Natasha Stojanovska-Ilievska

A corpus-based study of the English light verb constructions with *give* denoting bodily actions and physical interaction

1 Introduction

This paper reports the findings of a corpus-based investigation into the light verb constructions (LVCs) with *give*. Drawing on examples from the British National Corpus (BNC), it analyses the semantic and syntactic characteristics of these LVCs and explores their similarities and differences to determine whether any meaningful patterns and associations can be discerned. It also discusses the intricate relations between the LVCs with *give* and their full verb (FV) counterparts (e.g. *to give a gasp vs. to gasp, to give someone a hug vs to hug someone*).

LVCs are bipartite constructions consisting of a verbal and a nominal component. The main semantic contribution of the construction is brought about by the eventive noun within the LVC, which is considered the semantic core of the LVC. On the other hand, light verbs (LVs) have long been considered to be devoid of meaning (hence: light) to a greater or a lesser degree, having derived from their 'heavy' counterparts through semantic bleaching. This paper touches upon the motivation behind the choice of *give*, rather than some other light verb, in these LVCs. In so doing, it lends support to those approaches to LVCs that acknowledge some level of semantic contribution from the light verb to the overall meaning of the LVC.

The heavy use of *give* is demonstrated in example (1a), which is excerpted from the BNC, as are all other examples, unless specified otherwise. It literally indicates the transfer of a concrete material object from one person to another. This idea of a transfer serves as a common thread running through all LVCs with *give*, with the caveat that, in LVCs with *give*, what is transferred is never a concrete, tangible material object. The idea of a transfer of possession of a concrete material object from (1a) has evolved in different directions in the LVCs with *give*, as is shown in examples (1b) through (1d). What elements of the concept of transfer are preserved and which ones are lost in these LVCs is discussed in greater detail in Sections 2 and 4. The use of these LVCs for the expression of a wide range of events, such as: emis-

Natasha Stojanovska-Ilievska, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, North Macedonia

Open Access. © 2025 the author(s), published by De Gruyter. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111388878-002

sion of sounds (1b), physical interaction (1c) and verbal interaction (1d), suggests that LVCs with *give* are semantically quite varied.

(1) a. *He gave her a delicate necklace of amethysts and pearls set in Scottish gold.* (APW, 549)
b. *She gave a cry* [...] (GW8, 2669)
c. *He gave her a brief hug* [...] (HA7, 2634)
d. *I gave him a simple answer* [...] (ADY, 3337)

Not only are LVCs with *give* semantically versatile, but they also exhibit some syntactic versatility, which is reflected in the variation of the syntactic patterns that these LVCs occur in, as well as in the different degrees of complexity in the structure of the noun phrase (NP) within the scope of the LVCs.

In this context, the main aims of this paper are: to offer a semantic classification of LVCs with *give* into families, to scrutinize their morphosyntactic features by delving into their structural complexities on a sentential level, as well as to investigate the semantic and discourse-pragmatic differences between the LVCs and their full verb counterparts. Therefore, this paper seeks to address the following research questions:

i. Are distinct families of LVCs with *give* associated with a specific tense, aspect and voice?
ii. Are there any semantic and discourse-pragmatic differences between the LVCs with *give* and their FV counterparts that factor into the choice of one structure over the other?

Based on these research questions, the following hypotheses were examined:

1. Each family of LVCs with *give* is associated with a specific tense, aspect and voice. The rationale behind this is that families of LVCs with *give* render prominent different aspects of the transfer of possession typical of the act of giving. These differences are formally reflected in distinct morphosyntactic patterns, which should enable the expression of a range of meanings aligned with the unique semantic background of each family. And it is recognized that meanings are conveyed through various means, including the grammatical categories.
2. There are semantic and discourse-pragmatic differences between the LVCs with *give* and their FV counterparts that motivate the selection of one structure over the other. Based on the principles of language economy, it is very unlikely that two structures would co-exist in a language with no semantic or discourse-pragmatic differences between them whatsoever.

To the best of my knowledge, a corpus-based study of families of LVCs with *give* seeking to uncover their shared and family-specific semantic and syntactic features and tendencies has hitherto not been performed. By filling this research gap, this study aims to provide new insights into LVCs with *give* and would, hopefully, encourage further research in this area.

This chapter is structured in five sections. Having introduced the research topic in the Introduction, I discuss the positions of authors who have made valuable contribution to our understanding of LVCs over the years in the section entitled Background on LVCs (2). The Methodological approach section (3) outlines the procedures that were followed in the research process. The Results and discussion section (4) presents the findings of the study and places them in the context of previous studies done in this field, while the final section (5) summarises the main points from the study and gives directions for further research.

2 Background on LVCs

2.1 Definitions

What is considered a LVC in this paper is a combination of a light verb and a noun phrase with an eventive noun as its head, which is either derivationally or phonetically related to a simple verb that corresponds in meaning to the entire construction (*to give a sigh* vs *to sigh*). An eventive noun may display the basic meaning of a process "whether generalized or a single instance" (Allerton, 2002, 121) or various other 'facet' meanings, including: an effected speech act, a mental or physical effect, a service, etc. (Allerton, 2002, 122–123). While some authors only allow for nouns derived through conversion (zero-derivation) in LVCs (Jespersen, 1942; Dixon, 2005; Wierzbicka, 1982), the approach taken in this paper aligns closely with Allerton (2002); Nesselhauf (2005) and Algeo (2006), whose understanding of eventive nouns within LVCs is broader and allows for nouns derived though various word-formation processes.

In this study of LVCs with *give*, the majority of the LVCs surveyed include nouns that were diachronically derived from the associated verb either through conversion or suffixation (which was verified online through the Oxford English Dictionary[1] and the Merriam-Webster Dictionary[2]). Yet in some cases it was not as straightforward to determine whether the noun predated the verb or vice versa (as was

1 http://www.oed.com, last access: 20.10.2024.

2 http://www.merriam-webster.com, last access: 20.10.2024.

the case with *kiss*, both the noun and the verb dating back to Old English). Sometimes, what synchronically looks like an instance of conversion, is actually a documented case of two separate borrowings from another language (*to cr*y and *a cry* from French). Because of these difficulties, the diachronic approach was abandoned, as well as the traditional qualification of the noun within the LVCs as 'deverbal'.

The terms 'prototypical,' 'literal' and 'heavy' *give* are used interchangeably to refer to the central meaning of *give* to denote an act of transfer of ownership of a concrete material thing from one person to another. They are contrasted with the terms 'light' or 'figurative' *give*, which are reserved for uses of *give* that illustrate more abstract notions reminiscent of an act of giving. The term 'light' underscores the loss of some semantic traits inherent in the heavy verb through the process of semantic bleaching (desemanticization), while the term 'figurative' highlights the extensions of the meaning of the literal verb in different directions. The semantic bleaching evident in light *give* can be understood as a reduction in "the contribution of one or more domains to the matrix domain" of prototypical *give*, thus giving rise to figurative extensions (Pompei, 2023, 165). The uses of *give* in the LVCs analysed in this paper are thus considered to be simultaneously both light and figurative.

For the purposes of this paper, the concept of a LVC family (Fleischhauer and Gamerschlag, 2019; Fleischhauer, 2021) was employed for the first time to LVCs with *give*. A LVC family basically includes LVCs that meet two criteria: (a) they contain the same light verb and (b) they lend themselves to the same interpretation pattern. LVC families demonstrate that the interpretation of LVCs stems from the consistent semantic contribution of the light verb in the first place. This paper is concerned solely with LVCs with *give*. Three general families are distinguished, of which only two will be analysed in this paper due to space limitations.

2.2 On the status of LVCs in phraseology

Based on their degree of fixedness and semantic transparency, phraseological units can be placed at different positions on the phraseological continuum (Granger and Paquot, 2008, 36; Cowie, 1981, 227–229). Idioms are often placed at one end of the spectrum as fixed expressions whose meanings are opaque, i.e. do not derive from the meanings of their constituent parts (e.g. *to kick the bucket*). On the opposite end are free combinations, which are not typically included in phraseology because their meanings are simply the sum of their parts (e.g. *write a letter*). Between pure idioms and free combinations lie two other categories: figurative idioms and restricted collocations (Cowie, 1998, 7; Cowie, 1981, 227–229). On this phraseological continuum, LVCs are often categorized as restricted collocations (Allerton, 2002, 221; Nesselhauf, 2005, 21), in which the light verb is used figuratively, while the noun is

used in its literal sense. While typically being semantically transparent (e.g. *to give someone a push* meaning 'to push someone'), LVCs can shift toward idiomatic usage (e.g. *to give someone a push* meaning 'to encourage someone'), further blurring the lines between restricted collocations and idioms. That said, LVCs share some similarities with idioms, as they are stored in memory and recalled as whole units (Allerton, 2002, 221).

2.3 The semantic contribution of the light verbs in LVCs

In the first half of the 20th century light verbs were perceived as verbs "with a vague meaning" primarily functioning as connectives (Poutsma, 1926, 394) or as "insignificant" verbs, operating merely as exponents of the grammatical categories of person and tense (Jespersen, 1942, 117). In the last decades of the 20th century, however, perspectives emerged suggesting that the light verbs within LVCs actually make major semantic contribution to these constructions (Stein, 1991; Wierzbicka, 1982). This perspective is consistent with the dominant views in the late 20th and early 21st centuries (Newman, 1996; Brugman, 2001; Gradečak-Erdeljić, 2004, 2009), which, despite some variations in terminology, propose that: a) light verbs have a more abstract meaning than heavy verbs, but are certainly not devoid of meaning, and b) essential semantic traits of the heavy verb can be recognized in the light verb as well. Applying the cognitive linguistics theory of force dynamics, it has been shown that the force dynamics inherent in the heavy verb is retained in the light verb to varying degrees (Brugman, 2001, 558–561; Gradečak-Erdeljić, 2009, 101–106), thereby indicating that the selection of a light verb in specific LVCs is not arbitrary, but rather highly motivated.

Going back to the examples in the Introduction, it is not by chance that light *give* was used in the LVCs in (1b), (1c) and (1d), rather than some other light verb, such as: *take, have, make* or *do*. *Take* is inappropriate as a substitute for *give* because *give* and *take* are considered relational opposites or converses, albeit "not exact converses" (Hurford and Heasley, 2007, 123, 137). Thus, *take* makes possible the conceptualization of the giving act from the perspective of the recipient, rather than the giver. For example, *take a punch from someone* would be the relational opposite of *give someone a punch*. When it comes to light *have*, it indicates a self-oriented activity that is either "aimless or aimed at some experience of the agent", without any external goal (Wierzbicka, 1982, 758). Hence light *have* is incompatible with LVCs indicating some interaction between two participants. Light *make* specifically points to the active process of creation of a new entity, as in *make a choice* or *make a claim*, while light *do* is more neutral in portraying the performance of an action, as in *do a dance* or *do a jump* (Gradečak-Erdeljić, 2009, 126–127). This is not to say that each even-

tive noun can be combined with only one specific light verb. For example, multiple light verbs can be used with *a shriek*, but the interpretation is different each time. Specifically, *give* in *give a shriek* would lend the action an involuntary overtone, *do a shriek* would be used to indicate a deliberate act of performing before spectators, while *have a shriek* would be used for an action done willingly and for personal pleasure (Quirk et al., 1985, 752).

On the other hand, verbs that share similar sub-categorization frames with *give* (such as: *donate, grant, bestow, present, confer, hand*, etc.) are also unacceptable as substitutes for light *give* in these LVCs because none of them is as experientially basic and as stylistically neutral as *give*. For example, the verb *grant* is applied in cases of formal giving of rights, permission or privileges from the position of authority, *donate* indicates giving something specifically with the purpose of helping someone, *present* implies giving something at an official or formal occasion, etc. Since all these verbs have highly nuanced meanings, they are not as amenable to a diversity of semantic and pragmatic contexts as is the case with *give*.

2.4 On the figurative extensions of *give* in LVCs

Give is a three-place predicate involving the transfer of ownership (of a material object) from one person to another. The subject argument denotes the first, generally human participant, i.e. the protagonist who has the material object. The indirect object (IO) argument denotes the second animate (usually human) participant in this relation. It is the protagonist to whom the material object is given, i.e. the recipient. The referent of the direct object (DO) argument is usually a concrete material object whose selectional restriction is 'non-human', despite there being examples of human referents of this argument, too. As a result of the process of semantic extension, this relation of transfer of a material object can be understood as a transfer of an immaterial (abstract) object (Topolińjska, 2000, 83). This conceptualization of more abstract concepts by means of more concrete ones is attributable to the experiential basicness of the act of giving and the semantic complexity of the prototypical *give*, both of which make it a rich cross-linguistic source of figurative (or metaphorical) extensions (Newman, 1996, 2, 15, 258).

In languages worldwide, eight major figurative extensions of *give* have been identified: interpersonal communication, emergence/ manifestation, causation/ purpose, permission/ enablement, schematic interaction, recipient/ benefactive marking, movement and completedness, though this list is not exhaustive (Newman, 1996, 134). Based on a survey of *give* + eventive noun combinations listed in specialized dictionaries of English collocations, three of these eight figurative extensions were identified as pertinent to the English LVCs with *give*: emergence

(closely related to that of causation), schematic interaction and interpersonal communication. How these figurative extensions are related to the semantics of the prototypical *give* is explained in the next paragraph.

The prototypical *give* typically indicates a transfer of a concrete material object from one person to another, as in (1a), where after the act of giving the referent of the subject argument loses possession of the necklace. In the LVCs (1b) through (1d) the meaning of *give* is semantically somewhat bleached since not all of the elements of the heavy *give* are present in the light *give*. In some LVCs, light *give* is quite distant from the prototypical *give*. For example, in the LVC *give a cry* in (1b), there are not even two participants between whom some kind of transfer occurs. However, what is similar between light *give* in this LVC and the prototypical *give* is that something emerges from a source. While in the prototypical *give*, the giver can be construed as the source from which something (i.e. the material object to be transferred) originates, in the LVC in (1b), the one who voices the cry can be perceived as the source of the sound, which is then emitted in the air. Despite the fact that a recipient is not specified, the concept of a sound emanating from a source is vaguely reminiscent of an act of giving. In such LVCs, we observe the extension of *give* to describe emergence, i.e. to convey the idea of something emerging from somewhere (Newman, 1996, 144–149). On the other hand, in the LVC *give a hug* in example (1c) there are two participants just like in the prototypical *give* and some interaction occurs between them at the initiative of the first participant, only this time it is not a concrete material object that is being transferred, but some form of physical contact is applied by the first participant to the second one. Hence, we can say that in this and other similar examples the meaning of *give* has evolved towards the notion of physical interaction, or what Newman refers to as schematic interaction (Newman, 1996, 201–206). In the LVC in (1d), the referent of the subject argument did not hand anything to anyone, nor did they lose possession of anything. Yet, there are some similarities between the heavy *give* in (1a) and the light *give* in (1d). Namely, there are two human participants, and there is interaction between them in both examples. It is just that the conveyed verbal message in (1d) is construed as the thing being given by the first to the second participant in the prototypical (or heavy) use of *give* in (1a). This is why in such cases it is said that *give* has developed a figurative extension to verbal interaction, or interpersonal communication in Newman's terminology (Newman, 1996, 136–144). These figurative extensions (emergence/ causation, schematic interaction and interpersonal communication) lay the core semantic foundations for the three major families of LVCs with *give*.

3 Methodological approach

Taking into consideration that some LVCs are typical of colloquial speech, while others are more frequently found in more formal discourse (Shahrokny-Prehn and Höche, 2011, 243–245; Allerton, 2002, 29), this study was based on the British National Corpus (BNC), which comprises various genres of written language: fiction (ca. 17%), magazines (ca. 8%), newspapers (ca. 11%), academic texts (ca. 16%), non-academic texts (ca. 17%) and miscellaneous (ca. 21%), as well as transcripts of spoken language (ca. 10%). The BNC is a closed corpus of approximately 100 million words, including materials dating between 1980-1993. All examples excerpted from the BNC include their text code and sentence number within brackets.

The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English (Benson et al., 2010), the Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English (Crowther et al., 2002), the LTP Dictionary of Selected Collocations (Hill and Lewis, 1997), were all used to compile a list of collocations of the type '*give* + eventive noun'. In cases of discrepancies, the online versions of the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English and the Collins English Dictionary were used to verify that specific combinations have actually been attested in the English language as collocations.[3] This manually generated list of LVCs with *give* was surveyed for some underlying semantic patterns. It appeared that my grouping of these LVCs into semantic fields closely (but not completely) mirrored some of Newman's (1996) figurative extensions of *give*. The LVCs were thus classified into three major families: LVCs indicating bodily actions, physical interaction and verbal interaction, of which the first two are analysed in this paper. LVCs that did not clearly fit into any of these categories (such as: *give someone assistance*, etc.), were not analysed any further. Hence, the classification is not exhaustive both in terms of the number of analysed families and in terms of the LVCs included in each separate family.

The search for LVCs was conducted online on the BNC website.[4] Since LVCs consist of two segments (a verbal and a nominal one), and both the verb phrase (VP) and the NP can be of varying length and complexity, of all the search options available on the website, searching for collocates seemed to be the most sensible approach. The rationale for this choice is that the Collocates search menu makes possible the simultaneous search for two words (a node word and its collocate), while capturing all their word-forms, and offering the possibility for specification of the distance

3 The dictionaries have been accessed online. The urls are: *Collins COBUILD Advanced Learner's Dictionary* https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/, last access: 7/10/2024.

4 https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/, last access: 7/10/2024.

within which the node and its collocate should occur. The collocation window approach (Gablasova et al., 2017) was applied to search for word co-occurrences within a defined short span, in this case four words to the left and four to the right of the node, as is typical (Sinclair, 1991; Nesselhauf, 2005). This method reveals broader word associations and not just words adjacent to the node. It allows for the occurrence of determiners and/or adjectival modifiers before the noun within a LVC, and it also generates both active and passive voice constructions, as in: *H.H. Barrows gave a presidential address* (GVW, 759) and *The keynote address was given by Sir Desmond Lorimer* (AMH, 438), respectively.

Thus, the lemma GIVE was entered as a node in the first search box in the Collocates menu, while the second box was filled with a lemmatized eventive noun, such as: SMILE_n, GRUNT_n, etc., where the capital letters indicate a lemma and retrieve all word-forms in consequence, while the attached _n restricts the search to nouns in cases when there is also a verb with the same form. Such searches generated exampl sentences with the nouns *smile*(*s*), *grunt*(*s*), etc. within four positions to the left and to the right of the verb *give* in any of its inflected forms. Such searches were performed for 40 distinct LVCs with *give*.

The search generated 2,261 hits, which were manually individually filtered to discard examples that met the search criteria but were not examples of LVCs. First, examples were discarded if a word-form of *give* and its collocate occurred across sentence boundaries, as is the case with *cry* and *give* in the following stretch of text: *They probably need a good cry. It certainly gives me, an innocent bystander, instant indigestion* […] (HH0, 117-118). Structures that superficially resemble LVCs, but fail to meet the criteria for LVCs were also discarded. Such was the case with […] *why worry about them? Erm you've given them a good start in life* […] (FMS, 607-608), where *start* refers to a beginning, rather than a sudden involuntary movement, as in *Suddenly he gave a frightened start* (CAB, 812). Hence, in this example, a near-paraphrase of 'you've given them a good start' with the lexical verb *start* is impossible, which would be a prerequisite for a structure to be considered a LVC. Constructions with idiomatic meaning, such as: *to give someone the kiss of life* meaning 'resuscitate' in *When they found her she was given the kiss of life* (CH2, 494) were beyond the scope of this study, as well. In addition, phrasal verbs with *give* were excluded from the analysis even if the collocate under investigation occurred in direct object position, as is case with the phrasal verb *give up* and the collocate *laughs* in: *I wouldn't give up those laughs for anything* […] (HRF, 899). Examples were also discarded where *given* was used as a preposition meaning 'considering,' as in: *Given a good performance today, he will clearly be in line for a place at Wembley* (A8C, 23). Finally, since this study aims to establish some association between particular families of LVCs with *give* and the verbal categories of tense, aspect and voice, non-finite verb forms (infinitives and participles) were also excluded from this study.

The remaining 1,664 examples were manually annotated: the light verb for the verbal categories of tense, aspect and voice, while the nouns within the LVCs for the nominal categories of definiteness and number. A noun was considered to have definite reference if it was preceded by a definite article, a determinative possessive, or a demonstrative determiner (Quirk et al., 1985, 253, 327, 362, 372). A noun was considered indefinite if it was not preceded by any article (zero article), if it was preceded by the indefinite article, or other indefinite determiners, such as: *some, any, either, neither, every, each, all, few, many, one, another*, etc. (Quirk et al., 1985, 253, 261, 376–392). The overall results per family are displayed in tables 1-4 in Section 4.

In each of the two subsections in Section 4, by referring to examples from the BNC and the data from the tables 1–4, the extent to which families of LVCs display syntactic flexibility is assessed, by verifying whether they allow passivization or an overt realization of an IO. In addition, the flexibility within the noun phrase (NP) itself is examined as well, by checking if the pluralization of the noun, and the substitution of the indefinite article with a marker of definiteness are allowed.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Family 1: LVCs denoting bodily actions

From a semantic point of view, what LVCs from Family 1 have in common is the fact that they all denote an action that involves movement of a part of the body (2a), while many of them additionally indicate the emission of vocal sounds (2b). Thus, we distinguish between two subfamilies within Family 1. They both demonstrate the same general morphosyntactic pattern but exhibit two distinct interpretational patterns.

(2) a. *Louise gave a little smile*. (C8S, 1529)
b. *I gave a scream of horror*. (H9U, 1745)

A convenient paraphrase for Subfamily 1A would be: 'the subject referent makes a facial or bodily movement denoted by the NP-internal noun', as in (2a), and it is exemplified with the following LVCs: *give a chuckle, give a cough, give a gasp, give a gulp, give a jerk, give a jump, give a laugh, give a shrug, give a shudder, give a sigh, give a smile, give a snort, give a sob, give a start, give a wave* and *give a wink*. These LVCs are generally based on the class of verbs involving the body (Levin, 1993), particularly the subclasses of verbs of gestures/signs involving body parts, verbs of body-internal states of existence and verbs of non-verbal expression. Subfamily 1B includes LVCs that can be paraphrased with 'the subject referent emits the sound

denoted by the NP-internal noun', as in (2b), and includes the following LVCs: *give a bellow, give a cry, give a groan, give a grunt, give a moan, give a scream, give a shriek*, and *give a squeak*. These LVCs are based on verbs of sound emission from Levin's (1993) classification, which are oftentimes cross-listed in other (sub)classes too, such as the subclasses of verbs of non-verbal expression, and verbs of manner of speaking, or the class of verbs of sounds made by animals. Thus, it was sometimes a bit problematic whether to include certain LVCs in the first or in the second LVC subfamily, especially if they could rightfully occur in both. For example, *giving a cry* essentially refers to the production of sound, but it is also related to non-verbal expression. Since it foremost denotes the emission of a vocal sound, which can secondarily be interpreted as an emotional expression through involvement of parts of the body, the LVC *give a cry* was included in Subfamily 1B.

The causative figurative extension of *give* is present in all of the LVCs in Family 1, where causativity is generally understood as "causing an event or thing, without any interpersonal manipulation" (Newman, 1996, 176). Closely related to this, the LVCs that denote production of sounds and egress of air instantiate the figurative extension of emergence, or appearance of something from somewhere (Newman, 1996, 145). Thus, the emission of sound in the LVCs resembles the movement of an object outside of the personal sphere of control of the giver in a giving act, while the source of the sound in the LVCs corresponds to the giver (Newman, 1996, 144–148).

Many of these LVCs indicate unintentional, instinctive or physiological reactions (Gradečak-Erdeljić, 2009, 115) or involuntary reactions (Jespersen, 1942, 118), as in (3). Such unintentionality in the performance of the action is not in line with the literal *give*, which indicates a conscious and intentional act.

(3) *There was no foothold and Maggie gave a cry of fear as she too felt the ground give way beneath them as they slid over the edge towards the lake*. (HGK, 2134)

Since the LVCs from Family 1 are related to intransitive verbs (*to sigh* vs *to give a sigh*), in these LVCs light *give* only requires a subject (S) and a direct object (DO), while an indirect object (IO) is generally not added (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, 293). This means that LVCs from this family are most distant from the literal *give* understood as a transfer of an object from one person to another, because they usually do not imply directing the movement or sound to anyone in particular. Thus, the majority of LVCs from this family (78.14%) are realized as monotransitive constructions. Likewise, the LVC *give a shrug* occurs within a monotransitive pattern in 93 of the 95 BNC examples, amounting to 97.89%. In example (4), however, the LVC is structurally different from all the hitherto mentioned examples because of its overt expression of the recipient in indirect object position. Thus, in (4) light *give* is syntactically closer to the literal ditransitive *give* because both protagonists necessary

for the realization of the transfer (the agent and the recipient) are realized in the LVC in their respective syntactic positions of a subject and an indirect object. The gesture *a shrug of apology* is directed to Mariana (the recipient in IO position), so what is actually communicated with her is the apology, which finds its expression through the shrug. Of the 24 LVCs from this family searched in the BNC, only three other LVCs sometimes occur in the ditransitive pattern: *give a smile, give a wink* and *give a wave*. They all denote gestures and facial expressions used in non-verbal interaction.

(4) *He brushed a few drops of sea water off the top of the carburetor, dabbed the float chamber full and gave Mariana a shrug of apology before kicking the starter.* (AMU, 1750)

In the LVCs from this family the eventive noun is profiled as a discrete unit of an action. This contributes to the understanding of the action denoted by the LVC as time-bounded. In example (5a) we see how the indefinite article in these LVCs is used as an indicator of the singularity of the action. Being quantized through the indefinite article, the NP in DO position adds the end-point required for a telic interpretation of the entire VP. This could be seen as an instance of 'object marking', which is applied in English as a telicity-encoding strategy (Filip, 2008, 234), because giving is an act that becomes telic through the involvement of a theme (van Gelderen, 2017, 58). Example (5b) with the FV *scream* has an atelic interpretation, which is proved by the felicitous use of the adverbial of duration *for hours*. On the other hand, in (5c) we are clearly dealing with a telic eventuality description regarding the same FV, because the presence of the adverbial *once* points to a single atomic screaming event, or a singular eventuality (Landman, 2008, 112) and it is precisely telic predicates that denote events which can be counted and can thus be modified by iterative adverbials (Filip, 1993, 91–92). In other words, "bounded predicates treat their arguments as logical individuals, i.e., as entities which can be counted" (Herweg, 2014, 191) and can thus combine well with temporal count adverbials, such as *once*, *twice*, *three times*, etc. Thus, while the FV *scream* can be interpreted as either telic or atelic depending on the context, LVCs with singular nouns within their structure conceptualize the event as an action with an inherent end-point, which licences their telic interpretation. By contrasting (5a) and (5b), we observe that LVCs can actually express Aktionsart (also called inner aspect in van Gelderen, 2017, 57) opposition with the corresponding FVs.

(5) a. […] *she gave a scream thinking that it was the spider running there*. (KCP, 73)

b. *In the end she left it to cry. It screamed for hours, probably waking the entire house*. (GUM, 2132-2133)

c. *Sam Somerville screamed once, buried her face in Quinn's back and began to cry*. (CAM, 1764)

Regarding the categories of definiteness and number, as much as 95.13% of all surveyed examples included an indefinite singular noun within the LVC, as in (5a), which is evident from Table 1. This confirms that LVCs from this family are basically used to express singular bounded actions. LVCs with indefinite plural nouns (6a), LVCs with definite singular nouns (6b) and LVCs with a plural noun with definite reference, such as (6c) were marginally represented among the surveyed examples of LVCs with *give* from this family, with 0.89%, 3.91% and 0.07% respectively.

(6) a. *She gave little moans of pleasure* [...]. (FS1, 397)
b. *Again, he gave that expressive shrug*. (JY7, 5563)
c. *She gave them her best smiles*. (GUK, 130)

As for tense, as much as 97.02% of the LVCs in active voice have been used in the simple past tense, while only rare examples in the simple present have been recorded, along with sporadic examples in the simple future and the past perfect, as apparent from Table 2. The findings about the predominance of the simple past, coupled with the fact that the NPs within the structure of these LVCs are quantized (by being singular) in 1341 cases (99.04%) speaks of a strong tendency for the LVCs from the 'bodily actions' family to denote telic eventuality descriptions in which the endpoint has been reached, because following Borik (2006, 39), "if a given proposition has the property of defining the event being described as telic, then whenever the past tense is used, we infer that the event has terminated (or reached an end-point)". Thus, in the absence of the perfective/ imperfective aspectual distinction in English, which is typical of many Slavic languages, LVCs could be perceived and employed as markers of telicity (Brinton, 2011), unlike the full verbs that alternate between telic and atelic readings.

LVCs from this family resist passivization, which can be seen from the contrast between (7a) and (7b). In the LVCs from this family the noun in DO position cannot be promoted to the subject position of a passive sentence because passivization operates on arguments (Kearns, 1988, 15). Rare examples of passive constructions (more specifically 2 out of 1354 examples, or 0.15%) were observed in the BNC in which the participant with the role of a non-prototypical recipient in the ditransitive LVCs was advanced to subject position, as is the case with the noun *onlookers* in example (7c).

(7) a. *She gave a cry, and fell to the floor*. (FSL, 443)
b. **A cry was given by her* [...].
c. *Onlookers at a charity sponsored walk were given a smile*. (ACM, 136)

Tab. 1: Distribution of NPs within the LVCs from Family 1 across the nominal categories of definiteness and number.

	indefinite singular NP	definite singular NP	indefinite plural NP	definite plural NP	Total
chuckle	21	1			22
cough	19	1			20
gasp	38		1		39
gulp	4				4
jerk	8				8
jump	11				11
laugh	240	8	2		250
shrug	90	5			95
shudder	23	3			26
sigh	148		1		149
smile	406	30	3	1	440
snort	31				31
sob	6				6
start	24	1			25
wave	28	1	1		30
wink	17				17
Total Subfamily 1A	1114	50	8	1	1173
bellow	7				7
cry	64	1	1		66
groan	22	1			23
grunt	29		2		31
moan	14		1		15
scream	24	1			25
shriek	10				10
squeak	4				4
Total Subfamily 1B	174	3	4	0	181
Total Family 1	1288	53	12	1	1354

The use of the LVCs with *give* from the 'bodily actions' family is also motivated by information structure considerations. The simple SV realization of the intransitive pattern oftentimes sounds "oddly incomplete" since the verb is typically not intended to bear the "maximum communicative dynamism in a sentence", resulting in the frequent addition of optional adverbials (Quirk et al., 1985, 1401). LVCs with *give* corresponding to intransitive full verbs actually stretch the predication over two segments (a verbal and a nominal one), thus fitting within the canonical English SVO word order and allowing for the placement of sentence focus on verbal content, profiled as an eventive noun in DO position (Brinton, 1996; Quirk et al., 1985;

Tab. 2: Distribution of the LVCs from Family 1 across the verbal categories of tense, aspect and voice. The numbers for Prog(ressive) and Perfect are summarized for the three tenses: Past, Present, and Future in the active voice.

	Active					Imp.	Passive	Total
	Present	Past	Future	Prog.	Perfect			
chuckle		22						22
cough		20						20
gasp		38			1			39
gulp		4						4
jerk	1	7						8
jump	1	10						11
laugh	8	241				1		250
shrug		95						95
shudder		26						26
sigh	3	146						149
smile	8	420	2		3	5	2	440
snort		31						31
sob		6						6
start		23		1	1			25
wave	1	24	1	1		3		30
wink	2	14			1			17
Total 1A	24	1127	3	2	6	9	2	1173
bellow		7						7
cry	2	63			1			66
groan	1	21				1		23
grunt	1	30						31
moan		15						15
scream		25						25
shriek		10						10
squeak		4						4
Total 1B	4	175	0	0	1	1	0	181
Total	28	1302	3	2	7	10	2	1354

Stojanovska-Ilievska, 2022). This contrast is illustrated in examples (8a) and (8b). In the example illustrating the intransitive pattern (8a) the sentence focus is on non-verbal content (*anxiously*), while in (8b) the sentence focus is on verbal content, profiled in the zero-derived noun *gasp*.

(8) a. *'It won't!' Maggie gasped anxiously.'* (HGK, 3229-3230)
b. *Suddenly Angela, who was gazing at the red mack her mummy was holding out to her, gave a gasp*. (B0B, 2555)

To sum up, the LVCs from this family are clearly associated with the simple past tense and the active voice. The marked predominance of singular (and hence quantized) nouns within these LVCs contributes to their telic interpretation and the establishment of a telic-atelic opposition with their corresponding full verb, as a major motivation for their use. The occurrence of these LVCs in the past tense indicates that the end-point in these telic eventuality descriptions has been reached. The focus on verbal content in these LVCs provides another motivation for their use, since it is not always readily available in the intransitive sentence pattern.

4.2 Family 2: LVCs denoting physical interaction

Family 2 basically deals with LVCs that involve someone performing a physical action upon another person/ object. In these constructions Newman (1996) perceives a figurative extension in which the meaning of *give* is reduced to schematic interaction between participants and the character of that interaction is defined by the noun within the structure of the LVCs. Within the 'physical interaction' family, three subfamilies were differentiated, adopting and partly modifying Levin's (1993) verb classes, understood as semantically relatively unified sets of verbs that exhibit similar patterns in diathesis alternations and other characteristics. These are illustrated in examples (9a) through (9c).

(9) a. *Myles Burke gave a final wipe to the brass knocker, the letter-box and doorknob* […] (B1X, 1012)
b. *Elizabeth gave him a push, which almost toppled him to the ground*! (C98, 1342)
c. […] *he gave her a big cuddle*. (CGT, 923)

In Subfamily 2A the physical action concerns maintaining the hygiene of something/someone, as in (9a). It is based on verbs from the subclass of 'wipe verbs' within the 'verbs of removing' class, so relevant LVCs include: *give sb/ sth a rub/ scrub/ squeeze/ sweep/ wash/ wipe*, while a convenient paraphrase is: 'the subject referent removes something from something/someone in a manner specified by the NP-internal noun'. In Subfamily 2B the physical action involves applying force (of variable degrees) upon someone/something, as in (9b). It is based on the (sub)classes of verbs of contact by impact, verbs of surface contact, verbs of exerting force and verbs of throwing, among which there is certain overlap and cross-listing. This

subfamily is exemplified by the LVCs *give sb/ sth a kick/ nudge/ push/ scratch/ shake/ shove/ slap* and it can be paraphrased by 'the subject referent applies force to someone/something in a manner specified by the NP-internal noun'. Finally, in Subfamily 2C the physical action involves the expression of tenderness or love for someone, as in (9c). It centers around the 'marry verbs' subclass from the class of verbs of social interaction, so pertinent LVCs include *give sb a hug/ kiss/ cuddle*. A common paraphrase for these LVCs would be: 'the subject referent expresses affection through physical contact with someone/something in a manner specified by the NP-internal noun'. The LVCs from Subfamily 2C typically indicate a unidirectional transfer, unlike their full verb counterparts (*to hug, to kiss, to cuddle*), which are also legitimately used to express a bidirectional (reciprocal) transfer.

In terms of the intentionality of the action, the external argument of these LVCs is almost exclusively limited to people acting intentionally, of their own free will. Regarding the transfer of energy from the first to the second participant, which is typical for almost all LVCs in this family, it developed based on the concept of transfer of a material object in the literal *give*, only in these LVCs it is not a specific object that is transferred, but energy. The recipients of that energy are non-prototypical recipients because, to a greater or lesser extent, they are affected by the action denoted by the LVC. In fact, both in examples (10a) and (10b) we are dealing with the same action (hugging), which is conceptualized in different ways in the constructions with the FV and the LV. In such situations, it is considered that the second human participant has the semantic role of a patient in both constructions, regardless of whether it is realized in DO position, as in (10a) or in IO position, as in (10b) (Quirk et al., 1985, 753). Newman (1996) uses the term RECIPIENT for the second participant in the LVCs when he contrasts it with the GIVER, i.e. the first participant involved in the act of figurative energy transfer. However, when it comes to defining the semantic roles of these two participants, he considers the first protagonist to be an agent and the second one to be a patient.

This highlights the importance of information structure in the selection of either a LVC or a construction with a full verb as a vehicle for conveying one's ideas. LVCs tend to place the focus on the verbal content contained in the eventive noun by placing it in clause-final position, as is the case with *a brief hug* in (10b), assuming the familiarity and givenness of the recipient of the hug. In contrast, in the corresponding structures with full verbs the focus is on the patient in DO position, presuming it constitutes new information, as is the case with *Elaine* in (10a). In a LVC this same participant would be syntactically realized in the IO position, typical for a recipient, but would still be affected by the action of the verb, as in: *Francis gave Elaine a hug*.

(10) a. *Francis hugged Elaine* […]. (F9X, 3599)
b. […] *He gave her a brief hug, then turned towards the jeep*. (JXU, 919)

These LVCs are based on transitive verbs indicating some form of physical contact applied by the first participant onto the second one, such as *to kick, to kiss*, or *to wash*. The patient NP in DO position of these transitive verbs is almost invariably placed in IO position (which is typically reserved for the recipient) in the LVCs, before the nominalization in DO position (as in: *to kick someone* vs. *to give someone a kick*). This double object construction occurs in 296 instances (or 98.67%) out of 300 example sentences where the IO argument was overtly expressed (including statements in the active voice and imperatives). The double object construction is sometimes said to contribute to the perception of the recipient of the physical contact as affected (Newman, 1996, 206), the stronger effect on the IO argument being attributed to the greater proximity to the verb. Other authors do not acknowledge any differences in this regard between the double object construction and the *to* variant and assume that there are other factors that motivate the predominance of the double object construction. Namely, it is the tendency of the recipients (as animate participants) to be more familiar in the discourse than themes and hence to be often pronominalized (Rappaport Hovav and Levin, 2008, 157). In compliance with the principles of information structure, such participants are hardly ever placed in clause-final position, as it is reserved for new information (rheme), as in (11a). Although the recipient in an act of giving, in general, is animate (mostly human), in these LVCs the recipients of the physical contact can be either animate (as in: *to give the baby a wash*) or inanimate (as in: *to give the floor a sweep*). By virtue of their being at the receiving end in a giving act (albeit a figurative one), these inanimate entities are practically construed as animate. This might explain the prevalence of the double object construction not only for animate, but also for inanimate recipients. Apparently, they also often have the status of givenness and are hence pronominalized in these LVCs, just like animate recipients.

LVCs where the NP denoting the recipient of the physical contact is placed within a prepositional phrase (PP) with *to* (aka *to* variant or *to* template) are very rare with LVCs from the 'physical interaction' family: 4 instances (or 1.33%) out of 300 example sentences where the participant was overtly expressed (including statements in the active voice and imperatives). When they do occur, they are usually prompted by an IO that is realized by a longer NP, which therefore tends to be moved towards the end of the sentence based on the end-weight principle (Collins, 1995, 44), as is the case with *the niece who killed her* in (11b). Thus, it is information structure and NP heaviness that determine the selection of the preferred variant (double object or *to* variant), as semantically there are no differences between the two variants and they both entail successful transfer (Rappaport Hovav and Levin, 2008, 146, 156).

(11) a. *Her husband gave her a hug and hurried inside* […] (ARK, 761)
b. *A grieving mother wept over the body of her daughter, then gave a loving hug to the niece who killed her*. (CEN, 1091)

Having said that, one has to bear in mind that the patient (or the affected) semantic role is understood in a scalar fashion depending on the level of affectedness by the action of the verb, where degrees of affectedness are understood as "a hierarchy of monotonically weakening truth conditions about the result state of the theme on the scale" (Beavers, 2011b, 335). On the Affectedness hierarchy, which is based on several diagnostic tests (Change entailed of x, x takes result XP, *Happened/did to* x, φ is dynamic, and Result XP variation), the patients of verbs of surface contact/impact are considered less affected than those of verbs indicating degree achievements (or non-quantized change) since they do not imply change, but only involve potential for change (Beavers, 2011b, 358–359). Thus, the participant in IO position is more affected in *give someone a push/shove*, than the one in *give someone a wash/kick/punch/rub*, etc. Applying the same reasoning to LVCs where the argument in IO position is an object rather than a human being, the patient in *give the car a push* would be considered more affected than the one in *give the table a wipe*.

As is shown in Table 3, the LVCs from this family occur in the passive voice very rarely. This means that, just like the LVCs from Family 1, the LVCs from this family also resist passivization by advancing the NP in DO position in the active sentence to the subject position in the passive sentence. This is shown in examples (12a) and (12b), indicating that the eventive nouns within these LVCs do not have the status of arguments. This points to a close connection between the LV and the eventive noun, and is indicative of its integration within the LVCs.

(12) a. *When I got home with it, I gave it a wash, and tried it out almost immediately*. (EFH, 187)
b. *[…] *a wash was given to it*, […]

In contrast, there are scarce examples of passivization in which the argument from IO position is advanced to S position, as is the case with *one distressed victim* in (13). This was observed in 2.58% of all examples. The possibility for passivization only by advancing the argument in IO position (also called 'outer passive' in Brinton, 2011, 566) testifies to the greater syntactic and semantic unity of the LV with the eventive noun, because in that way the constituent elements of the LVC are not separated (Brinton, 2011, 565–566).

(13) […] *one distressed victim is given a reassuring hug from a concerned friend*. (CBF, 6088)

Tab. 3: Distribution of the LVCs from Family 2 across the verbal categories of tense, aspect and voice. The numbers for Progressive and Perfect are summarized for the three tenses: Past, Present, and Future in the active voice.

	Active							
	Present	**Past**	**Future**	**Prog.**	**Perfect**	**Imp.**	**Passive**	**Total**
rub	1	1			1	3		6
scrub						2		2
squeeze	1	6						7
sweep	1						1	2
wash		1	3	1	1	1	1	8
wipe		1				1		2
Total 2A	3	9	3	1	2	7	2	27
kick	4	14	2	1	2	1		24
nudge	1	4						5
push	2	26	4	2	2	4	3	43
scratch		2						2
shake	1	21	1		1	7		31
shove	4	12			1			17
slap		9	2					11
Total 2B	12	88	9	3	6	12	3	133
cuddle	2	4			2	10	1	19
hug	2	30		1	1	8	2	44
kiss	8	35	5		1	38		87
Total 2C	12	69	5	1	4	56	3	150
Total	27	166	17	5	12	75	8	310

Among all the LVCs in the active voice, the simple past is the prevalent tense (73.13%), but other tenses have also been documented (see Table 3). Another study of LVCs with *give* has also demonstrated that they are primarily used in the past tense, suggesting that the syntactic and semantic characteristics of particular LVCs may be related to a specific inflected form of the verb (which in this case is *gave* to indicate past tense), rather than being spread across the lemma GIVE as a whole (Martínez Caro and Arús-Hita, 2020). The fact that LVCs occur preferentially with the simple past tense suggests a connection with the concept of an inflectional island, meaning that certain syntactic and semantic properties of the verb could be said to reside in a specific inflected form (Newman and Rice, 2006).

Contrary to the typical, actualized use of these LVCs in the simple past tense to denote actions that took place in the past, as in (9a), (9b) and (9c), LVCs from this family can also be used in the simple present tense to express habituality. For ex-

ample, in (14), the act of people from Somalia hugging those who bring them food is depicted as a regular occurrence. This LVC illustrates a telic eventuality description owing to the quantized NP in DO position, but unlike the LVCs in the simple past, this LVC does not indicate that the end-point has been reached.

(14) *Some of them who can speak English come up to you and give you a hug and say, Thank-you, you give us life.* (K1C, 2417)

LVCs from this family generally do not express longer, continuous actions, but rather actions that are performed momentarily, or last a short time. Consequently, these LVCs occur in the progressive aspect in just 5 out of 227 examples in the active voice, amounting to 2.20%. Example (15) is one such case, where the present progressive is used for an action that is performed at the moment of speaking. The prevalence of the perfect aspect is 5.29%

(15) *I am not hurting you. I am giving you a wash*. (KDE, 2330-2331)

Table 4 demonstrates that, regarding the categories of definiteness and number, in the vast majority of examples (94.19%) the nominal part is realized with an indefinite noun in the singular, as is the case with examples (9a)–(9c). In the BNC there were hardly any examples where the NP within the LVCs was realized as a definite noun in singular (1.94%), as in (16a) or an indefinite plural noun (3.87%), as in (16b). There were no examples of definite plural nouns within these LVCs.

(16) a. *And he gave her the kiss she was waiting for* […]. (JY0, 6419)
b. *She made me coffee, gave me hugs* […]. (G0A, 1605)

The change of possession indicated by literal *give* is non-incremental, as it does not progress in successive stages, but operates on a binary scale, shifting from the recipient's not possessing something to their actual coming into in possession of it, both in the double object construction and in the *to* variant (Beavers, 2011a, 26). Being a non-incremental verb in which a complete change of possession is lexicalized, *give* falls within the achievement aspectual subclass of verbs and always has a telic interpretation with quantized themes and overt recipients (Rappaport Hovav and Levin, 2008, 149; Beavers, 2011a, 20). The actual overt realization of the recipient contributes to the demarcation of the result state. This is demonstrated in (17a) as after the completion of the giving act, it is not Carrie, but Mike who has possession of the watch. The inference of a successful transfer is indefeasible with literal *give* (Beavers and Koontz-Garboden, 2020, 115), as shown in (17b). Such is the inference of a successful transfer with light *give* as well. Although in the LVCs from this family light *give* does not instantiate a change of possession as such, the IO referent receives some form of physical contact from the subject referent nonetheless, as in

Tab. 4: Distribution of NPs within the LVCs from Family 2 across the nominal categories of definiteness and number.

	indefinite singular NP	definite singular NP	indefinite plural NP	definite plural NP	Total
rub	5		1		6
scrub	2				2
squeeze	7				7
sweep	2				2
wash	8				8
wipe	2				2
Total Subfamily 2A	26	0	1	0	27
kick	22	2			24
nudge	5				5
push	41	2			43
scratch	1		1		2
shake	31				31
shove	17				17
slap	11				11
Total Subfamily 2B	128	4	1	0	133
cuddle	17		2		19
hug	42		2		44
kiss	79	2	6		87
Total Subfamily 2C	138	2	10	0	150
Total Family 2	292	6	12	0	310

(17c). Even if Dot was reluctant to receive the hug from Gloria, yet from (17c) it is indisputable that Gloria wrapped her arms around Dot, thereby establishing unilateral physical contact with Dot. This can be interpreted as a successful (figurative) transfer of energy from Gloria, as an energy source, to Dot, as an energy sink (Langacker, 1991, 292–293; Newman, 1996, 49, 204). The successfully completed transfer is irrefutable, as shown in (17d).

(17) a. *Carrie gave Mike a watch as a Christmas present*. (EF1, 1803)
b. *#Carrie gave Mike a watch as a Christmas present, but he didn't receive it*.
c. *Gloria gave Dot a hug* [...]. (AC5, 6)
d. *#Gloria gave Dot a hug, but Dot didn't receive it*.

The use of the literal *give* with frame adverbials like *in five minutes* is felicitous, but since *give* indicates a simple transition which is completed instantaneously, its

combination with such adverbials does not indicate that an event was completed within the given time frame, but that it took place after the specified interval elapsed (Dowty, 1979; Jackendoff, 1996; Rappaport Hovav and Levin, 2008; Rappaport Hovav, 2008). On the other hand, combinations of *give* with durative adverbials like *for five minutes* are infelicitous by virtue of the fact that the act of giving is momentary by default, as is shown in (18a). Example (18b) demonstrates that the same reasoning obtains with LVCs with *give*. Namely, (18b) means that it took Gloria five minutes to decide to give Dot a hug. Should we substitute the LVC *give a hug* with the corresponding full verb *hug* in the same sentence, as in (18c), we would see that the event of hugging could be understood as taking full five minutes (with the adverbial *for five minutes*), or it could be interpreted as occurring after the five-minute interval has passed (with the adverbial *in five minutes*), the latter being exactly the same interpretation as the one of the LVC in (18b).

(18) a. *Carrie gave Mike a watch as a Christmas present in five minutes/ *for five minutes*.
b. *Gloria gave Dot a hug in five minutes/ *for five minutes*.
c. *Gloria hugged Dot in five minutes/ for five minutes*.

Verbs in which a non-incremental change is lexicalized, such as *give*, are inherently telic and their use in the simple past tense entails that the end-point of the predicate has been reached (Rappaport Hovav and Levin, 2008, 151; Rappaport Hovav, 2008, 28). For example, *Carrie gave Mike a watch* entails that Mike received a watch. The same applies to LVCs with *give* too, as *Gloria gave Dot a hug* entails that Dot was hugged. In addition, the uses both of literal and of light *give* in the progressive aspect would give rise to the imperfective paradox (Rothstein, 2008, 48): *Carrie was giving Mike a watch* does not entail that Carrie gave Mike a watch and *Gloria was giving Dot a hug* does not entail that Gloria gave Dot a hug. This again is indicative of telicity.

However, the FV *hug* being a semelfactive (which is considered a subclass of activity verbs), has two distinct valid interpretations depending on the context. Namely, *Gloria hugged Dot in five minutes* or *Gloria hugged Dot once* would entail that Dot was hugged by Gloria, the telic interpretation stemming from the use of *hug* as a semelfactive verb, indicating the completion of a single, atomic, minimal event of hugging. However, the addition of the duration adverbial *for five minutes* in *Gloria hugged Dot for five minutes* would induce an activity reading (involving multiple iterations of the single event), thus lending the predicate an atelic interpretation (Rothstein, 2008, 49), because activities do not have an end-point and are by their nature unbounded without the inclusion of some indicators of measure or direction. The telic-atelic dichotomy in the interpretation can also be verified by the application of the progressive test: on a semelfactive, 'single occurrence' reading,

Gloria was hugging Dot does not entail that Gloria hugged Dot because she might have been interrupted midway. In contrast, on the activity (or iterative) reading, *Gloria was hugging Dot* does entail that Gloria hugged Dot, provided that the event of hugging included at least one minimal interval.

Unlike full verbs, such as *hug* above, which are ambiguous between a telic or an atelic interpretation without linguistic or extra-linguistic cues, the LVCs with *give* from Family 2 generally license telic interpretations, except when non-quantized nouns (bare plural nouns) occur in DO position. The fact that such examples are scarce in family 2 (3.22%) renders their significance negligible. Thus, just like in Family 1, we observe an aspectual opposition between the LVCs with *give* (18b) and their corresponding full verbs (18c), the former yielding almost exclusively telic readings, while the latter licencing atelic interpretations as well.

In summary, observations relating to the aspectual profile of literal *give* were found to translate to light *give* as well, although in the LVCs from the 'physical interaction' family we are not dealing with an actual transfer of possession, but rather with an application of physical contact by the subject referent onto another entity, as a form of figurative transfer of energy. The strong preference for the NPs in DO position within these LVCs to be quantized as one (evident in their occurrence as singular nouns in 96.13% of all cases) coupled with the overt expression of the recipient of the physical contact, either in a double object construction or a *to*-template, in 99.34% of the sentences (statements in the active voice and imperatives) licenses the telic interpretation of these constructions. These findings, together with the fact that (73.13%) of the LVCs in the active voice were used in the simple past tense, suggest that speakers may be inclined to use LVCs with *give* as opposed to their corresponding full verbs when they wish to clearly communicate that the end-point of an event was reached at some point prior to the moment of speaking. Passivization was uncommon, and was exclusively realized though the promotion of the IO argument to S position. Information structure and the heaviness of the NP denoting the recipient of the physical contact were found to be relevant factors determining the order of constituents within the sentence. Information structure considerations prove also relevant when choosing either a LVC or a construction with a full verb as a vehicle for conveying one's ideas.

5 Conclusion

This corpus-based study provides a semantic classification of LVCs with *give* into families and examines their morphosyntactic characteristics by exploring their structural complexities at sentence and phrase level. It also analyzes the semantic

and discourse-related differences between these LVCs and their full verb equivalents. More specifically, this paper sought to address two research questions and consequently tested two hypotheses. The findings corroborated these hypotheses. By examining examples from the BNC, it was revealed that each family of LVCs with *give* was indeed associated with a specific tense, aspect and voice. The study demonstrated that there exist considerable similarities between the two analysed families of LVCs in terms of their resistance to passivization and their preference for the past simple tense. In addition, the findings suggest that an aspectual opposition can be established between the full verbs and the corresponding LVCs, such that the LVCs with a quantized, singular noun within their structure are perceived to indicate telicity, while the corresponding full verbs allow atelic interpretations. All these findings collectively indicate that LVCs, unlike their full verb counterparts, provide speakers with the means to unambiguously express that the end-point of a past event has been reached, with the understanding that it will be interpreted as completed. Seeking additional evidence for factors that could potentially motivate the choice of either LVCs of full verbs, it was shown that information structure considerations could also determine the selection of one structure over the other. It was also made clear that the choice of the light verb *giv*e in these LVCs is not arbitrary, but strongly motivated.

In this study three LVC families were identified (bodily actions, physical interaction and verbal interaction) based on Newman's (1996) research into the most common figurative extensions of *give*. This paper focuses only on the first two families due to space limitations. The LVCs from Family 1 indicate movement of parts of the body and production of sounds. The LVCs from Family 2 make possible a different conceptualization of the actions portrayed by their corresponding FVs. These two families demonstrate some obvious parallels to the prototypical *give*, even though there are some discernible differences as well. The LVCs from Family 1 tend to lack an obvious correspondent for the recipient in the giving act, while the LVCs from Family 2 are vaguely reminiscent of the transfer between the participants evident in the prototypical *give*. Hence the LVCs from the 'bodily actions' family are primarily realized in a monotransitive pattern, while the LVCs from the 'physical interaction' family are almost exclusively realized in a ditransitive pattern. Within these two families denoting bodily actions and physical interaction, several subfamilies were differentiated based on their semantic properties. In practice, the boundaries between the individual (sub)families were not always so clear-cut, as was the case when some LVCs from Family 1 (typically denoting involuntary emission of sounds or performance of bodily actions) were used to denote deliberate acts of non-verbal communication and it is Family 3 that revolves around interpersonal communication.

Looking ahead, a similar analysis of the third family of LVCs with *give* would make a valuable contribution to our overall understanding of these constructions, by allowing us to view the findings from this study from a new, broader perspective. Another area worth exploring is the distribution of LVCs with *give* across different text types in online corpora, which could reveal patterns in usage frequency and stylistic preferences associated with specific genres. By complementing this one, such studies would offer new insights into this issue and would deepen our understanding of the diversity and complexity of LVCs in general.

Bibliography

Algeo, John. 2006. *British or American English: A Handbook of Word and Grammar Patterns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allerton, David. 2002. *Streched verb constructions in English*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203167649.

Beavers, John. 2011a. An aspectual analysis of ditransitive verbs of caused possession in English. *Journal of Semantics* 28. 1–54.

Beavers, John. 2011b. On affectedness. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29. 335–370. 10.1093/jos/ffq014.

Beavers, John and Andrew Koontz-Garboden. 2020. *The Roots of Verbal Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198855781.001.0001.

Benson, Morton, Evelyn Benson and Robert Ilson. 2010. *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English: Your Guide to Collocations and Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins 3rd edn.

Borik, Olga. 2006. *Aspect and Reference Time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199291298.001.0001.

Brinton, Laurel J. 1996. Attitudes toward Increasing Segmentalization: Complex and Phrasal Verbs in English. *Journal of English Linguistics* 24. 186–205. https://doi.org/10.1177/007542429602400304.

Brinton, Laurel J. 2011. The grammaticalization of complex predicates. In Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, 559–569. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199586783.013.0045.

Brugman, Claudia. 2001. Light verbs and polysemy. *Language Sciences* 23. 551–578.

Collins, Peter. 1995. The indirect object construction in English: an informational approach. *Linguistics* 33(1). 35–50. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1995.33.1.35.

Cowie, Anthony P. 1981. The treatment of collocations and idioms in learners' dictionaries. *Applied Linguistics* 2(3). 223–235.

Cowie, Anthony P. 1998. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crowther, Jonathan, Sheila Dignen and Lea Diana. 2002. *Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, Robert M. W. 2005. *A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dowty, David. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Filip, Hana. 1993. *Aspect, Situation types and Noun Phrase Semantics*. New York: Garland.

Filip, Hana. 2008. Events and maximalization: The case of telicity and perfectivity. In Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect*, 217–256. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fleischhauer, Jens. 2021. Light Verb Constructions and Their Families – A Corpus Study on German '*stehen unter*'-LVCs. In *"Proceedings of the 17th Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2021)*, 63–69. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics. 10.18653/v1/2021.mwe-1.8. https://aclanthology.org/2021.mwe-1.8, last access: 13/01/2025.

Fleischhauer, Jens and Thomas Gamerschlag. 2019. Deriving the meaning of light verb constructions – a frame account of German *stehen* 'stand'. In Constanze Juchem-Grundmann, Michael Pleyer and Monika Pleyer (eds.), *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association, vol. 7*, 137–156. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/gcla-2019-0009.

Gablasova, Dana, Vaclav Brezina and Tony McEnery. 2017. Collocations in Corpus-Based Language Learning Research: Identifying, Comparing, and Interpreting the Evidence. *Language Learning* 67(S1). 155–179. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12225.

Gradečak-Erdeljić, Tanja. 2004. Periphrasis in the coding of events. In Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Alina Kwiatkowska (eds.), *Imagery in Language. Festschrift in Honour of Professor Ronald W. Langacker*, 431–443. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Gradečak-Erdeljić, Tanja. 2009. Proces shematizacije engleskih laganih glagola. *Jezikoslovlje* 10(2). 95–131.

Granger, Sylviane and Magali Paquot. 2008. Disentangling the phraseological web. In Sylviane Granger and Fanny Meunier (eds.), *Phraseology. An interdisciplinary perspective*, 27–49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Herweg, Michael. 2014. Spatio-temporal modification and the determination of aspect: a phase-theoretical account. In Doris Gerland, Christian Horn, Anja Latrouite and Albert Ortmann (eds.), *Meaning and Grammar of Nouns and Verbs*, 185–222. Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press.

Hill, Jimmie and Michael Lewis. 1997. *LTP Dictionary of Selected Collocations*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hurford, James R. and Brendan Heasley. 2007. *Semantics: a coursebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1996. The proper treatment of measuring out, telicity, and perhaps even quantification in English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14. 305–354.

Jespersen, Otto. 1942. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles, Part VI, Morphology*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.

Kearns, Kate. 1988. *Light Verbs in English*. Doctoral dissertation: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Landman, Fred. 2008. 1066: On the differences between the tense-perspective-aspect systems of English and Dutch. In Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect*, 217–256. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Langacker, Ronald. 1991. *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Vol. 2.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Levin, Beth. 1993. *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Martínez Caro, Elena and Jorge Arús-Hita. 2020. *Give* as light verb. *Functions of Language* 27(3). 280–306. https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.16036.mar.

Nesselhauf, Nadja. 2005. *Collocations in a Learner Corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Newman, John. 1996. *Give: A cognitive linguistic study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110823714.

Newman, John and Sally Rice. 2006. Transitivity schemas of English EAT and DRINK in the BNC. In Stefan Th. Gries and Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds.), *Corpora in cognitive linguistics: Corpus-based approaches to syntax and lexis*, 225–260. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197709.225.

Pompei, Anna. 2023. How light is 'give' as a Light Verb? A case study on the actionality of Latin Light Verb Constructions (with some references to Romance languages). In Anna Pompei, Lunella Mereu and Valentina Piunno (eds.), *Light Verb Constructions as Complex Verbs*, 149–200. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110747997-006.

Poutsma, Hendrik. 1926. *A Grammar of Late Modern English, Part 2: The Parts of Speech*. Groningen: P. Noordhoff.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 2008. Lexicalized meaning and the internal structure of events. In Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect*, 13–42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka and Beth Levin. 2008. The English dative alternation: A case for verb sensitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 44. 129–167. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226707004975.

Rothstein, Susan. 2008. Telicity and atomicity. In Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspect*, 43–78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Shahrokny-Prehn, Arian and Silke Höche. 2011. Rising through the registers – A corpus-based account of the stylistic constraints on Light Verb Constructions. *Corpus* 10. 239–257. https://doi.org/10.4000/corpus.2110.

Sinclair, John. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stein, Gabriele. 1991. The Phrasal Verb Type 'to have a look' in Modern English. *IRAL* 29. 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1991.29.1.1.

Stojanovska-Ilievska, Natasha. 2022. Information packaging strategies serving the communicative needs of speakers. *Crossroads. A Journal of English Studies* 38. 5–17.

Topolińjska, Zuzanna. 2000. *Polish-Macedonian: Grammatical Confrontation 3. Studies in Morphosyntax*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts.

van Gelderen, Elly. 2017. *Syntax: An Introduction to Minimalism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.214.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1982. Why can you have a drink when you can't *have an eat? *Language* 58(4). 753–799. https://doi.org/10.2307/413956.