



THE COMPARISON OF THE CAUSATIVE VOICE IN ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI

LA COMPARACIÓN DE LA VOZ CAUSATIVA EN INGLÉS Y AZERBAIJANO

Maya Ahmadli

E-mail: mayaahmedli@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3791-9219>

Azerbaijan University of Architecture and Construction, Baku, Azerbaijan.

Suggested citation (APA, seventh ed.)

Ahmadli, A. (2026). The comparison of the causative voice in English and Azerbaijani. *Universidad y Sociedad*, 18(2), e5623.

ABSTRACT:

This article provides a comparative analysis of the grammatical and semantic features of the causative voice in English and Azerbaijani. The primary aim is to clarify the morphological structure, semantic functions, and areas of usage of the causative in both languages. In English, causativity is expressed mainly through analytic constructions using verbs such as make, have, let, and get. In contrast, Azerbaijani forms the causative voice morphologically by attaching suffixes such as *-dır/-dir/-dur/-dür* and *-t/-d* to the verb stem. The article also discusses the role of the causative voice within syntactic structures, its frequency of use in both spoken and written language, as well as the challenges encountered in teaching this grammatical category. The findings indicate that, in both languages, the causative voice plays a crucial role in expressing causation; however, there are significant differences between English and Azerbaijani in terms of the methods of expression and areas of application.

Keywords:

Causative voice, Verb category, Causativity, Morphology, Typological similarity.

RESUMEN:

Este artículo ofrece un análisis comparativo de las características gramaticales y semánticas de la voz causativa en inglés y azerbaiyano. El objetivo principal es esclarecer la estructura morfológica, las funciones semánticas y las áreas de uso de la forma causativa en ambas lenguas. En inglés, la causatividad se expresa principalmente mediante construcciones analíticas que emplean verbos como make, have, let y get. En cambio, el azerbaiyano forma la voz causativa morfológicamente añadiendo sufijos como *-dır/-dir/-dur/-dür* y *-t/-d* a la raíz verbal. El artículo también analiza el papel de la voz causativa dentro de las estructuras sintácticas, su frecuencia de uso tanto en el lenguaje hablado como en el escrito, así como las dificultades que surgen en la enseñanza de esta categoría gramatical. Los resultados indican que, en ambas lenguas, la voz causativa desempeña un papel fundamental en la expresión de la causación; sin embargo, existen diferencias significativas entre el inglés y el azerbaiyano en cuanto a los métodos de expresión y los ámbitos de aplicación.

Palabras clave:

Voz causativa, Categoría verbal, Causalidad, Morfología, Similitud tipológica.



INTRODUCTION

The verb occupies a distinctive place within the system of parts of speech. It differs from other word classes through its specific characteristics, which are most prominently reflected in the richness of its grammatical categories (Divjak et al., 2024). In most languages, these include tense, mood, voice, aspect, person and number, and sequence. Although these categories have been repeatedly examined on the basis of various linguistic materials, they continue to retain their relevance today. It should also be noted that the study of verb voices based on the material of two unrelated languages with different grammatical structures carries both theoretical and practical significance (Härtl & Zaychenko, 2024). Consequently, a comparative analysis of the voice category in English and Azerbaijani—two languages belonging to different families with distinct grammatical structures—is particularly relevant.

The term **voice** (Latin: *vox*) was first used by representatives of the Roman grammatical school. The traditional Greek equivalent, *diathesis* (literally “state” or “position”), referred to the active and passive forms of the verb. As Lyons (1978, pp. 394–395) notes, this term is in fact more directly applicable to modern English than to Classical Greek itself. In general, the voice category is one of the most important and complex grammatical categories of the verb, occupying a central position in expressing subject–object relations. Research on this category has developed in two main directions: from formal markers toward semantic functions, and from semantic functions toward the formal means through which these are expressed (Kondratyeva & Kostina, 2021).

When discussing the causative voice of the verb, it is inevitable to address the concept of causativity itself. The causative voice is a grammatical category that expresses a situation in which the subject causes another person or object to perform an action. Since English and Azerbaijani belong to different grammatical typologies, the means of expressing causativity differ substantially: analytical constructions dominate in English, while synthetic forms through suffixation prevail in Azerbaijani. Thus, from a cognitive perspective, causation reflects how speakers conceptualize cause-and-effect relationships, and its universal presence across the world’s languages underscores its communicative importance (Nie, 2020). From a theoretical standpoint, Comrie (1989) distinguishes between lexical, morphological, and analytic causation, establishing a continuum of formal integration useful for comparing typologically distant languages. Dixon (2000) further refines this by distinguishing direct causation, where the causer has immediate control, from indirect causation, where a greater conceptual distance exists between the two events.

The importance of studying the causative voice in English stems from its frequent use across formal and informal

registers, being especially relevant in academic and professional contexts where expressing causal relationships precisely is essential. In Azerbaijani, the causative voice displays systematic morphological features typical of Turkic agglutinative languages: causative suffixes attach to verbal roots following vowel harmony rules and allow multiple affixations to express double or triple causation, achieving formal economy that English can only match through more complex syntactic constructions. Social and educational environments, including gender-related factors, also influence communicative patterns and language interpretation (Nuri et al., 2024).

This comparative study of the causative voice in English and Azerbaijani aims to contribute to the typological understanding of this grammatical category by examining structural, semantic, and functional similarities and differences between both systems through a contrastive analysis encompassing morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic dimensions.

DEVELOPMENT

The term *icbar* originates from Arabic. Q. Kazimov defines it as “the act of compelling someone to perform an action or forcing an activity,” highlighting its etymological connection to the words *cäbr* (coercion) and *mæcbur* (compulsion) (Kazimov, 2010, p. 205). In essence, both terms are closely related. Before providing the English equivalent of the causative voice, it is necessary to examine the essence of the linguistic terms such as *causativity*, *causation*, and *causative verbs* that are frequently used in linguistic literature. This conceptual clarification will help establish a solid theoretical basis for the subsequent comparative analysis.

When discussing *causativity*, the primary focus is on the cause-and-effect relationship. The subject (whether animate or inanimate) triggers the object to perform a particular action or to undergo a change of state. In other words, causative meaning fundamentally involves the interaction between a subject and an object (Reidel, 1971, p. 5). Causativity manifests itself exclusively through a binary opposition: cause and effect. Before moving on to the linguistic essence of the issue, it would be appropriate to focus on how the category of causation is formed in language (Crystal, 2008). In English, the causative is expressed not by synthetic but by analytical means. **The main causative models in English are as follows:** 1) **Make + object + bare infinitive** – expresses *compulsion* or *forcing someone to do something*. *Example: The teacher made the students read.* 2) **Have + object + bare infinitive** – conveys the meaning of *arranging for something to be done* or *assigning a task to someone*. *Example: I had my assistant prepare the report.* 3) **Get + object + to + verb** – expresses *persuasion, encouragement, or inducement*.

Example: *She got him to clean the room.* 4) Let + object + bare infinitive – denotes *permission*. **Example:** *Let him go.*

In these models, the *main action is not performed directly by the subject*, but rather *indirectly through another agent or participant*. Maslieva (1980, p. 23) notes that historical linguistic data clearly demonstrate that the formation of the concept of *causation* in human consciousness is directly connected with practical human activity. One action typically creates the preconditions for the occurrence of another action.

The analysis of the *etymology of words expressing causation* plays a crucial role in understanding the emergence and formalization of the concept of causation itself. From this perspective, the etymology of the word *cause* is examined across different languages. The Latin word *causa* is etymologically linked to the word *cudo*. As a result of this connection, the concept of causation is reflected in several modern languages: Italian *causa*, Spanish *causa*, French *cause*, and English *cause* (Maslieva, 1980, p. 17). It is no coincidence that in most languages, there exist both causal-consecutive adverbs and causal-consecutive adverbial clauses. This phenomenon stems from the fact that any language reflects objective reality and indicates the interrelations between objects with different characteristics, as well as the changes that occur as a result of their mutual interaction. The language of each nation has historically played a crucial role in the formation of the cause-effect category. As a result, various linguistic means have emerged to express this category, one of which is the category of causativity. In particular, causativity plays an undeniable role in the deeper analysis of the semantic and grammatical characteristics of the causative voice.

Reidel (1971, p. 5) characterizes causativity as follows: when discussing causativity, what is primarily meant is the cause-effect relationship. In such cases, the subject (a person or an object) influences the object, causing it either to perform a certain action or to undergo a change of state. As a result of this influence, a particular outcome is produced. Thus, when referring to causativity, what is primarily implied is the subject-object relationship. At the core of this relationship lies the cause-effect opposition, in which each component complements the other.

Let us turn to some of the ideas expressed about causativity in the collection "*Typology of Causative Constructions. Morphological Causative*" For example, when discussing morphological causatives in Tajik, Y. Y. Kordi and T. Berdieva note that by "causative meaning," what is implied is an action that occurs as a result of the influence of one person (or object) on another person (or object) (Kordi & Berdyeva, 1969, p. 206). When discussing morphological causatives, it should first be noted that this primarily involves the derivation of transitive verbs from intransitive ones through various affixes, for example:

yanmaq – yandırmaq ("to burn" – "to make burn"), *sinmaq – sindirmaq* ("to break" – "to cause to break"), *dolmaq – doldurmaq* ("to fill" – "to cause to fill"), and so on. As is well known, morphological causation is widespread in the Azerbaijani language, as well as in all Turkic languages. In contrast, it is not possible to speak of morphological causation in modern English. Instead, modern English relies on syntagmatic oppositions to express causative meaning. For example: *The water boiled. He boiled the water. He walks. He walks the baby.*

In the cases mentioned, the same verb can function as either causative or non-causative, depending on its position and role within the sentence structure. In Modern English, causative and non-causative verbs can also be expressed through suppletion, that is, by using entirely different lexical items to mark the causative-non-causative opposition: 1) to die – to kill (*ölmək – öldürmək*) 2) to rise – to raise (*qalxmaq – qaldırmaq*) 3) to exist – to create (*mövcud olmaq – yaratmaq*)

In Modern English, another type of causativity is expressed through analytic constructions. In this case, causativity is realized by means of an auxiliary verb. For example, analytic causativity in English is typically expressed using the verb *to make*: 1) to do something – to perform an action; 2) to make somebody do something – to compel someone to perform an action. In Azerbaijani linguistics, a number of studies have been conducted on the category of causality. In this regard, one can refer to R. F. Huseynova's dissertation entitled "The Role of Causality in the Information Structure of Discourse", she characterizes causality as follows:

Causality represents such cause-effect relations, in which one phenomenon generates or logically substantiates the other, thereby establishing an internal connection between them. This internal interrelation constitutes the essence of causality. Causality is governed by general regularities; there is no phenomenon without a cause, and conversely, there is no phenomenon that does not derive from some consequence. (Huseynova, 2005, p. 25).

It should be noted that there is considerable disagreement among linguists regarding the nature and classification of causative verbs. Recent studies continue to refine the typological understanding of causativity, emphasizing its cross-linguistic variation and semantic gradients (Baglini & Bar-Asher Siegal, 2025). When discussing the expression of causative relations, M. Q. Simulov also touches upon the issues of causativity and transitivity. According to Simulov, causativity represents an intensified or "expanded" form of transitivity, since in such cases the action is not only transferred to the object but also triggers the performance of another action. Transitive verbs, on the other hand, typically take a direct object. This object may or may not follow the transitive verb in the sentence structure (Simulov, 2005, pp. 48–49).

It is clear that not all transitive verbs can be classified as causative verbs. Causativity is a linguistic phenomenon that is directly related to the notion of inducement or causation. At this point, it is appropriate to examine the means of expressing causativity in Azerbaijani and English. As is well known, in Azerbaijani, causativity is predominantly expressed through the causative voice, which is formed morphologically by means of specific suffixes. In English, however, there are no morphological markers for causativity. Contemporary analyses in construction grammar further elaborate how English causatives reflect event-structure schemata rather than pure syntactic derivation (Tran, 2024). Therefore, it is necessary first to clarify the structure and means of expression of the causative voice in Azerbaijani and then to examine its equivalents in English.

The theoretical literature on verb categories gives the impression that there is no unanimous view in Turkological studies regarding the causative voice. It should be emphasized from the outset that in this study, we consider the causative voice to be an independent verb category in its own right (Symulov, 2005, p. 56). Musayev M.M. and Jafarov G.H., when discussing the broad and narrow meanings of the obligative form of the verb, note that:

the first form is mostly used to denote an action carried out by the agent based on their own decision or within a narrowly defined sphere of activity. The second form, on the other hand, is associated with instances in the Azerbaijani language where the action is performed or may be performed under external pressure or dictated necessity. (Musayev & Jafarov, 2014, p. 40).

In modern Azerbaijani, as well as in other Turkic languages, the causative voice of the verb possesses specific grammatical markers. Not all languages, however, have special grammatical means to express causativity. This does not imply that causativity is absent in those languages; rather, it is expressed through other linguistic mechanisms. In this regard, N. Mammadov's observation is noteworthy. He points out that since Persian does not have a distinct causative verb form, the verbs *vadar kardan* and *majbur kardan* (to compel, to force) are used to express causative meaning (Mammadov, 1971, p. 257). In modern English, we observe a similar phenomenon. One of the most frequently used verbs to express causativity is to make, which conveys the meaning of "to compel" or "to force."

Let us now examine in detail the means of expressing the causative voice in the Azerbaijani language. It is an undeniable fact that the causative voice is typically used with transitive verbs. In Azerbaijani, however, many transitive verbs are derived from intransitive ones. Therefore, it is essential to clarify the mechanisms by which transitive verbs are formed from intransitive verbs. A review of the existing linguistic literature reveals that, in order to more clearly demonstrate the markers of the causative voice, it is crucial to identify the suffixes employed in the derivation

of transitive verbs from intransitive ones. For this purpose, we rely on the classification proposed by Kazimov (2010, pp. 183–186).

1. The suffix *-t*. This suffix is used to derive transitive verbs in two cases:
 - a. From verbs ending in a vowel: e.g., *qurumaq* → *qurutmaq* "to dry", *çürümək* → *çürütmək* "to make rot / to cause to decay."
 - b. By adding *-t* to intransitive verbs formed with the suffixes *-al*, *-əl*, *-l*: e.g., *azalmaq* → *azaltmaq* "to reduce", *düzəlmək* → *düzəltmək* "to fix / to correct", *ucalmaq* → *ucaltmaq* "to raise / to exalt."

It should also be noted that the *-t* suffix can be attached not only to intransitive verbs but also to transitive verbs, thereby forming causative constructions. Examples include: *gözləmək* → *gözlətmək* "to make someone wait," *izləmək* → *izlətmək* "to make someone watch/follow," *oxumaq* → *oxutmaq* "to make someone read." When the *-t* suffix is added to a transitive verb, it indicates the causative voice. In such cases, special attention must be paid to the semantic structure of the verb as well as to its relationship with other sentence elements. Furthermore, to determine whether a verb is used in a causative sense, the sentence can be expanded with words expressing commands, requests, insistence, instructions, consent, wishes, or pleas. For example:

Samir həmin kitabı Tahirə oxutdu → Tahir həmin kitabı Samirin təkidi (razılığı, xahişi, arzusu, əmri, ricası) ilə oxudu.

"Samir made Tahir read that book" → "Tahir read that book because of Samir's insistence (consent, request, wish, order, or plea)."

2. Through the suffixes *-it*, *-it*, *-ut*, *-üt*, a group of intransitive verbs are converted into transitive verbs, e.g., *qorxmaq* → *qorxutmaq* "to frighten," *axmaq* → *axıtmaq* "to cause to flow," *hürkmək* → *hürkütmək* "to startle," etc.
3. By means of the suffixes *-ır*, *-ir*, *-ur*, *-ür*, intransitive verbs are transformed into transitive ones, e.g., *qaçmaq* → *qaçırmaq* "to make run / abduct," *köçmək* → *köçürmək* "to relocate," *itmək* → *itirmək* "to lose," etc.
4. The suffixes *-ar*, *-ər* derive transitive verbs from some monosyllabic intransitive verbs ending with a consonant, e.g., *qopmaq* → *qoparmaq* "to tear off," *çıxmaq* → *çıxarmaq* "to remove."
5. The suffixes *-dir*, *-dir*, *-dur*, *-dür* convert intransitive verbs into transitive ones, e.g., *yanmaq* → *yandırmaq* "to burn (something)," *gülmək* → *güldürmək* "to make someone laugh," *dinmək* → *dindirmək* "to calm (someone)," etc.

At the same time, these suffixes play a significant role in the formation of the causative voice. For example: *yandırmaq* → *yandırtmaq* "to have something burned," *sildirmək* → *sildirilmək* "to have something wiped."

6. The suffixes *-iz*, *-iz*, *-uz*, *-üz* function as non-productive suffixes that convert a limited number of intransitive verbs into transitive verbs, e.g., *qalxmaq* → *qalxızmaq* “to make rise,” *qorxmaq* → *qorxuzmaq* “to frighten.”

In some verbs, these suffixes cannot occur alone; they appear in combination with the *-dir/-dir* suffix, forming structures such as *-ızdır / -ızdır*. For example: 1) *çimmək* → *çimzıdirmək* “to bathe → to make someone bathe”; 2) *dammamaq* → *damızdırmaq* “to drip → to cause to drip”; 3) *əmmək* → *əmizdirmək* “to suck → to make suck / to breastfeed (cause to suck)”.

The purpose of listing these examples above is to provide the reader with a clear understanding of the structure and formation of transitive verbs in Modern Azerbaijani. This is essential because the causative voice in Azerbaijani is always formed on the basis of transitive verbs. In Modern Azerbaijani, the causative voice of the verb is mainly formed by adding the suffixes *-dir*, *-dir*, *-dur*, *-dür*, and *-t* to transitive verbs. These derivational processes demonstrate the morphological productivity and dialectal richness of Azerbaijani, particularly in the Nakhchivan speech varieties, where suffixation and stem alternation reveal deep-rooted patterns of linguistic creativity (Ismayil, 2024). As mentioned earlier, these suffixes are also used to derive transitive verbs from intransitive ones. To distinguish between these two functions, it is important to pay attention to the original meaning of the verb.

For example: 1) *Həyətdə Novruz bayramı tonqalı yandı.* → The Novruz bonfire burned in the yard. (Intransitive verb); 2) *Onlar həyətdə Novruz bayramı tonqalı yandırdılar.* → They lit the Novruz bonfire in the yard. (Transitive verb); 3) *Onlar həyətdə Novruz bayramı tonqalı yandırdılar.* → They had the Novruz bonfire lit in the yard. (Causative verb)

As the examples illustrate, in the second sentence, the suffix *-dir* functions to derive a transitive verb from an intransitive one, whereas in the third sentence, it indicates the causative voice. In Modern Azerbaijani, as well as in other Turkic languages, the causative voice of verbs is expressed through specific grammatical markers. However, not all languages possess special grammatical means to indicate causativity. This does not imply that causativity is absent in such languages. In this regard, N. Mammadov's observation is particularly noteworthy. He points out that in Persian, since there is no special verb form to express the causative voice, the language employs verbs such as *vadar kardan* or *majbur kardan* (“to compel, to force”) to convey causative meaning (Mammadov, 1971, p. 257).

Similarly, in modern English, we encounter a comparable situation. To express causativity, the verb *to make* (“to compel, to cause someone to do something”) is among the most frequently used constructions. However, in Azerbaijani, many transitive verbs are themselves derived from intransitive verbs. As previously discussed, the causative voice in Azerbaijani is formed on the basis of

transitive verbs. Thus, after reviewing the existing literature, we concluded that, in order to more clearly identify the means of expressing the causative voice, it is essential to determine the affixes used to derive transitive verbs from intransitive ones — for which we rely again on Kazimov's classification (2010, pp. 183–186).

Since causativity, as a philosophical and logical category of cause-and-effect relations, has a universal character, it manifests itself in various forms across all languages. Recent linguistic studies also emphasize this point: “The English-Azerbaijani Dictionary gives the following definitions for the words ‘causative’ and ‘causation’ in Azerbaijani: (1) *səbəbiyyət* (act of causing); (2) *səbəblik* (causation); (3) *hadisələr arasında səbəb əlaqəsi* (causative relations among events)” (Abdullayeva, 2020). This raises the question: through what means is causativity — or inducement — expressed in English? Before addressing the core of the issue, it is useful to refer to several points made by S. D. Katsnelson regarding the functions of covert grammatical categories. Katsnelson (1972, p. 83) notes that a covert category is one that lacks independent formal markers in the language, yet its categorical features are perceptible. However, this does not mean that covert categories lack any means of expression. Through the semantic and grammatical combination of individual words and phrases within a sentence, covert grammatical categories find their expression.

It is well known that, due to the analytic structure of Modern English, many grammatical categories that existed historically no longer have explicit morphological markers. One such category is the causative voice of the verb. In Old English, one of the suffixes used to express inducement was *-ge-*. For example: 1) *Restan* – to rest; 2) *Gerestan* – to cause someone to rest / to make rest; 3) *Standan* – to stand; 4) *Gestandan* – to cause someone to stand / to make stand.

In the course of the historical development of the English language, as with some other grammatical categories, the means of expressing causativity also disappeared due to various factors (Naumova, 1966, pp. 62–70). As is well known, in Turkic languages, including Azerbaijani, the causative voice of the verb is marked by specific morphological indicators. However, in modern English, there are no morphological markers that express causativity — in other words, inducement. As the examples demonstrate, in contemporary English, causativity is mainly realized through the following structural pattern: *N1 + V1 + N2 + V2* → The man made the boy leave (Akhmedli, 2019, p. 334).

In such cases, the subject (N1) exerts an influence on the object (N2), prompting it to perform a certain action. At this point, the choice of the verb used as V1 is of crucial importance. Logically, only causative verbs should occupy this position. This naturally gives rise to the following

question: which verbs are considered causative verbs in Modern English? According to The Systematic Dictionary of English Verbs, verbs are classified into four main lexical-semantic groups: 1. State verbs, 2. Process verbs, 3. Action and activity verbs, and 4. Causative verbs. Within this classification, 1,080 verbs are identified as causative verbs. The analysis of the causative verbs that concern us demonstrates that not all verbs can function as V1 in the aforementioned sentence model. In our study, we consider only those verbs that are actually used as V1 to be causative verbs.

When discussing causative verbs in modern English, it is essential to first mention the verb *to make*. A review of various dictionaries reveals that *to make* belongs to a broad range of lexical-semantic groups, such as *to make somebody do something* and *to make something do something*. The construction *to make somebody do something* conveys genuine causativity in the strict sense of the term: it denotes inducing or compelling someone to perform a particular action. The construction “*to make* + object + verb” expresses that an event occurs as a result of a certain cause. Unlike the first model, in this case, the subject and the object may not necessarily be expressed by animate nouns: 1) What makes the grass grow so quickly? 2) The wind made the bells ring. 3) She made the water boil.

A. S. Hornby, in The Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English (Hornby et al., 2005), identifies 30 lexical-semantic groups of the verb *to make* and its combinations. He presents the following meanings of the verb *to make*: 1) to make – to compel – vadar etmək, məcbur etmək; 2) to make – to force – məcbur etmək; 3) to make – to persuade – inandırmaq; 4) to make – to cause – səbəb olmaq, məcbur etmək. In that dictionary, one of the main constructions presented is to make smb. do smth. (Hornby et al., 2005). For example: *She made the baby sleep, the baby was made to sleep, her action made everybody laughs*. The primary verbs that typically function as causative verbs in English include: *to make, to have, to let, to get, to force, to bid, to keep, to allow, to permit, to forbid, to want, to wish, to like, to hate, to bear*, and others. The analysis of the literary examples demonstrates that “to make” is one of the most frequently used causative verbs. It carries multiple meanings such as to compel, to make someone do something, to create, to cause, and to consist of. In literary texts, the verb to make is particularly notable for its function in expressing causation, which underscores its central role among causative verbs: 1) But Joe said it didn’t matter and made her sit down by the fire (Joyce, 1988, p. 115).; 2) ...after that Donnelly played for the children and Joe made Maria take a glass of wine (Joyce, 1988, p. 117).; 3) When I first heard them, I laughed. I hear them now, and they make me shudder (Wilde, 1978, p. 149).; 4) They’ll make them leave the room (Maltz, 1963, p. 261).

In the examples provided, the verb *to make* functions as a causative verb, clearly indicating both the initiator and the performer of the action. In each case, the verb to make expresses the subject’s initiative in prompting the performance of a particular action: 1) That made Maria blush and smile at the young lady (Joyce, 1988, p. 114); 2) ... it made her think of poor Georgina Burns (Joyce, 1988, p. 227); 3) Her eyes made Gabriel feel awkward (Joyce, 1988, p. 151); 4) Her tone rather than her words made him look at her (Maltz, 1963, p. 170). In none of the examples is the subject expressed by a personal noun. Therefore, it is not possible to speak of an initiator of the action in these sentences. The determining factor in the use of the verb *to make* in such cases is the cause that has been formally established at that moment. Thus, causativity can be discussed in the aforementioned constructions only when the subject is expressed by a personal noun or pronoun. The analysis of the verb *to make* shows that, along with its diverse lexical meanings, it also serves as one of the main grammatical means of expressing causativity. The construction *to make* + bare infinitive is considered a lexical-grammatical device for indicating causative relations in modern English.

Regarding the use of the verb *to have*, it is well known that the verb *to have* is polysemic. This verb carries the following meanings: a) The verb to have is used as a main verb in the sense of “to possess”: I have a new red car; b) the verb to have is used in a number of verbal collocations: to have a good time, to have a smoke, to have a look, etc.; c) the verb to have functions as an auxiliary verb in the formation of the perfect tenses: He has never seen them. He had done it before we came; d) the verb to have is used as a synonym of the modal verb must: As it is raining, we have to take a taxi. Another meaning of the verb to have is the causative or coercive meaning. A. S. Hornby provides the following examples illustrating the causative use of the verb to have:

- a. to have something done: 1) I must have these shoes repaired; b) when did you last have your hair cut?
- b. to have somebody do something: 1) I would have you know that; b) what would you have me do?

Depending on the second component of the construction, the verb *to have* functions as a causative verb in two structural models (Hornby et al., 2005). In the first case, a complement + past participle combination follows the verb *to have*. In the second case, a complement + infinitive construction is used after the verb. 1) I had my car repaired yesterday. — Dünən maşınımı təmir etdirdim.; 2) I had him repair my car yesterday. — Mən dünən onu maşınımı təmir etməyə məcbur etdim. In general, the use of the verb *to have* in the sense of compulsion is less frequent compared to the verb *to make*. When discussing this particular meaning of the verb *to have*, one aspect is especially noteworthy. During the teaching process,

language learners often experience difficulties when forming interrogative and negative constructions of such sentences. It should be kept in mind that in these cases, the auxiliary verb *to do* is used. For example: a) When do you usually have your room papered? b) I didn't have my car repaired yesterday.

It should be particularly emphasized that sentences of this type functionally coincide directly with the causative voice: a) Mən dünən maşınımı təmir etdirmədim. → I didn't have my car repaired yesterday. B) Siz adətən otağınızın kağızını nə vaxt dəyişdirirsiniz? → When do you usually have the wallpaper in your room changed? C) I have the floor cleaned every week. → Mən hər həftə döşəməni sildirirəm (təmizlədirirəm). One notable aspect in the use of the verb *to have* in such constructions is that when the complement takes the participial form, the participle seems to convey the completeness of the action, reflecting features characteristic of the perfect aspect. However, when the complement follows *to have* in the infinitive construction, the infinitive appears in its indefinite form. In this case, the verb *to have* functions as a near synonym of *to make*. It is probably for this reason that the verb *to make* is more commonly used to express the meaning of compulsion.

In English linguistics, it is even argued that, alongside the verbs *to make* and *to have*, the verb *to let* also plays a certain role in expressing causativity. Let us turn to concrete language examples. 1) "Why didn't you let him stay and drink?" the unhurried waiter asked (Hemingway, 1971, p. 153).; b) You just covered them over with something and let them go to it (Hemingway, 1971, p. 115). c) You'll let Fleur do what she likes, I suppose (Hornby et al., 2005, p. 137); d) I've often told him he ought to let you know (Hornby et al., 2005, p. 124).

Compared to the verbs *to make* and *to have*, the causativity expressed by the verb *to let* is distinguished to some extent by its "softness." In this case, the speaking subject indicates permission for the object (the complement) to perform a certain action. A common feature shared by all three verbs is that they are used without the particle *to*. In Modern English, *to get* is one of the most frequently used verbs. Its meaning depends on the word with which it is combined. Within a sentence, it can convey a wide range of meanings such as *to obtain*, *to find*, *to buy*, to be exposed to, *to arrive (reach)*, *to understand*, *to communicate*, and others. Let us consider the following combinations of the verb *to get*: 1) He got the book. – O, kitabı əldə etdi/aldı/tapdı. 2) He got there. – O, oraya çatdı. 3) He got angry. – O, hirslandı. In the first sentence, the verb *get* functions as a transitive verb, taking a direct object. In the second sentence, *get* is used as an intransitive verb, linking with an adverbial modifier. In the third sentence, however, the verb *get* functions predicatively. From the meanings provided in dictionaries, it becomes evident that the verb *get* carries a wide range of meanings. Undoubtedly, what

interests us is the causative meaning of the verb *to get*. A. S. Hornby's dictionary provides detailed information about the meanings of *to get* and its various combinations.

The sixth meaning of the verb *to get* is: to persuade / to cause smb/smth. to do smth. (Galsworthy, 1975, p. 359). Now let's look at the examples selected from works of fiction: 1) "Well, you get your boyfriend to sleep?" he asks (Hemingway, 1971, p. 131).; 2) Next morning Tomas couldn't get the car to start (Hemingway, 1971, p. 131).; 3) I'll get him to sing later on. All Dublin is raving about him (Joyce, 1988, p. 209). Interestingly, although rare, the meaning of *to get* sometimes coincides with that of *to have*: I must have my hair cut. / I must get my hair cut. Mən saçımı kəsdirməliyəm.

Causative Verbs: *force*, *to persuade*, *to compel*, *to oblige*, *to tempt*: (məcbur etmək, vadar etmək / inandırmaq, sübut etmək, tovlamaq / məcbur etmək, vadar etmək / məcbur etmək, vadar etmək / tovlamaq, yoldan çıxarmaq, şirnikdirmək).

One of the causative verbs is *to force*. Similar to the verb *to make*, this verb is used in the sense of compelling or obliging someone to perform a certain action by applying force or strengthening an effect. However, unlike *to make*, the verb *to force* is followed by an infinitive with the particle *to*: "...he forced her to ask him to her house" (Joyce, 1988, p. 112).

It should be emphasized that the verb *to force* is frequently used in the passive voice. In our view, in such constructions, causativity becomes more prominently manifested. This is due to the fact that in passive structures, the grammatical subject functions as the theme of the sentence rather than as the initiator of the action: ...she was forced to raise the question of her son (Maltz, 1963, p. 137). In such cases, sentences constructed in the passive voice can be easily transformed into their active counterparts → Somebody forced her to raise the question. We may conclude that while the subject that triggers causativity in the active voice is expressed explicitly, in the passive voice it is represented implicitly. In such cases, the agent is merely implied rather than overtly stated. This issue will be revisited in more detail later in the discussion.

The verb *to compel* has the following meanings: to force, to subjugate or obtain, and to achieve. This verb also plays a certain role in expressing causativity. In this sense, it is used in both active and passive constructions: 1) His conscience compelled him to confess.; 2) He was compelled by illness to resign. 3) ...they were compelled to meet stealthily (Joyce, 1988, p. 122). *To tempt* as a causative verb. The construction to tempt somebody to do something carries the meaning of leading or luring someone to do something, persuading, enticing, or seducing them into performing an action. 1) The warm weather tempted us to go for a swim. 2) She tempted the child to have a little more soup. In addition, the verb *to force* exhibits

broader possibilities of usage. Another group of causative verbs consists of verbs that express desire and intention. This group includes verbs such as *to want*, *to mean*, *to wish*, *to choose*, *to desire*, and others. 1) He wanted his life to go smoothly (Hemingway, 1971, p. 112).; 2) "I don't want you to do anything that you don't want to do—" (Hemingway, 1971, p. 167).; 3) I want you to realize before it's too late (Hornby et al., 2005, p. 158).; 4) "I don't mean you to play it", Jack says. "I just want to get my money's worth" (Hemingway, 1971, p. 134).; 5) "Your father didn't wish you to hear", she said. "These things will happen. I've often told him he ought to let you know" (Galsworthy, 1975, p. 124).

As the presented examples demonstrate, verbs expressing desire and intention indicate the subject's influence on the object in determining whether a particular action is carried out or not. In such cases, the performance of the action is presented as an intention. The verbs *to permit* (to allow, enable, give permission) and *to allow* (permitting, enable, concede, acknowledge, accept, agree) are also used as causative verbs in the sense of granting permission.

1. Many times, she allowed the dark to fall upon them, refraining from lighting the lamp (Joyce, 1988, p. 123).
2. "No one knows that I am here", she protested. "Do you think my mother would permit this?" "She'd permit you to marry me, that's certain" (London, 1980, p. 349).

Unlike the verb *to let*, the infinitive following these verbs is used with the particle *to*. In this example, the verb *permit* does not merely convey the meaning of "to allow"; rather, it simultaneously carries a strong causative (inducive) force.

The verbs *to ask*, *to order*, *to tell*, and *to teach* can also function as causative verbs: 1) He asked me to speak to you this morning and then you can stop in and see him at his office (Hemingway, 1971, p. 11).; 2) "Yes. Because of the artillery. The captain told me to go because of the artillery" (Hemingway, 1971, p. 312).; 3) "Why not order her to stay in camp?" Wilson said to Macomber (Hemingway, 1971, p. 255).; 4) "You can shoot me. You're a good shot now. I taught you to shoot, didn't I?" (Hemingway, 1971, p. 273). In the majority of the examples, the subject's influence on the object in order to perform a particular action is clearly observed. The number of such verbs can be significantly expanded. Overall, the object + infinitive construction serves as a primary means of expressing causativity in modern English. In this sentence model, the subject prompts or induces the object to carry out the intended action. Depending on the intended purpose, different types of causative verbs are employed. The analysis of the selected linguistic material indicates that the most commonly used verbs for this purpose are *to make*, *to have*, and *to let*. Regardless of which causative verb is used, the constant meaning conveyed by the object + infinitive construction remains the same: to compel or

cause someone/something to perform a particular action. However, depending on the speaker's intention, this meaning may take on various nuances.

Two main differences can be observed in the expression of causativity between English and Azerbaijani. Similar comparative results were found in typological research across Turkic languages: "Tatar incorporates causative markers slightly more than that of Azerbaijani, and in the Azerbaijani examples there is a slightly richer variety of coding for marking relations between the members of transitivity pairs" (Rzaguluzade, 2021, p. 47).

- a. In Azerbaijani, causativity is expressed through synthetic means, whereas in English, this meaning is conveyed through analytic or lexico-syntactic means.
- b. In Azerbaijani, if the performer of the action is not explicitly mentioned, it remains unclear who carries out the action. In contrast, in English, the performer of the action is always known. For example, in the sentence *Mən məktubu yazdırdım* ("I had the letter written"), it is not clear who performed the action of writing. However, in the sentence *I made him write the letter*, it is explicitly clear that the action is carried out by him. Undoubtedly, these differences are related to the fact that the two languages belong to different grammatical structures and linguistic families.

As previously mentioned, causativity is generally realized through the object–infinitive construction. Within this syntactic pattern, the subject's inducement of the object to perform the secondary action is made explicit. In other words, the agent influencing the object is clearly identifiable. This inevitably leads to a logical question that warrants further examination: Does the causative meaning also occur within the subject–infinitive construction? To answer this question, it should first be noted that, unlike the object–infinitive construction, the subject–infinitive construction is typically used in the passive voice. To clarify this point, let us consider the following example: *I made Tom (him) carry the box*. This sentence can be transformed into a subject–infinitive construction as follows: *Tom (he) was made to carry the box*.

The main difference between the two sentences lies in the fact that in the first sentence, the subject is active, and its identity is explicitly known. In contrast, the subject–infinitive construction displays the typical characteristics of the passive voice. In such cases, the subject is prompted to perform a particular action as a result of an external influence. In this case, the agent responsible for the causation is expressed implicitly and can only be inferred. The predicate of the sentence is formed by one of the causative verbs used in the passive voice. Similar to the object–infinitive construction, in the subject–infinitive construction the main semantic and grammatical load falls on the infinitive. Regarding the explicitness of the causer, two distinct patterns can be observed: in the object–infinitive

construction, the subject is expressed explicitly, whereas in the subject–infinitive construction, the subject is only implied.

In this example, the causative meaning is manifested twice: (a) in the main predicate and (b) in the passive form of the infinitive. The purpose of highlighting these two instances is to demonstrate that causative verbs used in both object–infinitive and subject–infinitive constructions play a crucial role in expressing the meaning of inducement.

Providing a comprehensive account of causativity is of interest from two perspectives:

1. From a typological standpoint, the investigation of object and subject infinitive constructions in modern English is of great significance, since the causative voice in Azerbaijani is, in one way or another, reflected within these constructions. Framing the issue in this way is also of considerable importance for the language teaching process.
2. Overall, in order to clarify the category of voice in both languages, it is not sufficient to analyze only the passive voice. While Azerbaijani and, more broadly, all Turkic languages possess specific morphological markers to express different voice forms, English has only formal means for expressing the passive voice.

Thus, the main differences between the causative voice in Azerbaijani and English can be summarized as follows: 1) In Azerbaijani, causativity is expressed through morphological means, whereas in English, it is conveyed through syntactic-analytical structures. 2) In Azerbaijani, causativity involves changes within the verb structure itself, while in English, it is formed through the use of auxiliary verbs and objects. 3) In both languages, the notion of causation is essentially the same; however, it is represented by different syntactic models. 4) In Azerbaijani, the causative voice is more productive and is recognized as a distinct grammatical category within the verbal system, whereas in English, this phenomenon is primarily examined at the level of syntactic constructions.

The topic addressed in this article represents a meaningful contribution to the interdisciplinary exchange that connects theoretical linguistics with applied language teaching, cognitive science, and intercultural communication. By analyzing how two typologically distant languages — one analytic and the other agglutinative — encode causation through fundamentally different grammatical systems, this study seeks to advance contrastive linguistics while opening dialogue with fields such as cognitive psychology, educational science, and intercultural studies. This interdisciplinary scope is further reinforced by the consideration of universal principles of human language, which link linguistic inquiry to broader debates in the humanities and social sciences concerning how communities construct and transmit meaning. From a social

and pedagogical standpoint, the findings presented here carry direct implications for language teaching policy, curriculum innovation, and bilingual instructional practice — areas of central concern for academic and research institutions committed to advancing society through scientific knowledge. In multilingual and multicultural educational contexts, increasingly prevalent in a globally integrated academic landscape, studies of this kind generate actionable, evidence-based knowledge in support of more effective language instruction.

CONCLUSIONS

The comparative analysis of the causative voice in English and Azerbaijani reveals both universal features and typological divergences. In both languages, this category serves as a key grammatical device to express cause–effect relationships; however, the means through which it is realized differ substantially. Azerbaijani expresses causativity through synthetic morphological means, using productive suffixes such as *-dir/-dir/-dur/-dür* and *-t*, systematically integrated into the verbal paradigm as an independent grammatical category. English, by contrast, lacks dedicated morphological markers and instead relies on analytic lexico-syntactic constructions — primarily object–infinitive and subject–infinitive patterns — involving causative verbs such as *make*, *have*, *let*, *get*, *force*, *permit*, and *allow*, of which *make* is the most productive. Causative meaning may be explicit, when both causer and causee are overtly expressed, or implicit, particularly in passive constructions where the agent is implied.

From a typological standpoint, this contrast reflects a fundamental divergence between agglutinative/synthetic and analytic language types, affecting not only formal expression but also how causative relations are processed and taught. Pedagogically, Azerbaijani learners of English must acquire analytical causative constructions absent in their native language, while English learners of Azerbaijani must master systematic suffixation — a contrast with measurable implications for bilingual instruction and transfer competence. In sum, while Azerbaijani encodes causativity within verb morphology itself, English achieves it through syntactic versatility. This divergence highlights the value of comparative grammatical studies for both linguistic theory and language pedagogy.

REFERENCES

- Abdullayeva, C. (2020). Place of Causativity in the Language System of the Azerbaijani and English languages. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(3), p211. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n3p211>
- Akhmedli, M. P. (2019). The Causative Voice of the Verb in Modern Azerbaijani and Its Analogue in English. *Bulletin of the Kazakh Leading Academy of Architecture and Civil Engineering*, 4(74), 331–337.

- Baglini, R., & Bar-Asher Siegal, E. A. (2025). Modeling linguistic causation. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 48(4), 647–691. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-025-09436-w>
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology* (2d edition, Ed.). University of Chicago Press. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/L/bo24426144.html>
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). Blackwell. <https://hslcorner.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/david-crystal-a-dictionary-of-linguistics-and-phonetics-1.pdf>
- Divjak, D., Testini, I., & Milin, P. (2024). On the nature and organisation of morphological categories: Verbal aspect through the lens of associative learning. *Morphology*, 34(3), 243–280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-024-09423-0>
- Dixon, R. M. W. (2000). A typology of causatives: Form, syntax and meaning. In A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (Eds.), *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity* (pp. 30–83). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511627750.003>
- Galsworthy, J. (1975). *The Forsyte Saga. To Let*. Progress Publishers.
- Härtl, H., & Zaychenko, K. (2024). *Grammatical Categories in Linguistics and Education*. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111140803>
- Hemingway, E. (1971). *Selected Stories*. Progress Publishers.
- Hornby, A. S., Ashby, M., & Wehmeier, S. (with Internet Archive). (2005). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. Oxford : Oxford University Press. <http://archive.org/details/oxfordadvancedle00asho>
- Huseynova, R. F. (2005). *The Role of Causality in the Information Structure of Discourse* [PhD. Thesis]. Azerbaijan Pedagogical University.
- Ismayil, Z. (2024). Development points of the derivation process related to Nakhchivan dialects and accents (based on written and oral literary and artistic examples). *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v6i2.1192>
- Joyce, J. (1988). *Dubliners*. Paladin Books.
- Katsnelson, S. D. (1972). *Typology of Language and Speech Thinking*. Nauka.
- Kazimov, G. Sh. (2010). *Selected Works* (Vol. 9). Nurlan Publishing House.
- Kondratyeva, N. V., & Kostina, K. G. (2021). History of study of the grammatical category of the voice in the Udmurt linguistics. *Vestnik Ugrovedeniya-Bulletin of Ugric Studies*, 11(3), 444–452. <https://doi.org/10.30624/2220-4156-2021-11-3-444-452>
- Kordi, E. E., & Berdyeva, T. D. (1969). The Morphological Causative in the Tajik Language. In *Typology of Causative Constructions. Morphological Causative* (pp. 206–220). Nauka.
- London, J. (1980). *Martin Eden*. Dnipro Publishers.
- Lyons, J. (1978). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Progress.
- Maltz, A. (1963). *The Gross and the Arrow*. State Textbook Publishing House of the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR.
- Mammadov, N. N. (1971). *Theoretical Foundations of Azerbaijani Linguistics*. Maarif.
- Maslieva, O. V. (1980). *Formation of the Category of Causality (Based on the History of the Language)*. Nauka.
- Musayev, M. M., & Jafarov, G. H. (2014). *Functional Grammar of the Azerbaijani Language: New Approaches to Morphology and Lexematics* (Vol. 2). Prestige Publishing House.
- Naumova, A. I. (1966). Some Historical Prerequisites for the Development of the Polyfunctionality of the English Verb. In *Some Issues of Germanic Philology and the Methodology of Teaching Foreign Languages in Secondary School and University* (Vol. 36, pp. 61–71).
- Nie, Y. (2020). Morphological causatives are Voice over Voice. *Word Structure*, 13(1), 102–126. <https://doi.org/10.3366/word.2020.0161>
- Nuri, A. B., Asadova, A. A., Heyderova, N. A., & Mammadova, K. M. (2024). Gender issues in education. *Universidad y Sociedad*, 16(6), 272–278. <https://rus.ucf.edu.cu/index.php/rus/article/view/4766>
- Reidel, A. I. (1971). *Lexical and Grammatical Characteristics of Causative Verbs in Prepositional Constructions* [PhD Thesis].
- Rzaguluzade, S. (2021). *Transitivity Pairs in Azerbaijani and Tatar* [Master's Thesis, Adam Mickiewicz University]. <https://www.academia.edu/73167921>
- Symulov, M. G. (2005). *Ways of Expressing Causative Relations in Structurally Different Languages (Based on the English and Chuvash Languages)*.
- Tran, Q. H. (2024). Analysis of State Changes in English Causative Constructions: Insights from Construction Grammar. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 4(4), 35–53. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.24442>
- Wilde, O. (1978). *The Picture of Dorian Gray*. Dnipro Publishers.