

*Sobirova Shakhzoda Fakhriddin qizi*  
*Teacher of the University of Economics and Pedagogy*

## THE CONCEPT OF FIELD IN LINGUISTICS AND ITS ANALYSIS

**Abstract.** In this article, opinions were expressed about field theory and its lexical-semantic scope in linguistics.

**Key words:** semantics, field, sememe, word, linguistics, teaching

The main task of semantics is to combine words with meanings. Such words usually form one lexical-semantic group. In particular, words denoting color, words denoting time, action - state have a separate semantic field.

The understanding of the field in linguistics as a set of lexical units with a common sememe, united by one archiseme, began in the 11th and 10th centuries, in particular, with the researches of M.M. Pokrovsky. A. Ufimseva explained the theory of the semantic field and its possibilities in the analysis of vocabulary content. B. Yoldoshev, who expressed a special opinion on the field theory, emphasizes that by the 19th century, under the influence of the field theory in physics, the theoretical interpretation of the concept of field also appeared in linguistics, and in linguistics it was mainly realized as a meaningful field. Initially, field theory was studied at the lexical level of the language and served for the creation of thesauruses and the practice of ideographic lexicography.

In linguistics, the set of language units (mainly lexical units) that reflect the conceptual, objective or task (functional) similarity of phenomena united by a common meaning (content) is defined as a field.

It was shown above that the unification of linguistic units on the basis of a certain meaning, the unification of lexical units of a certain language into such meaningful nests is developed in Eastern linguistics. Later, in the 19th century, the idea of dividing linguistic units into meaningful groups gained momentum in Europe. Accordingly, this theory became inextricably linked with European linguistics.

In the 19th century, attention was paid to the generality of lexical (in general, language) units by M. Porkovsky. Theoretical interpretation of the field concept. This theory is prominent in the works of I. Trier, G. Ipsin, V. Porsig, L. Weissgerber, A. Yolles, and later developed with the works of A. A. Umiseva, N. I. Filicheva, Yu. N. Karaulov, G. S. Shchur.

It should be noted that field theory entered linguistics as a concept of semantic field.

V. Humboldt's instruction of internal form, L. Weissgerber and I. Trier, in terms of conceptual essence, G. Ipsin and V. Porsig's content group and system of words, and F. Dornzeif and W. Wartburg, the objectivity characteristic of the vocabulary of the language and concepts developed from a group perspective.

One of the decisive studies that contributed to the continuous formation of the concept of "field" in linguistics was the work of L. Weisgerber. According to Weisgerber, it is necessary to study the world as an intellectual form, not as a simple tool of spiritual content. In his opinion, semasiology should not be a science of meanings, but a science of concepts.

During the comparative-historical study of the lexicon of the ancient Indo-European languages, G. Ipsen used the term "semitic field" for the first time to refer to the group of words defining the names of metals in the Eastern languages. limited in terms and based on the exclusion of a particular group.

At the same time as W. Porsig, F. Yolles introduced a new interpretation of the meaningful field to linguistics. He showed that this group is characterized by the fact that units belonging to a certain whole express some aspect of this whole.

In the following years, a number of studies were conducted on field theory problems. G. Shchur notes that more than a thousand articles have been published on field problems. Having studied such theoretical studies in detail, it is possible to divide them into certain groups in terms of their history and problems. In this case, it is possible to distinguish the specific concepts of the theory from the point of view of being proven in a chronological direction, from the point of view of studying the problems of the theory, as well as from the point of view of the field theory being carried out together with the analysis of historicity and problems.

As mentioned above, there are many studies related to the field theory in linguistics, and their authors interpreted the essence of the field in different ways. Based on these works, Yu.N. Karaulov defines the main features of the field as follows:

interaction of elements of the field: this refers to the meaningful identity, meaningful relationship (semantic correlation) of the elements and their relationship to the object;

on the basis of the differences in the designation of the elements of the field, this feature is sometimes described as interchangeability;

independence of content areas (due to the above characteristics);

the uniqueness of the features of the area in different languages (historical structure, national aspects).

In Uzbek linguistics, there are also studies that consider the complex of lexical or syntactic units as a field.

One of the first studies devoted to the study of phenomena in the Uzbek language, linguistic reality as a field, Sh. Iskanderova's doctoral dissertation. Based on the analysis of the personal microfield, the scientist started the method of studying the lexicon of the Uzbek language on the basis of the meaningful field, and researched the lexemes related to the person and his appearance, age, behavior, and activity from the point of view of a single field.

He highlighted the functional-semantic features of lexical units representing the concept of "person".

H. Ne'matov, E. Begmatov, M. Abdiev say that it is impossible to have a lexical, or more precisely, a valid field within one level. As noted by A.M. Kuznesov, researchers in many cases consider the lexical field as a semantic concept of a lexical-semantic group, a lexical paradigm. In this regard, the opinion of T. Mirzakulov that "When approached from the point of view of the field, it puts an end to the inter-level differences by connecting the phenomena of several levels of the language, while the paradigm is within one level and preserves the inter-level border" is important.

Although the scientist's research did not carry out a specific examination of the theory and practice of the field, he also expressed opinions on the solution of some controversial issues related to the issue of paradigms.

T.Mirzakulov, analyzing the relationship between field and paradigmatics and trying to clarify the differences between them, emphasizes that the concept of field, the relationship of morphemics with adjacent levels, serves as a basis for studying the nature of adjacent zones within the framework of paradigmatics.

The difference between the concept of the field and the lexical-semantic group cannot be explained only by the fact that it is a higher-level combination of lexical units within the system. Taking the field as an existence scattered throughout the language is considered an objective approach to the phenomenon

H. Hajiyeva analyzes the field of respect using component and contextual methods and finds out that the field has the first two major organic tools - linguistic and non-linguistic. If the linguistic tool is scattered on different levels of the language, the non-verbal tool is the expression of respect by means of different behaviors of the speaker.

F. Safarov, who specially researched the field of number and quantity in Uzbek linguistics, covered the issue of the field and its study in detail. He gives the philosophical, general scientific and linguistic grounds for distinguishing the number-quantity microfield as a component of the quantity macrofield. Numerical means of the field of quantity - refers to the linguistic properties of the means of the core, center and perimeter of the field.

Despite the different approaches to the semantic field and differences among researchers, we can point out several theoretical issues that are defined by linguists in the same way:

the structure of the language dictionary does not consist of an irregular chaotic collection of units, it is divided into a number of semantic areas that are united based on the generality of the words in terms of content;

each semantic field divides the entity it represents into components in a special way unique to that language:

the semantic content of the word is not considered something that comes from itself, it arises through conflicts with other words (units) in the field.

In order for the theory of the semantic field to be a theory of structural semantics, first of all, it is necessary to separate the semantic fields objectively, and it is also advisable to analyze the meanings of the structure theory of the semantic fields by component. Semantic fields are built on the logical side, that is, on the conceptual basis, so there remains a separation between semantics and other linguistic fields. In fact, semantic fields need to be built on a linguistic basis.

Thus, the field as a linguistic speech phenomenon reflects the opposite dual relationship of language. In fact, the relationship between field tools is linguistic, and the relationship between them is not directly observed.

### Reference:

1. Akobson, Roman. 1987. Language in literature. Edited by Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
2. Toolan, M. (2003). Language in Literature (2nd). London: Hodder Headline Group.
3. Wales, Katie. 2011. A dictionary of stylistics. 3d ed. Harlow, UK: Longman.
4. Hebron, M. (2004). Mastering the Language of Literature. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Freeman, Donald C., ed. 1970. Linguistics and literary style. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
6. Leech, G. and Short, M. (2007). Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose.
7. Simpson, P. (1997). Language through Literature: An Introduction. London: Routledge.
8. T. Masayuki, S. Yoshifumi & W. Katie (Eds.) 2009, Literature and Language Learning in the EFL