SCTCMG 2018

International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

INTEGRAL LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF CASE STUDY OF SEMANTIC FIELD "CONSTRUCTION"

A.D. Vagapov (a, c, b)*, M.R. Makhaev (a, b), D.K-S. Bataev (a, b, d),
Kh.N. Mazhiev (a, b, d), A.Kh. Mazhiev (a, b, d)
*Corresponding author

(a) Complex Research Institute n.a. Kh.I. Ibragomov, 21a Staropromoslovoe st., Grozny, Russia,
(b) Academy of Sciences of the Chechen Republic, 13 Esambaev av., 364024, Grozny, Russia
(c) Chechen State Pedagogy University, 33 Kievskaya, Grozny, Russia,
(d) Grozny State Petroleum Technical University n.a. M.D. Millionshchikov, 100 Kh.A. Isaev, Grozny, Russia,

Abstract

The article discusses the possibility of combining three paradigms coexisting in modern linguistics by studying ethnic specificity of semantic fields of national languages. For this, Russian researchers have developed a method of integral linguistic analysis.

The article describes foundations of integral linguistic analysis combining comparative historical and comparative typological methods, seme semasiology based on the integral concept of meaning and comprehensive semantics analysis.

A comprehensive study of the ethnic specificity of semantic fields of national languages using the method of integral linguistic analysis consists of four stages. At the first stage, the list of lexical units constituting the semantic field of language X should be identified. At the second stage, "screening" of identified lexical units is carried out. Lexical units go through an "etymological filter". Lexical units of the semantic field of language X which reveal lexical correspondences to lexical units of the same semantic field of language X-2 go to the third stage for thorough etymological analysis. At the third stage, seme analysis of vocabulary definitions of identified etymological relatives of the semantic field is carried out to reveal their seme composition. At the fourth stage, psycholinguistic meanings of etymological relatives of the semantic field under study are identified. Finally, the seme composition identified when analyzing vocabulary definitions and seme composition identified when describing psycholinguistic meanings are compared.

Integral linguistic analysis is used for comprehensive studies of the ethnic specificity of the semantic field "construction" of the Chechen language. The article presents first results of the study.

Keywords: Paradigm, etymology, lexicography, psycholinguistics, semantic, linguistic.

1. Introduction

A polyparadigmatic situation (co-existence of several paradigms) is one of the iconic phenomena at the current stage of linguistics (Shakhovsky, 2002). There are at least three paradigms (comparative-historical, system-centered and anthropocentric[1]) within which studies are carried out. Various studies are devoted to the study of paradigms in linguistics (Terekhova, 2014).

Within the comparative historical paradigm, the issues of genesis of various languages, reconstruction of the original language, similarity of related languages are solved by comparative historical reconstruction and comparative typological analysis. One of the results of comparative historical research is creation of etymological dictionaries.

If within the system-centric paradigm language was studied as an autonomous formation ("language in and for itself"), within the anthropocentric paradigm, the emphasis is on the "language-person" dyad ("person in language"). The idea of the anthropocentric nature of language is manifested in the statement that "language develops only in society because a person understands himself only after having experienced clarity of his words with others rather than because a person is a part of the whole (a tribe, humanity) or because of the need for mutual understanding". The foundations of this paradigm go back to V. von Humboldt and his interpretation of language as a mediating link between consciousness and surrounding reality (Gauf, 2000).

Coexistence of these paradigms is due to differences in research objectives. A system-centric approach is used to understand the internal structure of the language system. A comparative historical approach is used for reconstruction of linguistic (phonetic, grammatical) patterns in the evolution of languages and their typologization. The anthropocentric approach makes it possible to identify deep layers of the semantics of linguistic units, simulate the linguistic consciousness of ethnic groups, "present features of national mentality reflected in words" (Sternin, 2011)

2. Problem Statement

At the same time, these paradigms can be combined within the comprehensive study of the ethnic specificity of semantic fields of a given language. Semantic fields are groups of words of different parts of speech which are united by a common theme.

The need to study the vocabulary as a system of interconnected lexical units is due to the very nature of the language, according to which lexical composition is a system of interconnected and interdependent lexical semantic groups and semantic fields rather than a collection of completely separate, unrelated lexical units.

The need to study the ethnic specificity of semantic fields is due to the fact that "studies of the language as a translator of ethnic culture are of particular importance" because of intensive language interactions (Makarova, 2006). The need to identify "ethnic" in the lexical composition of a language contributed to a special discipline - ethnolinguistics (Yuce, 2014; Underhill, 2016; Camacho, 2016).

To obtain a full range of data on the ethnic specificity of semantic fields, complex studies are required. To this end, the method of integral linguistic analysis is being developed by unifying the methods

---

[1] Classification of paradigms and terms used for their nomination is a separate issue. At present, there are different approaches to classification of paradigms which are rather ambiguous.

of seme semasiology[2] tested in numerous works of Voronezh theoretical and linguistic school (Sternin, 2013; Makhayev, Polekhin, & Sternin, 2018a; Makhayev, Polekhin, & Sternin, 2018b) and historical and comparative-typological research methods tested on the material of the Chechen language (Vagapov, Batayev, & Mazhiev, 2018)

3.   Research Questions

The research subject is the semantic field "construction" in the Chechen language which was chosen for a crucial role of the construction sector in the life of the Chechen ethnos (a developed tower culture, traditions to help fellow villagers build their houses (Belkhi), to go for season construction works with all family members, etc.[3]).

4.   Purpose of the Study

The article aims to identify the ethnic specificity of the semantic field "construction" in the Chechen language on the basis of integral linguistic analysis.

5.   Research Methods

Integral linguistic analysis of semantic fields consists of four stages:

Stage 1: identification of a list of lexical items that are included in the semantic field of language X (any modern language) which is based on the analysis of X language dictionaries.

Stage 2: the list of lexical units included in the semantic field of language X goes through an "etymological filter" to identify lexical units of the semantic field which have lexical parallels (genetic affinity) with lexical units of the same semantic field of language X-2.

Stage 3: identification of seme composition in the lexicographical meanings of etymological relatives of the semantic field of languages X-1, X-2 ... X-N by seme analysis of their vocabulary definitions. The need for this stage is due to the fact that "vocabulary definitions are not built on the seme principle, they use synonyms, they are often tautological and cannot serve as a reliable source of seme description of meanings" (Sternin, 2013). In addition, vocabulary definitions do not reflect peripheral semes, and functional and connotative semes which are important for reconstructing ethnic characteristics of lexical units are rarely fixed in dictionaries.

Stage 4: identification of psycholinguistic meanings of the etymological relatives of the semantic field of languages X-1, X-2 ... X-N by conducting psycholinguistic associative experiments with native speakers of languages X-1, X-2 ... X-N. Psycholinguistic meanings reflect semantic components (often peripheral) which are not fixed by explanatory dictionaries. However, they are a valuable material for studying the ethnic specificity of the semantics of lexical units.

Stage 5: comparison of the seme composition identified when analyzing vocabulary definitions and seme composition identified when describing psycholinguistic meanings. This comparative analysis allowed us to identify semantic components presented in the language consciousness of native speakers.

---

[2] Seme semasiology is based on the integral theory of the meaning and complex analysis of meaning description.
[3] According to economists, fly building teams constructed thousands of schools, shops, residential houses, etc. in Russia and Kazakhstan.

6. Findings

Due to a limited volume, the article presents the results of the first and second stages of the studies on the ethnic specificity of the semantic field "construction" in the Chechen language and outlines the remaining stages.

At the first stage, a list of lexical units of the Chechen language which constitute the semantic field "construction": tIeIa (step, step), hIusam (dwelling), basar (paint), baha (wooden (snow shovel)), lawn (lawn), b-watt (pour, put, immerse; build, erect a wall), waba (pole for lifting weights), lamis (ladder), installation (installation) was identified

At the second stage, etymological links between Chechen lexical units of the semantic field "construction" and lexical units of other languages of the same semantic field were identified. Lexical correspondences to Chechen lexical units were identified in many Indo-European languages.

Table 01. Lexical correspondences to the word «Б-илла» («found»)

English	Old English	German
build	**byldan**	**Bilden**

C.f. chech *гIала йилла* 'found a fortress, a city'. The exchange of initial sounds b-, y-, d- in *билла // йилла // дилла* 'to lay, to base, to build' is explained by the Chechen grammatical classes. Phonetic alternation of *лл // лд* in this stem, cf. Chechen *тIилд* 'earlobe; uvula; rooster's comb' (*<*дил-д'* meat pulp' *< *дилла* 'lay, overlay, layered', from which *dilha'* meat pulp, flesh 'is also derived); Chechen *хийла, хилийла* in dialectal *хилда* 'let it be', *лойла* 'let him give (God)' in dialectal *лолда*, etc. Therefore, there is no fundamental phonetic obstacle to relation of Nakh billan 'to build, lay' and German *bildan 'to build '.

Table 02. Lexical correspondences to the word «Б-уотта» ('pour; put, load, pile up; to build a wall')

English	Russian
Put, put up	**бутить** ('rubble')

Sound differences in the stems of these words can be expalined. First, voiced consonants in the Germanic languages were naturally stunned, therefore, German put* originally had the form *but. Secondly, the ending of the infinitive-an // -ən in these languages is reduced (weakened), therefore, English put can be reconstructed as * butan. This is confirmed by written forms, cf., for example, ME putten, OE putian // potian. Thirdly, experts find it difficult to explain why the vowels u // o // y // i alternate in the English roots (cf. ME Pitte, OE pytan). Fourth, mysterious alternation of the back lingual t with doubled tt is observed. It is difficult to explain from the point of German studies. We can mention Nakh *буоттан*, present tense of *бутт(у)*, the form of the repetitive aspect *биттан*, present tense *буьтт(у)* which repeat all the mentioned alternations of vowels and consonants.

Table 03. Lexical correspondences to the word «Тилла» ('pour; put, load, pile up; to build a wall')

German	Old German	Old English	Russian	Ukranian
Diele	**thil**	**Thille**	**стелить, настилать, настил (cover)**	**стеля 'ceiling'** (with a mobile sound с)

Table 04. Lexical correspondences to the word «ч1ерг» ('ceiling beam) originating from *k'erg 'roof timber) [4]

Serbo-Croatian	Russian	Lithuanian
Krek	кряк (dialect)	kreklas ('roof timber')

Table 05. Lexical correspondences to the word «Тигал/стигал/тигла» ('sky') [5]

Old Norvegian	Old German	Old English	Latin	Lithuanian
Tigl	ziegal	Tigele	tegula ('roof cover, roof), tegile 'cover')	stiegele ('roof tile)

The semantic transition of the meaning of 'roof, ceiling' to sky, firmament 'is confirmed by many other examples, cf. latin palatum 'ceiling, vault' and 'heaven, firmament', Eng. ceiling - celestial heavenly '.

Table 06. Lexical correspondences to the word «Лага» ('floor beam')

Old Icelandic	Enlish	Slavian	Russian dialect	Belorussian dialect
lag	log	laga ('thick stick')	лага ('cross beam')	лага ('floor beam')

The etymological meaning - 'lining, underlaying (log)' - is restored on the basis of the Nakh stems of *лиега* 'maple' *laga* 'lie down, fall', and iter. *liega* 'lie down, lean, fall' (cf. germ. * liegan, fame * legati).

Table 07. Lexical correspondences to the word «бōг1ам» derived from *бāг1ум*

Old German	German	Old English
boum < *boghum	baum < *baghum)	Beam

Parallels to the Chechen word are available in a number of other Caucasian languages. On the basis of the Nakh languages *Bōg1am* can be explained as a derivative with suffix - *(у)м* from the verb stem *bag1-*, related to chech. *BuiGi* to hoist, rebuild ', *biig1a* ' to mount, stick, install '.

Table 08. Lexical correspondences to the word «Т1ēг1а» (stage) derived from Nakh *mIāг1u*

Russian	Serbian	Old English	German	English
Стега	стаза	stāger	stiege	stage

The results of the second stage of the comprehensive study are described in the dictionary of construction terms of the Chechen language (Vagapov, Batayev, & Mazhiev, 2018)

---

[4] Cp. borrowed from the Chechen language *к1ерк* 'roof beam
[5] It had the meaning "roof, cover, tile" which can be seen from its affinity to one-stem words in Table 05.

7. Conclusion

Thus, etymological analysis identified lexical units of the semantic field "construction" of the Chechen language which have lexical correspondences to the lexical units of the same semantic field of a number of Indo-European languages.

At the next (third) stage, it is necessary to identify the seme composition in the lexicographical meanings of etymological relatives of the semantic field "construction" by means of seme analysis of their vocabulary definitions.

To conduct a psycholinguistic experiment, it is necessary to involve native speakers of Chechen, English, German, Russian. Stimulus material should be formulated in Chechen, English, German and Russian, respectively.

Integral linguistic analysis in a comprehensive study of the ethnic specificity of semantic fields of national languages helps study linguistic phenomena, thinking and behavior of ethnic groups. The authors look forward to international scientific cooperation in this area.

References

Camacho, JCM. (2016). *Towards a characterization of an (almost) ignored linguistic discipline: ethnolinguistics. Estudios de linguistica-universidad de alicante-elua (pp. 181-212).* Alicante: Univ Alicante.

Gauf, W. (2000). *Selected Works on Linguistics.* Moscow, IG Progress.

Makarova, E.Yu. (2006). *Language as a basis of ethnic culture: dis. ... cand. Philosophy Sciences: 24.00.01.* Volgograd: Volgograd State Medical University

Makhayev, M.R., Polekhin, N.A., Sternin, I.A. (2018a). *Voronezh and Derbent in the regional language consciousness. Communication culture and its formation.* Voronezh, "RHYTHM".

Makhayev, M.R., Polekhin, N.A., Sternin, I.A. (2018b). The degree of development of the toponym "Derbent" (according to linguistic associative experiments). *Bulletin of the Social-Pedagogical Institute, 1,* 44-51.

Terekhova, S. (2014). Modern approaches in linguistics and the theory of translation multi-paradigm translator's text analyses. *Beitrage der europaischen slavistischen linguistik (Polyslav), 17,* 195-200.

Shakhovsky, V.I. (2002). Language personality in the emotional communicative situation. *Philology, 2,* 59.

Sternin, I.A. (2011). Psycholinguistic meaning of the word. *Bulletin of Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Russian and foreign languages and methods of their teaching, 18.*

Sternin, I.A. (2013). Methods for describing the semantics of the word. Yaroslavl, Istoki.

Underhill, JW. (2016). *Who wants walls? An Ethnolinguistics of insides and outsides. Translating values: evaluative concepts in translation (pp. 11-36).* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Vagapov, A.D., Batayev D.K.S., Mazhiev Kh.N. (2018). Dictionary of construction terms of the Chechen language. Grozny, IP "Bisultanova P.Sh.

Yuce, K., Eryaman, MY., Sahin, A., Kocer, O. (2014). Paradigm shift in social sciences and qualitative research in applied linguistics in turkey. *Egitim ve bilim-education and science, 39,* 1-12.