

Иерархия семантических связей слов в тематических группах

В данной статье рассматриваются гиперо-гипонимические связи как один из основных принципов организации словаря. Детальное рассмотрение инвентаря отношений между словами в рамках тематической группы позволяет теоретически осмыслить понятие тематической группы, определить ее роль и место в семантическом пространстве, отношения между предметами и явлениями окружающей действительности и их отражением в мышлении. Тематические группы слов рассматриваются нами как инструменты управления учебным процессом. Результаты ассоциативных экспериментов позволяют представить картину связей слов в сознании носителей языка, в которой отмечается большое число повторяющихся реакций на один и тот же стимул. Формирование активного словарного запаса учащихся может идти от ассоциативных связей к логическим, являющимися едиными для всех людей. Экспериментальное исследование показало, что в учебных целях необходимо распределение слов в тематических группах в соответствии с их внутренней «субординацией»: иерархия, ядро/периферия, гиперо-гипонимические отношения.

Ключевые слова: гипонимия, категоризация, парадигматическая связь, семантическое поле, тематическая группа.

Kassymova R.T., DSc, Professor of al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
Almaty, Kazakhstan,
rashida-kas@mail.ru

Hierarchy of semantic connections of words in thematic groups

Abstracts. In this article hyper-hyponymic relations are considered as one of the basic principles of the organization of the dictionary. A detailed examination of the inventory of relations between words within the thematic group allows us to theoretically comprehend the notion of a thematic group, to determine its role and place in the semantic space, the relationship between objects and phenomena of the surrounding reality and their reflection in thinking. Thematic groups of words are considered by us as tools for managing the learning process. The results of associative experiments allow us to present a picture of the connections of words in the minds of native speakers. A large number of repeated reactions to the same stimulus are presented in the given picture. An active vocabulary of students can be formed with the help of associative links transitioning into logical links, which are the same for all people. Experimental research has shown that for educational purposes it is necessary to distribute words in thematic groups in accordance with their internal "subordination": hierarchy, core / periphery, hyper-hyponymic relations.

Key words: hyponymy, categorization, paradigmatic connection, semantic field, thematic group.

Қасымова Р.Т.,
әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университетінің профессоры, п. ф. д.,
Алматы қ., Қазақстан,
rashida-kas@mail.ru

Тақырыптық топтардағы сөздердің семантикалық байланыстарының иерархиясы

Аннотация. Осы мақалада байланыс гиперо-гипонимикалық негізгі сөздік ұйымдастыру қағидаттарының бірі ретінде қаралады.

Сөз арасындағы қарым-қатынастарды зерделеудің толық зерттеуі тақырыптық топтың тұжырымдамасын теориялық тұрғыда түсінуге, оның семантикалық кеңістіктегі рөлі мен орнын, айналадағы шындықтың объектілері мен құбылыстары олардың арасындағы қатынастар және ойлаудағы көріністеріне байланысты анықтауға мүмкіндік беріледі.

Сөздердің тақырыптық топтары оқу үдерісін басқаруға арналған құралдар ретінде қарастырылады.

Ассоциативті эксперименттердің нәтижелері бірдей ынталандыруға көп рет қайталанатын реакциялардың бар екендігін көрсететін жергілікті сөйлеушілердің ойларындағы сөз байласуларының суретін ұсынуға мүмкіндік береді.

Эксперименттік зерттеулер көрсеткендей, білім беру мақсатында тақырыпты топтарға ішкі «бағыныстылығына» сәйкес бөлу керек: иерархия, ядро / периферия, гипер-гипонимикалық қатынастар.

Түйінді сөздер: гипонимия, санаттау, парадигматикалық байланыс, семантикалық өріс, тақырыптық топ.

Hierarchy of semantic connections of words in thematic groups

Introduction. Such feature of the dictionary as its semantic continuity, is caused by the fact that each word enters certain semantic links with the meanings of other words: hyper-hyponymic; synonymic; paronymic; antonymic; word-formation, etc. According to the representative of the Kazan linguistic school N.V. Krushevsky, it is never impossible "... to lose sight of the basic nature of language: the word is the sign of a thing. Idea of a thing and idea of the word designating this thing are bound by the law of association in inseparable couple ... If idea of a thing is inseparable with idea of the corresponding word, what follows from this? Words have to be classified in our mind in the same groups, as the things they signify " (Krushevsky, 1981: 252-254). It means that we keep idea of meaning and idea of sounding in the memory before we start talking.

Although the term "hyponymy" is also not among traditional terms of semantics, the concept in linguistic literature is considered as a language universal and as one of the basic principles of the organization of lexical structure (J. Layonz, S. Ullman, V.G. Admoni, A.A. Ufimtseva, etc.). In a number of researches hyper-hyponymic communications in lexicon between meanings of different words are analyzed (Yu.D. Apresyan, M.V. Nikitin, Yu.S. Stepanov, Yu.N. Karaulov, M.V.

Lysyakova, etc.), within one word the hyponymic relations between meanings are less investigated (E. Ginzburg).

Another term is worth mentioning here, equinomy, which means the relation of concepts and names of one subject area and one level of generalization (cf. : birch, oak, pine, maple).

L.A. Novikov uses the term of a *sogiponima* for designation of the words corresponding to specific concepts on the relation to each other: a poodle – a terrier – a mastiff – a sheep-dog – the borzoi (Novikov, 1987: 76). Genus-species relations are the reflection of hierarchy of the general – private in things.

The hyponymy is defined as one of the main paradigmatic relations in the semantic field and as the hierarchical organization of its elements based on the genus-species relationship. In the context of hyponymic relations in lexicon as a private opposition of the genus-species nature "... hyponyms act as the marked elements, and hyperonyms represent a basis of such opposition" (Kuznetsova, 1989: 45). Along with this the scientist specifies "the second possible type of the hyponymic relations in lexicon which are the oppositions of the words designating a part and the whole, for example: a branch – a tree, the carburetor – the engine (Ibid, 1989: 45); hyponyms in these examples are names of *parts*, while hyperonyms act as the names of the *whole*. According to M.V. Nikitin, the hyperonym and hyponyms are the same as the generic and species concepts (Nikitin, 1974: 40). The research of the hyponymic relations has allowed putting forward the following thesis important for language semantics: "the genus-species principle of classification ... is an abstraction of the relationship between genus and species in wildlife" (Stepanov, 1981: 76).

Experiment. It is known that scientific classification originates from the ordinary one. The divergence between these ways of knowledge is explained by the fact that scientific knowledge has the research tools applied to comprehend the essence of objects and processes. The researcher delving into studying of different fragments of reality can formulate more exact and complete definitions that can't be told about ordinary classification.

In daily reality "by naming a subject, we place it in a certain cage of the most complex naive systematization at once, being unaware of it. Onomasiological processes aren't less closely connected with thinking, than processes classification" (Frumkina, 1985: 29). Each of us has situations when we get to "the nominative deadlock" because of ignorance of a name of concrete subject.

We have offered primary school pupils of control and experimental classes of Kazakh language schools tasks to check their abilities on: a) correlation of a word with the subject picture; b) identification of nature of communication between a word incentive and a word reaction; c) definition of word meanings of concrete lexicon; d) finding of an excess word; e) association of group of words in a word. For example, the analysis of data of a test has allowed us to allocate four types of answers for finding an excess word when the examinee: 1a) reproduces one sign; b) reproduces one function; c) introduces this subject into a concrete situation; 2) refers a word to a certain category; 3) translates into native (Kazakh) language; 4a) wrong; b) there is no answer.

Carrying out experimental work at school has shown that the role of a language guess based on anticipation in the process of semantization of meanings of new words is large enough, and this way of an explanation of words gives the chance to trainees to predict and foresee the meaning of an unknown word and develops ability to an anticipation and stimulates interest in a word.

The types of semantic processes (associations) allocated on the basis of these psychophysiological experiments correspond to types of a contextual guess about a word meaning on a basis of: similarities of concepts; oppositions; expansions (transition from a specific concept to patrimonial) and narrowings (transition from a generic term to specific) concepts (for example: a) expansion: chicken, a rooster, a duck, a goose is a poultry; b) narrowing: furniture – a table, a chair; sweets – candies, cake, fruit jelly, a zephyr); hierarchy (shift) of concepts; associative transfer of concepts on categories: a) the reason – the investigation: the five - joy; b) part and whole: the handle - an umbrella; c) subject and material: a duck - plasticine; d) action – an object – the figure: to water – a flower - the girl; e) the figure – an object: the pupil - the book.

Results and discussion. It is known that in any dictionary "denotative" and "significative" groups of words are to be distinguished: 1) denotative lexicon tends to designate objects of the external world, denotations; 2) significative lexicon tends to designate concepts, significances. If the first assume the enumeration of their components on the principle "a part – whole", then the second groups of words reflect the logical relations of the genus and species: so, for instance, "in the everyday use we define a sofa as a type of furniture without hesitating, and a plate as a kind of ware (in the dictionary by Ojegov in this question there is no unity: a chair – a sort of furniture ..., a sideboard – a sort of case ..., whereas a case – a piece of furniture, etc.) though in strict sense the sofa and a case, without being interchangeable, represent parts of furniture" (Guard, 1976: 132).

In the hyponymic relations the kernel acts as a patrimonial name, and it means that existence of a sort, or superordinate, is an indicator of a certain semantic link between hyponyms, their equality in relation to a hyperonym and independence of each of them. Scientists designate this type of paradigmatic communications by the term "inclusion" that assumes inclusion of an element in a class: "distribution of a lexical unit of X is included in distribution of unit Y according to what the value of unit of X is richer according to contents, than value of unit Y" (Novikov, 1987: 28).

So, firstly, the hypo-hyperonimic relations are considered as the hierarchical organization of elements of the semantic field which are based on the genus-species relations (M.A. Krongauz, J. Layonz, M.V. Lysyakova, A.D. Bridge, M.V. Nikitin, L.A. Novikov, etc.); secondly, as a categorization *sensu stricto*, i.e. categorizing an object with its recognition as a member of this category (L. Wittgenstein, E.S. Kubryakova, J. Lakoff, A.D. Bridge, E. Roche, R.M. Frumkina, etc.); thirdly, as the conceptualization, which is a process closely connected with the process of categorization, since the peculiarity of conceptualization as one of the most important processes of human cognitive activity consists in understanding the information that comes to it and leading to the formation of concepts, conceptual structures and the

entire conceptual system in the human brain (A.A. Zalevskaya, E.S. Kubryakova, M.V. Nikitin, etc.).

Conclusion. The system approach to lexicon: the transition from studying the external side of linguistic division - the connection of words with extralinguistic factors (the lexicon was considered only as a building material), to the identification of internal, structural links of lexical units - allows us to assert that it is the semantic links that basically determine the process of the words choice. Words are combined into thematic groups by lexical relations, which are the reflection of links in objective reality. All types of semantic links between lexemes in the dictionary serve as the most important principle of the organization of the dictionary in consciousness of the person. It is through the influence of semantic links on the dictionary that it represents a holistic hierarchical structure. Due to the influence of semantic links on the dictionary it represents a holistic hierarchical structure.

Список литературы

- 1 Крушевский Н.В. Очерк науки о языке (Извлечения) // История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях. Ч. 1. М.: Учпедгиз, 1960. С. 252-257.
- 2 Современный русский язык. Теоретический курс. Лексикология /Под ред. Л.А. Новикова.- М.: Русский язык, 1987. 160 с.
- 3 Кузнецова Э.В. Лексикология русского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 1989. 216 с.: ил.
- 4 Никитин М.В. Лексическое значение в слове и словосочетании. Владимир, 1974. 222 с.
- 5 Степанов Ю.С. Имена. Предикаты. Предложения (семиологическая грамматика). М.: Наука, 1981. 360 с.
- 6 Фрумкина Р.М. Смысл и сходство //Вопросы языкознания.- 1985.- № 2.- С.22-31.
- 7 Караулов Ю.Н. Общая и русская идеография. М.: Наука, 1976. 355 с.

References

- 1 Karaulov Yu.N. (1976). General and Russian ideography. Moscow: Nauka, 355 p. (In Russian)
- 2 Krushevsky N.V. (1960). Essay on the science of language (Extracts) // History of linguistics of the XIX-XX centuries in essays and extracts. Part 1. M.: Uchpedgiz, P. 252-257. (In Russian)
- 3 Kuznetsova E.V. (1989). Lexicology of the Russian language. Moscow: Higher School, 216 p. (In Russian)
- 4 Nikitin M.V. (1974). Lexical meaning in word and word combination. Vladimir, 222 p. (In Russian)
- 5 Modern Russian. Theoretical course. Lexicology / Ed. L.A. Novikov.- Moscow: The Russian Language, 160 p. (In Russian)
- 7 Stepanov Yu.S. (1981). Names. Predicates. Suggestions (Semiological grammar). M.: Nauka, 360 p. (In Russian)
- 8 Frumkina R.M. (1985). Sense and similarity // Questions of linguistics.- No 2.- p.22-31. (In Russian)