound so frightfully sinister.  
Nasadil jste takový báječně strašidelný přízvuk. <LJ>
20. What makes you say that?' she said.  
"Proč to říkáte? " pravila. <LJ>
21. This too made him smile and Bertrand's beard twitched, but he said nothing to break the pause.  
Tomu se také musel usmát a Bertrandův plnovous se zachvěl, ale Dixon neřekl nic a všichni ostatní mlčeli. <LJ>
22. One of the effects of this query was to make Dixon feel very drunk, and afterwards he could never quite work out why he did what he did next, which was sitting down beside Margaret on the bed, putting his arm round her shoulders and kissing her firmly on the mouth.  
Jedním z následků této otázky bylo, že se Dixon cítil velice opilý, a později si nikdy nemohl dobře vysvětlit, proč udělal, co udělal potom, jinými slovy, že se posadil na postel vedle Margarety, objal pevně její ramena a políbil ji na ústa. <LJ>

23. This, and the shudder she gave, made his head reel the furthest yet; too far, indeed, for him to do any more thinking.  
Tento pohyb a zachvění, kterým na něj reagovala, mu zamotalo hlavu ještě víc; dokonce tolik, že ztratil jakoukoliv schopnost vůbec myslet. <LJ>
24. The cork came out with a festive, Yule-tide pop which made him wish he had some nuts and raisins; he drank deeply.  
Zátka vydala slavnostní, silvestrovský zvuk, který v něm vyvolal touhu po mandlích a rozinkách; zhluboka se napil. <LJ>
25. A dusty thudding in his head made the scene before him beat like a pulse.  
Všechno, co viděl, mu pulsovalo tupým duněním v hlavě. <LJ>
26. This made him feel very unhappy, a feeling sensibly increased when he looked at the bedside table.  
Zachvátila ho veliká lítost, která citelně vzrostla, když se podíval na noční stolek. <LJ>
27. A study of the egg and bacon and tomatoes opposite him made him decide to postpone eating any himself.  
Když podrobně prostudoval vejce, slaninu a rajská jablka na protějším talíři, rozhodl se odložit jídlo vůbec. <LJ>
28. It was an idiom he'd caught from Carol Goldsmith. Thinking of her made him think, for the first time that morning, of the embrace he'd witnessed the night before, and he realised that it had its bearing on this girl as well as on Goldsmith. Bylo to rčení, které pochytil od Carol Goldsmithové, a tím si po prvé toho rána vzpomněl na objetí, kterého byl svědkem předešlého večera. Zároveň si uvědomil, že má význam nejen pro Goldsmithe, ale i pro děvče sedící naproti němu u stolu. <LJ>
29. She said this in a tone that made him turn his back for a moment at the sideboard and make his Chinese mandarin's face, hunching his shoulders a little.  
Řekla to takovým způsobem, že se k ní obrátil zády, a stoje u příborníku, udělal obličej čínského mandarína. <LJ>
30. She grinned, which made her look almost ludicrously healthy, and revealed at the same time that her front teeth were slightly irregular.  
Zasmála se, vypadala při tom až směšně zdravě, ale také se ukázalo, že má mírně nepravidelné přední zuby. <LJ>
31. Whatever made you think you could get away with that sort of thing?  
Jak jste si mohl myslet, že vám něco takového projde? <LJ>
32. Apart from making him feel he might die or go mad at any moment, his hangover had vanished.  
Až na pocit, že každým okamžikem buď zemře, nebo zešílí, jeho kocovina vyprchala. <LJ>
33. Welch suddenly made him switch everything on again by saying :  
Welch ho náhle donutil znovu zapnout veškerou pozornost : <LJ>



34. Look here, you old cockchafer what makes you think you can run a history department, even at a place like this, eh, you old cockchafer? I know what you'd be good at, you old cockchafer...
- Poslyš, ty jeden troubo, proč myslíš, že můžeš vést katedru historie? Ani tady ji nedovedeš vést, a jestli chceš vědět, k čemu se hodíš ... ty troubo jeden ... "
- <LJ>
35. When he was sure that Welch had finished blowing his nose, Dixon got up and thanked him for their chat almost with sincerity, and the sight of Welch's 'bag' and fishing-hat on a nearby chair, normally a certain infuriant, only made him hum his Welsh tune as he went out.
- Když se Dixon ujistil, že Welch přestal smrkat, povstal a takřka upřímně mu poděkoval za rozhovor. Pohled na Welchovu "brašnu" a tweedový klobouk, ležící na nedaleké židli, který ho pravidelně přiváděl k zuřivosti, tentokrát pouze způsobil, že si vycházejí tiše prozpěvoval refrén o Welchovi. <LJ>
36. A falsetto explosion from the coffeurn across the room made him start slightly; then he said :
- Trhl sebou, protože se na druhém konci místnosti ozval prudký hvizd, vyluzovaný párou syčící z velkého stříbrně se lesknoucího hrnce s kohoutkem a poklicí, v kterém byla horká káva : <LJ>
37. What makes you say that?'
- Proč?" <LJ>
38. Her manner to him so far that evening had been not even cold; it had been simply non-existent, had made him feel that, contrary to the evidence of his senses, he wasn't really there at all.
- Chovala se k němu celý večer více než chladně; prostě ho nevnímala, a začínal mít pocit, že navzdory důkazům, které mu podávají jeho smysly, ve skutečnosti není přítomen. <LJ>
39. He'd read somewhere, or been told, that somebody like Aristotle or I. A. Richards had said that the sight of beauty makes us want to move towards it.
- Kdysi někde četl nebo slyšel, že buď Aristoteles nebo I. A. Richards prohlásili, že pohled na krásu člověka přitahuje. <LJ>
40. Just then she reappeared, walking up to them with a kind of deliberate carelessness that made Dixon suspect her of having a bottle of something, now no doubt much depleted, hidden in the ladies' cloakroom.
- Právě v tom okamžiku se objevila a kráčela k nim s onou vědomou ledabylostí pohybů, které u Dixona vzbudily podezření, že si schovala láhev, nyní již bezpochyby prázdnu, na dámské toaletě. <LJ>
41. What makes me feel so, so unhappy, is the awful gulf it shows that there is between us.
- Ale jsem tak nešťastná z té strašné propasti, která je vlastně mezi námi. <LJ>

42. The sight of their party still, or again, just where they'd been before made him want very much to pitch forward on to the floor and go to sleep.  
Pohled na jejich společnost stále na témž místě v něm vyvolal touhu vrhnout se na podlahu a usnout. <LJ>
43. Dixon abruptly made his head vibrate ; without tilting it, he moved his lower jaw as far over to one side as he could.  
Dixonovi prudce zabrnělo v hlavě. Docílil toho tím, že vysunul dolní čelist co nejdál do strany. <LJ>
44. But it was good for him; the incident made it seem natural to turn back towards the portico.  
Ve skutečnosti to však dopadlo dobře. Nyní se zcela přirozeně otočili a kráčeli zpět ke schodům. <LJ>
45. What finally made you make up your mind?'  
A co u vás nakonec rozhodlo? " <LJ>
46. He didn't seem quite like the others, chiefly because he didn't start trying to make me be his mistress the entire time.  
Zdalo se mi, že je jiný než ti ostatní, hlavně proto, že se pořád nesnažil, abych se stala jeho milenkou. <LJ>
47. As Carol might have done, she pinched his arm too hard, making him cry out, saying to him in vocal italics :  
Stejně jako by to byla udělala Carol, štípala ho do paže tak silně, až vykřikl, a pravila přitom s důrazem takřka grafickým : <LJ>
48. It'll make me feel much less tired, I know.'  
Budu pak daleko méně ospalá, já se znám. " <LJ>
49. In the darkness Dixon blundered into something which struck him dextrously on the shin and made him swear in a whisper.  
Dixon v temnotě narazil na cizí těleso, které ho udeřilo do holeně, až tiše zaklel. <LJ>
50. She smiled at him in a way that made his head swim more than the kiss had done.  
Usmála se na něj tak, že se mu zatočila hlava ještě víc než při polibku. <LJ>
51. Of course, he knows he isn't great really, and that's what makes him behave like this.  
Samozřejmě ví, že není geniální, a proto se tak chová. <LJ>
52. It makes me say to myself, Oh, it's no good, he just doesn't know me at all, never has done, either.  
Co si mám jiného myslet, než že je to všechno zbytečné, úplně zbytečné. Nerozumíte mi a nikdy jste mi nerozuměl. <LJ>
53. As he felt at the moment, this made him want to cry.  
Ve stavu, v němž byl, mu z toho bylo takřka do pláče. <LJ>

54. Soon enough, he knew, it would take its place with those three or four memories which could make him actually twist about in his chair or bed with remorse, fear or embarrassment.  
Věděl, že se dříve nebo později zařadí mezi tři čtyři vzpomínky, pod jejichž dojmem se kroutil v židli nebo na posteli výčitkami svědomí, strachem nebo rozpaky. <LJ>
55. It would probably supplant the present top-of the-list item, the time he'd been pushed out in front of the curtain after a school concert to make the audience sing the National Anthem.  
Pravděpodobně zaujme čestné místo, které bylo až dosud obsazeno vzpomínkou na okamžik, kdy ho po školním koncertě vystrčili před oponu, aby zahájil společné zpívání státní hymny. <LJ>
56. He knew now what he'd been trying to conceal from himself ever since the previous morning, what the row with Bertrand had made him temporarily disbelieve : he and Christine would not, after all, be able to eat tea together the following afternoon. Uvědomil si, co sám před sebou od samého věřejšího jitra skrýval a več mu hádka s Bertrandem dočasně umožnila nevěřit : že s Christinou přece jen nebude moci zítra odpoledne pít čaj. <LJ>
57. What makes you say that?'  
"Proč to říkáte?" <LJ>
58. He came back with a lot of things about me being my own mistress, and I was to do what I wanted to do and wasn't to feel I was tied in any way. It made me feel rather mean.'  
Začal vykládat, že mi nic nezakazuje, že si mohu dělat, co chci, že si nepřeje, abych se cítila něčím vázaná, a podobně, až jsem si připadala hodně provinilá." <LJ>
59. You make it sound pretty formidable.  
"To zní náramně. <LJ>
60. The authoritative vapidty of this reacted with Dixon's general feeling of peevish regret and made him begin to talk fast.  
Plochosť a povýšenost jejího prohlášení narazily na Dixonovu nevraživou sebelítost a způsobily, že začal rychle mluvit. <LJ>
61. There was something you said, it made me think you've got the idea I sleep with Bertrand.  
Z toho, jak jste mluvil, se mi zdá, že máte zřejmě dojem, že s Bertrandem spím. <LJ>
62. ' It would make me feel we hadn't seen the last of each other.  
"Měl bych alespoň pocit, že jsme se neviděli naposled." <LJ>
63. I'll give you dance, I'll make you dance, don't you worry.  
"Já vám ukážu tanec, já s váma zatančím, na to můžete vzít jed. <LJ>
64. Then just as they're delighting in having got me punch-drunk with talk I come back at 'em and make 'em do what I've got lined up for 'em.'

- Jenže právě když mají ohromnou radost z toho, jak mě svými řeči zblbli, otočím se a donutím je udělat, co jsem na ně ušil." <LJ>
65. ' When I'm punch-drunk with talk, which is what I am most of the time, that's when they come at me and make me do what they want me to do.'  
 "Se mnou je to právě naopak. Když jsem úplně zblblý řeči, a to je skoro pořád, obyčejně přijdou a donutí mě udělat to, co na mne ušili oni." <LJ>
66. Christine flashed a look at Bertrand that made him not say whatever he'd been going to say, and said herself :  
 Christina šlehla po Bertrandovi pohledem, kterým ho zarazila, dříve než řekl, cokoliv měl na jazyku, a pravila sama : <LJ>
67. A pang of helpless desire made Dixon feel heavy and immovable, as if he were being talked to by Welch.  
 Náhlý příval bezmocné touhy způsobil, že Dixon ztuhl a znehybněl, jako kdyby s ním mluvil Welch. <LJ>
68. Gripping his tongue between his teeth, he made his cheeks expand into little hemispherical balloons; he forced his upper lip downwards into an idiotic pout; he protruded his chin like the blade of a shovel.  
 Stisknuv jazyk mezi zuby, nafoukl tváře do dvou vydutých polokoulí; spodní ret svěsil idiotsky co nejnižše, bradu lopatovitě vystrčil kupředu. <LJ>
69. Chairs scraped at either side of him; a hand caught at his shoulder and made him stumble .  
 Všude kolem něho vrzaly židle; čísi ruka ho uchopila za rameno, až zavrával. <LJ>
70. They'll never forgive me for wrecking a public lecture, though. And nervousness wouldn't make me imitate Neddy and the Principal, would it?'  
 "Kdepak, nikdy mi neodpustí, že jsem jim pokazil veřejnou přednášku, a Neddyho nebo rektora jsem taky nenapodoboval z rozčilení." <LJ>
71. A rapping on glass made him turn round.  
 Zaslechl klepání na sklo a otočil hlavu. <LJ>
72. What made her tell you?'  
 Proč vám to řekla?" <LJ>
73. What made Carol tell you?'  
 Proč vám to řekla Garol?" <LJ>
74. The spin of Rama was starting to make itself felt .  
 Ráma mu začínal dávat na vědomí svou rotaci. <RR>
75. He tapped harder, with no more result, and was about to exert his full strength when some impulse made him desist .  
 Udeřil silněji se stejným výsledkem, už se připravoval napřít veškerou sílu, když ho náhlé vnuknutí přimělo, aby od toho upustil. <RR>

76. Too much staring at those blinding bars of light had made his eyes hurt again;  
Díval se do těch oslepujících pruhů světla příliš dlouho a znovu ho rozbolely oči;  
<RR>
77. Well, if you can make it sound like a straightforward scientific theory, I'll send it,  
top priority, to the Rama Committee.  
"No dobře, jestli to dokážeš udělat tak, aby to znělo jako poctivá vědecká teorie,  
odvysílám ji - bleskově - Výboru Ráma. <RR>
78. The little victory made him feel much happier;  
Malé vítězství způsobilo, že se cítil mnohem spokojeněji; <RR>
79. Jimmy never knew what made him stop and look more closely into the metal maze  
to the south.  
Jimmy nikdy nepochopil, co jej zastavilo a přimělo, aby se pozorněji zahleděl do  
kovového bludiště na jihu. <RR>
80. it makes me feel a fool.'  
Já se snad zblázním." <RR>
81. And what would have made them ignore the solemn promise of their own Amba-  
sador?  
A co je přimělo k tomu, že ignorují slavnostní slib svého vlastního velvyslance?  
<RR>
82. You cannot make anyone do anything anymore.  
Už nemůžete nikoho k ničemu nutit. <EP>
83. This was the only light that made the trompe l'oeil seem convincing.  
Jedině v tomto světle vypadala ta malba přesvědčivě. <EP>
84. They thought that would make me leave."  
Mysleli si, že mě to donutí odejít." <EP>
85. She is always made to feel that she is the one who has found him, this man who  
knows darkness, who when drunk used to claim he was brought up by a family of  
owls.  
Caravaggio Hanu vždycky nechá, aby si myslela, že ho našla ona, zrovna jeho,  
člověka, který se ve tmě vyzná, který v opilosti vždycky hlásal, že byl vychován  
soví rodinou. <EP>
86. In mid-step, the beginning of the shutter's noise making me jerk my head towards  
it.  
Ozval se skřípot žaluzie a já uprostřed kroku trhl tím směrem hlavou. <EP>
87. Who knew what country the war had made him live in.  
Kdo ví, v které zemi ho válka přiměla žít. <EP>
88. " Yes. You could really make him do anything.  
"Ano. Člověk ho mohl skutečně přimět k čemukoli. <EP>
89. To make them empty their bowels before they die.  
Aby si vyprázdnili střeva, než zemřou. <EP>

90. Who the hell were we to be given this responsibility, expected to be wise as old priests, to know how to lead people towards something no one wanted and somehow make them feel comfortable.  
Proč zrovna na nás padla ta odpovědnost, proč se od nás čekalo, že budeme moudré jako staří kněží, že budeme vědět, jak dovést lidi k něčemu, co nikdo nechce, a že nějak dokážeme, aby se cítili dobře. <EP>
91. "You should be trying to trick me," the burned pilot told his interrogators, "make me speak German, which I can, by the way, ask me about Don Bradman.  
"Měli byste to na mě zkusit s nějakou lstí," řekl popálený pilot svým vyšetřovatelům.  
"Donuďte mě mluvit německy, což mimochodem umím, zeptejte se mě na Dona Bradmana. <EP>
92. When he was a child his father had bunched up his fingers and, disguising all but the tips of them, made him guess which was the long one.  
Když byl ještě malý kluk, tatínek sevřel dohromady prsty a ukryl je až na konečky a nechal ho hádat, který prst je ten nejdelší. <EP>
93. He was still annoyed the girl had stayed with him when he defused the bomb, as if by that she had made him owe her something.  
Dosud ho trápilo, že když zneškodňoval bombu, děvče s ním zůstalo. Jako by ho tím nutila, aby jí něco dlužil. <EP>
94. Making him feel in retrospect responsible for her, though there was no thought of that at the time.  
Jako by v něm zpětně vyvolávala pocit, že je za ni odpovědný, třebaže v té chvíli na to nikdo nemyslel. <EP>
95. And something in him made him step back from even the naive innocence of such a remark.  
A cosi v jeho nitru ho přimělo uhnout i před naivní nevinností takové poznámky. <EP>
96. Will make the shellfish grin.  
škeble se nejspíš začnou smát <EP>
97. How can Kip love you if you are not smart enough to make him stop risking his life?"  
Jak tě Kip vůbec může milovat, když nejseš natolik chytrá, abys ho zastavila, aby už neriskoval život?" <EP>
98. Sometimes she cups a hand over the glass funnel and blows out the flame, and sometimes she leaves it burning and ducks under it and enters through the open flaps, to crawl in against his body, the arm she wants, her tongue instead of a swab, her tooth instead of a needle, her mouth instead of the mask with the codeine drops to make him sleep, to make his immortal ticking brain slow into sleepiness.  
Někdy přiklopí ruku přes skleněný cylindr a plamínek sfoukne, jindy ho nechá hořet a přikrčí se pod lampou a vklouzne do otevřeného stanu, schouleně leze k jeho tělu, k paži, kterou potřebuje, jazyk místo tamponu, zuby místo jehly, ústa místo masky

- s kapkami kodeinu, aby ho uspala, aby jeho nesmrtelný čínorodý mozek zvolna přivedla k spánku. <EP>
99. Some old Arab poet's woman, whose white-dove shoulders made him describe an oasis with her name.  
Po ženě nějakého dávného arabského básníka, jejíž běloskvoucí ramena ho vedla k tomu, označit oázu jejím jménem. <EP>
100. Sometimes for my exam I make them play bridge.  
Někdy je na zkoušku nechávám hrát bridž. <EP>
101. As he pulled it along, a third bomb exploded a quarter of a mile away and the sky lit up, making even the arc lights seem subtle and human.  
Zrovna když ji vlekl, vybuchla třetí bomba necelé čtvrt míle od toho místa a obloha se rozjasnila, že i ta oblouková světla vypadala lidsky křehce. <EP>
102. Something makes us believe it.  
Něco nás nutí tomu věřit. <EP>

## A.2 GET

103. "Oh, that was easy,' says Man, and for an encore goes on to prove that black is white and gets himself killed on the next zebra crossing.  
'To to ale bylo snadné,' libuje si člověk, a protože ještě nemá dost, dokáže, že černé je bílé, a na nejbližším přechodu ho zajede auto. <HG>
104. "No, I think if it's all the same to you," he said, "I'd better get you both shoved into this airlock and then go and get on with some other bits of shouting I've got to do."  
"Helejte, jestli je vám to fuk, "vypadlo z něj," tak vás rači šoupnu do té přechodový komory a pak si pudu vodbejt nějaký řvaní, co mám za úkol." <HG>
105. "That's it," said Zaphod with the sort of grin that would get most people locked away in a room with soft walls.  
"Přesně," potvrdil Zafod se svítem v oku, jenž by většinu lidí bezpečně dostal do vypolstrované cely. <HG>
106. If I were you, Dixon, I should take all the steps I possibly could to get this article accepted in the next month or so.  
"Na vašem místě, Dixone, bych podnikl všechny kroky, aby někde ten článek během příštího měsíce přijali. <LJ>
107. Thank you very much, I should love to come,' Dixon said, thinking he must get Margaret to do some intelligence-work on the something he'd probably be called upon to lend a hand with.  
"Děkuji, velice rád," řekl Dixon, umiňuje si, že musí donutit Margaretu, aby provedla

zpravodajský průzkum pravděpodobných možností, o jakou pomoc by mohl být požádán. <LJ>

108. I remember being terrified they'd tell the police and get me carted off to a police hospital - are there such things, James? - but they were just angelic; they couldn't have been nicer.

Pamatuji se, jaký jsem měla strach, že zavolají policii a dají mě převést na policejní oddělení - existuje vůbec policejní nemocnice, Jamesi? -, ale chovali se prostě nádherně; nemohli být laskavější. <LJ>

109. He'd said he would, meaning to turn up, but in the event he hadn't been able to get his next day's lecture written up in time, nor, he realised, had the prospect of another conference about Catchpole seemed inviting when ten o'clock came.

Řekl, že přijde, a skutečně chtěl, ale když se přiblížila desátá, uvědomil si, že by si nestačil připravit na zítřek přednášku, nehledě na to, že se mu další podrobný rozbor případu Catchpole nezdál dostatečně lákavý. <LJ>

110. The huge class that contained Margaret was destined to provide his own womenfolk : those in whom the intention of being attractive could sometimes be made to get itself confused with performance; those with whom a too-tight skirt, a wrong-coloured, or no, lipstick, even an ill-executed smile could instantly discredit that illusion beyond apparent hope of renewal.

Pro něj byl pouze široký sortiment žen typu Margarety. Žen, u kterých úmysl hezky vypadat mohl být někdy omylem pokládán za cosi blížícího se vzhlednosti; žen, u kterých příliš úzká sukně, špatně zvolená nebo žádná rtěnka, nebo dokonce neobratně provedený úsměv mohly tuto iluzi zdánlivě navždy rozbít. <LJ>

111. How long would it be before he could persuade her first to open, then to empty, her locker of reproaches, as preliminary to the huge struggle of getting her to listen to his apologies?

Jak dlouho se bude muset snažit, aby nejprve otevřela a pak vyprázdnila bednu výčitek, které budou nezbytnou předehrou vyčerpávajícího zápasu o možnost přimět ji, aby vyslechla jeho omluvu? <LJ>

112. If Welch didn't speak in the next five seconds, he'd do something which would get himself flung out without possible question - not the things he'd often dreamed of when sitting next door pretending to work.

Jestliže Welch během příštích pěti vteřin nepromluví, udělá něco, zač bude vyhozen bez dalších otázek - ale něco jiného, než o čem snil, sedaje v sousedním pokoji a předstíraje práci. <LJ>

113. It had taken him the whole of an evening in the Oak Lounge and a great deal of expense and hypocrisy to get her to admit that she still had a grievance against



him, and more of the same sorts of commodity to persuade her to define, amplify, discuss, moderate and finally abandon it.

Stálo ho to celý jeden večer u výčepu, s vynaložením značných výdajů a pokrytectví, než ji donutil k přiznání, že se na něj stále zlobí, a další množství téhož, než ji přiměl definovat, specifikovat, prodiskutovat, pak zmírnit a nakonec potlačit zaujetí, které vůči němu chovala. <LJ>

114. I must go and see the doc and get him to give me something.  
Musím jít k doktorovi, aby mi něco předepsal. <LJ>
115. Shall I get Neddy to ask me down for tea at the week-end?'  
Mám se pokusit, aby mě Neddy pozval v sobotu nebo v neděli k svačině? " <LJ>
116. I'll ring up the Welches for you now and get the Professor to ring you.  
Zavolám k Welchovým a požádám, aby vás zavolal. <LJ>
117. I can't get her to say anything.'  
"Nemůžu z ní dostat ani slovo." <LJ>
118. Still, the point is that he gets me all lined up for the Ball, with a hint of other things to follow and then tells me he's not taking me after all in front of that mother of his, and in front of dear Margaret too. That's what annoyed me in the first place.  
Ale o to nejde. Mě dožralo, že mi nejdřív slíbí ples a potom ještě leccos dalšího, a v poslední chvíli řekne, že se mnou nikam nejde, a dokonce před svou matkou a drahouškem Margaretou. <LJ>
119. He tried to get her to walk off with him, but she stayed where she was in the doorway, the lights from the corridor throwing her face into shadow.  
Pokusil se ji odvést, ale zůstala stát ve dveřích, kterými padalo do ulice světlo z chodby. Její tvář byla ve stínu. <LJ>
120. People get themselves all steamed up about whether they're in love or not, and can't work it out, and their decisions go all to pot.  
Lidé si obyčejně lámou hlavu, jestli se zamilovali nebo ne, nevyznají se v tom a jejich rozhodování vypadá podle toho. <LJ>
121. The difference is that they can get their brains going on that, instead of taking the sound of the word "love" as a signal for switching them off.  
Rozdíl je v tom, že někomu se právě tehdy mozek rozjede, místo aby se mu při pouhém slově "láska" automaticky zastavil. <LJ>
122. It's just been me flying off the handle in one way and another, and you rather reluctantly trying to get me to grow up.  
Vždycky mě něco chytlo tak nebo jinak a vy jste se chtě nechtě snažil, abyste mě přivedl k rozumu. <LJ>

123. Ah, wait a minute; he'd get Barclay to find him a book on medieval music.  
Moment ; může požádat Barclayho, aby mu našel knihu o středověké hudbě. <LJ>
124. But my God, go to most places and try and get someone turfed out merely because he's too stupid to pass his exams – it'd be easier to sack a prof.  
Ale proboha, jen to zkuste na většině menších škol někoho vyrazit jen proto, že má v hlavě piliny a nemůže udělat zkoušky - to se vám spíš podaří vyhodit profesora.  
<LJ>
125. Well, if I find you playing this sort of trick again, or any sort of bloody clever trick, I'll break your horrible neck for you and get you dismissed from your job as well. Understand?'  
Tedy : jestli mi to ještě jednou provedete, nebo jestli mi vůbec něco takového ještě jednou provedete, zpřerážím vám pazoury a dám vás vyhodit ze školy, rozuměl jste?" <LJ>
126. I thought we got all that settled yesterday.  
"Myslela jsem, že jsme tohle všechno včera vyřešili. <LJ>
127. Have you ever thought what slow work it must be getting even half a page of foot-  
notes set up?'  
Uvědomujete si, jaká je to pomalá práce, vysázet třeba jenom půl stránky vysvětlivek?"  
<LJ>
128. It's a great pity he's managed to get my niece tied up with him, a great pity.  
Škoda, že se s ním ta moje neteř zapletla, na mou duši škoda. <LJ>
129. It would save us a lot of trouble if we could get it working ...'  
Ušetřilo by nám spoustu potíží, kdybychom ho dokázali uvést do provozu ... <RR>
130. Something brushed lightly against his hair; he had been too busy to get it cut, and  
would have to do something about that before he next put on a space-helmet...  
Něco se mu lehce dotklo vlasů, měl příliš mnoho práce, než aby se dal ostříhat,  
a pomyslel si, že s tím bude muset něco podniknout, než si zase nasadí na hlavu  
přílbu kosmického skafandru... <RR>
131. To increase their rate of coverage, the four explorers had now spread out through  
the crystal columns and were taking photographs as quickly as they could get their  
cameras focused on the fleeting images. This was an astonishing piece of luck, Nor-  
ton told himself, though he felt that he had earned it;  
Aby zvětšili svůj akční rádius, čtyři průzkumníci se mezi křišťálovými sloupy rozdělili  
a fotografovali takovou rychlostí, že jen stačili na prchavé obrazce zaměřovat kamery.  
Tohle je úžasné štěstí, říkal si Norton, třebaže měl dojem, že si je zasloužili; <RR>
132. We can probably get someone to drive you up.  
Nepochybně někoho seženeme, kdo vás tam zaveze. <EP>

133. "Get your Italian friend to find seeds for you, he seems capable in that category.  
" Musíte přimět svého italského přítele, aby vám sehnal semena, je zřejmě v tomhle směru schopný. <EP>
134. The only way I could get her to communicate was to ask her to read to me ... Do you realize neither of us has children?"  
Já ji požádal, aby mi četla, a jedině tím se mi podařilo, že začala komunikovat ... Uvědomujete si, že ani vy, ani já nemáme děti?" <EP>
135. "Then she met that Potter at school and they left and got married and had you, and of course I knew you'd be just the same, just as strange, just as – as – abnormal – and then, if you please, she went and got herself blown up and we got landed with you!"  
"Potom se seznámila s tím Potterem, a když vyšli školu, vzali se a měli spolu tebe, a já jsem samozřejmě věděla, že budeš taky takový, stejně divný, stejně - stejně nenormální, a potom, když laskavě dovolíš, se dala vyhodit do povětří a tys nám zůstal na krku!" <HP>
136. "He usually gets me ter do important stuff fer him.  
"Vobvykle mě posílá zařizovat důležitý věci. <HP>
137. "If either of you get us caught, I'll never rest until I've learned that Curse of the Bogies Quirrell told us about, and used it on you.  
"Jestli nás kvůli někomu z vás chytí, nedám si pokoj, dokud se nenaučím tu satan-skou kletbu, o které nám říkal Quirrell, a neprokleju vás." <HP>
138. "Shut up, Peeves – please – you'll get us thrown out."  
"Buď zticha, Protivo - prosím - nebo nás vyhodí." <HP>
139. Disgusted that the Slytherins had lost, he had tried to get everyone laughing at how a wide-mouthed tree frog would be replacing Harry as Seeker next.  
Vadilo mu, že Zmijozel prohrál, a snažil se všechny rozesmát tím, že příště bude místo Harryho hrát chytače nějaká rosnička, poněvadž dokáže stejně roztáhnout hubu. <HP>
140. They sat by the hour eating anything they could spear on a toasting fork – bread, English muffins, marshmallows – and plotting ways of getting Malfoy expelled, which were fun to talk about even if they wouldn't work.  
Vysedávali tam dlouhé hodiny a jedli všechno, co se dalo nabodnout na opékací vidlici - chleba, koláčky, ibiškové pokroutky - a vymýšleli si způsoby, jak dostat Malfoye ze školy; užili spoustu legrace, když se o nich bavili, i když věděli, že jim k ničemu nebudou. <HP>

141. Ron knew them so well he never had trouble getting them to do what he wanted.  
Ron je znal tak dobře, že je vždycky bez obtíží přiměl, aby udělaly právě to, co si přál. <HP>
142. It's not exactly a secret we hate him, Dumbledore'll think we made it up to get him sacked .  
Není žádné tajemství, že ho nemáme rádi; Brumbál si řekne, že jsme si to všechno vymysleli, abychom ho vystřnadili ze školy. <HP>

### A.3 HAVE

143. It says that the effect of a Pan Galactic Gargle Blaster is like having your brains smashed out by a slice of lemon wrapped round a large gold brick.  
Vypít Pangalaktický megacloumák je podle Stopařova průvodce asi jako nechat si vyrazit mozek z hlavy plátkem citronu obaleným kolem masívní zlaté cihly. <HG>
144. "Get off," said Ford, "They're ours," giving him a look that would have an Algolian Suintiger get on with what it was doing.  
"Vodpal, to jsou naše piva," řekl Ford a vrhl na něj pohled, který by přiměl i algolského slunečního tygra, aby si hleděl svého. <HG>
145. I'll have you hung, drawn and quartered!  
Dám vás pověsit, vláčet a rozčtvrtit! <HG>
146. His right-hand head looked round casually, said "hi" and went back to having his teeth picked .  
Pravá hlava jen zběžně vzhledla, řekla "ahoj" a dál si nechala šfoulat v zubech. <HG>
147. I imagine old Welch had this part of the house built on.  
"Welch si tuhle část domu asi dal přistavět. <LJ>
148. Which would be worst : mending them himself, which would involve finding, or more likely re-buying, the required materials, having them repaired at a shop, which meant remembering to ask someone where such a shop could be found, remembering to take the trousers to it and remembering to fetch and pay for them, or asking Miss Cutler to do them?  
Která alternativa je horší : spravit si je sám, což by znamenalo nalézt nebo spíš znovu koupit potřebné rekvizity, nebo si je dát spravit, což by zase znamenalo pamatovat si, že se musí někoho zeptat, kde by mu je spravili, pamatovat si, že tam musí kalhoty zanést, a pamatovat si, že zase pro ně musí jít a zaplatit za ně, nebo konečně požádat slečnu Cutlerovou, aby mu je spravila? <LJ>

149. "I thought, as we do not have to begin till the middle of next week, I'd have some of the unit come down to Home Farm.  
"Říkal jsem si, že když máme začít až uprostřed příštího týdne, vezmu část jednotky k sobě na farmu. <EP>
150. "Very well," he said, handing it back to Hagrid," I will have Someone take you down to both vaults.  
"Dobrá," řekl a vrátil ho Hagridovi. "Pošlu někoho, aby s vámi sjel dolů do obou trezorů. <HP>
151. "Got to have that ruddy tail removed before he goes to Smeltings."  
"Musí si dát uříznout ten zatracený ocásek, než nastoupí do Smeltings." <HP>
152. "Harry, please relax, or Madam Pomfrey will have me thrown out.  
"Nerozčiluj se, Harry, nebo mě madame Pomfreyová vyžene." <HP>