

**Univerzita Karlova v Praze**

Filozofická fakulta

Ústav anglického jazyka a didaktiky

filologie – anglický jazyk



Tomáš Starý

**Syntactic and Semantic aspects of a ditransitive construction with  
the verb *lend* and an eventive object.**

**Syntaktické a sémantické aspekty ditranzitivní konstrukce se  
slovesem *lend* a událostním předmětem**

Bakalářská práce

**Vedoucí práce:** PhDr. Gabriela Brůhová, Ph.D.

PRAHA 2015

“Prohlašuji, že jsem bakalářskou práci vykonal samostatně s využitím uvedených pramenů a literatury, které jsou v práci řádně citovány. Zároveň tímto prohlašuji, že jsem tuto práci nevyužil při žádném ze svých přechozích studií.”

V Praze, dne 9. srpna 2015

.....

Děkuji PhDr. Gabriele Brůhové, Ph.D. za trpělivost spojenou s vypracováním této bakalářské práce. Za její čas, který se mnou strávila při konzultacích, za její podnětné připomínky, bez kterých by tato práce jen velice těžko dosáhla své finální podoby, za její nadšení z jazyka, které mě přimělo k napsání této práce.

### List of abbreviations

CGEL	A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language
LGSWE	Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English
CamGEL	The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language
O <sub>d</sub>	Direct object
O <sub>i</sub>	Indirect object
O <sub>prep</sub>	Prepositional object
O <sub>event</sub>	Eventive object
C <sub>s</sub>	Subject complement
NP	Noun phrase
PP	Prepositional phrase
P	Predicator
C	Complement
S	Subject
CD	Communicative dynamism
FSP	Functional sentence perspective

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1:</b> Frequency of the verb <i>lend</i> followed by an eventive object .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Table 2:</b> List of collocates with <i>lend</i> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Table 3:</b> Number of different $O_{event}$ .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Table 4:</b> Frequency of the types of $O_{event}$ .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Table 5:</b> Concrete/abstract realizations of the $O_{event}$ .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Table 6:</b> Concrete/abstract uses of the $O_{event}$ .....	<b>27</b>
<b>Table 7:</b> Frequency of $O_{event}$ modification .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Table 8:</b> Types of modification of the eventive object .....	<b>29</b>
<b>Table 9:</b> Frequency of clause patterns .....	<b>30</b>
<b>Table 10:</b> Frequency of concrete/abstract $O_i/O_{prep}$ in the $SVO_dO_{prep}$ pattern .....	<b>31</b>
<b>Table 11:</b> Frequency of concrete/abstract $O_i/O_{prep}$ in the $SVO_iO_d$ pattern .....	<b>32</b>
<b>Table 12:</b> Animateness of the $O_i/O_{prep}$ .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Table 13:</b> Frequency of modification of the $O_{event}$ in the $SVO_dO_{prep}$ pattern .....	<b>34</b>
<b>Table 14:</b> Frequency of modification of the $O_{prep}$ in the $SVO_dO_{prep}$ pattern .....	<b>34</b>
<b>Table 15:</b> Frequency of the $O_{event}$ modification in the $SVO_iO_d$ pattern .....	<b>35</b>
<b>Table 16:</b> Frequency of the $O_{event}$ modification in the $SVO_iO_d/SVO_dO_{prep}$ patterns .....	<b>35</b>
<b>Table 17:</b> Frequency of the $O_{event}$ modification in the $SVO_iO_d$ pattern .....	<b>36</b>
<b>Table 18:</b> Frequency of $O_{event}$ modification across clause patterns .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Table 19:</b> Percentage of $O_i/O_{prep}$ modification across clause patterns .....	<b>38</b>
<b>Table 20:</b> Type of $O_{event}$ determination .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Table 21:</b> Realizations of $O_{event}$ determination .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Table 22:</b> Semantic roles of the $O_i/O_{prep}$ .....	<b>42</b>
<b>Table 23:</b> Most frequent collocates appearing in $SVO_d$ pattern .....	<b>43</b>
<b>Table 24:</b> Contextual/indefinite recoverability of the $O_i/O_{prep}$ .....	<b>44</b>

## ABSTRAKT

Tato práce se zabývá zkoumáním komplementace anglického ditranzitivního slovesa *lend*. Práce je zaměřena na příklady *lend* vyskytující se s událostním předmětem. Teoretická část zahrnuje obecnou charakteristiku ditranzitivních sloves – přístup k nimž se zásadně liší napříč autory –, realizace jejich komponentů a jejich pasivními protějšky. Dále jsou v teoretické části zahrnuty sémantické role jednotlivých komponentů – nepřímého, předložkového a přímého předmětu. Důkladnější pozornost je pak věnována zejména vymezení událostního předmětu, který se pojí pouze se sémanticky obecnými slovesy a ve spojení s nimiž je nositelem významu právě událostní předmět. Práce zkoumá, za jakých podmínek je možné vypustit nepřímý či předložkový předmět a v případech, kdy budou oba předměty přítomny, bude cílem zjistit jejich pořadí a faktory, které toto pořadí ovlivňují. Předpoklad je takový, že bude převažovat vzorec  $SVO_iO_d$ , jelikož podle Quirka a spol. (1985) je toto jediná možná varianta u konstrukcí obsahující událostní předmět.

Praktická část obsahuje sto příkladů slovesa *lend* s událostním předmětem získaných z Britského národního korpusu, na kterých je ukázáno, jaká podstatná jména se nejčastěji vyskytují v roli událostního předmětu u slovesa *lend*. Práce dále zkoumá reálné pořadí předmětů v konstrukci a do jaké míry toto řazení odpovídá teorii, tedy převaze vzorce  $SVO_iO_d$ . Praktická část je rovněž zaměřena na modifikaci a determinaci jednotlivých komponentů a realizaci nepřímého předmětu, jelikož se dá předpokládat, že řazení předmětů bude do jisté míry ovlivněno právě těmito faktory. V neposlední řadě praktická část také dokumentuje, jak častý je výskyt slovesa *lend* pouze s jedním (přímým) předmětem.

## ABSTRACT

The present paper is concerned with the ditransitive verb *lend* and its components. Instances of *lend* occurring with an eventive object are the main focus. The theoretical part includes a general characteristic of ditransitive verbs – the approach to which significantly varies –, the realizations of their components and their passive counterparts along with the semantic roles of the components. Greater focus is then given to the classification of the eventive object, which accompanies a semantically general verb and in such constructions carries the meaning. The aim of the work is to determine under what circumstances can the indirect or prepositional object be omitted and in events when both objects are present their order and the factors that influence it. The assumption is that the pattern SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> will be prevalent as according to Quirk et al. (1985) this is the only possible ordering in the eventive object constructions.

The empirical section of the work contains one hundred examples of the verb *lend* accompanied by an eventive object extracted from the British National Corpus. These examples demonstrate the most frequent nouns occurring in the eventive object position with the light verb *lend*, the actual ordering present in such constructions and to what degree it corresponds to theoretical foundations. The analysis is further focused on modification and determination of the individual components and the realization of the indirect object as these will be factors influencing the order of the objects. Finally, the analysis also concerns itself with the instances of only one (direct) object being present.

## CONTENTS

List of abbreviations .....	i
List of tables.....	ii
Abstrakt.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Valency potential.....	2
2.2 Ditransitive verbs.....	3
2.2.1 Passive forms .....	4
2.2.2 Realizations .....	5
2.2.3 Other authors.....	7
2.3 Types of object .....	8
2.3.1 Direct object.....	8
2.3.1.1 Semantic roles of direct object .....	8
2.3.2 Eventive object.....	9
2.3.2.1 Expanded predicate construction collocates.....	10
2.3.2.2 Light verbs.....	12
2.3.4 Indirect object .....	13
2.3.4.1 Semantic roles of indirect object .....	14
2.3.5 Prepositional object .....	14
2.3.5.1 Semantic roles of prepositional object .....	15
2.4 Object omission.....	15
2.5 Object order.....	17
<b>MATERIAL AND METHOD .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>22</b>
4.1 Eventive object collocations with <i>lend</i> .....	22
4.2 Categories of object-nouns according to their verbal counterparts .....	24
4.3 Concrete/abstract nature of the eventive object .....	27
4.4 The function of the expanded predicate construction.....	28
4.5 Object order.....	30
4.5.1 Factors determining the use of the SVO <sub>i</sub> O <sub>d</sub> /SVO <sub>d</sub> O <sub>prep</sub> pattern.....	31
4.5.1.1 Concrete/abstract nature of the eventive object.....	31
4.5.1.2 Animateness.....	33
4.5.1.3 Modification .....	34
4.5.1.3.1 SVO <sub>d</sub> O <sub>prep</sub> pattern.....	34
4.5.1.3.2 SVO <sub>i</sub> O <sub>d</sub> pattern.....	34
4.5.1.3.3 SVO <sub>d</sub> pattern .....	36
4.5.2 Factors determining the SVO <sub>prep</sub> O <sub>d</sub> pattern .....	36
4.5.3 Factors determining the SO <sub>prep</sub> VO <sub>d</sub> .....	37
4.5.4 Summary .....	38
4.6 Determination and quantification .....	39
4.7 Semantic roles .....	41
4.8 Object omission.....	42
4.8.1 Semantic roles of the O <sub>i</sub> /O <sub>prep</sub> in the SVO <sub>d</sub> pattern .....	44
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>49</b>



**RESUMÉ .....51**  
**APPENDIX .....54**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The present thesis focuses on the ditransitive verb *lend* in its ‘light use’ followed by an eventive object carrying the meaning of the construction. The theoretical part – based on some of the major grammars of the nineteenth and twentieth century such as Quirk et al.’s *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (henceforth CGEL), Huddleston and Pullum’s *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (henceforth CamGEL), Biber et al.’s *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (henceforth LGSWE) – deals with the dissimilar approaches of the above mentioned authors towards defining ditransitive verbs. The main focus of the theoretical part is then on characterising the semantic and syntactic aspects of the expanded predicate construction. Namely the work concerns itself with the semantic roles of the individual components with special emphasis on the eventive object, the omissibility of objects in ditransitive constructions and the order of the objects when both are present. The empirical section of the paper then deals with one hundred examples of the verb *lend* followed by an eventive object extracted from the British National Corpus. The order of the objects will presumably appear mainly in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern and the examples will demonstrate to what degree is this presumption valid and what factors influence the clausal position of the objects. The analysis further addresses the animateness of the indirect object, the realization of the direct object as to its concrete or abstract quality.

## 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Valency potential

Despite general disagreement of certain authors as to the definition of ditransitive verbs, what is universally agreed on is the centrality of the verb in the composition of the clause. Biber et al. (2006: 125-126) regard the verb phrase as central to the clause as it is customarily found in medial position and the occurrence of other clause elements is dependent on the valency potential of the verb.<sup>1</sup> In agreement with LGSWE, Quirk, et al. (1985: 50) also consider the verb central due to its predominantly medial position and to its ability to accumulate other clause elements but further add as deciding factors its generally obligatory nature in the clause as well as its inability of moving within the clause. Moving slightly aside from clause structure to sentences Ivan Poldauf in his “The Third Syntactical Plan” declares the verb nucleus in Indo-European languages as the core not only of a clause but also of a sentence as it contains “all the structurally indispensable components of the sentence,” these being eg subject, obligatory objects and adverbials, and subject complement (Poldauf, 1963: 241).

Quirk, et al. (1985: 53) distinguish seven types of clause patterns:

- a) SV *Someone (S) was laughing (V)*
- b) SVO *My mother (S) enjoys (V) parties (O<sub>[d]</sub>)*
- c) SVC *The country (S) became (V) totally independent (C)*
- d) SVA *I (S) have been (S) in the garden (A)*
- e) SVOO *Mary (S) gave (V) the visitor (O<sub>[i]</sub>) a glass of milk (O<sub>[d]</sub>)*
- f) SVOC *Most people (S) consider (V) these books (O<sub>[d]</sub>) rather expensive (C)*
- g) SVOA *You (S) must put (V) all the toys (O<sub>[d]</sub>) upstairs (A)*

According to these pattern Quirk et al. (1985: 56) then determine the following verb types:

1. copular verbs (correspond to clause patterns SVC and SVA)
2. intransitive verbs (correspond to clause pattern SV)
3. transitive verbs
  - a. monotransitive (correspond to clause patterns SVO)

---

<sup>1</sup> It is important to mention here that generally this does not apply to the subject and adverbials (Biber et al., 2006: 126)

- b. ditransitive (correspond to clause patterns SVOO)
- c. complex transitive (correspond to clause patterns SVOC and SVOA)

As can be seen, the essential element in regards to transitivity is the object. Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 216) then mention the fact that when talking about transitivity we should not limit ourselves to verbs only but clauses as well. A clause without an object is regarded as an intransitive one analogically as is a verb not followed by an object. Furthermore, according to CamGEL (2002: 216-217) transitivity is not a set description of verbs but rather of the uses of verbs as some verbs have the possibility of acting both transitively and intransitively at various instances, thus being referred to as dual-transitive verbs:

- i. *She read # She read the letter*
- ii. *The door opened # She opened the door*

## **2.2 Ditransitive verbs**

As has been already mentioned the approach towards defining ditransitive verbs is considerably inconsistent among various authors. I will focus on some of the major works in English linguistics of the 20th century, mainly Quirk et al.'s definition in *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* in contrast with Huddleston and Pullum's approach in *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*.

The point in which all authors including those mentioned above agree is that ditransitive verbs are primarily those that appear in the clause pattern  $SVO_iO_d$ , in other words that in contrast with an intransitive verb a transitive verb has to be followed by an object; a ditransitive verb then further has to appear in a syntactic relation with not one, but two objects. Before we delve deeper into defining ditransitive verbs it is important to briefly mention Quirk et al.'s (1985: 720) clause division – Subject (S), Verb (V), Object (O), Complement (C), and Adverbial (A) which will be used as the frame of reference for clause elements throughout the work.

The centrality of the verb in Quirk et al.'s notion has already been discussed, following the verb in regards to its central position is the subject, object(s) and the most peripheral element is the adverbial. This view is also adopted by Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 215) who regard the subject and object as “more central to the grammar than adjuncts [which are] differentiated primarily by their semantic properties.”

When talking about the syntactic relation with two objects, it is necessary to make a distinction between the objects as they are seldom referred to as merely ‘objects’ but rather acquire a somewhat more specific terminology, such as ‘direct/indirect/prepositional object’. Quirk et al. (1985: 54) illustrate this distinction on the examples of a monotransitive clause *My mother enjoys parties* in contrast with a ditransitive clause *Mary gave the visitor a glass of milk*. The nature of the object *parties* reflects a different semantic role than the object *the visitor* and therefore the two must be somehow distinguished. CGEL refers to *parties* as a  $O_d$  and to *the visitor* as an  $O_i$ .

In contrast with Huddleston and Pullum, however, Quirk et al. (1985: 59) frequently (and freely) use the term ‘prepositional object’ when talking about ditransitive verbs by which he means a prepositional phrase that alternates with the  $O_i$  and is generally located after the  $O_d$ . Such an instance of paraphrasing is referred to as a systematic correspondence which helps us understand grammatical structures (Quirk et al. 1985: 57). Systematic correspondences are based on the relation between grammatical choice and meaning (Quirk et al. 1985: 57) which is important for us not only in the case of the relation between  $O_i$  and  $O_{prep}$  but also when we will be discussing the semantic roles of individual clause elements.<sup>2</sup> One of the examples of a systematic correspondence is the subject matter of passivization.

### 2.2.1 Passive forms

Quirk et al. (1985: 57-58) state that transitive verbs are generally able to create passive forms:

*A number of people saw the accident* SVO  
 ~ *The accident was seen (by a number of people)*  $SV_{pass}(A)$ .

This example hints that ditransitive verbs can generally form two passive forms:

*My father gave me this watch* SVO $_iO_d$   
 ~ *I was given this watch (by my father)*  $SV_{pass}O_d(A)$   
 ~ *This watch was given (to) me (by my father)*  $SV_{pass}O_i(A)$ .

In the first passive sentence the subject of the clause became the former  $O_i$ , thus forming the so-called first passive, while in the second sentence the former  $O_d$ , thus forming the second

---

<sup>2</sup> The symbol ‘~’ will be used for instances of correspondence and ‘#’ for its lack

passive (Quirk et al. 1985: 1208). The same view is adopted by CamGEL (249) with the addition that the first passive tends to be significantly more preferred. Huddleston and Pullum then further focus on the acceptability of both variants. They claim that the first passive presents no difficulties with clauses where the  $O_i$  corresponds to the PP with *to* having the recipient role as in *I sent a copy to Sue* ~ *Sue was sent a copy* but there are questions raised as to the acceptability of the second passive as in *?A copy was sent Sue*. In the instance when the  $O_i$  corresponds to the PP with *for* having a beneficiary role neither of the passives are considered fully acceptable:

*I ordered Sue a copy*

*?Sue was ordered a copy*<sup>3</sup>

*#A copy was ordered Sue*

With regards to the second passive the alternative with the prepositional paraphrase is more common than the alternative without it.<sup>4</sup> The *by*-phrase functions in the passive forms as an optional adverbial and therefore may or may not be omitted.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 246) argue that passivization is an important feature in order to determine an object and define what they call the ‘passive test.’ The passive test in their terms consists of that “if a core complement NP of an active clause can be converted into the subject of a related passive, then it is an object.” Having said this, it is of course necessary to question his refusal of Quirk et al.’s prepositional object being an object is readily addressed in the assertion that there are exceptions to this in the same way that not all objects are able to form a related passive. (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 246-7)

### 2.2.2 Realizations

Quirk et al. (1985: 1171) associate six different realizations of the components of ditransitive clauses, but as we are concerned merely with NPs only the first two will be dealt with:

[D1] Noun phrases as  $O_i$  and  $O_d$  *They offered her some food*

[D2] Noun phrase with  $O_{prep}$  *Please say something to us*<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The first passive is considered as plausible (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 249)

<sup>4</sup> See above – *This watch was given (to) me (by my father)* – the variant with the preposition *to* will be generally preferred to the one without it

The basic type of ditransitive complementation Quirk et al. associate with the initial type [D1] *They offered her (O<sub>i</sub>) some food (O<sub>d</sub>)* where both O<sub>i</sub> and O<sub>d</sub> are realized by noun phrases and the order of the objects is stable with the O<sub>i</sub> being closer to the verb than the O<sub>d</sub> (Quirk, et al. 1985: 1208) Type [D2] includes what Quirk et al. denominate as TYPE II prepositional verbs and further divide the type to three subcategories:

- [D1] O<sub>i</sub> + O<sub>d</sub> *They offered her some food*
- [D2a] O<sub>d</sub> + O<sub>prep</sub> *We addressed our remarks to the children*
- [D2b] O<sub>i</sub> + O<sub>prep</sub> *We reminded him of the agreement*

In terms of passivization: contrary to the [D1] type which can form two forms of passive constructions both [D2] types can generally form only one type of passives (Quirk et al. 1985: 1209):

- [D2a] ~ *Our remarks were addressed to the children*  
# *The children were addressed our remarks (to)*
- [D2b] ~ *He was reminded of the agreement*  
# *The agreement was reminded him (of)*

It is important now to mention that not all verbs belong to only one group, there are instances where a single verb extends beyond its primary type. Such verbs are for example:

<i>tell</i> [D1 + 2a + 2b] – <i>pay/pay to/pay with, serve/serve to/serve with, provide/provide for/provide with</i>	Mary <i>told</i> only John the secret [D1] Mary <i>told</i> the secret only <i>to</i> John [D2a] Mary <i>told</i> only John <i>about</i> the secret [D2b]
<i>offer</i> [D1 + 2a] – <i>bringt/bring to, give/give to, lend/lend to</i>	John <i>offered</i> Mary some help [D1] John <i>offered</i> some help <i>to</i> Mary [D2a]
<i>envy</i> [D1 + 2b] – <i>excuse/excuse for, forgive/forgive for</i>	She <i>envied</i> John his success [D1] She <i>envied</i> John <i>for</i> his success [D2b]
<i>blame</i> [D2a + 2b] – <i>supply for(to)/supply with</i>	Helen <i>blamed</i> the divorce <i>on</i> John [D2a] Helen <i>blamed</i> John <i>for</i> the divorce [D2b]

(Quirk et al. 1985: 1210-1212)

<sup>5</sup> The other four are:[D3] O<sub>i</sub> + *that* clause *They told me that I was ill*; [D4] O<sub>i</sub> + *wh-* clause *He asked me what time it was*; [D5] O<sub>i</sub> + *wh-* infinitive clause *Mary showed us what to do*; [D6] O<sub>i</sub> + *to-* infinitive *I advised Mark to see a doctor* (Quirk et al. 1985: 1171).

However, there are also verbs that stick only to one type and have no means how to expand to other types:

<i>wish</i> [D1]	They <i>wished</i> him good luck
<i>say</i> [D2a]	Why didn't anybody <i>say</i> this <i>to</i> me?
<i>warn</i> [D2b]	Mary <i>warned</i> John <i>of</i> the dangers

(Quirk et al. 1985: 1210-1212)

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 248) agree that most ditransitive clauses have an alternative containing a PP:

- i. *I sent Sue a copy* # *I sent a copy to Sue*
- ii. *I ordered Sue a copy* # *I ordered a copy for Sue*

What is interesting in the case of the CamGEL view is that while it acknowledges the existence of a variant to the typical ditransitive construction  $SVO_iO_d$  they do not regard such constructions as ditransitive but as monotransitive: “the PP *to/for Sue* is not an indirect object, not an object at all, having none of the properties [of an object] and the NP *Sue* is of course an oblique, hence not a possible object of the verb” (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002: 248). This is a rather radical concept of ditransitive constructions compared to CGEL but CamGEL (2002: 248) supports this premise by the fact that the traditional notion of the PP being regarded as an object is based on the account of the semantic roles of the indirect object and the PP *Sue* being the same and consequently claims that were such a viewpoint adopted it would be necessary to contemplate whether *Sue* in *Sue was sent a copy* is also not an indirect object as it again has the same semantic role.

### 2.2.3 Other authors

To briefly mention the concept of ditransitive clauses of other authors I have chosen Biber et al.'s definition in LGSWE (2006: 381): ditransitive clauses are those that are accompanied by an  $O_i$  and a  $O_d$  functioning as NPs. However, he also acknowledges the possibility of ditransitives appearing as the  $SVO_d$  pattern being “expanded by a recipient or benefactive role” (Biber et al 2006: 150). The  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern is then regarded both as prepositional verbs with a  $O_d$  and a  $O_{prep}$  or as monotransitive verbs with a  $O_d$  and a recipient



adverbial.<sup>6</sup> (Biber et al. 2006: 388) Adopting the middle grounds between Quirk et al.'s and Huddleston and Pullum's approaches towards ditransitive verbs is also Mukherjee (2005). Mukherjee (2005: 8) criticises Quirk et al.'s loose understanding of ditransitive verb complementation, mainly the instances when a certain verb cannot appear in the standard ditransitive pattern SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> and can only appear in a prepositional construction, such as *convince* or *inform*. According to him, in order for a verb to be regarded as ditransitive, it has to be able to form the already mentioned standard pattern SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub>, thus ruling out Quirk's [D2a] and [D2b] types. Once a verb is capable of doing that, its prepositional variants may also be considered ditransitive. (Mukherjee 2005: 12).

## 2.3 Types of object

### 2.3.1 Direct object

A direct object is relatively firmly positioned in ditransitive clauses, is generally realized by a concrete noun (Quirk et al. 1985: 1208) and it is usually inanimate (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 248). Biber et al. (2006: 126) state that a direct object typically "follows immediately after the verb phrase." In comparison with the O<sub>i</sub>, the O<sub>d</sub> is more central to the VP.

#### 2.3.1.1 Semantic roles of direct object

There are several semantic roles of a direct object in monotransitive clauses; the most typical of them is the affected role. The overall overview of semantic roles of a O<sub>d</sub> are (Quirk et al. 1985: 749-52):

- i. **affected object** which is described in Quirk et al.'s (1985: 741) words as "a participant (animate or inanimate) which does not cause the happening denoted by the verb, but is directly involved in some other way." CGEL illustrates this on the example: *James sold his digital watch yesterday*. A somewhat less obscure definition is offered by Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 231) who define the affected role as being "affected by an action performed by some causer:" *They hit me, They kissed us*.

---

<sup>6</sup> Biber et al. (2006) thus accept Quirk et al.'s (1985) view by utilising the term 'prepositional object' but at the same do not entirely reject the approach of Huddleston and Pullum (2002) who completely dismiss a prepositional phrase being able to function as an object.

- ii. **locative object** may sometimes be confounded with adverbials due to the omission of the preposition, however, its ability to form related passive constructions identifies it as an object: *We walked (through) the streets; He passed (by) a cyclist.*
- iii. **resultant object** exists only on the basis of the activity of the verb: *Baird invented television; I baked a cake.*
- iv. **cognate object** similarly as the resultant object depends on the activity denoted by the verb and can be generally paraphrased by substituting the NP by with an adverbial equivalent: *They fought a clean fight ~ They fought cleanly; He died a miserable death ~ He died miserably.*
- v. **instrumental object** presents an object that is used as an instrument: *She is playing the piano; He nodded his head.*
- vi. **eventive object** (cf 2.3.2) generally takes appears accompanied by a verb of general meaning and is the element carrying the meaning.

### 2.3.2 Eventive object

There is a close relation between the eventive and cognate objects at times (Quirk et al 1985: 751): *They fought a long fight (O<sub>cog</sub>) ~ They had a long fight (O<sub>event</sub>)* both being examples of what Algeo (1995: 203) calls the expanded predicate construction.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly to Quirk et al. Algeo (1995: 204) defines the expanded predicate construction as containing a semantically general verb and a semantically specific object. The difference between the two examples then is that in the construction containing the eventive object the verb is semantically general and the meaning is represented by the object (Quirk et al. 1985: 750). The eventive object is generally deverbal as in *do a dive ~ dive; give an answer ~ answer; have a bath ~ bathe* (Algeo 1995: 204). There are, however, exceptions to his both Quirk et al. and Algeo mention: examples such as *I'm making an effort; He did some homework; Have mercy* present no possibility of paraphrasing the object with a formally equivalent verb. (Quirk et al. 1985: 751; Algeo 1995: 206) Algeo (1995: 205) thus distinguishes several types of verb-O<sub>event</sub> concord:

---

<sup>7</sup> Algeo (1995: 203-4) presents his belief that the English language is the result of the combination of grammar and lexis. Grammar, which is centred around the verb, and lexis, whose dominant element is the noun. And these two elements, the verb and the noun, form the so-called expanded predicate, one of its manifestations being a transitive verb with an eventive object.

- i. in its purest form the object-noun resembles its verbal counterpart in both phonological and morphological properties: *try ~ have a try; party ~ have a party*
- ii. another type of concord portrays the verb in slight modification but still clearly recognisable: *breathe [] ~ take a breath []; compare ~ make a comparison, prefer ~ make a preference* (Algeo 1995: 205)
- iii. the next type has already been mentioned and consists in having no formally recognisable verbal counterpart. This group contains:
  - a. expanded predicate constructions like *He did some homework* or *Have mercy* having no formal nor other verbal equivalent
  - b. expanded predicate constructions like *have sex ~ copulate; take cover ~ hide* having at least a non-cognate verbal equivalent
- iv. The last type concerns itself with instances when the deverbal O<sub>event</sub> seems to have a cognate verbal counterpart but does not correspond to the meaning of the verb (Quirk et al. 1985: 751; Algeo 1995: 206): *make love (to) # to love, have a bite # to bite, take a chance # to chance.*

On these examples it can be seen that most eventive object constructions can be paraphrased with the use of a single verb (Brůhová 2010: 66): *have a party ~ party; make a comparison ~ compare; have sex ~ copulate*, but there are instances that do not allow such paraphrasing: *He did some homework*. Keeping in mind that the verbal paraphrases shown so far were predominantly intransitive verbs Quirk et al. (1985: 751) assert that there are also cases when the object is deverbal from a verb that is normally used transitively: *I made a mistake/an attempt/a correction*. Contrary to *fight* in *They had a fight* the verb *mistake*, *attempt* and *correct* are transitive verbs: *I have mistaken you for a brother; You should attempt to read the novel in one sitting;*<sup>8</sup> *The teacher has not corrected all the papers yet.*

### 2.3.2.1 Expanded predicate construction collocates

Quirk et al. then present some of the most commonly found collocations of verbs and eventive objects whose noun heads are derived from verbs:

---

<sup>8</sup> source: <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/attempt>, 29/3/2015

<b>DO</b>	a dance	a left/right turn	a somersault
	a dive	a report	a translation
	a drawing	a sketch	some work

Verbal nouns are commonly used as objects, *eg*:

some cleaning	some repairing
some drawing	some sewing
some knitting	some thinking
some painting	some writing

**GET** a glance (at), a look (at), a shot at <informal>, a view (of)

**GIVE** advice, an answer, a cheer, consideration (to), a cough, a cry, a definition, a description, encouragement, an explanation, help (to), a kick, a kiss, a laugh, a nod, permission, a push, a reply, a sigh, a smile, a wash, a wave

**HAVE** an argument, a bash <informal>, a bath, a bite <informal>, a chat <informal>, a dream, a drink, an effect, a fight, a guess <esp BrE>, a holiday <esp BrE>, an influence (on/over), a lie down <informal BrE>, a look (at), a meeting, a nap <informal>, a quarrel, a rest, a seat, a shave, a shower, a sleep, a smoke, a swim, a talk, a taste, a walk, a wash

**MAKE** an accusation (against), an agreement (with), allowances (for), an attack (on), a bargain (with), a call (on), a choice, a comment, a contribution (to), a copy (of), a criticism (of), a decision, a discovery (that), an escape, a fuss, a guess, (an) inquiry (into/of), an impression (on), an improvement (on), an investigation (into/of), a note (of), an objection (to), an observation (that), an offer (that), a payment, a promise (that), a proposal (that), a recommendation (that), a reduction in, a reference to, a report (on), a request (that/for), a start, a suggestion, a turn, use of

**OFFER** an apology, one's resignation, a suggestion

**PAY** attention (to), a call (on), a visit (to)

**PUT** emphasis on, an end to, a question to, a stop to

**TAKE** a bath, a bite <informal>, a breath, care (of), a dislike to, a dive, a drink, a glance (at), a guess, a look (at), a nap, (a) note (of), notice (of), offence (at), a photograph (of), pity (on), a rest, a risk, a seat, a shower, a shave, a sleep, a smoke, a swim, a vacation <esp AmE>, a walk, a wash

(Quirk et al. 1985: 751-2)

Algeo (1995: 206) further presents a small table of expanded predicate collocations containing a semantically specific verb which contrary to semantically general verbs collocate only with a restricted amount of eventive objects:

ask a question; breathe a sigh; effect an alteration; find a solution; go for a walk; grant permission; heave a sigh; hold interest for; offer an apology; offer one's resignation; offer a suggestions; pick a quarrel; reach an agreement; submit an application; tender one's apologies; utter a curse; utter a sigh

Despite these semantically specific verbs being considered expanded predicate constructions they are not what Algeo (1995: 208) regards core expanded predicates as for these he distinguishes the following conditions:

- i. the verb being either *give*, *have*, *make* or *take* which effectively excludes all semantically specific constructions as well as constructions with a cognate object<sup>9</sup>
- ii. existence of a morphologically and semantically equivalent verb to the eventive object eliminating constructions as *take account of* ~ *allow* for lacking morphological correspondence, *do an investigation* ~ *investigate* lacking morphological identity or *have a bash at* ~ *try* (*#bash* ~ *strike*, *attack*) containing morphological identity but lacking semantic correspondence
- iii. the eventive object being an indefinite noun eliminating constructions as *I'll do the answering*
- iv. constructions meeting some but not all of the conditions are regarded as pseudo-expanded predicates.

### 2.3.2.1 Light verbs

The semantically general verb may also be defined as a 'light verb' (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 290-1). A light use of verbs "[contributes less] to the meaning of the predication [...] in comparison with [...] their complements" (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 290). In the instances that the eventive construction has a verbal counterpart as in *She kissed him* ~ *She gave him a kiss* we call the verb in the former example the 'associated verb' the opposition

---

<sup>9</sup> Cognate objects in their pure form *sigh a sigh* are regarded as archaism, once modified *Tigger smiled his happiest smile* they are somewhat more acceptable.

between the two expressions “leaves open the issue of whether the verb or the noun is more basic.” (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 291)

The purpose of the expanded predicate construction is many-fold, mainly:

- a. to transfer the focus of the clause from the verb onto the object (Algeo 1995: 204). Algeo employs Quirk et al.’s contrast between *He gave Helen a nudge* where the focus is on the activity rather than on the person as in *He nudged Helen*. With this is connected functional sentence perspective: we use the eventive construction when we wish to put end-focus on the activity, not the person. (Brůhová 2010: 66)
- b. preference of the eventive object construction compared to the simple SV pattern. (Algeo 1995: 205; Quirk et al. 1985: 751)
- c. the expanded predicate construction enables the addition of modifiers and determiners to the noun making it thus more specific: *She kissed him* x *She gave him an unusually passionate kiss* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 291-2).<sup>10</sup> The addition of determiners also enables quantification: In *He drank my milk* it is clear that there is nothing left of my milk whereas *He had a drink of my milk* suggests that most of my milk is still present. (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 291-2)

#### 2.3.4 Indirect object

An indirect object is generally animate and positioned first in ditransitive complementation<sup>11</sup> (Quirk et al. 1985: 1208): *Mary gave the visitor (O<sub>i</sub>) a glass of milk (O<sub>d</sub>)*. Instances of an inanimate O<sub>i</sub> appear as Dušková (2006: 13.32) claims in instances such as *she gave the door a push* employing the eventive object construction. According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 244) O<sub>i</sub> occurs only in ditransitive clauses, in which it differs to the O<sub>d</sub> which can appear in both monotransitive and ditransitive clauses. The O<sub>i</sub> can often be paraphrased by a PP which then typically appears after the O<sub>d</sub> and generally expresses the same semantic role: (Quirk et al. 1985: 727) *I’ll send Charles another copy ~ I’ll send another copy to Charles*.

---

<sup>10</sup> The expression *She kissed him unusually passionately* is considered somewhat awkward, this being the case with many instances of paraphrasing complex NPs (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 291)

<sup>11</sup> However, as Quirk et al. (1985:1211) later mention, in the case of some verbs (eg *compare with*) two inanimate objects can appear instead of the more typical pattern of one animate and the other inanimate

### 2.3.4.1 Semantic roles of indirect object

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 245) declare the most prototypical semantic role of the  $O_i$  the **recipient** role, in Quirk et al.'s (1985: 741) words "of the animate being that is passively implicated by the happening or state:" *I've found you a place; We paid them the money*. This recipient role, either intended or true, is according to Dušková (2006: 13.32) regarded as the only true semantic role of the  $O_i$ <sup>12</sup> and corresponds to the paraphrase *to* and *for*. (Biber et al. 2006: 129) Biber et al. (2006: 129) however mention other roles of the  $O_i$  – the **benefactive** role which corresponds to the paraphrase with the preposition *for* and is at times analysed as one with the recipient role;<sup>13</sup> and the **affected** role which is associated with the light use of verbs, such as *give, pay, owe* or *lend* presenting an eventive object. (Biber et al. 2006: 129; Quirk et al. 1985: 753) Quirk et al. (1985: 753) also state that in the case of the affected  $O_i$  its prepositional counterpart is basically non-existent as the expanded predicate construction puts emphasis on the action rather than the verb and therefore the noun should receive end-focus position. Balcarová (2013: 34) draws from Haspelmath et al. (2007: 46) and mentions another semantic role of the  $O_i$  standing opposite of the beneficiary role – the **malefactive** role: *I robbed him of money*.

### 2.3.4 Prepositional object

The prepositional object does not differ from the direct object neither in its syntactic nor semantic properties. (Dušková 2006: 13.36) It is mainly realized by a noun or a pronoun: *She confided in her friend; I marvel at his boldness* but can be also realized by nominal clauses<sup>14</sup> (Dušková 2006: 13.36; Biber et al. 2006: 129). The  $O_{prep}$  is however most closely linked to the  $O_i$ : as has been already said, most prepositional objects have their counterpart in the simple  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern; both  $O_i$  and  $O_{prep}$  need a mediating element, either a  $O_d$  or a preposition (Biber et al. 2006: 130); and their mutual counterparts generally express the same semantic role. The most frequently found prepositions in relation to ditransitive verbs are *to* and *for*. Nevertheless, there are other prepositions that can function as the  $O_{prep}$  (Quirk et al.

---

<sup>12</sup> To this corresponds Dušková's (2006: 13.32) claim that due to its semantic properties the  $O_i$  can be expressed either by a noun or a pronoun as the semantic role of the recipient does not allow an inanimate entity. However, this will prove untrue in the case of the eventive  $O_d$  where the  $O_i$  will appear in the affected role with the possibility of portraying an inanimate  $O_i$ : *He gave him a push*.

<sup>13</sup> in Quirk et al.'s (1985: 741) words the recipient role is regarded as the actual recipient whereas the beneficiary role is regarded as the intended recipient

<sup>14</sup> Biber et al. state, however, that this refers only to *-ing* and *wh-* clauses

1985: 1211; Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 311): *protect from, interest in, accuse of, congratulate on, charge with, they bear no ill will towards you, I played a game of chess with/against him.*

#### **2.3.4.1 Semantic roles of prepositional object**

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 310) identify two major semantic roles of the prepositional alternation of indirect objects which draw from their non-prepositional counterparts:

- i. recipients (or actual recipients) are regarded as the most central semantic roles of indirect objects which are commonly represented by their prepositional counterparts. They employ the preposition *to* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 308-10): *I'll show you the photo ~ I'll show the photo to you*
- ii. beneficiaries (or intended recipients) employ the preposition *for* and are further divided into beneficiaries of [a.] goods and [b.] services (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 310): [a.] *I'll get another glass for you*; [b.] *Let me open the door for you*. The alternation with  $O_i$  is largely restricted to the instances of goods rather than services (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 310): [a.] *I'll do a quiche for you ~ I'll do you a quiche*; [b.] *I'll do the washing-up for you ~ \*I'll do you the washing-up*

#### **2.4 Object omission**

The chapter will be derived mainly from Brůhová (2012). When dealing with the question of the omission of either the  $O_i$  or  $O_d$ , we will be concerned with what Poldauf (1963) calls his first syntactical plan – in other words – with the structure of the core (Brůhová 2012: 123). The central point under inspection is Brůhová's claim that “even the components of the first syntactical plan can be omitted under certain circumstances” (Brůhová 2012: 123).

When talking about omissibility it must be first stressed that we are talking about syntactic omission. Even though an  $O_i$  or  $O_d$  may be physically absent from a clause, they are



still present semantically, therefore the three-participant necessity of a ditransitive verb<sup>15</sup> is maintained at all times. Brůhová (2012: 124-126) then mentions two types of omission:

- i. Depending on the recoverability of the object where she distinguishes between [a.] contextual (or definite) recoverability<sup>16</sup> meaning that the omitted participant is clearly recoverable from the context: *I asked him the price but he wouldn't tell me [the price]* and [b.] indefinite recoverability where the omitted participant is not needed to complete the meaning: *He tells [people] lies*.
- ii. Depending on the kind of omitted object. Quirk et al. (1985), Huddleston and Pullum (2002), Dušková (2006) and Brůhová (2012) all agree on the fact that the omission of the O<sub>i</sub> is more frequent due to the already mentioned higher centrality of the O<sub>d</sub> over the O<sub>i</sub>. Huddleston and Pullum's example *They offered us \$100* vs *They offered \$100* poses no threat to the grammaticality of the verb or change its meaning (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 312). There are, however, exceptions when the O<sub>i</sub> cannot be deleted as in *They wished us a safe journey* (not clearly recoverable); *They gave us a beating* (light use of *give*). (Brůhová 2012: 125) Significantly less frequent are verbs allowing the omission of only the O<sub>d</sub> (Brůhová 2012: 125): *They fined us \$100* vs *They fined us* where the semantic role of both instances of *us* remains the same regardless of their functioning as an O<sub>i</sub> or O<sub>d</sub>. (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 313) This is contrasted with the verb *charge* which allows for the omission of both O<sub>i</sub> and O<sub>d</sub>: *They charged us \$100* vs *They charged \$100* vs *They charged us*. (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 313) Concerning the problem of determining the nature of the objects when one of them is omitted in the type of omission of *charge* Brůhová (2012: 126) mentions Quirk et al.'s and Huddleston and Pullum's approach of regarding verbs like *ask*, *teach* as monotransitive once the O<sub>d</sub> is omitted (the O<sub>i</sub> becoming O<sub>d</sub>) and verbs like *give* as ditransitive under the same circumstances (the O<sub>i</sub> remaining O<sub>i</sub>).

Dušková (2006: 13.32) agrees that the most of ditransitive verbs may be employed without the presence of the O<sub>i</sub>. Regarding the O<sub>d</sub>, its omission tends to be problematic and therefore less frequent, one of the reasons being that the O<sub>i</sub> can at times be mistaken for the former O<sub>d</sub>: *I found her (O<sub>i</sub>) a corner seat (O<sub>d</sub>)* # *I found her (O<sub>d</sub>)*. There are, however, instances when even

---

<sup>15</sup> Subject (left-hand participant), O<sub>i</sub> and O<sub>d</sub> (right-hand participants) (Brůhová 2012: 123).

<sup>16</sup> Either linguistic or situational (Brůhová 2012: 124).

after the omission of the  $O_d$  the  $O_i$  maintains its recipient role: *They paid him ( $O_i$ ) twenty pounds ( $O_d$ )* ~ *They paid him ( $O_i$ )*. (Dušková 2006: 13.32) However, as Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 312) mention, the omission of the  $O_i$  is possible only when the  $O_i$  has the recipient or beneficiary role. In the event that the  $O_i$  has the affected role, in other words, when it is part of the eventive object construction, the  $O_i$  ceases to be omissible.

## 2.5 Object order

As has been already mentioned, the two most typical orderings of objects in ditransitive constructions are [a.] the  $O_i$  followed by the  $O_d$  in the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern and [b.] the  $O_d$  followed by the  $O_{prep}$  in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern. Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 248) illustrate this on the example *They offered all the overseas students one of the experienced tutors* vs *They offered one of the experienced tutors all the overseas students*. In both cases, the underlined NP standing closer to the verb functions as the  $O_i$ . Quirk et al. (1985: 1396) explain this as an implication that the  $O_i$  carries less communicative dynamism (CD) than the  $O_d$ <sup>17</sup> and thus refer to the end-focus principle. When the  $O_i$  carries more CD than the  $O_d$  it is paraphrased by its prepositional counterpart (Quirk et al.: 1396):

*She gave her brother a signet ring* ~ *She gave a signet ring to her brother*

This alternation between the  $SVO_iO_d$  and  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern is another example of a systematic correspondence (cf chapter 2.2.2).

In the case of the eventive object construction, which enables us to give emphasis to the activity instead of the human participant, as in *He nudged Helen* vs *He gave Helen a nudge*, the prepositional counterpart *He gave a nudge to Helen* is questionable (Quirk, et al. 1985: 1396). In such instances that the human participant is needed in the end-focus position it is better to avoid the eventive object construction completely and use the monotransitive option *He nudged Helen* (Quirk et al. 1985: 1396). Quirk et al. (1985: 1396) also mention a third possibility of object ordering and that the  $O_{prep}$  can appear before the  $O_d$ : *She gave to her brother a signet ring*. The difference between the  $SVO_iO_d$  and  $SVO_{prep}O_d$  patterns is that in the latter case the  $O_{prep}$  carries a higher degree of CD than the  $O_i$  but at the same time less

---

<sup>17</sup> Communicative dynamism is a term explained by XXX which is based on the fact that every sentence is oriented towards a certain element. This particular element then contributes the most the development of the communication and therefore carries the highest degree of CD. (5,6)

than the  $O_d$ . However, Quirk et al. (1985: 1396) emphasise that the third possibility is possible only under the circumstances that the  $O_d$  is not realized by a pronoun: \**She gave her brother it*. Another deviation from the typical  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern is mentioned by Dušková (2006: 13.32) in cases when both objects are realized by a pronoun. Dušková states that apart from the regular  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  counterpart and the alternative without the preposition but maintaining the typical order exists a variant portraying the reverse order of the objects<sup>18</sup>:

*Give me the ring* ( $SVO_iO_d$ ) ~ *Give it to me* ( $SVO_dO_{prep}$ ) ~ *Give me it* ( $SVO_iO_d$ )  
 ~ *Give it me* ( $SVO_dO_i$ )

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 248) then even present a situation when the object has the possibility of occupying prenuclear position. In these cases, the pattern  $O_dSVO_i$  is largely preferred to the pattern  $O_iSVO_d$  (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 248):

*The key he gave Sue* ( $O_dSVO_i$ ) vs ?*Sue he gave the key* ( $O_iSVO_d$ )

Apart from the principle of end-focus determining the ordering of objects in ditransitive constructions Brůhová (2012: 42) mentions the end-weight principle. Quirk et al. (1985: 1361) describe the principle of end-weight as the fact that “new information often needs to be stated more fully than the given ([...] with a longer, ‘heavier’ structure)” and use the example *John offered to Mary the help that she needed*. (Brůhová 2012: 42) Brůhová (2013: 65-66) mentions that the principle of end-focus and end-weight are in complementary relation to one another as “new information often needs to be stated more fully than the given.”

---

<sup>18</sup> This variant is, however, very infrequent and restricted to BrE (Quirk et al. 1985: 1396).

### 3. MATERIAL AND METHOD

#### 3.1 Material

The following empirical part of the present paper will be based on the selection of one hundred examples of the expanded predicate construction containing the verb *lend* followed by an eventive object. The examples have been extracted from the British National Corpus (BNC), a corpus containing over one hundred million words of both written and spoken language.<sup>19</sup> The BNC selection is synchronic, in other words, the examples correspond to late twentieth century British English. The method employed to extract the examples was to search for all forms of the verb *lend* {lend/V} in corpus order and then manually select the first one hundred instances of the verb followed by an eventive object. Instances of light *lend* accompanied by two O<sub>event</sub> have been taken as two examples of O<sub>event</sub> in this form:

L06 L07/A1B 1046	If this suggests that there are other sorts of English people than the sort Auden has in his sights, on the other hand it <b>lends point and force to his censure of Beerbohm</b> , and of what Beerbohm stands for in English life.
---------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Further criteria determining the excerption are stated below.

As has been already mentioned in chapter 2.2.2, this work deals with complements of ditransitive verbs realized as none other but NPs, all other realizations of either O<sub>i</sub> or O<sub>d</sub> were therefore excluded. Drawing from Brůhová (2010: 55, 78) and Bláhová (2011: 28-29) the following instances of *lend* have been included:

- i. instances of *lend* having a semantically general meaning:<sup>20</sup>
- ii. instances of *lend* appearing only in active voice:
- iii. instances of *lend* complemented by a NP or a NP within a PP in the case of O<sub>prep</sub>:
- iv. instances of *lend* complemented both by two objects as well as instances when either O<sub>i</sub> or O<sub>prep</sub> are omitted:<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/corpus/index.xml>

<sup>20</sup> This being said it is necessary to mention that in all the examples of *lend* followed by an eventive object the meaning of the verb maintains some semblance of its use as a semantically specific verb.

<sup>21</sup> In the case of the eventive object construction the presence of the O<sub>d</sub> is vital due to the absence of meaning of the semantically general verb

- v. instances of *lend* followed by an eventive object of both indefinite and definite reference
- vi. idiomatic expressions regardless of their clause pattern stability, in other words both expressions below are included:
  - (1) L02 Large publicity campaigns began and the Irish Times also **lent its weight to the pro-divorce argument, campaigning in its columns until the eve of the referendum in late June.**
  - (2) L84 HAVING shepherded the Tories through the general election, Charles and Maurice Saatchi **are lending a hand to Eduard Shevardnadze, the former Soviet Foreign Minister now chairing the State Council of Georgia.**

Examples of *lend* complemented by a reflexive pronoun have been excluded for two reasons: according to Brůhová (2010: 78) [a.] their order is fixed and more importantly [b.] the meaning of such a construction differs from the basic meaning of *lend*. Contrarily to Brůhová (2010), idiomatic expressions such as *lend weight to something* are included in the selection. Despite agreeing with her claim of the construction appearing exclusively in the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern – similarly as in the case of reflexive pronouns – such examples maintain the basic meaning of *lend* and furthermore serve to disprove Quirk et al.'s (1985) argument that in the case of both objects being present in an expanded predicate construction with an eventive object the only possible clause pattern of the construction is SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub>. This being said it must be noted that *weight* in the eventive object position does appear in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern:

- (3) L78 There had been others lacking in imagination, who stuck to the basic facts but **lent them theatrical weight.**<sup>22</sup>

Other restrictions, as those stated by Algeo (1995) in chapter 2.3.2 or those mentioned by Bláhová (2013: 27-28) are dismissed and a looser view on the expanded predicate construction has been adopted allowing for:

- i. deverbal O<sub>event</sub>:
  - (4) L12 He said: ‘How would a political party as totally committed as the Labour Party to equality of treatment and of opportunity for girls and women, **lend its support to the introduction of schools in which men exercise all the power, and women are assigned a subordinate and restricted role?**’

---

<sup>22</sup> However, only one case of *lend weight* in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern appears throughout the entire BNC.

- ii.  $O_{event}$  that have undergone a process of derivation:  
 (5) L79 Elling clung to a cliff face that **lent its dwellings protection (=protect) from the wind** and provided the inhabitants with an uninterrupted view over the sound.
- iii.  $O_{event}$  that do not have a formal or other verbal equivalent:  
 (6) L05 These **lent brilliance to the footwork which became more intricate and thus more interesting.**
- iv.  $O_{event}$  having a non-cognate equivalent:  
 (7) L94 **With a bit of luck Eleanor might lend a hand (=help).**
- v.  $O_{event}$  that present a verbal counterpart but does not correspond to the meaning of the construction:  
 (8) L99 'I thought I'd come along and **lend a hand (#to hand),**' he smiled at Maggie.

This approach has been adopted due to the fact that we are concerned with questions such as the concrete or abstract nature of the  $O_d$  as well as in/animateness of the  $O_i$  and there is no need to limit ourselves to what Algeo calls core expanded predicates (cf chapter 2.3.2). Not to mention that adopting such binding criteria would disclude many examples of otherwise sound eventive objects.

## 4. ANALYSIS

In order to identify one hundred examples of the verb *lend* followed by an eventive object 315 text samples containing the verb had to be examined in the BNC:

**Table 1: Frequency of the verb *lend* followed by an eventive object**

Samples with <i>lend</i>	<b>315</b>
Samples with <i>lend</i> followed by O <sub>event</sub>	<b>100</b>
Frequency	<b>32%</b>

Table 1 shows that approximately every third occurrence of the verb *lend* appears with an eventive object which is a relatively high frequency given the fact that neither Algeo (1995:208) nor Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 293-296) do not consider *lend* as one of the main expanded predicate verbs (cf chapter 2.3.2.1). This result is also interesting when compared with Brůhová's (2010: 79) paper where the percentage of the light use of *lend* among other instances of ditransitive *lend* was merely 18,5%. This difference could be given due to the fact that as Brůhová's (2010) paper was not concerned solely with O<sub>event</sub> but generally on ditransitives, her criteria on determining the O<sub>event</sub> were more strict. Both cases of *lend* – either followed by two objects or only by O<sub>d</sub> – are included in the table.

### 4.1 Eventive object collocations with *lend*

Table 2 illustrates the list of nouns functioning as an eventive object, their number of occurrences and their frequency of occurrence:

**Table 2: List of collocates with *lend***

<b>Noun</b>	<b>Occurrences</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
support	14	14%
a hand	9	7%
weight	8	8%
name	4	4%
significance	4	4%
credence	3	3%
colour(s)	3	3%
authority	2	2%
protection	2	2%
an ear	2	2%
point	2	2%
voice(s)	2	2%
brilliance, force, dimension, enchantment, edge, substance, favour, form(s), skills, expertise, allure, elegance, understanding, use, justification, stability, air, encouragement, meaning, glamour, style, look, tones, goodness, charm, chance, knowledge, legitimacy, character, mockery, dignity, subtlety, humour, viability, colourfulness, sheen, depth, wit, familiarity, recognition, flavour, power, integrity, semblance, touch	1	0,01 (1%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1 (100%)</b>

The most frequent collocates with light *lend* are *support* (14 instances), *a hand* (9 instances), *weight* (8 instances), *name* and *significance* (4 instances), *credence* and *colour(s)* (3 instances) and *authority*, *protection*, *an ear*, *point* and *voice(s)* (2 instances). Finally, there are forty-five different realizations that appear only once.<sup>23</sup> We can see that out of one hundred examples there are altogether fifty seven different realizations of the eventive object:

**Table 3: Number of different  $O_{event}$**

<b>No. of tokens</b>	<b>No. of types</b>
100	57

This observation excludes the possibility of *lend* belonging to Algeo's list of expanded predicate constructions containing a semantically specific verb (cf chapter 2.3.2.1). It can be

<sup>23</sup> These are arranged by their relative order in the BNC.



therefore asserted that *lend* maintains some of its meaning as a semantically specific verb even when it is used in an expanded predicate construction.

#### 4.2 Categories of object-nouns according to the existence of their verbal counterparts

Having identified the individual collocations let us now categorize them. In chapter 2.3.2 several types of  $O_{\text{event}}$  have been mentioned according to the degree of the existence of their verbal counterpart. In instances when the classification of the individual collocation into one of the four groups was unclear the following dictionaries have been employed:

- a. *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*
- b. *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*

Examples as (lend) *support, weight, edge, colour, look, favour, form(s), allure, use*<sup>24</sup> correspond to group [i], the purest form of the  $O_{\text{event}}$  corresponding both phonologically and morphologically to its verbal counterpart:

(9) L11 FOREIGN ministers of the European Community **lent enthusiastic support yesterday to a Commission plan to give Poland and Hungary food and financial aid worth \$215m** (£140m), together with loans worth up to £700m.

~ FOREIGN ministers of the European Community **yesterday enthusiastically supported a Commission plan to give Poland and Hungary food and financial aid worth \$215m** (£140m), together with loans worth up to £700m.

(10) L18 Partly by way of compensation, the government **lent its favour increasingly to the allegedly more cost-effective polytechnics** (now made independent of local authorities), and to more practically or vocationally orientated institutions such as business schools.

~ Partly by way of compensation, the government **increasingly favoured the allegedly more cost-effective polytechnics** (now made independent of local authorities), and more practically or vocationally orientated institutions such as business schools.

(11) L04 Spiky dahlias **lend their vibrant colours to the scheme.**

~ Spiky dahlias **colour the scheme** in their vibrant way.

Chapter 2.3.2 argued that most of the  $O_{\text{event}}$  are derived from intransitive verbs. Note that according to *Merriam-Webster's* dictionary *support, weight, colour, edge, favour, allure, form*

---

<sup>24</sup> Despite its having slight phonological deviation of the voiceless [s] in its use as a noun becoming voiced [z] when used as a verb.

and *use* present in their corresponding verbal meanings transitive verbs, whereas only *look* presents an intransitive verb.

Group [ii] contains object-nouns that have undergone the process of derivation from their verbal counterpart but are still clearly recognisable. Among these belong (lend) *significance* (*signify*), *protection* (*protect*), *substance* (*substantiate*), *enchantment* (*enchant*), *understanding* (*understand*), *justification* (*justify*), *stability* (*stabilize*), *encouragement* (*encourage*), *meaning* (*mean*), *knowledge* (*know*), *mockery* (*mock*), *sheen* (*shine*), *recognition* (*recognize*), *glamour* (*glamourize*), *style* (*stylize*), *legitimacy* (*legitimate*), *character* (*characterize*), *dignity* (*dignify*), *colourfulness* (*colour*), *familiarity* (*familiarize*), *semblance* (*resemble*):

(12) L79 Elling clung to a cliff face that **lent its dwellings protection from the wind** and provided the inhabitants with an uninterrupted view over the sound.

~ Elling clung to a cliff face that **protects its dwellings from the wind** and provided the inhabitants with an uninterrupted view over the sound.

(13) L43 North **lent a good deal of encouragement to Thomas Dowling, ‘the priest for the contras’, who was called in by Calero to say Mass in the camps in Honduras;** but Dowling found the contras drifting, rather than committed.

~ North [greatly] **encouraged Thomas Dowling, ‘the priest for the contras’, who was called in by Calero to say Mass in the camps in Honduras;** but Dowling found the contras drifting, rather than committed.

(14) L97 The wrinkled skin, while rubberised to **lend some semblance of naturalism**, was dry and fragile.

~ The wrinkled skin, while rubberised **to resemble naturalism (naturalistic features)**, was dry and fragile.

Again the presumed dominance of intransitive verbs is not present, as eg *protect*, *enchant*, *understand*, *know*, *mock*, *characterize*, etc are transitive verbs.

Group [iii] then presents instances of the  $O_{event}$  having either no verbal counterpart or a verbal counterpart which, nevertheless, has no formal connections with the object-noun. This group consists of eg (lend) *a hand*, *an ear*, *credence*, *brilliance*, *dimension*, *elegance*, *goodness*, *subtlety*, *viability*, *depth*:

(15) L03 A sloping garden needn't be an uphill struggle, as Pippa Greenwood discovered when she **lent a hand to the Lloyds on camera**.

~ A sloping garden needn't be an uphill struggle, as Pippa Greenwood discovered when she **helped the Lloyds on camera**.

(16) L53 We knew that we should have to find this for ourselves, as the Billeting Office would not be prepared to move us again, nor **lend a very sympathetic ear to our complaints**.

~ We knew that we should have to find this for ourselves, as the Billeting Office would not be prepared to move us again, nor **listen sympathetically to our complaints**.

(17) L20 That individuals prosecuted for sodomy did not necessarily identify themselves with the demonized sodomite of official discourse also **lends credence to Foucault's distinction between sodomy as a kind of behaviour, and homosexuality as a modern identity**.

~ That individuals prosecuted for sodomy did not necessarily identify themselves with the demonized sodomite of official discourse **supports Foucault's distinction between sodomy as a kind of behaviour, and homosexuality as a modern identity**.

Finally group [iv] consists of O<sub>event</sub> with a cognate verbal counterpart having a distinct meaning: *charm, chance, name, authority (authorize), point, voice, force, air, tone, humour, flavour, power, touch, skill, expertise (expertize), wit, integrity (integrate)*:

(18) L06+07 If this suggests that there are other sorts of English people than the sort Auden has in his sights, on the other hand it **lends point and force to his censure of Beerbohm**, and of what Beerbohm stands for in English life.

# If this suggests that there are other sorts of English people than the sort Auden has in his sights, on the other hand it **points to and forces his censure of Beerbohm**, and of what Beerbohm stands for in English life.

(19) L75 Agent Cooper, who is forever dictating into a pocket tape recorder to an unseen associate named Diane, **lends the show much of its deadpan humour** as when he rhapsodizes about the aroma of the Douglas Fir or the savoury charms of a piece of pie with the glass-eyed earnestness of a Boy Scout on ecstasy.

# Agent Cooper, who is forever dictating into a pocket tape recorder to an unseen associate named Diane, **humours the show** as when he rhapsodizes about the aroma of the Douglas Fir or the savoury charms of a piece of pie with the glass-eyed earnestness of a Boy Scout on ecstasy.

According to *Merriam-Webster's* dictionary the meaning of the verb *humour* is<sup>25</sup>:

- a. to try to please or satisfy (someone) by doing what is wanted
- b. to soothe or content by indulgence
- c. to adapt oneself to

All three definitions of the verb do not correspond to the meaning of the O<sub>event</sub> construction *lend humour* and therefore it belongs to group [iv].

---

<sup>25</sup> <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/humor>

Table 4 summarizes the frequency of the  $O_{event}$  pertaining to one of the four above mentioned groups:

**Table 4: Frequency of the types of  $O_{event}$**

Types of $O_{event}$	No. of tokens	Frequency
Group [i]	31	<b>31%</b>
Group [ii]	25	<b>25%</b>
Group [iii]	21	<b>21%</b>
Group [iv]	23	<b>23%</b>
TOTAL	100	<b>100%</b>

### 4.3 Concrete/abstract nature of the eventive object

Chapter 2.3.1 states that the  $O_d$  is generally realized by a concrete noun. Table 4 presents the division of the fifty-seven different realizations of the  $O_{event}$  according to their concrete or abstract quality:

**Table 5: Concrete/abstract realizations of the  $O_{event}$**

Types of $O_{event}$	No. of types	Frequency
Concrete	10	<b>17,5%</b>
Abstract	47	<b>82,5%</b>
TOTAL	57	<b>100%</b>

When we account for the frequency of the individual realizations of the  $O_{event}$  we are given a slightly larger frequency of concrete nouns but the general distribution remains:

**Table 6: Concrete/abstract uses of the  $O_{event}$**

Types of $O_{event}$	No. of tokens	Frequency
Concrete	22	<b>22%</b>
Abstract	78	<b>78%</b>
TOTAL	100	<b>100%</b>

Quirk et al. (1985: 247) mark concrete nouns by their being among other criteria “accessible to the senses, observable and measurable.” Abstract nouns are accordingly “typically

nonobservable and nonmeasurable.” Both categories are count and noncount but Quirk et al. (1985:247) mention that the tendency is the overlap of abstract nouns with noncount quality and concrete nouns with count quality. Among the ten instances of concrete nouns belong *a hand, colour(s), an ear, voice(s), form(s), tones, colourfulness, sheen, flavour* and *touch*:

(20) L62 A son of the manse, he **lends to Labour the dark Church of Scotland tones that can make the recession sound as bleak as the wind that whips off the Firth of Forth in midwinter.**

(21) L92 They also **lend a delicious flavour** when added to cheap cuts of stewing lamb with caraway seeds, especially if the sauce is finished by the addition of a little soured cream.

All present concrete nouns are perceivable by the senses, observable and measurable, and therefore meet with Quirk et al.’s (1985) criteria. Accordingly, the majority of the abstract nouns are nonmeasurable, nonobservable and to a greater or lesser extent uncount:

(22) L19 Karen is hoping local businesses will **lend their support to the venture.**

(23) L33 Otherwise, be prepared for your dog to become accidentally conditioned by circumstances that **lend new significance to the sound of the dinner bell.**

If we examine Tables 5 and 6 it can be declared with a large degree of certainty that in the eventive object construction containing light *lend*, there is a considerable dominance of abstract nouns and therefore the claim that the O<sub>d</sub> is typically realized by a concrete noun does not seem to apply to light *lend*. In the case of *lend an ear* and *lend a hand* it can even be argued that while both nouns are in their literal meaning concrete, their meaning becomes metaphorical and the boundary between abstract and concrete quality becomes blurred and subjective:

(24) L03 A sloping garden needn't be an uphill struggle, as Pippa Greenwood discovered when she **lent a hand to the Lloyds on camera.**

(25) L53 We knew that we should have to find this for ourselves, as the Billeting Office would not be prepared to move us again, nor **lend a very sympathetic ear to our complaints.**

#### **4.4 The function of the expanded predicate construction**

One of the main functions of the expanded predicate construction is the FSP aspect, in other words, the position of an element in a clause marks to a large extent its degree of CD<sup>26</sup>. (Firbas, 1992: 7-8) Apart from the FSP aspects the reason behind the preference of using the eventive object construction as opposed to the simple SV pattern is to transfer the focus of the

---

<sup>26</sup> Communicative dynamism (CD) is a quality of a clause element that marks its contribution to the development of “a communicative purpose.” (Firbas, 1992: 7)

clause onto the object which enables further modification of the object making it consequently more specific (cf chapter 2.3.2.1). Table 7 demonstrates the percentage of the expanded predicate constructions whose  $O_{event}$  has undergone modification:

**Table 7: Frequency of  $O_{event}$  modification**

Type of $O_{event}$	No. of occurrences	Frequency
Modified $O_{event}$	43	43%
Simple $O_{event}$	57	57%
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	<b>100%</b>

We can see that 43% of the eventive objects have undergone either pre- (26) or post-modification (27):

(26) L49 Planners hope that fashionable street furniture **will lend Continental glamour to our city centres.**

(27) L23 Stanzani was also responsible for the involvement of the French aerospace company, Aerospatiale, which **has lent its considerable expertise with carbon-fibre and Kevlar to the project.**

Whereas 57% of them appear in the simple form:

(28) L55 Research in Mexico, Colombia and Venezuela, carried out several years after Turner's work, **lends support to some aspects of the Turner thesis, but not others** (Gilbert and Ward 1985).

(29) L82 Perhaps Sir Ian should **lend Mr Major a hand** by telling us what the average shopper's trolley contained in 1979, and what it contains today.

Table 8 then provides an overview of the different kinds of modification:

**Table 8: Types of  $O_{event}$  modification**

Type of modification	No. of occurrences	Frequency
<b>Pre-modification</b>	30	<b>73%</b>
<b>Post-modification</b>	8	<b>20%</b>
<b>Pre-+Post-modification</b>	3	<b>7%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	41	<b>100%</b>

The most frequent type of modification is pre-modification occurring in 73% of the cases, 20% are represented by post-modification and 7% of the eventive objects are both pre-modified and post-modified at the same time.

## 4.5 Object order

As can be seen in Table 9 the verb *lend* followed by an  $O_{event}$  appears in six different clause patterns:

**Table 9: Frequency of clause patterns**

Type of pattern	No. of occurrences	Frequency
$SVO_dO_{prep}$	61	<b>61%</b>
$SVO_{prep}O_d$	3	<b>3%</b>
$SO_{prep}VO_d$	1	<b>1%</b>
$SVO_iO_d$	18	<b>18%</b>
$SVO_d$	17	<b>17%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	<b>100%</b>

Upon first view of Table 9 we can observe that Quirk et al.'s (1985) claim of the eventive object construction occurring solely in the  $SVO_iO_d$  position proves false in the case of light *lend*. In such cases we can see that the predominant pattern is  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  appearing 61% of the time. Included in this pattern is the  $O_{prep}SVO_d$  variant which is realized as a subordinate clause being a mere alternation of the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern:

(30) L63 Ms Walter offers us not a contralto tragedy-queen but a real woman passionately attached to her husband (**to whom Mick Ford lends a shy goodness**) and children.

(31) L64 In what ways have the false doctrine of abstraction, and the equally mistaken materialism **to which it lends support**, been a 'great source of errors and difficulties' in our search for knowledge?

The second most frequent clause pattern is  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern occurring 18% of the time:

(32) L69 Yet Moran made no move towards her, promised nothing, gave no hint of any reciprocation of interest, **lent her no support**.

(33) L77 The blue and yellow uniforms **lent the scene a colourfulness not to be found in Britain**, save perhaps in military ceremonial, and I could not but wonder why in our churches and social life colour has become so taboo.

The frequency of the omission of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  is fairly high and 17% of cases present the omission of either  $O_i/O_{prep}$ :

(34) L86 '**Lend a hand** and play the game?'

(35) L90 It has always happened, of course, but in the old days, when the stock market was a smaller and more human place, the intimacy of dealing **lent some protection**.

Other alternative patterns such as  $SVO_{prep}O_d$  and  $SO_{prep}VO_d$  appear only seldom – in 3% and 1% of the time respectively:

(36) L61 They **lend to an airport lounge the look of a grotesque, sprawling creche peopled by monster babies**. ( $SVO_{prep}O_d$ )

(37) L65 Joseph **to the background lends an honest charm**. ( $SO_{prep}O_d$ )

#### 4.5.1 Factors determining the use of the $SVO_iO_d/SVO_dO_{prep}$ pattern

##### 4.5.1.1 Abstract/concrete nature of the eventive object

The prevalence of the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern can be explained by Červenková's (2015) study of the verb *give* followed by an  $O_{event}$  which employs Huddleston and Pullum's (2002: 293-294) division of the  $O_{event}$  according to the nature of the object into four different groups:

- i. *She gave a sigh* denoting bodily actions often involving the inhalation or exhalation of air. The construction does not permit the addition of another complement.
- ii. *She gave him a kiss* portraying deverbal nouns of physical action and presenting no possibility of the alternation with a  $O_{prep}$ .
- iii. *She gave him advice*, to which belong noncount nouns and the prepositional counterpart of the  $O_i$  is possible.
- iv. *She gave (me) a description of him* where the  $O_i$  is optional and paraphrasable by the  $O_{prep}$ .

Keeping in mind that Quirk et al. (1985) claim that there is a large tendency of abstract nouns to overlap with the noncount quality, group [iii] can thus be regarded as generally abstract nouns, therefore presenting the option to paraphrase the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern as  $SVO_dO_{prep}$ . Looking at the sixty-one examples of the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern in Table 10 we can see that only 11% of the  $O_{event}$  are concrete and 89% of them are abstract:

**Table 10: Frequency of concrete/abstract  $O_i/O_{prep}$  in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern**

Type of noun	No. of occurrences	Total no. of $O_i/O_{prep}$ samples	Frequency
Concrete	7	61	11%
Abstract	54	61	89%
<b>TOTAL</b>	61	61	<b>100%</b>



An example of a concrete  $O_{event}$  in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern:

(38) L48 HAVING shepherded the Tories through the general election, Charles and Maurice Saatchi **are lending a hand to Eduard Shevardnadze, the former Soviet Foreign Minister now chairing the State Council of Georgia.**

An example of an abstract  $O_{event}$  in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern:

(39) L34 Currently **lending support to and ‘cheer-leading’ Bristol’s Massive Attack**, Neneh believes that dance music in the Nineties is ‘gonna to clear’, but her attitude to her own music is relaxed.

The prevalence of abstract over concrete nouns is present in the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern as well:

**Table 11: Frequency of concrete/abstract  $O_i/O_{prep}$  in the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern**

<b>Type of noun</b>	<b>No. of occurrences</b>	<b>Total no. of <math>O_iO_{prep}</math> samples</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
<b>Concrete</b>	5	18	<b>28%</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	13	18	<b>72%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	18	18	<b>1100%</b>

Nevertheless, there is a relatively large increase in the use of concrete nouns from 11% in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern to 28% in the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern. This suggests that the larger the number of concrete nouns present in an excerpt the greater tendency towards the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern.

#### 4.5.1.2 Animateness

Chapter 2.3.4 mentioned that the  $O_i$  and its prepositional counterpart is usually animate with the possible exception being the case of the eventive object construction. Table 12 shows the number of animate and inanimate  $O_i/O_{prep}$  across the clause patterns:

**Table 12: Animateness of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$**

Clause pattern	No. of samples	No. of animate $O_i/O_{prep}$	Frequency
$SVO_iO_d$	18	10	55%
$SVO_dO_{prep}$	61	10	16%
$SVO_{prep}O_d$	3	0	0%
$SO_{prep}O_d$	1	0	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	83	20	24%

Table 12 demonstrates that in 55% of the  $O_i$  in the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern were animate and only 16% of the  $O_{prep}$  were animate in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern:

(40) L21+22 They have **lent forms and skills even to the great serpent who beguiled Eve**, who swallowed Jonah and who wrestled in the wilderness with the young man from Nazareth. ( $SVO_dO_{prep}$ )

(41) L66 However, I find Turner's work on the results of such movement into the liminal state to be a very useful way of interpreting what an insider experiences when he moves to the margins of his own domain, and I suspect that many such transformations across fiercely defended boundaries of cultural experience **lend the individual the chance to stand aside and reflect on his subjective place in the order of things**. ( $SVO_iO_d$ )

The results are interesting when compared to Červenková's (2015) analysis of light *give* in terms of its  $O_i/O_{prep}$  in/animate-ness. *Give* presented a clear preference of animate  $O_i/O_{prep}$  over inanimate  $O_i/O_{prep}$ : out of eighty examples containing either an  $O_i$  or  $O_{prep}$ , fifty-two were animate (65%) and only twenty-eight were inanimate (35%). From this it can be noted that in the case of the use of light *lend* the situation is contrary and the appearance of an inanimate  $O_i/O_{prep}$  is significantly higher (76%) than that of an animate  $O_i/O_{prep}$  (24%). Another conclusion drawn from Table 12 is that in the case of light *lend*, the speaker's decision to include an animate being will compel him to use the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern rather than the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern. The results also correspond to Brůhová's (2010) object ordering in the case of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  being realized by a pronoun and the  $O_d$  by a noun. 94% of the pronominal  $O_i/O_{prep}$  occurred in the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern and given the fact that in the present thesis 7 out of a total of 8 (87,5%) pronominal realizations of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  also appeared in the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern

it can be declared that the pronominalization of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  plays a crucial role in the ordering of the objects.

### 4.5.1.3 Modification

#### 4.5.1.3.1 $SVO_dO_{prep}$ pattern

The preference of the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern may be given to various reasons. The presence of abstract nouns is – according to the above results – one of them, the principle of end-weight and end-focus another. Tables 13 and 14 show the degree of modification of the  $O_{event}$  and the  $O_{prep}$ :

**Table 13: Frequency of modification of the  $O_{event}$  in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern**

Type of $O_{event}$	No. of modifications	Total no. of $O_{event}$	Frequency
Modified	19	61	31%
Simple	42	61	69%
<b>TOTAL</b>	61	61	<b>100%</b>

**Table 14: Frequency of modification of the  $O_{prep}$  in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern**

Type of $O_{prep}$	No. of modifications	Total no. of $O_{prep}$	Frequency
Modified	45	61	74%
Simple	16	61	26%
<b>TOTAL</b>	61	61	<b>100%</b>

Tables 13 and 14 provide a clear example of the interaction between the principle of end-weight and end-focus. Whereas the  $O_{event}$  in non-final position is modified in a mere 31% of the time, the  $O_{prep}$  in final position is modified in 74% of the time.

#### 4.5.1.3.2 $SVO_iO_d$ pattern

Contrary to the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern out of the eighteen samples of the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern fourteen of them present a modified  $O_{event}$ :

**Table 15: Frequency of the eventive object modification in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern**

Type of O <sub>event</sub>	No. of O <sub>event</sub> modifications	Total no. of O <sub>event</sub>	Frequency
<b>Modified</b>	14	18	<b>78%</b>
<b>Simple</b>	4	18	<b>22%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	18	18	<b>100%</b>

The numbers are very similar to the percentage of modified/simple O<sub>event</sub> in the case of the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern, only in reverse order. Where in the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern only 33% of the O<sub>event</sub> were modified, the O<sub>event</sub> in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern is modified in 78% of the time; where in the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern 69% of the O<sub>prep</sub> are modified, the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern displays only 22% of the O<sub>i</sub> modified:

**Table 16: Frequency of the O<sub>event</sub> modification in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub>/SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> patterns**

Clause pattern	No. of O <sub>event</sub> modified	Total no. of O <sub>event</sub>	Frequency
SVO <sub>d</sub> O <sub>prep</sub>	20	61	33%
SVO <sub>i</sub> O <sub>d</sub>	14	18	78%
<b>TOTAL</b>	34	79	<b>42%</b>
Clause pattern	No. of O <sub>i</sub> /O <sub>prep</sub> modified	Total no. of O <sub>i</sub> /O <sub>prep</sub>	Frequency
SVO <sub>d</sub> O <sub>prep</sub>	42	61	69%
SVO <sub>i</sub> O <sub>d</sub>	4	18	22%
<b>TOTAL</b>	44	79	<b>56%</b>

To conclude, Table 16 presents a clear interaction between the principles of end-weight and end-focus. The final component of a pattern presumably carries a larger degree of CD and the tendency is to emphasize its position by presenting it in a heavier construction.

#### 4.5.1.3.3 SVO<sub>d</sub> pattern

The frequency of modification in the case of omission is the lowest of the three preceding patterns:

**Table 17: Frequency of the eventive object modification in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern**

Type of O <sub>event</sub>	No. of O <sub>event</sub> modifications	Total no. of O <sub>event</sub>	Frequency
<b>Modified</b>	5	17	<b>29%</b>
<b>Simple</b>	12	17	<b>71%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	17	17	<b>100%</b>

The reason for the low rate of modification may be given to economic factors. Provided that one of the reasons for omission is to save time or effort in communication we may assume that these reasons would lose their purpose were the O<sub>event</sub> further modified:

(42) L85 When television's Gardeners' World heard of their plight they set about **lending a hand**.

(43) L93 **Crooks signed up to enjoy the benefits of corruption and to lend their power**.

#### 4.5.2 Factors determining the SVO<sub>prep</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern

The relatively small number of examples featuring the above mentioned patterns may not be of great importance as the sample would need to be more numerous in order to draw definite conclusions. Nevertheless, since they are present in the study a few words should be said about them.

The more common pattern among the two is the pattern SVO<sub>prep</sub>O<sub>d</sub>. In all three examples the preposition *to* could be omitted but as has been argued in chapter 2.5 one of the results of adding the preposition may be the acquisition of a higher degree of CD:

(44) L61 They **lend to an airport lounge the look of a grotesque, sprawling creche peopled by monster babies**.

(45) L62 A son of the manse, he **lends to Labour the dark Church of Scotland tones that can make the recession sound as bleak as the wind that whips off the Firth of Forth in midwinter**.

Consider the same sentences without the preposition:

They **lend an airport lounge the look of a grotesque, sprawling creche peopled by monster babies**.

A son of the manse, he **lends Labour the dark Church of Scotland tones that can make the recession sound as bleak as the wind that whips off the Firth of Forth in midwinter.**

Instantly both indirect objects lose some of their prominence and the reader may give them less significance than was the of their containing the preposition. The word ‘reader’ is employed here as in spoken language the degree of CD may shift due to the speaker’s intonation.

Another reason for using the preposition is mentioned by Brůhová (2010: 44). She claims that its presence enables us to distinguish the syntactic elements with greater ease than without the preposition. In other words, without the preposition *to*, the *airport lounge* in the sentence: (44) *L61 They lend an airport lounge the look of a grotesque, sprawling creche peopled by monster babies* could be understood as a  $O_d$  until the reader reaches the latter half of the sentence.

#### 4.5.3 Factors determining the $SO_{prep}VO_d$ pattern

There is only one instance of the pattern  $SO_{prep}VO_d$  in the selection. In terms of CD of the  $O_{prep}$ , its degree is comparable to that of the examples of the  $SVO_{prep}O_d$  pattern but there may perhaps be talk of a slight increase in its prominence in the present pattern still. Compare (46) *L56 Joseph to the background lends an honest charm.* vs *Joseph lends to the background an honest charm.* By placing the PP in the part of the clause where the addressee would not expect it, the author might suggest a higher degree of prominence. Brůhová’s (2010) notion of greater syntactic differentiation in this case does not play a major role as without the preposition the clause would not make sense.

#### 4.5.4 Summary

Table 18 provides the frequency of modified  $O_{event}$  across clause patterns:

**Table 18: Frequency of  $O_{event}$  modification across clause patterns**

<b>Clause pattern</b>	<b>No. of total samples</b>	<b>No. of modification of <math>O_{event}</math></b>	<b>Frequency</b>
$SVO_dO_{prep}$	61	20	<b>33%</b>
$SVO_{prep}O_d$	3	3	<b>100%</b>
$SO_{prep}VO_d$	1	1	<b>100%</b>
$SVO_iO_d$	18	14	<b>78%</b>
$SVO_d$	17	5	<b>29%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	43	<b>43%</b>

Nearly every instance of the  $O_{event}$  occupying the final position of a clause pattern displays a higher percentage of modification than when the  $O_{event}$  is in non-final position. The  $SVO_{prep}O_d$  and  $SO_{prep}VO_d$  are modified in 100% of their appearances and the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern has a considerable frequency of modification as well (78%). Contrarily, the  $O_{event}$  in non-final position is modified merely 33% of the time. Table 19 then presents the percentage of modified  $O_i/O_{prep}$  across clause patterns:

**Table 19: Percentage of modification of  $O_{prep}$  across clause patterns**

<b>Clause pattern</b>	<b>No. of total samples</b>	<b>No. of modification of <math>O_i/O_{prep}</math></b>	<b>Frequency</b>
$SVO_dO_{prep}$	61	51	<b>86%</b>
$SVO_{prep}O_d$	3	1	<b>33%</b>
$SO_{prep}VO_d$	1	0	<b>0%</b>
$SVO_iO_d$	18	2	<b>11%</b>

Again Tables 18 and 19 confirm the idea of the end-weight and end-focus principle. 86% of the prepositional objects in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern are modified and only 11% of the indirect objects in the  $SVO_iO_d$  are modified. The absence of modification in the  $SO_{prep}VO_d$  pattern does not provide very relevant data in Table 18 nor Table 19 due to its low frequency of occurrence. Comparing Tables 13-19 we can state with a fair amount of certainty that the element occupying the final position is generally modified as opposed to one occupying a non-final position.

#### 4.6 Determination and quantification

Apart from pre- and post-modification the  $O_{event}$  is often preceded by an expressed determiner. Table 20 marks the frequency of determination occurring in the expanded predicate construction:

**Table 20: Type of  $O_{event}$  determination**

Type of determination of the $O_{event}$	No. of occurrences	No. of total samples	Frequency
<b>Expressed determiner</b>	52	100	<b>52%</b>
<b>Zero article</b>	48	100	<b>48%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	100	100	<b>100%</b>

The relatively high percentage of zero article determination is given to the fact that the majority of the  $O_{event}$  are realized by abstract nouns which as has been mentioned overlap with uncountability (cf chapter 4.5.1.1):

(47) L09 Of course, distance **lends enchantment to the work of developers of the past.**

(48) L86 As the recriminations between the brothers become more explosive, and the wounds of jealousy reopen, I've a horrible suspicion that Harwood wants us to be genuinely moved, but after all the superficial comedy, his attempt to **lend the play emotional depth** arouses embarrassment rather than pity.

Table 21 shows the various realizations of determination:

**Table 21: Realizations of  $O_{event}$  determination**

Type of determiner	No. of occurrences	No. of total samples	Frequency
<b>possessive pronoun</b>	19	100	<b>37%</b>
<b>indefinite pronoun</b>	5	100	<b>5%</b>
<b>article</b>	28	100	<b>28%</b>
<b>zero article</b>	48	100	<b>48%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	52	100	<b>52%</b>

Apart from zero article determination the determiner appearing most of the time in connection with  $O_{event}$ , and that in 22% of the time, is the indefinite article *a*:

(49) L08 THE ALLEGATION that the Royal Ulster Constabulary contains an 'Inner Circle' of officers preparing private lists of IRA suspects and working against the Anglo-Irish agreement **has lent a new dimension to the security force-loyalist collusion saga.**



Chapter 2.3.2.1 stated that the function of the expanded predicate construction is the possibility of further modification and determination of the construction. As Červenková (2015) rightly quotes Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 291) the most common determiner appearing with light verbs is the indefinite article which can be seen in both her study of the verb *give* as well the present paper concerning itself with the verb *lend*. However, it must be noted that in terms of *lend* such great prominence of the indefinite article is considerably due to the expression *lend a hand* and *lend an ear* together occurring eleven out of the twenty-two times (50%) of the use of the indefinite article.

Following *a* the most frequent determiner is the possessive pronoun. With 9%, 6% and 4% *its*, *their* and *his* appear respectively. Together possessive pronouns constitute 19% of the determiners, appearing then roughly at the same rate as *a*:

(50) L02 Large publicity campaigns began and the Irish Times also **lent its weight to the pro-divorce argument, campaigning in its columns until the eve of the referendum in late June.**

(51) L28 Mountainous volumes **lend their weight to dreams of a snow-bound Christmas John Samuel slaloms through this year's selection of books for the skiing enthusiast.**

(52) L73 The Ajdabiya shaikh of one of the lineages involved confirmed the story: he was on the point of departure for Kufra to **lend his weight to the representatives of reason and peace.**

The last more prominent type of determination is the definite article *the* which occurs in 6% cases and is explicitly of cataphoric reference:

(53) L62 A son of the manse, he **lends to Labour the dark Church of Scotland tones that can make the recession sound as bleak as the wind that whips off the Firth of Forth in midwinter.**

(54) L31 Here you remember that Common Law would not recognize the assignment; Equity in effect would, by compelling the assignor to **lend the use of his name to the assignee** for the purpose of suing the debtor, or, in the last resort, allowing the assignee to sue directly against the debtor, but requiring him, as a rule, to make the assignor a defendant.

## 4.7 Semantic roles

Regarding the semantic roles of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  chapters 2.3.3.1 and 2.3.4.1 informed us about the  $O_i$  having the roles of the:

- i. recipient
- ii. benefactive
- iii. malefactive
- iv. affected

The affected role then being associated with the light use of verbs. The semantic roles of the  $O_{prep}$  are generally not dealt with as much but since the  $O_{prep}$  functions as a counterpart to the  $O_i$  same approach will be adopted to both. However, since the purpose of this chapter is to determine whether the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  in the eventive object construction must always be of the affected role the recipient and beneficiary role will be dealt with as simply the recipient role.

The boundaries between the recipient/beneficiary roles vs affected roles of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  are, however, very subjective and difficult to determine. There are cases which provide a perhaps more straightforward interpretation such as:

(55) L02 Large publicity campaigns began and the Irish Times also **lent its weight to the pro-divorce argument, campaigning in its columns until the eve of the referendum in late June.**

(56) L08 The Speaker of the House of Commons, Bernard Weatherill, **has lent his name to a Commission on Citizenship in which the organisation Community Service Volunteers has taken a lead.**

(57) L19 Karen is hoping local businesses will **lend their support to the venture.**

The above examples of  $O_{prep}$  are being in some way benefitted by the ‘Large publicity campaigns and the Irish Times,’ ‘Bernard Weatherill,’ or ‘local businesses’ either in the form of receiving support, or making their cause more authoritative and real. The same criteria generally apply to examples such as (lend) *support, weight, a hand, name, point, glamour, enchantment* and generally nouns providing a quality – either positive or negative – or which support and enable certain situations. Similarly there are examples of the affected  $O_i/O_{prep}$  which are clearly affected by the circumstances:

(58) L71 Harkabi described the idea of a ‘transfer’ — the mass expulsion of Palestinians — as just the kind of project that is calculated to **lend the struggle its absolute, ‘existential’ character.**

Table 24 summarizes the frequency of the recipient/beneficiary role and the affected role:

**Table 22: Semantic roles of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$** 

Semantic role of the $O_i/O_{prep}$	No. of occurrences	No. of total samples	Frequency
recipient/beneficiary	68	83	82%
affected	15	83	18%
<b>TOTAL</b>	83	83	<b>100%</b>

As we can see, there is a clear prevalence of the recipient/beneficiary role (82%) over the affected role (18%) which might be given to the fact that there is a prominence of abstract over concrete nouns. Furthermore, in the case of concrete nouns, their meaning is rather metaphorical than literal. Therefore action nouns in the place of the  $O_{event}$  such as *give somebody a push* in the case of light *give* assigning the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  the affected role seldom appear. Similar approach is adopted by Červenková (2015) who maintains the nomenclature of the affected role of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  but divides it into the affected role and the affected recipient role. This deviation from the affected role is further strengthened by the fact that the semantics of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  are not confined to merely the division between recipient and affected role but the beneficiary role also appears. Moreover, as will be shown in the following chapter, accepting the fact that the  $O_i$  of light verbs appears merely in the affected role would dismiss the possibility of the omission of the  $O_i$  altogether. As we have already seen, however, omission in the case of light *lend* occurs quite frequently and the question arises whether the affected  $O_i$  can in reality be omitted or whether light verbs present other possibilities in the semantic categorization of the said  $O_i$ .

#### 4.8 Object omission

Chapter 2.5 comments on object omission in ditransitive clauses. Omission can affect either  $O_i/O_{prep}$ ,  $O_d$  or both. As has been previously stated, the omission is in the case of the eventive object construction impossible as the omission of the  $O_i$  is according to Huddleston and Pullum (2002) not possible in the event the  $O_i$  has the affected role (cf chapter XXX). However, as has been stated in the previous chapter, the  $O_i$  of light *lend* is not confined merely to the affected role but on the contrary appears majorily in the recipient/benefactive role and therefore the notion of omission is plausible. Chapter 4.5 showing the frequency of various clause patterns demonstrates that the omission of the  $O_i$  in the light use of *lend* indeed occurs relatively frequently, in 17% of the cases. To compare the results with Červenková (2015): in the case of *give* the percentage was even higher and out of one hundred examples,

20% appeared in the SVO<sub>d</sub> pattern. To further disprove Huddleston and Pullum's (2002) claim the percentage of the omission of the O<sub>i</sub> in the light use of verbs is nearly identical to simple ditransitive constructions. Brůhová's (2010: 80) paper focusing on ditransitives in general proved that out of two hundred examples of ditransitive *lend* 17% appeared with the O<sub>i</sub> omitted.

Among the expressions appearing in the SVO<sub>d</sub> pattern, there are twelve different realizations of the O<sub>event</sub> in such cases:

**Table 23: Most frequent collocates appearing in SVO<sub>d</sub> pattern**

Noun	No. of occurrences	No. of total samples	Frequency
hand	6	17	35%
wit, familiarity, recognition, protection, flavour, power, voice, integrity, naturalism, ear, touch	1	17	6%

We can see that the distribution of direct objects appearing in construction with the O<sub>i</sub>/O<sub>prep</sub> omitted is regular. The only expression that stands out is *lend a hand*. Out of the nine instances of *lend* (someone) *a hand* throughout the entire excerption six appear without the O<sub>i</sub>/O<sub>prep</sub>, 67% of the time. Brůhová defined two types of contexts which enable the deletion of the O<sub>i</sub>, contextual and indefinite (cf chapter 2.4). Examples 60, 61 and 62 are instances of contextual deletion of the O<sub>i</sub>:

(60) L94 With a bit of luck Eleanor **might lend a hand**.

(61) L99 'I thought I'd come along and **lend a hand**,' he smiled at Maggie.

(62) L91 Naturally he couldn't answer them all himself, so Post Office staff **lent a hand** and every kid who wrote to him got a reply, postmarked Reindeerland or Santaland.

In the first example the recipient is clear from the preceding linguistic context, referring to 'him' from the previous sentences as can be seen from the extraction below. The case of the rest of the contextuality omitted examples is similar:

(63) 837 He had never invited anyone to dinner at the house, for the simple reason that they never had anything he could honestly call dinner. 838 When he rang Eleanor he would explain that it was only to be a simple snack. 839 If the worst came to the worst he could cook it himself. 840 He was a mean hand at fry-ups; he'd learnt that at his public school. 841 There were electric rings in most of the studies, and the official meals were somewhat Spartan and not to every boy's taste. 842 **With a bit of luck Eleanor might lend a hand**.

Indefinite deletion is then present in:

(64) L90 It has always happened, of course, but in the old days, when the stock market was a smaller and more human place, the intimacy of dealing **lent some protection**.

In both examples the referent is unclear and does not need to be expressed in order for the utterance to make sense. Table 26 provides an overall analysis of contextual/indefinite recoverability of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  in the  $SVO_d$  pattern:

**Table 24: Contextual/indefinite recoverability of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$**

Type of recoverability	No. of occurrences	No. of total samples	Frequency
<b>Contextual</b>	8	17	<b>0,47 (47%)</b>
<b>Indefinite</b>	9	17	<b>0,53 (53%)</b>

We can see from the results that the distribution of contextual and indefinite omission is approximately the same. Eight of the omitted objects were contextually clear and nine were not needed for the complete meaning of the expression and their absence did not affect the grammaticality of the verb.

#### **4.8.1 Semantic roles of the $O_i/O_{prep}$ in the $SVO_d$ pattern**

The distribution of semantic roles in the  $SVO_d$  pattern confirms the general semantic pattern of the remaining examples, in other words, all the instances of the omitted  $O_i/O_{prep}$  present either a recipient or a beneficiary role. Therefore, Huddleston and Pullum's (2002) assertion that the affected  $O_i$  is not omissible remains in the case of light *lend* valid as remains valid the theory proposed in chapter 4.7 of the multiple semantic roles of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$ .

## 5. CONCLUSION

The aim of the present paper was to define the expanded predicate construction containing the semantically general or ‘light’ verb *lend* followed by an eventive object. Focus was placed on the types of eventive objects that collocate with the verb in terms of their degree of phonological and morphological correspondence with their verbal counterparts; on the concrete or abstract quality of the nouns in eventive object position; on the function of the expanded predicate construction concerning its modification and determination; on the semantic roles of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$ ; on the possibility of omitting one of the participants of the construction; on the possible ordering of the objects in instances that both are present.

Initially, it was necessary to extract one hundred examples of *lend* accompanied by an eventive object. To select them several criteria had to be established in order to determine what is an eventive object and what is an ordinary direct object. These criteria are stated in Chapter 3. A looser approach was adopted, partly for the reason that despite *lend* being used as a light verb in the eventive object construction maintains its semantic distinctiveness and the boundary between the semantic roles of the objects is unclear and is liable to subjectivity. These one hundred examples were divided into the four groups of eventive objects according to the non-existence of their verbal counterparts. This proved to be one of the most difficult tasks as the existence of a verbal counterpart to some object nouns was often not instantly apparent and the use of dictionaries had to be employed, namely *Merriam-Webster* and *Oxford Learner’s Dictionary*. In accordance with these nouns as *allure*, *weight* or *edge* were assigned to class 1 of eventive objects, having phonologically and semantically identical verbal counterparts. Similar difficulties appeared in placing the eventive object nouns into the remaining three groups which would not be possible without the use of dictionaries.

In terms of the realization of the direct object, 78% of them displayed abstract rather than concrete nouns. These findings were surprising as according to Quirk et al. (1985) the  $O_d$  is generally realized by a concrete noun. However, when put to perspective with the work of Červenková (2015), who analysed the light verb *give*, the majority of the eventive belonged to her Type II eventive objects portraying abstract nouns as well. The conclusion is that in the case of light verbs – based on *give* and *lend* – the presence of abstract nouns in direct object position will be more numerous than in non-eventive direct objects. Furthermore, as Chapter 4.3 states, even concrete  $O_{event}$  nouns are often used in a metaphorical sense and their meaning thus becomes more abstract.

Another case when the theoretical foundation parts with the empirical findings is the order of the objects. According to Quirk et al. (1985) the construction containing an eventive object should appear in majority in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern. This, however, is not the case of light *lend*, which portrays 61 (61%) instances of the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern and only 18 (18%) instances of the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern. The prevalence of the prepositional pattern can be explained by Huddleston and Pullum's (2002) division of eventive objects. Their claim is that eventive objects being noncount nouns (and thus being considered as generally abstract) the prepositional counterpart is possible. In light of this, given to the prevalence of abstract over concrete nouns in the collocations with light *lend*, the frequent occurrence of the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern is to some extent understandable. The extraction also ascertained a preference of the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern over the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern in the case of the employment of a concrete noun. Only 11% of the O<sub>event</sub> in the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern are concrete whereas the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern displays 28% of its O<sub>event</sub> concrete.

Following the abstract/concrete quality of the O<sub>event</sub> as a determiner of the order of the objects is the animateness of the O<sub>i</sub>/O<sub>prep</sub>. According to Chapter 2.3.4 the presumption was that the O<sub>i</sub>/O<sub>prep</sub> would be generally animate. Dušková (2006), however, claims that in the case of light verbs the O<sub>i</sub>/O<sub>prep</sub> can be inanimate as well. The results proved, that in the case of light *lend*, the majority of the O<sub>i</sub>/O<sub>prep</sub> were indeed inanimate (76%). The prevalence of animate O<sub>i</sub>/O<sub>prep</sub> was present in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern (55%) and when taken together with the fact that there is a larger percentage of concrete nouns in the SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern than the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern it appears that the former sticks to theoretical rules and presumptions much more readily than the latter who seems to rather violate them.

One of the functions of the expanded predicate constructions is the ability to add modification and determination, making the expression more specific. The presence of modified and unmodified O<sub>event</sub> is approximately the same, 43 (43%) instances are modified in some way, 57 (57%) appear in their simple form. Out of the 43 instances of modification, 30 (70%) of them are premodifications, 8 (19%) post-modifications and 3 (7%) instances were both pre- and post-modified. Modification of the O<sub>event</sub> is most frequent in SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern and that in 14 (78%) cases whereas the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> has its O<sub>event</sub> modified merely 19 (31%) cases. The number of modified instances is higher in the SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern but the relative frequency according to the total number of occurrences is lower. A lower frequency of modification of the eventive object can also be viewed in the SVO<sub>d</sub> pattern, only 18% of

the object nouns are modified as opposed to 82% which are not. Generally speaking, the  $O_{event}$  being in final position – excluding instances of omission of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  – assigns it an 80% probability of being modified whereas in non-final position the possibility of modification is only 33%. This notion exemplifies the notion of end-weight and end-focus and alongside the abstract/concrete quality of the  $O_{event}$  and the in/animate-ness of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  functions as a major influence on the order of the objects. This idea is strengthened by the modification of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$ . The  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern has its  $O_{prep}$  modified in 51 (86%) instances whereas the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern displays merely 2 (11%) modified  $O_i$ .

Expressed determination is present in 52 (52%) of the 100 samples, 48 (48%) of them being determined by zero article. The large percentage of zero article determination is given to the fact that the majority of the  $O_{event}$  are realized by abstract nouns which are generally non-count. The most frequent lexical determination is realized by the indefinite article *a* (22%) which according to Huddleston and Pullum (2002) functions as the most common determiner of light verbs. After *a* the most frequent determination is realized by possessive pronouns (19%), the definite article (6%) and indefinite pronouns (5%). When looked at individual clause patterns, the most frequent form of determination in the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern is zero article (39%) which is also the most frequent form in the  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  pattern (62%) and the indefinite article prevails only in the  $SVO_d$  pattern (59%).

Regarding the semantic roles of the  $O_i$ , in the case of light *lend* the boundaries between the recipient and affected role are difficult to determine, mainly due to the fact that *lend* in the eventive object construction maintains partly its semantically specific meaning. The particularity of meaning of the verb is the reason why there is a general prevalence of the recipient role over the affected role as *lend* itself suggests some transportation of quality, positive or negative, to another person or thing. Another reason for the absence of the affected role may be the fact that most of the  $O_{event}$  are realized by an abstract noun and thus correspond to Huddleston and Pullum's (2002) Type III eventive objects such *give advice* which is a clear example of the beneficiary/recipient role, not the affected role.

The final chapter of the empirical part concerned itself with the possibility of omission of the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  as the omission of the  $O_{event}$  is due to the semantically general meaning of the verb impossible. According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002) the omission in the case of the eventive object construction is not possible, the  $O_i/O_{prep}$  is omissible only in its recipient role. However, as has been demonstrated, the presence of the affected  $O_i/O_d$  is compared to the recipient role minimal and therefore the omission becomes possible. This notion can be



seen by the fact that 17 (17%) instances of light *lend* appears in the  $SVO_d$  pattern, all the missing participant having the recipient/beneficiary role. The percentage of omitted  $O_{event}$  is nearly as high as the percentage of the  $SVO_iO_d$  pattern which was presumed to be the predominant pattern. The most frequent collocation with light *lend* with an omitted  $O_i/O_{prep}$  is (lend) *a hand*, appearing in 6 (35%) cases. The distribution of indefinite or contextual omission is approximately the same, 9 (53%) instances of indefinite omission and 8 (47%) instances of contextual omission.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Algeo, J. (1995) "Having a look at the expanded predicate." *The Verb in Contemporary English: Theory and Description*. Ed. Bas Aarts and Charles F. Meyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schlesinger, I. M. (1995) "On the Semantics of the object." *The Verb in Contemporary English: Theory and Description*. Ed. Bas Aarts and Charles F. Meyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D. et al. (2006) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Brůhová, G. (2010) *Syntactic, semantic and FSP aspects of ditransitive complementation: a study of give, lend, send, offer and show*. PhD. Thesis. Prague: Charles University.
- Brůhová, G. (2012) "Object deletion in ditransitive verbs and its semantic consequences." *A Centenary of English Studies at Charles University: from Mathesius to Present-day Linguistics*. Prague: Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague
- Dušková, L. et al. (2006) *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Praha: Academia.
- Huddleston, R. and Pullum G. K. (2002) *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Křístková, J. (2009) *Událostní předměty po slovesech have/take (have/take a little look) a jejich překladové ekvivalenty*. MA thesis. Prague: Charles University
- Quirk, R. et al. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1982) "Why can you have a drink when you can't \*have an eat?" *Language* 58: 753-799.
- Balcarová, Adéla (2013) *Syntactic, Semantic and FSP Aspects of Ditransitive Complementation: a study of blame and provide*. M.A. Thesis. Prague: Charles University.
- Červenková, Tereza (2015) *Syntactic and Semantic Aspects of a Ditransitive Construction with the Verb Give and an Eventive Object*. B.A. Thesis. Prague: Charles University.
- Poldauf, I. (1964) "The Third Syntactical Plan." *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 1. L'École de Prague d'aujourd'hui.

Firbas, Jan (1992) *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*. New York: CUP.

## 7. RESUMÉ

Úvodní kapitola této práce představuje téma, které se zabývá zkoumáním anglického ditranzitivního slovesa *lend* doplněno událostním předmětem. Cíl práce spočívá v tom, zjistit, zda-li je tato konstrukce vždy doplněna oběma předměty – přímým i nepřímým – nebo zda-li je nepřímý předmět vypustitelný. V případech, kdy jsou oba předměty přítomny je cílem práce určit, v jakém pořadí se předměty vyskytují a jaké jsou faktory tohoto řazení. Dá se předpokládat, že mezi tyto faktory bude patřit míra modifikace přímého či nepřímého/předložkového předmětu, konkrétní či abstraktní povaha přímého předmětu či ne/životnost nepřímého/předložkového předmětu. Řazení obou předmětů by se podle Quirka a kol. (1985) mělo vyskytovat pouze ve vzorci  $SVO_iO_d$  a tudíž je předpoklad, že tento vzorec bude převažovat. Dále se práce zabývá sémantickými rolemi nepřímého předmětu a v neposlední řadě také pojení se přímého předmětu s determinátory a kvantifikátory.

Teoretická část nejprve vymezuje valenční potenciál slovesa (2.1) s ohledem na to, že právě sloveso je centrální složkou větné fráze a pojí na sebe další komponenty. Následná kapitola (2.2) se věnuje již definici pojmu ditranzitivní slovesa, která zdůrazňuje komplementaci slovesa dvěma předměty. Zde se již objevuje nesoulad mezi jednotlivými autory. Někteří považují za ditranzitivní sloveso pouze to, jež se objevuje ve vzorci  $SVO_iO_d$  (Huddleston a Pullum, 2002), zatímco jiní připouští existenci tzv. předložkového předmětu a jako ditranzitiva chápou jak vzorec  $SVO_iO_d$  tak  $SVO_dO_{prep}$  (Quirk a kol., 1985). Podkapitola (2.2.1) ditranzitivních sloves se věnuje jejím pasivním alternacím. Většina ditranzitivních sloves je schopna tvořit dvě formy pasiva, tzv první pasivum, kde se podmětem stává nepřímý předmět, a druhé pasivum, kde se podmětem stává předmět přímý. Dále se teoretická část (2.2.2) zabývá realizací jednotlivých komponentů. Quirk a kol. (1985) zmiňuje šest různých variant realizace předmětu v ditranzitivních konstrukcích: oba předměty vyjádřeny nominální frází; kombinace nominální a předložkové fráze; kombinace nominální fráze a závislých vět začínajících *that* a *wh-*; kombinace nominální fráze a infinitiv s *to* či s infinitivní frází začínající *wh-*. Kapitola 2.3 se poté již zabývá typy předmětů (přímý, nepřímý, předložkový) a jejich sémantickými rolemi. Zde je největší důraz kladen na vymezení událostního předmětu (2.3.2), který se pojí se sémanticky obecnými slovesy, ve spojení s nimiž je právě on nositelem významu celé konstrukce. Obecně se událostní předmět objevuje v identické formě jako sloveso, ze kterého je odvozen a které odpovídá stejnému významu. Existují ale případy, kdy událostní předmět má slovesný protějšek, jež se od událostního předmětu liší svým

významem, nebo dokonce událostní předmět nemá protějšek žádný. Huddleston a Pullum (2002) uvádí jako funkce konstrukce s událostním předmětem zaměření pozornosti ze slovesa na předmět, preferenci užívání SVO vzorce na úkor SV vzorce a možnosti modifikace a determinace konstrukce s událostním předmětem, čímž sdělení získává větší specifčnost. Po vymezení událostního předmětu se teoretická část věnuje vypustitelnosti nepřímého předmětu (2.4). Zde Brůhová (2012) zmiňuje dva typy vypustitelnosti, na základě kontextuální (přímé) či nepřímé schopnosti předmět doplnit. Huddleston a Pullum (2002) tvrdí, že možnost vypustit nepřímý předmět je pouze v případě, pokud má sémantickou roli příjemce, což by znamenalo, že v konstrukcích s událostním předmětem, v rámci nichž má nepřímý předmět funkci zasaženého, by vypustitelnost možná nebyla. Jako poslední se teoretická část zabývá řazením předmětů (2.5), kde převažují vzorce  $SVO_iO_d$  a  $SVO_dO_{prep}$ , první z nichž podle Quirka a kol. (1985) je jediný možný v konstrukcích s událostním předmětem.

Kapitola 3 demonstruje, jakým způsobem byl vybrán materiál, který je použitý v analytické části. Bylo vybráno prvních 100 příkladů z Britského národního korpusu obsahující sloveso *lend* v kterémkoli jeho tvaru následované událostním předmětem. Vyřazeny byly příklady obsahující reflexivní zájmena z důvodu fixnosti komplementů a posunutím významu slovesa *lend*. Mezi příklady, který byly do práce zahrnutý jsou mimo jiné příklady obsahující sloveso *lend* v sémanticky obecném významu, příklady *lend* pouze v aktivu, příklady *lend* komplementovány pouze nominálními frázemi. Všechny druhy událostního předmětu (mající morfologicky a sémanticky identický slovesný protějšek či ne) zmíněné Algeem (1995) byly zahrnuty do analýzy.

Praktická část se věnuje analýze 100 příkladů vybraných z Britského národního korpusu. Kapitola 4.1 informuje o podstatných jménech, která se v rámci těchto 100 příkladů objevila, a s jakou frekvencí se opakovala. Celkem se v roli událostního předmětu objevilo 57 různých substantiv. Kapitola 4.2 poté třídí jednotlivé událostní předměty do kategorií zmíněných v kapitole 2.3.2 podle existence a míry identity slovesných protějšků. Následující sekce se zabývá abstraktní či konkrétní povahou přímého předmětu, která ukazuje, že 78% událostních předmětů pojících se se slovesem *lend* má abstraktní hodnotu, což vyvrací tvrzení, že přímý předmět bývá obecně vyjádřen konkrétním substantivem. Kapitola 4.4 se poté věnuje funkcí konstrukce s událostním předmětem, zejména z pohledu modifikace. Důraz je kladen na poměr modifikovaných (43%) a nemodifikovaných (57%) událostních předmětů a následně typ modifikace. Zde je nejčastěji zastoupena pre-modifikace v 73%, zatímco post-modifikace se objevuje pouze ve 20% případů a 7% případů je jak pre-

modifikováno tak post-modifikováno. Sekce 4.5 ilustruje poměr jednotlivých řazení předmětů, jinými slovy poměr větných vzorců, které vyvracuje tvrzení Quirka a kol. (1985), že v konstrukcích s událostním předmětem se bude vyskytovat pouze vzorec  $SVO_iO_d$ . Vzorec, který byl zastoupen nejčastěji, byl vzorec  $SVO_dO_{prep}$ , a to v 61 případech. Podkapitoly 4.5.1-4.5.3 poté zkoumají, jaké faktory ovlivňují jednotlivé řazení předmětů – abstraktní či konkrétní povaha přímého předmětu, ne/životnost nepřímého/předložkového předmětu a zejména modifikace jednotlivých předmětů. Kapitola 4.6 zkoumá míru determinace a kvantifikace. 52 příkladů ilustruje událostní předmět, kterému předchází nějaká forma determinátoru, 48 je determinováno nulovým determinátorem. Vzhledem k tvrzení Huddlestona a Pulluma (2002), že nejčastější typ determinátoru by měl být neurčitý člen, tento výsledek opět demonstruje rozdíl mezi teoretickými předpoklady a praxí, jelikož v případě slovesa *lend* je nejčastější typ determinace právě nulový determinátor. Tento fakt může souviset s větší mírou abstraktních substantiv v pozici přímého předmětu. Kapitola 4.7 se věnuje sémantickým rolím nepřímého/předložkového předmětu a ukazuje, že není pravidlem, že v konstrukcích s událostním předmětem se objevuje nepřímý/předložkový předmět pouze v zasažené roli. Tento fakt poté souvisí s kapitolou 4.8, která analyzuje míru vypustitelnosti nepřímého/předložkového předmětu. Jelikož byl nepřímý/předložkový předmět vypuštěn v 17 případech a podle Huddlestona a Pulluma (2002) zasažený nepřímý/předložkový předmět nelze vypustit, potvrzuje se, že v konstrukcích s událostním předmětem se lze setkat i s jinými sémantickými rolemi, než se nepřímým/předložkovým předmětem zasaženým.

Závěr stručně shrnuje cíle této práce a poznatky z praktické části s porovnáním s teoretickými podklady a poskytuje souhrnou a přehlednou charakteristiku jednotlivých jevů.

Seznam použité literatury v abecedním pořadí uvádí jednotlivé gramatiky a studie, ze kterých tato práce čerpala.

Apendix uvádí seznam 100 příkladů ditranzitivního slovesa *lend* s událostním předmětem, ze kterých čerpala praktická část. Příklady jsou očíslovány od 1 do 100, podle toho, jak jdou postupně v Britském národním korpusu. Příklady jsou rovněž uvedeny s kódem z Britského národního korpusu pro případné snazší dohledávání.

## 8. APPENDIX

### Examples of *lend* with both objects realized (SVO<sub>d</sub>O<sub>prep</sub> pattern)

No./BNC No.	Text
L01/A03 919	Both Sebokeng inquiries exposed a pattern of unlawful behaviour by members of the security forces and <b>lend weight to allegations of unprovoked use of lethal force by security forces</b> , like in Daveyton on 24 March when 12 members of the ANC were shot dead by the police.
L02/A07 1112	Large publicity campaigns began and the Irish Times also <b>lent its weight to the pro-divorce argument, campaigning in its columns until the eve of the referendum in late June.</b>
L03/A0G 1482	A sloping garden needn't be an uphill struggle, as Pippa Greenwood discovered when she <b>lent a hand to the Lloyds on camera</b>
L04/A0G 2094	Spiky dahlias <b>lend their vibrant colours to the scheme</b>
L05/A12 1034	These <b>lent brilliance to the footwork which became more intricate and thus more interesting.</b>
L06 L07/A1B 1046	If this suggests that there are other sorts of English people than the sort Auden has in his sights, on the other hand it <b>lends point and force to his censure of Beerbohm</b> , and of what Beerbohm stands for in English life.
L08/A1Y 585	THE ALLEGATION that the Royal Ulster Constabulary contains an 'Inner Circle' of officers preparing private lists of IRA suspects and working against the Anglo-Irish agreement <b>has lent a new dimension to the security force-loyalist collusion saga.</b>
L09/A24 94	Of course, distance <b>lends enchantment to the work of developers of the past.</b>
L10/A27 64	The Speaker of the House of Commons, Bernard Weatherill, <b>has lent his name to a Commission on Citizenship in which the organisation Community Service Volunteers has taken a lead.</b>
L11/A28 352	FOREIGN ministers of the European Community <b>lent enthusiastic support yesterday to a Commission plan to give Poland and Hungary food and financial aid worth \$215m (£140m), together with loans worth up to £700m.</b>
L12/A2P 365	He said: 'How would a political party as totally committed as the Labour Party to equality of treatment and of opportunity for girls and women, <b>lend its support to the introduction of schools in which men exercise all the power, and women are assigned a subordinate and restricted role?</b> '
L13/A3Y 88	But Dr Jones's involvement with industry has led him into difficulties — which <b>lend a critical edge to the parable.</b>
L14/A4R 12	Mr de Klerk said Mr Mandela was fully aware of the proposed releases, <b>lending substance to the belief that the world's most famous political prisoner has played a decisive negotiating role with the government way beyond the political limitations normally placed on prisoners.</b>

L15/A5Y 863	These stories also demonstrate the need for policemen and women to be continually prepared for ‘a big one’ and to be ever vigilant, which <b>lends further significance to some ‘little crimes’</b> .
L16/A5Y 1163	This <b>lends further significance to the distinction Easton's section police make between ‘big’ and ‘little’ crime.</b>
L17/A64 1347	Foreign relief organizations and subsequent students of their work have tended to exaggerate this dichotomy with regard to the Famine, but internal Soviet sources <b>lend credence to the view that the sudden withdrawal of many kinds of domestic relief was premature.</b>
L18/A66 1254	Partly by way of compensation, the government <b>lent its favour increasingly to the allegedly more cost-effective polytechnics</b> (now made independent of local authorities), and to more practically or vocationally orientated institutions such as business schools.
L19/K4T 7383	Karen is hoping local businesses will <b>lend their support to the venture.</b>
L20/A6D 88	That individuals prosecuted for sodomy did not necessarily identify themselves with the demonized sodomite of official discourse also <b>lends credence to Foucault's distinction between sodomy as a kind of behaviour, and homosexuality as a modern identity.</b>
L21 L22/A6J 1285	They have <b>lent forms and skills even to the great serpent who beguiled Eve</b> , who swallowed Jonah and who wrestled in the wilderness with the young man from Nazareth.
L23/A6W 38	Stanzani was also responsible for the involvement of the French aerospace company, Aerospatiale, which <b>has lent its considerable expertise with carbon-fibre and Kevlar to the project.</b>
L24/A7D 1872	Few complain about ‘Just looking thanks’ in a town where stock is displayed in authentic settings; where you can walk the patch in a day; where dealers make time to talk and where Bath's famous light <b>lends allure to even the diciest piece.</b>
L25/A7P 162	Equité from Christian Dior <b>lends elegance to your cleansing routine.</b>
L26/A85 332	Fears of an energy shortfall will <b>lend new weight to calls by PowerGen, the smaller of the two Central Electricity Generating Boards</b> , to take over a bigger share of the power market.
L27/A8F 395	She might even feel that he has at least <b>lent a new understanding to such lines as ‘There's nothing serious in mortality.’</b>
L28/AA0 110	Mountainous volumes <b>lend their weight to dreams of a snow-bound Christmas John Samuel slaloms through this year's selection of books for the skiing enthusiast.</b>
L29/AB6 263	The heaviest green voting was in the Tory south, <b>lending weight to the belief that many voters were disenchanting Tories casting a vote against an unpopular government.</b>
L30/ABM 1465	It thus <b>lends support to the materialistic view that it makes sense to think of objects in abstraction from a mind which perceives them.</b>
L31/ABP 247	Here you remember that Common Law would not recognize the assignment; Equity in effect would, by compelling the assignor to <b>lend the use of his name to the assignee</b> for the purpose of suing the debtor, or, in the last resort, allowing the assignee to sue directly against the debtor, but requiring him, as a rule, to make the assignor a defendant.



L32/AC9 834	This very early phase of the Bronze Age was also marked by the appearance of a distinctive ceramic form called the Beaker, which also <b>lends its name to this period of transition from the Neolithic to the Early Bronze Age.</b>
L33/ACM 447	Otherwise, be prepared for your dog to become accidentally conditioned by circumstances that <b>lend new significance to the sound of the dinner bell.</b>
L34/ACN 1201	Currently <b>lending support to and ‘cheer-leading’ Bristol's Massive Attack</b> , Neneh believes that dance music in the Nineties is ‘gonna to clear’, but her attitude to her own music is relaxed.
L35/ACP 166	<b>Lending their voices to the cause</b> are Megadeth, the Red Hot Chili Peppers, Ozzy Osbourne, Robert Downey Jnr, Michael Penn, Iggy Pop and Donny Osmond, who, bizarrely, dons a neo-Nazi outfit to make his point
L36/ACS 1724	After the Nobel announcement, Novy Mir's letter of rejection of two years before was hastily published to <b>lend justification to Pasternak's expulsion from the writers' union as a traitor</b> : ‘The spirit of your novel is that of non-acceptance of the Socialist Revolution, that it brought the people nothing but suffering and destroyed the Russian intelligentsia ... that the Revolution was a mistake and that all that happened afterwards was evil.’
L37/ACX 1846	This is a perfect study in controlled design, the bold log steps <b>lending stability to the awkward change of ground level.</b>
L38/AD2 1124	This time the leadership of the OUP joined Paisley in <b>lending political weight to the demonstration</b> , which passed without incident.
L39/ADD 243	Many were amazed that the war against Bolshevism was already more or less over, but no less a person than the Führer himself had again <b>lent support to such notions</b> with his proclamation to the soldiers on the eastern Front on 2 October, in which he spoke of ‘the last mighty blow to smash the enemy even before the onset of winter’.
L40/ADD 421	Hitler himself <b>had lent support to such optimism</b> , as we saw earlier, in his speech on 30 September 1942, by stating emphatically that German troops would ‘overrun Stalingrad and take it’.
L41/ADD 931	Where he did intervene in public, it was generally to <b>lend support to ‘legal’ discriminatory measures</b> — for the most part popular and meeting with widespread approval — excluding Jews from German society and the economy.
L42/ADK 935	Like lighting, sound creates atmosphere and <b>lends authority to the proceedings.</b>
L43/ADL 1328	North <b>lent a good deal of encouragement to Thomas Dowling, ‘the priest for the contras’, who was called in by Calero to say Mass in the camps in Honduras;</b> but Dowling found the contras drifting, rather than committed.
L44/ADM 728	‘Simmetry’ would be a place for dead people, <b>lending new meaning to Blake's poem about the tiger.</b>
L45/ADW 1279	The Ajdabiya shaikh of one of the lineages involved confirmed the story: he was on the point of departure for Kufra to <b>lend his weight to the representatives of reason and peace.</b>

L46/AHN 1962	‘It <b>has lent credence to such manifest absurdities as the equality of the sexes and the equality of races.</b>
L47/AJD 892	Camra is also worried by proposals from the Dutch brewers Heineken and their rivals, the makers of Grolsch, to buy into the makers of Pilsner Urquell (Original), based in the Czech town which <b>lent its name to the brewing process.</b>
L48/AJU 1266	HAVING shepherded the Tories through the general election, Charles and Maurice Saatchi <b>are lending a hand to Eduard Shevardnadze, the former Soviet Foreign Minister now chairing the State Council of Georgia.</b>
L49/AJV 284	Planners hope that fashionable street furniture <b>will lend Continental glamour to our city centres.</b>
L50/AK4 666	It is already known that Strauss worked to a system of keys associated with particular characters and situations, but Professor Gilliam identifies his primary concern in Elektra as ‘establishing a sense of motivic continuity in the orchestral line’, thus <b>lending extra point to Strauss's description of Salome as ‘a symphony in the medium of drama’.</b>
L51/AK9 590	As in hundreds of communities across Central Europe, the Jews and Germans who <b>lent a cosmopolitan air to towns and villages in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary were murdered or expelled.</b>
L52/ALU 1183	The use of his name and his connection with the area, particularly with the Physic Garden and also his reputation abroad, <b>lent an air of authority to these pieces of china</b> — as no doubt Mr Sprimont, the astute manager of the factory appreciated.
L53/AMC 798	We knew that we should have to find this for ourselves, as the Billeting Office would not be prepared to move us again, nor <b>lend a very sympathetic ear to our complaints.</b>
L54/AN0 54	It is essential that the Security Service should be kept absolutely free from political bias or influence and nothing should be done that might <b>lend colour to any suggestion that it is concerned with the interests of any particular section of the community, or with any other matter than the Defence of the Realm as a whole.</b>
L55/AN3 1035	Research in Mexico, Colombia and Venezuela, carried out several years after Turner's work, <b>lends support to some aspects of the Turner thesis, but not others</b> (Gilbert and Ward 1985).
L56/AN3 1335	A closer look at the bourgeoisie, in terms of their social background, relationships with other classes and political opinions, <b>lends support to the argument that, in practice, they are not the class that is going to bring about radical change.</b>
L57/AN3 1534	Most of the evidence from Mexico <b>lends support to the spalding view,</b> while the data on the Allende period in Chile show very distinct revolutionary potential.
L58/AN5 324	The findings of a major study in Sheffield between 1976 and 1978 <b>lent ‘no support to the view that formal action encourages parents to ensure that their children attend more regularly in the future’.</b>
L59/AN9 287	The underwater explorer Jacques Cousteau was among those who <b>lent his name to the protest.</b>

Examples of *lend* with both objects realized (SVO<sub>prep</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern)

No./BNC No.	Text
L60/A10 1226	This book shows something of what has emerged out of religious interpretations of death, not as a history of death but as an indication of what lies at the root of the major religious traditions, <b>lending to each its characteristic style.</b>
L61/AAV 866	They <b>lend to an airport lounge the look of a grotesque, sprawling creche peopled by monster babies.</b>
L62/AHX 339	A son of the manse, he <b>lends to Labour the dark Church of Scotland tones that can make the recession sound as bleak as the wind that whips off the Firth of Forth in midwinter.</b>

Examples of *lend* with both objects realized (O<sub>prep</sub>SVO<sub>d</sub> pattern)

No./BNC No.	Text
L63/A93 88	Ms Walter offers us not a contralto tragedy-queen but a real woman passionately attached to her husband ( <b>to whom Mick Ford lends a shy goodness</b> ) and children.
L64/ABM 1546	In what ways have the false doctrine of abstraction, and the equally mistaken materialism <b>to which it lends support</b> , been a 'great source of errors and difficulties' in our search for knowledge?

Examples of *lend* with both objects realized (SO<sub>prep</sub>VO<sub>d</sub> pattern)

No./BNC No.	Text
L65/AC6 679	Joseph <b>to the background lends an honest charm.</b>

Examples of *lend* with both objects realized (SVO<sub>i</sub>O<sub>d</sub> pattern)

No./BNC No.	Text
L66/A0K 1002	However, I find Turner's work on the results of such movement into the liminal state to be a very useful way of interpreting what an insider experiences when he moves to the margins of his own domain, and I suspect that many such transformations across fiercely defended boundaries of cultural experience <b>lend the individual the chance to stand aside and reflect on his subjective place in the order of things.</b>
L67/A0K 1208	'College men' or 'academics' are considered to be potentially dangerous and polluting because of their limited understanding of the 'polis's' real world; for they never stay long enough to experience the depth and complexities of the activities which <b>lend him his 'special knowledge'.</b>
L68/A1G 46	Behind it all was the hand of Nelson Mandela, which may <b>lend the event much significance</b> should it turn out that President FW de Klerk is serious about negotiating with black leaders.
L69/A6N 708	Yet Moran made no move towards her, promised nothing, gave no hint of any reciprocation of interest, <b>lent her no support.</b>

<b>L70/A8X 132</b>	Lord Justice McCowan said he found it quite impossible to hold that Mr Hurd's political judgment — that the appearance of terrorists on programmes increased their standing and <b>lent them political legitimacy</b> — was one that no reasonable home secretary could make.
<b>L71/A9J 109</b>	Harkabi described the idea of a 'transfer' — the mass expulsion of Palestinians — as just the kind of project that is calculated to <b>lend the struggle its absolute, 'existential' character</b> .
<b>L72/AA9 171</b>	But she is excellent in the play-extracts, <b>lending Amanda in Private Lives just the right touch of acid mockery</b> and hinting at a whole world of repressed longing as the suburban wife in Still Life (the embryonic version of Brief Encounter).
<b>L73 L74/ABL 331</b>	There is no doubt that my masters often <b>lent me dignity and subtlety altogether beyond my needs</b> .
<b>L75/ACN 709</b>	Agent Cooper, who is forever dictating into a pocket tape recorder to an unseen associate named Diane, <b>lends the show much of its deadpan humour</b> as when he rhapsodizes about the aroma of the Douglas Fir or the savoury charms of a piece of pie with the glass-eyed earnestness of a Boy Scout on ecstasy.
<b>L76/ACP 1533</b>	They <b>lend her the viability of shared experience</b> , giving her the confidence to shrug her shoulders when she feels like it.
<b>L77/AE8 1413</b>	The blue and yellow uniforms <b>lent the scene a colourfulness not to be found in Britain</b> , save perhaps in military ceremonial, and I could not but wonder why in our churches and social life colour has become so taboo.
<b>L78/AEA 476</b>	There had been others lacking in imagination, who stuck to the basic facts but <b>lent them theatrical weight</b> .
<b>L79/AEA 1278</b>	Elling clung to a cliff face that <b>lent its dwellings protection from the wind</b> and provided the inhabitants with an uninterrupted view over the sound.
<b>L80/AHA 1156</b>	DRINKING is no newer a theme than the quest for truth or the pursuit of friendship, but the startling originality of Stephen Amidon's Thirst at least <b>lends it a fresh sheen</b> .
<b>L81/AHF 1265</b>	HARRY NEUBAUER, who has died aged 59, was a psychiatrist of multifarious qualities — not least an exuberant personality which <b>lent his earnest profession a splash of much-needed colour</b> .
<b>L82/AJ9 374</b>	Perhaps Sir Ian should <b>lend Mr Major a hand</b> by telling us what the average shopper's trolley contained in 1979, and what it contains today.
<b>L83/AJN 327</b>	As the recriminations between the brothers become more explosive, and the wounds of jealousy reopen, I've a horrible suspicion that Harwood wants us to be genuinely moved, but after all the superficial comedy, his attempt to <b>lend the play emotional depth</b> arouses embarrassment rather than pity.

### Examples of lend with O<sub>i</sub>/O<sub>prep</sub> omitted

No./BNC No.	Text
L84/A0F 1661	Without thinking, I got up and went over to see if I could <b>lend a hand</b> .
L85/A0G 89	When television's Gardeners' World heard of their plight they set about <b>lending a hand</b> .
L86/ A0L 2947	' <b>Lend a hand</b> and play the game?'
L87/A12 867	But it is not so easy to find good examples of his suggestion that batterie can <b>lend wit</b> except in the Blue Boy's révoltades in Ashton's Les Patineurs .
L88 L89/A2U 200	More often than not, each melodic line stands perfectly well by itself, and hearing it thus at least <b>lends something of the sense of familiarity and recognition that the thirteenth-century literati might have enjoyed</b> if they attempted to disentangle aurally the separate strands of the motet.
L90/A8H 277	It has always happened, of course, but in the old days, when the stock market was a smaller and more human place, the intimacy of dealing <b>lent some protection</b> .
L91/AA6 12	Naturally he couldn't answer them all himself, so Post Office staff <b>lent a hand</b> and every kid who wrote to him got a reply, postmarked Reindeerland or Santaland.
L92/ABB 990	They also <b>lend a delicious flavour</b> when added to cheap cuts of stewing lamb with caraway seeds, especially if the sauce is finished by the addition of a little soured cream.
L93/ABG 1022	<b>Crooks signed up to enjoy the benefits of corruption and to lend their power.</b>
L94/AC3 842	<b>With a bit of luck Eleanor might lend a hand.</b>
L95/ADW 851	<b>So the tactic in a dispute was to persuade as many people as possible to lend their voice, to show concern, and to mediate.</b>
L96/AK4 1277	Maggie Smith and Bob Hoskins excel, and <b>lend a much-needed British integrity</b> .
L97/ALJ 1116	The wrinkled skin, while rubberised to <b>lend some semblance of naturalism, was dry and fragile</b> .
L98/AMB 525	So open your book and <b>lend an ear</b> .
L99/AN7 1163	'I thought I'd come along and <b>lend a hand</b> ,' he smiled at Maggie.
L100/C9F 1048	When everything is in readiness, the Christmas decorations <b>lend a final festive touch</b> .