Asqar Eshmuminov
Termez State University
Tel: +998 91 581 27 54
easqar@list.ru

IMPLEMENTATION OF MAYDON'S THEORY IN LINGUISTICS

Abstract: This article discusses the implementation of maydon theory to linguistics and theoretical ideas about maydon theory.

Key words: field theory, microfield, macro field, thematic field.

Language: English

Introduction

Everything in existence is interconnected as a system. In the 1940s, the Swiss linguist Charles Balli coined the term "associative field". As he writes, the concept of "associative maydon" is a flexible (elastic) concept, as evidenced by the fact that the size of these associations is not the same in different people: it should be borne in mind that the field can include near and far associations. According to the scientist, if a character has motivation, then it is based on internal associations (tree, its associative taxa: branch, leaf, bark, birch, etc.) and vice versa based on internal associations based on a sign of merony (part of the whole, e.g. steering wheel; contact with the whole object: house, car)

In recent years, systematic research in linguistics has begun to receive more attention. The peculiarity of this research is that it does not approach linguistic facts autonomously, but focuses on revealing the essence hidden under each phenomenon. The researcher focuses more on the relationship between linguistic phenomena.

Ferdinand de Saussure, the founder of structural linguistics, drew the attention of linguists to the discovery of the relationship between linguistic units and identified the existence of paradigmatic and syntagmatic types of relationship. The unification of linguistic units into specific paradigms based on a specific unifying meaning later gave rise to field theory in linguistics. In linguistics, "meaning" is combined with commonality and a field is defined as a set of language units (mainly lexical units) that reflect the conceptual, subject, or functional similarity of the events being identified.

Materials and Methods

The unification of linguistic units on the basis of a certain meaning, the unification of lexical units of a certain language into such semantic cells has developed in Eastern linguistics. Later, in the 19th century, the idea of grouping linguistic units into semantic groups or dividing the whole into specific semantic groups flourished in Europe. Accordingly, this theory is inextricably linked with European linguistics. In the 19th century, M. Pokrovsky drew attention to the generality of lexical (generally) linguistic units (i).

The theoretical interpretation of the concept of Maydon can be seen in the works of I. Trir, G. Ipsen, V. Porsig, L. Weisgerber, A. Yolles, and later the theory was developed by A.A. Ufimseva, N.I. Filicheva, YN Karaulov, GS Shchur. It should be noted that field theory has entered linguistics as a concept of semantic field. So what is the basis for the emergence of content field theory? The emergence of this theory dates back to the 20s and 30s of the last century, when it was associated with a rethinking of Humboldt's theory of the "internal form of language." The scientific debate over the "internal form of language", which was the main object of long-term linguistic research during this period, gave rise to this theory.

Clarivate Analytics indexed

The term "meaningful Maydon" was interpreted differently by researchers at the time. I.Tirre meant "field of concepts", "scope of concepts" as a semantic field. L. Weisgerber "a certain part of the content of language", "part of the structure", V. Porsig "the essential dependence of meanings", G. Ipsen semantically and grammatically related group of words as a semantic field reaches A. Yolles calls it a "semantic union" and defines antonymous pairs within it. F. Dornzaif and W. Wartburg see the semantic field in the lexical structure of language - separable semantic groups. comprehension can be combined with learning the language in all its aspects and in different relationships. Humboldt's doctrine of the "internal form" was interpreted by L. Weisgerber and I. Trier in terms of its conceptual essence, by G. Ipsen and V. Porsig by the semantic group and system of words, and by F. Dornzaif and Wartburg in terms of the lexical structure of the language. and developed in terms of a group of concepts.

The theoretical basis of the new Humboldtian direction in semantics is the law of lexical division of language, the division of language structure the laws derive from the "internal form of language." Humboldt understood the "internal form of language" as, first of all, a constant element of mental activity, which raises the level of expression of the sound. His later followers argue that the main task of language learning is to find "a unique conceptual idea that manifests itself in a new way, in a puzzling way, in the semantic structure of different languages.".

F. de Saussure can be said to have guided the neo-Humboldtists in clarifying the above question. According to F. Saussure, language has its own system, which is a system of mutually conditioned signs. Saussure redefined the law of division of language by studying language as a closed system of conditional signs that were important only when they were opposed to each other. Explaining the mechanism of division of language as a certain structure, he writes: a small piece that unites is the article, and the sound is the sign for the idea".

Behind every word is a system of sounds, situations, and conceptual connections. A word is a network of multidimensional connections. Normally, some methodological connections (e.g., figurativeness) are ignored, with spiritual connections leading the way. Saussure: "Language's attitude to thought is that its characteristic function is not to create a material sound medium to express an idea, but to mediate it between thought and sound. In this case, their combination leads to a two-sided delimitation of units. Chaotic thinking, which is inherently chaotic, becomes clear as a result of a need, "he said. Humboldt and his later followers were united by F. de Saussure's understanding of the nature of the structure of language as a closed system organized by its own laws. "Every language is a system of choices based on and opposed to objective reality," says Thierry..

L. Weisgerber's work was one of the decisive researches that helped to form the concept of "maydon" in linguistics. According to Weisgerber, language should be studied not as a simple means of spiritual content, but as an intellectual form of the world, and that semantics should be a doctrine of concepts, not a science of meanings. In contrast to I. Trier and L. Weisgerber's interpretation, the next group of scholars of the new Humboldtism, such as G. Ipsen, V. Porsig, A. Yolles, F. Dornzaif, F. von Wartburg, made the whole lexical group of words or language the object of linguistic research. content. In a comparative-historical study of the lexicon of ancient Indo-European languages, G. Ipsen first used the term "semantic field" to refer to a group of words denoting metal names in Eastern languages. based on the fact that it is functionally limited and forms a separate group. V. Porsig introduced the concept of semantic field to the science of semiotics, which sought to reveal the theory of the field on the basis of the study of speech. According to him, the semantic field is related to the main relationships established between words in a particular language, and arises from the relationship between verbs, adjectives and nouns that perform a predicative function. Simultaneously with W. Porsig, F. Yolles also introduced a new interpretation of the semantic field into linguistics. He showed that units belonging to a particular whole belong to this group as they represent some aspect of that whole. In recent years, a number of studies have been conducted on the problems of Maydon's theory. G.Shchur notes that more than a thousand articles have been published on field issues. By studying such theoretical researches in detail, they can be generally divided into certain groups in terms of history and problems. This can be distinguished mainly by considering the individual concepts of the theory in chronological order, proving them, studying them in terms of the problems posed by the theory, as well as the fact that field theory is carried out in conjunction with historical and problem analysis.

In linguistics, the development of field theory in recent years has reached such a level that its ideas and methods have begun to be applied not only to the lexical level of language, but also to other levels. Preliminary research provided a theoretical basis for the discovery of general laws for the construction of various dictionaries (mostly thesauruses) based on the scope of the content field. Later, other areas of language, including morphosemantics and grammar, developed significant works in this area. The interpretation of the concept of field and the individual approach to its specific features have created various problems in the study of field theory. Problems based on the accuracy of the boundaries of the field, the autonomy, integrity, continuity of the field as a linguistic unit, or the relativity of the field independence, the broad nature of the interaction of the fields; problems with the structure of the fields

(open - no space in the field); problems of field and polysemy relations have been raised on the basis of whether polysemous words belong to only one field or may be elements of several fields. Depending on the characteristics of the field, these problems are solved by researchers in different ways. In Uzbek linguistics, there are a number of views on the interpretation of the field.

Conclusion

Thus, in Uzbek linguistics, the study of language units on a field basis is widely practiced. This method,

in our opinion, is very important, especially in the study of vocabulary. Considering the Uzbek lexicon as a macro-field, dividing it into micro-fields is very effective in creating thesauruses and ideographic dictionaries. Therefore, an in-depth study of the theoretical basis for the division of the linguistic field and the structure of the language dictionary into such areas is one of the most pressing issues facing modern Uzbek linguistics.

References:

1. Kaspruk, D. I. (2018). *Antropolingvisticheskie aspekty sopostavitel`nogo issledovanija leksiki na primere semanticheskogo polja «fitness»*. kand.filol.nauk. diss. (p.19). M.
2. (1990). *Lingvisticheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar`*, (p.38). M.: SJe.
3. Zvegencev, V.A. (1957). *Semasiologija*. (p.266). M.: MGU.
4. Sossur, F. (1977). *Kurs obshhej lingvistike*. (p.112). Moscow.
5. Mirzakulov, T. (1994). *Ўzbek tili morfem paradigmatikasi va sintagmatikasi masalalari*: Filol. fanldokt.diss. avtoref, Tashkent.
6. Abduvaliev, M. (1988). Tўsiksizlik majdoni va uni tashkil jetuvchi sintaktik birliklar. *Ўzbek tili va adabijoti*, № 4, pp. 62-66.
7. Eshmuminov, A. (n.d.). Problems of creating national corpus of the uzbek language (level of synonyms). *Theoritically applied sciense*, 5 (73), 47-50.
8. Nurmonov, A. (2012). *Tanlangan asarlar III zhild*. (p.55). Toshkent.
9. Eshmuminov, A. (2019). O'zbek tili milliy korpusining sinonimik bazasini yaratish me'yorlari. *Word art, Jornal of Word Art* #3, 29-33.
10. Eshmuminov, A. (n.d.). Progressive development of corporate linguistics in the world and uzbek linguistics. *Theoritically applied sciense*, 10 (102), 439-442.
11. Eshmuminov, A. (n.d.). Problems of creating national corpus of the uzbek language (level of synonyms). *Theoritically applied science*, 5 (73), 47-50.
12. Eshmuminov, A. (2019). *O'zbek tili milliy korpusining sinonim so'zlar bazasi*. Dissertatsiya, avtoreferat Termiz /12.
13. Eshmuminov, A. (n.d.). Problems of creating national corpus of the uzbek language (level of synonyms). *Theoritically applied sciense,* 5 (73), 47-50.
14. Kadyrova, O. Kh. (2021). Information and communication technologies in the process of teaching foreign languages as the basis of an innovative approach to learning. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 09 (101), 649-651.
15. Humayun, N. M. (n.d.). *Ethnocultural situation of uzbek people in northern Afghanistan*.
16. Kadirova, O. Kh. (2021). Comparative typological analysis of russian-uzbek literary relations in their historical development. Hunan DAxue Xuebao. *Journal of Hunan University Natural Sciences*, 12(48), 1615-1626.
17. Kadirova, Z. Z. (2021). Some comments on the interpretation and contrast aspects of the terms "paraphrase" and "periphrase". *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science,* 06 (98), 486-489.

Clarivate Analytics *indexed*