

VIEWS ON SEMANTIC FIELD THEORY IN LINGUISTICS

Masharipov Jakhongir Axmedovich

Urgench State University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21102491>

Annotation. The article illustrates the theoretical approaches regarding semantic field. It is explained when this theory was founded along with its types namely linguistic and extra-linguistic. Furthermore, it is analyzed the criteria of forming semantic fields and its component parts.

Key words: semantic field, lexical unit, criterion, structural relationship.

As Karaulov (Карaulов, 1985; 271) noted, the concept of semantic field is expressed as a basic element of world language models. Speaking about this concept, it is necessary to clarify some aspects of field theory in linguistics.

The term “semantic field” was first introduced into science by G. Ipsen in 1924 (Ipsen, 1924; 224). Since then, this concept has entered the scientific works of linguists from different countries and in various areas of linguistics, and the field theory of the language system has acquired various interpretations and applications.

Field theory mainly includes many points of view that express important variants of the general idea - the semantic relations of words in the language with each other. The main reason why the field theory is effective is that linguists were able to find in the concept of “field” a systematic and structural value that constitutes a word and exists as a link in the lexical-semantic system.

Turning to the definitions of the concept of semantic field, the main criteria for the relationship of lexical units and their inclusion in one or another group are “general lexical meaning” (Dolgikh, 1973; 89-98), “semantic feature” (Vasiliev, 1971; 105-113), the presence of different meanings of a word, component aspects, etc. A concept, a subject, and a certain situation can also be taken as such a general element criterion.

From the above, it is not difficult to see that the features used to determine the semantic field are divided into two main groups. The first of them consists of features that are somehow connected with the lexical meaning; these features can be called linguistic. The second group consists of features focused on the conceptual, subject-thematic sphere; they can be called extralinguistic (Kozlovskaya, 2006; 64). Accordingly, there are two main approaches to the study of the semantic field: linguistic and extralinguistic. It should be noted that chronologically the second approach appeared before the first and its founder is I. Trier.

I. Trier's concept is based on the idea that language is an independent closed system that determines the essence of all its main parts. Language divides into parts that exist in the mind in the form of a system of concepts. This system represents the content side of the language and participates in its division.

Conceptually, each such field corresponds to a lexical field consisting of a set of individual words in the language. Lexical fields completely cover the corresponding spaces of conceptual fields, thereby defining their boundaries. On the other hand, the belonging of words to the conceptual field, that is, the ability to express concepts in certain areas, determines the composition of the lexical field, and this field, in turn, acts as an independent unit and occupies

an intermediate place between integral and individual words in the language system. The independence of such units, according to I. Trier, lies in the fact that individual words do not carry a separate meaning. Each of them has a meaning because there are other words adjacent to it that belong to this field. Taking this into account, in order for the listener to understand a word, it is necessary that all other units belonging to this word field are present in his mind. In other words, a word has meaning only within the framework of this entire field and only because of this whole. As I. Trier wrote: "An individual word acquires a certain meaning on the basis of the numerical composition and location of its opposite meanings in the general field, and the correct understanding of this individual word depends on the mental existence of this general field and its specific structure. In order for the process of understanding to take place, the quantity and location of the linguistic signs of this conceptual field must be presented to the listener implicitly (directly)." (Trier, 1931; 7)

According to A.A. Ufimtseva, I. Trier misinterpreted the following main features of the concept of semantic field:

1. The strict and permanent determination of the boundaries of the semantic field.
2. The determination of the lexical meaning only through the entire conceptual field, while ignoring the subject and semantic properties of the word.
3. The strict correspondence of the word field and the semantic field.
4. The continuous (lueckenlos) nature of word fields in the process of covering semantic fields (Уфимцева, 1986;137)

I. Trier's concept has been criticized by linguists for its metaphysical logic, that is, its fields were considered logical and speculative, and were not characterized by linguistic properties (Lyons, 1977;371; Geckeler, 1971;255).

As an alternative to the conceptual approach in defining the semantic field, a linguistic direction was formed, based on the use of the connections that exist between the meanings of individual words, which are considered as basic and independent units of the language. Representatives of the linguistic approach study the lexical composition of the language in different ways and use different methods, but they all study not concepts, but words or phrases, word groups and study their types of semantic connections.

Among the most prominent proponents of semantic field analysis in linguistics, it is worth mentioning Ipsen and Porzig (Ipsen, 1924;30-45; Porzig, 1934;70-97), who based their research on the development of the concept of semantic field on the lexico-grammatical and lexico-syntactic analysis of slogans and language, Reuning (Reuning, 1941;141), who used the method of independent study of semantic systems in different languages, and the Rudskogers (Rudskoger, 1952;505), who reduced the concept of "field" to the meaning of a polysemantic word.

This approach has become one of the most widely used and has been further developed as a result of the research of various domestic linguists who interpret various syntactic complexes as semantic-syntactic fields (Филичева, 1971;42-52; Золотова, 1982;368).

Semantic fields unite words according to the commonality of meaning expressed by the central semantic part of the field. The main attention in the study is paid to the meanings of words and their connections in the field. In this case, the fields of the semantic field can include words belonging to one part of speech and words from different parts of speech, united by a

common meaning and word-forming feature (Минина, 1970; Ревзина 1969;154). Thus, the first stage of determining the semantic field is to determine the central word and the concept that predetermines the contours of further associations of lexical units through it.

A significant contribution to the new stage of development of the concept of field and the construction of language dictionaries according to the laws of semantic field was made by Yu.N. Karaulova, who, with his research, developed the principles of dictionary construction. The linguist, responding to the requests of practical linguistics, taking into account the achievements of modern theoretical linguistics, put forward new principles for constructing the structure of ideographic dictionaries and gave a new interpretation to the concept of semantic field.

In modern linguistics, the subject of study of field theory is lexical units, which are united on the basis of the commonality of meaning they express (semantic principle) or the commonality of functions they perform (functional principle), or a combination of both (functional-semantic principle). Fields determined on the basis of these principles represent a systematic formation; are characterized by mutual internal connections and have their own characteristics. With all the diversity of the material interpreted as a field, it becomes possible to identify the most general features of the linguistic field, which most researchers study and write about in one way or another.

A field is a lexical set of elements connected by structural relationships. According to G.S. Shura, the integral features of a field are, firstly, the presence of an integral feature in the semantic structure of its components, and secondly, the presence of the phenomenon of attraction, that is, the phenomenon of attraction - "due to the presence of a group of elements with a common feature, new elements with the same sign are also included in this group" (Shura, 1974; 101-102).

Several studies have also been conducted on the structural relations of the field, including A.A. Zalevsky (Полевые структуры, 1989; 33-40) who identifies the following as the main structural relations: introduction (connection), convergence (closeness) and divergence (difference). Introduction or connection is understood as lexical units united by hyperhyponymic, synonymous, gradual and partitive (partial) relations. Connection means that a lexical unit is included in this group if it has at least one similar seme with other elements of this group. Convergence includes relations of general connection, temporal, local, instrumental and reminiscence (reminiscent) relations. Divergence combines relations such as antonymic connection, incompatibility and opposition.

Another important feature of the concept of field, recognized by many domestic and foreign linguists, is the presence of a specific feature of the field structure (Bondarko, 1972; Karaulov, 1976; Krivchenko, 1973; 99-103). They argue that the field has a special core-periphery structure, in which the core is characterized by the maximum concentration of complete features, and the periphery is characterized by the weakening of the incomplete intensity of these features. The components of the core are somewhat specialized in implementing the functions of the field. These are mandatory components of the field, which routinely and constantly perform their functions in the field. The boundary between the core and the periphery, as well as between the zones of the field, is not rigid (Bosova, 1997; 31-32). Most researchers confirm that all elements of the field are in various semantic relations, but

note that their nature varies depending on the group of words being studied. However, it is emphasized that the field has a heterogeneous structure as an invariant parameter of the semantic field, that is, the presence of a core and a periphery and the existence of unequal semantic relations between them (Bosova, 1980; 115).

Like any structural system, the field has a certain configuration. That is, there are microsystems within the field that have relative independence, which is manifested in the existence of connections between microsystems both inside and outside the field.

The above-considered properties of the field, that is, the presence of relations between its elements, the structure of the field - the core, the periphery, the lack of rigid boundaries, and other properties, are equally applicable to all field models. At the same time, this or that field model may have additional properties that are inherent only to it. Thus, the semantic field, in addition to the indicated properties, is also characterized by the mutual determination or interchangeability of its elements. V.L. Krivchenko states that words are grouped into semantic fields in the minds of speakers based on thematic proximity or belonging to a single field of logical understanding, based on their referents (Krivchenko, 1973; 100-101).

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Бондарко А.В. К теории поля в грамматике - залог и залоговость // ВЯ №3. - М.: Изд-во АН СССР, - 1972. - с.20-35
2. Босова Л.М. Исследование семантического поля Beautiful: Автореф. дис.... канд. филол. наук. - Л.: 1980. - 23с.
3. Васильев Л.М. Теория семантических полей // ВЯ №5. - М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1971.- С.105-113.
4. Долгих Н.Г. Теория семантического поля на современном этапе развития семасиологии // НДВШ. Филологические науки. - М.: Высшая школа, 1973, №1. - с.89-98.
5. Караулов Ю.Н. На уровне языковой личности/ Между семантикой и гносеологией. -М., 1985. -С.4-30.
6. Козловская, О. Г. Когнитивные и структурно-семантические особенности морской терминологии: Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. - М.: 2006. – 63-77с.
7. Кривченко Е.Л. К понятию "семантическое поле" и методам его изучения // НДВШ. Филологическое науки, №1. - М.: Вышш. шк., 1973. -с.99-103.
8. Золотова Г.А. Коммуникативные аспекты русского синтаксиса. -М.: Наука, 1982.- 368с.
9. Полевые структуры в системе языка. - Воронеж: Изд-во Воронежского ун-та, 1989. - 197с.
10. Уфимцева А. А. Лексическое значение. Принципы семасиологического описания лексики. -М.: Изд-во "Наука", 1986. -240с.
11. Филичева Н.И. Структура словосочетания и семантическое поле // Вестник Моск. гос. ун-та им. М.В. Ломоносова. - №3, 1971. - с.42-52.
12. Щур Г.С. Теория поля в лингвистике. -М.: Изд-во "Наука", 1974. -254с.
13. Geckeler H. Strukturelle Semantik und Wortfeldtheorie. - Muenchen: Fink, 1971.-255s.

14. Ipsen G. Der Alte Orient und die Indogermanen // Festschrift fuer W.Streitberg. - Heidelberg: Winter, 1924. - s.30-45.
15. Lyons J. Semantics. - Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1977. - 371p.
16. Porzig W. Wesenshafte Bedeutungsbeziehungen // Beitrage zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur. - №58. - Berlin, 1934. - s.70-97.
17. Reuning W.K. Joy and Freude, A Comparative Study of the Linguistic Field of Pleasurable Emotions in English and German. - Swarthmore (Pa.), 1941.-14 lp.
18. Rudskoger A. Fair, Foul, Nice, Proper. A Contribution to the Study of Polysemy. - Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1952. - 505p.
19. Trier H.J. Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandnes. Die Geschichte eines sprachlichen Feldes. - Heidelberg: Winter, 1931.- 299s.