Typology of Semantic Roles of Actants and Predicates in Contemporary Linguistic Science

[1]Olga Kukatova, [2]Ravshana Isakova, [3]Ataeva Ranucha,
[4]Firuza Otazhonova, [5]Navruza Begmatova

[1]PhD, Associate Professor of Russian Philology, Faculty of Foreign Philology,National University of Uzbekistan named after MirzoUlugbek, Uzbekistan.

[2]Head of the Interfaculty Department of Russian language, National University of Uzbekistan named after MirzoUlugbek, Uzbekistan.

[3]PhD, Associate Professor of Russian Philology, Faculty of Foreign Philology,National University of Uzbekistan named after MirzoUlugbek, Uzbekistan.

[4]Lecturer, Interfaculty department of Russian language, National University of Uzbekistan named after MirzoUlugbek, Uzbekistan.

[5]Lecturer, Interfaculty department of Russian language, National University of Uzbekistan named after MirzoUlugbek, Uzbekistan.

E-mail address: 4015523@mail.ru

Abstract: The article is devoted to the concept of the semantic role and its interpretation within the framework of the theory of the predicate-argumentative structure of the utterance as well as to the principles of distinguishing the semantic roles of the actants of predicates, their composition and number. The article describes the essential differences in the approaches to the description of the semantic structure of the utterance: formal, logical, communicative-pragmatic and predicate-argumentative. Attention is focused on the problem of actants' semantic roles classification on the basis of predicates, their properties, the relationship of the semantic structure of the predicate and the semantic roles of actants.

Keywords: semantic role, semantic structure of the utterance, actant, predicate, hyperrol, predicate-argumentative structure of the utterance, Agent, Paiens, Causator, Comitative, Benefactive.

1. Introduction

The typology of the semantic roles of predicates is considered in the linguistic literature primarily in connection with the problems of describing the semantic structure of a sentence. Among the most urgent problems related to the semantic side of the sentence, we can name suchdefinition of the semantic structure of the sentence as the identification and characterization

of individual structural elements and their relationship [Akmalova 2005].

In the study of the sentence semantic structure, there are several different approaches: formal-semantic, logical, communicative-pragmatic, predicate -argumentative.

Russian Grammar of 1980[th]offers a formal-semantic approach, which involves the "mutual action" of the structuralschematic semantics and the lexical meanings of the words that fill this scheme [Russian Grammar-1980: 123-126]. The meanings that are formed on the basis of such interaction, N. Yu. Shvedova calls "categories of the semantic structure of the sentence, or its semantic components" [Ibid.: 124]. Semantic components are understood as the predicative feature, the subject and the object of the sentence, which are also in interaction. The researcher notes that the semantic structure of a simple sentence can contain both elementary semantic categories (predicative attribute, subject and object of the sentence) and non-elementary (semantic components with determinative and circumstantial-determinative meanings) [Ibid.: 125].

The works of N. N. Arvat are also close to the approach proposed by N. Yu.Shvedova. In these researches the semantic structure of a sentence is described based on such categories as subject, predicate, localizer, attribute and others which reflect the "connection of typed elements of reality" [Arvat 1984: 33]. Semantic components are organized on hierarchical terms: basic (subject and predicate) and additional, the specificity of which determines the semantic types of sentences [Ibid.].

The logical approach involves establishing the correspondence of the semantic structure of the sentence to the structure of thought [Arutyunova 1973; 2003]. With this approach, the main task in the study of the meaning of the sentence is to determine the logical-syntactic principles, that is, the types of relations between the logical subject and the logical predicate. N. D. Arutyunova distinguishes the following types of relations: the logical relation of identification (identity) (The author of the book – Ivan), the logical relation existences (beingness) (Night), logical relation of nomination (This is Sergey), logical relation of characterization (Sergey is a student) [Ibid.].

The communicative-pragmatic approach, implemented in the works of E. V. Paducheva, is focused on establishing the correspondence of the role structure of the utterance to its communicative structure, which characterizes the Center (Focus) and the Periphery of the speaker's attention zone [Paducheva 1997: 22; Paducheva 2004: 51-78]. The participants corresponding to the substantive members of the proposal are usually located in the Periphery zone [Paducheva 1998: 22]. The focus of the speaker's attention is on the participants corresponding to such members of the sentence as the subject and the complement. Thus, in this approach, the object of consideration is not the propositional structure of the sentence, but a diathesis-a statement that sets "the focus of attention on a particular participant in the situation"

[Paducheva 1999: 37].

The predicate-argumentative approach (or propositional approach) was proposed in the works of W. Chafe, C. Fillmore, V. G. Gak, and others [Tesniere 1988; Fillmore 1968; 1977; Chafe 1970; Susov 1973; Bogdanov 1977; Mustayoki 2006; Apresyan 2006; Shiroglazova 2004]. It involves the differentiation of the surface-syntactic and deep-semantic structure of the utterance. At the same time, the surface-syntactic structure is understood as a verb and its propagators. The deep-semantic structure is interpreted as the relationship between a predicate and its actants (arguments, participants, participants), which receive semantic interpretation in terms of semantic roles (deep cases, semantic actants, semantic valences and semantic arguments).

The peculiarity of the predicate-argumentative approach is that it connects the semantic structure of the utterance, on the one hand, with the semantics of the predicate, on the other, with a certain composition and content characteristics of actants called semantic roles. Using language tools, semantic roles are different they are interpreted in the surface-syntactic structure of the utterance and are attributed to the actants of the predicate. However, the direct nature of the semantic role is understood by researchers in different ways. Thus, according to C. Fillmore and W. Chafe semantic roles are considered as components of the deep-semantic structure of the sentence correlated with the participants of a certain state of affairs and in a certain relation to the predicate [Fillmore 1968; 1977; Chafe 1970]. The development of this idea is observed in the works of E. V. Paducheva, who notes that the semantic role "characterizes the participant of the situation at the denotative level, thus, from the point of view of the place of the corresponding object in the situation indicated by the verb", in accordance with this "the content of the semantic role is part of the interpretation of the verb" [Paducheva 1997: 21]. For example, "An agent is someone who acted. The Location, Source, and Destination components correspond to the 'be in place' and 'move from / to place' components. The experiment corresponds to the component ' X perceives (sees, hears, feels)'"[Ibid.: 23]. The definition proposed by E. V. Paducheva is similar to that formulated by V. A. Plungyan, according to which the semantic role "is part of the semantics of the predicate and reflects the general properties of the participants in certain groups of situations" [Plungyan 2000: 164]. From the point of view of N. N. Gridneva, semantic roles "reflect the relationship between the predicate and the nominal group" [Gridneva 2009: 30]. Predicates are called "special semantic entities" [Bulygina 1982: 8], which can be expressed by different parts of speech. Most often, predicates are expressed by verbs, although they can be expressed by nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and words of the state category. A predicate contains a set of all mandatory semantic roles in a collapsed form, so the typology of sentences based on the organization of their meaning is directly related to the type of predicate and its semantic features.

In the concept of I. P. Susov, an attempt is made to present the semantics of a sentence as a unity of three levels: relational, predication and level of expression of the logical (mental) structure of the sentence. At the relational level, defined as a mental reflection of the situation, the components of meaning are identified as relatemes correlated with the concept of semantic role [Susov 1973].

Thus, the predicate-argumentative approach to the study of the semantic structure of the utterance allows us to establish the relationship between the semantic structure of the predicate and the semantic roles dependent on it, to identify the typology of semantic roles for a certain type of predicate and show their uniqueness, to describe the semantic structure of the sentence more fully and accurately, to raise the question of the features of the relationship between the deep-semantic structure of the sentence and its surface-syntactic structure. In addition, it allows you to reveal and / or clarify the semantic properties of various types of predicates related to the composition of their case frames.

2. OBJECTIVES

The aim of the work is to consider the typology of semantic roles of actants predicates in several aspects: 1) the basis for the allocation of semantic roles, their composition and number; 2) the properties of mandatory and optional semantic roles; 3) the distinction between event and non-event (subject) semantic roles; 4) the relationship of a set of semantic roles with the type of predicate; 5) the correspondence of the semantic role to its syntactic actant, the types of such correspondences; 6) the hierarchy of semantic roles, manifested in the choice of the subject and communicative isolation.

3. LITERATURES REVIEW

Semantic roles and their interpretation in the framework of the theory of the predicate-argumentative structure of the utterance. Principles of distinguishing the semantic roles of predicate actants, their composition and number.

In the linguistic literatureactants are understood either as formal entities or as semantic ones. The most controversialquestion of the grounds for the allocation, composition and number of semantic roles of actants of predicates is presented. Initially, this aspect of the study of semantic roles was reflected in the work of L.Tesniere [Tesniere 1988], where the verb is understood as the structural center of the sentence and the actant is characterized from a semantic point of view as "the one who performs the action" (the subject, the first actant), "the one who experiences the action" (the second actant), "the actant in whose favor or to the detriment of which the action is performed" [Ibid.: 124]. A number of scientists note that while analyzing specific examplesactants were interpreted by L.Tenier as formal entities, not semantic ones [Kubryakova, Pankrats 1985: 73; Gak 1998; Silnitsky 1973: 136]. As components of the deep-semantic structureactants are

interpreted in the works of C. Fillmore, who proposed a typology of semantic roles in terms of deep cases [Fillmore 1968; 1977]. The main and basic principle of distinguishing a particular deep case, according to C. Fillmore, is the principle of universality, which implies the presence of a particular deep case in all languages of the world, regardless of whether they have a grammatical category of the case. Within the framework of the theory of the Moscow Semantic School, it is customary to contrast semantic actants with syntactic ones [Apresyan 1995].

Distinguishing between the deep and surface levels of the utterance structure C. Fillmore interprets the semantic role as a "deep syntactic-semantic relationship", understood as the relationship between the verb and its nominal groups (or subordinate clauses) each of which is connected with the verb by a logical-syntactic relationship. At the surface-syntactic level, the semantic role is encoded by some surface case (case form). Fillmore emphasizes that" the explanatory value of the universal system of deep cases lies in their syntactic, and not in their (simply) morphological nature "[Fillmore 1968]. Initially, C. Fillmore distinguished six cases: "Agentive – A) - the case of the usually animatethe initiator of the action identified with the verb; Instrumental (I) - the case of an inanimate force or object that is included in the action or state called by the verb as its cause; Dative (D) – the case of an animate being that is affected by the state or action called by the verb; Factive (F) – the case of an object or being that occurs as a result of the action or state called by the verb; Locative (L) - the case that characterizes the location or spatial orientation of the action or state called by the verb; Objective (O) is semantically the most neutral case, the case of something" [Fillmore 1968]. In the next work of the scientist, the list of semantic roles was clarified: the concept of the Patient is introduced and it is given a fundamentally different definition compared to the Lens-"the object that is used" [Fillmore 1977].

However, as the researchers note, Ch. Fillmore did not formulate the principles of describing the content of the semantic roles of predicates, did not distinguish between event and subject roles. In their opinion, the principles of assigning roles remained unclear, and the possibility of changing the set of roles depending on the change in the value of the predicate was not taken into account [Arutyunova 1972: 301; Arutyunova 1973: 119 – 120; Katsnelson 1988: 110 – 117; Bostonov 2005: 10]. The list of semantic roles proposed by Ch. Fillmore later changed both in quantitative and qualitative terms, which depended on the objectives of the study, the number of languages involved, and the "fractional threshold" [Bogdanov 1977: 66]. In the concept of Yu. D. Apresyan, the factor of "fractional threshold" means, for example, the fractional representation of a Locative as a starting point, end point, and place [Apresyan 1995: 126]

In general, the variation in the number and composition of semantic roles is explained by the lack of uniform criteria for their allocation [Raspopov 1981: 27; Susov 1980: 24].

In the contemporary linguistic literature, there are three main approaches to the classification of semantic roles: field, two-level, andby language. The field and two-level approaches are based on the principle of universality, which assumes the possibility of describing the semantic structure of an utterance with the help of a certain system of semantic roles applicable to any language.

In the field approach, all semantic roles can be considered as a field with a nuclear and peripheral part. The nuclear part includes such semantic roles as Agent, Patient, Instrument, Experimenter, Locative, Addressee, Beneficiary, Comitative, which are inherent in all or most languages [Tesniere 1988; Fillmore 1968; 1977; Chafe 1970; Susov 1973; Bogdanov 1977]. They are the most important for a particular language or a language in general, and they reflect the main content categories of the language – subject, object, tool, actor, etc.

Thus, an agent is usually interpreted as someone who acts consciously, purposefully, "controls the situation" [Fillmore 1968; 1977; Tesniere 1988: 405; Kibrik (elektr.resource); Kibrik 1998: 17]. A. F. Dremov notes that the Agent is the initiator of some event, and is also interpreted as the reason for the change of another participant [Dremov (elektr.resource)]. A different point of view is expressed by W. Chafe, who excludes the characteristic "goal-setting" and introduces the characteristic "potency" (the presence of energy) and, accordingly, the Agent can be interpreted both as animate and inanimate [Chafe 1970: 128]. Cf.: a) The boy ran and b) The fire burned the house, where the actants boy and fire are interpreted as Agents. V. Yu.Koprov distinguishes three types of Agent: Agent-anthrophony, Agent-zoonym, Agent- causer. The agent-causer has three sub-categories: Agent-cause (Wheat died due to severe cold), Agent-tool (A hurricane destroyed a building) and Agent-patient (A tree fell and broke a car) [Koprov 2006]. In contrast to the Agent, the Experimenter is understood as a participant receiving information, feeling [Altman 1976: 221; Fillmore 1968; 1977; Tesniere 1988].

The patient is interpreted as an object that is used [Fillmore 1977], that is, experiencing an action on the part of another participant,for example, the Agent [Chafe 1970: 121 – 123]. The patient is also interpreted as a hyper-role, that is, a semantic role that combines the meanings of two or more semantic roles, for example, the Object and the Patient itself: I read a book (Object) and I spilled water (Patient) [Kolomatsky 2009: 37].

The instrument is interpreted as an inanimate object, with the help of which something is carried out, that is, it is not the "initiator of action" [Chafe 1970: 176], "does not undergo changes" [Kibrik (elektr.resource)]. However, there are differences in the interpretation of this role. The instrument is treated either as a participant, "included in an action or state... as its cause" [Fillmore 1968]. For example: He cuts bread with a knife. In this case, the knife actant can be interpreted as the participant with which the action is performed. Cf.: The boat was carried away

by the wind, where the wind actant is understood as the cause of the action carried away.

The locative is interpreted as a place (or otherwise-location) [Fillmore 1968]. For example: I was standing outside the house.

The addressee is understood as an actant, to which the action is directed "through the impact on a direct object" [Butova 2006: 39]. Cf.: a) Igor wrote a letter to his brother. At the same time, such semantic roles as the Recipient – "the recipient of a material object (to give a letter to a brother), the Destinative – "the person or object to whom an action or object is intended" (to do for the father), are included in the semantic role of the Addressee, interpreted in this case as a hyper-role [Ibid.].

A beneficiary is defined as someone who loses, gains, or owns something [Chafe 1970: 176], and also "is a person who benefits" [Ibid: 171]. For example: I have an apartment.

The comitative is usually understood as the semantic case of the accompaniment, the usual way of marking which is the preposition c + creative case. From the point of view of the hierarchy of roles, the Comitative is a peripheral semantic role. Wed. 1a. Igor and his friend (mother) went to the mountains, where the transformation of 1b is possible. Igor and his friend (mother) went to the mountains. 2a.

Igor goes to school with a gift if 2b is impossible * Igor and the gift go to school [Arkhipov 2005: 50]. It is different to define this role in relation to another main participant, as performing the same role as the participant who is in the position of the subject [Ibid.]. Thus, "The Comitative does not correspond to any fixed role: the participant of the situation, marked by the Comitative, has the same semantic role with one of the other participants", since compatibility is not a constituent feature of the comitative construction [Ibid.: 43].

The peripheral roles include such as Counterparty, Mediator, Elementative, Onomosiative, and others.

The counterparty is interpreted as "an active participant in a situation in which another active subject takes part, and the actions of these two participants do not coincide: the predicate fully describes only the activity of the subject, but not the activity of the counterparty" [Apresyan 1995: 128]. For example, in a purchase and sale situation: the subject buys, and the counterparty sells.

Mediative means [Bogdanov 1977: 176]. For example: It cleans the surface with a powder (cleaning tool).

The elementative is the inanimate producer of an action. For example: The wind (hurricane) opened a window [Ibid].

Onomasiotic – "the semantic role of the name, nickname". For example: the novel "War and Peace" [Ibid].

A two-level approach to the description of the system of semantic roles is proposed in.Valin and W. Foley. The researchers believe that the role structure of the sentence is organized by the predicate and the semantic roles attributed to the participants of the situation. Scientists distinguish between the basic (non-derivative) and derived levels. The basic and derived levels are related as the concept of genus (more general) and the concept of species (particular). The basic level (that is, the initial level) is formed by two semantic roles: the Actor and the Undergoing, from which the Actor is able to control the situation", and the Undergoing "does not condition or control the situation" [Foley, W. A., and van Valin, R. D. Jr. 1977]. The derivatives of the Actor are the Agent, the Force, the Experimenter, etc., the derivatives of the Undergoing are the Patient, the Object, etc. Thus, the roles of Agent, Patient, and Experiment constitute a derived level. Semantic roles at the basic level are called hyperroles. For example, 3a. The student reads a book and 3b. He admires the landscape, where the actants are the student and he are the Actors, but the predicate read suggests an active, active participant in the situation, respectively, the student is assigned the role of Agent, whereas in 3b the actant is an inactive, feeling participant, who is assigned the role of Experiment; in 3a the actant book is the Patient, in 3b the actant landscape is the Object. According to the researchers, the binary opposition of the Actor and the Undergoing is the "organizing principle" of the role system of the language, which allows the most adequate description of the role structure of the sentence. The main difference in the interpretation of the system of semantic roles by V. Valin and W. Foley is that semantic roles are "considered here not as the simplest initial concepts, but rather as derived relations" [Ibid.: 387].

The system of semantic roles proposed by V. V. Bogdanov basically coincides with the classifications of C. Fillmore, W. Cheif, and some others. These are the Agent, the Patient, the Benificant, the Experimenter, the Object, the Perceptive (which is "the object of a physiological or mental action or state"), the Instrument, the Mediator, the Elementative, the Onomasiotic, the Resultant ("the result of the action of the predicate"), etc.

The classification of semantic roles by V. V. Bogdanov is based on the sign of animateness / inanimateness. Thus, the animate are the Agent, the Patient, the Beneficiary, the Experimenter; the inanimate are the Object, the Instrument, the Mediator, theElementative. Roles such as Perceptive, Onomasiotic, Locative, Resultant, etc. characterized as animated-solid / inanimate. In the list of roles, V. V. Bogdanov does not include event-based roles such as Causer, Goal, etc. [Bogdanov1977: 52-55].

Following Ch. Fillmore, I. P. Susov attributes semantic roles to the participants of the situation and, in accordance with this, identifies the initial object, which is attributed to the semantic role of the Agent, the closing object, which is attributed to the semantic role of the Patient; the relationship between them is defined as the relationship of the active actor and the

object of the Agent's action. A concomitant object is one "that participates in the relation indirectly, being neither the source nor the end point" [Susov 1973: 18]. The basis for distinguishing these types of semantic roles in the utterance, according to I. P. Susov, is the idea that"every relationship is directed, that is, it proceeds from some point and closes at another point." In other words, the very structure of the situation that exists in objective reality dictates the allocation of several types of semantic roles [Ibid.].

The classification of the types of semantic roles of predicates, developed by Yu. D. Apresyan, includes 25 types of semantic roles. It separately presents the original and derived semantic roles. Thus, the End Point and the Starting Point, the Route, the Source are derived from the Place, the Goal-from the Content and the Result, the Addressee and the Intermediary - from the Subject, the Condition, the Motivation, the Result - from the Cause. Syncretic roles are also distinguished, that is, those that contain the values of two semantic roles at once. These are, for example, the roles of the Instrument and the Place (to go by train) [Apresyan 1995: 130].

In contrast to the field and two-level approaches to the classification of roles, T. B. Alisova's linguistic approach takes into account not only the fundamental multiplicity of semantic roles, but also all possible ways of their surface design in a given language [Alisova 2009: 42]. T. B. Alisova emphasizes that the criterion for identifying a semantic role "will be the sum of all its possible designations, and to characterize the functional range – taking into account all its meanings".

"The accuracy of the definition of the semantic category of the subject, object, etc., achieved only through their relationship with a certain range of forms, fundamentally excludes the universal nature of these concepts..." [Ibid.: 42].

The list of semantic roles of T. B. Alisova differs in that almost all of them are related to the category of person: "person or object, carrier of an absolute attribute, person or object of localization, localizer, person - "owner", person-carrier of relations of perception, object of possession and perception, produced, changed, moved object; person-carrier of mental reaction, object (cause) of mental reaction, person-producer of active action on the object; the person – the "recipient" of the object or information, the person-the producer of the causal action, the cause of the action, the instrument of the action" [Ibid.: 40-55].

The field and two-level approaches to the description of the system of semantic roles differ in the degree of accuracy and detail. The nuclear and peripheral parts of the semantic roles make it possible to see all their diversity, which allows us to describe the features of the role structure of the actants of predicates of specific languages.

A two-level system for describing semantic roles is more compact and gets deployed precisely when studying a particular language. As for the linguistic approach, the criteria for such

classification make it possible to make the system of semantic roles of a particular language as fractional and accurate as possible.

3.1.   Properties of semantic roles of actants predicates

The properties of semantic roles of actants include such as the propositive (event-based) nature of the semantic role, the conditionality of the character of the semantic role by the type of predicate, and the correspondence of a particular semantic role to a particular syntactic actant.

One of the most important characteristics inherent in semantic roles is eventfulness / non-eventfulness (objectivity) semantic role, i.e. the ability / inability to denote a proposition. Originally Ch. Fillmore identified only non-event roles. These are Agents, Experimenters, Tools, Benefactives (Beneficiaries), and others, which, according to V. V. Bogdanov, are characterized by such semantic features as + (-) 'commonality', + (-) 'numerability', + (-) 'uniqueness', + (-) 'animateness', + (-) 'humanity', + (-) 'femininity' [Bogdanov, 1977: 35]. Along with this, W. Chafe identified the attribute "potency / non-potency", which means the possession of "one's own internal energy" [Chafe 1970: 128 – 129]. This feature is inherent in both animate and inanimate participants of the situation. In contrast to non-event roles, event semantic roles are called events and are characterized by the ability to be expanded into a proposition. This property, according to a number of researchers, has the semantic roles of the Causer, Goals, Conditions, and Content [Apresyan 1995: 126; Krylov (elektr.resource): 20]. Cf.: 1a. The early arrival of my brother excited me-1b. The fact that my brother came early excited me.

3.2.   Hierarchy of semantic roles of actants predicates

As is well known, the hierarchy refers to the relations between the lower and higher levels [Akhmanova 2004: 166]. The hierarchy of semantic roles can be considered in paradigmatic and syntagmatic terms. In paradigmatic terms, semantic roles are opposed to hyperroles as semantic entities of a higher order.

Syntagmatically, the hierarchy of semantic roles is related to choice: 1) the subject, that is, with the order of choice of semantic roles to replace certain syntactic positions, 2) the focus of the speaker's attention (or "pragmatic peak" [Van Valin, Foley 1982: 376 – 410]). A hyper-role can be, for example, an Actor and a Undergoing,Patients [Susov 1973], Patients and Kautzer [Paducheva 2004], Subject-Agent, Subject-Patient [Shiroglazova 2004: 6].

N. S. Shiroglazova deduces hyperroles on the basis of two features that characterize any semantic role: ± animateness, ± activity. Accordingly, modifications of these two features give four hyper-roles: the Agent is included in the Subject-Agent (animate active participant), the Object, the Tool, the Locative – in the hyper-role of the Object-Patient (inanimate inactive participant). The Causer combines the role of Agent, Force, and Cause on the basis that these roles themselves in certain situations can be the cause of a certain state of affairs [Shiroglazova

2004]. According to the researcher, the presence of hyperroles makes the system of semantic roles qualitatively different, since, on the one hand, it is "not too voluminous", on the other hand, such a system is potentially deployable and, depending on the purpose of the study and the analyzed languages, the number of deep cases can be increased [Ibid.: 9]. Cf. 1a.He cracked the nut (the nut is a participant who has undergone changes (Patient)). 1b. He reads the letter (the letter is a participant in the situation to which the action (Object) is directed. These two roles are combined into a hyper-role Object-Patient. E. V. Paducheva combines the semantic roles of Force, Cause, and Agent in the hyper-role of Causation [Apresyan 1995: 23]. For instance: 2a. The hurricane (Force) tore off the roof of the house. 2b. He (the Agent) opened the door. 2c. The arrival (The reason) of his brother upset him.

Syntagmatically, the hierarchy of semantic roles concerns the choice of the subject and the focus of the speaker's attention. C. Fillmore defines the choice of subject as follows: if there is an Agent in the semantic structure of the utterance, the Agent becomes the subject, if there is no Agent, but if there is a semantic role

The Tool subject becomes the Tool. The presence of these two semantic roles in the sentence structure implies the semantic role of the Object. Therefore, in the absence of an Agent and a Tool, the Object becomes the subject (Agent>Tool>Object) [11]. Developing this idea, V. Valin and U.Foley notes that if there is an Actor in the semantic structure of the utterance, the Actor becomes the subject, and if there is no Actor, the Actor Undergoes. In the absence of both roles – other roles (Actor > Undergoing > other) [43. P. 391]. Cf.: 3a. He (Agent) broke the window (Object) with a stone (Tool); 3b. The stone (Tool) broke the window (Object); 3b. The window (Object) broke. 4a. He (The Experimenter) he is afraid of an earthquake (Causer); 4b. An earthquake (Causer) is afraid of him (Experimenter). In the above examples, the "semantic role of the highest rank", "syntactic position of the highest rank", that is, the subject and the Focus of the speaker's attention are correlated – the most important component of the semantic structure of the utterance for the speaker, opposed to the Periphery, a less important component [Ibid.: 390.]. In 3a, the Focus of the speaker's attention is the Agent (he), in 3b – the Tool (stone), in 3b – the Object (window). In 4a, the speaker's attention is focused on the Experiment (he), the Causer (earthquake) on the Periphery, in 4b, the focus of attention is moved to the Causer (earthquake), the Experimenter on the Periphery of the speaker's attention.

The theory of Ch. Fillmore gets its further development in the concept of E. V. Paducheva. According to the researcher, the role and communicative structure of the utterance are correlative. The semantic role is characterized from the point of view of the communicative emphasis in the utterance, in connection with which the concept of the communicative rank of the participants is introduced [Apresyan 1995]. "The communicative rank characterizes the participant in relation to

the speaker's focus of attention", and the semantic role-in terms of "the place of the corresponding object in the designated area "the verb of the situation" [Ibid.: 21]. At the same time, it is emphasized that "a consistent distinction between the role and communicative characteristics of the actor allows us to separate the oppositions that are associated with participation in the situation from those that are associated with the semantics of perspective – with the focus of empathy, communicative significance for the speaker" [Paducheva, 1995]. The same semantic role, depending on the meaning of the predicate, can move from the Center to the Periphery, that is, turn from semantically mandatory to optional. Thus, communicative ranks and semantic roles are autonomous entities. The concept of communicative rank introduced by E. V. Paducheva correlates with the concept of perspective in C. Fillmore. At the same time, the concept of communicative rank affects not only syntactically expressible participants who are in the Center or Periphery of the speaker's attention zone, but also syntactically inexpressible ones with the rank of Zero, for example, Observer.3 In contrast to the concept of perspective, the concept of communicative rank allows us to treat the Subject and the direct Object not as formal entities, but as communicatively significant concepts. The participant corresponding to the situation is most often located in the Peripheral zone [Paducheva 1998; 1999; 1999; 2009]. It is noted that the same role can have different communicative ranks, which is associated with the concept of diathesis, 4 understood as a set of semantic roles in the case frame of the verb and their communicative ranks.

Thus, the ratio of the formal structure of the utterance described in terms of the members of the sentence, the semantic structure (the predicate and its actants) and the communicative structure of the utterance (the ratio of Focus ~ Peripherals) is complex and ambiguous.

4. Conclusion

In a number of different approaches to the description of the utterancesemantics, the predicate-argumentative approach differs as it represents the semantics of the utterance as a result of the semantics interaction of the predicate and the semantic roles of its actants.

The semantic roles of actants correlate with the semantic structure of the predicate. Accordingly, predicates belonging to different semantic types have a different set of semantic roles in the case frame. In turn, predicates of the same class have the same set of semantic roles.

The semantic roles of the actant represent a system. Important system-forming factors are their compatibility, the possibility of giving two participants the same semantic role, one participant two semantic roles, as well as the possibility of splitting the semantic role.

There are different approaches to the description of the system of semantic roles: field, two-level and multilingual. Despite the difference of views, common to all concepts is the emphasis on the problem of classification of semantic roles of actants of predicates, their properties that characterize the semantic role in relation to the predicate; the relationship of the semantic

structure of the predicate and the semantic roles of actants, as well as the semantic role and its syntactic actant.

The mechanism for identifying a set of semantic roles and the mechanism for assigning a semantic role to a predicate are the necessary conditions that allow us to determine the distinctive features of the semantic roles of predicates; their composition and name; the method of representation in each particular language, as well as whether this method of representation is individual or typical for a particular type of predicate. At the same time, it allows you to define a universal set of semantic roles; possible combinations of them that are characteristic of a certain type of predicates; the correlation of semantic roles - signs inherent in the predicate and the semantic role corresponding to its actant.

These directions in the description of the system of semantic roles reflect an attempt at a comprehensive analysis of the semantic structure of speech, but leave open the question of the composition and number of semantic roles of a particular language and human language in general. It is generally accepted today that the semantic roles that reflect the most important content categories of any language include Agent, Tool, Patient, Locative, Addressee, Experimenter, and Beneficiary.

There is an ambiguous relationship between the semantic, formal, and communicative structures of utterance. Determining the nature of the relationship between the semantic structure of the utterance, that is, the system of semantic roles for a certain type of predicate, and its communicative structure allows us to distinguish in the semantic structure of the utterance information about the presence / absence of a particular role from information about their communicative ranks.

The concept of communicative rank is associated with the differentiation of the Center and the Periphery of the speaker's attention zone. The change in the communicative rank is accompanied by a change in the diathesis-the syntactic construction that sets the focus of the speaker's attention. The diatetic shift is accompanied by a change in the communicative ranks, but not in the composition of semantic roles under a certain predicate.

References:

[1] Akmalova F. S. Semantic and formal-structural representation of the category "state" (based on the material of English, German and Russian languages): Dis. ... candidate of philology. - Izhevsk: Udmurt State University, 2005. - 234 p.

[2] Altman I. V. The study of the semantics of three-term constructions. Problems ofstructural linguistics-1976 // Sb. sci. tr. - M.: Nauka, 1978. - p. 215-233.

[3] Alisova T. B. Essays on the syntax of the contemporary Italian language. - Moscow: Librocom, 2009. - 296 p.

[4] Arvat N. N. Semantic structure of a simple sentence in the contemporary Russian language. - Kiev:

High school,1984. - 157 p.

[5] Arutyunova N. D. Problems of syntax and semantics in the works of Ch. Fillmore. - Moscow, 1973. - No. 1. - p. 117-124.

[6]Arutyunova N. D. The sentence and its meaning. Logico-semantic problems-Ed. 3-e. - M.: Editorial URSS, 2003. - 383 p.

[7]Arutyunova N. D. Syntaxis / / General linguistics. The internal structure of the language. - M.: Nauka, 1972. - p. 259-343.

[8] Arutyunova N. D. Problems of syntax and semantics in the works of Ch. Fillmore / / Voprosyyazykoznaniya. - Moscow, 1973. - No. 1. - p. 117-124.

[9]Arkhipov A.V. Typology of comitative constructions: Dis. ... candidate of Philological Sciences. - Moscow: MSU, 2005 – - 191 p.Apresyan Yu. D. Selected works. Volume I. Lexical semantics. - M.: School "Languages of Russian Culture" of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 1995. - 472 p.

[10] Apresyan Yu. D. Types of correspondence of semantic and syntactic actants / / Problems of typology and general Linguistics. International Congress dedicated to the 100th anniversary of A. A. Kholodovich / / Sb. sci. tr. - SPb.: Nestor-Istoriya, 2006. - p. 15-27.

[11]Akhmanova O. S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. - M.: Editorial URSS, 2004. - 576 p.

[12] Bogdanov V. V. Semantic-syntactic organization of the sentence. - L.: LSU Publishing House,1977. - 203 p.

[13]. Bostonov A. H. Role semantics of the right-sided actant in English sensory verbs. Diss. ... candidate of philology. - Ufa: Bashkir State Pedagogical University, 2005. - 147s.

[14]Bulygina T. V. To the construction of the typology of predicates in the Russian language.

[15]Butova A. Yu. On the question of the main types of actants in the Russian language. Contemporary problems of theoretical and applied linguistics (Kazan, May 23 – 25, 2006: Proceedings and materials in 2 volumes). - Kazan: Publishing house of Kazan University, 2006. - Vol. 2-p. - 39-41.Access mode: http:www. kls.ksu.ru/boduen/bodart 3. php?d=8&num=4000000

[16] Van Valin R., W. Foley. Referential-role grammar / / New in foreign linguistics. Syntactic theories in American linguistics: Sat. sci. tr. - M.: Progress, 1982. - issue 11. - p. 376-410.

[17]Gak V. G. Aktant // Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. - M.: BolshayaRossiyskayaenciklopediya, 1998. - p. 22.

[18]Gridneva N. N. Fundamentals of syntax semantics. Textbook on theoretical grammar of the English language. - St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press, 2009. - 48 p.

[19]Demyankov V. Z. Case grammar / / Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. - M.: Huge Russian encyclopedia, 1998. - p. 357.

[20]Dremov A. F. System theory of cases and its place in the evolution of views on case in linguistics of the XX century // Access mode: www.philol. msu. ru/~rlc2001/abstract/files/morfolog.doc

[21]Kasevich V. B. Khrakovsky V. S. General questions of semantics with predicate actant / / Semantics and syntax of constructions with predicate actants: Materials of the All-Union conference "Typological methods in the syntax of multi-system languages. April 14 – 16, 1981: Sat. sci. tr. - L.: ANSSSR, Institute of Linguistics, Leningrad branch. - p. 7-23.

[22]Katsnelson S. D. Notes on the case theory of Ch. Fillmore / / Questions on language learning. - Moscow, 1988. - No. 1. - p. 110-117.

[23]Kibrik A. E. Lyutikova E. A. General syntax / / Access mode: http://www:philol/msu/ru/~otpl/new/main/courses/syntax/php/

[24]Kibrik A. E. Agens / / Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. - M.: Huge Russian encyclopedia, 1998. - p. 17

[25] Kolomatsky D. I. Distribution of Russian passive forms: corpus research: Dis. ... candidate of philological sciences – - M., 2009 – - 335 p.

[26]Koprov V. Yu. Lexico-grammatical categories of nouns and typology of the agent / / Zhivoe Russian word: Sb. sci. articles in honor of the anniversary of prof. T. G. Arkadieva. - St. Petersburg: RSPU named after A. I. Herzen, 2006. - p. 48-52.

[27] Noonan M. About subjects and topics // Contemporary foreign linguistics / / Sb. sci. tr. - M.: Progress, 1982. - issue 11. - p. 356-375.

[28]Kubryakova E. S., Pankrats Yu. G. Case grammar // Contemporary foreign grammatical theories: Sat. sci. tr. - M.: INION, 1985. - C. 68-109.

[29]Melchuk I. A., Kholodovich A. A. On the theory of grammar - Moscow, 1970. - No. 4. - p. 111-124.

[30]Mustayoki A. Theory of functional syntax: from semantic structures to linguistic means. - M.: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2006. - 512 p.

[31]Plungyan V. A. General morphology. - M.: Editorial URSS, 2000. - 384 p.

[32]Raspopov I. P. Several remarks about the so-called semantic structure of the sentence // Questions of linguistics. - Moscow, 1981. - No. 4. - p. 24-34.

[33] Russian grammar. - Moscow: Nauka,1980. Vol. 2 – - 709 p.

[34]Silnitsky G. G. Semantic types of situations and semantic classes of verbs / / Problems of structural linguistics-1972.: Sb. sci. tr. - M.: Nauka, 1973. - p. 373-391.

[35]Susov I. P. Semantic structure of the sentence. - Tula: TulSU, 1973 – - 141s.

[36]Susov I. P. Semantics and pragmatics of the sentence. - Kalinin: Kalinin State University, 1980. - 49 p.

[37]Tesniere L (1988) Éléments de syntaxestructurale, Klincksieck, Paris.

[38] Fillmore Ch. The case for case // Universals in Linguistic Theory / E± by E. Bach, R. T. Harms. New York, etc., 1968.

[39] Fillmore Ch. J. The case for case reopened // Syntax and Semantics. 1977. Vol. 8. P. 59-81.

[40] Chafe, W. L. (1970). Meaning and the Structure of Language. London / Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[41] Shiroglazova N. S. The system of deep cases and the means of their expression: Autoref. ... candidate of philology. Izhevsk: Udmurt State University. - 2004. – 20 p.