

Formation of Fiber Length in High-Generation Hybrids Obtained Through Ecological-Geographical Long-Term Hybrids

Хайдаров М. Р.

Бухарский государственный педагогический институт
Преподаватель кафедры узбекского и русского языков
Haydarov0101@gmail.com

Abstract:

This article discusses various approaches to the concept of semantic field in linguistics.

Keywords: lexical field, connotation, concept, hyperonym, hyponym.

Introduction

In linguistics, the term "semantic field" is most commonly used. It refers us to a set of linguistic units that are united by a certain commonality of a semantic property that is not reducible to the surface level. Initially, words acted as such units, but with the development of linguistic science, the range of elements included in the semantic field expanded to include phrases and sentences [2].

The semantic field can be clearly demonstrated by the example of the color notation field. It includes various color schemes, such as shades from red to crimson or from blue to turquoise, united by a common semantic component - the concept of color.

The semantic field has a number of key characteristics. First of all, it is intuitively recognized by native speakers, representing a psychological reality for them. In addition, the semantic field has autonomy, it can be singled out as an independent subsystem of the language. The third important point is that the elements of the semantic field form a system due to special semantic connections between them. In addition, each semantic field is connected to the others, and together they make up a language system [3].

The theory of semantic fields is based on the idea of the presence of specific semantic groups in a language. It is assumed that language units may be part of one or more of these groups. Thus, the lexical composition of a language can be represented by a set of separate word groups that are connected to each other by various types of relations, such as synonymy or antonymy. The concept of representing vocabulary as a set of numerous independent word systems was discussed as early as the nineteenth century, including the works of M.M. Pokrovsky. The first attempts to define semantic fields were made in the creation of ideographic dictionaries or thesauri, for example, in the works of P. Roger. However, the term "semantic field" began to be actively used after the publication of the works of J. S. Smith, Trier and G. Ipsen. It is important to understand that such a representation of the lexical system serves as a linguistic hypothesis rather than an indisputable fact, so it is often used as a methodology for language



research rather than as its final result [5]. Concepts that are part of a separate semantic sector are connected by means of ordered, systemic relations, which allows them to contrast with each other. Semantic sectors can have intersections or be completely nested within each other. A deep understanding of the meaning of a word is only possible if you know the meaning of other words in the same area.

Let's look at an illustration of this concept using the example of two color gradations: the transition from red to pink and the extended gradation, which includes an additional transition to a pinkish shade. Within the framework of the first gradation, the variety of color tones can be summed up in one term - "pink". While the second gradation offers a more subtle delineation of shades, defining them as "pink" and "pinkish". It should be noted that an ordinary language unit can have many interpretations and, therefore, belong to different semantic fields [6]. For example, the adjective "red" may be included in a semantic field describing colors, at the same time it may be included in another field where its meaning is extended to "revolutionary."

The semantic attribute that forms the basis of the semantic field can be considered as a concept that can be used to describe the reality around a person and his personal experience to a certain extent. This view of the semantic attribute does not contradict the fact that the semantic field is perceived by native speakers as an independent associative complex associated with a particular aspect of human experience and therefore possessing a psychological reality. Scientists such as J. Trier, A.V. Bondarko, I.I. Meshchaninov, L.M. Vasiliev and I.M. Kobozeva point out the absence of a rigid opposition between semantic and conceptual concepts in their works. The paradigmatic type of semantic field refers to a situation where the field units are lexemes of the same part of speech connected by a common semantic categorical feature. Such fields are often characterized as semantic classes or lexical-semantic groups [8]. Scholars, including I.M. Kobozeva, L.M. Vasiliev and others, focus on the fact that the connections between the elements of a particular semantic field can change depending on the degree of their uniqueness and simplicity. Among the most common types of connections are connections of the paradigmatic type, which include antonymic, synonymous, genus-specific connections, etc. Let us concentrate on such a set of words as "tree", "branch", "trunk", "leaf", etc. These words are able to form an autonomous semantic field, which is based on the concept of "part - whole". However, these same words can be included in the broader semantic field associated with the concept of vegetation. In this context, "tree" functions as a hyperonym, which refers to various lexemes, for example, "oak", "birch", "palm", etc. This includes words such as "to speak", "to communicate", "to chatter", "to scold", "to criticize", "to mock", "to mock", etc. The minimal semantic field of the paradigmatic type can be described as a group of synonymous verbs of speech. Such a field includes words such as "to speak", "to tell", "to chatter", etc. Despite the common essence of "speaking", the meanings of these words vary. Units of a given semantic field differ in differential features, for example, "mutual communication" (conversation) or "one-way communication" (message). They also differ in stylistic, habitual, word-formation, and connotative aspects of meaning. For example, the verb "to scold", in addition to the same "speaking", carries an additional connotative meaning with negative expression.



A common semantic feature that unites elements of one semantic field can play the role of a differential one in other semantic fields of the same language. For example, the semantic field "verbs of communication" may contain a field of verbs of speech, as well as lexemes such as "telegraph", "write" and others that play the role of differentiation. In order to define and describe semantic fields, the methods of component analysis and associative experiments are often used. Groups of words that are formed in the process of associative experiments are called associative fields.

In scientific linguistics, one can observe a tendency to replace the general term "semantic field" with more specific definitions, such as "lexical field", "a number of synonyms" or "lexical-semantic field". This makes it possible to more accurately characterize the language units related within the same field and their relationships. However, in many studies, the "semantic field" and narrower definitions are used interchangeably.

A number of linguists, including F.P. Filina, S.D. Katsnelson, A.A. Ufimtseva, Y.N. Karaulova, M.S. Rotova, L.M. Vasilyeva and N.G. Dolgo, apply an approach based on the field concept in their research. In the course of the analysis, they identify a number of lexical microsystems, including a lexical-semantic field, a lexical-semantic group, a number of synonyms, a group of antonyms, a thematic group, and an associative field [6]. For example, F.P. Filina uses the concept of "lexical-semantic groups" to describe verbal semantic fields. He sees these groups as lexical associations with homogeneous and comparable meanings, which are unique phenomena in the language due to its historical development.

Consideration of the contribution of eminent scholars such as Potebnaya, Pokrovsky, Meyer, Sperber, and Ipsen to the study of semantic relationships between language elements is, of course, the subject of a separate scientific analysis. They laid the foundations for the identification of general laws for the formation of semantic connections and created the basis for the classification of various semantic fields.

Professor R. Meyer, in particular, investigated three categories of semantic fields:

1. Natural, which combines such concepts as the names of flora and fauna, the human body, various perceptions, etc.
2. Artificial, where terms related to military ranks, mechanical devices, etc. are reflected.
3. Semi-artificial, which includes specialized hunting and fishing terms, ethical concepts, and so on.

Meyer brought a unique understanding of the phrase "semantic class" by presenting it as a systematized set of expressions viewed from a special, unique perspective. He focused on a certain semantic attribute that acts as a distinguishing factor. In the context of semasiology, Meyer saw his main task in determining the belonging of each word to a certain system, as well as in identifying the system-forming, differentiating factor of this system [3].

A key figure in the subsequent development of the study of vocabulary from the standpoint of semantic fields was J. S. Smith. Separator. The term "semantic field", which he actively used, was first introduced in the works of G. Ipsen. Trier defined a semantic field as a group of words with coinciding meanings. The hypotheses proposed by Trier have deep resonance with W. Humboldt's theory of the internal form of language and Ferdinand de Saussure's doctrine of linguistic meaning. J. Trier based his concepts on the notion of the synchronous state of



language as an autonomous, stable structure that defines the essence of each of its components. Accordingly, he argued that individual words could not have an autonomous meaning. Instead, the meaning of each word is shaped largely by its relationship to the words around it. Trier made a clear distinction between "lexical" and "conceptual" fields, making both terms often used in linguistics. In Trier's conception, the field is made up of elementary units, such as concepts and words. In this regard, the elements of the language field completely overlap the area of the corresponding conceptual field [5]. In this way, Trier proposed a complete parallelism between conceptual and linguistic fields.

REFERENCES

1. Ashukin N. S. Krylatye slova [Winged words]. - Moscow, Vysshaya shkola Publ., 1960.
2. Aleynikova T.V. Phraseological units with components of anthroponyms in the modern Russian language. Moscow, 2002.
3. Arutyunova N. D. Yazyk i mir cheloveka [Language and the world of man]. Moscow, 1999.
4. Babkin A. M. Russian Phraseology, Its Development and Sources. - Leningrad, Prosveshchenie Publ., 1970.
5. Boldyrev N.N. Cognitive Semantics. - Tambov, 2000.
6. Vezhbitskaya A. Yazyk. Culture. Poznanie.- M., 1996
7. Volina V.V. Vesyolaya grammatika. Moscow, 1995.
8. Gavrilova, E.D. Kognitivnye osnovy formirovaniya evaluatsionnogo smysla v yazyke [Cognitive foundations of the formation of evaluative meaning in language]. - Tambov, 2010.
9. Golub I. B. Stylistics of the Modern Russian Language.- Moscow, Vysshaya shkola Publ., 1986.
10. E.S. Erabchikova, "Computer Animation as a Means of Studying the Phraseology of the Language," Narodnaya asveta, No. 7, 2006.
11. Niyazova, M. (2021). Inglizvao`zbeklardato`ymarosimiqlqishi. CENTRE FOR SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS (buxdu. Uz), 2(2).extracted from http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/1091
12. Khayatovna, N. M. UDC: 82-91 (= 512.133= 111): 177.7 INTERPRETATION OF BLESSINGS IN THE GENRES OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH FOLKLORE. SCIENTIFIC REPORTS OF BUKHARA STATE UNIVERSITY, 211.
13. Khayatovna, NiyazovaMokhichekhra. "UDC: 82-91 (= 512.133= 111): 177.7 INTERPRETATION OF BLESSINGS IN THE GENRES OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH FOLKLORE." SCIENTIFIC REPORTS OF BUKHARA STATE UNIVERSITY: 211.
14. Khayatovna, N. M. UDC: 398.93 ENGLISH AND UZBEK BLESSINGS WHICH FORMED BY THE BELIEF OF MAGIC WORDS. SCIENTIFIC REPORTS OF BUKHARA STATE UNIVERSITY, 72.
15. Niyazova, M. K., &Temirova, M. (2023). Semantic analysis of old english phraseological units. Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research, 12(3), 35-39.
16. Niyazova, M. K., &Subxonova, N. M. (2023). A Critical Study of Crusoe's Mind and Character. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching, 20, 105-110.



17. Kodirov A. LINGUISTIC AND COGNITIVE REPRESENTATION OF THE CONCEPT "HOPE" IN RUSSIAN //International Bulletin of Engineering and Technology. – 2023. – T. 3. – №. 5. – C. 106-108.
18. Khayatovna, N. M. (2022). Commonalities of English and Uzbek blessings. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(5), 406-410.
19. Niyazova, M. K., & Subxonova, N. M. (2023). A Critical Study of Crusoe's Mind and Character. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 20, 105-110.
20. Niyazova, M. K. (2019). ILLUSTRATION OF FRUITS AND VEGETABLES IN THE PUZZLES OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERATURE. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (11), 545-549.
21. Niyazova, M. (2020). The origin of word folklore and blessings in English literature. *Center for Scientific Publications (Buxdu. Uz)*, 2(2).

