www.inter-publishing.com

Article

The Aspectual and Temporal Content of the Functional-Semantic Field

Davlatova Muhayyo Hasanovna

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences, Associate Professor Head of the English Language Department, Bukhara State Medical Institute

* Correspondence: hasanovnamuxa@gmail.com

Abstract: This article discusses the importance of the category of aspectuality in the analysis within the framework of the theory of functional-semantic field, such as aspectivity, temporality, relative locative. . The study of the functional-semantic field includes, first of all, the analysis of the semantics of the field. Such a study includes, on the one hand, the definition of the semantic category that forms the basis of this field, on the other hand, the composition and relationship of the semantic features of this category, as well as the definition of the semantic dominant. FSM is the main, most important feature characterizing the content of this field, its uniqueness and influence on other semantic features identified in its composition.

Keywords: Verb Predicates, Lexical, Functional, Semantic Field, Compositionality, Argument, Agens

1. Introduction

In the linguistic theory developed by A. B. Bondarko, the multi-level tools of a language (morphological, syntactic, word-formation, lexical, as well as combined ones such as lexical-syntactic, etc.), along with their functions based on a certain semantic category, are applied to an integrated and interactive system of tools. These systems are based on the commonality of their functions. Functional-semantic fields, as initial systems, include not only grammatical units, classes, and categories but also elements of their environment belonging to the same semantic category. The term "functional-semantic field" is associated with the idea of grouping (an ordered set of) interacting linguistic tools and describing them. The concept of a "functional-semantic field" has been incorporated into the system of grammatical concepts and terms, enabling the study of linguistic units not only in the direction from form to meaning but also from meaning to form. (https://old.bigenc.ru/linguistics/text/4725839).

At the core of each functional-semantic field lies a specific semantic category, or semantic invariant, which encompasses various linguistic tools and determines the nature of their interaction. For instance, the semantic invariant of aspectuality, which involves conveying the direction and distribution of actions (all types of predicates) over time, is reflected in a system of meaningful variables. These include characteristics such as the relationship of the action to a boundary, spatiality (the initiation, continuation, and completion of an action), and perfectivity, which defines the relevance of the consequences of an action (intersecting the domains of aspectuality and temporality). Each semantic variant within this functional-semantic field is associated with specific formal expression tools.

The functional-semantic field is a dual (content-formal) unit that encompasses the unique tools of a given language along with all their formal and semantic characteristics.

The ideas discussed above were further developed in A. V. Bondarko's subsequent works, leading to the creation of a comprehensive theory of functional grammar. This theory is based on the concepts of the functional-semantic field, categorical situation, the stratification of semantics, its classification within the framework of invariance/variability, and the concept of nearest semantic orientations. [Bondarko 2002: 193–204].

2. Materials and Methods

Academic A.V. Bondarko's theory of functional grammar significantly influenced the formation of scientific approaches to studying the functional-semantic field in various languages [Bondarko, 1983]. The subject of functional grammar was to study the rules and principles for using a set of grammatical units and linguistic tools in speech to perform a single semantic task. The functional-semantic field (FSF) is a space that reflects the meaningful aspects of language and the field structure of the world [Ulazaeva, 2016]. This space is formed through linguistic tools of various levels, applied synchronously within a single semantic system. These tools perform common semantic functions and express various variants of the meaning of a specific semantic category.

In other words, the functional-semantic field was recognized as a linguistic level that encompasses various variants of a specific semantic category and all means of expression in a language. Linguistic tools in a language are divided into core and peripheral components based on their lexical meaning. This category also determines the distinction between the core and peripheral functions of linguistic tools.

A.V. Bondarko systematically divided FSFs into two types: moncentric and polycentric. The former are strictly centralized fields relying on grammatical categories (such as temporality, aspectuality, etc.), while the latter rely on a combination of distinct yet interconnected categories of the language. Polycentric fields involve a state where the semantic field is implemented in multiple structures with central and peripheral components. In expressing state semantics, central roles are played by words within the category of state—adjectives (both full and short forms), passive participles, stative verbs, and other constructions.

A.V. Bondarko noted that this is due to their ability to reflect "state semantics" in various ways [Bondarko, 2002]. However, the grammatical structure of the sentence and its context are also crucial in forming constructions. In a given language, the system of rules and principles governing their operation influences the meaningful correlation of interacting elements (lexical, morphological, grammatical, etc.) within the FSF

3. Results

In recent times, significant attention has been paid to studying functional and semantic fields, as they directly represent linguistic reality observable through language. At the same time, they express the deep linguistic structures grounded in general linguistic concepts. Furthermore, by comparing the functional and semantic fields of different languages—based on the invariant core features within the FSF—it is possible to generalize universal linguistic conceptual principles.

The study of the functional-semantic field primarily involves analyzing the semantics of the field. Such research, on the one hand, seeks to identify the semantic category that forms the foundation of the field. On the other hand, it aims to determine the composition and correlation of the semantic features through which this category is realized, as well as to identify the semantic dominant of the FSF. The dominant represents the core and most significant feature describing the content, which defines the specificity of the field and its influence on other semantic features identified within it.

In this context, it is essential to analyze the means of expressing the semantic features of the elements that constitute the field. Regarding this, I. I. Meshchaninov stated that "the same concept can be conveyed through various means, which becomes especially evident in the comparative analysis of materials from different language systems." Therefore, the distinctive characteristics of forming the structure of an FSF in a particular language and the nomenclature of its elements reflect the internal essence and specificity of that field.

The concept of the functional-semantic field is closely tied to the idea of a specific conceptual space. Within this space, the configuration and zones of the central and peripheral components of the field are determined through the analysis of linguistic phenomena and their functions. Additionally, its intersections with other levels, that is, the interaction of semantic elements across various fields, are identified.

As A.V. Bondarko noted: "When determining the composition and structure (monocentric or polycentric) of FSF components, the subject of analysis is the multi-level linguistic unit within its systemic-paradigmatic relationships. In this type of systemic-paradigmatic analysis, each linguistic tool is considered to possess a specific semantic potential. Naturally, all considerations regarding the ability of a field's components to express certain meanings and their semantic functions are based on the analysis of explicit statements presented on their productive side."

An FSF encompasses a set of multi-level units unified by a common meaning. In this context, objects are compared based on specific characteristics, and each form of comparison explains the semantic structure of the field, which is unique to it, along with its semantic commonality.

4. Discussion

The semantic category of comparison can be expressed through various linguistic tools—morphological, syntactic, word-formation, lexical, or any combination of these. Among them, there are discrete methods (embodying the independent meaning of a linguistic unit, such as a lexeme, the grammatical form of a word, or a syntactic construction) and non-discrete methods (i.e., related to another meaning or dependent element as part of a certain semantic complex). These methods may also be explicit or implicit, direct or indirect, and involve combinations of linguistic tools and elements of the speech context.

Thus, the general meaning (semantic content) of the grammatical forms under consideration is determined by their relationship to the differential semantic features required for the system. The latter refers to "the minimal semantic element by which at least two members of the system differ" [Bondarko, 1971b: 79].

Regarding the temporal grammatical markers of Russian verbs, A.V. Bondarko identifies simultaneity (IS), precedence (P), and succession (S) relative to the moment of speech, as well as differential features such as the localization (L) and perfectivity (P) of the action. Additionally, by studying the compatibility of the verb's perfective and imperfective forms with certain contextual elements ("aspectually significant words"), the following list of differential semantic features was derived during the process of determining the semantic content of aspectual grammatical markers: integrity (I), processuality (P), locativity (L), continuity (C), and others.

5. Conclusion

This study highlights the importance of botanical terms (phytonyms) in Russian and Uzbek linguistics as linguistic, cultural, and historical markers. The research reveals that phytonyms carry significant semantic, phonetic, and morphological features, reflecting unique ecological and societal contexts. In Russian, single-word botanical terms often derive from suffixation, symbolizing cultural and natural identity, such as the birch, which

represents Russian nature. In Uzbek, compound words and root combinations dominate, reflecting the Turkic linguistic structure and cultural values, as seen with terms like "qizilmiya." The findings underscore the pivotal role of phytonyms in enriching language and promoting cross-cultural understanding through lexical borrowing and adaptation. Furthermore, their metaphorical meanings in folklore and literature illustrate the deep connection between language and cultural heritage. By bridging linguistic and cultural analysis, the study offers a nuanced understanding of how botanical terms evolve and function, emphasizing their role in the dynamic interaction between language, culture, and history.

REFERENCES

[1] [Bondarko A.V. Vvedeniye. Osnovaniya funksionalnoy grammatiki. // Teoriya funksionalnoy grammatiki: Vvedeniye. Aspektualnost. Vremennaya lokalizovannost. Taksis. / Otv. red. A.V. Bondarko. L.: Nauka, 1987. S. 5–39., s. 2"Yangi O'zbekiston" gazetasining onlayn nashri - https://yuz.uz/uz/newspaper .

[2] ". Meshaninov I.I. Ponyatiyniye kategorii v yazike. // Istoriya sovetskogo yazikoznaniya / Sost. F.M. Berezin. M.: Visshaya shkola, 1981. S. 66–73., s. 58],

[3] Dieckmann W. Politische Sprache, politische Kommunikation; Vorträge, Aufsätze, Entwürfe. – Heidelberg, 1981. – 202 S.

[4] Klein, J. Politische Rhetorik. Eine Theorieskizze in rhetorik-kritischer Absicht mit Analysen zu Reden von Gebels, Herzog und Kohl//Sul. Nr. 75. – 1995. – S. 62-99.

[5] Lakoff G. Metaphor and war: The metaphor system used ti justify war in the Gulf//Engulfed in war: just war in the Persian Gulf. – Honolulu, 1991. – P. 5-19.

[6] Marco Buschmann (FDP), Plenarsitzung im Deutschen Bundestag, 11.09.2020 - https://de.openparliament.tv/media/DE-0190174091?t=57.32,84.24&f=DieAusnDies,WundMichErns&c=l .

[7] Schröder L. Plenarsitzung im Deutschen Bundestag, 08.09.2022 - https://opendiscourse.de/plenarsitzungen/20-51 .

[8] Баранов А.Н., Караулов Ю.Н. Русская политическая метафора. – М.: Наука, 1991. – 264 с.

[9] Будаев Э.В., Чудинов А.П. Современная политическая лингвистика. – Екатеринбург, 2006.- 252с.

[10] Веселова Н.В. Ирония в политическом дискурсе. Автореф.дис…канд. филол.наук. – Новгород, 2003.

[11] Водак Р. Язык. Дискурс. Политика.- Волгоград: Перемена, 1997.- 139с.

[12] Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. 477 с.

[13] Попова Е.А. Культурно-языковые характеристики политического дискурса. Автореф.дисс…канд.филол.наук. – Волгоград, 1995.- 21с.

[14] Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Different aspects of resultative structures according to their linguistic essence. Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research, 2 (05), 475–479. VOLUME03 ISSUE06 PAGES, 39, 47.

[15] Davlatova, M. K. (2021). The process of transformation of philosophy understanding as factor of information culture of the period of the English renaissance (XVI c.). Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 1(5), 949-957.

[16] Davlatova, M. X. (2018). The easy way of learning English with the help of songs. Теория и практика современной науки, (4 (34)), 578-581.

[17] Давлатова, М. X. (2021). The Expression of resultative and depictive constructions in english and uzbek languages. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 4(5).

[18] Shadmanov, K. B., Davlatova, M. H., Ostonova, S. N., & Radjabova, A. T. (2020). ENGLISH RENAISSANCE: TRANSFORMATION OF 61 PHILOSOPHY UNDERSTANDING AS A FACTOR OF INFORMATION CULTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EPOCH. Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science, 5(1), 61-67.

[19] Muhayyo, D. (2017). THE ROTOR CONSTRUCTION OF COTTON RAW IN APPEARING VERTICAL BOUNDARY. Интернаука, (9-2), 76-78.

[20] Давлатова, М. (2020). FE'LLARNING ASPEKTIK VA LEKSIK-SEMANTIK TASNIFI. МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА, 3(1).

[21] *Давлатова, М. Ҳ.* (2021). РЕЗУЛЬТАТИВЛИКНИНГ АСПЕКТУАЛ ТАДҚИҚОТЛАР ДОИРАСИДА ЎРГАНИЛИШИ. Scientific progress, 2(2), 1678-1683.

[22] *Давлатова, М. Х.* (2013). Хорошее поведение-важный способ формирования личности. Вестник Таджикского национального университета, (3-6), 237-241.

[23] Hasanovna, D. M. (2022). Resultative and causative meanings in English and Uzbek languages. TA'LIM VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI, 297-302.

[24] Davlatova, M. H. (2021). Semantic implementation of resultutive structures. JournalNX-A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, 6, 291-294.

[25] Shirinova, N. D., & Davlatova, M. K. MORPHOLOGICAL WAY OF DIFFERENTIATION OF SUBSTANCE AND ATTRIBUTIVE MEANINGS IN THE LANGUAGE SYSTEM. ILMIY XABARNOMA. НАУЧНЫЙ ВЕСТНИК Учредители: Андижанский государственный университет им. ЗМ Бабура,(1), 86-89.

[26] Davlatova, M. X. (2015). The role of Songs in learning English. Journal. MolodoyUchyonniy, 10, 90.

[27] Ширинова, Н. Д., & Давлатова, М. Х. МОРФОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ СПОСОБ РАЗГРАНИЧЕНИЯ ЗНАЧЕНИЙ ПРЕДМЕТНОСТИ И КАЧЕСТВЕННОСТИ В СИСТЕМЕ ЯЗЫКА. Muassis: Buxoro davlat universiteti TAHRIRIYAT: Muharrirlar: MQ Abuzalova MA Bokareva NN Voxidova, 40.

[28] Hasanovna, D. M. (2023). ON THE TYPES OF RESULTS STRUCTURES EXPRESSED BY A SECONDARY PREDICAT. International Journal Of Literature And Languages, 3(03), 52-58.

[29] Hasanovna, D. M. (2021). Semantic Implementation of resultutive structures. novateur publications JournalNX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal.

[30] Muhayyo Davlatova. Semantic properties of effective constructions in English and Uzbek languages. E3S Web Conf. Volume 420, 2023 EBWFF 2023 - International Scientific Conference Ecological and Biological Well-Being of Flora and Fauna (Part 1).

[31] Davlatova, M. H. RELATION OF LEXICAL-SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF VERBS TO RESULTABILITY.

[32] *Давлатова, М.* (2023). Typology of expressive emotional relations in linguistics . Современные тенденции при обучении иностранному языку в XXI веке, 1(1), 172–178. извлечено от https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/trends-language-teaching/article/view/21174.

[33] Davlatova Muhayyo Hasanovna. (2023). ON THE TYPES OF RESULTS STRUCTURES EXPRESSED BY A SECONDARY PREDICAT. International Journal Of Literature And Languages, 3(03), 52–58. https://doi.org/10.37547/ijll/Volume03Issue03-10.1]