



THE CONTENT ASPECT OF THE CONCEPTS OF "SEMANTIC FIELD" AND "THEMATIC GROUP" IN THE MODERN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Kholmiraeva Munira Jakhongir kizi

Student, Termez State Pedagogical Institute,
(Uzbekistan, Termez)

Abstract

This article provides a partial overview of the descriptions of the concepts "semantic field" and "thematic group" by Russian linguists. Based on their research, an attempt is made to identify the structural and content features of these concepts.

Keywords: "Semantic field", internal organization, lexical units, structure, content.

Introduction

The concept of "semantic field" was introduced by G. Ipsen [6, pp. 200-237] and led to the creation of the term semantic field, and the field theory itself and the ideographic description of vocabulary were substantiated and developed in the works of J. Trier [7, p. 347], W. Porzig [8, pp. 70-97]. The units of groupings are large sets of lexical units: semantic field, thematic groups, lexical-semantic groups. The classical definition of a thematic group and a lexical-semantic group is the definition given by F. P. Filin [9, pp. 523-537], who distinguishes two main features - extralinguistic and linguistic: the first characterizes thematic, and the second - lexical-semantic groups of words. The main difference between a semantic field and a thematic group lies in the methodology for selecting vocabulary for analysis. Thus, the linguistic features of linguistic units are grouped based on their paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and hierarchical relationships, and then correlated with realities of the world or their categorization. This



classification is represented by the semantic field, synonyms, antonyms, lexical-semantic variants of a word, as well as morphological, syntactic varieties, and forms of linguistic units. If these are linguistic units correlated with extralinguistic reality, then the classification of linguistic units reflects the typology of the real-world objects themselves. This typology is represented by thematic groups of linguistic units.

The basis for identifying individual fragments of the material and ideal worlds is the association of words under the generic term "thematic group" (system, class, category, subgroup, etc.). This can be understood as any set of words of the same lexical and grammatical category, identified based on an extralinguistic feature. Very often, a thematic group is limited to designations of the subject area. Such thematic word groups can be both large and small word associations.

The field approach to describing linguistic phenomena has become widespread in modern linguistics. According to L. A. Novikov, "in modern theoretical semantics, the field becomes one of the main categories and complex units, as well as the very method of describing the system of units of different levels: vocabulary (semantic field), grammar (functional-semantic field), and word formation (word-formation nest)" [1, p. 555]. Semantic fields reveal the diverse connections between linguistic units and are therefore the most complete and adequate reflection of the lexical-semantic system of language with its complex hierarchical structure [1, p. 570].

Field theory was addressed in the works of such Russian linguists as M. M. Pokrovsky, L. M. Vasiliev, F. P. Filin, Yu. D. Apresyan, Yu. S. Stepanov, Yu. N. Karaulov, L. A. Novikov, A. A. Ufimtseva, D. N. Shmelev, Z. D. Popova, I. A. Sternin, G. S. Shchur, R. M. Gaysina, E. V. Kuznetsova and others. Unlike their foreign colleagues, who considered field theory from the point of view of the logical (onomasiological) approach (from concept to sign), Russian linguists reduced all existing theories to the linguistic (semasiological) approach, according to which the study of the lexical system implies the study of words and phrases that are used to nominate individual objects and phenomena of reality (from sign to concept).

In the scientific literature one can find many definitions of the concept of "field". Thus, Yu. N. Karaulov in the monograph "General and Russian Ideography"



defines the semantic field (the scientist uses the term "field name") as a "unit" of the lexical-semantic system of language with common properties and the following principles of internal organization: the interrelationship of elements; the regular nature of the connections between elements; the significance of each element, depending on its relationship to neighboring elements; a fundamentally general, uniform character of semantic structures underlying equivalent fields for all languages; the historically conditioned existence of a specific field in each language; cultural and linguistic specificity of the manifestation of semantic structures that form equivalent fields in different languages [1, pp. 23-34].

According to I. M. Kobozeva, a semantic field also encompasses such properties as "relative autonomy" and "continuity of designation of semantic space" [2, p. 99].

The content of semantic fields is delimited according to lexical meanings and has the following characteristics:

- a field is formed from various types of microfields (lexical-semantic groups), and the number of units included in it can vary from relatively limited to very large;
- in the structure of the semantic field, a core is distinguished (a lexical unit or several units expressing the general meaning of the semantic field in its "pure" form), a center (units that are the immediate environment of the core, having a semantically more complex meaning, the most specified for performing the functions of the field, the most frequent in relation to others) and a periphery (lexical units that have a more complex, rich content, closely interacting with members of adjacent semantic fields, realizing the semantics of a given field in specific contextual conditions). This description can be shown in the following example: the core is the semantic field "animals", the center is "wild animals", the periphery is birds, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, fish. Elements of the center and the periphery constantly interact;
- field units enter into not only paradigmatic but also syntagmatic and associative-derivational relations;
- the boundaries of a semantic field are vague and relative in nature. Members of other fields may enter the periphery of a field in their semantic variants, while members of a given field may enter other fields in their variants [5, p. 38; 4, p.



459; 3, pp. 566-567]. For example, the lexical units "birds" and "mammals" are also part of the center of the thematic field "domestic animals," etc.

The periphery of semantic fields contains the largest number of lexical units, where they are united into a single center—the thematic group. The thematic group includes denotative (or concrete) vocabulary—words that serve as names for classes of concrete, material objects that we perceive in all the diversity of their attributes, properties, connections, and relationships. The relationships between units in thematic groups (unlike, for example, lexical-semantic groups) have their own characteristics:

- there is no synonymy within the group;
- antonymy is specifically manifested;
- nominations are distributed in hypo-hypernymic relationships, i.e., a hypernym and its derived hyponyms are distinguished.

To study the vocabulary richness of a language, it is necessary to use the method of dividing the vocabulary into both thematic and lexical-semantic groups. The study of semantic fields and the exploration of thematic groups and subgroups of various layers of vocabulary provides valuable material for various areas of modern linguistics.

References:

1. Karaulov Yu. N. General and Russian Ideography. Moscow, 1976. pp. 23-34.
2. Kobozeva I. M. Linguistic Semantics. Moscow, 2000. p. 99
3. Novikov L. A. Lexicology // Novikov L. A. Selected Works: in 2 volumes. Moscow, 2001. Vol. 2: Aesthetic Aspects of Language. pp. 555, 566-567.
4. Russian Language: Encyclopedia / edited by Yu. N. Karaulov. Moscow, 2003. p. 459.
5. Sternin I. A. Lexical Meaning of a Word in Speech. Voronezh, 1985. p. 3
6. Ipsen G. Der alte Orient und die Indogermanen // Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft / Festschrift für W. Streiberg. Heidelberg: Winter, 1924. S. 200-237.
7. Porzig W. Wesenhafte bedeutungsbeziehungen // Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1934. Bd. 58. S. 70-97.



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 01, **Issue** 09, December, 2025

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

-
8. Trier J. Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes (Die Geschichte eins sprachliches Feldes). Heidelberg: Winter, 1931. Bd I. 347 S.
9. Filin F. P. On lexical-semantic groups of words // Ezikovedski izsledovanja v chest na akad. Stefan Mladenov. Sofia, 1967. Pp. 523-538.