Causative constructions of the *hacer / fare + verb* type in Spanish and Italian, and their Czech counterparts: a parallel corpus-based study[1]

Pavel Štichauer — Petr Čermák (Prague)

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the Czech translation counterparts of the Spanish / Italian causative construction with the causative verb *hacer / fare* + verb. On the basis of two parallel corpora, a typology of Czech equivalents is proposed. In contrast to the general divide between analytic/synthetic translation constructions, the research uncovers a number of various recurrent patterns. The paper shows the quantitative distribution of the defined types of patterns. It demonstrates that between the two opposite poles of expressing causativity, i.e. through morphological causativization and syntactic causative construction, there are languages, such as Czech, that display a wider range of structural possibilities. Although some types clearly dominate, the overall range of patterns is much larger.

KEYWORDS

causatives, parallel corpus, Italian, Spanish, Czech, translation patterns

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we intend to present an empirically based contrastive study of causative constructions in two (or, more precisely, three) typologically different languages: on the one hand, we deal with the Italian and Spanish *fare / hacer + verb* constructions and, on the other hand, with their equivalents in Czech, a West Slavic language which displays a rather heterogeneous range of possibilities to express causativity. The study is strictly corpus-based in that the data to be presented are all drawn from two independent parallel corpora (which are part of the *Czech National Corpus*, and particularly of the *InterCorp* project) — Spanish/Czech and Italian/Czech.

The aim of this paper is to show that between languages with two opposite poles of linguistic expression of causativity, i.e. regular morphological causativization (through affixation) and syntactic (or periphrastic) causativization whereby a general causative verb is combined with a lexical base verb, there are also languages — such as Czech — that encode causativity in various other ways by combining morphological and syntactic means in rather unpredictable ways.

The paper aims to arrive at a typology of Czech structural equivalents of Romance causative constructions, while acknowledging, as will be reiterated below, that these

---

are, more precisely, *translation solutions* that tend to exhibit diverse adaptations due to the textual type, the translator's idiolect, etc.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly introduce the topic of the paper focusing on the fundamental difference between the morphological and the syntactic expression of causativity. In Section 3, we deal with the main characteristics of the Spanish, Italian and Czech expressions of causativity. In Section 4, we describe the parallel corpus InterCorp. In Section 5, we put forward a typology of Czech systemic equivalents. In Section 6, we provide the main quantitative evaluation of the defined types of equivalent, and in Section 7 we proceed to a further discussion of the main distributional properties of the proposed typology. In Section 8, we conclude our investigation highlighting some problems and limitations.

2. CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS —
SYNTACTIC VS. MORPHOLOGICAL REALISATION

Generally, "in a causative construction, a bare verb, V, (...) alternates with a verb meaning 'cause/allow/persuade/help ...to V' (...)." (Sadler — Spencer, 1998, 226). Causativity can be realised either *syntactically*, or *morphologically*. The syntactic realisation makes use of a *causative verb* that combines with the base verb giving rise to complex predicates of the well-known type *Bill made Phil sing a song*. The morphological realisation expresses causativity through *affixation* using a causative morpheme (e.g., the English *en-* in *enslave*, in Japanese, etc.).

In a wide range of languages, this kind of morphological causativization is quite common and completely regular; this situation, as Sadler and Spencer (1998, 227) claim, has led "many researchers [to] regard the morphological causative as an instance of an argument-structure alternation, rather than lexemic derivation proper. This is particularly attractive when the causative is completely productive and lacking in lexical idiosyncrasies."

3. ITALIAN / SPANISH *HACER* / *FARE + VERB*
CONSTRUCTIONS VS. CZECH CAUSATIVIZATION

Spanish and Italian (along with other Romance languages) are known to use a highly productive and unrestricted causative construction with the causative verb *hacer / fare* + infinitive (*hacer pensar / far pensare* 'to make think').[2] Czech, one of the West Slavic languages, lacks this analytic construction and displays other structural possibilities

2   This is obviously a simplified point of view as there are some syntactic differences between the two languages which may restrict the use of a causative construction but which do not seem to have much relevance for the present contrastive study. For detailed characteristics of these constructions in Spanish cf., e.g., Campos (1999, 1544), Mendikoetxea (1999. 1692), Delbecque — Lamiroy (1999, 2013), and in Italian, e.g. Salvi — Vanelli (2004, 234–239); Skytte — Salvi (2001, 497–509). We summarize these characteristics in Sections 3.1.-3.2.

of expressing causativity instead. One of these possibilities is, as we might expect, a morphological realisation through affixation: one of the traditional views of how a causative construction can be translated into Czech is by using a specific causative prefix *roz-* (*plakat* 'weep' / *roz-plakat* 'to make weep').

However, the prefix *roz-* is a very constrained affix which is limited in use not only by its productivity, but especially by the restrictions imposed on the verb selection: only a very small subset of verbs allows for the *roz-* prefixation.[3] In Czech, there is thus more variation as far as the range of structural possibilities is concerned; and it is therefore evident that an attempt to establish a contrastive typology cannot possibly result in a "clear-cut" binary picture.

In what follows, we briefly describe the main ways and characteristics of expressing causativity in each of the languages under investigation.

3.1. CAUSATIVITY IN SPANISH

Within the traditional framework of Spanish linguistics, a distinction is sometimes made between factitive and causative expressions. In RAE (2009, 2624 ff.), for instance, the factitive meaning is taken to be a subtype of a more general causative meaning. The factitive construction is defined for those cases where the subject is not the agent of the process/state expressed by the verb, but is integrated into the construction as a *causer*, i.e., as a subject that *causes* someone else to perform the action expressed by the verb.

Under such a view, there are various expressions that carry the causative meaning: change-of-state verbs such as *entristecer* 'to make sad', *enloquecer* 'to make crazy', or various verbal constructions such as *poner + adjective, volver + adjective, dejar + adjective*. When dealing with the causative verb *hacer*, RAE (2009, 2620, 3107 ff.) focuses on the relationship between the causative verb *hacer* and the base verb (dubbed here *verbo medio*), and proposes to distinguish the following three instances:

1) The causative verb *hacer* and the *verbo medio* are lexically and semantically distinct, e.g. *matar — hacer morir* ('to kill — to make die').
2) The *verbo medio* is almost identical to the causative verb, the distinction is in that it has a reflexive form, e.g. *secar — hacer secarse* ('to dry — to make dry').
3) The causative verb is identical to the *verbo medio*, e.g. *aumentar — hacer aumentar* ('to increase — to make increase').

This typology comes very close to our purpose in that it posits the fundamental semantic aspect of this construction which is the basic means of expressing causativity in Spanish.

The combination of the causative verb *hacer* with any verb base seems to be largely unrestricted both syntactically and semantically. However, there are some particular aspects traditionally mentioned in the literature, such as the similarities and differences of the causative constructions with respect to other infinitival constructions (Hernanz, 1999, 2247 ff.), syntactic constraints (Hernanz, 1999, 2247–2248), the be-

---

3   Moreover, the attested prefixed verbs also display some unpredictable idiosyncrasies.

haviour of clitics within the construction (Fernández–Ordóñez, 1999, 1326–1327; Hernanz, 1999, 2249 ff.), the behaviour of the reflexive pronouns, negation, etc. (cf., e.g., Hernanz, 1999, 2255).

Particular attention is also paid to the differences between the *hacer + verb* construction and other constructions, especially those which seem to compete with the *hacer + verb* pattern, e.g. *dejar + verb*. In fact, the latter construction, while being syntactically identical, displays a subtle semantic specialisation (in terms of a higher degree of '*permissiveness*'). On the basis of a number of examples (e.g. *Dejó llorar al bebé toda la tarde*, lit. 'She left/made the baby weep all the afternoon'), Hernanz (1999, 2258–2265) claims that the semantic feature involved can be best described as '*no impedir*', i.e. not impeding the action performed by the underlying subject of the embedded verb. This semantic feature accounts for the low acceptability of *hacer* in the following example: *En la carretera había un inmenso socavón que no dejaba/*hacía pasar los coches* ('There was a huge hole in the road that did not allow / *make the cars pass through').

3.2. CAUSATIVITY IN ITALIAN

In Italian, the difference between factitive and causative constructions is generally not posited at all (cf. Skytte — Salvi, 2001; Salvi — Vanelli, 2004, among others). We thus find, under the general heading of *factitive constructions*, both causative constructions with the causative verbs *fare / lasciare + verb* and other infinitival constructions, such as the so-called *costruzione percettiva* with *intendere, sentire, udire, vedere*.

Even though the syntactic realisation of both types of constructions is identical, there is a fundamental semantic difference, alluded to also above in the case of Spanish, between *fare* and *lasciare*. In fact, the causative verb *lasciare* shows similar semantic features identified also in its Spanish counterpart *dejar*. We find the semantic difference (the absence/presence of a degree of '*permissiveness*') in the low acceptability of, say, *far capire /?lasciar capire* ('to make understand –?to let/leave understand'), as opposed to the neutral *far entrare / lasciar entrare* ('to make enter –?to let/leave enter').

The construction with the causative verb *fare* displays the following properties (cf. Skytte — Salvi, 2001, 499–509):

1) The causative construction carries one more argument/participant, semantically described as *causer*, and introduced by the causative verb *fare*.
2) The resulting construction behaves as a kind of complex predicate which rules out some syntactic transformations, for instance it is impossible to have some types of topic fronting / dislocations or verb extractions, cf. *preferisco mangiare la minestra — è mangiare la minestra che preferisco* ('I prefer eating the soup — it is eating the soup that I prefer') vs. *gli faccio mangiare la minestra — *è mangiare la minestra che gli faccio* ('I make him eat the soup — *it is eat the soup that I make him').
3) As opposed to Spanish (and other Romance languages), the Italian *fare + verb* construction can undergo passivization, cf. *Paolo ha fatto cadere il libro — il libro è stato fatto cadere (da Paolo)* ('Paul made the book fall — the book has been made to fall (by Paul)'). In our corpus, this construction is rather marginal: it does not reach the minimum number of tokens to be taken into consideration, and so it is not further analysed in the present paper.

4) As in Spanish (but probably to a greater extent), it is possible to split the construction by embedding various elements, such as adverbs, between the causative verb and the base verb. Again, given the low token frequency of such cases, in the following we work exclusively with the "clean" sequences of the causative verb immediately succeeded by the base verb (see Čermák — Nádvorníková, 2015, 49–50, 59 for a discussion and the precise evaluation of the qualitative and quantitative aspects of this possibility).

3.3. CAUSATIVITY IN CZECH

While in the Romance languages we have limited our attention only to the neutral causative constructions with *hacer / fare* which we will take as a starting point, in Czech our approach is quite different. We will deal with all possible expressions of causativity that can potentially represent a systemic equivalent of the Romance causative construction. In what follows, we rely on the traditional classification of causative verbs put forward by Karlík — Nekula — Pleskalová (2002, 412–413). As will be shown, this classification overlaps, to a large extent, with the typology of Czech equivalents that we will propose below, in Section 5.

Karlík — Nekula — Pleskalová (2002) distinguish three major causative verb types: first, the verbs which are created by means of a word-formation process; second, the verbs where causativity is inherently built in the semantics of the verb; and, third, various analytic (or phrasal) constructions conveying causativity. These types will be briefly described in more detail.

First, there are causative (transitive) verbs which are linked to their non-causative (intransitive) verbs by means of a word-formation process (derivation), e.g. *sedět — posadit* ('to sit / to be seated — to make sit'), *plakat — rozplakat* ('to weep — to make weep'). Besides these prefixed deverbal verbs, we also find deadjectival verbs, such as *modrý — modřit* ('blue — to make blue/to paint blue'), and there is an important group of verbs which form pairs of reflexive and non-reflexive forms, e.g. *rozhněvat se — rozhněvat* ('to get angry — to make angry'), *rozbít se — rozbít* ('to get broken — to break').

Second, the large and heterogeneous class of "inherently" causative verbs, under which also the first class could theoretically be subsumed, contains verbs like *shodit — spadnout* ('to make fall — to fall'), where no word-formation process can be assumed, or causatives that manifest such argument-changing behaviour only syntactically, e.g. *zblbnout*, which can be used both as an intransitive change-of-state verb (*Petr úplně zblbnul* 'Petr got totally stupid') and as a transitive causative verb (*Petr úplně zblbnul svého kamaráda* 'Peter made his friend totally confused').

Finally, the third group is comprised of various analytic constructions, ranging from complex clauses where the verb in the main clause explicitly expresses causativity (e.g. *způsobit, aby /že* 'to cause that') to full-fledged causative constructions with the verb *nechat/dát* ('let/leave/give') + *verb*.

As already noted, this classification will be taken over, with slight modifications and some essential improvements, in our treatment of Czech equivalents that will be presented below in Section 5. Before embarking on this classification, a word on the parallel corpus is in order.

OPEN
ACCESS

4. DATA EXTRACTION FROM THE PARALLEL CORPUS INTERCORP

As already mentioned at the outset of this paper, this research is strictly corpus-based: all the presented data have been obtained from an Italian-Czech / Spanish-Czech parallel corpus under the InterCorp. The InterCorp, which is part of the Czech National Corpus (www.korpus.cz), is a project whose goal is to build up parallel corpora[4] for most of the languages taught at the Faculty of Arts of Charles University in Prague. The quantitative description of the parallel corpus will be given below along with the main results.

In order to obtain the parallel data, we proceeded first to a rough sequence-based search, combined with POS tags (whereby the sequences of *hacer / fare + Vinf* have been extracted using a general CQL query *[lemma="hacer/fare"] [tag="VLinf"]*), and, second, we did all necessary post-processing involving also careful and time-consuming manual correction and verification.

On the basis of a limited range of tokens, and drawing on the classification presented in Section 3 above, we have developed a typology of Czech equivalents that, as will be shown, extends beyond the original Czech classification in that it includes some unexpected (but much exploited) translation solutions.

5. TYPOLOGY OF CZECH EQUIVALENTS

The typology of Czech "translation equivalents" (cf., e.g., Čermák — Corness — Klégr, 2010), or "recurrent translation patterns" (cf., e.g., Krzeszowski, 1990, 27), created on the basis of the parallel-corpus data, proposes/identifies/includes 11 types. Of these the last 11th type is reserved for those cases where there is *no match* with any of the ten positively defined types. There is a general divide running across these types which splits them into, on the one hand, *synthetic* solutions (1–4), and, on the other hand, *analytic* constructions (5–9).

Type 1. The causative roz- *prefixation.* This type is usually taken to represent a kind of default translation solution. However, the prefix *roz-* is problematic for at least two reasons.

First, besides conveying causative semantic instruction, it may also have other meanings depending on the semantics of the base verb, e.g. *rozběhnout se* ('to start running'), where an ingressive rather than causative meaning is triggered.

Second, the prefix is highly restrictive in the selection of verb bases. Only a few verbs allow for causative *roz-* prefixation; for instance, it is totally unacceptable to form verbs such as **rozvidět* (a hypothetical form meaning 'to make see').[5]

An example of this translation solution is given in (1).[6]

---

4   See, e.g., Aijmer (2008) for a general discussion of parallel corpora.
5   Although the question of such constraints is important, it is of course beyond the scope of the present paper.
6   In all examples taken from the corpus (and limited mainly to the Spanish-Czech (sub)corpus, due to its richness), we provide only a partial English gloss of the verbs involved, leav-

(1) *llorar/hacer llorar — plakat/rozplakat* ('to cry/weep — to make cry/weep')
*Ya **la hizo llorar a su mamá** — dijo la madre de la Nelly. → „Až **jste rozplakal svou matku**," řekla Nellina matka.* (Julio Cortázar, *Výherci*, transl. Blanka Stárková, Prague: Garamond, 2007).

Type 2. Other prefixations: otočit. Also this type is problematic in that some causative verbs may contain prefixes that exhibit some additional semantic — typically aspectual — properties. However, in all instances — clearly rather infrequent — we find the causative meaning as well, e.g. *opít* ('to make drunk'). One example is given in (2).

(2) *girar/hacer girar — točit se/otočit* ('to turn — to make turn')
*Medrano **hizo girar la llave** de la puerta y la entreabrió. → Medrano **otočil klíčem** ve dveřích a pootevřel je.* (Julio Cortázar, *Výherci*, transl. Blanka Stárková, Prague: Garamond, 2007).

Type 3. The i-stem verbs: posadit.[7] This type generally contains all deverbal verbs which display an unpredictable and irregular behaviour, and in which the prefix does not fulfil any discernible causative function, as we can see in (3).

(3) *sentar/hacer sentar — sedět/posadit* ('to sit — to make sit')
*Benita Sepúlveda **me hizo sentar** en el lustrador de zapatos, rodeada de guardias. → Benita Sepúlvedová **mě posadila** na židli čističů bot a rozestavěla kolem mě stráže.* (Mario Vargas Llosa, *Kozlova slavnost*, transl. Petr Zavadil, Prague: Mladá fronta, 2006).

Type 4. The semantic/inherent causative verbs: shodit. This type, defined rather broadly, includes lexically autonomous one-word equivalents, i.e. verbs which are not complex and which convey causativity as a lexically specified feature of the meaning; the defining feature of this type of verbs is the absence of a derivational relationship between pairs of semantically related causative and non-causative verbs (e.g., *hacer pensare / far pensare* 'to make think' — *připomínat* 'remind of').
The type is illustrated by (4).

(4) *caer/hacer caer — spadnout/shodit* ('to fall — to make fall')
*Había espacio en la pasarela del andamio junto a la cornisa para que **alguien los hubiese hecho caer**. → Na plošině lešení u římsy bylo dost místa na to, aby **je někdo shodil**.* (Arturo Pérez Reverte, *Kůže na buben*, transl. Vladimír Medek, Prague: Euromedia Group, 2004).

---

ing aside a complete — and stylistically reliable — translation of the whole passage which is clearly beyond the limits of this paper.

7   For a precise morphological definition of these *i-stem verbs* see Karlík — Nekula — Pleskalová (2002, 412–413).

***Type 5. The analytic causative construction:* dát napít.** With this type, which is structurally identical to the Spanish/Italian construction, we move on to analytic translation patterns. Although there are various — semantically specialised — causative verbs, such as *dát, nechat, přimět/přinutit,* and *dovolit* ('to give', 'to let', 'to force', and 'to allow', respectively), we still consider them to belong to this type for the simple reason that syntactically they all have the same realisation (the causative verb + *infinitive*).

An example of this construction analogous in all three languages is given in (5).

(5) *beber/hacer beber — pít/dát pít* ('to drink — to make drink')
Úrsula, que había aprendido de su madre el valor medicinal de las plantas, preparó e **hizo beber a todos un brebaje** *de acónito (...). → Úrsula, která od své matky znala léčivé vlastnosti různých bylin, připravila odvar z oměje a* **dala jim ho vypít** *(...).*
(Gabriel García Márquez, *Sto roků samoty,* transl. Vladimír Medek, Prague: Odeon, 2003).

***Type 6. Idiomatic constructions:* dohnat k slzám.** This type subsumes specific, and rather heterogeneous, analytic constructions bordering on phraseological multi-word expressions (e.g., *hacer pensare / far pensare* 'to make think' — *vést k úvahám* lit. 'to lead to reflections'). The degree of idiomaticity of the construction is clearly shown by the fact that the verb cannot combine freely with any (direct or prepositional) complement; nor can the verb be alternatively substituted with other similar verbs. Thus, for instance, in *dohnat k slzám,* only a limited number of alternations can be made, such as *dohnat k pláči / k nářku /?k breku,* whilst other verbs, such as ?? *přitáhnout k pláči* (lit. 'to drag to crying') are clearly ruled out (with the one exception of *donutit k pláči/slzám,* lit. 'force to tears').

A different example is offered in (6).

(6) *saber/hacer saber — vědět/dát na srozuměnou* ('to know — to make know')
Y **le hizo saber** *que si esta vez el hijo se muere antes de nacer, igual que las otras veces, será culpa de la mujer y no de un kamagarini. → A* **dal mu na srozuměnou,** *že pokud i tentokrát dítě zemře před narozením, bude to vinou ženy, ne kamagariniho.* (Mario Vargas Llosa, *Vypravěč,* transl. Anežka Charvátová, Prague: Mladá fronta, 2003).

***Type 7. The causative light verb + deverbal noun:* způsobit utrpení.** This type is defined, with respect to the preceding Type 6, by the presence of a lexical causative verb (*způsobit, přimět, přinutit*) combined with a deverbal noun ending in *-í* (*utrpení* 'suffering', *stárnutí* 'aging', etc.)[8].

It is illustrated by an example in (7):

---

8 We follow here Karlík — Nübler (1998, 106–107), who define two types of deverbal nouns: those derived by means of different suffixes (e.g. *četba, stavba*), and those which are to be taken rather as syntactically transposed event nouns of the type *kreslení, psaní.* Such a division is morphologically quite clear, but semantically less so since both types of nouns can, in some cases, function as pure event nouns (e.g. *během stavby...* 'during the construction,

(7) *sufrir/hacer sufrir — trpět/způsobit utrpění* ('suffer — to make suffer')
*Le sorprendió que sellarle los ojos con hilos **lo hiciera sufrir** menos que los sacudones del Trono. → Překvapilo ho, že zapečetění očí nití **mu působí** menší **utrpení** než trhavá bolest na trůnu.* (Mario Vargas Llosa, *Kozlova slavnost*, transl. Petr Zavadil, Prague: Mladá fronta, 2006).

Type 8. The biclausal causative construction: způsobit, aby/že trpěli. This type falls under analytic solutions: it consists in a biclausal structure with an explicit causative verb in the main clause and a clause introduced by the complementizer *aby/že*. Crucially, this type is opposed to Type 9, dicussed below, where causativity is expressed in a much more indirect way.

An example of the biclausal causative solution of this type is given in (8):

(8) *creer/hacer creer — uvěřit/způsobit, aby/že uvěřili* ('to believe — to make believe')
*Los guerreros del Escorpión habían penetrado en ese fantástico jardín como en un sueño, drogados por los polvos dorados, que **les hacían creer** todo lo que veían. → Válečníci Škorpiona vstoupili do této kouzelné zahrady jako ve snu, zdrogovaní zlatavým práškem, který **způsobil, že uvěřili** všemu, co viděli.* (Isabel Allende, *Království Zlatého draka*, překl. Monika Baďurová, Prague: BB-art, 2004).

Type 9. The change of syntactic roles (subject-object alternation): ¿Qué le hace pensar así? — proč myslíte? This translation solution consists in a change of syntactic functions. We thus find constructions where the underlying subject of the embedded verb (realised on the surface level as an object of the causative complex verb) is "restored" in the subject function in Czech (which results in the suppression of the complex causative construction). Schematically, the Spanish/Italian causative construction, such as *X hace llorar a Y* ('X makes cry Y'), corresponds to the straightforward *Y llora* ('Y cries') in the Czech translation, and the causativity linked to the agent X is expressed indirectly or is not expressed at all.

Given the heterogeneous nature of this translation pattern, two different examples are supplied in (9) and (10) below:

(9) *brillar/hacer brillar — zářit/x, až se rozzářila* ('shine — to make shine')
*Cogió la diadema con la punta de los dedos y **la hizo brillar** bajo la luz deslumbrante. → Konečky prstů uchopil čelenku a **podržel ji** pod oslnivým světlem, **až se** celá **rozzářila.*** (Gabriel García Márquez, *Dvanáct povídek o poutnících*, transl. Vladimír Medek, Prague: Odeon, 2005).

(10) *abrir/hacer abrir — otevřít/otevřít (při)* ('open — to make open')
*Fue una sensación aguda, fugaz como un relámpago, que **le hizo abrir los ojos** de puro terror. → Byl to ostrý, prchavý pocit, jako blesk, při němž **hrůzou otevřel oči**.*

when building'), and, at the same time, can undergo lexicalisation and become concrete referential nouns (e.g. *psaní* in the sense of *letter*) (cf. Štichauer, 2008, 50–51 for a critical discussion of these deverbal nouns).

(Javier Sierra, *Tajemství poslední večeře*, transl. Miluše Válková, Prague: Euro-media Group, 2006).

Type 10. Unclassifiable translation solutions. This type obviously comprises all translation solutions which do not fit into any of the above types.

To be sure, this type may be extremely interesting from a translational point of view, but cannot be satisfactorily captured by any quantifiable typology. Let us consider one case of such an unpredictable solution in the Italian example in (11), to which a more detailed gloss is added, for the sake of clarity:

(11) *sapere/far sapere* — vědět/dát vědět ('to know — to make know'):
Soprattutto però era una città istruita: è sempre il **Villani a farci sapere ['it is still Villani who makes us know']** *che gli 8–10.000 bambini fiorentini sapevano tutti leggere e scrivere (...).* → *Především však byla městem vzdělaným:* **podle Villaniho [according to Villani]** *umělo 8 — 10 tisíc florentských dětí číst a psát (...).* (Giuliano Proccaci, *Dějiny Itálie*, transl. Bohumír Klípa — Drahoslava Janderová — Kateřina Vinšová, Prague: NLN, 2007).

Type 11. „No match": no translation at all. By "no match" we mean those cases which do not contain an explicit expression corresponding to the causative construction. Sometimes (and, of course, the frequency of the phenomenon may be relevant) the translation is implicit with respect to the original, e.g. in Italian, *Ha aperto la porta per farli entrare* lit. 'he opened the door to make them enter' — *otevřel jim dveře*, lit.'he opened them the door'. In this sense, then, the translation solution does not comply with any of the types.

6. A QUANTITATIVE OVERVIEW OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Following an outline of the qualitative typology of the Czech translation patterns, the next step is to look at the quantitative aspects of the investigation. First, the section gives the overall figures of the corpus search starting with the number of verbs entering the causative constructions and their frequencies. Second, it presents the quantitative distribution of the above ten types.

As already mentioned, all data come from two parallel corpora: Spanish-Czech and Italian-Czech; since both corpora are of a different size, no direct comparison of the figures is possible, and so only the relative frequencies of the types are taken into consideration. Nevertheless, in what follows, we present all statistics obtained from the corpus search.

First, the exact size of the corpora (in tokens) is given below in **Table 1**.

	Spanish	Italian
Number of texts	105	17
Number of tokens (Spanish/Italian)	9326150	1631204

TABLE 1. Corpus size Spanish/Italian: number of text/number of tokens

Second, **Table 2** provides the details of the search: the overall number of verb types, the number of verb types according to their frequencies (from the most frequent ones to the *hapaxes*).

	Spanish	Italian
The total types (of verbs) / the total tokens (of verbs)	755 / 4533	494 / 2994
Relative token frequency	0.49‰	1.83‰
Verbs with the token frequency ≥ 15 (Spanish), 10 (Italian) / the total tokens	65 / 2858	41 / 810
Verbs with the token frequency 2–14 (Spanish), 2–9 (Italian) / the total tokens	324 / 1309	157 / 723
Hapaxes	366	296

TABLE 2. The basic results of the corpus search: number of total types, relative frequencies, total types according to frequencies

Leaving aside the differences in token frequencies (due to a rather large difference in the size of the two corpora), the frequency limit requires some comment. Since the aim is to provide the quantification of the most frequent types defined above, it was necessary to set a lower frequency limit on which verbs will be considered. The verbs whose token frequency is less than 15 tokens for Spanish and 10 tokens for Italian were not taken into consideration simply because the number of "translation solutions" is far too low for any valid conclusions to be drawn. Moreover, these solutions, if amounting to just a couple of examples, would tend to be distorted in other ways (for example, by the unbalanced text representation, or by some "idiolectal effects" due to one concrete translator).[9]

7. QUANTITATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE DIFFERENT TYPES

The results summarized in **Table 3** and **Table 4**, for Spanish and Italian respectively, were obtained by computing tokens of each verb within the imposed frequency limit.

	Verbs	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11
Tokens	4533	122	104	14	**1034**	**369**	**278**	9	94	**603**	203	28
%	100	4	4	1	**36**	**13**	**10**	0	3	**21**	7	1

TABLE 3. The frequencies of each of the types — Spanish (T = Type)

9 For the list of these 65/41 verbs (Spanish/Italian) see Čermák — Nádvorníková, 2015, 41–42, 52.

	Verbs	**T1**	**T2**	**T3**	**T4**	**T5**	**T6**	**T7**	**T8**	**T9**	**T10**	**T11**
Tokens	810	7	4	1	**329**	**117**	**39**	0	40	**177**	65	32
%	100	1	1	0	**40**	**15**	**5**	0	5	**21**	8	4

Table 4. The frequencies of each of the types — Italian (T = Type)

The results are interesting in at least two respects. First, there is a significant overlap between the two corpora, regardless of the differences in size. This means that the dominant translation patterns tend to be stable across the two languages under investigation[10] and also across different-sized corpora (providing that the corpus is not too small, of course). Second, the dominant translation types are Type 4 (with 36% and 40% for Spanish and Italian, respectively), Type 9 (with 21 % for both languages), and Type 5 (with 13% and 15% for Spanish and Italian, respectively).

The leading Type 4 (the semantic/inherent causative verb, such as *shodit*) is the solution consisting in a lexically (and derivationally) autonomous equivalent, i.e. a verb which is not a complex word and which conveys causativity as a lexically specified feature of the meaning. The "prevalence" of this type demonstrates that Czech has at its disposal a large amount of semantically specific verbs. This lexical richness, we suggest, makes it unnecessary for Czech translators to use syntactically complex constructions.

Type 9 represents an unexpected outcome of our investigation as it is not mentioned in any of the Czech reference grammars of Spanish or Italian. The solution consists in a change of syntactic roles whereby the underlying subject of the main verb — the object of the complex causative predicate — resumes its subject function in the Czech translation. This translation pattern is probably dictated by functional sentence perspective. Therefore, highlighting the subject or object of the main predicate, with respect to the topic-focus distinction, may be a principal reason for this solution. However, a more detailed analysis is needed, but this is a matter for future research.

Type 5 corresponds to a construction structurally identical to the Spanish/Italian type: it involves the causative verb construction of the type *dát/nechat + infinitive*. Again, an in-depth analysis of the verbs which allow for this solution is required. In fact, only a limited number of verbs can be used in this causative construction. Moreover, the relatively high percentage of this translation pattern could also be accounted for by the influence of the source language. Accordingly, the frequency of the pattern could be enhanced by the presumed effects of what is usually referred to as "translationese". However, the impact of the source language on the use of this particular construction in Czech has been shown to be entirely irrelevant (for details cf. Čermák — Nádvorníková 2015, 23–25).

Finally, the extremely low frequencies of the other types require individual explanations. For instance, the unexploited *roz-* prefixation is, as already mentioned above, extremely constrained; it is limited only to a handful of verbs (*rozplakat, rozbrečet,*

10 Essentially the same situation obtains even when two other Romance languages (French and Portuguese) are taken into consideration, cf. Čermák — Nádvorníková, 2015, 59–79.

rozesmát, roztočit). In fact, this limitation of translation types to a particular set of verbs[11] is clearly visible when a detailed analysis of the verbs is carried out (see the details in Čermák — Nádvorníková 2015, 44–45, 54–55).

8. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The paper presented a parallel corpus-based investigation of the "recurrent translation patterns" of the Spanish and Italian causative verb constructions (with *hacer / fare + infinitive*) and their Czech counterparts.

The study, based on two (sub)corpora of the InterCorp project, developed a typology of Czech equivalents classifying them into 14 major types (the last types 10 and 11 subsume a variety of hardly classifiable or unclassifiable solutions) and offered a quantitative distribution of these types. Both steps, the qualitative typology and the quantitative evaluation of the actual use of the types, resulted in both empirically and theoretically novel findings which go well beyond the traditional and intuitive observations about the interlinguistic correspondences between the Romance languages and the Czech language.

However, the investigation has also highlighted some problems and limitations. First, even within the qualitatively well-defined typology of Czech equivalents there are some original translation solutions which appear to be unclassifiable. Second, the specific usage of some of the verbs is clearly an important factor. As a result, the typology of translation solutions becomes somewhat problematic when it comes to particular verbs.

In spite of these problems, the study has shown that apart from languages with the two opposing modes of expressing causativity — syntactic and morphological — there are languages, such as Czech, where the means of expressing causativity are so heterogeneous that it becomes hard to offer a typologically reliable picture of them. There are, nonetheless, some tendencies on which a parallel corpus-based study may shed some interesting light.

REFERENCES

Aijmer, K. (2008) Parallel and comparable corpora. In: Lüdeling, A. and M. Kytö (eds) *Corpus Linguistics. An International Handbook*, vol. 1, 275–292. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baroni, M. (2009) Distributions in text. In: Lüdeling, A. and M. Kytö (eds) *Corpus Linguistics. An International Handbook*, vol. 2, 803–822. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Campos, H. (1999) Transitividad e intransitividad. In: Bosque, I. and V. Demonte (eds) *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, , 1519–1574. Madrid: Espasa.

Čermák, F., P. Corness and A. Klégr (2010) *InterCorp: Exploring a Multilingual Corpus*. Prague: NLN.

11 Conversely, there are verbs whose translations include a large number of the defined types, whilst other verbs, as mentioned, tend to figure in just one or two translational patterns.

Čermák, P., O. Nádvorníková et al. (2015)
Románské jazyky a čeština ve světle paralelních korpusů [Romance Languages and Czech in the Light of Parallel Corpora]. Prague: Karolinum.

Čermák, P. and P. Štichauer (2010) Španělské a italské kauzativní konstrukce *hacer / fare* + sloveso a jejich české ekvivalenty [Spanish and Italian causative constructions *hacer / fare* + verb and their Czech equivalents]. In: Čermák, F., J. Kocek et al., *Mnohojazyčný korpus Intercorp: Možnosti studia*, 70–90. Prague: NLN.

Delbecque, N. and B. Lamiroy (1999) La subordinación sustantiva: las subordinadas enunciativas en los complementos verbales. In: Bosque, I. and V. Demonte (eds) *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 1965–2081. Madrid: Espasa.

Fernández Ordóñez, O. (1999) Leísmo, laísmo y loísmo. In: Bosque, I. and V. Demonte (eds) *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 1317–1397. Madrid: Espasa.

Hernanz, M. L. (1999) El infinitivo. In: Bosque, I. and V. Demonte (eds), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 2197–2356. Madrid: Espasa.

Karlík, P., M. Nekula and J. Pleskalová (2002) *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny* [An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Czech]. Prague: NLN.

Karlík, P. and N. Nübler (1998) Poznámky k nominalizaci v češtině [Notes on nominalization in Czech]. *Slovo a slovesnost* 59/2, 105–112.

Krzeszowski, T. P. (1990) *Contrasting Languages: The Scope of Contrastive Linguistics.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Li, Y. (2005) *X°. A Theory of the Morphology-Syntax Interface.* Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press.

Mendikoetxea, A (1999) Construcciones con *se*: medias, pasivas e impersonales. In: Bosque, I. and V. Demonte (eds). *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, 1631–1722. Madrid: Espasa.

RAE (2009) *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Libros.

Sadler, L. and A. Spencer (1998) Morphology and argument structure. In: Spencer, A. and A. M. Zwicky (eds) *The Handbook of Morphology*, 206–236. Oxford: Blackwell.

Salvi, G. and L. Vanelli (2004) *Nuova grammatica italiana*. Bologna: il Mulino.

Skytte, G. and G. Salvi (2001) Frasi subordinate all'infinito. In: Renzi, L., G. Salvi and A. Cardinaletti (eds) *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, Nuova edizione, vol. 2, 483–569. Bologna: il Muligno.

Štichauer, P. (2008) *Derivace a kompozice v diachronní perspektivě:* nomina agentis *ve vývoji italštiny* [Derivation and compounding in a diachronic perspective: *nomina agentis* in the development of Italian]. Prague: Karolinum.

Petr Čermák
Department of Romance Studies, Faculty of Arts, Charles University
nám. J. Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1, Czech Republic
petr.cermak@ff.cuni.cz

Pavel Štichauer
Department of Romance Studies, Faculty of Arts, Charles University
nám. J. Palacha 2, 116 38 Praha 1, Czech Republic
pavel.stichauer@ff.cuni.cz