DISTRIBUTION-TRANSFORMATION SCHEMES ACTING AS OPERATORS OF SEMANTIC INTERPRETATION

Fakhriddin Israilovich Abdurakhmanov*

*Associate Professor,
PhD of Pedagogic sciences,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University, UZBEKISTAN
Email id: Fahro@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The article describes the semantic representations that could be derived from the interpretation of actantial verb structures that followed Fillmore called frames. In the article it is assumed that in the semantic interpretation of distributive-transformational scheme communique between frames minimal interpretation of case determines the value of each of the actants. To determine the value of case, it is sufficient and necessary to carry word of this case forms a distributive basis, transformational and call frame corresponding to a segment of the interpretation of the noun.

KEYWORDS: *Distributive-Transformational Scheme, The Frame, The Value Of Case, Actant, Semantic Class, Nuclear Structure, Transforms, Actantial Verb, Distribution Element.*

INTRODUCTION

Modern linguistics study frames – semantic representations separable from the interpretation of the actant structure of the verb[1]. It can be expected that relation between frames of a minimal interpretation, within semantic interpretation of the distribution-transformation scheme, determines meaning of the case of each actant. To determine the significance of case, it is sufficient and necessary to refer a word of the case-form to the distribution-transformation sign and name the frame in compliance with the segment of the noun interpretation.

METHODOLOGY

It is important to highlight an integration of information, which is equivalent to recognition of sounding or graphic language. The fact of recognition is that the represented option of message reduces to invariant, i.e. to what Yu. D. Apresyan names syntactic paradigm: totality of syntactic features of the top class of hierarchical classification[2]. However, it should be the hierarchy that allows for a further partition of each of the segments (in our situation transforms) on the ground of mutual relation.

The transform has, at least, three act ants: noun, first and second nouns. These actants are divided into mutually mutated derivates. For instance, second noun can be replaced with the

first one, which results in mutation – prepositional-case forms of the sentence both the first and the second noun change. Writer preferred Caucasus to Crimea ←→ Writer preferred Crimea to Caucasus.

Meaning of transforms and syntactical paradigm, as a whole, remains unchangeable despite the difference between transforms and their derivates. Each transform equivalent to the other irrespective of the sequence of transforms, the sequence of their replacement can also be optional. Despite, the meaning of each transform and syntactical paradigm remains unchangeable. Semantic variant is detected owing to a minimal semantization rather than contextually set differences. Transforms are the mapping of the same semantic field onto the syntax, only differentiating with its pragmatic meaning, i.e. highlighting necessary and optional information.

Note that in some cases syntactical paradigm is represented with the only transform. In this case, further context will be on the distribution scheme. Owing to the distribution scheme as well as the transformation feature one may interpret meaning of verb and actants with only difference in that the syntactical paradigm is a class that contains one segment, which is a particular case of syntactical paradigm.

As noted above, definition of semantic class of a word combination form by control is equally right for any verb and its act ants that have distribution-transformation scheme of the transformation feature. Any animated person can act as an agent; direct object of action can be marked as an addressable transmissible objective, and, finally, indirect object of action has the meaning of an addressee. Having combined these meanings, we receive an interpretation "some person carries out concessive action non-alienation, during which an object is given to an addressee".

This interpretation is slightly clumsy and we can define a semantic class of a word-combination form by control as "carrying by animated subject of an object to an addressee"[3]. List of two hundred verbal lexes (one of the meanings of a meaningful verb as one of this semantic class) matches the class of the meanings, for example, inject a drug into the patient's body, present diploma to a graduate, grant an advance to workers etc. in this way, minimum of semantization provides an explicit insight into semantic invariants of immediate constituents.

Pair of equisignificant sentences (predicative phrases) joined in invariant of sign is viewed as a transformation characteristic. Semantics of constituents make an invariant. Both sentences made of the same constituents that have the same actants synonymic by their lexical meaning of verb.

Distribution-transformation scheme has the following indices: N^1_n – noun in nominative case in the position of the subject; N^2 – first element; N^3 – second element; V – verb. Index of the actant has a preposition at its left side, absence of the preposition is not marked especially, however, at its right side the index has the case titled by its initial letter, for instance: a – accusative case, g – genitive case etc. Animateness and inanimateness of actant, which is important for the studied class of verbs, is considered. The prefix of verb is specified.

In language such characteristics of a linguistic sign which remain invariable at all consecutive changes of this unit are called as an invariant. When there is a sign invariant in respect of the contents, it is a question of a synonym and when in respect of expression, homonyms take place. It is possible to call the mechanism of finding of an invariant the integrator conditionally. Its task – is reference of a number of options to one invariant.

Considering speech as information conductor, and speech activity as coding generation of options and decoding (finding of the general part of an invariant and a difference of options of unit of language), we should assume existence in language of such qualities which would

allow as a result of coding and decoding to make operations at message formation. "We cannot tell with big confidence, what units of language are elementary and enter into code stock. Probably, such elementary units are the differential, phonologic and semantic signs entering into two stocks. Apparently, the stock forms also sign functions bilateral dependences, or interdependence between the parties of the contents and expression of a bilateral sign"[4]

In the transformational analysis in its traditional execution at syntax level different or is units of underlying level - morphemes. In the componential analysis at semantics level different or are also units of underlying level - semantic multipliers as what words, i.e. the minimum syntactic units act. The componential and transformational analysis equally treats the invariant mechanism, the integrator, supplementing each other, differing not with the device, and differentiator and operators. Our approach to a semantic multiplier as to a word of a natural language, reasonable Yu...Karaulo[5], allows to interpret stock of a semantic field as a set of words of a natural language.

The semantic class is a code containing rules of a choice of syntactic options. Syntax grows out of display of a semantic class to the message. The semantic class defines a syntactic behavior or distribution of words. Distribution of an element is understood "as the sum of all environments in which it meets", i.e. when fixing some element, the statement breaks up to this element and other part of the statement - its environment. In particular, distribution of a verb is defined by an ego an actant environment - the subject of action, a direct and indirect object.

If the semantic field is displayed on syntax, it means that distributive signs of a word contain information on its value. Leaning on distributive signs, it is possible to decode a semantic field. The syntactic class allocated with the help distributive - the transformational analysis, is at the same time and semantic.

CONCLUSION

The structure that designates necessary information: noun in nominative case + verb + noun in accusative case without preposition; nouns in other preposition-case forms mark optional information. Semantic Microsystems of verbs, which manage the form of the accusative case, divided as relation to case-form of actants. A marked optional form as a second element is the reason for a classification.

Pragmatic meaning of actants specify the difference of variations, so that some actants of the left transform mean necessary information and belong to an unmarked nuclear structure $N^1_n +$ $V + N^2_b$ while in the right transform actant N^2 means optional information and acts not as direct object, but as some other preposition-case form; actant N^3, in its turn, appear as indirect object in some prepositional form, except for nominative and accusative case without preposition, and represents an optional information in the left transform, meanwhile in the right transform it acts as the direct object N^3_B and means necessary information in an unmarked nuclear structure. Transformational characteristic sets a semantic class to a form of a word-combination on, so that the definition of a semantic class is equally right for any verb and its actants with distribution-transformation scheme for the transformation characteristic.

Definition shows little meaning of the action of each of the three actants, for which is necessary to 'search a single nuclear "general" meaning for each word that would cover all its meanings"[6]. As little meanings of actions and actants are shown in definition of a semantic class set by a transformational characteristic, thus the definition can be named a minimal semantization. Matching of the elements of the definition and significative meanings of verbs and their actants that belong to the distribution-transformation scheme is a generative operator of a variant of the right predicative phrase and may be named a crossed semantization.

REFERENS

1. Filmore Ch. J. Frames and Semantics of understanding. // Advanced trend in foreign linguistics. 23th Edition. Cognitive aspects of language. – Moscow: Progress. 1988. – pp. 52-92.

2. Apresyan Yu. D. Ideas and methods of contemporary structural linguistics: (Brief Essay). – Moscow: Prosveshenie, 1966. 300 p. 193

3. Filmore Ch. J. Frames and Semantics of understanding. // Advanced trend in foreign linguistics. 23th Edition. Cognitive aspects of language. – Moscow: Progress. 1988. – pp. 52-92.

4. Lekomtsev Yu. K. Structure of the Vietnamese simple sentence. – Moscow, 1964.

5. Redkin of V-A, Interrelation of the transformational and componential analysis at a semantics of directly making predicative phrases//Semantic categories of language and methods of their study.

6. KaraulovYu.N. Linguistics' guard designing and thesaurus of the literary language. – Moscow: Science, 1980. - 207 p.