

## VALENCY AND COMBINATORIAL CAPACITY OF VERBS

ANATOLIJ M. MUKHIN

*Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Leningrad*

The last few decades have seen a concentration of linguists' attention in the study of sentence structure on the verb, especially its finite forms which are considered to be the structural centre of the sentence. On this basis there came into use and became widespread the notion of valency of the verb, whose interpretation is nevertheless a matter of some difficulty.

In this respect one cannot overlook the following fundamental considerations underlying the above-mentioned treatment of the verb as the structural centre of the sentence. First, verbs in their finite and non-finite forms do not constitute syntactic units produced during the analysis of sentences on the basis of their intrinsic syntactic relations. Neither can nouns in their various forms nor adjectives be called syntactic units for the same reason. Second, not all the sentences in the English or Russian languages contain verbs which can be studied from the point of view of their valency. Third, in addition to their valency characteristics determined within the sentence, verbs also possess a purely lexical combinatorial capacity, which is usually registered in dictionaries and helps one to understand their meanings.

Of the three above considerations concerning the role of the verb in the sentence I shall limit myself in the present paper to the discussion of the last one which requires differentiation of the units of lexical and syntactic levels of the language showing lexical and syntactic semantics respectively. Comprehensive investigation of both units in their systemic relations with due regard for the possibility of their interaction is of major importance for the contrastive-comparative study of languages.

Combinatorial capacity as a distributional characteristic of verbs which reveals their lexical semantics is shown by the units of the same linguistic

level. Thus, we may speak of the capacity of verbal lexemes to combine with other lexical units, e.g. substantive lexemes, in which case their combinatorial capacity is brought about by form elements — prepositions — or without them.

It should also be noted that the study of combinatorial characteristics of verbal lexemes will inevitably lead us to recognize among them transitive verbs, on the one hand, which are determined by their ability for prepositional or non-prepositional government, and intransitive verbs, devoid of such ability, on the other. For example, English verbs *wait* 'to stay or rest in expectation' and *look* 'to try to find' are transitive (monotransitive, to be exact), and as such they show prepositional government by means of the preposition *for*: to wait for a chance, to wait for news, to look for a book, etc., while one more monotransitive verb *love* demonstrates non-prepositional government: to love one's parents, to love one's country, to love finance, etc. In Russian, the three above-mentioned verbs correspond to monotransitive verbs showing non-prepositional government of genitive and accusative cases respectively: ожидать случая, ожидать известий, искать книгу, любить родителей, любить родную страну, etc.

The fact that each transitive verb exhibits definite government makes it possible for a linguist to build up symbolic models such as those given below where the letter C designates a complement lexeme which in Russian is case-marked (genitive —  $C_g$  or accusative —  $C_a$ ), cf.:  $V_{tr}+for+C$  (to wait for a chance, to look for a book, etc.),  $V_{tr}+C$  (to love one's parents, etc.),  $V_{tr}+C_g$  (ожидать случая, etc.),  $V_{tr}+C_a$  (искать книгу, любить родителей, etc.).

The suggested interpretation of transitive verbs as based on government, prepositional or non-prepositional, is confirmed by lexicographic practice irrespective of the traditional understanding of transitivity adopted by dictionaries (namely, the occurrence of the accusative case of the governed noun in Russian or non-prepositional complements in English). Indeed, if a verb is really transitive, i.e. capable of government (either prepositional or non-prepositional), any more or less complete dictionary would tend to reflect its specific government. This means that dictionaries would, as a rule, indicate the preposition required by the transitive verb, or the case of a governed noun — genitive or accusative, dative or instrumental, as in Russian.

For intransitive verbs, on the contrary, no dictionary would point out any preposition characteristic of them, nor would a case-form of a noun or pronoun be indicated which goes with these verbs. This seems only natural since intransitive verbs are not capable of government, their lexical semantics not conditioning the use of a certain preposition or a case-form. Therefore it often becomes possible to differentiate transitive from intransitive verbs by experiments with replacement of a preposition or a noun case-form following the verb: in the case of government this procedure is not allowed (except where

a transitive verb shows variable government), while intransitive verbs usually permit a prepositional word-group to be replaced by similar combinations of words. Thus, the prepositional word group *on the table* following an intransitive verb in the sentence *The book is lying on the table* may be replaced by any other prepositional combination of the type *in the table, under the table, near the table, beside the table, above the table, etc.*<sup>1</sup> (cf. in Russian: Книга лежит на столе → ... под столом → ... возле стола → ... над столом, etc.). In the sentence with a transitive verb *This depends on you* the preposition *on*, however, resists replacement by any other preposition but *upon* (cf. also the impossibility of replacing the proposition and the pronoun in the corresponding Russian sentence: Это зависит от вас).

Differentiation of transitive verbs from intransitive which are not capable of government, is a major prerequisite for the study of the combinatorial capacity of the former ones, since their lexical semantics is rather completely revealed by combinations with the governed elements, i.e. complements, or complement lexemes (designated by the letter C in the symbolic models of government similar to those mentioned). It is on this basis, namely, taking into account both lexical semantics and the combinatorial capacity of transitive verbs having the same government, that the lexico-semantic groups of these verbs may be discerned.

Groups are also recognized among the verbs of the same government. Such is the case, for example, with two lexico-semantic groups which include the above English verbs having the same government ( $V_{tr}+for+C$ ). One of them is composed of monotransitive verbs with the meaning of expectation or hope (bargain, hope, look<sub>1</sub>, wait, watch), which combine with complements denoting abstract notions or natural phenomena: to bargain for a job, to bargain for rain, to hope for success, to hope for fine weather, to look for favour, to look for rain, to wait for a reply, to wait for a chance, to watch for a favourable opportunity, etc.

The second lexico-semantic group comprises monotransitive verbs having the meaning of search for sth, procuring for sth (angle, dap, dig, dive, fish, fumble, look<sub>2</sub>, mine, pickeer, prospect, sweep, etc.). Their combinatorial capacity is somewhat different since complement lexemes following them denote concrete inanimate objects or substances: to angle for trout, to dap for the fish, to dig for gold, to dive for pearls, to fish for fish, to fumble for a knob, to look for a book, to mine for coal, to pickeer for uranium, to prospect for gold, to sweep for mines, etc.

The verbs of the latter group may also be used figuratively in which case they would combine with lexemes denoting abstract notions and, sometimes, persons: to angle for honour, to angle for promotion, to angle for sb, to fish for information, to fish for compliments, etc. It is worth mentioning that a number of verbs constituting this lexico-semantic group (feel, grope, hunt,

nose, search, seek, quest), demonstrate prepositional government by means of not only the preposition *for* but *after* as well (variable prepositional government  $V_{tr} + \text{for/after} + C$ ). Hence, the difference between the above two groups of monotransitive verbs consists not only in their lexical semantics and combinatorial capacity but partly in their government.

Similarly, common lexical semantics and identical combinatorial capacity based on non-prepositional government ( $V_{tr} + C$ ) allow to isolate a lexico-semantic group which would include the third monotransitive English verb *love* mentioned above. This group is formed by verbs denoting feeling as directed at sb or sth (abhor, abominate, admire, adore, appreciate, apprehend, credit, detest, disdain, disfavour, dislike, disregard, disrelish, disrespect, distaste, dread, esteem, execrate, fancy, fear, hate, like, loath, love, etc.), which are characterized by their ability to combine with a great number of complement lexemes denoting objects and abstract notions as well as inanimate concrete objects: to adore a woman, to hate a person, to detest cats, to pity sb's failure, to respect sb's feelings, etc.

The combinatorial capacity which reveals peculiarity of lexical semantics of these verbs distinguishes this group from many other lexico-semantic groups of monotransitive verbs showing the same non-prepositional government. In Russian it corresponds to a group of verbs (far less in number) demonstrating non-prepositional government of accusative case ( $V_{tr} + C_a$ ): любить, ненавидеть, почитать, презирать, уважать, etc. Hence it follows that while comparing transitive verbs in different languages, Russian and English, for example, one should take into account their distribution over different lexico-semantic groups, i.e. their systemic relations. One of the major criteria for the isolation of such lexico-semantic groups is the combinatorial capacity of verbs determined on the basis of an appropriate type of government.

Systemic relations of transitive verbs imply at the same time their relationship to lexico-semantic groups of transitive lexemes of different parts of speech, transitive substantive lexemes in particular, which are also determined by their ability for government (prepositional in English). Thus, the above group of monotransitive verbs denoting feeling correlate in English and Russian with nouns of the same root which have identical lexical semantics and similar ability to combine with complements. These monotransitive nouns govern in English by the prepositions *for* or *of*, while in Russian the preposition *к* is followed by the dative case, cf.: admiration for beauty, adoration for a woman, hatred for a person, dislike for a boy, respect for sb's feelings, etc.; любить родину → любовь к родине, ненавидеть врага → ненависть к врагу, etc.

It is the systemic relation between groups of monotransitive lexemes of different parts of speech that enables a researcher to carry out experiments, e.g. substantivization procedure, to emphasize the inherent unity of the lexico-semantic group studied, as in: to admire beauty → admiration for beauty,

to adore a woman → adoration for a woman, etc.; любить родину → любовь к родине, ненавидеть врага → ненависть к врагу, etc. The substantivization procedure along with modelling techniques may often prove to be an effective experimental tool to distinguish the verbs of the given lexico-semantic group from those which however close they seem to the former ones by their meaning, should nevertheless be classified under different lexico-semantic groups.

Considering monotransitive verbs in connection with the combinatorial capacity of verbs one should not disregard the verbs with double government which display ability to combine with two complements ( $C^1, C^2$ ). For example, the ditransitive English verbs *exchange* 'to give something in return for something else' and *solicit* 'to ask somebody for something' show double (non-prepositional and prepositional) government  $V_a + C^1 + \text{for} + C^2$ . They nevertheless belong to two different lexico-semantic groups in accordance with their different lexical semantics and the ability to combine with complement lexemes. Thus, the first one enters a group of verbs with the meaning of the exchange of sth for sth (barter, change, exchange, substitute, swap, trade), while the second — a group with the meaning of a request to sb for sth (ask, beg, beseech, importune, pester, petition, solicit, sue).

The verbs of the first group usually combine with nouns denoting concrete inanimate objects or substances (both complements): to barter wheat for machinery, to change one thing for another, to exchange farm products for manufactured goods, to substitute one document for another, to substitute tea for coffee, to swap one's wrist watch for the radio, to trade knives for skins. The combinatorial capacity of the verbs of the second group having the same government is different in that the first complement denotes, as a rule, persons, while the second one — inanimate objects or abstract notions: to ask sb for a favour, to beg sb for food, to beseech sb for mercy, to importune sb for a loan, to pester sb for money, etc. The verbs of this group may also combine with infinitives (in place of the second complement with *for*): to beg sb to give permission, to beseech sb to do sth, to importune one's husband to give more money, to petition Parliament to redress grievances, etc.

The examples presented are significant enough to conclude that the ability of transitive verbs to combine with complement lexemes is a major factor to be taken into account while studying systemic relations of these verbs, i.e. their membership of certain lexico-semantic groups, which may or may not be correlated with lexico-semantic groups of transitive lexemes of different parts of speech, especially groups of substantival lexemes close to them in terms of their common lexical semantics and combinatorial capacity. Suchlike investigation of transitive verbs, as well as nouns, is carried out within lexical constructions — verbal or substantival phrases made up of lexemes. The peculiarity of verbal phrases as lexical constructions lies partly

in the fact that finite forms of verbs are not included into their structure. A finite form of the verb requires the subject to be mentioned while it shows up as its predicate, which is only possible within sentences made up of syntactic units, the subject and the predicate being among them.

Lexical constructions may also be formed by intransitive verbs which are characterized by their ability to combine with other lexemes though not exhibiting any type of government. Lexical semantics of transitive verbs often manifests itself fully enough in these verbal phrases, for example: to fly round a farm, to gallop across the field, to glide through the water, to prowl along a coast, to ramble over the country, to run about the streets, to travel round the world, to walk along the road, etc. The ability of intransitive verbs to combine with nouns of certain semantic classes testifies to the fact that they, as well as transitive verbs, may form lexico-semantic groups.

It is not unusual that the combinatorial capacity specific to intransitive verbs may only be determined in sentences, with the lexeme in the position of the subject taken into account. This is most clearly demonstrated by the comparison of correlative pairs of monotransitive and intransitive English verbs, such as *boil*<sub>1</sub> 'to heat to the boiling point, — *boil*<sub>2</sub> 'to bubble up', *burn*<sub>1</sub> 'to destroy by fire' — *burn*<sub>2</sub> 'to be on fire', *open*<sub>1</sub> 'to cause to be open' — *open*<sub>2</sub> 'to become open', *resume*<sub>1</sub> 'to continue after interruption' — *resume*<sub>2</sub> 'to proceed after interruption', *sell*<sub>1</sub> 'to offer for sale' — *sell*<sub>2</sub> 'to be sold'. Thus, while studying the first members of the above pairs (monotransitive verbs) it would suffice to consider verbal phrases only: to boil water, to burn a paper, to open a door, to resume a conference, to sell a book. On the contrary, investigation of the intransitive verbs (which often correspond to Russian reflexive verbs with -ся) would necessitate their analysis within sentences, as their characteristic ability to combine with nouns reveals itself on the basis of a predicative bond underlying sentence structure: The water boiled. The paper burnt. The door opened. The conference resumed. The book sells well.

It should also be mentioned that the study of the combinatorial capacity of some transitive verbs may also be carried out within sentences where their lexical semantics is revealed completely. It concerns, in particular, those monotransitive verbs in English which correlate by their meaning and combinatorial capacity with ditransitive verbs homonymous to them. For example, a monotransitive verb *rest*<sub>1</sub> 'to depend, to rely', demonstrates the ability to combine with the same nouns as its counterpart — a ditransitive verb *rest*<sub>2</sub> 'to base, to ground', but these nouns are used in the position of the subject in the first case and in a dependent position by the verb — in the second: *His arguments rested on trivialities* — *He rested his arguments on trivialities*, etc.

To sum up, the capacity of verbs to combine with other lexemes may be inferred from both lexical constructions — verbal phrases, and syntactic con-

structions — sentences, the latter using verbs with their combinatorial potentialities as their building blocks. As for the valency of verbs, it may only be determined in sentences, with respect to syntaxemes (as elementary syntactic units having syntactic semantics), which accompany verbs, their finite forms in particular.

To take an example, one may speak of the object valency of monotransitive or ditransitive verbs. It is found that the object syntaxemes are used differently in sentences with transitive verbs of different lexico-semantic groups. Thus, dissimilar use of the object syntaxemes in speech is demonstrated by the above monotransitive English verbs: those with the meaning of expectation or hope (*bargain*, *hope*, *look*<sub>1</sub>, *wait*, *watch*), on the one hand, and the meaning of search, procuring of sth (*angle*, *dap*, *dig*, *dive*, *fish*, *fumble*, *look*<sub>2</sub>, *mine*, *pickeer*, etc.), on the other. It also holds true for the above-mentioned ditransitive verbs having the meaning of exchange of sth for sth (*barter*, *change*, *exchange*, etc.) and request to sb for sth (*ask*, *beg*, *beseech*, *importune*, *pester*, *petition*, etc.). In some contexts one may not necessarily find an object syntaxeme, represented by a noun with the preposition *for* following the above monotransitive verbs, as in the examples: *I hadn't bargained for so much trouble*. *I hoped for better things*. *They were always pickeering for occasions of finding fault*.

The same applies to the use of object syntaxemes accompanying transitive verbs of different lexico-semantic groups in Russian and other languages. Comparison of the object valency of certain groups of monotransitive or ditransitive verbs in English, Russian and other languages may reveal some peculiarities of these languages pertaining to interaction of the units of lexical and syntactic levels of the language.

One may also study the indirect object valency of verbs (mainly ditransitive ones), for transitive verbs do not show uniformity as to the use of indirect object syntaxemes. In general, one may even conclude that the indirect object syntaxeme is absent with ditransitive verbs more often than the object syntaxeme though the verbs of certain lexico-semantic groups of ditransitive verbs in English as well as in Russian can hardly be used without that syntaxeme. For example, certain differences in the use of indirect object syntaxemes may be found in the above groups of ditransitive verbs: on the one hand, verbs having the meaning of exchange of sth for sth, vs. those with the meaning of a request to sb for sth. The use of indirect object syntaxemes represented by combinations of nouns or pronouns with the preposition *for* accompanying ditransitive verbs can be amply demonstrated by the following sentences (which also contain an object syntaxeme): *He petitioned the House of Lords for a bill*. *He is always pestering me for something*.

While studying object and indirect object syntaxemes as elementary syntactic units which can only be determined in sentences on the basis of

syntactic bonds, one should take into account some of their specific features. First, the above syntaxemes may be represented both by individual lexemes and prepositional groups, which predetermine the existence of a wide range of variants of a certain object or indirect object syntaxeme. Thus, the object syntaxeme accompanying the above-mentioned monotransitive English verbs with the meaning of expectation and hope or search, the procuring of sth is represented by a combination of a noun (or a substantive — S) and preposition *for* (for S), which is merely one of all the possible variants of the given syntaxeme. The same object syntaxeme as used with the verbs of different lexico-semantic groups may have variants represented by combinations of nouns with some other prepositions (at S, by S, from S, of S, on S, etc.), or by a noun without prepositions (S), as is the case with monotransitive verbs having the meaning of feeling or emotional attitude (abhor, abominate, admire, adore, hate, like, love, etc.). The variants of this kind which are caused by the immediate lexical context of a syntaxeme are lexico-combinatorial variants of the syntaxeme. The ability to have variants of this kind is mostly characteristic of object and indirect object syntaxemes though some other syntaxemes may also have lexico-combinatorial variants.

Second, object syntaxemes in English, represented by nouns or pronouns with prepositions or without, are used both in dependent position (including not only that attached to the verb but to the noun and adjective as well) and the position of the subject. This constitutes an important difference between object syntaxemes and a great number of other syntaxemes which may also have variants represented by nouns with prepositions or without. For example, the following sentences contain the same object syntaxeme as used in the dependent position (for S variant) and in the position of the subject (detached variant S... for): We may hope *for rain*. *Rain* may be hoped *for*. Some other variants of the object syntaxeme represented by nouns with prepositions (at S — S... at, by S — S... by, from S — S... from, etc.) are used in a similar way, though it should be pointed out that the use of the object syntaxeme in the position of the subject is liable to greater restrictions than in the dependent position attached to the verb. In this case we are dealing with positional variants of the object syntaxeme which are highly characteristic of the English language.

In Russian it is also typical of object syntaxemes to have positional and lexico-combinatorial variants. But positional variants of object syntaxemes in Russian are only represented by case-forms of nouns and pronouns: accusative (without a preposition) and nominative. The following two sentences demonstrate the object syntaxeme as represented by the accusative case of the noun in the dependent position attached to the verb (S<sub>a</sub> variant) and by the nominative case in the position of the subject (S<sub>n</sub> variant): Мы пригласили соседей. Соседи были приглашены нами. It is the use of the same object

syntaxeme in different syntactic positions that enables a researcher to carry out experiments — transformations of passivization and de-passivization for the study of object syntaxemes both in Russian (Мы пригласили соседей ↔ Соседи были приглашены нами) and in English (We may hope for rain ↔ Rain may be hoped for). It should be noted in this connection that the comparative study of positional and other types of variants of object syntaxemes in English and Russian makes it possible to reveal substantial differences between the two languages.

Third, both object and indirect object syntaxemes represented by nouns with or without prepositions pose the problem of lexical realization of their different variants. In this respect as well, the syntaxemes under consideration differ greatly from any other syntaxemes represented by nouns with prepositions or without. The specific feature of object and indirect object syntaxemes lies in the fact that their different positional and lexico-combinatorial variants are realized by those complementary lexemes which are taken into account while establishing lexico-semantic groups of transitive verbs (see above). This testifies to the most intimate relation of object and indirect object syntaxemes with monotransitive and ditransitive verbs forming lexico-semantic groups on the basis of the appropriate type of government. Therefore, transitivity in general may be defined as the ability of verbs (as well as other lexemes) to exhibit any type of government and to be accompanied in sentences by object or indirect object syntaxemes. It means that transitivity is a lexico-syntactic property of verbs.

Now, let's turn back to the notion of valency as a syntactic property of verbs which manifests itself in the sentence in reference to elementary syntactic units exhibiting syntactic semantics. Among these there are recognized not only object and indirect object syntaxemes, but also many others represented by nouns with prepositions or without or by some other morphological means. However, unlike object and indirect object syntaxemes, other kinds of syntaxemes may accompany both transitive and intransitive verbs.

It is the case, for example, with causal syntaxemes having different variants which show preferable use with certain verbs while limited use or no use at all with others. Thus, a causal syntaxeme represented by the combination of a noun with the preposition *for* (for S variant) in English, or by the accusative case of a noun with the preposition *за* in Russian (за S<sub>a</sub> variant) may often be found with different monotransitive verbs: those with the meaning of blame or reproach (blame, censure, chide, condemn, defame, denounce, indict, rate, rebuke, reproach, reprove, reprimand, revile, upbraid; бранить, журить, корить, осуждать, отчитывать, поносить, порицать, порочить, разносить, etc.), or the meaning of punishment of sb (arrest, fine, punish, etc.), or praise (commend, praise, etc.), as well as the above monotransitive verbs

with the meaning of feeling or emotional attitude (admire, adore, dislike, hate, etc.). Combinations of nouns with the preposition *for* representing as they do any causal syntaxeme may also be used with intransitive verbs (suffer, tremble, etc.), a number of adjectives (angry, glad, wild, etc.), and nouns: He trembled for his wife and children. He suffered for his faults. He was angry with himself for his weakness.

So, while studying the possible use of causal syntaxemes with the above transitive and intransitive verbs or nouns, or adjectives, we in fact determine the causal valency of all those lexemes belonging to certain lexicosemantic groups. Of special importance here is the fact that the given verbal lexemes, as well as lexemes of other parts of speech are usually accompanied by the same variant of the causal syntaxeme, namely that represented by the combination of a noun with the preposition *for* (for S).

It may be noted, however, that causal syntaxemes (both in English and in Russian) may be represented by different prepositional combinations. One of them is a combination with the preposition *because of* which is a most demonstrative and widespread indicator of causal semantics. Therefore, in order to prove a syntactico-semantic feature of causality in case of the prepositional combination with *for* it is possible to replace the combination under the study by the combination of the same noun with the preposition *because of*: He was angry with himself for his weakness → He was angry with himself because of his weakness, etc. Sometimes, the same may be achieved by the substitution of the given prepositional variant of the causal syntaxeme for a clause with the conjunction *because*: He was angry with himself for his weakness → He was angry with himself because he was weak, etc.

A similar use of a noun with the preposition *for* is observed with monotransitive verbs with the meaning of looking through, combing sth (comb, consult, hunt, rake, rummage, scan, scour, search), e.g.: The police have combed the city for the murderer. They scoured the country for the lost child. In this case, however, the prepositional group represents a different syntaxeme, the final one (showing purpose), and consequently, the verbs exhibit the final valency. The experiments with the replacement of the prepositional group (for S) by the infinitive group where the infinitive is also a final syntaxeme (a final syntaxeme of process, to be exact, in contrast to the final syntaxeme of substance under study), enable one to prove the syntactico-semantic feature of finality: The police have combed the city for the murderer → The police have combed the city to find the murderer; They scoured the country for the lost child → They scoured the country to find the lost child.

A rather peculiar valency is shown by a great number of transitive verbs meaning 'snatch, seize, grasp' or 'hold' (capture, catch, clutch, get, grab, grasp, grip, have, hold, pin, seize, take, wring), 'lead, haul, draw' (bring, drag, pluck, pull, twitch), 'lift' (lift, pick up, raise), etc. These verbs are used with

an object syntaxeme expressed by a noun or pronoun without a preposition, and a syntaxeme, represented by the combination of a noun with the preposition *by*, as in the following sentences: His mother clutched him by the shoulder. I can't drag her back by the hair. I got him by the front of his shirt. She grasped me firmly by the arm. The combinations of a noun and the preposition *by* in these sentences represent one of mediative syntaxemes (or syntaxemes of means), which seems to be complicated by the semantics of manner. Hence we may conclude that the verbs under consideration exhibit both object and mediative valency.

As follows from the above, the study of verbal valency has a direct bearing on the problem of differentiation between transitive and intransitive as well as monotransitive and ditransitive verbs. By stating that the valency of a verb in the sentence is an objective one we in fact classify the verb as transitive. But the object valency is characteristic of both monotransitive and ditransitive verbs. The latter may require an indirect object syntaxeme beside an object syntaxeme to be used. However, the differentiation of an indirect object syntaxeme from other syntaxemes which happen to be represented by the same means (a prepositional group, for example) may sometimes offer certain difficulty. The above were just the cases where difficulty arises as to whether we are dealing in sentences with monotransitive or ditransitive verbs which may require an indirect object syntaxeme beside an object syntaxeme. In cases where the combinations of a noun with the prepositions *for* or *by* are considered to possess the syntactic semantics of finality (purpose) or mediativeness (means), as with the above verbs *comb* (The police have combed the city for the murderer) and *clutch* (His mother clutched him by the shoulder), there is no possible reason to believe them to be ditransitive.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that the combinatorial capacity and the valency of verbs are mutually complementary though the former is determined for lexemes, i.e. the units of the same level of language exhibiting lexical semantics, while the latter is the property of syntaxemes which are the units of syntactic level of language and, as such, possess syntactic semantics. In the study of the combinatorial capacity of verbal lexemes, a linguist may aim at determining a certain lexicosemantic group, whose members differ from other verbs by their lexical semantics and the ability to combine with other lexemes. The study of the valency of verbs, in its turn, will make it possible for a linguist to ascertain for which lexico-semantic groups a certain valency (causal, final or mediative, as in the above sentences) is more typical, or less typical, or not typical at all. Of great importance, therefore, for the lexical semantics of verbs may not only be their combinatorial capacity but their valency as well, reflecting as it does the interaction of lexical and syntactic units, i.e. lexemes and syntaxemes respectively.

As a result, dictionaries would often illustrate the meaning of verbs by

sentences and verbal word-groups which may help to conclude what valency is most characteristic of the verbs under consideration, either transitive or intransitive. Thus, the above-mentioned group of English monotransitive verbs with the meaning of blame or reproach (blame, chide, condemn, denounce, rate, etc.) is often supplied in the dictionaries with examples of their usage which testify to their strong causal valency (being as they are usually accompanied by causal syntaxemes, represented by the combination of a noun or a pronoun, or gerund with the preposition *for*), cf.: He cannot be blamed for it; She blamed herself for having committed an error; to chide a pupil for being lazy; to condemn a person for his conduct; to denounce smb for theft; to rate smb for doing smth, etc. Similarly, dictionaries would also reflect the valency typical of intransitive verbs, such as the causal or final considered above, or instrumental, locative, temporal or any other but objective and indirect objective valencies which are only characteristic of transitive verbs.

The study of the valency of verbs, as well as their combinatorial capacity does not exclude, but necessarily imply a similar study of the lexemes of various parts of speech, substantival and adjectival in particular, among which transitive and intransitive lexemes are also recognized. These lexemes are often used in English, Russian, and other languages in the position of the predicate (together with an auxiliary link verb or without it) in which case they play a role in sentences similar to that of verbs in their finite forms. Therefore, the verb cannot be considered the only organizing centre of the sentence, the more so that the verb itself is not a syntactic unit. Yet, the organizing role of the verb is obvious for a great number of sentences both in English and in Russian. This fact emphasizes the primary importance of the study of verbal valency, that should be carried out in connected texts by means of statistical analysis.

#### REFERENCE

Ilyish B. A. 1971. *The structure of Modern English*. Leningrad.