Modern scientific research on semantic field theory

Ismoilova Dilorom

Department of English language, Ferghana State University
E-mail: d.r.ismoilova@mail.ru

Abstract: *Irrefutably, many scientific works are conducted following the principles of structural linguistics. In linguistics, the study of linguistic units by dividing them into different meaningful groups on a thematic basis provides new scientific conclusions to the science. A systematic approach to the area under study during scientific research provides sheer opportunity for the researcher to study in groups and identify similarities and differences of units belonging to the semantic group or field. Field theory is used to investigate the language listem dividing into many microsystems. The article discusses modern research which contributed to the development of the field theory. The author highlights essential theories presented by researchers and analysed their scientific conclusions concerning practical results.*

Key words – *semantic field theory, grammatical field theory, field elements, system linguistics.*

Introduction

The content of field is created through the generality of concepts expressed by linguistic units. Linguistic units united under one general concept are manifested by their belonging to different levels. It is worth stating that the term field was a term in the field of physics before joining the ranks of linguistic terminology. The fact that the field became a term related to linguistics as a result of the integration of sciences. For almost a century, the theory of investigating world languages as a field has been refined and enriched in content. The term field was interpreted variously by representatives of different generations and different linguistic schools. However, we can see that all the classifications given to the field have something in common.

Questions such as what is the adequate definition of the semantic field, whether it is a coincidence in the language or an aspect of the language that requires special study, besides, the effort to analyze the structure and types of the field, and to clarify their characteristics, are being scrutinized in later researches.

Acknowledgements

It should be acknowledged that, the field theory was firstly introduced by German linguists. J. Trir and G. Ipsen made substantial contribution to the development of field theory throughout the world. The various interpretations by linguists such as Weisgerber, Lyons, Porsig and Jolles are undoubtedly a fruitful source for later research. Their theoretical and practical conclusions paved the way for many new studies.

Although Ipsen's field theory was the most productive of the methods used in language research until then, it could only be used at the level of limited vocabulary. Porsig's field theory became a term for describing certain phenomena that occur during the development of the internal structure of the language. It also served as an important tool for understanding the evolutionary processes of language and thought. However, since Porsig's field theory was not used in large-scale studies, it was not considered as a perfect method.

S. Ohman, who pointed out that the content field is one of the urgent issues of linguistics, says that the solution of semantic research problems can be solved by one of the above theories,

depending on their nature. He also adds that new methods and methods in the science of semantics are not yet at the level of completely abandoning the old approaches.

Ohman mainly focused on the study of the same semantic fields in modern languages. For example, he analyzed semantically two lexemes in English and German, belonging to the same language family.

A research was made by Russian linguists to the study of field theory caused various debates in world linguistics. While the tendency to introduce this theory to the lexical level of the language developed in Europe, Russian scientists began to use the term "field" in order to analyze other grammatical constructions of the language. M. Gukhman put forward the theory that the field is made up not only of lexical units, but also of grammatical categories and semantically-functionally common word combinations and called it a grammatical field. Guliga and Shendels used the term "grammatical-lexical field" based on the issues related to the grammatical structure of the language and the coherence and interaction of lexical tools. They focused on the field of plurality in the modern German language. This field is formed by means of plural nouns, adjectives, numerals, quantity pronouns, plural personal pronouns and collective nouns.

The views of the Russian researcher A. Bondarko on the field classification made it possible to rise to a new level in the "reform" of the field theory. He described the field term based on the grammatical structure of the language system. According to him, the grammatical structure can include not only units of the same level, but also lexical units that have a common semantic-functional aspect. Based on this scientific view, Bondarko developed the classification of functional-semantic fields. The functional-semantic field is a system of units belonging to different levels (morphological, syntactic, word-forming, lexical, mixed-lexical-syntactic) that unite on the basis of the commonality and interrelationship of the meaningful tasks of a given language. The main features of this field are the existence of a common semantic function in the constituents forming the field, the interaction of grammatical and lexical tools, the division of the field structure into core and peripheral parts, and the possibility of exchange between this field and other field elements.

Discussions and results

The field theory has been recently investigated by many other linguists in the world. Most of them have provided crucial scientific conclusions in terms of word groups.

In particular, G. Kleparsky's fruitful research in the field of content deserves recognition. Kleparsky's main goal was to analyze the evolutionary development of the "human" lexical field. The uniqueness of this study is that Kleparsky studies human-person space units derived from lexemes belonging to "flora and fauna " lexical fields. In addition, it presents a complete linguistic analysis of the lexical fields of "boy", "girl and woman". His analysis is based on a diachronic method and aims to study the historical evolution of the English synonym pair "girl-woman".

For example, the lexeme *pigeon* in the English language initially had the meaning of a young pigeon in the Middle Ages, but later it began to mean a girl, a woman. This lexeme, used metaphorically, began to be used in the beginning of the 16th century, along with the adjectives pretty (charming), young (young) and fair (fair). The metaphorical use of the lexeme dove (pigeon) is also reflected in this scientific work of Kleparsky. More precisely, the application of this lexeme to women of what age, appearance and nature is schematically described. The scheme shows that the word dove is used for young, elegant and fair women and girls.

Rusinek, a researcher who conducted scientific work on the semantic field of "alcoholic beverages" using Kleparsky's method, analyzed how semantic changes affect the field. For example, in order to prove the semantic development of the lexeme *moonshine*, he argued that this lexeme belongs to different lexical fields. Etymologically, this word, originating from the German language,

during its semantic development was a unit related to lexical fields such as natural phenomena, food, mental activity, and alcoholic beverages. The lexeme of moonshine, which was recorded for the first time only at the end of the Middle Ages, in the early period of its historical development, is formed on the basis of the literal translation of the parts that make up the compound word, used together as moonlight and belong to the lexical field of natural phenomena. This is synonymous with the lexeme moonlight and justifies that it is located in the same semantic field. It is from this period that the lexeme moonlight also has the meaning of a stupid idea, an idea not worth talking about, and naturally, with this meaning, it also occupied a place in the field of intellectual activity. The most interesting part of the etymology of this lexeme is its use as a type of alcoholic drink. In those times, people secretly prepared alcohol in an illegal way, in the dark of night. Thus, the name of this drink is moonlight, that is, it is made in the light of the moon. And finally, the next meaning of the lexeme under discussion is a type of food made from eggs, which is semantically connected to the content field of food. Bearing in mind that the lexical level of the language system is always changing, we tried to determine the changes in the semantic structure of the lexeme analyzed above. According to it, we found out that the word moonlight is in circulation in the international network in another new sense:

Bob never moonlights, he is loyal to his profession.

In this case, this lexeme expresses the meaning of doing some additional work besides the main workplace and hiding this activity from the manager. It can be concluded that the lexeme moonlight with this sema cannot belong to any of the above semantic fields.

 The effective results of studying changes in the semantic structure of different languages on a thematic basis led to an increase in the number of scientific works devoted to the search for points of connection of two or more semantic fields by researchers at the next stages. In this regard, Rusinek himself is a great initiator. Because thanks to his efforts, the intersections of the person, the human field and the members of the two types of fields on the paths of semantic development were made known to the people of s

This Polish researcher first turned to the semantic field of "clothes" and studied all the units belonging to this field, distinguishing among them those that later expressed human content. Later, Rusinek took up an even more interesting scientific topic. He carefully analyzed the bilateral changes in the semantic fields of "cakes" and "people" in English and Polish. As a result, a list of lexemes that belonged to the field of "cakes" and became a representative of the field of people in the semantic evolution, and whose primary meaning refers to the field of people and later merged into the field of "cakes", was formed. For example, the English word Florentine has the primary meaning of living in Florence, Florentine. Due to semantic changes, this word is now considered a type of cake. At the same time, we can see that there are names of sweets with the names of famous statesmen and inventors who have left a mark in history. They are garibaldi, Napoleon, frangipane. Frangipani is an Italian inventor who invented an almond-scented perfume in the 13th century, hence the name of almond-flavored creams used in confectionery.

Etymologically, we can show a number of words that have entered the human lexical field as a result of the metaphorical use of lexemes with the meaning of cake in the English language. They have become lexemes describing human nature in a series of meaningful changes: cake (a traditional round cake) - a stupid and stupid person; cookie (flat, small cake) - a beautiful and elegant woman; and sponge (a very light cake) has new content, such as a person who lives at the expense of others. As a result of Rusinek's study of the stages of semantic change related to the lexeme of tart, we can observe that although this lexeme belongs to the semantic field of tart for years, it has undergone various meaningful changes in this field itself. This word, which first entered the English language

in the 15th century, was used in human speech in the sense of "a round cake or bread". Later, it was observed that it was used in the sense of "a pie filled with meat, cheese and vegetables". In the 19th century, as a result of the development of the tendency to liken people to the names of sweets, the lexeme tart also acquired the meaning "beloved girl, woman".

Another work that analyzed the intersection points in the semantic evolution of the content of the person, human content field and other field members was written by R. Keltika, according to which, during the semantic development of the elements of the lexical field of pets, they become elements of the person, human lexical field. issues are justified linguistically.

"The vocabulary layer of the language is not a product of individual words, but a system of interconnected lexical networks. Semantic field theory is also called lexical field theory. Crystal uses semantic fields such as transportation, color, and body parts as examples to prove her point. He presents two types of contexts, emphasizing the need to take into account the context in which the lexeme is located before dividing lexemes into certain semantic fields:

I was being treated in the hospital last week.

In this context, the lexeme hospital belongs to the semantic field of "health".

The hospital needs a new roof.

In the second example, the lexeme hospital is considered a unit related to the semantic field of the "building".

The theories presented by Chinese researchers and the practical results achieved by them occupy an important place in the research conducted in the field of semantics in recent years.

In particular, Y. Zhou is a supporter of studying semantics through the field theory based on interrelatedness and the relationship of language units to each other. Zhou interprets the theory of the field in this way: "Semantic field is a collection of several words, called the lexical field, which are interconnected in terms of content and united under a single concept." These words can be interpreted in two ways. From one point of view, it can be expressed by the single concept in the definition - superordinate (general, superior concept). In this case, the rest of the semantic field consists of hyponyms. For example, hyponyms such as spoon, ladle, sieve, knife, gas stove are united under the concept of "kitchen".

Conclusions

Studies based on the content area not only reveal the relationship between the elements that make up this area, but also show that the vocabulary of each language is a unique system with its own distinctive aspects.

In conclusion, if we consider some aspects of the research works abovementioned, we are sure that the content field has a complex nature.

References

1. Chjou Y. A new research on English semantic field. Shandong foreign languages journal. 2001. –P 21-23
2. Crystal D. An encyclopedic dictionary of language and languages. –Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993. – P 347
3. Gao Ch. The application of semantic field theory to English vocabulary learning. Theory and practice in language studies, 2013. –P 2030-2035
4. Kieltyka R.Zoosemic terms denoting female human beings: semantic derogation of women revisited. Studia Anglica Posnaniensia, 2005. –P 167-186
5. Kleparskiy G.A. Theory and practice of historical semantics: the case of Middle English synonyms of girl/young woman. –Lublin, 1997

6. Abbasova, N. K. (2020). O'ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDA OLMOSHLARNING QIYOSIY TAHLILI. In *МОЛОДОЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬ: ВЫЗОВЫ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ* (pp. 472-476).

7. Hoshimova, N. A. (2020). Ingliz va o'zbek tillarining funktsional uslublari. *Молодой ученый*, (19), 584-585.

8. Muzaffarovna, A. N., & Qizi, A. S. T. (2020). Characteristic features of word formation of a newspaper article in English and Uzbek languages. *Проблемы современной науки и образования*, (2 (147)), 41-43.

9. Ortiqov, R. (2022, June). STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTICAL FEATURES AND DIFFERENCES OF ORAL AND WRITTEN SPEECH. In *INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES ON LEARNING AND TEACHING* (Vol. 1, No. 9, pp. 438-442).

10. Abdumalik o'g'li, O. R. (2021). THE BRIEF INVESTIGATION OF CONTEMPORARY SPEECH STYLES OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 9(12), 1280-1283.

11. BO, I. T. N. O. R., & TAVSIYALAR, Y. A. M. R. Ortiqov–Farg 'ona davlat universiteti o 'qituvchisi. *FARG 'ONA DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI*, 128.

12. Abdumalik o'g'li, O. R. Cultural Comparison of Uzbek and English Language Speech Styles.

13. Mirzayeva, D. (2019). PROVERB AS A KIND OF PAREMIOLOGICAL FUND AND AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC AND METHODOLOGICAL RESEARCH. *Мировая наука*, (11), 33-36.

14. Mirzaeva, D. (2021). THE ROLE OF PAREMIA IN THE SYSTEM OF NATIONAL CULTURAL HERITAGE. *Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики*, 2(3).

15. Mirzayeva, D. (2021). PROVERBS AND SAYINGS AS A PRODUCT OF THE NATION'S COGNITIVE THINKING. In *Multidiscipline Proceedings of Digital Fashion Conference* (Vol. 1, No. 2). Ismoilova, S., & Xalilova, G. (2022). RESEARCH ON THE ISSUE OF QUESTIONS IN LINGUISTICS. *Development and innovations in science*, 1(1), 17-19.

16. Ganieva, M. S. (2021). Socio-philosophical aspects of the study of the issue of gender and entrepreneurial woman in a new society. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research*, 10(12), 441-445.

17. Ganieva, M. S. (2021). IN THE SOCIETY OF WOMEN–GIRLS INNOVATION-THE SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL ESSENCE OF ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY. *Scientific progress*, 2(8), 947-951.

18. Ганиев, Б. С., & Ганиева, М. С. (2020). Семья как важный социальный фактор формирования предпринимательских навыков у молодежи (Опыт Узбекистана). In *Проблемы социальной психологии и социальной работы* (pp. 25-27).

19. ГАНИЕВ, Б., & Ганиева, М. С. (2019). Религиозно-исламские и духовные корни предпринимательской деятельности в Средней Азии. In *ИДЕАЛЫ И ЦЕННОСТИ ИСЛАМА В ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОМ ПРОСТРАНСТВЕ XXI ВЕКА* (pp. 332-335).