From the Lexicon to the Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary

Anna Ginter

Abstract. The Meaning-Text approach is viewed as 'an outgrowth and natural continuation of the generative-transformational approach' since the most immediate foundations of the Meaning-Text Theory are to be found in Chomsky's theory (Mel'čuk 1981, p. 56; Gladkij, Mel'čuk 1969, p. 7). As a matter of fact, the Meaning-Text Theory adopted the fundamental assumptions and terminology of the standard theory by Chomsky, in its search for more developed model of language functioning. It is obvious, however, that the Meaning-Text Theory as influenced by other works, theories and studies (for example, observations referred to the Machine Translation and works of Soviet semanticists) must differ in many points from Chomsky's approach. The most significant difference is connected with the fact that the Meaning-Text Theory develops the idea of language-independent semantic representation and provides examples of semantic decomposition of lexical meanings. What is more, contrary to the standard theory, Mel'čuk, Zolkovsky and Apresjan proposed the principle of using highly involved syntax in Semantic Representation.

For the reasons presented above, the main goal of my paper is to show the main assumptions of the two theories taking into consideration components that seem parallel in the approaches proposed by Chomsky and Mel'čuk. Both the lexicon in the standard theory and the Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary in the Meaning-Text Model refer directly to semantic aspects of the two linguistic descriptions. The lexicon consists of an unordered set of lexical entries and certain redundancy rules, while the Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary is to comprise all the semantic and combinatorial data concerning the relationships of a given word to other words. It would be worth analysing the two elements from the point of view of their design, rules, foundations and value for the further scientific explorations – which is the objective of the paper.

Key words: *generative grammar, Meaning-Text model, semantics, Chomsky, Melchuk, lexicon, Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary.*

Introduction

> *'There is no aspect of linguistic study more subject to confusion and more in need of clear and careful formulation than that which deals with the points of connection between syntax and semantics' – says Chomsky in his Syntactic Structures (1972, p. 93).*

Indeed, in their studies and observations, the early American linguists (Boas, Sapir, Bloomfield, Harris) neglected the area of meaning. They made any positive contribution whatsoever to the theory or practice of semantics. Moreover, semantics was frequently defined to be outside linguistics proper (compare: Lyons 1970, p. 33). Semantic considerations were strictly subordinated to the task of identifying the units of phonology and syntax. Consequently, this part of the grammar was to be independent of semantics.

Noam Chomsky was among the first linguists who included semantics as an integral part of the grammatical analysis of languages. His *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (published in 1965) present a model of transformational grammar designed for the analysis of natural languages, which tries to explain correspondences between the syntactic structures and their meaning. Some ideas of Chomsky's approach were widely discussed and criticised as being of 'any direct relevance to the description of natural language' (Lyons 1970, p. 109). However, there is no doubt that his investigation of language should be treated as revolutionary, and as such attracted the attention of not only linguists, but also psychologists and philosophers.

The most successful theory that can be described as a continuation of the generative-transformational approach was demonstrated in the Meaning-Text Model prepared by Mel'čuk and Zholkovsky. Some of its terminology as well as its foundations can be found in Chomsky's theory. What is more, the Meaning-Text theory formulates the more radical point of view on semantics, which is the idea of language-independent semantic representation.

For the reasons shown above, the main **objective** of the study is to find these aspects of the lexicon that found their further development and exploration in the Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary. To achieve this aim we should accomplish the following tasks:

1) to present the lexicon, an element of Chomsky's approach being a basis of semantic theory in generative grammar; 2) to present the Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary – a core component of the Meaning-Text Model as a continuation and a final stage in the investigation of language functioning; 3) to single out these aspects of the lexicon that were adopted and developed in the Meaning-Text Theory; and finally: 4) to describe the applications of the Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary. It must be underlined, however, that the following discussion does not aim at comparing the two theories – the problem of such comparison is too complex and too wide to be studied here.

The **research methods** involve analysis of the selected semantic aspects of the theories by Chomsky and Mel'čuk

as well as a discussion of a problem of similarities between them.

Research object: the lexicon (Chomsky's standard theory) and the Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary (the Meaning-Text Model).

Semantic Aspect in Chomsky's Standard Theory

In *Syntactic Structures*, published in 1957, it was argued that, although semantic considerations are not directly relevant to the syntactic description of sentences, there are evident correspondences between the structures and elements that are discovered in formal, grammatical analysis and 'specific semantic functions'. In the years that followed the publication of *Syntactic Structures*, Chomsky and his collaborators came to the conclusion that the meaning of sentences could, and should, be submitted to the same kind of precise, formal analysis as their syntactic structure, and that semantics should be included as an integral part of the grammatical analysis of language. As a result, in 1965, in *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Chomsky put forward a more comprehensive theory of transformational grammar, which differed from the earlier theory in a number of important respects (see: Lyons 1970, pp. 78-82). Consequently, the grammar of a language is now seen by Chomsky as a system of rules relating the meaning (or meanings) of each sentence it generates to the physical manifestation of the sentence in the medium of sound (compare: Lyons 1970, pp. 78-79; Lyons 1989 / 2, pp. 37-38).

It is worth mentioning that in *Aspects*, a generative grammar, as 'a system of rules that can iterate to generate an indefinitely large number of structures' (1975, pp. 15-16), is analysed into the three major components: the syntactic, phonological and semantic components. According to Chomsky's explanation (1975, pp. 15-18), the syntactic component specifies an infinite set of abstract formal objects, each of which incorporates all information relevant to a single interpretation of a particular sentence. The phonological component of a grammar determines the phonetic form of a sentence generated by the syntactic rules – in other words, it relates a structure generated by the syntactic component to a phonetically represented signal. The semantic component determines the semantic interpretation of a sentence – it relates a structure generated by the syntactic component to a certain semantic representation. Both the phonological and semantic components are therefore purely interpretative and, as Chomsky admits himself, they have not been analysed in the presented theory. Each utilises information provided by the syntactic component concerning formatives, their inherent properties and their interrelations in a given sentence. Consequently, the syntactic component of a grammar must specify, for each sentence, a deep structure that determines its semantic interpretation and a surface structure that determines its phonetic interpretation. The first of these is interpreted by the semantic component; the second – by the phonological component (compare: Chomsky 1975, p. 141).

Hence, the form of grammar suggested by Chomsky in *Aspects* can be presented in the following way (according to Chomsky's conclusion (1975, pp. 141-142):

1. a syntactic component – which consists of:
   a) a base:
   a categorial subcomponent,
   a lexicon,
   b) a transformational component;
2. a semantic component;
3. a phonological component.

Structure of the Lexicon

The base of the grammar contains a lexicon and a categorial component, which cannot be analysed separately since they complement each other's structure and function. A categorial component, defined as the system of rewriting rules of the base ('solely branching rules, which are possibly all context-free') – that is 'the system of base rules exclusive of the lexicon and subcategorization rules' as belonging to the lexicon' (Chomsky 1975, pp. 120, 123). The rules of the categorial component carry out two functions:

1. they define the system of grammatical relations;
2. they determine the ordering of elements in deep structures.

The lexicon can be described as an unordered list of all lexical formatives. More precisely, it is a set of lexical entries, each lexical entry being a pair (D, C), where D is a phonological distinctive feature matrix 'spelling' a certain lexical formative and C (a complex symbol) is a collection of specified features of various sorts (syntactic and semantic features, features that specify which morphological or transformational processes apply to strings containing the items in question, features that exempt items from certain phonological rules, etc.) (compare: Chomsky 1975, pp. 84, 164).

The lexical entry, being part of the lexicon, must specify:

a) aspects of phonetic structure that are not predictable by general rule (for example, in the case of bee, the phonological matrix of the lexical entry will specify that the first segment is a voiced labial stop and the second an acute vowel, but it will not specify the degree of aspiration of the stop or the fact that the vowel is voiced, tense, and unrounded);

b) properties relevant to the functioning of transformational rules;

c) properties of the formative that are relevant for semantic interpretation (that is, components of the dictionary definition);

d) lexical features indicating the positions in which a lexical formative can be inserted (by the lexical rule) in a preterminal string.

In other words, the lexical entry contains information that is required by the phonological and semantic components of the grammar and by the transformational part of the syntactic component of the grammar, as well as information that determines the proper placement of lexical entries in sentences, and hence, by implication, the degree and manner of deviation of strings that are not directly generated (Chomsky 1975, pp. 87-88).

Chomsky assigns the subcategorization rules to the lexical component of the base in the following way (Chomsky 1975, pp. 121-123): The context-free subcategorization rules can be regarded as syntactic redundancy rules and hence assigned to the lexicon. The rules that introduce contextual features select certain frames in which a symbol appears and they assign corresponding contextual features. A lexical entry may be substituted in these positions if its contextual features match those of the symbol for which it is substituted. What is important, the contextual features must appear in lexical items. However, the rules that introduce contextual features into complex symbols can be eliminated by an appropriate reformulation of the lexical rule. Instead of formulating this as a context-free rule that operates by matching of complex symbols, we can convert it to a context-sensitive rule by conventions of the following sort. Suppose that we have a lexical entry (D, C) where D is a phonological feature matrix and C is a complex symbol containing the feature [+X-Y]. The lexical rule permits D to replace the symbol Q of the preterminal string φQψ provided that Q is not distinct from C. Suppose that we now require, in addition, that this occurrence of Q actually appear in the frame X-Y. That is, we require that φQψ equal φφQψψ, where φ is dominated by X and ψ by Y in the Phrase-marker of φQψ. The next step is to eliminate all context-sensitive subcategorization rules from the grammar and rely on the formulation of lexical features, together with the principle just stated, to achieve their effect. The earlier conditions on subcategorization rules become conditions on the kinds of contextual features that may appear in lexical entries. Thus strict subcategorization features for an item of the category A must involve frames that, together with A, form the single constituent B that immediately dominates A; and the selectional features must involve the lexical categories that are the heads of grammatically related phrases.

When realised the fact of oversimplification of the lexicon described as a set of lexical entries, Chomsky suggested its further development (see: Chomsky 1975, pp. 164-192). As an example it would be worth presenting here one of the aspects – redundancy. According to Chomsky's assumption, the proper method for inserting lexical items is by a general rule that inserts the lexical entry (D, C) in a position Q in a Phrase-marker (Q being a complex symbol developed by rewriting rules), where C is not distinct from Q in the technical sense of feature theory. Furthermore, as he claimed, a grammar is more highly valued if the lexical entries contain few positively specified strict subcategorization features and many positively specified selectional features. And then, after having adopted the conventions:

(i) only positively specified strict subcategorization features and only negatively specified selectional features appear explicitly in lexical entries, the others being introduced by the auxiliary convention (ii)

(ii) if the lexical entry (D, C) is not explicitly provided with the feature specification [αφ ? ψ] for the contextual feature[φ ? ψ] (where α = + in the case of a strict subcategorization feature and α = – in the case of a selectional feature), then assign it the specified feature [-αφ ? ψ],

he gave the lexical entry for the word frighten as:

(frighten, [+V, + ? NP., -[+N] ? [-Animate], · · ·])

The conventions will introduce: the category features [-N], [-Adjective], [-M.]; the strict subcategorization features [- ─], [- ─ NP⌒#⌒ S ⌒#], · · · ; the selectional features [+ [+N] ─ [+ Animate]], [+ [+ N] ─ [+ Human]], · · ·. Thus frighten will be specified as a Verb, but not a Noun, Adjective or Modal; as insertable in the context sincerity ─ *John* but not sincerity ─ or sincerity ─ justice. (for further explanation see: Chomsky 1975: 164-165)
Apart from the suggestion shown above, Chomsky presents other conventions and syntactic redundancy rules, inflectional and derivational processes, leading to a more precise description of the lexical entries in the lexicon. However, he admits that their analysis 'creates a problem for any sort of generative grammar' and 'does not see the way to give thoroughly satisfactory treatment' of them (Chomsky 175, p. 190). For that reason he underlines in his works that the aspects of the standard theory (including the lexicon) as well as their properties and functions need further investigation.

The Meaning – Text Theory – General Remarks

As an alternative to the extended standard theory, it was developed generative semantics. Its representatives: Lakoff, McCCawley, Fillmore, did not agree with Chomsky in numerous points in terms of the standard theory. Consequently, they tried to formulate a theory that would identify semantic representations with syntactic phrase-markers (compare: Chomsky 1976, p. 136; Grzegorczykowa 1990, p. 73). Generative semantics, however, was inspired by Chomsky's theory and in many cases paraphrases its assumptions (see: Chomsky 1976, pp. 135-199). And both, extended standard theory of Chomsky and generative semantics, occurred inspirational to Mel'čuk, Žolkovsky and Apresjan, whose works led to formulating a more developed model of generating human speech, known as the Meaning-Text Model.

The Meaning-Text Model (MTM) is a system of rules that simulates the linguistic behaviour of humans. It is

> *'aimed at performing the transition from what is loosely called meanings (any information, or content, that a speaker may be willing to transmit by means of his language) and texts (physical manifestations of speech), and vice versa' (Mel'čuk 2000, p. 1)*

The MTM distinguishes the following four major levels of linguistic representation: the semantic, the syntactic, the morphological and the phonological / orthographic. All levels, with the exception of the semantic one, are divided into two sublevels: a deep one (referred to meaning) and a surface one (determined by physical form). As a result, there are seven representation levels in the MTM (Mel'čuk 1981, pp. 32-33; Mel'čuk 1995, p. 17):

- Semantic Representation (SemR), or the meaning,
- Deep-Syntactic Representation (DSyntR),
- Surface-Syntactic Representation (SSyntR),
- Deep-Morphological Representation (DMorphR),

- Surface-Morphological Representation (SMorphR),
- Deep-Phonetic Representation (DPhonR, or what is commonly called 'phonemic representation'),
- Surface-Phonetic Representation (SPhonR, which is called 'phonetic representation'), or the text.

A representation has been defined by Mel'čuk as

> *'a set of formal objects called 'structures', one of which is distinguished as the main one, with all the others specifying some of its characteristics. Each structure depicts a certain aspect of the item considered at a given level' (Mel'čuk 1981, p. 33).*

The Formula can be presented in full in the following diagram:

SemR↔DsyntR↔SsyntR↔DmorphR↔SmorphR↔DPhonR↔SPhonR

		Surface	Deep	Surface	
Semantics	Deep Syntax	Syntax	Morphology	Morphology	Deep Phonetics

Diagram 1. MTM as a system of rules simulating the linguistic behaviour of humans

The top line in the Diagram is a sequence of the utterance representations of all seven levels, with the correspondences between any two adjacent levels shown by two-headed arrows. The bottom line shows the components of the MTM and their functions. Thus semantics provides for the correspondence between the semantic representation of an utterance and all the sequences of deep-syntactic representations carrying the same meaning, etc. Accordingly, the MTM consists of the following six basic components (Mel'čuk 1981, p. 43):

- The Semantic component (semantics);
- The Deep-Syntactic Component (deep syntax);
- The Surface-Syntactic component (surface syntax);
- The Deep-Morphological Component (deep morphology);
- The Surface-Morphological Component (surface morphology);
- The Deep-Phonetic Component (phonemics).

The Surface-Phonetic component, which provides for the correspondence between a surface-phonetic representation and actual acoustic phenomena, falls outside the scope of the MTM model in the strict sense (compare: Mel'čuk 1981, p. 44).

Each component of the MTM is a set of rules having the trivial form:

$$X \leftrightarrow Y \mid C,$$

where: X – a fragment of utterance representation at level n,

Y – a fragment of utterance representation at level n + 1,

C – a set of conditions (expressed by Boolean formulas) under which the correspondence X ? Y holds.

The two-headed arrow must be interpreted as 'corresponds', not 'is transformed into'. Thus, when the transition from a meaning 'X' to a DSyntR Y is performed, 'X' itself is not changed: nothing happens to 'X' while Y is being constructed by semantic rules under the control of 'X'. The relation between a representation n and an 'adjacent' representation n+1 is the same as that between the blueprint of a house and the house itself, if illustrated by using Mel'čuk's example. 'The blueprint is by no means transformed into the house, but during construction, it is the blueprint that guides the workers' (Mel'čuk 1981, p. 44).

As Mel'čuk underlines, the rules in the MTM are logically unordered. All relevant information about the language is expressed explicitly, i.e. by symbols within the rules rather than by the order of the latter. The reason for this decision is that 'finding the best order of rule application in a specific situation goes far beyond the task of linguistics proper'. Moreover,

> *'the rules themselves are conceived of not as prescriptions, or instructions of an algorithm, but rather as permissions and prohibitions, or statements in a calculus. Basically each rule is a filter sifting out wrong correspondences' (Mel'čuk 1981, p. 44).*

The Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary

A core element of an MTM, where the biggest part of data about specific language is stored, is a formalised semantically-oriented lexicon called an Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary (ECD) The ECD is a monolingual dictionary featuring the following five important properties (Mel'čuk 1995, pp. 19-20, 22-23):

1. it is active: it is oriented not only toward making texts comprehensive (i.e. providing for the transition from a text to the meaning expressed by it), by also toward assisting the user in the production of texts (i.e. providing for the transition from a meaning to the texts which express it). The objective of this type of dictionary is to give the user as complete a set as possible of the correct means for the linguistic expression of a desired idea.
2. it is generalist (not specialised): the ECD attempts to systemise all synonymic means of expressing a given idea.
3. it includes a great deal of encyclopaedic information, strictly distinguishing the encyclopaedic from the linguistic information proper (it presents them in different sections of a dictionary entry).
4. it pursues theoretical goals: the ECD is completely theory-oriented. It is conceived and implemented within the MT theory, and the lexicographic method used is intimately tied to this general linguistic framework. It is designed primarily for scientific purposes and tries to bridge the chasm between lexicography and theoretical linguistics by laying the basis for an interaction between both fields.
5. it strongly emphasises the systematic, explicit and formalised presentation of all information made available.

The ECD allows for the representation of the following three basic types of relations between lexical items (Mel'čuk 1995, pp. 26-27):

I. semantic (paradigmatic) relationships between words and phrases, for example: synonymy, antonymy, semantic proximity, etc. They are reflected in the definitions of

related words: two fully synonymous words have identical definitions; two nearly-synonymous words have nearly identical definitions; and so on. The 'definition' formulates one discrete sense of the entry lexical unit, i.e. the sense of a lexeme or a phraseme; and it does this in terms of specially selected elementary semantic units (= word senses) and / or 'derived', or intermediate, semantic units, i.e. word senses which are more basic than the word sense being defined and which are themselves defined quite independently of the entry unit. Thus, in the ECD, each word sense is semantically decomposed (except the semantic primitives).

II. syntactic (syntagmatic) relationships between the entry lexical item, which is semantically a predicate, and other words or phrases (in a sentence) which are syntactically dependent on it and express its 'semantic actants'. These sentence elements are said to fill in the slots of the 'active syntactic valence' of the entry lexical item and are called its 'syntactic actants'. The active syntactic valence is specified by means of a table called a Government Pattern. The government pattern supplies the following three major types of information:

- for each semantic actant of the entry lexical item, it indicates the corresponding syntactic actant;
- for each syntactic actant of the entry lexical item, it indicates the form which this actant takes on the surface (grammatical case, infinitive or a finite form, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.);
- for all syntactic actants, it indicates which of them are incompatible in the sentence (or, conversely, are inseparable, i.e., invariably used together), and under what conditions.

III. the third type includes lexical (both paradigmatic and syntagmatic) relationships between the entry word and those other words which can either replace it in a text (under specific circumstances), or be joined to it in more or less fixed word combinations (also known as 'collocations'). This involves Lexical Functions.

Structure of a Lexical Entry in ECD

As it has been already mentioned, the basic unit of an ECD is a dictionary entry corresponding to a single lexeme or a single phraseme, i.e. one word or one set phrase taken in one separate sense. A family of dictionary entries for lexemes which are sufficiently close in meaning and which share the same signifier (i.e. have an identical stem) is subsumed under one vocable (which is identified in upper-case letters before all of the dictionary entries it covers, and in page headings as well)[1]. The ordering of the lexemes within a single vocable tends to follow a logical principle: if the definition of lexeme L' mentions lexeme L belonging to the same vocable, then L' must follow L. In other words, an 'including' definition always follows the 'included' one, so that within a vocable all interlexemic references with inclusion are only made backwards (compare: Mel'čuk 1995, p. 28).

A regular dictionary entry of a lexical unit L includes three major divisions:

- the signified of L, or the semantic part;
- the signifier of L, or the formal (i.e. morphological and phonological) part;
- the syntactics of L, or the combinatorics part.

To these are added the illustrations part, the encyclopaedic part, etc.

The structure of a dictionary entry consists of the ten following zones (they are given in the order they have in actual entries) (Mel'čuk 1995, pp. 29-47):

1. Morphological information about the entry lexical unit L (declension or conjugation type; gender of nouns; aspect of verbs; missing or irregular forms; etc.). For a complete phraseme, its Surface-Syntactic tree is also quoted in this zone.
2. Stylistic specification, or usage label (specialised, i.e. technical; official; informal, colloquial, substandard; poetic; obsolescent, archaic; etc.).
3. Definition of L, consisting of constants (elementary and complex word senses of the language in question) and variables (X, Y, Z...), the latter being present if L happens to be a predicate (in the logico-semantic sense of the term). In this case, the item to be defined is not simply the lexical unit L as such, but an expression including L and the variables, which represent L's arguments, or semantic actants.
4. Government Pattern (GP) – this is a rectangular table in which each column represents one semantic actant of the entry lexeme (marked by the corresponding variable), and each element in the column represents one of the possible surface realisations of the corresponding syntactic actant.
5. Restrictions on the Government Pattern – these give all possible details relevant to the combinability of the entry lexeme L with its DSynt-syntactic actants and state the conditions under which these actants can / cannot co-occur.
6. GP Illustrations – the GP and all the restrictions on it are illustrated by all possible combinations of the entry lexeme L with all its actants as well as by all the impossible combinations prohibited by those restrictions.
7. Lexical Functions – this zone, characterising the idiomatic (language-specific) substitutability and cooccurrence relations of the entry lexeme L, makes up the major part of a dictionary entry. Among the standard simple lexical functions used in the ECD there are: Syn (synonym), Anti (antonym), Gener (generic concept), Dimin (diminutive), Augm (augmentative), Magn ('very', 'to a [very] high degree), etc. (compare: Apresjan 2000, pp. 56-59)

[1] For further information and examples concerning the structure of an ECD entry, see: Mel'čuk 1995, p. 27-28.

8. Examples – the use of the entry lexeme and the corresponding lexical functions is exemplified by actual sentences.
9. Encyclopaedic Information – is admitted to the extent to which it is vital for the correct use of the entry lexeme. This information includes, among other things, an indication of the different species or different parts / stages of the object or process denoted by a key-word or entry lexeme, the main types of its behaviour, its co-species, etc. (compare: Apresjan 1995, pp. 43-47)
10. Idioms – a list of semantically unanalysable idiomatic expressions in which the given entry lexeme appears. The list includes expressions that, on the one hand, cannot be decomposed in constituent parts with 100% compositionality and regularity, and on the other hand, are not representable in terms of lexical functions. These expressions are mentioned in the entry of the headword for reference purpose only.

Built in such way, the Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary can find use in the following areas (Mel'čuk 1995, pp. 47-48):

1. The ECD is likely to become a central component of automatic text synthesis and analysis systems, since it presents all the essential information about the vocabulary of the language in question in an explicit and systematic way.
2. The ECD represents a contribution to language theory, as it provides for the development and refinement of a semantic metalanguage, the systematic account of phraseology, and the development of a multifaceted approach to the word taken as the sum of all its semantic and syntactic characteristics.
3. Various potential advantages are provided by the ECD in the area of language instruction (of both native and foreign tongues), as well as in any activity connected with the development of language skills. Textbooks, pedagogically-oriented dictionaries, reference works, etc., can be successfully developed along the format of the ECD.

ECD as a Continuation of the Lexicon

In his work *Meaning-Text Models: A Recent Trend in Soviet Linguistics* Mel'čuk provides five basic principles contrasting with the assumptions of Chomsky's theory (Mel'čuk 1981, pp. 57-58). On the basis of the above analysis of the lexicon and the ECD, it would be possible now to single out these components of the two concepts that seem similar and may occur an evidence of adoption of some aspects of Chomsky's theory by Mel'čuk and his collaborates:

1. Both the lexicon and the ECD are theory-oriented and they are elaborated within coherent linguistic theories: the standard theory in the generative grammar and the Meaning-Text Theory (respectively). Lexicographic methods in both cases are tied to the general frameworks of the theories. Moreover, the lexicon and the ECD are formally linked to the grammar – the lexicon and the grammar in each case are tuned to each other, so that they are in complete logical agreement: all grammar rules are stated in terms of features and elements supplied in the lexical entries (compare: Mel'čuk 2000, p. 3).
2. Both the lexicon and the ECD pay attention to semantic, syntactic and lexical relationship. While Chomsky stresses mainly the syntactic aspect, Mel'čuk presents a well-organised lexicographic structure that involve the representations of the three kinds:
   - a lexical entry in each of the analysed theories includes phonological aspect and more or less specified other divisions (syntactic, semantic, morphological, transformational). In Chomsky's approach most of them have been mentioned by the author as problems that need more investigation.
   - The syntactic zone in a lexical entry of the ECD (the Government Pattern) is suggested as parallel to the subcategorisation frame (linked to the lexicon) and the information that determines the proper placement of lexical entries in sentences in the standard theory (see: Chomsky 2000, pp. 5).
   - Properties relevant for semantic interpretation in Chomsky's lexicon found their equivalents and further investigation in lexical functions and encyclopaedic information.

It is also worth mentioning that Mel'čuk explored or developed the aspects that occurred problematic in Chomsky's theory, such as idioms and idiomatic expressions as well as the problem of 'field properties' (compare: Chomsky 1975, p. 217), which found their place in certain zones of a lexical entry in the ECD. For many reasons, the ECD can be described as an answer to Chomsky's dilemmas.

Conclusion

In the light of what has been presented above, we can say that the two theories meet each other at many points, even considering so relatively small (although significant) parts of their frameworks as lexicons. Undoubtedly, comparison of all aspects of the discussed theories would prove that 1) Chomsky introduced a new approach to semantic investigation in linguistics, which resulted in many further explorations, and 2) the Meaning-Text Theory certainly can be described as influenced by Chomsky's work.

To sum up, it would be worth mentioning that studies into semantics and the Meaning-Text Theory are continued by Mel'čuk and his collaborates in the Observatory of Meaning-Text Linguistics (University of Montreal). The Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary has been developed and prepared for English, Russian and French languages so far. In 2000 it was presented by Polguere a „natural" lexicalisation model for language generation, as one of achievements of the group of linguists. And interestingly, a careful analyses of the new theory could possibly show its connection with Chomsky's idea of contextual features and the rules included in the lexicon.

References

1. Chomsky, N 1975, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Cambridge-Massachusetts, The M.I.T.Press.
2. Chomsky, N 1976, Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar (3rd ed.), The Hague-Paris, Mouton.

3. Chomsky, N, 1972, Syntactic Structures (10th ed.), The Hague-Paris, Mounton.
4. Chomsky, N 1969, Topics in the Theory of Generative Grammar (2nd ed.), The Hague-Paris, Mounton.
5. Gladkij, AV (Гладкий, АВ) 1973, Формальные грамматики и языки. Москва, „Наука".
6. Gladkij, A & Mel'čuk, I (Гладкий, АВ & Мельчук, ИА) 1969, Элементы математической лингвистики, Москва, „Наука".
7. Grzegorczykowa, R, 1990, Wprowadzenie do semantyki językoznawczej, Warszawa, PWN.
8. Lyons, J 1970, Chomsky, London, Fontana / Collins.
9. Lyons, J 1984, Semantyka, vol. 1-2, Warszawa, PWN.
10. Mel'čuk, I 1981, Meaning-Text Models: A Recent Trend in Soviet Linguistics, Annual Reviews Inc, Anthropol, pp. 27-62.
11. Mel'čuk, I 2000, Semantics and the Lexicon in Modern Linguistics, an Internet version of the article under the same title, published in Gelbukh (ed.) 2000.
12. Mel'čuk, I 1995, The Russian Language in the Meaning-Text Perspective, Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 39, Moskau-Wien.
13. Mel'čuk, I & Raviè, R (Мельчук, И. А. & Равич, Р.Д.) 1967, Автоматический перевод, Под ред. Г.С. Цвейга и Э.К. Кузнецовой, Москва, Изд. АНСССР.
14. Polguere, A 2000, A „Natural" Lexicalization Model for Language Generation, [In:] Preceedings of the Fourth Symposium on Natural Language Processing 2000 (SNLP'2000), Chiangmai, Thailand, 10-12 May 2000, pp. 37-50.

Anna Ginter

Nuo leksikono iki aiškinamojo kombinatorinio žodyno

Santrauka

Reikšmės-teksto teorija yra suvokiama kaip natūralus generatyvinio-transformacinio traktavimo tęsinys, kadangi reikšmės-teksto teorijos pagrindai yra sutinkami Chomskio teorijoje (Melčuk, 1981: 56; Gladkij, Melčuk, 1969: 7). Iš esmės, reikšmės-teksto teorija perėmė pagrindines standartinės Chomskio teorijos prielaidas ir terminologiją, siekdama surasti geresnį kalbos funkcionavimo modelį. Tačiau akivaizdu, kad reikšmės-teksto teorija, kuriai įtakos turėjo ir kiti darbai bei idėjos (pvz., mašininio vertimo tyrimai ir Sovietų Sąjungos semantikos specialistų darbai), turi skirtis nuo svarbiausių Chomskio traktuotės išvadų. Svarbiausias skirtumas siejamas su reikšmės-teksto teorijos idėja apie nuo kalbos nepriklausomą semantinę reprezentaciją. Be to, Melčuk, Zolkovsky ir Apresjan pasiūlė plačiai naudoti sintaksę semantikos reprezentacijai.
Pagrindinis straipsnio tikslas – parodyti pagrindines dviejų teorijų prielaidas, atsižvelgiant į komponentus, kurie atrodo analogiški Chomskio ir Melčuko pasiūlytiems požiūriams. Tiek leksikonas standartinėje teorijoje, tiek aiškinamasis kombinatorinis žodynas reikšmės-teksto modelyje yra tiesiogiai priskiriami dviejų lingvistinių aprašymų semantiniams aspektams. Leksikoną sudaro netvarkingas leksinių elementų rinkinys ir tam tikros daugiažodiškumo taisyklės, tuo tarpu aiškinamasis kombinatorinis žodynas skirtas sudaryti visas semantines ir kombinatorines reikšmes, atskleidžiančias tam tikro žodžio ryšius su kitais žodžiais.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2006 03
Parengtas spaudai 2006 06

The Author

Anna Ginter, PhD, a Russian, Polish and English linguist, Assistant Professor at University of Lodz, Institute of Russian Studies, head of the Department of Applied Linguistics and also a lecturer in the Vocational Higher State School in Plock, Institute of Neo-Philology, Department of English and Department of Russian with English.
She *specialises* in studies of general linguistics as well as in analysing stylistic devices used in Russian, Polish and English literature and their translation in the background of modern theories. She has written articles and book reviews related to the aspects of linguistics and translation, and a monograph *The world behind Nabokov's words. Plays on words and their translation* (Lodz: University of Lodz 2003).
Address: Instytut Rusycystyki, ul. Wolczanska 90, 92-522 Lodz, Poland.
E-mail: ginteranna@poczta.onet.pl

DOI: 10.5755/j01.sal.1.8.43256