

Mykhaylenko V. V.

SEMANTIC DECOMPOSITION VS COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS FROM FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC VEIW

The present paper is focused on the semantic structure of the adjective "rich" in language system and discourse structure. Componential analysis is an instrument of Lexical Semantics, while Semantic Decomposition – in Functional Semantics.

Key words: lexical semantics, functional semantics, adjective, componential analysis, decomposition, component.

Михайленко В. В. Семантична декомпозиція vs компонентний аналіз у функціонально-семантичній перспективі. – Стаття.

У фокусі статті – семантична структура прикметника «rich» у системі мови та структурі дискурсу. Компонентний аналіз є інструментом лексичної семантики, а семантична декомпозиція – інструментом функціональної семантики.

Ключові слова: лексична семантика, функціональна семантика, прикметник, компонентний аналіз, декомпозиція, компонент.

Михайленко В. В. Семантическая декомпозиция vs компонентный анализ в функционально-семантической перспективе. – Статья.

Настоящая работа посвящена исследованию семантической структуры прилагательного «rich» в языковой системе и структуре дискурса. Компонентный анализ является инструментом лексической семантики, тогда как семантическая декомпозиция – инструментом функциональной семантики.

Ключевые слова: лексическая семантика, функциональная семантика, прилагательное, компонентный анализ, декомпозиция, компонент.

Preliminaries. The Oxford Linguistic Research Encyclopedia defines lexical semantics as the study of word meaning – either internal semantic structure of words, or the semantic relations that occur within the vocabulary. In the first case we deal with polysemy, metonymy, metaphor, and prototypicality. Within the second case we deal with lexical fields, lexical relations, conceptual metaphor and metonymy, and frames. The organization of the lexicon into grammatically relevant, semantically coherent adjective classes presupposes that an adjective's meaning can be decomposed into two parts. 1. A part shared by all members of the same class. 2. A part that distinguishes among the class members. A variety of pros and cons have been offered that internal structure in adjective like *rich* can be discerned by using traditional syntactic tests for ambiguity. In this paper we shall investigate the relationship between syntactic form and intended meaning wherein lexical decomposition is necessary to capture generalizations (R.S. Jackendoff, 1983; David Dowty, 1979; Davis Pinker, 2013; James Pustejovsky, 1991; Christopher Davis, 1995). The position which R.S. Jackendoff advocates with respect to semantic decomposition is that word meanings must have internal structure, due to the creativity of language use and the regularities which accompany that use, and that part of this structure is the specification of necessary conditions for the application of a word. [14; 15; 16; 17]. The decomposition of word meaning into smaller semantic elements allows specification of a generative, compositional system which constrains the way such elements can be related and thereby constrains the ways in which sentences can be constructed; the point which is strongly argued by James Pustejovsky [26, p. 193-6]. B. Levin and T.R. Rappaport determine the syntactic position, for

instance, the arguments of the verb which can be used to predict when a verb will not participate in an alternation [19, p. 197f.].

The semantic distinctions of the adjective *rich* directly interact with syntactic form and must be considered a part of lexical knowledge. Our assumption is also based on the opinion expressed by Peter Harder [13, p. 103] that a functional account of language [10, p. 366–373] is founded on the argument that languages are systematically responsive to the human environment.

The state of art. Generative Lexicon introduces a knowledge representation framework which offers a rich and expressive vocabulary for lexical information. The motivations for this are twofold: GL is concerned with explaining the creative use of language; we consider the lexicon to be the key repository holding much of the information underlying this phenomenon. More specifically, however, it is the notion of a constantly evolving lexicon that Generative Lexicon attempts to emulate; this is in contrast to currently prevalent views of static lexicon design, where the set of contexts licensing the use of words is determined in advance, and there are no formal mechanisms offered for expanding this set [26, p. 91]. Researchers in linguistics typically assume that language meaning is compositional, and that a theory of semantics for language should model this property. There appear to be, however, many phenomena in language that are non-compositional and which are not directly accounted for by conventional models of compositionality. This gap in descriptive power has motivated several views of richer representation and semantic operations, one of which is Generative Lexicon Theory [25; 26]. Generative Lexicon is concerned in part with explaining the creative use of language.

On this view, our ability to categorize and structure the world is an operation of generative categorization and compositional thought, and the lexicon is seen as a dynamic component, responsible for much of the information underlying this phenomenon. Language, therefore, is the natural manifestation of our generative construction of the world through the categories it employs (Noam Chomsky, 1986; Jonathan Ginzburg and Ivan Sag, 2000; and Ray S. Jackendoff, 2002). Linguists who do adopt some form of lexical decomposition do not typically concern themselves with the philosophical consequences of this endeavor. However, Jerry Alan Fodor claims that any model of semantics involving decomposition is without support and leads to the anarchy of conceptual holism. In fact, however, most linguists assume some kind of de-compositional structure for the semantic representations associated with lexical items [7]. Carnap's definition of syntax dealing with symbols alone irrespective; semantics dealing with the relationship between symbols and what they stand for; and pragmatics dealing with the property involving users and interpreters of the symbols is the most influential on linguistics [12, p. 34]. This analytical differentiation made the study of each discipline much deeper. Though researching one and the same object all these three disciplines give its generalized ubiquitous description. But from the functional view they overlap -- when the adjective *rich* is researched it's all sides it must be highlighted because language functions in context and it should be described "within an environment of meanings" [12]. In the experimental part we shall explore the interface of the adjective *rich* functioning in the attributive function in the nominal phrase of Modern English discourse.

Experiment. Lexical decomposition was first used by anthropologists as a technical method for describing and comparing the vocabulary of kinship in different languages. Until some years later did some scholars take it and use it as a general theory semantic structure [21] Lexical decomposition is the belief that word meanings can be built up compositionally from the meanings of simpler words. The basic idea of the Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach (see the works by Wierzbicka 1972; 1996; 2002) is that word meaning should be described in terms of a small core of elementary conceptual particles, known as semantic primes. The practice of semantic decomposition involves the problem of establishing the proper atomic units for the paraphrase – semantic primitives.

There are two opposite views on Lexical Decomposition, first, as an alternative term for Componential Analysis, an analysis into meaning components are called decomposition. John Lyons was among the first to define Componential Analysis as: one way of formalizing, or making absolutely precise, the sense-relations that are hold among lexemes [21]. And, second, Semantic Decomposition [5, p. 279–308]

and Componential Analysis [22, p. 113] are synonymic terms. Linguistically sensitive theories of lexical structure tend to focus on how word meanings relate to syntactic forms within a sentence; that is, linking lexical-semantic form to syntax [25; 19, p. 275–289; 3, p. 197–213]. To accomplish this, much of the work on the structure of lexical items in language over the past ten years has focused on the development of type structures and typed feature structures. In a lexical decomposition analysis, the assumption must be that the components jointly constitute a definition of the meaning of the decomposed word. If the components [22, p. 113] are themselves words, then we should have full-blown synonymy. The adjective *rich* can be treated as ambiguous if and only if it reveals two or more distinct components.

Here we must underline a very significant feature of Componential Analysis that it is an instrument of Lexical Semantics, wherein the whole is parsed into components, and Semantic Decomposition [cf.: 5, p. 279–308; 6] must be an instrument of Functional Semantics; wherein the components constitute the whole. This hypothesis will be verified in the process of discourse analysis.

Let's consider the original meaning of the adjective *rich* to view its meaning dynamics. Old English *rice* "strong, powerful; great, mighty; of high rank", developed into later Old English "wealthy," from Proto-Germanic **rikijaz* (source also of Old Norse *rikr*, Swedish *rik*, Danish *rig*, Old Frisian *rike* "wealthy, mighty", Dutch *rijk*, Old High German *rihi* "ruler, powerful, rich", German *reich* "rich". The Old English developed into later Old English "wealthy". The form of the word was influenced in Middle English by Old French *riche* "wealthy, magnificent, sumptuous", which is, with Spanish *rico*, Italian *ricco*, from Frankish **riki* "powerful", or some other cognate Germanic source (Etymological Dictionary)

The Definitional Analysis of the adjective *rich* in the attributive function has revealed the following semantic matrix of its. 1. A rich person has a lot of money or valuable possessions. 2. A rich country has a strong economy. 3. If something is rich in a useful or valuable substance or rich source of it. 4. Rich food contains a lot of fat or oil. 5. Rich soil contains large amounts of substances. 6. A rich deposit of a mineral or other substance is a large amount of it. 7. If you say that something is a rich vein or source of something such as humour, ideas, or information, you mean that it can provide a lot of that thing. 8. Rich smells are strong and very pleasant. Rich colours and sounds are deep and very pleasant. 9. A rich life or history is one that is interesting because it is full of different events and activities. 10. A rich collection or mixture contains a wide and interesting variety of different objects (Collin's, MacMillan, Cambridge et al.).

Componential Analysis developed in the second half of the 1950s by European and American linguists

(e.g., M. Pattier, 1990; E. Coseriu, 1986; L. Bloomfield, 1994; E. Nida, 1965) argues that word meaning can be described on the basis of a finite set of conceptual building blocks called semantic components or features. Cf. the definition given by the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: the basic idea of the Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach (Wierzbicka 1972, 1996; 2002) is that word meaning should be described in terms of a small core of elementary conceptual particles, known as semantic primes. Lyons was among the first to define Componential Analysis as: “One way of formalizing, or making absolutely precise, the sense-relations that are hold among lexemes. The componential analysis aims at analysing the conditions under which semantically related words are differentially used, for example in determining the components by which *wealthy*, *successful*, *strong* are more specific than *abundant* (cf.: Collin’s, McMillan, Cambridge, Merriam-Webster’s, et al.). A semantic component is a potentially contrastive part of the meaning of a lexical unit. The analysis of a set of related linguistic item, word meanings, into combinations of features in terms of which each item may be compared with every other. Componential Analysis is a method of describing the subject matter of a language. It aims at constructing verifiable models of how specific bodies of cultural (or ideational) content are coherently organized, insofar as such content is represented by words and expressions in a people’s language. And the linguistic tradition proves that that this method in both semantic and cultural description, componential analysis is perhaps best characterized as a method of ideography.

A semantic domain “RICH” is a group of adjectives with related meanings. No matter that “the meaning of an adjective does not depend on the meaning of other adjectives, to establish what the meaning of an adjective is we have to compare it with the meanings of other adjectives, intuitively related words” [29, p. 210]. We have revealed differential features of the dominant lexeme “RICH” : 1) owning a lot of money, property, or valuable possessions; 2) containing a large quantity of something; 3) containing a lot of things such as butter, eggs, or cream that make your stomach feel full very quickly; 4) containing a lot of substances that are good for growing plants; 5) beautiful, expensive, and of very high quality; 6) a rich colour, sound, or smell is strong in a pleasant way; 7) interesting, with a lot of different qualities, experiences, or events; 8) worth a lot of money, or bringing a lot of money; 9) used for describing the mixture of fuel and air in an engine when there is too much fuel (see: Collin’s; McMillan, Cambridge, Merriam-Webster’s etc.).

R.S. Jackendoff (1983; 1990; 1993) proposes a number of basic conceptual categories such as material position, extravagance ingestion, colour event, state, action, place, path, property, and amount, as

well as formation rules that combine these categories [14; 15; 16; 17]. Accordingly, we can build a conceptual system [“RICH”] with the following subsystems: 1) *possessing a large amount of money, land, or other material possessions*: affluent, flush, moneyed, wealthy; 2) *characterized by extravagant, ostentatious magnificence*: lavish, lush, luxuriant, luxurious, opulent, palatial, plush, sumptuous; 3) *characterized by great productivity*: fecund, fertile, prolific, fruitful, productive; 4) *not readily digested because of richness*: heavy; 5) *full, full of color*: bright, colorful, gay, vivid; 6) *extremely funny*: hilarious, priceless, sidesplitting, killing.

Linguistics is very sensitive to technological development which made it possible to search large corpora. Therefore corpus linguists have succeeded general linguistics, applied linguistics, computational linguistics and, in particular, computational lexicography [see: 11, p. 1–6]. The qualitative corpus analysis is a methodology for pursuing in-depth investigations of linguistic phenomena, as grounded in the context of authentic, communicative situations that are digitally stored as language corpora and made available for access, retrieval, and analysis via computer. The corpus-linguistic research has begun to address many more syntactic phenomena due to corpus and cognitive linguists’ assumption that syntax and lexis are not qualitatively different. The Corpus analysis of various discourse registers registered 6613 text fragments with the lexeme *rich* in the predicative, attributive, subjective, and objective functions; 468 cases are revealed in the spoken register which we can employ for the functional-semantic analysis. The attribute *rich* is a constituent of the nominal phrases in the sentence structure. We shall make use of association measures applied to co-occurrences of adjectives of the semantic domain “RICH” to their co-occurrences with other words in the syntactic pattern “Rich + Noun [with various semantic domains]”; it is called “collostructional analysis” (a blend of collocation and construction). And our aim is as well to describe the constituents of the Semantic Domain “RICH” functioning in language in use:

1. RICH + HUMAN-BEING’S STATE

1.1. Among them were **rich** aristocrats who would have had the same fine dental work with gold fillings. 1.2. One thing’s for sure, the sons and daughters of all those **rich** Tories who bulldozed through this crackpot curriculum won’t be hindered in any way. 1.3. But it’s a younger generation – the Yuppies, the Sloane Rangers, the **rich** whizzkids, women my age – who are seeing fur as a status symbol again.

2. RICH+FINANCE/PROPERTY

2.1. He reaped **rich** dividends with his new strategies for the packaging of popular pleasure. 2.2. Shared her religious views and elevated Dunfermline to the status of an abbey, with **rich** endowments. 2.3. A **rich** financial package – including creative control.

3. RICH +LAND

3.1. A land of **rich** fertile valleys that reach up to touch the edge of wild moorland. 3.2. [It] should be grown in a **rich**, moist soil in full sun. 3.3. Where the drab clothing of the workers blended into the deep **rich** brown of the arable land.

4. RICH +COUNTRY/INSTITUTION

4.1. Type of goods and services traditionally exported and imported by most of the contemporary **rich** nations, indeed, fell into fairly clear patterns. 4.2. This shift in the centre of gravity from the **rich** North to the less developed world will increase the Third World's influence. 4.3. The results are dramatic: the share of world output produced by the **rich** industrial economies drops to 54%, from 73% on the old method.

5. RICH +VEGITATION

5.1. They do best in a **rich**, limy potting mixture which should be kept moist while they are growing. 5.2. The sweet Geranium Fairy sitting beneath her flower's **rich** blooms. 5.3. The best examples have a good balance of dry tannin and **rich** fruit.

6. RICH + ENVIRONMENT

6.1. Creating a **rich** musical environment in the home will stimulate a child's interest. 6.2. Northamptonshire is a county **rich** with fortified sites from Iron Age hillforts to Saxon "burhs". 6.3. Schools provide a linguistically **rich** environment, able to provide compensation for children believed to be linguistically deprived at home.

7. RICH + HERITAGE

7.1. Festivals and exhibitions which add to the **rich** culture of its architectural, artistic and musical heritage. 7.2. With its famous shops, delightful parks and **rich** history, there is plenty to see and do. 7.3. Leaving a space of approximately 6000 square metres for the city's **rich** medieval remains.

8. RICH +ART/ARTIFACT

8.1. Her training in textile design are combined in a series of **rich**, colourful and unusual images. 8.2. A wonderland of mechanical organs **rich** with exuberant carvings. 8.3. She glanced down at her magnificent dress and the **rich** emerald jewelry glistening on her hands and throat, her mother's favourite gems.

9. RICH +FOOD AND DRINKS

9.1. A good example is Sainsbury's Chilean Cabernet Sauvignon, 2.89 – **rich**, well-balanced and most enjoyable. 9.2. I don't know, perhaps not eat so much **rich** food. 9.3. This very **rich** and delicious dish should be served with plain boiled rice or jacket potatoes.

10. RICH +COLOUR

10.1. Tones are very much a favourite combining terracotta and golds with **rich** spice colours. 10.2. **Rich**, fireside colours add warmth to the room. 10.3. Watch for the **rich** earthy tones of their Etruscan paving, the mosaic patterns impressed on the slab

11. RICH + PRODUCT

11.1. Ultra **rich** revitalizing balms, they literally melt into the epidermis, providing comfort and soft-

ness. 11.2. Dry Skin Cream a **rich** moisturizer to smooth out fine lines. 11.3. And the Vevay range of products covers everything – **rich** creamy cleansers and moisturisers, up-to-the-minute fashion shades for eyes, lips – and hair.

12. RICH +MAN'S FEATURE

12.1. Martha, Brendan says, his voice **rich** and warm. 12.2. Eye colours should be **rich** and dark with lips outlined in soft brown and filled in with nearly nude shades. 12.3. I lapped at the warm, **rich** blood; very nice, very fresh.

13. RICH + SMELL

13.1. It was a large tiled room, brightly lit and with the dry, **rich** smell of animal feed. 13.2. **Rich** raw smells of tar, rotting excrement, spices and brine rose up.

14. RICH + RESOURCES

14.1. It's a market that despite our **rich** coal reserves, is fixed in such a way that it ensures that. 14.2. They dug and blasted out the ores from thin, but **rich**, mineral veins.

The corpus analysis gave us an opportunity to involve a great volume of the texts representing various discourse registers for a further frequency analysis and correlation of the semantic component of the lexical meaning of adjective *rich* and the type of register (professional vs. non-professional), in this paper the investigation is undertaken irrespectively of the discourse register. In the process of the discourse analysis we attempted to reveal the semantic decomposition of the lexical meaning of the adjective *rich* influenced by the author's intension, adjective distribution, and discourse structure. We have revealed semantic domains of nouns co-occur with the adjective *rich*: 1) rich + human-being's state; 2) rich + finance/property; 3) rich + land, 4) rich + country/institution; 5) rich + vegetation; 6) rich + environment; 7) rich + heritage; 8) rich + art/artifact; 9) rich + food and drinks; 10) rich + colour; 11) rich + product; 12) rich + man's feature; 13) rich + smell; 14) rich + resources.

Conceptual analysis is used to study and modify the explicit conceptual theory of some language. Anita Nuopponen gives a critical analysis of the method of Conceptual Analysis, its metalanguage and application [23, p. 1]. In the present paper Conceptual Analysis is defined as a method of a concept explication based on the analysis of experimental data, subjective definitions experiment and analysis of lexicographic data. It helped to clarify the concept of *rich*, its characteristics and relations to other concepts – human-being, finance, property, country/institution, flora, heritage, art/artifact, artifact, environment, food and drinks, colour, smell, resources which are represented dominant lexemes and linked they can build a conceptual system registered in the language of use. The lexemes of the Semantic Domain [22, p. 117] "RICH" can be preceded in the sentence by boosters and hedges expressing the author's intentional mean-

ing which I would call ‘attitudinal markers’. Hedges are used to generally reduce, soften. DOWNGRADE, DOWNTONE (merely / less / relatively / comparatively, etc.) the effect the tenseness of the value of the adjectival meaning of *rich*. Boosters (too / very / much / more / most / fantastically / so / intensely / such / mega / infinitely / truly / really / luxuriantly / incredibly / extraordinarily / especially / newly / really / immeasurably / enormously / increasingly / filthy, etc.) are used to intensify the value of the adjectival meaning of *rich*.

Summary & perspectives. In this paper, we have examined the relationship between Semantic Decomposition as an instrument of Functional Semantics and Componential Analysis as an instrument of Lexical

Semantics. The final interplay of these two strategies is a clearer understanding of some of the mechanisms of compositionality in language. The corpus analysis yields significant quantitative data for the general description of the adjective *rich* its distributional characteristics and lexical meaning structure in language system and discourse structure. There is also an attempt to meet the challenge to find some representation that can adequately transmit the interface between syntax and semantics. And an algorithm of etymological, definitional, domain, componential, conceptual, discourse and corpus types of investigations proved to be efficient. The correlation of the semantic structure of the adjective *rich* and the discourse register will be in focus of our perspective study.

References

1. Chipman Susan E.F. The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Science / Susan E.F. Chipman. – Oxford : OUP, 2016. – 375 p.
2. Chomsky N. Knowledge of English: Its Nature, Origin, and Use / N. Chomsky. – London : Greenwood Publishing Group, 1986 – 307 p.
3. Davis C. Use-Conditional Meaning and the Semantics of Pragmaticalization / C. Davis, D. Gutzmann // Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung. – 2015. Vol. 19. – Pp. 197–213.
4. Dowty D.R. Word Meaning and Montague Grammar / D.R. Dowty. – Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2012. – 418 p.
5. Faber P. Decomposing Semantic Decomposition: Towards a Semantic Metalanguage in RRG / P. Faber // Proceedings of The 2005 International Conference on Role and Reference Grammar. – Taiwan : Academia Sinica, 2009. – Pp. 279–308.
6. Faber P. Constructing a Lexicon of English Verbs / P. Faber, R. Uson. – Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 1999. – 371 p.
7. Fodor J. Concepts: Where Cognitive Science Went Wrong / J. Fodor. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. – 192 p.
8. Gibbon D. Semantic Decomposition of Character Encodings for Linguistic Knowledge Discovery / D. Gibbon et al. // Studies in Classification, Data Analysis, and Knowledge Organization. Data and Information Analysis to Knowledge Engineering / Proceedings of the 29th Annual Conference of the Gesellschaft für Klassifikation e.V. – University of Magdeburg, March 9–11, 2005. – Pp. 366–373.
9. Ginsburg J., Interrogative Investigations: Form, Meaning and Use of English Interrogatives / J. Ginsburg, I. Sag. – Stanford : CSLI Publications, 2000. – 359+ 76pp.
10. Givon T. Functionalism and Grammar / T. Givon. – Amsterdam : John Benjamins, 1995. – 486 p.
11. Gries S. Corpus Linguistics: Quantitative Methods / S. Gries // Carol A. Chapelle (edr.). The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics – Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2013. – Pp. 1–6.
12. Halliday M. Introduction of Functional Grammar / M. Halliday. – London, N.Y. : Routledge, 2004. – 805 p.
13. Harder P. Functional semantics: A Theory of Meaning, Structure and Tense in English / P. Harder. – Berlin, NY. : De Gruyter-Mouton, 2010. – 585 p.
14. Jackendoff R. Language, Logic, and Concepts / R. Jackendoff, P. Bloom, K. Wynn. – Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 2002. – 492 p.
15. Jackendoff R. Semantics and Cognition / R. Jackendoff. – Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 1983. – 283 p.
16. Jackendoff R. Semantic Structures / R. Jackendoff. – Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 1992. – 322 p.
17. Jackendoff R. The Architecture of the Language Faculty / R. Jackendoff. – Cambridge MA : MIT Press, 1997. – 262 p.
18. Langacker R. A Dynamic Usage-Based Model / R. Langacker / M. Barlow, S. Kemmer (eds.). Usage based on Models of Language. – Stanford, CA: CSLI, 2000. – Pp. 1–63.
19. Levin B. Lexical subordination / B. Levin, T. Rappaport // Papers from the 24th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. – Chicago : 1988. – P. 197.
20. Lipka L. An Outline of English Lexicology Lexical Structure, Word Semantics, and Word-Formation / L. Lipka. – Tübingen : Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1992. – 212 p.
21. Lyons J. Semantics. – Vol. / J. Lyons. – Cambridge : CUP 1977. – 897 p.
22. Mykhaylenko V. A Glossary of Linguistics and Translation Studies / V. Mykhaylenko. – Ivano-Frankivsk: King Danylo Galytskyi University of Law, 2015. – 528 p.
23. Nuopponen A. Methods of concept analysis – a comparative study/ A. Nuopponen // LSP Journal. – 2010. – Vol. 1. – № 1 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <http://lsp.cbs.dk>.
24. Pinker S. Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure / S. Pinker. – Cambridge, MA : MIT Press, 2013. – 522 p.
25. Pustejovsky J. Lexical Knowledge Representation and Natural Language Processing / J. Pustejovsky, B. Boguraev // Artificial Intelligence. – 1991. – Vol. 35. – Issue 4. – Pp. 193–223.
26. Pustejovsky J. Type Construction and the Logic of Concepts / J. Pustejovsky // P. Bouillon, F. Busa (eds.). The Language of Word Meaning. – Cambridge : CUP, 2001. – Pp. 91–123.
27. Van Valin R. Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function / R. van Valin, R. LaPolla. – Cambridge : CUP, 1997. – 713 p.
28. Van Valin R. Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface / R. van Valin. – Cambridge: CUP, 2005. – 334 p.
29. Wierzbicka A. Semantics: Primes and Universals / A. Wierzbicka. – Oxford : OUP, 1996. – 512 p.