IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)
e-ISSN: 2320–7388, p- ISSN: 2320-737x Volume 14, Issue 1 Ser. 1 (Jan. – Feb. 2024), 13-16
www.iosrjournals.org

Semantic Relationships in MAKE Causative Structures

Đỗ Thị Phương Thúy
Fundamental Falcuty, Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology, Hanoi, Vietnam

Abstract
"The semantic structure of a causative construction includes cause and effect. Each event has obligatory components: causes and causees are two elements of the causative verb MAKE in the event of cause, causees and predicate of result are two mandatory components of the result event. The article focuses on analyzing two semantic relationships between components in the MAKE causative structures: causative predicate MAKE and result predicate, causees and causative result.

Key words: *causers, causees, causative verbs, semantic relationships, causative structures*

Date of Submission: 02-01-2024 Date of Acceptance: 12-01-2024

I. Introduction

Causative structures have long been a research interest of many authors. Most research works follow the direction of Syntactic Semantics such as Mill (1960), Masayoshi Shibatani (1996, 1999) or Ray Jackendoff (1995). Some others follow the direction of Functional Grammar such as Halliday (1994, 2004) or the direction of Syntactic Typology with typical authors such as Bernard Comrie (1989, 2000), Jea Jung Song (1990, 1996), Gilquin (2015)… In most of their works, causative structures with the verb MAKE only appeared as important examples of a syntactic causative construction. They have not been studied fully and deeply on syntactic and semantic features. That prompted this writing's author to carry out this research especially on the semantic features of each component in the causing event in the structures.

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.

The conditions for the above two incidents to constitute a causing event are based on two factors: (1) Time: The time at which the caused event occurs (t2) always follows the time (t1) of the causing event. (2) Dependency: The outcome of events completely depends on the impact of events. The dependence here shows that no resulting event will occur at time t2 if the impact event does not occur at time t1. This is the 'semantic entailment' relationship in the relationship between two part events of a causative construction and is also a characteristic attribute to identify a causative construction.

Although the above two parts are distinct in time (t1 and t2), they are integrated with each other in terms of surface structure.

Causers are the beginning of the action sequence, the initial source of energy. This causer transmits its energy further. This transfer of energy is accomplished by the causative verb MAKE and together with causees, it forms the causing event. In the resulting event, causees can undergo many types of changes such as performing new actions, changes in new processes, states, and properties. Each component in the structure has a different meaning but complements each other to create semantic relationships.

II. Methodology

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.

Data collection

We use Sketch Engine software to collect data in British National Corpus. This software allows to filter all sentences containing the word MAKE from all sources on the web. By using the supported formula, sentences containing MAKE 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 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: Geting the amount of MAKE – causative structures

After phase 1, the total number of corpuscles is extremely large (up to more than 80,000 sentences.We use the formula $n = \frac{N}{1 + N \times e^2}$ by Yamante Taro (1967) to get the quantity for our research. In which, *n* is the number of samples to be taken for analysis, *N* is the total number of samples collected, *e* is the allowed error = 0.05.

Based on the number of *n* of each structure, we will randomly take the sum of 5 structures. Final number *n* is also done according to the formula supported by Excel.

Phase 3: Filtering the corpus thoroughly

After having the quantity *n* of each structure, for the last time, we manually filtered more than 1500 examples 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 n obtained after stage 3 is 1505 examples.

Phase 4: Analyzing the corpus

1505 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.

III. Findings

Semantic relationship between causees and causative result

Result predicate always comes after the causees and is the change in the activity and nature of the cause due to the impact. Therefore, these two components are closely related in meaning. Syntactically, result predicate has no elements expressing tense or tense meaning. In all four structures [N1 make N2 Adj], [N1 make N2 Vpp], [N2 be made to Vinf] and [N1 make N2 Noun], there is always the presence of *to be* – a verb that conveys the physical characteristics of the subject (in this case, causees) - even though the surface structure does not have one. This verb *to be* is the 'implicit' element that connects the two components causees and result predicate. Thus, it can be said that in terms of meaning, causee is the subject of causative result.

The relationship between causees and causative results will be presented by analyzing and describing the role of causes in the relationship with the result predicate.

MAKE causative structures is a two-clause causative structures in which the causee is the intersection element between those two clauses. Causees have a dual role when in the causing situation it plays the role of the object, in the resulting situation it is transformed into a role corresponding to each type of event as follows:

a) Causees perform a new action

In this type of situation, causees' role is changed to agent (Ag) - an argument that refers to the entity that controls the action. For example:

(1) Ag *She **made** me go and ask your Mum for it.*

(2) Ag – Go *An old professor **made** me ,read the classics.*

(3) Ag – Go – Rec *He **made** me give Celia's address to him.*

In example (1), in the result clause, there is only one *me* argument - the agent performing the *go* action. In example (2), in addition to the *me* entity, there is also the appearance of Goal (Go) - the entity affected by the *read* action. In example (3), in addition to the agent *me* and Goal (Celia's address), there is also the appearance of the receptor (Rec) *him*

b) Causees undergo a new process

Let's consider the following examples:

(4) Proc *Marillier **made** me fall head-over-heels for an amphibian.*

(5) Fo *What **makes** the wind blow hard?*

(6) Fo – Go *God **made** the wind blow the clouds*

For a process there is one parameter, this parameter will usually refer to the entity that is affected or influenced by the process. The *me* causee in the example (4) is changed into the affected person (Processed – Proc) of the *fall* process. In addition, that parameter can also be the force (Fo) of that process (example 4). In a process with two parameters (example 5) the variation *the wind* is in the process situation with two roles (*the wind and the clouds*) and at this time the wind is transformed into an actor. Because although uncontrolled, that process is still expressed as an autonomous cause.

c) Causees have a new state

Dik's opinion is that no specific semantic function should be assigned to the arguments in a nuclear predicate structure indicating state. We think that Dik's point of view is only correct for predicate structures that indicate properties, the nature of things/events, [-perceptual] objects (Roses are red). With human subjects, they completely have a semantic function - the object experiencing that state. For example:

*(7) Echoes of Harry **made** her sad.*

*(8) His reply **made** me love him even more.*

Sad and *love* are predicates of states; they are not the inherent nature of causes. They can be considered a temporary state that appears after being affected. Thus, causees have gone through a process to obtain a new state. Therefore, Cao Xuan Hao (2004) assigns causees a semantic function as the bearer or experiencer of emotions is appropriate.

d) Causees change position

Positioner (Po) is the semantic function of the causee in the causative result when it has a new position. Note that the agent (in action) and the bearer of the posture are both intentional. The difference is that the person with the position controls a motionless situation while the person with the position controls a moving situation.

Consider an example:

*(9) They **made** me lie on the ground and threw a blanket over me.*

A positional event can also have two arguments as in the example above. The first parameter is *me* - the bearer of the posture, the second parameter is usually the position (*the ground*) in which the bearer of the posture places themselves.

Semantic relationship between causative predicate and result predicate

a) Dynamicity

The relationship between the [dynamic] properties of the causative prediate and the result predicate creates the [dynamic] characteristics of the entire causative structures. Causative structures include two events in which the resulting events are changes created by the causing events, so it can be affirmed that causative prediate make is [+dynamic]. The rest of the causative structures (the resulting events) will determine the [dynamics] of the entire causative structures.

In the four types of resulting event meanings, we see that action and process events are [+dynamic] while position and state events are [-dynamic].

The following two cases occur:

Case 1: causative prediate [+dynamic] + result prediate [+dynamic] = causative structures [+dynamic]. For example:

*(10) His mouth and hands caressed her body in a way that **made** her move sinuously against him.*

Case 2: causative prediate [+dynamic] + result prediate [-dynamic] = causative structures [-dynamic]. For example:

*(11) The way he talked **made** her mad.*

Of the two cases above, there is only one case where the [+dynamic] properties of both causative prediate and result predicate create [+dynamic] properties for the entire causative structures. The [+dynamic] nature of causative structures often appears in the structures [N1 make N2 Vinf] and [N2 be made to Vinf]. However, the appearance rate of these two structures is only a minority compared to the remaining three structures. These two things can identify most causative structures whose make is [-dynamic].

b) Intentionality

The [intentionality] of a causative structure depends on the entity. When the causer is [+perceptual], the causative structures are [+intentional] or [-intentional]. When the causer is [-perceptual], the causative structures will be [-intentional]. This [intentionality] does not depend on whether causees can be [+perceptual] or not.

*(12) What would you say if I told you I could **make** your contract disappear?*

*(13) When he felt he had said enough and **made** us laugh enough, he went back to his dressing room.*

*(14) His use of the English language **made** me respect him.*

*(15) Defiance **made** her turn her back, but the sound of a dark laugh sent a chill through her.*

Causative actions such as *make your contract disappear* and *make us laugh enough'* are all [+intentional] actions of the modifiers 'I' and 'he' even though the causes are [+perceptual] as 'we' or [-perception] as 'your contract'. On the contrary, when the expressions 'His use of the English language' and 'Defiance' are both [-perceptual], these causative structures are [-intentional].

c) Directness/indirectness

The issue of directness/indirectness causation has been mentioned by some scientists such as Mc Cawley (1976, 1978) and Shibatini (1973, 1976). Mc Cawley believed that the lexical causative structures usually has a direct meaning while the syntactic causative structures usually has an indirect meaning.

Consider the following situation:

(16) The gunsmith did not repair the sheriff's gun properly, so it failed to fire in a moment of need, and the sheriff got shot.

a. The gunsmith caused the sheriff to die (caused the sheriff's death).

b. The gunsmith killed the sheriff.*

(Mc Cawley, 1976)

It's easy to see in the above example that the sheriff's death was not caused by the gunsmith, so the lexical causative structures cannot be used with *kill*. But the underlying cause, also known as the indirect cause of the sheriff's death, was because the mechanic did not repair the sheriff's gun.

d) Default causative results

Some causative prediates have obvious meanings such as *force*... there are still possibilities of failure. The word "but" can still be added between two things. For example:

(17) Mary forced John to mow the lawn but he didn't do it.

*(18) *Mary **made** the car stop but it didn't stop.*

Thus, we see that causative prediate with MAKE itself, when spoken, already contains success within it. Therefore, the conjunction 'but' can never be added between the cause and the result. Furthermore, 88.1% of MAKE causative structures confirms the success of these causative structures.

IV. Conclusions

The two semantic relationships between causees and causative result, causative predicate and result predicate in MAKE causative structures have been analyzed clearly in the paper. In the first relationship, causees is affected by causers undergoing new changes made by verbs, nouns, adjectives and past participles. In the second one, the relationship between the two predicate are expressed with dynamicity, intentionality, directness/ indirectness and default causative results. The article helps provide a system of knowledge about causative constructions in general and especially about causative constructions with MAKE, the most typical causative verb in English.

REFERENCES

[1]. Comrie.B. (2000), Causatives And Transivity, John Publishing Company, Benjamins.
[2]. Comrie.B. (1989), Language Universals And Linguistic Typology: Syntax And Morphology. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
[3]. Halliday.M.A.K. (1994), An Introduction To Functional Grammar, Blackwell, London.
[4]. Halliday.M.A.K. (2004), Dẫn Luận Ngữ Pháp Chức Năng. Nxb Đhqghn (Bản Dịch Của Hoàng Văn Vân)
[5]. Jackendoff.R. (1995), Semantic Structure, The Mit Press, Cambridge.
[6]. Shibatani.M. (1996), Grammatical Constructions: Their Form And Meaning, Oxford University Press. Usa.
[7]. Shibatani.M. (1999), Approaches To Language Typology, Oxford Universtiy Press.
[8]. Song.J.J. (1990), On The Rise Of Causative Affixes: A Universal Typological Perspective, Lingua.
[9]. Song.J.J. (1996), Causatives And Causation: A Universal-Typological Perspective. London And New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
[10]. Talmy.L. (1988), Force Dynamics In Language And Cognition. Mit Press, Cambridge.
[11]. Talmy.L. (1996), Semantic Causative Types In The Grammar Of Causative Constructions. Brill Publisher.
[12]. Talmy.L. (1976), Semantic Causative Types, In M. Shibatani (Ed.) Syntax And Semantics 6: The Grammar Of Causative Construction, P.43-116. Academic Press, New York.