

MACROCATEGORICAL METHODOLOGY-SYSTEMS

Isarov Omon*; Xolikova Farangiz**

*Lecturer,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Samarkand, UZBEKISTAN

**Master Degree Student,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Samarkand, UZBEKISTAN
Email id: xolikovafarangiz@mail.ru

DOI: 10.5958/2278-4853.2022.00124.0

ABSTRACT

The article provides succinct general analytical and critical overview of macro categories, i.e. macro fields in linguistics. Each analyzed macro category (or macro field, system, complex, approach, standpoint, methodology) is treated as a separate integral strategy in linguistic research domain.

KEYWORDS: *Macro Category, Field, Theory, Category, Conceptual, Grammatical-Lexical, Functional-Semantic, Typological.*

INTRODUCTION

The macro categorical (field) approach towards language reveals both local and global connections between language elements. Therefore, this trend remains one of the main directions of modern linguistics.

There are currently several macro category (field) theories in linguistics. The principal ones are *conceptual category theory, grammatical-lexical field theory, functional-semantic category (field) theory, typological category theory*.

The conceptual category theory was developed by the famous Russian linguist created by I.I.Meshchaninov [Meshchaninov, 1945]. A concept category represents a particular concept using lexical, morphological, or syntactic paradigm units. According to I.I.Meshchaninov, subject and predicate are categories of concepts. However, they are expressed in the syntactic device of the sentence, have language, and become cut grammatical concepts. The relationship between the categories of concept and the categories of language is described in I.I. Meshchaninov describes: "Conceptual categories can enter into vocabulary, syntax and morphology, and only when they are revealed in the formal side of syntax, morphology, they become grammatical concepts" [Meshchaninov, 1945].

The theory of grammatical-lexical field was developed by Russian linguists E.V.Gulyga, E.I.Shendels. They explain the grammatical-lexical field as follows: "...a set of various means of a grammatical and lexical level designed to express and name common meanings that are

interconnected not by random relationships, but by relationships that make it possible to establish certain patterns” [Гулыга, Шендельс, 1969: 184].

According to E. V. Gulyga and E. I. Schendels, the grammatical-lexical field has the following characteristics:

1. A set of tools in different paradigms that interact systematically with each other. Upon entering the field, these vehicles remain part of the field.
2. The general meaning that applies to the parts of the field, to one degree or another.
3. The division of a common meaning into two opposite or polar meanings and their formation of a micro field.
4. The non-uniformity, complexity of the area and the possibility of assuming it as horizontal and vertical sections.

In the horizontal position lie the micro fields, which are the semantic fields. For example, the “grammatical field of time” consists of three parts: the field of the present tense, the field of the past tense, and the field of the future tense.

The field is wider than synonymous series because it contains a variety of meanings that are completely opposite to each other, even completely contradictory meanings.

In the vertical position lie the parts of the micro fields. They are part of both the macro-field and the micro-field. The vertical structure of the area depends on the nature of the parts, the number of plots and their location relative to each other.

Most are dominant in grammatical-lexical areas. The dominant field is such a part that it serves as a special form to express that meaning. It expresses that meaning more clearly than other forms and is used consistently. Dominance can belong to morphology, syntax, or lexicon. Each micro field can have a dominant area, and even a non-dominant area. Around the dominant may be the elements (parts) that are most closely related to it. Together they form the nucleus. Elements far from the nucleus are located at the periphery of the field.

The multiplicity of elements allows them to participate in multiple areas, in which case they are dominant in one area (micro field) and can also be a secondary medium in another area.

Field-forming tools may or may not be used together. When used together, one of them can reinforce, concretize, weaken, assimilate, and transform the meaning of the other into a new meaning. The method of component analysis (component analysis) is used to analyze the meaning of the parts of the field. The theory of grammatical-lexical field can be used both in the study of the same language and in the comparative study of languages [Gulyga, Shendels, 1969: 184].

Functional-semantic category (field) theory created by Russian linguist A.V.Bondarko. In his early works, A.V.Bondarko called the macro-category a “functional-semantic category” [Bondarko, 1971: 115], and in his later works he also called it a “functional-semantic field” [Bondarko, 1976: 255].

A.V.Bondarko describes the functional-semantic field as follows: “The functional-semantic field is a complex category representing a system of heterogeneous language means that can interact to perform certain semantic functions” [к.: Бондарко, 1987: 242].

The functional-semantic field has content and expression plans, and these two plans are designed by A.V.Bondarko described as follows: “The plan of expression includes the formal-structural side of all those heterogeneous linguistic means that are elements of this field. The content plan includes the meanings of these linguistic means - grammatical, lexical and lexical-grammatical (in particular, word-building) meanings, covered by a common invariant semantic feature of this field (meaning such features as the expression of temporal, modal, aspectual, voice relations, etc. .). The content plan of the fields under consideration is a “system of systems” of differential semantic features related to a certain semantic area (aspectivity, pledge, etc.)” [Бондарко, 1976: 255].

The semantic functions that make up the content plan of a functional-semantic field do not belong to the category of concepts, but are related to and based on them. Therefore, here the universal and kouniversal elements merge with each other [see: in the above source].

According to A.V.Bondarko, the functional-semantic field belongs to language, and the category of concept to thought. Features of the functional-semantic field are as follows:

1. The presence of a general invariant semantic function in the language tools entering the field.
2. The interaction of not only the same grammatical and lexical elements, but even different grammatical and lexical elements.
3. The presence of systems that have the following characteristics: a) center, periphery; b) the gradual transition of elements of one field to another, their intersection with each other, the common constituent parts.

To separate the center from the edge of the field and the edge of the field from the center, A.V.Bondarko recommends the following five symbols that serve as criteria:

1. The accumulation of special characters that characterize a group (in the center) - sparse (in the periphery).
2. Concentration of connections and relationships, the location of the same linguistic element at the point of intersection of the lines connecting the group elements, the most opposition (in the center) - the thinning of the network, weakening, more or less isolated (in the periphery).
3. Maximum high functional load (in the center) - reduction of such load (in the periphery).
4. The highest level of specialization (in the center) for the expression of a particular semantic function of the same language means - a low level of specialization, which plays an additional role in the implementation of that semantic function (in the periphery).
5. Constant and high-level repeated use of the same language element (in the center) - not constant, but occasional use (in the periphery) [see: above work].

According to A.V.Bondarko, if there is a morphological category within the linguistic means within the field, it forms the center of the field. The meaning of the morphological category is so strong that it can define the core of that area. However, it should also be noted that the performer

of such a task performs only the categorical meaning, not all the meanings of the morphological category [see: above work].

Language can also have non-core functional-semantic fields. A microfield within a functional-semantic field is a minimal element of a functional-semantic field. It can also have its own expression and content plans.

Typological category theory elaborated by J.B.Buronov. According to the scholar, the typological category theory was created primarily to compare languages, but it can also be used in the study of a single language as well. In some places, the term “typological field” is used instead [Buronov, 1973: 184].

The typological category has a typological meaning and a typological form. Typological meaning is a general abstract linguistic meaning formed as a result of the interaction of morphological, lexical, and syntactic units. Typological meaning has different paradigms, and different paradigms of language are directly involved in its expression. It is based on a system of two or more languages. Typological meaning includes grammatical and lexical meanings and is a general meaning for the languages being compared [see: source above].

A typological form is a different paradigm unit that represents a typological meaning. The invariants of the typological form are diverse and are represented by morphological, lexical, and syntactic units. The means of forming a typological form consist of segment and suprasegment morphemes in the morphological paradigm, word-forming affixes and independent lexical units in the lexical paradigm, and phrases and sentences in the syntactic paradigm [see: above work].

The universal macrocategorical theories described above allow for a comprehensive study and analysis of the composition of a particular linguistic macrocategory (macrofield).

REFERENCES

- Мещанинов И.И. Понятийные категории в языке // Тр. Военн. ин-та иностр. яз. - 1945. - №1.
- Гулыга Е.В., Шендельс Е.И. Грамматико-лексические поля в современном немецком языке. -М.: Просвещение, 1969. - 184 с.
- Бондарко А.В. Грамматическая категория и контекст. -М.: Наука, 1971. -115 с.
- Бондарко А.В. Общая характеристика семантики и структуры поля таксиса // Теория функциональной грамматики: Введение. Аспектуальность. Временная локализованность. Таксис. -Л.: Наука, 1987. -242 с.
- Бўронов Ж.Б. Инглиз ва ўзбек тиллари қиёсий грамматикаси. -Т.: Ўқитувчи, 1973. -184 б.
- Abdullaeva F.B., Rasulova Z.B., Isarov O.R. On the Definition of Technical Terms and Terminological Dictionaries // Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal. – 2019. – Т. 2020. – №. 1. – С. 16.
- Isarov O.R. The subordinate clause of time in light of functional-semantic category of taxis.
- Исаров О.Р. Полипропозитив таксис структуралари: модус ва диктум референцияси //вестник каракалпакского государственного университета имени бердаха. – 2012. – т. 15. – №. 1-2. – С. 106-108.

Abdullaeva F.B., Isarov O.R. Theoretical and Practical Issues of Technical Terminology // Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal. – 2019. – Т. 2019. – №. 1. – С. 8.

Исаров О.Р. Инглиз тилида таксиснинг ифодаланиши таҳлили: Филол. фан. номз. дис. (10.02. 04). – 2009.

Исаров О.Р. Таксис категориал ҳолатлари ва таксис ифодаловчи феъл комбинациялари // Естественные и технические науки. – С. 117.

Risaliyevich I.O. Comparative study of the conceptions related to the category of taxis - Journal of Critical Reviews, 2020. - P. 159-161.