

Exploring Syntactic Function Inversion in the Context of Lexical Verb Transfer between English and Tamil

Dr. R. Saranya

CAS in Linguistics, Annamalai University
drsaranyaraja@gmail.com

Shakir Azeem C B

Ph.D. Research Scholar
CAS in Linguistics, Annamalai University

=====
Abstract

The staggering volume of translation into Indic languages in various fields as well as domains, especially from English, has given rise to acute and long-term demands to investigate the underlying linguistic-cognitive processes with a view to clarifying, facilitating and enhancing transfer mechanism for a desired quality output. This pertains to both MT/MAHT and human translation, not only because of the scale but also support-system tooling needs of the vast and pervasive ongoing translation activity.

Understanding the key role of verb as the central element in predicator has inevitable implications in mediation of meanings across languages smoothly and accurately. The propositional components embedded within clause elements that lead to informational content in a text largely revolve around predicator and the event. The need therefore to delineate the behavior of lexical verbs as the core of predicator becomes crucial.

Going beyond syntactic categorization of lexical verbs, this paper attempts to account for syntactic function inversion – subject-object or subject-complement inversion – of lexical verbs between English and Tamil in terms of event structures, syntactic and semantic classification of verbs, diathesis alternation, argument realization and theta roles. In this, it draws upon some of

the best-known works and developments in these areas including Levin (1993; 2005), Jackendoff (1996), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998), Perek (2015), Li (2015) and Truswell (2019).

The equivalents of English verbs ‘have’ and ‘like’ in their lexical versions are among some of the most commonly occurring ones in Indic languages of Dravidian and Indo Aryan families with intriguing behavior leading to syntactic function inversion in translation. These are taken as primary candidates for investigation leading to other groups of English lexical verbs that exhibit similar behavior in translation between English and Tamil.

The significance of this exploration lies in explicating crosslinguistic non-correspondence in behavior of one sub-set of lexical verbs in Tamil vis-à-vis English and thus help elucidate the rationale behind determining the referred sense in a text for translation as well as make appropriate choices of equivalence and translation technique in producing the target language text. I am sure the elucidation will also add significantly to the insights underpinning the development of NLP algorithms. The study is extendable across Indic language pairs and between English and other Indic languages, of Dravidian and Indo Aryan families.

Keywords: Syntactic Function Inversion, Lexical Verb Transfer, English and Tamil, Construal, Cross-linguistic transfer, Event structure, Predicator Verb.

Introduction

Mediation of predicate verbs in translation, i.e., cross-linguistic transfer, depends on how the event itself denoted by the predicate verb is construed and re-expressed from a source language (SL) text to a target language (TL) text. The issue then becomes one of examining the event structure that a verb in the predicator gives rise to. This paper attempts to explain the predicator verb transfer between English and Tamil proceeding from a simple syntactic categorization of the verb, through its argument realization, to the semantic content of the verb and the event structure.

The verbs ‘like’ and ‘have’ in their lexical versions are taken as candidates for this investigation. Both exhibit a triggering role in translation shift in terms of syntactic function inversion – i.e., change of the subject into object or complement. While the verb ‘like’ is explored for all its sense groups given by the possible sub-categorization frames, the verb ‘have’

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 24:12 December 2024

Dr. R. Saranya and Shakir Azeem C B., Ph.D. Research Scholar

Exploring Syntactic Function Inversion in the Context of Lexical Verb Transfer between English and Tamil

is dealt with only for those sense groups whose meaning extension stays within the ambit of its core meaning of ‘possession’.

History of Event Structure Research

This study benefits from Truswell (2019) where he gives a broad outline of event structure research. The three pillars in this field are Davidson’s covert event argument (1967), Vendler’s classification of events based on their temporal or aspectual properties (1957), and compositionality of verb meaning through decomposition by Lakoff (1965) and McCawley (1968). The significance of Davidson’s approach to event semantics that adverbial modifiers play a role in conditioning the events lies in the importance of pragmatic information in interpreting events, going beyond semantic content of the verb. Vendler’s classification of events into states, activities, accomplishments and achievements based on telicity and durativity laid the foundation for further research on classification of events, such as Kratzer (1995) and Maienborn (2007), and Smith (1991), who respectively proposed subdivisions in classes of states and achievements. Lakoff and McCawley, the generative semanticists, put forward the conception of semantic complexity of the verb in terms of verb root on the one hand and core predicates – CAUSE, BECOME and DO – on the other. This set off research on lexical decomposition and two-dimensional meaning composition of verbs.

Further studies by synthesis and refinement of these core ideas have led to the development of event structure research to an advanced level as it is today. Particularly notable in this event-related framework to investigate verb meaning are two major lines of research (Dolling, 2008). One of these (developed by, for example, Dowty, 1979; Jackendoff, 1990; Pustejovsky, 1991; Bierwisch, 1997; Rappaport and Levin, 1998) attempts to establish that the syntactic behavior of a verb follows from its lexical-semantic entry. It “assumes that verbs have to be decomposed in the lexicon, independently of syntax, into more primitive predicates (p. VIII). The other line (e.g., Hale and Keyser, 1993; von Stechow, 1996; Ritter and Rosen, 1998; Travis, 2000; Ramchand, 2003; Borer, 2005) holds that the event structure is expressed in syntax and that the meaning of verbs could be decomposed into primitives attached to functional heads and verbal roots.

The contribution of Levin (e.g., 1993, 2009, 2011, 2015) as well as Rappaport and Levin (e.g., 1998, 2001, 2002, 2015) to verb classification is particularly remarkable. They base it on a verb's participation in diathesis alternations, extended meanings, and the bipartite structure of verb meaning premised on the event schema and root mediated ontological type. Especially, they have demonstrated the attribution of manner vs. result ontological dichotomy to the root. Li (2015) proposes an event structure representation beyond this syntactic and semantic characterization to include pragmatic/discourse factors.

Notable works on study of verbs in Tamil and their classification are Lindholm (1969), Schiffman (1969, 1999), Annamalai (1975, 1985), Kothandaraman (1977), Steever (2005) among others. Rajendran (e.g., 1978, 1981, 2002a, 2002b, 2006) has an impressive array of contribution on Tamil verb research including syntactic and semantic description of verb classes of communication, transfer and direction, and a work on resolving verbal polysemy in Tamil.

Annotations and Examples for Investigation

For annotation and examples, this study takes the help of VerbNet, the most extensive online verb lexicon for English. It incorporates Levin's classification of verbs organized into a refined taxonomy and integrates two more later-developed extensions (of Korhonen and Briscoe (2004) as well as Korhonen and Ryant (2005)), which makes the database most comprehensive and versatile (Kipper, 2007). VerbNet also provides a 'Unified Verb Index' annotation bringing together PropBank, FrameNet and OntoNotes Sense Groupings. The index has a total of 8537 verbs represented.

Further examples for the study are taken from five standard online lexicons– Cambridge dictionary, Collins, Longman, Macmillan and Merriam Webster – that are citation- and corpus-based with a sound representation of real-life language use. For example, Cambridge and Collins dictionaries are built on Cambridge English Corpus and COBUILD respectively.

Transfer of English Verb 'like'

Organizing the data for investigating syntactic, semantic and pragmatic characteristics of the verb (in different situations):

The examples from the lexicons are tabulated using a scheme of sense-grouping hierarchy. Starting from an overarching description as an ‘experiencer focused emotion’ (FrameNet), it is divided into two sense groupings (OntoNotes) approximately corresponding to the meanings of ‘admire’ and ‘want’ respectively (VerbNet). The ‘admire’ group is glossed as “have affection towards, be fond of, enjoy (habitually), or approve”, while the ‘want’ group is glossed as “wish, want (polite), or prefer to do something” (PropBank; OntoNotes).

Further, the ‘admire’ group uses the verb in its indicative mood, not occurring in the progressive aspect as a rule. The ‘want’ group occurs as subjunctive with almost always the use of modal ‘would’ and rarely ‘should’.

These two sense groupings are further sub-divided as follows:

‘Admire’ group’s division is based on whether the grammatical (syntactic) object is an entity, event or quality. Without further division, the types of these object-embodying entities, events and qualities – perceptual categories – are given as descriptions.

‘Want’ group’s division is based on whether the grammatical (syntactic) object is an entity or event. Again, the types of these entities and events are given as descriptions.

For each entry, the syntactic realization patterns are noted in terms of constructional forms, transitivity and arguments. The descriptor set for construction forms are given by 1. Statement/question; 2. Phrasal/clausal; and 3. Positive/negative. The semantic information noted, in addition to the above-mentioned glosses and perceptual categories, are semantic roles, argument descriptions and event descriptions. The pragmatic information noted is the lexicon description of contextual meaning.

Corollaries are elicited from the above information in each entry, while also providing Tamil translation. Then, inferences are drawn from these to account for the transfer behavior of the predicator verb, i.e., the reasoning on what equivalent the verb takes in each situation, nature of its arguments, and distribution of the patterns.

Abbreviations

SYN – Syntactic information; SEM – Semantic information; PRG – Pragmatic information

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 24:12 December 2024

Dr. R. Saranya and Shakir Azeem C B., Ph.D. Research Scholar

Exploring Syntactic Function Inversion in the Context of Lexical Verb Transfer between English and Tamil

St – Statement; Qn – Question; Ph – Phrasal; Cl – Clausal; Pos – Positive; Neg – Negative; mod – modal; S – Subject; V – Predicator Verb; v – Non-Predicator verb; O – Object; A – Adjunct; C – Complement; Arg0/1/2... – Argument 0/1/2...

En – Entity; Ev – Event; Qy – Quality; Cn – Concrete; Ab – Abstract; Exp – Experiencer; Stm – Stimulus; Piv – Pivot; Thm – Theme; Lkr – Liker; Obaf – Object of affection

Template for syntactic description:

Construction form	Object realized by	Affirmation	Transitivity	Clause elements	Arguments
Statement, Question	Phrase, Clause	Positive, Negative	Transitive, Intransitive	Subject, Predicator Verb, Object, Adjunct, Complement	Arg0/1/2/3...

Template for semantic description:

Perceptual Category of the Object	Semantic roles	Argument Description	Event Description Number
Entity, Event, Quality, Concrete, Abstract	Experiencer, Stimulus, Pivot, Theme	Liker, Object of Affection, Desirer, Desired	[1], [2]

Data and Description for ‘Admire’ Group

Event Descriptions:

[1] emotional_state (E, Emotion, Experiencer) in_reaction_to (E, Stimulus)

[2] desire (E, Pivot, Theme)

Table-1 ‘Admire’ group – Grammatical object as entity

S. N o.	Example Sentence	Descriptions
1a	<p>i. Do you like fish? ungkaLukkumiinpiTikkumaa?</p> <p>ii. The tourists liked the paintings. suRRulaapayaNikaLukkuintaooiviyangkaLpiTittirundtatu.</p>	<p>SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>PRG:to enjoy or approve of something</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>PRG: to feel something is pleasant or attractive</p>
1b	<p>i. I liked the movie a lot more than I thought I would. paTamndaanetirparttataividamikavumenakkuppiTittirundtatu. paTamndaanetirparttataividamikavumndanRaakairundtatu.</p> <p>ii. Which of her novels did you like best? avarutaiyaendtandaavalungkaLukkumikappiTittirundtatu.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO A ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1- Arg2</p> <p>SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>PRG: to enjoy or approve of</p>

		<p>something</p> <p>SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1-Arg2</p> <p>SEM: En-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>PRG: to enjoy or feel something is pleasant</p>
1c	<p>i. You'll like my brother. ensakotaranunakkuppiTittuviTum.</p> <p>ii. Do you think Alex likes me? alexukkuennaippiTikkirataa? alexennai virumpuki Raanaa?</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: En-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>PRG: to think that someone is nice or enjoy being with them</p> <p>SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: En-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>SEM: En-Cn/Piv-Thm/ Desirer-</p>

		Desired/[2] PRG: to think someone is sexually attractive (event [2])
1d	i. How do you like America? amerikkaungkaLukkuevvaLavupiTittirukkiratu? amerikkaeppaTiirukkiratu?	SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1- Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: asking for opinion on something or whether it is enjoyable or pleasant
1e	i. I like my beer warm. matusaRRusuuTaakairuppatuenakkuppiTikkum. ii. I like my music loud. isaiyaisaptamaakavaittukkeTpatuenakkuppiTikkum.	SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1- Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to enjoy or be fond of SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1- Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Exp-

		Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:to enjoy or be fond of
1f	<p>i. I like it when a book is so good that you can't put it down. oru puttakammuuTivaikkamuTiyaataaLavusuvaarasyamaakairukkum pootuatuenakkuppiTikkum.</p> <p>ii. I quite like honey but I could live without it. teen enakkumikavumpiTikkum, enRaalumatuillaamalennaalvaazamudiyum.</p> <p>iii. I like him as a fellow Indian. oru indtiyanenRavakaiyilavanaaienakkuppiTikkum.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:to enjoy or approve of something</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to enjoy or approve of something</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p>

		PRG: to approve of someone for something
1g	<p>i. This plant likes dry soil. indtassedikkuvaRanTamaNpiTikkum.</p> <p>ii. I like onions but they don't like me. enakkuvengkaayampiTikkumaanaalvengkayattukkuennaippiTikk aatu.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:something is conducive for development (figurative)</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1- Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: good for one's health (figurative)</p>
1h	<p>i. Leave any time you like. unakkuppiTittandeerattilsellalaam. ndeevirumpiyandeerattilsellalaam.</p> <p>ii. I do believe there were some elephants which I liked. enakkuppiTittasilayaanaikaLangkeirundtanaenRuninakkiReen. angkesilayaanaikaLenakkuppiTittirundtatu.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Int/SVO⇒ Arg0-v SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:wish or prefer (occurs as part of adjectival, not a</p>

		<p>predicator)</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Int/SVO⇒ Arg0-v-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:to enjoy or approve of something (occurs as part of adjectival, not a predicator, but could be rephrased to occur as predicate)</p>
li	<p>i. Please take a moment to “Like” us on Facebook. tayavuseytu oru ndimiTameTuttukkondumukanuulilengkalai “piTittirukkiratu” enRupativiTungkal.</p> <p>ii. Bunker then thanked the 477,000 people who had liked her post for their support. pirakupangkar tan pativiiTTukku “piTittirukkiratu” pooTTa 477,000 peerukkundanRiterivittaar.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1- Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to click on ‘like’ in social media context expressing approval towards something</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO</p>

		<p>⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: En-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>PRG: to click on ‘like’ in social media context expressing approval towards something</p>
--	--	--

Table-2 ‘Admire’ group – Grammatical object as event

S. No.	Example Sentence	Descriptions
2a	<p>i. I like jogging. jaakingseyvatuenakkuppiTikkum.</p> <p>ii. I just didn't like being in crowds. kuuTTamaanasuuzndilaiyiliruppatuenakkuaRavepiTikkavillai. kuuTTamaanasuuzndilaiyilirupataindaanaRavevirumpavillai.</p> <p>iii. I like going out to parties with friends or watching TV. ndanparkaLoTuveliyevirundtukusselvatualatutolaikkaatsipaarppa tuenakkuppiTikkum.</p>	<p>SYN:</p> <p>St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SV</p> <p>O⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>PRG: to find enjoyable or agreeable</p> <p>SYN:</p> <p>St/Cl/Neg/Trn/SV</p> <p>O⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv-Thm/ Desirer-</p>

		<p>Desired/[2] PRG: to think as interesting, enjoyable or attractive</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:to enjoy doing something</p>
2b	<p>i. She likes to read Russian novels. rashiyandaavalkaLpaTippatuavaLukkuppiTikkum.</p> <p>ii. Do you like to go swimming? ndeessalaTippatuunakkuppiTikkumaa? ndeendeessalaTikkavirumpukiRaaya?</p> <p>iii. I don't like to interrupt her when she's in a meeting. avaL oru sandtippilirukkumpootukuRukkiTuvatuenakkuppiTikkaatu.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to find enjoyable or agreeable</p> <p>SYN: Qn/Cl/Pos/Trn/SV O⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv-Thm/ Desirer-</p>

		<p>Desired/[2] PRG: to think as interesting, enjoyable or attractive [1]/ to wish to do something [2]</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Neg/Trn/SV O⇒Arg0-V-Arg1-Arg2</p> <p>SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>PRG:to prefer to do something in a particular way</p>
2c	<p>i. I like him to look smart. avanpaarkkaazakaakairukkavenTumenRundaanvirumpukiReen.</p> <p>ii. She likes us to hand our work in on time. ndaangkaluriyandeerattilengkalveelaiyaimuTittukkoTukkavenTumenRuavaLvirumpukiRaaL.</p> <p>iii. We like our students to take part in college sports activities. engkalmaanavarkaLkalluurivilaiyaaTTukkaLilpangkeTukkavenTumenRundaangkalvirumpukiRoom.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv-Thm/ Desirer-Desired/[2]</p> <p>PRG:prefer it to be done as part of your normal life</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO</p>

		<p>⇒Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv-Thm/ Desirer-Desired/[2] PRG:to prefer to have something done in a particular way</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv-Thm/ Desirer-Desired/[2] PRG:to try to make something happen regularly</p>
2d	<p>i. I didn't like the idea of being a single parent. oRRaippeRRavaraakairuppatuenakkuppiTikkavillai.</p> <p>ii. They liked the idea of one-stop shop for training material. payiRsissaatanangkaLanaittumoreeiTattilkiTaippatuavarkaLukkup piTittirundtatu. payiRsissaatanangkaLanaittumoreeiTattilkiTaippataiavarkaLvirum pinaarkaL.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Neg/Trn/SV O⇒Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:to regard in a favorable way</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SV</p>

		<p>O⇒Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/ Desirer- Desired/[2] PRG:to regard in a favorable way</p>
2e	<p>i. I don't like it when you get angry. ungkaLukkukkoopamvarumpootu (atu) enakkuppiTikkaatu.</p> <p>ii. The children liked that the clown had a red nose. koomaalikkusivandtamuukkuiruppatukuzandtaikaLukkuppiTittirun dtatu.</p> <p>iii. John likes pickles on his grilled cheese sandwiches. posukkiyaseenvissiluuRukaaitaTavissaappiTuvatujaanukkuppiTikk um.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Neg/Trn/SV O⇒Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:to think that it is nice or good</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to enjoy a situation</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p>

		PRG: to prefer to have something in a particular way
2f	<p>i. How did you like the President's speech last night? neRRuiravutalaivarinuraiunakkuendtaLavupiTittirundtatu? neRRuiravutalaivarinur<i>ieppaTiirundtatu?</i></p> <p>ii. How do you like your eggs? muTTaikaLaiieppaTissamaittiruppatuunakkuppiTikkum? muTTaikaLaiieppaTissamaikkavenTumenRundee<i>virumpukiRiir?</i></p>	<p>SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SV O⇒Arg0-V-Arg1-Arg2</p> <p>SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>PRG: to be fond of or approve</p> <p>SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SV O⇒Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: Ev-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1]</p> <p>SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv-Thm/ Desirer-Desired/[2]</p> <p>PRG:to prefer to have something done in a particular way</p>
2g	<p>i. I don't like to be taken for an idiot. muTTaaLaakappaarkkappaTuvataindaan<i>virumpavillai.</i></p> <p>ii. She obviously liked to think what she was thinking.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Neg/Trn/SV O⇒Arg0-V-Arg1</p> <p>SEM: Ev-Ab/Piv-Thm/ Desirer-</p>

	ndissayamaakaavvaaRuyoosippataiavaLvirumpinaaL.	<p>Desired/[2] PRG: to wish to appear in a particular way</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Ab/Piv-Thm/ Desirer-Desired/[2] PRG: to wish to be/do something in a particular way</p>
--	---	---

Table-3 ‘Admire’ group – Grammatical object as quality

S. N o.	Example Sentence	Descriptions
3a	<p>i. I don't like the way he speaks. avanpeesukiRamuRaienakkuppiTikkavillai.</p> <p>ii. I like the way the cookery book is set out. samaiyalkuRippupputtakamamaikkappaTTirukkumvitamenakkuppiTittirukkiratu.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Neg/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Qy-Cn/Exp-Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to approve of way of behaving</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒</p>

		Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Qy-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to approve or feel pleasant about a particular course of action
3b	<p>i. What I really like about her is her sense of humour. avaLiTamunmaiyleeyeenakkuppiTittatuavaLuTaiyandakaissu vaitaan.</p> <p>ii. What do you like about England? ingkilaandtupaTTriunakkuennapiTikkum?</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-v-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: Qy-Ab/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:to feel something is pleasant in someone (occurs as part of adjectival, not a predicator, but could be rephrased to occur as predicate)</p> <p>SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒Arg0-V-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: Qy-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to feel pleasant about a thing in something</p>
3c	i. Do you like this colour?	SYN:

	<p>indtandiRamunakkuppiTittirukkiRataa?</p> <p>ii. I don't like dishonesty. eemaRRuvatuenuakkuppiTikkaatu.</p>	<p>Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Qy-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to think that it is nice or good</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Neg/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Qy-Ab/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to think that it is good or right</p>
3d	<p>i. I like him for his honesty. avaRuTaiyaneermaienakkuppiTikkum. avaRiTamneermaienakkuppiTittirukkiratu.</p> <p>ii. Oliver likes me for being the way I am. ndaannaTantukoLLumvitamaalivarukkuppiTikkum. ennuTaiyaetaartanaTattaiiaalivarukkuppiTikkum.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: Qy-Ab/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to approve of a person's character</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: Qy-Cn/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG:to feel pleasant about a person's</p>

		disposition
3e	<p>i. I liked its academic slant. Atan aayvuriitiyaanapookkuenakkuppiTittirundtatu.</p> <p>ii. I liked the honesty in him. avaRiTamneermaienakkuppiTittirundtatu.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Qy-Ab/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to approve of or feel pleasant about a trait</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-V-Arg1 SEM: Qy-Ab/Exp- Stm/Lkr-Obaf/[1] PRG: to approve of a person's character</p>

Corollaries and Inferences for 'Admire' group

For the English lexical verb 'like' – considered to be a stative verb and not occurring in progressive form as a rule – occurring as S-V(likes)-O pattern in its variants, Tamil has two equivalents: piTikkum and virumpukiReen with their inflectional variants. The occurrence and argument realization (cases) of either of these are found to be conditioned by two factors, namely volition (agentivity) of the event and the construal of event direction of the verb.

piTikkum occurs in two forms, one with a subject and another without a subject as in:

- (1) *veekamaai* *ooTuvatu* *enakkup* *piTikkum*
fast running I_dat like
- (2) *avarai* *enakkup* *piTikkum*
he_acc I_dat like

In both the forms the volition (agentivity) of the verb is totally absent, clearly exhibiting a stative meaning.

The form (2) is a defective verb with null subject and closer to the English weather verbs, such as ‘(It) rained’. However, it takes an object with explicit or zero accusative marker, which plays the semantic role of stimulus. The stimulus in form (1) on the other hand seems to have a subject, for it is unmistakably nominative in case and not an accusative with a zero marker for it. The modification of syntactic roles during the transfer from ‘like’ to ‘piTikkum’ either in form (1), where the object becomes the subject or in form (2) where the subject is null, is accounted for by the event direction in the construal of the verb, which is towards **Stimulus**. Whereas in the English ‘like’ the event direction in the construal of the verb is towards the **Experiencer**. In other words, the Tamil ‘piTikkum’ is posited on ‘causing of the state (of pleasantness, approval, etc.)’, while the English ‘like’ is posited on ‘resulting of the state’.

The other Tamil equivalent ‘virumpukiReen’ – or its variants – occurs when there is volition (agentivity) in the event expressed as ‘intent’, taking on the sense of ‘wish or prefer’ rather than ‘a feeling of pleasantness or approval towards’. In the above tabulated examples, where the events have a volition – categorically or possibly – the Tamil equivalent is marked in red font. The categorical ones are 2c (i, ii, iii) and 2g (i, ii), while the possible ones are 1c(ii), 2a(ii), 2b(ii), 2d (ii) and 2f (ii). For the categorical ones, the volition is unambiguous by the sentence meaning itself, while for the possible ones the volition is ambiguous or equivocal awaiting the determination with the help of clarification from the larger practical context (pragmatic information), provided for by the text or practical situation of which the sentence is a part of.

There is more to observe regarding this behavior:

1. Most of them occur when the grammatical object (Arg1) is an event and none when it is a quality.
2. It also depends on whether the event is a habitual/recurring one or instantiated (2 a(ii), 2b(ii), 2f (ii)), the instantiation to be confirmed by the larger context, and the latter hold the possibility of expressing intent and therefore volition.

3. The syntax forms ‘like someone/something to do/be’ (2c (i, ii, iii)) and ‘like oneself to be something’ (2g (i, ii)) unmistakably expresses intent and therefore implies volition categorically.

The construal of event direction in the verb ‘virumpukiReen’ is same as that of ‘like’ with the event description, desire(E, Pivot, Theme). It is towards **Theme** and therefore accusative.

The translated versions given in brown font show native preference of expression that uses alternate to the above set of regular equivalents. Nevertheless, the usage of regular equivalents in these cases is prevalent even if less frequently and could be considered as a route to intuitively derive the said alternates in translation process.

Data and Description for ‘Want’ Group

Event Descriptions:

[1] desire (E, Pivot, Theme)

Table-4 ‘Want’ group – Grammatical object as entity

S. No .	Example Sentence	Descriptions
4a	i. Would you like something to drink? kuTikkaeetaavatuveenTumaa? ii. I think I'd like the soup for my starter. mutalilenakkusuupveenTumenRundinaikkiReen.	SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: En-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to say politely that you want something

		<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒Arg0-mod-V-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Piv-Thm/Desirer-Desired/[1] PRG: to say politely that you want something</p>
4b	<p>i. I'd like a flight on American from Newark to Nashville. ndevaarkkilorundtuneeshvil pooka amerikan (ndiruvana) vimaanattil oru siitveenTum.</p> <p>ii. I would like penpals from all over. ellaapakutikaLilirundtumkaTitandanparkaLaivaittukolla viru mpukiReen. (aasaippaTukiReen)</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒Arg0-mod-V-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Piv-Thm/Desirer-Desired/[1] PRG: to say politely that you want something</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒Arg0-mod-V-Arg1-Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Piv-Thm/Desirer-Desired/[1] PRG: to wish to have a relation</p>
4c	<p>i. I'd like an explanation for this. itarkaanakaaranattaindaanterindtukollaveenTum.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒Arg</p>

	<p>ii. I'd like your opinion about that.</p> <p>tayavuseytu atupaRRiungkalapippiraayattaiterindtukolla veenTum.</p> <p>atupaRRiungkalapippiraayattaiterindtukolla virumpukiReen.</p>	<p>g0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: En-Ab/Piv-Thm/Desirer-Desired/[1] PRG: to politely demand something</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: En-Ab/Piv-Thm/Desirer-Desired/[1] PRG: to ask for a response</p>
4d	<p>i. How would you like a glass of lemonade?</p> <p>oru kiLaasezumissaisaa RuveenTumaa? (saappiTukiriirkaLaa)</p> <p>ii. how would you like a change?</p> <p>oru maRRam veenTumenRundinaikkiRiirkaLaa?</p> <p>oru maRRam irundtalnanRaakairukkumee?</p>	<p>SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: En-Cn/Piv-Thm/Desirer-Desired/[1] PRG: to politely offer something</p> <p>SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: En-Ab/Piv-Thm/Desirer-</p>

		Desired/[1] PRG: to feel toward or regard
4e	i. Anything else you would like while I am up? ndaantoongkuvataRkumunnaalungkaLukkuveeRueetaavatuve enTumaa?	SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1- Arg2 SEM: En-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to politely offer something
4f	i. So, you would like a mental picture of what's going on? aaka, naTappataippaRRiungkaLukku oru paarvaiveenTum, illaiyaa?	SYN: Qn/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: En-Ab/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to want a clear understanding
4g	i. I should like my beer warm, thank you. enakkumatusaRRusuuTaakaveenTum, nanRi.	SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Ar g0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: En-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to want something in a particular way

Table-5 'Want' group – Grammatical object as event

S. N o.	Example Sentence	Descriptions
5a	<p>i. I'd like to go to Moscow. ndaanmaaskoo pooka virumpukiReen. ndaanmaaskoo pooka veenTum.</p> <p>ii. I'd like to book a seat for tonight's performance. inRuiravukkaaTsikku oru siiTmunpativuseyyaveenTum.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to say politely that you wish/wantto do something</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to say politely that you want something to be done</p>
5b	<p>i. The commissioner would like to say thanks to everyone who's helped with the project. tiTTattukkuutaviseytaelloorukkumkamishanarnanRisollavirump ukiRaar.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer-</p>

	<p>ii. I'd like to apologize. ndaanmannippukkeettukkollavirumpukiReen.</p>	<p>Desired/[1] PRG: to wish to express (or about to express) something</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv-Thm/Desirer-Desired/[1] PRG: to wish to express (or about to express) something</p>
5c	<p>i. I'd like you to send this for me, please. tayavuseytundeengkaLitaienakkuanuppivaikkaveenTum.</p> <p>ii. I would like you without using your calculator. tayavuseytundeengkaLungkaLkeelkuleeTTaraipayanpaTuttakku uTaatu. ndeengkaLungkaLkeelkuleeTTaraipayanpaTuttakkuuTaatenRu ndaanvirumpukiReen.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv-Thm/Desirer-Desired/[1] PRG:to request something to be done</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv-Thm/Desirer-Desired/[1]</p>

		PRG: polite instruction
5d	<p>i. I would like the whole lot finished by the weekend. itaimuzukkavaaraiRutikkuLmuTittaakaveenTumenRuvirumpuki Reen.</p> <p>ii. I would like the children found. kuzandtaikaLaikaNTupiTittaakaveenTum.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to request something to be done</p> <p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to want to make something happen</p>
5e	<p>i. I would like his cooking. ii. I would like him cooking. enakkuavanuTaiyasamaiyalveenTum. avansamaikkaveenTumenRundaanvirumpukiReen.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph- Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Ar g0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to want a thing to be done in a particular way</p>

5f	<p>i. I'd like a bath. ndaankuLikkaveenTum. ndaankuLikkavirumpukiReen.</p> <p>ii. I would like exercising. ndaanuTaRpayiRsiseyyavirumpukiReen.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: indicating a wish or desire, or a need</p> <p>SYN: St/Ph/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to wish to engage in something</p>
5g	<p>i. Would you like to tell me what happened? ennandandtatuenuenniTamsollavirumpukiRiirkaLaa? ennandandtatuenuenniTamsollalaamee?</p> <p>ii. Would you like to come along to the movies? ennooTupaTattukkuvaravirumpukiRiirkaLaa? ennooTupaTattukkuvarukiRiirkaLaa?</p>	<p>SYN: Qn/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to politely inviting to do something</p> <p>SYN:</p>

		<p>Qn/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: polite offer, asking for preference</p>
5h	<p>i. How would you like to take the afternoon off? matiyaviTuppaieppaTikkazikkavirumpukiRiirkaL?</p>	<p>SYN: Qn/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO ⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to wish a particular course of action</p>
5i	<p>i. I should like to call again soon to take a test drive. sootanairiitiyaakaooTTippaarkkaviraivilndaanmiindtumazaikkav irumpukiReen. sootanairiitiyaakaooTTippaarkkaviraivilndaanmiindtumazaippee n.</p>	<p>SYN: St/Cl/Pos/Trn/SVO⇒ Arg0-mod-V-Arg1 SEM: Ev-Cn/Piv- Thm/Desirer- Desired/[1] PRG: to wish earnestly or expect to do something</p>

Corollaries and Inferences for ‘Want’ Group

For the English verb sequence ‘would like’, occurring as S-V(would like)-O pattern in its variants, Tamil has two equivalents: virumpukiReen and VeenTum with their inflectional

variants. The occurrence and argument realization (cases) of either of these seem to be conditioned by three factors, namely presence of speech act, politeness of expression and the construal of event direction of the verb. The speech act itself is correlated to the intensity of volition (agentivity) of the event.

The Tamil equivalent ‘veenTum’ – or its variants – occurs when the expressed ‘intent’ evokes and expects a speech act (shown in blue font 4a (i, ii), 4b (i), 4c (i, ii), 4d (i, ii), 4e (i), 4f (i), 4g (i), 5a (i, ii), 5c (i, ii), 5d (ii), 5e (i, ii), 5f (i)). When the object of ‘would like’ is a perceptual event, the construal of event direction is towards **Pivot** and therefore it is accusative. But, when the object of ‘would like’ is a perceptual entity, the construal of event direction is towards **Theme** and therefore it is unaccusative. In the latter case, a syntactic function inversion takes place where the object of English ‘would like’ becomes the subject of Tamil ‘VeenTum’. The negative form of ‘VeenTum’ is ‘kuuTaatu’.

The Tamil equivalent ‘virumpukiReen’ – with its variants – occurs when the expressed ‘intent’ does not evoke and expect a speech act (shown in red font, 4b (ii), 5a (ii), 5b (i, ii), 5f (i, ii), 5g (i, ii), 5h (i), 5i (i)). The meaning of its event is generally glossed as ‘wish or prefer’.

When the practical context (pragmatic information) is required to determine whether a speech act is involved in the event or not, both options are given as a possibility.

However, ‘virumpukiReen’ could also occur in a speech act situation that demands explicit politeness of expression which comes with a semblance of formality too (shown in green font, 4c (ii), 5c (ii), 5d (i), 5 e (ii)). This could be delineated with a use of alternative form ‘tayavuseythu’ (‘please’) in some situations (4c (ii), 5c (ii)). The construal of event direction of ‘virumpukiReen’ is towards **Theme** and therefore it is accusative, with the same syntactic behavior as the English ‘like’.

Further Observations:

1. When the pattern is ‘S-would like-S (itself) to verbally express something’, there is no speech act involved and ‘virumpukiReen’ is used (5b (i, ii)), as are ‘would you like to...?’ and ‘how would you like to...?’ patterns (5g (i, ii), 5h (i)).
2. The requirement of politeness of expression is not always unambiguously determined by the sentence meaning and needs clarification from the practical context.
3. When the object is a perceptual entity, it seems that speech act is always involved and hence the equivalent is ‘VeenTum’. The only exception is when the object can be interpreted and transposed as a perceptual event in translation as in 4b (ii), where no speech act is involved.

The translated versions given in brown font show native preference of expression that uses alternate to the above set of regular equivalents. Nevertheless, the usage of regular equivalents in these cases is prevalent even if less frequently and could be considered as a route to intuitively derive the said alternates in translation process.

Preliminary Observations for the English Verb ‘have’

Since this is an ongoing study and the treatment of the verb ‘have’ along above lines is still under preparation, only a preliminary observation is presented here.

WordNet lists 19 senses for the English lexical verb ‘have’, which are mapped into 11 sense groups in OntoNotes. The entries in VerbNet into 3 sense groups approximately corresponding to the meanings of ‘own’, ‘devour’ and ‘give birth’ respectively seems incomplete. For example, the senses of ‘have’ as light verb is missing, among others.

An initial survey of these sense groupings suggests that all the senses arise from the core meaning of ‘possession’. However, these divide into two broad groups: one whose meaning revolves around this core meaning, while the other undergoes meaning extension to denote a sense far from ‘possession’.

The first group includes senses of 1. Own, 2. Possess a quality/feature, 3. Contract a disease/ailment, 4. Contain, 5. Being related, etc. All of these can be projected into the meaning

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 24:12 December 2024

Dr. R. Saranya and Shakir Azeem C B., Ph.D. Research Scholar

Exploring Syntactic Function Inversion in the Context of Lexical Verb Transfer between English and Tamil

of possession as innate or external, permanent or temporary, complete or partial, etc. It is noteworthy that these senses occur only when the lexical verb ‘have’ take perceptual entities or qualities as the grammatical object.

The second group that moves away from the core meaning includes senses of 1. Eat, 2. Light verbs, 3. Give birth/be pregnant, 4. Have an intimate relationship, 5. Experiencing a state or event, 6. Accept, allow or receive, etc. These take on senses not explicitly related to ‘possession’. Most of them occur with perceptual events as the grammatical object, while some groups such as (6) also takes perceptual entity for the grammatical object but implying a perceptual event.

For the first group, Tamil takes equivalents for the verb ‘have’ as such. They are ‘irukkiRatu’, ‘vaittiRukkiraar’, ‘konTa’ and their inflectional variants. While for the second group, the denoted event meaning is simply taken to encode equivalents. The possibility of a small set of equivalents revolving around the core meaning of ‘possession’ is ruled out.

This behaviour is possibly due to construal ability of the English lexical verb ‘have’ which can accommodate and articulate even perceptual events as grammatical entities (‘thing’), while the Tamil equivalents ‘irukkiRatu’, ‘vaittiRukkiraar’, and ‘konTa’ do not seem to have this construal ability to transpose perceptual events as grammatical entities.

Scope and Conclusion

The initial motivation of the study was to probe and account for syntactic function inversion, especially change or dropping of the subject, during cross-linguistic transfer from English to Tamil. However, investigating a wide range of representative examples from real-life usage reveals occurrence of variant equivalents and a mixed behavior, with some equivalents subject to syntactic role inversion and others not. One of the equivalents ‘VeenTum’ also occurs in either of the ways according to context. The organization of example data into frames and sub-frames of perceptual categories is seen as significant for the study.

The prominent underlying reasons for the above behavioral patterns are found to be volition (agentivity), its concomitant of speech-act, and two construal properties of the verb, namely the event direction and the ability to articulate a perceptual event as a grammatical object (entity). These factors themselves in turn are determined not only by the semantic content of the verb, but also pragmatic content of the event, as provided for by adverbial modifiers of the event as well as larger practical context.

A word about the limitations of this paper. Since this is from an ongoing study, a fuller treatment of the English verb 'have' similar to the investigation on the English verb 'like' is still under preparation and could not be included here. Only preliminary observation was possible. Further, even for the verb 'like' some of the less commonly occurring patterns such as 'whether you like it or not', 'if you like', and 'got to like' await investigation. Also, the phrase structure information has not been included in the syntactic description owing to constraints of time. Though its inclusion may not add substantially to the inferences, it could have lent better credibility to the study.

Study of cross-linguistic behavior of verbs, especially between English and Indian languages, assumes an increasing significance in the context of huge and pervasive translation activity that is going on today, for providing a clarity on the transfer processes involved. MT projects are also expected to benefit from it. The approach of data organization and drawing corollaries adopted in this paper also has the prospect of delineating and mapping regularities for larger sets of verb classes and thus drawing cross-linguistic behavior patterns.

=====
=====

References:

Annamalai, E. (1975). The Semantics of verbs vaa and poo in Tamil. *Indian Linguistics* 36(3), 212-16.

Annamalai, E. (1985). *Dynamics of Verbal Extension in Tamil*. Trivandrum: Dravidian Linguistics Association of India.

- Claire Bonial, Julia Bonn, Kathryn Conger, Jena Hwang and Martha Palmer (2014)
PropBank: Semantics of New Predicate Types. The 9th edition of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference. Reykjavik, Iceland.
- Davidson, D. (1967). The Logical Form of Action Sentences. In N. Resher (Ed.), *The Logic of Decision and Action*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Dölling, J., Heyde-Zybatow, T., & Schäfer, M. (2008). *Event Structures in Linguistic Form and Interpretation*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kothandaraman, P. (1977). *The Verb in Modern Tamil*. Pulamai Publications.
- Kratzer, A. (1995). Stage-level and individual-level predicates. In G. N. Carlson & F. J. Pelletier (Eds.), *The generic book* (pp. 125-175). Chicago University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1965). *On the nature of syntactic irregularity*. PhD. Diss., Indiana University.
- Levin, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, B. (2009). *Where Do Verb Classes Come from? Verb Typologies Revisited: A Cross-linguistic Reflection on Verbs and Verb Classes*. Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium.
- Levin, B. (2011). *Lexical Semantics of Verbs II: The Structure of Event Structure*. Course LSA 116. UC Berkeley.
- Levin, B. (2015). Verb Classes Within and Across Languages. In B. Comrie and A. Malchukov (Eds.), *Valency Classes: A Comparative Handbook* (pp. 1627-1670). Berlin: De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Li, C. (2015). Event Structure and Argument Realization. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 28, 249–275.
- Lindhom, J. (1969). *The role of iru 'be' in a grammar of Tamil*. Chicago: University of Chicago (unpublished M.A. thesis).
- Maienborn, C. (2007). On Davidsonian and Kimian States. In *Existence: Semantics and Syntax*, (pp. 107-130). Springer.
- McCawley, J.D. (1968). The role of semantics in a grammar. In E. Bach & R.T. Harms (Eds.), *Universals in Linguistic Theory* (pp. 124–170). Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Princeton University "About WordNet." WordNet. Princeton University. 2010.

- Rajendran, S. (1978). Syntax and Semantics of Tamil Verbs. *Ph.D. Thesis*. Poona: University of Poona.
- Rajendran, S. (1981). Semantic Structure of Tamil Verbs. In 13th All India Tamil Teacher's Association Conference *aayvukkuvai Vol 2*, 305-310.
- Rajendran, S. (2002a). Semantics Structure of Directional Verbs of Movement in Tamil. *Language in India 2* (5).
- Rajendran, S. (2002b). Syntax and Semantics of Directional Verbs of Transfer in Tamil. *Language in India 2* (8).
- Rajendran, S. (2006). Syntax and Semantics of Directional Verbs of Communication in English and Tamil. *Language in India 6* (2).
- Rappaport H.M., & Levin, B. (1998) Building verb meanings. In Miriam Butt & Wilhelm Geuder (Eds.), *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors* (pp. 97–134). Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Rappaport H.M., & Levin, B. (2001). An Event Structure Account of English Resultatives. *Language 77*, 766-797.
- Rappaport H.M., & Levin, B. (2002). Change of state verbs: Implications for theories of argument projection. In J. Larson & M. Paster (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 269–280). Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Rappaport H.M., & Levin, B. (2015) ``The Syntax-Semantics Interface: Semantic Roles and Syntactic Arguments. In S. Lappin & C. Fox (Eds.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, (pp. 593-634). Oxford: Blackwell
- Schiffman, H. F. (1999). *A Reference Grammar of Spoken Tamil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffman, H. F. (1969). *A Transformational Grammar of Tamil Aspectual System*. University of Chicago Ph.D thesis published as volume 7 of Studies in Linguistics and Language Teaching, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Smith, C. (1991). *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Steever, S. B. (2005). *The Tamil Auxiliary Verb System*. New York: Routledge.

Truswell, R. (2019). Introduction. In R. Truswell (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Event Structure*. Oxford University Press.

Vendler, Z. (1967). *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Weischedel, Ralph, et al. OntoNotes Release 5.0 LDC2013T19. Web Download.
Philadelphia: Linguistic Data Consortium, 2013.
