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## INTRODUCTION

For over a generation, there was the conviction that the best language teaching materials are based upon a contrastive analysis of the language to be learned and the language of the learner. Allied with the conviction was the hypothesis that the new linguistic system, and by extension, the new cultural behaviour, should be established as a set of new habits by drill, drill which would ensure overlearning. Such a pedagogical philosophy was systematized by Charles C. Fries (1945) and Robert Lado (1957).

However, all this firm belief in contrastive analysis seems to be in the past, at least for some people. The generative-transformational theory claims that language behaviour is rule-governed behaviour, and consequently that language learning should be in the form of a process of internalizing the creative rules in the new language, and not just that of mere habit forming.

Before such a theoretical dilemma, a language teacher may be tempted to make the most use of existing linguistic theories to improve teaching materials as best he could. With this pragmatism in mind, I am trying to present a contrastive analysis of Vietnamese and English on the case, clause, and sentence levels in this study.

On the theoretical linguistics ground, this analysis of cases, clauses, and sentences in Vietnamese in contrast with English will make an attempt to utilize both tagmemics (Brend 1970, 1972a, and 1972b, Cook 1969, Longacre 1964, Pike 1954, 1955, 1960, 1966, and 1971) and a case grammar model (Fillmore 1968, 1969, and 1971) called lexicase (Manley 1972, Starosta 197la, 1971b, 1972a, 1972b, 1972c, 1973, Taylor 1972). Such an eclectic combination of tagmemics and case grammar is not new either in the field of general linguistics (Cook 1970, l97la, l97lb, and 1972, Heidi Platt 1970, John T. Platt 1971) or in Southeast Asian linguistic analysis (Liem 197la, l97lb, 1972a, 1972b, 1973a, and 1973b). Case grammar studies on Vietnamese can be found in Clark l97la and l97lb, Ha 1970, Manley 1969, Taylor

1968, and Tran 1971, and a tagmemic analysis of Vietnamese can be seen in Liem 1969.

In that this study is tagmemically oriented, it recognizes firstly the hierarchical levels in syntax and secondly the grammatical unit or tagmeme as composed of a slot and a filler class. The concept of hierarchies in syntax makes it possible to single out the clause and sentence levels for this study, and consequently it is unnecessary to write, at the very beginning, phrase structure rules of the entire base component, a matter of mandatory nature in a transformational analysis (Chomsky 1965:88ff.). The grammatical slot of the tagmeme at the clause level has been pointed out by Becker (1967a and 1967b), Fries (1970), and Young, Becker, and Pike (1970) as having not only the overt syntactic relationships (case realizations or case forms) but also the covert meaning relationships (case relations) with the predicative verb which is considered to be central in the clause (Chafe 1970).

In that this paper is also case grammar oriented, it recognizes the case relations between various nouns and the predicative verb in the clause (or proposition in Fillmore's terminology). The type of case grammar utilized here introduces both the overt case realizations (or case forms) and covert case relations into the grammar as syntactic features assigned to nouns by verbs (Starosta l97la, 197lb, 1972a, 1972b, and 1973).

In that this is also a contrastive analysis of Vietnamese and English, the study will present not only the particular construction in Vietnamese but also will point out similarities or differences in parallel constructions in English. However, specific types of drills to teach the patterns will not be suggested because generally drills on case forms and case relations in Chapter I will be substitutional, whereas they will be surface-to-surface transformational on the clause and sentence levels in subsequent Chapters. The phrase level has been purposely omitted in this study because there are not many similarities on that level in Vietnamese and English. The reader is referred to Liem 1969, Chapters III and IV, pp. 75-163, for an analysis of the phrase level in Vietnamese. Particular attention should be paid to the verb phrase on pages $75-108$, the noun phrase on pages 109-31, and the cross-level tagmemes and cross-level constructions on pages 160-4 of the 1969 study.

## CHAPTER I

## CASE FORMS AND CASE RELATIONS

### 1.1. VIETNAMESE CASE RELATIONS AND CASE FORMS

In Vietnamese, there seem to be twelve case relations whose definitions are taken from Fillmore 1968, 1969, and 1971 whenever necessary:

The AGENTIVE (AGT) case: the AGT actant is the "instigator of the action identified by the verb" (Fillmore 1968:24). It is assumed here that the agent is not necessarily equated with "intent", for recent research on Tagalog (Ramos 1974) has indicated that certain generalities cannot be captured unless we allow for non-intentional agents as well as intentional non-agents.

The OBJECTIVE (OBJ) case: the OBJ actant is the "semantically most neutral case, the case anything representable by a noun whose role in the action or state identified by the verb is identified by the semantic interpretation of the verb itself" (Fillmore 1968:25). In general, it will be that element which is acted upon, or whose state or existence is predicated. This relation subsumes several that have been treated as distinct in other case grammars including Experiencer, and Result/Factitive. These two types are treated as the interpretations given to the neutral Objective case when it appears with psychological and creative verbs respectively.

The DATIVE (DAT) case: the case of the "animated being affected by the state of, or experiencing the action of the verb" (Fillmore 1968:24).
The BENEFACTIVE (BEN) case: the BEN actant receives the benefit of the action identified by the verb.
The COMITATIVE (COM) case: the COM actant accompanies another actant in the verbal activity or state described.
The INSTRUMENT (INS) case: the INS actant is "the case of the inanimate force or object casually involved in the action or state identified by the verb" (Fillmore 1968:24).

The LOCATIVE (LOC) case: the LOC actant indicates "the location or special orientation of the state or action identified by the verb" (Fillmore 1968:25). ${ }^{1}$
The DIRECTION (DIR) case: the DIR actant indicates the orientation of the state or action identified by the verb.

The TIME (TIM)
of the action or state identified by the verb.
The SOURCE (SRC) case: the SRC actant indicates the location or time from which action has begun.

The GOAL (GOL) case: the GOAL actant indicates the space or time toward which the action or state identified by the verb has occurred.
The EXTENT (EXT) case: the EXT actant indicates the space or time through which the action or state identified by the verb has occurred. 2
Out of the twelve cases, only the AGENTIVE and OBJECTIVE cases are nuclear in the clause, the DATIVE, BENEFACTIVE, and INSTRUMENTAL cases are semi-nuclear in the sense that they can be hosted only by certain verb classes, and the rest of the cases, COMITATIVE, LOCATIVE, DIRECTIONAL, TIME, SOURCE, GOAL, and EXTANT are satellite in that they occur with most verbs except those otherwise marked.

The twelve covert case relations are pigeon-holed in eleven overt case realizations (or case-forms) of which some are marked by their positions vis-à-vis the verb, and some are marked by prepositions. The case realizations are:

NM Nominative position immediately preceding the verb, no prepositions.
O Objective position immediately following the verb, no prepositions.
D Dative realization with preposition cho. (This preposition and all the following ones except với and bàng are coverbs. For discussion and examples of the words that are called coverbs here, see Thompson 1965:230-4, and for definitions of coverbs, see Li 1970:5 and Clark forthcoming.)
B Benefactive realization with prepositions gium or h $\hat{q}$.
C Comitative realization with preposition vơi.
I Instrumental realization with preposition bàng.
L Locative realization with preposition ${ }_{o}^{2}$.
Di Directional realization with prepositions such as lên, xuóng, qua, lai, etc.
SR Source realization with preposition tur.
GL Goal realization with prepositions tới or dén.
EX Extent realization with preposition dực.
The twelve covert case relations and the eleven overt case realizations can be charted in a two-dimensional matrix yielding twenty-five possibilities as in Chart I below:

## CHART I: CASE FORMS AND CASE RELATIONS

|  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | NM | O | D | B | C | I | L | Di | Sr | Gl | Ex |  |
| 1 | AGT | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | OBJ | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | DAT | 3 | 7 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | BEN |  | 8 | 16 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | COM |  |  |  |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | INS | 4 | 9 |  |  |  | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | LOC | 5 | 10 |  |  |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | DIR |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |
| 9 | TIM |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | SRC |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 |  | 23 |  |  |
| 11 | GOL |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |  |
| 12 | EXT |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 |

The twenty-five possible combinations of covert case relations and overt case realizations can be arrived at by applying case-related redundancy rules which are not specified here but which can be drawn from Chart II overleaf.

Chart II begins with [ +K ] for case positivity and ends with the twenty-five tagmemic slots (covert case relations and overt case realizations) already stated in Chart I in another way. Following are examples of the tagmemic slots, whereas their filler classes will be discussed along with the classification of verbs in Vietnamese:

1. [+NM, +AGT] is hosted by transitive agentive (i.e.
-submissive and -dative) verbs.
1.1 .
Ong áy
he
[ +NM $]$
[ +AGT$]$
mua báo.
bought newspapers
$\begin{array}{ll}{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+\mathrm{O}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}\end{array}$
2. [+NM, +OBJ] is hosted by copulative, stative, and intransitive verbs.
2.1. Ông áy là bác-sĩ.
he is a doctor
[+NM ] [-K]
[+OBJ]

$\begin{array}{cc}\text { 2.2a. ing áy } \\ \text { he cham } & \text { lam. } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM} \text { is si ow very }} \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}\end{array} \quad \begin{gathered}\text { (Adverb) }\end{gathered}$ (he is very s low)


2.2c. Ông áy chert. | he |
| :---: |
| $\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { is de } a d \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]}\end{array}\right.$ |

$\begin{array}{rll}\text { 2.3a. On aby } & \stackrel{?}{o} & \text { Saigon. } \\ \text { he } & \text { stays } & \text { in Saigon } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} & & {[+\mathrm{O}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & & {[+\mathrm{LOC}]}\end{array}$
2.3b. Ông áy ra Saigon.
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { he } & \text { went out } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+0 \quad]} \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & {[+\mathrm{DIR}]}\end{array}$


3. [+NM, +DAT] is hosted by transitive submissive (bi and đươc) and transitive dative verbs.
3.la. ông aby

3.1b. Ông aby bi

$\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { +NM }\end{array}\right]$ they beat (he was beaten by them) [+DAT]

3.2b. Ông aby
bi ロ (rang)
$\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { +NM } \\ \text { [ }\end{array}\right.$
knew (that) she had gone already
[ + DAT
[ + OBJ
3.2c. Ông áy muốn (răng) bà aby di rồi. he wanted (that) she went already
$\left[\begin{array}{l}{[+N M} \\ {[+D A T}\end{array}\right.$
$[+D A T]$

4. [+NM, +INS] is hosted by transitive agentive and intransitive verbs.

```
4.1. Dao này cát thịt.
    knife this cuts meat (this knife cuts meat)
    \(\begin{array}{ll}{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+0} \\ {[+ \text { INS }]} & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}\end{array}\)
```

It is noted here that only "potent" nouns can occur in the [+NM, +INS] slot.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 4.2. Xe này di } \begin{array}{l}
\text { Saigon. } \\
\text { vehicle this goes to Saigon (this vehicle goes to } \\
{[+N M]}
\end{array} \quad[+0 \text { Saigon) }
\end{aligned}
$$

5. $[+\mathrm{NM},+\mathrm{LOC}]$ is hosted by stative verbs. ${ }^{3}$

5.1. Phong này lanh. | room this is cold |
| :--- |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |
| $[+\mathrm{LOC}]$ |

For a special class of nouns occurring in this slot, see Thompson 1965:200-3 who calls them "relator nouns" while Starosta calls similar nouns in Sora "Noun auxiliaries" (Starosta 1967).
6. [+O, +OBJ] is hosted by transitive verbs.

| 6.1.ông áy  <br> he mua <br>  bought | sách. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | books |  |
|  | $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  |
|  | $[+\mathrm{AGT}]$ | $[+O B J]$ |


| 6.2. Ông áy biêt chuyên ây. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| he | knows | story |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+0$ |
| $[+\mathrm{DAT}]$ | $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  | that (he knows that story)

7. [ + O, +DAT] is hosted by ditransitive dative verbs.
$\left.\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { 7.1. } & \text { Öng áy bán } & \text { tôi sách. } \\ \text { he } & \text { sold } & \text { me } & \text { books } \\ {[+N M}\end{array}\right]$
8. [+0, +BEN] is hosted by ditransitive benefactive verbs. It is noted that this construction is always ambiguous, and therefore is usually avoided.

\section*{8.1. ông ảy mua tòi sách. <br> | he | bought $m e$ | books |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ | $[+0$ | $[+0$ |
| $[+\mathrm{AGT}]$ | $[+\mathrm{BEN}][+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  | <br> $[+0$

$[+D A T]$}
9. [ $+0,+I N S]$ is hosted by transitive or intransitive verbs. (Perhaps, there are only special transitive verbs that can host [ + O, +INS].)


| 9.2. Ông áy | di | xe do. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| he | went | by bus |  |
|  | $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+0 \quad]$ |
|  | $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  | $[+$ INS $]$ |

10. [ $+0,+L O C]$ is hosted by intransitive locative verbs.

ll. [ $+0,+D I R]$ is hosted by intransitive directional verbs.
ll.1. Òng áy ra Saigon.
he went out to Saigon (same as example 2.3b.)
$\begin{array}{ll}{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+0} \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & {[+\mathrm{DIR}]}\end{array}$
11.2. Ông ãy di $\begin{gathered}\text { he } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}\end{gathered}$
11. [+O, +TIM] is hosted by any verb, thus may be considered as being a sentence tagmemic slot and consequently is not a clause tagmemic slot which can be defined as a combination of a case realization and a case relation. ${ }^{4}$
12.l. Ông ây di hòm qua.
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { he } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ \text { [+OBJ }] & \text { went } \\ & {[+\mathrm{Hesterday}} \\ {[+\mathrm{TIM}]}\end{array}$
12. [+O, +GOL] is hosted by intransitive +goal verbs.

| 13.1. Öng áy tới | Saigon. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| he | arrived | in Saigon <br> $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ <br> $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |

14. [+O, +EXT] is hosted by any verb except those marked otherwise.

15. [ + D, +DAT] is hosted by transitive agentive verbs.

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text { 15.1. Ông åy bán } & \text { sách } & \text { cho tôi. } \\
\text { he } & \text { sold books } & \text { to } & \text { me } \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & & {[+0} & & {[+\mathrm{D}]} \\
{[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & & {[+\mathrm{BJ}]} & {[+\mathrm{DAT}]}
\end{array}
$$

16. [ $+\mathrm{D},+\mathrm{BEN}]$ is hosted by transitive and intransitive verbs. (It is an ambiguous construction because [ +D ]
can be either [+BEN] or [+DAT].)
 $[+D]$
$[+D A T]$
$\begin{array}{cccc}\text { 16.2. Ông áy } & \text { di } & \text { cho tôi. } \\ h e & \text { went } & \text { for me } \\ & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & & {[+\mathrm{DEN}]}\end{array}$
17. [ $+\mathrm{B},+\mathrm{BEN}]$ is hosted by transitive and intransitive verbs.

$$
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text { 17.1. Ông áy mua } & \text { sách } & \text { gium. tôi. } \\
\text { he } & \text { bought books } & \text { for } & \text { me } \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & & {[+0} & & & {[+\mathrm{B}} \\
{[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & & {[+\mathrm{BEN}]}
\end{array}
$$

17.2. Ông áy di gium tôi.
he
+NM $]$
$+\mathrm{OBJ}]$
18. $[+C,+C O M]$ is hosted by any verb except those marked otherwise.


| 18.2. | Ong ảy |  | vói |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | he [ | went | with |  |
|  | [ + + NM OBJ$]$ |  |  |  |

19. [ +I, +INS] is hosted by transitive, intransitive, and some stative verbs such as chét to be dead.

19.2. ing ây di $\begin{array}{cccc}\text { he } & \text { bang } & \text { xe do. } \\ & \text { bent } & \text { by } & \text { bus } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} & & & {[+\mathrm{I}} \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & & & {[\text { INS }]}\end{array}$
20. [ + L, +LOC] is hosted by any verb except those otherwise marked.

21. [ + L, +SRC] is hosted by intransitive verbs, and could be thought of as [+L, +LOC] or even as [+O, +LOC] if ${ }_{\alpha}$ to stay in the following example were considered as the main verb of the clause.


$$
\left[\begin{array}{ll}
+0 & ] \\
{[+\mathrm{LOC}]}
\end{array}\right.
$$

22. [+Di, +DIR] is hosted by transitive and intransitive verbs.


23. [+Sr, +SRC] is hosted by all verbs if it means a time source, and by most verbs except those marked otherwise if it means a place source.
23.1. Ông ây di tiu My
$\left[\begin{array}{c}\text { [ } \mathrm{NM}]\end{array}\right.$ went from America
23.2. lOng aby di $\begin{array}{ccc}\text { he } & \text { t ur } & \text { hoo qua. } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}\end{array}$
24. [+Gl, +GOL] is hosted by all verbs if it means a time goal, and is hosted by most verbs except those marked otherwise if it means a place goal.

25. [+Ex, +EXT] is hosted by all verbs if it means a time extent, and is hosted by most verbs except those otherwise marked when it means a place extent.



### 1.1.1. CASE-LIKE TAGMEMES IN VIETNAMESE

There are two case-like tagmemes in Vietnamese: Manner and Purpose. They are similar to cases in that they are clause-level tagmemes, and have a case relation to verbs. However, they differ from cases in that the Manner slot is filled by either an adjective or a noun phrase and the Purpose slot is filled by a prepositional phrase or a verb phrase.

Examples of Manner:

| Ong áy | di | châm. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| he | go | slow |
| (He | went | slowly.) |
| [+NM $]$ |  | [+MANNER] |
| [+OBJ] |  |  |


| Ong äy | di | môt cách | châm-chapp. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| he | go | one manner slow |  |
| (He | went | in a sZow | manner.) |
| [+NM $]$ |  | [+MANNER] |  |
| [+OBJ] |  |  |  |

Examples of Purpose:

```
Òng áy di de mua báo.
    he go in order to buy newspapers
    (He went in order to buy newspapers.)
[+NM ] [+PURPOSE]
[+OBJ]
```

| Ong äy | di mua báo. |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| he | go buy newspapers |  |
| (He | went to buy newspapers.) |  |
| [+NM ] |  | [+PURPOSE] |
| [+OBJ] |  |  |

Theoretical justifications to consider the Manner and Purpose tagmemes as case relations or not would be too far out of the scope of this study. Suffice it to say that the Manner tagmeme is much closer to a case relation than the Purpose tagmeme is.

### 1.1.2. TAGMEMIC ORDERING AND OPTIONALITY

Theoretically, given a verb that is hospitable to all the tagmemic slots, all the twenty-five slots, and the case-like Manner and Purpose, could appear in one single clause. However, because what is already known in larger linguistic or situational contexts is not necessarily repeated, only some of them occur in the same clause. When they cooccur in the same clause, there seems to be a relative order of case realizations as follows, with the ones on vertical lines being fluctuant among themselves:

When there are many case realizations in a clause, one of them, and usually the time case realization, is topicalized and moved to the front position of the clause.

Any clause level slot, whether nuclear such as the [+NM, +AGT], or semi-nuclear such as the [ $+0,+D I R$ ], or satellite such as the [ +T , +TIM] can be omitted when it is clearly understood in higher linguistic hierarchies than the clause itself. For example, the reply in this two-sentence conversation does not have its [+NM, +OBJ] because it is clearly understood:
Ong di không?

| you go no? |
| :--- |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |
| $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |

```
#i.
    go (yes, I am going)
```


### 1.2. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF CASE FORMS AND CASE RELATIONS

In foreign language teaching and learning, there are two aspects: production and recognition. On the production level, the foreign
language learner needs to use the right case forms to convey the case relations in the target language. It is assumed here that case relations are universals, whereas case realizations, or case forms, are language-specific. A contrastive analysis of case relations and case forms in Vietnamese as the target language and English as the learner's native language should then have to present how various case relations are pigeon-holed in the two language-specific sets of case forms in order to point out production problems and facilities. Likewise, it should point out how the two language-specific sets of case forms share similarities and differences in hosting universal case relations in order to point out recognition problems and facilities.

### 1.2.1. CONTRASTIUE ANALYSIS OF CASE RELATIONS AND THEIR REALIZATIONS

The universal case relations may be realized in similar or different case forms in the target and source languages. Whenever there is a difference, there is likely a production problem to be taught and learned. The following contrastive analysis will expose the realization or realizations of each case relation in Vietnamese, and then, compare it or them with the case form or case forms in English that host the same case relation. Pertinent examples will be repeated for reading convenience.

### 1.2.1.1. +AGT, Agentive

The Agentive case relation is realized only by the Nominative case form in Vietnamese:

| öng áy | mua | báo. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | bought | newspapers |
| [+NM ] |  | [ +0 ] |
| [+AGT] |  | [ + OBJ] |

There ought to be no problem here, for the Agentive case relation is also hosted by the Nominative slot in English. However, the problem exists because of the presence of the Agentive slot in English and its absence in Vietnamese. Thus, the two languages use different case forms for passive constructions in English, and submissive constructions in Vietnamese:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{He} \text { was beaten by them. } \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\
{[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { Ông áy bi ho dánh } \\
\text { he suffer they beat }
\end{array} \\
& \text { (He was beaten by them.) } \\
& \begin{array}{lr}
\text { He was beaten } \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+\mathrm{O}} \\
{[+\mathrm{DAT}]} & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

In the embedded clause:
Ho dánh.
they
$[+\mathrm{NM}]$
$[+\mathrm{AGT}]$

The English student of Vietnamese will then have to learn the transitive Dative construction, and the semantic differences between bi to suffer, to unhappily experience and dưo to receive, to happily experience as in:

| Ong áy | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { đước } & \text { ho } \\ \text { receive they } \end{array}$ | th ươn g award |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( He | was awarded by | them.) |
| [ + NM | [+0 ] |  |
| [+DAT] | [+OBJ] |  |

In the embedded clause:
Ho thương.
they award
$[+\mathrm{NM}]$
$[+\mathrm{AGT}]$

The construction is Dative in the sense that its Nominative slot is always filled by a Dative, and never by an Objective, case relation. The use of the term Dative here is theoretically disturbing because it can be inanimate as in the following sentence:

| Nhà này dươc | xây-cát năm ngoái. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| house this receive build | year last |  |  |
| (The house was | built | last year. |  |
| [+NM ] |  |  |  |

Theoretical considerations will be out of the scope of this study. Suffice it to say that, although being inanimate, a house actually can benefit from being built or suffer from being burnt, and hence, it is quite logical to say that the case relation above is a Dative.

The foreign student of Vietnamese ought also to know of the following constructions which can be found in journalistic style and translations but are not generally accepted in spoken language:


In the first construction, an Agentive slot introduced by bới by was apparently patterned after European languages. In the second construction, do by, to originate replaced the traditional bi to unhappily experience or dượ to happily experience, and hence, could have a [+NM, +OBJ] slot before it.

### 1.2.1.2. +OBJ, Objective

The objective case relation is realized by a Nominative slot in stative or intransitive constructions, and by an Objective slot in transitive constructions:

| ông áy [+NM [ +OBJ ] | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { ia bac-s í } \\ \text { is } & a \text { doctor } \\ & {[-K]} \end{array}$ | (2.1.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { òng áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+ \text { NM }]} \\ & {[+ \text { OBJ }]} \end{aligned}$ | chậm. <br> is slow | (2.2a.) |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ông áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+N M \text { ] }} \\ & {[+ \text { OBJ }]} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{3}{0}$ stays | Saigon. (2.3a.) $\begin{aligned} & \text { in Saigon } \\ & {\left[\begin{array}{l} +0 \\ {[+L O C]} \end{array}\right.} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ông áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+N M \text { ] }]} \\ & {[+A G T]} \end{aligned}$ | mua bought | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sách. (6.1.) } \\ & \text { books } \\ & {\left[\begin{array}{l} \text { +O } \\ {[+ \text { OBJ }]} \end{array}\right.} \end{aligned}$ |

The Objective case relation can also be realized by the same case forms in English. As a consequence, there is no learning problem involved. The case is also realized as a Nominative in English passive constructions:

> The book was bought yesterday. $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$

Such a [+NM, +OBJ] tagmeme with passive constructions is not available in Vietnamese. One would have to use the [+NM, +DAT] tagmeme presented in l.2.l.1. above, and consequently would have to be aware of the Dative connotation.

### 1.2.1.3. +DAT, Dative

The Dative case relation is realized by a Nominative, an Objective, or a Dative case form in Vietnamese:


The Dative case relation can also be realized by the same case forms in English. As a consequence, there is no learning problem involved, except the semantic connotation of the verbs bi to suffer, to unhappily experience, and được to receive, to happily experience, a matter to be discussed in a later chapter.

### 1.2.1.4. +BEN, Benefactive

The Benefactive case relation is realized by an Objective, or a Dative, or a Benefactive case form in Vietnamese:

| Ong áy | mua | tôi | sách. |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| he | bought | me | books |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+0$ | $[+0$ |
| $[+\mathrm{AGT}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{BEN}][+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  |

It is noted that this construction is at most as acceptable as the following one having a Benefactive case form which can either precede or follow the Objective case form:


$$
\left.\begin{array}{lll}
\text { Ong áy mua } & \text { sách cho tôi. }  \tag{16.1.}\\
\text { he } & \text { bought } & \text { books for me } \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & & {[+0}
\end{array}\right] \begin{aligned}
& {[+\mathrm{D}} \\
& {[+\mathrm{AGT}]}
\end{aligned}
$$



Since the Benefactive case relation is also realized by the same case forms in English as in Vietnamese, there is no learning problem, except the slight semantic difference between the [ +D ] case form cho toi which may convey an obligation on the part of the agent of the action, and the $[+B]$ case form gium toi which does not have the connotation.

### 1.2.1.5. +COM, Comitative

The Comitative case relation is realized by a Comitative case form in both languages, and hence, there is no learning problem:

| Ong áy | ai | vơi | tòi. |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| he | went | with | me |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  |  | $[+\mathrm{C}$ |
| $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  |  | $[+\mathrm{COM}]$ |

The learner of Vietnamese should, however, notice the use of vơi with as a conjunction of coordination as in:

| Ong áy với | tôi dau. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | and | I | were sick |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  |
| $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  |

### 1.2.1.6. +INS, Instrumental

The Instrumental case relation is realized by a Nominative, an Objective, or an Instrumental case form in both Vietnamese ${ }^{6}$ and English. Hence, there is no learning problem:

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dao näy } \\ & \text { knife this } \\ & \text { [+NM ] } \\ & \text { [+INS] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { cát } & \text { thit } . \\ \text { cuts } & \text { meat } \\ & {[+0} \\ & {[+O B J]} \end{array}$ | (4.1.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Ong áy dung } \\ \text { he } & \text { used } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} & \\ {[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dao. } \\ & \text { knives } \\ & {[+0} \\ & {[+ \text { INS }]} \end{aligned}$ | (9.1.) |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Ông áy } & \text { đi } \\ \text { he } & \text { went } \\ {[+N M} \\ {[+O B J]} & \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { xe do. } \\ & \text { by bus } \\ & {[+0 \quad]} \\ & \text { [+INS] } \end{aligned}$ | (9.2.) |

Notice that the Objective case form used for an Instrumental case relation to an intransitive verb in Vietnamese is idiosyncratic to the language, and consequently, is a learning problem for English speakers.

The construction is, however, equivalent to an Instrumental case form which is more familiar to English speakers:

| Ong áy | di | bàng | xe do. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| he | went | by | bus |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  |  | $[+I$ |
| $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  |  | $[+I N S]$ |

1.2.1.7. +LOC, Locative

The Locative case relation is realized by a Nominative, an Objective, or a Locative case form in Vietnamese:
Phong này lanh.
room this is cold
$[+\mathrm{NM}]$
$[+\mathrm{LOC}]$
room this is cold
[+LOC]

(10.1.)

| Ông äy | mua | sách | or Mry. |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| he | bought | books | in America |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+O$ | $[+\mathrm{L}]$ |
| $[+\mathrm{AGT}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ | $[+\mathrm{LOC}]$ |

Whether phong room in example (5.1.) above is considered to be an objective or a Locative case, there is no learning problem involved. However, the following use of a Noun Auxiliary in the Nominative form is something for the learner to be acquainted with.

| Trong phong này lanh. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| inside room this cold |  |  |
| (This | room is cold.) |  |
| [+NM $]$ |  |  |
| [+OBJ] |  |  |

The [+O, +LOC] tagmemic slot in example (10.l.) above is a learning problem because English would have the $[+L,+L O C]$ tagmemic slot instead:


The [ $+\mathrm{L},+\mathrm{LOC}$ ] tagmemic slot exists in both languages, and consequently, is not a learning problem.

### 1.2.1.8. +DIR, Direction

The Direction case relation is realized by an Objective, or a Direction case form in Vietnamese:


The Vietnamese $[+0,+D I R]$ tagmemic slot presents a learning problem because English would use a [+Di, +DIR] slot instead, but the [+Di, $+D I R]$ being present in both languages, does not.

### 1.2.1.9. +TIM, Time

The Time case relation is realized in both languages by an Objective case form, and consequently, should not present any learning problem. However, the problem stems from the fact that its position may be important: when a time expression does not lexically indicate the past or the future, it is a past time expression if it stands at the end of the sentence, and it is a future time expression if it is at the beginning of the sentence:


When the time expression is clearly a past time expression, it can be placed at the beginning of the sentence for topicalization purposes, but a future time expression can never be placed at the end of a sentence:

| Năm | ngoái, | tôi di | Saigon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Last | year, | $I$ went | to Saigon |
| [ +T ] |  | [+NM ] | [+0 ] |
| [+TIM] |  | [+OBJ] | [+LOC] |
| *Tôi | di | Saigon | năm tơi. |
| $I$ | will go | to Saigon | next year |
| [+NM ] |  | [+0 ] | [+T ] |
| [+OBJ] |  | [+LOC] | [+TIM] |

### 1.2.1.10. +SRC, Source

The Source case relation is realized by a Location, or a Source case form in Vietnamese. The [+L, +SRC] tagmemic slot is a learning
problem, but the [+SR, SRC] slot is not:


| Ông áy | di | tu | M $\hat{y}^{\text {. }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | went | from | America |
| [ +NM |  |  | [+SR ] |
| [+OBJ] |  |  | [+SRC] |

### 1.2.1.11. +GOL, Goal

The Goal case relation is realized by an Objective or a Goal case form in Vietnamese. Only the [+O, +GOL] tagmemic slot presents a learning problem since English has only the [ $+G 1,+G O L]$ slot:


### 1.2.1.12. +EXT, Extent

The Extent case relation is realized by the Objective, or the Extent case form in Vietnamese. The [+O, +EXT] tagmemic slot, being language-specific, is a learning problem for English speakers:

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ông áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{aligned}$ | di went | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hai } \\ & \text { two } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dâm. } \\ & \text { mizes } \\ & {[+0} \\ & {[+E X T]} \end{aligned}$ | (14.2.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ông áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{aligned}$ | đi went | được for | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { hai } & \text { dàm. } \\ \text { two } & \text { miles } \\ & {[+E X]} \\ & {[+E X T]} \end{array}$ | (25.2.) |

### 1.2.1.13. Case-Like Tagmemes

The Manner slot in Vietnamese is filled by an Adjective Phrase, or a Manner Noun Phrase. The use of an Adjective Phrase in this slot is a learning problem for English speakers because an Adverbial Phrase would be used in English instead:


| ông áy | đi | môt cách | chạ̀m-chap. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [+NM] |  | [+ṀANNER] |  |
| $[+$ OBJ |  | [+Noun] |  |

The Purpose slot in Vietnamese is filled by a Prepositional Phrase or a Verb Phrase. The use of a Verb Phrase in this slot is a learning problem for English speakers since English would normally use a Prepositional Phrase, with the exception of Go get the book, 7 for example:


### 1.2.2. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF CASE FORMS AND THEIR HOSTED CASE RELATIONS

Case forms are pigeon-holes in which case relations are cast. They are language-specific in that different languages use different means to convey case relations, for example, Latin uses inflections as case forms whereas English uses word order and inflections for the same purpose. They are also language-specific in the sense that the same case form, say Objective, may host some case relations in language $A$ but not in language $B$. Since superficial case forms host deep case relations, a contrastive analysis of them and their hosted case relations in the target and the source languages will point out differences (which cause understanding or recognition problems) and similarities in the languages.

### 1.2.2.1. +NM, Nominative

The Nominative case form has its position immediately preceding the verb, and has no prepositions in Vietnamese as well as in English. In Vietnamese, it hosts the Agentive, Objective, Dative, Instrumental, and Locative case relations:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Òng áy mua báo. (1.1.) } \\
& \text { he bought news } \\
& \begin{array}{ll}
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+\mathrm{O}} \\
{[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}
\end{array} \\
& \text { ông áy lia bác-sĩ. (2.1.) }  \tag{2.1.}\\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { he is a doctor } \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
$$

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ông áy } \\ \text { he } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{gathered}$ | chậm. <br> is slow | (2.2a.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ông áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{aligned}$ | Saigon. <br> stays in Saigon | (2.3a.) |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { ông áy } \\ \text { he } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{DAT}]} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \mathrm{bi} \\ \text { was forced } & \text { di } \\ & \text { to go } \\ & {[+0} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{array}$ | (3.1a.) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ông áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{DAT}]} \end{aligned}$ | b! ho hánh. <br> was beaten by them <br>  $[+0]$ <br>  $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ | (3.1b.) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ông áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{DAT}]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { biét } & \text { bà áy. } \\ \text { knows } & \text { her } \\ & {[+0} \\ & {[+O B J]} \end{array}$ | (3.2a.) |

The Nominative case form in English hosts the same case relations. Consequently, there is no recognition problem for the case form in Vietnamese for English speakers. It is, however, noted that the [ +NM , $+D A T]$ tagmemic slot before bi to unhappily experience in examples (3.la.) and (3.lb.) above and its semantic counterpart dược to happily experience carries with it the unhappy or happy connotation depending on the verb, and that it can be the Nominative of the verb in the $[+0$, $+O B J]$ as in (3.la.) or its Objective (superficially omitted) as in (3.lb.). It is also noted that the [+NM, +OBJ] tagmeme is not separated from its Adjectival verb in Vietnamese in example (2.2a.) by a copula as it is in English.

### 1.2.2.2. +0, Objective

The Objective case form has its position immediately after the verb, and it has no prepositions in Vietnamese as well as in English. In Vietnamese, it hosts the objective, Dative, Benefactive, Instrumental, Locative, Directional, Time, Goal, and Extent case relations. Thus, it is the most loaded case form in the language:


| Ong áy | mua | tôi | sách. |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| he | bought | me | books |
| $[+N M$ |  | $[+0$ | $[+0$ |
| $[+$ AGT $]$ |  | $[+B E N][+O B J]$ |  |


| ong ãy | ding | dao. |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+0$ |
| $[+\mathrm{AGT}]$ |  | $[+$ INS $]$ |


| Ong äy | ơ | Saigon. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  |  |
| $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{O}]$ |
| $[+\mathrm{LOC}]$ |  |  |


| Ong áy   <br> he ra Saigon. <br> $[+\mathrm{NM}]$   <br> $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$  $[+\mathrm{DIR}]$ <br> went to Saigon   |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $[+\mathrm{DIR}]$ |


| Ong áy di | hai dâm. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| he | went | for tịo miles |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+0$ |
| $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{EXT}]$ |

Of the above tagmemic case form/case relation slots in Vietnamese, the $[+0,+L O C],[+0,+D I R],[+O,+G O L]$, and $[+0,+E X T]$ in examples (10.1, ll.1, 13.1 and 14.2.) above are recognition problems for English speakers. The Vietnamese [ $+0,+$ TIM slot can be placed at the end or at the beginning of the sentence when it is a past time expression. When it is a future time expression, it must be at the beginning of the sentence:

| Mai | tôi | di | Saigon |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| tomorrow | $I$ | will | go |
| $[+0 \quad]$ | $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+0 \quad]$ |
| $[+\mathrm{TIM}]$ | $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{DIR}]$ |

Because of the semantic relevance of its position at the beginning or the end of a clause, it might be theoretically more sound to consider the slot to be a [ + T, +TIM] ( $T$ for Time case form) rather than [ +0 , +TIM]. The English student of Vietnamese ought to learn the position of the tagmeme and its grammatical meaning.

### 1.2.2.3. +D, Dative

The Dative case form is signalled by the preposition cho for, to which is originally a co-verb meaning to give. It is placed after
the verb, or after the Objective case form if any. In Vietnamese, it hosts the Dative, and the Benefactive case relations:

$$
\left.\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text { Ong áy } & \text { bán } & \text { sách cho tooi. } \\
\text { he } & \text { sozd books to } & \text { me }  \tag{16.1.}\\
\text { [+NM }] & & {[+0} & & {[+\mathrm{D}]}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Example (16.1.) above is ambiguous because the $[+D]$ case form can be interpreted either as hosting a [+BEN] or a [+DAT] case relation. The English speaking student of Vietnamese ought to recognize the possibility of a Benefactive case relation in a Dative case form which, in English, can host only a Dative case relation.

### 1.2.2.4. +B, Benefactive

The Benefactive case form is signalled by one of the two prepositions gium and hộ for which are originally co-verbs meaning to help, to assist. It is placed after the verb or after the Objective case form, if any. It hosts the Benefactive case relation in both Vietnamese and English, and consequently it does not present any problem:


### 1.2.2.5. +C, Comitative

The Comitative case form is signalled by the preposition vơi with. It is placed after the verb or the Objective case form, if any. It hosts The Comitative case relation in both Vietnamese and English, and consequently does not present a learning problem:

| Ong áy | mua | sách | vơi | tôi. | (18.1.) |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | bought | books | with | me |  |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+0$ |  |  |  |
| $[+\mathrm{AGT}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{COM}]$ |  |

The student of Vietnamese needs, however, to know that the preposition vơi with functions as the conjunction of coordination va and when it introduces a coordinated Nominative case form:

| Ông áy vơi | tôi dau. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | and$I$ <br> [+NM were sick <br> [+OBJ] | $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |

### 1.2.2.6. +I, Instrument

The Instrument case form is signalled by the preposition bang by means of. It is placed after the verb, or after the Objective case form, if any. It hosts the Instrumental case relation in Vietnamese:


Inasmuch as the Instrumental case form hosts the Instrument case relation in English also, the student of Vietnamese ought not to have any learning problem. However, he should bear in mind that the Comitative (with) case form in English contains not only a Comitative or a Manner but also an Instrumental case relation:

```
\(\begin{array}{llr}\begin{array}{l}\text { John } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{AGT}]}\end{array} & \text { broke } & \text { the gZass } \\ {[+\mathrm{O}} & \text { with a broom. } \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & {[+\mathrm{I}]}\end{array}\)
John broke the glass with his bride.
\(\begin{array}{lll}{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+\mathrm{O}]} & {[+\mathrm{I}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & {[+\mathrm{COM}]}\end{array}\)
John broke the glass with a grin.
\(\left.\left.\begin{array}{lll}{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+0} & ]\end{array}\right][+\mathrm{I}]\right]\)
```


### 1.2.2.7. + L, Location

The Location case form is signalled by the preposition ${ }^{2}$ at, from which is originally a co-verb meaning to stay, to be at. It is usually placed after the verb, or after the Objective case form if any. It is probably the most outer case form because, when there is more than one case form in a clause, it is the first one to be topicalized and moved to the position at the beginning of the clause. It hosts a Location, or a Source case in Vietnamese:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{clcccc}
\text { Ong äy } & \text { mua } & \text { sách } & \text { oे } & \text { Mr̃. } & \text { (20.1.) } \\
\text { he } & \text { bought } & \text { books } & \text { in } & \text { America } & \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & & {[+0} & ] & {[+\mathrm{L}]} \\
{[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & {[+\mathrm{LOC}]}
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{llll}
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text { Ong áy } & \text { ờ } & \text { Mỹ } \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+\mathrm{L}} \\
{[+O B J]} & & {[+\mathrm{SRC}]}
\end{array} & \text { (21.1.) }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

Naturally, example (2l.l.) above could be interpreted as having either a [+L, +SRC], [ $+\mathrm{L},+\mathrm{LOC}]$, or [ $+\mathrm{O},+\mathrm{LOC}]$ tagmemic slot. The interpretation as $[+L,+S R C]$ is here preferred for contrastive purposes. The student should familiarize himself with the [+L, +SRC] tagmemic slot since it is alien to his native language.

### 1.2.2.8. +D, Direction

The Direction case form is signalled by prepositions such as lên up, xuóng down, qua over, lại back, ra out, vô in, etc. which are all coverbs meaning respectively go up, go down, go over, go back, go out, go in, etc. It is placed after the verb, or after the Objective case form, if any. It hosts the Direction case relation:
$\left.\begin{array}{clccc}\text { Ông áy dem } & \text { sách } & \text { lên } & \text { Saigon. } \\ \text { he } & \text { brought } & \text { books } & \text { up to } & \text { Saigon } \\ {[+ \text { NM }]} & & {[+0} & \\ {[+ \text { AGT }]} & & {[+O B J]} & & {[+D i}\end{array}\right]$

The Directional case form in English hosts also the Direction case relation, consequently it does not present a learning problem. However, the student ought to know the semantic features of the prepositions: besides their normal geographical directions such as up for len, down for xuong, out for ra, in, into for vo, etc., Vietnamese directional prepositions may also convey a psychological rather than geographical connotation, that is we go down to the kitchen, up to the living room, out to the sea, or in to town, etc. as the following examples indicate:

| ông ây | đi went | xuông to down | nhà bép <br> the kit | (which is not necessarily on a lower level than the living room from |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | [+Di] | which he went) |
|  |  | [+DIR] |  |
| ông áy | đi went |  | lèn to up | nhà Ông Quận-Trướng. (because the disthe District Chief'shouse trict Chief's |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & {[+D 1} \\ & {[+D I R]} \end{aligned}$ |  | portant place, one must go up to it) |
| ông áy | đi went | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { vo } & S \\ \text { to } & S c \\ \text { in } \end{array}$ | Saigon. <br> Saigon | (because Saigon is the central city, one enters it) |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & {[+D I} \\ & {[+D I R]} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| ông ây | 01 went | ra to out | Nha-Trang. <br> Nha-Trang | (because Na-Trang is a coastal city) |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $[+D i$ $[+D I R]$ |  |

### 1.2.2.9. +Sr, Source

The Source case form is signalled by the preposition tư from. It is placed after the verb, or after the Objective case form, if any. It hosts the Source case relation both in Vietnamese and English, and consequently it does not create a learning problem:

| Ong äy | di | tu | Mẽ. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| he | went | from | America |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  |  |  |
| [+OBJ] |  |  | $[+\mathrm{Sr}]$ |

(23.1.)
1.2.2.10. +G1, Goal

The Goal case form is signalled by prepositions such as tơंito, đén to, etc. which are coverbs and both mean to arrive. It hosts the Goal case relation in both Vietnamese and English, and hence, it does not present a learning problem:

| Ông áy | đi | tới | Saigon. | (24.2.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | went to | (and arrived at) | Saigon |  |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ | $[+\mathrm{Gl}]$ |  |  |  |
| $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ | $[+\mathrm{GOL}]$ |  |  |  |

### 1.2.2.11. +Ex, Extent

The Extent case form is signalled by the preposition dươ for which is originally a co-verb meaning to obtain. It hosts the Extent case relation in both Vietnamese and English, and hence, it does not create a learning problem:


### 1.2.2.12. Manner and Purpose Case Forms

The case-like Manner tagmeme has its slot after the verb, or after the Objective case form, if any, and is filled by a Manner adjectival or nominal phrase:


The use of an adjectival phrase in the Manner tagmemic slot is a learning problem for English speakers who are used to an Adverbial phrase in this slot:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { He } \\
& {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\
& {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}
\end{aligned} \quad \text { went } \begin{gathered}
\text { slowly. } \\
{[+ \text { MANNER }]}
\end{gathered}
$$

The case-like Purpose tagmeme has its slot after the verb, or the Objective case form, if any, and is filled by a prepositional phrase signalled by the preposition de $^{\overrightarrow{2}} i n$ order to or a verb phrase:

| ông áy | di ${ }_{\text {i }} \mathrm{e}^{\text {e }}$ | mua báo. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | went in order to | buy newspapers |
| [+NM] |  | [+PURPOSE] |
| [+OBJ] |  |  |

Ong áy di mua báo.
he went to buy newspapers

The use of a verb phrase in a Purpose tagmemic slot is a learning problem for English speakers who are used to the prepositional phrase signalled by to, or in order to.

### 1.2.2.13. Tagmeme Ordering and Optionality

When various case forms co-occur in a clause, there seems to be a relative word order as follows, with those on vertical lines being fluctuant among themselves:

$$
+\mathrm{L}+\mathrm{NM}+\text { verb }+\mathrm{O} \begin{aligned}
& +\mathrm{D} \\
& +\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C} \\
& \\
& \\
& \\
& \\
& \\
& +\mathrm{I} \text { MANNER }
\end{aligned}
$$

As the chart above indicates, when there are many case forms in a clause, one of them, and usually the Locative case form, is topicalized and moved to the front position of the clause. Examples showing the word order:
$\left.\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Hôm qua, } & \text { ông ảy mua sách bàng tièn Viêt-Nam với tôi. } \\ \text { yesterday, } & \text { he } & \text { bought books with Vietnamese money with me } \\ \text { [+O }] & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} & & {[+0 \quad]} & {[+I}\end{array}\right]$

| Ông áy | gởi | sách | $t$ is | Saigon |  | Nha-Trang |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | sent | books | from | Saigon | to | Nha-Trang |
| [+NM ] |  | [ +0 ] |  | [+Sr] |  | [+D1 |
| [ + AGT] |  | [ + OBJ] |  | [+SRC] |  | +DIR] |



The word order of tagmemes is something universal in that nuclear tagmemes tend to cluster around the verb whereas satellite tagmemes stand further away from it. By the same token, the Locative case relation can be placed at the very end or the very beginning of the clause. Actually, there are as many as three types of Locative case relations, the Inner Locative, the Outer Locative, and the Far Outer Locative expressions according to Platt (1971:30-3). However, along with the universal rule of word order of satellite and nuclear tagmemes, each language seems to have a specific order of nuclear tagmemes among themselves, or of satellite tagmemes among themselves. This language specific characteristic exists in Vietnamese as in English. The student needs to know the specific word order in Vietnamese: the generalized word order given above must be altered because of rhythmic reasons which dictate that a shorter tagmeme, whether nuclear or satellite, is preferably placed before a longer tagmeme:

| Ong áy | mua | sách | gium | Ông Đ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | bought | books | for | Mr. Do |
| [+NM] |  | [ +0 ] |  | [ +B ] |
| [+AGT] |  | [+OBJ] |  | [+BEN] |


cuón tư-đién, v.v.
dictionaries, etc.
$[+0$
$[+O B J]$

In Vietnamese, what is known in larger context, whether linguistic or paralinguistic, is not necessarily repeated but is usually omitted within the sentence boundaries. The student of Vietnamese needs to learn how to retrace what is linguistically missing on the recognition level, and how to omit what is superfluous on the production level:
Ong di không?

| (Are you going? ) |
| :--- |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |
| $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |

Đi.
(Yes, I am going.)
The answer in the above conversation does not include the [ +NM , +OBJ] tagmeme because the linguistic context is clear enough without it. The student of Vietnamese ought also to know that monosyllabic, or short, sentences may be considered as indicative of impoliteness on the part of the person who utters such sentences. For example, the word lám very in the following sentence does not necessarily mean it, but may just be added to make the sentence a little bit longer:

Nhà này dẹp lám.
(This house is (very) beautiful.
[+NM ] [+Intensifier]
[+OBJ]

## CHAPTER I I

## CLAUSE TYPES AND VERB CLASSIFICATION

Vietnamese clauses are units of predication containing a minimum of an obligatory nucleus Predicate tagmeme, and an optional nucleus Nominative tagmeme. They are grouped into thirteen Clause Classes which are shown in Chart 3.

The Independent Declarative Clause Class is the kernel Clause Class from which all the other Clause Classes can be derived when appropriate surface Transform rules are applied. Thus, a complete analysis of the Clause units in Vietnamese consists necessarily and sufficiently of an inventory of all the Declarative Clause Types and a statement of Clause Class Transform rules.

### 2.1. CLAUSE TYPES

According to their identificational-contrastive features such as the nuclear tagmemic slots (Longacre 1964), clauses in Vietnamese can be classified into five types as in Chart III below.

CHART III: CLAUSE TYPES


It is noted that the classification of clauses into Clause Types is parallel to that of verbs into verb classes in Chart IV below, and that the five Clause Types can be sub-classed into sixteen allo-types according to their internal structures just like verbs are classified into sixteen groups.

### 2.1.1. COPULATIVE CLAUSE

The Copulative Clause Type is characterized by its three nuclear tagmemes: the [+NM, +OBJ], the copulative verbal predicate, and the [-K] tagmemes:
[ [+NM, +OBJ] [+verb, +copula] [-K]]


The Clause Type does not present a learning problem because it exists also in English.

### 2.1.2. STATIVE CLAUSE

The Stative Clause Type is characterized by its two nuclear tagmemes: the $[+N M,+O B J]$, and the stative verbal predicate:
[ [+NM, +OBJ] [+verb, +stative]]
$\begin{array}{cc}\text { Ông áy } & \text { lanh. } \\ \text { he } & \text { is cold } \\ \text { [+NM }] & {[+ \text { verb }]} \\ \text { [+OBJ] } & \text { [+stative] }\end{array}$
The Clause Type presents a production problem in that its English counterpart must have its stative verb (or adjective) introduced by a copula:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
H e & \text { is cold. } \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & \text { [+verb } & \text { [+adjective }] \\
{[+ \text { OBJ }][+ \text { copula }]}
\end{array}
$$

### 2.1.3. SUBMISSIVE CLAUSE

The Submissive Clause Type is characterized by its three nuclear tagmemes: the [ $+N M,+D A T]$, the transitive submissive verbal predicate, and the $[+0,+O B J]$ tagmemes:
[ [+NM, +DAT] + [+verb, +transitive, +submissive]

$$
[+0,+0 B J]]
$$

```
Mong áy bi was forced they beat cánh. (3.lb.)
    (He was beaten by them.)
[+NM][+verb ]
```

It is noted that the $[+0,+O B J]$ slot in this Clause Type can only be filled by a clause although the following construction with a nominal filler may be accepted by some native speakers:
\(\left.\begin{array}{llll}Ông áy \& bi \& hai \& bat tay. <br>

síap hand\end{array}\right]\)| (He | got two | sZaps on the face.) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| [+NM ] |  |  |
| [+DAT] |  |  |
| [+OBJ] |  |  |

The Clause Type presents a recognition problem in the semantic connotation of its two possible verbs bi unhappily experience, and dưoc happily experience, and a production problem in the filler class of the $[+0,+O B J]$ slot.

### 2.1.4. TRANSITIVE CLAUSE

The Transitive Clause Type is characterized by its three nuclear tagmemes: the $[+N M,+A G T]$ or $[+N M,+D A T]$, the transitive verbal predicate, and the $[+0,+O B J]$ tagmemes:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \begin{array}{l}
{\left[\begin{array}{l}
{[+N M,+A G T]} \\
{[+N M,+D A T]}
\end{array} \text { [+verb, +transitive] [+O, +OBJ]] }\right]}
\end{array} \\
& \text { Ông áy mua báo. (1.1.) } \\
& \text { he bought newspapers } \\
& \begin{array}{ll}
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\
{[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & {[+\mathrm{verb}]} \\
{[+ \text { trans.] }][+\mathrm{OBJ}]}
\end{array} \\
& \text { Ông äy biét bàáy. (3.2a.) } \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { he } \\
+\mathrm{NM}]\left[\begin{array}{c}
\text { knows } \\
\text { [+verb }
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
\text { her } \\
{[+0}
\end{array}\right]
\end{array} \\
& \text { [+DAT] [+trans.] [+OBJ] }
\end{align*}
$$

The Clause Type does not present a learning problem since it exists in English too.

### 2.1.5. INTRANSITIVE CLAUSE

The Intransitive Clause Type is characterized by its two nuclear tagmemes: the $[+N M,+O B J]$ and the intransitive verbal predicate:

$$
\left.\left.\left.\begin{array}{l}
{[+ \text { NM, }+ \text { OBJ }]}
\end{array}\right] \text { [+verb, -transitive }\right]\right] \text { ] Saigon. }
$$

The Clause Type presents a production problem in that its Locative, Directional, or Goal case relation is usually realized by the Objective case form.

### 2.2. CLASSIfICATION OF VERBS

The classification of clauses in Vietnamese into five Clause Types above was based upon identificational-contrastive features such as the presence or absence of nuclear case form/case relation tagmemes. The five Types can also be subdivided into sixteen sub-types (or allotypes) according to their internal structures. This subclassification of Clause Types is parallel to the classification of verbs in the language. In fact, according to their hospitality to case-marked tagmemic slots, verbs in Vietnamese can be classified into sixteen groups as indicated in Chart IV. The sixteen verbs representative of their classes will be listed below with their hospitable case-marked tagmemic slots. It is noted that all the case-marked tagmemic slots, except the slot [ + , +OBJ] hosted by the submissive verbs, can be filled by noun phrases. When they can be filled by other than noun phrases, they will be so indicated. Numbers will refer to the examples found earlier in this study. Learning problems for the English speaking student will be pointed out, if any. A list of sample verbs in each group will be given as examples for the preparation of substitution drills.

### 2.2.1. la be

The verbs in this class host [+NM, +OBJ] and [-K] (or caseless) tagmemic slots:

$$
[+[+N M,+O B J] \ldots[-K]]
$$

$\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { noun phrase } \\ \text { verb phrase } \\ \text { clause } \\ \text { prep. phrase }\end{array}\right) \quad\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { noun phrase } \\ \text { verb phrase } \\ \text { clause } \\ \text { prep. phrase }\end{array}\right)$

Both [+NM, +OBJ] and [-K] slots can be filled by a noun phrase, a verb phrase, an independent clause, or a prepositional phrase:

| ông äy ià | bác-sĩ. | (2.1.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he $i s$ | a doctor |  |
| [+NM] | [-K] |  |
| [noun phr.] | [noun phr.] |  |
|  | chét. |  |
| to go is | to die |  |
| [verb phr.] | [verb phr.] |  |


Ong áy di la ong áy khon.
he go be he inteiligent
(He was wise to have gone.)
[clause]
[clause]
Ti̛ dây dén dó la hai dàm.
from here to there is two miles
[prep. phrase]
[noun phrase]

The filling of the [+NM, +OBJ] slot hosted by an equational verb such as la be by a verb phrase or an independent clause in Vietnamese is a learning problem on the production level for English speakers who are used to a To verb phrase, or a dependent clause introduced by That in the same slot in English:

| to go is | to die |
| :---: | :--- |
| [+NM ] |  |
| [+OBJ] | [-K] |
| [to verb phr.] | [to verb phr.] |
| That he went <br> [that clause] | was a good move. |
| [noun phr.]. |  |

The verb la be seems to be the lone verb of its class. There is another similar verb, lam to exercise the profession of in that it is also an equational verb:

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ong áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & \text { [+NM ] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lam } \\ & \text { iss } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{bac} \mathrm{c}-\mathrm{s} \tilde{\mathrm{i}} . \\ & \text { a doctor } \\ & {[-\mathrm{K}]} \end{aligned}$ | (professionally) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [+OBJ] |  |  |  |
| [noun |  | [noun phr |  |

### 2.2.2. chạm sZow

The verbs in this class are stative verbs, host a [+NM, +OBJ] slot, can be adverbialized, and can be followed by an Intensifier:


The class of stative verbs presents two learning problems for English speakers. Firstly, they are not introduced by a copula or equational verb like in English, and secondly, they function as adverbs. Note the equivalent English clauses:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { He is veryslow. } \\
& \text { [+NM] copula } \\
& \text { [+OBJ] }
\end{aligned}
$$

Examples of verbs in the class: le fast, gioi good, welて, dơ bad, badly.

### 2.2.3. lanh cold

The verbs in this class are stative verbs, host a [+NM, +OBJ] slot, cannot be adverbialized, and can be followed by an intensifier:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[+[+N M,+O B J] \text { (Intensifier)] }} \\
& \text { Ông áy lanh lám. } \\
& \text { he cold very } \\
& \text { (He is very cold.) } \\
& \text { [ }+\mathrm{NM}] \text { (2.2b.) } \\
& \text { [OBJ] }
\end{aligned}
$$

Being also stative verbs, these verbs present a learning problem for English speakers because they are not introduced by a copula like their English equivalents are:
He is very cold.
$[+\mathrm{NM}]$ copula
$[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$

Examples of verbs. in the class: nong hot, vui gay, buõ sad, dau sick.
2.2.4. chét to be dead

The verbs in this class are stative verbs that host a [+NM, +OBJ] slot and that cannot take an intensifier. Incidentally, there are also reasons to consider these verbs intransitive:

```
\([+[+N M,+O B J] \ldots]\)
    Òng áy chét. (2.2c.)
        he died
    \([+\mathrm{NM}]\)
\([+\mathrm{OBJ}]\)
```

The class of verbs does not present a learning problem since it behaves like its equivalent class of verbs in English. Examples of verbs in the class: sóng live, sinh be born.

### 2.2.5. bi be adversely affected

The transitive submissive verbs in the class host [+NM, +DAT] and $[+0,+O B J]$ slots. The $[+O,+O B J]$ slot is only filled by a clause:

$$
\begin{equation*}
[+[+N M,+D A T] \ldots[+0,+O B J]] \tag{3.la.}
\end{equation*}
$$



The phrase structure tree for the clause is as follows, with the Nominative in the embedded clause being deleted obligatorily:
clause


Ông äy bi ho forced they beat
he (3.1b.)
(He was beaten by them.)
$\begin{array}{lc}\text { (He was beaten by them.) } \\ \text { [+NM ] } & {[+0} \\ \text { [+DAT] } & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \\ & {[\text { clause }]}\end{array}$
The phrase structure tree for the clause is as follows, with the Nominative in the embedded clause being optionally deleted and with the Objective in the embedded clause being obligatorily deleted:
clause


The class of transitive submissive verbs presents a semantic and a structural problem. The semantic problem stems from the fact that the verb utilized always carries an adversative or a benefactive connotation. The structural problem is that of the embedded clause. The two
verbs in the class are: bi be adversely affected, and dượ happily experience. Following are examples with đượ:


It is noted that the obligatorily deleted Objective case form in the embedded clause does not necessarily host an objective case relation as in the above examples. It can also host a Benefactive case relation:
clause


### 2.2.6. mua buy

The class of bi-transitive Benefactive verbs is characterized by the fact that its verbs host [+NM, +AGT], [+O, +BEN] or [+O, +DAT], and [+O, +OBJ] slots:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {\left[+[+\mathrm{NM},+\mathrm{AGT}]-\left[\begin{array}{l}
{[+0,+\mathrm{BEN}]} \\
{[+0,+\mathrm{DAT}]}
\end{array}[+0,+\mathrm{OBJ}]\right]\right.} \\
& \text { Ong áy mua tòi sách. } \\
& \left.\begin{array}{lll}
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & {[+0}
\end{array}\right][+\mathrm{O}] \\
& \begin{array}{l}
{[+0} \\
{[+D A T]}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

The sentence is ambiguous in that it may mean either He bought the books for me (on my behalf), or He bought the books and gave them to me. The former interpretation is a Benefactive case relation, and the latter a Dative case relation. It is noted that the sentence can contain a Dative case form rather than an Objective case form, and the ambiguity still exists:


This class of verbs does not present a serious learning problem to students, except the inherent ambiguity between a Benefactive and a Dative.

### 2.2.7. bánselて

The class of bi-transitive Dative verbs is characterized by the fact that its verbs host [+NM, +AGT], [+O, +DAT], and [+O, +OBJ] slots:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& {[+[+N M,+A G T] \ldots[+0,+D A T][+0,+O B J]]} \\
& \text { ông äy bán tôi sách. (7.1.) } \\
& \left.\begin{array}{ccc}
\text { he } & \text { sold } & \text { me } \\
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} & & \text { books } \\
{[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & & {[+\mathrm{DAT}]}
\end{array}\right][+\mathrm{OBJ}]
\end{aligned}
$$

The class of verbs does not present a learning problem since its counterpart in English has the same syntactic features. It is however noted that the Dative case relation can be realized by the Dative case form, and yet, is placed before the [ $+0,+O B J$ ] tagmeme, a matter that, in English, would depend upon the relative lengths of the two tagmemes:


Also, due to phonetic harmony requirements, the shorter of the two post-verbal tagmemes is placed before the longer one:

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Ong äy } \\ \text { he } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{AGT}]} \end{gathered}$ | bán <br> sold | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tôi nhièu. } \\ & \text { me many } \\ & {[+0 \quad]} \\ & {[+D A T]} \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{ll} \text { sách và } \\ \text { books } & \text { and } \\ {[+O} \end{array}\right]$ | báo. newspapers $[+0$ $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ong áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{AGT}]} \end{aligned}$ | bán <br> sold | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sách cho } \\ & \text { books to } \\ & {[+0} \\ & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \hat{0} \mathrm{ng} \\ M r & \text { Bà } \\ M_{r} & M r s \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nguyẽn-văn-Trương. } \\ & \text { Nguyen-van-Truong } \\ & {[+\mathrm{D}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{DAT}]} \end{aligned}$ |

Examples of verbs: gởi send, chuyên transfer, giup he $l_{p}$, sang transfer.

### 2.2.8. chon choose

The Verbs in this transitive class host [+NM, +AGT] and [+O, +OBJ] tagmemes, and their [ $+0,+O B J]$ tagmeme can be optionally complementalized:

```
[+[+NM, +AGT] [+O, +OBJ] (Complement)]
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Ông äy chon bà áy lam dai-dièn. \\
he & chọse her to be representative \\
{\([+\mathrm{NM}]\)} & {\([+0\)} \\
{\([+\mathrm{AGT}]\)} & {\([+\mathrm{OBJ}]\)} &
\end{tabular}
```

The relationship between the $[+0,+O B J]$ tagmeme and its complement is as follows:

| bà áy lam | dal-dién. |
| :--- | :--- |
| shén is | representative |
| $[+N M]$ copula | $[-K]$ |
| $[+O B J]$ |  |

The class of verbs presents a learning problem because the complement to the objective case must be introduced by a copula in Vietnamese, while the English similar construction does not usually have a copula:


Examples of verbs: cự to elect, lựa choose, bò phiéu cast vote.

### 2.2.9. ăn eat

The verbs in this transitive class host [+NM, +AGT] and [+O, +OBJ] tagmemes. The [+O, +OBJ] tagmemic slot can be filled only by a noun phrase and it cannot be complementalized:

```
\([+[+N M,+A G T] \ldots[+O,+O B J]]\)
\(\begin{array}{lll}\text { Ong áy } & \text { ăn } & \text { thịt. } \\ \text { he } & \text { ate } & \text { meat } \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} & & {[+\mathrm{O}} \\ {[+\mathrm{AGT}]} & & {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}\end{array}\)
```

The class of verbs does not present any learning problem since there is an equivalent class in English. Examples of verbs: uóng drink, hit inhale, nhî secrete, ngôn swallow.

### 2.2.10. nói speak

The verbs in this transitive class host [+NM, +AGT] and [+O, +OBJ] tagmemes. The [ $+0,+O B J]$ slot $c a n$ be filled by either a noun phrase or a dependent clause introduced by ràng that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
{[+[+\mathrm{NM},+\mathrm{AGT}]-} & {[+0,+\mathrm{OBJ}]] } \\
& {[\text { noun phr. }] } \\
& {[\text { dep. clause }] }
\end{aligned}
$$

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ong áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{AGT}]} \end{aligned}$ | nói $t o z d$ | chuyên này. this story <br>  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ông áy } \\ & \text { he } \\ & {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ & {[+\mathrm{AGT}]} \end{aligned}$ | nói said | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ràng ông Hải } \\ & \text { that Mr Hai } \\ & \text { [+O ] } \\ & \text { [+OBJ] } \\ & \text { [dep. clause] } \end{aligned}$ |

The class of verbs does not create a learning problem because there exists an equivalent class in English. Examples of verbs: kè recount, khuyèn advise, bảo tezl, tin inform (which is different from the same form meaning believe.)

### 2.2.11. biét know

The verbs in this transitive class host [+NM, +DAT] and [+O, +OBJ] tagmemes. Their [ $+0,+O B J]$ slot can be filled by either a noun phrase or a dependent clause introduced by răng that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{aligned}
{[+[+N M,+D A T]}
\end{aligned} \quad\left[\begin{array}{l}
{[+0,+O B J]} \\
\\
\\
\\
\\
{[\text { noun phr. }]}
\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

The class of verbs does not present a learning problem since there is an equivalent class in English. Examples of verbs: tháy see, nghe hear, hiêu understand, ngh $\tilde{i}$ think.

### 2.2.12. ghét hate

The verbs in this transitive class host [+NM, +DAT] and [+O, +OBJ] tagmemes. They differ from the previous verb class in that they can be modified by an intensifier. Their [+O, +OBJ] slot can be filled by either a noun phrase or a dependent clause introduced by rang that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
{[+[+N M,+D A T] \text { (Intensifier) }-} & {[+0,+ \text { OBJ }]] } \\
& {[\text { noun phr. }] } \\
& {[\text { dep. clause }] }
\end{aligned}
$$



The class of verbs does not present a learning problem since there exists an equivalent class in English. It is noted however that the intensifier in English in this case is very much, and not very as in Vietnamese:
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{cc}\text { He } \\
{\left[\begin{array}{ll}{[+N M}\end{array}
$$\right]} \& likes <br>
{[+D A T]} \& <br>

{[+0} \& {[+O B J]}\end{array}\right]\)| very much. |
| :--- |
| [intensifier] |

Examples of verbs: giận angry, buòn sad, thich like, ưa prefer.
2.2.13. $\dot{\sigma}^{2}$ stay at, be at

The verb ${ }_{o}^{2}$ stands by itself as an intransitive locative verb, and occurs very frequently either as a main verb or as a co-verb. It hosts [+NM, +OBJ] and [+O, +LOC] tagmemes when it is a main verb:
$[+[+N M,+O B J] \ldots[+O,+L O C]$


As a co-verb, $\dot{\alpha}$ functions as a locative preposition introducing a Locative case relation:


The verb ${ }_{o}^{\dot{\sigma}}$ presents a learning problem on the production level in that its Locative case relation is cast in an Objective case form in Vietnamese whereas in English the same case relation is cast in a Locative case form. It is incidentally noted that Hawailan English has the same construction as in Vietnamese:


### 2.2.14. ra go out

The verbs in this intransitive class are characterized by their being directional and having a [+locomotion] feature. They host [+NM, + OBJ] and [+O, +DIR] tagmemes:

| [ + [ +NM , +OBJ] | [ $+0,+$ diR]] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { ông äy ra } \\ \text { he went out } \end{gathered}$ | Saigon. <br> to Saigon | (2.3b.) |
| [+NM] [+locom.] | [+0 ] |  |
| [+OBJ] | [+DIR] |  |

The verbs in this group are also co-verbs. As such, they function as directional prepositions introducing a Directional case relation:


The class of verbs presents a learning problem on the production level in that their Directional case relation is cast in an Objective case form whereas in English the same case relation would be cast in a Directional case form. It is also incidentally noted that such a [+O, +DIR] tagmeme exists in Hawaiian English:
$\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{He} \\ {[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\ {[+\mathrm{OBJ}]} & \text { went } \\ {\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { Haleiwa. } \\ {[+\mathrm{DIR}]}\end{array}\right.} & \end{array}$
Examples of verbs: vô go in, lên go up, xuống go down, lại go back.

### 2.2.15. di go

The verbs in this intransitive class are characterized by their being directional and having a [-locomotion] feature. They host [+NM, $+O B J]$ and [+O, +DIR] tagmemes:


The verbs in this group are also co-verbs. As such, they function as a directional preposition introducing a Directional case form:


The class of verbs presents a learning problem of the production level in that their Directional case relation is cast in an Objective case form whereas in English the same case relation would be cast in a Directional case form.

### 2.2.16. tới arrive

The verbs in this intransitive class are characterized by their having a [+goal] feature. They host [+NM, +OBJ] and [+O, +GOL] tagmemes:

$$
[+[+N M,+O B J] \ldots[+0,+G O L]]
$$



The verbs in this group are also co-verbs. As such, they function as a goal preposition introducing a Goal case form:

| áy | gời | sách | t ${ }^{\text {of }}$ | Sai |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| he | sent | books | to | Sai |
| +NM |  | [+0 |  | [+Gl |
| [+AGT] |  | [+OBJ] |  | [+GOL |

The class of verbs presents a learning problem on the production level in that their Goal case relation is cast in an Objective case form whereas in English the same case relation would be cast in a Goal case form, with the rare exception of verbs such as reach which host [+NM, +AGT] and [+O, +OBJ] tagmemes:


Examples of verbs: đén arrive, vè return, qua go over, sang go over.

### 2.2.17. có have

This verb could be classed in the transitive Dative group discussed in 2.2.11. above. Thus, it would host $[+N M,+D A T]$ and $[+0,+O B J]$ tagmemes:

| $[+[+\mathrm{NM}$, | $+\mathrm{DAT}]$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $[+0,+\mathrm{OBJ}]]$ |  |
| $\mathrm{Tòi}$ | có | sách. |
| $I$ | have | books |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ |  | $[+0$ |
| $[+\mathrm{DAT}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |

However, the verb stands out of the group in that it can occur without a Nominative. It means there is, there are, etc.:


The pattern presents a learning problem for English speakers on the production level. As for the teaching of all the classes of verbs above, substitution drills could be prepared to teach this existential pattern.

## CHAPTER III

## CLAUSE CLASSES

Besides the dimension of five Clause Types shown in 2.1., there is a second dimension of thirteen Clause Classes which differ from one another by their internal structures or by their distribution in larger grammatical constructions. Chart V below shows the Clause Classes in Vietnamese.

### 3.1. DECLARATIVE CLAUSE

The Class of five Independent Declarative Clause Types is the kernel from which all the other twelve Classes can be derived when appropriate transform rules are applied (Longacre 1964). It was presented in 2.1. As a Class, it does not cause any learning problem for the English speaking student since the same Class of Independent Declarative Clause exists also in English.

### 3.2. IMPERATIVE CLAUSE

The clauses of the Independent Imperative Clause Class are identified by their imperative predicates:

## 1. Copulative Imperative:

ông nên lam bác-sí.
Mr'd better do doctor
(You'd better be a doctor.)
$[+$ verb $]$
$[+$ copula $]$
[+imp.]
Only the copulative verb lam to exercise the profession of, and not the copulative verb la be, can be used in imperative form.


## 2. Stative Imperative:

ông nên lẹ-lang. you'd better be fast

Only some, and not all, Stative verbs can be used in imperative form.
3. Submissive Imperative:

Óng chớbi ho đánh. better not
(You'd better not be beaten by them.)
[+verb]
[ttrans.]
[+subm. ]
[+imp. ]
The Submissive Imperative Clauses are very rarely used. The following pattern is more frequently used to convey the same meaning:


The embedded clause in the sentence above is:

| ho | đánh | ông. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| they | beat | you |
| $[+$ NM $]$ | [+verb | $[+0$ |
| [+AGT] | [+trans.] | $[+0 B J]$ |

4. Transitive Imperative:
ông hãy mua báo.
you'd better buy newspapers [+verb
[+trans.]
[+imp. $]$
5. Intransitive Imperative:
ông hãy ${ }_{0}^{\circ} \quad$ Saigon. you'd better be in Saigon [+verb
$[$-intrans. $]$
+imp.]

The Imperative Clause Class in Vietnamese presents some learning problems for the English speaking student:
(1) While the Nominative case form is normally omitted in English imperative clauses, it is more frequently present than absent in Vietnamese. This is a production problem in that the student ought to remember to have the Nominative case form present in his imperative clauses. The omission of the Nominative case form
here might convey the unwanted connotation that the speaker does not care for the listener since he does not address the latter with the second person pronoun.
(2) In Copulative Imperative Clauses, only the copula lam. to exercise the profession of, and not the more frequently used copula la be, is used.
(3) The various imperative modals and their meanings are as follows:

```
hãy exhortation to action: had better:
        Ông hãy di.
        you had better go
            [+verb]
            [timp. ]
nên advice to action: had better:
        ông nên di.
        you had better go
                    [+verb
                    [-trans.]
[timp. \(]\)
khoan advice to postpone action: had better wait:
        ông khoan di.
        you had better postpone the trip
            [+verb
            [-trans.]
[+imp.
dưng prohibition to action: had better not:
        Ông di̛ng di.
        you had better not go
            [+verb]
            [-trans.]
            chớ prohibition to action, with a weaker meaning
            than difng had better not:
        Ông chớ di.
        you had better not go
            \([+\) verb
[-trans.]
[+imp. \(]\)
```

            (4) The student should also be aware of the double usage of
        a negative and an affirmative imperative modal as in:
    $$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{llll}
\text { Ông } & \text { đưng } & \text { nên } d i \text {. } \\
\text { Ông } & \text { chód } & \text { nen } d i \text {. }
\end{array} \\
& \text { you had better not go } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { [+verb } \\
\text { [-trans.] } \\
\text { [+imp. }]
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

### 3.3. INTERROGATIVE ALTERNATIVE CLAUSE

The clauses of the Independent Interrogative Alternative Clause Class have one of their tagmemes alternating with another tagmeme of the same grammatical function. The alternative introducing tagmeme is composed of an obligatory Alternative Introducer, and an optional copula:

AlternativeIntroducer [+Alternative Introducer $\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { hay } \\ \text { or } \\ \text { [Copula } \\ \text { là } \\ \text { be }\end{array}\right]$
Interrogative Alternative Clause with Alternative Predicate:


Interrogative Alternative Clause with Alternative Nominative:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ông Hái hay (là) ông Hoàn di? } \\
& \text { (Are Mr Hai or Mr. Hoan going?) } \\
& \begin{array}{lll}
{[+\mathrm{NM}]} \\
{[+\mathrm{OBJ}]}
\end{array} \quad[+ \text { altern.] } \quad[+\mathrm{NM}]
\end{aligned}
$$

Interrogative Alternative Clause with Alternative Objectives:

Interrogative Alternative Clause with Alternative Instrumental:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ông đi bāng xe hơi hay (la) (bàng) xe lưa? } \\
& \text { (Did you go by car or (by) train?) } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
{[+\mathrm{I}]} \\
\text { [+INS] }
\end{array} \quad \text { [+altern.] } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { [+I } \\
\text { [+INS] }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

The Clause Class presents a learning problem on both the production and the recognition levels because of its word order: While the same alternative clauses in English have their Nominative and Predicate reversed, the Vietnamese clauses keep the regular Nominative + Predicate order.

### 3.4. INTERROGATIVE RIGHT-WRONG CLAUSE

The clauses of the Independent Interrogative Right-Wrong Clause Class contain an Interrogative Right-Wrong tagmeme whose formula is as follows:

The Interrogative Right-Wrong tagmeme is composed of an obligatory Right particle, an optional Alternative Introducer, and an obligatory Negative particle.

1. Copulative Interrogative Right-Wrong:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Ong la bác-síi phá (hay) không? } \\
\text { (You are a doctor, aren'tyou?) } \\
\text { [+Interrog.Right-Wrong] }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

2. Stative Interrogative Right-Wrong:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Ong dau phái (hay) không? } \\
\text { (You are sick, aren't you?) } \\
\text { [+Interrog.Right-Wrong] }
\end{gathered}
$$

3. Submissive Interrogative Right-Wrong:
Ong bi ho dánh phai (hay) khong?
(You were béaten by them, weren't you?)
[+Interrog.Right-Wrong]
4. Transitive Interrogative Right-Wrong:

5. Intransitive Interrogative Right-Wrong:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ong di phái (hay) không? } \\
& \text { (You are going, aren't you?) } \\
& {[+ \text { Interrog.Right-Wrong] }}
\end{aligned}
$$

The Clause Class does not present a learning problem to the English speaking student. Likewise, answers to affirmative Interrogative Right-Wrong questions are parallel to those to tag questions in English:

Question:
Ông di phái (hay) không?
(You are going, aren't you?)

Right answer:

| (Da) phái, | tòi di. |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| (Polite) correct, | $I$ | $a m$ going. |

Wrong (contradicting) answer:

$$
\begin{array}{cllll}
\text { (Da) khong phäi, tôi không di. } \\
\text { (PoZite) not correct, } & \text { am not } & \text { going. }
\end{array}
$$

The Right answer actually means: What you assumed is correct, I am going. The Wrong answer actually means: What you assumed is not correct, I am not going. The rationale behind such answers explains the seemingly contradictory answers to negative Right-Wrong questions:

Question:
Ông không di phài (hay) không?
You are not going, are you?

Right answer:

$$
\begin{array}{clll}
\text { (Da) phái, } & \text { tôi khong } & \text { di. } \\
\text { (Polite) correct, } & I \text { am } & \text { not } & \text { going. }
\end{array}
$$

Wrong (contradicting) answer:

$$
\begin{array}{cll}
\text { (Da) không } & \text { (phái), tôi di. } \\
\text { (Polite) } & \text { not } & \text { (correct), I am going. }
\end{array}
$$

The answers to negative Right-Wrong questions in Vietnamese are, in appearance, just contradictory to the answers to tag questions in English:

```
Question:
You are not going, are you?
Affirmative answer:
Yes, I am going.
Negative answer:
No, I am not going.
```

The English speaking student of Vietnamese ought to remember that, in Vietnamese, answers to Right-Wrong questions are actually to concur or to disagree with the assumptions in the questions, they are not affirmative or negative answers.

### 3.5. INTERROGATIVE POSSIBILITY CLAUSE

The clauses of the Independent Interrogative Possibility Clause Class contain an Interrogative Possibility tagmeme whose formula is as follows:

InterrogativePossibility [+Possibility dượ posibible tAltern. Introd. hay or
+Negative không not

The Interrogative Possibility tagmeme is composed of an obligatory Possibility particle được, an optional Alternative Introducer hay, and an obligatory Negative particle không.

1. Copulative Interrogative Possibility: grammatical only with
lam exercise the profession of, and not grammatical with la be:
Ông lam bác-sî được (hay) không? (Can you be a doctor?)
[+Interrog.Possibility]
2. Stative Interrogative Possibility: grammatical only with some verbs.

Ông vui (lên) được (hay) không?
gay up
(Can you cheer up?)
[+Interrog.Possibility]
3. Submissive Interrogative Possibility: ungrammatical.
4. Transitive Interrogative Possibility:
(Can you mua báo thy newspapers?) được (hay) không?
[+Interrog. Possibility]
5. Intransitive Interrogative Possibility:
ông di được (hay) không?
(Can you go?)
The Clause Class does not present a serious learning problem to the English speaking student, except that not all of his generated sentences with stative verbs will be grammatical, and that only the copulative verb lam, and not la, can be used in a copulative Interrogative Possibility clause. The student, however, ought to practise answering these Possibility questions:

Question:


Negative answer:

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
\text { (Da) } & \text { không được, } & \text { tôi } & \text { không } & \text { đi được. } \\
\text { PoZite) } & \text { Impossible, } & I & \text { cannot go. }
\end{array}
$$

### 3.6. INTERROGATIVE YES-NO CLAUSE

The clauses of the Interrogative Yes-No Clause Class contain a YesNo Interrogative tagmeme whose formula is as follows:

InterrogativeYesNo [ $\pm$ Affirm. Modal have $\pm$ Altern. Introd. hay +Negative ${ }_{n}^{k}$ khong]

The Interrogative Yes-No tagmeme is composed of an optional Affirmative Modal có, an optional Alternative Introducer hay, and an obligatory Negative Particle khong. The optional Affirmative Modal can be placed before any tagmeme in which the question lies, and the other two elements are always placed at the end of the clause.

1. Copulative Interrogative Yes-No: grammatical only with lam exercise the profession of, and not grammatical with la be.

$$
\begin{array}{rll}
\text { Is ông áy (có) lam bác-síi } & \text { (hay) không? } \\
\text { a doctor } & \text { (or not)? } \\
& \text { [+Interrog. YesNo] }
\end{array}
$$

2. Stative Interrogative Yes-No:

$$
\begin{array}{rlll}
\text { Ông áy } \begin{array}{ll}
\text { (có) lanh } \\
\text { Is }
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text { (hay) không? } \\
\text { cozd }
\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}
\text { (or not)? }
\end{array} \\
& \text { [+Interrog. YesNo] }
\end{array}
$$

3. Submissive Interrogative Yes-No:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ông áy (có) bị họ dánh (hay) không? } \\
& \text { Was he beaten by them (or not)? } \\
& \text { [+Interrog. YesNo] }
\end{aligned}
$$

4. Transitive Interrogative Yes-No:

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text { Ông áy (có) mua báo (hay) không? } \\
\text { Did he } & & \begin{array}{l}
\text { buy newspapers (or not)? }
\end{array} \\
& & \\
& & \text { +Interrog.YesNo] }
\end{array}
$$

5. Intransitive Interrogative Yes-No:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { Ông áy (có) di } & \text { (hay) không? } \\
\text { Did he } & \text { go } \begin{array}{ll}
\text { (or not)? } \\
& \\
& \\
& \\
& \text { Interrog. YesNo] }
\end{array}
\end{array}
$$

The Clause Class presents a production problem to the learner: while in English, Yes-No Interrogative clauses have their Nominative and Predicate tagmemes reversed in order, Vietnamese Yes-No Interrogative still preserve the regular declarative word order of Nominative + Predicate.

The Clause Class does not have negative interrogative types:

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { *ông äy không (có) di (hay) không? } \\
\text { Did he not } & \\
& & \\
& & \text { go? Interrog.YesNo] }
\end{array}
$$

The reason for the ungrammaticality of a negative Yes-No Interrogative clause in Vietnamese is that the interrogative clauses are actually alternative affirmative/negative questions. Since the Interrogative Yes-No tagmeme is already negative in meaning, its counterpart, the declarative clause, should be affirmative. The student of vietnamese will then have to learn the intonationally interrogative negative sentence to be discussed in Chapter IV and to be given below for the present discussion:


### 3.7. INTERROGATIVE NOMINATIVE CLAUSE

The clauses of the Interrogative Nominative Clause Class contain an Interrogative Nominative tagmeme:

1. Copulative Interrogative Nominative:

2. Stative Interrogative Nominative:

| Ai | lanh?  <br> Who is cold? <br> [+NM [+OBJ <br> [+Interr.]  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

3. Submissive Interrogative Nominative:

| Ai | bi ho dánh? |
| :--- | :--- |
| Who | was |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}$ | $]$ |
| $[+\mathrm{DAT}$ |  |
| $[+$ Interr. $]$ |  |

4. Transitive Interrogative Nominative:

| Ai | mua | báo? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Who | bought | newspapers? |
| [+NM |  |  |
| [+AGT |  |  |
| [+Interr.] |  |  |

5. Intransitive Interrogative Nominative:

| Ai | đi? |
| :---: | :---: |
| Who | went? |
| [+NM |  |
| [+OBJ |  |
| [+Int |  |

The Interrogative Nominative Clause Class does not present any learning problem to the English speaker since there exists in English an equivalent Clause Class.

### 3.8. INTERROGATIVE OBJECTIVE CLAUSE

The clauses of the Interrogative Objective Clause Class contain an Interrogative [+0, +OBJ] tagmeme:

1. Copulative Interrogative Objective: non-existent since there is no [ $+0,+O B J$ ] in the clause type.
2. Stative Interrogative Objective: non-existent since there is no [+O, +OBJ] in the clause type.
3. Submissive Interrogative Objective:
ông áy bi gì?
(He was adversely affected by what?)

| $[+0$ | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $[+O B J$ | $]$ |
| [+Interr. $]$ |  |

4. Transitive Interrogative Objective:
ông áy mua gì?
(What did he buy?)

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
{[+0} & ] \\
{[+ \text { OBJ }} & ] \\
{[+ \text { Interr. }]}
\end{array}
$$

5. Intransitive Interrogative Objective: non-existent since there is no $[+0,+O B J]$ in the clause type.

The Clause Class presents a production problem in word order: while in English, the similar clauses have their Nominative and Predicate tagmemes reversed, the order of the two tagmemes remains the same as in declarative clauses.

### 3.9. EXTRA-INTERROGATIVE CLAUSE

The clauses of the Extra-Interrogative Clause Class contain an interrogative satellite tagmeme.

1. Copulative Extra-Interrogative, example with [+D, +BEN]:

> ông áy là bác-síl cho ai?
(For who was he a doctor?)
$\begin{array}{ll}{[+D} & ] \\ \text { [+BEN } & ] \\ \text { [+Interr. }]\end{array}$
2. Stative Extra-Interrogative, example with [+L, +LOC]:
ông aby dou ờ đâu? sick where
(Where is he sore?)

| $[+$ L | $]$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $[+$ LOG | $]$ |
| [ + Intern. $]$ |  |

3. Submissive Extra-Interrogative, example with [+SR, +SRC]:
ông aby bi ho đánh tuff hopi naos?
(Since when was he beaten by them?)

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
{[+ \text { SR }} & ] \\
{[+ \text { SR C }} & ] \\
{[+ \text { Inters. }]}
\end{array}
$$

4. Transitive Extra-Interrogative, example with [+C, +COM]:

Ông aby mus báo với ai?
(Who did he buy newspapers with?)
$\begin{array}{ll}{[+C} & ] \\ {[+ \text { COM }} & ] \\ \text { [+Enter. }]\end{array}$
5. Intransitive Extra-Interrogative, example with [+I, +INS]:
ông aby $\quad$ ai bàng git?
(How did he go?)

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
{[+I} & ] \\
{[+ \text { INS }} & ] \\
{[+ \text { Intern. }}
\end{array}
$$

The Clause Class presents a production problem in word order: while English requires a reverse order of the Nominative and the Predicate, and also the interrogative tagmeme to be preposed, Vietnamese preserves the declarative word order.

### 3.10. DEPENDENT RELATIVE CLAUSE

The clauses of the Dependent Relative Clause Class are optionally introduced by a Dependent Relative Clause Introducer. There are three of those introduces: the relative adverb rang that, the co-verb echo that, $s o$ that, and the auxiliary la that (as an auxiliary, it means be).
rang usually introduces a direct quotation, and has the widest range of usage.
chou usually introduces a wish.
la usually introduces a statement, or a thought.

1. Copulative Dependent Relative:
2. Stative Dependent Relative:

3. Submissive Dependent Relative:
4. Transitive Dependent Relative:
5. Intransitive Dependent Relative:


The Clause Class does not present a learning problem to the English speaking student because there exists also an equivalent Clause Class in English.

### 3.11. DEPENDENT NOMINATIVE CLAUSE

The clauses of the Dependent Nominative Clause Class contain an optional Dependent Nominative tagmeme. The most usual filler of the Dependent Nominative slot is ma that although Interrogative Pronouns also occur in the slot.

1. Copulative Dependent Nominative:

| (Ngươi) <br> (The person) | (mà ) | là | bac-sf. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | who | was | a doctor. |
|  | [+NM | ] |  |
|  | [+OBJ |  |  |
|  | [+dep. |  |  |

2. Stative Dependent Nominative:

| ( $\mathrm{Ngươ} \mathrm{i}$ ) | (mà ) | đau |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (The person) | who | was sick. |
|  | [+NM ] |  |
|  | [+OBJ ] |  |
|  | [+dep.] |  |

3. Submissive Dependent Nominative:

4. Transitive Dependent Nominative:


It is noted that interrogative pronouns such as ai who cannot be omitted when they fill a Dependent Nominative slot, while mà that can.
5. Intransitive Dependent Nominative:


The Clause Class does not present a learning problem since there is an equivalent Clause Class in English. However, the optionality of the relative pronoun ma that in the Nominative slot creates a recognition problem. Note the ungrammaticality of the following English clause because of the omission of its dependent Nominative:
*The person went returned.

### 3.12. DEPENDENT OBJECTIVE CLAUSE

The clauses of the Dependent Objective Clause Class contain an optional Dependent Objective tagmeme. The most usual filler of the

Dependent Objective slot is mà that although Interrogative Pronouns also occur in the slot.

1. Copulative Dependent Objective: non-existent since there is no $[+0,+O B J]$ in the clause type.
2. Stative Dependent Objective: non-existent since there is no [+O, +OBJ] in the clause type.
3. Submissive Dependent Objective: non-existent because the [ +0 , $+O B J$ ] slot in this clause type cannot be filled by a noun phrase.
4. Transitive Dependent Objective:

5. Intransitive Dependent Objective: non-existent since there
is no [+O, +OBJ] in the clause type.
The Clause Class does not present a learning problem since there is an equivalent Clause Class in English.

### 3.13. EXTRA-DEPENDENT CLAUSE

The clauses of the Extra-Dependent Clause Class are introduced by an Extra-Dependent satellite tagmeme. The Extra-Dependent satellite slot can be filled by the pronoun mà that or by Extra-Dependent expressions which will be exemplified below:

1. Copulative Extra-Dependent:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (Ngày) (má) ông áy lam bác-s íi... } \\
& \text { (The day) when he was a doctor... } \\
& {[+0} \\
& {[+T I M]} \\
& {[+ \text { dep. }]}
\end{aligned}
$$

2. Stative Extra-Dependent:

3. Submissive Extra-Dependent:
4. Transitive Extra-Dependent:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (Ông áy nghî) đè (ông áy) mua báo. } \\
& \text { ( He stopped work) in order (that he) bought newspapers. } \\
& \text { [+PURPOSE] } \\
& \text { [+dep. }]
\end{aligned}
$$

5. Intransitive Extra-Dependent:

| $\left(\mathrm{Ch}_{\mathrm{o}}^{\mathrm{o}}\right)$ | (má) | ông áy | di... |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (The place) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (that) } \\ & {[+0 \quad]} \end{aligned}$ | he | went to. |

The Clause Class does not present a learning problem to the speaker of English because there exists an equivalent Clause Class in English. However, the student should master, on the production level, the use of the optional relative Dependent pronoun in Vietnamese where in English it should be another pronoun:


(It is noted that the [+Ex, +EXT] slot above was filled by the split expression đuoc ma for which.)


## CHAPTER IV

## CLAUSE UNITS

The five Clause Types in Chapter II，and the thirteen Clause Classes in Chapter $I I I$ form a bi－dimensional matrix giving sixty－five possi－ bilities or Clause Units of which fifty－one are always grammatical， and six are grammatical only within the restrictions pointed out in the description of the Clause Classes hosting them．The total picture of Clause Units in Vietnamese is presented in Chart VI below：

CHART VI：CLAUSE UNITS

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{N}{0} \\ \stackrel{1}{0} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 馬 } \\ & \text { 人, } \\ & \text { 日, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 1 Copulative | $\times$ | （ $\times$ ） | $\times$ | $\times$ | （ $\times$ ） | （ $\times$ ） | $\times$ |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ |  | $\star$ |
| 2 Stative | $\times$ | （x） | $\times$ | $\star$ | $\times$ | （ $\times$ ） | $\times$ |  | $\star$ | $\times$ | $\times$ |  | $\star$ |
| 3 Submissive | $\times$ | （ $\times$ ） | $\times$ | $\star$ |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | $x$ | $\star$ | $\times$ | $\times$ |  | $\star$ |
| 4 Transitive | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\star$ | $\star$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\star$ | $\pm$ |
| 5 Intransitive | $\star$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\star$ | $\times$ | $\star$ |  | $\star$ | $\times$ | $\times$ |  | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ |

In summary，on the Clause Type Dimension，the English speaking stu－ dent will have to learn the Submissive Clause Type 3 and the optional characteristic of all nominal tagmemes，whether they are nuclear or satellite，on the surface structure．On the Clause Class Dimension， seven Clause Classes present some learning problems for him：

Imperative (2), Interrogative Alternative (3), Interrogative RightWrong (4), Interrogative Yes-No (6), Interrogative Objective (8), Extra-Interrogative (9), and Extra-Dependent (13).

## CHAPTER V

## SENTENCE CLASSES

Vietnamese sentences are grammatical units which potentially occur alone as complete utterances. They range in length from a single word (response, vocative, exclamative, and even interrogative, or declarative sentences) to lengthy coordinate or pyramiding structures of clauses with or within clauses.

### 5.1. GENERAL REMARKS ON SENTENCES IN VIETNAMESE

In Chapter II on Clause Types in Vietnamese, it was stated that the nuclear nominal tagmemes such as the Nominative or Objective can be omitted when larger linguistic or extralinguistic units permit such an omission. As a consequence, when such a clause level tagmeme is missing, the sentence containing the clause ought to be understood within larger contexts. In other words, what is assumed to be known elsewhere is not necessarily repeated. Thus, a Vietnamese sentence is usually a contextually dependent sentence. As an example of such a contextual dependence, the following sentence can be understood in different ways according to the larger linguistic or extralinguistic contexts:

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
\begin{array}{c}
\text { Ong ảy } \\
\text { [+IndepDeclCl] }
\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}
\text { tòi } \\
\text { [+IndepDeclCl] }
\end{array} & \text { vè } & \text { +FallInton. }
\end{array}
$$

The sentence may mean:

```
If he goes home, I will go home.
When he goes home, I will go home.
Every time he goes home, I go home.
Because he is going home, I am going home.
I will not go home unless he goes home.
```

Furthermore, Vietnamese seems to prefer coordinate sentence structures with successive independent clauses to complex structures with pyramiding clauses within clauses. As an example, the two following facts will be chronological rather than logical order (i.e. TimeSituation dependence rather than government relationship):

The two facts of returning home and meeting me are stated in their chronological order rather than the logical order of Time or circumstantial of the first fact, and government of the second fact.

The English speaking student of Vietnamese encounters such ellipses of linking words as a recognition problem. He ought to be able to interpret the underlying logical relationships without the help of surface markers. ${ }^{8}$

### 5.2. SENTENCE CLASSES

Vietnamese Sentence Classes differ from one another in terms of their internal structure and distributions in larger linguistic matrices. In terms of their internal structures and external distributions, they are grouped into six Classes as follows:

CHART VII: SENTENCE CLASSES


### 5.2.1. INDEPENDENT DECLARATIVE SENTENCE

The Independent Declarative Sentence has the following identificational features and structure formula:
it is not necessarily preceded by anything;
it is not necessarily followed by anything.
IndepDeclSent [+IndepDeclClause +FallInton]
An Independent Declarative Sentence is composed of an obligatory Independent Declarative Clause, and an obligatory Falling Intonation
pattern (for a study of intonation, see for example Aurelie Huong Mai Tran 1969, and for drills on intonation, see Liem 1970). Example:
Ong áy di ròi. +FallInton.
He has gone already.
[+IndepDeclClause]

There is no learning problem for the English speaking student because the same Sentence Class exists also in English.

### 5.2.2. INDEPENDENT IMPERATIVE SENTENCE

The Independent Imperative Sentence has the following identificational features and structure formula:
it is not necessarily preceded by anything;
it is necessarily followed by a verbal or non-verbal response.
IndepImpSent [+IndepImpClause $\pm$ ImpParticle +RisFallInton]
An Independent Imperative Sentence is composed of an obligatory Independent Imperative Clause, an optional Imperative Particle, and an obligatory Rising-Falling Intonation. Example:

| Ong ding |
| :--- |
| You had better |
| di not |
| [+IndepImpClause] |$\quad$| no |
| :---: |
| go. | +RisFallInton.

[+ImpParticle]

The following points about the Sentence Class are to be learned by the student:
(1) The Rising Falling Intonation pattern.
(2) The usual presence of an Imperative particle such as nhé O.K., nghe $0 . K$., literally meaning hear, chớ $0 . K$., yes, etc.
(3) Whereas in English imperative sentences the Nominative slot is more usually omitted than kept, the reverse is true in Vietnamese. The reason for keeping the Nominative slot is probably because its omission could be considered as an implication of irreverence or impoliteness.
(4) The various imperative modals and their meanings as shown in 3.2 .

### 5.2.3. INDEPENDENT STRUCTURALLY INTERROGATIVE SENTENCE

The Independent Structurally Interrogative Sentence has the following identificational features and structure formula:
it is not necessarily preceded by anything;
it is necessarily followed by a verbal or non-verbal response.

IndepStructInterrSent [+IndepInterrClause +RisInton]
An Independent Structurally Interrogative Sentence is composed of an obligatory Independent Interrogative Clause, and an obligatory Rising Intonation pattern. Example:
ông áy di chưa $\quad$ +RisInton.
Did he go yet?
[+IndepInterrclause]

Besides the learning problems on word order, clause types discussed in Chapter III on Interrogative Clause Types, the student ought to practise the use of only the Rising Intonation pattern in Vietnamese Interrogative Sentences because he is used to the choice of either a Falling Intonation pattern or a Rising Intonation pattern in English Interrogative Sentences.

### 5.2.4. INDEPENDENT INTONATIONALLY INTERROGATIVE SENTENCE

The Independent Intonationally Interrogative Sentence has the following identificational features and structure formula:
it is not necessarily preceded by anything;
it is necessarily followed by a verbal or non-verbal response.
IndepIntonInterrSent [+IndepDeclClause $\pm$ InterrParticle +RisInton]
An Independent Intonationally Interrogative Sentence is composed of an obligatory Independent Declarative Clause, an optional Interrogative Particle, and an obligatory Rising Intonation pattern. Example:


The Intonationally Interrogative Sentence Class is much more frequently used in Vietnamese than is its counterpart in English. Particularly, when the question is negative as exemplified above, the only way to make it is to utilize the Interrogative Rising Intonation pattern because a negative question would be ungrammatical:

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { *ông } & \text { không } & \text { di } & \text { không? } \\
\text { *You } & \text { did not } & \text { go, } & \text { didyou not? }
\end{array}
$$

The Intonationally Interrogative Sentence Class presents the following learning problems for the English speaking student:
(1) The use of Interrogative particles such as à, hà, kia, đó,
sao, chớ which are not readily translatable into English.
(2) The answers to negative Intonationally Interrogative utterances: the Vietnamese way of answering negative questions is the opposite to that in English. Example:

Question:

```
Ông khòng di à +RisInton.
You did not go, did you?
Answer:
Không, tòi đi.
No, I went.
```

The negative word khong is actually not a negative answer, but means that the negative assumption in the question is not correct. On the contrary, if the negative assumption in the question is correct, the answer will be:

Answer:

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { Da, } & \text { tòi } & \text { khóng } & đ i . \\
\text { Yés, } & I & \text { did not } & \text { go. }
\end{array}
$$

This is both a recognition problem and a production problem.

### 5.2.5. DEPENDENT INTRODUCER SENTENCE

The Dependent Introducer Sentence has the following identification-
al features and structure formula:
it is necessarily preceded by some linguistic cue which it elaborates;
it is not necessarily followed by a verbal or non-verbal response.

DepIntrodSent [+Introducer +DeclClause +FallInton]
A Dependent Introducer Sentence is composed of an obligatory Sentence Introducer, an obligatory Declarative Clause which may be either Independent or Dependent, and an obligatory Falling Intonation pattern. Example:


The Dependent Introducer Sentence Class does not present a structural problem to be learned for there exists a counterpart Clause Class in English. However, the student ought to be familiarized with the Introducers such as:
(1) Clause Level Coordinators: thíthen, cho nên consequently, etc.
(2) Prepositional Phrases: trái lại on the contrary, vè mặt khác on the other hand, etc.
(3) Adjective Phrases: lạ-lung thay curiously enough, kinh-khüng thay terribly enough, etc.
(4) Verb Phrases: nói cho đúng to tell the truth, etc.

### 5.2.6. TAGMEMICALLY DEPENDENT SENTENCE

The Tagmemically Dependent Sentence has the following identificational features and structure formula:
it is necessarily preceded by some linguistic cue which it elaborates;
it is not necessarily followed by a verbal or non-verbal response.

TagmDepSent [+IndepDeclClause -Tagmeme +FallInton]
A Tagmemically Dependent Sentence is composed of an obligatory Independent Declarative Clause that has one or more of its nuclear tagmemes missing, and an obligatory Falling Intonation pattern. Example:

| Mua | hòmqua +FallInton. |
| :--- | :--- |
| (I) bought | (it) yesterday. |
| $-[+\mathrm{NM}]$ | $-[+0$, |
| $(+\mathrm{AGT}]$ | $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |

The above example could be an answer to the question when did you buy the book? It is tagmemically dependent because its [+NM, +AGT] and [+O, +OBJ] tagmemes are missing, and that it needs contextual clarification for its understanding.

The Tagmemically Dependent Sentence Class is very commonly used to formulate short answers to questions. In these short answers, usually any other tagmeme but the Predicate can be omitted. Example:

\[

\]

The English speaking student of Vietnamese ought to familiarize himself with the Sentence Class both on the recognition and production levels.

## CHAPTER VI

## SENTENCE TYPES

Besides the dimension of six Sentence Classes shown in Chapter V, there is a second dimension of four Sentence Types which differ from one another by their internal structures. Chart VIII below shows the Sentence Types in Vietnamese.

## CHART VIII: SENTENCE TYPES



### 6.1. SIMPLE MAJOR SENTENCE

The Simple Major Sentence has the following identificational features and structure formula:
being a Major Sentence, it contains necessarily a complete Clause; being a Simple Sentence, it contains necessarily only one complete Clause.

SimpleMajorSent [+IndepClause +Inton]
A Simple Major Sentence is composed of an obligatory Independent Clause and an obligatory Intonation pattern.

Examples:
Declarative:

```
Ong áy di ròi. +FallInton.
    He went already.
[+IndepDeclClause]
Imperative:
Ông dưng di nhé +RisFallinton.
You'd better not go.
[+IndepImpClause]
```

Interrogative:
Ông áy di chưa
[+IndepInterrClause]

The Sentence Type does not present a learning problem to English speaking students because the same type exists in English.

### 6.2. COMPOUND MAJOR SENTENCE

The Compound Major Sentence has the following identificational features and structure formula:
being a Major Sentence, it contains necessarily a complete Clause;
being a Compound Sentence, it has a lengthy coordinate or noncoordinate structure containing more than one Clause.

SimpleMajorSent [+IndepClause $\pm$ Coordinator +IndepClause +Inton]
A Compound Major Sentence is composed of at least two coordinate or non-coordinated Independent Clauses and an obligatory Intonation pattern. Examples:

Declarative:

```
Ong äy di mà tôi không di +FallInton.
    He went but I did not go.
[+IndepDeclClause] [+IndepDeclClause]
                    [+Coordinator]
```

Imperative:
Ông dựng di và ông dừng vè +RisFallinton.
You'd better not go and you'd better not return.
[+IndepImpClause] [+Coordinator] [+IndepImpClause]

Interrogative:


The Sentence Type does not present a learning problem as such, since it exists also in English. However, the student ought to be aware of the fact that Vietnamese uses it a great deal: instead of using pyramiding structures of Clauses within Clauses, the Vietnamese tend to prefer coordinated structures. Often times the same Nominative governs a lengthy series of predicative constructions:

| $\text { ông } \underset{H e}{ }$ | di went | lam to work | vè nhà returned home | thäy công-việc saw work | lam hét finished (it) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [+NM] | [+Pre |  | [+Pred.] | [+Pred.] | [+Pred.] |
| mới <br> then <br> [+Pre |  | allInt | n. |  |  |

Likewise, the Vietnamese tend to prefer the use of coordinating structures of the Compound Major Sentence Type to loosely express the different cause-effect, supposition-consequence, time-relativity, etc. The student of Vietnamese ought to be able to withdraw from larger linguistic or extra-linguistic context in order to correctly interpret the following sentence which may mean any of the following translations:

| Ông áy vè | tòi vè | returns |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| He | return. | Fallinton. |

[+IndepDeclClause][+IndepDeclClause]
If he goes home, I will go home.
When he goes home, I will go home.
Every time he goes home, I go home.
Because he is going home, I am going home.
Since he is going home, I am going home.
etc.

### 6.3. COMPLEX MAJOR SENTENCE

The Complex Major Sentence has the following identificational features and structure formula:
being a Major Sentence, it contains necessarily a complete Clause;
being a complex Sentence, it contains a structure of pyramiding Clauses within Clauses.

ComplexMajorSent [+IndepClause +DepClause +Inton]
A Complex Major Sentence is composed of at least an obligatory Independent Clause and an obligatory Dependent Clause, and an
obligatory Intonation pattern. Examples:
Declarative:

| Ong äy vè | khi tôi di |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| He returned | when I | went. |  |
| [+IndepDeclClause] |  |  |  |
| [+DepTIMEClause] |  |  |  |

## Imperative:



Interrogative:
Sao ông áy nói (răng) ông dau +RisInton.
Why did he say (that) you were sick?
[+IndepInterrclause] [+DepRelclause]

The Sentence Type does not present a learning problem per se because it has its counterpart in English. However, the use of the Dependent Nominative Clause in complex sentences is a production problem: whereas in English the Nominative must be present in the form of a relative pronoun, in Vietnamese, it does not have to be present:
*You'd better buy the material has many flowers.
The student ought to be able to omit the Nominative in his production of Vietnamese sentences such as the translation of the English sentence above (translation of the exemplified Imperative Sentence in Vietnamese above).

### 6.4. MINOR SENTENCES

The Minor Sentence does not contain a complete Clause. It may be a one-word response to a question, vocative sentence, or exclamative sentence. Examples:

Responses:
Da +FallInton.
Yes.
Khöng +FallInton.
No.
Đúng +FallInton. Correct.

Questions:
Ai +RisInton. Who?

## Cál gì +RisInton. What?

Vocatives:
Hai ơi +RisFallInton. Hai voc. word

Hai +RisFallInton. Hai!

Exclamatives:
Üa +RisInton.
Oh?
A +RisFallInton.
Ah!
The Sentence Type does not present a learning problem per se because it exists in English as well. However, there is a cross-cultural problem in the use of Minor Sentences in Vietnamese. In fact, these sentences could likely convey the unintentional connotation of impoliteness because of their shortness and abruptness when produced by a foreign learner. On the recognition level, the student must be able to realize that a short affirmative answer by a Vietnamese, such as "Da +Falling Intonation" "Yes." does not necessarily mean Yes. It may mean only that the Vietnamese interlocutor does not want to contradict his interlocutor, and hence, gives a monosyllabic affirmative answer.


## CHAPTER VII

## SENTENCE UNITS

The six Sentence Classes in Chapter V, and the four Sentence Types in Chapter VI form a bi-dimensional matrix giving twenty-four possibilities or Sentence Units of which twenty-one actually occur in the language. The total picture of Sentence Units in Vietnamese is presented in Chart IX below:

CHART IX: SENTENCE UNITS

| Sentence <br> Classes <br> Sentence Types |  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { H } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { H } \\ & \text { I } \\ & \text { H } \\ & H \end{aligned}$ |  | ¢ |
| 1 | Simple |  | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 2 | Compound | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 3 | Complex | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 4 | Minor | X | X |  | X |  |  |

In summary, on the Sentence Type dimension (cf. Chapter VI) the English speaking student will have to learn the particular use of the Compound Major Sentence Type, the Complex Major Sentence Type with Dependent Clauses having no Nominative, and the cross-cultural differences in the use of Minor Sentences in Vietnamese. On the Sentence Class dimension (cf. Chapter V) he will encounter learning difficulties in the Independent Imperative Sentence Class, the Independent Intonationally Interrogative Sentence Class, the Dependent Introducer

Sentence Class, and in the use of Tagmemically Dependent Sentences as short answers to questions.

## NOTES

1. Marybeth Clark, in Coverbs and Case in Vietnamese, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawaii, proposes the Locative case as the only case indicating orientation in space. It is realized by the L subcase-forms Location, Source, Goal, and Terminus, which are inherent features of prepositions. Such an analysis is probably more elegant than the one proposed here. However, for contrastive purposes, the adopted analysis seems to be preferable.
2. The Extent case is posited in this analysis. Example (25.1.) which appears on page 12 is presented below:

25.1. Ông áy di | he dượ hai giơ. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $[+\mathrm{NM}]$ | went | for |
|  | two hours |  |
| $[+\mathrm{OBJ}]$ |  | $[+\mathrm{EX}]$ |

However, được could be considered as a verb get, be able and not as a preposition as above. Thus, it would be the main verb of the sentence, and the Noun Phrase hai giơ would be the object of dượ while ông áy di would be a nominalized phrase and subject of the same verb. The structure of the example given above would then be:


The consideration of dược as a verb and meaning get, be able would also be applicable to the following examples:


It is supposed that both solutions are acceptable. The preference given to either solution will depend on the overall analysis of Vietnamese syntax.
3. An alternative analysis would be to consider phong as having an objective case relation with the verb. This would mean that there would not be a [+NM, +LOC] tagmemic slot. The Locative case relation would then be realized only as a Locative slot, i.e. [+L, +LOC]. However, the solution [ $+\mathrm{NM},+\mathrm{LOC}$ ] is preferred here because it seems to accommodate the following example more satisfactorily:
Trong phong này lanh.
inside room this cold
(This room
[+NM is cold.)
[+LOC]
4. The positing of this [+O, +TIM] slot is not a very good solution to the Time case relation because the $[+0]$ slot, when it contains other case relations than Time, occurs only after the verb if it is not topicalized, while the [ $+0,+T I M]$ can occur either at the very beginning or at the very end of a sentence. Perhaps a better solution would be to have another [+T, +TIM] tagmeme.
5. Note that phrases such as vơi toi with me are considered to be [ $+C,+C O M$ ] only when they follow a verb. If they are adjacent to the Nominative slot, they are considered as being a part (by coordination) of that slot. Thus:

| ông ảy | với <br> with | ${ }_{I}^{\text {toio }}$ | di. go |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( He | and |  | went |
| [+NM] |  | [+NM | ] |
| [+OBJ] |  | [+OBJ |  |

In the above example, với is, like va and, a conjunction of coordination. This distinction is necessary in order to explain the grammaticality or ungrammaticality of the following two examples:

*ông äy (dèu) lanh vơi tôi.
he equalzy cold with I
(He was together cold with me.)
6. The Instrumental case relation can also be realized by a topicalized Comitative case form in Vietnamese. Without being topicalized, a [+C +INS] tagmeme would not be considered grammatical by most Vietnamese:

7. One could also consider this to in English not as a preposition but as a complementizer which occurs before embedded verbs.
8. Carolyn P. Miller demonstrates "how the relationships between the relative clause in Vietnamese and certain constructions structurally ambiguous with it may be described in terms of their underlying or deep structure" (Miller 1966:l). After giving a transformational generative analysis of ambiguous dependent relative clauses in Vietnamese, Miller maintains that "a fluent speaker of Vietnamese is able to correctly disambiguate a sentence which is structurally ambiguous because he is able in terms of context to relate the sentence to the proper underlying construction. If he is not aware of the context of the sentence, he may fail to disambiguate the sentence, or he may relate it to the wrong underlying form" (Miller 1966:l). The foreign student of Vietnamese will have to be able to do the same for the comprehension part of his language acquisition.
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