

KHAZAR UNIVERSITY

Faculty: School of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department: English Language and Literature

Major: English Language and Literature

MA THESIS

Theme: ““English transitive and intransitive verbs and peculiarities of their usage”

Master Student: Aziza Zulfugarova

Supervisor: Ph. D. Eldar Shahgaldiyev

Baku 2014

Table of contents

Introduction.....	3
Chapter 1. Category of transivity and intransitivity in the English language.....	13
1.1 Linguistic interpretation of transitive and intransitive verbs	13
1.2 The peculiarities of transitive and intransitive verbs	17
1.3 The use of transitive and intransitive verbs with prepositions (to/for) and personal pronouns in the English language	21
Chapter 2. The main differences between transitive and intransitive verbs and peculiarities of their usage	28
2.1 Comparative analysis of transitive and intransitive verbs.....	28
2.2 The absolute use of transitive verbs in Modern English	30
2.3 The absolute use of transitive verbs from the semantic and syntactic point of view	39
Chapter 3. Semantic and syntactic analysis of transitive and intransitive verbs	46
3.1 The classification of transitive and intransitive verbs	46
3.2 Factors affecting the absolute use of transitive verbs	58
Conclusion	63
Bibliography	65
Appendix.....	67

Introduction

The verb occupies an extremely important place in the grammatical system of the English language owing to the wide branch of its system and verb forms play a major role in building of sentences. Verb is a part of speech which represents an action or a state. In Modern English the verb has a more developed system of means of inflections and morphogenesis (generalizing movement) than any other parts of speech.

Being one of the main parts of speech, the verb involves the attention of many researchers. That's why there are various problems in the study of this part of speech and there are also various classifications and views on the system of tense forms of the verb.

Verbs are a category of words which are used to denote the performance of an action (to draw, to climb, to plant). There are also stative verbs (to like, to hate), verbs of possession (to have) and existence (to be).

Most utterances have a notional verb in speech. These verbs are used in tense forms. Verbs have a voice and moods. It defines whether the subject of a sentence is performing the action or the action is performed to it. There are two voices in English grammar: active voice and passive voice. Active Voice is used when the subject of a sentence, the doer of an action is known to readers.

e.g. She has cleaned the rooms.

Passive Voice is used to show whether the subject of the sentence concerns to something or somebody who doesn't carry out the action but is influenced by the action of the verb.

e.g. The rooms have been cleaned by her.

Verbs also have moods. There are three moods in English.

- 1) The Subjunctive Mood;
- 2) The Imperative Mood;
- 3) The Indicative Mood.

The Subjunctive Mood is used to convey hesitation and wishes of the speaker.

e.g. I wish I had more friends.

This mood is not used widely.

The Imperative Mood is used to give orders. It is also used to express requirements, requests, demands and commands. The singular or the plural form of the second person (you) is used for the subject of a sentence.

e.g. Close those windows!

e.g. Turn the computer on, please!

e.g. Don't drink too much coffee!

e.g. Let's go to the cinema.

The Indicative Mood is used widely in English. It is used to denote facts, ask questions and negate statements.

e.g. She is late.

Why is she late?

As there is a traffic jam.

Some grammarians use the term of Interrogative Mood for questions.

Verbs are finite and non-finite. A finite verb or a notional verb is a verb that has a subject (a doer) and it is the main verb in sentences. This type of verbs shows number (singular or plural) and tense forms (present, past, perfect continuous).

For example: We moved to New York.

We is the subject; *move* is a finite verb and it shows the action performed by the subject of the sentence.

Non-finite verbs don't have any subject in a sentence. It means that they don't have number or tense forms, either. These verbs have the following forms: the participle, the gerund and the infinitive which is used by *to*.

For example: I took some courses to develop my French.

To develop is a non-finite (an infinitive verb) and *took* is the main verb (a finite verb) which is used in the role of the predicate in the sentence.

An action verb is a verb which indicates the implementation of an action. These verbs are dynamical ones and they mean something occurring. The action verbs can be regular and irregular. Regular verbs have basis forms. e.g. to start.

The suffix *-s* is added to the end of a verb in the Present Simple Tense Form. e.g. starts.

A gerund form where the suffix *-s* is added to the end of a verb. e.g. starting.

The suffix *-ed* is added in the Past Simple Tense Form. The past participle form is also take the suffix *-ed*. e.g. started.

As it is seen, these verbs don't change from the root. They are only used with certain suffixes in required speech situations.

Irregular verbs are different. These verbs change from the root in the Past Simple Tense Form. These changes are also observed in the past participle forms. e.g. to sing – sang – sung.

The gerund forms of these verbs are the same as in the regular verbs. e.g. singing.

The suffix –s is also added to the end of the irregular verbs in the formation of the Present Simple Tense Form in order to denote the third person singular. e.g. sings.

There are more than one type of verbs in sentences. They are notional verbs, auxiliary verbs and modal verbs. The notional verbs denote the main state or action of the subject and it changes in accordance with the subject in a sentence. Most sentences have a notional verb in a speech situation. The notional verbs have different forms depending on the tense forms.

e.g. I take care of her children.

I am taking care of her children.

I took care of her children.

I was taking care of her children.

I have taken care of her children.

I had taken care of her children.

I have been taking care of her children.

I will take care of her children.

Notional verbs can be regular (to like) and irregular (to wear).

Auxiliary verbs are sustaining verbs and they are used with a notional verb. These verbs serve to provide the reader with the information which is not provided by a notional verb. They are used to form continuous tense, perfect tense forms and passive voice. It should be noted that there are auxiliary verbs (to be, to have, to do) which are used as notional verbs but they have different meanings in sentences.

To have means to possess something if it is used as a notional verb. This verb is used as an auxiliary verb in order to form perfect tense forms. e.g. They have already informed about the meeting.

The verb *to do* is also used as a notional and an auxiliary verb and it is also an irregular verb. As an auxiliary verb it is used to form interrogative and negative forms in the Present Simple and Past Simple Tense Forms.

To be is a widely used verb in the English language and it can be used as a notional and an auxiliary verb, too. It is an irregular verb. e.g. She is not interested in the problems of the company.

Modal verbs cannot be used alone in sentences. They are used with the notional verbs of the statements. Modal verbs are *must, shall, should, can, could, ought to, may, might, will, would*.

Must denotes an obligation and a duty.

e.g. You must pay the bills.

Shall is used to suggest something to somebody.

e.g. Shall I carry your bags?

Shall is used more widely in England than in the USA.

Should means a recommendation and it is used to give advice to someone.

e.g. You should solve these problems.

Can is used to ask permission, a request and it is used to denote an ability.

e.g. Can I open the door? (Asking permission)

Can you lend me some books written by this author? (A request)

We can check their annual budget. (Ability)

Could expresses an ability in the past and a request.

e.g. You could help her but it was too late for this. (Ability)

Could you lend me your car keys? (A request)

Ought to is used to tell what is right or wrong.

e.g. The children ought to respect adult people.

May is used for possibilities and asking for permissions.

e.g. May I use your computer? (Permission)

It may be a serious problem for the construction company. (A possibility)

Might is used to show possibility for the present time and future.

e.g. She might be sleeping now. (For the present time)

He might give up smoking. (For future)

Will is used for suggestions and predictions.

e.g. If you would like, I will help you. (A suggestion)

The annual income of the company will decrease next year. (A prediction)

Would is used for a request, an invitation, and preferences.

e.g. Would you give me that book? (A request)

Would you like to come to the party next Sunday? (An invitation)

«Would you prefer fish or meat?» - «I would like fish, please». (A preference)

These verbs are used to denote a situation, a state in sentences. They don't denote any action. The following verbs indicate state verbs. The verbs which are used to denote possession (to want, to have, to possess); feeling (to taste, to feel, to smell); emotion (to need, to like, to hate); opinion (to trust, to realize, to believe).

Stative verbs can be either regular or irregular. These verbs don't take the suffix *-ing*. It means that they are not used in the continuous tense forms.

e.g. Children like to play different games. (Not: Children are liking to play different games).

But there are certain verbs (to have, to think) that can be used in the continuous tense forms depending on the meanings of these verbs in sentences as they have several meanings.

If the verb *to have* denotes a possession then, it doesn't take the suffix *-ing*.

e.g. I have a lot of friends. (Not: I am having a lot of friends).

This verb takes the suffix *-ing* only in that case if it is used in word combinations: to have a dream, to have discussions, to have dinner and so on.

e.g. We had dinner with our friends yesterday.

The next verb is *to think*. If this verb denotes an opinion then, it is not used with the suffix *-ing*.

e.g. I think, French is not difficult. (I think = as to me)

The verb *to think* is used in the continuous tense forms when somebody is pondering or thinking about something.

e.g. She is thinking about selling her car.

Phrasal verbs are a group of verbs which are used with an adverb or a preposition. So it means that phrasal verbs have different meanings from the main verbs and the meaning is understood from the context. There are certain phrasal verbs that are used informally by speakers in their everyday speech. The usage of these phrasal verbs must be avoided in written language. Some grammarians consider that phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs are different. But there are also grammarians who think that these verbs are not different from one another as they have the same structure. Let's consider the following main verb (to look) which has different meanings when it is used as a phrasal verb.

e.g. To look - to seem (a main verb)

To look for – to search (a phrasal verb)

To look forward to – to wait something with excitement and pleasure (a phrasal verb)

To look after - to take care of (a phrasal verb)

The category of transitivity and intransitivity of verbs is also one of the main discussed issues in the English language. The problem of transitivity deserves a special consideration. There are different peculiar characteristic features and development trends in this field which have been the subject of discussions.

In the process of language development there can appear new phenomena that lead to various discussions and debates by grammarians. One of these phenomena is the use of transitive verbs without objects.

Spoken language has its own rules which are contrast to the standard norms of literary language. Various factors beyond the linguistic order have a certain influence on the formation of standard norms of speech. The conversation of interlocutors, visual and auditory contact between them, their free orientation in the theme and atmosphere of the conversation – all these contribute to the development of structures which are characteristic for spoken language.

The distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs, the absolute use of transitive verbs in the English language and other major issues will be reviewed in this dissertation.

In this regard, it is frequently observed the cases of «contraction» and «simplification» of syntactic units of different levels (phrases, sentences, complex syntactic units). These phenomena are caused by both extra linguistic and linguistic reasons (e.g. lexical-grammatical nature of the combined components of any structure).

In this thesis it will be considered some cases when transitive verbs do not have any object according to their nature but it would perform the role of a direct object in the sentence. This phenomenon is sometimes called the absolute use of transitive verbs.

It is known that a transitive verb as if it reserves a place for itself near the word (phrase) denoting the subject that is directly called an action of these verbs (or objects arising as a result of this action, and so on). This object is dependent on the verb and performs the role of the direct object in the sentence. Depending on the lexical meaning of the verb-predicate and its dependent object, speech situation and communicative positions of statements will have the need of implementation of transitivity.

Thus, the object of this research work is the peculiarities of transitive and intransitive verbs and the ways of their usages in the English language.

One of the aims of this research work is a comprehensive study of the absolute use of transitive verbs in the English language. The achievement of the aims involves the following tasks:

- To analyze syntactic and lexical-semantic characteristics of verbs;
- To consider the main factors influencing on the objectless use of transitive verbs.

A set of research methods specifies the overall direction of the work. The methods optimally meet the certain goals and objectives:

- The method of dictionary definitions;
- The contextual analysis;
- The method of transformations.

The hypothesis of the study is that the absolute use of transitive verbs still includes the seme of the object, but it is not expressed on the syntactical level.

It was made a lot attempts to study the formal description of a language as a system in recent decades: the Copenhagen Glossematic School, Generative Grammar by Noam Chomsky and Logical Grammar by Richard Montague and a number of later linguistic schools and their representatives set the task to create concepts and models of the language that would be based on the strict logical or even mathematical principles. The interests to such researches are not accidental, as the establishment of an effective formal description of languages promises great perspectives in the field of automatic natural language processing and text (for example, machine translation) and may be in the creation of artificial intelligence in the future.

However, a number of fairly complex issues arises in the solving the problems in the formal language description, such as the openness of the language system, the correlation of order and disorder in it, as well as the interaction of the structure and semantics.

It was attempted to highlight one of the principal aspects in the formation of a formal logic model of a language, namely the principles of categorization of verbal predicates from the position of the category of transitivity of verbs in this thesis.

The category of verbal transitivity was considered with its close relation to other grammatical categories, characterizing the use of English verbal predicates on the syntactic and semantic levels. However, there are lots of issues concerning the transitivity of verbs in the English language that are still remain unresolved and not concluded.

The relevance of the research is due to the need for a deep lexical-syntactic analysis and the identification of the main features and differences in the functioning of the transitive verbal predicates on the basis of the comparative characteristics in the usage of transitive verbs in the sentences, as well as the semantic and quantitative grammatical categories which include transitive verbs.

The formalization of the approaches to the language allows us to give an adequate and accurate description of mechanism in the functioning of its units with the methods that are based on the limited set of grammatical categories and their combinations that can be represented as a series of the discrete elements.

The main subject of this research is the category of transitivity of the English verbs from the semantic and syntactic point of view and the absolute use of transitive verbs with the missing direct object in different situations in sentences.

This goal requires a consistent solution of the following tasks:

- 1) The identification of the relationship of grammar and cognitive categories of transitivity of verbs and the main differences between them.
- 2) The semantic description of verb transitivity and the identification of relations of transitive category.
- 3) The development of the criteria for formal logical representation of the category of transitivity taking into account the potential predicative constructions.
- 4) The development of an abstract model of semantic-syntactic analysis of the verbal predicates.
- 5) The disclosure of mechanisms of the equal level interactions such as «lexeme-phrase» and «phrase-text» from the analysis of the syntactic structures and the text.

The theoretical basis of the research consists of the following issues:

- Semantic and syntactic analysis of transitive and intransitive verbs;

- The absolute use of transitive verbs in Modern English;
- The absolute use of transitive verbs from the semantic and syntactic point of view.

The following provisions were formulated and submitted in the study of this research:

- The basic properties of English verbs are largely determined by their management of control that ensures the priority of structure analysis in relation to the lexical-semantic analysis in the interpretation of English speech.

- With a poorly developed system of verb affixes, the transitivity of verbs is morphologically unmarked category that results with a widespread liability, and the status of transitivity and intransitivity of verbs is defined according to the syntactic model in the English language.

The theoretical significance of the thesis lies in the fact that the study distinguishing the patterns of the syntactic structure and verbs contributes to the development of theory of the categorial grammar and paradigmatic syntax. The results obtained during the research allow us to determine the prerequisites for the establishment of a formal model of a language as a self-organizing system.

The practical value of the thesis consists of the facts that the core theme, conclusions and materials used in the dissertation were based on the practical examples concerning transitivity and intransitivity of verbs in Modern English.

This thesis consists of an introduction, three chapters, conclusion, bibliography, appendix and the list of the used literature.

In the introduction it is marked the novelty and the urgency of the chosen topic, the object and subject of the research work is defined, certain goals, tasks, methods and objectives are set, the hypothesis is outlined.

The first chapter deals with the category of transitivity and intransitivity, the interpretation of transitivity in the English language and the peculiarities of transitive and intransitive verbs in Modern English. The usage of transitive verbs and intransitive verbs with the prepositions (to / for) and personal pronouns, the reverse order of objects are also explained in this chapter.

The classification of transitive verbs which consists of several divisions and analysis of the examples of the absolute use of transitive verbs in different verb subclasses are examined in the second chapter. The main differences between transitive verbs and intransitive verbs and peculiarities of their usage, the distinction between them, also the absolute use of transitive verbs from the syntax, the lexical-semantic, the semantic and syntactic point of view, as well as the solution of these problems are marked in the second chapter.

The semantic and syntactic analysis of transitive verbs and intransitive verbs, their classification and the factors affecting the absolute use of transitive verbs in the English language are considered in the third chapter.

The conclusion presents the summary and the result of the research work. The bibliography contains different grammar books written by foreign grammarians. Then, it follows the list of literary works and applications. There is also an appendix which consists of examples, especially it consists of quotes by different well-known people including writers, poets, politicians, scientist and other people. These examples are about the subclasses of the absolute use of the transitive verbs that are analyzed in this research work.

Chapter 1. Category of transitivity and intransitivity in the English language

1.1. Linguistic interpretation of transitive and intransitive verbs.

The verb occupies an exceptional place due to the wide extent of its system in the grammatical system of the English language. It also plays a great role in the building of the sentences. The verb is a part of speech which names the actions or represents the state, the manifestation or the change of features as actions and so on. In Modern English verb has a more developed system of means of analysis of inflections than any other part of speech.

English verbs have a highly developed system of time forms, the opposition of the active voice and passive voice, the opposition of indicative mood and also imperative mood. These are the main verb categories that cover the entire system of the verb as a whole. In addition to this, there are also residual and flawed forms of person and number. Should it be referred to the categories of verbs? It is a debatable issue since they do not represent the system of forms.

All these categories are acting within the limits of personal forms. In addition there are non-personal forms, such as participle, gerund, infinitive. They have special functions than personal forms.¹

The verb is a part of speech which expresses the grammatical meaning of the action. It is quite a rich system which cannot be said about the word-building structure of the verb. The phenomenon of «semantic agreement» in the sentence and semantic signs of true names of the subject and object are shared by the predicate of a verb. This fact plays an enormous role in the language. For example, *branch bends* and *man bends*. In some sense *to bend* is different and consequently the verb *to bend* has a different value determined as parts of components of the various characteristics of the subjects in this example. In a very large number of cases, in contrast to the above, such differences are anyway expressed lexically in all languages and the verb in itself carries an indication of compatibility with one or other name categories of subjects or objects.

As it is known, verbs are characterized by different classifications. There were and there are a number of classifications of verbs by different linguists. Some of the classifications were unsuccessful. So linguists attempt to create a universal classification of verbs. Their attempts at creating a unique classification of verbs, at least to distinguish the name from the verb on the morphological basis were not successful.²

The best summed up outcome was made by É. Benveniste: «the opposition of process and object can neither have a universal force nor a single criterion in linguistics. It cannot have a

¹ Irina Ivanova, Varvara Burlakova and Georgiy Pocheptsov, *Theoretical Grammar of Modern English* (Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1981), 50

² Yuriy Stepanov, *Nouns, Predicates, Sentences (Semiological Grammar)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1981), 114-116

clear meaning, either. The fact is that such concepts do not reproduce the objective properties of reality and this expression cannot be peculiar in every language.

The difference between the process and the object is obligatory for that who argues the classifications on the basis of his or her native language which is turned into a universal phenomenon. But even if you ask him or her on what this distinction is based on, he will be forced quickly to admit that if the *horse* is the object and *to run* is the process, it is because the first is the name and the second is the verb. The definition seeks for natural justification of the method by which particular language organizes its concepts.

Therefore, we do not have the right to use the concepts, such as object and process for characteristics of the opposition of the verb and noun, regardless of the type of language; or categories such as time or morphological differences. Nevertheless, the searched criterion exists and it has a syntactic nature. We define the verb as «a necessary element of building complete affirmative statements».³

In accordance with the morphological classification, verbs are divided into two groups: standard verbs and non-standard verbs. And they have a special group of constant verbs.

There is another classification of verbs which characterizes the verb from the point of view of the direction of actions on the object. From this point of view, all significant verbs are divided into transitive verbs and intransitive verbs.

The problem of transitivity in Modern English deserves a special consideration. Peculiar properties and development trends rise in this field which have been the subject of discussions and gave a reason to different interpretations.

The issue of dividing the verbs into transitive and intransitive verbs refers to the most difficult questions of theoretical grammar. There are still a lot of fundamental ambiguities and in many cases, the ranking of a particular verb in the particular sentence refer to one or to the another category. It is a very difficult matter.

In the broadest sense, only those verbs could be considered as transitive verbs which meanings need an object of any nature, in contrast to those which do not require any objects.

However, the concept of transitivity is usually accepted to be taken in a more narrow sense and to consider only those verbs as transitive verbs that take the so-called direct object. In the English language the question is that whether the verb in the given situation is transitive or intransitive in this narrow sense and this issue can be controversial.

³ Émile Benveniste, *Problems in General Linguistics*, translated by Mary Elizabeth Meek (Florida: University of Miami, 1974), 168-170

Now let's proceed with the systematic consideration of the question about transitivity and intransitivity.

According to the semantic features verbs can be:

1) The verbs that have a completely accomplished meaning and they cannot take direct objects;

2) The verbs that have a complete meaning and they can take a direct object which clarifies the meaning;

3) The verbs that do not have a complete meaning and they cannot be used without direct objects.

To the first category primarily it is included the verbs that express state: *She is listening to music; She is jumping; She is sleeping*; as well as the verbs denoting actions which are closed in the subject by its nature and they are not transferred to any object; *She is writing; She is running; She is cooking; She is wearing; She is dancing*, etc.

It is true that some of these verbs (to plan, to jump, to sleep, to cook) may have other meanings if they are used with transitive verbs, i.e. take a direct object, but in these cases, some linguists consider them as a different type of verbs.

The second category is much more difficult. Here includes the verbs of the following types: *We are reading; We are writing; We are drinking; We are drawing* and so on.

Each of these verbs has a complete meaning without any object: it characterizes activities in the broadest sense of meaning. It is quite enough to answer to the question: *What is she doing?* The answer will be as following: *She is drawing*. In this respect, *She is drawing*, in essence, is not different from *She is running* or *She is cooking*. It can be said that the activity which *to draw* expresses, in essence, has a kind of condition which is related to the subject.

Verbs of the second category are different from the first category as they allow a further question: *What is she reading? What is she buying? What is she eating? What is she drinking? What is she drawing?*, i.e. it can be asked a requiring refinement of the name of the object on which they act or which arise as a result of the action. Thus, the answers of the given questions can be answered as: *She is reading a book, She is buying a dress, She is eating an apple, She is drinking a glass of juice*.

In these cases, the direct object clarifies and completes the meaning of the verb without changing its basic semantics. Thus, it is necessary to state that the verbs such as *to read, to buy, to eat, to drink*, etc can be both transitive and intransitive.

The third category of verbs differs from the previous ones in that the direct object seems to be required for the realization of the meaning of the verb. However, within this broad category

two groups can be perceived: on the one hand, verbs with the specific meaning are so specific that their general semantics does not cause any doubts, even though they are in need of a direct object, for example, *to refer, to disturb, to destroy*; on the other hand, the verbs with the meaning are so vague that they acquire a concrete and tangible meaning only in the context depending on the direct object. For example;

The verb *to take*:

e.g. She *takes* a lesson; She *takes* a book or She is *taking* her final exams;

The verb *to make*:

e.g. She is *making* a list; She *made* tea, or She *made* some steps forward.

There is another example and it is about the verbs *to read* and *to write*. It is clear that one cannot read or write without an object, because in the act of reading and writing there should be something to be read or written.

Finally, the last subgroup (the second unit of the third group) includes the verbs which meanings are so vague that the sentence does not give a satisfactory meaning in the absence of clarified objects. So the following sentence, *She buys* is unclear without a direct object. If we add *books from the bookshop* as an object, the basic meaning of the verb will be reinforced more or less than the physical act of *buying*.

If it is added the objects as *measures, books*, etc, the meaning of the verb becomes much weaker and metaphorical; the object renders such a strong impact on it that the combination of these two elements becomes something combined and acquires the character of the phraseological or idiomatic growths in which the verb loses its meaning and the individual meaning of the noun play the role of an object.

The noun *measures* as an object of the verb *to take*, of course, does not have the same meaning as in the expression *measures of inflation* and so on. It has the following meanings: *take measures, measures of length, metric measures*, etc. However, the same meaning in the combination with the verb *to take*, the word *measures* is also used in terms of *drastic measures, radical measures*, etc.

In other combinations of this type the attention can be fully paid to the object and the verbs become something of a supporting element as the indicator of an entire phrase in such cases. For example, the role of the verb *to take* in the expressions *to take notice of, to take advantage of*; or the verb *to have* in the expressions like *to have a wash, to have a run, to have a dream, to have a drink, to have a rest, to have a good time*, etc. It should be noted that all these combinations mentioned above are typical for Modern English and they are used widely not only in spoken language but also in written language.

So there is a greater interest on the second group of verbs because they have a complete meaning, but they can take a direct object clarifying this meaning.

Let's consider the classification of verbs according to the ability of expressing the orientation of the action on the object.

From this point of view, there arises a question whether these verbs express the meaning of the direct action on an object and as a consequence of this, they can take an object. So from this point of view all verbs are divided into the following groups: transitive verbs and intransitive verbs. It should be taken into consideration that the very often rethinking of the verb, its usage in the derived meaning lead to the change of its characteristics as transitive and intransitive.

The transitivity and intransitivity of the verb do not depend on whether the verb is predicative or non-predicative.

1.2. The peculiarities of transitive verbs and intransitive verbs

Most English verbs that take an object are generally called transitive verbs. Verbs that do not take an object are generally called intransitive verbs. Most English verbs can be used both transitively and intransitively. For example; *She can sing*. In this sentence the verb *to sing* is intransitive, whereas it is not used with an object. But in the sentence: *She can sing a song*; the verb *to sing* is a transitive verb, whereas it is used with an object *a song*.

Nevertheless, some verbs existing in the English language can be used only intransitively. There are some verbs that should be paid attention:

<u>Infinitive</u>	<u>Past Simple</u>	<u>Past Participle</u>
To cough	coughed	coughed
To exist	existed	existed
To fall	fell	fallen
To happen	happened	happened
To occur	occurred	occurred
To rise	rose	risen
To run	ran	run
To sleep	slept	slept
To stand	stood	stood

To work

worked

worked

Verbs can be classified according to different criteria, but the main interest is their classification due to the object. As it was mentioned above the verbs are divided into two groups: transitive verbs and intransitive verbs. Moreover, verbs take a direct object, but there are also the verbs which take indirect objects. Here are some examples according to this rule.

e.g. Ann gave the baby *a doll*.

Tom sent the manager *the reports*.

In these examples *doll* and *reports* are direct objects. *The baby* and *the manager* are indirect objects. In the given examples the words *the baby* and *the manager* are distinguished as indirect objects of the verbs *to give* and *to send*. Indirect objects are applied to things which receive indirectly the actions represented by the verbs. The words *a doll* and *the reports* that are used in the given examples are the direct objects of the verbs. Indirect objects are usually used with living things.

It is also possible if a sentence comprising an indirect object can be rewritten by adding a preposition before the indirect object. When this rule is done, the original indirect object can be considered both as the indirect object of the verb and as the object of preposition.

e.g. Ann gave the baby a doll.

This sentence can be rewritten as follows: Ann gave a doll to the baby. In this sentence *the baby* can be distinguished both as the indirect object of the verb *to give* and as the object of the preposition *to*.

Some English verbs, such as *to say*, *to explain* can be used with an indirect object only in that case if the indirect object is followed by a preposition. Here are some examples.

e.g. He said something to his friends.

The manager explained the problem to the staff.

In these examples, *something* and *problem* are direct objects; *friends* and *staff* are indirect objects. These verbs cannot be used with an indirect object which immediately precedes the verb. One of the reasons may be the avoidance of forming sentences that are uncertain and implicated. For example, if a sentence that starts with the words: *The manager explained the staff* then it would form the effect that it was *the staff* who were being explained. When *the staff* is followed by the preposition *to*, there is not any uncertainty.

e.g. My brother broke the c My sister cried.

Let's define the difference between the verbs *to break* and *to cry*. It is not talked about the meaning of these verbs, but it is talked about the grammar. It should be observed from the grammatical point of view and how these verbs are grammatically different. The first verb, *broke*, has another word after it. The second verb, *cried*, does not have any word after it. In general, it can be divided into two groups: the verbs that must take a word or words after them and the verbs that do not have to be used with any word after them.

Transitive verbs

e.g. My brother broke the cup.

In this sentence, the word that is used after the verb is the object of the verb *broke*. It is said that *the cup* is the object because it gets the action of the verb. All the objects referring to verbs get the action of the verb.

Here are some additional examples of transitive verbs with their objects.

e.g. He sold his car.

I bought some milk.

They read a book.

Tom wrote a letter.

When a verb takes an object that gets the action of the verb, it is said that it is a transitive verb.

Intransitive verbs

e.g. My sister cried.

In this sentence it is clearly seen that there is not any word after the verb *cried*. In other words, there is not used any word after the verb, so there is not any noun to get the action of the word. It is impossible to say as: *My brother cried something*. The verb *to cry* is not used with an object. It is impossible to cry something.

Here are some examples of intransitive verbs.

e.g. She slept.

The shelf fell.

My dog ran.

He sneezed.

It should be noted that in each case, the subject is performing the action of the verb.

So transitive verbs that are used with a direct object transform an action to an object and can also have an indirect object which shows to or for whom the action is performed. In other words, a transitive verb is a kind of verb that transforms an action to an object.

e.g. I suggest some changes in this plan.

Changes are the direct object of the verb *to suggest*.

She took some pictures.

Some pictures are the direct object of the verb *to take*.

We sent Angela the postcard.

In this sentence, the direct object *the postcard* gets the action of the verb *to send*. The indirect object *Angela* is the person to whom the postcard was sent.

e.g. The teacher gave her students some tests.

In this sentence, the direct object *some tests* gets the action of the verb *to give*. The indirect object *students* are the group of people to whom the tests were given.

So it is clearly obvious that indirect object indicates to or for whom the action is performed, though the prepositions *for* and *to* are not used. These verbs are called bi-transitive or di-transitive verbs. It means that they are followed by either a direct object or an indirect object. Transitive verbs that are used by an indirect object usually demand a preposition. If the verb is followed only by one object then it is called a mono transitive verb.

e.g. The students gave their essays to the teacher.

Linking verbs are distinguished as intransitive verbs. They are a subgroup of state verbs. They do not convey any action.

e.g. She seems happy about her life.

They are the champions.

State verbs indicate a state of being. In such cases an adjective usually describes the subject whereas the verb is not described in the sentence. The following words are the examples of state verbs: *to keep calm*, *to feel excited*, *to remain silent*, *to be lucky*, *to taste good*, *to become nervous*, *to look beautiful*.

1.3. The usage of transitive and intransitive verbs with prepositions (to/for) and personal pronouns in the English language.

Please note that almost all the English verbs are transitive and intransitive simultaneously and their significance in a particular sentence depends on the availability of a direct object after these verbs.

She lights candles. To light is a transitive verb because there is a direct object after the transitive verb.

The newspaper burns. To burn is an intransitive verb because the sentence ends immediately after the intransitive verb.

These websites sell expensive flights. To sell is a transitive verb because a direct object comes after the transitive verb.

Expensive flights sell later than the cheap ones. To sell is an intransitive verb in this sentence as there is an adverbial modifier of time after the verb and the direct object is missing.

She collects stamps. To collect is a transitive verb with the direct object in this sentence. The direct object comes immediately after the transitive verb without any preposition.

They gathered at a café. To gather is an intransitive verb with the adverbial modifier of place in the given sentence and it comes after the intransitive verb.

Let's consider the usage of the verb *to yield* as a transitive and intransitive verb. This verb has both transitive and intransitive meanings. If there is a direct object after the verb *to yield* then this verb is translated as *to plant* and *to result*. Here are the following examples of this verb with the following meanings.

For example: These apple and pear trees yield good fruit every year.

This type of soil yields better crops than the other one.

The valuable currency of the country yields seven per cent yearly.

The new fee is supposed to yield million of dollars into the national budget.

In the absence of the direct object in the sentence, the verb *to yield* has the following meanings as an intransitive verb. It is translated as *to give up; to step back or to concede*.

For example: After the worthless discussions, the opponents yielded.

There is not any direct object after the verb. So it means that the opponents gave up or step back the discussions.

e.g. One of the ways to give up an enticement is to yield to it.

There is an indirect object after the verb with the preposition *to*. Therefore, it has the meaning of *to concede*.

As we can see the verb *to yield* in the transitive and intransitive usages have no connection with each other. So if the presence or absence of the direct object after the verb is not specified then, they will never be able even to understand the meaning of sentences in the English language. Let's see the following examples.

e.g. Whereas two kilos of apples yield one litre of juice, four kilos of oranges make only two litres of juice.

In the given example, the verbs *to make* and *to yield* are transitive verbs, because there are direct objects after these verbs. Therefore, these verbs are in the meaning of *to give*.

e.g. Pedestrians have the right to cross the road, when cars yield.

The verb *to yield* stands at the very end in this sentence and it is clearly seen that it is an intransitive verb which is translated as *to concede*.

e.g. When it shows the red light in traffic lights, then cars, buses have to yield.

All the same, a simple sentence is terminated at the predicate *yield*, which comes after the modal verb *have to* in this case, therefore, it is translated as *have to concede* or *have to give way*.

In the presence of a single object in the sentence (as a rule, a direct object as an indirect object, direct or only indirect objects), as well as in the presence of both objects (direct and indirect objects at the same time) has a well-trained word order in sentences in the English language: subject + predicate + direct object + *to / for* + indirect object + adverbial modifier of place. An English sentence with an action verb as a predicate and such kind of word order (direct object + prepositions *to / for* + indirect object) is called a sentence with a prepositional phrase.

If the English verb-predicate has two objects (both direct and indirect objects simultaneously), then they can be easily interchanged: in this case an indirect object comes first: *to give* (whom? what?), and then comes a direct object: *to blame* (whom? what?). Then the word order is as following: subject + predicate + indirect object + direct object + adverbial modifier of place – no prepositions are placed before an indirect object in this case. Thus, the use of prepositions *to / for* will depend on the need to point out the indirect object standing after the direct object in the English language.

For example: She left the money on the table.

In this case only a direct object is possible, because an indirect object is missing in the sentence: she (subject); left (predicate); the money (direct object); on the table (adverbial modifier of place).

e.g. They ordered our favourite meals for us.

As both objects are present in the sentence (the direct object – our favourite meal; and the indirect object – us), both variants are possible.

e.g. She has given car keys to Andrew.

In this example both the direct object (car keys) and the indirect object (Andrew) can be used at the same time. This kind of rule in the sentence is a characteristic one in the English language.

As a rule, the inverting construction suggesting the reverse order of the objects (an indirect object comes first, and then a direct object comes) are used in the English language only in those cases if the direct object is too long and the indirect object is short. In this case, in the direct order of objects listener can simply forget the beginning of the sentence by the time the speaker would have finished the sentence with the direct object.

e.g. An expensive and relaxing travel in a different country can help a tourist to avoid spending the days in cheap places in the countryside.

Let's analyze the members of this sentence. *An expensive and relaxing travel* – it is a subject expressed with the qualitative adjectives; *can help* – a modal verb with a notional verb, they form a verbal predicate altogether; *a tourist* – is an indirect object; *to avoid spending the days* – is a direct object and it is not expressed with a noun, but with a verb in the infinitive form with the corresponding words to it; *in the countryside* – the adverbial modifier of place.

It is clear that if to apply the normal order of objects (first a direct object, and then an indirect object) in the English sentence, the speaker would forget everything that was previously mentioned.

As it was mentioned above that an indirect object can be used with the prepositions *for* and *to*. However, the use of a direct object and an indirect object with transitive and intransitive verbs has been mentioned. Let's consider the following rule: the preposition *for* imposes an indirect object after the verbs in the following examples.

For example: Ann was in the supermarket some hours ago and she *bought* food *for* her family.

When we were on holiday we *chose* a very comfortable house *for* our rest.

I usually *cook* different meals *for* my family when I have free time.

If you want you can *leave* a message *for* her.

She *does* everything *for* her family and children.

At last they *found* a five-star hotel for us in Italy.

Their family *bought* a three-room flat *for* their son in the centre of the city.

She *makes* coffee *for* her family members after dinner every day.

We want to buy a new car, that's why we *save* money *for* it.

This construction company *builds* hotels not only *for* tourists but also *for* local people.

The use of prepositions after all other verbs in the English language corresponds to the simple rule: an indirect object is imposed with the preposition *to*.

For example: Ann does not *give* any permission *to* her children to go out with their friends if their homework is not ready.

This restaurant *suggests* delicious food *to* local people and tourists.

Most hotels *provide* different types of services *to* their guests in this country.

Our country *sells* oil *to* the different countries of the world.

In most countries shops are *closed to* people after ten o'clock in the evening.

The given rule and examples show that the use of prepositions in the English language continues to be used with the verb-predicate even if it comes after a modal verb, the auxiliary verb is in the function of negative form:

e.g. You do not have to suggest her a job if she does not want to work in this company.

In this sentence, the notional verb (to suggest) comes after the auxiliary verb in the negative form (do not) and after the modal verb (have to). It does not impact on the notional verb and the use of direct objects and indirect objects. It does not impact on the use of prepositions in the English language, either.

In some cases, the adverb can stand immediately after the direct object, if it is connected with its meaning:

e.g. Most hotels provide different types of concessive services to tourists in this country.

If a direct object and an indirect object are both expressed with personal pronouns then only a prepositional structure or a direct order of objects are used. The object of such kind of sentences is the pronouns in the objective case – *it* or *them*.

e.g. She needs your car. Can you lend it to her?

It cannot be used the reverse order of the objects (lend her it) in the last sentence.

However, if one of the objects is expressed by a noun or a word combination in the English language, then they can be easily interchanged:

e.g. The servant was very polite and he was ready to give a hand to her.

Since the direct object is expressed by the word combination *to give a hand*, then nothing prevents from interchanging it with the indirect object:

e.g. The servant was very polite and he was ready to give her a hand.

I cannot find my course books. Can you find them for me?

It can be only used the direct order of objects with the prepositional structure, as well as the direct and indirect object are expressed by the personal pronouns in the second sentence and the variant with the reverse order of the objects are incorrect: *Please, find me them*.

For all other English pronouns (such as *one, some, this, that*) the turnover with the prepositional structure is not necessary. This rule does not refer to the personal pronouns.

e.g. She needs food. Can you buy some to her?

Although the direct and indirect objects are expressed by the pronouns, nevertheless, as it is seen that the direct object is not expressed by the personal pronouns, it is expressed by the indefinite pronoun. As it was mentioned above that the change of objects is not possible only in that case if both objects are expressed with the personal pronouns. But in this sentence, the direct object is expressed by the indefinite pronoun *some*. Therefore, nothing prevents from changing their places in the sentence: She needs food. Can you buy her some?

There are a lot of verbs that objects can be used in the reverse order in the English language. So here is the structure that can be used in sentences: Verb + Indirect Object + Direct Object.

e.g. The students of the first year said they were going to take their first exam at the university. So we wished them success.

It is only possible the reverse order in the usage of the objects in the second sentence: So we wished success to them.

e.g. The representatives asked us a lot of questions in the meeting yesterday.

The direct order of the objects is not possible in this sentence: The representatives asked a lot of questions to us.

e.g. These dresses cost us just fifty dollars at the sale in Italy.

The reverse order of words is only possible in this sentence, because the predicate is expressed by the verb *to cost*. There is not any need to use a prepositional structure in the sentence: These dresses cost just fifty dollars to us at the sale in Italy.

e.g. We did not allow our children much freedom. (We did not allow much freedom to our children).

Some English transitive verbs can be used with objects only in the direct order, i.e. according to the prepositional scheme: Verb + Direct object + Indirect object.

e.g. We carried the bags to her house.

This is the best restaurant in the town and it carries the main important meals to its customers.

It was described the importance of places of interests to readers in his book.

Let's pay attention to the structure of this sentence: the inversion does not take place because it is not possible with the verb *to describe*. Although the direct object is long (the importance of places of interests) and the indirect object consists of the indefinite pronoun and the noun (some books) in the given sentence.

e.g. Please, explain your behavior to us.

Will this insurance company explain the worst accident to us?

The indirect object is expressed only with the short object pronoun (us) and the direct object is expressed with the long word combination (the worst accident).

e.g. These guides have a good ability to explain unique and specific cultural differences to the tourists.

The verb *to explain* is in the infinitive form in this sentence, but it is still used with two objects: the direct object (unique and specific cultural differences) and the indirect object (tourists).

e.g. The guides are doing their best at giving interesting information to the tourists about the town and historical buildings by spending some hours sharing their experience and knowledge.

The transitive verb *to give* is used as a gerund (giving – as giving information or providing information), nevertheless, the direct object comes first (tourists) and then it comes the indirect object (the town and historical buildings).

e.g. The aim of the visit is to introduce our country to the guests.

She does not believe to us. We cannot prove anything to her. It is difficult to persuade her.

These documents are the only evidence that prove they are illegally in this country to the police.

The direct object of the verb *to prove* is expressed with an additional subordinate sentence (they are illegally in this country), even despite the object is used in the usual order with the prepositional structure and the indirect object (the police) stands after the direct object.

They said nothing to us. There is only the direct order of the words and it is not possible to change this sentence as: *They said us nothing.* There is an omission of the preposition *to* after the verb *to say*.

As it is seen, the category of transitivity and intransitivity and interpretation of transitivity in the English language and peculiarities of transitive and intransitive verbs in Modern English were observed in the **first chapter**.

In the first subchapter linguistic interpretation of transitive and intransitive verbs was considered. Moreover, different classifications of verbs by linguists were presented.

In the second subchapter the peculiarities of transitive and intransitive verbs and their classification according to the different criteria were explained.

In the third subchapter we can clearly see, the usage of transitive and intransitive verbs with prepositions *to/for* and personal pronouns. Accordingly, the following word order was presented: subject + predicate + indirect object + direct object + adverbial modifier of place – no prepositions are placed before an indirect object in this case.

Thus, the use of prepositions *to/for* will depend on the need to point out the indirect object standing after the direct object in the English language. The dissertation highlights that if a direct object and an indirect object are both expressed with personal pronouns, then the object of such kind of sentences is the pronouns in the objective case – *it* or *them*.

Chapter 2. The main differences between transitive and intransitive verbs and peculiarities of their usage.

2.1. Comparative analysis of transitive and intransitive verbs.

Transitive verbs

These verbs, as opposed to intransitive verbs, express actions directed to one or another object. For this reason they can take an object. Only a few number of transitive verbs have the meaning of relationships, such as to belong (to), to have, to depend (on), to suit, to resemble, etc and they do not constitute a form of passive voice, as they do not denote any action. The transitivity of the verbs may be disclosed:

a) In the compatibility with the direct object. For example, the verbs: to take, to see, to make, to do, to build, to touch, to hear, to move, to have:

e.g. They have a large library.

Here includes the combinations with the direct object expressed with the reflexive pronouns (myself, herself, ourselves, etc). For example: She wanted to cook the cake by herself.

b) In the compatibility with the prepositional object. For example, the verbs: to talk about, to wait for, to look for, to look at, to take care of, etc. In this case, the preposition is the indicator of the transitivity of the preceding verb. For example:

e.g. They will take care of the child.

In some cases the verbs of this type can take different prepositions depending on the semantics.

Intransitive verbs

The verbs that express an action, not extending to the object are included to this type of verbs. The state verbs include to this class. The following are the examples of state verbs: to live, to sleep, to be, to exist. The verbs denoting movement: to write, to go, to drive, to drink, to want, to love, etc.

The characteristic features of intransitive verbs are:

- They cannot take objects;
- The absence of forms of passive voice

. In the structure of phraseological units the leading component (the verb) can also take the form of passive voice; in this case the preposition is after the phraseological unit.

e.g. To take notice of – to be taken notice of

To look for – to be looked for

Besides the actual transitive verbs (i.e. the verbs that the transitive meaning is main), the verbs are often used in the transitive meaning which have basically intransitive meaning. For example, intransitive verbs such as: to fly, to drive and some other verbs can be transitive verbs as well (make someone or something perform the appropriate action). In the following examples, it can be seen how transitive verbs can be used as intransitive verbs: *to fly a plane; to run a risk*. These verbs change their meanings when they are used as intransitive verbs.

As it was mentioned above some verbs can be either transitive verb or intransitive verbs. It depends on the meaning.

To eat as an intransitive verb:

e.g. When Ann is at school, she has no time to eat.

To eat as a transitive verb:

e.g. Ann usually eats pizza for dinner.

To eat is transitive; *pizza* is the direct object

Transitive verb: *to turn*

e.g. Ann turned her head.

Intransitive verb: *to turn*

e.g. Ann turned and walked back to the garden.

Some verbs are usually intransitive: to live, to die and so on. They may occur in the transitive usage in the construction of the so – called cognate object: to live a long life.

The verbs that their transitive meaning is primary can be used absolutely without objects (in the active voice). In this case, there is not any rethinking of the verb, the verb remains as a transitive verb because the object of the action is clear from the context or insignificant. It means that such actions have the ability to perform actions: They will leave today.

The following verbs as *to dress, to wash, to shave* are often used absolutely when the object of the action is the doer (the reflexive pronoun is omitted):

e.g. If she will go in and dress, I shall wash.

In those cases, when transitive and intransitive meanings are both essential but not derivatives then it should be noted about two homonymous verbs – transitive or intransitive, but it should be pointed out that this view is not shared by all linguists.

Thus, in the English language the distinction between transitive verbs and intransitive verbs is much more difficult than in any other languages. In some cases transitivity and intransitivity is revealed in the context or in the word combinations.

2.2. The absolute use of transitive verbs in Modern English

As it is known, the problem of transitivity in the English language is associated with a number of controversial general linguistic problems, such as polysemy and homonymy; identity and the boundaries of the word, etc

The interpretation of the absolute use of transitive verbs is necessarily followed by the general conception of transitivity and therefore, researchers diverge in different directions.⁴ As they have different opinions on this issue. Some of these opinions are controversial.

In the «Dictionary of linguistic terms» by O.S. Akhmanova, the term «absolutivity» is defined as «self – sufficient, not requiring the proliferation and refinement with other words».

e.g. She drinks, in contrast to, She drinks a cup of coffee.

Although no one was engaged with the special study of absolute usage of transitive verbs, many linguists mention it in their grammars, and some of them relate it to the most important language phenomena.⁵

To have a look at the transitivity as the category of syntax which is manifested in the presence of the verb objects determines the interpretation of the absolute consumption as a particular case of verb intransitivity. These are the characteristic features of English grammars and dictionaries for classical English grammars and dictionaries.⁶

Developing this point of view, O. Jespersen and G.O. Curme insisted on the inexpedient use of the absolute use from other cases of the objectless use of verbs that he qualified as intransitive, regardless of the reasons of the absence of the object.

⁴ Vera Arinstein, *Practice of semantic-syntactic interpretation of the absolute use of transitive verbs in Modern English. Theory and methods of semasiological research* (St. Petersburg: LEMA, 1979), 3

⁵ Lia Kovaleva, *The issues in English Philology* (Irkutsk: IGLU, 1970), 110

⁶ Vera Arinstein, *Practice of semantic-syntactic interpretation of the absolute use of transitive verbs in Modern English. Theory and methods of semasiological research* (St. Petersburg: LEMA, 1979), 3

At the same time some researchers who studied this problem in English and other languages notice that the transitive verbs in the absolute use attach action in general, the action is more abstract in which the transitivity is weakened in its specific content and the verb can be considered as a half-intransitive verb. A focus on the process of distraction of the object reaches its maximum in such usages as: *This child is only five years old, and he already reads*. The transitive verbs in the intransitive usage are transferred to another semantic group of state verbs (in the narrow sense – the group expressing a certain human activity). Moreover, such semantic shift and the lack of need for further elaboration and disclosure in the object, in fact, deprive transitivity.

There is another dominated concept of transitivity in linguistics which takes into account the syntactic, lexical-semantic, semantic-syntactic features of verbs. Let's consider them in order.

The problem of syntactic features of verbs is closely linked with the study of optional and mandatory compatibility. According to this study, language elements can have two types of compatibility: mandatory and optional. Mandatory compatibility is inherent in the related elements that are required as the semantic content and the form of the language units. Mandatory compatibility characterizes those units that have a «strong control». This term was used by A.M Peshkovsky to denote relation of the verb with case forms of the noun and it is necessary to complete the transmitted verb meaning.⁷

«Strong control» is contrast to «weak control» in which such a necessity is not expected. However, if in the studies of strong and weak control are associated with certain case forms projecting the verb, then the concept of mandatory and optional compatibility is wider and not limited with the relationship between a verb and its substantive dependent, although it is most clearly manifested in the verbal compatibility.

The theory of mandatory and optional compatibility received final recognition after its development in the works of the leading Russian scientists V.V. Vinogradov, V.G. Admoni and was further developed by a number of researchers.

V.G. Admoni distinguishes verbal forms that do not have an absolute use, and also notes the lack of independence of the individual subclasses of lexico - grammatical classes of words. According to V.G. Admoni, there is a special type of transitive verbs of incomplete predicate which are characterized by a mandatory compatibility with an object and the verbs with an adverbial modifier. According to V.G. Admoni, it is observed only in the verbs of incomplete

⁷ Alexander Peshkovsky, *Selected Works* (Moscow: UCHPEDGIZ, 1959), 34

predicate with the meaning of place. V.G. Admoni considers that the connection of the noun to its definition is optional.⁸

Developing the further idea of mandatory and optional compatibility, V.G. Admoni includes to this concept not only the combination of certain classes of words or particular morphological forms, but also the members of the sentence. Secondary members of the sentence – an object, an attribute and an adverbial modifier are attached to a mandatory compatibility with its leading word. It is difficult to disagree with this statement, but it hardly makes any sense to attach it to the phenomenon of mandatory and optional compatibility, because to be a member of a sentence means to perform any function in the sentence, and the function of the sentence member in the grammatical sense of this term necessarily involves relation with other syntactic elements. Any functional unit of syntax assumes its specific compatibility. Beyond compatibility, the function cannot be performed in main and secondary members of the sentence. Therefore, the extension of the concept of mandatory and optional compatibility on the members of the sentence that mentioned above is hardly expedient.

As evidence that the mandatory compatibility exists, the verb *to be* is often cited as an example and its equivalents in other languages. It is assumed that the verb *to be* is an example of a language element, which is not capable of absolute functioning and requires mandatory compatibility. If we consider the verb *to be* in isolation outside a certain syntactic structure then, this statement may seem fair. Studying certain words as lexical units, the concept of optional and mandatory compatibility is quite reasonable. For example, the English verb *to lay - laid - laid* is taken in isolation, as a lexical unit that requires an indication of a place and this property is manifested in a number of syntactic constructions:

e.g. They were laying the table for dinner.

The necessity of a verb element is easy to prove by applying the method of omission as well as syntactic construction as:

e.g They were laying.

It has an incomplete meaning and cannot be regarded as correct.

It must be admitted that the verbs such as *to lay - laid - laid* or *to be* are focused on some additional elements that reveal the essence of the transmitted actions in their semantic content.

Participating in the syntactic structure, the verbs of this type typically implement their associative properties and are combined with the corresponding dependence. This gives the reason to a number of linguists to consider those units as part of combinatorial capacity in certain

⁸ Vladimir Admoni, *Sentence structure and word combinations in the Indo-European languages* (St.Petersburg: Nauka, 1979), 134

syntactic structures of their mandatory compatibility. However, the essence of this phenomenon is not as simple as it may seem at first glance. In vast majority of cases, verbal units with semantic and formal orientation on some implementing elements getting into the syntactic structure, usually implements its own properties which are potentially isolated units of the dictionary. This pattern is quite natural, because the syntactic structure is significantly due to the semantics of its constituent units.

However, in some syntactical constructions, there are significant differences between the requirements of the semantics, forms of individual units and their syntactic functioning. Words that are included into a syntactic construction can implement only those of its valence properties which are provided to update the place in the syntactic construction. Otherwise, these valence properties remain in unexpressed state or presented in a hidden form.⁹

So there is a question. What is valence? The concept of valence is still relatively new in linguistics. It received its spread only in the last thirty years. Valence is understood as the ability of the verb to have a certain number of open positions that are filled by certain elements. Initially, the valence was determined only as a property of the verb, and the compatibility was a broad concept and included the valence in itself. Verb (predicate) was considered as the dominant part of the sentence. «The primacy of the predicate is underlined by the fact that it is the carrier of predictive categories (time, modality, etc.) and supports the organizing unit of the sentence: other parts of the sentence – a subject, objects and an adverbial modifier are related through the verb».¹⁰ It is characteristic that the valence is only considered as a property of the verb for this approach; valence is quantitative in nature, in terms of the number of «required members»; qualitative characteristic of «accomplices», it is referred to as a distribution in regard to their morphological and semantic properties, but not due to their syntactic role in the sentence.

However, after certain time, some changes were observed in foreign linguistics. There is a tendency to associate valence (the number of «members») with the meaning of the utterance. G. Helbig, on this basis, determined the valence as «an abstract approach of the verb to its dependent elements».¹¹ Semantic valence is the restriction of selectivity, regulatory compliance of context members. The arguments that are presented in a certain way as morpho - syntactic structures (certain members of the sentence and parts of speech in certain forms) represent the syntactic valence. Syntactic valence considers mandatory or optional filling of open positions, determined by the carrier of valence in each language. Thus, we can see that there is a relationship between syntactic and semantic valence, and the semantics of the verb is the main factor in determining the number and syntactic function arguments. But it should be noted that

⁹ Irina Ivanova, Varvara Burlakova and Georgiy Pocheptsov, *Theoretical Grammar of Modern English* (Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1981), 151-153

¹⁰ Lucien Tesnière, *Structural elements of Syntax* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1988), 12-13

¹¹ Maria Stepanova, Gerhard Helbig, *Parts of speech and valency in Modern German* (Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1978), 157

the syntactic valence characterizes only the formal (structural) side. Therefore, the semantic valence should be considered as a content and syntax - as a form of expression of semantic valence.¹²

If we go back to the verb *to lay – laid - laid* which according to the opinions of supporters of the optional and mandatory compatibility, there is a mandatory factor for the valence on the fact of the adverbial modifier of place and consider its functioning in syntactic structures. It turns out that if this verb enters the form, the scheme of which are not provided for the required position within the meaning of elements of adverbial modifier of place then, it can function freely to operate without these dependent units.

For a given syntactic model construction requires an absolute use of the verb *to lay*, because it is necessary to convey the idea of the process of «laying» without regard to where and how it occurs. In such cases, the adverbial modifier of place is not only required, but it is impossible since the emergence of the dependent units upon the verb deprives the ability of the verb to communicate the meaning of the universality of the action. It is similar with the verb *to be* getting in a model of: *She is playing the piano*. The verb *to be* stands out as a unit:

e.g. She is young lucky / smart / shy and so on.

However, if we observe the text of Hamlet's monologue and to consider the well-known construction *to be or not to be*, then in this structure the verb *to be* is not characterized only by mandatory compatibility, but also it is characterized by mandatory incompatibility. Such absolute use of the verb *to be* is caused by the requirements of the model and it is observed not only for the verb *to be* as existential, but also as a ligament. For example:

e.g. I want them to be as glad and happy as they are now.

The existence of structural scheme requiring absolute functioning of verbs such as *to be* and *to lie*, suggests that the presence or absence of a complementary unit is determined not only by the meaning of the verb, but also by the position it occupies in each of admitting its structures. Even the personal form of the verb in the imperative mood can function without dependent compatibilities, although the personal forms are characterized by the expanded compatibilities.¹³

V.V. Burlakova studying the use of transitive verbs in Modern English, writes: «If a transitive verb is viewed as vocabulary units of language at the level of lexical meaning, in this case, any transitive verb that is really taken in isolation always has the obligatory lexical combinability. However, if the analysis is viewed on the syntactic level, i.e. to consider the functioning of the transitive verbs in certain structures then, the situation changes dramatically,

¹² Maria Stepanova, Gerhard Helbig, *Parts of speech and valency in Modern German* (Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1978), 53

¹³ Irina Ivanova, Varvara Burlakova and Georgiy Pocheptsov, *Theoretical Grammar of Modern English* (Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1981), 151-153

because in this case, the compatibility of a transitive verb is regulated by the requirements of the model». ¹⁴

Another concern is to ensure that by distinguishing the different levels of language, namely, lexical in relation to which the issue of transitivity as lexical=semantic features and syntax and their interaction should be taken into account. In the study of transitivity the sentences in a speech cannot be excluded from the centre of view because transitive verbs are used with or without an object in such speech situations. So the statement by N. D. Andreev about the problem of a categorical measure (quantitative level implementation of a language category) by the example of the transitive verbs is quite reasonable. He considers: «The simplest example of syntactic categorical measures may be the relative frequency of occurrence of the direct object of transitive verbs as the verb *to kill*. This verb of relative frequency is much higher than the verb *to say*; there is strong transitivity which opposes the weak transitivity». ¹⁵ In this case, the interaction of different levels of the language does not mean the mixing units of different levels. The study of the frequency of the use of an object in one or another transitive verb can be made only in the framework of sentences and in the speech. As in the framework of the same phrase the transitive verb itself, or rather its adoption of a lexical-semantic group of transitive verbs is defined on the basis of a lexical control. ¹⁶

The dependence of the compatibility of units on the syntactic model, in which they are included, can be demonstrated on the example of other classes of words. The forms of genitive case of nouns are very indicative in this sense as it implies a mandatory compatibility with the leading element, overriding possessive case:

e.g. Jane's hair, my father's car, a dean's office, etc

Nevertheless, there are syntactic constructions in which the presence of a leading postpositive element in the form of possessive case is impossible:

e.g. She is an old friend of Jane's.

Thus, the compatibility of the verbal unit may be determined by a verbal syntactic structure in which it is included. The same verb, for example, can function in different structures. In the verbal combination *to make some comments on it to someone* it is also possible the construction with two dependent similar types, however, due to the different structure and it represents other schemes:

e.g. To make some comments on it – to make some comments to someone

¹⁴ Varvara Burlakova, *The basic elements of word combinations in Modern English* (St. Petersburg: LGU, 1975), 35

¹⁵ Nikolay Andreev, *Problems of structural and probabilistic analysis of language* (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1975), 56

¹⁶ Anton Mukhin, *Linguistic analysis of the theoretical and methodological problems* (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1976), 134

The structure is a certain set of elements in certain relation if some elements are entered or withdrawn from this structure then, the structure itself will change.¹⁷

It has been paid and being paid a lot of attention to the control of the verbs in linguistics. Here it is regarded the interpretation of control written by A.M. Peshkovsky, a concept as an integral part of its general syntactic views had a significant influence on the later study of syntax of the English language and other languages. It is talked about the concepts of «strong control» and «weak control». A.M. Peshkovsky pointed to the close and the organic relationship of control and transitivity, although this relationship darkened too broad interpretation of their control («strong control» and «weak control»). He wrote: «The phenomenon of strong and weak control in relation to verbs creates a division of verbs into transitive and intransitive. Transitive verbs are called those verbs that are capable to a strong management and intransitive are unable to it. As the verbs *to live, to die, to grow, to sneeze, to cough and so on*».¹⁸

Considering the linguistic nature of the control there is a relationship that exists between a transitive verb and an object. It is also about the place of the object among linguistic units has a relative attitude that V. N. Yartseva noted in the report. This report was devoted to the key issues of comparative – typological analysis of members of sentences in different language types: «When considering the grammatical category called as an object should resolve the issue: whether the object is directly included in the simplest model of the sentence or it belongs to a nominal verbal - binary phrase and only through its intercession it is included in the sentence. According to many authors, it is noted that the object is the second objective center giving an opportunity to resolve the issue in favor of the first of these assumptions. However, the division of verbs into transitive and intransitive verbs exists in languages (no matter, whether this division is morphological or lexical – syntactic methods) and manifests in many languages of the dependence of the direct object not only on the verb, but also on the bits of words in which the meaning of the action is reflected. For example, the names of the actions, the names of the performers of the actions, and so on. It makes a close analysis of the simple (without extension) object binomials».¹⁹

In this statement by V. N. Yartseva, the accessories object of a nominal – verbal phrase plays an important position, through which it is included in the sentence. This position really finds support in the division of verbs into transitive and intransitive of which the first can manage, the latter are not able to control the object. Hence, it is clear that the concept of objects, transitivity and control are mutually dependent on each other as concepts arising in relation to the phenomena - units and relationships - the same level of language. And if the control and transitivity cannot be interpreted as a phenomenon of the syntactic level of the language so the object cannot be understood in this context, namely, as an element of the sentence. In this

¹⁷ Irina Ivanova, Varvara Burlakova and Georgiy Pocheptsov, *Theoretical Grammar of Modern English* (Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1981), 151-154

¹⁸ Alexander Peshkovsky, *Selected Works* (Moscow: UCHPEDGIZ, 1959), 34

¹⁹ Victoria Yartseva, *Historical syntax of the English language* (Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, 1961), 166

connection it is necessary to consider carefully once again the so-called secondary parts of the sentence, which include the object. And in this respect, a remarkable conclusion made by V. N. Yartseva: «According to our view, the range of the members of the sentence, the occurrence of which was due to the approach to the syntax from the standpoint of logic may be the subject of revision and refinement».²⁰

In that report, V. N. Yartseva noted some interesting observations and conclusions by V. A. Avronin, who investigated the question of what lies on the basis of the connection between the direct object and the transitive verb, as well as the words belonging to other parts of speech. From his research, V. A. Avronin made an explicit and very constructive conclusion: «the words belonging to a particular part of speech, as well as, its syntactic function do not play a crucial role in the problem of the subordination of the direct object. But what plays a crucial role in this case? The answer to this question can only be: semantics of a subordinating word».²¹

The impossibility of determining the meaningful features of objects on the basis of control it can be judged, for example, according to the statements by O. Jespersen and V. N. Yartseva who investigated the semantic relations between the verb and objects in the English language. Thus, V. N. Yartseva writes: «When we consider the objective ties arising between the verb and its object in the verb – object collocations, it can be seen that they can be different in the content».²² On this basis, different types of objects are distinguished in grammar books:

- The inner object: She smiled a little short smile.
- The object having certain goals: to bring up a child, she turns on the computer, etc

However, although the object is always somehow limits and specifies the action expressed by the verb, semantics of verbs themselves, as well as the content of the objects can be so diverse that the classification of this kind should be composed of an unlimited number of small units, and not surprisingly, O. Jespersen says «due to the infinite options of meanings inherent in the verbs, sensitive (or logical) relations between the verbs and their objects can be so diverse that they formulate any attempt of their analysis or classification. On the basis of control, in accordance with the direction of this linguistic (lexical) relations between a transitive verb and an object can be set on the lexical-semantic differentiation of transitive verbs some of which, for example, in the English language, is controlled by a preposition, others use another preposition

²⁰ Victoria Yartseva, *Historical syntax of the English language* (Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, 1961), 166

²¹ Valentine Avronin, *Problems of studying the functional aspect of language* (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1975), 166

²² Victoria Yartseva, *Historical syntax of the English language* (Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, 1961), 169

or without any preposition, etc».²³ This means that controlling elements still have other features with their common lexical and semantic features of transitivity which are different from the contextual features.

The study of transitive verbs (and generally lexemes endowed the signs of transitivity related to different parts of speech) requires the allocation of special lexical units which are quite different from the sentence and structural units of the syntactic level of the language.

The setting of transitivity of verbs linguists often turn to sentences but not to phrases, i.e. syntactic units in the framework of which phrases are formed («helping material for sentences»). J. Vendryes comes to the following conclusion: «The verb is really intransitive without the usage of an object. Because the action they express does not pass on any subject».²⁴ However, would it be correct to solve the question about transitivity and intransitivity of verbs dependent on whether the object is performed in the sentence or not? The intransitivity of verbs can be judged only if they control objects in phrases or whether they are able to form sentences on the basis of lexical control. The transitive verb can be used without object in the sentences and in this form it does not cease to be a transitive verb. To verify this, there can be performed an experiment consisting in the fact that instead of a single transitive verb, a transitive verb can be used with an object. Consequently, the solution of the issue of such specific content features of the verbal lexeme as transitive or intransitive should not be linked with the use or disuse of objects in a given sentence which is a unit construction of other syntactic level of language.²⁵

L. S. Barkhudarov writes: «if the transitive verb is used without an object (absolute use) then, the transitive verb does not cease to be a transitive as in the absolute use it retains the potential opportunity to be combined with an object (in this case, there is no change in the semantics of the verb)».²⁶

A.M .Peshkovsky, in his turn, notes that «if a transitive verb is exactly used in a transitive meaning (she bought, she asked) then, it will be the predicate of the incomplete sentences, although there is a subject».²⁷

Let's consider this rule in the context of such sentence as: He killed a hare. The author considers this sentence as incomplete and based on the testimony of experiments—

²³ Otto Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1958), 123

²⁴ Joseph Vendryes, *A linguistic introduction to History* (Cardiff, Kegan Paul International Publishing Limited, 2004), 52

²⁵ Anton Mukhin, *Linguistic analysis of the theoretical and methodological problems* (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1976), 111-134

²⁶ Leonid Barkhudarov, *The structure of a simple sentence in Modern English* (Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1966), 89

²⁷ Alexander Peshkovsky, *Selected Works* (Moscow: UCHPEDGIZ, 1959), 37

transformations of an incomplete sentence to complete the meaning in the given sentence: He killed; He killed the hare.²⁸

This approach to the absolute use of transitive verbs is not considered as a loss of transitivity, as verbs in the absence of objects is noted that the persistence of correlation with the object (the object's intention).

2.3. The absolute use of transitive verbs from the semantic and syntactic point of view

Development of linguistics, in particular, semantic and syntax allowed completely new views on many issues including the absolute use of transitive verbs. The progress in the study of control and members of sentence are associated with the recognition of the fact that a good syntactic theory should operate at least two series of concepts: syntactic and semantic.

Here are the following principles that should be taken into account:

- a) There's not a logical connection between semantic and syntactic control;
- b) The semantic control, as well as, the syntactic control can be strong and weak;
- c) Therefore, there are four possible semantic and syntactic types of control.

The first type has a strong semantic and syntactic control. For example, *to love* (who, whom), *to give* (who, what, whom), *to tell* (who, whom, what), *to want* (who, whom, what), *to like* (who, whom what) and so on.

The second type has a strong semantic and weak or no syntactic control. Any case of non-verbal expression of the meaning which is verbal by nature can be as an example. Thus, the verb *to export* has three strong notional and syntactic valences:

e.g. Our country exports oil to different European countries.

The first valence is that the verb *to export* has a slightly different model of syntactic control as the same model of semantic control: only the second valence has a strong syntactic control (exports oil), but the first and the third valences are weak (the export of our oil to European countries).

The third type of semantic and syntactic control has a weak or no semantic control. But it has a strong syntactic control. The following verbs are the examples of this type:

²⁸ Anton Mukhin, *Linguistic analysis of the theoretical and methodological problems* (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1976), 111-134

e.g. To give (something to somebody)

To take care of (someone)

To put (something on the table)

To cut (someone's hair)

To comb (someone's hair), etc

These are the best examples for the third type of verbs.

All these verbs are semantically double, but they subordinate the complex and apparently, syntactically able, the so-called dual-control. They may implement three valences at once. In this regard, the statistical method for measuring control should be interpreted as a means of formalization of concepts of syntactic control, but not semantic control.

Finally, the fourth type of semantic and syntactic control has a weak semantic and syntactic control. It can be illustrated by the following examples: to wave to someone, to cure someone from something and so on.

One of the specific features of the object is its ability to serve as a starting point during the position-based functions. It has to be made a sense of what these features are and how they are distributed among the object.

In the first approach, the positional functions have been highlighted by traditional grammar. The nominative case as «direct» in contrast to all other cases in paradigm and selecting direct and indirect objects from the indirect cases, traditional grammar identified a hierarchy of functions, the nature of which remains unrevealed. The concepts of «direct» and «indirect» setting the steps of this hierarchy have not been clearly defined.

These concepts reflect some real relationships in the system of cases that nominative case really encharges all paradigm. But the attempts to figure out the functional meaning and theoretical bases of this hierarchy have not been taken into consideration for a long time. In this situation, the negative role was played by the fact that the problem of positional functions is associated mainly with regard to the cases. There is an impression of that the whole problem is of identical character and concerns only that languages which have case forms. Meanwhile, the positional functions are universal features of languages, not only case languages, but also non-case languages.

It was discussed about one of the positional functions, namely, functions of a subject. Now let's turn to a more detailed consideration of the positional functions, in this regard, the relative predicates with mandatory content valence will be interesting.

Distinguishing between mandatory and optional valence, it should be paid attention to the fact whether it is dealt with the content or formal plan. There is no complete overlap between these plans and in valence issues. The optional in the formal sense of the object, in particular, may be as mandatory in terms of content.

e.g. She is cooking.

It means that she is busy with cooking something. The direct object is missing but in terms of content it is not required. But it is necessary in the content plan. The predicative meaning of the verb «to cook» necessarily includes «a place» not only for a person who cooks, but also for something that is cooked. If the object of the verb *to cook* was not mentioned in the given sentence, it is only because that it was not necessary according to the speech situation.

The concept of formal and content valence that was put forward can be in terms of transformational grammar.

Here are the following examples:

e.g. She can already cook (a person who learnt to cook).

She sews. (in order to keep her family)

In these sentences there are no required objects in terms of content and the list of cooked or sawn objects do not make a sense.

The valence in terms of content is optional which is inherent in the predicate in most general terms. The predicate does not contain the specified «places» for each of its objects in these cases. It indicates only general categorical area to which they are related to. The predicates of the directional movements are typical in this respect. They are combined with objects indicating the spatial coordinates of the subject of the sentence while a speaker is provided to choose the corresponding coordinates from the many possible ones.

Let's return to the positional features. Only predicates with the valence of the required content represent an interest in this aspect and that is not all. The transitive predicates are main for the positional functions.

Actually, the transitive predicates express the influence of the active substance, usually a person on other object. As a rule, such predicates are three-placed and they contain «a place» for the doer, the object of influence and for tools through which the action on the object is performed. In the sentences which predicates occupy these «places» are distributed according to the positions by the following ways: the position of the subject is occupied by the doer: the position of a direct object is exposed to the object, and the position of the indirect object - a tool directly influencing on the object.

e.g. The plane brought the researchers to London.

It can be noticed that in the original source of sentences the distribution of predicates according to the positions is performed by the one specified predicative rule: there is always an active substance (usually a person) in the position of the subject and there is an inert object in the position of the direct object. Semi-active objects are in the position of an indirect object. But they are in the position of subject in some circumstances.

Transitivity and intransitivity of verbs is regarded as a category of deep semantic level, affecting it but not completely determines the surface of syntactic structure of sentences. The interpretation that was mentioned above is more plausible.

As it was already noted above that there is a tendency to explain the absolute use of transitive verbs on syntactic factors. There are all bases in order to consider that the absolute use is characteristic for certain syntactic positions of transitive verbs as a combination of a direct object. Among the positions that are characteristic for the absolute use of transitive verbs the non-personal forms are indicated while the absolute use of transitive verbs are in the position of the predicate in the Present Simple and Past Simple Tense Forms. It usually entails the obligatory presence of an object.²⁹

This explanation can hardly be considered satisfactory, since it does not corresponds the language reality: the absolute use of transitive verbs as it will be shown below meets regularly in positions which are characteristic for non-personal forms and in the position of a simple verbal predicate in all tense forms. The Present Simple and the Past Simple tense forms are not exceptions:

e.g. She works hard as she has to keep her family. (The Present Simple Tense Form)

She cooked. (The Past Simple Tense Form)

B. A. Ilyish relates this phenomenon to the problem of transitivity and intransitivity of verbs. He considers that the verbs without objects are intransitive verbs. B. A. Ilyish writes that the continuous tense forms can actually perform both the one and the other function (as an intransitive and a transitive): *She was writing. She was writing a letter*, etc. The issue with the perfect tense forms is different. For example, the forms of the Present Perfect Tense Form as: *She has bought; He has finished; She has taken; He has forgiven; She has paid* cannot be used as an intransitive verb form without a direct object. The sentence *She has written* represents an incomplete meaning and it requires an object after the verb.³⁰

The perfect tense forms will give a satisfactory sense only in those cases if the transitive verbs are used with a direct object.

²⁹ Varvara Burlakova, *The basic elements of word combinations in Modern English* (St. Petersburg: LGU, 1975), 97

³⁰ Boris Ilyish, *Modern English Language* (Moscow: Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages, 1948), 200-202

e.g. She has published a lot of books.

They have read different books.

She has drawn a picture of her mother.

Thus, in this case transitivity and intransitivity are closely related to the category of aspect. It is not difficult to install semantic basis for this connection: if the action is presented as continuous then, it can be understood as a situation in which the subject remains and it is sufficiently clear without specifying an object. If the action is presented as a finished one, i.e. completed and led to a new state then, the objectless understanding is impossible. It should be indicated the exact result expressed by the perfect form of the verb. Specifically, this result will be indicated by the name of the object which is exposed to occur as a result of the completed action. The perfect tense forms necessarily require a particular result.

It remains to consider a more difficult problem about how transitive and intransitive verbs behave themselves in regard to the general forms: she writes, she will write. Of course, they can be as transitive verbs: she writes a book every year, she wrote this book last year, she will write a book in a year. But can they also be intransitive? It seems they can be used as an intransitive verb, as in terms of continuous form which is particularly suitable for the intransitive function.

e.g. She runs very quickly.

In terms of the Past Simple Tense Form, however, it requires a reservation: it can be used as an intransitive verb only in the case if it means habitual or repeated action.

If it denotes a single completed action then, the use of an intransitive verb is impossible. For example, it cannot be said as: She read in two hours.³¹

The references to sociological factors cited by O. Jespersen in the relevant section of his grammar of Modern English are not more persuasive ones. O. Jespersen considers the absolute use of transitive verbs as a sign of successful civilization and predicts the spread of this phenomenon to the extent that the relationships between people and publicly known information funds will be strengthened.³²

The explanations of the absolute use of transitive verbs with the lexical-semantic features and with the specific terms of speech situation seem more plausible. For example, She is reading now. It means that she is busy with reading.

³¹ Boris Ilyish, *Modern English Language* (Moscow: Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages, 1948), 200-202

³² Otto Jespersen, *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. Part 3: Syntax, Second Volume* (London: George Allen and Unwin LTD, 1954), 168

The predicative meaning of the verb *to read* would inevitably contain «a place» not only for «the reader» but also for «what is read». In this sentence the subject of reading is not mentioned. It is because of in terms of speech situation it was not necessary. The semantic and communicative aspects of the absolute use of transitive verbs have not been studied specifically. The different attempts of those researchers who have tried to identify the ways of such study will be presented in this thesis.

As it was noted above, the study is based on the recognition of the conservation of the verbs used in the absolute use of the object intentions. This situation has far-reaching consequences for the semantic interpretation of the phenomenon as a whole, since it is essentially equivalent to the assumption that the absolute use of the verb conveys some information about the missing object. The semantic structure of the verb contains semes of its objects. Seme is a small unit in semantics. It refers to sememe.

Thus, the issue of the absolute use of transitive verbs is closely related to the theory of meaning and lexical problems. There is a need of theoretical justification of the occurrence of the seme object in the structure of verbal meaning. This justification is possibly based on the concept of meaning which was developed by M. V. Nikitin and it has two aspects:

- a) Intensional is the concept in its deductive-logical aspect
- b) Implicational is a field that can be called its probabilistic potential in the connection with the given name.³³

The object, as noted above, is closely connected with the semantic predicate. So there are all bases to assert that it is the part of the intension or implicational verbal meaning. This theoretical position is confirmed in monolingual dictionaries: dictionary definitions of transitive verbs invariably contain a reference to the nature of the object or directly naming the possible object or marking its substantiality. In the first case, it can be concluded that the seme corresponding to the meaning of the object is included in the intensional verbal meaning and it is included in the implicational verbal meaning in the second case.

As the observation on the specific material shows that there is a definite relationship between the proportion of the objective seme and the capacity of the force field of the verb. The greater the capacity of the force field, the less the probability of occurrence of a particular potential object in the given verb. Therefore, there are few reasons for the inclusion of this objective seme in the semantic structure of the verb.

³³ Mikhail Nikitin, *Lexical meaning of words and word combinations* (Voronezh: VGPI, 1974), 33

This phenomenon can be viewed as a manifestation of semantic agreement. It is observed in those cases when the verb and object have a general seme and it is characteristic only for those verbs which are combined with a limited number of objects.

The semantic aspect of combining the words in combinations of non-phraseological character explains the close relationship between the verb and its actants with those categories of realities which are behind these linguistic signs. Actant is a noun phrase or a noun which comprises the action. The action is manifested by a verb. Studying the example as: «the grain flowed in the bins», here the use of the verb *to flow* instead of the verb *to spill* was enough to change the idea about the structure of the substance. These examples show how the process of dismemberment of the situation is gradual and traces of which have persisted in the meaning of the words, thus, forming a circuit break defining the exact shape of the connected form of the attachable segment. Dividing the concept of moving mass and the notion of movement the language at the same time continues to link the nature of the movement with the properties specified in the motion of substance.

The investigation of the absolute use of transitive verbs is closely connected with the nature of the relationships between the verb and its object. It is characteristic for both verbs that have preserved their semantic level and for the verbs that have lost it. However, the lexical-semantic factors that lead to the objectless use of verbs are specific to each group. The study of these reasons and objectless functioning of verbs shows that the absolute use is the phenomenon of heterogeneity: for the externally identical form on the lexical-semantic bases reveals different patterns. Thus, after considering the question about the absolute use of transitive verbs and different approaches to the study of this problem it can be concluded that the interpretation of this problem in terms of semantic and syntactic features is the most successful one.

So, the absolute use of transitive verbs in different verb subclasses was examined in this chapter. The absolute use of transitive verbs from the semantic and syntactic points of view was marked. The progress in the study of members of sentence is associated with the recognition of the fact that a good syntactic theory should operate at least two series of concepts: syntactic and semantic. Thus, some principles were examined.

A problem of valence and control was also presented in this chapter. The concept of valence is new in linguistics and it is understood as a property of the verb.

Chapter 3. Semantic and syntactic analysis of transitive and intransitive

3.1. Classification of transitive and intransitive verbs

Verbs can be classified according to different criteria. According to their focus on an object the verbs can be transitive verbs and intransitive verbs. Different transitive verbs allow the absolute use but it should be noted that not all transitive verbs allow the absolute use. There are a lot of classifications of verbs, but the most successful interpretation is semantic classification of verbs. The most general rule of semantic matching of the verb with its object is to ensure that the verbs denoting spiritual (intellectual, emotional, volitional, and so on) activities, i.e. the verbs denoting processes occurring in the subject that are called intensional verbs in logic, as well as auditory verbs require objects. The verbs of physical (mechanical) actions are combined with appropriate objects (as well as with specific subjects). Those verbs that indicate an action, i.e. the feeling combined with the subjective objects. Other verbs denoting interpersonal relationships and object-oriented emotion are adjoined to this group. For example, *to love, to like, to hate, to be angry at somebody*, etc.

The range between the predicates expressing mental acts and the verbs denoting physical actions are the verbs with the meaning of social activity and institutional actions. The meanings of these verbs which cannot be reduced to the mental or physical actions may be divided into two overlapping groups: individual-oriented and event-oriented. The first group includes the verbs denoting sanctions, remuneration, destination, etc. For example, *to pursue, to arrest, to thank, to reward, to appoint, to instate, to submit to the title, to recommend*, etc. These verbs are combined with the subject entity (the name of the person). The second group includes the verbs denoting some types of purposeful activities of social type such as: *to work, to achieve, to protest, to call, to fight, to manage, to maintain, to prevent, to prohibit, to permit, to require* and so on. These verbs are combined with objects that are similar in function to the circumstantial purpose.

The verbs of visual perception are ambivalent: they can be combined either with subject or object. The same applies to the predicates of internal vision (to imagine, to dream, to fancy, etc) with the only difference that the object of these verbs are deprived of reference to the object the events of reality, i.e. has an intensional character.

The evaluative verbs also take a fluctuating position because the evaluation can be given as a subject or a person according to their properties, as well as the event or judgment on the subject can be estimated according to their characteristics. The estimation of the most common type (good – bad) has a broad and weakly differentiated sphere of compatibility. The more specific the estimation, the more certain requirements are submitted to the selection of the object.

The verbs of speech activity are completely indifferent to the semantic nature of the object (an object, a person or an event). These verbs can control the object indicating the subject.

e.g. To speak about the daughter; To speak about the daughter's arrival.

The verbs with information and the knowledge of rotation of concrete vocabulary can hide a difference between the essence of the matter (to inform about the daughter's arrival, to inform about the change of the work schedule) and an indication of the subject relevant to the topic of the message. For example, *Have you already informed about your daughter's arrival? Do you have any information about your daughter? Do you know that your daughter is coming tomorrow? I have been told that your daughter came. I have already been informed about your daughter's arrival.*

The semantic opposition of intensional and non-intensional types of verbs is partly connected with deep differences between the object and pro positive object which are combined into a single syntactic category only on the basis that they are both in the control of the completion, in fact, in other cases the verbs without objects are semantically incomplete.

If a concrete object denotes the subject that experiences some changes as a result of implemented action, then the pro positive object either explicit the content of mental processes (emotional, intellectual, volitional) proceeding in the subject or embodies an indication of target actions (with the verbs of purposeful social activity). The movement of subordinate target and reasons in a more central position of subordinate object, as well as other cases of defiance in the centre of the sentence of peripheral acts offers a usual grammatical procedure.

The group of predicates of propositional approach is semantically different. It includes the verbs of speaking and communication, memory and knowledge, judgment and thinking, the verbs of emotional experiences, the verbs with the meanings of judgment, will and motivation, the verbs of auditory perception and so on. A concrete object with this verb usually presents a proposal to restore that sometimes it is necessary to fill the semantic gap creating an ellipsis. For example, to borrow money = to take some money from somebody, to wish a loyal friend = to wish someone to have a loyal friend, promise to give her son a watch, to advise someone to visit interesting places, to expect someone's arrival, to ask something for a friend = to ask someone to do something for his or for her friend, to want to drink a cup of tea, etc. Some verbs tend to be included in its lexical meaning of the instructions on the target event.

The verbs of auditory perception that are as used in their direct meaning, determine the interpretation of the eventful object. If a noun takes the place of the object with the subjective meaning then, it must be deployed in the sentence. For example, *I heard about Mozart. I heard compositions by Mozart.* The connections of verbs of auditory perception with the lexis are quite natural because the sound proceeds in time length. It is not accidentally said that «to hear time, to hear the movement of time», but it is seen «the visible signs of time». The sound in a certain sense is a «materialized» time, «the spiritual body of the world».

The verbs of mechanical (physical) actions are combined with the objects which have the subjective meaning. For example, to cut wood, to sew a dress, to eat soup, to knit stockings, to water flowers, etc. The emergence of an abstract noun as an object of the verb leads to its

concrete definition, interpretation in the objective sense (to swallow something), or dematerializes the verb (to swallow one's pride). The verbs of physical actions or the stative verbs require objectivity to its doer or object that undergoes a physical change.

Thus, the verbs denoting mental acts and verbs of auditory perception may be in the role of object only in proposition and the names of pro positive meanings and its subject of the names with the meaning of living beings. The verbs of physical actions have only the names of specific values as its actant (subject and object). Actant is a noun phrase or a noun that comprises an action. This is an action that is expressed by a verb. If this requirement is not met in the surface structure of the sentence then, the sentence requires semantic transformations in order to be understood.

a) Subclass *to cook*

The verb of this class has a more limited force field. Their objects are organized in a system integrated in some generic term. The generic seme of the object is included in the intensional verbal meaning. For example, the verbs such as *to eat*, *to cook* include the elements of food or meals. The objectless use of verbs of this subclass is possible in cases when the situation has sufficient indication on the generic characteristics of the object. Since the seme of this object is included in the intensional verbal meaning, the object is reduced in accordance with the rule of conjunction. The essence of which is to ensure that the semantic feature is represented in the meaning of the combination only once and no matter how many times it is contained in the meaning of the words combinations.

e.g. Ann can cook as well as do housework.

In this example the verb *to cook* means to cook meals. Since the object duplicates the corresponding seme in the verb and it is reduced. Let's consider an example with the verb *to eat* which also contains object semes.

e.g. Well, as to me you have only three choices: to eat, to sleep, or to play tennis.

When she is not working or sleeping, she is eating.

She must sing in the company of Mr. Brown and Mrs. Brown.

In the third example, the verb *to sing* is used means an object that is directly related to music: singing a song. This can be confirmed by the definition of the verb as it means to sing, to perform a song or music using one's voice.

e.g. Andrew could not paint.

In this example, it is assumed that the doer of this action could not draw something (a picture or a drawing), since in this sense the verb to paint means to create a picture using paints. The definition of this verb is defined as to draw a picture of someone or something.

But in the following example the reader understands that the subject of this action will paint the walls. The second meaning of this verb is to paint something in order to change the color of something.

e.g. We have to wash the walls before we start to paint them.

I can sew. I am also going to learn knitting.

In this example, two verbs were used without a direct object, but the reader does not make a great effort to restore the object which the author implies. In order to confirm the statement let's turn to the definitions of the verbs: to knit – to make something using sticks and these sticks are called knitting needles. E.g. to knit clothes, to knit socks, etc; to sew—to repair or to make something by stitching, using a thread, a needle or a sewing machine. Thus, in the first sentence, in the role of the object can be used any thing: a scarf, a sweater, a skirt and so on. In the second sentence, in the role of the object can be a shirt, a dress, etc.

e.g. She waited until they had played the piano to her.

The definition of the verb *to play* has the following meanings: to perform music using musical instruments, to play a game, to play a sport. In the given example, the use of the direct object is omitted, the readers will easily guess that there is used the first meaning of the verb *to play*, the use of the musical instrument with the aim of creating music. Perhaps, it is understood that the doers of the action play the piano and she enjoys music because music calmed her soul. But in the following example, it will be presented the second meaning of the verb *to play* (to play a game).

e.g. The children are playing in the yard.

In this sentence it is implied that the children play different games in the yard.

e.g. «Can you draw?»

«I do not like drawing».

Before considering the last sentence, it would be better to define the meaning of the verb *to draw*. It means to create a picture with using pencils or pens. The object is omitted in this sentence but from the meaning of this verb, the reader can restore it. Thus, it can be assumed that the object in this sentence implies a painting or a drawing. Besides the verb, it is indicated a tool that acts in the role of tips, thereby it leads the reader to the correct object restoration.

It should be noted that, when reading the examples where the verbs of this subclass are used the reader has certain associations which confirms the fact of the presence of the generic seme of these verbs or a distinct semantic level.

e.g. She will cook you a dinner.

Dinner, besides the generic same meal contains the same main. The definition of a dinner is the main meal of the day. This same is contained only in the object, so it cannot be reduced.

The verb *to sing* means an object that is directly connected with music, singing or performing a song or melody. For example, *She sings well*.

Thus, the absolute use reveals semantic level in these verbs. Their objects in the reference level must have a number of specific features which are essential to perform the action indicated by these verbs.

The objects of such verbs can be allocated on the basis of the passive features. If a formal object is characterized by more than one feature then, the generalization can flow in two directions: to hope for the future and hope for the best, to be afraid of the future and to be afraid of a dog, etc.

It can be given a set of definitions of the formal object according to all its characteristic features: *to hope for the best future*, *to envy others' possessions*, *to be afraid of bad people*. It is defined a formal object of emotional verbs just in this spirit by scientists. It can also be added that when it comes to formal objects of such verbs, it must be preceded the signs of a reference of their subjective character. We hope only that we consider good, we are afraid of what we consider bad, regret only to those things that we consider bad and so on. Such reference is excessive for the verbs that do not denote mental acts: it can be dried everything that wet, regardless of belief and perception of the subject.

The signs characterizing a formal object correspond to the components of the meaning of the verb forming a semantic link between the verb and the subject. The fewer these common features, the more general is the meaning of the verb. For example, the verb *to think* and *to speak* almost deprived of the semantic specificity in the selection of an object, because it can be thought or spoken about everything.

Thus, there were attempts to determine the conditions of forming semantically correct object combinations.

This subclass is extensive. It includes the verbs as to sing, to cook, to draw, to paint, to eat and so on.

b) Subclass *to nod*

This subclass includes the verbs that describe the situation allowing only one object. The definition of the verb *to nod* is to bend one's head in agreement or greeting; the verb *to shrug* means to raise shoulders slightly.

e.g. She nodded and left the room.

She shrugged.

The objectless use of the verbs of this subclass is normal.

If the object is still explicated then the construction with and without the object are completely synonymous and syntactically are of the same type:

e.g. Jane nodded positively.

Tom nodded his head decidedly.

Jack shrugged his shoulders.

I shrugged.

The regular and contextually not related absolute use of these verbs has both semantic and lexical prerequisites. In the semantic terms, these verbs are distinguished particularly, as a distinct semantic level. In the situation which mentioned above it is clearly seen that the character of the action is associated with the properties set in the motion of the substance in the language. In essence, in the verbs of this subclass the object performs the semantic role which imposes a natural limit on the number of objects involved in the situation.

It is interesting to note that the number of such verbs in Modern English is few. Besides the verbs *to nod* and *to shrug*, the verb *to clap* can be included in this subclass which is characterized by the absolute use and combination with the object *hands*.

e.g. After the performance she clapped her hands.

It means that she applauded the performance shown by actors.

There is another verb *to frown* which also needs to be regarded. The definition of this verb is to stir one's eyebrows down because of irritation or anxiety. In the definition of this verb an implemented seme is included. So these verbs cannot have an object.

e.g. Ann put her hand forward and began to cry. I frowned.

Here are two more examples of verbs (*to wink* and *to wince*) that are included into this subclass. The definition of the verb *to wink* is to close and open eyes in to order to sign to someone. But the verb *to wince* means to affect or to react to something with an unexpected expression on face that indicates pain, confusion or embarrassment.

e.g. He winced suddenly.

She winked at me and left the house.

This type of indication implements is characteristic for different languages as it reflects the structure of the world but not the features of its language model or lexical units. If the semantic level is not erased in the process of turnover, then the area of compatibility of the indicative words (verbs, adjectives, adverbs) remains very narrow. Here are the examples: to beat (about the heart), to bite (with the help of the teeth), etc. The last example shows that some actions can be performed with the help of only one implement (with the help of teeth) which specifically designed by nature for a particular purpose. This principle can be described by the following examples as: to look and to see with eyes, to hear and to listen with ears, to bite with teeth, to speak with a tongue and so on. In these cases, the nature of things eliminates the possibility of expanding collocations with the implement names. The reference to the relevant authorities for these verbs is completely unnecessary: to see with one's own eyes, to hear with one's ears or to look with big eyes, to bite with sharp teeth.

It can be assumed that the absolute use of the verbs of this subclass is due to the seme in their rate and it also prevails over the object-oriented. The fact is that they have already passed a significant way in this direction and it is seen from the next example in which the verb *to shrug* is combined with the object.

e.g. They were hurt by her calmness, but they shrugged it off.

Thus, the absolute use of the verbs of this subclass in lexical terms is the way of avoiding the semantic redundancy.

It should be paid attention to the dependent objectless use of verbs with a limited field of force on the stability of the limits of their implication. In those cases, sometimes for some reasons especially from the extra linguistic reasons the verb cannot immediately transform a seme of a new object in its intensity and therefore, the reduction of the object that denotes a new object is impossible. It is well illustrated in the example of the verb *to smoke*. Apparently, this verb has included the seme of tobacco products.

e.g. He smokes and he cannot get rid of it.

c) Subclass *to expect*

The verbs that have an extensive and not clearly limited force field are included to this subclass. The probability of occurrence of one or another object is the same in these verbs. As a result, the verbs of this subclass do not contain any seme in their intensity combined with their objects. This can be judged by the dictionary definitions of verbs containing indications on substantiality of the object but not terming it concretely.

The characteristic features of the absolute use of the verbs in this subclass are that there is a reduction of the object and the way to identify the relevance of relations of the verb with the

whole class of conceivable objects and at the same time avoiding referential certainty: *to believe* is *to trust*. The reduction of the object gives the reader the opportunity to present a wide range of objects that are combined with the verb. So we can believe in many things or people and we can also trust people. The reader can have a wide range of imagination.

e.g. Just expect and perceive, and everything will be good for you.

In the given example the verb *to expect* means to look forward to happening of something. So it can also be spoken about the breadth of the implied objects because it can be expected different things or events and so on in the given example.

e.g. In these last seven days no one wants to understand me.

While considering this example it should be referred to the definition of the verb *to understand*. *To understand* means to comprehend, to grasp something or someone. Based on this definition it becomes obvious that the verb does not give an accurate indication of the subject and the reader needs to think through the meaning of the sentence. But on the basis of life experience it can be guessed that perhaps many people are busy with their own problems so that they are not so interested in the life of other people. Everyone lives for himself without cluttering their minds with other people's problems.

e.g. I told I tried to remember but I failed every time.

The definition of the verb *to remember* is to keep somebody or something in mind that was seen or happened in the past and to think of again. As in the previous example, the verb *to remember* is not pointed to an object. It opens a wide choice of objects for the reader. Thus, the person may not remember what he told or he was told earlier. Or he cannot remember an event or a person which is referred to in his conversation with the partner. Possibly, it is discussed the place where the person has been but he had forgotten and cannot remember.

e.g. We read for exams. We read for instructions. We learned to read for enjoyment.

The definition of the verb *to read* is to look at carefully in order to understand the meaning of something that is printed or written. These three different sentences are used without objects but it can mean different objects. Let's consider these three sentences in order. So in the first sentence it may be implied: books, dictionaries or other sources that contain useful information for the exam. In the second sentence it may be involved: books that contain information on how to use something, books on cooking, or some kind of instruction or manual. In the last sentence the usage of the object suggests reading books, magazines or newspapers. It is also possible even in foreign languages as it was emphasized the fact that the people learned to read for pleasure. Because many educated people learn foreign languages in addition to their native language in order to read a book in a foreign language and to understand the world better in the author's native language but not to read translations of books.

e.g. The child counted on his fingers.

The verb *to count* has the following meaning. *To count* is the process of computing or calculating something. It can be number or things. In this sentence it is not pointed to an object. Based on the definition it can be assumed that the child counts any number of objects or people. In this example it is given an indication of the fact that the child counts on his fingers. It can be supposed that the child cannot perform mathematical calculations in his mind and he uses his fingers. Possibly, the object of this sentence is friends or toys of the child.

e.g. They protested.

The definition of the verb *to protest* is the process of attempting to make people to suppose or to think about something that are opposite. It is an objection or disapproval. In this sentence it is not pointed to an object. The verb does not contain an object, i.e. this suggests that the reader can imagine different objects with this verb. For example, the person can defend his innocence, his testimony or statements.

e.g. It is quite interesting to get to know how students learn.

The definition of the verb *to learn* is to gain knowledge or experience of something. As in this sentence refers to the students, the reader is confronted with a wide variety of objects. For example, if they are small children they can learn alphabet or to count, a song or a poem, but if they are adult students, perhaps, it was meant learning a subject: chemistry, physics or foreign languages and so on.

e.g. He was regret but he did not promise.

To promise is to tell someone that you will exactly do something. A person can keep promise or break promise. Here it is meant any act or behavior on the part of the person but does not give an accurate indication of the object, thus, motivating and forcing the reader to reflect on the implicit object.

e.g. We have to know.

In this sentence the verb *to know* was used as an example. *To know* is the process of noticing or understanding something as a fact; to comprehend or realize obviously and with conviction. In this sentence, as in previous ones, the object is not specified. Different facts can be implied in the role of the object in this example. For example, to know the truth, to know who had done something, etc. In this sentence it is likely meant the truth, i.e. the character of this sentence wants to know what happened.

e.g. It was not important if he wins or loses. But he always wins.

To win is to gain a victory in a game or a competition. In this sentence, though there is no indication on the object, but the reader can assume what was meant, most likely, a competition or

a game. As it was given in the example it is not important whether the character of this sentence wins or not. The process is important for him as taking part in some kind of activity.

The verbs of this subclass belong to different lexical-semantic categories. Here includes the verbs of physical actions (to prepare, to take, to sing), spiritual activities (to love, to understand, to want), and social activities (to assure, to require). As it will be shown in the following examples, the absolute use of these verbs has a way of accentuation of the procedural meaning of the verb.

d) Subclass *to write*

This subclass is close to the first subclass and also on the system of the arrangement of objects. Its specificity is that the basic meaning of the verb which is implemented with the arranged system of the objects prevent the reduction of the object. This reduction implements only a specialized derivative meaning that has developed on the background and includes its main seme in its intensity which is one of the members of hyponymy system of objects. Hyponymy is the connection between a particular word and a general word when the former is comprised within the latter.

The specialized meanings of the verbs of this subclass are also primary. *To drink, to save, to love* are also referred to this subclass. The verb *to write*, for example, has a specialized meaning which is implemented in the absolute use. It is to write letters or to be busy with writing.

e.g. She took a piece of paper and began to write.

It is hard to support family by writing.

For the verb *to drink* it is to drink alcohol.

e.g. He used to drink every evening.

The verb *to save* it is to save money.

e.g. I saved and bought a house.

The last verb is *to love*. It is to feel a deep attachment to the person of the opposite gender.

e.g. The person who knows how to love, can appreciate other people's feelings.

Her friend could not even love.

With the specialized meanings of the verbs of this subclass are semantically related to derivative nouns as: a savings bank from the verb to save; a teacher from the verb to teach, a student from the verb to study and a lover from the verb to love.

Sometimes the objects of the verbs of this subclass cannot be reduced. However, these cases are usually structurally motivated. One of the possible factors is the necessity to remove the syntactic restrictions of compatibility if there is any determination to the object which cannot be reassigned to the verb.

e.g. She preferred writing auspicious, jolly and favorable letters.

Characteristically, the objects with their definitions given in the connecting structure which again underlines the redundancy of letters is the entry to the corresponding seme in the content of the verb *to write*.

e) Subclass *to ride*

This subclass is different from all previous ones because in the absolute use the verbs embodies a transitive meaning, derivative and intransitive meaning. These verbs are semantically close as transitive and intransitive verb meanings describe the situation of the action. Transitive meanings assume the existence of the performer resulting in the state of the action of the objects or substances being denoted by the object which can be reduced as in the examples of other subclasses.

e.g. I will ride. He rides perfectly and he promised me to teach it.

In this sentence, as it was mentioned above, the important fact is that the performer of the action sets something in motion. The reader can understand a car, a bike or riding a horse as an object of the verb *to ride*. This rule can be seen in the following example, too.

e.g. Her father drove without uttering a word.

In this example it is clear that the object is a car. The object is reduced but it can be easily replaced.

The intransitive meanings are realized in those cases where the subject ceases to denote the performer of the action and becomes a symbol of the moving object or substance.

e.g. While we were moving the weather was good.

They drove through the forest.

They drove back to the house.

In the given sentences the subjects of the sentences are the pronouns in the plural form. Therefore, the doer of the action describes the process.

Intransitive meanings of the verbs stand in the same line with the verbs of action. Their only actant indicates the moving object as the last ones. Actant is a noun phrase. It functions as a doer of the notional verb in the sentence.

According to their semantic and syntactic properties, the verbs *to move* and *to drive* are close to intransitive meanings of the verb *to ride* and *to fly*. This is particularly noticeable in relation to the verbs *to ride* and *to drive*. The verbs and corresponding derivative nouns are synonymous in this case. They describe the state of the motion.

e.g. It was a long ride, more than three hours.

I was told that it would be about a fifteen minute drive.

The only difference is in the status of the intransitive meaning: the verb *to ride* has a higher status, but the verb *to drive* has a lower status.

The study of the objectless use of the verbs such as *to drive* shows intransitivity hides fundamentally different phenomena in traditional grammar. As a rule, these are accompanied by any objectless use. The given analysis suggests that the transitive verbs with the intransitive meaning can be considered only as a derivative meaning that differs from the original amount and the syntactic-semantic categories of their actants.

Apart from the subclasses of verbs that were mentioned above, it should be considered the group of verbs such as *to shave*, *to wash* without reflexive pronouns which are considered as an absolute use by some researchers.

e.g. I shall wash and dress.

She dressed herself quickly and went out.

She washed herself and came back.

This is quite a different type of the absolute use. These transitive verbs have a special object of the action which coincides with the subject of the action. Consequently, the action of such verb is closed in the sphere of the subject, that is, it is close to the intransitive verb according to the grammatical semantics. When the verb loses its reflexive pronoun which formally links it with the transitive verbs, it parts and becomes an intransitive verb.

e.g. I like to give presents.

Her mother washes for a living.

Thus, the phrase *the child doesn't ride freely* is ambiguous and this phrase can have the following meanings:

- 1) The child finds it difficult to ride himself;
- 2) It is difficult to ride and it is also difficult to teach him riding;
- 3) The child is afraid of riding freely may be he thinks that he can fall down.

These three meanings go back to the different depth of transitive constructions.

The absolute use of transitive verbs in the lexical and semantic aspects was considered above. Such approach made it possible to outline the principles of classification of the verbs depending on the relations of semantic components in the verb-object terms. However, as the research shows the lexical and semantic peculiarities of the verbs create only the prerequisites for their use in a particular speech situation.

3.2 Factors affecting the absolute use of transitive verbs

Besides the semantic, lexical semantic and semantic-syntactic features of the verbs, there are communicative factors that influence on the absolute use of transitive verbs in the English language. Communicative factors in relation to the absolute use of the transitive verbs will be understood as the use of the objectless structure in order to emphasize the logical allocation of verbal meanings. On such allocation, focusing on the process of the withdrawal of the object is often mentioned in connection with the absolute use of the transitive verbs. The possibility of the absolute use in order to accentuate the verb is the fact that the absence of explicit objects with the use of transitive verbs is perceived in the act of communication as a significant lack allocating with the background of a full paradigmatic objectless expression. In contrast to the complete structure in which the verb and object components communicatively equal in terms of the objectless expression, the level of communicative dynamism of the verb component increases due to the absence of the object. However, the mentioned communicative factors of the absolute use of the transitive verbs are not characteristic for all verb subclasses. In the subclasses of verbs as *to nod* and *to write* which are combined with the limited number of objects and the irrelevance of the verbs that are used with the objects does not depend on the concrete speech situation. The selection of the absolute structure is not dictated by the emphatic allocation of the verb meanings. It is dictated by the tendency of elimination of the semantic redundancy.

The communicative factors of the absolute use of the transitive verbs appears clearly in those subclasses that have unlimited or weekly limited force field. It can be seen in the subclasses of the verbs as *to expect* and *to cook*. In these types of verbs the use of objects is equally probable. Therefore, the explicitly expressed object has a high degree of communicative dynamism as a verb. Thus, the substantial signs of combinations are less relevant than the verb

and the verb becomes the centre of all communicative messages or information. Let's consider some examples.

e.g. We were taken to the same restaurant that we had eaten at when we came back to London for the first time.

In the given situation the specification of the object is acceptable – the inclusion of the objects, such as supper or dinner. However, this would make the object and the verb communicatively equal.

e.g. We are having a very hearty supper with our staff.

In the consideration of the objectless use of the transitive verbs it should be taken into account the lexical and semantic properties of the object variables indicating the participants of the situation presented in the statement. The speaker chooses consciously a structure in which in his opinion, the participant enters the centre of attention.

e.g. She didn't want to eat from broken china.

In this example broken china is extended as this part of the situation is the most significant for the transmitted message. The object *food* is derived from the semantics of the verb *to eat* (to take food into the mouth and ingest it in order to nourish body) and it is not relevant to the situation. The communicative point of view from which the speaker offers *to eat* and what causes his indignation is much more important in this situation. There is another example:

e.g. It was really uncomfortable for me because I didn't want to eat with his friends.

The object is mentioned with the same verb *to eat* and the doer of the action is indicated. In this case, the optional valence is filled because there is a communicative necessity. It was difficult for the doer to eat with the people who cause some trouble for him and it could create a wrong impression that some of the characters feel uncomfortable during the meal.

It should be noted that the objectless use of the verb is especially observed with the continuous forms which are the morphological means of the accentuation of the process. Apparently, in these cases two means of accentuation act simultaneously in the same direction:

e.g. We had been studying for the final examinations.

She has been telling us about her life story.

However, it is also observed the dependence of means of accentuation on the semantics of the verb in the continuous forms as in the subclasses *to cook*, *to write*, *to ride* containing the generic semes in their meanings. Some verbs of the subclass *to expect* are not found in the continuous forms. Evidently, the degree of verbal action with referential uncertainty which is

characteristic for the verbs of this subclass is incompatible with the grammatical meaning of the continuous form which describes a particular action on a more or less specific object.

The morphological forms of verbs can also be regarded in terms of accentuation of verbal action. Non-perfect forms of the infinitive and gerund, modal and other verb categories are more suitable for the transmission of the action in general, in derivation from the concrete object rather than the personal forms of the verb. As it was mentioned they are characteristic for the absolute use of transitive verbs.

e.g. As to me, the people who do not know what the art is cannot feel music or dance, cannot understand paintings.

She likes reading, singing, cooking, she likes doing everything that she can do in her free time.

It should be noted that the frequency of non-personal forms is not associated with their syntactically combined properties. It is associated with their communicative features - the ability to focus on the verbal action. This is evident from the fact that non-personal forms are not specific for all verbs, but only for the subclasses as *to cook* and *to expect* that have a vast force field.

The subclasses *to nod* and *to write* for which the absolute use is not a method of accentuation of the verbal actions occur mainly in the predicative forms and are often used in the Past Simple Tense Form and in the perfect tense forms. It is found in the forms of pointing to the specificity of the action and its time. Due to the reduction of the object in the transitive form syntactically occur in terms which are different from those that were described above: this suggestion with the pro positive object has an antecedent in the context. The influence of the context can be implemented in different ways. In some cases, the possibility of the omission of verbal component and direct object are due to the fact that the subject is directed by the action has already been mentioned in relation to the verb as a part of the context.

e.g. These tasks are really difficult. You have to understand and learn them correctly.

She had never read and learned a lot but she always knew.

I tried to grasp this text, but it was difficult to remember it.

Only few friends knew that I live in England because I lived in Germany.

We cannot understand her behavior.

She loves him and she will not forget him even she has to leave the city.

Such pro positive object can be explicated by the demonstrative pronouns «that» and «it». The replacement of this type is a wide spread phenomenon.

e.g. She was never so fat. Have you noticed that?

«Helen is at hospital». «I know it».

However, less common and less studied is the non-reduction of such structures where the ellipsis is used instead of the replacement. The objectless use of the verb is not the manifestation of the negligence in a conversational style. It is regularly found both in dialogues and in the author's speech.

e.g. Everyone looked at her very attentively but she acted as if she had not paid attention.

«Alan did not inform us about the accident», Alice said, «We just learned three days ago».

The peculiarity of these cases the elliptic reduction is that the object is omitted in the anaphoric context. The rule for such context is the explication of the object and its reduction is not observed even if all necessary conditions of the elliptic reduction and its antecedent are in relation to the key words serving as an indicator of the syntactic position of the recurring component. In such circumstances it is observed the replacement of objects through the word «one» or personal pronouns of the third person.

e.g. I don't have any relations with my neighbors and they have it with some of them.

The impossibility of reducing the objects in such cases makes think over the reasons causing such possibility in the following examples such as:

e.g. Alan knew what she inferred, but he pretended not to seize.

John realized that he had forgotten about the meeting.

He tried but he had not forgotten her behavior. He loved her and could not forget.

The matter seems to be primarily in the nature of the recurring components. These components have different structures. The completeness of the structure is observed when the substantive object is repeated. Apparently, the fixedness of various ways for various spheres makes the reduction of the object possible in one of them. This reduction becomes as an indicator of the pro positive character of the object and thus, contributes its identification. The proper identification of the pro positive object contributes the semantic category of the subordinating verb: the verbs combined with the pro positional object. These verbs are the so-called the intensional verbs expressing the spiritual activities, inner vision, information and knowledge, etc. Here are the examples according to these types of verbs: *to notice, to like, to remind, to hope, to want, to love, etc.*

It should be noted that in the cases of the situational ellipsis, the object is not derived from the semantics of the predicate but it is drawn from the situation itself and the reducible object of the statements cannot be a unique restoration.

Defining the manifestations of communicative-pragmatic factor, it should be mentioned the role of the paralinguistic means of expression of thoughts is not only as the factors of the subject, but also as a situational phenomenon, subjective environment at the moment of speaking, highlighting, underlining with the help of various movements and instructions of the speaker. These tools perform the functions of compensation eliminated in the process of communication of some redundant language means.

e.g. She went over to Anthony, he did not utter a word. He looked at her and took the letter out of his pocket and gave it to her.

The situation reviewed here is simple. The speaker and the listener understand what kind of the subject matter is. In regard to the choice of the incomplete construction and options with the pronouns *it* and *that* and *it is*, apparently, connected with the communicative factors. The ellipsis of the object allows focusing on the same action in the verb-object terms.

e.g. They are surely going to spend their time in the village.

They give a guarantee.

Thus, the observations show that the absolute use of the transitive verbs is the result of the interaction of many factors related to different language levels. It may be motivated by the semantic, communicative and syntactic reasons. In semantic terms it is either a way of mainstreaming relations of the verb with all terms of its potential objects or as a means of eliminating semantic duplication. On the communicative level the unexpressed object turns out to be one of the ways of accentuation of some action in the predicate. Finally, the absolute use of transitive verbs in syntactic terms is the result of reduction of communicatively irrelevant object of the verb – object expression repeating the information of the previous sentence.

Conclusion

In the conclusion of the thesis, main conclusions must be summarized. Thus, the absolute use of transitive verbs is the use of transitive verbs when describing the situation with the expressed doer and unexpressed object.

The objectless use of transitive verbs is considered from the point of view syntactic, lexical-semantic and semantic-syntactic characteristics of the verbs. The interpretation of this problem by researchers who studied this problem from the viewpoint of the semantic-syntactic features is the most successful. This concept lies in the fact that it is important to distinguish between the valence of the mandatory and optional paying attention to the fact whether it is dealt with the substantive or formal plan.

Transitivity and intransitivity is considered by scientists as a category of a deep semantic level which affects the surface of the syntactic structure of the sentence without determining it completely. After the representatives of this trend, we proceed from the recognition of the preservation of the verbs used in the absolute intention of the object, the verb conveys certain information about the missing object, i.e. the semantic structure of the verb contains semes of its objects. In this thesis it is observed the classification of verbs consisting of five subclasses: to cook, to nod, to expect, to write, to ride.

Verbs are classified depending on the size of the force field of the verb. The more the capacity of the force field, the less the probability of occurrence of particular potential object for a given verb and consequently, there are less reasons for the inclusion of the object semes in the semantic structure of the verb.

The research shows that the lexical-semantic peculiarities of verbs create only the prerequisites for their use in a particular speech situation. Then, the communicative and syntactical factors come into force which leads us to the following conclusion: the absolute use of transitive verbs is the result of the interaction of many factors. There is the following conclusion after analyzing the examples of the absolute use of transitive verbs: in semantic terms it is a way to eliminate the semantic duplication, implemented an indication of the class or classes of objects; in communicative terms it is the way of accentuation of action semes in the predicate; in syntactical aspect it is the way of elimination of communicative redundancy.

Thus, after considering a number of examples concerning the absolute use of transitive verbs, the following conclusion can be made: the absolute use of transitive verbs still includes object semes, but it is not expressed on the syntactic level.

Comprehensive study of the absolute use of transitive verbs can present interesting results both in semasiology and in the study of semantic and syntactic issues.

So, the absolute use of transitive verbs in different verb subclasses was examined in this chapter. The absolute use of transitive verbs from the semantic and syntactic points of view was marked. The progress in the study of members of sentence is associated with the recognition of the fact that a good syntactic theory should operate at least two series of concepts: syntactic and semantic. Thus, some principles were examined.

A problem of valence and control was also presented in this chapter. The concept of valence is new in linguistics and it is understood as a property of the verb.

Bibliography

Admoni, Vladimir. *Sentence structure and word combinations in the Indo-European languages*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1979

Andreev, Nikolay. *Problems of structural and probabilistic analysis of language*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1975

Arinstein, Vera. *Practice of semantic-syntactic interpretation of the absolute use of transitive verbs in Modern English. Theory and methods of semasiological research*. St. Petersburg: LEMA, 1979

Avronin, Valentine. *Problems of studying the functional aspect of language*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1975

Barkhudarov, Leonid. *The structure of a simple sentence in Modern English*. Moscow: Visshaya Shola, 1966

Benveniste, Émile. *Problems in General Linguistics*, translated by Meek, Mary E. Florida: University of Miami, 1974

Blokh, Mark. *A course in Theoretical English Grammar*. Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1983

Burlakova, Varvara. *The basic elements of word combinations in Modern English*. St. Petersburg: LGU, 1975

Curme, George O. *Principles and Practice of English Grammar*. New York: Barnes and Noble Inc., 1947

Curme, George O. *English Grammar*. New York: Barnes and Noble Inc., 1957

Ilyish, Boris. *Modern English Language*. Moscow: Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages, 1948

Ivanova Irina, Burlakova, Varvara and Pocheptsov, Georgiy. *Theoretical Grammar of Modern English*. Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1981

Jespersen, Otto. *Growth and structure of the English language*. Leipzig: B.G.Teubner, 1912

Jespersen, Otto. *Language: its nature, development and origin*. London: George Allen and Unwin LTD, 1922

Jespersen, Otto. *A Modern English Grammar on historical principles*. Part 3: Syntax, Second Volume. London: George Allen and Unwin LTD, 1954

Jespersen, Otto. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958

Kovaleva, Lia. *The issues in English Philology*. Irkutsk: IGLU, 1970

Mukhin, Anton. *Linguistic analysis of theoretical and methodological problems*. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1976

Nikitin, Mikhail. *Lexical meaning of words and word combinations*. Voronezh: VGPI, 1974

Peshkovsky, Alexander. *Selected Works*. Moscow: UCHPEDGIZ, 1959

Stepanova, Maria and Helbig, Gerhard. *Parts of speech and valency in Modern German*. Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1978

Stepanov, Yuriy. *Nouns, Predicates, Sentences (Semiological Grammar)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1981

Tesnière, Lucien. *Structural elements of Syntax*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1988

Vendryes, Joseph. *A linguistic introduction to History*. Cardiff: Kegan Paul International Publishing Limited, 2004

Yartseva, Victoria. *Historical syntax of the English language*. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, 1961

Appendix

Examples: a) Subclass *to cook*

Destroying rainforest for economic gain is like burning a Renaissance painting to *cook* a meal. (Edward Osborne Wilson)

He was a bold man that first *ate* an oyster. (Jonathan Swift)

He *ate* and drank the precious Words, his Spirit grew robust; He knew no more that he was poor, nor that his frame was Dust. (Emily Dickinson)

Part of the secret of a success in life is to *eat* what you like and let the food fight it out inside. (Mark Twain)

Think in the morning. Act in the noon. *Eat* in the evening. Sleep in the night. (William Blake)

You are going to let the fear of poverty govern your life and your reward will be that you will *eat*, but you will not leave. (George Bernard Shaw)

There is a friendly tie of some sort between music and *eating*. (Thomas Hardy)

Dinner was made for *eating*, not for talking. (William Makepeace Thackeray)

I wanted to *paint* a picture some day that people would stand before and forget that it was made of paint. I wanted it to creep into them like a bar of music and mushroom there like a soft bullet. (Oliver Henry)

Painting is just another way of keeping a diary. (Pablo Picasso)

Every portrait that is *painted* with feeling is a portrait of the artist, not of the sitter. (Oscar Wilde)

Painting is a blind man's profession. He *paints* not what he sees, but what he feels, what he tells himself about what he has seen. (Pablo Picasso)

One should always *play* fairly when one has the winning cards. (Oscar Wilde)

We don't stop *playing* because we grow old; we grow old because we stop playing. (George Bernard Shaw)

Life is not a matter of holding good cards, but of *playing* a poor hand well. (Robert Louis Stevenson)

Life is too important a thing ever to *talk* seriously about. (Oscar Wilde)

I love to *talk* about nothing. It is the only thing I know anything about. (Oscar Wilde)

It is better to *keep* your mouth closed and let people think you are a fool than to open it and remove all doubt. (Mark Twain)

Keep love in your heart. A life without it is like a sunless garden when the flowers are dead. (Oscar Wilde)

Home is a name, a word, it is a strong one; stronger than magician ever *spoke*, or spirit ever answered to, in the strongest conjuration. (Charles Dickens)

Examples: b) Subclass *to nod*

Mike *nodded*. A sombre *nod*. (Pelham Grenville Wodehouse)

When you are old and gray and full of sleep, and *nodding* by the fire, take down this book and slowly read, and dream of the soft look your eyes had once, and of their shadows deep. (William Butler Yeats)

Don't *clap* too hard – it is a very old building. (John Osborne)

An aged man is but a paltry thing, a tattered coat upon a stick, unless soul *clap* its hands and sing, and louder sing for every tatter in its mortal dress. (William Butler Yeats)

Hope is a bad thing. It means you are not what you want to be. It means that part of you is dead, if not all of you. It means that you entertain illusions. It is a sort of spiritual *clap*, I should say. (Henry Miller)

Nor do they trust their tongue alone, but speak a language of their own; can read a nod, a *shrug*, a look, far better than a printed book; convey a libel in a frown, and wink a reputation down. (Johnathan Swift)

The world occasionally *shrugs* its shoulders, and people get knocked off. (Simon Winchester)

The diligent scholar is he that loves himself, and desires to have reason to *applaud* and love himself. (William Godwin)

A joke, even if it be a lame one, is nowhere so keenly relished or quickly applauded as in a murder trial. (Mark Twain)

Examples: c) Subclass *to expect*

To *expect* the unexpected shows a thoroughly modern intellect. (Oscar Wilde)

Do not do unto others as you *expect* they should do unto you. Their tastes may not be the same. (George Bernard Shaw)

The two most misused words in the entire English vocabulary are love and friendship. A true friend would die for you, so when you start trying to *count* them on one hand, you don't need any fingers. (Larry Flynt)

Man only likes to *count* his troubles, but he does not *count* his joys. (Fyodor Dostoevsky)

We make a living by what we get. We make a life by what we *give*. (Winston Churchill)

Our doubts are traitors and make us lose the good we often might *win* by fearing to attempt. (William Shakespeare)

You don't *win* once in a while; you don't do things right once in a while; you do them right all the time. (Vince Lombardi)

Kindness is the language which deaf can *hear* and blind can see. (Mark Twain)

Don't waste your time with explanations: people only *hear* what they want to *hear*. (Paulo Coelho)

I'm so clever that sometimes I don't *understand* a single word of what I'm saying. (Oscar Wilde)

The more you explain it, the more I don't *understand* it. (Mark Twain)

It is the smile on the earth's face, open to all, and needs but the eyes to see, the mood to *understand*. (John Galsworthy)

I wish I could make him *understand* that a loving good heart is riches enough, and that without it intellect is poverty. (Mark Twain)

Look deep into nature, and then you will *understand* everything better. (Albert Einstein)

If you tell the truth, you don't have to *remember* anything. (Mark Twain)

When we *remember* we are all mad, the mysteries disappear and life stands explained. (Mark Twain)

How well he's *read*, to reason against reading! (William Shakespeare)

It is what you *read* when you don't have to that determines what you will be when you can't help it. (Oscar Wilde)

If one cannot enjoy *reading* a book over and over again, there is no use in *reading* it at all. (Oscar Wilde)

A book you finish *reading* is not the same book it was before you *read* it. (David Mitchell)

Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player, that struts and frets his hour upon the stage, and then is *heard* no more; it is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. (William Shakespeare)

His heart danced upon her movements like a cork upon a tide. He *heard* what her eyes said to him from beneath their cowl and knew that in some dim past, whether in life or revery, he had *heard* their tale before. (James Joyce)

Freedom is the right to tell people what they do not want to *hear*. (George Orwell)

People may *hear* your words, but they feel your attitude. (John C. Maxwell)

The most interesting information comes from children, for they tell all they *know* and then stop. (Mark Twain)

Our ambition should be to rule ourselves, the true kingdom for each one of us; and true progress is to *know* more, and be more, and to do more. (Oscar Wilde)

Envy is the art of *counting* the other fellow's blessings instead of your own. (Harold Coffin)

Surely there comes a time when *counting* the cost and paying the price aren't things to think about any more. All that matters is value - the ultimate value of what one does. (James Hilton)

The hardest arithmetic to master is that which enables us to *count* our blessings. (Eric Hoffer)

Education is an admirable thing, but it is well to *remember* from time to time that nothing that is worth knowing can be taught. (Oscar Wilde)

Promise me you'll always *remember*: You are braver than you believe, and stronger than you seem, and smarter than you think. (Alan Alexander Milne)

In time we *hate* that which we often fear. (William Shakespeare)

The worst sin toward our fellow creatures is not to *hate* them, but to be indifferent to them: that's the essence of inhumanity. (George Bernard Shaw)

The only way to keep your health is to eat what you don't want, drink what you don't *like*, and do what you'd rather not. (Mark Twain)

Experience is simply the name we *give* our mistakes. (Oscar Wilde)

We need to *give* each other the space to grow, to be ourselves, to exercise our diversity. We need to *give* each other space so that we may both *give* and receive such beautiful things as ideas, openness, dignity, joy, healing, and inclusion. (Max de Pree)

Examples: d) Subclass *to write*

All you have to do is *write* one true sentence. *Write* the truest sentence that you know. (Ernest Hemingway)

I wish I could *write* as mysterious as a cat. (Edgar Allan Poe)

The difficulty of literature is not to *write*, but to write, what you mean; not to affect your reader, but to affect him precisely as you wish. (Robert Louis Stevenson)

Tears are words that need to be *written*. (Paulo Coelho)

They *wrote* in the old days that it is sweet and fitting to die for one's country. (Ernest Hemingway)

Good *writing* is like a windowpane. (George Orwell)

The very ink with which history is *written* is merely fluid prejudice. (Mark Twain)

We live in the mind, in ideas, in fragments. We no longer *drink* in the wild outer music of the streets – we remember only. (Henry Miller)

War and *drink* are the two things man is never too poor to buy. (William Faulkner)

To *love* beauty is to see light. (Victor Hugo)

We are not the same persons this year as last; nor are those we *love*. It is a happy chance if we, changing, continue to *love* a changed person. (William Somerset Maugham)

We *loved* with a love that was more than *love*. (Edgar Allan Poe)

The greatest happiness of life is the conviction that we are *loved*; loved for ourselves, or rather, loved in spite of ourselves. (Victor Hugo)

Children begin by *loving* their parents; after a time they judge them; rarely, if ever, do they forgive them. (Oscar Wilde)

A *loving* heart is the truest wisdom. (Charles Dickens)

It is easier to *forgive* an enemy than to *forgive* a friend. (William Blake)

Always *forgive* your enemies; nothing annoys them so much. (Oscar Wilde)

Selfishness must always be *forgiven* you know, because there is no hope of a cure. (Jane Austen)

Examples: e) Subclass *to ride*

The moon is at her full, and *riding* high, floods the calm fields with light. (William Cullen Bryant)

The journey of my life is like a man *riding* a bicycle. We know he got on the bicycle and started to move. (William Golding)

The middle of the road is where the white line is and that's the worst place to *drive*. (Robert Frost)

Perhaps there is only one cardinal sin: impatience. Because of impatience we were *driven* out of paradise, because of impatience we cannot return. (Wystan Hugh Auden)

This wretched brain gave way, and I became a wreck at random *driven*, without one glimpse of reason or heaven. (Thomas Moore)

When you have shot one bird *flying* you have shot all birds *flying*. They are all different and they *fly* in different ways but the sensation is the same and the last one is as good as the first. (Ernest Hemingway)

Our prayers for others *flow* more easily than those for ourselves. This shows we are made to live by charity. (Clive Staples Lewis)

He *travels* the fastest who travels alone. (Rudyard Kipling)

I have found out that there ain't no surer way to find out whether you like people or hate them than to *travel* with them. (Mark Twain)