System-Forming unit of a language-Lexico-Semantic Field (On the Basis of the Azerbaijani Language)

Rufat Ibrahimov

Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences Institute of Linguistics (PhD researcher)

Abstract: *Every language in the world has its own specific features. Linguistic investigations hold by scholars step by step reveal its secrets. In the latest professional investigations terms semantic system, lexico-semantic field, lexical unit have been met very often. Azerbaijani linguistics is also keeping pace with this trend. In the article lexico- semantic system of the Azerbaijani language has been analyzed from the onomasiological and semasiological point of view. The investigation shows that onomasiology is closely connected with nominative theory. Thematic groups, paradigmatic relations have widely been investigated and proved that they have got universal characters closely connected with language units. Some famous scientists' opinions (Marouzeau, Trir, Sentenberg, Karaulov, Shur etc.) about the theme are listed. The study of vocabulary systemic links lies in articulation of semantic field. As a sample some Azerbaijani words and word combinations (with translation into English) have been used.*

Keywords: lexico-semantic field, lexical units, lexico-semantic groups, thematic groups, nomination theory

1. Introduction

In modern linguistics the problems of semantics occupy one of the leading places which are caused by the necessity to prove the functioning rules of language units in the process of communication. Lexical meaning is one of the most important tools to fix the results of human cognitive activity in language.

Thereupon lexico-semantic fields are constant object of investigation in linguistics.

As in any other languages lexics of the Azerbaijani language isn't a simple collection of words but the same level system units that are correlated and interdependent. Studying lexical system of a language we disclose interesting and many-sided life of words connected with diverse relationship. No word in a language exists separately; isolatedly without its own nominative system.Words unite into groups on the basis of certain features. The main system forming unit of a language is a lexico-semantic field. The semasiological and onomasiological aspects of language units are crossed oneself on it. The reason is that articulation of the lexico-semantic field occurs in two ways.

The first way is connected with general conceptual category (place, quantity, act etc.) and with the selection of diversified lexical units that are differentially transmitting aspects of the general concept. This way is usually classified as onomasiological because onomasiology comes from ideas and studies their expressions. [2]

The second way of the semantic field analysis means selection and analysis of lexical units that have got common invariant meaning and their unification into blocks. The target aspect is classified as semasiological.

Semasiology and onomasiology represent various aspects of lexical units' analysis. Semasiological investigation – this is the way from sound to content (closely connected with the meaning of a target word) ; Onomasiological investigation – this is the way from content to expression that means the revealing the words existing for fixation of a certain concept. In the same time semasiology and onomasiology are closely connected and unthinkable without each other. They both study the language vocabulary, words and each word has its own meaning.

In modern linguistics onomasiology is tied with nomination theory, study of word naming processes and lexical objectification of concept.

Nomination theory is connected with description of lexical units' general patterns, interaction of thinking and human factor role in symptoms choice that underpin nomination. All these aspects suggest investigation in linguistic technics of nomination-its aspects and means, nomination typology construction, description its functional arrangements (mechanisms).

In object (concept) naming any of its features is revealed by which the denotation is defined. A particular feature, connecting the name with its source determines inner form of the word. These symptoms are extremely diverse: they can be external features of the subject (colour, form, size, etc), its purpose (destination) and functions, relation with spot, methods of manufacturing and various relationships with other concepts. Inner form deals with new words foundation; it hides the linguistic motivation of nominative units.

The study of vocabulary systemic links lies in articulation of semantic field and their semantic structure identification. Semantic field is closely connected with the vocabulary system idea that reflects mans knowledge system about environment.

One of the main tasks of Azerbaijani language is identification and description of the field structure because lexics it isn't identified what kind of fields exist in

Azerbaijani, what is their lexical scope, how their structure is organized, what kind of elements they casuist of, how structural parts of fields are linked together. There was no attempt to identify exact borders of specific lexical fields. Without the total description of all kinds of fields, it is impossible to characterize vocabulary system and to show main features of lexics systematically organized.

Semantic field concept itself concentrates in main problems of lexical semantics and determines their consideration from the position of systematic approach. In the field description various kinds of relations among words are analyzed not isolated but in common system of all lexico-semantic ties.

Nevertheless, semantic field remains the least investigated lexical unit. The strict limits of the use of the semantic field haven't been specified. Different combinations of words are often denoted by it. In most investigations the size of field concept is either vaguely wide or too narrow. There is no uniformity in terms usage. Semantic field runs out as a lexical category of the highest order; synthesizing in it more private categories (synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, conversion etc) and representing the most adequate reflection of a language system.

The question what is the identificator of the semantic field is controversial. There are two basic approaches to the assignment of semantic fields. In lexicology one of them is logical; the other is linguistical. [3] The logical approach implies structural analysis of a particular understandable sphere that corresponds to a verbal field. [4] With a linguistic approach semantic fields stand out not in conceptual but in linguistic basis. It appears that linguistic and conceptual aspects are reflected is the semantic field structure. It is hardly advisable to appose lexico-semantic and conceptual elements in the field. The main destination of the semantic field and its general function are primarily concluded in adequate linguistic reflection of a certain reality area contoured by its elements. Thus, semantic field turns out to be associated with world's reality through words composing it.

Investigating semantic field, first of all we wonder about what identity naming it serves for, which phenomenon designations it reflects. On the other hand semantic field analysis assumes disclosing of purified linguistic phenomenon existing in the field (synonymy, antonymy, derivation of lexico-semantic blocks).

Conceptual categories are explicated at different language levels. That's why the ways of their expression are different: these are lexical, morphological, word-formative and syntactical means. Action, quantity, time, state relate to the general conceptual categories that reflect in a language. Semantic field unites lexical means, aggregate of words and nominative word combinations that relate to various parts of speech linked by common meaning and serving for expressing certain conceptual category on lexical level. Dominant is organized by its structure; this is the main element which forms its semantic profile. That's why every lexico-semantic field has its own individual structure (I. Sentenberg)

Structuring problems of lexico-semantic field are complex because the paradigmatic groups are non-liner but multistage. Paradigmatic relations among words depend on ties existing among reality phenomena. Field structure is created by multi-step and consistent division. As a result paradigmatic groups of different level and volume are singled. Each lexical group in a field system doesn't exist isolatedly, only in corporation with other groups which allows one to speak about the presence of paradigmatical and hierarchical ties among all elements of the field.

The most important component of the lexico-semantic field is lexico-semantic groups of words (LSGW). LSGW is a combination of words with homogeneous comparable values: « hərəkət etmək » (to move), « getmək » (to go), «addımlamaq» (to step) « sürünmək» (to crawl) and etc. Lexico-semantic groups (LSG) forms of concrete part of speech. LSG are stood out on the basis of semantic indications (identifying semes) that are regularly related in all lexical units and differential semes opposing this lexeme to other lexemes of micro field structure. The basis for the allocation is the relevance of words to the area specified by the subject. Thematic groups of words serve as a special link for the description of a vocabulary material.

Thematic groups-these are lexeme unions denoting specific subject area. The identification of these groups is based on extra linguistic criteria. That's why the members of the series considered have no common semantic sign. More often in the thematic groups genus-species relations of denotats is being implemented. For example; "Nəqliyyat" (transport)- "avtobus" (bus), "sərnişin" (passenger), "bilet" (ticket). Thematic group elements can be linked in total or separately" compare: "üz" (face), "yanaq" (cheek), "çənə"(chin) ,"gözlər" (eyes), "dodaq" (lip). [1]

Situational lines of words that correlate with *concept, mean time, place, circumstances and the relation* among them can also be attributed to thematic groups.

Paradigmatic relations also have universal characters closely connected with the opposition of language units (antonyms). These relationships pervade the whole language in various directions, organizing its units into confrontational groups and pairs. The definition of the field as a paradigm and a class as a totality of lexemes, united by a common semantic distinctive feature, makes the difference between these terms very vague and elusive. [5 p.42]

Word building nests – the root of word commonality plays a great role in systematic organization of the semantic field. The root (root word) expresses semantic commonality of related words. It also acts like semantic component carrier for all words of the field. Word building nests are structural elements of the semantic field.

Paradigmatic relations are never characterized by real interaction relations so as they represent relatively homogeneous units' relationships that are formed by mental association:

For example, phonemes regroup into various classes (paradigms) - classes of significant morphemes, derivational

morphemes, inflectional morphemes and etc. Each word has a different grammatical form system ("kənd"- village, "kənddə" - in a village, "kəndə" - to a village) that is a paradigm. Then the word "kənd" (village) taken a paradigm form joins with other paradigms with similar properties:

For example, "bulaq" (spring), "dirək" (pillar), "daş" (stone) and etc. into a class of nouns. [1]Distribution of words according to a lexico-semantic class is also a kind of a paradigmatic group of words because on the basis of any lexico-semantic class level there is always a certain semantic sign, common for all words inside the class. For example: the words "təyyarə" (plane), "maşın" (car), "gəmi" (ship) have common meaning element. This is that all are means of transport.

Paradigms representing significant parts of speech form a huge paradigm of main words. Like that, all types of functional words form a huge paradigm of functional words. Gathering together main and functional words form a super paradigm. Common features for both main and functional words that differ them form all types of morphemes are their syntactical independence. Conformity of some set of words with quite a broad concept and possibility of representation of concept into the speech by one of these words like on the basis of a paradigm. So, any of these words – "ag" (white), "mavi" (blue), "göy" (dark blue), "sarı" (yellow), "yaşıl" (green), "qəhvəyi" (brown), "qara" (black) and etc. can replace a position of the defermination in the expression "----- rəngli köynək" (a…colored skirt).

According to F. Saussure's opinion the concepts that language units use haven't existed before the language: they are the product of a language system in total. "Language is a system that is based only on its own collision of units" [6, p.103] Selection a suitable lexico-sematic unit for performing concrete speech task can be considered as a main operation for a paradigmatic group of words.

Thus, not simple set or on accidental class of units but the class formed on the basis specific properties and features of units are called a linguistic paradigm. That's why we can say that any linguistic paradigm is a class of units but not any class of units is a linguistic paradigm.

Language levels are called super paradigms. They include the combination of all the relatively homogenous units (the same degree complexity units) that can enter into one another's syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations. Among the members of super paradigm there can only be hierarchical relations (morphemes consist of phonemes, words consist of morphemes, collocations consist of words sentences consist of collocations).

2. Result

A systemic approach to the study of new fragments of the dictionary makes it possible to reveal the individual abilities of lexical units in the process of their unification and helps clearly understand system regularities of the language. In this way, semantic field as a special system has got a complex linguistic structure. Fields main property is its integrity that is provided by entering less complex units into more complex ones.

References

[1] Axundov A. Azərbaycan dilinin izahlı lüğəti. Bakı, 2005, 452 s.
[2] Marouzeau J. La linguistique ou science du langage. Paris, 1950
[3] Караулов Ю.Н. Общая и русская идеография. Москва, 2010. 360 с.
[4] Trier J. Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes, 1931
[5] Шур Г.С. Теория поля в лингвистике. Москва, 1974. 254 с.
[6] Фердинанд де Соссюр Труды по языкознанию. Москва, 1977. 254 с.

Author Profile

Rufat M. Ibrahimov is a Ph.D. student in Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences Institute of Linguistics after Nasimi. He is studying on his research work named "Lexico-semantic field theory (in the context of the Azerbaijani language)". His specialization is Linguistics. He is working as an English instructor in Sumgait State University. He has been teaching English for sixteen years.