

## VIEWS OF GLOBAL SCHOLARS ON FIELD THEORY: WITH EXAMPLES FROM ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

*Ataboyev Akhadjon Djumakoziyevich*  
(PhD) Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences  
*Tokhirov Nurmukhammad Hasan ugli*  
Student, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

**Abstract:** this article explores the views of international linguists regarding field theory, with a focus on both theoretical and practical insights, particularly those of Wilhelm von Humboldt. The study critically evaluates the perspectives of Indo-European linguists and emphasizes the author's own interpretations. It is especially relevant for scholars interested in the lexicology and translation studies of English and Uzbek languages.

**Keywords:** language, word and phrase, system, expression, structure, synchronic, field

**Introduction.** In the contemporary study of linguistics, field theory has emerged as a significant approach in analyzing the relationships between words and their meanings. The idea that words do not function in isolation but are connected through systems and categories has attracted the attention of many linguists around the world. This article provides an overview of key theoretical foundations and historical perspectives, especially those developed in the early 20th century, and demonstrates how semantic fields help us understand vocabulary in a more structured way.

The field theory in linguistics rests on the belief that words are part of larger conceptual systems. These systems reflect human cognition, culture, and perception of the world. By studying semantic fields, linguists can uncover hidden relationships between words and trace changes in meaning across time and space. The relevance of this approach becomes even more visible when analyzing multiple languages, such as English and Uzbek, side by side.

**Historical Foundations of Field Theory** - The foundation of field theory in linguistics lies in the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt, who viewed language as an organic system. Humboldt believed that language is a dynamic force shaping human thought, not merely a tool for communication. His perspective laid the groundwork for structuralism and inspired later linguists to explore the internal organization of language.

Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, another pioneer, introduced important concepts such as the distinction between phoneme and letter and proposed synchronic (language at a given time) and diachronic (language over time) approaches. Although his ideas were initially overlooked, they became central to modern linguistic theory.

Ferdinand de Saussure, often considered the father of modern linguistics, further developed these ideas by presenting language as a structured system of signs. According to Saussure, the meaning of a word arises not from its isolated definition but from its position in a system and its relation to other signs. He emphasized synchronic analysis, focusing on the structure of language at a particular moment rather than its historical evolution.

Saussure's influence reached beyond linguistics into fields like anthropology and semiotics. His idea that language is a "system of differences" became a foundation for the development of field theory. For instance, in the English language, the word "cold" only gains full meaning when contrasted with "hot," "warm," or "cool." Such oppositions form the basis of semantic fields.

Emergence and Evolution of Semantic Field Theory. The concept of the semantic field gained prominence through the work of German linguist Günther Ipsen, who introduced the term *Bedeutungsfeld* (meaning field) in 1924. Ipsen compared language to a mosaic, where each word fits into a specific place, contributing to the whole picture. According to him, words within the same field share three common features: meaning, structural function, and grammatical behavior. However, critics noted that Ipsen's model was too rigid. Many words, especially in natural language, resist neat classification. For example, in Uzbek, the word *ko'ngil* (heart, mood, feeling) carries multiple shades of meaning that may fit into different semantic fields depending on context.

Building on Ipsen's work, another German scholar, Jost Trier, proposed a more dynamic view of semantic fields. He suggested that words within a field constantly influence each other. The emergence of new terms or the change in usage frequency of existing ones can shift the boundaries of a semantic field. Trier emphasized that meaning arises through opposition and hierarchy within the field.

An example from English would be the field of "academic performance": excellent, good, fair, poor, very poor. The meaning of poor cannot be understood in isolation – it gains significance only in contrast with the others. Similarly, in Uzbek, the field of emotions may include: *xursand*, *hushchaqchaq*, *serjahl*, *xaf*, *alamzada*, with each term placed on a scale of emotional intensity. Applications in English and Uzbek. Field theory allows for a comparative study of languages. In both English and Uzbek, certain semantic fields demonstrate cross-linguistic similarities, while others show cultural specificity.

For instance, the field of color terms in English includes red, blue, green, yellow, etc., which tend to be more fixed and universally recognized. In Uzbek, while primary colors exist, there are additional traditional shades like *sabzi* (green, poetic style) and *olcha rang* (cherry-colored), showing how cultural context shapes vocabulary.

Another interesting area is kinship terms. In English, terms such as uncle, aunt, cousin are relatively limited. In Uzbek, however, *amaki*, *tog'a*, *xola*, *amma*, *jiyan*, and many others form a rich and nuanced semantic field. This reflects the social structure where extended family ties are emphasized.

Field theory also aids in translation studies. Translators must understand the semantic relationships among terms to convey meaning accurately. For example, the English word "freedom" may be rendered in Uzbek as *erkinlik*, *ozodlik*, or *mustaqillik* depending on context. Recognizing the semantic field helps avoid mistranslations and ensures cultural sensitivity.

Critical Perspectives and Limitations. Despite its strengths, field theory is not without limitations. Not all words can be neatly placed into semantic fields. Language is fluid and constantly changing, with words acquiring new meanings or losing old ones.

Moreover, the theory assumes a level of systematicity that may not exist in actual language use. Idioms, metaphors, and slang often escape classification. For example, English idioms like "kick the bucket" or Uzbek expressions like *qarg'aning bolasi qarg'a bo'ladi* function outside regular semantic fields.

However, field theory remains a useful analytical tool, especially in lexicology and cognitive linguistics. It provides structure for vocabulary analysis and helps organize the lexicon in meaningful ways. As research continues, hybrid models that combine field theory with corpus linguistics and cognitive approaches are being developed.

**Conclusion.** Field theory represents a significant advancement in our understanding of how language works. From Humboldt to Trier, scholars have expanded the concept, allowing

linguists to explore relationships between words in more structured and meaningful ways. Though the model has limitations, its applications in translation studies, comparative linguistics, and lexicology make it a valuable framework for linguistic research.

By analyzing semantic fields in English and Uzbek, this study shows that field theory is not only a theoretical concept but also a practical tool that can deepen our understanding of language systems, cultural expressions, and human thought.

**References:**

1. Aas, K. F. (2007). Globalization and crime. Sage. Berlin, B, & Kay, P. (1991). Basic color terms: Their universality and evolution. University of California Press.
2. Cabré, M. T., & Sager, J. C. (1999). Terminology: Theory, methods, and applications. John Benjamins Publishing.
3. Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2007). An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
4. Cowie, A. P. (1998). Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications. Clarendon Press.
5. Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence. Cambridge University Press.
6. Douglas, J. E., & Burgess, A. W. (1992). Crime classification manual: A standard system for investigating and classifying violent crimes. Lexington Books.
7. Eldridge, B. (2013). Our rival, the rascal: A faithful portrayal of the conflict between the criminals of this age and the defenders of our society. Pemberton Publishing.
8. Fay, J. (2012). Key terms and concepts for investigation. Oxford University Press.