

# Lexical Compatibility and Features of the Combination of Adjectives Denoting Size

S Getmantsev<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Voronezh State Technical University, 20 years of October street, 84, Voronezh, Russia

E-mail: bogdan.ershov@yandex.ru

**Abstract.** The article deals with the problems of lexical compatibility and compatibility of adjectives that denote size in Russian and English. The question of lexical compatibility is one of the central issues of modern semasiology and lexicology. The basis of lexical compatibility is the process of knowledge and conceptualization of the surrounding world. The picture of the world embodied in the national language determines the specifics of compatibility in it. Compatibility of lexical units associated with the system properties of the word "sign". The nature of the signified determines the semantic potential of the word. The study of the compatibility of words in terms of their comparison in different languages is extremely interesting. They make it possible to more clearly identify the national specifics in the system of organization of languages, provide rich material for studying the typology of languages. Such studies and their results are invaluable for improving the efficiency of teaching one language on the basis of another, for the theory and practice of translation and for lexicographic theory and practice. The article examines the lexical compatibility of adjectives in size, which requires attention to the compatibility features of adjectives.

## 1. Introduction

It is known that the words presented in bilingual dictionaries as translated equivalents have significant differences in lexical compatibility. The study of the national specifics of the lexical compatibility of words from different lexical-semantic groups seems to be necessary both for theoretical understanding and for the practice of teaching and learning foreign languages. In our work, the lexical compatibility of Russian and English adjectives denoting size was investigated.

The relevance of the study is due to significant interesting modern linguistics to the problems of semasiology, in particular the search for various bases for the formation of systemic groups of vocabulary. The results of this study will provide some additional information about the principles of constructing an LSG, taking into account the specifics of the compatibility of its elements, which will ensure optimal construction of the LSG and will contribute to a more accurate identification of their properties. The fact that the study is conducted on the material of two unrelated languages will reveal the national specifics of the compatibility of the elements of the LSG under study in English and Russian, and this, in turn, will help to a certain extent remove the factor of subjectivity and arbitrariness when building the LSG the construction of the LSG is syntactic compatibility, which was not previously taken into account. This ensures the relevance of this work [1].

## 2. Methodology

The methodological basis of the study lies in the fact that the work proposes a new, additional criterion for constructing an LSG - the compatibility of its elements [2]. The technique consists in the further development of the method for constructing lexical-semantic fields and various lexical-semantic groups. For the first time, the national specificity of LSG for adjectives of size in English and Russian languages was revealed, taking into account the syntactic compatibility of their elements, which was not previously considered [3].

Research methods are dictated by the specifics of the selected object, the purpose and objectives of the study. The main research methods are:

Method of observation; method of categorical analysis; field analysis method; method of quantitative analysis; benchmarking [4].

## 3. Discussion

The historiographic basis of the study was the works of academician V.V. Vinogradova on lexicology and lexicography. Trudy L.V. Scherby, O.E. Vinogradova, M.V. Vlavatskoi, M.V. Dzhagaryana, R.N. Dmitrieva, F.N. Dyachkovskogo, N.A. Kozelskoy, E.S. Kubryakova, E.R. Laskareva, V.V. Morkovkina, M.F. Pankina, E.V. Rakhilina, N.K. Ryabtseva, A.A. Ufimtseva, G.K. Khasanova, V.I. Shemyakina, D.N. Shmeleva, Ya.V. Ekimyana formed the basis for the study of problems of lexical compatibility. In our study, we relied on the point of view of B.Y. Normana, according to which, words in different languages are combined in different ways and are divided into groups. When constructing the lexico-semantic fields of adjectives for the Russian and English languages, we relied on the field model proposed by G.S. Sciurus and later developed by other linguists, such as N.G. Arkhipova, A.V. Bondarko, T.Yu. Golechkova, E.V. Kuznetsova, N.M. Malkina, Z.D. Popova, A.M. Shishlyannikova, N.V. Yudina and other [5-23].

## 4. Results

The study conducted in this article showed that the ratio of denotative and connotative components in the semantic structure of adjectives of size is found both on the paradigmatic axis, which is revealed in the vocabulary definitions of these adjectives, and in terms of their syntagmatic connections. Vocabulary definitions show that there is always a denotative supporting component in the semantic structure of the analyzed adjectives. The brightest and most vivid images of Russian speakers, as well as native English speakers, are associated with the names of household items, names of body parts of humans and animals, names of plants, devices and devices, vehicles, buildings, structures, relief details, celestial and celestial bodies. everything that surrounds a person in nature and everyday life [6].

The semantic structure of the studied group of adjectives does not significantly depend on the genetic and structural features of the language. The processes of development of secondary meanings, which are, as it were, potentially embedded in the semantic structure of a word, are universal and characteristic of living languages. [7].

However, despite the universal nature of the perception of the sizes of objects and phenomena of the surrounding world and the great similarity of systems of subject-marked size standards for different peoples, national-specific features of a particular culture as a whole, features of everyday life, historical traditions, etc. features of culture and history people are understood, enter the world of people's thoughts, and then, having already received a linguistic expression, are included in the semantic space of the language of the people [8].

The study of the lexical fields of Russian and English size adjectives shows that in both fields similar lexical-semantic processes are found, the consequence of which is the development of lexico-semantic groups (parcels) that are in the field.

In general, the structure of lexico-semantic fields of adjective size in Russian and English has the same number of parcels: "sizes larger than normal", "dimensions of area greater than norm",

“dimensions of volumetric objects greater than norm”, and also “sizes smaller than norm”, “ area sizes less than normal ”, “ dimensions of volumetric objects below normal ”. Only 6 parcels [9].

Both in Russian and in the English field an equal number of parcels is allocated. However, the fullness of parcels in two languages is different. The core occupancy in the English field is somewhat larger, which is explained by the presence of synonyms: big / large; little / small. At the extreme periphery of the parcels “sizes larger than normal” and “sizes smaller than normal” in the English field there is a greater number of adjectives derived from animal names, such as mammoths, elephants, as well as literary characters names, Lilliputians, mythical creatures such as elves, Cyclopes, Titans, Hercules, Colossus, and from the name of a group of undersized Negroid peoples living in the equatorial forests of Africa - pygmies [10].

Communicative activity of the nucleus and the periphery is represented as follows: in texts where expressivity and figurativeness must be emphasized, adjectives of the periphery are more common than adjectives of the nucleus. There is no clear boundary between the core and the periphery. In the text, peripheral adjectives can become communicative-relevant, while nuclear ones recede into the background [11].

In general, it can be concluded that the national characteristics of the field structures of the language system are concentrated mainly in the zones of peripheral elements, while the nuclear elements serve as a basis for establishing the equivalence of systems. The core of the lexical system of the language includes the most frequent and informative vocabulary. This is typical for both Russian and English fields [12].

Interlingual study of language fields is of great interest, since helps to solve the problem of the relationship between the universal and the idio-ethnic in the language, allows to reveal the national specifics of the division and reflection in the language of objective reality [13].

## 5. Conclusion

A comparative analysis of size adjectives in English and Russian revealed their significant similarities. Despite the different structure of languages, and, consequently, various ways of expressing lexical relations, correspondences can be found in English and Russian [14]. The lexico-semantic field as a type of lexical grouping has national specificity, which appears in comparison with a similar grouping in another language. Selection of the core and periphery in the process of field analysis of a linguistic phenomenon is very effective in practical terms, because gives reliable material in the practice of language teaching and lexicography [15].

## References

- [1] Ashmarov I A, Ershov B A 2018 Church as a social and economic institution of society in the XIX -early XX centuries II International Scientific and Practical Conference "Orthodoxy and Society: the Edge of Interaction" *Chita: Transbaikal State University* 33-41
- [2] Ershov B A 2009 The value of spiritual and moral values in the education of young people *Bulletin of the Voronezh State Technical University* 3 34-37
- [3] Ershov B A, Zimenkova E V 2016 Consequences of the collapse of the USSR *International Journal of Humanities and Natural Sciences* 3 20-22
- [4] Ershov B A 2012 Historiographical aspects of the relationship between the Russian Orthodox Church and state structures in the provinces of the Central Chernozem region in the XIX-early XX centuries *Bulletin of the Voronezh State Technical University. Series "Humanities"* 188-192
- [5] Fedyanin V I, Ershov B A, Zubov I V 2016 Spiritual and moral education of cadets in the institutes of the State fire service of the Ministry of Emergency Situations and higher military educational institutions in modern Russia: history and modernity *Bulletin of Vyatka State University* 2 63-67
- [6] Fursov V N, Ershov B A, Lubkin Y Y 2016 Participation of the Russian Orthodox Church in the patriotic education of the young generation in modern Russia *Proceedings of the Voronezh State Pedagogical University* 1(270) 147-150

- [7] Vinogradova O E 2013 Experimental analysis of word compatibility as a method for describing lexical semantics *European Social Science Journal* **9-3(36)** 264-271
- [8] Vlavatskaya M V 2010 Demarcation of semantic, lexical and phraseological compatibility in the context of combinatorial semasiology *Bulletin of the Pyatigorsk State University* **3** 92-96
- [9] Vlavatskaya M V 2013 Classification of types of compatibility by the number of words combined *Philology Questions of theory and practice* **1(19)** 43-47
- [10] Vlavatskaya M V 2011 Compatibility as a factor in the actualization of the lexical meaning of a word *News of the Volgograd State Pedagogical University* **5(59)** 67-71
- [11] Golyachkova T Yu 2011 Lexical compatibility: peculiarities of mastering the advanced stages of fluency in English *Bulletin of the University of the Russian Academy of Education* **4** 97-100
- [12] Gorelik T S 1967 Adjective phrases in modern English (Moscow) 301
- [13] Dzhagaryan M V 2015 The problem of lexical compatibility *University readings, materials of scientific methodological readings* (Pyatigorsk) 211-215
- [14] Dmitrieva R N 2014 On the problem of lexical compatibility of words when translating *Bulletin of the North Caucasus Federal University* **3(42)** 230-233
- [15] Dyachkovsky F N 2006 On the types of lexical compatibility of words and lexical meaning. Russia and Germany: problems of modern federalism: a political science collection 293-303 (Yakutsk)
- [16] Kozelskaya N A 1982 Components of the word meaning and lexical compatibility *Aspects of lexical meaning* 66-71
- [17] Laskareva E R 2015 Lexical compatibility and degree of freedom in a foreign language. Russian as a foreign language and its teaching methodology: *Materials of sections of the XVIII International Philological Conference* 20-26
- [18] Morkovkin V V 1979 Compatibility of the word and the problems of lexicography *Problems of word compatibility: collection of scientific papers* 145 129–138 *M.: MGPII*
- [19] Norman B Yu 2004 Theory of language: an introductory course: study guide *Flint: Science*
- [20] Pankina M F 2013 The theory of lexical compatibility of words as a subject of study. Actual problems of language training in non-special universities: *Proceedings of the III International Scientific Conference* 131-132
- [21] Rakhilina E V 2008 Cognitive analysis of subject names: semantics and compatibility *M. .: Russian dictionaries*
- [22] Ryabtseva N K 2000 Size and quantity in the language picture of the world *Logical analysis of language: languages of space* 108–116
- [23] Solovev D B 2020 Using of Instruments of the State Support for Integration of Science and Business on the Example of Far Eastern Federal University *Smart Technologies and Innovations in Design for Control of Technological Processes and Objects: Economy and Production. FarEastCon 2018. Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies* **138** pp 923-933. [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15577-3\\_85](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15577-3_85)