以語料庫研究英文中的 *Send*

楊致碩*

國立臺北科技大學

摘要**

以往有關雙賓動詞的研究大多以與格位移（dative shift）來分析兩種可互換的句型結構以及典型的雙賓動詞 *give*。本研究探討了在不同句型中的 *send*，並且考量了 *send* 在雙賓句構中句型交替的限制。本研究以當代英語語料庫（COCA）作為語言分析的樣本，並以句法和語法上的不同分析前 270 筆資料。儘管 *send* 常與雙賓動詞連用，但結果卻顯示有 64％的資料無法以與格位移做句型上的互換。其中有 28％的資料以省略接收者的方式或以地方狀語（adverbial of place）代替語意角色中的接收者，來將 *send* 用於單及物動詞（monotransitive）；其他的句型包含將 *send* 用於使役動詞（causative verb）或片語動詞（prepositional verb）。只有剩餘的 36％的資料明顯地以雙受詞（double object）或介係詞與格（prepositional dative）出現在「允許語格位移」的雙賓句構中。研究結果顯示了 *send* 和所有物的轉移並無很大的關連性，反而傾向於用來表達隱喻的延伸（metaphorical extensions）概念。例如，將地點或狀語以擬人化的方式轉喻（metonym）為接受者的，來擔任接收者的語義角色。除此之外，當主事者（agent）使受事者（patient direct obejct）執行某項動作時，隱喻的目標會藉由動詞 *send* 來完成。在一些少數的例子中，*send* 會以不及物動詞（intransitive）的方式用於偽被動語態（passive voice）來表達即將發生的轉移事件。

關鍵詞：雙及物性、單及物、不及物、交替、語格位移、轉喻、
　　　　　隱喻的延伸

A Corpus-based Study of *Send* in English

Chih-Shuo Yang*

National Taipei University of Technology

Abstract**

Previous studies investigating ditransitive verbs normally focused on the alternating pairs of construction in terms of dative shift and the prototypical ditransitive verb *give*. This study examines *send* in different syntactic patterns and considers the restrictions on alternation when it was used as "ditransitive." The Corpus of Contemporary English (COCA) was used as a source to retrieve language data with the first 270 concordance lines being analyzed through different constructions syntactically and semantically. Though *send* is frequently associated with strong ditransitivity, the results showed that 64% of the tokens were not allowed for a dative shift. Moreover, 28% were used as monotransitive with the recipients being omitted or the adverbial of place fulfilling the semantic role of the recipients. Other patterns included the use of *send* as a causative verb or a prepositional verb. Only the remaining 36% were used in an explicit ditransitive syntax with either a double object or a prepositional dative construction that are allowed for a dative shift. The result implies that *send* is not strongly associated with transference of possession. On the other hand, extended meanings tend to be applied to express metaphorical extensions (i.e. change of location or state). For example, locations or adverbials are personified as metonyms for the recipient to carry a semantic role of the affected entities. Additionally, when the agent subject causes the patient direct object to carry out certain actions, a metaphorical goal is accomplished by the action of *send*. In a few cases, *send* is used intransitively in the pseudo-passive to express pending transference.

1. Introduction

1.1. Aim and Motivation of the Study

In Construction Grammar theories, constructions serve as the fundamental building blocks of a language. In both written and spoken forms, constructions reveal the natural semantic and syntactic context of a given word or phrase, carrying with them the essence of what can be called "meaningful" in a given language.

I find ditransitive verb constructions to be especially fascinating. Ditransitive verbs, such as *give*, *send*, and *lend* are strongly collocated with ditransitive constructions to express transference of possession from one to another. However, one can sometimes find exceptions. Consider the following three examples.

(1.1a) She will send the food to her college next week.
(1.1b) I hope that you can send me home.

In (1.1a), the affected entity (recipient) is not animate and refers to a particular location, yet is able to claim possession of the transferred entity. Moreover, in (1.1b), an animate entity is being transferred with an adverbial carrying the semantic role of the recipient. The transference in both instances is not literal but metaphorical to the extent that one can simply express a metaphorical transference with an analogy.

(1.1c) That sends us running irrationally.

In (1.1c), rather than expressing transference of possession, a metaphorical goal is achieved by the action of *send*.

Due to the exceptional cases mentioned above, it is intriguing to conduct in-depth research on the use of *send* in English by investigating its syntactic structure, semantic distribution, and pragmatic context. In order to examine the use of *send* in natural language use, the most authentic language materials from a corpus will be collected.

1.2. Research Questions of the Study

In this study, three research questions will be addressed for discussion:
1. What sentence patterns of *send* are displayed in natural language use?
2. What is the semantic distribution of each sentence pattern in natural

language use?

3. To what extent can *send* be used in metaphorical extensions?

1.3. Organization of the Study

The paper is structured as follows. In section two, previous studies concerning ditransitive constructions are reviewed and introduced. Section three presents the methodology of the present study. Section four presents the results concerning frequency and distribution of *send* used in different sentence patterns. Section five discusses the metaphorical use of *send* with examples. An overall summary of the study is then presented in section six.

2. Literature Review

In order to investigate the sentence patterns of *send*, a typical ditransitive verb in English, studies concerning ditransitive constructions were reviewed and are introduced in this section. In section 2.1, I will present an overview of ditransitive construction, including its definition and typical syntactic structure. Then, in section 2.2, restrictions on dative shift will be highlighted. In section 2.3, a classification of different ditransitive verbs by Mukherjee will be illustrated. Lastly, benefactive constructions will be discussed in section 2.4.

2.1. Overview of Ditransitive Constructions

A ditransitive construction is defined as a construction consisting of a ditransitive verb, an agent argument (A), a recipient-like argument (R), and a theme argument (T) (Conti, 2008). Ditransitive constructions can be found cross-linguistically, and such a construction among all languages typically displays the same characteristics. Mal'chukov, Haspelmath, and Comrie (2010:2) proposed that "the most typical ditransitive constructions contain a verb of physical transfer such as 'give', 'lend', 'hand', 'sell', 'return', describing a scene in which an agent participant causes an object to pass into the possession of an animate receiver." Also, from a construction grammar perspective, ditransitive constructions refer to a transfer of a patient argument to a potential recipient (X causes Y to receive Z) (Goldberg 1995). That said, ditransitive verbs are frequently associated with the transference of possession. In the transferring event, the theme (T) is transferred to the recipient (R) resulting from the action of the

ditransitive verb.

Although ditransitive constructions are found in many languages around the world, ditransitive construction alternation is not applicable in all languages. However, Mal'chukov, Haspelmath, and Comrie (2010) have argued that the ditransitive construction alternation is common in English, where the alternation between double-object construction and prepositional dative construction is used. Consider the following examples.

(2.1a) Mary gave John a pen.
(2.1b) Mary gave a pen to John.

This type of alternation is also called "dative alternation", "dative shift", or "dative moment." As Haspelmath (2015: 7) stated, "languages sometimes exhibit ditransitive alternation in which competing ditransitive constructions can be used with the same verb (*gave*) and roughly the same meaning." However, some possible semantic differences could exist between the two instances. In (2.1a) a double object construction is used to express a complete transfer with two NPs indicating both the recipient and the theme. In (2.1b), a prepositional dative construction is used to express an incomplete transfer with a NP indicating the theme and a *to*-dative indicating the recipient.

2.2. Dative Alternation

As indicated above, the dative alternation involves the alternation between the double object and the prepositional object; however, not all recipients alternate between both constructions. Restriction for the dative alternation lies in the semantic role of the recipients. The goal argument of the ditransitive construction must bear a possessor role which is essentially restricted to animate entities (Bresnan, 1982). As suggested by Jung and Miyagawa, the goal argument cannot bear a possessor role when it is inanimate (2004). Consider the following examples.

(2.2a) The editor sent the article to Philadelphia.
(2.2b) The editor sent Philadelphia the article.

(2.2a) is grammatically acceptable when the spatial goal fulfills the semantic role of the recipient. However, grammatical acceptability is questioned in (2.2b) where the inanimate entity bears a possessor role. Jung and Miyagawa (2004:103) have proposed "the only grammatical

reading available for (2.2b) is when the goal argument is an organization or corporate body, where Philadelphia is somehow interpreted as an animate entity." As often noted, Philadelphia in (2.2b) is acceptable only if it is a metonym for the recipient such as the Philadelphia office (Goldsmith 1980).

Hovan and Levin (2008) also argued that verbs such as *send* and *throw* sometimes entail a change of location rather than a change of possession. Moreover, the spatial change may involve a location in cyberspace (2.2c).

(2.2c) I sent him an e-mail.

2.3. Classification of Ditransitive Verbs

As a matter of fact, ditransitive verbs are strongly collocated with ditransitive constructions, but this is not true of all of them. In order to discover which particular construction is preferred over others in the usage of ditransitive verbs, the classification of verbs based on frequency proposed by Goldberg has to be considered.

In this view, type frequency is expected to affect the classification of new verbs. Two types of frequency information need to be distinguished. On the one hand, there is token frequency which refers to the number of times a given instance (e.g. a particular word) is used in a particular construction; the other type of frequency is type frequency, which refers to the number of distinct words that occur in a particular construction. (Goldberg, "Argument" 214)

Following Goldberg's view on the classification of verbs, Mukherjee suggested that two dimensions should be taken into consideration when defining the frequency-based typicality of ditransitive verbs. One is the overall frequency of a ditransitive verb in the corpus and the other is the frequency with which a ditransitive verb occurs in an explicit ditransitive syntax (2005). The two dimensions are considered to be interrelated since a typical ditransitive verb appears to demonstrate frequent occurrence in an explicit ditransitive construction syntax. Based on the underlying dimensions, Mukherjee proposed that three groups of ditransitive verbs can be distinguished depending on two sorts of frequency information.

(1) typical ditransitive verbs, which are used very frequently
in general and also frequently in an explicit ditransitive syntax
(*give*, *tell*); (2) habitual ditransitive verbs, which are used
fairly frequently in general but not in an explicit ditransitive

syntax in the clear majority of all cases in which they occur (*ask*, *send*, *show*, *offer*); (3) peripheral ditransitive verbs, which are used only sporadically in general and/or which are used only rarely in an explicit ditransitive syntax. (Mukherjee 83-84)

2.4. Benefactive Construction

While ditransitive constructions normally require a trivalent ditransitive verb with three arguments (agent, theme, and recipient), some other constructions sometimes show similar elements between each of these objects (Hudson 1992). Benefactive constructions which belong to monotransitive constructions but behave like ditransitives are certainly one of these. Consider the following examples: (O_1 refers to the indirect object, O_2 refers to the direct object, and O_0 refers to the ordinary object).

(2.4a) He built [his children]$_1$ [a tree-house]$_2$.
(2.4b) He built [a tree-house]$_0$ for his children.

Hudson suggested that O_2 has the most similarities to O_0, and that O_2 and O_0 should therefore be treated as a single grammatical function. Also, the fact is that O_1 is more like an adjunct than a complement. For example, there are similarities between [his children] and [for his children]. Although Hudson argued that [his children] in O_1 was simply complement-like, he has acknowledged the fact that [for his children] in (2.4b) is an adjunct rather than a complement (1992). Consequently, instance (2.4b) in which beneficiary benefits from some actions involving the direct object have to be considered as a monotransitive construction.

3. Methodology

3.1. The Corpus

In order to investigate *send* in English, I used the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) as a source to retrieve the language data. It contains more than one billion words of text from eight genres, including spoken English, fiction, popular magazines, newspapers, academic texts, TV and movie subtitles, blogs, and other web pages.

3.2. Data Extraction

In this study, I used *send* as the token to extract the first 300 concordance lines from the COCA. Three hundred tokens were considered to be a modest sample size that can reveal a generalizable result. After the extraction of the Corpus data, filtering of the data was conducted manually. Two kinds of concordance lines were excluded from the data analysis. First, the tokens used as a noun modifier rather than a verb were removed (3.2a). Second, the tokens appearing in a noun clause or relative clause were also eliminated (3.2b). In addition, any repeated concordance lines were also removed and only one kept for analysis.

(3.2a) It is time to hit the *send* button.
(3.2b) Or FDR could have just accepted the peace agreement the Japs were trying to *send*.

Then, after filtering the corpus data, 270 concordance lines were left for analysis for both syntactic and semantic approaches to be conducted.

3.3. Data Analysis

In this section, I introduce the criteria of categorizing sentence patterns and analyzing the semantic and pragmatic distribution of each pattern. Three approaches including syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic methods were employed for data analysis.

3.3.1. The Syntactic Approach

The syntactic approach was conducted by considering the arguments and transitivity of each sentence pattern. A binary distinction was first made to distinguish *send* used as a transitive verb from an intransitive verb. *Send* was labeled "intransitive" whenever no object is immediately followed by the token, while it was labeled "transitive" whenever the token immediately takes an object.

In the transitive construction, monotransitive and ditransitive were further distinguished by considering the arguments. The token was labeled "ditransitive" only when the three arguments are fulfilled in a construction with an agent, an explicit theme (direct object) and an explicit recipient (indirect object). The label "monotransitive" was then assigned when the transferred entity (theme) is omitted or does not stand as the form of a

direct object.

Apart from considering the arguments and transitivity of each sentence pattern, the tokens followed by a preposition, such as *into*, *on*, *in*, etc., were regarded as a prepositional verb.

3.3.2. The Semantic and Pragmatic Approaches

After the completion of the syntactic analysis, the sematic and pragmatic approaches were then adopted to analyze the distribution of each sentence pattern. A number of factors were considered in order to determine the meaning of the "*send*" phrase, such as the role of the recipients, the type of transference, the animacy of objects, contextual information, and so on.

4. Results of the Sentence Patterns

While most sentence patterns match with the meaning categories with a prior prediction, some exceptions were found. This section presents the results concerning frequency and distribution of *send* used in different sentence patterns.

4.1. Frequency of the Sentence Patterns

The frequency of each sentence pattern is presented in Table 4.1. It shows that *send* used ditransitively accounts for 54.1% of all the instances. In addition, 27.8 % of the tokens were used as monotransitive. In a few cases, *send* is used as an intransitive verb or a causative verb. Additionally, s*end* used as a prepositional verb accounts for the remaining 15.1% of the tokens.

Table 4.1 Frequency of "send" used in the sentence patterns

Type	Verb type	Sentence Pattern	Hits	Percentage
I	Ditransitive verb	(S) *send* [O_i:NP] [O_d:NP] (S) *send* [O_d:NP] [O_i:PP$_{to}$]	146	54.1%
II	Monotransitive verb	(S) *send* [O_d: NP] O_i	75	27.8%
III	Intransitive verb	[O_d:NP] send	4	1.5%

IV	Causative verb	(S) *send* [O$_i$: NP] gerund / preposition *into*	4	1.5%
V	Prepositional & phrasal verbs	(S) *send* in / into / out / off	41	15.1%
Total			270	100.0%

4.2. Distribution of *Send* Used Ditransitively

Send as an explicit ditransitive verb is expected to be used frequently in a ditransitive construction; these accounted for 54.1% of all the instances. Nonetheless, 17.4% are not allowed because of dative shift and are preferably chosen by language users with the use of metaphorical transference in dative constructions. Moreover, nearly half of the tokens were found to occur in metonyms in an indirect object position.

Based on my findings, the criterion for dative alternation lies in the restriction that the recipient must be an animate entity (4.3a) except that some language users are inclined to personify the recipient.

(4.3a) I think you should print this out, but **send it to the instructor** also.

Moreover, in the case of personification, the transferred entity (direct object) in the construction must be inanimate (4.3b). The case of personification entails that a 'recipient' such as corporations, governments or institutions is considered as an animate entity capable of possession.

(4.3b) By the way <u>send</u> a can of food to the Red Cross.

In contrast, instances not allowing for dative alternation were found in the cases where the recipient is an inanimate entity (4.3c).

(4.3c) If you have other questions, suggestions or comments, **send e-mail to ericzorn at gmail.com.**

Apart from that, the case also occurs in the instances where the recipient can to some extent be personified as an active recipient, but the transferred entity (direct object) is in high animacy (4.3d).

(4.3d) He had good health insurance, could save money, buy a house, and **send his kids off to college.**

The distribution of the pattern used ditransitively is presented in Table 4.3. It shows that 63 tokens out of 146 were used in metonyms (like instances 4.3b, 4.3c, and 4.3d). The result implies that *send* is not strongly associated with transference of possession. On the other hand, extended meanings tend to be applied to express a metaphorical transference with locations carrying the semantic role of affected entities (goals). *Send* can be said to appear typically in a caused-motion construction instead of a ditransitive construction.

Table 4.2 *Distribution of the pattern used ditransitively*

Type	Construction	Dative Shift	Recipient	Direct object	Hits	Percentage
1	Double object	**Allowed**	Animate		46	31.5%
2	*to*-dative	**Allowed**	Animate		37	25.3%
			Personified	Inanimate	15	10.3%
3	*to*-dative	**Not allowed**	Inanimate		19	13.0%
			Personified	Animate	29	19.9%
Total					146	100.0%

4.3. Distribution of *Send* Used Monotransitively

The distribution of each pattern used monotransitively is presented in Table 4.2. It shows that the language user's choice of such patterns is largely concerned with the given context and the role that the recipient plays (**Type 1** and **Type 4**). However, the choice sometimes depends on the user's attempt to understand the recipients as a *to*-infinitive clause or an adverbial complement as a means to provide additional information or imply a metaphorical transference (**Type 2** and **Type 3**).

Table 4.3 *Distribution of the pattern used monotransitively*

Type	Distribution	Hits	Percentage
1	Contextually inferable recipients	11	14.7%
2	Recipient understood as a *to*-infinitive clause	3	4%
3	Recipient understood as an	14	18.7%

	adverbial complement		
4	Irrelevant specification of recipients	47	62.7%
Total		75	100.0%

Each type of distribution is illustrated with an example as follows.

Type 1: If the semantic role of the recipient is inferable in a given context or a preceding discourse, the pattern is preferably chosen in which the recipient is omitted (4.2a).

(4.2a) After 60 days, creators cannot reverse the same charge to **backers'** credit cards, so to issue refunds, they'll need to initiate a new transaction to **send money** via Amazon Payments or PayPal.

Type 2: The pattern is used when the recipient in a *to*-infinitive clause is understood as a potential indirect object. In such cases, the clause is functioning as an adjunct to provide additional information of potential recipients (4.2b).

(4.2b) He established new, more reasonable policies in our relations with Cuba, such as allowing Cuban-Americans to visit their families and **send money to support them**.

Type 3: When metaphorical transference needs to be implied, the pattern is used with an adverbial complement, such as *there*, *here*, *elsewhere*, *home*, etc., fulfilling the semantic role of the recipient. Additionally, the direct object is usually an animate entity, being metaphorically transferred to a particular location (4.2c).

(4.2c)　The grad schools don't send their student teachers elsewhere.

Type 4: If the specification of the recipient is irrelevant to the context, or is considered unnecessary to be identified, the pattern is selected with the recipient being omitted (4.2d).

(4.2d)　Although one can always **send a letter** via the publisher I dare say it'd be faster to send directly.

In most cases, the language users' intention to use *send* monotransitively is mainly due to the fact that the role of the recipient is almost irrelevant to a given context. As suggested in Table 4.2, such cases account for **62.7%** of the tokens used in this pattern.

4.4. Distribution of *Send* Used Intransitively

Send is explicitly categorized as a transitive verb in the Cambridge Dictionary, Collins Online Dictionary, and Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (*send* used as a phrasal verb is not discussed here). However, the results in Table 4.4 show that four instances out of 270 were used intransitively in two types of distribution.

Table 4.4 *Distribution of the pattern used intransitively*

Type	Distribution	Hits	Percentage
1	Pending transference	2	50%
2	Inferable or irrelevant recipients and themes	2	50%
Total		4	100.0%

Each type of distribution is illustrated with an example as follows.
Type 1: The pattern is preferably used when the language users intend to imply pending transference of the themes. In the transferring process, the action of *send* is more noteworthy than what is being sent. Furthermore, *send* is used in the pseudo-passive in which active constructions behave like passives. As such, the subjects do not function as an agent but a patient affected by the action of the verb (4.4a) (4.4b).

(4.4a) I recently added an email to the event actions of the Event Module and noticed that the aforementioned **email would never send**.
(4.4b) I got in touch with support and was told that the Event Module does not decipher signature rules and the email **will not send**

Type 2: The pattern is used when both the recipient and the direct object are either inferable from a given context or irrelevant to a discourse (4.4c) (4.4d).

(4.4c) Although one can always send a letter via the publisher I daresay it'd be faster to **send** directly.

(4.4d) The <u>imbecile Obammi</u> will send after our guns are every bit as responsible as he is.

4.5. Distribution of *Send* Used as a Causative Verb

This pattern is used by the language users in a sense when the agent subject causes the patient direct object to carry out an action. It is commonly employed to indicate a change of state (i.e. causation), rather than a change of possession or location. *Send* used as a causative verb is generally followed by either a present participle (4.5a) or the preposition *into* (4.5b).

(4.5a) And since so many of today's PC crowd don't know what the word "Occident" means, this should **send** them **scurrying** off to find dictionaries.

(4.5b) Then that **send** me **into thinking** all the events that had to happen in my son's life.

Such a pattern however is infrequently used based on the findings, which only accounts for 1.4% of all the instances.

5. Discussion

This section elaborates on the metaphorical use of *send* with examples from the 270 tokens. Also, the ergativity of the verb is presented with in-depth discussion on *send* used intransitively.

5.1. *Send* Used in Metaphorical Extensions

Based on the results presented in the previous section, it is patently obvious that *send* is not strongly associated with transference of possession. On the other hand, extended meanings tend to be applied to express a metaphorical event (i.e. change of location or state). Three common types of metaphorical use from the data are illustrated and discussed with examples below.

Type 1: The direct object being an animate entity is metaphorically transferred to a particular location, and the adverbial complement then fulfills the semantic role of the recipient.

(5.1a) There are so many like you who are willing to **send** other men's sons <u>there</u>.

Different from the transferring events in ditransitive situations, *send* in instance (5.1a) can be associated with a metaphorically extended meaning. *Men's sons* as animate beings cannot either be claimed for possession or be involved in a transferring process physically. As such, metaphorical transference is applied to indicate a change of location resulting from the action of the verb.

Type 2: Locations such as corporations, governments, institutions, nations, etc. are personified as metonyms for the recipient in an indirect object position (5.1b) or an *into*-PP position (5.1c).

(5.1b) Whoever was behind the contract killing apparently intended to **send** a powerful message **<u>to authorities.</u>**

(5.1c) They then **send** these **<u>into Jamaica</u>** with no import tariffs

Although *send* is used as a ditransitive verb in (5.1b) and a prepositional verb in (5.1c), it unambiguously implies a metaphorical transference in both instances. However, the semantic differences of the transference between *to*-PP and *into*-PP appear to lie in the boundedness of the location.

In instance (5.1b), the location (authorities) serves as a metaphorical goal which is intended to be reached by the action of the verb. The *to*-PP entails that the direct object is sent to an unbounded region at the end of the transferring event. In contrast, the *into*-PP in instance (5.1c) suggests that the object enters a contained bounded region when it reaches the metaphorical goal.

Despite the subtle semantic difference, both aforementioned instances again underline the fact that the locations should be personified as metonyms for the recipient in order for the transferring event to metaphorically occur.

Type 3: Actions which the agent subject causes the patient direct object to carry out are regarded as metaphorical goals.

(5.1d) Does our certain knowledge of Death **send** us **running** irrationally and headlong into creating delusional ideations of something "beyond" our certain end?

(5.1e) Then that **sends** me **into thinking** all the events that had to happen in my son's life.

The present participle in (5.1d) and the *into*-PP in (5.1e) can be viewed as a metaphorical goal to be achieved. That said, the goal in both instances is metaphorically constructed as a resulting action of *send* in which the object is forcefully moved by the agent.　Instance (5.1d) suggests that certain actions (running and creating) are a metaphorical goal introduced by a present participle in a non-volitional causative event. Similarly, instance (5.1e) shows that a change of the mindset and thought (thinking) is the metaphorical goal to be accomplished. The goal (thinking) towards which the object is propelled is expressed via a prepositional phrase (into-PP)

What is suggestive about *send* is that the verb is in a sense semantically similar to other causative verbs, such as *make*, *let*, *have*, and *get,* except for the syntactic differences. (Root forms of a verb are followed by *make*, *let,* and *have,* while infinitive verbs are followed by *get.*) What is worth noting here is that this extension of use in analogy is an emerging pattern of *send*. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the usage was first found in the 19th century to indicate an action to drive (a person) into some state of condition or to cause someone to go to (sleep).The verb inherently signifying the act of transference is now metaphorically used to designate a non-volitional causative event.

5.2. *Send* as an Ergative Verb

The results in the previous section underline the fact that *send* can function as an agent subject and a patient subject. We can thus conclude that *send* is an ergative verb. In most cases, *send* is used as a ditransitive verb to express a transferring event either physically or metaphorically. However, *send* in a few cases can be used intransitively to indicate pending transference due to its ergativity. That said, the ergative use of *send* allows it to preclude the grammatical objects. Two types of intransitive use of *send* from the data are illustrated and discussed with examples below.

Type 1: Pending transference of the themes is implied in the transferring process (5.2a).

(5.2a) I got in touch with support and was told that the Event Module does not decipher signature rules and the email **will not <u>send.</u>**
Type 2: Both the recipient and the theme are either inferable or irrelevant (5.2b).

(5.2b) The imbecile Obammi will **send** after our guns are every bit as responsible as he is

Both instances (5.2a) (5.2b) are structurally similar in syntax but a semantic difference exists with regard to the semantic role of the subject. The transferred entity (the mail) is realized as the subject in (5.2a), while the agent (Obammi) is realized as the subject in (5.2b).

As discussed in the previous section, instances like (5.2a) employ a strategy of pseudo passives. One of the major reasons to adopt such a verb construction could lie in the emphasis of the transferred entity. In instance (5.2a), *the email* acts as if it is a volitional being that can perform the sending action with intent. Therefore, the pending transference is stated in a pseudo passive other than the typical passive from (The email **will not be sent**).

6. Conclusions

In this section, I summarize the findings of the study by answering the research questions in order in 6.1. In 6.2, the pedagogical implications are given according to the findings of the study. In 6.3, some limitations of the study are acknowledged and future research studies are presented.

6.1. Overall Summary of the Study

Since the first and the second research questions relate to the types and the distributions of *send*, both questions will be answered together.

Based on the results from COCA, five sentence patterns of *send* were found in total. The four most noteworthy patterns discussed in the previous sections are presented as follows.

The first sentence pattern relates to *send* used in a monotransitive construction

[(S) *send* [O_d: NP] Θ_i]. This pattern is preferably used when the recipient is inferable or irrelevant. Moreover, the recipient is sometimes understood as a to-infinitive clause or an adverbial complement to account for the usage.

The second sentence pattern pertains to ditransitive constructions where *send* is used in either a double object construction [(S) *send* [O_i:NP] [O_d:NP]] or a prepositional dative construction [(S) *send* [O_d:NP] [O_i:PP_{to}]].

Although such patterns account for over half of all the instances, some of them are not allowed for a dative shift and are preferably chosen by language users with the use of metaphorical transference in dative constructions. Moreover, nearly half of them were found to occur as metonyms in the indirect object position. The criterion for dative alternation lies in the restriction that the recipient must be an (personified) animate entity and the transferred entity must be inanimate.

The third pattern [[O_d:NP] *send*] in which *send* is used intransitively accounts for only a few of all instances. The pattern tends to be used in the pseudo-passive to imply pending transference. Additionally, when both the recipient and transferred entity are either inferable or irrelevant from a given context, this pattern will be chosen and used as well.

The fourth pattern [(S) *send* [O_i: NP] gerund / preposition *into*] is also used infrequently. *Send* in this particular pattern is used as a causative verb to express a causative event. Again, this is an emerging pattern, the earliest recorded usage of which was in the 19th century according to the Oxford English Dictionary.

The third research question pertains to the use of *send* in metaphorical events. As illustrated earlier, *send* is not strongly associated with transference of possession. On the other hand, extended meanings tend to be applied to express a metaphorical event (i.e. change of location or state). *Send* can be used in the following two distributions to express metaphorical transference. First, the direct object being an animate entity is metaphorically transferred to a particular location and the adverbial complement then fulfills the semantic role of the recipient. (*You send other men's sons there.*)

Second, locations such as corporations, governments, institutions, nations, etc. are personified as metonyms for the recipient in an indirect object position or an *into*-PP position. (*I send a powerful message to authorities.*) In addition to metaphorical transference, the accomplishment of a metaphorical goal is also used when the agent subject causes the patient direct object to carry out certain actions. (*That sends me into thinking all the events.*)

6.2. Pedagogical Implications of *Send*

In an EFL or ESL instructional context, language teachers are suggested to teach students different usages of *send* and other ditransitive verbs instead of only focusing on certain transferring events. Students have to be aware that *send* can be collocated with a number of sentence patterns under different semantic distributions. Furthermore, language learners should be instructed to learn the usage of *send* in metaphorical extensions by considering semantic and pragmatic factors. As for the emerging patterns of *send* (e.g. *send* used as a causative verb), language teachers are recommended to teach students those patterns with example sentences from authentic language materials such as COCA or the BNC.

6.3. Limitations and Future Research Studies

The first limitation relates to the source of the corpus used in the present study. Although COCA is the world's most widely-used corpus of English, it is designed to represent American English. The investigation of *send* is expected to extend to Global Englishes in future studies.

Second, the scope of the present study is admittedly limited and narrow since other typical transitive verbs, such as *lend*, *donate*, *tell*, etc., have not been investigated or discussed. The present study has indicated that *send* as a habitual ditransitive verb is not highly associated with transference of possession but tends to be used in metaphorical events. Future studies are recommended to scrutinize the creative use of other ditransitive verbs in analogies and metaphorical extensions.

Lastly, a more comprehensive future study with a larger sample size, more actual discourse, a more comprehensive list of verbs, and more robust analysis may reveal more generalizable results.

Bibliography

Bresnan, Joan. *The mental representation of grammatical relations*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1982.

Conti, Carmen. *Receptores y beneficiarios: Estudio tipológico de la ditransitividad*. Lincom Europa, 2008.

Goldsmith, John. "Meaning and mechanism in grammar." *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics,* edited by Susumu Kuno, pp.423-428, Harvard University Press, 1980.

Goldberg, Adele Eva. *Argument structure constructions*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1992, https://escholarship.org/content/qt6d01k2vd/qt6d01k2vd_no Splash_fa945307e 3b529969e3e1e4745674010.pdf

Goldberg, Adele Eva. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Haspelmath, Martin. "Ditransitive constructions in the world's languages." *Annual Review of Linguistics*, vol.1, no. 1, 2015, pp. 19-41.

Hovan, Malka Rappaport, & Levin, Beth. "The English dative alternation: The case for verb sensitivity." *Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2008, pp. 129–167, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40058030.

Hudson, Richard. "So-called 'double objects' and grammatical relations." *Language*, vol. 68, no. 2, 1992, pp. 251–276, https://doi.org/1 0.2307/416941.

Jung, Yeun-Jin., & Miyagawa, Shigeru. "Decomposing ditransitive verbs." *Proceedings of SICGG*, Summer 2004, pp. 101-120.

Mal'chukov, Andrej, et al. *Studies in ditransitive constructions: A comparative handbook*. Walter de Gruyter, 2010.

Mukherjee, Joybrato. *English ditransitive verbs: Aspects of theory, description and a usage-based model*. Rodopi, 2005.

"Send." *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, 2022, https://www-oed-com.libsearch.ntut.edu.tw:3001/view/Entry /175851?rskey=IAv975&result=3#eid. Accessed 31 August 2022.

Address for correspondence

Chih-Shuo Yang
Department of English
National Taipei University of Technology
No. 1, Sec. 3, Zhongxiao E. Rd., Da'an Dist.
Taipei City 10608
Taiwan

a3384516963@gmail.com