THE POSSESSEE SEMANTICS IN PRIVATIVE VERBS 
WITH THE POSSESSOR-PLANT IN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

1. Theoretical background

Privative verbs (hereafter PVs) are universal language units with complex semantic structure as they combine semes representing three fundamental categories of the language, i.e. causative, possessive, and negative semes [5: 40]. Each of the above categories has been thoroughly scrutinized not once, however various aspects of privative verbs have not received proper attention so far, which predetermines the relevance of the present research.

The object of the present research is quite restricted as it is limited to the group of PVs where the subject of the causative situation is a plant, e.g. Eng. to pare «to cut away the outer edge of (a fruit), in thin layers, slices, or flakes»; Ukr. зривати «надломивши, відокремлювати від стебла, кореня і т. ін. (листок, квітку, плід тощо)» ‘to separate from the trunk, root, etc. by breaking away (a leaf, fruit, etc.)’.

The empiric material of the present study is constituted by 137 lexemes (to be more precise lexico-semantic variants (hereafter LSVs) of the verbs): 82 lexemes in the English and 55 units in the Ukrainian language which were retrieved from the present-day English dictionaries among which are Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, The Oxford English Dictionary, Webster’s Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language.

Before going any further, it is necessary to outline some theoretical issues of the units under analysis. Care should be taken to differentiate the term “privative” used in phonology (for one type of phonetic oppositions), morphology (for morphemes with negative semantics), and lexical semantics (for causative possessive verbs with negative seme – privative verbs in other words).

However, even within the verbal theory the use of the term remains ambiguous, as it is sometimes used to define not only dynamic situation of deprivation (as in case with the privative verbs) but also stative situations of lack / non-possession. To differentiate the above two Vyach. Vs. Ivanov [3] and I. A. Mel’čuk suggest using the term “karitive” for stative situations and “privative” for dynamic ones [4: 425–427].

2. Discussion

Following the ideas of structural linguistics [1] the basic semantic formula of PVs can be represented in the following way: “X causes Y not to have Z” where X is the causer, Y is the object of causative situation and at the
same time the subject of possessive situation (possessor) and \( Z \) is the object of possessive situation (possessee); \( X \) and \( Y \) are in the causative relation to each other, \( Y \) and \( Z \) are in the possessive one. It must be pointed out that the present research covers only those PVs in which \( Y \) is represented by a plant only.

In the present-day English and Ukrainian languages, the plant is defined as one of the forms in which life exists on the Earth, i.e. flora is considered to belong to the class of living-beings. Nevertheless, the analysis of the empiric data obtained allows to arrive at a conclusion that the semantics of PVs views plants rather as inanimate objects. Such discrepancy between the concept and its interpretation in PVs semantics can be accounted for by the fact that in the Indo-European language plants belonged to the class of inanimate objects [2: 467].

3. Results

Since the causer (\( X \)) and the possessor (\( Y \)-plant) coincide for all PVs analysed in this study, the stratification of the verbs is based on the semantic character of the possessee (\( Z \)). The analysis of the empiric data collected gives possibility to divide the units under consideration into two major groups: PVs for which \( Z \) is a constituent part of the \( Y \)-plant and PVs for which \( Z \) is the outer layer of the \( Y \)-plant or its fruit.

3.1. The group of PVs for which \( Z \) is a constituent part of the \( Y \)-plan contains 56 of English lexemes which makes 68.3\% of the English corpus and 27 units – 49.1\% of the Ukrainian corpus.

The vast majority of English (37 units) and Ukrainian (20 units) PVs belonging to this group substitute the position of \( Z \) by a branch, in case of these verbs \( Y \) is exclusively a tree or a bush as only these plants are able to have branches.

Central lexemes are represented by PVs without any additional semantic features (hereafter ASF) to prune and to lop, and phrasal verbs derived from them, e.g. to prune away, to prune back, to prune down, to prune from, to prune of, to prune off; to lop away, and to lop off. However, some of the verbs demonstrate that LSVs to pollard, to disbranch, to shroud, to trash, and to limb have quantitative ASF “everything”, i.e. denote a complete deprivation of \( Y \) from \( Z \); PVs to pare, to ratoon contain ASF “quality” indicating \( Z \) as something “unnecessary” and “useless”. English PVs can also have a “locative” ASF (7 lexemes) which indicates the deletion of the top of the tree or the bush.

For Ukrainian PVs відчахувати, підпилювати, спилювати and those derived from them попідпилювати and поспилювати \( Z \) is represented exclusively by branches of the tree or the bush, however 8 PVs can combine \( Z \)-branch and \( Z \)-leaves. The Ukrainian corpus is also characterised by units with “locative” ASF which indicates the location of \( Z \) – “the top part of the plant” (7 lexemes). It is noteworthy that in contrast to the English language for the
dominating majority of Ukrainian PVs Z is not a tree but the flower or the bush. A characteristic feature of Ukrainian verbs is that there are only 2 units for which Z is exclusively leaves, e.g. збезлистити and обиморгувати.

3.2. The second group of PVs with the possessor-plant represents Z as the outer layer of the plant or its fruit and includes 26 English PVs (31.7%) and 28 Ukrainian PVs (50.9%).

For the English verbs to bark, to debark, to disbark, to ring-bark, to rind, and to ross the possessee is the bark of the tree which is mainly motivated by the root stem of the majority of the lexemes; the verb to girdle has the ASF – “goal” of the action “to kill a tree” or “to render a tree more fruitful”; 11 units represent Z as the outer layer of the fruit, e.g. to excoriate, to pare, to pare off, to pulp, to blanch. It must be pointed out that for a number of English PVs the semantics of Z is predetermined by their derivational stem, e.g. to shell, to shuck, to husk, and to unhusk.

The group of Ukrainian PVs with the Z – the outer layer of the plant or its fruit includes 28 units among which only 7 lexemes are characterised by the possessee-bark; similar to English verbs the semantics of a number of Ukrainian PVs is motivated by the derivational stem кора ‘bark’, e.g. корувати, обкорувати, оскорувати which explains the concretisation of the possessee. It is noteworthy that Ukrainian PVs for which Z is the outer layer of the fruit (21 units) are stratified into 4 derivational groups: 1) чистити, обчищати, зчищати, позчищати; 2) лущити, лупесати, відлуплювати, злущувати; 3) лущити, полущити, злуцувати, позлуцувати, вилущувати, відлущувати, повідлущувати; 4) оббирати, пооббирати.

4. Conclusion

4.1. Privative verbs are complex units which combine in their semantic structure three fundamental categories of the language: causative, possessive, and negative semes. Privative verbs should not be confused with privative oppositions studied in phonology and privative prefixes researched in morphology.

4.2. The units under study can be stratified into two groups: privative verbs for which the possessee is a constituent part of the possessor-plant and verbs for which possessee is the outer layer of the possessor-plant or its fruit, the first being much more productive in the English language while the latter is characterised by higher productivity in the Ukrainian language.

4.3. Privative verbs with the possessor-plant in both languages can include in their semantic structure additional semantic features among which the following can be found: “goal”, “unnecessary”, “useless”, “locative”, etc.

4.4. In a number of privative verbs with the possessor-plant, especially in the Ukrainian language, the correlation with the possessee semantics is
predetermined by their close correlation with the stem from which the privative verbs were derived.

4.5. The perspective of the further research lies in building the empiric data base which will include languages of the world belonging to various families, thus allowing to obtain more empiric data for mapping the category of privativity around the world.
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