Article

Language & Linguistics 語言暨語言學

Language and Linguistics
16(3) 369–395

DOI: 10.1177/1606822X15569164
lin.sagepub.com

SAGE

Profiling Hakka *Bun*[1] Causative Constructions*

Huei-ling Lai

National Chengchi University

This paper proposes that a family of four related constructions is needed to provide a more complete account for the syntactic and semantic generalizations and idiosyncrasies of the *bun*[1] causative constructions in Hakka by examining the features of CAUSER, CAUSEE, and EFFECT. The traditional claim of semantic entailment as a crucial feature of causation is argued to be too restrictive; pragmatic strengthening is argued to capture the dominant distribution of cause–act functions. In addition, in contrast to what is expected by the prototypical iconic sequencing of the participants in a causal chain, the sequence of a causing event and a resulting event from authentic data is shown to reveal a ground–figure asymmetry. The highlighting of the resulting event for information management is done by linguistic strategies such as topicalization or left-dislocation of CAUSEE and suppression of CAUSER. Such linguistic arrangements are speculated to prepare causative *bun*[1] for undergoing further grammaticalization into the passive function.

Key words: causation, cause–act, cause–result, figure–ground, Hakka *bun*[1], purpose

1. Introduction

Heine & Kuteva (2002:152) show that the conceptual development from GIVE to CAUSATIVE has been attested cross-linguistically, as illustrated by Thai (*hâj* 'give' > causative complementizer), Vietnamese (*cho* 'give' > permissive/causative complementizer), Khmer (*qaoy* 'give' > causative complementizer with sentential object), Luo (*miyo* 'give' > causative auxiliary), Somali (*siin* 'give' > *-siin* causative suffix), and Siroi (*t-* 'give' > causative auxiliary). In line with the claim of the grammaticalization path, Yap & Iwasaki's (2003) study of certain East and Southeast Asian languages, Chappell & Peyraube's (2006) study of modern Southern Min, and Lai's (2001) study of Hakka have also found a similar schematized cline for the development from a verb of giving to a causative verb at an earlier stage on the path of the further development of a causative verb into a passive marker.[1] Newman's investigation of three-place predicates advocates that the prevalence of such cognitive and linguistic development from 'give' to causation is by no means accidental, given the close semantic association between the meaning of giving and that of causation,

* This study is based partly on research project NSC 100-2410-H-004-185-MY2. Thanks go to Shih-min Li for collecting some of the data and references on the earlier drafts of the study. My thanks are also extended to the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions. I am, of course, responsible for possible remaining errors.

[1] The further conceptual development from GIVE to PASSIVE has been extensively discussed in the literature (e.g. Chang 2006; Chappell & Peyraube 2006; Chappell et al. 2007; Norman 1982; Sun 1996; Xu 1994; Yap & Iwasaki 2003, among others). Detailed discussions on this point will be left for future research, however.

'whereby the structure of a transfer event in the source domain, involving a giver, a recipient, and a thing given, is mapped onto the structure of a causative event in the target domain, involving a CAUSER, CAUSEE, and a caused event' (Newman 2005:158). However, despite the numerous studies of the development of the verb of giving from giving to causation, the insights gained by research have not been effective in investigating the linguistic manifestations of the concept of causation. While the grammaticalized extension is well-established, the linguistic manifestation of causation presents a wide array of syntactic and semantic complexities in different languages. The cognitive salience assumed in prototypical causation models, the billiard-ball causation model, the direct manipulation model, and the iconic sequencing of the participants, does not necessarily coincide with linguistic frequency when corpus data are examined (Gilquin 2007). For instance, da Silva's (2007) analysis of verbs of letting demonstrates that the concept of letting in itself is a complex conceptual category that encompasses several semantic notions.

When it comes to the Hakka *bun*[1] construction, discrepancies in definitions and classifications of causation have arisen in previous studies (see Chiang 2006; Huang 2005; Lai 2001; Lin 1990). If we zoom at the grammaticalized cline the portion of causative-related usages of Hakka *bun*[1] constructions, we shall find that the meaning of causation is quite complicated. The intriguing linguistic behaviors exhibited by empirical data need to be more carefully teased out to better our understanding of the complex category of causation, in particular when usage-driven corpus data taken from larger contexts are examined. Moreover, while a strong affinity exists between causation and purpose, as has been evidenced cross-linguistically in Song (1996), among others, more careful attention still needs to be paid to the nature of their intricate relations, as exhibited by examples of *bun*[1] constructions.

To illustrate, consider the following Hakka *bun*[1] examples, which all convey a flavor of causation, but also, at the same time, demonstrate two syntactic configurations—[NP1 *BUN* NP2 VP2] or [NP1 VP1]-*BUN*-[NP2 VP2].[2,3] The causation delivers different nuances of meaning: in example (1), an animate NP1 gives permission to NP2 to perform a certain action; in example (2), a causing event is performed by NP1 with the purpose of providing NP2 with money to carry out a certain action; in example (3), a causing event which is performed by NP1 indirectly causes a change in the psychological status of NP2; and in example (4), a natural event brings about an impact on an inanimate NP2 to be sunk into the water.

---

[2] The data used in this study come from Hakka in Taiwan. According to the data from the Council for Hakka Affairs (客委會) in Taiwan, there were approximately 5,877,000 Hakka people in Taiwan, about 25.6% of the total population. Phonological and morphological differences can be observed between various sub-dialects including Northern Sixian Hakka (北四縣), Southern Sixian Hakka (南四縣), Hailu Hakka (海陸), Dapu Hakka (大埔), Zhaoan Hakka (詔安), and Raoping Hakka (饒平).

[3] The Hakka data presented in this paper are mainly based on Sixian, Hailu, and Dapu Hakka dialects taken from a Hakka Corpus (including The NCCU Corpus of Spoken Hakka 政大客語口語語料庫, http://140.119.172.200/, and written materials including *Miaoli Hakka Stories I–II* 苗栗縣客語故事集一～二, *Dongshi Hakka Stories I–VI* 東勢鎮客語故事集一～六, Stories found in *Hakka Monthly Magazine* 客家雜誌 Issues 65–228, *Stories of Touqian River* 頭前溪个故事, and the novel *Thoughts under Tung Flowers* 油桐花下个思念).

(1) 阿叔姆定著會分你討細婆[4]
a^{1}*sug*^{4}*me*^{1} *tin*^{3}*cog*^{8} *voi*^{3} *bun*^{1} *ng*^{5} *to*^{2} *se*^{3}*po*^{5}
aunt definitely will BUN 2SG marry concubine
'Mother will definitely let you marry a concubine.'

(2) 佢捉魚仔賣，賺錢分吾老公讀書
ngai^{5} *zog*^{4} *ng*^{5}*-e*^{2} *mai*^{3} *con*^{3}*qien*^{5} *bun*^{1} *nga*^{1} *lo*^{2}*gung*^{1} *tug*^{8}*su*^{1}
1SG catch fish-SF sell make money BUN 1SG.POSS husband study
'I caught fish to sell so as to make money for my husband to go study.'

(3) 阿文摎阿英都盡增志，無分阿姆失望
a^{1}*-vun*^{5} *lau*^{1} *a*^{1}*-in*^{1} *du*^{3} *qin*^{3} *zen*^{3}*zii*^{3} *mo*^{5} *bun*^{1} *a*^{1}*-mei*^{1} *siid*^{4}*mong*^{3}
A-vun and A-in both very hard-working NEG BUN mother disappointed
'A-vun and A-in are both working hard, not letting their mother down.'

(4) 響雷公，落大雨，該頭樹就分佢沉到水肚去
hiong^{2}*lui*^{5}*gung*^{1} *log*^{8}*tai*^{3}*i*^{2} *ge*^{3} *teu*^{5} *su*^{3} *qiu*^{3} *bun*^{1} *gi*^{5} *ciim*^{5}
thunder rain heavily that CF tree EMP BUN 3SG sink
do^{3} *sui*^{2} *du*^{2} *hi*^{3}
LOC water in go
'It thundered and rained heavily, making that tree sink into the water.'

My aim in this study is, then, threefold. First, a taxonomy will be provided for the classification of Hakka *bun*^{1} constructions after a finer-grained examination of the linguistic components. Crucially, there needs to be a more in-depth investigation into the interaction of the *bun*^{1} construction and the lexical semantics in order to capture the syntactic and semantic complexities. A perspective that serves better to account for the intriguing complexities as exhibited by Hakka causative *bun*^{1} constructions is that of the constructional approach (Goldberg 1995, 2006; Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004, among others). The constructional approach takes a usage-based viewpoint and holds that the meaning of language is derived from the context in which it arises. It recognizes form and meaning as parts of each grammatical element rather than as separate components of the grammar. Both generalizations and idiosyncrasies are involved in each of the sub-classes of *bun*^{1} constructions. The notion of such sub-classes as comprising a family of related constructions can better capture their syntactic and semantic distributions. Second, when Hakka corpus data are examined, it will be seen

[4] The Chinese characters and the Romanization system in this paper are rendered as in the Taiwan Hakka Dictionary of Frequently Used Words (臺灣客家話常用詞辭典 http://hakka.dict.edu.tw/) pronounced in 2008 and the Taiwan Sixian Hakka Romanization System proclaimed by the National Languages Committee, Ministry of Education (教育部國語推行委員會) in 2009. The following grammatical abbreviations are used: BUN, the morpheme *bun*^{1}; 1/2/3SG, first, second, third person pronoun; CL, classifier; EMP, emphatic marker; LAU, the morpheme *lau*^{1} as a commutative maker; LOC, locative marker; NEG, negation marker; POSS, genitive marker; NOM, nominative marker; PRT, particle; SF, suffix. Tone numbers are used to represent the pitch values in the examples: 1, rising; 2, falling; 3, high level; 4, short low; 5, low level; 8, short high.

that the permissive-type and the purposive-type causatives together outnumber the coercive-type and the non-preventive-type causatives together. The association between permission, purpose, and result needs to be more clearly spelled out. Third, authentic data within a larger discourse indicates that, contrary to what is expected by the prototypical sequence of the participants in an action chain, the causing event often is not explicitly expressed. In addition, contrary to the view usually maintained in the existing literature, according to which the resulting event is deemed as a subordinate clause denoting a result or a purpose, the information conveyed by the causing event and the resulting event is not symmetric, the pragmatic function of the two events exhibiting ground–figure asymmetry. The often-found structural strategies, such as gapping of the causing event, omission of the CAUSER, and topicalization or left dislocation of the CAUSEE, serve to manage the information flow in a larger discourse. This paper claims that such a display of linguistic elements is a precursory stage for further grammaticalization from causative to passive, a development that has been well attested in the extant literature. Following the Introduction, §2 presents the previous analyses of Hakka *bun*[1], thus providing the background to the current study. Section 3 presents previous studies on causation and purpose. Section 4 presents the four types of constructions. Section 5 examines the pragmatic function of the construction in actual usage, and §6 concludes the study.

2. Previous analyses of Hakka *bun*[1]

The morpheme *bun*[1] in Hakka carries multiple functions—a verb denoting the sense of giving, a goal marker, a causative marker, and a passive marker, as illustrated in the following examples from Lai (2001:139, (1a)–(1f)).[5]

(5) a. 佢分一枝筆俚
gi bun yi gi bid ngai
he BUN one CL pen me
'He gave a pen to me.'

b. 佢分俚一枝筆
gi bun ngai yi gi bid
he BUN me one CL pen
'He gave me a pen.'

c. 佢送一枝筆分俚
gi sung yi gi bid bun ngai
he give one CL pen BUN me
'He gave a pen to me.'

d. 佢帶東西分狗仔食
gi dai dung-xi bun geu-e sid
he bring thing BUN dog eat
'He brought food for the dog to eat.'

[5] The Chinese characters are added onto the Hakka examples in Lai (2001) for consistency in presentation.

e. 佢會分俚去台北
gi voi bun ngai hi toibed
he would BUN me go Taipei
'He would let me go to Taipei.'

f. 佢分俚打
gi bun ngai da
he BUN me beat
'He was beaten by me.'

With regard to the polysemous phenomena exhibited by *bun*[1], Lai (2001) argues that the dative alternations illustrated by (5a) and (5b) give rise to two grammaticalized clines—one from a verb-of-giving (5a) to a goal maker (5c) and then to a clause-linking complementizer (5d), and the other from a verb-of-giving (5b) to a causative verb (5e) and then to an agent marker (5f).[6]

While Lai's (2001) study provides a significant insight into the interconnection between the different functional domains of *bun*[1], there are two issues which can be further investigated. First, examples (5d) and (5e) demonstrate a conceptual similarity, the former denoting a purpose and the latter denoting a causative usage. Schmidtke-Bode (2009) points out that the causative sense and the purposive sense are often denoted by one lexical item in various languages, due to the great conceptual overlapping of the two notions of causation and purpose. The usage of *bun*[1] in Hakka illustrates such a case. In addition, Wierzbicka (1998:184) demonstrates that cause is a simpler notion than purpose since, conceptually speaking, purpose contains cause as a semantic primitive. The parallelism between the conceptual structures embodied in possession and control motivates the co-existence of the giving sense and the causative sense, and there is often a purpose behind the action of giving someone the permission to do something (see Newman 1996, 1998). Such relatedness between concepts deserves further investigation. Second, with more authentic data from a corpus, the concept of causation manifests more linguistic complexities than those exhibited by (5d) and (5e). Such complexities also deserve an in-depth investigation. The two tasks will be tackled in §4. In particular, various types of causation will be teased out according to the various grammatical elements in causative *bun*[1] constructions.

3. Previous studies on causation and purpose

Comrie (1981) declares that any causative situation involves two component situations: the cause and its EFFECT (result). A three-way typological distinction is commonly used to classify causative forms—the lexical, the morphological, and the syntactic (analytic or periphrastic)—as illustrated by the following English examples, respectively.

(6) a. The landslide *caused* the bridge *to collapse*.
b. The man *killed* my dog.
c. The skirt was *shortened*.

[6] Chiang (2006) has a similar argument regarding the polygrammaticalization of *bun*[1] in the Dapu dialect of Dongshi.

The causative expression in (6a) is indicated by a sequence of two separate verbs *caused to collapse*; in (6b), where the sense of causation is included in the basic semantic content of the verb *killed*; and in (6c), where the causative expression is derived through affixation as in *shortened*.[7]

In Kroeger (2004), morphological causatives in a number of languages are investigated, with a focus in particular on the patterns for expressing the CAUSEE and its syntactic realization under the lexical-functional approach. The study divides the semantics of causative constructions into several types. The following examples from Kroeger (2004:204ff, (32)–(34)) are chosen for illustration; the examples in (7) are of analytic causation and those in (8) and (9) are of lexical causation.

(7) a. The captain caused his boat to sink (by drilling holes in the bottom).
b. The captain caused his boat to sink (by allowing too many passengers to come aboard).

(8) a. John made his daughter watch the rugby match on TV.
b. John allowed his daughter to watch the rugby match on TV.
c. John had his daughter watch the rugby match on TV.

(9) a. John put his (sleeping) daughter into her car seat.
b. John made his (*sleeping) daughter get into her car seat.

According to Kroeger, example (7a) indicates direct causation whereas (7b) indicates indirect (mediated) causation. The distinction lies in the connection of the action of the CAUSER and the resulting event. While in the former the CAUSER does or says something directly to the CAUSEE, usually with the intention of bringing about the resulting event, in the latter, no such direct action is indicated and the resulting event may be an unintended consequence of the actions of the CAUSER. The examples in (8) illustrate the contrast between a coercive causative and a permissive causative, with neutral causation lying in-between. Coercion as in (8a) with *make* is stronger than permission as in (8b) with *allow*, regarding the degree of initiation and control exercised by the CAUSER, and the degree of control or option retained by the CAUSEE. In neutral causation as in (8c) with *have*, the initiation may come from the CAUSER, but the CAUSEE may have the option to refuse. The last pair in (9) makes a contrast between physical manipulation and verbal direction in that the former, in (9a) with *put*, involves the CAUSER employing direct physical action to bring about the resulting event, whereas the latter, in (9b) with *have*, involves the CAUSER saying something to the CAUSEE to bring about the resulting event.

Three remarks regarding Kroeger's analysis can be made. First, causative meaning is not an intrinsic part of, but a pragmatic inference of the meaning of *allow* in example (8b). Second, (8c) with *have* involves a speech act of request and hence is not neutral since it implies a social relationship of politeness between the CAUSER and the CAUSEE. Third, example (9a) with *put* is sociative

[7] The phrase *cause to die* is not very common as a causative verb with a human NP as a CAUSER, but rather is more common with a causing event NP as in *The landslide caused the destruction of the village*. But, to follow Comrie's three-way classification, this example is to illustrate the analytic causatives with two separate verbs.

causation in the sense of Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002). Kroeger focuses more on whether a CAUSEE has an option to refuse to carry out the action initiated by the CAUSER, and the term 'neutral' to him means that the CAUSEE has such an option since the verb *have* serves as a verbal direction. These remarks reveal discrepancies in the categorization of causation.

The distinction between direct and indirect causation is commonly understood in the extant literature to capture the difference of lexical causatives and syntactic causatives, the former encoding a situation involving an agentive CAUSER and a patientive CAUSEE, and the latter involving an agentive CAUSER and an agentive CAUSEE. However, the boundary between the two types is not as clear-cut as argued in Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002). They provide typological evidence to advance the theory of a continuum along a semantic cline, with the manipulative and directive interpretations as prototypical reifications of the two basic causative states of affairs associated with lexical and syntactic forms. In particular, Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002:89ff) propose that the crucial defining feature lies in the difference of the spatiotemporal profile of the entire causing event rather than the nature of the CAUSEE. For direct causation, the causing event and the caused event share the same spatiotemporal profile, whereas for indirect causation they share two distinct profiles. In addition, they also propose an intermediate category, sociative causation, which itself forms a continuum: joint-action, assistive and supervision sociative. In sum, the causative continuum is formulated as ranging from direct causation at the one end, with joint-action, assistive, and supervision sociative causation in-between, and indirect causation at the other end.

Another endeavor in this line of reasoning on the understanding of causation is found in da Silva (2007:179ff), in which the specific concept of letting is discussed. The following examples from the paper illustrate three senses of letting: not to prevent; to let go, to release; and to allow, or to permit.

(10) a. John started fooling around and I let him do it.
b. John let the bird fly out (by opening the birdcage).
c. John asked me if he could go to the cinema, and I let him go.

According to da Silva, the three senses of letting causation can be used to categorize three groups of verbs. The first group, let_1 as in (10a) and other verbs of non-preventing, expresses a non-interventive or non-preventive causation in which the agent does nothing to stop or prevent an already ongoing event. The second group, let_2 as in (10b) and other freeing-exemptive verbs, expresses an unblocking causation in which the agent removes the blockage so as to allow the resulting event to happen. The third group, let_3 as in (10c) and other permissive verbs, expresses a permissive causation in which the agent makes permissible a future event and has responsibility for its social and moral legitimization.

Causation has been depicted in terms of prototypicality in the cognitive paradigm. The prototypical ordering of the participants in a causative construction is based on the principle of iconic sequencing with the ordering CAUSER, CAUSEE, and patient, as in the example *John had his daughter open the window*. Such a sequence accords with the prototypical causation models—the billiard-ball causation model (see Langacker 1991) or the direct manipulation model (see Lakoff 1987). In the former, a single, specific physical CAUSER transmits energy to a single, specific physical CAUSEE, which can absorb the energy or transmit it further to a single, specific physical

patient; in the latter, a single definite human CAUSER manipulates a single, definite human CAUSEE, distinct from the CAUSER, into producing a volitional and material EFFECT, which can affect, or not, a single, definite human CAUSER. A similar global perspective of causation is found in Talmy (2000:494). However, while looking at basic causative situation in terms of dynamic oppositions, he claims that the resulting event functions as a figure, and the causing event as the ground, and that the causal relation is *result-from*, in which the resulting event takes place during the duration of the causing event.

Linguistic categorization of causation is characterized by an essential feature often referred to as the counterfactual inference: if the causing event had not taken place, then the resulting event would not have either (see Comrie 1981). Hence, negating the entailed result would give rise to unacceptability as illustrated by the following English example in (11).

(11) *Mary made Jim clean up the room, but he wouldn't do it.

Such a counterfactuality feature serves to distinguish causative from purposive in the literature. Since causation involves an intentional agentive CAUSER, and intentions give rise to actions which in turn may give rise to a desired result, the notions of purpose and result are closely related to each other, and are hence often encoded by one single marker in many languages (Schmidtke-Bode 2009; Song 1996). As mentioned previously, languages often employ lexical verbs of giving to denote these two notions. When human beings give objects to a recipient, we transfer the control of the possession of the object to the recipient. Likewise, when we act intentionally, we direct our actions for the purpose of achieving certain desired goals that match our intentions. Schmidtke-Bode (2009:20) defines purpose clauses as 'part of complex sentences which encode that one verbal situation . . . is performed with the intention of bringing about another situation, that of the purpose clause'. In other words, the crucial features of purpose are 'intentionality, target-directedness, future orientation, and a hypothetical result state' (Schmidtke-Bode 2009:19). According to the definition, there is a high degree of overlap between the notions of causation and purpose: for causation, the causing event is conceived of as a cause of the entailed resulting event, and for purpose, the causing event is conceived of as a cause of the intended resulting event.

Furthermore, the strong affinity between result and purpose has also been demonstrated cross-linguistically by the conflation of the two functions into one single polysemous marker (see Schmidtke-Bode 2009). There is a strong argument that the desired result is indeed actualized unless such an expectation is specified otherwise in a default situation (see Schmidtke-Bode 2009). Such a pragmatic inference can become highly conventionalized so as to become one part of the meanings of the polysemous marker. Song (1996:152) shares a similar perspective as he maintains that '[h]umans generally succeed in realizing goals for which they perform actions'. He further argues that semantic entailment as the single defining feature for causative constructions is 'too restrictive, if not inaccurate . . . since semantic entailment is not a necessary condition for being regarded as a causative expression' (Song 1996:157). What a CAUSER in a causing event intends to give rise to in a resulting event can be either a resultant state for a CAUSEE to undergo or an action for a CAUSEE to perform. Indeed, by reference to synchronic and diachronic evidence from cross-linguistic sources, Song (1996) has argued for the existence of purposive-type causative constructions as genuine causative constructions due to their frequent association of causative function.

Several remarks can be made at this point. Previous studies on causation have shed some light on the nuances and the elements involved in the understanding of such a conceptual category, but they also show that no single situational notion of causation exists. Their cross-classifications of the complex semantic and syntactic parameters indicate some similarities in the categorization of the concept of causation, and yet there are also some discrepancies, including the delineation of the volitionality of the CAUSER and of the CAUSEE, the affectedness of the CAUSEE, and the verbal features of the resulting event. Their findings also indicate that more than one meaning can often be associated with, for instance, *have*, *let*, or *make* causation. The conflation of multiple functions into a single marker shows that the intimate relations between purposive and causative constructions need to be more explicitly spelled out. In addition, as pointed out in Shibatani & Pardeshi (2002), previous studies on causation are based on prototypical instances, mostly not extracted from actual usage. Not only do such data follow the prototypical iconic ordering of the sequencing of the participants in a causative construction, but they also closely follow the temporal sequence projected in the billiard-ball causation model of Langacker or the direct manipulation model of Lakoff. However, investigating authentic data from actual usage will provide a different picture. A more in-depth global investigation of authentic data in actual usages, based on Talmy's (2000) figure–ground claim in conjunction with information management strategies, is therefore called for.

4. The multi-functions of *bun*^{1} causative constructions

As shown in examples (1) to (4), two canonical constructions are found—[NP1 *BUN* NP2 VP2] and [NP1 VP1]-*BUN*-[NP2 VP2]. In the first canonical configuration, *bun*^{1} is a causative verb, indicating a human agentive CAUSER gives permission to a human CAUSEE to carry out an action, and, in the latter, *bun*^{1} is reanalyzed as a connector between the two clauses denoting a causing event and a resulting event, respectively, and three functions can be identified for this configuration. Notice that event here is broadly understood as an action, process, or state.

Constructions used here are viewed as meaning-bearing units in the way they are used in the constructional approach (see Goldberg 1995, 2006), and, in addition to the meaning of the individual components that compose a construction, the construction itself provides its own semantic content independent of the components. The subtleties of both the meanings of the components and of the construction play significant roles in shaping the composite meaning of the whole of the construction. Furthermore, following Goldberg's (1995) 'Principle of No Synonymy', stating that distinct syntactic constructions are semantically or pragmatically distinct as well, this study will hold that the differences of the components in the causative *bun*^{1} constructions under investigation represent different conceptualizations of different situations. Specifically, an analysis of not only verbal senses but also the semantic features, including the volitionality, animacy, and affectedness of the CAUSER and CAUSEE, are also crucial in identifying the causative functions of the whole *bun*^{1} construction. Both the generalizations and idiosyncrasies involved in each of the subtypes of *bun*^{1} constructions will be explicitly spelled out, and the notion that the four types comprising a family of related constructions can better capture their syntactic and semantic distributions will be proposed.

4.1 Teasing out the four types of *bun*[1] causative constructions

An examination of the corpus data gives us 318 tokens of *bun*[1] causative constructions. Some examples are modified to illustrate certain points and some are taken from previous studies with some modifications for the sake of consistency. Three frame elements of the *bun*[1] causative construction are used to identify the elements of the two syntactic configurations—CAUSER, CAUSEE, and EFFECT. The first predicate is called the causing event, and the second one, the resulting event.[8] The CAUSER is the entity that leads to the resulting event, the CAUSEE is the entity that is influenced by the CAUSER and carries out the EFFECT of the resulting event, and the EFFECT is the event or state carried out by the CAUSEE. The notions of animacy, intentionality, and affectedness are employed for investigation of the semantic features of the CAUSER and the CAUSEE, and dynamicity is employed for the EFFECT. These notions can further be broken down into semantic features such as [human], [animate], [agent], [actor], [experiencer], [volitional], [affected], [action], and [state], to better capture the semantic nuances of each individual element. The apparatus is illustrated in (12a) and (12b), and the generalized meaning given in (12c).

(12) a. $[\text{NP1}]_{\text{CAUSER}}$ BUN_{verb} $[\text{NP2}_{\text{CAUSEE}}\ \text{VP2}_{\text{EFFECT}}]$
[causing event] [resulting event]

b. $[\text{NP1}_{\text{CAUSER}}\ \text{VP1}]$ $BUN_{\text{connector}}$ $[\text{NP2}_{\text{CAUSEE}}\ \text{VP2}_{\text{EFFECT}}]$
[causing event] [resulting event]

c. The syntax and semantics of Hakka causative *bun*[1] constructions can be used to account for either a cause–act or a cause–result relation between two events, a causing event and a resulting event.

Four types are sub-classified as given in Table 1: permissive-type causative constructions (52 tokens), purposive-type causative constructions (218 tokens), coercive-type causative constructions (27 tokens), and non-preventive-type causative constructions (21 tokens). The first configuration in (12a) manifests the permissive type and some of the coercive types, and the second configuration in (12b) the purposive type, some of the coercive types, and the non-preventive type. Permissive and purposive types manifest the cause–act relation, and coercive and non-preventive types the cause–result relation.

Table 1: The distribution of the four types of *bun*[1] constructions

Type	Token	Percentage	Syntactic configuration
Permissive	52	16	[NP1 BUN_{verb} NP2 VP2]
Purposive	218	69	[NP1 VP1] $BUN_{\text{connector}}$ [NP2 VP2]
Coercive	27	8	[NP1 BUN_{verb} NP2 VP2] [NP1 VP1] $BUN_{\text{connector}}$ [NP2 VP2]
Non-preventive	21	7	[NP1 VP1] $BUN_{\text{connector}}$ [NP2 VP2]
Total	318	100	

[8] The data coding schemes are modified from Gilquin (2010).

The fact that permissive and purposive types together (totaling 85%) outnumber coercive and non-preventive types together (totaling 15%) is significant both structurally and semantically. On the one hand, the canonical *bun*^{1} construction of the permissive type manifests a pivotal construction (*jiānyǔshì* 兼語式) commonly found in the Chinese languages. Tang (2000) maintains that causation is one of the main functions of a pivotal construction.[9] He also distinguishes two types of causation: the cause–act (*shǐlìng* 使令) type when VP2 denotes an activity, and the cause–result (*zhìshǐ* 致使) type when VP2 denotes a state. The permissive-type function of *bun*^{1} comes from its ditransitive verb sense of giving, and the purposive type comes from its dative function of goal-marking. The transfer of control links the two verbal senses conceptually; and the target-directedness links the two notions goal and purpose conceptually, both conveying a strong desire for NP2 to carry out the EFFECT. On the other hand, when *bun*^{1} is the connector, both the syntactic and semantic varieties of the causing event and the resulting event expand, leading to either the coercive type or the non-preventive type. The frequent employment of a *bun*^{1} construction to denote either a cause–act or a cause–result function has made it a full-fledged causative construction. Furthermore, the fact that a single morpheme is exploited to cover the multiple functions of transfer, purpose and result demonstrates the metaphorical extension of *bun*^{1} from a more concrete notion to a more abstract one, along with its structural grammaticalization from a causative verb into a grammatical marker connecting clauses. The discussion here also provides evidence for the claim that to identify semantic entailment as the single defining feature of causative constructions is indeed too restrictive. In what follows, each sub-class will be discussed with illustrative examples.

4.2 Permissive-type causative constructions

The permissive-type causative *bun*^{1} construction belongs to the cause–act type of causation, whereby the CAUSER socially or morally grants the CAUSEE the permission to bring about a permitted resulting event. The CAUSER is a human agent whose authority allows the future EFFECT carried out by the CAUSEE to be permissible. The CAUSEE is an animate actor, and the EFFECT indicates an action for the CAUSEE to perform.

---

[9] Chang (2006) notes that there are two types of causative pivotal constructions in Mandarin Chinese: one is cause–act (*shǐlìng* 使令), and the other, permit (*yǔnràng* 允讓). The two types are represented by two different verbs, *jiào* (教) 'make' and *ràng* (讓) 'allow', as given below in (i) and (ii). However, Hakka uses *bun*^{1}alone to represent the two functions. Hence each individual component of a construction needs to be teased out to come up with the different constructional meanings.

(i) *Zhāngsān jiào Lǐsì líkāi* (張三教李四離開)
Zhangsan make Lisi leave
'Zhangsan made Lisi leave.'

(ii) *Nǐ néng ràng tā zuòxià mā?* (你能讓他坐下嗎？)
you can allow him sit down Q
'Can you allow him to sit down?'

(13) Permissive-type causative constructions
Syntax: $[NP1]_{CAUSER}$ BUN_{verb} $[NP2_{CAUSEE}$ $VP2_{EFFECT}]_{permitted\ resulting\ event}$
Semantics: An agentive authoritative human (in the causing event) intentionally grants the permission for an animate actor to carry out the EFFECT in the resulting event.
CAUSER: authoritative agentive human
CAUSEE: animate actor
EFFECT: action predicate

The following examples can serve as illustrations.

(14) 阿叔姆定著會分你討細婆[10]
a^{1}sug^{4}me^{1} tin^{3}cog^{8} voi^{3} bun^{1} ng^{5} to^{2} se^{3}po^{5}
aunt definitely will BUN 2SG marry concubine
'Mother will definitely let you marry a concubine.'

(15) 今晡日當晝，定著毋好分細人仔去魚塘肚泅水
gim^{1}bu^{1}ngid^{4} dong^{1}zu^{3} tin^{3}cog^{8} m^{5}ho^{2} bun^{1} se^{3}ngin^{5}-e^{2} hi^{3} ng^{5}tong^{5} du^{2} qiu^{5}sui^{2}
today noon must NEG BUN child-SF go fishpond in swim
'Today at noon, (you) must not let the children go swimming in the fishpond.'

(16) 大姊讀書時節，成績盡好，毋過因為家庭環境，無可能分佢繼續升學
tai^{3}ji^{2} tug^{8}su^{1} sii^{5}jied^{4} siin^{5}jid^{4} qin^{3} ho^{2} m^{5}go^{3} in^{1}vi^{3}
eldest sister study time grades very good but because
ga^{1}tin^{5} van^{5}gin^{3} mo^{5} ko^{2}nen^{5} bun^{1} gi^{5} gi^{3}xiug^{8} siin^{1}hog^{8}
family condition NEG possible BUN 3SG keep on education
'My eldest sister did excellently at (elementary) school. However, she was not permitted by Grandfather to continue her education due to the family's poor circumstances.'

In each of the three cases, the sense of permission comes from the CAUSER, an authoritative agentive human who wields social or moral power such as to grant the power to the CAUSEE to perform an action. In (14), it is the wife who can give the permission to the husband to marry a concubine.[11] The other two examples in negative forms characterize the other side of the same

[10] According to Hakka custom, children are told to call their parents Uncle or Aunty so as to avoid certain inauspicious situations that could arise and cause harm to the family.

[11] The background of the story has to do with the continuation of generations, a very important social concept in traditional Chinese cultures, Hakka included. A son is deemed to have the responsibility to have male offspring so as to allow for his family to continue, generation after generation. If a married wife is unable to become pregnant, she is to suffer the blame, and is required to allow her husband to marry a concubine so that there is a chance for a son to be born to the family. In this case, the context brings out a very clear permission function.

coin—the meaning of prohibition. In (15), the children are strongly prohibited from going swimming in the fishpond at noon in order that they will not be pulled down by river ghosts and be drowned; in (16), the elder sister was prohibited (by her grandfather) from continuing her education due to the impoverished circumstances of the family. The deontic sense denoted by *bun*^{1} manifests in its co-occurrence with the modal verb *voi*^{3} (會) 'will' denoting volition in (14), the adverb *tin*^{3}*cog*^{8} (定著) 'definitely' denoting assurance in (15), and *mo*^{5} *ko*^{2}*nen*^{5} (無可能) 'impossible' denoting prohibition in (16), all indicating the exertion of the authority from the CAUSER so as to socially or morally legitimize the EFFECT carried out by the CAUSEE.[12] The EFFECT of the resulting event conveys a dynamic action predicate, as illustrated by the three examples. The success of the permitted cause–act EFFECT is taken for granted due to pragmatic inference, in particular when the CAUSER expresses a strong will for its realization. The contexts of the stories reveal that the permitted resulting events are all actualized to support the coherent development of the story line.

4.3 Purposive-type causative constructions

The most frequently-found type of causative construction involves the purposive type, as illustrated by the syntactic configuration with *bun*^{1} connecting two clauses, whereby the CAUSER performs a certain action in the causing event for the purpose of realizing the desired resulting event.[13] The purposive-type causative construction also belongs to cause–act causation. Such a constructional meaning of cause–act purpose is quite compatible with a wide array of verbs as long as the successful performance of the action can be directed toward a goal, which in turn can lead to a purpose. The causing event involves an agentive human CAUSER intentionally performing a certain action, *bun*^{1} functions as a connector, and the desired resulting event contains an animate actor CAUSEE to carry out the EFFECT. Examples are given below.

(17) Purposive-type causative constructions
Syntax: $[NP1_{CAUSER}\ VP1]_{causing\ event}$ *BUN* $[NP2_{CAUSEE}\ VP2_{EFFECT}]_{desired\ resulting\ event}$
Semantics: An agentive human CAUSER intentionally initiates the causing event for the purpose of causing the CAUSEE to successfully carry out the EFFECT in the desired resulting event.
CAUSER: agentive human
CAUSEE: animate actor
EFFECT: action predicate

[12] Notice that in example (16), the CAUSEE is left-dislocated with a co-indexed third person pronoun *gi*^{5} in the resulting event and that the authoritative CAUSER is gapped. According to the story, the authoritative human CAUSER is the grandfather. The functions of non-canonical structures in a larger discourse will be discussed in §5. This example comes from the story *Born in a Wrong Family* (出差世) in *Stories of Touqian River* (頭前溪个故事).

[13] Song's (1996) work has been presented in §2. After a more careful examination of the Hakka data, this term is adopted from Song (1996) to reflect the close connection among the four types of causative constructions and the employment of one single morpheme *bun*^{1} for the various functions in Hakka.

(18) 偌捉魚仔賣，賺錢分吾老公讀書
ngai^{5} *zog*^{4} *ng*^{5}*-e*^{2} *mai*^{3} *con*^{3}*qien*^{5} *bun*^{1} *nga*^{1} *lo*^{2}*gung*^{1} *tug*^{8}*su*^{1}
1SG catch fish-SF sell make money BUN 1SG:POSS husband study
'I caught fish to sell for money so as to support my husband to study.'

(19) 其姆逐日同別人煮飯，分侬仔早日討著阿珍[14]
gia^{5} *me*^{1} *dag*^{4}*ngid*^{4} *tung*^{5} *ped*^{8}*ngin*^{5} *zu*^{2}*fan*^{3}
3SG:POSS mother every day TUNG others cook
bun^{1} *lai*^{3}*-e*^{2} *zo*^{2}*ngid*^{4} *to*^{2}*do*^{2} *a*^{1}*-ziin*^{1}
BUN son soon marry A-ziin
'Mother used to cook for others every day (so as to make enough money) for her son to get married to A-ziin sooner.'

(20) 水鬼會拖一隻細人仔浸死，好分佢出世
sui^{2}*gui*^{2} *voi*^{3} *to*^{1} *id*^{4} *zag*^{4} *se*^{3}*ngin*^{5}*e*^{2} *ciim*^{5} *xi*^{2} *ho*^{2} *bun*^{1} *gi*^{5} *cud*^{2} *se*^{3}
river ghost will drag one CL child drown dead able BUN 3SG return life
'The river ghost will drag a child down and make him drown so that the ghost can use the child's body to be reborn as a human.'

In each of the three examples, an agentive CAUSER with intentionality carries out an action for the purpose of realizing the desired EFFECT carried out by the CAUSEE. In (18), the speaker caught fish and sold them so as to make money to support her husband's studies; in (19), the purpose of Mother's cooking for others is to make enough money for her son to get married. Example (20) illustrates a case with a co-referential CAUSER, a river ghost, and a CAUSEE, the pronoun *gi*^{5} 'he'. Legend has it that a river ghost has to find a victim to replace him in the underworld in order that the ghost can use his body to be reborn as a human being.[15] The intentionality can be indicated by the modal verb *voi*^{3} (會) 'will', and the desired resulting event is for the CAUSEE to carry out the EFFECT—namely, to be able to be reborn as a human. The desired purpose is strengthened by the co-occurrence of *bun*^{1} and *ho*^{1} (好), a connector also indicating purpose.[16]

In the three cases, the resulting events express a desired goal that the CAUSER has an intention to achieve. They carry the features of directedness, future orientation, and a desired result, all fitting with the notion of purpose as defined by Schmidtke-Bode (2009). Since the causing events denote activities that involve the strong intentionality of the CAUSER to achieve the desired goals, the potential for the achievement of the goals is not only strengthened, but also taken for granted. In other words, if there was no intention for the desired goals to be achieved, the process by which

[14] To clearly indicate the linear order of the causing event and the resulting event, the causing event is moved forward in this example for illustration.

[15] This example is often used to warn children stay away from riverbanks so as not to drown. The legend that a river ghost may steal their bodies is used to strengthen such a directive function of warning.

[16] Yeh (2012) analyzes *ho*^{1} (好) in such a case as a condition-purpose connector. Refer to her study for details.

they were achieved would not have been put into effect to begin with. Hence, the purposive type indicates a cause–act causation because the desired resulting event is conceptualized as causally dependent upon the causing event.

4.4 Coercive-type causative constructions

Unlike the first two types, which belong to cause–act causation, the last two types belong to cause–result causation, and, as the result can give rise to different degrees of affectedness for the CAUSEE to undergo, the cause–result causation is sub-classified into two types, mostly based on the features of the CAUSEE. The coercive type refers to the case in which the CAUSEE undergoes a psychological or emotional change of state due to the circumstances of the causing event. The CAUSEE is an experiencer. The non-preventive type refers to a case in which the CAUSEE is strongly affected by the EFFECT brought about by the causing event. The CAUSEE is a patient. In both cases, the CAUSER in the causing event does not have a strong intentionality to bring about the influence of the EFFECT on the CAUSEE. However, due to the nature of the situation indicated in the causing event, the CAUSEE in the resulting event is affected by the EFFECT. Let us consider the coercive type first in (21) with illustrative examples to follow.

(21) Coercive-type causative constructions
Syntax: $[\text{NP1}_{\text{CAUSER}}\ \text{VP1}]_{\text{causing event}}$ *BUN* $[\text{NP2}_{\text{CAUSEE}}\ \text{VP2}_{\text{EFFECT}}]_{\text{uncontrolled resulting event}}$
Semantics: An animate CAUSEE undergoes a psychological or emotional change of state of the EFFECT brought about by the causing event. The causing event can be a certain action performed by an animate CAUSER or a descriptive situation.
CAUSER: animate actor or a situation
CAUSEE: animate experiencer
EFFECT: psych-predicate

(22) 阿英盡煞猛，分阿姆異放心
a^{1}*-in*^{1} *qin*^{3} *sad*^{4}*mang*^{1} *bun*^{1} *a*^{1}*me*^{1} *i*^{3} *fon*^{3}*xim*^{1}
A-in very diligently BUN mother very at ease
'A-in works so diligently, setting her mother's mind at ease.'

(23) 阿文摎阿英都盡增志，無分阿姆失望
a^{1}*-vun*^{5} *lau*^{1} *a*^{1}*-in*^{1} *du*^{3} *qin*^{3} *zen*^{3}*zii*^{3} *mo*^{5} *bun*^{1} *a*^{1}*-mei*^{1} *siid*^{4}*mong*^{3}
A-vun and A-in both very hard-working NEG BUN mother disappointed
'A-vun and A-in are both hard-working, not letting their mother down.'

The two examples present cases in which the CAUSEE is an experiencer undergoing the psychological or emotional change expressed by the psych-predicate in the EFFECT, *fon*^{3}*xim*^{1} (放心) 'mind at ease' in (22), and *siid*^{4}*mong*^{3} (失望) 'to be disappointed' in (23). While the subject *A*^{1}*-in*^{1} has the volition to work hard, she might or might not have the intention to set her mother's mind at ease; her mother may feel at ease, anyway. Frequently found psych-predicates include psychological verbs

such as *sun*^{3}*xim*^{1} (順心) 'to be satisfied', *kien*^{2} (譴) 'to be angry', *xin*^{3}*fug*^{8} (信服) 'to be convinced', *fon*^{1}*hi*^{2} (歡喜) 'to be happy', and the like. While the CAUSER might or might not have the intention to bring about certain effects as a consequence of his or her action to the CAUSEE, it is not so much under the control of the CAUSEE whether he or she will undergo the psychological or emotional experience brought about by the causing event. When the causing event arises, the CAUSEE is affected mentally or emotionally.

Examples with a situation as a causing event are also found, leading to the EFFECT that the CAUSEE will undergo. Consider the following examples.

(24) 初秋个日頭照到大地一片光亮，分人有種盡鬆爽个感覺
cu^{1}*qiu*^{1} *ge*^{3} *ngid*^{4}*teu*^{5} *zeu*^{3} *do*^{2} *tai*^{3}*ti*^{3} *id*^{4}*pien*^{2} *gong*^{1}*liong*^{3}
early autumn NOM sunlight lighten LOC earth everywhere luminous
bun^{1} *ngin*^{5} *iu*^{1} *zung*^{2} *qin*^{3} *sung*^{1}*song*^{2} *ge*^{3} *gam*^{2}*gog*^{4}
BUN people have kind very comfortable NOM feeling
'The sun in early autumn lightens the earth, making people feel cozy.'

(25) 多樣性个攤位，正經分人試著目珠無閒，耳孔也無閒
do^{1}*iong*^{3}*xin*^{3} *ge*^{3} *tan*^{1}*vi*^{3} *ziin*^{3}*gin*^{1} *bun*^{1} *ngin*^{5} *cii*^{3}*do*^{2} *mug*^{4}*zu*^{1} *mo*^{5} *han*^{5}
diverse NOM vendor really BUN people feel eyes NEG available
ngi^{2}*gong*^{1} *ia*^{1} *mo*^{5} *han*^{5}
ears also NEG available
'The great variety of vendors really attracted people to the exclusion of anything else.'

In these two examples, the causing event describes a situation, the shining of the sun in early autumn in (24) and the great variety of vendors in (25). When the CAUSEE is situated in such a situation, he or she undergoes a change of state psychologically or emotionally, as indicated by *gam*^{2}*gog*^{4} (感覺) 'feeling' and *cii*^{3}*do*^{2} (試著) 'feel', respectively. Notice that two distinctive features can be detected in distinguishing coercive-type causatives from purposive- and permissive-type causatives. For the latter two, the CAUSEE is an actor who has the volition to carry out the action indicated by the EFFECT. For coercive-type causatives, the CAUSEE is an experiencer who does not have the control to undergo the EFFECT that specifies a psychological or emotional change of state. For purposive- and permissive-type causatives the CAUSEE is an actor who has the volition to carry out the action indicated by the EFFECT.

4.5 Non-preventive-type causative constructions

The last type of causative construction that also manifests cause–result causation is the non-preventive-type causative construction. Intentionality does not feature in the constructional meaning of non-preventive causative constructions. The causing event describes a circumstance, either a natural disaster or a situation caused by an unintentional CAUSER, and the resulting event denotes a caused result due to the situation. The CAUSEE is a patient strongly affected by the resultant state denoted by the EFFECT. Examine (26) and the illustrative examples that follow.

(26) Non-preventive-type causative constructions
Syntax: [NP1$_{\text{CAUSER}}$ VP1]$_{\text{causing event}}$ *BUN* [NP2$_{\text{CAUSEE}}$ VP2$_{\text{EFFECT}}$]$_{\text{resultant state}}$
Semantics: a circumstance, either a natural disaster or a situation brought about by an unintentional CAUSER in the causing event, leads to the resultant state undergone by the CAUSEE in the resulting event.
CAUSER: animate actor or circumstance
CAUSEE: animate or inanimate patient
EFFECT: resultative complement

Examples (27) and (28) illustrate the most commonly found cases in the data in which the causing event denotes a natural disaster, causing the CAUSEE to be affected by the resultant state in the resulting event.

(27) 頭下落該陣大雨分河壩水淹出來
teu^{3}ha^{3} lok^{8} ge^{3} ciin^{3} tai^{3}i^{2} bun^{1} ho^{5}ba^{3} sui^{1} nem^{1}-cud^{4}-loi^{5}
moments ago drop that CL big rain BUN river water full-outside-come
'It rained so heavily just now, making the water in the river overflow its banks.'

(28) 響雷公，落大雨，該頭樹分佢沉到水肚去。
hiong^{2}lui^{5}gung^{1} log^{8}tai^{3}i^{2} ge^{3} teu^{5} su^{3} bun^{1} gi^{5} ciim^{5} do^{3} sui^{2} du^{2} hi^{3}
thunder sound rain heavily that CL tree BUN 3SG sink LOC water in go
'It thundered and rained heavily, making that tree sink into the water.'

In both cases, the heavy rain associated with the severe weather causes the overflowing of the river in (27), and the sinking of the tree in (27). The falling of the heavy rain is the circumstance that brings about the resultant state in the resulting event. Both the CAUSER and the CAUSEE are inanimate.

In addition to these two cases, a few cases involve an animate CAUSER or an animate CAUSEE; but the property of intentionality still does not feature in these examples. In these cases, the CAUSER is an animate actor, the CAUSEE is an animate patient, and the EFFECT denotes a resultant state. For instance, in the following example in (29), the unintentionality of the human CAUSER can be explicitly identified by *m^{5}gi^{3}ded^{4}* (毋記得) 'forget' and by the co-occurrence of *bun^{1}* with the conjunctive marker *sa^{3}* (續) 'unexpectedly', which normally conveys that something is unanticipated. The CAUSEE in this case is strongly affected by the causing event, as indicated by the EFFECT *iau^{1}-xi^{2}* (枵死) 'die of hunger'.

(29) 伯姆毋記得餵豬仔，續分豬仔枵死
bag^{4}mei^{1} m^{5} gi^{3}ded^{4} vi^{3} zu^{1}-e^{2} sa^{3} bun^{1} zu^{1}-e^{2} iau^{1}-xi^{2}
aunt NEG remember feed pig-SF unexpectedly BUN pig-SF hungry-die
'Aunty forgot to feed pigs, unexpectedly causing them to die of hunger.'

Notice that non-preventive-type causatives differ from the other types in three aspects. The first and most important distinction lies in the intentionality of the CAUSER: non-preventive-type causatives involve an unintentional CAUSER. Second, the CAUSEE of the other three types is always

animate whereas the CAUSEE of non-preventive causation can be either animate or inanimate. Third, whereas the EFFECT of the other three types denotes either an action performed by the CAUSEE or a change of a psychological condition experienced by the CAUSEE, the EFFECT in the case of non-preventive-type causatives indicates a resultant state that the CAUSEE is affected by.

4.6 Aggregating the four types

To sum up, after a close examination of the semantic features of the CAUSER, the CAUSEE, and the EFFECT, the multiple functions of causative *bun*[1] constructions can be classified into four types: permissive, purposive, coercive, and non-preventive. The crucial features for the constructional meanings are the intentionality, volition, and affectedness of the CAUSER and the CAUSEE as well as the dynamicity of the EFFECT predicates. While the first two types belong to cause–act causation, the second two belong to cause–result causation. The data show that, regardless of any generalizations which can encompass their syntactic and semantic features, the constructions within the categories described here still exhibit a great deal of syntactic and semantic variation**.** Hence it is better to treat Hakka causative *bun*[1] constructions as forming a family of four subtypes of constructions, sharing important syntactic and semantic properties but differing in certain syntactic and semantic specifics. Table 2 depicts the particulars and the generalizations of the four types of Hakka causative *bun*[1] constructions.

Table 2: The syntax and semantics of the family of the *bun*[1] causative constructions

Generalization	The syntax and semantics of Hakka causative *bun*[1] constructions can be used to account for either a cause–act or a cause–result relation between two events, a causing event and a resulting event.			
Syntactic configurations	$[NP1]_{CAUSER}$ BUN_{verb} [causing event]	$[NP2_{CAUSEE}$ $VP2_{EFFECT}]$ [resulting event]	$[NP1_{CAUSER}$ VP1] $BUN_{connector}$ [causing event]	$[NP2_{CAUSEE}$ $VP2_{EFFECT}]$ [resulting event]
Subtypes	Permissive	Coercive	Purposive	Non-preventive
CAUSER	authoritative agentive human	animate actor or situation	agentive human	animate actor or circumstance
CAUSEE	animate actor	animate experiencer	animate actor	animate or inanimate patient
EFFECT	action predicate	psych-predicate	action predicate	resultative complement

5. *Bun*[1] causative constructions in a larger discourse

A typical characterization of causation reflects an iconic sequence of a causal chain, that of a human agent acting on a patient as depicted by Lakoff (1987:54f.) and Newman (1996:172f.). Prototypical instances of causation, mostly based on authors' introspection, not only follow the prototypical iconic ordering of the sequencing of the participants in a causal chain, but also follow quite well the temporal sequence projected in the billiard-ball causation model of Langacker or the

direct manipulation model of Lakoff. However, a closer examination of the corpus data based on authentic usage reveals a different set of circumstances regarding the various causative types and the word ordering of the grammatical roles, as well as the information conveyed by the causing event and the resulting event. Thus, a more complete investigation of the examples within a larger context was carried out. It has been found that, contrary to what is expected under the prototypical sequence of the participants in an action chain, the causing event can be gapped. In addition, contrary to what is usually held to be the case in the extant literature, according to which the resulting event is deemed as a subordinate clause denoting a result or a purpose, the pragmatic function conveyed by the causing event and the resulting event exhibit ground–figure asymmetry. The often found structural strategies, such as the gapping of the causing event, omission of the CAUSER, or topicalization or left dislocation of the CAUSEE, all serve the purpose of managing the information flow in a larger discourse. It is claimed in this paper that such an array of linguistic structures demonstrates the development of a precursory stage for the further grammaticalization of *bun*^{1} from causative to passive. Moreover, the requirement for coherence in the story-telling genre further confirms the realization of the intended result of purposive-type causatives and also that of the permitted result of permissive causatives.

Let us first provide an example of the case of purposive-type causative constructions to support the claim. Consider the following passage.

(30) 阿姆二十二歲嫁分阿爸个時節，**做木匠个姐公當毋盼得，做二槓衫櫥分阿姆做嫁妝**；阿姆今年八十五歲囉，有一槓衫櫥還在阿姆个間房項，陪等阿姆行過六十三個年頭囉！(From *Hakka Monthly*, Issue 192, *Mother's Dowry Wardrobe*)

a^{1}*me*^{1} *ngi*^{3}*siib*^{8}*ngi*^{3} *se*^{3} *ga*^{3} *bun*^{1} *a*^{1}*ba*^{1} *ge*^{3} *sii*^{5}*jied*^{4} ***zo*^{3} *mug*^{4}*xiong*^{3} *ge*^{3}**

mother twenty-two CL marry BUN father NOM time be carpenter NOM

***jia*^{2}*gung*^{1} *dong*^{1} *m*^{5}*pan*^{3}*ded*^{4} *zo*^{3} *ngi*^{3} *gong*^{3} *sam*^{1}*cu*^{5} *bun*^{1}**

grandfather very unwilling to part with make two CL wardrobe BUN

***a*^{1}*me*^{1} *zo*^{3} *ga*^{3}*zong*^{1}** *a*^{1}*me*^{1} *gim*^{1}*ngien*^{5} *bad*^{4}*siib*^{8}*ng*^{2} *se*^{3} *lo*^{1} *iu*^{1} *id*^{4} *gong*^{3}

mother be dowry mother this year eighty-five CL PRT there is one CL

sam^{1}*cu*^{5} *han*^{5} *coi*^{1} *a*^{1}*me*^{1} *ge*^{3} *gien*^{1}*fong*^{5} *hong*^{3} *pi*^{5} *den*^{2}

wardrobe EMP LOC mother NOM bedroom in accompany DUR

a^{1}*me*^{1} *hang*^{5}*go*^{3} *liug*^{4}*siib*^{8}*sam*^{1} *ge*^{3} *ngien*^{5}*teu*^{5} *lo*^{1}

mother walk across sixty-three NOM year PRT

'When my mother got married to my father at 22, my grandfather, who was a carpenter, felt so unwilling to part with her as to make two wardrobes for her as dowry gifts. Now my mother is 85 years old, and one of the wardrobes still stands in her bedroom, having already accompanied her for 63 years already.'

This story describes Mother's life and her wardrobe, which is now owned by the narrator's mother. In the purposive-type causative construction, the causing event, together with the CAUSER, the grandfather who makes the wardrobe for his daughter as a dowry gift is only mentioned as a background, and the caused purposive event is the figure in the information flow. As the story centers on Mother's life and her wardrobe, the desired result is realized as the story develops in a coherent way.

A similar situation is also found in the following example. The context of the passage in (31) is to emphasize that the purpose of practicing traditional customs is for young people to learn to appreciate the traditions of their ancestors. In the information flow, it is the desired resulting event that is the foregrounding figure. The CAUSER in this example is even suppressed due to its low discourse prominence since it is non-referential and generically understood.

(31) Ø迎這兜老古董，一方面，分後生人知，先祖个東西

(From *Hakka Monthly*, Issue 197, *Let's Go Ambling Around the Streets Together*)

Ø	*ngiang^5*	*ia^{2}deu^1*	*lo^2*	*gu^{2}dung^2*	*id^{4}fong^{1}mien^3*	*bun^1*	*heu^{3}sang^{1}ngin^5*	*di^1*
	perform	these	old	antique	on the one hand	BUN	young people	know

xien^{1}zu^2	*ge^3*	*dung^{1}xi^1*
ancestor	POSS	thing

'(We) tried to perform using these traditional artifacts in order to let young people understand the customs maintained by their ancestors.'

Cases are also found where the CAUSEE is left-dislocated with a third person pronoun co-indexed with it in its original place, and the causing event is not explicitly expressed. Consider the following example in (32), a case of permissive-type causatives:

(32) 媒人轉去摎這頭家講，這頭家講：恁正細妹仔，分佢當家做得

(From *Miaoli Hakka Stories*, *The Fourth Duck Sister*)

moi^{5}ngin^5	*zon^{2}hi^3*	*lau^1*	*ia^2*	*teu^{5}ga^1*	*gong^2*	*ia^2*	*teu^{5}ga^1*	*gong^2*
matchmaker	go back	LAU	this	boss	say	this	boss	say

an^2	*ziin^3*	*se^{3}moi^3-e^2*	*bun^1*	*gi^5*	*dong^1-ga^1*	*zo^{3}ded^4*
so	talented	girl-SF	BUN	3SG	manage the house	can

'The matchmaker went back to talk to the boss (about the lady). The boss replied: The young lady is so talented that she should be permitted to manage the business for the family.'

The main character of this story is a very talented lady called *the fourth duck lady*, who is the fourth daughter of her family and who is in charge of looking after their ducks. To maintain the information flow, the topic, in this case a co-referential deictic expression with the defining feature metonymically highlighted, is left-dislocated with the third person pronoun co-indexed in the original position. In fact, to keep the story line coherent, the whole causing event is gapped due to its redundancy. In a traditional Hakka family, it is the father who will be the boss of a family, and the duck lady must be given permission by the father to manage the family business. And since the topic of the story is the duck lady, such background knowledge denoted by the causing event including the agentive CAUSER, the supposed authority who grants the permission for the resulting event, is already a part of an established scenario and is less prominent, and hence is omitted due to its lack of discourse prominence. This example contradicts the claim of the prototypical causation models and the cognitively most salient temporal sequence of the iconic sequencing of the participants. In addition, it shows that the causing event, when conveying background information, is

not required to be explicitly expressed, even if it contains an authoritative agentive CAUSER that presumably would be the trigger for the permitted resulting event to happen. Similar cases are found with the permissive-type causative constructions presented earlier. In example (16), the CAUSEE, the eldest sister, is the topic of the story, and is left-dislocated with a third person pronoun co-indexed in the resulting event, and the authoritative agentive CAUSER (the grandfather) is omitted; likewise, in example (15), the agentive CAUSER (the parents) is also omitted since it is the children's safety that is the main concern of the story. The two examples are repeated below.

(15) 今晡日當晝，定著毋好分細人仔去魚塘肚泅水
gim^{1} bu^{1} ngid^{4} dong^{1} zu^{3} tin^{3} cog^{8} m^{5} ho^{2} bun^{1} se^{3} ngin^{5}-e^{2} hi^{3} ng^{5} tong^{5} du^{2} qiu^{5} sui^{2}
today noon must NEG BUN child-SF go fishpond in swim
'Today at noon, (you) must not let the children go swimming in the fishpond.'

(16) 大姊讀書時節，成績盡好，毋過因為家庭環境，無可能分佢繼續升學
tai^{3} ji^{2} tug^{8} su^{1} sii^{5} jied^{4} siin^{5} jid^{4} qin^{3} ho^{2} m^{5} go^{3} in^{1} vi^{3}
eldest sister study time grades very good but because
ga^{1} tin^{5} van^{5} gin^{3} mo^{5} ko^{2} nen^{5} bun^{1} gi^{5} gi^{3} xiug^{8} siin^{1} hog^{8}
family condition NEG possible BUN 3SG keep on education
'My eldest sister did excellently at (elementary) school. However, she was not permitted by Grandfather to continue her education due to the family's poor circumstances.'

These cause–act causative constructions in a larger discourse highlight two important points. First, the intended resulting event for both purposive-type and permissive-type causatives is usually carried out. Second, the intended resulting event is usually the main figure in the information flow in the discourse from which the data are taken.

Examination of more authentic data of the other types within a larger discourse strengthens the claim regarding the information conveyed by the causing event and the resulting event. The two events are not symmetric: the pragmatic function of the two events exhibits ground–figure asymmetry. The following examples in (33) and (34) show that the causing event in which the animate CAUSER is involved provides a background so that the animate CAUSEE in the resulting event can experience a certain change of psychological state. Likewise, in (35), the doctor's behavior and attitudes are clearly delineated, thus providing more specific background information about the CAUSER's unintentionality so as to explain why the resulting event occurs. In all three cases, the resulting event represents the figure, the communicative focus in the passage.

(33) 學期一開始偃就寫一份教學計劃書，分學生仔親身體驗客家風情
hog^{8} ki^{5} id^{4} koi^{1} sii^{2} ngai^{5} qiu^{3} xia^{2} id^{4} fun^{3} gau^{1} hog^{8} gie^{3} vag^{8} su^{1}
semester as soon as begin 1SG EMP write one CL teach plan
bun^{1} hog^{8} sang^{1} e^{2} qin^{1} siin^{1} ti^{2} ngaim^{3} hag^{4} ga^{1} fung^{1} qin^{5}
BUN student personally experience Hakka customs and practices
'As soon as the semester began, I wrote a teaching plan so that students could personally experience the spirit of Hakka customs and practices.'

(34) 前兩日，細舅公个賴仔來佢屋下看阿爸，分佢試著盡感心
qien^{5} *liong*^{2} *ngid*^{4} *se*^{3} *kiu*^{1}*gung*^{1} *ge*^{3} *lai*^{3}*-e*^{2} *loi*^{5} *vug*^{4}*ha*^{1}
before two CLF little grandmother's brother NOM son-SF come home
kon^{3} *a*^{1}*ba*^{1} *bun*^{1} *ngai*^{5} *cii*^{3}*do*^{2} *qin*^{3} *gam*^{2}*xim*^{1}
see father BUN 1SG feel very touched
'The visit of the son of my grandmother's youngest brother to my father two days ago made me feel so touched.'

(35) 醫生無細意个態度摎行為分病人自家死忒
i^{1}*sen*^{1} *mo*^{5} *se*^{3}*ngi*^{3} *ge* *tai*^{5}*tu*^{5} *lau*^{1} *hang*^{3}*vi*^{3}
doctor NEG careful NOM attitude LAU behavior
bun^{1} *piang*^{3}*ngin*^{3} *cii*^{3}*ga*^{1} *si*^{2}*-ted*^{4}
BUN patient by oneself die-PHA
'The doctor, through his careless attitude and behavior, led to the patient's dying by himself/herself.'

6. Concluding remarks

This study has endeavored to offer a comprehensive and descriptively plausible account of Hakka causative *bun*^{1} constructions, and so provide a contribution to a more systematic characterization of the complex conceptual category of causation. While the grammaticalized extension from lexical 'give' to causation is prevalent in many languages, there needs to be a finer-grained investigation of the linguistically-manifested grammatical elements in order to provide a clear description of the linguistic elements involved in the complex concept of causation. Two syntactic configurations as given in (12a–c) are identified following the two syntactic structures of dative alternation (see Lai 2001). It is claimed that all of the components of the construction need to be integrated holistically to allow for a better understanding of the relations of the two events connected by *bun*^{1}. In particular, an understanding of the features of the CAUSER and the CAUSEE such as intentionality, animacy, volition, and the semantic nuances of the EFFECT predicates is crucial in order to explicitly tease out the nature of the possible relation between the two events connected by *bun*^{1}. Four major subtypes are posited, with each sharing certain generalizations, but differing in specific idiosyncrasies. As a result, the four types are claimed to form a family of related constructions.

In addition, the skewed proportion of permissive and purposive types of *bun*^{1} causatives in the corpus data manifests the dominant distribution of cause–act causation. The verbal sense of *bun*^{1} in the permissive function derives from its sense of giving as a ditransitive verb. The purposive function derives from its goal-marking function in conjunction with the reanalysis of *bun*^{1} into a clausal connector. The study also sets out the relation between transfer, purpose, and result in more detail than previous studies. It claims that while counter-factuality is a crucial feature for identifying the cause–result-type causatives, it is too restrictive to account for the semantics of cause–act-type causatives. In line with Song's (1996) position, the study argues that such a defining feature should

be relaxed, if not deleted. Since the connector *bun*^{1} carries a lexical meaning of giving, denoting a human activity involving a transfer of possession of an entity, the connection of transfer with purpose is cognitively natural, as the purpose of such a transfer is often present in the construction. Since a purpose is a desired result and is usually pragmatically inferred in default situations, and since humans tend to expect the success of their intended actions, the strong affinity between purpose and result can often give rise to semantic conventionalization of purpose as a part of the meaning of the connector.

In Hakka, the functions of both cause–act-type and cause–result-type causatives are shouldered by one single marker originating from the verb of giving *bun*^{1}. To encompass both cross-linguistic generality and Hakka specificity, the study employs purposive-type causatives and permissive-type causatives to account for the skewed distribution of the cause–act category in the corpus data. It is considered that the current proposal offers a better account both for well-motivated syntactic and semantic polysemy patterns and for the fact that all of the notions of transfer, purpose, and result are conflated into one single polysemous marker in Hakka.

Furthermore, in contrast to what is expected under a prototypical iconic sequencing of the participants, the usage of authentic data reveals that not all parts of a causal chain will manifest linguistically, with some portions being gapped. To serve a certain information packaging function, CAUSEE constituents are found topicalized or left dislocated while CAUSERs are found to be omitted. In fact, sometimes, the whole causing event is gapped either when it is not important, or when it is already established in the scenario created by the story. While the analysis verifies Talmy's (2000:494) depictions of a basic causative situation—'[t]he caused event functions as the Figure and the causing event as the Ground of the whole situation . . .'—this study, by examining authentic data in a larger discourse in a corpus, sets out in detail how the intricate relationships of the two events manifest in a story-telling genre. Scrutiny of the discourse contexts further demonstrates that desired and permitted resulting events not only are realized, but also play more prominent roles in the contexts than causing events.

In fact, such an arrangement of the information flow can be speculated to be a process of preparation for the further grammaticalization of *bun*^{1} from causative to passive. It is worth remembering that intentionality does not feature anymore in the causing event for non-preventive causatives, and a CAUSEE undergoes a resultant state brought about by the causing event. As the resulting event is often in focus, and the causing event is sometimes gapped or occurs with the agentive CAUSER suppressed, it is highly likely for the CAUSEE to receive further promotion as the topic. As Givón (1993) points out, the emergence of a passive construction involves the demotion of the agent and at the same time the promotion of a non-agent participant into the primary topic. A further investigation of causative *bun*^{1} constructions and passive constructions, as well as of how the constructions interact with the information structure of discourse contexts, is an issue that is worthy of further research.

It is also worth noting, incidentally, that Gilquin (2010) finds a noticeable absence of an explicit causing event in most *get* and *have* constructions in both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the English periphrastic causative constructions based on a subset of the British National Corpus and other authentic sources. 'The profiling of the causing event . . . appears to be the exception, rather than the rule . . .' (Gilquin 2010:78). Thus, both English, a dominant language

for which there is a large amount of corpus data, and Hakka, a minor language for which there is a relatively much smaller amount of such data, testify to the significance of the dynamicity of the actual use of language and to the extent to which the study of such use may shape theoretical study. A more careful investigation into various constructions based on empirical data, on the one hand, and more in-depth examination of the theories, on the other, can bring about added value for both in the future.

References

Chang, Li-li. 2006. Hanyu shiyiju biao beidong de yuyi fazhan [The semantic development from causatives to passives in Chinese]. *Language and Linguistics* 7.1:139–174.

Chappell, Hilary, & Alain Peyraube. 2006. The analytic causatives of Early Modern Southern Min in diachronic perspective. *Linguistic Studies in Chinese and Neighboring Languages: Festschrift in Honor of Professor Pang-Hsin Ting on his 70th Birthday*, ed. by Dah-an Ho, H. Samuel Cheung, Wuyun Pan & Fuxiang Wu, 973–1011. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.

Chappell, Hilary, Ming Li, & Alain Peyraube. 2007. Chinese linguistics and typology: the state of the art. *Linguistic Typology* 11.1:187–211.

Chiang, Min-hua. 2006. Dongshi Kejiahua 'tung' yu 'bun' de yufa tezheng ji erzhe zhijian de guanxi [Grammatical characteristics of *tung* and *bun* in Dongshi Hakka and the relatedness of the two markers]. *Language and Linguistics* 7.2:339–364.

Comrie, Bernard. 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

da Silva, Augusto Soares. 2007. Verbs of letting: some cognitive and historical aspects. *On Interpreting Construction Schemas: From Action and Motion to Transitivity and Causality*, ed. by Nicole Delbecque & Bert Cornillie, 171–200. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gilquin, Gaëtanelle. 2007. The place of prototypicality in corpus linguistics: causation in the hot seat. *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics: Corpus-based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis*, ed. by Stefan Th. Gries & Anatol Stefanowitsch, 159–191. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gilquin, Gaëtanelle. 2010. *Corpus*, *Cognition and Causative Constructions*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1993. *English Grammar: A Function-based Introduction*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Goldberg, Adele E., & Ray Jackendoff. 2004. The English resultative as a family of constructions. *Language* 80.3:523–568.

Heine, Bernd, & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Huang, Han-chun. 2005. Causation types and the path to passives: a comparative study of Hakka *pun* and Mandarin *rang*. Paper presented at 2005 National Conference on Linguistics, July 3–4, 2005. Hsinchu: National Chiao Tung University.

Kroeger, Paul. 2004. *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-functional Approach*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lai, Huei-ling. 2001. On Hakka *bun*: a case of polygrammaticalization. *Language and Linguistics* 2.2:137–153.

Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women*, *Fire*, *and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, Vol. 2: *Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Lin, Ying-chin. 1990. Remarques sur "ˌPUN" 與 et "ˌLAU" (/"ˌTHUNG" 同) dans les dialectes Hakka. *Cahiers de Linguistique—Asie Orientale* 19.1:61–89.

Newman, John. 1996. *Give: A Cognitive Linguistic Study*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Newman, John. (ed.) 1998. *The Linguistics of Giving*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Newman, John. 2005. Three-place predicates: a cognitive-linguistic perspective. *Language Sciences* 27.2:145–163.

Norman, Jerry. 1982. Four notes on Chinese-Altaic linguistic contacts. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series 14.1–2:243–248.

Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten. 2009. *A Typology of Purpose Clauses*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Shibatani, Masayoshi, & Prashant Pardeshi. 2002. The causative continuum. *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*, ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani, 85–126. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Song, Jae Jung. 1996. *Causatives and Causation: A Universal-typological Perspective*. London & New York: Longman.

Song, Jae Jung. 1998. On the development of MANNER from GIVE. *The Linguistics of Giving*, ed. by John Newman, 327–348. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sun, Chaofen. 1996. *Word-order Change and Grammaticalization in the History of Chinese*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*, Vol. 1: *Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Tang, Ting-chi. 2000. Pivotal constructions: structure and function. *Selected Papers from the Fifth International Conference on Chinese Linguistics*, ed. by H. Samuel Wang, Feng-fu Tsao & Chinfa Lien, 87–118. Taipei: Crane.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1998. The semantics of English causative constructions in a universal-typological perspective. *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*, ed. by Michael Tomasello, 113–153. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Xu, Dan. 1994. The status of marker *gei* in Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 22.2:363–394.

Yap, Foong Ha, & Shoichi Iwasaki. 2003. From causatives to passives: a passage in some East and Southeast Asian languages. *Cognitive Linguistics and Non-Indo-European Languages*, ed. by Eugene H. Casad & Gary B. Palmer, 419–445. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Yeh, Jui-chuan. 2012. On the grammaticalization and subjectification of the 'HO+X' (好 X) construction in Hakka. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series 42.2:527–565.

[Received 23 January 2013; revised 6 May 2014; accepted 20 May 2014]

Department of English
National Chengchi University
64, Sec. 2, ZhiNan Road
Taipei 116, Taiwan
hllai@nccu.edu.tw

剖析客語「分」致使構式

賴惠玲
國立政治大學

本文本著構式語法之精神，剖析客語「分」致使構式之致使者、遭受者、及使動效果等之語意屬性及句法行為，主張客語「分」致使構式應該更細緻劃分成四次類：允讓類、目的使令類、被迫類及非防止性類。本文因而認為過去文獻中用「語意意涵」測試致使義過於侷限應該放鬆，才能涵蓋佔大多數之允讓與使令用法。此外，本文檢視語料庫中「分」致使構式出現之更大言談語境，發現不同於過去文獻之主張致使事件在前結果事件在後之典型象似性詞序，結果事件在訊息結構中扮演更重要的角色，因此遭受者主題化或靠左提升，以及致使者隱現反而是常見之訊息管理策略，而此句法行為是「分」致使構式進一步語法化成被動用法之前奏。

關鍵詞：客語「分」構式，致使，目的，使令，前景–背景