



Journal Website:
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajps>

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

ANALYSIS OF FUNCTIONAL - SEMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS OF ENGLISH VERB PREDICATES

Submission Date: March 20, 2024, Accepted Date: March 25, 2024,

Published Date: March 30, 2024

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume04Issue03-14>

Davlatova Mukhayyo Khasanovna

Head Of The English Department, Associate Professor Bukhara State Medical Institute Named After Abu Ali Ibn Sino, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Verb predicates play a significant role in the grammar. One of our primary motivations for doing so was to avoid arbitrary lexical stipulations on each verb that could potentially occur in the construction. Through an analysis of linguistic structures, lexical items, and expressive devices, this study seeks to identify common patterns and variations in the expression of emotions across languages. Therefore it is worthwhile to see how much can be accounted for in a principled way by paying close attention to semantic constraints.

KEYWORDS

Predicates, lexical syntax, ditransitive, source, delimitable, description, transparent interpretation, constructions.

INTRODUCTION

Aspect of the syntax or semantics of ditransitive expressions are not predictable from other constructions existing in the grammar. First, to see that the construction contributes semantics not attributable to the lexical items involved, consider the verb bake when used ditransitively:

1. Sally baked her sister a cake.

This expression can only mean that Sally baked a cake with the intention of giving it to her sister. It cannot mean that Sally baked the cake so that her sister wouldn't have to bake it; nor can it mean that Sally baked the cake as a demonstration of cake-baking, 2. or that she baked a cake for herself because her sister wanted her to have one. Unless we associate the

"intended transfer" aspect of meaning to the construction, we are forced to say that bake itself means something like 'X intends to cause Y to receive Z by baking.' This "transfer sense" of bake would be posited only to avoid attributing aspects of the semantics to the construction.

Ditransitive expressions are syntactically unique in allowing two nonpredicative noun phrases to occur directly after the verb; the fact that English will allow such a configuration is not predictable from other constructions in the language.

The semantics of the ditransitive construction has not been studied, and this work owes a large debt to previous analyses, in particular to Catelli (1984), Green (1974), and Oehrle (1976) for their detailed discussion of hundreds of ditransitive expressions. There are certain semantic constraints on the ditransitive syntax which have not been incorporated into most theories of argument structure. The reason these constraints are often overlooked is that there appear to be exceptional cases. However, the exceptional cases form a delimitable class that can be seen to involve a general systematic metaphor (of the type described in Lakoff & Johnson 1980). It will be shown that the constraints do in fact hold in the source domain of the metaphor. To identify the first constraint, notice that each of the verbs described so far independently selects for a volitional subject argument. This generalization can be captured by assigning a

constraint on the nature of the subject argument directly to the construction. The volitionality must extend so that not only is the action described by the verb performed agentively, but also with the relevant transfer intended. For example, in 3 below, Joe must be understood to intend to give the picture to Sally. It cannot be the case that Joe painted the picture for someone else and later happened to give it to Sally. 3 Joe painted Sally a picture. Similarly, in 4 it cannot be the case that Bob told the story to someone else and Joe just happened to overhear. 4 Bob told Joe a story. This constraint also accounts for the ill-formedness of the following examples: 5 "Joe threw the right fielder the ball he had intended the first baseman to catch. 6 "Hal brought his mother a cake since he didn't eat it on the way home. 7 Joe took Sam a package by leaving it in his trunk where Sam later found it. This is no to say that the first or second object arguments of the ditransitive cannot be given a transparent interpretation. The description used to pick out the argument referent may be understood to be the speaker's description, not the subject argument's. For example, consider Ohara gave his mother a Kiss.

Joe gave Marya sweater with a hole in it.

This sentence is felicitous despite the fact that Ohara did not realize he was kissing his mother. Likewise for this statement is acceptable even if Joe did not intend to give Mary a defective sweater. Also, it is not necessarily contradictory to use "accidentally" in

ditransitive expressions; for example: Joe accidentally loaned Bob a lot of money [by mistaking Bob for Bill, his twin; without realizing that Bob would skip bail with it; instead of giving the money as a gift as he had intended]. While I do not attempt to untangle the relevant issues here, I appeal to the fact that the same possibilities of interpretation occur with other expressions that are generally agreed to require volitional subject arguments. For example, murder is a verb which is universally recognized as selecting for a volitional subject argument. Still, it is possible to say the following without contradiction: 1) Mary accidentally murdered Jane [although she had meant to murder Sue; although she had only meant to knock her unconscious]. What I am suggesting, then, is that whatever notion of volitionality is adopted to deal with verbs such as murder should also be used to capture the semantic requirement of the subject position of the ditransitive construction. The existence of this constraint has been obscured by examples such as these: a. The medicine brought him relief. b. The rain bought us some time. c. She got me a ticket by distracting me while I was driving. d. She gave me the flu. e. The music lent the party a festive air. f. The missed ball handed him the victory on a silver platter.

In these examples, the subject argument is not volitional. Even when the subject argument is an animate being, as in (c, d), no volitionality is required. However, these examples form a delimitable class of

expressions, as they are all instances of a particular conventional systematic metaphor, namely, "causal events as transfers."² This metaphor involves understanding causing an effect in an entity as transferring the effect, construed as an object, to that entity. Evidence for the existence of this metaphor independent of the ditransitive construction comes from the following expressions:

- a. The Catch-22 situation presented him with a dilemma.
- b. The unforeseen circumstances laid a new opportunity at our feet.
- c. The document supplied us with some entertainment.
- d. The report furnished them with the information they needed.

Further evident, both for the existence of the metaphor and for it motivating the ditransitive examples, comes from the polysemy of each of the predicates involved in those examples. The predicates bring, buy, get, give, field, and hand are used to imply causation, but on their basic sense they each involve transfer from an agent to a recipient. The link between these senses is provided by the metaphor. Bring, buy, get, give, lend, and hand here involve the metaphorical transfer of effect. Each of the examples implies that the subject argument is used of the first object argument being affected in some way by "receiving"

the second object argument. An additional semantic constraint is that the first object be understood to be a beneficiary, or a willing recipient. This constraint is needed to account for the following example from Green (1974). Sally burned Joe some rice. Following example unacceptable even if malicious intentions are attributed to Sally; however, it is acceptable in the context that Joe is thought to like burnt rice. Furthermore, one cannot felicitously say either of the following: Bill told Marya story, but she wasn't listening. Bill threw the coma victim a blanket.

In these examples, the first object is not understood to be a willing recipient; accordingly, they are unacceptable.

This constraint may also be responsible for the slight difference in meaning between the following two examples provided by Robert Wilensky (personal communication): a. She fed lasagna to the guests. b. She fed the guests lasagna.

Most speakers find the first example to be somewhat less polite than the second. Since feed is normally used with reference to the food intake of babies or animals, the impoliteness of the first example is not surprising; what requires explanation is the fact that the second example is interpreted to be relatively more polite. The constraint that the first object must be construed as a willing recipient can account for this, since the ditransitive version has the effect of imposing the

interpretation that the guests are willing agents, thereby according them more respect.

That the recipient is expected to be willing should not be confused with the idea that the recipient is expected to benefit from the transfer. Jack poured Jane an arsenic-laced martini. In some cases, however, the issue of the recipient's willingness or unwillingness is irrelevant to whether transfer is successful. These involve expressions in which actual successful transfer is implied: Ex: Bill gave the driver a speeding ticket. Bill gave Chris a headache. Bill gave Chris a kick.

Nonetheless, all cases in which the first object is required to accept the transferred object in order for transfer to be successful imply that the first object is assumed to be a willing recipient. Noticing that a recipient is involved in ditransitive expressions may be a first step toward motivating the double object syntax of the construction. Beginning with Jakobson, those interested in the semantics of the direct object have noted that recipients of force and effect make for good direct objects (Jakobson 1938; for recent discussion see, e.g., Langacker 1987; Rice 1987a). (Of course, this is not to say that all direct objects are recipients; clearly, the objects of cognition verbs such as believe, see, and know would present difficulties for such a claim.)

Finally, the construction has been shown to be associated with a scene of transfer. Describing the first

object as a "recipient" rather than "possessor" more adequately captures the dynamic character of this semantics.

To summarize, there is a general problem with attempts to account for caused-motion and resultative expressions by means of a simple concatenation of two independently existing predicates, the semantic interpretation being arrived at by general pragmatic principles. Such analyses do not account for the fact that such concatenation is allowed in the language in the first place. Unless we treat the secondary predicate as an argument or an adjunct, there are no preexisting means by which to concatenate the two predicates. Treating the secondary predicate as an argument of the matrix verb is tantamount to creating an extended sense of the verb.

REFERENCES

1. Goldberg, A. E., R. Jackendoff. The English resultative as a family of constructions. *Language*, 2004.80, –P. 532–568.
2. Hoekstra T. Small Clause Results // *Lingua*. 1988. № 74. –P. 101-139.
3. Jackendoff R. Conceptual semantics and cognitive linguistics // *Language*, № 7. 1996; 104, –P 93-129.
4. Jackendoff R. *Semantic structures*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. USA. 1990. –312p.
5. Levin B., RappaportM. The lexical semantics of verbs of motion: The perspective from unaccusativity”. In I.M. Roca (ed), *Thematic Structure: Its Role in Grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992.–P. 247-269.
6. Rappaport Hovav, Malka, Beth Levin. An event structure account of English resultatives. *Language* 77: 2001. –P.766-797.
7. Rappaport T. R. Secondary Predication and the Lexical Representation of Verbs // *Machine Translation* 5, 1990. –P.31-55.
8. Rappaport Hovav, Malka, Beth Levin. 1996. Two types of derived accomplishments // *Proceedings of the First LFG Workshop*, ed. by Miriam Butt and Tracy H. King. Retrieved June 22, 2013, from <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/1/toc-lfg1.html>.
9. 147. Rappaport Hovav, Malka, Beth Levin. An event structure account of English resultatives. *Language* 77:2001.–P.766-797.
10. Ritz M. E. Perfect tense and aspect // R. I. Binnick (ed.). *The Oxford hand book of tense and aspect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. –P. 882–907
11. Rothstein S. *Secondary Predication* // *Blackwell Companion to Syntax* / Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (Eds.) 2006. Vol. II. –P. 209-233.
12. Tenny C. *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax–Semantics Interface*. –Dordrecht: Kluwer. 1994:

13. Tommola H. On the perfect in North Slavic // Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe. Berlin: Moutonde Gruyter, 2000. –P 441-578.
14. Vendler Z. Verbs and Times // Philosophical Review 56, 1967.–P. 143 –160.
15. Hasanovna, D. M. (2019). VARIABILITY OF ASPECTUAL MEANINGS IN ENGLISH. European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences Vol, 7(12).
16. Davlatova, M. H. (2020). An Integrative history of Aspectual meanings. JournalNX, 6(04), 17-22.
17. Davlatova, M. H. (2020). Aspectual variability of information culture in the history of the English language. International Journal on Integrated Education, 3(3), 24-28.
18. Davlatova, M. H. (2020). Lexico-semantic Structure and Its Analysis on the Example of Verbs. JournalNX, 6(06), 189-192.
19. Davlatova, M. H. (2021). Relation of lexical-semantic structure of verbs in the linguistic essence. IEJRD-International Multidisciplinary Journal, 6(5).
20. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Semantic Implementation of resultative structures. JournalNX, 7(06), 291-294.
21. Давлатова, М. Х. (2017). Этапы работы с видеотекстами на занятиях Английского языка. Интернаука, (9-2), 16-19.
22. Давлатова, М. Х. (2015). The role of songs in learning English. Молодой ученый, (10), 1145-1147.
23. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Different aspects of resultative structures according to their linguistic essence. Academicia Globe, 2(05), 475-479.
24. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Linguistic and cognitive features of performing effective actions. World Bulletin of Social Sciences, 3(10), 41-44.
25. Давлатова, М. (2020). Aspectual and lexico-semantic classification of verbs. Сўз санъати халқаро журнали, 1, 2020.
26. Давлатова, М. Х. (2018). Работа над видеотекстом на занятиях английского языка. Теория и практика современной науки, (4), 242-246.
27. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). On the interrelationship of resultive and causative meanings. World Bulletin of Public Health, 9, 212-215.
28. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Resultative and causative meanings in English and Uzbek languages. TA'LIM VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIIY JURNALI, 297-302.
29. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Aspectual and lexical-semantic classification of verbs. Open Access Repository, 8(2), 116-121.

30. Hasanovna, M. D. (2022). Typology of expressive emotional and linguistic features. *International journal of literature and languages*, 2(11), 65-69.
31. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Different aspects of resultative structures according to their linguistic essence. *Academica Globe: Inderscience Research*, 2 (05), 475-479. VOLUME03 ISSUE06 PAGES, 39, 47.
32. Davlatova, M. K. (2021). The process of transformation of philosophy understanding as factor of information culture of the period of the English renaissance (XVI c.). *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 1(5), 949-957.
33. Davlatova, M. X. (2018). The easy way of learning English with the help of songs. *Теория и практика современной науки*, (4 (34)), 578-581.
34. Давлатова, М. Х. (2021). The Expression of resultative and depictive constructions in english and uzbek languages. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 4(5).
35. Shadmanov, K. B., Davlatova, M. H., Ostonova, S. N., & Radjabova, A. T. (2020). ENGLISH RENAISSANCE: TRANSFORMATION OF PHILOSOPHY UNDERSTANDING AS A FACTOR OF INFORMATION CULTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EPOCH. *Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science*, 5(1), 61-67.
36. Muhayyo, D. (2017). THE ROTOR CONSTRUCTION OF COTTON RAW IN APPEARING VERTICAL BOUNDARY. *Интернаука*, (9-2), 76-78.
37. Давлатова, М. (2020). FE'LLARNING ASPEKTIK VA LEKSIK-SEMANTIKA TASNIFI. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 3(1).
38. Давлатова, М. Х. (2021). РЕЗУЛЬТАТИВЛИКНИНГ АСПЕКТУАЛ ТАДҚИҚОТЛАР ДОИРАСИДА ЎРГАНИЛИШИ. *Scientific progress*, 2(2), 1678-1683.
39. Давлатова, М. Х. (2013). Хорошее поведение-важный способ формирования личности. *Вестник Таджикского национального университета*, (3-6), 237-241.
40. Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Resultative and causative meanings in English and Uzbek languages. *TA'LIM VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 297-302.
41. Davlatova, M. H. (2021). Semantic implementation of resultative structures. *JournalNX-A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal*, 6, 291-294.
42. Shirinova, N. D., & Davlatova, M. K. MORPHOLOGICAL WAY OF DIFFERENTIATION OF SUBSTANCE AND ATTRIBUTIVE MEANINGS IN THE LANGUAGE SYSTEM. *ILMIY*

- ХАВАРНОМА. НАУЧНЫЙ ВЕСТНИК
Учредители: Андижанский государственный университет им. ЗМ Бабура,(1), 86-89.
43. Davlatova, M. X. (2015). The role of Songs in learning English. Journal. MolodoyUchyonniy, 10, 90.
44. Ширинова, Н. Д., & Давлатова, М. Х. МОРФОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ СПОСОБ РАЗГРАНИЧЕНИЯ ЗНАЧЕНИЙ ПРЕДМЕТНОСТИ И КАЧЕСТВЕННОСТИ В СИСТЕМЕ ЯЗЫКА. Muassis: Buxoro davlat universiteti TAHRIRIYAT: Muharrirlar: MQ Abuzalova MA Bokareva NN Voxidova, 40.
45. Hasanovna, D. M. (2023). ON THE TYPES OF RESULTS STRUCTURES EXPRESSED BY A SECONDARY PREDICAT. International Journal Of Literature And Languages, 3(03), 52-58.
46. Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Semantic Implementation of resultative structures. novateur publications JournalNX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal.
47. Muhayyo Davlatova. Semantic properties of effective constructions in English and Uzbek languages. E3S Web Conf. Volume 420, 2023 EBWFF 2023 - International Scientific Conference Ecological and Biological Well-Being of Flora and Fauna (Part 1).
48. Davlatova, M. H. RELATION OF LEXICAL-SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF VERBS TO RESULTABILITY.
49. Давлатова, М. (2023). Typology of expressive emotional relations in linguistics . Современные тенденции при обучении иностранному языку в XXI веке, 1(1), 172–178. извлечено от <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/trends-language-teaching/article/view/21174>.
50. Davlatova Muhayyo Hasanovna. (2023). ON THE TYPES OF RESULTS STRUCTURES EXPRESSED BY A SECONDARY PREDICAT. International Journal Of Literature And Languages, 3(03), 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.37547/ijll/Volume03Issue03-10>.
51. Davlatova Muhayyo Hasanovna. (2023). ON THE TYPES OF RESULTS STRUCTURES EXPRESSED BY A SECONDARY PREDICAT. International Journal Of Literature And Languages, 3(03), 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.37547/ijll/Volume03Issue03-10>.
52. М.Х.Давлатова. Nutq tuzilmalari mazmunidagi semantika va pragmatikaning munosabati. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 5 (5), 2022