Insights into Lexico-Semantic Fields of Romanian Editorial- Polygraphic Terms

Svetlana CALARAȘ¹

¹Master in Philology, Moldova State University, PhD student, Academy of Sciences of Moldova, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova,
svetlana.calaras1980@gmail.com

Abstract: Due to the dynamic nature of the vocabulary, we can argue that any lexico-semantic field can be unlimited, has no rigid boundaries, which leads to difficulties in establishing semantic relationships between the constituent units of a semantic field, and the second problem arising from this phenomenon would be the establishment of the inventory of a semantic field. Thus, the system that is the objective of our research consists of the units of "inventory" (terms) and the relationships between its constituent elements, and the fluctuation of the boundaries of a semantic field that leads to difficulties in the limiting it and in the rigorous composition of the inventory semantically. Not all words in the vocabulary can be grouped into lexico-semantic fields, only those that are organized and stable. A semantic field also corresponds to a certain grammatical category - gender, number, time, aspect, mode, etc., and the oppositions between the members of a lexical-semantic field correspond to the oppositions of their grammatical categories. Therefore, in order to practically approach the structuring of a lexico-semantic field, a theoretical and methodological incursion in structural semantics is absolutely necessary. We consider that the reflections regarding the concept of lexical field are absolutely fundamental in order to be able to try to structure such linguistic fields in a certain field, in our case - in the editorial-polygraphic field.

Keywords: *lexico-semantic field; inventory; term; opposition; editorial-polygraphic field.*

How to cite: Calaraș, S. (2020). Insights into Lexico-Semantic Fields of Romanian Editorial-Polygraphic Terms. *Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty: Political Sciences and European Studies*, 6(1), 51-58. doi: 10.18662/lumenpses/6.1/16

1. Introduction

The universe seems at first sight to be a chaotic conglomeration of beings, phenomena and objects, but it certainly is a system consisting of a structure of elements among which there are certain relationships. As a result, human language is also a more or less objective reflection of the universe being first reflected and systematized by the human psyche, which finds its correspondence in language system. Thus, we can admit that the vocabulary of the language in general and of each language in part is a relatively perfect copy of the universe. The relationship between the components of the universe and the lexical elements represents the system of notions, which reflects the way reality is organized.

2. The notion of the lexico-semantic field and its peculiarities

Researching various semasiological works, we found that the notion of lexico-semantic field has other synonymous or quasi-synonymous equivalents: *thematic group*, *lexico-semantic group*, *lexico-semantic paradigm*, *associative field*, *constellation*, *paradigmatic class*, *lexico-semantic class*, *lexico-semantic (sub)ensemble*, etc. However, the essence of this concept remains the same: a group of linguistic units, associated by similar characteristics, which allows them to exclude each other in a given context, hence the relations of switching, substitution, and even opposition between lexical units of the same lexico-semantic field. In other words, *the lexical structure that organizes a continuous semantic substance by dividing the common value between several language units in direct opposition to each other constitutes a lexical field*. (Lazăr, 2003, p. 77).

Therefore, according to E. Coșeriu: a lexical field consists of the present term in a certain point of the speech chain and the terms that its presence excludes in an immediate way. (Lazăr, 2003, p. 78).

Some scholars reflect on the difference between the *lexico-semantic field* and the *lexico-semantic group*, the members of the *lexico-semantic group* meeting on the basis of linguistic (glottic) relations, and the members of the *lexico-semantic field* - on the basis of extralinguistic (extraglottic) relations between words, or the relations between the concepts themselves, which is related to paradigmatic semantics (Babin-Rusu, 2006, p. 96). A complete semantic analysis involves the *semantic analysis* of the word (compositional), the *contextual analysis* and the *stylistic analysis* (functional). Therefore, the semic analysis belongs to the *denotative meaning*, whereas the contextual and stylistic analysis - to the *connotative* one.

However, due to the dynamic nature of the vocabulary, we can conclude that any lexico-semantic field can be unlimited, has no rigid boundaries, which leads to difficulties in establishing semantic relationships between the constituent units of a semantic field, and the second problem is that the result of this phenomenon would be to establish the *inventory* of a semantic field.

According to Ion Coteanu and Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu (Coteanu et al., 1985, p. 220), the lexemes identified by studying the lexicographic definitions, which delimit the semantic field of terms from the total mass of the vocabulary, represent an *inventory* of the semantic field. Thus, the system that is the objective of our research consists of the units of *inventory* (terms) and the relationships between its constituent elements, therefore, the fluctuation of the boundaries of a semantic field leads to difficulties in delimiting it and the rigorous composition of the inventory semantically. The minimum functional units of a lexico-semantic field are called *lexemes*, while those units that name the common, global value of a field - *archilexemes* (*arch-* is a prefix that shows superiority, from Greek *arkehein* – greater over).

However, only by analyzing the equivalence (opposition) relations between the lexical units of the field, we can remove subjectivism in its delimitation. Thus, we distinguish such relations as:

- *privative opposition* - when a term has a feature of meaning in addition to another term.
- *equivalent opposition* - when each of the two opposing terms must have at least one distinct feature each.
- *disjunctive opposition* - when no characteristic feature of one term is contained in the other term and vice versa. (Berejan, 1973, p. 166)

Therefore, the analysis of the members of a semantic field is made on the basis of the distinctive semantic features revealed by their oppositions.

The positioning of the lexico-semantic field from a hierarchical point of view could be done in the following way: *word - lexico-semantic field - language - thinking - conceptual reality - ontic reality* (Bahnaru, 2011, p. 96). Another hierarchical division of the global system of language is into: *notional fields* and *lexical fields*, which are parallel to each other and are subdivided into *notions* and *words*, respectively. (Lobiuc, 2009, p. 19)

Not all words in the vocabulary can be grouped into lexico-semantic fields, only those that are organized and stable. A semantic field also corresponds to a certain grammatical category – gender, number, time, aspect, mode, etc., and the oppositions between the members of a lexical-semantic field correspond to the oppositions of their grammatical categories.

Eugeniu Coșeriu also talks about micro-fields, subordinated to the fields, which function due to the hierarchical relations between the *hypo-/hyperonymic* and *co-hyponymic* lexemes. Those *hyperonyms* are also called *archilexemes*, which were mentioned earlier. The reunion between two or more lexico-semantic fields is called the *super-ensemble*. (Lobiuc, 2009)

Therefore, in order to practically approach the structuring of a lexico-semantic field, a theoretical and methodological incursion in structural semantics is absolutely necessary. We consider that the reflections regarding the concept of lexical field are absolutely fundamental in order to be able to structure such linguistic fields in a certain field, in our case - in the *editorial-polygraphic field*.

3. The editorial-polygraphic lexico-semantic field

The present research intends to propose a description, from the perspective of structural semantics, of the vocabulary segment characteristic of the editorial-polygraphic field. In order to establish certain theoretical and methodological aspects, such as the criteria for identifying the semic units relevant for the structural description of the editorial and polygraphic fields, it is necessary to research lexicographical definitions with elements from the theory and practice of structural semantics already mentioned. Another essential feature for any lexico-semantic field is the problem regarding the establishment of the archisemic units and the archilexemes of the field, as well as the delimitation of the inventory of lexemes that make up the analyzed field.

As understood during our research, the manufacturing flow of editorial-polygraphic production starts from the *Premedia* stage, which is represented by publishing houses or newspaper and magazine editorial offices, where the elaboration of the *original* takes place. The *Premedia* stage is followed by the *PrePress* stage, or Preparing the form. Next is the actual *Printing* (*Press* stage), which is followed by *Finishing* (*PostPress*), to finally have the printed product distributed by the same publisher, newspaper or magazine, who/ which produced the original (manuscript, layout): *Over the centuries, the process of printing the book has done nothing but channel itself in two directions: editorial and typographic (polygraphic) [...]*. (Lescu, 2005, p. 41).

As far as we know, another attempt to delimit the editorial-polygraphic lexico-semantic fields has not been made so far, therefore, after long reflections on this subject and the analysis of the terminological corpus, we made a conventional delimitation of the editorial-polygraphic field. The following lexico-semantic super-ensembles: that of the *Typographic Processes*

(*PrePress*, *Press* and *PostPress*) and of the *Editorial Processes* (*Premedia* and *Distribution*). At the same time, these super-ensembles can be made up of several fields which can, in turn, be divided into numerous microfields. For example, the *Typographic Processes* super-ensemble may be divided into lexico-semantic fields: Raw material, Printing equipment (printing machinery and tools), Printing procedures/ techniques, Finishing/ binding, Printing professions, etc., or the lexical-semantic super-ensemble of *Editorial Processes* may include the following fields: Techniques and procedures for editing the original (manuscript, layout), Materials used for editing, Publishing equipment, Professions related to editing, Professions related to the distribution of printing production, etc.

We have selected for the inventory of the lexico-semantic super-ensemble of the *Typographic Processes* some examples of Romanian terms: etching, bold, blindruc (dry print), chisel, calc, capital, cardboard, cicero, linotype keys, cliché, dumb cover, talking cover, crystal (white letter, un thickened), collector, italic, diplograph, device, conductor flexography, guillotine, deification tool, italics, narrow, wide, mockup, capital letter, memphis (Egyptian letter), machine, normal, papser, pilc, pointe sèche, pochoir, reglet, schwabacher (gothic), semi-black, software, chiffon, slips, splint, stamp, taille douce, tiefdruc / tifdruc (deep print), algebraic print, high print, partial print, rotary print, xerographic print, plot, trichrome, versal (uppercase), etc.

The lexico-semantic super-ensemble of the *Editorial Processes* includes the following terminological units: album, author, title, beneficiary of the editorial production, bibliography, brochure, technical box, book, CIP (cataloging in publication), colon-digit, colon-title, counter-title, proofreader, UDC, broadcaster of the editorial production, special / critical / final, publisher, state / private / cooperative / associated / publishing / of books / magazines / newspapers / specialized / universal, scientific / didactic / production / reference / political / informative / official / artistic literature edition, textbook editions, editions for the blind, electronic readers, copies of legal deposit, frontispiece, glossary, index, ISBN, ISSN, ISMN, book launch, manuscript, collection number, plan / project, chief painter, afterword, preface, editorial production, cartographic products, editor, reprint, magazine, collection logo, word processing, circulation, etc.

As a final point, we could give an example of the semic analysis of the names of *Typographic Products*, since, being nouns, they are more independent of context, and in this series of names we clearly see the relations of inclusion and hyper-/ hyponymy of the terms. According to lexicographical research, we started from the archetype of typographic

products, finding a number of common semic units: books, magazines, newspapers, brochures, flyers, packaging, banners, posters, leaflets, booklets, folders, bags, forms, notepads, business cards, calendars, labels, greeting cards, notebooks, etc., ie the archetype of typographic products is present in all the lexemes of the given group.

For example, in the lexico-semantic field of the names of *Typographic Products (prints)*, the archiseme is /printed/, /paper/, /ink/, to which the archilexeme /print/ corresponds. If we consider that /print/ on /paper/ with /ink/ can be “of a certain type” (Ciornei, 2010, p. 113), we can distinguish, conventionally, the following paradigmatic classes, depending on the volume (number of pages) and dimensions: large prints (books, magazines, banners, diaphanies, lamà and totem displays, dummy boxes, vetrophanies, etc.), medium prints (newspapers, brochures, calendars, notebooks, blocknotes, booklets, posters, bags, etc.) and small prints (flyers, stickers, leaflets, folders, bags, forms, business cards, labels, greeting cards, securities, tickets, stoppers, shelf talkers, wobblers, etc.) (Table 1).

Table.1. Semic analysis of the Romanian names of Polygraphic Products

Common semes of the field /printed/+ /paper/+ /ink/			Polygraphic Products		
			periodical	non- periodical	accidental
Variable semes of the field /volume/ + /dimensions/	Large	Large prints	magazines bulletins yearbooks	books	banners, diaphanies, lamà and totem displays, dummy boxes, vetrophanies.
	Medium	Medium prints	newspapers	brochures	calendars, notebooks, blocknotes, booklets albums, ceiling hangers, posters, decalcomanies, bags.
	Small	Small prints		flyers leaflets	flyers, packaging, albums, stickers, folders, forms, business cards, labels, greeting cards, securities, tickets, stoppers, shelf talkers, wobblers.

Source: Author's own conception

Apart from this, printing (polygraphic) products can also be classified by quality (low, medium, high, super clear), by destination (usual and technical) and by other characteristics (semic features), thus forming other paradigmatic classes, which can be seen as microfields of the same lexico-semantic field of Polygraphic products.

Hence, we found that lexicographic definitions can only be considered as starting points in the semic analysis, as they do not provide all the information necessary for a complete semic analysis, some semic units being explicit and others – implicit. The lexicographical definition remains the starting point for any analysis that is intended to be scientific and rigorous, but it still has proved to have some obvious shortcomings. Therefore, we need to operate with a selection of this information, retaining only the necessary elements, and complete it with the information provided by the comparative analysis.

4. Conclusions

In this way, the system of semantic fields orders thinking, consequently, we are put in front of the neopositivist statement that language determines thinking. The importance of this theory consists in the elaboration of a method of structuring the lexicon and of determining the influence of language on thinking.

Starting from the idea that the structure of the vocabulary in its entirety, due to the number of words in a language, cannot be fully known, thus the delimitation of the lexico-semantic field or sub-ensemble is of theoretical and practical interest. The delimitation criterion is semantic by nature. The terms of a sub-ensemble are brought together on the basis of common semantic properties. Thus, the lexico-semantic field is qualified as a category based on the semantic relationships between words. Based on the features of semantics, the words from a language are grouped within a lexico-semantic field according to the proximity of the objects of the reality that they name.

Moreover, in order to disambiguate the meanings of polysemantic words that belong to the same field or several fields, there should be done a contextual analysis of the units from a certain lexico-semantic field. The analysis of lexico-semantic paradigms of this type is used successfully, especially in the process of identifying the semantic structure of polysemantic words in order to present them in explanatory dictionaries.

To summarize, it is necessary to state that the identification of lexico-semantic fields and of paradigmatic, syntagmatic, derivational (word

formation or new meanings) and inclusive (hierarchical or hypo-hyperonymic) relations are a solid support in proving the systemic character of the language, which is of great help in establishing the lexicographic definitions of words, and specifically, of terms, and consequently, in compiling terminological dictionaries needed by the specialists in a certain scientific area, in our case – in that of the editorial-polygraphic area.

References

- Babin-Rusu, T. (2006). Diferențierea structurilor lexico-semantice. *Limba Română, Secțiunea Gramatică*, XVI(4-6), 95-99.
- Bahnaru, V. (2011). Conceptul de câmp semantic în lexicologia modernă (cu referire specială la studiile lui Eugen Coșeriu). *Lucrările Colocviului internațional „Eugeniu Coseriu - 90 de ani de la naștere* (pp. 95-103). Editura Academiei Române.
- Berejan, S. G. (1973). *Semanticheskaia ekvivalentnost' leksicheskikh yedinit*s [Semantic equivalence of lexical units]. Shtiintsa.
- Ciornei, A. R. (2010). Analiza semică a câmpului lexico-semantic al numelor de arbori în Biblie. *Receptarea Sfintei Scripturi: între filologie, hermeneutică și traductologie. Lucrările Simpozionului Național „Explorări în tradiția biblică românească și europeană”* (pp. 109-121). Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”.
- Coteanu, I., Forăscu, N., & Bidu-Vrăncianu, A. (1985). *Limba română contemporană. Vocabularul*. Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Lazăr, L. (2003). Criterii de tipologizare a câmpurilor lexicale. *Dacoromania*, VII-VIII, 77-99.
- Lescu, M. (2005). *Activitatea editorială. Ciclu de prelegeri*. CCRE “Presa”.
- Lobiuc, I. (2009). Considerații asupra teoriilor câmpurilor lexico-semantice. *AUI, secțiunea III e, Lingvistică, tomul LV*, 19-24. Editura Universității „Alexandru-Ioan Cuza”.