

*SHE WILL MAKE A GOOD WIFE: ON A CERTAIN USE OF MAKE**

Yukiko Kazumi

0. Introduction

The word *make*, one of the most common verbs in English, has a usage illustrated in (1):

(1) Jane will make a good wife.

Here *make* seems to have a very close meaning to that of intransitive verbs such as *be* or *become*. This is in clear contrast to the use of *make* in the following sentence:

(2) Jane will make a new shirt.

The *make* in (2) has a meaning similar to that of *produce* and is recognized as a transitive verb.

Moreover, these sentences differ in passivizability:

(3) *A good wife will be made by Jane.

(4) A new shirt will be made by Jane.

This difference, coupled with the difference in meaning, forms the very reason why such an NP as *a good wife* in (1) has been treated as a predicative NP, not as an object NP, in a number of studies (cf. Curme (1931); Jespersen (1927);¹ Scheurweghs (1959)).²

However, we often observe sentences in which two NP's follow the verb, such as (5):

(5) Jane will make him a good wife.

This sentence can be roughly paraphrased as 'Jane will make a

good wife for him.' The sentence includes two non-subject NP's, i.e., *him* and *a good wife*. Note that there is no predicational relation between the two NP's. In this respect, the example in (5) is similar to the following 'double object' transitive sentence:

(6) Jane will make him a new shirt.

In (6), as in (2), *make* is used as a typical transitive verb, which subcategorizes indirect and direct objects. In order to relate the sentence in (5) to that in (1), one may consider *him* to be an adjunct. In fact, it might be possible to analyze *a good wife* as a predicative NP, keeping *him* in the status of adjunct. In this analysis, however, the similarity observed between (5) and (6) is considered to be merely a disguise.

Notice, however, the dative *him* in (5) can be recognized as a 'dative of interest' as well as *him* in (6). We assume, following Jespersen (1927:285), that 'dative of interest' is a kind of indirect object, 'the affective (or emotional) indirect object'. Given this assumption, we can analyze *him* in (5) as an indirect object, and thus, the following *good wife* as a direct object.³ In this paper, we will refer to *a good wife* in (1) also as object so as to relate the use of *make* directly to the use in (5). Here and henceforth, the two uses of *make* in (1), (5) and (2), (6) will be referred to as B('become')-*make* and P('produce')-*make* respectively.

This study is an attempt to elucidate the nature of the use of *make* given in (1) and (5) as contrasted with that in (2) and (6). Specifically, we will propose that the two uses of *make* share the same abstract notion PRODUCE, which we consider the core meaning of the verb *make*. Under this notion, these uses are conceptually related in that they are two versions of PRODUCE. On the basis of the analysis, we will provide a natural account for peculiarities of B-*make*.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 1 points out

a peculiarity in the referent of direct objects of B-*make*. Section 2 presents an analysis which associates B-*make* with P-*make*. Specifically, it is argued that the notion of PRODUCE is shared by the two uses of *make*. Furthermore, the notions of 'external-PRODUCE' and 'internal-PRODUCE' are introduced. Section 3 deals with a difference in passivizability observed between B-*make* and P-*make*. It is shown that the analysis presented in Section 2 enables us to explain the difference. Section 4 points out that adjectives must appear with direct objects of B-*make* and shows that the fact can also be explained by our analysis. Section 5 gives some concluding remarks.

1. A Peculiarity of B-*Make*: Referents of Direct Objects

This section presents two relevant uses of *make*, i.e., B-*make* and P-*make*, pointing out a crucial difference observed between them.⁴

In the first place, compare the pair of sentences given above in (1) and (2), repeated here as (7) and (8):

(7) Jane will *make* a good wife.

(8) Jane will *make* a new shirt.

The two sentences differ only in the object NP. In fact, there is a crucial difference between the referents of these NP's. In (7), on the one hand, the referent of *a good wife* can be identified with that of *Jane*; in (8), on the other hand, the referent of *a new shirt* can never be identified with that of *Jane*.

Next, let us turn to the examples given above in (5) and (6), repeated as (9) and (10):

(9) Jane will *make* him a good wife.

(10) Jane will *make* him a new shirt.

As stated above, these sentences are similar on the surface: their difference is found only in the last NP. Again, the same difference exists, as is observed between (7) and (8). That is, in (9) *Jane* and *a good wife* share the same referent, while in (10) the referent of *Jane* is naturally distinct from that of *a new shirt*. Note that the sentences in (9) and (10) can be paraphrased into (11) and (12) respectively:

- (11) Jane will ~~make~~ a good wife for him.
 (12) Jane will ~~make~~ a new shirt for him.

Needless to say, the pair maintains the same difference pointed out above.

Here we find the following B-~~make~~ sentence:

- (13) John ~~made~~ his student a good teacher.

Interestingly, the sentence is ambiguous: (i) John ~~made~~ a good teacher and (ii) John's student ~~became~~ a good teacher. When the sentence has the latter reading, that is, *his student* and *a good teacher* are in a predicational relation, the ~~make~~ is being used as a causative verb. When it has the former meaning, the ~~make~~ is considered to be B-~~make~~. In this case, the same referent is shared by *John* and *a good teacher*. The B-~~make~~ version of (13) can be roughly paraphrased into (14):

- (14) John ~~made~~ a good teacher for his student.

This sentence also shows a correferentiality between subject and object:

In the observation made above, we have pointed out a crucial difference with respect to referents between direct objects of B-~~make~~ and P-~~make~~: the former is identified with the referent of the subject, while the latter evidently has a specific referent separate from that of the subject.

2. An Analysis

We have seen that the two uses of *make*, namely, B-*make* and P-*make*, show a clear difference in referentiality. In this section, we propose that the two uses of *make* is conceptually related in that they share the same abstract notion of PRODUCE, and argue that the contrast between them follows from the difference between two versions of PRODUCE: internal-PRODUCE and external-PRODUCE.

Before proposing our analysis, let us examine the meaning of B-*make* sentences more closely. In the first place, consider the meaning of the sentence *Jane will make a good wife*. It is a common view that this sentence differs from the sentence *Jane will become a good wife* in the following respect: the former implies that *Jane* already has the qualities of a good wife. Given this, the meaning of the sentence *Jane will make a good wife* can be as follows:

- (15) *Jane will fulfil the role of a good wife drawing out her qualities of a good wife.*

The important points of (15) are (i) the referent of the subject NP has the qualities of a good wife and (ii) the qualities enable the referent to fulfil the role of a good wife. Here we can say that an abstract notion of PRODUCE is involved in the use of *make* as well as P-*make*. That is, in the sentence, *Jane does PRODUCE a good wife* gathering her qualities of a good wife. It seems that the idea of defining *make* in terms of the notion PRODUCE is quite plausible. In fact, Cattell (1984:245) states, "... *make* means something like 'do the actions to produce', and the noun phrase that follows *make* simply fills in what is produced". Although his study is mainly concerned with composite predicates such as *give a kiss*, *have a bath*, and *make a dash*, his idea that the notion of producing is the core meaning of the verb *make* seems quite natural and convincing. Hence it can be argued that the

two uses of *make* are defined in terms of PRODUCE.

We may consider now that both P-*make* and B-*make* have the same 'PRODUCE X' schema (here, 'X' denotes 'end-product'). If this is correct, we are able to attribute differences between the two uses of *make* to the difference of 'X'. That is, when 'X' is a concrete entity separable from the 'producer', 'PRODUCE X' is interpreted as P-*make*, while when 'X' is an abstract entity identified with the 'producer', 'PRODUCE X' is interpreted as B-*make*.

Now we are in a position to present our analysis of the two different uses of *make*. As stated above, B-*make* describes a version of PRODUCE in which the 'end-product' cannot be a concrete entity. Let us call it 'internal-PRODUCE' since the act of producing is done inside of the 'producer'. Here, in order to *make* the contrast explicit, we refer to action described by P-*make* as 'external-PRODUCE'. These can be stated as follows:

(16) *External-PRODUCE*:

to PRODUCE an object completely separable from the 'producer'.

(17) *Internal-PRODUCE*:

to PRODUCE a thing inside the 'producer' drawing out potential abilities.

Both external-PRODUCE and internal-PRODUCE can be thought of as notions derived from the abstract PRODUCE. External-PRODUCE, on the one hand, is visible in that it produces a concrete object outside of the 'producer'. Internal-PRODUCE, on the other hand, is invisible since it is done inside the 'producer' and the 'end-product' cannot be separated from the 'producer'.

The present analysis which associates B-*make* with internal-PRODUCE can be supported by the following observation made by Cattell (1984:255) with respect to the use referred to here as B-*make*: 'there is an 'inalienable' relationship

between subject and direct object''. The following contrast pointed out by Cattell (ibid.) also seems to show the 'inalienable' relationship:

- (18) *Beryl made a lovely bride, and here is the lovely bride that she made.
 (19) Peter made a box, and here is the box that he made.

(18) reveals that the object of B-*make* cannot be a distinct entity in contrast to the object of P-*make*.

If we associate B-*make* with internal-PRODUCE, the fact that the object of B-*make* cannot have a referent independent of that of the subject is a purely natural result. Since the 'end-product' of internal-PRODUCE is inside of the 'producer', the object of B-*make* cannot have a distinct referent. This is in contrast to the case of P-*make*, where *make* represents external-PRODUCE whose 'end-product' is outside of the 'producer'. In this case, the object has an independent referent.

In addition, there is a crucial difference between the two versions of PRODUCE: as for internal-PRODUCE, it seems that the 'producer' cannot be intentional. Compare the following:

- (20) I will make a good wife.
 (21) I will {be/become} a good wife.

The sentence (20) is acceptable only when the speaker judges herself fit to be a good wife. This is in contrast to the fact that both versions of (21) are acceptable when the speaker has the will to become a good wife.

Next, consider the following contrast:

- (22) a. *Tom forced Jane to make a good wife.
 b. *Tom persuaded Jane to make a good wife.

- (23) a. Tom forced Jane to make a new shirt.
 b. Tom persuaded Jane to make a new shirt.

The fact that the examples in (22) are unacceptable shows that B-make is incompatible with stimuli or pressure of the outside world. This supports our analysis which equates B-make with internal-PRODUCE, which can be considered to be a purely internal act.

Moreover, the following contrast shows that internal-PRODUCE is not visible to person(s) other than the subject.

- (24) a. *Jane deliberately made a good wife.
 b. *Jane carefully made a good wife.
 (25) a. Jane deliberately made a new shirt.
 b. Jane carefully made a new shirt.

(24) is unacceptable because of the adverbs *deliberately* and *carefully*, which describe the way of producing.

In this section, we have related the two uses of *make* under the abstract notion PRODUCE. In the following sections, we will show that our analysis enables us to explain peculiarities of B-make.

3. Difference in Passivizability

3.1. The Facts

As briefly mentioned in Section 1, a clear contrast is observed between B-make and P-make in passivizability. First, observe the following examples:

- (26) a. Jane will make a good wife.
 b. *A good wife will be made by Jane.
 (27) a. Jane will make a new shirt.
 b. A new shirt will be made by Jane.

- (28) a. Jane will make a good wife for him.
 b. *A good wife will be made for him by Jane.
- (29) a. Jane will make a new shirt for him.
 b. A new shirt will be made for him by Jane.
- (30) a. Jane will make him a good wife.
 b. *A good wife will be made (for) him by Jane.
 c. *He will be made a good wife by Jane.
- (31) a. Jane will make him a new shirt.
 b. A new shirt will be made (for) him by Jane.
 c. *He will be made a new shirt by Jane.

The examples in (26), (28) and (30) show that B-*make* sentences cannot be passivized. In contrast, as shown in (27), (29) and (31), P-*make* sentences can basically be passivized, although (31c), where the indirect object of (31a) is in subject position, is not acceptable. The fact that both (30c) and (31c) are ungrammatical can be accounted for if we assume that the indirect object *him* is 'dative of interest'. It is generally considered that 'dative of interest' cannot be in subject position of a passive sentence (e.g., **I was lit on my way by the servant* < *The servant lighted me on my way*). What should be noticed here is the contrasts between (26b) and (27b), (28b) and (29b), and (30b) and (31b). In other words, the phrase *a good wife* does not appear in subject position of passive sentences.

It might appear straightforward to attribute the unpassivizability of B-*make* sentences to the predicate-like property of *a good wife*. However, we have analyzed *a good wife* as a direct object on the assumption that *him* should be an indirect object, not an adjunct. In what follows, we will argue that the unpassivizability of B-*make* sentences follows from the characteristic of internal-PRODUCE, in which its 'end-product' is produced inside of the 'producer'.

3.2. An Analysis

In the first place, we need to make clear what is the condition for passivizability. Before doing this, we have to ask what is the nature of passivization.

Intuitively, passivization is bringing into focus the object NP of a transitive sentence, putting the NP into subject position of a passive sentence. In her study, Okuyama (1990/1993) defines passivized sentences in terms of notions of FOREGROUND and BACKGROUND. She observes, ''passives are expressions such that CHANGE OF STATE of the subject NP is conceived of as the FOREGROUND and the other participant(s) as the BACKGROUND (1993:178)'' . In other words, it can be said that passive sentences require that the subject should be in the foreground, while the *by*-phrase is in the background.

If this is correct, we may say that the transitive sentences are passivized only if the subject and the object refer to different entities. This is due to the notions of FOREGROUND or BACKGROUND, because for a FOREGROUND-BACKGROUND relation to hold there must be at least two entities available. This is evident from the following statement by Langacker (1987:125), ''A participant in the foreground is typically more prominent and easily perceived than one in the background, simply because of greater proximity to the viewer'' .

Keeping this in mind, let us proceed with our discussion. First, recall that the subject *a good wife* cannot have a referent separate from *Jane* in the sentences (26b), (28b), and (30b), which are repeated as (32b), (33b), and (34b) respectively:

- (32) a. Jane will make a good wife.
 b. *A good wife will be made by Jane.
- (33) a. Jane will make a good wife for him.
 b. *A good wife will be made for him by Jane.

- (34) a. Jane will make him a good wife.
 b. *A good wife will be made (for) him by Jane.

As seen in Section 2, the 'end-product' of internal-PRODUCE is produced inside of the 'producer', and thus, in a B-*make* sentence, which is a linguistic realization of internal-PRODUCE, the object NP cannot have a distinct referent from that of the subject. Thus, in (32b), (33b), and (34b), no FOREGROUND-BACKGROUND relation holds. For this reason, (32a), (33a), and (34a) cannot be passivized.

To sum up, we have accounted for unpassivizability of B-*make* by means of the notion of internal-PRODUCE coupled with the definition of passivized sentences in Okuyama (1990/1993): since B-*make* is a linguistic realization of internal-PRODUCE, in which the 'end-product' cannot have a referent separate from that of the 'producer', B-*make* sentences cannot be passivized.

4. A Peculiarity of Direct Objects of B-*Make*

In the preceding section, we have pointed out that B-*make* sentences cannot be passivized and provided an account for the fact by means of internal-PRODUCE. This section reveals another interesting peculiarity with respect to B-*make*.

First, it would be worth pointing out that a variety of adjectives other than *good* can appear in direct objects of B-*make*:

- (35) Jane will make a {thoughtful/kind/careful/bad} wife.

However, adjectives like the following do not fit B-*make* sentences:

- (36) Jane will make a {?young/??tall} wife.

The contrast between (35) and (36) can be observed also in the case of *be*. Observe the following examples:

- (37) a. Jane will be a {thoughtful/kind/careful/bad} wife.
 b. Jane will be a {?young/??tall} wife.

This fact should be explained by some semantic or pragmatic constraint although we will not decide what kind of constraint works here.

What should be stressed here is the intriguing fact that direct objects of B-*make* must have an adjective. First, compare the following examples of B-*make* and P-*make*:

- (38) a. Jane will make a good {wife/teacher}.
 b. *Jane will make a {wife/teacher}.
 (39) a. Jane will make a new shirt.
 b. Jane will make a shirt.

In B-*make* sentences in (38), the adjective modifying the object NP cannot be deleted. In contrast, P-*make* sentences in (39) does not need such a prenominal modifier. Next, observe the following sentences:

- (40) a. Jane will be a ?(good) wife.
 b. Jane will be a (good) teacher.
 (41) a. Jane will become a ?(good) wife.
 b. Jane will become a (good) teacher.

In both (40) and (41), the (a) sentences are still acceptable even if they lack the adjective; and the (b) sentences are perfect with or without the adjective. What makes slightly odd the adjective-less versions of the (a) sentences is our common knowledge that a woman will be a wife when she get married. Thus, the (a) sentences without an adjective are less informative than (b) sentences without an adjective.

The important point to be noted here is why the direct object of B-*make* must be modified by some appropriate adjectives, as (38) shows.⁵ Given the present analysis which recognizes B-*make* as a linguistic realization of internal-PRODUCE, this fact can be explained in a natural way. Recall that internal-PRODUCE is defined as 'to PRODUCE a thing inside the 'producer' drawing out potential abilities.' If this is correct, 'end-product' of internal-PRODUCE must be an outcome of drawing out potential abilities. Thus, it follows that the direct object of B-*make* must be a realization of some potential abilities. Now let us return to (38). In (38b), the NP's such as *a wife* can be interpreted not as a realization of some potential abilities, but as NP's which represent only a certain social status. Thus, they cannot be used as direct objects of B-*make*. In contrast, the direct object in (38a), where the adjective *good* is added, can be interpreted as a realization of some potential abilities.

In this section, we have argued that the peculiarity with respect to direct objects of B-*make* follows from the definition of internal-PRODUCE.

5. Concluding Remarks

This paper has shown that the two uses of the verb *make* are related to each other under the abstract notion PRODUCE. Our analysis, which associates B-*make* with internal-PRODUCE, enables us to provide a natural account for the following two facts: (i) B-*make* sentences cannot be passivized, and (ii) direct objects of B-*make* must be modified by some appropriate adjectives.

Along the line of the present analysis, we are able to attribute the surface similarities between B-*make* and P-*make* to the core meaning of *make*, namely, PRODUCE. Furthermore, we have succeeded in differentiating B-*make* and P-*make* precisely by means of the two versions of PRODUCE, that is, internal-PRODUCE and external-PRODUCE.

NOTES

* This paper is a revised version of the paper read at the 49th monthly meeting of the Tsukuba English Linguistics Colloquium held on April 29, 1991. I am very grateful to Minoru Nakau and all other participants at the meeting for their insightful comments and helpful suggestions. I would like to express my gratitude to Yukio Hirose, Hidehito Hoshi, Mika Okuyama, Yuji Tanaka, Naoaki Wada, Satoru Kobayakawa, Takeshi Shimada for their helpful comments and discussions on earlier versions of this paper. In completing this paper, I have greatly benefited from many times of discussions especially with Mika and Hidehito. I really appreciate their all-out support. I also thank Mikinari Matsuoka for his careful reading of an earlier version. In addition, I would like to thank Robyne Tiedeman, Ronald Craig, and Roger Martin, who patiently acted as my informants. All the sentences in this paper have been checked at least by one of them and most have been checked by all of them. Finally, I wish to express my thanks to Takaaki Hattori for his support, understanding and encouragement.

¹ More precisely, Jespersen (1927) uses the term 'predicative' for such NP's.

² See Poutsma (1926), who analyzes an NP like *a good wife* as 'quasi-object'.

³ Curme (1931:28) states, ''*wife* is still an object, as we can see by the simple dative object *him* before'' with respect to the sentence *She will make him a good wife*.

⁴ Although the number of examples given in this section is limited, there are a lot of NP's fit for the object of B-make, for example, *a good {doctor/journalist/actress...}*, which represent some role or occupation.

⁵ In the case of the subjunctive mood, however, all the adjective-less direct objects other than *a wife* and *a husband* are permitted: *She might make a {teacher/journalist}*. Even *a wife* and *a husband* are permitted if an appropriate indirect

object is added: *She might make someone a wife or He might make a husband.* In order to explain these facts, we have to take into account the meaning of the subjunctive mood. Since this issue is beyond the scope of the present paper, we have to await future research.

REFERENCES

- Cattell, N. Ray. 1984. *Composite Predicates in English*. Stephen R. Anderson et al. eds., *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 17. New York: Academic Press.
- Curme, George O. 1931. *Syntax*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1927. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*, Part III. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Langacker, Ronald, W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. vol. I. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Okuyama, Mika. 1990. *On the Meaning and Use of Passives in English*. Unpublished BA thesis, University of Tsukuba.
- . 1993. 'Have Causatives and Related Issues,' in this volume, 163-189.
- Poutsma, H. 1926. *A Grammar of Late Modern English*, Part II, Section II, Groningen: P. Noordhoff.
- Scheurweghs, G. 1959. *Present-Day English Syntax*. London: Longmans.

Doctoral Program in Literature and Linguistics
University of Tsukuba