I can't *make* you love me:
A Diachronic Study of (Im)purity in Chinese Analytic Causatives

This study addresses the issue of (im)purity of causative markers when speakers of Mandarin Chinese express the concepts pertinent to causation with analytic construction.

Terasawa's (1985) description of English causative *make* notices there are two types, a "pure causative" and an "agentive causative", which seems a shared feature of analytic causatives in Chinese. But he also claims "the 'coercive' meaning does not develop until much later" with respect to the earliest example of the pure type. This leaves the questions for Chinese: 1) Can we also categorize Chinese analytic causative auxiliaries into exactly the same two types? Are there more or do they need amending to apply to Chinese situation? 2) Which type comes first? Which follows? How do they change over time? Do they evolve the way Terasawa predicts for English or do they behave differently? 3) When one type is chosen over another by language users, what other significant features, both grammatical and semantic, are there of the causative construction?

Our bottom-up study plots correspondence analysis (Glynn 2013) and motion chart (Hilpert 2011) of an annotated data set consisting of two corpora, Sheffield Corpus of Chinese (Hu, et al 2007) and the UCLA Chinese Corpus (Tao and Xiao 2007), which spans from 1100 BC to 2005 AD.

Three causatives *shi*, *ling* and *jiao2* (out of seven in total) are attested in all time periods in the materials but for the purpose of comparison with Terasawa's study, we zoom in on *shi*, the translation equivalent of *make* for a detailed discussion. And it bears out that *shi* cannot be simply divided into "pure" or "agentive", but into "pure" or "impure", where the latter encompasses subcategories like commanding or enabling. Motion charts allow us to answer the second question in a vivid way to show the developing story of Chinese is opposite to English in this case. We also visualize periodized distributions of causative verbs among the grammatical and semantic features to identify their distinctive usage patterns.

References

Glynn, Dylan. 2013. Correspondence Analysis. An exploratory technique for identifying usage patterns. In Glynn and Robinson (eds.), *Polysemy and synonymy. Corpus methods for cognitive semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hilpert, Martin. 2011. Dynamic visualizations of language change: Motion charts on the basis of bivariate and multivariate data from diachronic corpora. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 16:4. 435-461.

Hu, Xiaoling and Jamie McLaughlin. 2007. *The Sheffield Corpus of Chinese* (First Edition). University of Sheffield, Sheffield.

Tao, Hongyin and Richard Xiao. 2007. *The UCLA Chinese Corpus* (1st edition). UCREL, Lancaster.

Terasawa, Jun. 1985. The historical development of the causative use of the verb *make* with an infinitive. *Studia Neophilologica* 57. 133-143.