

Plan of Expression and Plan of Contents in Quantitative Categories

¹Mr. PV Ramana Murthy, ²Ms.G.Shoba Rani,

¹Associate Professor,² Assistant Professor,Dept. of CSE,
Malla Reddy Engineering College (Autonomous), Secunderabad, Telangana State

Abstract- Development level of modern science of linguistics is characterized by increasing interest to the description of descriptive function of the language. That's why the attention of the investigators, having changed its orientation, has directed to the study of mutual correlations of elements of different language levels, taking part in conveying the contents of the utterance. This allows making the analysis possible not only directed from forms to contents, from means to functions, but also it makes it possible to carry out analysis directed from contents to the forms/from functions to the means. In order to study quantity semantics expressed by the word form, having the meaning of grammatical quantity, we think it purposeful to divide them into two groups – to the morphological and syntactic forms. Morphological quantity forms are peculiar to the substantivized words and nouns possessing correlative quantity forms.

I. INTRODUCTION

Characteristic feature of modern linguistic science is an attempt, made by the scholars to study the complicated language systems, mainly, to study the completion of the ties, their varieties and understanding of the objects, being in mutual correlations with the surrounding atmosphere. From this view point the necessity of giving dynamism to the explanation of systematic approach to the existing fields becomes more obviously visible. Very rapid widening of theoretical knowledges and all the fields of experimental - practical investigations brought to the global change to the style of scientific thought and gave an impulse for the creation of paradigm of creative activity of the new scientific thinking.

Establishment of the methodology of creative activity in linguistics, first of all is linked with the rapid development functionalism which declared the instrumental conception of the language. As to this conception, language is a means of mutual social impact and human beings in their mental and practical activities mutually influence on one another by the force of language. In the

conceptions and categories of functional linguistics, language structure, in the process of realization of speech, is studied in the concrete speech practice, and that's why, today, all the imaginations, which are explained by the factual usage of everything by grammar, which is called "natural grammar", is just linked with this functional direction. Dynamism of the state of a language is mostly associated with the division of its system and with its separately-taken semisystems and periferic fields. We think that it is purposeful to carry out functional-grammatic investigations from the position of the theory of language fields, in such directions, which modernize conceptual-language operations and which creates possibilities to analyse language and speech facts by the principle of "aim means", namely, to carry out these investigations giving possibilities to determine which means of a language possesses to attain communicative purpose and gives possibilities to determine in which attitudes these means are. Establishment of field grammar and its development in the modern theory of perception is unseperable from the thought of "creative activity" paradigm. Field analysis as the manifesting methodics in more special forms of the functional direction is aimed at reflecting in more perfect form of the life activity of the language, and its deeper objective laws of its mutual ties with creative activity. In this case, in the realization of the principles of the field approach, often the problematics of systematization, from the traditional object – from the language (language structure) passes to the speech communication. At the same tome as language and speech, reflect directly the reality of thought, and agreeing with the fact of transition of language and speech into each other dialectically, we may base on such a conclusion that, today the methodological duty of linguistics is to make attempts not to isolate language and speech, but it is to make attempts to understand in which mutual ties they are, and in which common platform these mutual ties are possible. Besides, it is important not only to accept the existence of such mutual ties, but also it is important to create its model. language and its separately-taken fields and by this, it has made methodic as one of the leading orientations of modern linguistic science (Schur G.S., 1974). Nevertheless, in the existing conceptions to the description of language means, their description in the national and individual human conscious of extralinguistic realities and so the ability of reflecting such notions in human speech are not paid sufficient attention. In these conceptions, approach to the language as the unity of system and function has not found its satisfactory reflection. Language and speech categories and structuralization of semisystems and the realistic future development of field theory of modeling of the language, for example, as a taxonomic

unit, for the transition of a language to the “field” as an instrument of learning in its concrete realization, the link in the general theory, which may appear to be as methodological basis has been investigated very little. Communicative pragmatic characteristics of the units entering the field too (especially archeological) has been apart from the investigation up to the present day, because in the widest literature linked with field problems, such a view point occupies the advantageous position and thinking as if field conceptions of the language are purely pragmatic conceptions, analysis in them has been closed by the system of language means. It is more interesting that, until the latest period functional orientation in linguistics unexceptionally developed as a synchronic approach. Consequently, the theory of language field has been left completely unstudied in the diachronic plan, whereas new principal possibilities to be able to give more dynamism to the diachronic investigations, to be able to ensure the possibilities to bring the system of functional means with which it will enable the investigators to approach the problem as a historical event, and necessity for the search of methods are of no doubt. Today, the problems which have been less investigated may be belonged to the issues linked with the application of Interlingua confrontations which are carried out on the functional background of field modeling, especially contentsive typology which is actively developing. The modern level of development of the science of linguistics are more characterized with the more increasing interest to functional grammar and in the widest sense, to the problems of functional description of the language. This is absolutely an appropriate, for today, linguistics has been directed in the consideration of the language nor as “language in itself” (Sossyur F., 1977) not as the purpose of classification of the language as an aim, or as the systematic descriptive aims, it must be directed to understand the language as a real practical conscious, as an important means intended in the human society in the condition of communication. That’s why the attention of the investigators having changed their orientation must be directed to the mutual ties (correlations) of the elements belonging to the study of the objective laws of activities of language units and their descriptions, must be directed to the mutual ties of the elements, belonging to different levels and taking place in the revelation of meaning of the utterance.

This assumes not only the possibility of analysis in the direction from forms to meanings/from means to functions, but also it makes it possible to make analysis in the direction from meanings to forms/from functions to means.

II. STUDY OF THE CATEGORY OF QUANTITY

Category of quantity as the category of quality which is linked with it is a category of universal conception. While studying different varieties in different languages we mean the semantic functional unity of the elements in mutual ties of different language, levels, the existence of the known to us semantic invariants of these elements in differential semantic signs as proper “functional-semantic category” (Bondarko A.V., Bulanin L.L., 1967). The theory of functional-semantic category is in the stage of all-rounded development on the basis of materials of the languages possessing different systems, different structures. It is worth mentioning that this is one of the most complicated problems in grammar. Interest to the semantics of quantity is explained by the reflection of quantitative opportunities peculiar to objects of different types, to movements and features and to proper notions. We consider the notion of “quantity” not by movements and signs, but often we consider it as a wider notion of “quantity” than the one which is linked with things (objects) (Holodovich A.A., 1979). But even when we deal with the quantity characteristics of the things (objects) we happen to indicate the sum of these things. For example, while speaking in the Russian language on the combinations as *два дома* in the Azerbaijani language “*iki ev*” in the English language “*two houses*”, if we say that the sum of the quantity of the things in these languages are expressed as special cases, we can say that in the words of *домик*, “*evcik*” “*small house*” (in the form of belittling), *домуце* “*böyük ev*” “*a larger house*”, not the quantity of the things are expressed, but the things are determined as to the quantity of mass. The expression of quantity is associated with the usage of means of different levels. At this time the specification of this or that quantity meaning, the loss of one meaning and the context, expressed by another meaning is of great significance. Besides, some language units express the meaning of quantity, just in context, in the combination of other units (Boduen de Kurtene I.A., 1963). In order to study the quantity semantics expressed by the word forms of grammatical quantity (single, plural) we have thought it purposeful to divide them into two groups – morphological and syntactic forms. Forms of morphological quantity are peculiar to the substantivized words and nouns, possessing correlative quantity forms. These forms reflect logical dependence on the real quantity of the intended thing (object). But the forms of syntactic quantity are peculiar to the words of parts of speech, reflecting their quantities and word forms of which grammatically are depending upon nouns.

III. QUANTITY SEMANTICS PECULIAR

As we are interested in the quantity semantics peculiar to the category of collective nouns we include into the list of words any nouns expressing the words in the singular form and by this time accompanied by the meaning of collection, inseparable meaning, which we are going to investigate. By this time we take into consideration the significant of plurality of the objects from the grammatical view point, whether they are countable or uncountable and possibility or impossibility of forming their grammatical forms of plurality. Such agreement of grammatical signs of words can be explained by the fact that we consider the collectiveness not as lexic-grammatical category, but as functional-semantic category (generally speaking, in relation to quantity as subcategory).

The semantic contents of the category of collectiveness are taken as equal to the total sum of these semes: “plurality” (definite or indefinite) + “sum total” + “Notions characteristic to things”. Such a combination is characteristic for the expression of this category by nouns. When this is expressed by other means, resubdivision of semes takes place. For example, the expression of noun combination with collective number of this category, the total sum and certain meaning of plurality is expressed by number but the meaning of the thingness is expressed by a noun.

IV. CONTENTS PLAN OF THE FIELD OF QUANTITY

Contents plan of the field of quantity and the analysis of the expression plan (Hrakovskiy V.S., 1989), the unification of language means within the quantity macro-field, extremely bases on the generalized meanings, that’s why in the above-mentioned macro-fields we think it purposeful to distinguish three semi-fields of the quantity: the semi-field of the things (objects), the semi-field of the quantity of the movement and the semifield of the quantity of the signs.

V. CONCLUSION

1. The expression plan of the quantity category in the investigated language is characterized by multi-functional collection of means of different levels.
2. The difference in the expression plan of the category of quantity shows itself in the mutual attitude of the types of means belonging to this category and in the semantic signs which they

express, in the systematization of means of different types and in the specify of some means peculiar to a concrete language.

3. The plan of contents of functional-semantic category of quantity is identical in different languages, but the plan of expression depending upon the general structural type of the language is more associated with the exceptional synthetism and exceptional analitism which exist in its type.

REFERENCES

1. Schoor GS. Field theory in linguistics. - M.: Nauka, 1974. - 225.
2. Sossyur F. Course of general lingvistics.- Works on linguistics. M.: 1977, p.146
3. Bondarko AV., Bulanin LL Russian glagol.- L.: 1967, p.18
4. Kholodovich AA Problems of grammatical theory. L. 1979, AC.109
5. Baudouin de Courtenay IA. Quantified in linguistic thinking // Selected works on general linguistics: Volume 2, Moscow, 1963, c.311-324
6. Nasilov DM. Problems Turkic aspectology: Aktsionalnost.L Science, 1989. -208 p.