International Journal Linguistics of Sumatra and Malay (IJLSM)
Journal homepage: https://talenta.usu.ac.id/lsm

Contrastive Causative Construction in Japanese and Indonesian: X-Bar Theory

Rani Arfianty
[1]*Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia*
[*]Corresponding Author: rani.arfianty@usu.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 12 January 2024
Revised 29 March 2024
Accepted 29 June 2024
Available online 30 June 2024

ISSN: 2986-3848

How to cite:
Arfianty, R. (2024). Contrastive Causative Construction in Japanese and Indonesian: X-Bar Theory. *International Journal Linguistics of Sumatra and Malay (IJLSM)*, 2(2), 56-66.

http://doi.org/10.32734/ijlsm.v2i2.15382

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe causative contractions in Japanese and Indonesian; how causative sentence structures in the form of diagrams through X-Bar theory, their meanings in Japanese and Indonesian, as well as their similarities and differences in both languages. The study used contrastive analysis to compare the causal sentence contraction of both languages. Research results show that the causal sentence construction of both languages is derived from non-causative sentences by converting predicates into causative verbs. However, there are several verbs in both Indonesian and Japanese, which already have a causative meaning, such as *korosu* (killing), *akeru* (opening), *mawasu* (spinning), and others. The causative construction of the Indonesian language is composed of three types: lexical causative, morphological causative, and paraphrastically causative. Japanese causative construction is only in lexical causative, and paraphrastically causative. The causative Japanese sentences are marked by the pronunciation of o-*saseru* and *ni-saseru* in intransitive verbs and transitive verbs at the end of the sentence. Also, *ni* and o-*saseru* appear in the same sentence as transitive verbs. Causative sentences of Indonesian can be formed by affixing ikan, -i, per-. The basic structure of Indonesian causative sentences is formed from inflections, spacer and verb phrases. The initial structure, predominantly FI over FV then, moved to the [Ses FP] position in its derivative structure.

Keywords: Causative, Transitive, Intransitive, o/*ni-saseru*, Japanese and Indonesia

1. Introduction

Causative sentences describe an event or someone who causes a causal event, and consist of two related elements, namely; a caused event and a causing event (Shibatani, 1976; 1982; Lyons, 1995; Pylkkanen, 2008). The concept of causative is a process of transitivization (Haspelmath, 2002; Dixon, 2000). The causative process generally consists of a clause that states the cause and one other as the effect (Comrie, 1989; Goddard, 1998; DeLancey & Comrie, 2006). Causative constructions can be formed through: applicative constructions, lexical causative constructions, morphological causative constructions, periphrastic causative constructions (Comrie, 1989; Mulyadi, 2004). Regarding causative constructions, Artawa (2004) and Blanco (2011) argue that in general, each language has its own causative construction. In universal languages, causative is formed through three basic clauses, namely: intransitive basic clauses, nontransitive basic clauses, and ditransitive basic clauses (Comrie, 1989). In each part of the clause, there is a different shift in relation after the causative construction occurs. The relationship here is the connection between the verb and the arguments of each clause that are interrelated in the clause structure, as stated in the following table:

Tabel 1. Changing the Valence of Non-causative Basic Verbs to Causative Verbs

Clause Type	Non-Causative Basic Verbs	Causative Verbs
Intransitive	SUB →	SUBJ
		OL
Nontransitive	SUBJ →	SUBJ
	OL →	OL
		OTL
Ditransitive	SUBJ →	SUBJ
	OL →	OL
	OTL →	OTL
		OBL

In the study of causative constructions in Indonesian, (Mulyadi, 2004) suggests that causative constructions can be formed in the following ways: applicative constructions, lexical causative constructions, morphological causative constructions, and periphrastic causative constructions. Applicative constructions are formed by changing the construction from an intransitive verb (1a) to a transitive verb (1b) by adding the affix *-kan* and the presence of an object. Lexical causatives can be formed by adding lexical items to form causation, such as: 'make', 'cause', 'allow', 'order', and 'command'. Morphological causative constructions are the process of adding causative morphemes, *~kan*; *~i* and *per~* (1c). While periphrastic causative constructions are constructions that use several forms of verbs to describe what can generally be expressed by a single verb in relation to affixes (Comrie, 1989; Whaley, 1997). Examples are as follows:

(1) a. *Pohon tumbang* (Intransitive verb)

b. *Ayah menumbangkan pohon* (Morphological causative)

c. *Ayah menyebabkan pohon tumbang* (Lexical causative)

d. *Ayah buat pohon tumbang* (Periphrastic causative)

e. *Ayah membuat pohon menumbangkan* (Ungrammatical)

As for Japanese causation, the construction of Japanese causative applications is characterized by the crowning of o-*(sa)seru* and *ni-(sa)seru.* The o-(*sa*)excitation in intransitive and transitive verbs, and *ni-*(*sa*) excitation is specific to transitive verbs. The following example shows the Japanese applicative causative use of the intransitive verb *taoreta* (2a) and the transitive verb, *taoshita* (2c).

(2) a. *Ki-gataore-ta*
Tree–Nom fell down-ta-V intransitive-overflow
A fallen tree

b. *Otosan-wa ki-otaore-sase-ta*
Father–Nom tree-Acc deciduous-transitive causative-Past
Dad made a tree fall.

c. *Otosan-wa ki-o tao-shi-ta*
Father-Nom tree-Acc fell down-transitive-Past
Father dropped the tree

d. * *Otosan-wa ki-otaore-sasi-ta*
Father-Nom tree-Acc deciduous-transitive causative-Past
Dad made a tree drop

Sentence (2a) uses intransitive verb, *taoru* (tumb), which is then added affix-(*sa*)se, *taoresase* (topple) indicating caustic and, in turn, "to the end". There is an addition of causative particles to the ki (tree) as a cause marker (2b). Verba *taoshita* (inverting) (2c) is a transitive verb, because it does not contain causative sparrow o-(*sa*)*seru* or *ni-(sa)seru*. However, a review of the meaning indicates that there is a causative process carried out by the subject, namely the causer (father) event that caused the cause (tree to fall). In Japanese, it is called

lexical causative. Meanwhile, the addition of the o-(*sa*)*seta* and *ni*-(sa)seta in (2b) is called periphrastic causative (Takami, 2011).

Preliminary studies of Japanese causation were conducted by Shibatani (1989), noting that the affix o-*(sa)sersu* indicates causative events, while *ni-saseru*, indicating causative causes. In other words, o-*saseru* has a more compelling interpretation than *ni-saseru*. Next, Takami (2011) explained that Japanese causative sentences were formed from applicative causative by changing intransitive verbs to transitive verbs, lexical causative constructions and periprastic causative constructions. Takami also mentioned that Japanese intransitive verbs generally have transitive verbs with caustic meanings. But there are some intransitive verbs that do not have them. Examples include: *hikaru* (light), *pocket* (shower).

What about Indonesian causative sentences? Does the Indonesian caustic verb have transitive verbs that already contain caustic meanings in it?

In this study, a comparison of the structure of causative sentences of Indonesian and Japanese language was presented to see the differences and characteristics of causative construction in each language. The data selected using the same verb (meaning) are then compared.

Generative syntax approaches are used to efficiently represent causative syntax structures and essential properties in sentences from Indonesian and Indonesian languages through tree diagrams (X-Bar theory) (Haegeman, 1994; Mulyadi, 2004), and in this paper, we propose a new approach to representative syntax structure as in the following diagram.



The phrase inflectional (FI) is the predominant constituent in the Sentence. This constituent consists of the subject FN as the following cause one FN as the object (patient) equivalent to the verb valence. The constituents located above (Spes FP) or K' are called matrix sentences. The constituent consists of FN subjects in the form of causative verbs. P serves as a complement, examples in English are that/for and the phrase wh-for position (Spes FP). Assuming a lower verb (V) is incorporated a causative predicate to form a complex predicate. Next, I' who dominated the FV constituency left a trail at its original position when it moved to the (Spes FP) position. This treatment lifted the FV leaving the FI below. At this position, the verb core of the FV at the lower position incorates with the predicate CAUSE TO. At that time, the subject at the bottom (FN cause) played a role as an object marked as a second object.

2. Method

The writing method in this study is a descriptive, synchronous method. Includes data collection, data analysis, and representation of rule structures. The technique used is tagging to identify the occurrence of the linguistic unit or the marker constituent itself to determine the event in question. The practice of using specified markers is syntactically performed.

Marking techniques as a method of research on morphological causality construction. Furthermore, this study includes data collection and analysis data. Research begins with the process of retrieving data, collecting, identifying and classifying in causative construction. Subsequently, the classified data were analyzed to identify the use of the causative construction of the Indonesian language and Japanese language to achieve the

purpose of this study.

Next, to clarify understanding of the results of analysis, it is necessary to design tree diagrams based on the syntactic category of each finding that follows the concept (Haegeman, 1994; Mulyadi, 2004). This study data is a variation of the Japanese causative sentences in the book "*Ukemi* to *shieki*: "*Sono Imi Kisoku* o *Sageru*" (Takemi, 2011).

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. Indonesian and Japanese Applicative Construction

This construction describes a change that is not a core argument that turns into a core argument. This construction is related to the syntax in which the existence of objects is determined, as follows.

(3) a. Standing student
b. The teacher told the students to stand up
c. *Teacher stands a student

Sentence (3b), is formed by non-causative contraction (3a). The intransitive verb 'standing' in (3a) is given a causative marker, forming the meaning of the cause and giving rise to the 'teacher' in its derivation structure as a causative argument (3b). This causative contraction also gives rise to two predicates, the predicate 'tell' as causative verb and the original non-causative verb, 'standing'.

Sentences (3) in Japanese are as follows:

(4) a. *Seito-gatta*
Student-Nom stands-V intransitive-overdue
Standing student

b. *Sensei-ga seito-oat-a-seta*
Teacher-Nom student-Acc stand-up-transitive causative-Past
The teacher told the students to stand up

c. * *Sensei-ga seito-oat-a-shita*
Teacher-Nom student-Acc stand-up-transitive causative-Past
Teacher stands student

Similar to the Indonesian causative sentence (3b), the Japanese causative sentence (4b), is formed from the non-causative contraction (4a). The intransitive verb (standing) in (4a) is given a causative marker (a) to give rise to the subject, sensei (teacher) in its derivation structure as a causer argument (4b). The pronunciation of (a)seta has changed the intransitive verb to transitive verb meaning causative, *dataseta* (standing).

In sentence (3), the syntax of the transitive verb is formed from the transitive verb 'standing' with the addition of 'truly' meaning action to cause the cause to take action (3b). This grammatical structure maintains its verb classification. However, in contrast to (3c), the addition of affixation to the verb essentially results in a semantically altered meaning that does not fit the object, 'student'. In Japanese sentence in sentence (4). The change of intransitive verbs (4a) to transitive verbs in (4b) is characterized by causative pronouns o~(a)-seta meaning 'to order'. The sentence structure of sensei as the perpetrator of NOM is characterized by giving orders to seito as ACC to perform 'stand up' action. A causative verb is seen in the tatt that gets a suffixes crowding and ends with a past modality, ta. The two structures of sentences (3) and (4) are more clearly shown in the following diagram.



(5b)


K
FN0
FV
Guru
V
FP
order
Spes FP
P’
P
FI
FN1
I’
I
FV
V
Student
stand up

(5c)


K
FN0
FV
Teacher
V
FP
order
Spes FP
P’
P
FI
FVi
FN1
I’
I
FV
ei
stand up
student

(6a)


FI
Spes
I’
I
FV
FN
V
Seito
tatta

(6b)



(6c)



The basic structure of causation, causative breeding is expressed in verbs that require causal complement. Thus, in the derivation structure, the verb moves to the position [SPES, FP]. In sentence (5b), the 'standing' verb originally dominated by FV under FI moves to the FP Spec position until the trace is left in the previous position. Then the causal predicate matrix incorporates the 'standing' verb, as in (5c). Whereas in diagram (6b), causative mapping is characterized by *–aeta* mapping that is predominantly FVi under FV. Seito as being under FI as cause. The causal alignment is characterized by a causal complement, namely: an *aseta* whose derivative moves to the position [SPES FP] and causes one argument to increase as a causal marker to leave a trace of the old position (6c).

3.2. Indonesian and Japanese Lexical Causative Construction

In Japanese and Indonesian, there is a transitive verb, which, when examined by meaning, indicates a causative event, the presence of a person/event that causes a thing to happen (Takemi, 2011; Mulyadi; 2004). As in the following example:

(7) Brother burned the paper

(8) *Ani-wa-* kami-*oyaita*
Brother-Nom paper-Acc burn-V transitive-excessive
Brother burned the paper

Sentence (7), has transitive verb 'burning', and *yaita* (burning) in sentence (8). Semantically these two sentences have the meaning of the subject doing an action that causes the object to 'paper' and we become burned. Until sentences (7) and (8) fall into lexical causative sentences.
The basic structural rules of sentences (7) and (8) are as follows:

(7) a. [K[FV]FP[P'[FI Brother [I'[FV[V]]]]].

(8) a. [K[FNani] [Kami FI[I'[P'[FVyaita[I'[FV[V1]]]]]].

Sentences (7) and (8) show the basic structure, where FV 'burning' is equally dominated by Fl. The derivation structure is shown in the following diagram:

(9)



(9a)





3.3. Caustic Construction Periphrastic Indonesian and Japanese Language

The periphrastic causative of Japanese language is characterized by the addition of the o-(*sa)seta* and *ni-*(*sa*)*seta* (takami, 2011). while in Indonesian it is by the addition of a verb form, such as:

(11) a. The student said his opinion
b. The teacher asked the students to speak their opinions

(12) a. *Seitou ga iken o itta*
Student-Nom's opinion-Accit-ta-transitive causative- past
The student to speak his opinion

b.*Sensei wa seitou niikeno iwaseta*
Teacher-Nom student-DAT opinion-Acciw-ase-ta-transitive causative- past
The teacher asked the student to speak his opinion.

The complex verb in sentence (12b), iw-ase-ta, can be considered as transitive (requiring object), and in this sentence is accompanied by a direct NP object, i.e. *Akasatifo* in word *iken* (opinion). This sentence describes a teacher's request to his students to express their opinions. The basic construction of caustic sentences *biklausa* (11a) and (12a) forms derivatives in (11b) and (12b). The rule of sentence (11a-12a) is as follows:

(13) a. [K[FV]FP[P'[FI Student [I'[FV]]] said [[FN]]]]].

b. [K[FN Seito]]].

The rule (11b-12b) is as follows:

(14) a. [K[FN Teacher] [FV] asked for-say [FP][FI student [I'[FV]]]]].

b. [K[FN Sensei][FI[FN1 seito]][FN2]][FN2]][FP's opinion request- [P'[FV]|FV'].





In the basic structure (15a), the FI position dominated the FV 'saying its opinion'. However, in the next stage, the FV moved to the (Spes FP) so as to leave a trace in its previous position. Based on this, the FV has shifted its position to (Spes FP) as a whole. The FV verb core incorporates into the matrix so that the internal argument, 'the opinion' is left under the position (Spes P), see (15b). Compare this with the diagram of the Japanese causative sentence (14b), as follows.



The basic structure of the sentence (16a), the position of FI dominate the FV *iwaseta* 'saying his opinion'. However, in the next stage, the FV moved to the (Spes FP) so as to leave a trace in its previous position. The FV has shifted its position to (Spes FP) as a whole. The FV verb core incorporates into the matrix so that the internal argument, 'the opinion' is left under the position (Spes P), see (15b). Compare this with the diagram of the Japanese causative sentence (14b), as follows.



4. Conclusion

Causative meaning speaker causes the opponent to do something. The construction of causative sentences in Japanese and Indonesian is derived from non-causative sentences by converting predicates into causative verbs. However, there are several verbs in Indonesian and Japanese, which already have a causative meaning, such as *korosu* (killing), *akeru* (opening), *mawasu* (spinning), and others. The causative construction of the Indonesian language is composed of three types: lexical causative, morphological causative, and paraphrastically causative. Japanese causative construction is only in lexical causative, and paraphrastically causative (Takemi, 2011). Unlike the Indonesian language, the basic sentence structure of the Japanese

language is SOV. The causative sentences of Japanese are marked by the pronunciation of o-*saseru* and *ni-saseru* in intransitive verbs and in transitive verbs at the end of the sentence. Also, *ni* and o-*saseru* appear in the same sentence as transitive verbs. Meanwhile, the causative sentence of Indonesian can be formed by affixing *–kan*, -i, *per-*.

The basic structure of Indonesian causative sentences is formed from inflections, spacer and verb phrases. The initial structure, predominantly FI over FV, moved to the [Ses FP] position in its derivative structure. In its application, the Japanese causative language is quite difficult to define its structural rules in sentences.

References

Blanco, M. (2011). *Causative in Minimalism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Comrie, B. (1981). *Language Universals and Lingistics Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Fukada, A. (2009). The Japanese Causative Controversy: A Pragmatic Perspective. *Japanese Language and Literature*. (2010). 44(1).

Goddard, C. (1998). *Semantic Analysis-A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University.

Haegemen, L. (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Malden: Blackwell

Hasibuan, Ibnu dan Mulyadi. (2019). Konstruksi Kausatif dalam Bahasa Mandailing: Kajian Tipologi Sintaksis: *NUSA*. (2019).14.(3)

Haspelmath, M. (2016). Universal of Causative and Anticausative Verb Formation and The Spontaniety Scale. *Lingua Posnaniensies*, LVIII (2)

Katada F. (2000). The Structure of Humble Causatives in Japanese: *Linguistica Atlantica*. (2000). 22

Kawaguchi, S. (2009). Acquiring causative constructions in Japanese as a second language: *Japanese Studies*. (2009). 29(2).

Kridalaksana, H. (2009). *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia

Lyons, J. (1995). *Pengantar Linguistik Umum (Terjemah Bebas)*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama

Manning, C (2010). *Studies in Contemporary Phrase Structure Grammar*.

Mulyadi. (2004). Konstruksi Kausatif dalam Bahasa Indonesia. *Linguistika*, vol 11, 2004.

Narrog, H. (2004). From transitive to causative in Japanese: *Diachrohnica*. (2004). 21(2).

Neeleman, Ad and Koot, Hans. (2012). The Theta System: Argument Structure at the Interface: The Linguistic Expression of Causation. Oxford University Press: London.

Payne, T. (1997). Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pylkkanen, L. (2008). Introducing Arguments. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

Sahara, Rita. Konstruksi Pasif Bahasa Jepang: Kajian Gramatikal Relasional: Soshum Jurnal Sosial Dan *Humaniora*, (2013). 3.(2)

Sari, S dan Mulyadi. (2018). Struktur Kalimat Kausatif dalam Bahasa Aceh Singkil: Analisis Teori X-Bar: *Medan Makna*. (2019).XVI.(2)

Shibatani, M. (1976). *The Grammar of Causative Construction: A Conspectus*. Shibatani (Ed.). Syntax and Semantic, 6:1-40. New York: Academic Press.

Shibatani, M. (1982). Japanese Grammar and Universal Grammar. Lingua 57 (p. 103-123). North Holland Publishing.

Takami, Kenichi. 2011. *Ukemi to shieki: Sono Imi Kisoku o Sageru*. Kitakusaha: Tokyo