

## POSSESSIVE SEMANTICS IN CAUSATIVE VERBS (THE EVIDENCE FROM ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN)

### 1. Introductory notes

The present paper outlines how possessive semantics is represented in causative verbs in the English and Ukrainian languages. English and Ukrainian causative verbs with possessive semantics lack any formal possessive markers, either word-building or word-changing. However, they combine in their semantic structure two fundamental linguistic categories: causativity and possessivity, which in case of privative verbs also involves implicit negation.

Semantic interpretation formulae developed for ornative (“A causes B to have C”) and privative verbs (“A causes B not to have C”) help visualise all the three categories from the verbs’ semantics: causativity, possessivity, negation. Semantic functions are distributed in the following way: A – the causer, B – the object of the causative situation and the subject of the possessive situation, C – the object of the possessive situation: the relation between A and B is defined as the causative one, between B and C as the possessive one.

The scope of verbs included in the research include both ornative (Eng. *to give, to present, to attach*, etc.; Ukr. *давати, дарувати, прикріплювати* і т.ін.) and privative verbs (Eng. *to steal, to cut off, to deprive*, etc.; Ukr. *красти, відізнати, позбавляти* і т.ін.).

- (1) Eng. *John* (A) *presented* (caused to have) *Mary* (B) *a flower* (C);
- (2) Ukr. *Джон* (A) *подарував* (caused to have) *Мері* (B) *квітку* (C);
- (3) Eng. *John* (A) *stole* (caused not to have) *a purse* (C) from *Mary* (B);
- (4) Ukr. *Джон* (A) *вкрав* (caused not to have) *у Мері* (B) *гаманець* (C).

### 2. Discussion

Various questions of possessive semantics have continuously been in the focus of the linguists’ attention. However, the vast majority of scholars concentrate on the evidence from the languages which have regularly reproduced grammatical means of expressing possessive semantics and as a rule are represented by nominal or more seldom verbal affixes forming in those languages the grammatical category of possessivity (Michael, 2013). Another means of expressing possessive semantics are syntactic constructions, the study of which also proves to be highly productive in all the languages of the world (Luo, 2013).

It is generally recognised that in the English language means through which the category of possessivity finds its expression include the noun possessive case (sometimes called the genitive case) and possessive pronouns (Heine, 1997); in the Ukrainian language, those are the genitive case of nouns, the possessive case of adjectives and possessive pronouns (Golovacheva, 1989). Thus, in this respect the languages demonstrate more allomorphic than isomorphic features.

As a result, the dominating majority of studies based on empirical material selected from the English and Ukrainian languages concentrate mainly on nominal aspects of possession.

Verbal aspects of possession are predominantly limited to the issue of the so-called *BE-* or *HAVE-*languages, i.e. languages which build basic possessive constructions either with the help of the verb *HAVE* (which is the case with both the English, e.g. *I have a brother* and the Ukrainian language, e.g. *Я маю брата*) or the verb to *BE* (which is also the case with the Ukrainian language, e.g. *У мене є брат*).

Non-grammatical semantic means of expressing possessive semantics in the languages of the world are mainly restricted to the studies in the realm of partitive nominal semantics (Golovacheva, 1989) whereas verbal one gains quite rare attention (Zaluzhna, 2019).

### 3. Results

3.1. It must be clarified that in the languages of the world possessive semantics in verbs can be expressed not only with the help of morphemes (word-building or word-changing) but also be incorporated into the word semantic structure. The most illustrative way of extracting possessive semantics proves to be the method of interpretation formulae which can be presented in the following way “A causes B (not) to have C”. The elements of causative possessive macro-situation include two micro-situations:

- causative micro-situation which binds A and B;
- possessive micro-situation which exists between B and C.

3.2. In the English and Ukrainian languages, causative verbs with possessive semantics can be stratified into two major types which form a privative opposition on the basis of the negative seme absence / presence:

- ornative verbs which express the notion of supply / provision, e.g. Eng. *to distribute, to supply, to arm*; Ukr. *роздавати, постачати, озброювати*;
- privative verbs which express the notion of deprivation, e.g. Eng. *to take away, to tear off, to rob*; Ukr. *позбавляти, віднімати, впрошувати*.

3.3. It is possible to carry out further stratification of the empirical material taking into account the character of causative relation between A and B (i.e. manipulative and directive) and the character of connection between B and C (i.e. inalienable and alienable possession).

### 4. Conclusion

4.1. Within verbal semantic means of expressing possessivity in both languages demonstrate more isomorphic than allomorphic features. In English and Ukrainian causative verbs, possessive semantics is expressed on the level the word semantic structure only as in both languages there is neither grammatical category of possession nor any verbal morphological means which express possessive semantics.

4.2. Interpretation formula developed for causative verbs with possessive semantics (“A causes B (not) to have C”) allows to single out 5 elements of the macro-situation: causative relation between A and B; possessive micro-situation between B and C; A – the causer; B – the object of the causative situation and the subject of the possessive situation; C – the object of the possessive situation.

4.3. Causative possessive verbs fall into 2 major types: ornative and privative with further possible stratification based on the type of relation between the elements of their semantic structure (manipulative and directive for the causative element, inalienable and alienable possession for the possessive one).

## REFERENCES:

1. Golovacheva, A. V. (1989) Kategorija posessivnosti v plane sodержaniya [The category of possessivity in terms of its contents]. Kategorija posessivnosti v slavjanskih i balkanskih jazykah. Moscow: Nauka. 44–111.
2. Heine, B. (1997) Possession. Cognitive Sources, Forces and Grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Luo, Y. (2013) Possessive Constructions in Mandarin Chinese. Possession and Ownership. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 186–207.
4. Michael, L. (2013) Possession in Nanti. Possession and Ownership. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 149–166.
5. Zaluzhna, O. O. (2019) Leksyko-stylistychni ta strukturno-syntaksychni osoblyvosti pryvatyvnykh dijesliv v anghlijskij ta ukrajinskij movakh [Lexico-Stylistic and Structural-Syntactic Peculiarities of Privative Verbs in English and Ukrainian]. Vinnytsia: Nilan Ltd. 316.

*Zapukhliak Iryna  
Vinnytsia*

## CULTURAL COMPONENT OF ENGLISH IDIOMS

The connection between a language and a culture has been studied by many researchers. The speaker's choice of lexical units and grammar forms is determined by his/her educational level, emotional state, social status of his/her addressee and cultural norms of the society. Idioms are always stylistically marked and have some connotative meaning.

English idioms can be divided into proper English ones and borrowed ones that are copies of foreign idioms, or derived from common sources (for example the Bible). The object of our study is the proper English idioms that reflect the unique mentality of native speakers.

Idioms were studied from different perspectives, because their internal structure and functioning of language distinguish them from ordinary words and free phrases. The usage of idioms may add expressiveness to any statements. Such scholars as A. Kargin, (Каргин, 2007) Т. Markelova (Маркелова, 2005) О. Мороз (Мороз, 2010) and others paid much attention to the research of their features. However, in our opinion, the question of the cultural connotations of English idioms has not been studied thoroughly enough. Connotative meaning of language units is one of the urgent problems of modern linguistics.

The relationship between language and culture was observed in the works by W. Humboldt. However, in our study, we support statements of V. Telia, who noted that "if the idiom has cultural and national specificity, it must have the means to implement them in their organization and symbolic way to point these at peculiarities. The image (which may include culturally marked realia serves as a tool of manifestation of the cultural and national specific features in the idioms, and the way of denotation to these specific features is the interpretation of this image in the cultural and national sign