Contrastive Analysis of Causative Constructions in English and Ukrainian: the potential of meso-constructions as *tertium comparationis*.

Key words: causative construction; meso-construction; *tertium comparationis*; corpus-based study; English/Ukrainian

The focus of the presented contrastive analysis are non-finite complement constructions with the meaning of causation. They are widely studied in English and found at the intersection of different frameworks under different terms: 'Accusativus cum Infinitivo', 'Accusativus cum Partizipio', 'object control constructions', 'equi-type structures', 'small clauses'. The case study prefers a theory-neutral term 'causative construction'. 'Construction' is understood as defined by Croft: any pairing of form and function in a language used to express a particular combination of semantic content and information packaging (Croft 2022, p.17). Causative constructions encode one event as the argument of a second event. Only certain predicates allow events as arguments, hence complement-taking predicates or CTPs (Noonan 2007, p. 53; Croft 2022, pp. 551-558).

The comparison of English causative constructions with Ukrainian ones provides the novelty of this research, following the claims that Construction Grammar beyond English has "shown its usefulness and power in the description" (Östman & Fried 2004, p.7); and constructions as the basic units at all levels of analysis are found in Slavic as well (Fried 2017, pp. 243-244). The use of 'construction' as a comparative concept is postulated by Croft and Boas (Croft 2022, p.17; Boas 2010, p. 16).

To attain "sufficient frequency" (Goldberg 2006, p. 5; also Horsch 2023b, pp. 18-19) for the analysis of studied constructions in two languages, one should harvest data from corpora. Experts in the sphere of corpus-based contrastive studies claim that a balanced, bidirectional parallel corpus is well suited for this purpose, since it can provide a necessary *tertium comparationis* (TC) (Hasselgård 2020; cf. Ebeling and Ebeling 2020). But what if the researcher is facing the absence of a bidirectional parallel corpus? We argue that the researcher can use two separate corpora (in our case COCA and GRAC (General Regionally Annotated Corpus of Ukrainian)), provided that he/she makes a correct TC choice, and applies a chosen pattern for the query built. In this study the 'construction' serves as the TC. Meso-constructions (partly schematic, partly substantive constructions) play an important role in the taxonomic constructional network, being intermediate between micro-constructions (specific, substantive instances) and macro-constructions (abstract schematic constructional templates) (Hoffman et. al 2019, p. 26; Horsch, 2023a, pp.704-706), therefore the principal claim of this paper is that meso-constructions show a greater potential as TC, since they allow building the search queries more efficiently, being a viable solution in a cross-linguistic research. Consider the following meso-constructions in English and in Ukrainian: in English: N1 *cause* [N2 Infinitive (N3)], in Ukrainian: N1 *prymusyty* (cause) [N2 Infinitive (N3)] (consider examples 1, 2):

(1) Every talk has **caused me to think** about some topic a new way. (BLOG: http://lfb.org/today/the-center-of-the-conspiracy/ 2012)

(2) Проста рекламна вивіска **змусить вас посміхнутися.** (Онлайн-ЗМІ: «Новини Хмельницького «Є», 2016)

Prosta	reklamna vyviska	**zmusyt′**	**vas**	**posmikhnutysya**.
simple	advertising sign	cause/make FUT SG	Pronoun ACC SG	INFINITIVE

'A simple advertising sign will make you smile'. (Online media: "News of Khmelnytsky "Ye", 2016)

The data harvested from two corpora reveal that there is a larger range of causative constructions in English in comparison to Ukrainian with more lexical fillers (in our case CTPs, that is verbs licensing the appearance of the non-finite complement construction as an argument). The filler types of the English causative construction include the Infinitive, Participle I and II as non-finites, as well as Nominal (adjective/noun) (consider examples 3-5), whereas in Ukrainian only the Infinitive is possible:

(3) If projects are off to a strong start, he'll hopefully **keep them moving**. (NEWS: Washington Post, 2011)

(4) You don't believe setting foot into the forest would actually **get us killed.** (MOV: Bats: Human Harvest, 2007)

(5) Despite what anybody else says, he **makes me happy.**
(BLOG http://stayonthego.com/nashville/featured/love-on-top, 2012)

Table 1 provides the results of the obtained corpus data that illustrate the vivid differences of causative constructions productivity in English and Ukrainian.

Causative construction with	English (quantity of lexical fillers/ CTP's)	Relative frequency per million	Ukrainian (quantity of lexical fillers/ CTP's)	Relative frequency per million
Infinitive	23	241.153	7	81.52
Participle I	8	18.929	-	
Participle II	4	22.690	-	
Nominal (adjective/noun)	6	123.628	-	

Table 1. Number of CTP's as lexical fillers, introducing each subtype of causative constructions in English and Ukrainian with the quantity of constructions given as the relative frequency per million

The efficiency of meso-constructions as TC is, thus, made vivid.

References

Boas, Hans C. (2010): Comparing constructions across languages. In: Hans C. Boas (ed.), *Contrastive Studies in Construction Grammar* (Constructional Approaches to Language 10), 1-20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1-20.

COCA: accessible at: https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/

Croft, William (2022): Morphosyntax: Constructions of the World's Languages. Cambridge University Press.

Ebeling, Signe Oksefjell & Jarle Ebeling (2020). Contrastive Analysis, Tertium Comparationis and Corpora. In: Nordic Journal of English Studies, 19(1), pp. 97-117. DOI: 10.35360/njes.514

Fried, Mirjam (2017). Construction Grammar in the Service of Slavic Linguistics, and Vice Versa. In: *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 25(2), pp. 241-276.

Goldberg, Adele E. (2006): Constructions at Work: The nature of generalization in language. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Hasselgård, Hilde (2020): Corpus-based contrastive studies: Beginnings, developments and directions. In: *Languages in Contrast*: International Journal for Contrastive Linguistics, 20 (2), pp.184-208. DOI: 10.1075/lic.00015.has

Hoffman, Thomas, Jakob Horsch & Thomas Brunner (2019): The More Data, The Better: A Usage-based Account of the English Comparative Correlative Construction. In: *Cognitive Linguistics*, 30(1). pp.1-36.

Horsch, Jakob (2023a): From corpus data to constructional networks: Analyzing language with the Usage-based Construction Grammar framework. In: *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 74, No. 3, pp. 701-740. https://doi.org/10.2478/jazcas-2024-0019

Horsch, Jakob (2023b): The comparative correlative construction in World Englishes: a usage-based construction grammar approach. Eichstätt (Germany): Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt. PhD thesis. https://doi.org/10.17904/ku.opus-833

Noonan, Michael (2007): Complementation. In: *Language typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. II: Complex constructions, 2nd edition, ed. Timothy Shopen, pp. 52-150.

Östman, Jan-Ola & Mirjam Fried (2004): Historical and intellectual background of Construction Grammar. In: *Construction Grammar in a Cross-Language Perspective* (Constructional Approaches to Language 2), edited by Mirjam Fried, Jan-Ola Östman. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 1-10.

Shvedova M., von Waldenfels R., Yarygin S., Rysin A., Starko V., Nikolajenko T. et al. (2017-2024): GRAC: General Regionally Annotated Corpus of Ukrainian. Electronic resource: Kyiv, Lviv, Jena. Available at: uacorpus.org.