

## The role of the verbs “to make” and “faire” in the expression of the notion of coercion

Leyla Yusifova

ANAS, Institute of Linguistics

[leylayusifova87@mail.ru](mailto:leylayusifova87@mail.ru)

DOI:10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n19p381

### Abstract

*The article deals with the role of the verbs "to make" and "faire" in the expression of the notion of coercion. Firstly, a brief explanation of the concept of coercion is presented from different aspects, the phenomenon of impact which forms a part of the structure of this conception, especially, is stressed. After this, the research of the verbs "to make" and "faire" which express namely this impact is presented. It is known that there are some research works about the verbs "to make" and "faire" which express the causality. In those research works just the analysis of some features of these linguistic units is presented, but the reasons of the expression of the process of impact by means of namely these linguistic units aren't explained. That is why in this article this point assumes particular importance, the reasons of the expression of this impact by means of namely "to make" and "faire" are investigated and explained on the grounds of the definite objective laws of language. In order to learning the reasons of the expression of impact by means of these linguistic units they are analysed and investigated like both lexical and functional units. In the research process it is clarified that the extensive semantic opportunities and the transitivity of these verbs allow them to function as a grammatical form which express impact categorically. As well, both of these linguistic units which belong to two different languages are analysed in comparative way, their similar and different features are determined.*

**Keywords:** make, faire, coercion, impact, causality

### Introduction

Coercion which is an integral part of the social communication is a wide, complex and abstract concept. The studying of the expression of this phenomenon that has the definite role to adjust the individual, social, legal and etc. relations among people in the society attains a great importance.

What is coercion? In the narrow meaning coercion is perceived as forcing someone to do something, or someone's feeling of obligation for fulfilling another's any desire, in the wide meaning coercion should be explained as the philosophical concept. Therefore, the concept of coercion can be explained by the several points of view. It is necessary to emphasize that by the different points of view the subjects and objects, the ways and means of coercion are different.

In the history of philosophy till the sophists, thus in the works of Aristotle coercion has been approached as the natural phenomenon (Аристотель, 2005). First time the sophists have explained the concept of coercion as the social phenomenon. Then the approach to the concept of coercion by the legal and philosophical points of view appears (Пучнин А.С., 1999). If as a philosophical category coercion is the act of forcing, but by the psychological point of view coercion is the external impacts which have been directed to the consciousness (will) and the act which has been done by the person who has been coerced (Каплунов А.И., 2004.). In this aspect the subject and object of coercion are individuals. In this case the subject and the object of coercion coincide, that is to say they become identical.

As well, coercion is a complex concept. Thus, this concept includes not only the subject and object, but at the same time the ways and means of coercion, the situation of impact, the predicate of coercion and etc.

And as well coercion is an abstract concept. Thus, the source of this concept is not the thing we can see by our eyes and the thing we can touch by our hands, but the process of impact which is done by one to another.

It is known that each concept finds its expression in less or more degree in language. We noted that coercion is the process of impact that is directed to the individual's consciousness. If there is process, so there is grammatical movement, or action. As is well known, in any language the principal signifier (indicator) of action, movement, or process is the verbs. So, this process of impact should be expressed by verbs and verbal categories.

### Method

The comparative and confrontative methods have been used in this research process.

### Materials

The study was conducted in the materials of English and French.

### Procedure

The study was approved by the department of Theoretical linguistics of Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences.

### Analyses and results

In this article the role of the verbs in the expression of the notion of coercion will be held a discussion. Do these verbs express the lexical meanings as "coerce", "compel", "force" and etc.? Otherwise, what is the role of these verbs in the expression of this notion? That is why, firstly, in our opinion, the lexico-semantic features of these verbs should be investigated. It should be noted that the French verb "faire" has the same meaning with the English verb "make". Both of the verbs have rich semantics and high frequency of use in the suitable languages. In the "English-Russian dictionary" of Muller V. and Boyanus S. the primary meanings of "make" are: "делать (to make); создавать (to create); производить, фабриковать (to produce); составлять (to compose); оказываться (to turn out); заставить (to compel); зарабатывать (to gain); готовить (to prepare) and etc (Мюллер В., Боянус С., 1999) In Oxford dictionary "make" is presented as a rich verb semantically, too. (Oxford dictionary) But in our opinion it is not enough to resort to the dictionaries in order to see the forms of manifestation of any lexical unit, generally any linguistic unit directly. For this it is also necessary to resort to the examples of language (speech). So let's see the contexts in which "make" has been used.

In the meaning of to create something: They made maps and named everything they saw. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

In the meaning of to prepare, to brew: Cathy made two cups of tea and took them into the bedroom. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

In the meaning of to produce: I bought him a pocketknife with three blades and a pearl handle, made in Germany. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

In the meaning of to gain, to obtain, to get: Other men took Samuel's ideas and made money from them, but he never did. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

Son, do you think I can make a profit on that? (John Steinbeck, 2001)

"To make" can also express the meaning of "to generate", "to beget": His breath made little high sounds. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

"To make" can be used with the abstract nouns such as "mistake", "joke", "attempt", "effort", "try", "plan", "decision". (John Steinbeck, 2001)

Catherine was clever, but she made one serious mistake. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

Doctor made his standard joke. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

Samuel made a few attempts. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

She made a great effort. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

Later in the year Adam made his great try, and it was a sensation in a year of sensations, both locally and internationally. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

Always she had been a good student, but now she began to make plans for the future. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

He made his decision. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

As seen, "to make" has been used in the different meanings in the same text. Although more examples came across us in the text, we didn't consider to present all of them. Because the purpose of the research is exploring the role of these linguistic units in the expression of the notion of coercion, but not the investigating the lexico-semantic features of these verbs. In order to elucidate the reasons of the expression of coercion by these linguistic units, we simply considered to investigate and present the lexico-semantic features of these verbs. It's possible to advance the same idea about the French "faire", too. Let's present the explanations which exist in the dictionary.

Donner l'être ou la forme (.), produire (to produce, to generate), fabriquer (to produce), opérer (to realise), exécuter (to execute, to fulfil), construire (to construct), façonner (to give a form)

Être cause de (be cause): l'argent ne fait pas le bonheur. (Money doesn't make happiness)

Se faire (to take place, to happen) (<http://dictionnaire.tv5.org/>)

In our opinion in order to see the contexts in which the verb “faire” can appear we should resort to the examples of the suitable language (speech). Thus, let’s see the examples.

In the meaning of to produce, to create, to prepare:

Ils étaient faits d’une soie antique d’un bleu foncé qu’étoilaient par places de grandes fleurs de lis brodées d’or. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (They were made (produced of the ancient dark blue silk which was sparkling by the big lily flowers embroidered with gold.)

In the meaning of to be, to happen, took place:

Je ne sais comment cela s’est fait... (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (I don’t know how it has happened)

In the meaning of to become, to turn:

M’est avis que ça ferait un joli couple tout de même. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (To my mind, it would make (become) a cute couple anyway.)

The verb “faire” can also be used with the abstract nouns such as “erreur” (error), “blague” (joke), “effort” (effort), “essai” (test) and so on.

Le baron, de son côté, méditait de grandes entreprises agricoles ; il voulait faire des essais.... (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (Baron, meanwhile, was meditating large agricultural enterprises; he wanted to test ...)

It is used in order to show the the state of weather:

Il fera beau dans l’après-midi. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (It will be cool in the afternoon, or the weather will be good in the afternoon.)

It becomes clear from the examples we have presented that both verbs are the polisemantic verbs which can be used in different contexts. And it is also clear from the examples that the contexts in which the verb “faire” has been used are almost identical, or the same with the contexts in which the verbs “make” has been used. Observing and analysing the contexts in which these verbs have been used, we come to the result that although both of the verbs can be used in different contexts in the suitable languages, there is a common feature (side)-common semantics that generalize all of them. Analysing the contexts in which both of these verbs have been used, it is possible to come to such a result that these verbs have the meaning of creating, generating, producing something. That is to say, the common meaning that combines these meanings is to create something. Our principal purpose is to learn the role of these linguistic units in the expression of coercion. But on this way, investigating the lexico-semantic features of these verbs was our first step. It became clear that these linguistic units don’t express the coercion as the lexical units. That is to say, “make” and “faire” don’t have the lexical meaning of “coerce”, “force”, “compel” and etc. But then what is the role of these linguistic units in the expression of coercion? Such a question arises: Can these linguistic units be the indicators of any grammatical category in language? Can these linguistic units be the grammatical form which expresses any grammatical meaning? If this is so, why namely these linguistic units?

In fact, “to make” and “faire” aren’t only the lexical units that express creating something in the suitable languages, but the form that aims to grammatical expression of causality. Causality (causation) is the expression of the relation of cause-result. In Latin *causare* express cause. When it is said causality, or causation, it doesn’t mean the situation, or event that causes, or brings about, it means exactly the relation of cause-result. The linguistic units which have been talked about convey namely this relation-the relation of cause-result, or cause-effect grammatically (Silnitsky and Nedyalkov-causation). It’s possible to research the expression of this relation by the way of analysing the causative situations. At this point, the nature of causative situations should be clarify. What is causative situation?

Nedyalkov V.P. and Silnitsky G.G. note that “reality can be presented as the mass of events and situations. There are the simple situations. They can be called the microsituations... There are the complex situations besides the simple situations. They can be called the macrosituations. (Недялков В.П., Сильницкий Г.Г., 1969) The authors call a type of macrosituations as causative (causative situation-L.Y.) They note that “CS (causative situation-L.Y.) consists of at least two microsituations whose parts are connected with each other by the relation of causation. (Недялков В.П., Сильницкий Г.Г., 1969)

The same authors note that “the microsituation of cause is the antecedent of CS, the microsituation of result, or effect is the consequent. They determine at least five constants in the causative macrosituation. The relation of causation is marked

as k and this constant is noted as the definable constant of causative macrosituation by the authors. They note that besides this constant CS has the four constants. They are: agens, the subject of the antecedent of CS (ri), the case that causes (si), patients, the subject of the consequent of CS (rj), the result (sj) (Недялков В.П., Сильницкий Г.Г., 1969).

So, the principal constant of causative situation is k, the relation of cause. This is called causation, too. It is impossible to debate the existence of causative situation without this constant. In different languages, even in a language this constant can be expressed by the different linguistic means and not only in the same level, but also in some levels. The purpose of the research isn't determining the ways of expression of causality, or the relation of cause in language. That is why we don't need to give a broad explanation about this. At this moment of the research the purpose is to determine the role of "make" and "faire" in the expression of k (causation), which is the definable constant of causative situation. We had noted that the expression of this constant is possible in some levels. But in which levels of language do these linguistic units express this notion? It is known that there are the words which have the lexical meaning of to cause in languages, so they express the causation in the lexical, lexico-syntactic levels. "To make" and "faire" set up the expression of this relation in the suitable languages. That is why firstly we should elucidate that these verbs have the lexical meaning of to cause, or not? Once more we think to resort the explanatory dictionaries of the suitable languages and then to continue the research on the base of the materials of language (speech). In the explanatory dictionaries of both languages we observe the explanations of these linguistic units as to be the cause of something.

To make-Cause (something) to exist or come about; bring about (<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/>)

Faire- Être cause de (to be the cause of): l'argent ne fait pas le bonheur. (Money doesn't make happiness.)(<http://dictionnaire.tv5.org/>)

As we know, in the explanatory dictionaries either the lexical meanings of the words are presented, or the contexts in which the words can be used are explained. In our opinion, these verbs don't have the lexical meaning of to cause, although they have this meaning in the dictionaries. But to our mind these verbs express the meaning of to cause indirectly in definite context. Thus, the semantics of the verbs "make" and "faire" includes this meaning. Then what is the reason of this? We investigated and presented the lexico-semantic features of these verbs and came to a result that these verbs have a common meaning that is to create, to generate, to produce something. If we create, or, generate something, we cause the same thing to exist. In this terms there is the meaning of to cause in the nature of these verbs. Let's explain our mind on the base of the examples.

His breath made little high sounds. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

L'argent ne fait pas le bonheur. (<http://dictionnaire.tv5.org/>) (Money doesn't make happiness.)

In the both examples, as we have seen, the verbs we talked about don't express the lexical meaning of to cause. But they convey the causing indirectly. Thus, if his breath has made sounds, then he has caused the sounds to happen. Or, if money doesn't make happiness, so, the cause, or reason of happiness isn't money, that is to say, money isn't the reason of happiness. Therefore, these verbs can express the meaning of to cause with depending on the context, although they don't have the lexical meaning of to cause.

In our opinion any grammatical form doesn't appear suddenly for expressing any grammatical meaning. The progression always begins from the lexical unit, that is to say, from word to affix, or to other grammatical form and etc. The progression of these linguistic units has also continued in this way. Both verbs are transitive. Generally, the transitivity is very strong in these verbs. If there is impact, then there is the reason, or cause for changing. It isn't a coincidence that these verbs express to create the change of the state, or mood and therefore, they express to cause the one's mood, or state to change indirectly. For example,

I can't drink it. It makes me sick. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

Love and fear made him cruel. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

She was not afraid of him, but he made her uncomfortable. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

Homme de théorie, il méditait tout un plan d'éducation pour sa fille, voulant la faire heureuse, bonne, droite et tendre. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (Man of theory, he meditating a good education plan for her daughter, wanting to make her happy, good, right and tender.)

Or, un soir, son père lui dit : « Fais-toi belle, demain matin. » (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (One evening her father told her: "Make yourself beautiful tomorrow morning.")

It is clear from the examples which belong to English and French that “make” and “faire” express to put the object of impact from one case to another. Analysing these examples it is possible to come to such a result : These linguistic units are the lexical units. They are transitive. It is known that for the causing the impact is important, necessary. Besides that there is activity in the meaning of these verbs. Thus, they convey the meaning of to create something. The polysemy, active meaning and transitivity of “make” and “faire” has allowed them to develop to the grammatical form that express causation. In the examples we have presented till now these linguistic units are the lexical units. But now we will approach them as the grammatical form that express causation. We had noted that there should be the impact for the causation, because causation can't happen without impact. “To make” and “faire” have strong transitivity, that is why they can be used as the grammatical form that expresses the relation of cause. Let's see the examples.

Her small, heart-shaped face and her wide-apart blue eyes made her look innocent.

si ri si ri k rj sj

She made it sound like a lie. 21 (John Steinbeck, 2001)

ri k rj sj

It made him shiver... 35 (John Steinbeck, 2001)

ri k rj sj

...elle avait lu Corinne qui l'avait fait pleurer... (Guy de Maupassant, 1883)

ri rj k

sj

(She had read the Corinne which had made him cry.)

Une force inconnue faisait se rencontrer leurs yeux qu'ils levaient au même moment

ri

k sj

rj

comme si une affinité les eût avertis. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883)(An unknown force (strength)were making their eyes they have raised at the same moment meet, as if an affinity were warning them.)

L'astre dardait ses flammes, faisait fondre cette nuée brillante. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883)

ri k sj rj

(The star was shining, was making this brillante could melt.)

La clarté sereine de cette matinée faisait s'éveiller comme un écho dans leurs coeurs.

ri k sj rj

(Bu səhərin səssiz aydınlığı onların ürəklərində sanki bir əks-səda oyandırırdı. The serene clarity of this morning was waking an echo in their hearts.) (Guy de Maupassant, 1883)

In this examples which belong to the English and French k (causation) has been expressed accordingly by “make” and “faire”. In our opinion It will be easier to start to explain from the result for understanding. In these causative situations we can note that in the first situation her innocent look, in the second it sounds like lie, in the third her shivering, in the fourth her crying, in the fifth the collision of their eyes, in the sixth the melting of the cloud, in the seventh the waking of an echo in their hearts as a result [rjsj]. Naturally, there is result, so, there has been the reason, or the situation of cause. [risi] indicates the situation of cause. The relation of the cause ( causation) has been expressed by the linguistic units which have been signed k. These linguistic units are “make” and “faire”. Thus, “make” and “faire” function as the grammatical forms that express the causation in these examples. They don't have the lexical meaning in these positions. Because these linguistic units don't express the causation as the lexical units. They express the causation, or causality by the grammatical way. If we take them from these examples, then only the situation of result will be expressed, but not the cause, or the situation of cause. For example, in the first as a result she looks innocent. The reason of this is her eyes, her face. The causation has been expressed by made. In the fourth situation she has cried. This is a result. The cause is Corinne (novel). The causation has been expressed by faire. That is to say only the result can be expressed without make and faire, but not the causation. Why? Because the impact is essential in this situation. A situation can't provoke another situation without the phenomena of impact. In the examples the verbs to look, to sound, to shiver, pleurer (to cry), se rencontrer (to meet),

fondre (here to melt), s'éveiller (to wake up) that express the result are the transitive verbs. That is why these verbs can't express the causation. To make and faire are the polysemantic transitive verbs which have the high frequency use in the suitable languages. Thus, the impact is expressed by means of these linguistic units. Namely lexico-semantic features and transitivity of these linguistic units have allowed them to develop into the grammatical forms that set up the expression of transitivity grammatically. Although this form has been generated from the lexical units, when it expresses causality, it isn't a lexical unit, it functions as the grammatical forms that expresses causation. But how do these linguistic units express the coercion?

It becomes clear from the information of the nature of the notion that coercion is the act which has been directed against the individual's will. It is possible to come to such a result that coercion is connected with the impact that directs into the individual's consciousness (will). Thus, in this situation impact is the principal phenomena. It's meaningless to talk about the existence of coercion without impact. If coercion is connected with impact that is directed into the consciousness, then in spite of the aspects of approaching the objects of coercion are conscious beings, that is to say, humans. Why do namely these linguistic units express this impact? The reason is the lexico-semantic features and transitivity of the lexical units of the same name. We should note that in the macrosituations which have been presented above there is the expression of a process of impact that it's the relation of cause. But in the situation of result there isn't the expression of impact. It isn't a coincidence that in the situation of result the action has been expressed by means of the intransitive verbs (Fondre is both transitive and intransitive.). But in the macrosituation in which the coercion exist we can see the expression of two successive processes of impact unlike the previous situations. The primary impact is directed to consciousness. It is expressed by means of "make" and "faire". But the second process of impact is the process which has been executed in the situation of result. It's not a coincidence that last process, or action is expressed by means of the transitive verbs. Because in the situation of result the impact of the object of coercion to any object against his desire, but according to the desire of the subject of coercion. When this process of impact which has been done by the object of coercion is directed into itself, but not into other object, the verbs can be intransitive in the situation of result. Let's see the examples.

He made them do exercises and march for miles carrying bags full of stones on their backs. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

"You'll make me cry-don't make me cry," said Faye. (John Steinbeck, 2001)

I'll make you beg to get in here! (John Steinbeck, 2001)

But something made him decide to turn off Walton Street and drive slowly towards the canal. (Colin Dexter, 1991)

On his death bed he had made his wife, aunt Reed, promise to look after me like her own children. (Charlotte Bronte, 1990)

Je l'ai vendue pour faire réparer les Peuples où nous habiterons souvent désormais. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (I sold it for repairing Peoples where we will live henceforth.)

Parfois l'engourdissement d'une position prolongée lui faisait rouvrir les yeux. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (Sometimes permanent numbness of position was making her reopen her eyes.)

Ils venaient souvent me faire réparer des meubles anciens, parce que je suis habile dans le métier. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (They were often coming to me for repairing the ancient furniture, because I am skilled in this art.)

J'ai essayé de me faire battre par lui. Il n'a pas voulu. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883)

(I essayed to make me beat by him. But he didn't want)

Son mari, à tout moment, se plaignait des privations qu'elle lui faisait endurer. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883)

(Her husband was always complaining of the deprivations she made him endure.)

In English examples the action that has happened, or will happen as a result has been expressed by means of the verbs do exercises, march, beg, decide, drive, promise, but in French examples by means of the verbs réparer, rouvrir, réparer, battre, endurer. As we have seen from the examples the process of impact which has happened for the execution of the action which has been expressed by these verbs has been expressed by the finite and infinitive forms of the auxiliary verbs "make" and "faire". In these examples the expression of the notion of coercion is observed. The next question is: In which levels of language do these linguistic units express the notion of coercion?

Bessalov A.Y. divides the causatives as two groups and ascribes "make" and "faire" into the assistant causatives. The principle is that the causative verbs express the main constant in pure form, or combining another. (Бессалов А.Ю., 2010) Pauli Salo calls the construction which is signed the causative word like make as analytical causative. But he ascribes the

linguistic units which have the lexical meanings as help, cause and so on in the same position, too. (Pauli Salo, 2003) But to our mind these shouldn't ascribe to the same group. Because we don't consider "make" and "faire" as the lexical units in this position. In our opinion, these linguistic units are characterized as a morphem. To cause, to help and others like these are always lexical units in that position, too. Kulikov L. notes that "for instance, English make + INF, German lassen + INF, French faire + INF constructions are syntactic causatives, while English cause to + INF, German zwingen zu + INF, Russian zastavljat' + INF are not. There are a number of syntactic and morphological criteria and features for distinguishing syntactic causatives (monoclausal CCs) from non-fused biclausal CCs; (where biclausal CCs are called 'periphrastic causatives' as opposed to 'same predicate' causatives) and the extensive literature on the clause union features. Thus, verbs like German lassen or French faire in syntactic causatives lack many typical features of independent (non-auxiliary) verbs; in particular, they cannot have their own arguments, and they typically do not passivize (cf. (4 d)), etc.: (Kulikov L.I., 2001) Indeed, although these forms passivize, change in accordance with time, person, but they don't change as a lexical unit. In fact the changing happens to the action which occurred in the result. Pauli Salo writes about faire: One problem concerns the status of faire: why does it appear as a separate morpheme? Why can certain adverbs appear between faire and V? Why is it the faire that is inflected for tense and person, and not V that is infinite? Basically, I will adopt the hypothesis proposed by Aissen according to which faire is to be categorized as an auxiliary. Taking only some of the relevant evidence at this point, let us consider the perplexing feature of the Romance faire causative that certain quantifiers are allowed to appear between the causative faire and the infinite verb. One such quantifier is tout, 'everything,' as illustrated below:

il fera tout sauter

'He'll make everything blow up.'

Assuming that faire is auxiliary, we might expect the same to be true of English grammatical participles. This is indeed so, as shown in (a-c) below.

- a. they had gone home
- b. they had all gone home
- c. they all had gone home

What we see here is that the auxiliaries indeed behave similarly with respect to faire causatives. Crucially, some adverbs may occur between faire and the infinitive in French, but this is also true of auxiliaries and main verbs, as in il est certainement parti, 'He has certainly left,' in which the adverb certainly intervenes between the auxiliary est and left. The same is true of the negative particle pas... Finally, it is the faire causative which inflects for tense and person, exactly as auxiliaries do. Thus, there is evidence that faire is comparable to an auxiliary, although now it must be admitted that no theory of auxiliaries has been presented in this study. I will return to this matter in Chapter 6.4, in which I claim that most auxiliaries are Last Resort options for providing hosts for inflectional features. In the chapter 6.4 the author again touches upon this problem: "For instance, I have suggested that the argument structures of Romance faire causatives behave as if they correspond to a single predicate at the lexico-logical form, given the fact that there are some well-known complications concerning the distribution of certain grammatical participles: for example, the verbal complex faire + V seems to consist of two fused verbs. However, this can be explained if we assume that faire is a particle created as a 'last resort,' comparable to auxiliaries.

Grammatical particles like copulae are created when a constituent itself cannot inflect for a strong feature. In faire + V causatives, it is the causative particle faire which, like other grammatical extensions, inflects for tense, number and gender. The predicate itself appears in an infinite form, which is some kind of verbal form not inflected for tense. Thus we may speculate whether, for some reason, the predicate inflects for a strong feature, say increased adicity at the lexico-logical form, and the morphological component assumes a grammatical participle, in this case faire, in order to realise the required strong inflections. It is this participle that inflects for tense as well. This hypothesis, with its relevant visible structure, is illustrated below:

- a. on a [ ( fait sortir ) Jean de sa chambre ]
- b. elle a [ fait ( faire sauter ) le pont µa son <sup>-</sup>ls ]

The verb has undergone an extension" in terms of the grammatical participle faire that ought to take all inflections: it is then not present at the LLF level. Indeed, this is just the case. In example (b), this process has been applied twice: the sentence means 'She had her son make the bridge blow up.' If this hypothesis is correct, then the faire participle is to be categorized as an 'auxiliary verb,' comparable to grammatical participles such as perfective auxiliary have. Note, however, that the faire

participle is not a syntactic head, nor does it have its own projection at the LLF level - indeed, there is no such constituent at LLF. It is expected that the infinitive verb and the faire participle form a highly integrated or 'fused constituent' in syntactic terms. This is indeed what happens in the case of Romance faire causatives. How integrated the hosts and their auxiliaries are depends on Morphology: they are not totally integrated since some elements can intervene (Pauli Salo, 2003). The author has talked about faire and has explained this linguistic unit as an auxiliary in the expression of causation. He has approached to this linguistic unit as a grammatical form, not a lexical unit. We also support this opinion. Ascribing the last opinion to English make we can say that both linguistic units are the grammatical forms when they express the causality, as well as, the notion of coercion. In that position they are characterized as the morphemes. The languages are inflected, that is why those forms have been integrated with the predicates and depending on just their morphological structures they haven't been integrated completely. Thus, both linguistic units are the grammatical forms that express the categorial meaning in that position.

What is the common feature of these linguistic units which belong to English and French? Both verbs are the polysemantic verbs which are used in the suitable languages and have the same lexical meaning. Both verbs have been developed from the lexical unit to the grammatical form. In this progress there is the role of the lexico-semantic features of these verbs. Both linguistic units are the grammatical forms that express the causality in the suitable languages. And thereby, both linguistic units express the notion of coercion more or less degree.

In the result of the research it becomes clear that these grammatical forms we have analysed and investigated in comparative way are distinguished (differ) from each other by the definite features. Firstly, it's necessary to note that these linguistic units belong to two different languages. In the result of the research it becomes clear that these linguistic units have many common features by the lexico-semantic and functional sides. But from the functional point, from the point of the attitude of these forms to predicate and from the point of the expressing coercion some different features are revealed. What are those different features? The mean of expression of the object of impact which is expressed by means of these linguistic units is situated (stands) between make and the verb which express the result in English. Let's see this sentence.

"I'll make you beg to get in here!" (John Steinbeck, 2001)

Here the pronoun you which expresses the object of impact stands between make which expresses the impact and the verb beg which expresses the action that will be occur in the result of that impact. But faire stands near the verb which expresses the action that occurs in the result of impact. The word which expresses the object of impact never stands between them. For example, in the sentence of "J'ai essayé de me faire battre par lui" faire and battre (beat) have been used side by side. In the linguistic literatures we meet such an idea that "the French verb faire displays a stronger causal link than its English counterpart make, since the predicates of cause and result are less remote with faire than with make." (Sami Chatti, 2012) But we don't accept this opinion. Thus, let's see the use of the utterances which express causality both in English and in French.

The judge made him tell the truth.

Le juge lui a fait dire la vérité.

As we have seen, in both sentences the causation (the relation of cause-effect) has been expressed in the same degree. But the structural difference comes from the progression of morphological structures of the languages.

But these linguistic units don't express the notion of coercion in the same degree. In the result of the research it becomes clear that faire expresses causality more commonly than make. Thus, make has been specialized for expressing namely coercion in English. But faire is suitable for all causal relations in French.

Ils venaient souvent me faire réparer des meubles anciens, parce que je suis habile dans le métier. (Guy de Maupassant, 1883) (They were often coming to me for repairing the ancient furniture, because I am skilled in this art.)

Here faire expresses causality adjoining the verb réparer (repair). The pronoun me is the person who does any work which is consigned to himself, that is to say, the object of the impact which has been expressed. That person repairs the furniture they have brought. But there isn't any coercion. It is true that the reason of his repairing furniture has been the desire of others. But it hasn't happened by means of coercion. Repairing furniture is his job. Thus, he is responsible for this work. In English in this position the auxiliary verbs to have, to get are used. But make expresses mainly the causality which occurs by coercion, incitement. As a result, we should note that faire expresses the causality more commonly in French, but make is used for expressing the causality which occurs by namely coercion.

There is an interesting point else. It is related to the thought we have emphasized before this. Although we have met the use independently of make, but we can't say it about faire. Let's present the English examples.

"...You told me once you wanted to work. You're going to work."

"I don't want to!" she cried. "You can't make me. I'll call the police!" (John Steinbeck, 2001)

As we have seen, make and work haven't been used in the same sentence. So, make has been used independently. Let's see an example else.

"Well, it's too late. I didn't want to drink the wine. But you, you nasty fat worm, you made me." (John Steinbeck, 2001)

In this sentence the case is the same. In our opinion it doesn't need a supplementary explanation. But in French we didn't meet such a case.

Such a question appears: has the ability of expressing causality by means of coercion allowed this linguistic unit to be used independently, or has the ability of being used independently allowed this unit to develop into the grammatical form which can express the causality having the lexical meaning of coerce, compel? All thoughts we have told and the facts of language prove that the first idea seems reasonable. So, make have developed in this way : make has been a polysemantic transitive verb, then the lexico-semantic features and transitivity of this verb have allowed it to develop into the grammatical form (auxiliary verb) which expresses impact and namely the lexical origin have stimulated it to specialise as the grammatical form which expresses causality and thereby it has been used as an independent verb that expresses the lexical meaning of to coerce. In our opinion, initially, this verb hasn't had the lexical meaning of to coerce.

## Conclusion

As a conclusion, we should say that in the beginning both linguistic units have been the lexical units, rich semantics and strong transitivity have allowed them to develop into the grammatical form that expresses impact. The expression of impact by means of namely these linguistic units wouldn't appear simply, or causelessly. Because in any language the appearance of any grammatical form itself happens on the basis of the definite conformity.

## References

- Аристотель , 2005, "Евдемова этика", Москва  
Бессалов А.Ю., 2010. – № 6, "Каузативные глаголы как средство выражения причинно-следственных отношений в английском и французском языках", // Вестник МГОУ. Сер.: Лингвистика. – М.: Изд-во МГОУ  
Каплунов А.И., 2004. – №12, "Об основных чертах и понятии государственного принуждения". Государство и право.  
Kulikov L.I., 2001, "Causatives", Language typology and language universals, Volume 2/2, Berlin  
Мюллер В., Боянус С., 1999, "Англо-русский словарь", Москва, Локид,  
Недялков В.П., Сильницкий Г.Г., 1969, "Типология каузативных конструкций. Морфологический каузатив", Л.,  
Pauli Salo, 2003, "Causatives and the empty lexicon: a minimalist perspective", Helsinki  
Пучнин А.С., 1999, "Принуждение и право". Дисс...кандлор.наук- - Тамбов,  
Sami Chatti, 2012, Vol. 4, No. 3, "Categorization of causation: Directness or animacy?", International Journal of Linguistics  
<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/>  
<http://dictionnaire.tv5.org/>

## Fiction

- Charlotte Bronte, 1990, "Jane Eyre", Oxford University Press  
Colin Dexter, 1991, "The dead of Jerico", Oxford University Press  
Guy de Maupassant, 1883, Une vie (roman), [http://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Une\\_vie](http://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Une_vie)  
John Steinbeck, 2001, "East of Eden", Penguin readers,