Abstract

        This paper examines, within the framework
of case grammar, the alternant relationship that holds
between the simplex in (1) "The thought frightened me" and
(2) "The thought made me frightened," and between the
simplex in (3) "John trembled with fear" and (4) "Fear made
John tremble." It is shown that while the causative
paraphrase in (2) is optional, the shape of (4) is
determined by subject selection. The effects of this
subject choice on the verb are described, and paraphrastic
causatives are shown to be formally and semantically
distinguished from complex causatives such as "I made John
do his homework." The explanatory use of the paraphrastic
interpretation is discussed, and rules are provided for the
generation of sentences (3) and (4). Finally, it is noted
that the explanation of these paraphrase relationships
obliges us to revise our criteria for analyzing a sentence
as complex in its deep structure. (Author/DO)

PARAPHRASTIC CAUSATIVES*

by

Sandra Scharff Babcock
2451 Fishinger Road
Columbus, Ohio 43221

*This is a copy of a paper delivered before
the Linguistic Society of America on December 28, 1968.

I am concerned now with the interpretation of
paraphrastic causatives in case grammar. Causative para-
phrases are complex alternants of sentences with simple verbs.
Examples of these are (1) FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE, which
is a paraphrastic alternant of (2) JOHN TREMBLED WITH FEAR,
and (3) THE SUN MADE THE SEA GLISTEN, which is a paraphrase
of (4) THE SEA GLISTENED IN THE SUN. These causatives are
defined as syntactic paraphrases because they contain trans-
formationally introduced constants, while all the elements
of simple alternants are introduced in the base. To
illustrate, let me note that (5) THE COLD FROZE JOHN and
(6) JOHN FROZE FROM THE COLD are simple alternants because
the preposition in the latter is introduced in the base.
On the other hand, sentence (7) THE COLD MADE JOHN FREEZE
is a paraphrastic alternant because the causative auxiliary
make is transformationally introduced. I will try to demon-
strate here that paraphrastic causatives and their alter-
nants are simple in their deep structure. I begin my
arguments by comparing paraphrastic causatives with
complex causatives such as (8) I MADE JOHN DO HIS HOMEWORK.

The most important difference between the make of
make John tremble and the make of make John do his home-
work is that in make tremble it is synonymous with cause,
while in make do his homework it is synonymous with force.
Another difference is that paraphrastic causatives, or
'causative inactives,' do not freely appear in the passive;

whereas what we might call 'causative actives' _do_ appear
in the passive. We can say (9) JOHN WAS MADE TO DO HIS
HOMEWORK, but not (10) *JOHN WAS MADE TO TREMBLE BY FEAR
or (11) *THE SEA WAS MADE TO GLISTEN BY THE SUN.

Another distinction that exists between paraphras-
tic causatives and causative actives is that although we
can say (12) JOHN DID HIS HOMEWORK BECAUSE I MADE HIM and
(13) JOHN DID HIS HOMEWORK BECAUSE HE WAS MADE TO, we can-
not say (14) *JOHN TREMBLED BECAUSE FEAR MADE HIM or
(15) *JOHN TREMBLED BECAUSE HE WAS MADE TO.

Yet another distinction between paraphrastic and
active causatives lies in the categorial relationship of
the participants to the verb phrase. In I MADE JOHN DO HIS
HOMEWORK, there are two Agentive nouns: the superficial
subject of _make_ and the noun _John_, which bears an Agentive
relationship tc the subordinate clause and is the Dative
object of _make do his homework_. In subject / object gram-
mars the double categorial status of the noun _John_ is
explained this way: _John_ is said to be the object of _make_
do his homework and the logical, or deep structure, subject
of _do his homework_. This analysis is extended, of course,
to cover _make John tremble_. The noun _John_ is said to be the
object of _make tremble_ and the logical, or deep structure,
subject of _tremble_. Now, in the framework of case grammar--
and I believe in fact -- the subject / object- argument
is not relevant to the analysis of complexity. In

order to justify the analysis of a sentence as complex in its deep structure, we must show that there is at least one participant that plays <u>one</u> categorial role in the main clause, and the <u>same</u> or a <u>different</u> role in the subordinate clause. This is easy to show for I MADE JOHN DO HIS HOME-WORK, which has two Agentive nouns, first of all -- enough reason for calling the sentence complex -- and which has one noun, <u>John</u>, which plays an Agentive role in the subordinate clause, and a Dative role in the main clause. Thus, we may properly say that I MADE JOHN DO HIS HOMEWORK is a complex sentence, and that the <u>make</u> of this sentence is among the verbs including its synonym <u>force</u>, which take sentential complements.

In FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE, however, we see a much different construction. The noun <u>fear</u> in the causative paraphrase bears the same Instrumental relationship to <u>make tremble</u> that it bears to <u>tremble</u> in the simple alternant. The noun <u>John</u> bears the same Locative relationship to <u>make tremble</u> in the causative paraphrase that it bears to <u>tremble</u> in the simple alternant. Therefore, since each categorial relationship occurs <u>once</u> in the simple alternant and <u>once</u> in the causative paraphrase, we must conclude that paraphrastic causatives <u>are simple in their deep structure</u>. Thus, the difference between FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE and JOHN TREMBLED WITH FEAR is one of subject selection. In fact, we can describe all of the paraphrastic causatives we have seen in terms of subject selection.

We say of a sentence like JOHN TREMBLED WITH FEAR that the Instrumental phrase with fear can be made the subject of the sentence if its status is registered in the verb. This registration has three effects: 1) the verb loses its capacity for absorbing the tense, requiring the insertion of make or cause in the Modality constituent; 2) the verb must be filled by a special causative form, which in this case is the infinitive; and 3) the paraphrastic causative sentence may not appear in the passive. (The derivation of FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE and JOHN TREMBLED WITH FEAR is illustrated in the handbook.)

In FEAR MADE JOHN TREMBLE the presence of make is obligatory. We cannot say (16) *FEAR TREMBLED JOHN. Tremble, thus, differs from open and close in (17) THE DOOR OPENED / CLOSED in that it has no simple active congener. But because of its alternation with make tremble, it does occur in sentences with superficial objects. Other verbs that behave like tremble and glisten are faint, flutter, shiver, and sweat. Sentence (18) JOHN FAINTED FROM HUNGER alternates with (19) HUNGER MADE JOHN FAINT; and (20) THE FLAG FLUTTERED IN THE BREEZE alternates with (21) THE BREEZE MADE THE FLAG FLUTTER.

In addition to verbs like these, there are some with simple active congeners which occur obligatorily in paraphrastic form in certain instances. This is the case with the verb wave when it has an Instrumental

subject. We can say (22) JOHN WAVED THE FLAG IN THE

BREEZE, and (23) THE FLAG WAVED IN THE BREEZE, but not

(24) *THE BREEZE WAVED THE FLAG. The paraphrastic

alternant, (25) THE BREEZE MADE THE FLAG WAVE, is obliga-

tory.

There are other verbs for which we may choose either

the simple or the paraphrastic alternant. Recalling

sentences (3) - (5) THE COLD FROZE JOHN, JOHN FROZE FROM

THE COLD, and THE COLD MADE JOHN FREEZE, we note that the

paraphrastic alternant is optional, though it is different

from its simple transitive alternant in what Fillmore has

called semantic focus and what I call configuration

properties. Among the verbs that permit optional alterna-

tion of simple verb and paraphrastic causative are

frighten, scare, distress, and terrify[*] We can say either

---

[*]But note that paraphrastic causative sentences
(with make or cause) always require Instrumental subjects.

---

(26) THE THOUGHT FRIGHTENED ME or (27) THE THOUGHT MADE ME

FRIGHTENED; and we can say either (28) IT DISTRESSED ME

or (29) IT MADE ME DISTRESSED. These verbs, like wave,

freeze, open, and close are inherent causatives. One of

the striking properties of most causative verbs is the

capacity for (optional or obligatory) paraphrase. Frighten

and scare differ from open and wave in that the special

required form of the verb is the participle. Whether

the participle or the infinitive is required depends on

the features of the verb and the selection of the subject.

Again we note that this analysis of <u>make frightened</u>
is based on the fact that in THE THOUGHT FRIGHTENED JOHN
and THE THOUGHT MADE JOHN FRIGHTENED the relationship of
the nouns <u>thought</u> and <u>John</u> to the verb are the same.
Both sentences are alternants of (30) JOHN WAS FRIGHTENED
BY THE THOUGHT; and (31) *JOHN WAS MADE FRIGHTENED BY THE
THOUGHT is ungrammatical.

There are still other types of paraphrastic
causatives, of which I mention only one here: causatives of
the type <u>make happy</u> and <u>make sad</u>. (32) I AM HAPPY / SAD
TO HEAR THAT alternates with (33) IT MAKES ME HAPPY / SAD
TO HEAR THAT; and let me stress the fact that the complexity
of these sentences is due to their clausal Instrument, not
to the presence of paraphrastic <u>make</u>. <u>Sad</u> is interpreted
in these sentences as the obligatory alternant of <u>sadden</u>.
That we can say (34) THE NEWS SADDENED JOHN, but not
(35) *THE NEWS HAPPIED JOHN is an accident of contempo-
rary English. Paraphrastic causatives of this type
may appear in the passive with some types of subjects.
(36) HE WAS MADE SAD BY THE NEWS is a grammatical sen-
tence.

Now, as an illustration that paraphrastic causa-
tives appear as alternants of simple sentences in other
languages, let's turn to some examples in Spanish. We note
that (37) A JUAN LE ENFURECE LA INJUSTICIA alternates
with (38) A JUAN LE PONE FURIOSO LA INJUSTICIA; and

(39) A JUAN LE ENTRISTECIÓ LA NOTICIA alternates with

(40) A JUAN LE PUSO TRISTE LA NOTICIA. (Incidentally,

it should be noted that none of these Spanish sentences

has a passive.) Once again, each categorial relationship

occurs only once in these sentences, and in this fact lies

the explanatory value of this interpretation: a simple

sentence is one in which each of the categorial relation-

ships occurs just once.

Finally, let me note that paraphrastic causa-

tives are not unique in their superficial complexity.

JOHN IS GOOD AT PLAYING TENNIS and JOHN IS A GOOD TENNIS

PLAYER are alternants of JOHN PLAYS TENNIS WELL, and none

of these, in my interpretation, is a complex sentence;

JOHN IS SLOW TO LEARN and JOHN IS A SLOW LEARNER are

alternants of JOHN LEARNS SLOWLY, and none of these is

a complex sentence. JOHN GAVE MARY A BAD SCARE alternates

with JOHN SCARED MARY BADLY; I HAD A BOOK STOLEN FROM ME

alternates with A BOOK WAS STOLEN FROM ME--and none of

these is complex in its deep structure. In fact, to

analyze JOHN IS GOOD AT PLAYING TENNIS as a complex

sentence -- apparently the only analysis permitted in a

subject / object grammar -- is to make it impossible to

account for its paraphrase relationship to JOHN PLAYS

TENNIS WELL. The explanation of these paraphrase and other

alternant relationships obliges us to revise our criteria

for what makes a sentence complex in its deep structure.