



(REVIEW ARTICLE)



Semantic Features of MAKE Causative Structures (in English) and LÀM Causative Structures (in Vietnamese): A Contrastive Study

Đỗ Thị Phương Thúy *

Fundamental Faculty, Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology, Hanoi, Vietnam.

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2024, 13(01), 446–456

Publication history: Received 30 March 2024; revised on 08 April 2024; accepted on 10 May 2024

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijrsra.2024.13.1.1674>

Abstract

Causative structures have been studied quite a lot in researches in English and Vietnamese. Most of the works are descriptive, few works are comparative. This article focuses on comparing the semantic characteristics of the causative structures containing MAKE in English and LÀM in Vietnamese to point out the similarities and differences between these two languages.

Keywords: Ausers; Causees; Causative Verbs; Semantic Features; Causative Structures

1. Introduction

Causal relations govern and explain most phenomena in the objective world, including the material world and the spiritual, unreal world. Through linguistic means, the above causal relations are clearly expressed in different structural forms. From a syntactic perspective, causal relations are expressed through two main structural types: (1) a structure with two clauses expressing causal relations combined together according to a main-subordinate relationship, often called a causal compound sentence; (2) a structure with one or two predicates expressing causal relations, often called a causative structure.

The two partial events in MAKE causative structures are (1) causing events in which causers perform or create certain activities on objects that are affected and (2) result events in which causees must perform a certain activity, or be subject to a change in state or condition. These two situations are always present in causative structures.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research design

The research used descriptive method of distribution analysis, direct element structure analysis. In addition, we also applied a number of other research methods such as statistical methods, classification... to clarify issues related semantic features.

2.2. Data collection

Phase 1: We use Sketch Engine software to collect data in British National Corpus and Vietnamese Corpus. This software allows to filter all sentences containing the word MAKE and LÀM from all sources on the webs. By using the supported formula, sentences containing MAKE and LÀM combine with verbs, nouns, and adjectives are fully filtered out by the software. In the process of filtering the examples in the corpus, it is inevitable that the software filters out the sentences

* Corresponding author: Đỗ Thị Phương Thúy

which have the form of a causative construction, they do not have the causative meaning. In this step, we have to manually filter and remove the sentences that do not match.

Phase 2: Getting the amount of causative structures

After phase 1, the total number of corpuscles is extremely large. We use the formula by Yamante Taro (1967) to get the quantity for our research. Final number is also done according to the formula supported by Excel.

Phase 3: Filtering the corpus thoroughly

After having the quantity of each structure, for the last time, we manually filtered examples one more time to exclude those sentences that had the same form but do not have a causative meaning. After filtering is complete, if the number is not enough, we will continue to take from the total corpus to compensate for the number of sentences that have been eliminated. The final total number obtained after stage 3 is more than 3000 examples.

Phase 4: Analyzing the corpus

More than 3000 examples will be returned to Sketch Engine software to form a separate corpus. Taking advantage of the useful tools of this software, the features related to the syntactic structure will be synthesized and we will analyze in detail in this article.

3. Findings

3.1. Comparison of semantic structures

3.1.1. The events

The causative structures with *make* and *lam* in both English and Vietnamese have two events which are related to each other. The result event always depends on the causing event. The two events are related to each other in terms of time and space, logic and the elements of the events are the components that participate in creating the structure such as causer, causee, causing predicate, result predicate in which causer is always the starting part of the chain of actions, affecting the object, and here the causee undergoes changes created by the causing action. For example:

- *God, those gawpers make me sick.*
- *Dưa chuột có công dụng lợi tiểu nên có thể làm sạch niệu đạo.*

3.1.2. Components in the structure

Semantic characteristics of the causer

The causer is a person, or things, event - the subject of the activity that the predicate represents.

* Similarities:

In both languages, they both indicate the cause, the subject that performs the action that causes the affected object. With the majority of causer being events, the [-perceptual] nature is more prominent, leading to the [-intentional] nature also having a high proportion in both causative structures with *make* and *lam*. The number of remaining causers with [+intentional] or [-intentional] nature depends on the context of the sentence.

The discussions about the pre game meets in Tetley pubs just make me homesick.

Đây là hiện tượng làm cho tất cả các ông chủ ngân hàng thực sự lo sợ.

* Differences:

The difference in the causers of the two causative structures lies in the ratio of classification according to semantic categories in which the causers is a thing/event in Vietnamese (87.31%) with a higher number in English (74.68%) and the ratio of causers in causative structures is lower (10.5% compared to 18.6%). The ratio of classification according to semantic categories above leads to the ratio of [perceptual] and [intentional] with the majority of the causers having [-

perceptual] and [-intentional] nature in both causative structures but the ratio is somewhat different. (89.57% and 81.40%)

Tất cả những gì anh ấy phải trải qua và những lời anh ấy nói với tôi thật sự làm cho tôi rất đau đớn, lương tâm tôi cũng bị dày vò không dứt.

You can't make me stay here.

Semantic characteristics of the causee

The causee has two syntactic functions in the sentence: the complement of the causing predicate and the subject of the resulting clause.

* Similarities:

The causative structures with *làm* and *make* are considered bi-clauses because the causee performs two roles at the same time. In both languages, there is a phenomenon of identity between the causee and the causer (although this rate is not high) when the causative force begins and ends within the causer or, according to the analysis of psychological impact, this force acts on the remaining entity in the same self of the causer. Causative structures with *làm* often use the pronouns *mình, thân mình, chính mình* for all persons, while causative structures with *make* use the reflexive pronouns (*myself, herself, himself, themselves, itself, ourselves*) corresponding to the person of the causer.

She tried to make herself think rationally.

Một người phụ nữ biết làm cho mình trở nên huyền bí, khó đoán biết, luôn mới lạ thường kích thích cánh mày râu tìm hiểu.

* Differences:

+ Position: the causer in both causative structures is quite flexible in terms of position. For *make* structures, the causee usually comes after the causing predicate *make* or the beginning of the causative structures. In the position at the beginning of the causative structures, the causee is the most emphasized object in the sentence when the causer is not important or unclear. The causee in causative structures with *make* cannot be replaced with the result predicate as in causative structures with *lam*.

In causative structures with *lam*, the causee can come right after the causing predicate (similar to English) or can come after the result. Unlike in English, the causee in some causative structures containing *lam* can be replaced with the result without changing the meaning of the sentence. For example:

Nếu phân tích nhằm minh họa, làm sáng tỏ một vấn đề nào đó, ấy là bạn đang làm văn chứng minh. → ...làm một vấn đề nào đó sáng tỏ..

Và cứ lắng lại lòng mình mà xem, khi ta làm tổn thương ai đó, chính trong lòng ta cũng đang tổn thương → ...khi ta làm ai đó tổn thương...

Cái tính gia trưởng của Huy làm khổ cô người yêu của mình.

Cái tính gia trưởng của Huy làm cô người yêu của mình khổ.

However, most causative structures have causee which cannot be change the position with the causee when the result of the cause is a verb indicating physical activity (*walking, standing, sleeping, crying, waking up...*), a verb indicating mental activity (remembering, forgetting, understanding, believing...) or causative structures that emphasize the result of the cause and the cause of the predicate cannot be changed. For example:

Nhìn dòng sông làm cô ấy nhớ lại tuổi thơ.

→ *Nhìn dòng sông làm nhớ lại cô ấy tuổi thơ.

Sớm mai, hơi sương lạnh lạnh làm tôi tỉnh giấc.

→ **hoi swong lanh lanh làm tỉnh giấc tôi.*

+ Classification by semantic category: The characteristics of this classification of the causer in the two causative structures are quite similar, only differing in proportion. Causative structures with *make* have a lower proportion of people as the causee than causative structures with *lam* (70.5% compared to 84.61%). The opposite proportion is true for causees that are events/things/animals. Therefore, the [perceptual] nature is also proportionally different in the classification of the causees. The proportion of [+perceptual] as the causee in causative structures with *lam* is higher. The [intentional] nature of causative structures with *lam* has a larger difference than that of causative structures with *make*.

+ Emphatic method: Causative structures with *lam* do not have an emphatic method of causee while causative structures with *make* have a causative structure [N2 be made to V2] to emphasize the object that is affected by the cause. Meanwhile, in Vietnamese, when changing to passive sentences with the structure [N2 bị/được N1 làm V2] hoặc [N2 bị/được làm V2 bởi/do/vì N1] is not considered causative structures because in these two structures, the central predicate is no longer *lam* but changes to *bi/duoc* - two predicates with receptive meaning, not causative meaning.

They were made to sleep in the basement → *causative structures*

Nhưng đôi khi cái phong tục tập quán vốn tốt đẹp ấy đã bị người ta làm cho biến tướng not causative structures

+ Omission ability: 99.9% of causative structures with *make* cannot be omitted even if they are in the context of the sentence, unlike causative structures with *lam* (32.1%) whose causee can be omitted while the meaning of the sentence is still restored. For example:

Canh nguội rồi, làm nóng lên đi.

The identity between causer and causee

* Similarities:

Causer and causee in most causative structures in both languages are generally independent, that is, they belong to two separate entities in terms of physical and psychological properties. However, there are many cases where these two entities are one. In other words, the entity acts on itself. This case also appears not only in causative structures but also in other structures (I cut myself). Reflexive pronouns in English and pronouns such as *minh, t_x minh, mình, t_x (mình, anh ấy, nó, họ, tôi), chính (mình, anh ấy, nó, họ, tôi), bản thân...* were born to express this idea. Thus, there is sometimes a phenomenon of identity between causer and causee.

In most cases, these two objects are distinguished quite clearly from each other thanks to semantic and syntactic characteristics (position). However, in some cases they are identified with each other (treated as one).

Tôi sẽ làm cho mình đẹp hơn nữa để cải thiện tình hình.

I made myself invisible.

The explanation for this case has been clearly analyzed by us in relation to two psychological entities of the same object. Usually, the causing force originates and “escapes” the causing entity, acts on the caused entity and causes the caused entity to perform an action or appear a new characteristic. However, there are still cases where the causing force does not “escape” the causing entity but acts within the causing entity, changing the causing entity itself. For example:

I didn't really want to spare the time because you could imagine that I wanted to get ready to come away but I made myself sit and really gave him time.

In fact, it is still possible to identify the causee in this case if viewed from the perspective of the inside of the entity. That is the “other half” of a psychological entity that is caused by the “this half” acting on it. But because “the other half” and “this half” are the same psychological entity, from the outside we only see them as identical.

Semantic characteristics of the causing predicate

The cause of the situation, in terms of surface structure, is expressed by the causing predicate *make* and *làm*, but if viewed from the semantic perspective, it is often difficult to understand the specificity of this predicate. Because both

the predicate *make* and *làm* are grammaticalized and lose their semantic function, leaving only the syntactic function - the function that these two predicates play very well - which is the cause leading to the change in the causee entity - the situation cannot happen without these two predicates. The two characteristics [dynamic] and [intention] are used to distinguish the situations. Each characteristic is divided into two types. In the first characteristic - [dynamic] nature, *make* and *làm* are both [+dynamic]. Actually, if we consider the [dynamic] nature of *make* and *làm*, it is quite difficult because sometimes the actions of *make* and *làm* cannot be seen. It not only affects the external aspect but also the internal, psychological aspect. Therefore, we need to consider the [dynamic] nature based on the change of the subject of that situation. Both of these verbs cause a change in the subject, expressed in four types of expressive meanings (action, state, process, posture). Therefore, *make* and *làm* are certainly [+dynamic]. In the second characteristic - [intentional] nature, according to Dik's classification of situations, the verb process is [-intentional]. But in the examples *Anh đã làm cho cô tổn thương* và *he made me feel ashamed*, *make* and *làm* are verbs that indicate actions but are [+dynamic], but the [+intentional] nature is not certain. Because when placed in two different situations, those two sentences can be [+intentional] or [-intentional]. Therefore, Dik's classification table above is correct for verbs (real words). As for *make* and *làm* - grammaticalized, not real words, we need to consider the context factor to be able to conclude their [intentional] nature.

These two causing predicates are basically similar in that they are lexically empty and completely grammaticalized. If there is a difference, it may lie in the fact that these two causing predicates in the two languages are classified into two different groups. In English, *make* is not distinguished from imperative predicates, so many linguists still classify it in the same group as other imperative predicates such as *permit, allow, abandon, insist*, etc. However, in Vietnamese, *làm* has been studied more thoroughly and is completely distinguished from the group of imperative predicates. In fact, the above viewpoint and classification are well-founded because the two key points that help causative structures differ from imperative structures are in the complement components. First, they are not only related to the verb but also have a subject-predicate relationship with each other. Second, causative structures with *làm*, in addition to the structure similar to English [N1 làm N2 V2], also have the structure [N1 làm V2 N2]. These two points are completely absent in causative structures containing *make*. Therefore, it is understandable that *make* is classified in the same category as the imperative structure.

Semantic characteristics of the causative result

The causative result has a subject as the causee and a result complement. This complement can be a verb or an adjective in both languages and can be a noun or a verb in the past participle. We use the theoretical framework of Dik (1981) to analyze the expressive meaning and found:

* Similarities:

In both languages, the causative result expresses the four types of expressive meaning that the above authors have mentioned: action, process, state and posture.

- Create new action

There are two types of verbs expressing action in the causative result: intransitive and transitive verbs with the majority being intransitive verbs with only one performer - the causative form, for *thấy, sống, bật cười, cười, khóc, bắn khoản, ... feel, look, laugh, realize, wonder, smile, go, jump, say ...*

Transitive actions with two infinitives (actors) and another complement of the verb occur in both languages but in a smaller proportion than in the example *nhớ, hiểu, suy nghĩ, nghĩ, khinh, muốn, thích, liên tưởng, tin tưởng, chú ý, đối diện, nhìn...feel, think, see, take, get, change, want, do, look, forget, love, know...Ví dụ:*

They made me remember why I started this journey in the first place.

Sự chia sẻ và quan tâm của ông đã làm cho tôi hiểu rằng, trong cuộc sống này, tình yêu và sự đồng cảm là những giá trị vô giá.

- Creating a new process

The difference between action and process lies in the intentionality of the subject. When the subject does not intend to perform the action and it still happens, the action is considered a process. One of the most common process verbs in both languages is *feel/cảm thấy*. It is a psychological process that occurs inside the subject unintentionally. Human

physiological actions such as *rùng mình, rơi, ngã*, etc. can also be considered processes because they are not intentional. In addition, the subject of the process is also things/events. Thus, of course, the process is not intentional. Process verbs often require a certain amount of time to start and end the action. The cause also creates new processes or destroys them. English has common process verbs such as *feel, happen, grow, last, appear, emerge, occur*... Vietnamese also has common process verbs such as *cảm thấy, sống, chết* ... or many process verbs derived from an adjective combined with an adverb *lên, đi, thêm* ... for example *tan ra, dịu lại, ấm lên, nóng lên, mờ đi, bốc hơi, đóng băng* ... For example:

Who started the Red Cross and made it grow?

CO2 làm Trái Đất nóng lên như thế nào?

Most of the new processes in the resultant situation are usually inactive processes. The transitive process appears very rarely in both languages.

- Creating a new state

The situation indicates the state of a person/thing/event with a [-intentional] nature. These are the predicates indicating the nature and status of the causee after the causative action. In both languages, the new states are usually new states - temporary existence (instead of long-term existence, nature) because these states are not the inherent nature of things and events but only appear after the causative action. For example:

The penal laws in force at the time, however, made mixed marriages difficult, if not impossible.

Nhưng đôi lúc, cha mẹ đã lo lắng thái quá và việc đó làm cho con cái bực bội.

In both languages, there is a type of bivalent verb that is associated with human senses or expresses human thoughts, feelings, perceptions or states, including emotional states, states indicating thinking viewpoints or states indicating sensory perceptions... which are also considered state verbs (*muốn, thích, ghét, khinh, yêu, thù, giận, phục*...). For example:

Sống ở đời làm người ta ghét mình thì dễ, chứ để người ta thương mình thì khó lắm chị ơi.

My childhood experiences made me hate myself and feel unworthy of anything positive.

One special point is that some verbs indicate both state and action in Vietnamese, such as *trông em bé/trông có vẻ mệt, nhìn lạ lắm/nhìn tôi chăm chăm, thấy chim trên trời/thấy mệt*... In English there are many such predicates for example *I think that/I'm thinking about you, feel the touch/feel fine, smell good/I smell with nose, I see/I see you, look nice/look at me*...

In addition, the new state is also expressed by nouns *trông, vờ, look, sound, grow, develop, become, get*,

- Creating a new posture

In the four types of expressive meanings of a situation that Dik proposed, causee is the common subject of the first three types of expressive meanings (new action, new process, new state). The remaining types of expressive meanings appear very rarely. This fact is quite consistent with the study of Cao Xuan Hao (2005) when he said that the expressive meaning of new posture appears very little compared to the other three expressive meanings. So little that in his study he grouped this type with the expressive meaning of action. However, we still analyze it separately to see that: because it is a situation, the result in causative structures with *make* and *làm* fully expresses the expressive meanings like other situations in the objective world.

It can be a process verb or a new state of the object after being caused by the impact. The difference between the result verb in the two causative structures lies in the ratio of [dynamic] and [intentional] nature. These two characteristics are related to the characteristics of the causative verb. When the actions of the causative verb are [+active], the resultant verb is [+active] and vice versa.

If the causee is [+intentional] when performing that action, the resultant verb is that nature and vice versa. Most changes of the causative verb are [-intentional] because they refer to changes in the nature of the causee. With verbs indicating mental and physical activities, in general, the [+intentional] nature of the resultant verb in causative structures with

make has a higher rate because verbs with [+intentional] nature such as *work, go, take, do, change, come...* appear more often. In Vietnamese, verbs with [-intentional] nature such as *sống, chết, cười, bật cười ...* appear more often.

3.2. Comparison of semantic relations

Semantic relations relate to the relations between the components in causative structures with each other, affecting each other. There are 3 relations in total: between the causer and the causee, the causative verb and the resulting verb, the causee and the resulting verb.

3.2.1. Semantic relations between the causer and the causee

* Similarities:

In both languages, this relation is a causal relation between the causer and the causee, the causative does something to lead to the result of the causative. The causative is the cause - the induced is the effect. This is a semantic relation that covers all causative structures. Specifically, based on the classification table according to the semantic categories of causative and the induced, each type of causative can affect each type of induced. Therefore, the relationship between these two components is a synthesis of small relationships:

- Causer is a person – causee is a person

This is a relationship between two [+perceptual] entities. The causee (human) is subjected to a cause and performs a new action, undergoes a new process, has a new state or changes posture. This can be a [+intentional] (*They made me eat dog's food, Họ làm cho cô ấy đau đớn*) or [-intentional] (*he made me cry although he didn't mean it, Tôi vô tình làm cho người ta tổn thương rồi*) causing the cause to originate from the causer. On the side of the causee, it can receive in a [+intentional] (*Họ làm cho cô ấy tin rằng...you made me laugh*) or [-intentional] (*She made me nervous, chúng con muốn làm nội vui*).

The combination of [intentional] and [perceptual] creates the [compulsion] nature of causative structures with *make* and *do*. Causative structures are [+compelling] when they satisfy the following conditions:

- The occurrence requires [+perception] and [+intention] of both the causer and the causee;
- The causee does not want to do that;
- The causer must exert a strong enough force.

Differences: In the Vietnamese corpus, there are no cases that meet the conditions to be [+forceful], while in the corpus with *make*, although few, there are still some causative structures with the above meaning:

They made me go into the army.

But he made me do it, I didn't want to do it, but he made me do it.

There are no causative structures with *làm*, and very small number of causative structures with *make*, it is quite inappropriate to attribute [+force] meaning to them.

- Causer is a person – causee is an object/event

This is the relationship between an [+perceptual] entity and an [-perceptual] entity. A person can act on an animal/thing/event and create a cause result that is a change in state or a new process of the thing/event. Obviously, this is the effect of a +/-intentional object on a -intentional object

Similarities: This type of relationship exists in both languages. For example:

Julia thought he made the hounds sound like lice.

Bạn tuyệt đối không nên dùng tay nặn để lấy ngòi vì túi độc có thể sẽ vỡ, làm cho nọc độc lan ra và thấm sâu hơn vào cơ thể.

- Causer is a thing/event – causee is a person

This relationship can be considered the most common compared to the other three relationships in both languages, especially Vietnamese with a very high rate of the causer being a thing/event. This shows that people are often influenced by the external environment from objective things/events. Although this external impact does not originate from humans, it has a great impact on humans because it can cause all four types of changes in the causee (action, state, process, posture). An object/event with [-intentional], [-perceptual] characteristics can create a result with [+perceptual] and +/-intentional characteristics. For example:

Có những nỗi buồn làm cho chúng ta không bao giờ quên, và nếu có quên cũng rất lâu mới quên.

The diagnosis of Celine Dion's disease made her cancel all the tours.

- Causer is a thing/event – causee is the thing/event

The result of the above relationship is a [-intentional] event because it is the combination of two [-intentional] entities. In both languages, this relationship exists. Although less than the three relationships above, it is undeniable that there is a rich variety in the relationships between causer and causee in causative structures in Vietnamese and English.

Chính điều này làm cho họ của người Do Thái rất giống với họ của những người vùng Scandinavia và đặc biệt là giống với họ của người Thụy Điển.

True, this made the code unwieldy and contradictory

3.2.2. The relationship between the causee and the resultant predicate

Causative structures express changes in the action, state, process, or position of the causee caused by the action.

* Similarities:

In both languages, these two objects are semantically related. In Vietnamese, they are subject-predicate phrases, while in English they are the subject and the subject's attributes. Corresponding to each type of semantic expression of this situation, the causee has a change of role from the object to another role with a corresponding function.

- A new action

Usually, the new action of the causee in this situation is the inactive actions created by humans, besides there are also indispensable actions that require another object to be affected by this action. However, in both languages, there is a tendency to lean towards the inactive actions. For example:

Ryan made me promise never to tell you.

He made me laugh like no one on earth has ever made me laugh.

- A new process

Most causees are people, some of them are things. When a thing/event or a person [-intention] undergoes a new process, the causee is called processor. In the corpora of both languages, the causee is often thing/event, rarely people. For example

But faith has always played a big part in the game, and in France they have often made things happen simply by believing.

Tức giận không giải quyết được gốc rễ vấn đề mà chỉ làm cho mọi chuyện trở nên nghiêm trọng hơn.

- A new state

The new state of the causee is expressed by adjectives indicating states such as *nóng, lạnh, ấm, khổ, vui*, etc. Usually, state verbs indicate internal properties of the object, without affecting the outside. But the group of state verbs in Vietnamese also includes verbs such as *yêu, ghét, kinh, nể*, etc. Although these verbs always need to be accompanied by an object, they are not considered action verbs but verbs indicating human emotional states. English also has equivalent words, so we boldly classify them into the group of verbs indicating emotional states such as *love, like, hate, dislike, enjoy*

* Differences:

Vietnamese has a special point that is different from English in that some state verbs, which are essentially adjectives (*nóng, lạnh, ấm...*) with [-dynamic] properties, but in causative structures with *làm*, they are transformed in function, becoming process verbs with [+dynamic]. For example:

Hiệu ứng nhà kính làm cho trái đất nóng lên. Compare with *với nước này nóng.*

Ghé thăm xứ Huế mộng mơ để làm dịu đi ngày hè oi ả. Compare with *Hương hoa bưởi rất dịu.*

Trái đất nóng lên is a process while *nước này nóng* is a state.

Làm dịu đi ngày hè oi ả is a process while *hương hoa bưởi rất dịu* is a property

- A new posture

Pose verbs such as *nằm, ngồi, đứng*, etc. are not classified as action verbs because of their [-dynamic]. They are also not state or process verbs because they are [+intentional]. It is appropriate to classify them as separate verbs, although their number of occurrences is quite small in the entire Vietnamese corpus in general and in causative structures with *make* and *lam* in particular. For example:

Câu nói của ông Tùng làm cho tôi ngồi yên bất động tại chỗ không nói ra lời nào.

In addition, the man reportedly also threw the boy onto a bed and made him sit on a stool for 50 hours.

3.2.3. The relationship between causative predicate and result predicate

* Similarities:

First, the relationship between these two predicates shows the [dynamic] nature of causative structures. It is quite similar. It is the combination of the [dynamic] nature in the cause and the [dynamic] nature in the result. When both of these situations are [+dynamic], we can say that the causative structure is [+dynamic]. Conversely, when one of the two situations is [-dynamic], then the causative structure is [-dynamic] or we can only consider the [dynamic] nature in each situation separately. For example:

He touched her mouth again with the flat of his thumb [+dynamic], making her heart thud strangely inside her [+dynamic]
→ *causative structures mang tính [+dynamic]*

Gió làm [+dynamic] cánh hoa bay [+dynamic] giữa trời. → *causative structures: [+dynamic]*

Anh ấy ra đi [+dynamic] làm cho cô ấy buồn [-dynamic] → *causative structures: [-dynamic]*

Second, the above relationship also shows the intentionality of causative structures. The intentionality of both causative structures *làm* and *make* depends entirely on the causer. However, determining this characteristic of the causer cannot be done without combining it with the context of the sentence. This characteristic of intentionality does not depend on the perceptual nature of the causer. That is, even if the causer is [-perceptual], it can still create [+intentionality] for causative structures and vice versa.

Morrigan is a witch who was abandoned in the human world, and because she was gifted, she made everyone around her uncomfortable unintentionally.

In our classroom, she made everyone uncomfortable. No one was confident enough to ask any questions because she looked at them like they're stupid.

Mother dolphin swims slowly to make her baby keep up.

Third, in terms of directness/indirectness, causative structures in both languages have the same analysis based on direct or indirect impact on the causer. In both languages, the structure [N1 make/lam N2 V] is indirect because they are syntactic causative structures. Causing the predicate *make* and *làm* to use different ways and means to impact the

causee, causing changes to the causee. The ways and means of *make* and *làm* are sometimes explicitly stated in the sentence, and sometimes not mentioned, but it is always understood that they do not have a naming function (i.e. they do not carry a specific lexical meaning by themselves) but are performed through the actions and ways of other self-actualizing verbs. For example:

Ross twisted Owen's arm and made him take the money out of his pocket.

I made him take me by giving myself to him like a slave.

In the two examples above, *make* is expressed by *twisting Owen's arm and giving myself to him like a slave*.

Fourth, the causative action produces a certain causative result

Unlike other causative structures, the two causative structures *make* and *làm* once uttered means that the action is successfully performed unless the causative structure is the complement of another central verb.

We love her and tried to make her happy but she went away without saying goodbye.

We made her happy.

Tôi đã cố gắng làm cho cô ấy hạnh phúc nhưng những vương vấn với người tình cũ làm cho cô ấy lúc nào cũng buồn bã.

Tôi đã làm cho cô ấy hạnh phúc.

The causative structures *make her happy* and *làm cho cô ấy hạnh phúc* in example (494) and the third example are not successful because these causative structures are not the central verbs in the sentence but only the complements of the verbs *try* và *cố gắng*. When standing alone and causing the predicate to act as the center, the causative action is sure to succeed.

* Differences:

This relationship is shown in the characteristics of [dynamic], [intentional], direct/indirect and default results of the causative structures.

In terms of [dynamics], in both languages this feature depends on the [dynamics] of both predicates. When one of the two predicates is [-dynamic], both causative structures are [-dynamic]. In both causative structures, [-dynamics] is the first feature when most of the resulting predicates are adjectives or verbs that indicate mental, cognitive, or noun activities. However, the proportion of this feature is different between causative structures with *make* and *làm* (92.36% compared to 74.57%)

In terms of [intentionality], because causing predicate is the central predicate, the [intentionality] of causing predicate completely determines the [intentionality] of causative structures. This feature is related to the subject and depends on the context of the sentence, the [intentionality] of causative structures will be determined. In general, both causative structures tend to be [-intentional], but the proportion of causative structures with *make* is slightly larger than that of causative structures with *làm* (89.05% and 88.73%).

In terms of direct/indirect, with causative structures with *làm*, the structure [N1 làm V2 N2] is the difference. With this order, in Vietnamese, the result predicate can stand right after causing predicate to create a verb phrase [làm V2]. The difference between [làm V2] and [V2 làm] is the completeness, not separated in terms of time and space.

Indirect causation: The two situations of causing and result are segmented by the speaker into two activities: the causing activity is considered the background and the result activity is considered the foreground. Foreground information is considered the prominent information that the speaker wants to convey or describe. These two activities are not allowed to be mixed or blended together but must be separate. The fact that the result predicate must appear after the direct complement indicating the affected object, and is also the subject of the result predicate, shows that these are two separate situations, not overlapping in time and space. And this is the basic property of indirect causation.

Direct causation: The events in direct causation are described by the speaker from an internal view (event – internal view) and the event is described as a complex of consecutive parts, without pauses, considered as not overlapping in

time and space, so it can be considered a direct causation. From this descriptive perspective, the speaker places the described event in the whole, without specifying any segment of the event.

In fact, causative structures of the form [N1 làm V2 N2] have a structure similar to lexical causative structures when we consider [làm V2] as a verb phrase.

Thus, all causative structures with *make* are indirect. In Vietnamese, causative structures of the form [N1 làm N2 V2] are indirect, while the structure [N1 làm V2 N2] is direct.

4. Conclusions

The similarities and differences in semantic characteristics of the two causative structures with *make* and *lam* have been compared and contrasted in this paper. The two causative structures above have many similarities in semantic characteristics of the two situations of cause and effect, the components of each situation, and especially they both have three semantic relationships between the cause and the causer, the causee and the result, the cause action and the cause result.

References

- [1] Bùi Mạnh Hùng (2008), *Ngôn ngữ học đối chiếu*, NXB Giáo dục
- [2] Bùi Minh Toán – Đinh Trọng Lạc (1997), *Tiếng Việt*, T.2, NXB Giáo dục, Hà Nội.
- [3] Cao Xuân Hạo (1991), *Tiếng Việt sơ thảo ngữ pháp chức năng*, NXB Khoa học xã Hội.
- [4] Cao Xuân Hạo (2003), *Ngữ pháp chức năng tiếng Việt*, Q. 1, Câu trong tiếng Việt, NXB Giáo dục.
- [5] Cao Xuân Hạo (2005), *Ngữ pháp chức năng tiếng Việt*, Q. 2, Ngữ đoạn và từ loại, NXB Giáo dục.
- [6] Cao Xuân Hạo (1991), *Tiếng Việt: Sơ thảo ngữ pháp chức năng*, Q. 1, NXB Khoa học Xã hội, Hà Nội, 1991.
- [7] Đào Thanh Lan (2002), *Phân tích câu đơn tiếng Việt theo cấu trúc đề – thuyết*, NXB Đại học Quốc gia, Hà Nội.
- [8] Diệp Quang Ban (1987), *Câu đơn tiếng Việt*, NXB Giáo dục, Hà Nội.
- [9] Nguyễn Thị Hoàng Yến (2016), “Về cặp vị từ gây khiến – khởi trạng trong tiếng Việt”, *Tạp chí Khoa học ĐH Sư phạm Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh* (8), tr.24 – 29.
- [10] Nguyễn Thị Hoàng Yến (2016), “Các kiểu cấu trúc kết quả trong tiếng Việt», *Tạp chí Khoa học, ĐH Sư phạm Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh* (7), tr.19.
- [11] Nguyễn Thị Kim Quyên (2007), *Vị từ gây khiến trong tiếng Việt*, Luận văn Thạc sĩ Khoa học Ngữ văn, Trường Đại học Sư phạm TPHCM.
- [12] Nguyễn Thị Quy (1995), *Vị từ hành động trong tiếng Việt và các tham tố của nó*, NXB Khoa học Xã hội
- [13] Anderson, S.R. (1985), *Phonology in the twentieth century: theories of rules and theories of representations*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- [14] Cambridge University Press, *Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (4th ed)
- [15] Chatti, S. (2011), “The semantic network of causative MAKE”, *Sorbonne Nouvelle University ICAME Journal* (35), p.5.
- [16] Cheung & Larson (2015), *Make causatives in English and Mandarin*, The Hongkong Polytechnic University.
- [17] Chomsky, N. (1965), *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- [18] Chomsky, N. (1975), *The logical Structure of Linguistic Theory*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- [19] Chomsky, N. (1976), *Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar*, 3rd ed, Mouton, the Hague - Paris.
- [20] Comrie, B. (1974), *Causative and Universal Grammar*, Transaction of the Philological Society, in Press.
- [21] Comrie, B. (1976), *The syntax of causative Construction: Cross – language Similarities and Divergencies*, Academic Press, San Diego.
- [22] Comrie, B. (1989), *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*, The University of Chicago Press.
- [23] Comrie, B. (2000), *Causatives and Transitivity*, John Publishing Company, Benjamins.
- [24] Comrie, B. (2003), *Causative*. In *International encyclopedia of linguistics*, 2nd ed