



Eximia Journal
(ISSN 2784-0735)

Vol. 6

2023

Field structure in linguistics

Yusifli Arzu Nesif, Jamalzade Khanım Markaz, Allahverdiyeva Ayshan Baylar

Teachers of the German Language Department Ganja State University, Azerbaijan

gulnarqafarova85@gmail.com

Abstract. The idea of the field was first put forward in German linguistics, and this interrelated term is widely used in a number of fields of science. This method has been used in linguistics since the beginning of the XX century. However, in linguistics, the opinion was unanimously defended and accepted that not all components of the field work with the same intensity and are not equally significant, and that they, in turn, are divided into central and peripheral layers. There are also various sizes, criteria for determining the central-peripheral division in the linguistic literature. From what has been said about the field structure, it is clear that both functional and semantic fields and purely verbal fields accumulate words, grammatical forms, signs that have the same or similar meaning and help to express, realize shades of meaning.

Keywords. morphological means, tense form, indefinite pronouns, semantic meaning

It is known that in the linguistic literature the terms “field”, “category”, “paradigm”, “system” are sometimes used as synonyms. That is, there are certain forms of expression in the language, variants of expression that have a certain meaning and are difficult to express this meaning. Usually these means of expression manifest themselves as units of different levels, even if they do not have the same level of grammar and frequency of processing. The semantic meaning of time is determined not only by the forms of time (morphological means), but also by nouns with the meaning of time, conjunctions, adverbs, prepositions, etc. that is, the representation of various language levels here allows us to consider it as a functional - semantic (grammatical - lexical) field. As you know, the idea of the field first appeared in German linguistics. This term, meaning a system of interrelated means of expression, is also widely used in a number of other fields of science (biology, sociology, physics, psychology). The field method has been used in linguistics since the beginning of the XX century. In the linguistic literature, it is noted that B. von Humboldt is considered a philosopher of language, it is in his works that we first encounter ideas about the existence of a field term. The teachings of S. Ballin, F. Bruno “ideological linguistics” and “active grammar” are closely related to the concept of the field. Undoubtedly, the development of field theory in modern linguistics, the widespread use of the field method is associated with the names of L. Vaysqerber, V. Portsiq and R. Hoberqin. The application of the field method in post-Soviet Germanistics to a specific language material and its theoretical development occupied an important place in the activities of A.V. Bondarko, E.I. Şendels, V. Admoni, Q. A. Zolotova, E. Qulıq and other linguists. In linguistics, there are “functional - semantic field”, “grammatical - lexical field”, “verbal field”,

“conceptual field” (Begriffsfeld), “syntactic field”, etc. An important place in linguistics is occupied by the so-called “functional - semantic” or “grammatico-lexical” area, which is the central morphological category and in which means of expression from other language levels are also collected [1]. The term grammatical-lexical field implies the presence of both purely grammatical and lexical components in a number of means of expression. The functional-semantic field is understood as a set of means of expression involved in the expression of invariant-semantic meaning and representing various language levels. Like all other fields, the time field is viewed in the vertical and horizontal directions. The components of the expression from individual language levels reflect the vertical position of the field, and the functional and semantic microenvironments corresponding to specific semantic units reflect its horizontal structure. For example, the negation field contains the following field elements:

- 1) the particle of negation nicht;
- 2) the pronoun kein;
- 3) negative pronouns and adverbs: niemand, nichts, nie, nirgends, nirgendwo, niemals, nimmer, nie und nimmermehr, nie und nimmer, keiner, keineswegs, keinesfalls;
- 4) the modal word nein;
- 5) unions: weder-noch, ohne dass, anstatt, dass, als dass
- 6) ohne-zu, statt/anstatt-zu constructions;
- 7) lexical and lexical-phraseological units, such as; unterlassen, ruhen, fehlen, verzichten, ablehnen, frei, leer, witwe, taub, stumm, die Wüste, etwas dahingestellt lassen, die Hände in den Schoß legen, Watte in den Ohren haben
- 8) word-forming parts of the word, such as nicht -, nichts -, un -, Miss -, A -, in -, Il -, Los -, etc .

The functional-semantic quantitative field is characterized by the following system of means of expression:

- 1). Plural forms: - e,-(e)n,- er, Ø, - s;
- 2). Numerals
- 3). Quantitative pronouns alle, beide, sämtlich, allerlei, mehrere, viele, einige, etliche, manche, wenige, ein paar, keine(r)lei);
- 4). Plural forms of adjectives and participles that agree with the noun;
- 5). Plural forms of personal pronouns;
- 6). collective nouns: die Schar, der Stoss, das Volk, die Armee, die Familie, das Gedeck, das Gebirge, das Geflügel, der Haufen, der Rudel, das Bündel

The following means of expression act as the main constructs of the sphere of functional - semantic modality: collected [2].

- 1). verb forms: indicative, conjunctive, imperative
- 2). modal words: vielleicht, wahrscheinlich, hoffentlich, offenkundig, höchstwahrscheinlich, eventuell, unbedingt, möglichts, möglicherweise;
- 3). modal verbs: wollen, können, müssen, sollen, dürfen, lassen;
- 4). constructions haben +zu+infinitive, sein+zu+infinitive;
- 5). one-part sentences (sentences based on the infinitive and participle);
- 6). the corresponding structures of subordinate complex sentences;
- 7). False branch sentence structures (Dass du sofort verschüindest!);

The mentioned functional-semantic fields are divided into many microsystems, functional-semantic microsystems, which creates their horizontal structure. For example, the field of functional - semantic negation is divided into the following microspheres:

The area of predicative negation:

- 1). the area of generalized predicative negation;
- 2). the area of differentiating - predicative negation;

The area of non-predicative negation:

- 1). negation of the subject area
- 2). negation of the adverb field;
- 3). negation of the object space;

The functional-semantic quantitative field includes the following microspheres:

- 1). The singularity field.

2). Paired field The field of functional-semantic (grammatical-lexical) modality, in turn, splits into the following microspheres:

- 1). reality, the microsphere of reality,
- 2). unreality, the microsphere of unreality.

This opinion is unanimously defended in the linguistic literature, and it is already considered that not all field components work with the same intensity and do not have the same significance. Thus, the region is divided into central and peripheral layers. The "center-periphery" structure includes the main form of connection of field constitutions, which manifests itself as a characteristic indicator of their internal integrity and completeness. This reveals their role in the performance of a certain semantic function, the level of participation in the distribution of invariant semantic load, their specific weight within the field, expresses the structural and semantic gap between the components .

In the linguistic literature, various sizes, criteria for determining the central - peripheral division are indicated. The outstanding Russian linguist A.V. Bondarko defines the division "center-periphery" as shown below: [3].

1). concentration, maximum concentration of specific signs (center) – weakening of such signs, reduction of structural stress (periphery);

2). more active participation in the system of confrontations (center) - weak participation in the system of confrontations, characterized by distraction and irregularity;

3). maximum functional power (center) - weakening, reduction of functionality (periphery);

4). a higher level of specialization to perform a certain semantic function (center) - the presence of an auxiliary, secondary role (periphery);

5). High processing frequency of the corresponding language elements (Center) relatively low processing frequency, relative limitation of the workspace.

Based on these structural lines based on the Central-Peripheral distribution, we can determine the order of the structural organization of other areas. Based on these criteria, the structure of the field of functional - semantic comparativity of the most complex fields can be described as follows

1). degrees of comparison of the adjective (positive, compound, superlative) - the center;

2). compound adjectives;

3). comparison methods related to *als* and *wie* connectors;

4). structures of subordinate complex sentences; In the linguistic literature, it is noted that usually grammatical and lexical fields with a structural center, dominant means of expression, attract attention with their complex structure, numerous and diverse components of expression.

For example, the field "animateness - inanimateness" in modern German ((Lebewesen- Nichtlebewesen) as such a field is given as an example. E.V.Gulyga defines the Constitutions of the sphere of animateness - inanimateness, the system of means of expression as follows:

- 1). the order of weak cases of nouns (it is known that this includes only masculine nouns, designated by the index "animateness", denoting living beings by name);
- 2). the selection of nouns that have undergone substantiation, as well as participles by grammatical gender and their decomposition;
- 3). verbs that are semantic meaning cannot be changed, personified by all grammatical persons;
- 4). personal, interrogative, indefinite and negative (ich, du, wir, ihr, sie; jemand, jedermann, wer, was, niemand, keiner);
- 5). Man sentence forms that use an indefinite personal pronoun;
- 6). forms of sentences with the construction accusativus cum infinitivo (Ich sehe ihn kommen);
- 7). sentences used in the absolute accusative (der absolute Akkusativ) case;
- 8). names of words denoting signs inherent only in living beings, especially intellectual beings, people, and the names of such beings are adjectives and nouns;
- 9). Means of word formation characterizing only the names of living beings, their signs, properties, activities;

Conclusion: From what has been said about the field structure, it becomes clear that words and grammatical forms, signs having the same or similar meaning, and the multiplicity and diversity of these means of expression make a common invariant function around the common meaning, both in functional -semantic fields and in purely verbal fields. expressions are more capacious, comprehensive and specific, capable of expressing the most subtle semantic differences, semantic nuances, serves implementation.

Literature

- [1] Abdullaev S. The category of negation in modern German and Azerbaijani languages, Baku, 1998 /P18-19.
- [2] A. V. Dyadicheva The whole grammar of the German language in 20 tables AST-WORD.Moscow.2010. p 35-38
- [3] Bondarenko N.Yu., Kuzmina Yu.A. Deklination der Adjektive Educational and methodical manual for third-year students of the Faculty of Foreign Languages studying German as a second specialty. - Rostov-on-Don: SFU PI, 2006. p.48-52
- [4] O.I.Moskalskaya theoretical grammar of the modern German language. Moscow ACADEMIA. 2004
- [5] GRUNDLAGEN DER DEUTSCHEN SPRACHTHEORIE: LEXIKOLOGIE, PHONETIK, GRAMMATIK UND STILISTIK. S. A. Uchurov, AND E. V. Lugovykh, A. O. Ilnier. Study guide . Yekaterinburg Ural University Publishing House 2018
- [6] The expression of the category of perfection in the German language with the verb form perfect.2010, Candidate of Philological Sciences Kamkina, Zhanna Vyacheslavovna
- [7] Temporal-aspectual characteristics of passive constructions in modern German scientific texts 2011, Candidate of Philological Sciences Belonog, Oksana Valeryevna
- [8] M. Huseyzade Modern Azerbaijani-speaking.Baku 2007
- [9] Khalifov B. Morphology of modern Azerbaijani language.Baku 2000