

**THE MINISTRY OF THE HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL  
EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN  
KARSHI STATE UNIVERSITY**

The right of manuscript

UDK 420:008

**Eshonqulov Azamat Sanjar o'g'li**

**Lexical and syntactic-semantic analyses of  
preposition “on**

Speciality: 5A120102

Linguistics ( English )

**DISSERTATION PAPER**

Dissertation for Master's Degree

The work has been discussed  
and recommended for defence

The Head of the department

PhD M. Daniyeva

“ \_\_\_\_\_ ” 2019

**Scientific advisor:**

Ass.Prof. R. Kiyamov

## Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter 1. General information about prepositions and lexical, syntactic and semantic features of verbs.....</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1. The position of prepositional constructions in the sentence in modern English.....	13
1.2. Lexical syntax and lexical semantics of the verbs .....	21
1.3. Lexical and syntactic-semantic constructions of verbs and their models .....	28
Overview on Chapter 1.....	39
<b>Chapter 2. Features of prepositional constructions and their lexical meanings in the context.....</b>	<b>40</b>
2.1. The role of prepositional constructions in the structure of context.....	41
2.2. The significance of prepositional construction “on” in shaping the lexical meaning of the sentence.....	51
2.3. Lexical and syntactic-semantic properties of preposition “on”.....	62
Overview on Chapter 2.....	66
<b>Chapter 3. Lexical and syntactic-semantic constructions with the help of preposition “on”.....</b>	<b>68</b>
3.1. Lexical and syntactic-semantic meanings of phrasal verbs with the preposition “on”.....	69
3.2. Verification of a polysemous Spatial Preposition “on”.....	73
3.3. Temporal syntactic-semantic constructions with preposition “on”.....	78
3.4. Locative syntactic-semantic constructions with preposition “on”.....	83
Overall conclusion.....	88
References.....	90

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years, in order to solidify the independence of our country and to improve the social and economic life of our motherland, our government has paid great attention in many spheres. Especially in the field of education, the latest changes are of high significance. From the early days of independence, Uzbekistan started collaboration with the community of the world in several spheres, as a result of which the field of education started blooming respectively. The First President of Uzbekistan I.A.Karimov stated as follows about the role of education in the development of the country: “When the matter goes to develop the country harmoniously, the development of scientific infrastructure is of great importance”<sup>1</sup>. Actually, one of the important issues that enables to widen our outlook towards world starts from acquiring a command of foreign languages. In this turn, the demand and suggestions in the area of linguistics are increasing tremendously day by day. The task of investigating the world languages by comparing with our native language and finding out the potential differences and similarities are one of the most important issues of modern linguists. Language serves as a bridge between nations which help to tie firm cultural, social and economic relations. In recent years, there is a huge demand and special attention in learning and teaching foreign languages in our country. Additionally, the First President of independent Uzbekistan I.A.Karimov didn't state in vain the following words: “Nowadays, great attention is being paid to learning and teaching foreign languages, there is no need to evaluate the huge significance of learning and teaching foreign languages perfectly for our nation, who is creating their own great future in collaboration with foreign countries in order to take a suitable place among world community”<sup>2</sup>. Nowadays, the utter need of having a command in foreign languages is increasing in many areas of our social and cultural life and among several age categories. Obtaining a excellent command of foreign languages stipulates a huge responsibility for

---

<sup>1</sup> Karimov I.A «Uzbekistan is in the threshold of 21st century: threat to safety, conditions of stability and assurance of development» Tashkent, Uzbekistan-1997. Page 326

<sup>2</sup> Karimov I.A from the speech delivered during the session #9 of Oliy Majlis “Sharq” Publishers house - 1998

linguists. Unfortunately, most of the scientific works done in the area of linguistics, namely the works comparing the English and Uzbek languages were investigated in Russian. That is why, the research works which are done in Uzbek are of high importance.

There will be no exaggeration to say that over the period of its independence, Uzbekistan reached the summit of success in every field. The attention that is being paid to the people of the country is tremendous. It is especially noteworthy to mention about the positive reforms that are being conducted in our independent Uzbekistan. To emphasize the role of culture and the intellectual potential of the people on their way to progress our First President I.A.Karimov said: “All of us should realize that on spiritual revival of the nation, preservation of traditions, development of culture and art, science and education depends on the situation in other spheres and how productive are reforms that we are conducting”<sup>3</sup>. The very case in the point can be seen in the system of education.

Every year a great number of presidential resolutions and special laws are adopted in order to further develop the system of education. The First President of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov didn't say in vain: “The new generation, educated, free from all vestiges of the past young people today is the decisive driving force for democratization, liberalization, update, and progress of the country”. These wise words imply that preparing an educated and intellectually advanced generation as an essential condition for sustainable development and modernization of the country is immensely vital. In this line, day by day educational infrastructure of Uzbekistan is improving rapidly. Moreover, as the continuation of positive reforms done by The First President of Uzbekistan I.A.Karimov, our current President of independent Uzbekistan Sh.M.Mirziyoyev several times reiterated to develop the quality of education. In this regard, Sh.M.Mirziyoyev noted as follows: “Nothing can develop a country as high as sports and education. High competence of our youth determines the bright future

---

<sup>3</sup> Karimov I.A. “Yuksak ma’naviyat – yengilmas kuch” T. 2008

of our country, in this turn the quality of education must be provided from the early stages of childhood. That is why the role of pre-school education is vital in developing the system of education”<sup>4</sup>. As it is stated above, the issue of teaching and learning foreign languages in early stages of children has been put forward and in this regard, several presidential resolutions have been adopted to further increase the quality of education which can compete with the standards of world education system. Such demands shouldered on the personnel who teach and investigate foreign languages increase the responsibility double-folded.

Rapid development of modern linguistics proved the fact that the language levels (lexics, morphology, syntactic, pragmatic linguistics and cognitive linguistics) should be investigated connectively with one another. This case leveled up the research works regarding the foreign languages. In this regard, in the research works following the verbal systems has created new aspects and concepts in investigating the lexical, syntactic-semantic features of languages. Such aspectual issues required special systematic orders and generalizations in the area of linguistics. Modern day linguistics mostly focuses on investigating issues on the level of pragmatic and cognitive aspects. Investigating the aspectual issues in several degrees of linguistics gives a proof that it is a wide and problematic side of the issue. When stating about the analysis of prepositions, it is obvious that the object of the research is done in the circle of verb, noun, noun phrase, semantics of text, time and many others.

It is clear to linguistics who deal with the semantics of prepositions that prepositions have been investigated under the degree of temporal semantics and syntactic, which covers all of the syntactic levels of the sentence. Even today such above-mentioned research works are still done, and the scope of such research works reached a new level, namely investigating in terms of cognitive-pragmatic aspects have recently become more common in researching prepositions. In the master’s dissertation paper, the prepositions and their

---

<sup>4</sup> Mirziyayev SH.M- during the speech delivered in the meeting with scholars, academics, and scientists 2017, August 4 Tashkent 2017

semantic meanings in the sentence and in the text have been highlighted based on the suggestions, namely semantic compositions such as grammar, lexics, syntactic and semantic concepts as well as cognitive features rendered by English linguists and scholars. In addition, as the basis of the research the classification of phrasal constructions and their role in expressions have been specially analyzed.

**Actuality of the research paper.** As it was mentioned above new methods, ways and aspects, such as psycholinguistics, lingua-culturology, cognitive linguistics and many others have emerged in investigating the modern linguistics. In spite of the fact that pragmatic and cognitive aspects were first analyzed in the lexical level of the language, nowadays they are being referred to the grammar structure, syntactic and semantic levels of language, as well. In this respect, the investigation of prepositions and phrasal constructions are directly connected with the investigation of temporal and locative aspects and even aspectual meanings as well as with the pragmatic aspects. When noting especially about the issues of pragmatic linguistics, connecting the investigation of the semantics of prepositions with cognitive aspects may open the brand new potencies of pragmatic method of investigating languages. It is widely clear that there are many linguistic scholars, like Oustin.J.L.(1962), Cerli.J.R.(1975), May J.L.(2001) Jackandof, Ray (2002) Pire Ch.(2000) as well as Uzbek linguists like Safarov Sh.(2008), Pardayev Z.(2013), Kiyomov R.(2009) Djamalova M (2017) who deal with pragmatic aspects. In this research paper, lexical, semantic-syntactic features of prepositions especially preposition “on” have been investigated in determining the locative and temporal semantics in the sentence.

**Theoretical significance of the research paper.** Many studies have been done to examine the use of prepositions by second language learners. However, the present study has focused on errors particularly in the use of prepositions of place, of time and of direction. Scholars have investigated the occurrence of students’ errors in the use of English prepositions and tested the relationship between the students’ achievement in the English language at school and their

achievement in the diagnostic test. The researcher found that the errors with spatial prepositions were more frequent than those with temporal prepositions. In this work, discursive and depictive meanings of temporal constructions are researched in the circle of defining the semantics of the verb. Additionally, aspectual semantics which is determined by verb and their types of temporal features have been investigated and they are all looked into one by one in separate order. It is clear that the semantics of temporality and temporal construction are the argumentative spot of linguistics. In the work, during defining the temporal groups, aspectual meanings have been appointed in the scope of a text and pragmatic features (Z.Verkul, 1978/Langacker, 1991). Such references towards the subject matter enable to identify the potency of complete combination of verbs in several languages and to understand the special deductions more profoundly.

**Tasks of research paper.** The main tasks of this research paper goes as follows:

- To determine the scope of meaning of prepositions in English and classify them into lexical, syntactic-semantic groups
- To identify the ways of syntactic-semantic and conceptual meanings of phrasal constructions with the help of compositional models
- To study grammatical features of prepositions in English and the similarities between the semantic meanings of lexical combinations
- To separate and classify the types of meanings of prepositions in English and basing on this to find out the effects on the semantics of the sentence
- To study the syntactic constructions of preposition “on” and creation of phrasal verbs and their effects on the semantics of the text
- To analyze phrasal verbs, emerged with the help of preposition “on” and the types of their meanings.

- To investigate the influence of preposition “on” upon the temporal and aspectual semantics and study the role of the verb in creating such meanings.

**Practical value of dissertation paper.** All of the information, such as conclusions and materials referred in this dissertation paper can be independently used as a source for those who deal with semantics, grammar, cognitive and pragmatic aspects of English, as well as it can come in handy in writing works related to cognitive investigations and in writing course, independent, creative, and qualification works of theoretical and practical grammar lessons.

**The aim of the research paper.** Key points of this Master’s Degree dissertation paper go as follows:

- To categorize the prepositions and phrasal constructions into semantic groups, and identify the scope of their meanings
- To create special compositions of expressions and translations of phrasal verbs and to analyze their meaning
- To define the lexical, semantic-syntactic degrees of preposition “on” in terms of temporality and locality.
- To find out and analyze the types of phrasal constructions of preposition “on”, which are made with the help of combining preposition “on” to several morphologic elements
- To highlight lexical, syntactic-semantic features of preposition “on” relying on the temporal, pragmatic and locative points and to research the similarities of the meanings which are connected with other types of simple word expressions.

**Scientific novelty of the research paper** can be distinguished in the following lines:

- Lexical, syntactic-semantic features of English prepositions and their diverse usages have been thoroughly investigated in this research paper.

- The semantics of preposition “on” in terms of temporal and locative aspects, as well as the influence of their meanings to the whole predicative part of the sentence have been proved.
- Special peculiarity of the research of English prepositions which are done covering the whole structure of a sentence and the important role of phrasal constructions have been once again reassured
- Semantic peculiarities of English preposition “on” and their role in the semantic meaning of the verbs have been defined.

**Object of the research paper.** Lexical, syntactic-semantic meanings of English preposition “on” and related phrasal constructions and the analysis of them are taken as the main object of the dissertation paper.

**Material of the research paper** provided in the research paper include English preposition “on” and its connection with the morphologic elements, such as noun, adjective and verb as well as the meanings of phrasal constructions originated from preposition “on” and more than thousand selected examples of sentences by famous English writers’ works.

**The method of the research paper** is chiefly based on the analysis of lexical, syntactic-semantic features of temporal and locative aspects of English preposition “on”. As the base of this research paper, the works supplied by famous Uzbek and English scholars such as Oustin.J.L(1962), Cerli.J.R(1975), May J.L(2001) Jackandof, Ray (2002) Pire Ch.(2000), Safarov Sh.(2008), Pardayev Z.(2013), Kiyomov R.(2009) and Djamalova M (2017) have also shared a great contribution to the emergence of the research paper.

**Outline of the research paper** consists of 90 pages, namely three chapters with overviews and the list of used literature. In the introduction part, there are discussed the aims, tasks, actuality, novelty, theoretical, practical value, general description of discussed issues and the ways of analysis.

In the first chapter which is subdivided into three divisions, there are discussed about the issues of prepositions and their expressive meanings and the reason of their wide usage, as well as lexical, syntactic-semantic features of

preposition “on” and their usage in grammar, lexical, and morphological areas of the English language.

In the second chapter, features of phrasal constructions and their meaning in the context have been theoretically discussed, and lexical, syntactic-semantic features of preposition “on” have been taken into special consideration. In addition, English prepositions and phrasal constructions have been classified into groups. In the next stage, preposition “on” has been thoroughly researched in terms of lexical, syntactic-semantic features and the connections between the lexical, syntactic-semantic meanings of prepositions have been highlighted.

In the third chapter, temporal, locative and other meanings have been discussed with the help of examples and their syntactic-semantic analysis. The results extracted from the research paper mostly focus on the impartial role of preposition “on” in the structure of sentence and their analysis according to modern models and methods of modern linguistics. In the conclusion part of the Master’s Degree, the overall views have been once more gathered.

## Chapter 1. **General information about prepositions and lexical, syntactic and semantic features of verbs**

The use of prepositions in the English language is one of the influential parts in organizing the structure of the sentence. Lexical, syntactic-semantic meanings of the prepositions, especially preposition “on” are discussed in this following chapter in terms of theoretical aspects. Furthermore, standpoints rendered by famous linguists and scholars supplement the theoretical part of every subdivision. This chapter reviews some basics in computational linguistics that are necessary to understand the thesis. The first section introduces the concept of semantic roles of the English verbs. Prepositions typically appear together with a complement as part of a prepositional phrase. Prepositions describe the relationship between the complement and another element of the sentence, usually a verb or noun phrase. The complement can be a noun phrase (at the beach) or V-ing phrase (in public spending).

Prepositions are a relatively small class of words, but they are among the most frequently occurring words in English. Three out of the ten most frequent English words are prepositions. Because of their frequency and their importance in expressing relationships between constituents, prepositions are an important building block for English syntax and semantics. Prepositions are highly ambiguous. One preposition can have different meanings in different contexts. Different meanings express different relationships between the prepositional phrase and the attached verb or noun phrase.

English prepositions, though a very small number compared with the vast number of nouns, adjectives and verbs which English has, represent an important and frequently used category in English. By definition, they are words that express relationship between two entities in a sentence: They indicate a relationship in space between one object and another, and/or a relationship in time between events, and a more abstract relationships (e.g. government). Previous studies of English prepositions have pointed out the difficulties of English prepositions use or usage for all non-native

speakers, and such difficulty does not come to an end even when learners achieve a high level of proficiency. In other words, learning to use English prepositions seem to be an on-going process as Jeng remarks.

The standard semantic description of English in has been traditionally understood as a matter of geometric configuration of the participants in the spatial relation. The landmark is conceived of as an area or volume, or as a three-dimensional entity, the topological relation of inclusion being emphasized. The landmark may also be understood as a medium configuration, in opposition to the geometric conception based upon the idea of container. Other authors pose a meaning based on the relative function of the participants, i.e. the control of the container over the contained entity. Finally, dynamic uses are acknowledged, but the nature of the motion expressed has not been described.

Our notion of conceptual schema - a gestalt configuration where some elements may be focused upon - refers to the central meaning from which other senses are derived. Our aim is to provide not just a list of uses, but a semantic structure that accounts for all the senses in terms of a radial network. The network extends through three conceptual regions that stand for topological, functional, and force-dynamic dimensions of the conceptualisation of the relationship. Three main imaginative procedures are described for meaning extension: First, shifts of the conceptual schema (rotation, profiling, semantic bleaching), second, partial sanction, which focuses on one or more dimensions (specialisation of meaning), and finally metaphorical mappings, which account for figurative meaning and idiomatic use.

## **1.1. The position of prepositional constructions in the sentence in modern English**

Prepositions are the subtlest and a set of small words that are of a closed class in English language. They express a relation between two entities, one being that represented by the prepositional complement, the other by another part of the sentence. The prepositional complement is characteristically a noun phrase, a nominal *wh*-clause, or a nominal –ing clause. For instance, *The book is on the table, Mary is not responsible for what she did, Dylan read the manual before installing the system.* Prepositions do not accept new words easily, but they have notoriously polysemous behaviours in sentences. They are difficult to learn as most of them have different functions and they do not have many rules to help in choosing the right prepositions in a particular context. They combine with other parts of speech to express new meanings, and they participate in idiomatic expressions. For instance, *He was angry at the weather and He was angry with me for failing to keep our appointment.* Sometimes, one preposition comes with the verb form, another with the adjective and still another with the noun form of the root word. For instance, *sympathize with someone, sympathy for someone and sympathetic to someone.*

The basic syntactic properties and semantic functions differ in many languages. In other languages, the prepositions occur after the complement (subject-object-verb). They are called postpositions. In English language, they are usually placed before a noun or a noun equivalent (subject-verb-object). Languages such as English, French, German, and numerous others are prepositional languages whereas Korean, Turkish, Finnish, and lots of others are postpositional languages. They often cause problems for second language learners as there are no one-to-one correspondences between English and the other languages. Besides, many prepositions have metaphorical and abstract meanings that a language learner finds difficult to learn. The task of choosing the right preposition is made even more difficult when the preposition is used together with a noun, a verb, or an adjective, especially since there are no

general rules by which a preposition is assigned. For instance, She relied on Max, similar to the other one, the author of the book – the prepositions on, to, and of are determined by rely, similar and author respectively. While learning, the various meanings and meaning extensions of prepositions are perhaps the greatest challenge. A pedagogical strategy is essential for students to pay attention to the co- occurrence, collocation, and discourse behavior of prepositions. According to Lindstromberg (1998) prepositions are traditionally classified into three categories: prepositions of place, of direction (or motion or movement) and of time. These prepositions pose a challenge to the learners as well as teachers of English because of the uniqueness of the problem involved.

The learners face difficulties in the proper usage of prepositions in sentences, and therefore, land in trouble. Besides that, each of these prepositions has various meanings and usages that make the learning process equally difficult. In English, many prepositions are used to describe both spatial and temporal relationships. Both spatial and temporal functions of prepositions may pose challenges on the part of the second language learners (Kemmerer, 2005). Lindstromberg (2010) states that spatial preposition is a physical thing located in relation to another. The meaning of each preposition is spatial to describe these meanings; the trajectory (TR) and the landmark (LM) are defined. For example, The ball is on the table. Here, the preposition on functions as a preposition of place. The phrase, *the ball* refers to a thing whose location the speaker wants to indicate. It refers to the subject of the preposition. The phrase, *the table* refers to another thing, the Landmark of the preposition. The preposition locates the Subject (the ball) in relation to the Landmark (the table). The category of spatial prepositions is broadly divided into two groups: prepositions of static location and prepositions of direction. When prepositions follow verbs, they become distinct whether they describe the location or direction. For example, the preposition at is used to represent a static location of an object in most cases, e.g. *John is waiting for his friend at the store*. There are cases in which at represents a direction or a destination, e.g. *The dog jumped at my face or we arrived at the*

*park*. While the number of spatial prepositions is small, the number and variety of spatial relationships denoted by them are many. This provides an insight into the problems and challenges of the inherent ambiguity and vagueness in the usage and understanding of spatial prepositions. (Quirk et al., 1972, p. 377) says that the temporal uses of prepositions frequently suggest metaphorical extensions from the sphere of place. In fact, prepositions of time are very regular and easy to understand as compared to prepositions of place. Many prepositions are very versatile, and a lot of research has gone into ways of identifying and organizing the polysemous meanings that a preposition can have. For the most part, however, studies have focused on the meanings of spatial and temporal prepositions (e.g. Boers and Demecheleer, 1998; Brugman 1981, 1984; Cooper 1998; Hawkins 1984; Herskovits 1981, 1986; Jackendoff 1990; Jackendoff & Landau 1993; Horberg 2006; Lakoff 1987; Langacker 1987; Leech 1969; Lindstromberg 1999; Miller & Johnson Laird 1976; Nam 1955; Talmy 1983; Tseng 2000; Tyler & Evans 2003; Vandeloise 1991).

Preposition is the first term necessary to define in the current study. For the simplicity of how prepositions are used for this study, I limit the definition and exclude distinctions such as free prepositions and bound prepositions. Biber et al. (1999) refers to prepositions as “links which introduce prepositional phrases”; “... a preposition can be regarded as a device which connects noun phrases with other structures” (p.74). I invented a sentence that includes a preposition to confirm how the descriptions above fit this study. The sentence, A summary is included in the text, presents a simple example for explanation. The preposition in connects the noun phrase the text to form the prepositional phrase in the text. This prepositional phrase shows the reader the location of where the subject a summary performs the action (or the verb) is included. Analysis of the uses of in and on as prepositions in this study will fully illustrate the ways in which prepositions function in authentic examples.

It is necessary to describe the role of the preposition further in terms of its functions and uses. A preposition and a complement (usually a noun phrase)

form a prepositional phrase. The underlined text in the following academic writing example from the Michigan Corpus of Upper-Level Student Papers shows the preposition *on* linked to the complement *page 10*, which is a noun phrase. “We gave each station the processing time shown in Table 4, on page 10” (keyword search of “on”) A noun phrase is not the only type of complement a preposition takes when forming a prepositional phrase; nominal clauses including *wh*-clauses and *ing*-clauses also comprise another complement type (Biber et al., 1999). To illustrate prepositional phrases with nominal clause complements, two more examples with the prepositional phrases underlined were pulled from MICUSP (2011). “Julia Thomas shines a light on what is missing in one attempt to create historic narrative” (keyword search of “in”). This sample presents the *wh*-clause *what is missing in one attempt to create historic narrative* complementing the preposition *on*. The *ing*-clause *choosing an elector* complements the preposition *in* in the next example. “Also, state districts must be roughly equal in population, thus further ensuring that each person has an equal part in choosing an elector” (MICUSP, 2011, keyword search of “in”). A third complement type to address is the adverb complement. The adverb complement *here* is underlined with the preposition in the following example from Biber et al. (1999). “So you’re sitting *in here* at the moment are you Stanley?” (p. 104). The last complement type attaches an entire prepositional phrase to a preposition. The following example from MICUSP (2011) shows the preposition *in* taking the prepositional phrase complement *about 1-4%*. Example: “Bipolar disorder (BD) occurs in about 1-4% of the population (Sachs, Huffman, & Stern, 2004).” (keyword search of “in”) These three complement types help distinguish how prepositions interact within prepositional phrases.

A preposition may also occur in isolation in another type of use. When a preposition lacks an adjacent complement or prepositional object, it is considered stranded. A stranded preposition is easily visible *in* a sentence that ends in a preposition; however, the location is relevant to the context. The

following example from Biber et al. (1999) highlights the stranded preposition in with underlined text. “What more could a child ask for” (p. 105). Although prepositions can connect with complements in three different ways, stranded prepositions are also present in academic writing.

The role of particle in prepositional constructions is the second term defined in this section. In order to define a particle, related terms must be identified to show why particle fits best for this study. Occurrences of the analyzed words in and on do not function only as prepositions. In and on appear in combinations of verbs and prepositions as well. Biber et al. (1999) addresses this alternative function by stating, “verb + preposition combinations such as confide in [and] rely on... are usually regarded as forming a multi-word unit and are called prepositional verbs” (p. 74). On the same page of the book, the authors add that prepositions can also be referred to as ‘particles’ when they are part of prepositional verbs. To clarify why the term particle is applied to the verb plus preposition combination, it is necessary to include related terminologies not directly relevant to this study. Four terms to address include the distinctions among phrasal verbs, prepositional verbs, phrasal-prepositional verbs, and other multi-word verb constructions. According to Biber et al. (1999), these four multi-word combinations function like single verbs. The authors present clear distinctions through individual examples and in how they identify each combination. Table 1.1, displays the kind of multi-word combination, the names for these combinations, and examples from Biber et al. (1999, pp. 403-406).

Table 1.1. Multi-Word Combinations of Lexical Verbs

Multi-word combination	Name of combination	Examples
verb + adverbial particle	phrasal verb	fall in; put on
verb + preposition	prepositional verb	use in; be based on

verb + particle + preposition	phrasal-prepositional verb	be laid out in; go on to
verb + noun phrase (+ preposition)	other multi-word verb	make a bet on
verb + prepositional phrase	other multi-word verb	bear in mind

Source: Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Table 1.1 categorizes the four types of combinations of lexical verbs where the words *in* and *on* can occur. The first combination is identified as a phrasal verb. Adding a verb to an adverbial particle yields a phrasal verb, according to Biber et al. (1999). The authors expand this definition by stating that adverbial particles like *in* and *on* usually help extend meanings. This is present in the examples, *fall in* and *put on*. For a complete understanding, the following sentence from the samples for this study includes the phrasal verb *put on*. “In this revised program, lots of effort was put on the preprocessor modification, such as structural assembly and mesh generator” (MICUSP, 2011, keyword search of "on"). The phrasal verb happened in the past tense in the example. Therefore, the underlined text *was put on* includes more than the base form of *put on*. Before I connect meaning to function of the phrasal verb in the example, another definition of the combination is mentioned. “A phrasal verb is a combination of a verb and one or more prepositions plus possible other words in addition. A key feature of a phrasal verb is that the whole combination of words should function as a lexical unit that has its own meaning” (Lindstromberg, 2010, p. 21). Lindstromberg’s (2010) definition confirms that the multi-word combination of *was put on* functions as a lexical unit meaning that the object of the action *the preprocessor modification* received much effort from the missing agent. Thus, the agent applied much effort to modifying the preprocessor. The second combination is listed as a prepositional verb.

Prepositional verbs attach a preposition to a verb, and passive verbs commonly occur in this construction (Biber et al. (1999)). The following example used in this study obtained from MICUSP (2011) illustrates the underlined prepositional verb *be based on* where the passive voice is present. “This decision is based on the discrepancy of the two reports” (keyword search of "on"). Biber et al. (1999) discuss how prepositional verbs occur more frequently in comparison to phrasal verbs. This is particularly evident in their findings from corpus research. Two separate tables display the frequency of prepositional verbs for academic register at 4,200 occurrences per 1 million words versus 800 occurrences per 1 million words for phrasal verbs.

The third combination connects the two previous forms together and is called a phrasal-prepositional verb. Phrasal-prepositional verbs combine a verb with an adverbial particle to a preposition (Biber et al., 1999). The next sentence presents an example from MICUSP (2011) where the phrasal-prepositional verb *be laid out* in is highlighted with underlined text. “They are laid out in a manner that allows for easy co-ordination and integration among the subsections within the same department” (keyword search of "in"). Phrasal-prepositional verbs infrequently occur based on the findings from Biber et al. (1999) that show only 50 occurrences per 1 million words for academic register. Both phrasal verbs and phrasal-prepositional verbs are rare in the academic register (Biber et al., 1999). The fourth categorization includes two main types listed as other multi-word combinations. One contains the sequence of a verb and a noun phrase with an optional preposition. This sequence is underlined in an academic example from Biber et al. (1999). “How can she make a bet on an unpublished author?” (p. 428). As the underlined text highlights, the preposition *on* is included in this example. Another main type of multi-word combination for this category connects a verb with a prepositional phrase. The following example from Biber et al. (1999) shows this combination with underlined text. “I also have to bear in mind the interests of my wife and family” (p. 427). Because the other multi-word combinations rarely occur in the academic register, the first three terms

(phrasal verbs, prepositional verbs, and phrasal-prepositional verbs) will be analyzed in greater detail in this study.

The last classification utilized in this study groups the remaining uses. This all-inclusive group does not define the specific parts of speech, because the first two classifications (preposition and particle) contain the majority of uses for *in* and *on*. Research has classified other uses into further categories such as *circumstance adverbials*. The adverbial in the following example from Biber et al. (1999) appears to imitate the function of a prepositional phrase, yet the researchers have classified the function as a circumstance adverbial. The academic example sentence, “Writers on style have differed a great deal in their understanding of the subject” (p. 763), highlights the phrase with underlined text. Due to the limited occurrences of other uses such as circumstance adverbials, the current study lacks further distinction beyond the inclusive name of other uses. One benefit from using a classification that groups all other uses together is that this study guides the reader to the two most common types of uses for the words *in* and *on*.

## 1.2. Lexical syntax and lexical semantics of the verbs

One of the most difficult aspect of the automated processing of human language is the phenomenon of polysemy, the ability for words to be used for different meanings in different contexts. Relatively recent studies, such as Pustejovsky (1995), have held the view that polysemy is a feature that enables creativity in linguistic acts, and that the meaning of words might be deduced by the application of generative mechanisms from their contexts, via processes refining semantical composition. Instead of thinking of all words denoting individual objects as sharing the same semantic types (of entities), advanced lexical semantics could class them along lexical sorts according to their contextual behaviour, and a process of type-checking could infer the correct meaning from any combination of predicate and object.

Lexical syntax and lexical semantics of the verbs are still investigated by linguists in terms of many aspects. The construction is intriguing because the verb and particle function autonomously in some respects (for example, the following both (1) and (2) allow the verb-particle combination to be separated, as in (1b) and (2b)), but in other respects have the linguistic properties of a single predicational domain (for example, (2) has an idiomatic meaning not predictable on the basis of its parts).

(1) a. They marched off the hangover.

b. They marched the hangover off.

(2) a. They let up the pressure.

b. They let the pressure up.

The syntactic properties of compositional examples like (1) and idiomatic ones like (2) are so similar that a unified syntactic representation is called for. McIntyre argues persuasively that putative differences come from such factors as the possibility of contrasting the particle, rather than from independently motivated syntactic differences). Unified accounts fall into two main camps—the ‘complex predicate’ analysis and the ‘small clause’ analysis. The complex predicate analysis takes (2a) as the paradigmatic with the possibility of

separation by syntactic processes (to account for (2b)). In (2), then, the pressure is the direct object of the complex verb *let up*, and by extension, in (1), the hangover must be the direct object of a complex verb *march off*. Because such constructions are productive and allow novel combinations, the complex predicate analysis is forced to assume that complex verbs can be constructed, either in the syntax or in the lexicon. Small clause accounts, on the other hand, take examples like (1b) as essential. Here, the relationship of the noun phrase to the verb preceding it is not that of direct object; instead, the hangover off is a predicational structure, a small clause. This captures the absence of any selectional relation between the verb and the noun phrase, and easily handles productive and compositional cases. The alternation between (1a) and (1b) is the result of movement. A small clause analysis generally treats examples of the sort (2) more or less as idioms—it is not unexpected that idiomatic expressions should be subject to the same constraints as compositional syntactic structures, when issues of referentiality and so on do not interfere. But the small clause analysis is often felt to be unsatisfactory for examples like (2), for example it leaves unexplained what the denotation of the putative small clause *the pressure up* would be. Our own proposal exploits recent developments in I-syntax to capture the positive aspects of both the small clause and the complex predicate accounts. As on the small clause account, the argument is merged with the particle before that substructure is merged with the verb, with no recourse being made to structured items in the lexicon, and no specifically lexical rules of structure building being posited. However, unlike the usual small clause account, we do not assume that the argument-plus-particle structure is truly clausal; instead, we assume that the verbal structure itself is complex, and that part of the verbal structure is crucially involved in the interpretation of the verb-particle construction. In the next section, we discuss the details of two prominent analyses of the construction in the literature, and use our critique of those analyses to underline the main challenges for any ultimately successful account. We then lay out the details of our own proposal showing how it avoids many of

the problems of the other two types of account and how it captures the unusual properties of the construction without construction-specific rules. Finally, we examine the example: the verb and the particle are adjacent, and the meaning is idiosyncratic, clearly stored in the lexicon. Such accounts typically envisage a lexical entry with two parts, inserted together into a syntactic tree, but implications of our proposal for other languages and for a maximally general theory of I-syntax.

In this account, the object main predicate is base generated as the complement of the particle within the small clause complement to verb. Den Dikken (1995) proposes that the predicate is ‘ergative,’ and hence cannot assign Case, forcing the main predicate to move to the ‘subject’ position of the small clause where it receives accusative case from the higher verb.

(3) Base Order: [Verb [Small Clause [ Predicate Main Predicate ]

(4) Shifted Order: [Verb [Small Clause Main Predicate [ Predicate] ]

The first obvious problem with this account is that it loses the robust generalisations concerning the mapping between syntactic position within the PP and the Figure-Ground distinction. Consider the following examples.

(5) Take off the hat

V [SC [Prt MP-figure]]

(6) Take the hat off

V [SC MP-figure [Prt t ]]

(7) Take the hat off his head

V [SC DP-figure [Prt DP-ground]]

Allowing the Figure main predicate in (5) to be base generated as the complement of the particle runs counter to the fact that complements of predicate are uniformly interpreted as Ground elements in the sense of Talmy 1978, and loses the obvious parallelism between the predicate and the corresponding preposition in (7). A second problem with the account lies in the fact that den Dikken must assume a different Case-assigning mechanism for the

main predicate in base position than for the main predicate in shifted position. The Figure is sometimes called the ‘locatum,’ the Ground the ‘location.’

In the framework of Hale and Keyser 1993, lexical semantics is directly reflected in a structure subject to syntactic principles of combination. Hale and Keyser postulate null heads in English verb phrases, e.g. unaccusative clear has a null inchoative head, and transitive clear has in addition a null causative head; thus a Verb Predicate headed by clear has for Hale and Keyser three heads, two of which are null. We follow this line of thinking, and argue that a particle may lexicalise one of the heads in the expanded Verb Predicate. The two overt elements, the verb and the particle, instantiate pieces of one larger articulated structure which forms a single complex event and thus has a single argument structure. In this version, the maximal first syntactic decomposition consists of three related subevents in a particular hierarchical relation as shown in (12).

(12) (causing subevent) → [ process subevent → (result state )]

Verb Predicate            Verb Predicate            Result-based Predicate

Each subevent is associated with a particular Predicate in the first syntax. We keep close to the tradition within work of this kind and associate the causing subevent with Verb Predicate and the process subevent with Verb Predicate we use Result-based Predicate for the optional result state projection. Within this system, the main predicates in the specifier positions of the different syntactic heads get a uniform event-related interpretation: the specifier of Verb Predicate is interpreted as the initiator or ‘subject of cause’; the specifier of Verb Predicate is the undergoer or ‘subject of process’; and the specifier of is holder of result state or ‘subject of result’. In our view, first syntax is the level at which the event is built up, and also the level at which the traditional notion of  $\theta$ -role is composed. In other words, main predicates can get ‘composite’ thematic interpretations due to move. The entailments associated with the different specifiers in Verb Predicate are not mutually exclusive, so that a single argument may be both the undergoer and the subject of result; the  $\theta$ -Criterion,

which denies the possibility of a single argument holding two  $\theta$ -roles, is stated over a notion of  $\theta$ -role more coarse-grained than what we have in mind. Consider now a simple case of the V-particle construction in English shown below

- (13) Throw      the dead rat                      out  
      V    Undergoer/Holder of Result    Prt.

The direct object in the sentence is both the undergoer of the throwing process and the holder of the abstract result state. In addition, the direct object is also thematically the Figure with respect to the semantics of the particle. If we assume the I-syntax described above, and if we further assume that the particle-headed predicational phrase is the complement of the Result head, we get the following preliminary representation. The argument must occupy Special Verb Predicate and Special Result Predicate during the course of the derivation. The specific proposal we make involving an I-syntax with a Result Predicate in the lowest position also makes sense of some otherwise mysterious facts. It has long been appreciated that causation (or something like it) is an important primitive in the composition of verbal meanings, and that causative heads give rise to clause union behaviour crosslinguistically. But it is also true that within English, and crosslinguistically, semantically resultative phrases give rise to 'clause union' behaviour (object sharing) with suspicious regularity. Consider the case of complex predicate formation in South Asian languages. These complex predicates are strikingly similar to the verb-particle construction in the important respect that the main verb and the 'light' verb behave as if they were part of a single predicational domain from the point of view of the external syntax, but where the syntactic and semantic contributions of the two verbal components are physically separable. Completive or resultative complex predicates form a substantial subclass of light verb constructions in these languages. within an I-syntax like the one proposed here. For us, the Verb-Predicate construction is the same as 'light verb' constructions in many languages, except for a difference in which member of the pair bears the greater burden of specific encyclopaedic

information. We seem to have come a long way from the original conception of a lexical syntax that provides an abstract decomposition of a single lexically integral element. The point we wish to make is that l-syntax is not the decomposition of lexical items so much as a kind of ‘first phase’ syntax where the compositional properties of event structure and event participant-hood are built up. English does not characteristically make this decomposition overt because it does not possess the necessary more fine-grained lexical items, but a comparison with other languages shows that this is a contingent fact. In our opinion, the verb-particle construction is another clear instance where we are forced to deconstruct our notion of what constitutes a lexical item. It is important to reiterate the point made by Hoekstra 1988 that there is no independent reason for the prepositional small clause in complement to Verb to be interpreted as a ‘result’ as opposed to some other kind of modifier (indicating for example, causality or contemporaneity). This is an interesting fact, and one that needs to be stipulated either in the semantic interpretation rules or in the syntax. Having a result based in the syntax is a way of expressing this relationship, one which we are claiming has some sort of linguistic generality within the ontology of event building.

So far the account has dealt with instances of particle shift which involve some kind of resultative semantics (the vast majority). However, there are a few cases known to us where the interpretation is clearly not resultative. Consider (28) below.

- (28) a. John moved the rat poison around (for hours).  
b. John moved around the rat poison (for hours).

It would be consistent with our account so far for us to propose the existence of a nontelic l-syntactic projection (call it Small Predicate) in complementary distribution with Result Predicate. This Small Predicate would be a path-descriptor in contrast to Result Predicate which is a telos-locator. The Sybtactic head would then be available for particle shift as shown by the word order change above. However, such a move has some undesirable consequences.

Firstly, it constitutes an expansion of our current ontology of event-building primitives, which in principle should be quite limited. Secondly, it saddles us with the task of discovering why verb- particle constructions of this type are so much rarer than the resultative type, crosslinguistically.

It should also be noted that there are some indications in the data from English that the nontelic around has rather different properties from the resultative particles proper. Specifically, if we look at the cases where the direct object is introduced the presence of the particle itself and not independently licensed by the verb, we get an interesting pattern.

(29) a. We ran Mary.

b. We ran Mary around (in our car) (for hours).

c. \* We ran around Mary. [OK with Mary as Ground]

While the atelic around can indeed license the addition of an object in (29b), it does not allow particle shift, as seen in (29c), in contrast to the resultative particle in (30).

(30) a. We ran Mary down. [i.e. we caught her, or ran over her]

b. We ran down Mary.

### **1.3. Lexical and syntactic-semantic constructions of verbs and their models**

The term construction is widely used descriptively in discussing grammar, and is still used informally in most theoretical work for characteristic formal patterns of syntactic categories or features, usually associated with a meaning and/or function. Modern linguistic theories employ a range of formal devices to produce or characterize surface constructions; they may be rules, or schemata, or constraints. It is usually assumed that competence in a language consists largely of these formal devices together with a lexicon; the constructions themselves are epiphenomenal. As such, constructions are an abstraction over the data which linguistic theory must analyze; insight in syntax is achieved through discovering generalizations across constructions.

The term construction is ubiquitous in contemporary syntactic literature, being used informally to refer to linguistic expressions in a variety of ways. The term also has a technical sense in the theory of Construction Grammar. The term construction is widely used to characterize certain kinds of form–meaning pairings, as when we refer to “possessive constructions” or “the verb-particle construction” to refer to examples like those below.

(1) Three examples of possessive constructions:

- a. Seymour’s new friend
- b. a new friend of Seymour’s
- c. Seymour has a new friend

(2) Three examples of the verb-particle construction

- a. We picked up a lamp at the flea market.
- b. We picked a lamp up at the flea market.
- c. What did you pick up at the flea market?

In general, linguists would not refer to the three examples in (1) as comprising a single possessive construction, because they are too different in their syntax; in (1a) the possessor precedes the possessed noun, in (1b) the possessor follows the possessed noun, and in (1c) the possessor is expressed as a

distinct argument outside the possessed noun phrase. These differences represent three different ways of expressing the concept of possession, in English. In (2), on the other hand, many linguists would be inclined to refer to all three sentences as manifesting a single verb-particle construction, on the basis of the perceived similarity of the syntax of the three cases. There is a very large class of verb-particle pairings which allow the ordering alternation shown in (2a)–(2b), where the order reflects no apparent difference in meaning (such as drop off, smash up, fix up, turn on, leave out). In such cases, the object can systematically be the focus of a question, as in (2c); so the general consensus would be that these three sentences illustrate the verb-particle construction. On this view, (1) illustrates three different form–meaning pairings, even though one component of the meaning is shared across all three, while (2) illustrates one form–meaning pairing, even though independent factors distort the shared form (and the correct characterization of the meaning component may be elusive). At the same time, (2c) illustrates a wh-question construction, in addition to the verb-particle construction. Since the properties of the wh-question construction (e.g. wh-expression in clause-initial position, auxiliary in second position) are independent of the verb-particle construction (e.g. the predicate includes a particle like up, down, out, etc.), there is no motivation for formulating a distinct “verb-particle wh-question construction.”

The term construction is not a technical term and consequently it is difficult to define. As an approximation, it can be defined as follows. (3) A construction is a characteristic formal pattern of syntactic categories or features, usually associated with some meaning and/or discourse function.

The use of the word pattern here is an attempt to be as theory-neutral as possible; a pattern might be a structure, or a template, or the output of a rule. The notion formal is meant to include aspects of form which are of significance to grammar. In some theories word order is a primitive of grammar, while in other theories word order is derived from structure, such that structure, but not linear order, would count as a formal property. The notion syntactic categories is intended to

include major parts of speech but also minor or functional categories such as the class of English verb-particles, or the class of determiners. The notion syntactic features in the definition is meant to include morphosyntactic features such as the past participle or dative case but also semantico-syntactic features such as negation or “wh” (borne by interrogative expression like what and who). Together syntactic categories or features includes function words such as infinitival to and bound formatives such as possessive 's, on any analysis. The definition in (3) is meant to exclude phonology and surface exponence, which do not characterize constructions as the term is ordinarily used in mainstream syntax. For example, we would not expect to find a construction which necessarily involved words beginning with the phoneme /w/, even if we speak loosely of various kinds of wh-constructions. Similarly, if there is more than one formal category in English which is spelled out by the suffix -ing, then we expect a construction to be identified by the underlying features which are being spelled out (e.g. progressive, or gerund), not by the phonological form of the exponent doing the spelling out. Though we might descriptively call something an Acc-ing construction, for example, in a more careful statement of its characteristics, we would distinguish the feature or category that -ing manifests.

Thus, the definition offered above is intended to stress syntactic form, not phonological form. This is in accord with the usual use of the word construction in syntax. An idiom like kick the bucket meaning ‘die’ requires the lexical items kick and bucket, and hence makes direct reference to exponents with phonological content. As such, ordinary usage would not make reference to a kick the bucket construction.

In this way, more or less functional elements like the interrogative pronoun what and the light verb do are treated together with syntax as opposed to lexical items like kick and bucket. Thus is it not controversial to speak of a construction of the form What’s X doing Y? meaning roughly ‘Why is X Y?,’ where X is a somewhat loosely applied in practice. Thus, it is not usually considered necessary to have a rigorous statement of the meaning of a

possessive construction like the one in (1a) in order to call it a construction, if it has a clearly defined syntactic form. But if there are two disjoint meanings involved, then it is common to think of them as involving two distinct constructions. For example, in English, the auxiliary inverts with the subject when a *wh*-item is fronted, but also when a negative element is fronted, as in (4)

- (4) a. Which of them would he recommend?  
b. None of them would he recommend.

Even if the syntax of the inversion is identical in the two cases, it would be most natural here to speak of subject-auxiliary inversion constructions in the plural, rather than a single subject-auxiliary inversion construction which was indifferent to whether the initial element was a negative or an interrogative phrase—though practice varies somewhat here (and in Construction Grammar, there is no limit to how abstract a construction can be).

The notion of discourse function in (3) is intended broadly, to include various pragmatic inferences and affect. For example, the *What's X doing Y?* construction is only used when there is some sense that it is incongruous or inappropriate for X to be Y (as discussed by Kay and Fillmore 1999). Thus the question *Why are men rebelling?* can be asked in a range of contexts, but *What are men doing rebelling?* can only be asked if there is some salient sense (perhaps the speaker's opinion, but not necessarily) that it is inappropriate, incongruous, or outrageous for them to be doing so. *subject* and *Y* is a predicate. For example: *What's the newspaper doing in the bushes?* or *What are you doing leaving without your shoes?* This construction requires *what* and *do* as well as the progressive with an appropriate form of *be*. The definition offered in (3) also suggests that a construction is usually associated with some meaning and/or discourse function. The importance of meaning is somewhat loosely applied in practice. Thus, it is not usually considered necessary to have a rigorous statement of the meaning of a possessive construction like the one in (1a) in order to call it a construction, if it has a clearly defined syntactic form. But if there are two disjoint meanings involved, then it is common to think of them as

involving two distinct constructions. For example, in English, the auxiliary inverts with the subject when a *wh*-item is fronted, but also when a negative element is fronted, as in (4).

(4) a. Which of them would he recommend?

b. None of them would he recommend.

Even if the syntax of the inversion is identical in the two cases, it would be most natural here to speak of subject-auxiliary inversion constructions in the plural, rather than a single subject-auxiliary inversion construction which was indifferent to whether the initial element was a negative or an interrogative phrase—though practice varies somewhat here. The notion of discourse function in (3) is intended broadly, to include various pragmatic inferences and affect. For example, the *What's X doing Y?* construction is only used when there is some sense that it is incongruous or inappropriate for X to be. Thus the question *Why are men rebelling?* can be asked in a range of contexts, but *What are men doing rebelling?* can only be asked if there is some salient sense (perhaps the speaker's opinion, but not necessarily) that it is inappropriate, incongruous, or outrageous for them to be doing so.

Returning to the examples in (1)–(2), we can apply the definition offered in (3) to show that it is harmonious with the common intuition that (1) illustrates three different possessive constructions while (2) represents three different manifestations of a single construction. According to (3), a class of phrases or sentences must share a characteristic formal pattern in order to belong to a single construction. The formal differences among the three examples in (1) are fairly clear; (1a) lacks *of* and the possessor precedes the possessum, while (1b) contains the function word *of*, and the possessor follows the possessum. Furthermore, in (1a), the possessum is understood as definite, while in (1b), the possessum is indefinite. The example in (1c) is predicative, and contains the verb *have*. So the fact that the three expressions describe the same semantic relation is not normally taken to imply the existence of a single possessive construction. Thus it seems that the definition appropriately picks out each of the

three as a construction. Turning to (2), we can first address the question of whether (2c) represents a different construction from the other two. Of course it does, as it involves *wh*-movement, but this is irrelevant to the verb–particle construction. The interrogative construction simply applies to a clause that has a verbal particle in the predicate, just as it does in an ordinary transitive clause. The second question is whether there is motivation to treat examples like (2a) and (2b) as distinct constructions. This cannot be conclusively determined without formal analysis. By and large, the two are distinguished only by word order, not by meaning, nor by functional categories or features. There are some differences, for example (2b) allows the object to be pronominal (We picked it up), but (2a) does not (\*We picked up it). If such differences can be independently explained, then an analysis can be motivated in which there is a single construction with some flexibility of order, that is, a single ‘characteristic formal pattern of syntactic categories or features’ in which whatever determines the placement of the particle before or after the internal argument is not characteristic, or is not a syntactic feature. This is the usual consensus though alternative analyses exist in which the two represent distinct constructions.

A number of constructions involve valence, argument structure, and grammatical functions. For example, a passive construction involves the demotion of the external argument, compared to the active use of the same verb. In English, the demoted external argument can be expressed in a *by*-phrase or left implicit, and the verb appears in a past participle form, with a form of the auxiliary *be*. The implicit argument can control a purpose clause, as illustrated in (5b), just as with the active construction in (5a). English also has a middle construction, in which the external argument cannot appear in a *by*-phrase, and is not syntactically active as diagnosed by a purpose clause, as illustrated in (5c).

- (5) a. The owner sold the house (to pay off debts).  
b. The house was sold (by the owner) (to pay off debts).  
c. Houses sell easily (\*by the owner) (\*to pay off debts).

In a conative construction, illustrated in (6b), the internal argument is oblique and is not as fully affected as in a regular transitive construction, compare (6a).

In a benefactive construction, illustrated in (6c), an indirect object derives some benefit from the action, or comes into possession of the direct object.

- (6) a. The baker cut the bread.
- b. The baker cut at the bread.
- c. The baker cut me a piece of bread.

Resultative and depictive constructions involve secondary predicates, as illustrated in (7a) and (7b) respectively.

- (7) a. They drank the bar dry.
- b. They ate the bread dry.

Control, raising, and so-called Exceptional Case Marking constructions usually involve infinitive complements in which arguments are, descriptively speaking, shared across the two clauses.

- (8) a. Ian wants to stay at the house. (control)
- b. Ian seemed to stay at the house. (raising)
- c. We believed Ian to stay at the house. (ECM)

English provides many more examples of constructions involving various configurations of arguments, and other languages provide yet more. In some cases, the availability of a construction may be tied to the availability of a lexical item; for example, it may be that if a language has an ECM construction if and only if it has a verb with the selectional properties exhibited by English believe in (8c). However, in other cases, the availability of a construction in a given language does not seem to be connected to lexical items. An example is the resultative construction illustrated in (7a), which many languages lack, despite having verbs and adjectives which are otherwise like the ones used in the English resultative construction. There is a range of constructions which have been analyzed as involving displaced constituents, or filler gap dependencies. These include (in the order in which they appear in [9]): wh-questions,

embedded wh-questions, clefts, pseudoclefts, relative clauses, comparative constructions, and (contrastive) topicalization.

(9) a. Which book did you read?

b. I asked which book you read.

c. It was this book that I read.

d. What I read was this book.

e. The book that I read was long.

f. She read a longer book than I read.

g. This book, I read.

These constructions have in common that the dependency can cross finite clause boundaries.

(10) a. Which book did your mother think you read?

b. I asked which book your mother thought you read.

c. It was this book that my mother thought I read.

d. What my mother thought I read was this book.

e. The book that my mother thought I read was long.

f. She read a longer book than my mother thought I read.

g. This book, my mother thought I read.

In this respect they contrast with passive, as illustrated in (11a), and for example raising, as illustrated in (11b) (compare [12]).

(11) a. \*The house was thought (by his mother) the owner sold.

b. \*Ian seemed stayed at the house.

(12) a. It was thought the owner sold the house.

b. It seemed Ian stayed at the house.

In fact, the constructions in (9)–(10) can cross indefinitely many finite clause boundaries, and for this reason are known as unbounded dependencies.

(13) a. Which book did you think your mother thought you read?

b. I asked which book you thought your mother thought you read.

c. It was this book that I thought my mother thought I read.

d. What I thought my mother thought I read was this book.

- e. The book that I thought my mother thought I read was long.
- f. She read a longer book than I thought my mother thought I read.
- g. This book, I thought my mother thought I read.

The availability and properties of unbounded dependency constructions can vary somewhat from one language to the next. For example, sometimes there is a resumptive pronoun in the gap position, and in other cases there is no displacement on the surface, with the filler element remaining in situ. Unlike the case with argument structure alternations, this kind of variation tends not to be dependent on lexical items, though it may be connected to the properties of functional elements such as *that* and *which*.

In fact, it has been proposed that properties of constructions are largely determined by the properties of their heads. This is explicit in the name of the theory Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (see Chapter 27 on HPSG), but is also a common assumption in other theories (e.g. Borer 1984). For example, the properties of a relative clause could conceivably be entirely determined by the cluster of features contained on its (possibly abstract) head. The head would be a kind of C[omplementizer] taking a finite TP complement, attracting a suitable nominal element to its specifier, and projecting a category which could be used as a nominal modifier.

In this regard, constructions like the *What's X doing Y?* construction mentioned above are complex, as they appear to involve an interdependency of several heads. Mainstream theory would probably treat a construction of this kind as a special kind of idiom. Construction Grammar, in contrast, holds that there is no principled difference between a fully general construction and a highly idiomatic one, or even between a fully general abstract construction and a lexical item; each is a pairing of form with function, broadly construed.

Traditional descriptive grammars may characterize and exemplify a list of constructions in a given language. They may organize the constructions according to perceived similarities, and may attempt to state generalizations which transcend the individual constructions. This much is extremely useful in a

reference grammar Modern syntactic theory necessarily goes further, and is based on the assumption that higher-level generalizations are necessary in order to achieve what Chomsky (1964) called explanatory adequacy, a model of language which accounts for how individual languages are learnable by children. Traditional grammar posited rules to characterize or generate constructions, such as passive and relative clauses. Generative grammar took this as a starting point and went on to abstract properties from classes of rules, such as elementary transformations and different kinds of formal conditions constraining them. Generative grammar in the 1970's explored the ways in which the properties interacted in rule systems, and sought to discover constraints on them. For example, Emonds (1976) observed that transformational rules did not produce structures unlike those which had to be base-generated ("structure preservation"), suggesting that the full power of transformations was unneeded. Chomsky (1977) showed that the class of unbounded dependencies displayed highly uniform properties, suggesting that they were not produced by distinct rules.

Subsequent work has increasingly focused on higher-level generalizations over rule types, shedding much light on the nature of grammar. Thus, generalizations about constructions involving valence and argument structure led to those being analyzed in Lexical-Functional Grammar as the output of lexical rules, accounting, for example, for their structurepreserving properties and their relative sensitivity to lexically listed traits of individual verbs.

The development of Principles and Parameters theory (Chomsky 1981) involved rethinking the nature of rules entirely; once deconstructed into a system of invariant universal principles interacting with parametric points of variations, there are no rules per se. This is expressed in the following quote from Lectures on Government and Binding: "The notions "passive," "relativization," etc., can be reconstructed as processes of a more general nature, with a functional role in grammar, but they are not "rules of grammar"" (Chomsky 1981: 7). Since constructions were the output of rules in the traditional conception of grammar, the elimination of rules from the theory means that in a Principles and

Parameters framework, constructions are epiphenomenal, as reflected in the following quote, also from Chomsky but a decade later: “A language is not, then, a system of rules, but a set of specifications for parameters in an invariant system of principles of Universal Grammar (UG); and traditional grammatical constructions are perhaps best regarded as taxonomic epiphenomena, collections of structures with properties resulting from the interaction of fixed principles with parameters set one or another way” (Chomsky 1991: 417). Since that time, although the notion of parameter has been substantially rethought, mainstream syntactic theories continue to regard the notion of construction, like the notion of rule or transformation, as a descriptive stepping stone on the path to greater understanding rather than as an analytic result in its own right. Work in Construction Grammar, too, recognizes that insight does not come from simply listing the individual surface constructions in a language, and therefore, like other theories, seeks generalizations over constructions; the difference between Construction Grammar and other theories mentioned here is that in Construction Grammar, the generalizations are themselves modelled as abstract constructions. Nor is this just a terminological distinction: the claim in Construction Grammar is that the generalizations have the same kinds of properties as the constructions themselves, at a suitable level of abstraction.

## Overview on Chapter I

Type-theoretical model of lexical semantics is already implemented in analysers for syntax and semantics based on refinements of Montague Grammar and categorial grammars, and has proven useful for the study of several specific linguistic issues, using restricted, hand-typed lexica. A first system being tested uses different sorts for regions, paths and times, as well as a fictive traveller, to analyse itineraries in a specific corpus of travel stories, as illustrated in section 2. The devising of a complete type system for each of the target languages, and thus the definition of a wide-coverage classification of entities into sorts, is a necessity for the next step: the completion of the lexicon and its semantics. The base types, and the semantics for the transformations necessary for our approach, can be obtained by those methods or a combination thereof:

1. by statistical means (this is, however, a very difficult issue even with a very simple type system, see Zettlemoyer & Collins (2009) for a discussion);
2. by hand (this is possible for restricted domains);
3. by derivation from other linguistic data.

For that last method, we believe that the classifier systems used in various languages present the properties we would expect from such a type system. We propose to use the classifier systems as a template for classifying sorts in the target language, and are currently designing tests in order to confirm that such categories are identified as such by speakers of the language. For those languages that do not have classifiers, we are considering the adaptation of a classifier system of a language that does. Finally, if the kind of semantic analysis we want to perform is oriented towards some sorts, it is possible to use both classifiers and specific sorts.

## **Chapter 2. Features of prepositional constructions and their lexical meanings in the context**

The term construction is widely used descriptively in discussing grammar, and is still used informally in most theoretical work for characteristic formal patterns of syntactic categories or features, usually associated with a meaning and function. Modern linguistic theories employ a range of formal devices to produce or characterize surface constructions; they may be rules, or schemata, or constraints. It is usually assumed that competence in a language consists largely of these formal devices together with a lexicon; the constructions themselves are epiphenomenal. As such, constructions are an abstraction over the data which linguistic theory must analyze; insight in syntax is achieved through discovering generalizations across constructions. This chapter examines the semantic and syntactic properties of English constructions containing a verb followed by two (or three) prepositions (including expressions like *to walk out on*, *to rely on*, *to go on*). First it is argued that, just like simple verb-preposition constructions (e.g. *to come across*, *to switch off* or *to refer to*), multi-preposition construction (MP-construction) come in various types. By applying a large number of semantic and syntactic criteria to authentic examples, it is shown that a distinction needs to be made between two major construction types – the composite-predicate construction and the appositional construction – whereby the latter construction type can be further divided into a resultative construction and a Verb + PP-construction. Subsequently, representations are offered for each of these construction types, reflecting the differences between these types at the Representational Level. Finally, some important implications for the theory are considered concerning the categorization of lexical elements, in particular the viability of (a) the distinction between particles, locative adverbs and prepositions (where they all take the same form), (b) the distinction between grammatical and lexical prepositions, and (c) the distinction between prepositions and conjunctions (where they take the same form).

## **2.1. The role of prepositional constructions in the structure of context**

The theories and models presented in chapter 1 seek to account for how language is represented in the minds of speakers, how it is acquired and central processes in the development. In the present study, the focus is on a subset of what learners must acquire, namely the grammatical category of prepositions. In the following chapter, an overview is provided about prepositions in English. In this section presented and discussed the definition and approach to prepositions generally held by generative frameworks of grammar, more specifically the one presented in Huddleston and Pullum (2002), which is adopted in this study. I present a general overview of the internal and external syntax of prepositions within the generative framework and present the major syntactic categories most relevant to the present study more extensively. Furthermore, an account of the semantic aspects of English prepositions are described. Also here, I elaborate on the semantic categories that are most relevant in relation to the data sample in more detail than the others. Besides laying the foundation for the syntactic and semantic categories used in connection with the analysis, this chapter also aims to show that acquiring the syntactic structure and function as well as the semantic meaning of prepositions in English is a complex task. There are different approaches to and definitions of prepositions depending on theoretical tradition. In this study, I have adopted a definition that allows for inclusion of a broader range of elements than in traditional grammars. According to generative approaches to grammar, prepositions head prepositional phrases that take various kinds of dependents. The reasoning is among other things that prepositions can take modifiers that are also found in noun, verb and adjective phrases e.g. two years after their divorce and very much in control. Two years are also found in adjective phrases as in: two years old, and very much in noun phrases as in very much a leader. Moreover, prepositions take several other constructions as complements in addition to the most typical case, i.e. noun phrases, e.g. adverb phrases, adjective phrases or interrogative clauses.

In addition, one PP may be embedded within another just like noun phrases and clauses. Different prepositions, like nouns, verbs and adjectives, license different types of complements. The typical preposition takes a noun phrase as complement *in the garden and to Paris*. The noun phrases *the garden and Paris* above, are objects, and so the prepositions *in and to* are transitive. The transitive preposition *in* above can also be intransitive, i.e. be used without an object, in examples like: *she stayed in*. Moreover, the distinction in clause structure between predicative complement and object applies also to PP structure. The typical preposition that licenses a predicative complement is *as*. *as* is an example of a PP functioning as predicative complement: *I regard their behavior as outrageous*. Here, *outrageous* has a predicative function with *him* as predicand. In the complement use, the preposition *as* is selected by the verb *regard*. As previously mentioned, the definition of prepositions adopted here includes a broader spectrum of words than the traditional definition. Although most traditional grammars accept that certain prepositions can take the various complements mentioned above, they do not allow declarative content clauses, in which case the words that are otherwise considered prepositions are labeled markers of subordination, i.e. subordinating conjunctions as in example: *It depends on whether he saw her*. Furthermore, traditional grammar does not allow prepositions to occur without a complement as with *in* above. Instead of intransitive prepositions, these instances are considered adverbs. However, all of the instances that traditional grammar label subordinating conjunctions, such as *above*, are here labeled prepositions and seen as heading the constructions in which they figure, except *whether*, *if* *when* used for *whether* and *that* *when* introducing a subordinate clause. Furthermore, as prepositions are considered heads similarly to nouns, verbs and adjectives, there is no reason to claim that they cannot occur without complements as the presence or absence of a complement does not affect the head function in either of the other phrase constructions. A number of prepositions have grammaticized uses, which means they have no

semantic content. They only serve to indicate the function of their complements:

- (1) They were mourning the death of their king
- (2) He was interviewed by the police

Serving as examples of this, of in (1) is the head of the PP complement in a noun phrase that corresponds to the clausal equivalent *their king died*. *by* in (2) marks the element that corresponds to the subject in an equivalent active construction. Grammaticized uses are often equivalent to inflectional case functions seen in e.g. *the death of the king* versus *the king's death*. The traditional definition fits the grammaticized uses of prepositions well, as these do not take modifiers and predominantly occur with noun phrase complements. However, there are a number of prepositions that do not have grammaticized uses and those I have mentioned that do, also have non-grammaticized uses, and so the traditional definition is not sufficiently broad to encompass this entire spectrum. Traditional grammars have pointed out that prepositions tend to precede their complements as a distinguishing factor. Although there are a few minor exceptions such as *notwithstanding*, this is indeed the case in canonical constructions. However, there are certain non-canonical constructions such as open interrogatives (3), in which the preposition is said to be stranded:

- (3) Who are they doing it for?

Here, the prepositional complement is missing from its default position after the preposition *for* but is still considered a preposition. However, the complement is to be found in pre-nuclear position in the form of a relative clause *who*. Despite these exceptions, traditional prepositions in canonical constructions do always precede their complements. However, this is also true in the case of verbs, adjectives and adverbs and so, this is not to be considered a distinguishing characteristic of prepositions either. According to the present approach, prepositions are a closed class compared to nouns, verbs and adjectives. Although some are added from time to time, they are far fewer in number and there is no freely productive morphological process for forming

them. Furthermore, typical prepositions denote or originate in notions of space. The resulting definition of prepositions proposed by Huddleston and Pullum that is adopted here is the following: “a relatively closed grammatically distinct class of words whose most central members characteristically express spatial relations or serve to mark various syntactic functions and semantic roles”. In relation to the present study, I adopt this definition and the generative approach to prepositions because, as previously stated, this enables me to include instances of non-target prepositions in the corpus that could potentially have been disregarded if adopting the traditional definition. Consequently, as the exact working definition adopted by the corpus compilers is unknown, I adopt the definition that allows me to include as many instances as possible.

Some characteristics of prepositions and PPs in the generative framework have already been presented above. As we have seen, prepositions typically take noun phrase complements. In these cases the complement of the preposition is an object and so the intransitive/transitive distinction traditionally made with verbs also applies to prepositions. Some of these prepositions take obligatory complements whereas others can occur without any complement. Prepositions may also take complements such as the following:

- (4) They have lived here since before the war
- (5) Why don't you save it for later?

In (4), the PP *before the war* is the complement of *since* and in (5) the adverb phrase *later* is the complement of the head preposition *for*. In addition to a number of complement types, PPs can also contain different types of modifiers of which only the ones in the form of PPs are relevant to our purposes here. PPs can occur as post-head modifiers within other PPs and certain directional PPs as pre-head modifiers

- (6) Downstairs in the kitchen were several other guests
- (7) Down under the house it was cool

Although PPs can, as we have seen, be embedded and have functions within other PPs, they more frequently function in other constructions. In the following section I elaborate on the major constructions in which PPs occur that are present in the data sample. I will illustrate each syntactic category in terms of examples of target PPs taken from the literature. Furthermore, I provide a preview into the data sample and the analysis by illustrating each category with examples of non-target usage from the corpus. At this point, the non-target examples will not be discussed or elaborated on further as they are only meant for illustration. As complements of verbs, PPs are more closely related to the verb and more clearly distinguished by their syntactic characteristics than adjuncts. Hence, they are more central to the grammar. The most essential characteristic of a PP with this function is that it must be licensed by the verb. The clearest cases of PPs as complements of verbs occur when a particular preposition is specifically selected by the verb:

(8) It depends on the cost

(9) I put it underneath the math

Verbs like *depend* in (8) that select a preposition are called prepositional verbs and prepositions that are selected by verbs, are called specified. In (8), *on* is a specified preposition as it cannot be replaced by another preposition e.g. *at*, *with*, *in*, etc. as the sentence then becomes ungrammatical. In other cases, a different preposition is not grammatically incorrect but does not correspond fully to the original meaning. The use of *on* in (8) is grammaticized, and so it does not have any independent meaning except in combination with *depends*. For this reason, it is fairly straightforward to recognize *on* as the complement of *depends* as the two entities are closely related. In (9), on the other hand, *underneath* has kept its full lexical content and is still a complement of the main verb *put*, although a less clear case. There is a finite set of prepositions that can occur with *put* as it involves the location of some entity. Both of the PPs above are also recognized as complements, not adjuncts, by virtue of being obligatory. Furthermore, PPs may also be optional and hence

function as modifiers in the verb phrase. Although the term adjunct is often used to refer to modifiers both in the clause and in the verb phrase, I have distinguished between the two in connection with the analysis of the data, and so I have included modifier in VP as a separate category. PPs functioning as modifiers of verbs are the largest syntactic group in the data sample, followed by adjuncts and complements of verbs. Non-target PPs in the corpus that function as modifiers in verb phrases include examples like (10a). In (11a), the PP is a complement of the verb and in (12a) the preposition is selected by the prepositional verb deal:

(10a) My mom drove me at the party

(10b) My mom drove me to the party

(11a) I might be able to get at school in time

(11b) I might be able to get to school in time

(12a) We will deal about this later

(12b) We will deal with this later

Special verb + preposition combinations, As pointed out above, PPs can function as complements of verbs. These verb + preposition combinations can be distinctive in three ways. We have already seen that a particular preposition may be selected by the verb rather than “being in potential contrast with other prepositions”.

(13) She put in her application

(14) I gave up the struggle

Furthermore, the construction in (13) is different from the usual pattern in that there is a complement in placed between the verb and the direct object. Words that occur in this position are called particles and are mainly intransitive prepositions. (14) is also an example of a verb + preposition with a particle between the verb and the direct object. However, the combination in (14) is fossilized and forms an idiomatic expression. A number of idioms contain intransitive prepositions. In the approach adopted here, idioms that form lexical units such as (14) are not considered syntactic constituents as in

traditional grammar as there is evidence that the syntactic structure in idiomatic expressions is the same as in equivalent literal interpretations. Hence, verb + preposition combinations that are traditionally labeled phrasal verbs, as in (14), which indicates that they are syntactic constituents that belong in the verb category, are not analyzed as such here but rather as regular verb + PP complement constructions.

Complement/modifier in noun phrase PPs may also function as post-head internal dependents of nouns, that is, as “immediate constituents of a nominal rather than of a NP”. Internal dependents in noun phrases can have the function of either complement or modifier. The distinction between the two is essentially the same as between complements and adjuncts in verb phrases but they are not as easily distinguished syntactically. Also in noun phrase structure complements must be licensed by an appropriate head, in this case the head noun, but the distinction between obligatory/optional made in clause structure is not as relevant. As we have seen, the verb determines the range of possible dependents it can take. In a similar fashion, with prepositional phrase complements, the head noun determines which prepositions can occur with it, e.g. the noun *journey* licenses prepositions related to motion: *the journey to Rome/from here*. Modifiers have a similar function to that of the modifier/adjunct in verb phrases. Modifiers are not dependent on a particular kind of head to license them and they are generally more flexible in terms of position than complements. A number of different PPs can function as post-head modifiers, including prepositions with a noun phrase complement, with a clause as complement and temporal and locative prepositions without complements. Also here, I have made a distinction in the analysis between PPs that occur as complements and PPs that occur as (post-head) modifiers of nouns. (15a) is an example of a PP functioning as complement of the noun *trip* and (16a) a post-head modifier of the noun *opinion*:

(15a) ... I thought that a trip on the beach would help

(15b) ... I thought that a trip to the beach would help.

(16a) Most people today have an opinion on who he was

(16b) Most people today have an opinion about who he was

PPs also occur as complements in adjective phrases, for the most part as optional but occasionally also as obligatory complements. Also here, the complement is regarded obligatory if its omission results in an unsystematic change in meaning. Phrases of this kind qualify as complements in that the preposition is licensed by the head adjective, e.g. He was afraid of dogs. However, as with nouns, complements of adjectives cannot be distinguished from modifiers by determining whether they are optional or obligatory. There are a number of different constructions where adjectives license a particular preposition, e.g. an adjective + about: annoyed about, concerned about, mad about, etc. and adjective + at: pleased at, good at, hopeless at, etc. Modifiers of adjectives with the form of PPs are most frequently found in post-head position, e.g. clear in his mind, dangerous in the extreme, deaf in both ears, etc. (17a) is an example of a PP functioning as complement of the adjective carved (note, however, that (17a) is ambiguous between an adjective phrase and a passive construction). (18a), is an example of a PP modifying the adjective angry.

(17a) The troll is carved of stone

(17b) The troll is carved in stone

(18a) He is so angry on Peter

(18b) He is so angry with Peter

In this section, an outline of the semantics of English prepositions in terms of typically are distinguished categories. Importantly, the focus is in the basic meanings of the prepositions and not the range of semantic roles that PPs can express. As addressed briefly above, some prepositions have uses that do not express semantic content beside the function they serve in syntactic structures e.g. by in passive constructions. These particular uses of prepositions are grammaticized. However, prepositions in English generally express or originate in a spatial relation that has been extended through

metaphorical processes into other semantic domains like time. Therefore, the main emphasis in this section and in general throughout the thesis, is on prepositions that express spatial relations. However, other senses relevant with respect to the data are also presented. Spatial relations in English are generally expressed by means of intrinsic framing. That is, the position of an entity is expressed relative to another entity. Spatial relations can, however, also be framed relative to the speaker, i.e. a deictic frame or by using information external to both the speaker and the figure-ground scene, e.g. north, south, etc. referred to as an absolute frame. Although English has linguistic means to express space in terms of all these, the intrinsic frame is generally favored. Here, the entity that serves as the reference point is called the landmark and the entity that is located relative to the landmark is called the trajector. Trajectors can be abstract and physical objects as well as situations such as events and states. Landmarks are typically physical objects or places in space, or metaphorical extensions of these:

(19) The pen is on the table

(20) He collapsed in the bedroom

In (19) above, the trajector is a physical object, i.e. the pen whose location is specified relative to the physical landmark the table. In (20) on the other hand, the trajector is the event he collapsed and the landmark the bedroom. The most common English prepositions are often highly polysemous as they are subject to metaphorical and metonymic processes. When they express other notions such as time, reason, motive, etc. they have been, as pointed out above, extended from the space domain through metaphorical transfer processes. This occasionally makes it a challenging task to establish dichotomies between meanings as they are closely related, and so they are often best seen as ranges of meaning rather than clear-cut categories. However, there is common agreement that most prepositions have a central or prototypical meaning to which most other senses can be traced and it should be possible to classify senses by using “consensual and high-level ontology labels”. Crucially,

in the classification adopted here prepositions are considered in their basic senses from which numerous metaphorical usages stem. For instance, in in its most basic sense is used to express spatial containment. Furthermore, containment has been extended to temporal senses where in conceptualizes the time frame of an action/or event as a container. Both the spatial and temporal use of in is thus categorized as instances of prepositions denoting location. Below, I present a brief description of the semantic categories relevant and employed in this study as well as target examples from the literature and non-target examples from the corpus.

## **2.2. The significance of prepositional construction “on” in shaping the lexical meaning of the sentence**

Grammatical construction can be evaluated as a property of prepositions. In general, the grammatical process is understood as a historical process by identifying grammatical unity that is not a grammatical language, which is a process of identifying grammatical features existing in this unit. Thus, grammar can be regarded as an inexhaustible process to enhance the grammatical features of language units. Nouns that refer to human body meanings can be examples of grammar. Moreover, English language prepositions, adverbial elements also take an active part in this process. Additionally, it is possible to observe aspects of the grammatical process in prepositions related to space relations. As you can see, the English language prepositions have expanded its functional application in the process of historical development. As a result, it is possible to notice that prepositions, which do not have any meaning in space, are then reflected in these characteristics. It is possible to say that this phenomenon is the same as the prepositions. All prepositions in English are meaningful. In addition to their lexical-semantic features, they are grammatical and also imaginative schematic. The meaning of the prepositions and their relationship to the subject can be directly monitored by many studies and linguists, including B.Pote, R. Wagner, B.Brendel and other linguists. Separate grouping of semantic characters of each predictor in their work is aimed at identifying meaning in the context of speech. The emphasis is on determining the space, time, and conceptual features of the prepositions. We will try to find a database of the linguistic consciousness by studying the functional use of specific lexical units. The semantic analysis of the presence of fragmentary words at different times, along with the opportunity to observe the evolutionary development of these words, also provides an opportunity to cover the aspects of their extralinguistic connotations. It also gives a chance to learn the concepts that are based on specific words. The key features of the predecessors are also important in emphasizing the functional significance of the lexical concepts. They include the functional information of

lexical concepts as the main parameters of space geometric parameters. In particular, prepositions can be used for the meaning that refer to the concept of space. This predicate represents the location of the subject at the top of another preposition. If the geometric parameter is a contact, the functional parameter is a point of reference and linguistic content. For example, *the apple is on the table*. Of course, the content of the lexical unit and the content of the parameters may be disclosed. For example, if the apple on the wall seems to be right from the linguistic point of view, the meaning is unreasonable, for the apple to remain on the wall should be either glued or hanging. In this case, the content and linguistic notion are incompatible. However, the existence of the concept of basic is important in establishing the consistence of the content and linguistic concept. Look at the examples *on one's feet / knees / legs / back, on tiptoe, on all fours*. In these examples, human body parts serve as the basis, So it is possible to observe the relationship between the contact parameters and the base parameter and the linguistic content of these compounds. It also refers to the meaning of the means of movement. In this context the contact parameters and base parameters are not important on foot / horseback, on the bus and so on. but in this context the lexical basis is assumed to be predominant. The following is an example of the underlying characteristic that is expressed in the following example: the earth turns on its axis. In this example, the support point is reflected in its axis combination. Another meaning of preposition "on" is of dependency which can be proved with the following examples: Are you on heroine? or she is on the pill. In the meaning of the person's dependence on something expressed in the noun. In this case, the preposition is a semi-lexical property. The psychological basis of the psychological dependency of the person. for example you can count / rely on my vote. Rationale or epistemic base values are reflected on / on purpose combinations. If we focus on the content and content of the examples, then we can see that there are not only basic contact parameters, but also other resources. The prepositions also predict the concept of the state of affairs. For example, "as far as she was capable of love, she loved

her, and her hand on her arm, she addressed her in a muted reluctant voice, the nearest she could get to tenderness". Functionally predetermined, is also used to refer to the expression of the duration of the activity associated with the activation. For example: *But I suppose some women do go on like that. Burden whose expression conveyed that he was rather approved by women who went on like that.* These terms are used in the term "functional activity", because such combinations indicate the state of the statistical character of physical activity, such as technical movable statisticality. For example, *The angela's prints were on the backdoor, the dord from the kitchen in the hallway, each bedroom door and a variety of bottles and jars on each dressing table. a marvelous was dawning on her.* According to V.Evies, the prepositioins have an activity icon. According to the scientist, the switching point means activating electrical equipment, i.e moving from static to dynamic. In this case depends on the functional and semantic nature of the transformation of the preposition. It acts as a reference point of the transformation of the action point of the verb. The switch statement in the combination is interpreted as a transformative character. In other words, the lexical concepts associated with the predetermination provide the functional movement parameters and correspond to the linguistic meaning. For example: *you would know who would be likely to call it or be fetched home by her. Tell me who came to your house. what friends or acquaintances called your wife? I dont think there is always a time till now, when i have had a reasonable amount of money to live on and now. we were on our beam ends. Angela couldnt walk.* In these cases, the units associated with the preceding are referred to as the word combination or attributes, which have the meaning of action. and the occurrence of the meaning of the state of affairs in the particular case is consistent with the temporal significance. it can be seen that the situation or event occurring within a limited period of time. the following examples will be considered:

- a. on fire
- b. on live (sports game)

- c. on tap (beer is available)
- d. on sleep (as in an alarm clock)
- e. on pause (as in a DVD player)
- f. on sale
- g. on loan
- h. on alert
- i. on best behaviour
- j. look out on the move
- k. on the wane m. on the run.

Time related predictive associations serve to determine the occurrence of the event events. For example, *As the front door climbed on the light that rimmed Hathall's curtains went out. so on the following morning Chief Superintendent howard fortune left his office at a quarter to six. he waited until half past seven. when his quarry did not come he made his way along daetmeed avenue and observed that there was no light in the window his uncle had told him he was Hathall's.* The examples given may relate to the various periods of predicting the time of the prediction. it can be understood that the semantics of the subject at the time of time, as well as the timeliness of the predetermined location, are presented as an important tool in the information provided. The fact that the information given is dependent on the time indicators helps to understand that a particular movement or activity of a substance is connected. In the context of space, an event plays an important role in expressing the place where the events occur. Take note of the following examples: *Turn up wearily away on the spot where he had been on the point of flinging him down the stairs, Wexford said you gave him back his deposit and he left. what time was that. Three of the car's doors were open simultaneously and the three policemen had been on their feet bounced on the wet stone as if on springs.* In these examples, we can see the predetermined associations of the time and the subject in the examples given in the examples given on the spot on the wet stones as the place of the event. Including the ones on their feet, the position of the subject, when

the point on the point on springs was pointing to the occurrence of the event. The use of the English preposition in the context of the text can be regarded as an example of the expansion of the synonymic dependence of this prediction on space and temporality. For example, *Out on the platform, Mrs. Hadall said that could have been avoided if you were done as you were asked. she was planted herself herself on the spotless carpet and turned slowly round the ceiling for the ceiling. (Ruth Rendell 43) Would you like to go upstairs? (Ruth Rendell 18) On the top of the covers, apparently deeply asleep (Ruth Rendell 54), can be divided into two groups in the context of the predicament of the temporal-related integral and differential markings. the first one is expressed with the exact horse. for example, the preacher was on the floor facing the floor and spreading the eagle. For example, he felt it now as he saw the glass door close on, the shop's warm orange glow receive every (Ruth Rendell 163) the bus went up by the Fulham into west Kensington an area he remembered from the time he had helped Howard on that former. It is possible to observe that the prehistoric coding of the place relates to more derivative changes. in this case, if the location of the moving position of the object, as the integral of the predetermined integral part of a predetermined object, can be replaced by the space change as a result of moving the position in the differential angles. these derivative expressions can be associated with predictions in the text. these derivatives can be correlated with the use of predictions in the text. The English version is based on different meanings. For example, *the picture is hanging on the wall. In the superficial part of the subject. For example, put the magazine on the table. When the weekdays or days of the day are stretched to the expression plan., The meeting took place on Mondays. (Ruth Rendell 45) They arrived on the first of June. Mrs. Hathall tightened her grip on the landing (Ruth Rendell 28), which she had attempted to jerk away (Ruth Rendell 19). Temporal or time interval, we can observe the preposition of the predictive time frame. On a fine summer mornin, on a cold evening, on the morning of the first of June. For example, on receiving your letter I telephoned to your brother. on coming home**

*I started to work. I went to my mother on a train on Sunday night. my angela drove me to the station. they will be here on the second of may. The forecast says it will be sunny on sunday. on coming back home, I tried to do washing.* It is possible to observe an image of events and phenomena, even if it is represented by a nominal unit. For example *He spoke on the international situation. he delivered a lecture on modern American literature. What is your opinion on this subject?* The English preposition, as mentioned above, has a wide range of meaning and the width of the functional expression area different from the other subdivisions. Including the go on keep on, represent the phase in which the action which is understood by the indefatigable form of the verb that follows. For example, *The bus went on over a bridge above railway lines, and the two other stations on the opposite side, west end lane and another west Hampstead on some suburban lines (Ruth rendell 133).* As well as the semantics of the additional length to the action of the predetermined expression within the framework of the predictor of a dynamic character, In which the verb is in harmony with the semantics of persistence in the continuation of the expression. For example: *They walked on and on until they reached a village. though it was quite dark. they drove on. ignoring him. we've got here and he went to look for it (Ruth Rendell 21),* As we have already mentioned, the ability to use the adverbial racish function in English, combined with verbs. Including the prehistoric, have been used in this function, and have formed stable compounds by combining the known facts. For example, *to comment on, to exaggerate,* we will try to cover the above-mentioned associations with examples:

The parties could not agree on the terms of the contract.

He did not comment on this event.

I congratulated him on his success.

That does not depend on me.

I insist on your presence.

You may rely on that.

He spent most of his money on books.

I will call him tomorrow. they are on the market.

Moreover, this predicate is a combination of definite expressions. You can include the following: on the contrary, on the invitation, and so on. The following examples can be found in the following sentences. *He was not helping, he was just looking on. How are you getting on, they get on very well together. Go on working. Put your coat on.* Above mentioned examples create the following statement by combining with the next non-volatile units *on the board, on sale, on credit, on demand, on foot, on sea, on the other hand, and so on.* prepositions serve to give a prospective line to the information that is expressed in the context of the conversation. For example: *And when he understood the true reason for the call, that at last when it was too late, Howard was on the brinkward was on the brink of accomplishing his task, he felt the sickness of despair of a man who does not want to come in and threaten his resignation (Ruth Rendell 187) such ruminations verged on the obsessional though and that he must avoid Ruth Rendell 133)* In this case, the prepositions can transform the whole verb. It is possible to observe the semantic superiority of the predictions when the verb has completely lost its head. In these cases, the prepositions have a sense of idiom and form the composition of phrasal verbs. They are as follows: *on a certain morning, on a cold day in a hell, on a commercial basis, on a diet, on a scale, on a short view, on a scale a site, on a site, on a site, on on the board, on on board, on on board, on on board, on on one's account, on one's own account, on one's account, on one's account, on one's account on one's mind, on one's mind, on one's mind, on one's tod, on one's tod, on one's tod, on one's tod the blink, on the wagon, on the face, on the front, on the ground, on the ground jump, on the mend, on the razor's edge, on the spir of the moment, on the surface, on the verge of death.* The following semantic groups can be grouped into groups. similarity, influence on the object meaningful connections: *pattern on smth, model on smth, question on smb, parody on smth, evidence on smth, imprint on smth, carve on smth, brand on smth, concentrate on smth, focus on smth, pressure on smth, strain on smth, tread on smth, throw oneself on smth in,*

*fringe on smth, encroach on smth, an attempt on smb's life, on the alert, agree on smth, satisfy oneself on smth, follow on smb, hang on smb, stealing on smb, advance on smb, fall on smb, descend on smb, close on smb, arrest on smth, blunder on smth, hit on smth, stumble on smth, thread on smth.*

Place or locative expressions: *On the wall, float on water, to kiss on the lips, on the continent, on the Thames, float on the surface, glide on the water/snow, skate on the ice, to skid on the road, slide on the slippery way, on the highway, on the path, on the canal, on the river, on the sea, on the farm, on the site, on the railway, on the look out for smth, on one's guard for smth, be on duty, be on the night shift, be on the sick leave, on the top of a hill, on the ground, on the snow, on the platform, on the table, on one's back, on tip toe, on a bicycle, on a horse, on a car, on the train.*

Temporal meanings of preposition "on" *on monday, on the first of may, cash on delivery, on foot, on tires, on hinges, on axes, on the way to smth, on the decline, on all fours, on such a day, on a fine morning, on the eve, later on.* As The meaning of the subject: *agreement on smth, lecture on history, on such terms, to buy on the cheap, to live on one's parents, press on smb, put the screw on smb, be severe on smb, censure on smb, lay the blame on smb, gloat on smth, be keen on smth, dote on smb, set one's heart on smb, beam on smb/ at smb, radiate on smb, bend one's eyes on smb, fix one's eyes on smb/smith, rivet one's eyes, on smb/smith feast one's eyes on smb/smith, keep an eye on smb/smith, squint on smb/smith, meditate on smth, dwell on smth, comment on smth, discussion on smth, converge on smth, agreement on smth, committee on smth.*

As the meaning of an outcome of an action: *on that ground, on that occasion of, act on advice, know on hearsay, on good authority on the 100th anniversary, on the smith, smile on smth. be on the list, on the list, on the staff, on the staff, on the smb, on liability, on smb.*

By movement: *on television, on the right / wrong track, embark on smth, get on the bus.*

As a state of the Situation: *on half pay, be on duty, beaguer on smb, mad on smb, on one's honour. As a moving object: to work on smth, to imping upon a fine on smb, on the march, on the go, strike on smth, be on the hunt, be on the make, be on the prowl.*

Place of being: *on the left, the post office, on the program, on the list.* If we summarize the assumptions associated with the English verbs, we can group them into three groups: 1) to, in, out, into, over, to , off, for, from, away; 2) walking, forward, down, forward, around, round, low, for verb loads that help to express procedural meanings of movement. 3) Verbs coming from the Predictive function, for example, *on the offensive, over, round, for, down,* meaning the aspect, depending on the semantic meanings of an object that represents a substantive, local position. English-language predictions are grouped into boxes by Jeckendfond, coupled with the ability to relate to movement behavior: a) route: *accross, over, through, past, down, along.* b) source: *away, from, out of, off, from.* c) goal: *to, into, onto, towards.* The meaning of Predlog is divided into different variants. In particular, the attributes related to the space vectors are found in most predecessors. These include prefix. In the case of a space, the predetermined meaning of the object with another object is what it is, while the temporal relationship refers to the meaning of action to send one's luggage on. It is known that the space attitude of predlogies has a close connection with time and time. the existence of the ability to predict the venue of space is also evidence of its ability to refer to time and time, including the presence of a predefined space, also means that this predefined object is available at a specific time limit. it seems that the predetermined preposition possesses the aspectual expression, other than temporal means. We can see this as the continuation of the movement in terms of the meaning of development: *to walk on, to go on, to move in a motion.* The manuscripts in the English language can be combined with the meaning of the nominal unit. eg: *And what about you, Clifford? Do you think the gender is a dynamo to help a man on the road? (D. Lawrence "Lady Chatterley's Lover") He's got you on your toes, this bleeder, has not he? Ginge*

*moved to an alcove table. Always popping up to the smoke you are. you dont want to let it go on top of you. You can end up in a bleeding bin (133).* In the given example, the predetermined word has served as a promising manifestation and has some relevance in a certain sense. The prospective sense implies that the movement is focused on the outcome, that is, the future. is one more manifestation of the aspect of the time, which is expressed in English with its predecessor. in this case, the prediction is the starting point of the known action or situation. For example: *this crisis came on. a terrible spasm of pain came just before he died. mother born of fretting.* (D. Lawrence "Lady Chatterley's Lover") Another characteristic of the starting point is the change in status, ie, the second occurrence, and its meaning becomes secondary. Example: *Then I took another girl, a teacher, who made a scandal by driving a man and driving her almost out of his mind* (D.H Lawrence "Lady Chatterley's Lover"). *So I took on Bertha, and I was glad he was common* (D.H Lawrence "Lady Chatterley's Lover"). In the examples given, the meaning of the second occurrence is linked to the efficacy and the diminutive correlation. Another aspect of the English preposition is that of intensive development. For example: *The pain was gone and on the legs bent, and I could feel it going out of the bone* (E. Hemingway "A farewell to arms"). In the emergence of the concept of space relations expressed in the English language, the concept of existence in space is recognized as the main categorical sign. so it is a lexical tool for expressing the meaning of space. directions in this group represent the meaning of the subject as a trisect. For example: *"Get in the car, Mike, and I will tell you on the way." Sergeant Hutton will certainly come back, she thought.* Here's how we look at the behavior of several loadings in other examples: We're going to analyze the behavior of a single load as described by the to-go feud. we have gone down the clear road and we went to the square. The ten verbs in these examples refer to the meaning of the pure aspect, that is, the long, the lower, the lower quotations represent the principal and direction. attribute appears. this term is derived from the beginning of another movement in the array. In general, the down predicate, as well as the

direction of the direction, not only the direction, but also the process of action, expressed by movements of behavior. The symptoms of language, expressed in different words, vary with their diverse population. Similar differences can be observed in the case of English prepositions. Including issues related to the transformation of the syntactic constructions in which the English language is based, has not yet lost its relevance. However, the semantic role of this prediction in syntactic combinations is complex and extensive. This prediction increases the content of the words that are associated with it, as well as the ability to distinguish them into certain lexical semantic groups. It should be noted that many predictions in English do not only link words, but also form the basis of the linkage process. as well as identifying the nature of the words that relate to them, as well as covering their content. from this point of view the content and the nature of the preface are varied. especially in the following he had no money in the case of predominance, for example, to cover the roots of possession, he spent the semantic sense of movement and distribution on the example of every money on books.

### **2.3. Lexical and syntactic-semantic properties of preposition “on”**

From the semantic point of view, the preposition is characterized by an insufficient lexical content and in the case of inherited prepositions extremely abstract (for some specialists inexistent); the content is expressed through various meanings, determined by their occurrence in different contexts, mainly by the terms of the syntagm to which they belong. It does not have semantical autonomy, that is why it cannot have syntactic functions. On the one hand, prepositions are dependent on or in a relation of semantic continuity (sometimes just compatibility) with the lexical content of the term they accompany, and on the other hand with the syntactic function they have. Some of the simplest, most abstract prepositions such as “of”, “in”, “on” are not influenced by the semantic level of its subordinate term. As far as the semantic characteristics of the prepositions are concerned, there have been different and various opinions expressed by specialists over the time. Although some researchers have argued that the preposition is not even a part of speech, but a grammatical sign, recent studies have shown that prepositions are units of meaning (a fundamental or clear meaning and a few secondary or not clear meanings were distinguished) and even more, that, according to the principles of logic, its clear meaning expresses a notion. Important contributions have been brought by cognitive linguistics whose methods and results can be applied to Romanian as well. There are various opinions regarding the semantic status of the preposition. Some grammarians do not even consider it a part of speech, the argument being that it cannot be part of a sentence by itself. They are seen as morphemes that express grammatical meanings (space/localization, association, modality): “Prepositions and conjunctions are grammatical signs, so they are indicators of the grammatical, supralexical meanings of the words in the structure in which they appear”. Other researchers claim that the prepositional units endowed with meaning and their contextual variants may be reduced to a fundamental meaning, specific to each of them. Values of the prepositions and establishes their significance starting from the

significance of the syntagms to which they belong; by eliminating the meanings of the noun and the verb from the syntagm N + Prep. + V (N – noun; V – verb), using the methods of analysis and synthesis, she eventually finds the specific meaning of a specific preposition: on – the interior of an entity. The other meanings and secondary functions are clustered around this fundamental meaning. The various meanings analyzed are in fact particular occurrences of some general meanings characteristic of each of the prepositions. But a few meanings remain outside the general meaning. They seem to be “remains of some older patterns that were not kept in the present relations system, recent influences that have not been integrated or will never be integrated in the system, mistakes” or linguistic facts not clarified or classified. The particular meanings of the prepositions can be close (in the case in which they comprise few variable notes) or far (when they have many variable notes). A relevant example for the latter situation is represented by the two meanings of the preposition on: “concrete direction and moving away from the initial point of contact” *They hopped on the platform and headed on towards west*; and the “cause” *Ann acted cruelly on purpose*. Yet, if we consider the cause as being the abstract orientation from a point to the subject of the action, the difference between the two meanings is given by a single note”, it underlines the fact that the prepositions (with their general meanings) form series of two or three terms based on their common features, such as the “interior” for the group on - (“interior” – “going through the interior” – “getting out of/ falling off the interior”). It is not easy to establish the place of a preposition in a series, especially for those prepositions that have both concrete and abstract meanings. When the abstract meanings can be interpreted as variants of the concrete ones (most of the times conditioned by verbs), the general meaning remains concrete, as it happens in the case of the preposition “on”. In analyzing closely the English-Russian parallels in the syntax of the preposition, considers that it is important to discover whether the preposition has a meaning of its own or not. It is admitted the criterion according to

which the meanings of a preposition are divided into: fundamental, secondary and general, seen as a result of all its meanings, but it is believed that it is important for his research to modify the terminology as a direct result of his findings: the preposition can have a clear meaning, corresponding to the fundamental meaning defined by linguists and a few meanings that are not clear. Following the principles of logic, the author claims that taking into account the clear meaning of the preposition, it expresses a notion, an opinion which is not shared by other grammarians. That is how we can explain the fact that prepositions can be translated into other languages, because to translate means “to find an equivalence between two sound complexes based on their common link with the same notion. For instance, for the preposition on, the following equivalence can be easily found: *The book is on the table.* The explanation of the phenomenon is that “in the bilingual person’s mind... the equivalence between the sound complexes is established” based on the clear meaning of the preposition. This is different from the meanings that are not clear, which appear in a series of syntagms, a case when the prepositions used vary from one language to another. In such a situation “the use of prepositions is (...) one of the skills that are most difficult to acquire in a foreign language” because “in this linguistic area one cannot formulate rules, and the basic meanings are not very useful”, the same relation being expressed in different languages by means of different prepositions. It is shown that the prepositions are characterized by mental operations which are fundamental for the development of the language. Their linguistic interpretation is taken into account through its genetic process, to which the linguistic signs provide material and impose restraints. Guillaume’s theory opposes the structuralist theories, considering that linguistic signs do not bring conceptual or structural elements to be put together in the course of the interpretation process, but influence directly the construction of the syntactic form (morphogenesis) and semantics (ideogenesis). Differentiation of lexical, syntactic-semantic angles

from the traditional interpretation, the structure of elements is combined into known semantic groups and their hierarchical structure is generated. As a result, one of these points, that is, the rest of the main prototype, is found to be legitimate. However, non-central values are compared to the central or main syllables, and the figurative schemes are determined by transformation, resulting in metaphorical changes. Thus, the main prototype of the prepositions related to the meaning of space is the central image of the word, which is the most important element between space and space. The remaining deductions are deducted from the prototype clauses using known rules, such as changing the status parameters or metaporting. It is understood that determining the boundaries of subjects as a central issue in describing the problem of predecessors' psychometry in specific cases. The English word "on" has the ability to create the following schema within different combinations.

<b>On+noun+with+ Adjective+noun</b>	<b>On+noun or with +verb</b>	<b>On+noun+ with+noun</b>	<b>On+noun+with+ Pronoun+with+ adjective</b>
On a certain morning	Bend one's eyes on smb	On the march/on the go	On one's account
On a cold day in a hell	Fix one's eyes on smb/smith	On the move	On one's Jack/on one's own authority
On a commercial basis	Draw one's attention	On the rise	On one's loss/on one's back

## Overview on Chapter II

Prepositions are related to the transformation of different meanings of the noun, the adjective, semantics of the functional-semantic field as a grammatical category. In this paper, English-language prepositions form a semantic, grammatical, and even lexical change in the verbs of the verb, and they play an important role in the development of the verb semantics. English-based prepositions combined with verbs have the ability to pronounce procedural, continuous meanings in the adverbial spelling function. An analysis of the English prepositions revealed the significance of the prepositions in the creation of various semantic manuscripts in English, and the following conclusions were reached:

1. The meaning of space and direction in, in, out, out, to, directions, along, along, from, forward, down.

2. The meaning of time is the basic semantic for prepositions from, for, at, from, for, till, until, and so forth.

3. The main prototype of the English-language prefix is that the subject represents the character of the substance in the superficial part of the subject.

4. An English-language preposition can be a combination of other word combinations that can create stable compounds, phrasological connections, and represent different meanings, and also have a specific language.

5. The predetermined ability to explore pragmatic and cognitive frameworks with the meaning and functional capabilities it represents. The English word predicate has the ability to create verb formulas, that is, a verb form in the function of adverbial spelling. In these cases, this predicament is fraught with a tendency and procedural aspect. The English predicate has the ability to classify semantic groups as a result of the combination of various manuscripts, verbs, and nouns, which have the ability to come up with various verbs in different positions and semantic groups. The potential analysis of the English prepositions indicates that their meanings are not only lexical, but also their ability to use these prepositions, their grammatical functions, and their

importance in the English language and spelling is observed. The bulk of English-language prepositions are versatile and multi-component. The English preposition creates a metonymy relationship with the human body in a particular position in different positions. In the given case, the predefined predicate or predictive combinations perform integral functions as an agent character. The predefined predictor completely changes the meaning of the verbs in the adverbial argument, or the behavior of some verbs is regarded as semantic component. The prototype of the predetermined predetermined term is defined by the meaning of availability in the upper part. Other manifestations of this predetermined metaphor can be considered a portable property. The semantic signals of the prefix are associated with the syntactic properties of the dynamic characteristic that is associated with it.

### Chapter 3. **Lexical and syntactic-semantic constructions with the help of preposition “on”**

Preposition *on* is one of the mostly used prepositions in English which is worth investigating the lexical syntactic and semantic features of the verbs combined with this preposition. In the following chapter, we discuss the main spatial and temporal meanings of preposition *on* and the role of the constructions in the context. Moreover, the examples provided in this chapter cover all of the levels of the language and provide complete information on the usage of this preposition. The scope of the meanings supplied by preposition *on* is completely vast and diverse. Generally speaking, verbs are the main dynamic traits of the prepositions which can create absolutely new meanings and new adverbial combinations. Besides that, polysemous meanings of phrasal verbs both in the context and in the real situation are considered the magical power of prepositions. The initial focus of this chapter is to highlight the examples related to preposition *on* and analyze those given examples in terms of levels and discover the new features of the verb-preposition constructions. It has been suggested that the distinct, but related, meanings of preposition *on* make up a semantic network whose center is the primary meaning, underlining the systematic organization of the mental lexicon as well as the extremely creative nature of the human conceptual system. The language determines radically the multiple interpretation attributed to a lexical item, but the construction of the meaning is mainly a conceptual process implying the elaboration and integration of linguistic and non-linguistic information in a very creative manner. Thus, the language does not refer to the real world, but to what is represented in the human conceptual system, comprising conceptual structures that reflect indirectly and interpret the world as being mediated by human experience and perception. Subsequently, the use underlies the extension of meaning, which is pragmatic in nature.

### **3.1. Lexical and syntactic-semantic meanings of phrasal verbs with the preposition “on”**

While contemplating the ability of the post-prepositions, N.A Anichkov points out that "post-prepositions are neither morphological nor syntactic but are lexical units." Despite the criticism of the language units concerned, the author stands firmly in the post. Anichkov said that it was inappropriate to take the English lexical unit as part of the word. Of course, in the formation of English phrasal verbs, it is a combination of two equally meaningful words. This means that the meaning of the semantic center in the meanings of the connections formed in the verb and adverbial part changes in the meaning of the verb in the influence of the meaning of adverbial meanings. The grammar meaning can be regarded as the first component of these combinations of verbs. Thus, in the figurative combination of English-speaking verbs, adverbial influence affects the meaning of the verb, its total change in meaning. In most cases, adverbial meanings are more likely to dominate the meaning of the verb. For example: *go ahead, look forward, go on, keep on*. Therefore, it is important to consider the meaning of adverbial spells while analyzing English-language phrases. The formation of the compounds in these cases is related to the essence of the adverbial spells. In this, the meaning of the verb is literally dominant in the meanings of adverbial meanings. According to S.G.Gorsky, it is important that prepositions that are based on verbs need to have the necessary meanings. If there were no lexical meaning in prepositions themselves, then it would not be necessary to put them into verbs. If we take this into consideration, it is important to define the semantic nature of the second component in the formulas. As a result, the preposition is fully assimilated in meaning, causing additional categorical meaning.

One of the peculiarities of English-language prepositions is that they have the ability to change their function by combining verbs. By combining verbs, they can form certain strings. At the same time, they form complex expressions in combination with certain verbs. For example, it can be seen from the

experience of the prepositions of the meanings. For example: *it does not depend on me*. The syntactic properties of prepositions are mostly studied in the phrasal layer and the level of the word. The basic unit of the phrasal surface is the predetermined phrasal construction. Prepositions are phrasal combinations, that are, the unit acting as the fundamental unit of the phrase, and the complement that is attached to it and the basis.

On a fishing expedition - if somebody is on a fishing expedition, they are trying to get information. On the roll - If you are on a roll, you are moving from success to success. On a silver platter - if you hand or give something on a silver platter to someone, you will let them have it very easily. On all fours - if anyone is on all fours, they crawl. On Carey street - if one is on Carey Street, which is in the UK, they are heavily in debt or have gone bankrupt. On good terms - if people are on good terms, they have a good relationship. On hold - if something is on hold, no action is taken. On ice - if plans are put on ice, they are delayed and no action will be taken for the foreseeable future. On pins and needles - if you are on pins and needles, you are very worried about something. On tenterhooks - this means that she is waiting for her impatiently and excitedly for something. On the ball - if somebody is on the ball, you are well informed and know what's going on in their area of responsibility. On the blink - if a machine is on or off, it is not working properly. On the blower - if they are on the phone, they are on the phone. On the cards - if anything is on the cards, it is almost certain to happen. On the carpet - when you are calling for the boss's office, and it's definitely not for a good reason, ie, you are in trouble, something has not gone by either may be you are responsible and have some explanations for it. On the case - if someone is on the case, they are dealing with a problem. On the cheap - if you do something on the cheap, you spend as little as possible to do it. On the dole - Somebody receiving financial help. On the dot - if somebody says they are leaving at on the dot, do not be late; they mean at exactly seven o'clock. On the factory floor - on the factory floor. On the fiddle - Someone who is stealing money from work is on the fiddle, especially if they are doing it by

fraud. On flip side - on the reverse or on the other side. On the fly - if you do things on the fly, respond to events as they happen. On the ground - things are actually happening, not a distance. On the hoof - if you decide something on the hoof. On the house - if you get something for free, that you would normally have to be bought, it's on the house. On the lam - if someone is on the lam, they are hiding from the police or authorities, especially against the arrest or the prison. On the level - if somebody is honest and trustworthy, they are on the level. On the line - if anybody's job on the line, they stand a good chance. On the make - if someone is on the make, they are trying to make a lot of money, usually illegally. On the map - if a place is a widely known place, it's put on the map. On the money - if you are on the money, you are right about something. On the never-never - if you buy something on the never-never. On the nod, somebody who is on the nod, either asleep or falling asleep, especially when they are not. On the nose - that means right on time. On the right foot, you get a good start. On the ropes - when something or someone is on the ropes, it or they are doing badly or possibly fail. On the run - if someone is on the run, they are avoiding the arrest and hiding from the police. On the same page - if people are on the same page, they have the same information and are thinking the same way. On the same wavelength - if people are on the same wavelength, they have the same ideas and opinions about something. On the shelf - if something like a project is on the shelf. On the skids - when things or people are on the skids, they are in serious decline and trouble. On the sly - if someone does something on the sly, they do it furtively or secretly. On the stump - when politicians are campaigning for support and votes, they are on the stump. On the take - Someone who is stealing from work. On the tip of your tongue - if a word is on the tip of your tongue, but you just cannot quite remember it at the moment. On the trot - means consecutively; I'd see them every day on the trot, which means I saw them three consecutive days. On the up and up - if you are on the up and up, you are making very good progress in life and doing well. On the wagon - if someone is on the wagon, they have stopped drinking alcohol. On the wallaby

track, in English, if you are on the wallaby track, you are unemployed. On the top of the world - if you are on the top of the world, everything is going well for you. On your high horse, when you are on your high horse, you are being inflexible, arrogant and will not make any compromise. On your last legs, they are close to dying. On your soap box - if you are up on your soap box about something, you are very overtly and verbally passionate about the topic. On your toes - somebody on his or her toes is alert and ready to go. There are many persistent connections in the English language that formulate prepositional phrases with words. For example, you can see many fixed combinations that are created using the predefined preposition. For example; on the other hand, on a bowl, on a bowl, on a floor on, on tenor, on tenor, on ten, ten on, ten on, ten on, ten on, on line, on one's hand, on on the ball, on the ball, on the bow, on the button, on the button cards, on the coattails, on the contrary, on the dot, on the dot, on the European plan, on the face on the fence, on the fence, on the go, on the hoof, on the hook, on the jar, on the line, on the loose, on the loose on the quarrel, on the mend, on the neck, on the nose, on the theft, on the one hand, on the coast, on the shady side, on the coast, on the coast, on the warrior, on the way, on the whole, on the wings, on the wings of the winds. In English, the term "space" is used to describe the duration or development of the process. *For example*; to send one's luggage on. This prepositional phrase predicates a place of attitudes such as the place where the subject is in contact with the subject (what was he on?), representing the on the roof of the subject. The space attitude, in turn, has an interconnected relationship with time, temporality. An English-language prepositional phrase arises from the point where space is located at the point of time and space relations.

### 3.2. Verification of a polysemous Spatial Preposition “on”

The simplest type of spatial expressions containing prepositional phrases in English generally consists of three elements, one preposition and two nouns. The nouns refer to an object to be located (Figure) and a reference object (Ground); the preposition refers to the spatial relationship between the Figure and the Ground. See the following examples.

- (1) a. a book on the table
- b. a book is on the table.

As in the examples (1), a spatial expression is structured simply using a noun and a prepositional phrase that modifies the preceding noun as shown in (1a). It may also be structured around a copular verb as shown in (1b). There are also spatial expressions that are not composed of three constituents. For instance, an expression ‘The book is nearby’, has only one noun and one preposition instead of two nouns, since the Ground object can be inferred from the context. The environments in which a spatial expression appears are varied, but the most important constituent is the spatial preposition. Prepositions are one of the main linguistic elements that are used to indicate spatial relationships between Figure objects and Ground objects. One of the main functions for spatial prepositions is to indicate a specific location in a large space, for example, the preposition *in* limits the location of a Figure within a Ground. The preposition *on*, *at*, and *in* are within the top 10 in both the Brown Corpus and the British National Corpus. According to Goethals (2001), frequency is a measure of probability of usefulness and high frequency words constitute a core vocabulary. Besides the rank in the frequency list, the number of senses also affects the selection of the preposition in this study. According to the Collins Cobuild English Dictionary (2012), *on* contains twenty-nine senses as a preposition, among which there are spatial senses as well as temporal senses and others, too. The number of senses is nineteen for the preposition *at*, seven for *in*,

thirteen for over, and twelve for under. These multiple senses of the prepositions are listed in the dictionary. In the rest of this section, I present various configurations and senses for the spatial preposition on. The preposition on describes ‘support,’ ‘contact,’ or ‘contiguity’ relationships that exist between the Figure and the Ground objects.<sup>1</sup>) Most often the Figure is in physical contact with the surface of the Ground. The same preposition can express multiple spatial relations. The examples in (2) describe how Figure objects are placed relative to the surface of the Ground objects. They show a wide variety of contact relations depending on the manner in which the Figures and the Grounds are physically related.

- (2) a. There is a tablecloth on the table. ‘cover’
- b. John put the poster on the wall. ‘attachment’
- c. There are pears on the branch. ‘hanging’
- d. John has a scar on his face. ‘unification’
- e. The picture on the cover of the books is ugly. ‘part of’
- f. The house on the lake is reserved. ‘adjoining’

In (2a), the Figure, a tablecloth, is in contact with the Ground, the table, in the manner of covering it. The Figure, the poster, is in contact with the Ground, the wall, in the manner of attachment to it (2b) and pears are in contact as a manner of hanging from the branch in (2c). The rest of the examples, (2d), (2e) and (2f), express various types of contacts such as unification, being part of, and adjoining, respectively. These diverse meanings demonstrate that Figure objects can be located in different places in relation to the Ground even when the same preposition is used. The regions of the Ground objects can vary. The region of contact with the Figure is the surface of the Ground (2a). The supporting regions of the Ground object can be vertical as in (2b). The region pertaining to the example (2f) is adjacency of the Ground object. The region is a specific part of the Ground and it can vary according to

spatial relationships. For instance, the regions can be identified as a surface, an interior, or broad exterior areas of the Ground. The upper surface of the Ground object supports the Figure object against the force of gravity. The various types of contact relations between Figures and Grounds show that a specific Figure can be assigned a different region in relation to a Ground on the basis of context knowledge. The choice among prepositions that describe a particular spatial scene is typically the outcome of the interaction among quite complicated perceptual, geometric, pragmatic and conventional factors. Herskovits provides a detailed explanation of a geometric approach to descriptions of spatial prepositions. She regards various spatial relations as “usage types” of the spatial prepositions, which deviate from an “ideal meaning.”<sup>2)</sup> An ideal meaning of a preposition describes the most typical situations associated with the preposition and usage types account for situations that deviate from the typical case via “pragmatic tolerance.” Herskovits distinguishes a series of usage types for each preposition and these usage types form one of the foundations of this study. Herskovits categorizes all the examples in (2) into one category, which she calls, “Spatial entity supported by a physical object,” one of 11 use types of on. <sup>3)</sup> This study will include identifying various spatial configurations inherent within the spatial expressions that contain the preposition on. When fine-grained specifications within spatial expressions are needed, Herskovits’ listed examples are categorized into more refined groups in order to differentiate the spatial configurations. For example, one seemingly simple relationship like ‘support’ does not fully explain spatial configurations. Due to the force of gravity, objects arranged in the vertical dimension tend to be supported by other objects as in (2).

As mentioned above, most prepositions in English express some sense of spatial location, which is the source of a number of extensions into other abstract non-locative domains through metaphor and metonymy:

(1) I am working hard *on* my English

(2) They are working out *on* it.

Positive, static location as in (1) may be expressed by means of prepositions such as *on*, *in* and *at*, and negative, static location (2) by means of *away*, *off* and *out*. Furthermore, prepositions may express change of location, which involves a source (3) (e.g. *from* and *off*), that is, an initial location, and a goal (4) (e.g. *to*, *on/onto*, *in/into*).

(3) I am heading *on* Heathrow

(4) I went *to* Heathrow.

In analyzing the semantic categories in connection with the first research question, I have included prepositions that express positive and negative static location in one category, whereas source and goal are separate categories. Prepositions that express either time position or duration are included as locational as they are seen as locating events in time. Non-target prepositions that express (static) position is the largest semantic category in the sample and include examples like (5a) below. Prepositions that denote a goal, is the second largest category with examples such as (5a). Source prepositions such as (6a) are relatively infrequent among the non-target prepositions in the corpus:

(5a) When we all, eventually was finished *on* the stage ...

(5b) When we ere all eventually finished *at* stage ...

(6a) When I was going *on* the mall, my moped stopped.

(6b) When I was going *to* the mall, my motorbike stopped.

(7a) I woke up *on* the point of the phone ringing again.

(7b) I woke up *from* the phone ringing again.

In addition to the three locational groups described above, I distinguish four additional categories based on what has been found in the sample. In (7a), non-target on expresses cause/reason. I have also included (7) in the same category as it expresses intention, which is seen as a sub-sense of causality (7a) ... on the last movie the return of the king they did win 11 Oscars

(7b) ... They won an Oscar for the last movie, the Return of the King

(8a) When we have taken a walk to the shop on purpose of buying a coke...

(8b) When we have taken a walk to the shop in order to buy a coke ...

Furthermore, I have included non-target prepositions such as (9a) in a separate category labeled manner:

(9a) He went home with the bus.

(9b) He went home on bus

As there are many non-target examples with senses such as about/regarding/with respect to these have been included in a separate category with examples such as (9a) and (10a):

(9a) I am carrying on a very deep research.

(9b) I am taking on this challenge.

(10a) I think they have kind of a apathetic position to the environment.

(10b) I think they have kind of an apathetic attitude on the environment.

Finally, I have included non-target prepositions where I cannot detect any semantic meaning but merely grammatical functions of various kinds in the category grammaticized prepositions. Examples include (11a) and (12a) below:

(11a) ... the adults are more clever to hold the environment clean.

(11b) ... the adults are better on holding the environment clean.

(12a) What a perfect start on a day.

(12b) What a perfect start of the day.

### 3.3. Temporal syntactic-semantic constructions with preposition “on”

The temporal syntaxes considered in this paragraph from the procedural category is characterized by syntactic - semantic signs of activity and post-preposition. Presence and suggestion - gerund combinations in the following sentences of the syntactic - semantic sign of activity are proved with the help of an experiment - transformation of verbalization when the gerund is replaced by the corresponding finite form of the verb in which there is an element endowed with the sign of agentivity (indicating the manufacturer of the action) for example:

1. she announced, upon having put her ear to the ground
2. she'd put her ear to the ground (pg: ... after a certain most honored member ...

The presence of the sign of posteriori in the content of the studied combinations is indicated by their functional correlation with the adverb after which has the status of an independent elementary unit in the structure of the sentence (characterized by the significance of the post-preposition of the sequence)

Temporal posterior active syntax has expression variants with combinations of various (indefinite and perfect) forms of gerund with the preposition after.

#### Variation+on+V

1. In the House, on the proceedings, that's possible, Ghost was surpassing
2. Clothes, on washing, after washing with water, water
3. On opening the door, he stood still wordlessly
4. Rivals were eager to take on winning strike.
5. They went on fighting harshly

#### Variation+on+V

1. It will be a lot more on the improved books.
2. He's quite on losing side, it seems funny
3. They were driving on teasing her on purpose

Thus, the syntactic - semantic content of the combinations after V and after V is characterized by signs of the procedurality of temporality of posteriority and activity. The syntaxes implemented by these combinations can be called procedural temporal posterior active. The syntax - semantic content of the studied combinations is characterized by an additional syntax - semantic feature.

Let's analyze the following sentences:

1. Do not get on the part.
2. He came home on being lost.

In the examples given, we replace the gerunda construction with a subordinate sentence of time:

1. Upon being tasted in every possible way

He didn't get the part

After they tested him ...

2. He ... came home after being lost

He came home after he was given for dead.

The conducted experiment reveals the presence of the indication of directionality - in the content of the propositional - gerundial combination, therefore this syntactic unit is called the processual temporal posterior active directional syntax.

Consider the posterior active directional syntax has the following options:

Variation+ on+ being V

After + gerundial indefinite form of the verb in the passive voice

1. ...and especially upon their demerits after being spoiled by Miss Domber
2. The youth of Michael Klein has been spilled over and has been spilled over.

Variation + on+ having been V

After + gerundial perfect form of the verb in the passive voice

1. on the fire, they were struggling hard
2. ... on having been running back, he stopped moving

Temporal post-preposition syntaxes are opposed to syntax that are characterized by a differential syntax and semantic sign of anteriority. The temporal syntax from the procedural category in the following sentences is also characterized by syntactic - semantic signs of activity and anteriority.

1. He paused on adding his new line.
2. Daniel said on the brink of draining his mug.

The given examples are subjected to experiment: we replace the combination of before + V with a subordinate sentence of time where there is an element endowed with a sign of agentivity (indicating the manufacturer of the action).

1. He paused adding / He paused before he added
2. Daniel said before draining his mug / Daniel said before his mug.

The presence of a sign of animority in the content of the studied combination with the preposition before indicates that they functionally correlate with the adverb before which has in the structure of the sentence the status of an independent syntactic unit characterized by the value of precedence. It is proposed that the gerundial combination in the following sentences, in addition to the sign of activity, also has a differential syntax-semantic indication of directionality:

1. There were bills - big bills awaiting the summer profits on being paid.

Let's put the given proposal to the experiment: let's replace the gerundial constructions with subordinate sentences of the time:

1. The clothes were washed before you were put on,
2. ... there were bills - big bills awaiting the summer profits before being paid ...  
/ ... before they were paid ...

The given experiment reveals the presence of signs of activity and directivity in the content of the proposed-gerundial combinations under study. In this section, as well as in the previous one, we have carried out a syntax-based analysis combined with the prepositions after and before appearing in the position of the dependent component in transitive and intransitive verbs. Analysis of the

syntactic - semantic content of the studied combinations leads us to the following conclusions:

1. For the prepositionally - nominal combined with the prepositions after and before, one syntactic position is characteristic, namely the dependent position in transitive and intransitive verbs.

2. Combinations with the prepositions after and before can serve as means of expressing various syntaxes — elementary syntactic units characterized by differential syntax-semantic features. Such units are primarily the following syntax from the category of substantial:

- 1) temporal posterior – he is always on the move
- 2) temporal posterior active – Tom carrying on well
- 3) temporal posterior static – Synod was on her own
- 4) temporal enteric – Simon running on the pitch
- 5) temporal enteric active – We will challenge on them
- 6) temporal enteric active – The company cannot count on the manager
- 7) temporal posterior and anterior to the terminal – The boy stood out on the street

In addition, two syntaxes are defined that are neither substantive nor procedural, i.e. deprived categorical syntax - semantic feature. Eeo - temporal and locative syntax.

3. Syntaxes expressed by combinations of after and before are between themselves and other syntax in system relationships. System relationships exist between temporal locative interactive as well as active syntaxes.

4. Within each of the paradigmatic series of substantive and procedural temporal syntaxes, opposition is carried out according to some or additional syntax and semantic feature, with general categorical and one or two non-categorical syntax and semantic features. For example, the paradigmatic row of the substantial temporal syntaxes includes the temporal posterior and several other temporal posterior. Locative locative relative locative interactive locative interactive quantitative form a series of locative syntaxes. The paradigmatic series of

interactive syntaxem consists of an interactive interactive object interactive interactive agent interactive temporal interactive syntactic syntax. The syntax of the method of the interactive method is also correlated with other syntaxes of the method. Active temporal syntax differs from all previous syntaxes not only by noncategorical but also by categorical features of processuality.

5. The study of syntactic - semantic features of prepositional sentences combined in the structure of a sentence contributes to the establishment of system relations by syntax and their variants. So temporal posterior and anterior syntaxes have variants expressed by combinations of a noun with prepositions before and after combinations of personal pronouns, so the system of syntax options are different.

### **3.4. Locative syntactic-semantic constructions with preposition “on”**

Locative is a semantic role which identifies the location or spatial orientation of a state or action. A locative semantic role does not imply motion to, from, or across the location.

1. On which play did we decide to put?
2. On the play, Romeo and Juliet, we decided to put.
3. We decided to put seriously on the play, Romeo and Juliet.
4. We put on the play, Romeo and Juliet, and they, on the play,
5. On which chair did John sit?
6. On his chair John sat.
7. John sat quietly on his chair.
8. John sat on the chair, and Mary, on the floor.
9. On which coat did John try?
10. On this coat John tried.

In English, a condition with the preposition "on" in a dependent position can be used to indicate a place to improve an action. In this case, a syntax is revealed, which is characterized by a syntax-semantic and a sign of locality. Consider several sentences in which the prepositional combination is in a dependent position: Hastings was jotting down by the window. Harry demonstrated a very good performance on the stage. Both of them had to talk. To determine the syntactic-semantic feature of locality, one can apply the transformation of replacing the element under investigation adverb there: Hastings was jotting down sitting by the window there. In addition to the transformation with there, all translated sentences can be subjected to experiment with the replacement of the preposition "on" expressing spatial relations. He helped him to transcribe his notes. Thus, the possibility of replacing the combination "on + S" by an adverb there or by a combination in front of S indicates the presence of a sign of locality in the syntactic semantic content of the elements under study:

1. John tried happily on the coat.

2. John tried on this coat, and Mary, on that skirt.
3. On what expression did John's face take?
4. On a happy expression John's face took.
5. John's face took gradually on a happy expression.
- 6 John's face took on a happy expression, but Mary's face, on a sad one.
7. On which bus did John get?
8. On bus 101 John got.
9. John got quickly on bus 101.
10. John got on bus 101, and Mary, on bus 104.
11. On which light did John turn?
12. On the lamp John turned.
13. John turned quickly on the lamp.
14. John turned on the lamp, and Mary, on the TV set.
15. On which relative did John depend?
16. On his grandma John depended.
17. John depended heavily on his grandma.
18. John depended on his grandma, and Mary, on her grandpa.
19. On which milk did John insist?
20. On whole milk John insisted.
21. John insisted unreasonably on whole milk.
32. John insisted on whole milk, but Mary, on low-fat milk.

The lexical base of locative syntaxes are substantial with the following meanings: a) nouns indicating the place or location of an object in space (a house, a name, a building, an altar, a stall, an instrument) b) nouns pointing to a work of art (a picture, a statue) c) nouns with the beginning of collectivity (public, union, tribe) d) nouns denoting related relationships (a man, a woman) his sons. e) nouns denoting the names of dishes and fruits. a fruit, mutton. a plate of fruit. f) nouns denoting meteorological, geographical, and astronomical phenomena (sun moon warmth) they were sitting before the sun. g) nouns denoting a profession (a mayor, an official) he stand before the menager

h) nouns toponyms and acronyms (center, place, opera, shop) and) nouns denoting a person's appearance (figure, eye, brow a lip) k) nouns denoting the names of animals (dog, a bird, a hound) l) nouns animation, denoting persons proper names, pseudonyms and then (king, knight, a queen) m) nouns denoting abstract notions of a phenomenon (tribunal, injustice, possibility) a substantial locative syntaxes has variants pronounced combinations pronominal with the preposition on. We have identified combinations of pronominal variants: a variant before me, a variant on him, a variant on her, a variant on it, a variant on us, a variant on you, a variant on them. The combinations on what, on which, in the position of the dependent component in the subordinate clause serve as means of expressing a relative (syntax) syntax, which differs from other syntaxes as being endowed with syntax and semantic sign of relativity. On the syntactic semantic feature of relativity. A.M. Mukhin writes: a peculiar group of pronoun lexemes is relative pronouns who, whom, which, that, whose, which is used only in subordinate dependent sentences, performing the union function in them. In other words, the syntactic connection between the subordinate and the main application is made precisely through the relative pronoun, which is to introduce the subordinate application. In this case, the relative pronoun, in contrast to the subordinate union, acts as an elementary syntactic unit (often in combination with a preposition), which are in one or another syntactic connection with another elementary unit in the subordinate clause. A syntaxiko semantic attribute of locality is proved by an experiment with the replacement of a prepositional variant of a locative relative syntaxem by its non-predictable variant, which is expressed by the where pronoun. It is possible to carry out the transformation of omission of the pronominal elements: In this case, there is a replacement of the expressed variant of the locative relative syntaxem by a partly expressed variant of it (from the formal means of expression there is only a preposition). The locative relational syntaxema has a number of connotative variants, represented by combinations of the preposition on with relative pronouns on which. on whom, on what. A distinctive feature of the on what

option is that this combination is most often used in colloquial speech (both in its book and oral versions). The implementation of the variants on whom and on which is determined by the lexical semantic anteceptive element: in cases where a substantive element with a face value is used in this position, the on whom variant is realized, and in other cases, the variant on which.

The adverbial element on is considered as a locative syntaxem proper, since the element on is deprived of the categorial sign of substantiality. Compare the above sentences with the following sentences: Again the run ice broke away on and on. In the first sentences we observe the implementation of the locative syntaxemi itself. This syntaxem, devoid of the sign of substantiality, can be expressed by various adverbial elements. The substantive locative syntaxema is combined with various determinants, and its lexical base consists of nouns of various semantics. The study of the locative syntax itself is not included in our tasks, since the combination of the sentence does not serve as means of its expression:

#### Phrasal and Non-phrasal Verbs in the Configuration of V-P-NP

##### V-on-NP

take on NP – They took on their rivals

take on NP – The boy has just taken on his jacket

turn on NP – The audience turned on to the magician

set on NP – The Hopkins have already set on a journey

capitalize on NP – We have to capitalize on our actions

feed on NP – The boy fed on milk

try on NP – You must try on this suit

trespass on NP – They all trespassed on the border

cheer on NP – The man cheered on the player

act on NP – The government acted on the law

get on NPc – Simon must get on the bus

work on NP – My uncle is working on his skill

focus on NP – Never lose your focus on the goal

slip on NP – The little boy slipped on the ice  
dwell on NP – I like dwelling on my own residence  
concentrate on NP – Pupils, concentrate on the lesson  
insist on NP – We insist on your presence  
call on NP – My friend calls on me occasionally  
depend on NP – Everything depends on you  
remark on NP – There is no remarks on this issue  
experiment on NP – The chemist experimented on the element  
agree on NP – I cannot agree on this matter  
put on NPd – Stones put on her coat  
put on NPe – Just put on your own view  
put on weight - He has recently put on some weight  
put on the brake - The driver put on the brake suddenly  
go on a diet – it is difficult to go on a diet

The syntaxes considered in this section differ from all previous syntaxes in their syntax and semantic features. They constitute the paradigmatic series of interactive syntaxes that are categorized as substantial. Consider the following sentences, in which prepositional combinations are endowed with syntactic semantic sign of interactivity (repeatability, repetition, multiple). He went on crying. Before proceeding to the proof of the presence of a sign of iteration, it should be noted that the underlined combinations in each case represent one syntax, that is, one indivisible syntactic integer. This feature of underlined combinations is confirmed by the impossibility of omitting their components. Day on day, he went on crying. The presence of a sign of interactivity in the content of combinations of the type can be revealed by means of experiments with the replacement of one variant of interactive syntax by another.

## **Overall Conclusion**

Based on the result of the data analysis which is presented above, it can be drawn by some conclusions. Preposition on which was analyzed in this writing describe that they have syntactic function. The function of preposition on is divided into two points, such as postmodifier in noun phrase, adverbial and complementation. From the data source it could be found only two functions that are adverbial and complementation, to develop a well structure. The application of the functions above makes the concern of the research to that's two functions.

From this writing can be found that the function of adverbial will occur if preposition on is presented in the complete sentence which consist of; subject, predicate and object.

On the other side, complementation will occur if the sentence is not complete as well. The prepositions in, at, and on in this writing are preceded by some classes of word that are verb and adjective. However, noun class dominates all of the classes of words. About the meaning, each preposition, that is, in, at, and on has some meaning categories. The meaning categories of preposition in consist of positive position, space, and time position. The meaning categories of preposition at consist of positive position, time position, and goal or target. The meaning categories of preposition on consist of positive position, and time position. The preposition "on" which expresses the meaning categories is followed or joined by a noun which is formed by a word, a phrase, and clause.

It is important to write on the setting of the thesis, as well. In the introduction part of the dissertation paper, the aim, goal, actuality, practicality and the eminent figures and their contributions have been mentioned. In the next stage, namely, in Chapter One, general information about prepositions, their usage and the lexical, syntactic semantic analysis of verbs have thoroughly highlighted. In Chapter Two, main features of preposition on and the phrasal constructions of the prepositions and their meanings have been analysed with

the help of examples. Following the Chapter Three, more precise and clear statements and examples which are taken from different sources have been presented by analyzing them all from the aspects of lexical, syntactic and semantic features. At the end of each sub-part, there have been rendered conclusions and overall views. This humble work is an attempt to improve the use of the English prepositions in particular "on" since they make problems for students. We hope that learners will benefit as well as we benefit to improve our English prepositions use. We also suggested that some meanings associated with words must be due to pragmatic differencing, context and background knowledge. The polysemy of the lexical unit in turns out to be a quite complex integrated system. The former controversy on the nature of the landmark as a container or a medium might be superseded by a conception with more than one prototype. After an analysis of a large number of examples it turns out that the lexical unit "on" gives predominance to a topological configuration in the conceptualization of the relationship between space and time. And the polysemy of the meanings and their combinations have been discussed in the third chapter of this dissertation paper. On the other hand this paper represents a step forward in semantic description. As far as theoretical modeling is concerned, the radial network model of polysemy has been improved. Conceptual distance between senses is graphically represented. Directions in semantic specialization are shown by conceptual regions. These conceptual regions are defined by three types of spatial configuration: topological, force-dynamic, and functional. This model integrates previous descriptions that used only one of these three parameters in isolation, and ignored the others. Moreover, it provides a systematic model for the polysemous semantic structure of lexical units that express spatial or temporal relations in English.

## References

1. Bennett, D. C. 1975. *Spatial and Temporal Uses of English Prepositions: An Essay in Stratificational Semantics*. London: Longman.
2. Bowerman, M. 1996. *Learning how to structure for language: a crosslinguistic perspective*.
3. Brugman, C. 1988. *The Story of Over: Polysemy, Semantics, and the Structure of the Lexicon*. New York: Garland.
4. Brugman, C. and George Lakoff. 1988. *Cognitive topology and lexical networks*.
5. Cooper, G. S. 1968. *A Semantic Analysis of English Locative Prepositions*.
6. Copestake, A. and Briscoe, T. 1995. *Semi-productive polysemy and sense extension*. *Journal of Semantics* 12 (1), pp. 15–67.
7. Cruse, D. A. 1986. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
8. Goethals, M.(2001) *The use of word frequency data in the teaching of English as an alternative/additional language*. *Reflections on Language and Language Learning*.
9. Gillon, B.S. 1987. *The Readings of Plural Noun Phrases in English*. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10, pp. 199-219. *Synthese* 85 (3), pp.
10. Lindstromberg, S. (2000). *English prepositions explained*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
11. Miller, G. & Johnson-Laird. (1976). *Language and perception*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
12. Nam, S. (1995). *The Semantics of locative prepositional phrases in English*.
13. Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and other Dangerous Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

14. Landau, B and Jackendoff, R. 1993. *“What” and “where” in spatial language and spatial cognition*. Behavioral and Brain Sciences 16 (2), pp. 217-265.
15. Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
16. Talmy, L. (1985). *Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms*.
17. Jackendoff, R. (1983). *Semantics and cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
18. Chomskiy, N. 1965 *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
19. Fauconnier, G. 1985 *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
20. Fauconnier, G. & E. Sweetser (eds.) 1996 *Spaces, Worlds, and Grammar*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
21. Fauconnier, G. & M. Turner 1994 *Conceptual Projection and Middle Spaces*, Report 9401, Department of Cognitive Science, UCSD.
22. Quirk et al., 1985 *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London: Longman.
23. Sinha, C. & L. A. Thorseng, 1995, 'A Coding System for Spatial Relational Reference', *Cognitive Linguistics*, 6-2/3, 261-309.
24. R.Kiyamov. Karshi – 2009. Лингвистический анализ предложных сочетаний в современном английском языке.