



## THE LINGUISTIC STATUS OF THE SEMANTIC FIELD AND LEXICAL-SEMANTIC GROUP

**Tashlanova Nigora Djurayevna**

Lecturer, Tashkent University of Information Technologies named after Muhammad al Khorezmi, 150100, Fergana, Uzbekistan  
E-mail: [nigoratashlanova7@gmail.com](mailto:nigoratashlanova7@gmail.com)

### Abstract

This article discusses the study of a dialect layer of the Russian vocabulary of colour, which refers to historical-lexicological, as well as a dialectal colouration dictionary, considering in terms of composition, structural connections, and dynamics. The traditional lexical study is performed on semantic fields and lexical-semantic groups.

**Keywords:** dialect layer, study of dialect colourative dictionary, dynamics, semantic field, lexical-semantic group, composition, verbal field, colour vocabulary, lexicology, semantic classes.

### Introduction

The study of the dialect layer of the Russian vocabulary of colour is a historical-lexicological one. The dialectal colour vocabulary is considered from the point of view of composition, structural connections, and dynamics. Traditionally, vocabulary is studied using semantic fields (SF) and lexical-semantic groups (LSG). Therefore, it is important to determine the status and place of SF and LSG in lexicology, including history.

As a working definition of SF, we choose the definition of S. V. Kezina, formulated by her following the general theory of systems developed by I. V. Blauberger, E. G. Yudin, L. Bertalanffy: "A semantic field is a set of words that have at least one common seme and are concerning each other in various connections" [Kezina 2008: 32]. Let us formulate the definition of LSG based on the provisions of F. P. Filin. LSG are "lexical associations with homogeneous, comparable meanings", which represent "a specific phenomenon of language, determined by the course of its historical development" [Filin 1957: 538]. The semantic field is larger in scope than the lexical-semantic group. The field includes LSG in its structure.

### Methodology

However, the opinions of scientists regarding the content of the concepts of "semantic field" and "lexical-semantic group" are different. Grouping the vocabulary of a language on various grounds is an issue that began to be discussed in linguistic works from the 19th century, for example, in the works of Academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences M. M. Pokrovsky. He became the first Russian linguist to apply a systematic approach in the field of semantics [Kezina 2008: 16].

The term “semantic field” and the concept of linguistic fields were created by the Austrian philologist G. Ipsen in 1924. The semantic field was described in more detail in the works of the German linguist J. Trier: he studied the conceptual field, which in the language corresponds to the lexical field superimposed on it. J. Trier was the first to use the method of semantic fields to analyze significant factual material. Field theory was also developed by L. Weisgerber, a specialist in German language and general linguistics: he identified it as a system, the law of development of which he considered the law of separating a part from the whole. He paid special attention to word fields and explored the meanings of words [Kuznetsova 1963: 29]. Among domestic scientists, the study of the semantic field was carried out by Yu. N. Karaulov, gave the following definition of the field: “A lexical-semantic field is a group of words of the same language that are quite closely related to each other” [Karaulov 1972: 57].

A more complete definition is L. M. Vasiliev, who believes that semantic fields are considered to be “semantic classes (groups) of words of any one part of speech, and semantically correlative classes (groups) of words of different parts of speech, and lexico-grammatical (functional-semantic) fields, and paradigms of syntactic constructions connected by transformational (derivational) relations, and various types of semantic-syntactic syntagmas” [Vasiliev 1990: 126].

The oldest, clearly structured, and often used for scientific purposes semantic field is the semantic field of colour. Most scientists recognize the totality of colour terms as a semantic field: V. A. Moskovich in his candidate's thesis “The semantic field of colour terms (experience of a typological study of the semantic field)”, V. G. Kulpina in the book “Linguistics of colour: Colour terms in the Polish and Russian languages”, G. K. Toyshibaeva in her candidate's thesis “Colour vocabulary (composition, semantic transformations, functions) in a literary text based on the works of F. M. Dostoevsky.” Researcher of the history of Russian colour terms N.B. Bakhilina calls the association of colour terms a lexical-semantic group [Bakhilina 1975: 4].

We recognize the totality of colour names as a semantic field, and in understanding the lexical-semantic group we follow F.P. Filin, who LSG considers as a fragment of the semantic field. The scientist identified such signs of LSG as openness and dynamism [Filin 1982: 234].

F.P. Filin also proposes to analyze vocabulary into thematic groups that combine words according to extralinguistic characteristics. Thematic groupings in our work were identified following extra-linguistic realities associated with the colour vocabulary under consideration (“Household Items,” “Calendar,” “Food,” etc.)

The theory of LSG was also developed by V. I. Kodukhov. In his lecture “Lexico-semantic groups of words,” he points out the same subject orientation of the words of the group. A. A. Ufimtseva also studied LSG and paid attention to “intralinguistic connections based on interdependent and interrelated elements of meaning” in the structure of LSG [Ufimtseva 1980: 274], however, unlike F. P. Filin, she considers LSG and the semantic field equal in the language system.

Another LSG researcher E.V. Kuznetsova considers the presence of categorical-lexical semes to be the main thing in this grouping [Kuznetsova 1975: 80]. V. I. Suprun claims that each LSG has a common main integrating semantic factor (invariant) [Suprun 1983: 6], which V. G. Gak calls a “categorical archiseme” [Gak 1977: 154], E. V. Kuznetsova - “identifier” [Kuznetsova 1975: 80], etc. Thus, we identify LSG - fragments of the semantic field of colour, the archives of which are words denoting colour tones. We have identified groups of white, blue, yellow, green, brown, red, orange, grey, blue, purple, black and mixed tones.

## Conclusions

So, the thematic group includes words denoting objects related to the topic. A semantic field unites words that have a common meaning. A lexical-semantic group is a fragment of a semantic field.

The semantic field of colour is one of the most actively studied in modern linguistics.

## References

1. Bakhilina N. B. History of colour designation in the Russian language. - M.: “Science”, 1975, 5-45s.
2. Bragina AA Colour definitions and the formation of new meanings of words and phrases // Lexicology and lexicography. M., 1972. S. 73 - 104.
3. Vasilevich A. P. Etymology of colour names as a mirror of national-cultural consciousness / A. P. Vasilevich // Colour names in Indo-European languages: systemic and historical analysis / [rep. ed. A. P. Vasilevich]. - M.: KomKniga, 2007. - P. 9-28.
4. Vasilevich A. P. Colour and colour names in Russian / A. P. Vasilevich, S. N. Kuznetsova, S. S. Mishchenko. - M.: Publishing house LKI, 2011. - 216 p.
5. Vasilevich A.P. study of vocabulary in a psycholinguistic experiment (based on colour designation in languages of different systems) - M.: Nauka, 1987. - 144 p.
6. Vinogradov V.V. Selected works. Lexicology and lexicography - M.: Nauka, 1977. - 312 p.
7. Gak V.G. On the problem of typology in the construction of statements. - In the book: Methods of Comparative Study of modern Romance languages. - M.: Nauka, 1966, p. 144-156.
8. Gak V. G. Experience in applying comparative analysis to the study of the structure of word meaning. - Questions of linguistics, 1966, I 2, 97-105s.
9. Galpern I. R., Koshansky G. V., Slyusareva N. A. On the methods of structural linguistics in the study of the vocabulary of a language // Author's abstract. Philol. nauk., No. 3 P 43-52.
10. Gorodetsky B. Yu. On the problem of semantic typology. M.: Publishing house. Moscow Univ., 1969. 564 S.
11. Galperin I.R., Kolshansky G.V., Slyusareva N.A. On the methods of structural linguistics in the study of the vocabulary of a language // Philol. Sciences. 1962. No. 3. P. 43-52.
12. Galperin I. R. Text as an object of linguistic research. M.: Nauka, 1981. -- 139 P.

13. Gukhman M. M. On the content and tasks of typological research. - In the book: Linguistic typology and oriental languages. Message materials. - M.: Nauka, 1965, -- 281 p.
14. Kashkin V.B. Comparative linguistics // Author's abstract. dis. Ph.D. Philol. Sci. - M., 2012
15. Mikheev AB Psycholinguistic studies of semantic relations (based on colour words). // Author's abstract. dis. Ph.D. Philol. Sci. M., 1983. 17 p.
16. Markov V. M. About the semantic method of word formation. Russian semantic word formation: collection. scientific works. Izhevsk, 1984.
17. Tarkhova, A. B. Semantic derivation based on ethnonyms and toponyms // Current issues of modern science: collection. scientific works: under general ed. S. S. Chernova. Vol. 3. - Novosibirsk: CRNS - Publishing house "SIBPRINT", 2008. - P. 292 - 299.
18. Turevich N. G. Development of colour meanings as part of a non-colour semantic field // Rus. linguistics. Kyiv, 1984. Issue. 9. pp. 53-61.
19. Turevich N. G. Development of colour meanings as part of a non-colour semantic field // Rus. linguistics. Kyiv, 1984. Issue. 9. pp. 53-61.
20. Shcherba L.V. Language system and speech activity. L.: Science; Leningr. department, 1974. 428 p.
21. Ташланова, Н. Д. (2019). Развитие критического мышления студентов в вузах. *Проблемы современной науки и образования*, (11-2 (144)), 63-64.
22. Tashlanova, N. (2021). The essence of collaborative approach in learning a language. *Scientific progress*, 2(8), 281-286.
23. Tadjibaeva, A., & Tashlanova, N. (2020). The collaborative approach in content and language learning. *Теория и практика современной науки*, (6), 31-34.
24. Tashlanova, N. D. (2019). Development of critical thinking of students in universities. *Problems of modern science and education*, (11-2), 144, 22-28.
25. Djuraevna, T. N. (2022). Language Teaching Methodology: Tradition and Modernity. *Central Asian journal of literature, philosophy and culture*, 3(2), 41-51.
26. Qurbonov, N. B., & Tashlanova, N. D. (2021). Derivative opportunities of the uzbek and english languages in the system of figurative place names. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 2(2), 400-408.
27. Ташланова, Н. Д. (2019). Использование опорной технологии в обучении русского языка. *Экономика и социум*, (9), 289-292.
28. Ташланова, Н.Д. (2019). Применение различных видов лекций для развития критического мышления студентов в высших учебных заведениях. *Экономика и социум*, (8), 220-224.
29. Ташланова, Н.Д. (2018). Формирование навыков при выполнении самостоятельных работ студентов в высших учебных заведениях. *Мировая наука*, (4), 238-240.
30. Ташланова, Н.Д. (2018). Эффективное использование современных компьютерных технологий на уроках иностранных языков. *Экономика и социум*, (11), 907-910.

31. Ташланова, Н. Д. (2022). Особенности Методических Приемов Изучения Второго Иностранных Языка. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 3(9), 1-11.
32. Djuraevna, T.N. (2022). Correlation of Didactics, Linguodidactics and Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 12, 7-16.
33. Djuraevna, T.N. (2022). Correlation of Didactics, Linguodidactics and Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 12, 7-16.
34. Tadjibaeva, A., & Tashlanova, N. (2020). The collaborative approach in content and language learning. *Теория и практика современной науки*, (6), 31-34.
35. Ташланова, Н. Д. (2019). Использование опорной технологии в обучении русского языка. *Экономика и социум*, (9), 289-292.
36. Djuraevna, T.N. (2022). Correlation of Didactics, Linguodidactics and Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 12, 7-16.
37. Ташланова, Н.Д. (2018). Эффективное использование игровых технологий в процессе обучения. *Форум молодых ученых*, (4), 1419-1421.
38. Tashlanova, N. Teaching special disciplines with innovative technologies. *Modern scientific challenges and trends*, 11(30), 201-204
39. Курбонов, Н.Б, Ташланова, Н.Д, (2022). Деривационные явления в топонимии в узбекском и английском языках. *Хоразм маъмун академияси ахборотномаси*, 302-305.
40. Н.Д.Ташланова, (2022). Использование дистанционного обучения в системе высшего образования. *Research Focus*, 1(2), 333-339.
41. Djuraevna, T. N. (2023). Methods of Preventing the Interference Phenomena. *European Journal of Pedagogical Initiatives and Educational Practices*, 1(2), 1-5.
42. Tashlanova, N. D. (2023). Innovative Aspects of Teaching Methods. *American journal of social and humanitarian research*, 4 (14), 117-121.