

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 05 Volume: 85

Published: 17.05.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



N.P. Panjiev
Unemployed
Candidate of Philology,
Associate Professor

LEXICAL UNITS-ELEMENTS OF THE LEXICAL-SEMANTIC GROUP OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Abstract: *The study of lexical units as components of the system is a relevant aspect in the study of vocabulary. This approach reveals the structure of semantics. However, learning the lexical composition of a language is not an easy task. The word reflects a certain part of reality.*

Key words: *lexico-thematic group, lexical units, home, culture, comparative analysis, similarity, difference.*

Language: *English*

Citation: Panjiev, N. P. (2020). Lexical units-elements of the lexical-semantic group of the Russian language. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 05 (85), 35-38.*

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-05-85-7> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.05.85.7>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

In modern linguistics, the view on vocabulary as a system of systems has been firmly established. He found his expression in the recognition of the fact of the existence in the language of different groups of words, contrasted in meaning, form, degree of similarity of forms and meanings, in the nature of relations that develop between words that form a particular group, etc.

However, the systematic vocabulary is manifested not only in the presence of certain semantic groups, semantic fields, classes or oppositions (such as the primordial - borrowed, active - passive, neutral and stylistically marked), but also in the very nature of the use of lexical units, where certain patterns are also observed (for example, antonyms can be used often in the same contexts, the same picture is observed in synonyms, and different meanings of the same word (LSW) are used, as a rule, in discrepancies contexts) [2, p.15].

Recognition of the lexical composition of a language by a system of systems is also consistent with the postulates of the general theory of systems, the basic concepts of which are "integrity", "element", "structure", "communication". Language, as you know, is: a long-evolving system, because as the society and its culture develop and become more complex, the lexical system of the language grows,

branches and differentiates, moreover, this system evolves along with the development of the grammatical and phonetic systems of the language.

Moreover, as recent studies of linguistics of the Russian language have shown, the lexical system of the language is even more stable than the grammatical one (such words as mother, son, brother, sister, earth, water, etc., even though grammatical, live in Russian from ancient Indo-European antiquity the language structure has undergone significant changes) [3, p.34].

The systematic vocabulary dramatically simplifies the search for the right words because the speaker does not search for the word he needs in the entire vocabulary of the language, but within a small part of it - a synonymic series, a semantic field, a lexico-semantic group, which the situation and the logic of thinking focuses on.

A characteristic feature of the lexical system of the language is its openness, since vocabulary is the most mobile level of the language, it most reflects changes in various areas of life (some words become obsolete and leave the language, others are born or borrowed), as the vocabulary of the modern Russian language is system, the words included in it are combined by two types of relationships - syntagmatic and paradigmatic.

Syntagmatic relations (Greek syntagma 'together built, connected') are linear relations arising between

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

members of horizontal series, correlated, according to the theory of F. de Saussure, as being defined and determining. Linguistic units, following one after another, form a language chain - syntagma, inside which they are in syntagmatic relations (cf. groupings of words of a syntagmatic type part - whole, subject - sign, subject and related action, etc., relations between which can be called inherent relations, for example, pine - needles - cone; dog - shaggy - barks - bites or a child's pen, pencil and pen, chair arm, etc.) [4, p.148].

Paradigmatic relations (Greek paradeigma 'pattern') are vertical relations arising between opposed language units - members of vertical rows. Each paradigm makes it possible to single out general and differential semantic features of linguistic units included in it. The lexico-semantic paradigm combines, as a rule, words related by relations of equivalence (cf. synonyms sad - sad), opposites (cf. antonyms day - night), conjugations (cf. semantic series pine - spruce - larch - cedar from words, included in the group of conifers or hand - brush - elbow - shoulder in the names of the hands), inclusions (cf. generic term - specific term: tree - pine) [4, p.149]. The syntagmatic relationship of lexical units is based on the concept of position, and the paradigmatic relationship of I on the concept of opposition [4, p.149].

Position is the position of the lexical unit in the text, in which its relationship to other units that are semantically close to it is manifested [4, p.149]. Distinguish between strong and weak positions. Strong positions are positions of distinguishing words or their lexical-semantic variants, cf. fresh cucumber, fresh newspaper number and fresh wind. Weak positions are positions of not distinguishing the position of neutralizing the meanings of words or theirs (cf. narrow fields: notebooks, hats, allotments of peasants). Opposition is the opposition of a lexical unit to other lexical units included in the paradigm with it (the words goat, cat, dog, cow are included in the paradigm based on the common attribute 'pets', but they also form the opposition, because the cow refers to cattle, goat - to small, and cat - to the cat family) [4, p.149].

The whole variety of relations of lexical units can be reduced to four main types of oppositions and distributions:

1 type of relationship is the same: the lexical units A and B are completely identical in use and meaning, since they are absolute synonyms [linguistics (A) - linguistics (B)]. They have an equivalent (lat. Aequalis 'equal'), i.e. coinciding distribution and zero opposition.

2 type of relationship - including, generic: the value of unit A includes the value of unit B [cf. linguistics (A) and science (B)], however, the value of unit B (science) is wider than A (linguistics), therefore, the distribution of unit A is included in the distribution of unit B. This type of distribution is

called inclusive, and the opposition - privative, i.e. . private because one member of the opposition has some kind of semantic attribute, and the other is devoid of it (cf. science is not only linguistics, but also other types of sciences), this type of opposition is often called intense.

3 type of relationship - overlapping, overlapping (it is most clearly represented in the antonyms): the lexical units A and B are only partially overlapping (for example, the words brother and sister are only partially overlapping in their common family blood relatives, in the other classes they differ therefore these lexical units have contrasting distribution and equipotent (lat aequipollens 'having the same meaning'), i.e. equivalent opposition (distinguishing features are as if in equilibrium), therefore this opposition is often called unstressed;

4 type of relationship - not matching either in meaning or in use, these words are out of place (for example, table and will), such relationships can be observed in homonyms (key 'tool for opening the lock' and key 'spring' or in words with a multi-valued meaning, cf. delicate taste and thin slice of bread), therefore these lexical units have additional (non-coincident) distribution and disjunctive (lat disjunctio 'dissociation, division, distinction') opposition [4, c.150].

Academician D.N. Shmelev suggested highlighting another type of relationship between the words of the lexical-semantic system of the language - epidigmatic (or formal and semantic word formation). Epidigmatic relationships are relationships that reveal the word-building connections of a word, thanks to which it is able to enter into various lexical-semantic paradigms. Epidigmatic relations are most often either equivalence relations, parallel derivation relations between derivatives of the same level (cf. teach - teacher // student // learning // study), or inclusion, subordination relations, successive derivation relations (cf. teach - > teacher -> teacher -> to teach) [1, p.150].

The existence of groups of words opposed to each other in terms of expression and in terms of content also indicates systemic relationships in the dictionary. From the point of view of the expression plan, homonyms (onion 'garden plant' and onion 'weapon'), homographs (flour - flour), homophones (fruit - raft), homoforms (oven - noun and oven - verb), paronyms (pay - pay), word-building nests (water - water - underwater). From the point of view of the content plan, the dictionary identifies synonyms (rush - rush), antonyms (thick - thin), synonymic series, lexical-semantic and thematic groups, semantic fields, etc.

The members of these associations are connected by a commonality of relations either to the subject area, or to the conceptual one. Since many words are ambiguous, they can be included in different semantic

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

fields and groups, as a result of which relations arise that hold these fields and groups together: not only close, but also distant, even opposite meanings are connected.

The linguistic development of objects and phenomena of the external world consists not only in their name, but also in their desire to classify. The structuring of the vocabulary of a language takes place according to various criteria - linguistic proper and extralinguistic. More M.M. Pokrovsky pointed out that in the lexical system of the language there are various groups or "phrases". Some of them are intralinguistic associations ("by fields, perceptions"), others are non-linguistic associations ("by subject areas").

These ideas are M.M. Pokrovsky¹ was developed in modern linguistics when developing the issue of semantic organization of the vocabulary of a language, in particular, in the theory of semantic fields, lexical-semantic and thematic groups. The problem of the semantic organization of the lexical system of language is today one of the most difficult in linguistics, which still has not received its final solution, despite the huge literature.

That is why there is still no rigorous definition of each of the mentioned semantic categories and, moreover, their comprehensive description (despite the fact that no one doubts their linguistic reality). Despite the difference in approaches to the description of these semantic categories, the linguistic works of recent decades clearly show a desire to reveal the interconnectedness and interdependence of their members.

The following definitions are usually used as workers. (4, p.151) On the basis of linguistic and extralinguistic features distinguish different groups of words. The lexical-semantic group - of the same part of speech, united by intralingual connections on the basis of interdependent and interconnected elements of meaning. (4, p.152).

LSH members are connected by certain semantic-paradigmatic relationships (synonyms, antonyms, all kinds of inclusions, refinements, differentiation, generalizations of close and / or adjacent values). A classic illustration of LSH and the procedure for its isolation was the example of A.A.

Ufimtseva², which she cites in the monograph "Experience in the study of vocabulary as a system." In modern Russian, the word "earth" is a multi-valued word. Among its values, the following stand out: 1) planet; 2) the top layer of the earth; 3) territory in someone else's possession; 4) country, state, etc. If you try to schematically represent the semantic structure of this word, you will get a rectangle: the polysemous word itself is indicated by the letter A, its lexical meanings (or LSB) by the letters ai, bi, ci, di, etc. Synonyms for these drugs are indicated by the letters a2, b2, c2, d2, a3, b3, c3 ...

A thematic group is a collection of words united on the basis of an extra-linguistic community of objects or concepts designated by them.(4, p.153)

The basis for distinguishing a thematic group is a combination of objects or phenomena of the external world, united by a certain sign and expressed in different words (compare, for example, a thematic group of a cow that combines the words bull, calf, barn, barn, shepherd, beef, etc.

One of the important features of a thematic group is the diversity of linguistic relations between its members or their absence at all, therefore the loss of one or another word of a thematic group or its change in meaning does not affect the meanings of other words of this group (for example, the word ridge in Russian in a thematic group the names of the parts of the human body were gradually replaced by the word back, however, this did not affect the meanings of the words arm, leg, knee, etc.).

The lack of linguistic ties between the members of the thematic group does not mean, however, their lack of extra-linguistic ties. Thanks to these extra-linguistic connections, the words are combined into thematic groups (in the Russian language, for example, the words spruce, pine, fir, larch are combined primarily objectively, since the language does not have a separate word for coniferous trees, which is one of the features of the Russian lexical systems). Thus, a thematic group is a combination of words based not on linguistic lexical-semantic connections, but on extralinguistic ones, i.e. on the classification of the objects themselves and the phenomena of the external world

¹ Общее языкознание: Структурная и социальная типология языков», Н.Б. Мечковская – М.: «Флинта», «Наука», 2001г. – с.268.

² «Общее языкознание», А.А. Гируцкий – Минск: «Тетраситемс», 2003г. – с. 131-132.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

References:

1. Maslov Jy.S. (1998). *«Vvedenie v jazykoznanie»*. (p.87, pp.96-98). Moscow: «Vysshaja shkola».
2. Mechkovskaja, N.B. (2001). *«Obshhee jazykoznanie: Strukturnaja i social'naja tipologija jazykov»*. (p.268). Moscow: «Flinta», «Nauka».
3. Rozental', D.Je., Golub, I.B., & Telenkova, M.A. (1998). *«Sovremennyj russkij jazyk»*. (pp.11-12). Moscow: «Ajris - press».
4. Vendina, T.I. (2001). *«Vvedenie v jazykoznanie»*. (pp.146-150). Moscow: «Vysshaja shkola».
5. Zinder, L.R. (1987). *«Vvedenie v jazykoznanie»*. Moscow: «Vysshaja shkola».
6. Solodub, Jy.P., & Al'breht, F.B. (2002). *«Sovremennyj russkij jazyk: Leksika i frazeologija sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka»*. Moscow: «Flinta», «Nauka».
7. Pokrovskij, M.M. (1986). *«Semasiologicheskoe issledovanie v oblasti drevnih jazykov»*. (p.82). Moscow.