

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2024 Issue: 12 Volume: 140

Published: 10.12.2024 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Botir Tajiboyev

Tashkent University of Applied Sciences,
docent, Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Gavhar Str. 1, Tashkent 100149, Uzbekistan

ABOUT FIELD THEORY IN LINGUISTICS

Abstract: The article discusses the concept of field and the issues of studying language as a field. Studying language as a field provides a basis for a deeper study of the relationship between language units and their location in a certain paradigm. According to the language unit, semantic, syntactic, associative, paradigmatic types of fields are listed. The signs and principles that unite language units in the field are commented on, in particular, the existence of a semantic field according to semantic, functional, functional-semantic principles is analyzed based on the views of linguists who have studied field theory. In addition, the article provides information about the microfields that make up fields and expresses the views of Uzbek linguists on this issue.

Key words: field, content field, semantic field, associative field, microfield, principle.

Language: English

Citation: Tajiboyev, B. (2024). About field theory in linguistics. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12 (140), 69-71.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-12-140-11>

Doi:  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2024.12.140.11>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

In World linguistics, the focus has been on the study of different sath units of language in the last century, combined into paradigms based on a common semantic mark. Such complex paradigms, made up of different sath units, were named by the *field* term in linguistics. The study of language as a field made it possible to study the systemality, interaction-relationship between its units.

According to Sh.Iskandarova, "...in linguistics, field theory has entered as a concept of a *content field* ... The emergence of this theory dates back to the 20-30 years of the last century, when it was introduced by V.Gumboldt's doctrine of the "internal form of language" is linked to his re-examination in a new direction. The scientific debate over the quality of the "internal form of language", the main object of long-running linguistic research during this period, became the basis for the birth of this theory¹".

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The theory of combining language units into general fields of content was originally developed by foreign scientists H.Trier, G.Ipsen, V.Porsig promoted in their work. G.Ipsen used the term *semantic field* for the first time in his work. He studied lexical units denoting a metal name of India-European languages, related in shape structure and meaning, by combining them into one common semantic field². H.Trier also noted that words in a given group will have a common semantic mark, and called such a group of words a *semantic field*³.

V.Porsig brought in to linguistics the *syntactic (syntagmatic) field* term. He integrated vocabulary and other syntactic devices into syntactic fields whose specific components can be semantically combined⁴.

It is understood that Linguistics has different views of the concept field. According to Sh.Iskandarova, "H.Trier, as a content field, meant "the field of concepts", "the circle of concepts".

¹ Iskandarova Sh. Til sistemasiga maydon asosida yondashuv // Izdoshlarning ilmiy ijodi. – Farg'ona: "Classic" nashriyoti, 2023. – S. 7-8.

² Ipsen G. Der Alte Orient und die Indogermanen // Festschrift für W.Streitberg. – Heidelberg, 1924. – P. 30-45.

³ Trier H. Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. – Heidelberg, 1931. Bd.1. – Vol.41. – P.100-397.

⁴ Porzig W.W. Wesenhafte Bedeutungsbeziehungen // Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur. 1934. – P. 70-97.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

L.Vaysgerber "a certain part of the content of the language", "a fragment of the content", V.Porsig "the essence connection of meaning", G.Ipsen interprets a group of meaningfully and grammatically connected words in a semantic field manner. A.Yolles, on the other hand, calls it "semantic Fusion" and defines antonymic pairs within its framework. F.Dornzaif and W.Wartburgs see a content field in linguistic vocabulary-separable semantic groups⁵.

Although scientists' views on the content field differ from each other, when studying language units combined into specific fields, they took into account the general semantic mark. In this respect, G.S.Shur considered such a semantic field to be a grouping of linguistic elements according to the general (invariant) sign. In this respect, G.S.Schur considered such a semantic field to be a grouping of linguistic elements according to the general (invariant) sign⁶:

1. The semantic principle - to combine the units of language on the basis of the generality of meaning they represent.

2. The functional principle is to combine language units into groups based on the totality of the tasks they perform.

3. Functional-semantic principle-combining language units into a field based on the generality of meaning and task⁷.

It is understood that their functional nature is also taken into account when combining language units into content fields based on the stated principles.

There are extremely many works aimed at studying the content field in linguistics. In particular, in Uzbek linguistics, the problem of the content field has also been advanced in a number of studies⁸.

But one of the decisive studies that helped the definitive formation of the concept of "field" was L.Vaysgerber's work. L. Vaysgerber believes that language is not as a simple means of spiritual content, perhaps it is necessary to study the world as an intellectual form, in his view, "semasiology should be a doctrine of concepts, not a science of meaning"⁹.

Analysis and results

⁵ Iskandarova Sh. Ko'rsatilgan manba. – S.8.

⁶ Шур Г.С. Теории поля в лингвистике. – М: Наука, 1974. – С.68. (– 255 с.)

⁷ Шур Г.С. Ko'rsatilgan manba. – S.24-25.

⁸ Sobirov A. O'zbek tilining leksik sathini sistemalar sistemasi tamoyili asosida tadqiq etish. – Toshkent, 2004. Abduvaliyev M. To'siqsizlik maydoni va uni tashkil etuvchi sintaktik birliklar // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. 1988. – № 4. –Б.62-66; Iskandarova Sh.M. O'zbek tili leksikasini mazmuniy maydon sifatida o'rganish (shaxs mikromaydoni): Filol. fan. dokt. ... diss. avtoref. – Toshkent, 1999; Nishonova N.R. O'zbek tilida "hayvon" arxisemali leksemalar maydonining mazmuniy tahlili: Filol. fanl. nomz. ... diss. avtoref. – Toshkent, 2000; Hojiyeva H. Y. O'zbek tilida hurmat maydoni va uning lingvistik-nutqiy xususiyatlari: Filol. fan. nomz. ... diss. avtoref. – Samarqand, 2001; Safarov F.S. O'zbek tilida son-miqdor mikromaydoni va uning lingvistik-nutqiy xususiyati: Filol. fan.

In linguistics, "within the framework of a substantive field, both semantic groups of words characteristic of a word category and groups of words with which different word categories have a substantive relationship with each other are included both lexical-grammatical (functional-semantic) fields and paradigms of syntactic constructions associated with transformational relations, as well as certain types of substantive-syntactic syntagms. Despite the fact that there are certain serious differences between them, they can be summarized by the fact that they are based on one or another content categories"¹⁰. Therefore, in linguistics, *lexical-semantic field*, *communicative-thematic field*, *syntactic field* and other types of semantic field are distinguished.

It is known that the lexical-semantic field is considered a union of lexical units that have a general meaning and imply the concept of *subject* matter. The communicative-thematic area, on the other hand, is "a combination of nominative units of a word-subject language, subject to mathematical consideration, at different forces and at different distances"¹¹.

Syntactic field, V.Porzig believes that is a semantic field formed on the basis of the syntactic relation of words¹². The basis of the syntactic field on the syntagmatic relation between words is dominated by the general syntactic character rather than the general semantic character. In this respect, Sh.Iskandarova emphasized consider V.Porzig's conclusion that "it is correct to call the field of lexemes connected by this type of relationship a *syntagmatic field*" is justified¹³.

In linguistics, other types of field are also distinguished. For Example, G.S.Shur saw the following types of field: *morpheme field*, *phoneme field*, *word constructors field*, *lexical field*, *micro and macro field*, *time Field*, *number macro field*, *confirmation field*, *negation field*, *presence field*, *Mile field*, *person field*, *lexical-grammatical field*, *transformational field*, *relational field*, *activity Field*, *State field*, etc¹⁴.

Such aspects as semantic, functional, structural features, what surface units they cover, distinguish these substantive fields, from each other. On the basis

nomz. ... diss. avtoref. – Samarqand, 2004; Voqqosova D.V. O'zbek tilidagi anemonimlarning semantik tahlili: Filol. fan. nomz. ... diss. avtoref. – Farg'ona, 2005.

⁹ Iskandarova Sh. Til sistemasiga maydon asosida yondashuv // Ildoshlarning ilmiy ijodi. – Farg'ona: "Classic" nashriyoti, 2023. – S.9-10.

¹⁰ Iskandarova Sh. . Ko'rsatilgan manba. – S. 15.

¹¹ Мартинович, Г.А. Введение (о некоторых проблемах изучения лексической семантики и лексической системности) // Текст и эксперимент. – СПб., 1993. – С. 23. (– С. 3-44)

¹² Porzig W.W. Wesenhafte Bedeutungsbeziehungen // Beitrage zur Geschichte der deutsche Sprache und Literatur. 1934. – P. 70-97.

¹³ Iskandarova Sh. Ko'rsatilgan manba. – S. 30.

¹⁴ Шур Г.С. Теории поля в лингвистике. – М.: Наука, 1974. – С.19-21.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

of classification, it can be said that units belonging to one line or different levels merge into semantic fields on the basis of a common semantic mark.

Some linguists recommend studying of semantic fields by decomposing them into internal small fields. Sh.Iskandarova puts forward the idea that in the study of Uzbek language units as a functional-semantic field, the language system is divided into different small fields by looking at it in a macrofields fashion. Scientist distinguished in Uzbek such types of small fields as subject, person, tense, space, state, action, attitude, proportion. In his opinion, "the basis of the division into small fields can only be observed within a single word category or within different word categories.

In particular, *white, black, red, green, yellow, pink* lexemes denoting color-tus entered the mark micromaydon as FSM, if the adjective is considered general in the form of a word category, then the units

belonging to the categories of the content of the action of the he *scratched, scratch, scratchy* are included in the order of the components of the micromanagement of movement. However, these words differ in the style of the verb and its functional forms. Whatever, words belonging to the small fields of a person, united by the function of naming a person, can also be observed within different categories, such as noun, adjective in traditional views¹⁵.

Conclusions

Functional-semantic fields decompose into small fields within a line or covering language units belonging to different levels. Well, the content field is the fusion of language units into semantic slots, based on the existence of a common content among field units, their division into small fields associated with one line or different levels.

References:

1. Iskandarova, Sh. (2023). *Til sistemasiga maydon asosida yondashuv. Izdoshlarning ilmiy ijodi.* – (pp.7-8). Farg'ona: "Classic" nashriyoti.
2. Ipsen, G. (1924). *Der Alte Orient und die Indogermanen.* Festschrift fur W.Streitberg, Heidelberg, 1924, pp. 30-45.
3. Trier, H. (1931). *Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes, Heidelberg, 1931. Bd.1. - Vol.41.- pp.100-397.*
4. Porzig, W.W. (1934). *Wesenhafte Bedeutungsbesichungen. Beitrage zur Geschichte der deutsche Sprache und Literatur.* 1934.- pp. 70-97.
5. Shhur, G.S. (1974). *Teorii polja v lingvistike.* (p.68). Moscow: Nauka.
6. Martinovich, G.A. (1993). *Vvedenie (o nekotoryh problemah izuchenija leksicheskoy semantiki i leksicheskoy sistemnosti).* Tekst i jeksperiment.1993, p. 23.
7. Sobirov, A. (2004). *O'zbek tilining leksik sathini sistemalar sistemasi tamoyili asosida tadqiq etish.* (pp.3-44). Toshkent.
8. Abduvaliyev, M. (1988). *To'siqsizlik maydoni va uni tashkil etuvchi sintaktik birliklar. O'zbek tili va adabiyoti.* 1988, № 4, pp.62-66.
9. Iskandarova, Sh.M. (1999). *O'zbek tili leksikasini mazmuniy maydon sifatida o'rganish (shaxs mikromaydoni):* Filol. fan. dokt. . diss. avtoref, Toshkent.
10. Nishonova, N.R. (2000). *O'zbek tilida "hayvon" arxisemali leksemalar maydonining mazmuniy tahlili:* Filol. fanl. nomz. diss. avtoref. (p.156). Toshkent.
11. Hojiyeva, H. Y. (2001). *O'zbek tilida hurmat maydoni va uning lingvistik-nutqiy xususiyatlari:* Filol. fan. nomz. diss. avtoref. (p.145). Samarqand.
12. Safarov, F.S. (2004). *O'zbek tilida son-miqdor mikromaydoni va uning lingvistik-nutqiy xususiyati:* Filol. fan. nomz. diss. avtoref, Samarqand.
13. Voqqosova, D.V. (2005). *O'zbek tilidagi anemonimlarning semantik tahlili:* Filol. fan. nomz. diss. avtoref. Farg'ona.

¹⁵ Iskandarova Sh. *Til sistemasiga maydon asosida yondashuv // Izdoshlarning ilmiy ijodi.* – Farg'ona: "Classic" nashriyoti, 2023. – S.34-35.