



**To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the
english and tatar languages.**

Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 386-395. ISSN 1390-9304

**To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the english and
tatar languages.**

Dinara D. Khairullina¹, Ekaterina A. Khuzina²

1 Kazan Federal University, Naberezhnye Chelny Institute, dinara0406@mail.ru

2 Kazan Federal University, Naberezhnye Chelny Institute

ABSTRACT

The present study lies in the mainstream of the paradigmatic semantics of language and deals with a semantic field structure. The urgency of the problem being studied is due to the fact that the field is a structural language organization that allows of studying the diverse aspects of lexical units. This paper briefly describes the main trends in the development of the theory of semantic fields in general and lexico-semantic and thematic groups in particular. The purpose of this work is structuring and analyzing the lexical and semantic field “Water” in English and Tatar, highlighting their common and specific structural and semantic features. The discrepancy in the semantics of equivalent words or the absence of any concepts in any culture being revealed by methods of continuous sampling and component analysis can be due to the natural features of the terrain, the living conditions and the way of life of the people.

Keywords:

lexico-semantic field, lexico-semantic group, thematic group, English, Tatar, water.



1. INTRODUCTION

One of the first strict definitions of the semantic field was given by E. Koseriu: “The semantic field is structurally the lexical paradigm that arises when the lexico-semantic continuum is divided into different segments corresponding to individual words of the language. These segments of the word are directly opposed to each other on the basis of simple sense-distinguishing features” (Vasiliev,1990). The method of component analysis, mentioned in this definition, is subsequently connected by virtually all scholars with the theory of semantic fields (Lieber, 2008; Kleparski,2007).

I.V. Sentenberg notes that in the lexico-semantic system of language the following types of lexico-semantic paradigms that are in the semantic relations of the hierarchy are identified: I – lexico-semantic fields; II – lexico-semantic groups; III – thematic rows (lexico-semantic subgroups); IV – polysemantic words, synonymic rows, antonymic rows, converse terms (Webster’s Third New International Dictionary and Seven Language Dictionary. N-Y, 1993.).

Lexico-semantic field (LSF) is understood as a set of language units that are in paradigmatic relations, i.e. united by a common lexical-semantic feature, representing the objective, conceptual and functional similarity of the indicated phenomena. It is a hierarchical organization, consisting of a kernel (forming the name of the field and represented by a generic seme), a near-kernel zone (consisting of the units that have a kernel-integral meaning) and periphery (including the units most remote in their meaning from the kernel).

G.N. Sklyarevskaya argues that LSF always has binary structure: the primary field (denotative), that reflects real relations and dependencies between the elements of reality, (for example, *boil water / су кайнаму, drop of water / су тамчысы, flow of the river / елга агымы* and others), is imposed upon the secondary field (metaphorical), that reflects metaphorical relations and social, intellectual and spiritual spheres *boil with rage / ачудан кайнау, a drop of wisdom / бер тамчы акыл, traffic flow / машиналар агымы* и др.)(Longman essential activator Oxford: Addison Wesley Longman Limited, 1997, P. 115). The most important component of the LSF is the lexico-semantic group of words (LSG), which is treated as the class of words of one part of speech that have a rather general integral semantic component and typical specifying differential components in their



To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the english and tatar languages.

Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 386-395. ISSN 1390-9304

meanings, and also characterized by a wide development of functional equivalence and regular polysemy. E.V. Kuznetsova notes that the LSG of words are such unions of lexemes that overlap each other, mutually penetrate each other, “intersect” with each other, but this does not give grounds for doubts about the systemic nature of the vocabulary (Kuznetsova, 1978, P. 7-13).

Thematic groups (TG) of words are an important link in the description of the vocabulary – combinations of lexemes of various parts of speech that denote a certain subject area, differing from each other by some thematic criteria. V.V. Morkovkin believes that “a characteristic feature of language communication is its thematic attachment” (Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. London: Addison Wesley Longman, 1998., P. 18). It is this principle on the basis of which the classes of words such as “parts of the body”, “school supplies”, “animals”, “plants” and others are differentiated.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material for the present work was the lexical units of aqua semantics in English and Tatar (about 800 units). The working methods chosen are the method of continuous sampling from explanatory dictionaries and the method of component analysis used to describe the structure of the meaning of lexical units and to reveal the integral and differential components of their semantics. We characterized the lexico-semantic field “Water” (LSFW) with some refinements, using the data from the works by N.V. Grishina (2002), I.G. Vrazhnova (2004), O.A. Titov (2016), etc. The scientific novelty of this paper is the comparative analysis of this material in typologically and genetically unrelated English and Tatar languages.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The kernel of LSFW in English and Tatar is the key lexemes *water / cy*, the words with high frequency, the most common meaning, stylistically neutral.

To **the near-kernel zone**, we will refer thematic and lexico-semantic groups, for all members of which the archiseme “water” is the main one:

1. “Water bodies and their parts”:

1.1. “natural”: *sea / диңгез; river, creek / елга, идел; stream, brook / инеш, болак* and others;



**To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the
english and tatar languages.**

Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 386-395. ISSN 1390-9304

1.2. “artificial”: *basin, pool / сусаклагыч, бассейн; well / кое; pond / бөя, буа* and others.

2. “**Character and features of water flow**”: *flow, run / агу; sprinkle / сибәләү; slush / кою; splash / чәчрәү* and others.

3. “**Characteristic actions associated with the water manipulation**”: *pour / түгү; water / су сибү; stir up / болгату; wet / юешләү, чылату* and others.

The **near periphery** of the field includes thematic and lexico-semantic groups, the core of the semantics of the members of which is the characterization of water as their habitat or residence:

4. “**Various aggregate states of water**”:

4.1. “states of water” (liquidity: *liquid / сыеклык; solid state: ice / боз, күрүн* (obsolete word); *snow / кар; icicle / боз тамчылары; газообразное: steam / бу, пар; fog, mist / томан; cloud / болыт*);

4.2. “atmospheric precipitation” (vertical: *rain / яңгыр, ләйсән; drizzle / пыскак яңгыр; snow / кар; hail / боз; horizontal: dew / чык; hoarfrost / кырау, бәс, сыкы; rime, frost / бәс, сыкы*);

4.3. “elements, connected with precipitation or with their result”: *thunderstorm / яшенле яңгыр; shower / койма яңгыр; snowfall / кар яву; black ice / бозлавык, тайгалак, thaw / эҗепшек* and others.

5. “**The forms of water existence, determined by the nature and ways of its movement**”:

5.1. “the state of water”, “moving body of water”: *flooding / тауу; ebb / су чигенү; flush / ташкын; wave / дулкын; waterfall, cascade / шарлавык* and others;

5.2. “natural catastrophe”: *flood, deluge / ташкын, су басу; tsunami / цунами* and others;

5.3. “the forms of water existence, expressing qualitative and quantitative relations”: *drop / тамчы; drench, shower / явым; splash / чәчрәвек* and others;

6. “**The forms of existence of physiological water**”: *sweat, perspiration / тир; tears / яшь; saliva / төкерек* and others.



**To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the
english and tatar languages.**

Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 386-395. ISSN 1390-9304

7. “The properties of objects, determined by the presence / absence of water in them, its quantity, impacts”: *wet, damp / юеш, дымык; dry / коры; moisture, humidity / дым, юешлек; aquatic, watery / сулы, сусыл; watery / сыек* and others.

8. “Characteristic actions in water or using water”: *irrigate / сугару; wash / юыну; drink / эчү; swim / йөзү; dive / чуму* and others.

The **far periphery** includes words, the semes of which, one way or another, are intersected with the kernel word in separate semes, but do not nearly related to it.

9. “Water flora and fauna”: *fish / балык; algae, waterweed / суусем* and others.

10. “Water vehicles and their parts”: *anchor / якорь; ship, vessel / кораб; boat / көймә; icebreaker / бозваткыч* and others.

11. “A part of the land occupied by a water body or bordering on it”: *shore, bank / яр; bottom / төн; coast / су бие* and others.

12. “Water economic objects (natural or artificial)”: *bridge / күпер, басма; dam / дамба; port / порт; water-parting / субүләр* and others.

13. “Professional activities related to water”: *waterman / көймәче; water-carrier / су ташучы; sailor / диңгезче; fisher / балыкчы* and others.

14. “The vessels and objects serving to store and transport water; economic activity related to them”: *hose / шланг; wash-stand / кулъюгыч* and others.

15. “Water sports”: *swimming / йөзү; surfing / серфинг; diving / дайвинг; waterskiing / су чаңгы спорты* and others.

1. Widespread are the correlations, when equivalent lexemes in unrelated languages carry a different set of semes in sememes. Compare the word *sea* in the English language and *диңгез* (sea) in the Tatar language. In English-language dictionaries, the interpretation of the word *sea* on the whole is very close to the interpretation of the word *ocean*: the first is used primarily in British English, the second – in American English (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. P. 1150), but the choice of the lexemes in geographical names is strictly fixed: *the Mediterranean Sea, the Atlantic Ocean* and others. In both languages, big lakes are called “seas”: *The Caspian Sea / Каспий диңгезе, The Aral Sea / Арал диңгезе* and others. It is noteworthy that the Tatar word *диңгез* (sea) is close to the interpretation of the word *күл* (lake) (Татар теленең аңлатмалы сүзлеге. – Казан: Матбугат йорты нәшрияты,



**To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the
english and tatar languages.**

Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 386-395. ISSN 1390-9304

2005). Often, a lake or an artificial reservoir is defined through the “sea”: *Цимлян диңгезе* (the Tsimlyan Lake), *Мәскәү диңгезе* (people call the Ivankovo Reservoir “the Moscow Sea”).

As a result of partial equivalence of denotative sememes of different languages, a phenomenon as lacuna is created: the absence in one of the languages being compared with each other of the name of a particular concept in another language (13, P. 71). Differences in the semantics of words or the absence of any concepts in any culture can be due to natural or climatic features of the district: for example, the words denoting **water flows**: *freshet* (fresh water flow streaming into the sea), *millrace* (water flow driving a mill wheel); **tributaries of rivers**: *anabranch* (flow channel of the river returning to its own riverbed), *bayou* (swampy branch of the river, lake or sea bay) and others; **natural phenomena**: *Scotch mist* (dense fog), *Darling Shower* (a dust storm with several drops of rain caused by the cyclone winds of the River Darling in Australia) and others are present in the English language and are absent in the Tatar language. Typical for the Tatar language is the presence of the non-equivalent lexeme *дәрья* with the nominative meaning “wide river”: *дәрья кичен чыгу* (to cross a very wide river), *Амударья* (Amudaria) and figurative “large quantity, abundance”: *халык дәрьясы* (a large number of people).

In the thematic group “**Atmospheric precipitation and natural phenomena associated with them**”, the following is characteristic of the Tatar language:

1) the presence of only one lexeme corresponding to two different lexemes in the English language: for example, the words *hail* and *ice* in English are corresponded by Tatar *боз* (hail, ice). In this regard, the differentiation of meanings in the text occurs through circumstantial concretizes and predicative words: *боз яву / боз сузу* (hail), *боз кузгалу / боз кутү* (icebreaking).

2) the ability to convey a similar meaning of words analytically, that is, via attribute phrases (adjective or participle + basic lexeme). For example, the English *shower*, *mizzle*, *thunderstorm*, *sleet* are corresponded by *койма яңгыр* (shower), *вак яңгыр* (mizzle), *яшенле яңгыр* (thunderstorm), *карлы яңгыр / ябалак кар* (slobber), *ярма кар* (sleet) in the Tatar language, and others.



**To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the
english and tatar languages.**

Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 386-395. ISSN 1390-9304

In the thematic group “**Characteristic actions in water or using water**”, one can distinguish a group of verbs denoting purification that is richer and more diverse in English: for example, in the expressions like “wash up face, hands, feet, etc.” the verbs: *to wash, have a wash, clean, cleanse, freshen up*, and others are used; when we mean “cleanse a floor, walls, a car and others” – the verbs *to wash, clean, mop, scrub* are used; the expression “wash clothes” may be described by verbs *to wash, do the washing, launder, dry clean, rinse*; “wash up plates and dishes” by *to wash up, do the dishes, wash the dishes* and others. In modern Tatar, all these situations are more often rendered with the help of the same verb *юу* (wash, launder): *кулларны юу* (wash up hands), *кер юу* (do the laundry), *савыт-саба юу* (wash up dishes), etc. A general tendency of both languages is that the presence of a seme with positive evaluation in the invariant meanings of the verbs denoting purification does not at all hinder the development of a seme with negative evaluation in the variant meanings. A vivid example of this is the use of the English *clean* and the Tatar *чистарту* (clean) in the meaning of “rob”: *to clean him out* (to use all his money), *өйне берни калдырмый чистартып чыгу* (rob the house, without leaving anything) and so on.

To express the semantics of swimming in English, at least four specific verbs are used: *swim* means active movement of an animate living creature in the water with the help of limbs, *sail* - movement of the ship across the water using oars or engine power, *float* - passive being of an object (less often a subject) on the surface of the water, *drift* - the stall position of the ship in the water or its slow motion by current or wind. In the Tatar language, the movement of ships and other inanimate objects over the water is described with the same verb used for animate persons: *йөзә белү* (be able to swim), *көймәдә елга буйлап йөзү* (sail by boat along the river), although some common verbs of motion may occur: *бару* (go), *йөрү* (go), etc.

Allomorphy of the two languages is considerably observed in the thematic groups “**Professional activities related to water**” and “**Water vehicles and their parts**”, which is due to the prevalence in the English language of non-equivalent units, describing, for example, some **types of vessels**: *coracle* (a fishing boat, woven from the willow and covered with leather or tarpaulin), *lugger* (small sailing vessel); **artifacts related to navigation**: *lockage* (lock structures or mechanisms), *foghorn* (siren,



To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the English and Tatar languages.

Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 386-395. ISSN 1390-9304

signaling to ships during fog), etc. The presence of lacunae of this group in the Tatar language can be explained by not so important role of shipping for the Tatars, as for the peoples of Great Britain and the United States. The Tatar nation has never been navigable. Moreover, the Tatars' right to settle along the rivers was historically restricted.

The thematic group “**Water sports**” remains practically void in the Tatar language: many names in the dictionaries are either absent or represented by loan words from other languages and Russian calques due to designation of the activities that were absent in the Tatar culture. The Tatars have always been an agricultural nation. Heavy physical labour did not leave time for sports.

4. SUMMARY

1. The lexico-semantic field under consideration in both languages is well structured. In it, a kernel, a near-kernel zone, a near and far peripheries are distinguished.
2. Since water is a universal concept, the segments of the LSFW in English and Tatar are isomorphic. They reveal both the image of “elemental” and “everyday” water.
3. The common for English and Tatar is the central position of the verbs in LSFW along with the nouns.
4. Allomorphy of the English and the Tatar languages is manifested in the internal quantitative composition of the selected TG and LSG, and in this connection, the LSFW in English is richer in lexical composition than in Tatar. One of the reasons for this can be that polysemy and the semantic nomination as its basis, the broader synonymic rows of the lexemes of aqua semantics than in the Tatar language, as well as the grammatical polysemy are characteristic of the English language (Popova, 1984).
5. Most of the nominations entering into the near-kernel zone and the near periphery of the LSFW coincide for the two languages. The non-coincidence between the semantics of equivalent lexemes, as well as the presence of lacunae, is observed to a greater extent at the periphery of the LSFW.

5. CONCLUSION

This study showed that the LSFW is a complex, dynamic system of polycentric structure with “blurred” boundaries between the kernel and the periphery, which has specific features in English and Tatar. Isomorphism of the LSFW in the English and the Tatar



To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the english and tatar languages.

Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 386-395. ISSN 1390-9304

languages consists in the presence of similarities in the field structure, in general ways of representing thematic and lexical-semantic groups, in the semantics of the linguistic units being compared. Differences are found in the grammatical structure of the studied languages, in the scope of the expressed concept of the lexemes that form the field, in their connections with each other, the presence of lacunae, the generation of which is caused, as a rule, by life conditions and mode of life of the people. The work can be used by postgraduate beginners in research working and the students dealing with problems of comparative philology, cognitive science, linguoculturology.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

7. REFERENCES

- Grishina N.V. The Concept of Water in the Linguistic World Image (on the Basis of Nominative and Metaphorical Fields of the Russian Language of the 11th-20th centuries): author's thesis for candidate of philology: 10.02.01. – Saratov, 2002. – 24 p.
- Kuznetsova E.V. About Intersecting Character of Lexico-Semantic Groups of Words // Semantics and Structure of a Sentence: Lexical and Syntactic Semantics. – Ufa, 1978. – P. 7-13.
- Kleparski G.A. The tradition of field theory and the study of lexical semantic change. – Zeszyt, 2007. – v. 47. – pp. 187-205.
- Longman essential activator Oxford: Addison Wesley Longman Limited, 1997.
- Longman Dictionary of English Language and Culture. London: Addison Wesley Longman, 1998. — 1568 p.
- Lieber R. Morphology and Lexical Semantics // Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. – 196 p.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. – 1540 p.



**To the question of comparative study of lexico-semantic fields in the
english and tatar languages.**

Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 386-395. ISSN 1390-9304

Titov O.A. Lexico-Semantic Field “Water” in V. V. Nabokov’s Story “Face” // Philology. Issues of Theory and Practice. – Tambov: Gramota, 2016. – № 9(63): in 3 parts. P. 1. – P. 171-173.

Татар теленең аңлатмалы сүзлеге. – Казан: Матбугат йорты нәшрияты, 2005. – 848 б.

Vrazhnova I.G. Idiomatics in Cognitive and Linguocultural Aspects (Based on the Material of Phraseological Units with the Components of the Semantic Field “Water”) dissertation for candidate of philology: 10.02.19. – Saratov, 2004. – 237 p.

Vasiliev L.M. Modern Linguistic Semantics. – M.: Higher School, 1990. – 176 p.

Webster’s Third New International Dictionary and Seven Language Dictionaiy. N-Y, 1993.