

**USING THETA ROLE PRINCIPLE IN VOCABULARY MATERIAL
DEVELOPMENT: A CASE OF VERB ‘TAKE’.****Saiful Akhyar**English Graduate Department
Post Graduate Program
Mataram University
paullobart9@gmail.com**ABSTRACT**

Verb ‘take’ is one of very popular verbs in foreign English class. This verb, based upon its distribution in syntactic configuration can be categorized as intransitive, transitive and ditransitive verb. The meaning inherent within this verb, determine the number of the argument required by the verb. The verb ‘take’ will assign a number of theta roles born by the decomposed atomic meaning yielded by the syntactic structure and lexical item selected by this verb. The number and type of argument, and the variant of this verb, enrich the syntactic structure and the semantic aspect of the verb ‘take’. The combination of the bare verb ‘take’ with any prepositions/particles to form phrasal verb resulted varieties of variants of the verb. These variants may differ in construction. It can appear either in continuous or discontinuous structure. The using of theta role principle simplified the acquisition of this verb and its variants. The grammar aspect can be unified and embedded within this model of vocabulary material development.

Keywords: Intransitive, transitive, ditransitive, theta role, argument structure, X- Bar Theory

**MENGGUNAKAN PRINSIP TETA ROLE DALAM PENGEMBANGA MATERI
PERBENDAHARAAN KATA: KASUS KATA KERJA ‘TAKE’****ABSTRAK**

Kata kerja take merupakan salah satu kata yang sangat populer dalam kelas bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing. Kata kerja ini, berdasarkan distibusinya dalam konfigurasi sintaktik dikategorikan sebagai kata kerja intransitif, transitif dan ditransitif. Makna yang melekat dalam kata kerja ini menentukan jumlah argumen yang dibutuhkan. Kata kerja take akan menentukan jumlah teta role yang terbentuk dari makna atomik dikomposit yang terlahir dari struktur sintaktik dan item leksikal. Jumlah dan jenis argumen serta varian kata kerja ini memperkaya stuktur sintaktik dan aspek semantik kata kerja take. Kombinasi kata kerja dasar ‘take’ dengan preposisi/partikel dalam pembentukan kata kerja prase menghasilkan variasi varian dari kata kerja ini. Varian-varian ini berbeda dalam konstruksi. Itu bisa muncul dalam stuktur kontinyus maupun diskontinyus. Penggunaan prinsip teta role menyederhanakan akuisisi kata kerja ini

dan variannya. Aspek tata bahasa bisa digabungkan dalam model pengembangan materi perbendaharaan kosa kata.

Katakunci: Intransitif, transitif, ditransitif, teta role, struktur argumen, teori X-Bar

INTRODUCTION

Learning foreign language, it is going to be more ideal if the learner is able to know all aspects of the language, either the linguistic or cultural knowledge. One of the most crucial elements of the language is vocabulary. I cannot imagine how we learn a second/foreign language without giving special treatment for this aspect. It is impossible to master a language by ignoring the vocabulary acquisition. Stahl & Nagy (2006) said, "*words are the tools we use to access our background knowledge, express ideas, and learn new concepts.*" Professor Stephen Krashen asserted the significance of acquiring words by saying "*When students travel, they don't carry grammar books, they carry dictionaries* (Krashen in Lewis, 1993). The successfulness of text comprehension is much influenced by the size of vocabulary acquisition. To understand a meaning from such a context, it will be more difficult for the learner who has poorer vocabulary than those better knowledge of the language or vocabulary (Nash and Snowling, 2006, cited from McKeown 1985, Cain et al. 2004). Those scholar's statement is clearly supported the great important position of vocabulary acquisition. Thus, it needs to put the student's words acquisition as the main priority in our curriculum.

Nowadays, word glossary is presented in the form of single item. The learners are requested to memorize the words in that form. It has occurred varies difficulty to the students. They must insert the words into their slot case to form a grammatical sentence. It carries other additional job either to the students or teachers.

In English as Foreign Language class, student's mindset in making up a sentence/s, they generally conceptualized a clause structure based upon the term SPOA (Subject, Predicate, Object, Adverb) /SPO (Subject, Predicate, Object) /SP (Subject, Predicate). These concepts manifested by varieties of their speaking performance and writing products. They construct a clause/s by inserting each slot with the word category. The syntactic sequence is driven by the intuition of their first/second language pattern. The students do not realize such a group of lexicon or predicate verb which requisite certain number of arguments, and even selection of its argument. That way of thinking tends to construct ungrammatical and unacceptable sentence structure.

At present, acquiring vocabulary is just focus on the literal meaning/meaning information. Whereas, within the vocabulary, implicitly contains grammar component. Vocabulary with its reoccurrence variants in the variety of sentences carries both the information about grammar and meaning. In teaching grammar, teachers frequently present their teaching material in the form of any formulations. Sentence structure is explained as conflating of SPOA, or a sentence at least have subject and predicate. It seems very abstract to the students, because they have to find the lexical items to put into the slots within the sequence of the formula. It can lead to increase the cognitive load for the learners, and absolutely is really big problem reminding that each lexicon has restriction and selectional argument for their own.

Students who had acquired quite a lot of vocabulary will get problem in combining the known words appropriately because they do not understand the word's properties/complement.

To answer those problems, I propose a model which generated from the principle of theta role to be applied in vocabulary material development. In this respect, how to construct vocabulary material when a teacher shall to prepare a vocabulary material of *verb take*.

Marika and Slava (2008) applied a method of teaching vocabulary. They used metaphor awareness as the way to solve the student's problem in acquiring the vocabulary of second language. The similar approach is presented by Boers (2013). It describes that the retention of such words and phrases meaning can be taught by using the figurative expressions under the heading of conceptual metaphor and idiomatic expression, especially, those that has the same source domain. Boers (2011a p. 563) argued that when the learner conscious that in metaphorical nature there's happened a deep comprehension of the literal, included involving the real meaning of the words within the phrase.

Teaching collocation also one of recommended options in improving learner's vocabulary size. Hoey (2000) argued that by learning words in collocation form, it may minimize the intensity of learning grammar, because within the collocation has been embedded the grammar aspect. X-Bar Theory was aimed at projecting the structure of the heads within the phrases, clauses and main clauses in the generative grammar perspective. It places the categorical word hierarchically based upon its appropriateness of slot in the sequence of clause/s. The structure is represented by tree diagram. The notion of theta role which I refer to in this proposal is related to the syntactic position of lexical heads within the framework of X-Bar Theory. The basis of the analysis under the theta criterion of Chomsky proposal;

Theta Criterion: Each argument bears one and only one θ -role, and each θ -role is assigned to one and only one argument.(Chomsky, 1981, 1993. P. 36).

Each predicate verb/lexicon has selectional arguments in syntactic relation. The term government and binding is related to the abstract meaning within the relation of lexical items in the environment of syntactic structure. It is commonly use in the context of case assignment. Chomsky (1986b) proposed this hypothesis based upon the notion of m-command.

Argument structure leads to the arrangement of lexical items within the projection of a clause or clauses. Argument structure is established by the properties of the word or lexical item in the syntactic arrangement. In this respect, it relates to the elements of syntactic relations which presented here as specifier and complement. The coverage discussion of argument structure carries to the characteristic of the argument's type, the property, and the structure projection of the verb (Hale & Keyser. 2002).

Argument structure is projected into syntax by applying linking rule to the lexicon, and leads to the matrix/place of argument of a clause. It links to external which supposed to be the subject position, and internal argument refers to object position (see, Afarli. 2007). In connection with the subject position, the VP-Internal Subject Hypothesis proposed that the subject NP generated from the internal position at D structure. It is the internal projection of the predicate verb/V". The NP projected into specifier matrix by the process of NP movement. Likewise, the NP gets role assigned by the verb max projection. But, the NP in the subject position is functioned as the specifier of the IP projection (see, Williams. 1994. Koopman & Sportiche, 1991).

Meaning component cohere with syntactic structure. Syntactic property is generated by the meaning of a verb. The combination of meaning component and syntactic structure results semantic property of a verb (Rapoport & Erteschik. 2007). In accordance with the meaning

component of verb, it is relevant to review the principle of Full Interpretation (FI) adopted of Chomsky (1986).

METHOD

This research applied Descriptive Qualitative method. The approach used of this research is based upon the theory of Generative Syntax, which underlying upon the Theory of Universal Grammar. It is a corpus base study, the documentary data in this respect is related to texts written in novel titled H.M.S. Surprise, The American Heritage Dictionary, Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, and An English-Indonesian Dictionary used as source of this study. It is to analyze the texts where the target lexicon occurs. The verb *take* as the object of study at this research categorized as popular lexicon in foreign language class. This verb analyzed based on its classification/type the argument, number, and variants.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Distrubution of verb 'take'

- (1) I shall take a turn
- (2) The dentist took two molars
- (3) I will take it upon myself
- (4) *He takes things in stride*
- (5) *The book takes its title from the Bible*
- (6) *It takes money to live in that town*
- (7) It takes about half an hour to get to the airport
- (8) *The driver downshifted to take the corner*
- (9) *The player took it on the fly*
- (10) *The transfusion apparently took.*
- (11) *He took sick.*
- (12) *Have the seeds taken?*
- (13) *This bus takes you to New York*
- (14) *We took a rented car.*
- (15) But even a small train takes an endless time to get moving
- (16) I should have taken her for a cook
- (17) was she taken from the French?
- (18) you will take some coffee?
- (19) Take your money and warm clothes
- (20) Take it to the armourer
- (21) They have taken it over
- (22) Take off your coat
- (23) *The plane took off on time*

- (24) *I'm taking off three days during May*
 (25) *The extra duties took up most of my time.*
 (26) *They took to each other*
 (27) *Do you take me for a fool?*
 (28) *I was given some pills to take away the pain*
 (29) *many unprotected women have been taken in by fine words,*
 (30) *you must take me up at the corner.*
 (31) *he is much taken up with his ship*
 (32) *Take it easy*
 (33) *Her stringy hair takes away from her lovely face*
 (34) *The curfew takes effect at midnight.*
 (35) *The antibiotics at last began to take effect.*
 (36) *The newly planted vines quickly took hold.*

Verb take can be found as intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive construction. This verb also takes infinite clause as its complement. Imperative, passive construction, and existential clause are also at this verb syntactic configuration. Varieties of thematic roles appear in this verb projection. Theta goal, agent, theme role, theta source, experiencer, instrument, locative, and theta temp are to be the arguments at the verb clause projection. A number of phrasal verb can be formed from the verb take with other particle or preposition. They are; take over, take off, take up, take for, take away, take in. The idioms that found here are; take away from, take effect, and take hold.

This paper does not discuss about the form of sentences in the term of traditional form. It is like affirmative, interrogative and negative sentences. Tenses are not to be the part of my analysis and discussion. Thus, it does not relevant to be taken up as the focus of this thesis.

Verb take is one of the verbs that has many decomposed meanings in English. It can occur either in intransitive, transitive or ditransitive construction. This verb takes a number of prepositions as the particle in phrasal form.

In line (1) and (2), this verb appears in two place predicate. It requires two arguments. The NP in the external argument receives its theta role from the head of the VP max. The motion of the event is initiated by the subject NP. The actor in that event is also involved in the activity. Thus, the NP subject is the role maker. But, the object NP move to the NP in the subject position. Thus, there is a motion of moving something from one place to subject NP either in reality or abstract. This description can be considered as the reason to specify the role of the subject NP. Because of that role, the NP gets goal theta role. The direct argument NP which existed in DP projection receives theme role (see, Jackendoff, 1974).

The similar case can be described for the line (3). The NP in the subject matrix gains goal role, and the NP in the direct argument which in here represented by impersonal 'it' is assigned theta theme. To give extra information, the verb take is completed with adjunct upon PP. The same thematic structure happened in line (4). The distinction is the later data takes an in PP adjunct.

At line 5, the verb take requires three arguments. The goal role projected to subject position. The adjacent complement of the verb gets theme role. The indirect argument within the projection of PP from obtains source role headed by P from.

line 6-7 shows that the verb take occurs in existential clauses. The subject matrix is filled with pleonastic 'it'. It does not refer to any entity in that sequence. The subject slot should be realized because English is overt subject language. In this respect, based upon the Extended Projection Principle (EEP), the IP projection must have a subject (see, Haegeman, 1994). It does happen for the lines (6-7). The direct argument of these data gets different role. In line 221, the NP of the adjacent complement of the verb within the boundary of VP gets theme role. The theme argument is followed by non finite clause. Thus, the internal argument of the line 221 are theme and infinite clause. It differs from line 222, the adjacent complement of the head in the VP max projection is given θ Temp. It is followed by infinite clause.

Line 8 describes that the verb take occurs in infinite clause. This clause takes PRO subject, and is controlled by the subject of the main clause. The PRO subject does not receive a theta role. Agentive role is received at the main clause. The direct internal argument of this clause gets θ Loc.

In line (9), the verb take needs three arguments to complete the meaning. The subject NP in the external argument receives theta goal. Meanwhile, the NP within the direct argument gets theta theme, and the NP in the projection of PP on gets theta Loc. It is assigned by the head of the PP within the PP on projection. In line (10-12), the verb take occurs in intransitive environment. This verb takes a single argument. However, the thematic structure of these clauses seem different to each other. Data 10 requires theme role as the subject, and the verb preceded by an attributive to modify the activity/verb. Data 11 shows that the NP subject gets experiencer role. The subject NP undergoes the event which modified by AP attributive. Line (12) denotes the theme role is assigned to the NP subject in D-structure.

Line 13 shows that the verb take needs three complements to complete the meaning. The NP in the subject position is used as the facilitator in the event. The NP carries the NP in the direct internal argument from a place to the other location. Based upon this function, the NP in the subject matrix is assigned instrument role by the predicate verb of this clause. Meanwhile, the NP in the direct argument gets theme role, and the NP within the PP projection is given theta goal by the head of the PP. In line (14), the verb appears in transitive construction. An external argument, and one internal argument. The external argument links to goal role. This role maker decide and select the type of transportation used in the event. The NP within the VP max projection takes instrument role. This NP preceded by an attributive AP to modify the argument.

Data 15 describes that the NP in subject position gains theta instrument, and modified by an attributive AP. But, the NP adjacent to the predicate verb gets θ Temp, and preceded by an attributive AP as the modifier. This argument is followed by non finite clause. Thus, the thematic structure of this verb is theta instrument, theta temp and infinite.

Data 16 points out that the verb take requires two arguments and one optional adjunct. The predicate verb as the head of the max projection specifies agentive role to the NP in the subject matrix. However, the accusative case NP in the direct argument gets patient role. This verb construction take an optional adjunct for PP to give an extra information to the reader.

At data 17, the verb take occurs in passive construction. The direct object moved upward to the subject position. The head of VP max projection assigns theme role to the NP in the subject position at D-structure. The actor who involves in this motion does not realized phonetically. Hence, the agentive role in this clause takes implicit argument. To complete the

meaning, a PP from is inserted into this projection. The head of this PP assigns source role to the NP within its projection.

Data 18 shows that the verb take occurs in transitive construction. The predicate verb requires two arguments, an external and a direct internal argument. This verb specifies goal role to the NP in the specifier matrix. The NP in the direct argument gets theme role, and preceded by quantifier.

Data 19-20 describes that the verb take appears in imperative construction. Both clauses take implicit argument for the subject position. The second person projected as the subject does not realized phonetically. Meanwhile, the internal argument at data 19 receives theta theme, and no additional particle as to give extra information. It differs with data 20, it needs a direct NP argument. In this case, represented in impersonal 'it'. This impersonal 'it' refers to any entity inherented within the context of the conversation. But, the impersonal 'it' has no obligatory control at this clause. That NP 'it' gets theta theme given by the head of the V". This data also needs an adjunct headed by to PP as to give more information, the NP within the PP projection receives theta goal specified by the head of the P". The similar analysis is addressed to data 32. The distinction is, this data takes an AP as the modifier.

The combination of the verb take with such prepositions resulted varieties of phrasal verbs. These phrasal verbs occur in variety of construction. Data 21 shows that the phrasal verb take over appears in transitive boundary. This phrasal takes two arguments. The object in the event moves (either management or location) from a such institution to the other one/place. The direction of the movement refers to the NP subject of this clause. Hence, based on the meaning interpretation, the NP in the specifier position of IP gets goal role. However, the NP in the direct argument receives theme role given by the head of VP max projection. This phrasal appears in discontinuous construction.

At data 22, the phrasal take off appears in imperativetive construction. The subject position does not realized phonetically at this data. It is regarded as the covert argument. In imperative, the implicit argument refers to second person perspective (see, Beukema & Coopmans, 1989). At this data, the phrasal verb takes a single argument, it is the internal argument which receives theta theme from the head of the V".

Data 23 points out that the phrasal take off occurs in intransitive and continuous construction. This phrasal takes a single argument. The NP in the specifier position receives theta theme. This clause completed with an optional adjunct on PP to give more information. The head of the PP assigns theta temp to the NP within its projection.

At data 24, the phrasal take off appears in transitive continuous construction. It requires two arguments to complete meaning. The subject NP undergoes the event, so that it gets experiencer role. The following NP of the VP max projection receives theta temp. To give an extra information, this clause takes an optional adjunct headed by P in the during PP boundary.

Data 25 shows that the verb take combined with particle up to form phrasal take up. This phrasal needs two arguments. In this data, the phrasal occurs in continuous construction. The NP subject which preceded by AP attributive gains theme role. However, the possessive NP in the internal argument gets theta temp, and modified by attributive AdvP. At data 30, this phrasal appears in discontinuous construction. This data shows that its thematic structure seems different to the data 25. Data 30 requires two arguments, an external, direct internal and PP at to complete the meaning. The external argument links to agentive role. This NP is the initiator of the event. The NP in the direct argument receives theme role. It is the object of being served or welcome. While, the NP in the PP projection gets theta location given by the head of the PP max. Lets us see the data 31, the phrasal verb take up occurs in passive and continuous

construction. The subject position is filled with the direct object in active voice. In passive, the object projected to subject matrix, and gets theme role in D structure. Meanwhile, the agentive role does not realized, or implied in implicit argument. To give extra information, this clause takes an optional adjunct with PP. The NP within the PP projection gets theta instrument specified by the PP head.

At data 26, the phrasal take to occurs in reciprocal. The anaphor bound by the NP in the subject matrix. Thus, the antecedent c-command the anaphor. The antecedent NP receives theta experiencer. It is accounted that the NP subject undergoes the feeling of fond. The reciprocal does not get theta role because of the role has been received by its antecedent.

Data 27 points out that the phrasal take for appears in transitive and discontinuous construction. The phrasal takes two arguments. The NP in the subject position has perceived the NP in the direct argument. The NP subject considered a certain characteristic to the NP in the direct argument. Hence, the NP in the specifier position gets experiencer role. But, the NP in the direct argument receives theme role. It is accounted that this NP as the object of perception. Meanwhile, the NP in the DP projection does not receive a role. It is accounted that the characteristic embedded at the same entity. The entity itself has been received a role when it occurs in the direct argument. Actually, the DP is not an argument. It is just a modifier of the direct NP. Thus, if this analysis is right. It is suitable with the principle of theta criterion, where an argument receive only one theta role and each theta role assigned only for one argument (see, Chomsky, 1981, 1993).

At data 28, the phrasal verb take away occurs in non finite clause. The PRO subject in the embedded clause is controlled by the indirect object of the main clause at D-structure. The controller NP binds the PRO, therefor the NP c-command the PRO. The indirect NP semantically functioned as the instrument to make the ‘pain’ disappear. Thus, this NP receives theta role instrument. As the PRO, it does not receive a role, because the controller has been received it. The NP in the direct argument of the S clause gets theme role. It is the abstract entity that should be taken away (see, Haegeman, 1994)

At data 29, the phrasal take in occurs in passive construction. The construction requires a single overt argument. The subject NP is generated from the object matrix at D structure. Thus, the theme role got when the subject NP was in internal argument. By phrase is inserted to give extra information to the clause meaning. The NP within the PP gets theta instrument given by the head of the P”. The actor is projected as the implicit argument in this construction. (see, Haegeman. 1994, Radford. 1988).

Data 33 describes that the verb take occurs in an idiom construction. The combination three different category of word formed an idiom. The meaning component cannot be translated under the lexical meaning of the lexicon. This combination resulted a single semantic meaning. Thus, the idiom take away from is constructed by two different arguments. The possessive NP in the subject position gets source role. It is the element that makes or causes the beauty of the face being detracted. The subject NP is preceded by an attributive AP to modify the NP. The possessive NP in the internal argument receives theme role. It is the object being affected. That NP is modified by an attributive AdvP.

At data 34-35, the idiom take effect requires a single argument. They appear in intransitive construction. The NP in the specifier position is assigned theme role. At PP adjunct is inserted to give an extra information. The NP in the PP projection gets theta temp specified by the head of the PP max. In data 250, this idiom occurs in non finite clause. The PRO subject is controlled by the subject of the main clause. Hence, the PRO is bound by the NP in the subject matrix of the ordinary clause. The NP gets theme role.

Data 36 shows that the idiom *take hold* appears in intransitive construction. It takes a single argument. The NP in the subject position receives theme role. It is preceded by an adjunct to modify the NP subject. Another adjunct also modifies the idiom.

Theta Role Distribution of Verb Take.

Based upon the analysis of the collected data, the distribution of thematic role of the verb *take* can be adduced as follows;

[Goal, Theme, [Adjunct]]

[Goal, Theme, Loc]

[Goal, Loc]

[Agent, Instrument]

[Agent, Patient, [Adjunct]]

[Theme, [Adjunct]]

[Theme, Goal, Source]

[Theme, Infinitive]

[Temp, Infinitive]

[Experiencer]

[Instrument, Theme, Goal]

[Instrument, Temp, Infinitive]

Based upon the distribution of the thematic structure of the *verb take*. I propose a model of vocabulary material development which generated from the variant of distribution of the verb itself. This model can be arranged as follows: The thematic role within the bracket is the thematic structure of the clause. The obligatory theta role is in the larger bracket. It should be in the clause construction. The exist of the obligatory theta role will keep the clause in well-formed and acceptable. The role in the inner bracket is the optional role within the clause construction. The optional theta role can be deleted. It does not make ill-formed of the clause syntactic structure. It is functioned as to complete the information of the clause meaning. The bracket in the clause is the NP which can be replaced by other NPs that receives the sama theta role from the head of the maximal projection. Thus, the inserting lexical entry will be tied up by the theta role within the bracket.

Teachers should group these patterns based upon the grade level of their student. For instance; pattern 1 – 6 for the beginner, pattern 7 – 13 for intermediate level, and pattern 14 – 21 for advance level, etc. It also can be grouped based on the degree of complexity of the material to be presented.

Model of vocabulary material development of verb take based upon the theta role principle:

Pattern 1:

[Theme, Adjunct]]

[The transfusion] apparently took

Have the [seeds] taken

Was [she] taken [from the French]?

Pattern 2:

[Goal, Theme, Adjunct]]

[I] shall take [a turn]

[The dentist] took [two molars]

[You] will take [some coffee]?

[I] will take [it] [upon my self]

[He] takes [things] [in stride]

Pattern 3:

[Goal, Theme, Loc.]

[The player] took [it] [on the fly]

Pattern 4:

[Agent, Locative]

[The driver] downshifted to take [the corner]

Pattern 5:

[Goal, Instrument]

[We] took [a rented car]

Pattern 6:

[Agent, Patient]

[I] should have taken [her] [for a cook]

Pattern 7:

[Goal, Theme, Source]

[The book] takes [its title] [from the Bible]

Pattern 8:

[Theme, Infinite]

It takes [money] [to live in that town]

Pattern 9:

[Temp, Infinite]

It takes about [half an hour] [to get to the airport]

Pattern 10:

[Experiencer]

[He] took [sick]

Pattern 11:

[Instrument, Theme, Goal]

[This bus] takes [you] [to New York]

Pattern 12:

[Instrument, Temp, Infinite]

But even [a small train] takes [an endless time] [to get moving]

Pattern 13:

Imperative

[Theme, [Adjunct]]

Take [your money and warm clothes]

Take [it] [to the armourer]

Pattern 14:

Take over

[Goal, Theme]

[They] have taken [it] over

Pattern 15:

Take off

[Theme, [Temp]]

Take off [your coat] (imperative)

[The plane] take off [on time]

[Experiencer, Temp, [Temp]]

[I]'m taking off [three days] [during May]

Pattern 16:

Take up

[Theme, Temp.]

[The extra duties] took up [most of my time]

[Agent, Theme, Loc.]

[You] must take [me] up [at the corner]

[Theme, [Instrument]]

[He] is much taken up with [his ship]

Pattern 17:

Take to

[Experiencer]

[They] took to each other

Pattern 18:

Take for

Experiencer, Theme

Do you take me for a fool?

Pattern 19:

Take away

[Instrument, Theme]

I was given [some pills] to take away [the pain]

Pattern 20:

Take in:

[Theme, [Instrument]]

[Many unprotected women] have been taken in [by fine words]

Pattern 21:

Take away from (idiom)

[Source, Theme]

[Her stringy hair] take away from [her lovely face]

Pattern 22:

Take effect (idiom)

[Theme, [Adjunct]]

[The curfew] take effect at midnight

[The antibiotics] at last began to take effect

Pattern 23:

Take hold

[Theme, [Adjunct]]

[The newly planted vines] quickly took hold

The Practicality of The Model

This model of vocabulary material development can reduce the teaching and learning of grammar. This model implicitly adopted the grammar acquisition. The grammar is embedded within the model itself. By inserting any lexical items, or NP that has the same role into the thematic role bracket, the clause keeps in well-grammatical sentence. Thus, teachers do not need to teach sentence structure, phrases structure, passive voice, and or imperative construction. Sentence structure is constructed by combination of phrases. The NP in the specifier position captivates the subject matrix of the highest projection. This NP c-commands the whole constituents in the projection (see, Radford. 1988. p. 115). The obligatory argument (theta role) is the minimum argument required to form well-grammatical sentence. This role is specified based on the decomposed meaning inherent within the *verb take*. This model of vocabulary material development of plays on this condition. It does happen to phrases as the material of teaching. The NP within the phrase projection is assigned by the head of the phrase maximal projection. Any NP to be inserted to the P'' projection should be appropriated with the role specified by the head of the P''. Teachers may put any NPs into the projection as long as suit with the role required by the P'' head. It is because the role is given by the head of the P''. Thus, the construction keeps in well-grammatical projection. In passive voice, teachers just focus on the obligatory theta role in its construction. The optional thematic role can be ignored. It still preserves the structure. In imperative, it can adopt Beukema and Coopmans proposal (1989), they described that imperative can be formed in IP and VP projection. Furthermore, those constructions also involve thematic role for their argument. Likewise, this model is

plausible to apply for those constructions. It just focuses on the obligatory thematic role. Hence, this model is applicable to all clauses construction, except for the tenses aspect. It is eligible to adduce that this model to be a simple model in vocabulary material development, because it is in package with the grammar knowledge.

This model can apply to acquire any particular language. It assumes that all human kind has unconscious knowledge about grammar of particular language, due to the principle of Universal Grammar. When the native speakers produce a sentence/s, it will result well-formed and acceptable expressions. Thus, if teachers construct vocabulary material based upon its lexicon's selectional argument/complement, student's vocabulary acquisition would be completed by its meaning and grammar information. Hence, any expressions/sentences produced by the students will be automatically well-grammar. It makes sense to advocate learning vocabulary together with its selectional arguments/complements. When the learners have been acquiring the lexical items completed with their selectional argument/complements, the learner's performance in sentence/s production automatically well-formed and acceptable.

CONCLUSION

Verb take can be found as intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive construction. This verb requires infinite clause. Imperative, passive construction and existential clause occurs at this verb projection. Theta agent, theme role, theta source, theta goal, theta instrument, theta patient, theta locative and theta temp found at this verb construction. A number of phrasal verb can be derived from this verb; take over, take off, take up, take for, take away, take in and the idioms; take away from, take effect, and take hold.

The distribution and alternation of theta role within the syntactic configuration of the verb take as follows; [Goal, Theme, [Adjunct]], [Goal, Theme, Loc], [Goal, Loc], [Agent, Instrument], [Agent, Patient, [Adjunct]], [Theme, [Adjunct]], [Theme, Goal, Source], [Theme, Infinite], [Temp, Infinite], [Experiencer], [Instrument, Theme, Goal], [Instrument, Temp, Infinite]

The model of vocabulary material development generated from the principle of theta role can simplify the acquisition of varieties of the target language component. This model also can reduce the teaching grammar in the foreign language class. The grammar aspect is embedded within this model. Teachers is bound by the obligatory thematic role in inserting any lexical items into the syntactic configuration. The optional argument can be deleted, and likewise does not yield ill-grammatical of the clause. This model is applied in varieties of clause patterns. The theta roles within the bracket will bind the lexical entry. Thus, teachers can insert any NPs or adjuncts as long as they have the same role.

REFERENCES

- Afarli A. Tor (2007). *Do Verbs Have Argument Structure? In Argument Structure*. Ed. Eric Reuland, Tanmoy Bhattacharya and Giorgos Spathas. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Philadelphia. USA
- Boers, Frank (2013). *Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to teaching vocabulary: Assessment and integration*. Language Teaching (2013). Cambridge University Press.
- Boers, Franks (2011). *Cognitive Semantic ways of teaching figurative phrases. An Assessment. Review of Cognitive Linguistic*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Chomsky, Noam (1993). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. The Pisa Lectures. Seventh Edition. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin
- Echols M. John & Shadily, Hasan (1990). *An English-Indonesian Dictionary*. PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama. Jakarta.
- Haegeman, Liliane (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Blackwell. Cambridge. USA.
- Hale, Ken. Keyser Jay, Samuel (2002). *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph; 39. The MIT Press
- Hoey, Michael (2000). *A world beyond collocation: new perspectives on vocabulary teaching*. In *Teaching Collocation. Further Developments in the Lexical Approach*. Edited by Michael Lewis. LTP Teacher Training.
- Hornby, AS (2010). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. International Student's Edition*. Eight Edition. Oxford University Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1974). *A Deep Structure Projection Rule*. Linguistic Inquiry. Vol. 5. No. 4. pp. 481-505.
- Kalyuga, Marika and Kalyuga, Slava (2008). *Metaphor Awareness in teaching vocabulary*. Language Learning Journal. Vol. 36, No. 2, December 2008, 249-257.
- Koopman, Hilda and Sportiche, Dominique (1991). *The Position of Subject*. Lingua 85 (1991) 211-258. North-Holland.
- Lewis, Michael (1993). *The Lexical Approach. The state of ELT and a Way Forward*. Language Teaching Publications. England.
- Nash, Hannah & Snowling, Margaret (2006). *Teaching new words to children with poor existing vocabulary knowledge: a controlled evaluation of the definition and context methods*. INT. J. LANG. COMM. DIS., MAY-JUNE 2006. VOL. 41 NO. 3 335-354. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Radford, Andrew (1988). *Transformational Grammar. A First Course*. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Radford, Andrew (2004). *Minimalist Syntax: Exploring the structure of English*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Rapoport, Tova. Erteschik-Shir, Nomi (2007). *Projecting Argument Structure. The Grammar of hitting and breaking revisited*. In *Argument Structure*. Ed. Eric Reuland, Tanmoy Bhattacharya and Giorgos Spathas. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Philadelphia. USA.
- Soukhanov H. Anne (Executive Editor) (no year). *The American Heritage Dictionary of The English Language*. Third Edition.
- Stahl, A. Steven & Nagy, E William (2006). *Teaching Word Meaning*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. London.
- Williams, Edwin (1994). *Thematic Structure in Syntax*. MIT Press. Cambridge.