

Nasiba MUSTAFAKULOVA,
O'zbekiston Milliy universiteti magistranti
E-mail: naSibaOmuStafakulova@gmail.com
Tel: (97) 1260039

Shoira YUSUPOVA,
O'zbekiston Milliy universiteti dotsenti
E-mail: shoira_yusupova@mail.ru
Tel: (94) 946500776

INGLIZ TILIDA "TABIIY OFATLAR"GA DOIR SO'ZLARNING LEKSIK-SEMANTIK MAYDONI

Аннотация

Mazkur maqola leksik-semantik maydon ingliz tilidagi "Tabiiy Ofatlar" ni bildiruvchi so'zlarning yoritilishiga qaratilgan. Tabiiy ofatlarni bildiruvchi so'zlar ma'lum guruhlar, kichik guruhlar va ularning yana guruhchalarga bo'linishi aniqlandi bilan bir qatorda, leksik-semantik maydon doirasidagi turli xil semantik munosabatlar ham tahlil etildi. Maqolaning ilmiy afzalligi shundaki, u birinchi bo'lib maydon texnikasidan foydalangan holda tabiiy ofat lug'at birliklarini tashkil qilgan. Tahlillar natijasi shuni ko'rsatdiki, "Tabiiy Ofatlar" ga xos so'zlar leksik-semantik maydoni bir nechta leksik-semantik guruhlarini o'z ichiga oladi. Sinonimiya, antonimiya, gipo-giperonimik, qism-butun munosabatlar kabi jihatlar leksemalar orasidagi paradigmatic munosabatlarga misol bo'lib, ular tasnif sxemasida ko'rsatilgan. Ushbu munosabatlar o'rganilayotgan sohaning dolzarbligi va tarmoqli tuzilishini namoyon qiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: leksema, leksik birlik, leksika-semantik maydon, leksik-semantik guruh, semantik munosabatlar, tabiiy ofatlar lug'ati.

ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОЕ ПОЛЕ СЛОВ ОБОЗНАЧАЮЩИЕ «СТИХИЙНЫХ БЕДСТВИЙ» В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Аннотация

Целью исследования было продемонстрировать структуру лексико-семантического поля «Стихийные Бедствия» на материале английского языка. Помимо выделения определенных групп, подгрупп и под подгрупп внутри исследуемой темы, в статье также учитываются разного рода смысловые отношения внутри нее. Научное превосходство статьи обусловлено тем, что в ней впервые были организованы словарные блоки стихийных бедствий полемым методом. По результатам исследования выяснилось, что лексико-семантическое поле слов обозначающие «Стихийные Бедствия» содержит множественные лексико-семантические группировки. Такие аспекты, как синонимия, антонимия, гipo-гиперонимия и отношения часть-целое, являются примерами парадигматических отношений между лексемами, которые показаны в схеме классификации. Эти отношения подчеркивают организационную сложность и иерархическую структуру изучаемой области.

Ключевые слова: лексема, лексическая единица, лексико-семантическое поле, лексико-семантическая группа, семантические отношения, лексика стихийных бедствий.

LEXICAL-SEMANTIC FIELD OF THE WORDS DENOTING "NATURAL DISASTERS" IN ENGLISH

Annotation

The study aimed to demonstrate the structure of the lexico-semantic field "Natural Disasters" by the material of the English language. In addition to identifying certain groups, subgroups, and sub-subgroups within the topic under investigation, also the article takes into account different kinds of semantic relations within it. The scientific superiority of the article stems from the fact that it was the first to organize disaster vocabulary units using a field technique. The results of the findings revealed that the lexico-semantic field of the words denoting "Natural Disasters" contains multiple lexico-semantic groupings. Aspects such as synonymy, antonymy, hypo-hyperonymic, and part-whole relations are examples of paradigmatic relationships between lexemes that are shown in the classification scheme. These relationships highlight the organizational complexity and hierarchical structure of the studied field.

Key words: lexeme, lexical unit, lexico-semantic field, lexico-semantic group, semantic relations, natural disasters vocabulary.

Introduction. The study semantic field and their relationships within lexical structure has become an essential part of semantic analysis. According to the field concept, language is a system that is part of a larger set in which constantly related to each other. The way based on field theory includes constructing a detailed study of the lexical system through different fields and their groups. As a result, this article makes a contribution to the development of the perspective field approach in linguistics.

The theoretical background of the study consists of the works written by foreign scientists on such research topics as "Environmental Semantics" by Helen Bromhead [1], "Ecollexicon" by Pamela Faber, Miriam Buendía Castro [2]. Latter one is an environmental knowledge base which is based on the evidences of Frame-based Terminology and contains 3,527 lexical units and 18,617 terms.

Literature review. To begin with, it is important to clarify the theoretical framework and some key terms, for instance, field of semantic and lexico-semantic group.

Linguists like L.Peters and N.Filatova [3] point out that for the time being lexical field theory has the following form: languages involve certain semantic sets including different semantic units. These units are a structural part of different groups. Therefore, all the vocabulary of a language is a set of groups that are in certain relationship.

In Lehrer's [4] point of view, she defines a semantic field as a group of words [i. e. lexemes] closely related in meaning often subsumed under a general term. Accordingly, the object of the analysis of semantic fields is to collect all the lexemes that belong to a field and show the relationship of each of them to one another and to the general term. Kobozeva [5] describes the semantic field as a set of linguistic units united by a commonality of content and reflecting the conceptual, objective or functional similarity of the designated phenomena. He also identifies the semantic field by the following main

properties: the presence of semantic relations (correlations) between the words composing it; the systemic nature of these relations; the interrelation of semantic fields within the entire lexical system (the entire dictionary).

Lyons [6] defines the notion of semantic structure in terms of certain relations that hold between the items in a particular lexical subsystem. They include such relations as sameness and difference of meaning, incompatibility, antonymy, etc. which are customarily held to fall within the scope of the theory of meaning.

In his article, Jolles proposed a field concept of his own with the help of correlation pairs like “right – left” and he was the first to include the structural relations of 'oppositeness' of meaning into his semantic fields, which he prefers to call “semantic groups” [7]. Some authors, including Filin proposes that it is possible to classify vocabulary into thematic groups for a variety of purposes, and in each case the composition of the group will change almost independently of the lexical and semantic connections of words [8].

Thus, Karaulov [9] writes about the need to divide various spheres of vocabulary into semantic fields, lexico-semantic groups, thematic groups, synonymic series, onomasiological groups. According to Egamnazarov [10], the lexico-semantic field is based on lexico-semantic groups of words. There is an assumption that the elements of semantic fields are lexico-semantic groups (LSG), and the semantic field is a generic concept in relation to LSG.

Research Methodology. This study involves solving three tasks with the help of particular research methods. The first task is to gather English lexical units connected with the topic “Natural disasters” from a professional research paper focused on natural disasters using a continuous sample method. To carry out the research and analyze collected materials is the second task including a classification scheme that created the semantic features of the concepts as well as identifying semantic relationships within the lexical-semantic field the words denoting “Natural disasters”, where each obtained group and subgroups should be analyzed, i.e. the organization and semantic relations among groups, subgroups and lexical units, which demands conceptual and contextual analyses. The last task is to create a detailed description of semantic relationship in lexical-semantic field “Natural disasters”.

Analysis and Results. Above mentioned criteria, the following significant norms should be added: the classified organization of a group, core and close and far periphery. Thus, as long as lexico-semantic groups are considered as basic parts of a (lexico-)semantic field, then the semantic field should have the identical contrast criteria, but with minor shifts, such as: the existence in the field of words relating to different parts of speech and a larger size of the field. If subgroups and its own divisions are distinguished within a lexico-semantic group, then these subdivisions must meet the similar criteria of differentiation as the lexicosemantic group itself, differing from it only in size.

Lexico-semantic groups were exemplified in some studies, for example, the lexico-semantic group of fitness [11] or the lexico-semantic group of health [12]. Catastrophe vocabulary has been studied in terms of its systematic organization as well. To prove this, several relevant works in this regard were collected, which mainly show different aspects in the categorization and description of natural disasters vocabulary.

The results of the work “Linguistic Representation of Natural Disasters in Media Coverage” include some topic words for the one type of disasters: flood, its impact, needs, reaction, environmental concerns, material and economic loses [13]. The author of the article “Disaster linguicism: Linguistic minorities in disasters” [14] studied the disaster experiences in the 2010–2011 Canterbury and Tohoku disasters in order to show how immigrants and refugees were affected because of language barriers. The writer introduces the concept of disaster linguicism at that time she focused on linguistic minorities in particular those who are not native speakers of the de facto languages.

The work “Environmental Semantics” gives an illustration of environmental semantics in action through the English extreme weather words like flood and bushfire in explications, and an action model for “School Strikers” protesting for climate action. She also explores the proliferation of expressions eco-anxiety, climate anxiety, and climate grief.

Another paper “Semiotics of natural disaster discourse in post-tsunami world: A theoretical framework” [15] proposes a semiotic model on the natural catastrophic event particularly tsunami. The key concept here determines the transformation of natural disaster into structural human and cultural losses.

The authors of the article “Ecolexicon” (Pamela Faber, Miriam Buendía Castro, 2014) illustrate three categories of conceptual relations in this field: hyponymic (generic-specific) relations, meronymic (part-whole) relations, and non-hierarchical relations. As a result, the conceptual relations include a set of 17 hierarchical (hypernymic and meronymic) and non-hierarchical relations, some of which are domain-specific.

Most of these studies dedicate solely one particular thematic group and many of them partly correlate with lexico-semantic groups as parts of the lexico-semantic field “Natural disasters”. In addition, the object of the mentioned studies was groups or lexical sets of natural disasters vocabulary. It is extremely significant when working with lexico-semantic groups and lexico-semantic fields, however, none of the studies explores semantic relations between the units of these groups. Thereby, the present study is intended not only to explore lexico-semantic groups within the lexico-semantic field “Natural disasters”, but also to identify semantic relations between the units of these groups.

As a result of the empirical study, 83 different lexical units representing extreme event vocabulary was analyzed and classified (38 units were verbs, 23 lexical units were nouns and 22 units were word combinations). A classification scheme illustrating the structure of the lexico-semantic field of the words meaning “Natural disasters” was developed based on the data gathered. This scheme identifies six main lexico-semantic groups that make up the lexico-semantic field of extreme events: *biological, geological, hydrological, meteorological, climatological, and extraterrestrial* (Figure 1, Column 1).

Figure 1. Scheme of the lexico-semantic field “Natural disasters”

Lexico-semantic field “Natural disasters”			
Lexico-semantic groups	Subgroups	Sub-subgroups	
Biological	Pandemics		
	Epidemics		
	Zoonotic diseases		
	Vector-borne diseases		
Geological	Earthquake		
	Eruption	Volcanic eruption Coastal eruption	
	Sinkhole		
	Mass movement	Rockfall	
		Landslide	
		Avalanche	
	Subsidence		

Hydrological	Flood	Riverine flood
		Flash flood
		Storm surge/ coastal flood
		Dam failure
	Mudflow	
Rogue wave		
Tsunami		
Limnic eruption		
Meteorological	Storm	Ice storm
		Blizzard
		Dust storm
		Hailstorm
	Thunderstorm	
Hurricane		
Tropical cyclone	Tornado	
	Typhoon	
Climatological	Extreme temperature	Heat wave
		Cold wave
		Extreme winter condition
	Drought	
	Desertification	
Wildfire	Forest fire	
	Land fire	
Extraterrestrial	Solar flare	
	Impact events	

Then, nearly all of these lexico-semantic groupings were split up into smaller groups. For instance, four subgroups comprise the lexico-semantic group *Geological* as followings: *earthquake*, *eruption*, *sinkhole* and *mass movement*. Furthermore, some of the previously listed subgroups are further subgroups of themselves. The lexico-semantic group *Climatological* has a subgroup *Extreme temperature*, which in turn contains a sub-subgroup *hot wave*, *cold wave*, *extreme winter condition*. Thus, this divide illustrates inclusion relations, which occur when (sub) groups interact with one another.

Some lexical units demonstrate synonymous relations within the lexico-semantic field of the words denoting “Natural disasters”. Take the lexical units “*earthquake*” and “*tremor*”, for instance. According to the “Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries”, *tremor* is “a small earthquake in which the ground shakes slightly”, and *earthquake* is “a sudden, violent shaking of the earth’s surface” [16]. After examining these definitions, we may conclude that the term “*earthquake*” is more appropriate for use in disaster terminology; however “*tremor*” is also an option. Consequently, these two lexical units are partial synonyms in this instance. The verbs “*devastate*” and “*ravage*” are another instance of partial synonymy. The definitions of *to devastate* and *to ravage*, respectively, are “to completely destroy a place or an area” and “to damage something badly”, according to the Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries. These two terms can therefore be regarded as partial synonyms in this instance.

We can find antonymy relationships within the lexico-semantic group *Climatological*. Consider the terms “*heat wave*” and “*cold wave*”, for example. *Heat wave* is “a period of days during which the weather is much hotter than usual” [17]. *Cold wave* is “an unusually large and rapid drop in temperature over a short period of time such as 24 hours” [18].

There are also hypo-hypernymic relationships within the lexico-semantic field the words denoting “Natural Disasters”, in particular between the lexeme *flood* (hypernym) and such lexical units as *heavy rainfall*, *river overflow*, *dam failure*, *coastal storm surge*, and *flash floods* (hyponyms); between the lexeme *volcanic eruption* and lexical units *magma chamber*, *volcanic vent*, *pyroclastic materials* (like *ash*, *rock fragments*, and *gases*), *lava flows*, *volcanic gases*, and *ash clouds* are in the part-whole relations.

Therefore, the primary lexico-semantic groups of the semantic field of the words denoting “Natural Disasters” were identified and described in this article, together with their lexical units and the semantic relationships between specific units within the subcategories and sub-subcategories. The suggested description of the lexico-semantic groups that make up the lexico-semantic field of extreme event may be expanded and strengthened with the addition of more representative practical material to the study.

Conclusion. The results of the research demonstrate the complex and multicomponent organization of the lexico-semantic field of the words denoting “Natural Disasters” which is made up of several lexico-semantic groups, subgroups, and sub-subgroups. The following are the primary groupings identified: biological, geological, hydrological, meteorological, climatological, and extraterrestrial.

Inclusion and intersection relations that are founded on lexical unit paradigmatic relationships like part-whole, synonymy, antonymy, and hypo-hypernymic relationships are characteristic of the lexico-semantic field of the words denoting “Natural Disasters”. As we have seen, the most prevalent kinds of relationships are synonymy, inclusion and hypernymic relations. Rarer phenomena include part-whole, antonymy, and relations of intersection. It is hypothesized that similar kinds of semantic relations are characteristic not just of the lexico-semantic field of the words denoting “Natural Disasters”, but also representing other concepts too.

REFERENCES

1. Helen Bromhead, Carsten Levisen. Environmental Semantics // Scandinavian Studies in Language, 2022. №13 (1).
2. Pamela Faber, Miriam Buendía Castro. Lexicography for Specialised Languages, Technology and Terminography. EcoLexicon // Proceedings of the XVI EURALEX International Congress: The User in Focus, 2014.
3. Петерс Л. П., Филатова Н. И. К вопросу о лексико-семантическом поле «Пицца» в испанском языке // Университетские чтения - 2015: мат. науч.-метод. чтений ПГЛУ. Пятигорск: Изд-во Пятигорского государственного лингвистического университета, 2015.
4. Adrienne Lehrer. Semantic fields and lexical structure. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1974 – P 1.
5. Кобозева И. М. Лингвистическая семантика. М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2000 – С 99.
6. John Lyons. Structural Semantics: An Analysis of Part of the Vocabulary of Plato. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, the Society, 1963 – P 67.
7. Васильев Л. М. Обзоры теории семантических полей // Вопросы языкознания, 1971 – С 110.
8. Филин Ф. П. О лексико-семантических группах слов // Очерки по теории языкознания. 1982. № 8.
9. Караулов Ю. Н. Общая и русская идеография. М.: Наука, 1976 – С 6;314.

10. Эгамназаров Х. Х. О понятии лексико-семантического поля в лингвистике // Ученые записки Худжандского государственного университета им. академика Б. Гафурова. Гуманитарные науки. 2018. № 1 (54) – С 186.
11. Медведева Н. А. Анализ лексико-семантической группы слов (композигов) с общим компонентом «фитнес» // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. 2017. № 10-2 (76).
12. Popova O.A., Gracheva N.G., Pepelyaeva Y.A. Russian as a foreign language: an analysis of the lexical-thematic group "health" // Russian Linguistic Bulletin. 2023. № 10(46)
13. Balandina E.S, Al-Abbodi M.F. Linguistic representation of natural disasters in media coverage // Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Ser. Linguistics. 2020. № 2 (17) – p 30-35.
14. Shinya Uekusa, Disaster linguicism: Linguistic minorities in disasters, Language in Society 48:3, 2019 – p 353-375.
15. Sungdo Kim. Semiotics of natural disaster discourse in post-tsunami world: A theoretical framework // Sign Systems Studies. 2006. № 1(34).
16. Oxford Learner's Dictionaries. URL: <https://oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com>
17. Cambridge English Dictionary. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org>
18. Merriam-Webster Dictionary. URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com>