

## ARNAVUT DİLİNİN YAPISINDA SEMANTİK DEĞERİN İNCELENMESİ GEREKLİLİĞİ

### ÖZ

Teorik durum çalışmaları ve pratik uygulamaları, Arnavutça'da bir morfolojik sözdizimi kategorisi olarak görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda, isim, zamir ve sıfat (Gramatika I) gibi birim başına sayı ve forma göre bu kategorinin oluşum paradigması verilmektedir. Ayrıca, konu, nesne, değiştirici, belirleyici gibi geleneksel işlevlerle yakından ilgilidir, bu işlevlere göre farklı sahnelerin belirli bir şekilde gruplandırılmasını sağlar (Gramatika II). Böyle bir anlayış, pek çok benzer sözdizimi değerlik modelinin sistemindeki tanımlamadaki farkı sınırlandırmıştır, ancak anlamsal değerlik analizine referansla, birbirlerinden farklıdır. Yalnızca pragmatik durumun pek çok kullanımı bu şekilde analiz edilememiştir veya semantik olarak değişen belirli kalıplarla aynı olduğu şeklinde etiketlenememiştir (hap dritaren /hap një faqe të re web) (opens the window / opens a new web page). Farklı teorilere göre ilgili bileşenleri ile birlikte yapılan anlamsal değer çalışması (anlamsal durum, anlamsal bileşenler, anlamsal kategoriler, belirli sözlü açıklamalar, vb.), Değerleme başlıklarının ve belirli tamamlayıcıların kullanılmasının farklı bağlamlarını bu bağlamlara göre doğru bir şekilde belirleme imkanı sağlar.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Değerlik, Diyatez, Geçişlilik, Aktif, Pasif



**Albana Deda (Ndoja)**  
dedalbana@gmail.com

**Araştırma Makalesi**

**Başvuru Tarihi: 10.03.2019**  
**Kabul Tarihi: 19.06.2019**

## **THE NECESSITY TO STUDY THE SEMANTIC VALENCE IN THE STRUCTURE OF ALBANIAN LANGUAGE**

### **ABSTRACT**

*The case in theoretical studies and practical applications is seen as a morpho-syntax category in Albanian. In this context, the paradigm of the occurrence of this category by number and form per unit such as noun, pronoun, and adjective (Gramatika I) is generally given. Also, the case is closely related to traditional functions such as the subject, the object, the modifier, the determinant, enabling a certain grouping of different scenes according to these functions (Gramatika II). Such a conception has limited the distinction to the description in the system of many similar syntax valence models, but in reference to the semantic valence analysis they differ from each other. Numerous uses not only of the pragmatic case could not be analyzed in this way or labeled as being the same with certain patterns that change semantically (hap dritaren /hap një faqe të re web) (opens the window / opens a new web page). The semantic valency study with its relevant components according to different theories (semantic case, semantic components, semantic categories, specific verbal descriptions, etc.) would provide the possibility of accurately determining the different contexts of using valence heads and specific complements according to these contexts.*

**Keywords:** Valence, Diathesis, Transitivity, Active, Passive



**Albana Deda (Ndoja)**  
*dedalbana@gmail.com*

**Research Article**

**Date Received: 10.03.2019**  
**Date Accepted: 19.06.2019**

In the current studies of the Albanian language, the concept of the case is related to its classical treatment that is to the formal case. The latter refers to the classic denominations that come to us since ancient times and relate to the different forms of paradigm of the noun, pronoun, and adjective for the Albanian language. The case in our grammar, and not only, is seen as a morpho-syntax category. Thus, certain nouns are generally associated with certain functions. Their grammatical meaning in grammar is expressed with this kind of methodology when referring to traditional cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, ablative)<sup>1</sup>. However, such a case treatment was merely a formal dress of traditional functions, in which the semantic level was ignored.

On the other hand, the loss of this feature in many languages such as English or the stench of the case indicators and in highly developed inflections languages such as Albanian (today Albanian does not present any special endings for each case, even in the declension in plural the end is more noticeable, as for the indirect cases we have the same form as in the definite, and indefinite) seek a different way of looking at the structures where they are designed to distinguish patterns of the same format but with different meanings.

Thus, for a traditional syntax researcher the structure *lundroj në internet* (navigate on the internet) structure there is nothing new to discuss from the formal case point of view as it is the same as *lundroj në liqen/ det, oqean* (navigating the lake / sea, ocean etc.) This is a known structure of the verb that is accompanied by a prefix syntagm (prefix on) in the definite or indefinite accusative, if there are definite determinants. Also, it is associated with a nominative case as a subjective and another accusative case preceded by prefixes *me* (*me anije/barkë/ lundër* etj.) (with) (with a ship / boat etc.). In this context, the structure *lundroj në internet* (I navigate on the Internet) has no change to the usual pattern of traditional syntax study.

Rather, if we refer to the theory of valence, the researchers will see a change in the verbal design pattern *lundroj* (navigate). This change is reflected precisely in the different kind of semantics, as part of the semantic valence study, which accompanies the two above-mentioned models.

The semantic component of the valence has different approaches, according to various theories. Thus a part of generalists associate it with semantic roles or theta roles [Fillmore (Charles Fillmore: 1968) and Hegeman (Liliane Haegeman: 1991)]. The theory of valence developed by Herbst and others differentiate at this level semantic roles, specific verbal descriptions, semantic components and semantic categories.

First of all, in the context of generative theory, it was taken concretely with the study of the semantic levels so embedded in the formal structures introduced in the first phase of the development of the theory from the Chomsky.

Fillmore is known precisely for the theory of grammar, as he calls it (Case Grammar), in which he dealt with the concept of deepcase<sup>2</sup>, or semantics. The latter also defined the semantic model (caseframe).

<sup>1</sup> Gramatika I, Akademia e Shkencave të Shqipërisë, 2001, f. 105-110.

<sup>2</sup>The beginnings of this concept are found in 1968 at Fillmore<sup>2</sup>, which calls them in other terms as deepcases, thematicroles, thetaroles.

The deep case refers to the semantic relations of a predicate with regard to its argument, which is graphically a noun syntagm<sup>2</sup>.

According to him, "the basic structure of the sentence consists of a verb and one or several noun phrases, each of which is related to the verb with a special strain relationship<sup>3</sup>." From the definition it can be concluded that the concept of semantics, surrounding the sentence of the sentence-forming is completely unknown in our grammar and different from that of the traditional form of the traditional, addressed in the latter (nominative, genitive, dative etc.) . He refers to the semantic nucleus of the nominal syntagm, namely its head, its positioning in the context of the situation, where it is part, and is named precisely on the basis of the latter.

Fillmore defines these semantic rations: Agent (the agent-A), the case of the instrument (instrument-I); rasi dative (dative-D), factitive case (factitive-F); location / space cases (locative-L); the objective case (objective-O) [Fillmore: 1968].

According to him, these cases include:

- o the case of the agent-A, is the case of the promoter, driver, the living author (creature, human mostly) of the action expressed by the verb:

**Unë** do të vrapoj dhe do ta shtyj gjahun drejt pritës sate. (AlbanianCorpus)

- o the case of the instrument, the instrument-I, the force or non-living object involved in the action and state given by the verb

Besohet se aksidenti ka ardhur atëherë, kur **automjeti** i markës së panjohur e goditi këmbësorin. (AC)

- o Dative-d case, the case of the creature being affected (alive usually) from the state or action given by the verb.

Mbaje mend, o Zot, Davidin dhe të gjitha mundimet e tij, ashtu si ai iu betua Zotit dhe lidhi kusht me të Fuqishmin e Jakobit, duke thënë:«Nuk do të hyj në çadrën e shtëpisë sime, nuk do të hipi mbi shtratin tim; nuk do t'u jap gjumë **syve** të mi as pushim qepallave të mia, deri sa të kem gjetur një vend për Zotin, një banesë për të Fuqishmin e Jakobit ».(A.C.)

- o Factitive-F case, the case of the object ose the case of what results from what is given by the verb.

Hajde, me, një palo furrxhi është, na pjek **bukët** dhe ne e paguajmë për këtë ».(A.C.)

- o Location/space-L case, the case that defines the location or space direction of the state or action given by the verb:

Dhe tani ja, unë, i shtyrë nga fryma, po shkoj **në Jeruzalem**, pa ditur çfarë do të më ndodhë atje. (A.C.)

- o The objective-O case, the most neutral case represented by a noun whose role in the state or action expressed by the verb is identified by the semantic nucleus of the verb itself. (This case is less defined than others with this definition, so we are not giving an example of the fact that these cases will be retaken more extensively in the semantic list given by Tarvainen below.)

<sup>3</sup>Charles Fillmore, *The case for case*, 1968, f. 21.

Fillmore says that the semantic case is expressed only once in a sentence. Let us see the following sentences:

1. Djali preu pemën. (The boy cut the tree.)
2. Sharra preu pemën. (The saw cut the tree.)
3. Djali preu pemën me sharrë. (The boy cut the tree with a saw.)

In the above sentences, the traditional subject is expressed in the same formal case, non-prepositional nominative. Likewise, the object in accusative without preposition. The third sentence has a prefix syntagm, which has both circumstantial and object nuances, according to Gramatika II (which does not provide accurate criteria for these cases), but is formally expressed with a noun with a preposition in accusative. According to this grammar, it can be said that we are dealing with the same verb - predicate in the same structure, with the parts of speech we have said above.

Fillmore explains that we do not really have the same semantic case model, since in the first case, the boy, is the doer of the action, **the actor**, whereas in the second case the subject is the instrument that has performed the action. According to him, **it is impossible to accomplish the same semantic case in the same position at the same time**, as the sentence below would be nongrammatical:

1. \*Djali dhe sharra prenë pemën. (The boy and the saw cut the tree)

This is because the agent **the boy** accomplishes this through creating space for the prepositional syntagm in the third sentence. Thus **the actor** predicts **the instrument** in a prepositional syntagm which realizes the means, the instrument, with which the action is realized:

**Djali** (vepruesi) *preu pemën me sharrë*(mjeti/instrumenti). **The boy** (actor/agent) cut the tree **with a saw** (means/instrument)

Naturally we are talking here about the same context in the three sentences. Thus, it is a boy, who is waiting with a saw and not someone else, who does not have any relation to the boy, being this a machine. Only the cases with the same lexical traits (+creature in the case of actor above) can be accompanied (with traditional terms). We clarify here that the lexical trait is a special value of the noun, different from the semantic case which is seen in the framework of the whole sentence structure, as it was noticed.

**Djali dhe vajza prenë pemën.** (The boy and the girl cut the tree)

In this sentence, the subject is made of two agents, that might have used the same means in different times or they might have used different means. This is clarified by the prepositional syntagm as a semantic case of the means/instrument. The latter is seen in the superficial structure.

According to Fillmore, there is not a subject (logical generative subject), but two as there are two agents with the same semantic case, what allows the accompanying, besides the different lexical trait ((±male/±female<sup>4</sup>). The same thing can be said even for the subject instrument (means):

6. Sharra preu pemën. (The saw cut the tree)
7. \*Sharra preu pemën me thikë. (The saw cut the tree with a knife)
8. \*Sharra preu pemën me dhëmbëza (me teh). (The saw cut the tree with a blade)

<sup>4</sup> The lexical features are part of the semantic level of valence study. They comprise descriptions of more elaborate lexical elements that can differentiate not only the different semantics, but also the same semantics, as is the case in question.

Sentence 7 is nongrammatical. In this case, the subject which is the means (instrument), does not select another means, which is expressed with a prepositional syntagm as in sentence 6. (However there are cases when a part of the case of the instrument can be seen in the surface in the form SP<sup>5</sup>).

The analysis so far shows a new dimension of description of the system different from traditional grammar, which does not in any case analyze such structures that represent models that can not be projected in the same speech context, despite having the same verbal predicates and, at first glance, the complement, having the same formal marks (they are in the same cases). Rather, in general terms, these kinds of relationships have been seen disconnected and without any analysis to include elements of different planes, especially semantic and syntax ones. Generally, illustrated models are more based on the informal intuitions of different authors.

It should be added that here we only have one part of the Fillmore study on this subject. Reflection of these works is the Framenet project (Charles Fillmore, Christopher R. Johnson, Miriam R.L. Petruck<sup>6</sup> etc.), which constitutes a valence corpus of semantic level of a part of the English lexical units<sup>7</sup>.

The later semantic level study recognized other developments. We can not overlook in this context the work of Lilian Hegeman fully based on the generative theory "Introduction to the Government and Binding Theory" (1991)<sup>8</sup>.

Hegeman, when dealing with the natural structure of the argumentative structure, starts with the formal logic approaches. It is well known that the latter has been the focus of most of the cognitive-descriptive studies that have been dealt with the valence. Also, if we see the clarification given about this structure, we will understand the resemblance to the conception with Tenien.

On the other hand, in comparison with Fillmore theta roles in the early stages of his study, which determines it for the arguments of this structure, appear more numerous. However, its treatment mostly affects the quantitative view of these arguments from a detailed analysis of the semantic level, as we saw in Fillmore. Thus, it states that a speaker, if he knows the meaning of a verb, he also knows the number of arguments he will receive (meet: 2 NP- the verb meet receives two arguments).

The concept of the semantic case here comes with the term of the thematic role or shortly said theta role. According to her, the verb marks the theta roles it takes. In the list of theta roles given by her, we can notice the difference with Fillmore. Thus in this paper we talk about the actor, the patient, the subject, the experimenter, the purpose, the source, the place.

Hegeman admits that in all cases it is not easy to have a precise definition of theta roles. This comes, according to us, also because of the small number of these roles, which fail to reflect all the relationships that appear in the pragmatic context.

With this level, but we think in a more controversial issue, it is discussed also the Valence Dictionary of English (VDE)

---

<sup>5</sup>Ch. Fillmore, *Casefor case*, 1968, p. 22 predicts the case when the same case can be repeated with some of its semantic content. So he gives the sentences: The car broke the window./ The car broke the windowwithitsfender./\*The car broke the windowwith a fender. According to him the second sentence is the same as: The car'sfender broke the window.

<sup>6</sup><http://ijl.oxfordjournals.org/content/16/3/235.abstract>, p. 235.

<sup>7</sup>The authors argue that "Framenet is a computer lexicographic project that introduces the semantic-syntaxual English words, obtained from a large electronic textbook corpus, using automatic and manual procedures, and publishes this information in a variety of web reporting (in specific computer files). "

<sup>8</sup> L. Haegeman, *Introduction to the GovernmentandBindingTheory*, CmbridgeUniverityPress, 1991.36.

Although the main vocabulary of this dictionary (VDE) is the representation of the syntax component of certain lexical units that can carry valence, the latter is accompanied by specifications of their meaning or accompanying complementaries<sup>9</sup>. These types of definitions relate to:

1. with the meaning of complements (especially those of the same word)
2. lexical unit which can be (or not) a complement

Herbst finds that the semantic roles in this vocabulary are given in the complement corpus only when this is necessary to distinguish complements from each other. He also adds that they are very general (this is also noticed by their limited number) and they are generally given in the function of reflecting the complementary syntax model (Herbst: VDE, xxx).

According to Votteler, semantic valence recognizes four kinds of approximations to its main corpus<sup>10</sup>. Thus, for the description of the complementary understanding the problem is approached by studying:

1. Semantic roles
2. semantic components<sup>11</sup>
3. semantic categories<sup>12</sup>
4. specific-verbal description

In VDE you can find general information on both of these semantic approaches. They belong to semantic roles, which, as we have said, are generally given to distinguish between structures such as:

- • Kjo ekspozitë (i prekuri) do të tërheqë vëmendjen drejt komunitetit lokal (përfituesi). This exhibition (the affected) will draw attention to the local community (the recipient).
- Këto lloj ekspozitash (i prekuri) tërheqin vëmendjen drejt ngritjes së liceve artistike (synimi / qëllimi). These types of exhibitions (the affected) draw attention to the promotion of artistic titles (goal / purpose)<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup>Thomas Herbst et al, *A valency Dictionary of English*, Mouton de Gruyter, 2004, f. xxviii.

<sup>10</sup>K. Götz-Votteler, *Theoretical, Descriptive and Cognitive Issues*, Mouton de Gruyter, 2004, f.40.

<sup>11</sup>In general, this concept involves the characterization of the complementary complement to the validity of a lexical unit with such terms: [±creature], [±human], [±abstract], etc. In the following sentence the complement of the verb kill can be characterized:

Djali vrau zogun.

The boy killed the bird.

The actor (boy) is characterized by such semantic components: [+ creature], [+ human]

The recipient (bird) can be identified with such traits of the semantic component: [+ creature], [-human]. It is clear that if the semantic roles are directly dependent on the semantic selection of the verb, the semantic components are generally specific features of the complement itself and can be seen as their inner wealth.

The concept for the complementary semantic components, of course, has expanded. It already includes a larger number of definitions than the ones we took as examples.

<sup>12</sup>Semantic categories are another side of the semantic study field used in the VALBU Valence Dictionary of German and refer to the person, group of persons, institution, etc. that can use a particular unit. The terminology used in relation to these representations relates to characterizations such as: person, animal, object, or force. These types of definitions do not relate to semantic features of the complement noun, but its use in model and specific categories, according to Votteler.

<sup>13</sup>Thomas Herbst et al, *A valency Dictionary of English*, Mouton de Gruyter, 2004, f. 627.

However, if we browse the dictionary, we can clearly distinguish that these semantic description elements are not for all the lexical categories considered (despite the fact that the ones found are very few in comparison to the particular studies of this type we also noticed above).

Here are most of these cases: *the actor, the affected, the beneficiary* (Herbst: VDE; xiii). Such a fact, after the presentation that became semantic roles, seems disappointing. However, we must bear in mind that this dictionary represents only a kind of corpus, which has as its main purpose the syntax validity, not all of the corpus of verbs, nouns and adjectives, but only a part of them (Below we will see that Frame-net shows another reality for the very specifics of this corpus.). The greatest semantics approach in this dictionary is found in connection with the **specific verbal description**.

Semantic categories in the vocabulary of words (when given) are given accompanied by further clarifications related to what is called a **verb-specific descriptor**. The latter, along with semantic roles, expresses the verbal meaning more precisely, in the context of a contextual semantic event skeleton, and it is preferred both in the VDE and the VALBU (German Dictionary of German Valence<sup>14</sup>). Let's look at the two verbs below and the definitions that relate precisely to the specific verbal description:

**notoj (swim):**

Dua të notoj dhe të zbuloj botën nënujore, kështu që nuk mund të pres gjatë për këtë udhëtim<sup>15</sup>. (I want to swim and discover underwater world, so I can not wait long for this trip)

notari (swimmer)-----vendi (place)

Nuk mund të notoj. (I cannot swim)

notari (swimmer)

Por, sido që të jetë, vdekja e Hajrijes mbeti si strumbullar rreth të cilit qarkullojnë rikujtimet, ku lidhet e tërë ajo që ishte atje dhe dikur, që përbën atë det të valëzuar, nëpër të cilin s'kam si të notoj ndryshe, pos si një mbytacak i paaftë, i cili mundohet të arrijë deri te brigjet e qetësisë së vet. (However, Hajrije's death remained as a pivot around which the recollections circulate, where all that was there and once belonged to, which is that wavy sea, where I have no idea how to swim other than an incompetent dumbbell, who tries to reach the shores of his tranquility.)

notari (swimmer)-----vendi (place)-----mënyra (manner)

**lundroj (navigate):**

Karlo Drusiani i tha sergjentit Mario që është e rrezikshme të lundrohet me atë varkë të vjetër në detin e vjeshtës. (Carlos Drussiani told to seargent Mario that it it was dangerous to navigate on the old boat in the autumn sea).

pasagjeri (passenger)-----hapësira (ujore) (water space)-----mjete (instrument)

Buna ka pas qenë e lundrueshme dhe ajo mund të lundrohet përsëri. (Buna was navigable and it can be navigated again)

hapësira (ujore) (water space)

The definitions below each sentence belong to the participants in the speech context. Each of them is related to the relevant verb and the arguments it has in that context. These kinds of clarifications make

<sup>14</sup>K.Götz-Votteler, *Theoretical, Descriptive and Cognitive Issues*, Mouton de Gruyter, 2004, f.40.

<sup>15</sup> Sentences are taken from Albanian Corpus.

it possible to frame a speech-pragmatic perspective that brings new participants into it (both complement and adjunct).

In the VDE, as the main models of lexical and complementary units that are selected are provided, explanations and constructions developed as such, for the verb **tërheq (attract)**, **këshilloj (advise) etc.:**

*tërheq-* një ngjarje mund të tërheqë një person (attract - an event can attract a person)

*këshilloj-* zakonisht do të thotë t'i thuash dikujt, me një qëllim bashkëpunues (dashamirës) se si të veprojë e çfarë të bëjë: Një person ose organizatë mund të këshillojë:

dikë ose të bësh diçka, p.sh ta rekomandosh atë mbi diçka ose për diçka p.sh të japësh këshilla për një çështje specifike (*mbi* ose *për* është dhënë për arsye formale). etj. (usually means telling someone, for a cooperative purpose (kindly), how to act and what to do: One person or organization can advise: for example, to recommend it to something or for something, for example, to give advice on a specific issue (over or for formal reasons). etc.)

So it can be seen that the participants of the specific verbal descriptor are given together with the latter in the context of real use. Although the specific verbal description gives some idea of the participants in the event and the action, the situation, the experience, etc. which expresses the verb, according to us, is incomplete if no complementary semantic case and other features expressed by the semantic component are added. However, such a thing is usually done with such details for the semantic corpus. VDE is mostly a partial reflection of a kind of corpus, in which the aim is generally to identify the syntactic models of lexical categories taken in analysis.

There are scholars who have seen the semantic case in detail, drawing a very large number of semantic narratives. One of them is also Tarvainen of the University of Jyväskylä (Kalevi Tarvainen), which presents an article under the Theory of Valences and Addition Grammar, "Semantic Cases in the Framework of Dependency Grammar"<sup>16</sup>.

This paper is an indicator of the broadening of the semantic concept (It is not possible to retrieve all the issues treated by Tarvainen, so it will be limited especially to the treatment of cases).

Regarding the semantic case, he initially deals with the question whether the semantic case should be considered as a relation, or as a category<sup>17</sup> ("Miqtë e mi shkuan në Londër." **në Londër** -duhet marrë si kategori =vend/ hapësirë etj., apo si synim, qëllim, arritje, që ka të bëjë me marrëdhënien?). (My friends went to London. **To London** – it must be taken as a category – place/space, etc., or an aim, purpose, which relates to the relation?)

After introducing linguists who differentiate the semantic case only in the context of the relation rather than the category and others that encapsulate the semantic case on both of these elements, he distinguishes:

o Case found only as complement valences (actor)

o Case that can be found and as a complement valence and as adjunct (therefore independent of the verbal valence, the latter)

<sup>16</sup> R. Dirven/G. Radden, *Concept of Case*, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen, 1987, f.75.

<sup>17</sup> R. Dirven/G. Radden, *Concept of Case*, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen, 1987, f. 84.

In defining the shadows it presents not only those related to the verb, but also the case of the complement of the adjectives and nouns<sup>18</sup>.

Obviously, the above statement does not constitute an overview of all studies regarding the semantic valence component and, respectively, the semantic case. It is just an illustration of the concept we rely on when we say that *navigating the web* and *navigating to the sea* is not the same semantic valence structure.

The semantic components selected from this head in this structure are [+ creature] syntax nominative SE (which refers to the traditional subject) and SP, prefix syntax, emerging as [+ virtual place] on the Internet. The latter is traditionally conceived as a place modifier.

If we do a research of the most usable verb patterns of navigate, we note that the second complement emerges as SP with semantic components [+ bjective place] in the lake / stream. At this moment we can distinguish the introduction of the semantic modification of the verb, realized in the valence network that it presents in this new model for it. Such a phenomenon is especially encountered in what has traditionally been called scientific style.

Some texts pertain to this style, namely that relate to the field of economics, jurisprudence and linguistics in the context of university textbooks, as we think that the introduction of new scientific realities is realized not only in the lexical, terminological, but also on structural, according to specific contexts.

In this context, the case of the structure that appears to be studied can be studied. Indeed, we have a structure that the Albanian did not have as a semantic valence model, but that appears to be indispensable, as it enters into the context of the necessary professional contexts such as the semantic field of the computer, the internet etc.

---

<sup>18</sup>I: the cases that are accomplished only as complements:

- Actor, the main participant in the lecture context
  - Patient and its types: passive participants in the lecture context: Patient in the process / Patient in a condition / Patient as a perceptive, observer / Patient as a possessor (possessor)
  - The objective (affected) is called a unit (object, spiritual or not, phenomenon), etc., which is affected by the action expressed by the verb.
  - Responsibility is called a unit, which is seen as a result of an action or process. Its lexical feature is [+ result]. The thematic case names the topic or subject of action of communication or mental action.
  - The perceptive (or perceptual) case means what is perceived, absorbed by the senses or mind
  - The path of achievement, achievement (or finishing of completion) names what we have tried or resisted (intention).
- II. Cases which can be accomplished as a complement and adjuncts
- Causative case. This case expresses the relationship between a cause and an effect.
  - The companionship (commitment) usually expresses a unit, which may be accompanied (or not) during a certain action
  - The addressee's case expresses a unit that gets something or is testing the consequences of an action.
  - The way of behavior (modative) conveys a different sense of the word, which has to do with how something has been done or how something has happened.
  - The instrument case identifies in the first place the instrument or the way in which something has been done.
  - The place case shows the location of an action.
  - The time case indicates the time of performing an action
  - The proximity case (essive) shows a relation that may have to do with identity, classification or quality in certain situations.

In this context of discussion, we think that the research of models of semantic valence of different verbal heads, but not only, perhaps within the framework of the framenet would greatly help in some aspects of the study of the structure of the Albanian language.

As we said, it would identify new models that are introduced under the influence of foreign languages as it was the case above. Such a thing would enable us to distinguish those who are indispensable models and those that are not necessary for Albanian as *xhelozoj dikë/xhelozohem për dikë* (jealous of someone, jealous for someone), when we are jealous of someone, or *gugëlloj (i google)*, when there is *kërkoj nëgugëll (search in google)*, etc., impacts of languages without developed verb inflections.

On the other hand, the study of semantic validity would greatly help in identifying the characteristic deviations of the various registers to the greater avoidance of the literary text.

## REFERENCES

- DEDA A. (2012), Rasa semantike, Terminologjia në shkencat e ligjërimit, Elbasan.
- DIRVEN/RADDEN, (1987), Concept of Case, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.
- FILLMORE Ch., (1968), The case for case.
- GÖTZ-VOTTELER K., (2004), Theoretical, Descriptive and Cognitive Issues, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gramatika I, (2002), Akademia e Shkencave të Shqipërisë.
- HAEGEMAN L., (1991), Introduction to the Government and Binding Theory, Cambridge University Press.
- HERBST Th. et al, (2004), A valency Dictionary of English, Mouton de Gruyter.
- <http://ijl.oxfordjournals.org/content/16/3/235.abstract>.
- [http://samples.sainsburysebooks.co.uk/9781134369928\\_sample\\_535420.pdf](http://samples.sainsburysebooks.co.uk/9781134369928_sample_535420.pdf).
- <https://www.press.umich.edu/pdf/9780472033850-part1.pdf>.
- TARVAINEN K, (1985), Semantic Cases in the Framework of Dependency Grammar.