ТОРАЙҒЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІНІҢ ХАБАРШЫСЫ

Филологиялық серия
1997 жылдан бастап шығады

ВЕСТНИК ТОРАЙГЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТА

Филологическая серия
Издается с 1997 года

R. A. Vafeev[1], R. Zh. Saurbayev[2], *F. T. Yerekhanova[3], E. Yu. Pogozheva[4], N. R. Omarov[5]

[1]Tyumen State University,
Russian Federation, Tyumen;
[2,4]Toraighyrov University,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Pavlodar;
[3]Central Asian Innovation University,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Shymkent;
[5]Pavlodar Margulan Pedagogical University,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Pavlodar
[1]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0994-0504
[2]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1419-7361
[3]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3344-3839
[4]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8100-633X
[5]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9114-3618
*e-mail: siliconoasis702@gmail.com

THE FUNCTION OF THE VIRTUAL AND THE ACTUAL MEANING OF THE WORD «HUL» («FISH») IN THE LEXICAL SEMANTIC PARADIGM OF THE KHANTY LANGUAGE

The article reveals the contents of a «virtual» and «actual» meaning of the word «hul» («fish») in the lexical-semantic paradigm of the Khanty language, developed by «field» research model fishing vocabulary. With a focus on the Khanty language's lexical-semantic paradigm, this article aims to reveal the role and meaning of hul by looking at its actual (contextual) and virtual (potential) meanings. Also it aims to explore the virtual and real meanings of the word «hul» («fish») in the lexical and semantic field of the Khanty language. To achieve this goal, it is necessary to examine the word «hul» from both its specific and general meanings, from the perspectives of language and communication. In this regard, it is important to note that the lexical composition of a language is not simply a random collection of words, but rather an organized whole with its own unique structure. The study has employed source investigation, ethnolinguistic and etymological

analysis, comparative historical analysis, and diachronic research. The research findings indicate that the functional and semantic analysis of the fishing vocabulary in the Khanty language has established the inventory composition of the field's core and periphery. The authors conclude that, even though the Khanty people's everyday lives and subsistence methods are fundamental to the meaning of «fish», its various meanings capture the variety of cultural and metaphorical environments that are part of the Khanty worldview.

Keywords: virtual meaning, actual meaning, paradigm, artificial situation of communication, dialect, segmentation of the lexical-semantic structure, peripherals.

Introduction

One of the most important tasks of modern linguistics is developing a «semantic field» and its application in studying different languages. The basis for using the «field model» is the existence of many elements, whose relationships are not just a collection of objects, but rather a system of lexical and paradigmatic connections. The background of the research is critically evaluating the research of individual scientists in this matter – determined fishing equipment in Khanty language vocabulary. The language of the Khanty people, who live in Western Siberia, is known for its rich vocabulary and semantic structure, which reflects the complex interrelationship between the Khanty culture and their natural surroundings.

The elements of this structure are interconnected and interdependent, forming a systematic system. This consistency is linked to the distinction between language as a system and language in use, or in other words, the dichotomy between language and speech. Depending on whether we view a linguistic expression abstractly, as a unit of the language system, or specifically, as a unit of spoken language, different types of meaning may be associated with it. To better understand how the different types of meaning differ in terms of generalization, let's analyze the semantics of the word «*hul*» (which means «fish») in more detail. Firstly, what does the word «*hul*» mean when it is considered as a part of the language's lexical system? To do so, let's imagine an artificial communication scenario.

In this scenario, the speaker addresses the listener and says the word «*hul*». There is no context at this point, meaning nothing has been previously mentioned about fish and the situation is arbitrary. The listener receives a message containing the word «*hul*», and learns very little. The information content of the message is minimal. However, the listener now knows something – the meaning of «hul» in the language system. This meaning is called the virtual meaning. From a wide range of words, one word has been selected, and thus, many subjects and actions

are already unthinkable as potential topics of conversation. However, the listener does not yet know which type of fish the speaker is referring to. These may include *velshi kholopn* (fresh fish), nyashiyn (just caught), *punan katlom* (river fish), «*hul*» (sea fish), or even *tuv pa shars* (fish from a river, lake, or sea). They may also be khanty mui (sturgeon), al khul (salmon), or enmom muy (natural or artificially grown). Additionally, they may be al hul (weedy or noble), un hul (large or small), voyang hul (fat or lean), tam *muwang* (local or imported), or *imi* (female) or *iki* (male). Lovang hul *bony fish or lovly «hul» boneless fish* (cartilaginous), etc.; somang hul scaly fish or somly *hul* «fish» without scales, etc.; tata ulty hul real fish or nomasn taity hul imaginary fish. The listener can't even be quite sure if the fish is actually in question. After all, we may be talking about a metaphorical fish (especially in the folklore of Hunts) or a hul «fish» in an exciting game of dominoes. Thus, the virtual meaning of the word is stretched in its scope. Therefore, the volume of the dictionary entry for the word *hul* «fish» in various explanatory dictionaries reflects this stretching of the meaning of the word to varying degrees.

Being stretched, the virtual meaning of a word creates uncertainty, as the listener is unsure which of the possible meanings to choose for the word «fish». At the same time, this virtual meaning is social, known only to native speakers and shared by all members of the linguistic community. Representatives of this community have common expectations regarding future information during communication.

Let us say, in the course of communication, we, as neutral observers, concluded from some signs that the speaker using the word «*hul*» was describing a fishing experience they had witnessed. This event, with its unique features, could be described as an unusual experience in general terms. From all these signs, the listener, given only the word «*hul*» and its implied meaning, received very little information, which could be roughly described by the signs *halty tuv* (burning lake) and *Hulang drags* (herd of fish). He did not recognize any other features of the specific «*hul*», but the virtual meaning of «*hul fish*» only included those features that were considered relevant. The process of selecting relevant features is an act of abstraction. In this regard, we can say that the meaning of a word is abstract. The virtual value, on the other hand, is one plus on the generalization axis. It is the most generalized type of value, which is both poor and rich at the same time.

According to scientist Weinrich [1], the lack of information in a word like *flower* is compared to the richness of each flower's features. However, the opposite is also true – the limitations of an individual thing compared to the power of a word. When we consider a linguistic expression, its meaning is specific. Each speaker or listener puts their unique content into what they say or perceive, making it more specific. So, we can move from an artificial situation, created to reveal the concept of the virtual meaning of a word, such as «hul» (which means «fish»), to a more

natural one, where the word is used as part of an integral communicative unit – a sentence. For example, in the Tuvan phrase *Tuva manloma hul velloma!*, the word «*hul*» has a specific meaning about the context, being part of a sentence that expresses a certain situation. In this case, the information about fish is much more specific than in an abstract definition. Here, the meaning of the linguistic expression for the word «*hul*» is more clearly defined and specific, so it is customary to refer to this as the actual meaning [2, p. 53–54].

Thus, the actual meaning of a linguistic expression is associated with the minimum degree of generalization of its information. The virtual meaning, on the other hand, is associated with the maximum degree of generalization. The two meanings are dialectically interrelated, with the virtual meaning serving as a basis for the actual meaning.

Materials and Methods

The virtual meaning of the word «hul» («fish») is an abstraction from its actual meaning and is formed based on it. However, the virtual meaning also serves as a semantic basis for the word's various meanings. A. M. Peshkovsky noted the correlation between the two meanings, stating that there are two images: one arising from pronouncing a single word and the other from pronouncing a phrase with that word. While the former may be a distraction from the latter, statically, it does not change the overall meaning. Nevertheless, this image does exist, and this *distraction* is not the result of our scientific reflection, but a living psychological reality. It can even be presented, contrary to reality, as a primordial essence, with specific images of words and phrases as modifications of this primordial essence [3, p. 93].

In addition, a great deal of scholarly research has been done on the Khanty language's lexical-semantic paradigm, covering a variety of components of speech.

For example, Ju. Normanskaja states that «As far as we know, the Khanty materials collected by G. F. Miller have not been described in detail by linguists before, despite them being among the first dictionaries of Khanty dialects» [4].

According to the semantics of verbs, V. N. Solovar assumes that «The Khanty language distinguishes between a movement along a trajectory close to an ideal circle (people, birds, objects) and chaotic movement, i.e. rotation of a substance or many small homogeneous objects (snow, whirlwind)» [5, p. 274].

The article of Vaneyan et al. solve a similar problem for falling verbs in Kazym Khanty [6].

A. A. Shiyanova considers that «Linguists have recently shown a particular interest in studying different categories of adjective names because, in modern languages, adjectives are crucial for characterizing the phenomena of the surrounding reality and actively contribute to the creation of a world model» [7, p. 169].

Further in-depth study of the history of interjections using the material of dialects of the Khanty language is required, since there are a large number of genetically related interjections in the language in question [8, p. 52].

If we consider the dialects in the Khanty language, F. M. Lelkhova gives a clear picture «Two traditional classifications exist, a binary and a trinary one, but they are the same. According to one, the two main dialect groups are Eastern and Western. Eastern ones are spoken east of the confluence of the rivers Irtysh and Ob, all others are western, belonging to two subgroups: northern dialects down the River Ob and southern dialects up the River Irtysh» [9, p. 120].

Consequently, I. Fedotova found that Khanty dialects today consist of three, rather than two, groups since the eastern dialectal group falls into two distinct variants: Surgut Khanty and Vakh Khanty. For language variants to be defined as a single language or at least as dialects of the same language, their basic vocabulary must coincide by more than 90%. In this case, coincidences were much lower: 79 %. The researcher therefore argues that these variants can be recognized as separate languages [10].

According to the degree of generality and concreteness of word meanings, i.e., virtuality and relevance, dictionaries establish *rules* for applying word concepts to reality [11, p. 281]. At the same time, information about the world is stored in our memory in a systematic rather than chaotic manner, i.e., in the form of various types of related associations and constructions, which are referred to in research as a *semantic field*.

According to E. M. Mednikova, the systemic nature of vocabulary is found primarily in the distribution of words into semantically related lexical groups, or lexico-semantic paradigms. Each word in a language is included in at least one lexico-semantic paradigm, although often more than one due to its polysemy. The individual meaning of any word can be understood through its relationship to all other words in the paradigm to which it belongs, based on specific characteristics [12].

E. L. Krivchenko adds that at higher levels of language structure, certain meaning units act as units for processing and storing information. At this level, a word can be seen as a combination of these units. The semantic connections between words are explained by the presence of shared units of meaning in their structure or by the similarity of how they are combined. This is not always obvious from direct observation or intuition. Krivchenko [13] argues that: «The semantic (verbal) field is a lexical paradigm formed when the lexico-semantic continuum is divided into segments corresponding to individual words in the language». These word segments directly oppose each other based on simple semantic features, as noted by Koseriu [14].

The system connections established by E. M. Mednikova and E. L. Krivchenko are based on certain semantic features. Signs of the lowest level of abstraction combine words into lexico-semantic groups, while other signs with more generalized meanings signal intergroup or inter-field connections.

The presentation of the vocabulary of any language requires a precise systematic semantic analysis, which is why it is necessary to first reveal the concept of a «semantic field. The semantic field is one of the many manifestations of the paradigmatic relationships between words, along with various types of synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and thematic groups. This fact often leads to confusion between the terms *field, paradigm,* and *semantic group* in research.

While conducting our research, we utilized a range of methods, such as examining primary sources, sampling, etymological and ethnolinguistic analysis, comparative history, and diachronic research procedures.

As the methodological basis for the study, renowned Turkologists, dialectologists, and others – among them R. M. Meyer, E. M. Mednikova, E. L. Krivchenko, V. Porzig, N. V. Krushevsky, A. M. Peshkovsky, H. Weinrich, V. N. Solovar, E. V. Paducheva, and others–established scientific and theoretical frameworks.

Results and discussion

Having analyzed the aforementioned data, the results delve into some issues that for a successful functional and semantic analysis of the fishing vocabulary in the Khanty language, it is necessary to:

1 Identify the *inventory* of fishing words in the Khanty language and determine if there are any common invariant properties between this vocabulary and the Russian language;

2 If the names of all (or most) of the fishing words are used for comparison, then we can see if there are differences in terms of expression, and similarities in terms of meaning, between the two languages.

In the functional and semantic analysis of the fishing vocabulary of the Khanty language, we have established the inventory composition of the core of the field and its peripheral layers:

a) in relation to the Khanty fishing vocabulary, the names of fish are the basis of the core of the semantic field (revealed – 35):

saalak 'small fry' (also called Sosva herring: saalak hul)

usch hul 'young fish coming during the plunge', (lit. plunging fish)

hanti hul 'all kinds of whitefish fish species' (lit. Khanty fish, namely: nelma, muksun, shchekur, cheese, pyjian)

al hul 'all kinds of simple fish of the Sorov species' (lit. simple fish)

suh 'sturgeon'

aj suh 'lobar' (small sturgeon, sturgeon)

kari 'sterlet' (and also karysh, borrowed from Russian from the hunt.)
aj kari 'sterlet or karyshok' (literally little sterlet)
wunsh 'nelma'
aj wunsh 'non-standard nelma' (literally little nelma)
Mohsang 'muksun'
kulnshi 'in Russian kolezen or non-standard muksun' (literally little muksun)
schohar 'shchekur'
aj schoχar 'non-standard shchekur' (literally little shchekur)
sarah 'cheese'
ush saraχ 'the stinging young cheese'
pischjan 'pyrjan'
ush pischjan 'the stabbing youth of pyrjan'
un sort 'large pike' (lit. big pike)
tunal sort 'last year's pike or pike born last year'
aj sort 'shchurogai' (lit. little pike)
un mewti 'big ide-male' (lit. big ide)
un mewti imi (awarne) 'large ide-female' (lit. big ide-female)
aj mewti 'podyazok' (lit. small ide)
kelshi 'soroga'
aj kelshi 'sorozhka' (literally little soroga)
schapar 'chebak'
aj schapar 'chebachok' (literally little chebak)
hanshang hul 'perch' (literally patterned fish)
lar 'ruff'
aj lar 'ruff' (small ruff)
tuwhul 'golden lake carp' (English lake fish)
as tuwhul 'silver river crucian carp' (lit. river lake fish)
un panne 'large burbot' (lit. big burbot)
aj panne 'small burbot' (lit. small burbot).

In relation to the Khanty fishing vocabulary, there are on the periphery of the semantic field:

b) the names of the parts of the fish (identified – 20), for example: hul Oh 'fish head', hul em 'fish eye', hul ungal wus 'fish mouth', etc.

c) the names of the viscera of fish (identified – 18), for example: hul sam 'fish heart', hul sitop 'fish bile', hul mohal 'fish liver', etc.

d) the names of the traditional fish dishes (identified – 26), for example: sort hul hoschjingk 'pike ear', johal 'boneless dried fish meat', etc.

e) names of household items, clothes and shoes, manufactured from fish (found – 11), for example: suh ajm 'sturgeon glue', hanschang hul am 'perches glue', etc.

f) name of fishing gear (revealed – 15), for example: pun 'snout for fishing', holop 'net', etc.

g) names of fishing gear parts (revealed – 46), for example: schol juh 'long rods of larch or pine used to make a fishing muzzle', etc.

h) names of types of transport related to fishing in autumn, spring and summer (revealed – 13), for example: metal lolpi 'two–oared wooden boat used for fishing with fixed or smooth net traps', etc.

i) names of types of transport related to fishing in winter (revealed - 18), for example: aj langkar uhal 'small shoulder sleds used for short-range fishing in the winter season', etc.

It may be stated with some degree of certainty that the cultural identity of the Khanty people is intrinsically linked to their fishing practices. Fishing and hunting constitute the foundation of their way of life, while Russian culture is more closely tied to agricultural pursuits. Consequently, the term «fish» is less frequently employed in the vocabulary and semantic realm of the Russian language when compared to the lexicon of the Khanty language.

Secondly, there is a lack of commercially important fish species in central Russia. In contrast, Western Siberia boasts a diverse array of fish species within the Ob River basin, contributing to the rich commercial vocabulary of the Khanty language.

The study of the vocabulary of a language through the division into semantic fields is a common method in structural semantics. However, some researchers take a broad approach to this concept, while others take a narrower approach. Due to its widespread use, the *field* method is often perceived as the only approach to structural and semantic analysis of vocabulary. In cases where scientists rely only on linguistic data and linguistic facts, it can be difficult to clearly define all the boundaries of a field due to the lack of clarity in the semantic space of a language. Peripheral elements fall into a vague semantic zone, and they can either cross the boundaries of different semantic fields or not fall into any field at all.

Therefore, one of the main challenges remains the development of reliable methods for defining the composition of a semantic field. Some semantic units in the center of a field form microsemantic fields, while others as peripheral elements remain outside the core of a field.

To correlate the *center* and *periphery* of a field, we have used not only active lexical material but also folklore. On the other hand, a comparison of the fishing-related vocabulary in the Khanty and Russian languages allows us to determine how and to what extent native speakers of these two different languages perceive the *fishing worldview*, what is similar, and universal, and what is unique and specific.

It should be noted that there are different approaches to the study of the semantic field. The German scientist J. Trier identifies two types of parallel fields:

conceptual, which are implied as units – concepts, and verbal, which consist of words. According to J. Trier, there is a complete parallelism between these two types of fields. However, Trier's recognition of this parallelism led to a major mistake in his approach. He allowed an absolute parallelism between verbal (symbolic) and conceptual fields, which were mutually exclusive. This approach did not take into account the actual meaning of lexical units, and it has been criticized for this reason. He also considered the *field* a closed group of words, studying only nouns, adjectives, and not verbs, among other things. Despite these critical remarks, J. Trier's work is an important step in the development of structural semantics within the field of theory. His work is relevant not only for descriptive linguistics, but also for the modern comparative study of multilingual systems [15].

The scientist V. Porzig studied syntagmatic relations, also known as syntagmatic fields. In recent years, there has been a growing emphasis on the comprehensive study of various linguistic means, such as lexico-semantic and lexico-grammatical fields, which are referred to as functional semantic fields in linguistics. V. Porzig was one of the first scholars to investigate these fields. He highlighted semantically related words, such as *neigh* and *horse*, *bark* and *dog, serve* and *food, ride* and *wagon*, *look* and *eyes*, and *blond* and *hair.* All of these words form combinations of a verb and noun with the meaning of an object of action or a bearer of an attribute [16].

In this regard, N. V. Krushevsky [17] wrote in 1883 about the ability of words to excite each other: dog and bark, horse and neigh, etc. He believed that this ability was based on the psychic law of association through contiguity. However, when studying syntagmatic fields, we can see the valence properties (lexical and grammatical compatibility) of linguistic units within a semantic field. The core of these valence properties consists of adjectives, as shown in the example of the Khanty language. In this language, the verbs «*shushty*» (to go), «*nyarematy*» (to grab) and «*aryty*» (to sing) have direct combinations with nouns such as «*kurngan*» (legs) and «*eshngan*» (hands). Similarly, adjectives like «*novi*» (white) and «*pitas*» (black) combine with nouns like «*ohsoh*» (hair) and «*samngan*» (eyes).

Some researchers in scientific works do not always focus on the analysis of the actual meaning but rather identify the connections between words and their semantic groups in a text and then interpret these relationships based on relevant realities.

Any approach to analyzing a semantic field must consider the process of actualizing it, or putting it into practice, in speech. This means showing how the elements of the field are represented in utterances, how they interact with each other, and how they function within sentences.

When studying the relationships between field elements, the main focus has always been on oppositional relationships. For example, in the case of

fishing vocabulary, names of fish form the core of a semantic field. In contrast, everything related to fishing makes up the periphery of the field and forms the oppositional components.

We also need to highlight the partial and complete coincidence in terms of the content of linguistic means forms of the lexical field of interest that represents a common part of the language for us. Any FSP is implemented by each language's center-periphery relationship. These relations manifest themselves specifically in the form of the dominant role of one part of the combined units (core) in relation to the other. Under certain conditions, the core of the field often becomes the center of attraction for peripheral elements. As strong as the center of gravity becomes, the ability to grow quantitatively and constantly expand the contours of the core of the field at the expense of the periphery is revealed. It is noted that the elements of the peripheral zone of the field, on the contrary, are characterized by low stability. All this can lead to their absorption and complete displacement by elements belonging to the core, or their modifications, which also limit their progress towards the center.

For example, in connection with the revival and development of fishing based on highly modern technologies in the Khanty – Mansiysk Autonomous Okrug and the Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous District, the core of the fishing vocabulary may well become a center of attraction and be replenished by new peripheral layers of the field. On the other hand, by introducing neologisms into scientific circulation, as well as a good potential source of expanding the field of all this vocabulary and enriching its core is folklore material, which has not yet been systematically studied.

Conclusion

The field theory is based on the idea of the existence of patterns of semantic connections between linguistic units, which began to be considered in the late XIX – early XX centuries by A. A. Potebnya, R. M. Meyer, and other famous scientists. The thoughts expressed in R. M. Meyer's scientific article «Semantic Systems» were especially important.

Thus, R. M. Meyer identifies only three types of semantic fields:

1) natural (names of trees, animals, body parts);

2) artificial (names of military ranks, components of mechanisms);

3) semi-artificial (terminology of hunters or fishermen, ethical concepts, etc.).

According to R. M. Meyer, words or whole expressions of words are ordered into semantic classes based on a single semantic feature, a differentiating factor. The meaning of verbs of movement, for example, usually includes many such semantic components. Thus, the German verb strieken (to descend) includes the following semantic components: from top to bottom, slowly, evenly; the verb fallen (to fall) – from top to bottom, quickly, evenly, etc. The task of semasiology,

according to R. M. Meyer's goal is, firstly, to establish the affiliation of each word to the system and, secondly, to identify the system-forming, differentiating factor of this system [18, p. 359].

Overall, the dynamic interplay between actual and virtual meanings within a lexical-semantic paradigm is best illustrated by the Khanty word «hul». Its basic meaning of «fish» is firmly anchored in the daily existence and subsistence of the Khanty people, yet its alternative interpretations capture the diverse cultural and metaphorical landscapes of the Khanty world. In addition to improving our understanding of the Khanty language, comprehending these levels of meaning gives us a better understanding of the cultural and environmental conditions that influence it. The way that «hul» moves between these domains with such fluidity – the embodiment of the complex relationships among language, culture, and the natural world – may be witnessed through transformational analysis.

References

1 **Weinrich, H.** Linguistics of lies. Language and modeling of social interaction: a collection of articles. – Moscow : Progress, 1987. – 44–87p.

2 **Paducheva, E. V.** On the semantics of syntax: materials for transformations grammar of Russian language. Russian Academy of Sciences, All-Russian. in-t scientific. and tech. information. Ed. 2nd, ispr. and add. – Moscow : URSS KomKniga, 2007. – 293 p.

3 **Peshkovsky, A. M.** Selected works. – Moscow : Uchpedgiz, 1959. – 252 p.

4 **Normanskaja, Ju.** Khanty dialects in unpublished materials by G. F. Miller. // International Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences Studies. 8(6). – 2023. – P. 45.

5 **Соловар, В. Н.** Семантика глаголов вращения в хантыйском языке. Полилингвиальность и транскультурные практики. – 20(2). – 2023. – С. 271–282. – https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8127-2023-20-2-271-282.

6 **Ванеян, С. и др.** Глаголы падения в хантыйском языке. Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Труды ИЛИ РАН. – 16(1). – 2020. – С. 435–461.

7 **Шиянова, А. А.** Семантика прилагательных хантыйского языка, характеризующих погодные явления. // Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика. – 7(2). – 2021. – С. 169–178. – https://doi.org/10.22250/24107190_2021_7_2_169_178.

8 **Fejes, L.** The place of «Southwestern» Khanty among the Khanty Dialects : Testimony of Metadata and Lexicon // ESUKA–JEFUL. – 13(2). – 2022 – P. 119–149.

9 **Lelkhova, F. M.** Imperative Interjometies in the Vakhov Dialect of the Khanty Language. // Nizhnevartovsk Philological Bulletin. – 9(1). – 2024. – P. 46–54.

10 **Fedotova, I, et al.** Диалектное членение хантыйского языка по данным базисной лексики. // Ural-Altaic Studies, 2023. – https://doi.org/10.37892/2500-2902-2022-47-4-117-166.

11 **Shcherba, L. V.** The language system and speech activity. 2nd ed., ster. – Moscow : URSS. 2004. – 427 p.

12 **Mednikova, E. M.** The meaning of the word and methods of its description : [Based on the material of modern English]. – Moscow : Higher School, 1974. – 202 p.

13 **Krivchenko, E. L.** On the concept of «semantic field» and methods of its study E. L. Krivchenko. // Philological sciences, 1973. – P. 99–103.

14 **Koseriu, E.** Lexical solidarity. Questions of educational lexicography : [Collection of articles]. – Moscow : Publishing House of Moscow. University, 1969. – P. 93–104.

15 **Trier, J.** Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. – Heidelberg : Winter, Bd. 1. 1931. – 347 p.

16 **Porzig, W.** Das Wunder des sprache. Probleme, Methoden und Ergebnisseder modernen Sprachnissenschaft. – Bern – München : Francke, 1967. – 424 p.

17 **Крушевский, Н. В.** Очерк науки о языке. – Казань, 1883. – С. 65.

18 **Meyer, R. M.** Bedeutungssysteme. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen. – Göttingen, Bd. 43. – H. 4. – 1910. – P. 352–368.

References

1 **Weinrich, H.** Linguistics of lies. Language and modeling of social interaction: a collection of articles. – Moscow : Progress, 1987. – 44–87 p.

2 **Paducheva, E. V.** On the semantics of syntax : materials for transformations grammar of Russian language. // Russian Academy of Sciences, All-Russian. in-t scientific. and tech. information. Ed. 2nd, ispr. and add. – Moscow : URSS KomKniga, 2007. – 293 p.

3 **Peshkovsky, A. M.** Selected works. – Moscow : Uchpedgiz, 1959. – 252 p.

4 **Normanskaja, Ju.** Khanty dialects in unpublished materials by G. F. Miller. // International Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences Studies. – 8(6). – 2023. – P. 45.

5 **Solovar, V. N.** Semantika glagolov vrashheniya v xanty`jskom yazy`ke. [Semantics of rotation verbs in the Khanty language // Polilingvial`nost` i

transkul`turny`e praktiki [Polylingualism and transcultural practices]. – 20(2). – 2023. – P. 271–282. **–** https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-8127-2023-20-2-271-282 [In Russian].

6 **Vaneyan, C. i dr.** Glagoly` padeniya v xanty`jskom yazy`ke [Verbs of falling in the Khanty language] // Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy` ILI RAN. – 16(1). – 2020. – P. 435–461.

7 **Shiyanova, A. A.** Semantika prilagatel`ny`x xanty`jskogo yazy`ka, xarakterizuyushhix pogodny`e yavleniya [Semantics of adjectives of the Khanty language characterizing weather phenomena] // Teoreticheskaya i prikladnaya lingvistika. – 7(2). – 2021. – P. 169–178. – https://doi.org/10.22250/2410-7190_2021_7_2_169_178.

8 **Fejes, L.** The place of «Southwestern» Khanty among the Khanty Dialects : Testimony of Metadata and Lexicon // ESUKA– JEFUL. – 13(2). – 2022 – P. 119–149.

9 **Lelkhova, F. M.** Imperative Interjometies in the Vakhov Dialect of the Khanty Language. Nizhnevartovsk Philological Bulletin. – 9(1). – 2024. – P. 46–54.

10 **Fedotova I, et al.** Dialektnoye chleneniye khantyiskogo yazyka po dannym bazisnoi leksiki [The dialect division of the Khanty language according to the data of the basic vocabulary]. Ural-Altaic Studies, 2023. – https://doi.org/10.37892/2500-2902-2022-47-4-117-166.

11 **Shcherba, L. V.** The language system and speech activity. 2nd ed., ster. – Moscow : URSS, 2004. – 427 p.

12 **Mednikova, E. M.** The meaning of the word and methods of its description : based on the material of modern English. – Moscow : Higher School, 1974. – 202 p.

13 **Krivchenko, E. L.** On the concept of «semantic field» and methods of its study E. L. Krivchenko // Philological sciences, 1973. – P. 99–103.

14 **Koseriu, E.** Lexical solidarity. Questions of educational lexicography : collection of articles. – Moscow : Publishing House of Moscow. University, 1969. – P. 93–104.

15 **Trier, J.** Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. Heidelberg: Winter, Bd. 1, 1931. – 347 p.

16 **Porzig, W.** Das Wunder des sprache. Probleme, Methoden und Ergebnisseder modernen Sprachnissenschaft. – Bern – München : Francke, 1967. – 424 p.

17 **Krushevskij, N. V.** Ocherk nauki o yazy`ke [An essay on the science of language]. – Kazan`, 1883. – P. 65.

18 **Meyer, R. M.** Bedeutungssysteme. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen. – Göttingen, Bd. 43. – H. 4. – 1910. – P. 352–368.

Р. А. Вафеев¹, Р. Ж. Саурбаев², *Ф. Т. Ереханова³,
Л. Ю. Погожева⁴, Н. Р. Омаров⁵
¹Түймен мемлекеттік университеті,
 Ресей Федерациясы, Түймен қ.;
²,⁴Торайғыров университеті,
Қазақстан Республикасы, Павлодар қ.;
³Орталық Азия инновациялық университеті,
Қазақстан Республикасы, Шымкент қ.;
⁵Әлкей Марғұлан атындағы
Павлодар педагогикалық университеті,
Қазақстан Республикасы, Павлодар қ.
31.01.25 ж. баспаға түсті.
04.06.25 ж. түзетулерімен түсті.
25.08.25 ж. басып шығаруға қабылданды.

ХАНТЫ ТІЛІНІҢ ЛЕКСИКА-СЕМАНТИКАЛЫҚ ПАРАДИГМАСЫНДАҒЫ «HUL» («БАЛЫҚ») СӨЗІНІҢ ВИРТУАЛДЫ ЖӘНЕ АКТУАЛДЫ МАҒЫНАСЫНЫҢ ҚЫЗМЕТІ

Мақалада ханты тілінің лексика-семантикалық парадигмасындағы «hul» («балық») сөзінің «далалық» зерттеу моделі балық аулау лексикасы әзірленген «виртуалды» және «актуалды» мағыналарының мазмұны ашылады. Бұл мақала ханты тілінің лексика-семантикалық парадигмасына назар аудара отырып, оның өзекті (контекстік) және виртуалды (потенциалды) мағыналарын қарастыру арқылы хулдың рөлі мен мағынасын ашуды мақсат етеді. Сондай-ақ ханты тілінің лексикалық-семантикалық өрісіндегі «хул» («балық») сөзінің виртуалды және нақты мағыналарын зерттеуге бағытталған. Бұл мақсатқа жету үшін «хул» сөзін оның ерекше және жалпы мағынасынан, тіл және қарым-қатынас тұрғысынан қарастыру қажет. Осы орайда тілдің лексикалық құрамы жай сөздердің кездейсоқ жинағы емес, оның өзіне ғана тән құрылымы бар ұйымдасқан тұтастық екенін атап өткен жөн. Зерттеуде деректану, этнолингвистикалық және этимологиялық талдау, салыстырмалы тарихи талдау және диахрондық зерттеулер қолданылды. Зерттеу нәтижелері ханты тіліндегі балық аулау

лексикасының функционалдық-семантикалық талдауы кен орнының өзегі мен шеткі бөлігінің түгендеу құрамын анықтағанын көрсетеді. Авторлар хантылықтардың күнделікті өмірі мен күнкөріс әдістері «балық» мағынасында іргелі болғанымен, оның әртүрлі мағыналары хантылық дүниетанымның бір бөлігі болып табылатын мәдени және метафоралық орталардың алуан түрлілігін қамтиды деген қорытындыға келеді.

Кілтті сөздер: виртуалды мағына, актуалды мағына, парадигма, коммуникацияның жасанды жағдайы, диалект, лексика-семантикалық құрылымның сегменттелуі, перифериялық құрылғылар.

Р. А. Вафеев[1], Р. Ж. Саурбаев[2], *Ф. Т. Ереханова[3], Л. Ю. Погожева[4], Н. Р. Омаров[5]

[1]Тюменский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, г. Тюмень;
[2,4]Торайгыров университет,
Республика Казахстан, г. Павлодар;
[3]Центрально-Азиатский
инновационный университет,
Республика Казахстан, г. Шымкент;
[5]Павлодарский педагогический
университет имени А. Маргулана,
Республика Казахстан, г. Павлодар.

ФУНКЦИЯ ВИРТУАЛЬНОГО И АКТУАЛЬНОГО ЗНАЧЕНИЯ СЛОВА «HUL» («РЫБА») В ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОЙ ПАРАДИГМЕ ХАНТИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

В статье раскрывается содержание «виртуального» и «актуального» значения слова «hul» («рыба») в лексико-семантической парадигме хантыйского языка, разработанной с помощью «полевой» исследовательской модели рыболовной лексики. Сосредоточившись на лексико-семантической парадигме хантыйского языка, данная статья ставит своей целью раскрыть роль и значение слова «hul», рассматривая его актуальные (контекстуальные) и виртуальные (потенциальные) значения. Также ставится задача исследовать виртуальные и реальные значения слова «hul» («рыба») в лексико-

семантическом поле хантыйского языка. Для достижения этой цели необходимо рассмотреть слово «hul» как с его конкретных, так и с общих значений, с точки зрения языка и коммуникации. В этой связи важно отметить, что лексический состав языка представляет собой не просто случайный набор слов, а организованное целое со своей собственной уникальной структурой. Исследование использовало исследование источников, этнолингвистический и этимологический анализ, сравнительно-исторический анализ и диахроническое исследование. Результаты исследования показывают, что функциональный и семантический анализ рыболовной лексики в хантыйском языке установил состав инвентаря ядра и периферии поля. Авторы приходят к выводу, что, хотя повседневная жизнь и способы ведения хозяйства хантов являются основополагающими для значения слова «рыба», его различные значения отражают разнообразие культурных и метафорических сред, которые являются частью мировоззрения хантов.

Ключевые слова: виртуальное значение, актуальное значение, парадигма, искусственная ситуация общения, диалект, сегментация лексико-семантической структуры, периферия.