

THE CONCEPT OF SEMANTIC FIELD IN LINGUISTICS

I.M. Ataboyev*; F.R. Turgunova**

*Teacher,

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute,

Jizzakh, UZBEKISTAN

Email id: ataboev.m@gamil.com

**Teacher,

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute,

Jizzakh, UZBEKISTAN

DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2022.00223.3**

ABSTRACT

The article considers the generality, the similarity between the elements that make up the semantic field. The words on this basis are combined into a lexico-semantic. In this respect, they differ fundamentally from groups. In our article, ideological dictionaries are a fundamental source for studying the meaning and content of words, their semantic field.

KEYWORDS: *Syntagmatic Attitude, Associative Attitude, Syntagma, Phraseologist, Dominant, Ideological, Idealistic Obstacle.*

INTRODUCTION

Ferdinand de Saussure had shown the existence of paradigmatic and syntagmatic types of relationships and drew linguists' attention to the opening up of relationships between linguistic units. The Saussure thus creates clear conclusions in determining the notion of value and the systemic nature of language. In his opinion, everything in a certain language epoch is based on relationships. The sum of a stable relationship is the language and determines its functionality. Therefore, each member of the system is determined by its syntagmatic and associative relationship with other members. The nature of the relationship is divided into two groups:

a) syntagmatic setting;

b) Associative attitude

These two attitudes correspond to the two forms of our mental activity. If the syntagmatic relation is based on the axial succession of the members of two or more relations and is praesentia, then the associative relation unites the members of such relations into a virtual, mnemonic series whose members are always absent. The word interacts in the speech process and enters into a sequential relationship. The feature of the row does not allow the pronunciation of two elements at the same time. These elements are chosen from the voice stream one and the other back. Such a connection with such a line F.de counts as a syntagma according to the Saussure. [1]

The syntax always consists of the interaction of at least two consecutive units. The members of the Syntagma will have a certain value according to the units that either came after him before him or contradicted both.

Since the syntagma is formed as a result of the free association of two or more entities, some authors argue that the syntagmatic relationship is inherent in language. Still, F.de the Sussyur shows that he is a genius both linguistically and linguistically. In his opinion, although the typical appearance of syntax is a sentence, one should not conclude that syntax is inherent only in the language since such a sentence is inherent in language.

A characteristic language sign is the free exchange of elements. It follows that the approach to syntagma indicates that some syntactic devices integrated into syntagma have the property of stability. For example, proverbs, phraseologies, etc. Such expressions are not formed in the process of speaking but are traditionally brought to speech. It also states that all rule-based syntagmas should also be in speech, not in speech.

Because there will be ready-made samples of such devices in the language. You can express the same opinion about combinations and sentences formed based on certain templates. Such templates will be pre-existing in the speaker's memory. Besides the fact that the word enters into a syntagmatic relationship, it is associated with other words outside the speech process in the memory of the colloquial language according to the sign of the community and forms certain groups in the memory of these associative units.

And between the units of the group, there will be different relationships. For example, in the Uzbek language when we say the word "ishla" comes to our subconscious imagination, on the one hand, a group of words like a word, tuzla, muzla, on the other hand, a group of words like a worker, unemployed, working. It is emphasized that such a relationship of linguistic units is radically different from the syntagmatic relationship shown above.

This attitude is not based on order, unlike the syntagmatic attitude. Perhaps, in his memory, the speaker is in an interconnected state. Associative groups that form in our minds are not limited to the rapprochement of members of a relationship with a certain common sign. Awareness also includes the character of connecting the members of the relationship in every relationship. The more associative the rows are, the more different the relationship. For example, a group of words united based on self-sufficiency, a group of words united based on sufficiency.

In addition, the assignment can only take place based on the similarity expressed or only based on the general validity of acoustic images. The assignment can be made either in terms of content and form, only formally, or only in terms of content. Every word that can be associated with itself is always remembered.

If we have any idea of the order and interchange of elements in a syntagmatic relationship, then the exact set and exact order of the members of the associative group cannot exist in our memory. Each member of the associative group can be recognized as a base point that intersects all members without other boundaries. The pros, the first is always present and the second maybe not so often. For example, the range of word changes is limited, the number of compromises is certain, but the range of their placement in the paradigm is at the discretion of the researcher. So the layout of the position of the members of the paradigm is sub-, random. It can be in either this order or that order.

Divided into small groups, which are carried out according to the circle of lexical-semantic groups, this is the division of words into thematic groups. This type of division into small groups occurs in words that are close to each other in relation to a specific sphere, direction, topic. For example, the names of limbs of the human body, words expressing the concept of color, words related to the western sphere, etc. This type of division into groups is manifested not only on a linguistic level but also on a non-linguistic level. And this indicates that there is a connection between the connection, generality, that is, a certain sphere in the direction of which words with generality are grouped in the matter.

Words belonging to such groups are completely different from the group of synonyms. Synonyms, i.e. words that have the same meaning or are close together, are collected in the synonym group. And in the group of words collected within the framework of a specific topic, words on a common topic are concentrated in one sphere, directions. In thematic groups, synonyms can exist as both antonyms and homonyms. For example, if we take a group of words denoting color, then in it the words denoting different colors are concentrated into one group. Words denoting color have always been the focus of linguists' attention and have given rise to several disputes. Because these generic words paved the way for the scientific research of significant lexical issues. One of the most fundamental of these is the link between language and connection and the problem of systematics or non-relativity of words. Hundreds of scientific papers have been written on this. V.A.Moskovich describes this microsystem in English in a systematic thematic way. They cover the whole spectrum. The remaining words indicating the color are colors that complement the secondary colors, i.e. the four colors. To make things clearer, these four basic words denoting color are the dominants of the synonym series. For example, if we take the word red as dominant, then the first-level synonyms that come after it in the synonym line are scarlet, orange, crimson, pink; and the second-level synonyms are vermilion, burgundy, cherry, coral, coppery, etc. The dominant noun differs from the first- and second-order words in its row not only in terms of semantics but also in its other features. [2].

Application-level;

Motivation ;

Single or joint characteristic;

Stylistic painting;

Force level. These characteristics are as follows:

Basic terms, for example, XS The first thousand words, in Eaton's book "Semantic frequency list", include many applied words; in the modern English language, their motivation is lost. All are the main words that exist in this. The motivation for additional words in the set of words that denote color is obvious. For example, orange comes from the name of the fruit, rose from the name of the flower, etc. The noun and the following first-degree words are called the predicate or predicate words. And the second-level words are derived or compound words - coppery red, jade green, sky-colored, etc.

Stylistically, the most important dominant word is the neuter (neuter) word, the first-level word that comes after it is the lyrical word. The meaning of the words denoting the four primary colors

mentioned above is incredibly broad. Breaking them down into tiny systems also narrows and clarifies meaning. [3]

The thematic groups or ideological groups are studied diachronically according to the principles of comparative typology. The author calls the group that he formed a group and proposes to study it to open the dictionary-based system. The author discovers four different liaisons in the framework of the lexical.

Following his comparative analysis of the semantics of the words land, ground, middanzeard, the general features are brought out in a concise and clear form. A charismatic feature of the concept serves to simultaneously combine into equivalent lexical elements and differ depending on other units. Thus all semantic variants of the word land are attached to the meaning of "the feature that characterizes extension in space", the rest (grund, eorpe, middan-zeardjorde, molde) in words are different from the same property [4].

All elements of lexical-semantic groups are kept in the same word categories and within the boundaries of the same lexical-semantic group. If the semantic meaning is not taken into account, then the ideological group is taken into account. Dividing into ideological groups, classifying words, is a separate part of the NNG. Bunda words and phrases are divided into groups not according to their lexical-grammatical meaning, but according to their meaning, significance, meaning system. These subgroups include nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs together, and all of these word categories are concentrated in one concept.

V.I. Agamdjanova is connected with the concept of light, which makes it possible to see the lateral perimeter light(n), Bright (a), shine(v.) and so on under a group of words. This approach is similar to semantic field theory, but much more accurate and concise since the author establishes the exact linguistic criteria depending on which group the word belongs to. The equivalence of the word, in this case, is reflected in its valence [5]. The theory of the semantic field has hitherto occupied the attention of linguists. Many articles and comprehensive monographs have been written and are now being written about it.

The level of vocabulary that forms an independent lexical area is determined by the word ARMY, which stands next to one word, according to the concept of the linguistic field of Jost Trier. The semantic field of units limits one to the other and covers the whole area. Huddi calls this field Jost Trier linguistic, consular, or lexical field. The definition he gave (S. Ulmann translation) is as follows: "fields (fields) is a linguistic phenomenon that exists between a word or a whole dictionary. They are part of a whole or part of similar words that are attached to a larger unit, and they are divided into smaller groups among themselves in the dictionary." After the book of the trio, scientific research in this regard was continued and several different definitions were given to this concept. For Example, V. Porsig, G. Ipsen, and other authors have described the conceptions given a little narrowly. Ipsen studied the names of metals in the Indo-European language and found that there is a connection between them and the qualities that represent color. V. Porsig focused on the consensus connection: dog-bark, blind-see, see-eye. A. And Jolles learned a couple that was worthy and suitable for one another. The main drawback of the Triad in these studies is its idealistic methodology.

His language believes that it is a super individual cultural product that shapes our idea and our knowledge of the whole world. His idea of the influence of language on thinking and the existing

"universe in the interval", which stands between a man and the universe, is completely variable. Except for idealistic barriers, The Theory Of The Triad can produce results that, if improved, are widely used in modern semantics. At this place A.Eat it. We must mention the thorough and accurate statistical scientific work of Shaykevich. Groups are concentrated without paying attention to their meaning on an official basis, and their elements have proved that words are related in semantic terms. For example, faint, feeble, worn, sick, tedious, and the whole formed a group "healthy". The words Thin, thick, subtle also come side by side and serve as the basis of the semantic equivalent.

The syntactic approach to the issue of the semantic field was initiated by the Moscow structuralist group. In their opinion, the exact syntactic feature of the word is its meaning. No, it's not. Apresyan [6] proposed to carry out a text analysis that included a list of words (phrases) on the role of location in the language to be revealed through syntactic analysis. At this place A.Eat it. We must mention the thorough and accurate statistical scientific work of Shaykevich. Groups are concentrated without paying attention to their meaning on an official basis, and their elements have proved that words are related in semantic terms. For example, faint, feeble, worn, sick, tedious, and the whole formed a group "healthy". The words Thin, thick, subtle also come side by side and serve as the basis of the semantic equivalent. [7]

The syntactic approach to the issue of the semantic field was initiated by the Moscow structuralist group. In their opinion, the exact syntactic feature of the word is its meaning. No, it's not. Apresyan [8] proposed to carry out a text analysis that included a list of words (phrases) on the role of location in the language to be revealed through syntactic analysis. By the location of the bunda, the number is indicated by the degree of application of each word and the placement of the meaning that will be present in each word. The semantic field can be described as the basis of the tension potential of word composition. The relationship between the degree of application of words by place and the number of word meanings after discovery, Yu.D.Apresian proposed to structure the field hierarchy of meaningful words, paying attention to the increasing role of word use. [9]

The semantic field will exist in the terminological system. Terminology is the main part of any language dictionary. At the same time, this is a rapidly developing part of speech, that is, the section where messages pass each pause. Linguistic terminology consists of many types of terminology. [10] A word or group of words denoting the names of concepts denoting the characteristics of a particular sphere, for example, industry, culture, religion, etc. we call terms. A group of words denoting concepts related to a certain area forms the semantic field of words related to that area. [11]

REFERENCES

1. de Sossyur F. common language-the course of gardenness. 1916.
2. Moskovich A. Statistics I semantics. Nauke, 1969.
3. Helen S. Eaton Semantic frequency list for English, French, German, and Spanish; 1940.
4. Ufimseva AA. Theories of the "semantic field" And the possibilities of their application in the study of the vocabulary of the language. Questions of the theory of language in modern foreign linguistics. Moscow, 1961. pp. 30-68.

5. Agamdzhanova VI. Syntagmatic conditioning of lexical semantics. Riga: Leningrad State University, 1980.
6. Apresyan YuD. Lexical semantics. Synonymous means of language. 1974. 367p.
7. Baskakov N. The A. Historical and typological phonology of Turkic languages. 1988. pp.111-112.
8. Oll SS. Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meamng. Oxford. 1983. 365p.
9. Rustamov I. The concept of linguistic yin in a literary text. JSPI Scientific Publications Archive, 2020;1(96).
10. Rustamov I. Classification of comic texts of a small genre in the Uzbek and English linguoculture. JSPI Scientific Publications Archive, 2020;1(96).
11. Rustamov I. Different Permanent Associations That Express Public Life in English and the Problems of Translating Them into Uzbek Language. JSPI Scientific Publications Archive, 2020;1(96).