

A comparative Study of Verbal Causative constructions in the English and Arabic Languages

Shatha F. Al Ruwaili

Northern Border University

(Received 12/11/2023 ; accepted 19/2/2024)

Abstract: This paper provides an up-to-date review of the linguistics of causative verbs in English and Arabic (MSA). Based on native speaker introspection and a search of standard accounts of English and Arabic grammar, it finds that three basic categories apply similarly to both languages: the division into lexical, syntactic and morphological means of expressing verbal causation. These are illustrated respectively by *kill* and *qatala*; *cause... to eat* and *ṣayyara... ya-aʔūl-u*; *sadden* (from *sad*) and *hazana* (from *hazina* 'to be sad'). However, there is a fourth category (prepositional causative verbs) that arguably applies only to Arabic: e.g. *ʔata-a ... bi-* meaning 'bring'. Furthermore, the subtypes of the morphologically derived causative verbs are very different between the two languages. English favours the use of suffixes and conversion. Arabic favours prefixation along with internal vowel change and consonant gemination. Several avenues for further research are revealed.

Keywords: Arabic (MSA), causative verbs, English, morphology

مقارنة لغوية بين الأفعال السببية في اللغتين: العربية والإنجليزية

شذى فهد الرويلي

جامعة الحدود الشمالية

(قدم للنشر في 2023/11/12م- وقبل للنشر في 2024/2/19م)

المستخلص: يقدم هذا البحث دراسة مقارنة لغوية بين الأفعال السببية في اللغتين: العربية والإنجليزية، وقد أثبتت الدراسة أن هناك ثلاث فئات رئيسية تستخدم في كلا اللغتين للتعبير عن الأفعال السببية: معجمية، نحوية وصرفية. وهناك فئة رابعة تنطبق في اللغة العربية وهي أفعال الجر السببية. علاوة على ذلك يوجد اختلاف كبير بين اللغتين في الأفعال المشتقة صرفياً؛ للتعبير عن الأفعال السببية. فعلى سبيل المثال، تفضل اللغة الإنجليزية استخدام اللواحق والتحويل، على خلاف اللغة العربية تفضل استخدام إضافة السوابق وتغيير حروف العلة الداخلية، وإدغام الحروف ساكنة.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

الأفعال السببية، اللغة الإنجليزية، اللغة العربية الفصحى، الصرف

(*) Corresponding Author:

(*) للمراسلة:



Assistant Professor, Department of Languages and Translation, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Northern Border University, Arar, Saudi Arabia

أستاذ مساعد، قسم اللغات والترجمة، كلية العلوم الإنسانية والاجتماعية، جامعة الحدود الشمالية، عرعر، المملكة العربية السعودية

DOI:10.12816/0061812

e-mail: Shatha.fahad@nbu.edu.sa

1 Introduction

All languages must possess some way of expressing cause-effect relations between entities, properties and events. Understanding, and therefore talking about, such relationships is a fundamental and distinctive human capability.

The literature has distinguished three different types of verbal causative constructions that may be used to express causation (Comrie, 1981; Lehmann, 2016). These types are (i) lexical causatives; (ii) periphrastic/analytic (i.e. syntactic) causatives; and (iii) morphological causatives. According to Khachatryan (2009), in Modern English the notion of cause and effect is found to be expressed in all three ways, so we can use English to introduce them. A lexical causative is formed without inserting any causative affixes or auxiliary verbs, and the root morpheme simply incorporates both the meaning of cause and of the effect that it produces (e.g., English *kill* meaning ‘cause to die’). A morphological causative is where a morphological process, such as adding a suffix to a form which separately indicates the effect carries the causal meaning (e.g. *moisten* meaning ‘cause to become moist’). Periphrastic / syntactic causatives are formed by a construction containing a higher verb with a causal meaning governing a separate word expressing the effect (e.g. *make (someone) late* meaning ‘cause to be late’).

The present paper explores these types in detail comparatively for English and Arabic (MSA). Its research question is therefore:

What similarities and differences are there between standard English and MSA in how verbal causality is expressed?

2 Method

The method followed a longstanding practice in descriptive and theoretical linguistic research and indeed in other domains (Maynes,

2012; Mansurovna et al., 2020). The research design was qualitative and relied predominantly on expert native speaker intuition for each language separately. This came from two sources. First, native speakers were directly represented by the author, as a native speaker of Arabic, and by a retired university teacher from a UK linguistics department, who is a native speaker of English, who was consulted. Second, evidence from many other experts was accessed via a systematic search of prominent publications in the field, including grammar and research articles. This included (but is not limited to) English: Khachatryan (2009, 2012), Biber et al. (1999), Radford (1988), Comrie (1981), and Adams (2017). Rather more sources were used for Arabic since it is less well studied than English. Hence there was an attempt to assemble all relevant references from the last 30 years or so. The following were the main sources in focus: Cowell (2005), Alotaibi (2022), Benmamoun (1991), Glanville (2018), Holes (2003, 2004), Ingham (1994), Noamane (2020), Qafisheh et al (1997), Taha et al (2017), Versteegh et al (2007), Watson (1993), Zibin (2019).

That sample of publications also valuably introduced data gathered directly from the speech and writing of native speakers more widely, which some experts had collected and analysed. Biber et al. (1999), for example, relies on an extensive corpus of authentic US English; Cowell (2005) relied heavily on Arabic texts and recorded conversations that he gathered in Syria. The validity of the present account was improved by the involvement of all these different kinds of sources (both introspective and observational), rather than just one.

The procedure then was that information relevant to verbal causation was collated from these sources and coded for each language, using a

parallel taxonomy of expression types wherever possible. The comparison was then made by the researcher to answer the research question. This last step, comparison, is the main contribution of the present account since it has rarely been attempted before (Gadalla, 1992).

3 Causative verbal constructions in English

3.1 Lexical causatives

These are also known as covert or underived causatives (Khachatryan, 2012). Malt and Wolff (2010) express a causal relation in a single clause that includes “a causer, a causee, and a change of state” (p. 101). For example, in *John delayed me*, John is the causer, *I am* the causee, and the change of state is from being on time to being late. Thus we can paraphrase this as ‘John caused me to become late’. In fact, the mention of a change of state is somewhat limiting since there are similar verbs where that label does not fit very well. For example, in *John brought his new car*, the car changes position rather than state (it is *caused to come* from a distant location to near the speaker). Later, we will see examples where actions rather than changes are caused.

Lexical causative verbs express the causative meaning based on their lexical or semantic meaning and they are not formally derived from any other verbs. In other words, the predicate in a lexical causative inherently expresses the causative meaning and is morphologically unmarked for causativity. The examples in this section are termed lexical because there is no morphological connection between the cause words and the effect words, e.g. between *delay* and *late* or between *bring* and *come*. Other examples are *kill* (cf. *die*, *dead*) and *teach* (cf. *learn*, *know*).

Lexical causative constructions are deemed to be syntactically mono-clausal in that they contain only one grammatical predicate (the main verb) and at least two arguments, where normally the subject is the causer (agent) and the object is the causee (patient). Thus they are transitive and in the passive, the causee becomes the subject and the causer appears in a *by* phrase and may be omitted: *I was delayed (by John)*. Other lexical causatives allow further arguments, e.g. *John gave me a new jacket* where John causes the jacket to become mine.

3.2 Periphrastic causatives

These constitute another way to express a verbal causative construction, which is always in principle available. This type contains a complex phrase. It is composed of two clauses and two predicates. There are the higher/main and lower/embedded clauses, and the two predicates/verbs, where the first one is associated with the cause, and the second one is associated with the result/effect (Radford, 1988). Comrie (1981) states that “The prototypical case of the analytic causative is where there are separate predicates expressing the notion of causation and the predicate of the effect, as in English examples like *I caused John to go* or *I brought it about that John went*, where there are separate predicates *cause* or *bring it about* (cause) and *go* (effect)” (p. 167).

In English quite a wide range of common verbs are regarded as causal in meaning and occur in the main clause in this construction, e.g. *make*, *cause*, *force*, *require*, and *have* (as in *I had the room painted* meaning that I caused someone to paint the room). Others are causal in a weaker sense of permission or assistance rather than requirement: *allow*, *let*, *help*, *enable* (Biber, et al., 1999: p363).

3.3 Morphological causatives

Here there is a relationship between the causative verb and a base which it is derived from. The immediate base commonly expresses the effect meaning and the morphological process typically carries the causal meaning. The morphological causative verb is in English derived from a base by a range of morphological means, including adding a prefix (e.g. *enlarge* ‘make large’), or suffix (e.g. *whiten* ‘make white’), or by changing a vowel in the base (sometimes termed ablaut) (e.g. *fill* ‘make full’), or by a process with no visible morphological form often called conversion or recategorization (e.g. *open* ‘cause to open’). However, often morphological causatives in English exhibit more than one of these processes and/or can be analysed as having a synchronic derivational history of more than one step.

3.3.1 Affixation

English has a number of quite productive suffixes which make causative transitive verbs (e.g. *-en*, *-ify*, *-ate*, *-ize*). Examples of prefixation are fewer (e.g. *en-*). In a few examples we see both prefixes and suffixes: *embolden* means ‘make someone bolder’. The most productive suffix is *-ize* as in *actualize*, *liquidize*, *decimalize*, *commercialize*, *humanize*, etc. With *-en* we have *whiten*, *soften*, *harden*, *widen*, etc. Straightforward examples with *-ate* and *-ify* are harder to find but include *validate*, *activate*, *intensify*, and *easify*. Several features are shared by these processes which make the picture more complicated.

First, often the derived word has not only a transitive causative meaning but also an intransitive ‘anticausative’ meaning as the verb for the corresponding effect. E.g. *soften* has the meaning of both ‘cause to soften’ and the process to ‘become soft’. *Intensify* can be used both as a causative *The strong wind intensified the cold* and

anticausative *The cold intensified*. The current name ‘anticausative’ for these latter verbs seems to be replacing former terms such as inchoative and unaccusative. It does not however mean that the two verbs have opposite meanings. It seems rather to reflect that the object of the causative corresponds to the subject of the anticausative. That does not mean that the anticausative has the same meaning as the passive of the causative, however. The causative, even in the passive, always implies the existence of some agent even if unstated, while the anticausative does not: *The fighting was intensified (by...the enemy? the bombing?...)* versus *The fighting intensified*.

A common pattern then is that we often (but by no means always) find trios of morphologically related words where the causative in its definition mentions the anticausative and the anticausative mentions a noun or adjective which effectively denotes an outcome state. E.g. *soften* (transitive), *soften* (intransitive), *soft* (state adj.) or *activate* ‘make active’, *activate* ‘become active’, *active*. Theorists who favour morphology formulated in rules that make one form from another, therefore, would propose that what we see here is two derivational steps: first the anticausative verb being made from the noun or adjective by affixation, and then the causative verb being made from the anticausative by conversion (see 3.3.3).

However, problems arise from gaps where the full sequences do not exist or have idiomatic variation in meaning (see below). Furthermore, some scholars would prefer one step analyses, where the causative is seen as directly derived from the relevant state: “A large number of transitive verbs are morphologically related to intransitive “adjectival” verbs” (Lyons, 1968: 361). In this view, in English, *Our industry is modern* (state) →

We modernized our industry (causative) in one derivational step (in contrast with our two-step suggestion above where we see the derivational history as *Our industry is modern* (state) → *Our industry modernised* (anticausative) → *We modernized our industry* (causative)).

A second issue is that many derived causatives and anticausatives are formed on bases of Greco-Latin origin that do not exist separately, e.g. *magnify* (no state adjective *magn* meaning ‘big’), *agitate*, *humiliate*, *emphasize*, *pacify*. Those bases do however usually recur in other derived words and have the corresponding meaning (e.g. *emphasis*, *emphatic*).

Third, even where the base exists, very often there are peculiarities of the form (irregularity) and/or the meaning (idiomaticity) of words in those trios. For example, *customize* does not mean to make something become a custom but to make something suit a particular customer; we find *automate* where for the meaning **automaticate* might be expected; *ratify* has no meaning of the type ‘cause someone to become a rat’.

3.3.2 Vowel change

In Germanic languages, including English, there is a shared history of some morphemes being marked by vowel changes within the base rather than, or as well as, by addition of anything before or after it. Only a few survive today, e.g. in irregular plurals like *man-men*, and as markers of irregular verb tenses e.g. *drive-drove*. Historically, these are variously due to different features termed Umlaut and Ablaut by 19th century German linguists. Just a few instances are found in causatives (and corresponding anticausatives), such as *fill* (‘make full’, ‘become

full’) and combined with suffixes as in *lengthen* (‘make long’, ‘become long’) and *strengthen*.

3.3.3 Conversion

This ‘zero marked derivation’ crossing boundaries between a part of speech categories (or in the present case, a major part of speech subclasses, transitive and intransitive) is very common in English (Adams, 2017). As we began to see above, it can in the two-step analysis be regarded as making causative verbs from anticausative ones which label the corresponding effect: *intensify* (trans, causative) ← *intensify* (intrans, anticausative) (← *intense* (state adj)). It can also be seen sometimes making the anticausative from the noun/adjective base: e.g. *open* (causative) ← *open* (anticausative) ← *open* (state, adjective).

However, the points made earlier about irregularity apply again. For example, although *break* exists as an anticausative and also as a causative, not all the meanings of each match up. We have *He broke the cup* and *The cup broke*; we even have *They broke the news* and *The news broke*; but alongside *He broke his promise* we do not have **His promise broke*. Furthermore, we can find examples of causatives of this type that go beyond the ‘change of state or position’ characterisation of the effect/anticausative that we began with above. In *John ran the engine, listening for faults* the engine is caused to run but does not really change its state or position, There is simply an action that is caused.

4 Causative verbal constructions in Arabic

Causative verbal constructions in Arabic can also be constructed either **lexically**, **syntactically (periphrasis)** or **morphologically**. According to Hallman (2008), in Arabic “the

causative form is semantically, syntactically, and typically morphologically additive” (p. 2).

As we saw above for the causative and non-causative in English, in Arabic also, semantically, a non-causative verb form can have a causative verb counterpart which possesses an extra argument not present with the non-causative verb form. Syntactically, it is again commonly assumed that derivation is of the causative from the non-causative (not the other way around), and there is a change in the argument structure of the causative construction. The derived causative verb form requires a change in the argument structure of the construction with which it is associated in syntactic structure. The derived causative verb form licenses the causer as an additional new participant which is not licensed or present with the non-derived and non-causative basic verb form. The new argument functions as the subject.

Saad (2019) describes that in more grammatical terms, saying that all intransitive verbs, which have no object, are causativizable and then take one direct object or involve a preposition. The same noun functions as the subject of the intransitive verb, and as an object of the causative.

(1)

- a. al-*dīʔ*b-u qatala al-*māʕiz*-a
DEF-wolf-NOM kill.PFV.3SGM DEF-goat-ACC
The wolf killed the goat.

MSA: Alotaibi (2022, p. 1179)

- b. fataha l-walad-u l-bāb-a
open.PFV.3SGM DEF-boy-NOM DEF-door-ACC
The boy opened the door.

MSA: Alsulami (2018, p. 53)

Saad (2019) further classifies causative verbs in Arabic into two classes (aside from purely lexical examples): overt and covert. The first type, the non-covert, is related to periphrastic/syntactic causatives, whereas the non-overt comprises both morphological derived causative verbs and prepositionally derived causatives.

4.1 Lexical Causatives

MSA is similar to other languages in expressing some causatives by a lexical verb. The lexical causative predicate verb expresses the causative relation lexically in a single clause including both causer (agent) and causee (patient) and a change of state within one morphologically simple word.

In 1a, the subject *al-dīʔb-u* ‘wolf’ is the causer which causes the object causee *al-māʕiz-a* ‘the goat’ to be killed. The same applies in example 1b where the subject *l-walad-u* ‘the boy’ causes the object causee to be opened.

4.2 *Periphrastic/ Analytic Causatives*

Analytical or syntactic causatives constitute another way of expressing causative relations. As in English, the sentence includes two separate lexical verbs or lexical predicates occurring in different clauses, where one is describing the causing and the other the caused event or change of state. The causative verbs (2)

- a. *ṣayyara* *zayd-un* *salim-an* *ya-aʔūl-u.* *al-tamr-a*
 make.PFV.3SGM *zayd-NOM* *salem-ACC* 3-eat.IPFV.SGM DEF-dates-ACC

Zayd made Salem eat the dates.

MSA: Alotaibi (2022, p. 1179)

- b. *ḡaʕala* *zayd-un* *salim-an* *ya-aʔūl-u* *al-tamr-a*
 make.PFV.3SGM *zayd-NOM* *salem-ACC* 3-eat.IPFV.SGM DEF-dates-ACC

Zayd made Salem eat the dates.

MSA: Alotaibi (2022, p. 1188)

4.3 *Morphological Causatives*

While the account of the first two types of causative in Arabic above runs closely parallel to that for those types in English, there are big differences when it comes to morphological causatives. The causative verb form in MSA is marked morphologically in three different ways as will be shown next: vowel change/ablaut; consonant gemination; and prefixation of the glottal stop /ʔa/. Of those, the first two are within the root.

There are no suffixes or zero conversions in the derivation of causative verbs, such as were widely seen in English. Furthermore, Arabic is widely analysed in a one-step approach where causatives are seen as derived directly from

occupy the main clause and the other lexical verb is in the subordinate/ complement clause (2). For the higher clause, Saad (2019) lists the verbs *ḡaʕala* ‘to make’, *taraka* ‘to let’, *samaħa* ‘to allow’, *ʔargama ʕala* ‘to force’, *tasababa fi* ‘to cause’ and refers to them as ‘hypercausative’ and matrix causative verbs that are used in the analytical causative (p. 81).

anticausatives/inchoatives, e.g. *ʕazuma* ‘become important’ → *ʕazzama* ‘make important’, or from states, e.g. *ħazina* ‘to be sad’ → *ħazana* ‘to make s.o. sad’, or other possible sources. In addition, the Arabic causative verb and its corresponding non-causative always differ in surface form in Arabic (except for the prepositional type 4.4) while in English they very often look the same but of course differ in their surrounding grammatical construction.

4.3.1 Vowel change / Ablaut

Williams (2001) states that “In the Semitic languages, vowel-change is a predominant mode of word-formation and word-inflexion” (p.8). This type of causative is marked by vowel change/substitution by ablaut of the stem vowel. As Fasold and Connor-Linton (2014) stated, and as

go.PFV.3sgm DEF-child-
nom
The child went out.

b. ?-axraġa r-raġul-u l-walad-a
go.caus.PFV.3SGM DEF-man-NOM DEF-child-ACC
The man made the child go out. Fehri: MSA (2001, p. 11)

(5)

a. daħika řamran
laugh.PFV.3SGM Amr
Amr laughed.

Saad: MSA (2019, p.33)

b. řađħaka zaydun řamran
go.caus.PFV.3SGM Zayd-NOM Amr
Zayd made Amr laugh.

Saad: MSA (2019, p.33)

The following example (6b) further illustrates a causative derived by glottal prefixing directly from a state. It also shows that glottal prefixation may be

accompanied by other changes to the vowel in the root.

(6)

a. ahmad-u ġaniy-un
ahmad-NOM rich.SGM-nom
Ahmad is rich.

Gadalla: MSA (1992, p. 9)

b. řa-ġna-a Allah-u Ahmad-a
be-rich.caus.PFV.3SGM Allah-NOM Ahmad-ACC
God caused Ahmad to be rich.

Gadalla: MSA (1992, p.10)

4.3.3 Gemination

Morphological causatives in MSA can further be realised by a morphological stem modification through the reduplication of the

middle root consonant, i.e. by lengthening the second segment.

This type of causative construction, just like the other morphological types above, requires a change in the argument structure of the base verb, where the causer must be represented as a new participant in this sort of structure. This makes

other changes in the syntactic functions where the causer functions as the subject, and the causee performs a different grammatical function (8).

Notably, Saad (2019) shows that while all intransitive verbs are causativizable, most (8)

a. darasa ʔaxī al-tārīxa
 study.PFV.3SGM brother-1SG.GEN DEF-history
 My brother studied history

b. darrastu ʔaxī al-tārīxa
 study.caus.PFV-1SG brother-1SG.GEN DEF-history

I taught my brother history
 Saad: MSA (2019, p.33)

4.4 *Prepositionally derived causatives*

These causatives arise only in quite limited instances, such as the causing of a change of position in the examples below. They do not involve morphology, but a special meaning of certain non-causative verb + preposition constructions. The form of the construction is quite familiar in English and many languages but would carry a causative meaning only pragmatically. In Arabic, these have taken on the status of conventional means of expressing verbal causation (Saad, 1982).

(9)

a. ʔata-a l-walad-u
 come.PFV.3SGM DEF-boy-NOM
 The boy came.

b. ʔata-a Ahmad-u bi-l-walad-u

transitive verbs are noncausativizable (except by periphrasis, 3.2). However, there are a few transitive verbs that have a causative formed by gemination (8b). While the source form takes only one object, the derived transitive verbs take two objects in the accusative form.

Thus, for example, in English, one can say *Ahmad came with the boy*, and in many circumstances, it might be reasonable to derive an implicature that Ahmad brought the boy, i.e., in some sense, caused the boy to come. However, it is also possible that the boy was a young Crown Prince and Ahmad was a humble assistant, in which case we would understand that they came together but any causation probably came from the boy. In English, therefore, the causation is determined only pragmatically. In Arabic, however, some argue that this construction unequivocally locates causation in the agent named as the subject, so that the verb+prepositional construction is a fourth type of causative (9b, 10b, 11b).

come.caus.PFV.3SGM Ahmad-NOM with-DEF-boy-GEN
 Ahmad brought the boy.
 Gadalla: MSA (1992, pp.68-69)

(10)

a. xara ġ-at il-bint-u
 go.PFV-3SGF DEF-girl-NOM
 The girl went out.

b. xara ġ-at Hind-u il-bint-i
 go.PFV-3SGF Hind-NOM with-DEF-girl-GEN
 Hind took the girl out.
 Gadalla: MSA (1992, p.69)

(11)

a. ġāʔa ʔamrun
 go.PFV.3SGM Amr-NOM
 Amr came.
 Saad: MSA (2019, p.33)

b. ġāʔa zaydun bi-ʔamrin
 go.PFV.3SGM Zayd-NOM with-DEF-Amr-GEN
 Zayd brought Amr.
 Saad: MSA (2019, p.33)

5 Conclusion

This paper brings together in section 4 all the widely recognised types of causative verbal construction in MSA within a framework that enables them to then be compared with the account of English causatives (section 3) to produce an answer to the research question (end of section 2). It therefore adds to the only comparable existing contrastive account that we uncovered (Gadalla,

1992). The answer to the research question must be as follows. At a broad level of classification, both languages are the same in the sense that they both exhibit lexical, syntactic, and morphological means of expressing causative verbal meaning, as is indeed often found around the world: Comrie, 1981. At a more fine-grained level, however, they differ considerably in two main ways.

First, our account shows that there is possibly a fourth form of causative expression used in Arabic in a way not paralleled in English: the prepositional causative. This is not mentioned in many accounts of Arabic causatives and constitutes an interesting additional option in the world context (Comrie, 1988). Second, it also demonstrates that while English and Arabic are similar in their use of lexical and syntactic/periphrastic causatives, they are rather different in what morphological mechanisms they use. Whereas English tends to rely mostly on suffixes and on changes of word class without any kind of affix or change of form to mark it (conversion), Arabic tends to rely on prefixation and changes of vowels and consonants within the base.

Our survey also draws attention to several interesting avenues for further research. These include the following. First, in Arabic there was no space to explore the interplay between the three morphological subtypes of causative in Arabic (glottal prefix, consonant gemination, and ablaut) and the standard classification of Arabic verbs into ten or so Forms (Cowell, 2005). While some forms, such as Form II, are fundamentally causative (in that case using consonant gemination e.g. *kattaba*), other Forms are not and may or may not form causatives in various ways, probably with limitations that are not fully understood.

Second, it began to emerge that some morphological types of causative both in English and Arabic tend to favour verbs with particular types of meaning, such as causing a change of state, a change of position, or causing an action (Fehri, 2001). E.g. Arabic prefixation accommodates causes of actions which have an

intransitive agent but ablaut forms do not. Again these connections need further exploration and any parallels with English explored. For example, can this be connected with the English tendency to express causation of an action with *-ate* (e.g. *activate*) and of a change of state with *-ize* (e.g. *modernize*) (Adams, 2017)?

Third, in English there are differences of opinion about what precise words or morphemes constitute the sources from which causative verbs are morphologically derived, e.g. does *open* meaning 'cause to open' derive from the verb *open* meaning 'become open' or direct from the adjectival state (*be*) *open*? Such issues arise also in Arabic but seem less pursued in that context. They include the matter of whether or not all causatives are derived from a basic, formless trilateral root, a string of three consonants with no specified short vowels, or from certain complete words containing vowel choices (Noamane, 2018).

The overall implication of the above is then that the verbal expression of causation remains a research area with numerous interesting further avenues to explore, both within Arabic and contrastively with English. The present study is offered as a contribution to that enterprise.

References

- Adams, V. (2017). *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. Routledge.
- Alotaibi, Y. (2022). Causative constructions in modern standard Arabic. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 12(3), 46–57.
- Alsulami, A. S. (2018). *Comparative Constructions in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA): An HPSG approach*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Essex.

- Benmamoun, E. (1991). Causatives in Moroccan Arabic. *Perspectives in Arabic Linguistics III*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins 173–195.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., and Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Comrie, B. (1981). Causative constructions. *Language universals and Linguistic Typology*, 158–177.
- Cowell, M. W. (2005). *A reference grammar of Syrian Arabic with audio CD: (Based on the dialect of Damascus)*. Georgetown University Press.
- Erwin, W. M. (2004). *A basic course in Iraqi Arabic: With audio MP3 files*, Volume 1. Georgetown University Press.
- Fasold, R. W. and J. Connor-Linton (2014). *An introduction to language and linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fassi Fehri, A. (1987). *Anticausatives in Arabic, causativity and affectedness*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fehri, A. F. (2001). Causativity, Transitivity, and Iterativity as Pluralities. *Linguistic Research* 6(1), 9-79.
- Ford, D. C. (2009). The three forms of Arabic causative. *OPAL* 2, 1–10.
- Gadalla, H (1992). *Causative-Transitivity in English and Arabic: A Contrastive Study* [Master's thesis, Qena - Assiut University,].
- Glanville, P. J. (2018). *The lexical semantics of the Arabic verb*. Oxford University Press.
- Hallman, P. (2008). Causativity and transitivity in Arabic. Retrieved May 6.
- Holes, C. (2003). *Gulf Arabic*. Routledge.
- Holes, C. (2004). *Modern Arabic: Structures, functions, and varieties*. Georgetown University Press.
- Ingham, B. (1994). *Najdi Arabic: Central Arabian*, Volume 1. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Khachatryan, R. (2009). Ways of expressing causation in Modern English. *Armenian Folia Anglistika* 5(1-2 (6)), 125–133.
- Khachatryan, R. (2012). Lexical causatives in Modern English: On classification of “kill-verbs”. *Armenian Folia Anglistika* 8(1-2 (10)), 91–98.
- Lehmann, C. (2016). Latin causativization in typological perspective. *Latinitatis rationes: Descriptive and historical accounts for the Latin language*, 917–943.
- Malt, B. and P. Wolff (2010). *Words and the mind: How words capture human experience*. Oxford University Press.
- Mansurovna, A.D., Muhammadjonovna, N.S. and Kyzy, A.N.Y. (2020). The role of introspection and intuition in linguistic research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business, Arts and Science (IJARBAS.COM)*, 2(3), 44 – 54.
- Maynes, J. (2012). Linguistic intuition and calibration. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 35(5), 443-460.
- Noamane, A. (2018). Morphological causatives in Moroccan Arabic: Word-based or root-based? *Asinag* (13), 217–240.
- Noamane, A. (2020). The morphophonology of Moroccan Arabic derived causatives. *Macrolinguistics* 8(2), 1–27.
- Qafisheh, H. A., T. Buckwalter, and E. N. McCarus (1997). *NTC's gulf Arabic-English dictionary*. NTC Publishing Group Chicago.
- Radford, A. (1988). *Transformational grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..
- Saad, G. N. (2019). *Transitivity Causation & Passivization: A semantic-syntactic study of the verb in classical Arabic*. Routledge.
- Taha, M., F. Sultan, and S. Yasin (2017). The morphosyntax of causative construction in Sudanese Arabic. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 25(2), 419–428.
- Versteegh, K. et al. eds (2007). *Encyclopedia of Arabic language and linguistics*. Leiden: *EJ Brill* 2.
- Watson, J. C. (1993). *A syntax of S. an⁻an⁻i Arabic*, Volume 13. Otto Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Williams, J. (2001). *The Development of Celtic Linguistics, 1850-1900: Gomer, parts 1 and 2*, Volume 3. Taylor & Francis.
- Zibin, A. (2019). The causative–anticausative alternation in Jordanian Arabic (JA). *Lingua* 220, 43–64.