# Translation of Vietnamese Serial Verb Constructions (SVCs) and/or Multi-verb Constructions into English

Lâm Quang Đông*

*Science and Technology Office, VNU University of Languages and International Studies,
Phạm Văn Đồng, Cầu Giấy, Hanoi, Vietnam*

**Abstract:** Like many languages in West Africa, Southeast Asia, amongst others, serial verb constructions (SVCs) are popular in Vietnamese in which several verbs appear together as a single predicate indicating multiple interconnected and/or sequential subevents in a complex event. To express such a complex event, non-serializing languages like English may require multiple clauses and/or sentences. Therefore, attempts to render Vietnamese SVCs as a single English predicate in translation works may not always be successful. This paper aims at addressing such difficulties by analyzing a number of multi-verb constructions, including SVCs, in Vietnamese from a semantico-syntactic perspective before discussing possible English translation options with illustrative examples of translation errors collected from the assignments of graduate students at the University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam National University, Hanoi (ULIS-VNU). The paper concludes with a suggested translation process for effectively dealing with Vietnamese SVCs and multi-verb constructions.

*Keywords:* SVC, multi-verb constructions, Vietnamese, English, translation.

## 1. Introduction

In 2014, in an international project concerning the Kotu language, I was assigned to translate the Kotu-Viet Dictionary [1] into English. I had no knowledge of the Kotu language, so I had to rely merely on the Vietnamese explanations as the source language (SL). During the translation process, I encountered various difficulties, as many of the Vietnamese examples did not provide me with sufficient information or context, e.g. several

participants in the sentence semantic structure are left implicit, including the subject, or a good number of sentences contain more than one verb without clear subjects or objects. This is quite natural in Vietnamese and Kotu, two among numerous isolating and serializing languages in the Austro-asiatic family, but I had to struggle to find proper ways of rendering them in the English translation. Among the most difficult are serial verb constructions (SVCs) and similar multi-verb constructions. This paper will elaborate such a difficulty from a semantico-syntactic perspective, discuss possible ways for translation of Vietnamese

_____
*Tel.: 84-913323447
  Email: volamthudong@gmail.com

SVCs and similar multi-verb constructions into English and offer hopefully useful implications for Vietnamese-English translation in general.

## 2. SVCs and similar multi-verb constructions in Vietnamese – a brief description

Like many languages in West Africa, Southeast Asia, amongst others [2], serial verb constructions (SVCs) are popular in Kotu and Vietnamese in which several verbs appear together as a single predicate indicating multiple interconnected and/or sequential subevents in a complex event. In our previous study [3], based on various criteria, particularly the semantic roles assumed by these verbs and their status, we were able to identify a non-exhaustive list of SVCs with two verbs in Vietnamese as follows:

(1) Asymmetrical SVCs: including the following common constructions

a. Event SVCs, e.g. E1. (Tô Hoài)

| Tôi | tập | suy nghĩ | về | mọi | hành động | của | mình. |
|-----|-----|----------|----|----|-----------|-----|-------|
| I | practice | think | about | all | act | of | I[1] |

'I practiced thinking thoroughly of all my acts.'

E2. (Tô Hoài)

| Tôi | và | Trũi | cũng | định | đi | khắp | thế gian | này |
|-----|----|------|------|------|----|------|----------|-----|
| I | and | Trũi | also | intend | go | all | world | this |

'Trui and I also intend to travel all over this world.'

b. Persona SVC, e.g.

E3. (Nam Cao)

| Tao | chỉ | liều | chết | với | bố | con | nhà | mày | thôi! |
|-----|-----|------|------|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| I | only | risk | die | with | father | child | house | you | only |

'I merely risk my life fighting with you and your father!'

E4. (Hà Đức Hậu)

| Bé | chăm lo | quét | nhà. |
|----|---------|------|------|
| small | care | sweep | house |

'The small child cares for cleaning the house.'

c. Manner SVCs, e.g.

E5. (Tô Hoài)

| Dế | Choắt | hé | mắt | nhìn | chị | Cốc |
|----|-------|----|----|------|-----|-----|
| Cricket | tiny | slightly open | eye | look | sister | Cormorant |

'Dế Choắt peeped at Sister Cốc.'

d. Resultative/Consequential SVCs, e.g.

E6. (Nam Cao)

| Sự thực | giết | chết | những | ước | mơ | lãng mạn |
|---------|------|------|-------|-----|----|----------|
| truth | kill | die | PL[2] | wish | dream | romantic |

'Truth kills all romantic dreams.'

E7.

| Chị | ấy | nghỉ | ốm. |
|-----|----|------|-----|
| Sister | that | rest | sick |

'She took a sick leave.'

e. Directional SVCs, e.g.

E8. (Nam Cao)

| Bốn | cái | ghế | mây | được | đi | tàu thủy | về | quê | của | Điền |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|----|----------|----|----|-----|------|
| Four | CL | chair | rattan | BEN[3] | go | boat | come | home | land | of Điền |

'The four rattan chairs were privileged to travel by boat to Điền's home village.'

E9. (Nam Cao)

| Đi | vào | nhà | uống | nước! |
|----|-----|-----|------|-------|
| go | enter | house | drink | water |

'Let's go inside for some water!'

f. Causative SVCs, e.g.

E10. (Nam Cao)

| Lão | làm | lão | khổ | chứ | ai | làm | lão | khổ |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|
| old | make | old | suffer | but | who | make | old | suffer |

---

[1] Please note in passing that the gloss underneath each Vietnamese example in this paper merely provides one notable sense/use among different senses/uses of the Vietnamese lexical items, or the particular function they are performing in this context, and they may not be the best equivalent to the Vietnamese counterparts.

---

[2] PL: plural marker

[3] CL: classifier; BEN: benefactive marker

'It is the old man, not any others, who caused suffering to himself.'

g. Posture SVCs, e.g.

E11. (Nam Cao)

Sáng hôm sau Điền ngồi viết, giữa tiếng con khóc
Morning day after Điền sit write amidst sound child cry

'The next morning, Điền sat writing amidst his children's crying.'

E12. (Vũ Quần Phương, Huy Thục)

Em đứng trên cầu đợi anh
I stand on bridge wait you

'I stood waiting for you on the bridge.'

(2) Symmetrical SVCs, including

a. Idiomatic SVCs, e.g. *cày sâu cuốc bẫm* (lit. Plough deep, hoe thoroughly, i.e. till the soil well), *cao chạy xa bay* (lit. Fly high and run far, i.e. Flee/ run away as far as possible);

b. Purposive SVCs, e.g.

E13. (Phan Nhân)

Tôi đi tìm em chứ em ở nơi đâu
I go look for you but you live place where

'I went searching for you, but where were you?'

E14. (Nam Cao)

Sao không vào tôi chơi?
why not enter me play

'Why not come into my house for a chat?'

c. Instrumental SVC, e.g. E15. (Tô Hoài)

Trũi dùng càng khẽ hích tôi một cái
Trũi use pincers slight push I one CL

'Trui used his pincers to give me a slight push / Trui pushed me slightly with his pincers.'

d. Perceptive SVCs, e.g.

E16. (Tô Hoài)

Xem tao trêu mụ Cốc đây này!
watch I tease woman Cormorant here this

'Watch me tease the Cormorant now!'

e. Sequential/Consecutive SVCs, e.g.

E17. (Nam Cao)

Hắn xồng xộc chạy vào, ngồi sụp xuống, rót rượu ra bát uống
He force fully run enter, sit collapse down, pour liquor out bowl drink

'He dashed in, sat straight down, poured spirit out into the bowl and drank.'

E18. (Nam Cao)

Rồi hắn lại nhịt thuốc vào nõ điếu châm đóm hút thêm điếu nữa
Then he again fill tobacco enter champer pipe light spill smoke extra puff more

'He then filled the pipe with tobacco again, set fire to the spill and took another puff.'

f. Beneficial SVCs, e.g.

E19. (Nguyên Hồng)

Bính mời bà cụ lại hàng mình, nhường cái ghế con cho bà cụ ngồi
Bính invite old lady come store I give CL stool child give old lady sit

'Binh invited the old lady to her store and gave her the little stool for her to sit.'

E20. (Tô Hoài)

Song anh có cho em nói em mới dám nói phép
but you have allow I speak I only dare speak

'But I can only dare to speak if you allow me to.'

Apart from SVCs with two verbs, Vietnamese sentences abound in SVCs with three, four or more verbs, and Bisang [4] even provided an example containing no other parts of speech but a series of verbs, e.g. E21.

Muốn biết được thua phải đi hỏi
want know win lose must go ask

'If you want to know who wins or loses, you must go to ask (somebody).'

Semantic as well as syntactic relations among these verbs may not be easily identifiable to inexperienced translators, which results in countless errors like those I found among most graduate students in my course.

Following are essential details of my data collection.

## 3. Collection of data

In an assignment for the course in General Linguistics offered at ULIS-VNU, I asked the graduate students to translate the Kotu-Viet dictionary from Vietnamese into English, each being responsible for only 2 pages (around 35 lexical entries with illustrative examples of how they are used). These graduate students are mostly Vietnamese teachers of English, i.e. they are native speakers of Vietnamese and their English proficiency ranges between CEFR B2 and C1 levels, or 6.0-8.0 IELTS. I anticipated that they would face several types of difficulties due to differences between the two languages. They then had to choose from 1 to 3 types of difficulties among those they encountered to write about in the assignment, using their linguistic knowledge gathered from the course. They were free to choose their perspective, either a contrastive analysis, a typological discussion of an inflectional language (English) and an isolating one (Vietnamese), a semantic explanation, a syntactic comparison at word or sentence level, etc. On the due date, 120 students turned in their papers.

As expected, the students committed a good number of errors, both at word level and phrase/sentence level, both semantic and syntactic. For the purpose of this paper, I will merely focus on errors concerning SVCs and similar multi-verb constructions. Examples of errors from one student's assignment are shown below:

E22.

Trượt   ngã,   văng   kính   đâu mất.
slip    fall    fly   spectacles where lose

S (student's error): Slipping and falling makes the glasses be thrown somewhere.

E23.

Mệt   quá,   ngã   quỵ   xuống.
Tired excessive fall  collapse  down

S: It's tired enough to collapse.

E24.

Uống   rượu   thấy   chuếnh choáng
Drink  liquor  find      groggy

S: Drinking wine made me feel dizzy.

E25.

Đưa   võng   cho   em bé   ngủ
sway hammock give   baby    sleep

S: Sway the hammock for the baby's sleep.

E26.

Lấy   ô   che   mưa
take umbrella cover rain

S: Take an umbrella to avoid the rain.

E27.

Dìu   ông   đi   từng   bước.
support grandfather go   each   step

S: Carry the grandfather step by step.

E28.

Lấy   đũa   con   ăn   cơm.
Take chopstick child eat  rice

S: Take little chopsticks to have meal.

E29.

Rắn   hổ mang   cắn   chết   người.
Snake  cobra    bite   die   human

S: Copperhead bite deadly.

E30.

Cắt   dọc   khoai   cho   lợn   ăn
chop  stem   yam   give   pig   eat

S: To chop potatoes for pig.

As can be seen, this student fails to establish semantic relations among components of these sentences while a number of participants in the event described by these sentences are absent. She consequently fails to identify the main clause from the subordinates, which eventually leads to syntactical errors in her hardly comprehensible translation. This student is not alone in this regard; similar errors are found in the assignments of other students as well. Apart from the students' lack of experience in translation work, this must also be due to the nature of the Vietnamese language itself, particularly SVCs and multi-verb constructions. The following section will analyze each of the 9 instances above so as to provide better understanding of their semantic and syntactic structures.

**4. Analysis**

E22.

| Trượt | ngã, | văng | kính | đâu | mất. |
|-------|------|------|------|-----|------|
| slip | fall | fly | spectacles | where | lose |

This sentence contains at least three verbs *trượt (slip), ngã (fall)* and *văng (fly)*, while the last *mất (lose)* is not normally regarded as a verb in Vietnamese; rather, it is considered a modal particle indicating some negative or malefactive impact of the event on the speaker. Therefore, the first two verbs are classified as a resultative/consequential SVC: [someone] fell as a result of slipping. This subevent, in its turn, results in the spectacles flying off that person and landing somewhere and they have not been found. Semantically, the event described by this sentence is highly complex, with three successive subevents, one leading to another. To make the matter worse, syntactically, the SVC does not have an explicit subject – this subject must be inferred from the context, and it

can be *I* – the first person, i.e. the speaker. As the comma indicates, the SVC functions as an adverbial clause specifying the reason or cause of the subevent in the main clause. Meanwhile, the main clause does not share the same subject with the SVC; in fact, the *spectacles* associate with the verb *fly* in a kind of middle voice. Such use of the middle voice is invisible to the student. She understood the cause-effect relation between these clauses, as evident in her use of the causative verb *makes*, but that is all. Her translation does not clarify who slipped and fell, who *the glassses* belong to, and the fact that the glasses have not been found is not indicated by any means, either. The biggest problem is that she tries to compact all the three subevents in a single clause with the finite verb *makes*, which is utterly impossible.

The same problem shows up in the next example:

E23.

| Mệt | quá, | ngã | quỵ | xuống. |
|-----|------|-----|-----|--------|
| Tired | excessive | fall | collapse | down |

The main and subordinate clauses also have cause-effect relation, but they share the same implicit subject, which can be either the first or the third person, singular or plural. It is interesting to note that the SVC *ngã quỵ*[4] contains two verbs *ngã* and *quỵ*, with the latter modifying the manner of the act denoted by the former – one possibility is that the person/people fell quite abruptly with their knees bent down under their own weight (c.f. *ngã gục/double oneself when fell, ngã nhào/topple, ngã lăn/tumble, ngã ngửa/fall back, etc.*) Yet, in English, a single verb

---

[4] A number multi-verb constructions which I classify as SVCs may have traditionally been regarded merely as compounds. See my detailed discussion of this point in [3].

*collapse* may suffice because it entails the act of falling and more or less indicates the manner of falling. Verbs like *collapse, stagger, stumble,* etc. can therefore be referred to as *Manner verbs*, which means they denote not only the action but also the manner of the action, i.e. manner is given in the verbs themselves in a process called *argument fusion* [4]. Nevertheless, the student renders the Vietnamese sentence in an ill-formed English one: *It's tired enough to collapse*.

She seems to make a little progress with the third case,

E24.

Uống   rượu   thấy   chuếnh choáng
Drink   liquor  find        groggy

when the causative structure with *makes* is used grammatically with the insertion of the experiencer *me: Drinking wine made me feel dizzy*. The purposive SVCs in E25

Đưa   võng   cho   em bé   ngủ
sway  hammock give   baby    sleep

and E30

Cắt   dọc   khoai   cho   lợn   ăn
chop  stem   yam    give   pig   Eat

are translated as *Sway the hammock for the baby's sleep* and *To chop potatoes for pig*, which may sound acceptable when the Purpose cum Beneficiary marker *cho* is properly replaced with its English equivalent *for*. When it comes to instrumental SVCs, however, problems recur:

E26.

Lấy   ô   che   mưa
Take  umbrella cover  rain

S: Take an umbrella to avoid the rain.

E28.

Lấy   đũa   con   ăn   cơm.
Take  chopstick child  eat   rice

S: Take little chopsticks to have meal.

My previous study [3] reveals that instrumental SVCs in Vietnamese like these present a dilemma: it is not possible to determine which of the verbs in the SVC is the governing one over the other. If it is the first, then the second functions as the purpose; if it is the second, then the first merely describes the act of acquiring the instrument so as to perform the action denoted by the second. These two instances provide evidence of the fuzzy lines between the various types of SVCs, i.e. many SVCs can be rightfully classified as purposive, benefactive/beneficial or instrumental, depending on what is taken as the governing verb. Consequently, the names given to these types are relative in nature for the mere purpose of emphasizing some distinction among them and facilitating our SVC analysis. Returning to the two cases in question, the student succeeds in providing the purpose of the action denoted by the first verb with the to-infinitive in English, which ensures the grammaticality or well-formedness of the translation, but the meaning seems to have been somewhat altered due to her wrong choice of verb (*to avoid*), and the cultural feature of the Vietnamese people with regards to the use of chopsticks in cooking and eating is not fully conveyed.

Now that the semantic and syntactic structures of the 9 instances have been clarified, the next question is how to properly translate them into English – which would be the better option, semantic or communicative/pragmatic translation – so as to avoid this kind of errors.

## 5. Semantic vs. communicative/pragmatic translation

As analyzed above, SVCs and multi-verb constructions in Vietnamese are highly complex, involving different layers and aspects of meanings, and are sophisticated in their syntactic structures so that they can describe multiple subevents in an inclusive, over-arching one culturally conceptualized as a single event or a single interconnected, sequential series of events. One among common criteria for a series of verbs to be classified as a prototypical SVC across languages is that the verbs must share at least one argument, typically the subject [2:3] [5], but Vietnamese SVCs go further: a number of verbs may appear side by side even when there seems to be no shared argument [6], e.g.

E31.

| Máu | chảy | thành | sông. |
| blood | flow | become | river |

'Blood flows like a river.'

SVCs "show semantic and functional similarities to multiclausal and subordinating constructions in non-serializing languages" [2:2-3]. They 'serve to provide in a uniform way the sort of information that in the surface grammar of languages like English is handled by a formally disparate array of subordinating devices: complementary infinitives, *-ing* complements, modal auxialiaries, adverbs, prepositional phrases, even whole subordinate clauses' [Matisoff (1969:71), in [2:3]. Although Aikhenvald and Dixon [2:4] believe that 'SVCs are often translatable as single predicates into non-serializing languages', they note that some problems may arise when translators attempt to use a single predicate in a non-serializing language for an SVC in a serializing one.

This is exactly the case in question. These students try to replace the Vietnamese SVCs and/or multi-verb constructions with a single predicate in English while the verbs may not share the same argument and the semantic roles and/or relations among various components of the sentences are not clear to them; hence their errors. They should have started first with semantic, then syntactic understanding of these SVCs and multi-verb constructions. Next, they have to consider how to render them in English. Would a semantic or communicative/pragmatic translation be an apppropriate rendition of Vietnamese SVCs and multi-verb constructions? There could be different answers, because a number of factors need to be considered.

First, for the type of explanative dictionaries like the Kotu-Viet-English dictionary we were working on, a semantic translation is necessary. All the subtleties of the literal and figurative meanings of the source language (SL) lexical items and their uses need to be clearly described in order for the dictionary users to thoroughly understand them and properly use them. Naturally, this would probably result in an SL SVC or multi-verb construction being explained in lengthy, multiclausal sentences in the target language (TL), which means the TL may not correspond to the SL syntactically. Also, the translator has to insert such necessary elements as the subject for the English to be well-formed, which adds extra-modification to the grammatical structure of the TL compared to the original. For instance, example E22 is likely to be translated as, amongst others,

*As I slipped and fell, my glasses flew off and I can't find them yet.*

*or When I fell due to a slippage, my glasses flew off and I haven't found them yet.*

The focal lexical item being explained here is *fly (off)*, and since Vietnamese words never change their form to show tenses, the translator has to base himself/herself on the context to put the English verbs into their proper form to express this grammatical category. As can be seen, for the meanings of the original sentence to be fully and clearly translated, two or three clauses are required in the English version.

In the same manner, the remaining eight sentences can be rendered, for instance, as:

E23. *Too tired/exhausted, I/he/she/we/they collapsed.*

E24. *I found myself groggy after drinking.*

E25. *She swayed the hammock for the baby to sleep.*

E26. *He opened the umbrella to ward off the rain / He protected himself from the rain with the umbrella.*

E27. *I supported my grandfather to walk step by step.*

E28. *Get the little chopsticks for the meal / Have rice with little chopsticks.*

E29. *Cobras can bite people dead* (if this is a generic description) */ A cobra bit someone dead* (if this describes a particular event that has taken place).

E30. *I chopped the yam stems to feed pigs.*

What personal pronouns can be inserted in these English sentences depends on the inference from the particular context, which unfortunately is not sufficiently given by the authors of this dictionary. Furthermore, for the example E28, a little cultural note should be added, e.g. the Vietnamese people traditionally use large chopsticks for cooking and serving rice from the pot to the bowl(s), while each individual uses smaller chopsticks for picking up the food from the large tray and serving himself/herself from his/her own bowl. These analyses demonstrate that syntactic simplicity has to sacrifice for the TL to fully cover the semantic complexity of the SL if this kind of dictionary wants to provide detailed explanation of SVCs and similar multi-verb constructions of Kotu and Vietnamese in a non-serializing language like English.

By contrast, such cumbersome grammatical structures should not be allowed if economical principle is being pursued for communicative purposes and the most important goal is to get the message across. In other words, in daily conversations, for instance, communicative or pragmatic translation must be the option. Certain senses of the lexical items in the SVCs, some "shades of meanings", or sophisticated attributes expressed by Vietnamese SVCs or multi-verb constructions, might be lost in the process, particularly when translators try to compact them in a single English predicate, as one of our previous papers has argued [7].

## 6. Conclusion

The analysis and discussion above lead us to the following suggestion: when translators encounter SVCs or multi-verb constructions in serializing languages like Vietnamese and have to translate them into a non-serializing one like English, it is advisable that they:

i) perform a stepwise semantic analysis, for instance, the sentence

E32. *Mình đem thằng Dế này quẳng ra ao cho "xừ" vịt bầu sực một bữa* (Tô Hoài)

can be analyzed as follows:

| E32 | *Mình* | *đem* | *thẳng Dế này* | *quẳng* | *ra* | *ao* | *cho* | *"xừ"vịt bầu* | *sực* | *một bữa* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Layer 1-Semantic Roles | Agent | $V_1$ | Theme | $V_2$ | Direction | $Goal_1$ | $V_3$ | $Goal_2$ | $V_4$ | Theme |
| Layer 2 -Semantic Roles | | | | | | | | Recipient Beneficiary | | |
| Layer 3-Semantic Roles | | | Patient | | | | | Agent | | |

because *thẳng Dế này* is Theme to both $V_1$ *đem* and $V_2$ *quẳng*, and Patient to $V_4$ *sực*; *ao* is Goal to $V_1$ *đem* and $V_2$ *quẳng*; *"xừ" vịt bầu* is both Goal to $V_2$ *quẳng,* and Recipient/Beneficiary to $V_3$ (which is a coverb rather than a verb proper in this function) *cho* and Agent to $V_4$ *sực*. Literally, the sentence can be glossed as:

| *Mình* | *đem* | *thẳng* | *Dế* | *này* | *quẳng* | *ra* | *ao* | *cho* | *"xừ"* | *vịt bầu* | *sực* | *một* | *bữa* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *We* | *bring* | *CL (vulgar)* | *Cricket* | *this* | *throw* | *out* | *pond* | *for* | *monsieur (French)* | *duck* | *eat (slang)* | *one* | *meal* |

Naturally, translators are not necessarily required to name the participants in the sentence's semantic structure as exactly as these, but at least they should be able to identify the semantic relations among them. This would facilitate their choice of the syntactic elements and structure of the TL in the next steps;

ii) establish syntactic functions of the various components of the SL sentence;

iii) consider the purpose of the translation and other important factors so as to choose among the various translation options available;

iv) determine the possible syntactic structure for the TL, separating the SL SVCs or multi-verb constructions into several clauses if necessary; and finally,

v) produce the TL version, e.g.

(E32a) *We would throw this Cricket to the pond so that "Madame" duck could have a good meal.*

(E32b) *We would throw this Cricket to the pond as a good meal for the duck.*

(E32c) *Let's turn this Cricket into a good treat for the duck, etc.*

Hopefully, this suggested procedure would help translators better understand Vietnamese SVCs and multi-verb constructions and render them properly in English so as to avoid the kinds of errors found in our graduate students' assignments.

### References

[1] Nguyễn Văn Lợi et al (2007). Từ điển Cơ Tu-Việt; Việt-Cơ Tu (Kotu-Viet, Viet-Kotu Dictionary). Hanoi: Social Sciences Publisher.

[2] Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and Dixon, R.M.W (eds.) (2006) Serial Verb Constructions, A Cross-Linguistic Typology. New York: Oxford University Press.

[3] Lâm Quang Đông (2013). Cấu trúc nghĩa biểu hiện của câu có kết cấu vị từ chuỗi tiếng Việt và kết cấu tương ứng trong tiếng Anh (Representational semantic structure of sentences with serial verb constructions and their equivalents in English). VNU research project QG.12.44.

[4] Pinker, Stephen (1993). Learnability and Cognition – The Acquisition of Argument Structure. Cambridge: the MIT Press.

[5] Bisang, Walter (1995). Verb Serialization and Converbs – Differences and Similarities. In Haspelmath, Martin and König, Ekkehard (ed.) Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 137 – 188.

[6] Lâm Quang Đông (2014). Một số đặc thù của kết cấu vị từ chuỗi tiếng Việt (Peculiarities of Vietnamese serial verb constructions). In Proceedings of the International Conference The Linguistics of Vietnam in the Context of Renovation and Integration. Hanoi: Institute of Linguistics, VASS, pp. 714-738.

[7] Lâm Quang Đông (2013). Sự chênh nghĩa giữa vị từ đơn tiếng Anh và vị từ chuỗi tiếng Việt, và thất thoát nghĩa khi dịch (Meaning gaps between English single verb and Vietnamese serial verbs, and meaning loss in translation). Lexicography and Encyclopedia, No.1, pp. 3-9.

**Sources of data for illustration**

Nam Cao (2009). Tuyển tập truyện ngắn (Anthology of Short Stories). Hanoi: Kim Đồng Publisher.

Hà Đức Hậu's song Bé quét nhà (Little Child Cleaning the House).

Tô Hoài (1941). Dế mèn phiêu lưu ký (Diary of a Cricket). Hanoi: Thời đại Publisher (reprint 2011).

Nguyên Hồng (1938). Bỉ vỏ (A Woman Pickpocket). Hanoi: Literature Publisher (reprint 1982).

Phan Nhân's song Em ở nơi đâu? (Where are you?)

Vũ Quần Phương and Huy Thục's song Đợi (Wait).

# Chuyển dịch kết cấu vị từ chuỗi và/hoặc kết cấu đa động tiếng Việt sang tiếng Anh

Lâm Quang Đông

*Phòng KH-CN, Trường Đại học Ngoại ngữ, ĐHQGHN, Phạm Văn Đồng, Cầu Giấy, Hà Nội, Việt Nam*

**Tóm tắt:** Như nhiều ngôn ngữ ở Tây Phi, Đông Nam Á cũng như các vùng khác, kết cấu vị từ chuỗi (SVC) rất phổ biến trong tiếng Việt, trong đó nhiều động từ cùng xuất hiện bên cạnh nhau như một vị thể đơn nhất, biểu thị nhiều tiểu sự tình gắn bó mật thiết với nhau và/hoặc có tính tuần tự, kế tiếp nhau trong một sự tình phức hợp. Để thể hiện một sự tình phức hợp như thế, các ngôn ngữ phi chuỗi như tiếng Anh có thể cần tới nhiều mệnh đề và/hoặc nhiều câu khác nhau. Do vậy, trong quá trình dịch thuật, nếu người dịch cố gắng diễn đạt SVC tiếng Việt bằng một vị thể đơn nhất trong tiếng Anh thì không phải lúc nào cũng thành công. Bài viết này bàn về những khó khăn đó qua việc phân tích một số kết cấu đa động, bao gồm SVC, trong tiếng Việt theo quan điểm ngữ nghĩa-cú pháp, sau đó sẽ thảo luận một số phương án chuyển dịch khả dĩ sang tiếng Anh với những ví dụ về lỗi dịch thuật thu thập được qua tiểu luận của học viên cao học tại Trường Đại học Ngoại ngữ - Đại học Quốc gia Hà Nội. Cuối cùng, bài viết đề xuất một quy trình dịch thuật có thể áp dụng để xử lý hiệu quả SVC và kết cấu đa động tiếng Việt khi dịch sang tiếng Anh.

*Từ khóa:* Kết cấu vị từ chuỗi, kết cấu đa động, tiếng Việt, tiếng Anh, dịch thuật.