

THE CONCEPTS OF “SEMANTIC CATEGORY”, “FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC FIELD” IN THE ASPECT OF COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Abdulhamidov Sanjarbek Xusnitddin o‘g‘li

Kokand State University

Department of Foreign languages

Annotation: The article considers a system of concepts on which one of the possible models of functional grammar is based. The initial concept in this system (in particular, in relation to comparative studies) is the concept of a semantic category. Emphasis is placed on the methodological significance of these notions in analyzing and contrasting linguistic phenomena across different languages. The study investigates how semantic categories serve as universal cognitive structures, while functional-semantic fields represent the language-specific realization of these categories through grammatical, lexical, and syntactic means. Special attention is given to the comparative potential of these concepts for identifying typological similarities and differences between languages, thus contributing to a deeper understanding of language systems and their functional organization.

Keywords: semantic category; functional-semantic field; comparative linguistics; typology; language systems; cognitive linguistics; grammatical semantics.

Introduction

When we talk about Semantic Category in the field of grammar, we mean the basic invariant categorical features, semantic constants that appear in various variants in linguistic meanings., expressed by various (morphological, syntactic, lexical, and combined) means of utterance. In this description of the SC (which by no means claims to be a definition; in this case, a strict definition is hardly possible at all), attention is drawn to the dominant position of the categories under consideration in the hierarchical system of semantic variation. Grammars in their correlations form the

basis of a systematic division of the studied linguistic meanings into overlapping and interacting “areas of content”.

The main SCS are universal, however, this universality can be traced only at the level of a few, the most general categories, such as aspectuality, temporality, taxis, temporal localization, modality, beingness, personality, collateral, subjectivity/objectness, animateness/inanimateness, definiteness/uncertainty, qualitative, quantitative, comparativeness, possessiveness, locativity, conditionality (as a grouping of categories of causes, goals, conditions, concessions, effects). When assessing the role of universals in comparative studies Significant difficulties have been repeatedly noted in research. Speaking about this, V.N. Yartseva notes that a way out can be found in "enlarging" the universals themselves, i.e. in attributing only very voluminous and general categories to this concept [1, p. 23].

Methods

The foundations of the universality of the basic principles are contained in the general patterns of reflection of objective reality in human consciousness. At the same time, the indicated direction of determination is from non—linguistic reality through consciousness and thinking to formally expressed linguistic meanings - presupposes the phenomenon of the “reverse effect” of language on thinking. The SC, on the one hand, is addressed to consciousness and thinking, and on the other — to the language structure. The implementation of the SC in linguistic meanings is affected forms. It is noteworthy that this duality of semantic (conceptual) categories is reflected in the concepts of O. Espersen and I. I. Meshchaninov [2, p.240].

Linguistic meanings include both universal conceptual aspects and aspects of specific linguistic semantic interpretation related to the peculiarities of the structure of languages of different types. Interlanguage differences in systems of forms and constructions, in the distribution of semantic elements between vocabulary, morphology, syntax, between categorical and non-categorical, explicit and implicit,

discrete and non-discrete, system-linguistic and the situational-contextual expression determines the infinite variety in the ratio of universal and non-universal in the compared meanings. In this interweaving of universal and non-universal elements of meanings covered by semantic categories, the prerequisites for the prospects of comparative research in the field of linguistic semantics are rooted.

Results and discussions

SC, which find expression in a particular language, form a certain system. Its elements are revealed in research based on certain working schemes. At the same time, one must be aware that intercategory relations and connections are extremely complex. Their comprehension is only in the initial stage. Disclosure of the system SC, explication of types of intercategory relations, definition of causal relationships in the studied relationships between SC in their specific linguistic expression, identification of commonalities and differences between languages of different types in systemic relationships SC — tasks of comparative research, designed for the long term.

In each grammatical meaning that appears in one form or another there is no other specific implementation, one way or another the connections of different SCS are represented. One of them is usually the dominant one, determining the categorical affiliation of a given meaning (such as the values of mood, tense, type, etc.), however, the conjugacy of the SC does not always allow us to unambiguously determine whether a given meaning in the analyzed utterance is primarily aspectual or modal, existential or locative, etc. Cf., for example, the conjugation of aspectual and modal features (in combination with signs of quality, temporality and temporal non-localization) in statements such as And always, I will say so inopportunoely (F. Dostoevsky. The Brothers Karamazov); This one always bursts in like a catechumenist. In essence, there are no “pure” meanings, free from manifestations of inter-categorical interaction.

One of the important aspects of SC research is the study of their variability (for variation as a fundamental property of the language system, see [3, p.87]). The SC occupies a dominant position (“top”) position in relation to the headed or multi-stage subsystems of meaningful variability (correlated with the variability of the means of formal expression). Thus, the SC of aspectuality occupies a top position in relation to such aspectual categories as limitativity (SC, which covers different types of predicate and situation relations in general to the concept limit), duration, multiplicity, phasing, perfection, categories of action, states, and relationships. Each of these SCS comes in more specific varieties and variants. For example, the concept of limit (limitativeness) exists in such varieties as the real and potential limit, explicit and implicit, absolute and relative. In the semantics of duration, the following varieties can be distinguished, in particular: a) definite and indefinite duration,

b) limited and unlimited,

c) extended (such as “how long”), closed, or effective (“for how long”), related to the preservation of the result (“for how long”),

d) continuous and intermittent, e) the duration of the action (in a broad sense) and the duration of the interval.

The study of such options is aimed at recognizing different sides and manifestations SC as an invariant. The study of variability within a particular SC involves identifying the types of relationships under consideration based on various semantic features. In the grounds for division, there must be a system hierarchy must be defined. So, when subcategorizing it is advisable to base the assessment of temporality primarily on those features that reflect the essence of temporality as a deictic category. The highest position is occupied by signs determined by the nature of temporary deixis: absolute / relative temporal orientation, relevance, / irrelevance of orientation at the moment of speech, fixed / unfixed nature of the temporal relationship, its definiteness / uncertainty, severity / lack of expression of the degree

of remoteness of the time of action from the moment of speech. Further in the hierarchy of features are as follows: a) character (a method) of linguistic interpretation of temporal relations (explicitness/implicitness of their representation, direct/figurative type of representation of time of action) and (b) signs associated with inter-categorical interaction (primarily with objective modality, as well as with aspectuality, temporal localization/non-localization and taxis); these are, in particular, signs of modal characterization/incongruity, indicative/non-indicative.

When analyzing a number of SCS (not only temporality), it is advisable to proceed primarily from those semantic features, which reveal the qualitative specifics of this category, and then move on to the features related to the ways of representing the semantics in question and to inter-categorical relationships. In specific comparative studies, the principle of independent analysis of subcategorization in each of the studied languages is essential, which eliminates the transfer of the “variation grid” from one language to another. An important aspect of SC analysis is the identification of microsystems based on a set of more specific semantic features. When analyzing microsystems within a particular IC, its irreducibility to only one feature is revealed, and the linguistic representation of the IC is revealed in a complex of more specific features that form the structure of the category (cf., for example, the ratio of features certainty/uncertainty, fame/obscurity, and some others within the category of determination [4, p. 91]). Research in this area includes not only the study of system-paradigmatic relations, but also the consideration of the functioning of the studied units interacting with the context [1, pp.40-41]. There is a significant improvement in the methodology of linguistic experiment in the component analysis of meanings, in particular with regard to working with informants. [5, pp. 119-146].

Conclusion

Consideration of the SC together with the system of means of their expression in a particular language leads to the concept of FSP. In contrast to the SC as a concept entirely related to the content plan, the FSP is a concept correlated with a

two-sided, substantive-formal unity. A particular field in a given language is constituted by bilateral linguistic units (verbal forms and classes of forms, syntactic constructions, lexemes and classes of lexemes, etc.). When it comes to the structure of a field — monocentric or polycentric — it also means the structure formed by two-way language units, classes of units and their relationships. So, the FSP is a grouping based on a specific IC grammatical and 'structural' lexical units, as well as various combined (lexico-syntactic, etc.) means of a given language that interact based on the commonality of their semantic functions. Each field encompasses a system of types, varieties, and variants of a particular SC, correlated with the formal means of expressing them.

In the conditional space of functions and facilities, the configuration of the central and peripheral components of the field is established, and areas of intersection with other fields are identified. Each field is part of a broader system, the elements of which play the role of an environment in relation to this FSF as the initial system. Usually, the FSF is included in a whole complex of overlapping systems. The function of the environment in relation to this field is performed by all fields within a certain

FSF grouping and beyond, which interact with the field under study, participating in the formation, preservation and development its properties as a system. Of course, in a specific comparative study, the subject of analysis may be, as a rule, one FSF or even one of the more specific functional and semantic units within a given field (for example, not the entire field of phasing, but a more specific field of initiality), however, when analyzing any particular functional and semantic subsystem, it is necessary to take into account its environment defining the place of the studied unity in a broader system.

This is due to the fact that the SC in its universal aspects is the basis for comparison, whereas the fields in the studied languages are comparable systems that include specific features of the structure of the compared languages. Such systems in

different languages can differ significantly from each other. Cf., for example, the field of certainty of uncertainty in “articular” and “non-articular” languages. Related to this is the need for an independent analysis of the FSF in each of the compared languages (for a more detailed description of field theory in grammar and the principles of comparative analysis of the FSF).

The categorical situation (CS) concept of the FSF is focused on the study of linguistic facts in a system-paradigmatic aspect. Within the framework of a certain functional-semantic unity, more specific subsystems are analyzed along with elements of their paradigmatic environment (for example, within the framework of the field of limitativity, specific and type-tense forms together with modes of action and categories of marginal/non-marginal verbs). This aspect of language analysis unity is necessary, but it cannot be considered sufficient. A concept is required that would connect the field as a paradigmatic system with its representations in speech, in an utterance, where the paradigmatic aspects of the subject of analysis would interact with the syntagmatic aspects. Such a concept is a “categorical situation”. CS is a typical (acting in one way or another) meaningful structure expressed by various means of expression, a) based on a certain SC and the FSF formed by it in a given language; b) representing one of the aspects the general situation conveyed by the utterance, one of its categorical characteristics (modal, temporal, aspectual, locative, qualitative, etc.)

References:

1. Yartseva V.N. Contrastive grammar. Moscow, 1981
2. Есперсен, О. (1958). Философия грамматики./Пер. с англ. ВВ Пассека и СП Сафроновой под ред. и с пред. проф. БА Ильиша. М.: Издательство иностранной литературы.
3. Бондарко, А. В. (Ed.). (1987). *Теория функциональной грамматики: Введение. Аспектуальность. Временная локализованность. Таксис*. Наука. Ленингр. отд-ние.

4. Сулейманова О.А. Некоторые семантические типы субстантивов и их актуализаторы весь!целый и all/whole: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. М., 1986.
5. Селиверстова, О. Н. (1982). Второй вариант классификационной сетки и описание некоторых предикатных типов русского языка. *Семантические типы предикатов/Под ред. ОН Селиверстовой. М.*
6. Abdulhamidov, S. (2023). BASIC PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURE FOR STUDYING CAUSATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS. Наука и технология в современном мире, 2(19), 19-22.
7. Abdulhamidov, S. (2023). CAUSATIVITY FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE LINGUOCOGNITIVE ASPECT. Инновационные исследования в современном мире: теория и практика, 2(23), 8-11.
8. Rakhmonovich, E. M., Elyorjon, I., & Sanjarbek, A. (2022). Terminology As An Informative Part Of The Language. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(11), 1591-1594.
9. Saydaliyevna, S. S., & Husniddin o'g'li, A. S. (2023). PECULIARITIES OF TRANSLATION OF SCIENTIFIC DEGREES. TA'LIM VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI, 3, 102-107.
10. Xusnitdin o'g'li, S. A. (2023). ISSUES OF CREATING A LINGUISTIC IMAGE OF THE WORLD. Gospodarka i Innowacje., 37, 44-46.