

RU

## Организация и семантические отношения лексико-семантического поля «Ландшафтная архитектура» (на материале английского языка)

Канеева А. С., Боднарук Е. В.

**Аннотация.** Цель исследования - представить структуру лексико-семантического поля «Ландшафтная архитектура» на материале английского языка. В статье выявлены конкретные группы, подгруппы и подподгруппы исследуемого поля, а также рассмотрены различные типы семантических отношений внутри него. Научная новизна исследования заключается в том, что в нем впервые произведена систематизация единиц ландшафтной лексики путем применения полевого подхода. В настоящее время в лингвистике практически отсутствуют работы, посвященные ландшафтной лексике, хотя ландшафтная архитектура и ландшафтный дизайн являются стремительно развивающимися сферами, оказывающими влияние на жизнь человека. Полученные результаты показали, что лексико-семантическое поле «Ландшафтная архитектура» включает в себя несколько лексико-семантических групп. Схема классификации лексических единиц лексико-семантического поля «Ландшафтная архитектура» отражает семантические отношения включения и пересечения компонентов поля, а также демонстрирует такие парадигматические отношения между лексемами, как синонимия, антонимия, гипо-гиперонимические отношения и отношения часть-целое, что свидетельствует о сложности организации исследованного поля и иерархичности его структуры.

EN

## Organization and Semantic Relations within the Lexico-Semantic Field “Landscape Architecture” (by the Material of the English Language)

Kaneeva A. S., Bodnaruk E. V.

**Abstract.** The aim of the study was to present the structure of the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture” by the material of the English language. The article identifies specific groups, subgroups and sub-subgroups of the field under study and also considers various types of semantic relations within it. The scientific novelty of the study lies in the fact that it was the first to systematize the units of landscape vocabulary by applying the field approach. Currently, there are practically no works devoted to landscape vocabulary in linguistics, although landscape architecture and landscape design are rapidly developing areas that have an impact on human life. The results of the study showed that the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture” includes several lexico-semantic groups. The classification scheme for lexical units of the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture” reflects the semantic relations of inclusion and intersection of the field components and demonstrates such paradigmatic relations between lexemes as synonymy, antonymy, hypo-hyperonymic and part-whole relations, which indicate the organizational complexity of the studied field and its hierarchical structure.

### Introduction

Nowadays scientists are interested in investigating semantic field structures of different languages all over the world. According to the field theory, language is a system of subsystems that constantly interact with each other. The approach based on the field theory involves a detailed study of the lexical system through the construction of different fields and their groups. Therefore, this study contributes to the development of the perspective field approach in linguistics, which determines the relevance of the work.

Our study involves the solution of three tasks with the help of particular research methods. The first task is to collect English language material (lexical units) related to the topic “Landscape architecture” from a professional paper

focused on landscape architecture using a continuous sampling method. To research and analyze collected language material is the second task including the creation of a classification scheme based on the semantic features of the concepts being studied and identification of semantic relationships within the lexico-semantic field "Landscape architecture", where each obtained group and subgroup should be analyzed, especially the organization and semantic relations between groups, subgroups and between lexical units, which involves the conceptual analysis (especially the analysis of vocabulary definitions) and contextual analysis. The last task is to create a detailed description of semantic relationships within the lexico-semantic field "Landscape architecture".

This article is a kind of pilot study that comprises a thorough analysis of the vocabulary "Landscape architecture" used in one randomly selected open access article published in the international journal "Landscape Architecture Magazine". The title of the article is "Landscape of Home, Landscape of Escape. Landscape Architecture Students Design and Build Gardens in Health Care Settings" (Winterbottom, 2009, p. 42-53) and its author, Daniel Winterbottom, is a Master of Landscape Architecture at the University of Washington, Seattle (Department of Landscape Architecture). This open access journal was found on the official website. The journal is owned by the American Society of Landscape Architects. It has been published since 1910. The target audience of this international journal is professional landscape designers and landscape architects from North America. The research material includes 122 different lexical units.

The theoretical background of the study consists of the works written by Russian and foreign scientists on such research topics as *landscape and landscape architecture vocabulary* (Лавренова, 2010; Чистякова, 2015; Aničić, Rechner, Perica, 2004; Horowitz, 2012; Jørgensen, 1998; Kreitzer, 2016; Мумсу, Тараксі, Үлмәз, 2017); *lexico-semantic fields and lexico-semantic groups in linguistics* (Денисов, 1980; Караулов, 1976; Кобозева, 2000; Кольцова, 2011; Куренкова, 2006; Кыркбаева, 2017; Медведева, 2017; Петерс, Филатова, 2015; Романова, Хоменко, 2020; Рублева, 2004; Филин, 1982; Эгамназаров, 2018).

The practical value of the study is determined by the fact that its materials can be used in preparation for seminars and lecture courses in general and English lexicology, as well as in general linguistics.

## Results and Discussion

To begin with, it is necessary to define the theoretical framework and some key terms, such as (lexico-)semantic field and lexico-semantic group.

Many researchers, for example, L. Peters and N. Filatova (Петерс, Филатова, 2015, с. 84), stress that nowadays the semantic field theory has the following form: languages contain certain semantic sets consisting of different semantic units. These units have the ability to be a structural part of different groups. Therefore, the vocabulary of a language is a set of groups structural units of which are words that are in certain relations.

I. Kobozeva (Кобозева, 2000, с. 99) describes the semantic field as a set of lexemes combined together due to the common content. These lexemes reflect the conceptual, subject or functional similarity of the designated phenomena. The researcher identifies such basic properties of the semantic field as: semantic relations of a systemic nature between the lexical units that make up the field; the autonomy of the field and the presence of the relationship between different semantic fields of the whole lexical system. In Y. Karaulov's (Караулов, 1976, с. 27) point of view, the structure of the semantic field contains a name of the field, a core (or keywords: synonyms, antonyms, derivatives and typical compatibility) and a periphery (lexical units associated with the core semantically or less closely stylistically).

F. Filin (Филин, 1982, с. 228) insists that a lexico-semantic group is a group of words that are combined together due to the similarity in their lexical meaning. Lexico-semantic groups have a hierarchical organization and contain other groups and subgroups. Moreover, the (sub)groups located below differ from the groups located above by a hyposema (Медведева, 2017, с. 115). Many researchers, including G. Kurkbayeva (Кыркбаева, 2017, с. 178), suppose that lexico-semantic groups also have a name, a core and a periphery. Some authors emphasize that lexico-semantic groups have the relations of intersection and inclusion (Рублева, 2004, с. 78) and that semantic proximity also takes place in groups (Филин, 1982, с. 230).

Currently, there are some approaches to understanding the relationship between the concept of a lexico-semantic group and the concept of a (lexico-)semantic field. Researchers, such as T. Romanova, A. Khomenko, P. Denisov, Kh. Egamnazarov and T. Kurenkova (Романова, Хоменко, 2020, с. 51; Денисов, 1980, с. 127; Эгамназаров, 2018, с. 185-186; Куренкова, 2006, с. 177), contend that lexico-semantic groups are structural parts of a (lexico-)semantic field. We have the same opinion.

In this part of the article, we should also mark the main criteria for differentiating between lexico-semantic fields and lexico-semantic groups. We accept the criteria identified by F. Filin (Филин, 1982, с. 229) for lexico-semantic groups: the presence of words belonging to the same part of speech; comparable and interconnected lexical meanings of group units; the presence of a single and common semantic component in the content of all group units; the presence of particular semantic relations within such groups. To the above criteria, the following significant criteria should be added: the hierarchical organization of a group, the presence of a name, core and periphery. Thus, if lexico-semantic groups are structural parts of a (lexico-)semantic field, then the semantic field should have the same differentiation criteria, but with minor changes, such as: the presence in the field of words belonging to different parts of speech and a larger size of the field. If subgroups and sub-subgroups are distinguished within a lexico-semantic group, then these subdivisions must meet the same criteria of differentiation as the lexico-semantic group itself, differing from it only in size.

Lexico-semantic groups were illustrated in some studies, for example, *the lexico-semantic group of fitness* (Медведева, 2017) or *the lexico-semantic group of elevation* (Кольцова, 2011). Landscape vocabulary has rarely been studied in terms of its systematic organization. To prove this, we have collected several relevant works in this regard, which mainly show different aspects in the categorization and description of “landscape” vocabulary.

The results of the work “Semiotics in Landscape Design” include some topic words for the main elements of landscape design (*land form, water, vegetation, location of buildings, outdoor furniture, land texture, visual effects*) (Jørgensen, 1998, p. 44-45). From our point of view, this classification is logically organized, so it was used as an auxiliary tool for the present study.

The authors of the article “Structural Vocabulary of Cultural Landscape on the Island of Krk (Croatia)” (Aničić, Rechner, Perica, 2004) studied the landscape vocabulary on the Croatian island in order to understand the value of unique landscapes. As a result, this source provides the structural vocabulary of the cultural landscape of a specific area and includes 4 thematic groups (*landscapes of rocky terrain, stone walled terraces, pastureland and tilled fields*) (Aničić, Rechner, Perica, 2004, p. 105). This classification, although well structured, is too narrowly focused on the cultural landscape rather than landscape architecture.

The work “Symbolic Landscapes and Their Spatial Components: Understanding the Environmental Design Vocabulary of Place Identity” (Mumcu, Tarakci, Yılmaz, 2017) “focuses on place identity in terms of landscape architecture” (Mumcu, Tarakci, Yılmaz, 2017, p. 600). The most important part of this article “Frequencies and Categorization of Spatial Components” (Mumcu, Tarakci, Yılmaz, 2017, p. 603) contains an analysis and gives a detailed categorization of spatial components in the context of place identity (*monument, statue, mural, wall painting, seating, moveable components, pavement, plants, water, lighting, architectural components, pergola/shelter, flag, children’s playground components*).

The author of the work “Semantics of a Cultural Landscape” (Лавренова, 2010) constructs a conceptual model of the cultural landscape as a sign system. This article was not entirely suitable for our research aims because of its focus on the cultural landscape and its semiotics, but it deserves attention as a non-standard view on the semantics of the cultural landscape.

The work “Landscape Categorization and Estimated Potential of Landscape Vocabulary in Modern English” (Чистякова, 2015) reveals landscape categorization principles and researches the evaluative potential of landscape vocabulary in modern English. Its author, E. Chistyakova, identifies thematic words for the main groups of “landscape” vocabulary (*natural water landscapes, land surface, boundary areas between land and water, anthropogenic land landscapes and anthropogenic water landscapes*) (Чистякова, 2015, с. 75). This work was really useful for the present study, not only because of the detailed description of how to identify landscape vocabulary, but also because of the well-written classification.

Most of these studies contain thematic groups and many of them partly correlate with lexico-semantic groups as parts of the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”. In addition, the object (in some cases, the secondary object) of the mentioned studies were groups or lexical sets of landscape vocabulary. However, none of the studies explores semantic relations between the units of these groups, although this is extremely significant when working with lexico-semantic groups and lexico-semantic fields. Thereby, the present study is intended not only to explore lexico-semantic groups within the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”, but also to identify semantic relations between the units of these groups.

As a result of our empirical study, 122 different lexical units representing landscape vocabulary were analyzed and classified. 25 units, or 20.5% of the total amount, were verbs, 48 lexical units, or 39.3% of the total, were nouns and 49 units, or 40.2%, were word combinations.

Based on the collected data, a classification scheme showing the organization of the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture” was created. According to this scheme, the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture” consists of 9 main lexico-semantic groups: *Landscape materials, Professions and statuses associated with landscape architecture, Landscape design-build process, Zones of landscape object, Landscape object’s components, Components of landscape constructions, Recreational facilities, Landscape architecture project, Land forms* (Figure 1, Column 1).

Almost all of these lexico-semantic groups were then divided into subgroups. The lexico-semantic group *Landscape materials* consists of 3 subgroups – *Organic materials, Non-organic materials* and *Slip-resistant materials*. The lexico-semantic group *Professions and statuses associated with landscape architecture* contains 2 subgroups – *Professionals* and *Non-professionals*. The third group, *Landscape design-build process*, was divided into 2 large subgroups – *Planning* and *Realization*. *Location* and *Function* are the subgroups of the lexico-semantic group *Zones of landscape object*. The next group, *Landscape object’s components*, is the biggest one. It consists of 5 subgroups: *Small architectural forms, Water objects, Service zone components, Vegetation, Pathways*. The subgroup *Gardens* is a structural part of the lexico-semantic group *Recreational facilities*. The lexico-semantic group *Landscape architecture project* contains a subgroup *Documents* (Figure 1, Column 2). So, as we can see, this division demonstrates inclusion relations, when (sub)groups enter each other like Russian dolls.

Moreover, some of the mentioned subgroups also consist of sub-subgroups. For example, the lexico-semantic group *Landscape object’s components* has a subgroup *Small architectural forms*, which in turn contains a sub-subgroup *Planters*. The sub-subgroup *Machinery* can be found as a structural part of the subgroup *Service zone components*, which belongs to the lexico-semantic group *Landscape object’s components*. In our opinion, the most interesting division has the subgroup *Vegetation*, which consists of 4 sub-subgroups – *Beds, Shrubs, Trees* and *Lawns* (Figure 1, Column 3). This phenomenon also demonstrates the inclusion relationship and reveals the variety of plant life-forms.

Figure 1. Scheme of the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”

Lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”			
Lexico-semantic groups	Subgroups	Sub-subgroups	
Landscape materials	Organic materials		
	Non-organic materials		
	Slip-resistant materials		
Professions and statuses associated with landscape architecture	Professionals		
	Non-professionals		
Landscape design-build process	Planning		
	Realization		
Zones of landscape object	Location		
	Function		
Landscape object’s components	Small architectural forms	Planters	
	Water objects		
	Service zone components	Machinery	
	Pathways		
	Vegetation		Beds
			Shrubs
		Trees	
		Lawns	
Components of landscape constructions			
Recreational facilities	Gardens		
Landscape architecture project	Documents		
Land forms			

It should be noted that the intersection relationship is not a rare phenomenon in the analyzed field. It can be seen if we consider the lexical units of 2 subgroups within the lexico-semantic group *Landscape object’s components*: *Water objects* and *Small architectural forms*. Both subgroups contain the same lexical unit – *(rain)water runnel*. Obviously, this lexical unit is in the intersection segment of these subgroups. The same can be seen within the lexico-semantic group *Landscape materials*. The unit *rubber* is a structural part of 3 subgroups – *Organic materials*, *Non-organic materials* and *Slip-resistant materials*. Lexical units *Concrete* and *Lumber* are components of 2 subgroups – *Organic materials* and *Slip-resistant materials*. Thus, the lexemes *concrete* and *lumber* are located in the intersection segment of 2 groups. The unit *rubber* is located in the intersection segment of 3 mentioned subgroups. This position of the lexeme *rubber* is due to the fact that *rubber* can be organic (if it is natural or India rubber) or non-organic (if rubber is synthetic) and slip-resistance is one of its basic features. Here we can also mention another lexeme *flower*, which is a component of all sub-subgroups of the subgroup *Vegetation* (subgroup of the lexico-semantic group *Landscape object’s components*): *Beds*, *Shrubs*, *Trees* and *Lawns*, because *beds* contain flowers, *lawns* can be flowering and representatives of two plant life-forms – *shrubs* and *trees* – have the ability to blossom. Consequently, the lexical unit *flower* is located in the intersection segment of the sub-subgroups *Beds*, *Shrubs*, *Trees* and *Lawns*.

Within the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”, synonymous relations between some lexical units can be seen. For example, consider two lexical units – *planter* and *container*. According to the “Cambridge English Dictionary”, a *planter* is “a large container in which plants are grown for decoration” and a *container* is “a hollow object, such as a box or a bottle that can be used for holding something, especially to carry or store it” (Cambridge English Dictionary (Online). URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org>). After analyzing these definitions, we can say that *planter* is a more suitable term for landscape vocabulary, but it is also possible to use the term *container*. Therefore, in this case, these two lexical units are partial synonyms. Another example of partial synonymy is the verbs *to erect* and *to build*. According to the “Cambridge English Dictionary”, *to erect* is “to build a building, wall, or other structure” and *to build* is “to make something by putting bricks or other materials together”. So, in this case, these two lexemes can be considered as partial synonyms.

A similar situation can be observed if we consider such word combinations as *therapeutic garden* and *healing garden*. A *therapeutic garden* is “an outdoor garden space that has been specifically designed to meet the physical, psychological, social and spiritual needs of the people using the garden as well as their caregivers, family members and friends” (Horowitz, 2012, p. 78). The term *healing gardens* is “most often applied to green spaces in hospitals and other healthcare facilities that specifically aim to improve health outcomes” (Kreitzer, 2016, p. 176). The author of the analyzed article means one and the same garden using these terms. Therefore, the lexical units *therapeutic garden* and *healing garden* can be considered as absolute synonyms.

We can see the relations of antonymy within the lexico-semantic group *Land forms*. For instance, consider a pair of terms *field* and *patch*. A *patch* is “a small area that is different in some way from the area that surrounds it” (Cambridge English Dictionary). A *field* is “a large area of land covered with the grass” (Oxford Learner’s Dictionaries. URL: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com>). Thus, these terms are not antonyms in the generally accepted sense, although the relation of converse antonymy manifests itself if we pay attention to the size parameter.

Part-whole relations can take place in the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”. For example, consider two terms – *lounge area* and *recreational facility*. A *lounge* is “a room in a hotel, theatre, airport, etc. where people

can relax or wait” (Cambridge English Dictionary) and an *area* is a “part of a building or piece of land used for a particular purpose” (Cambridge English Dictionary). Thus, a *lounge area* is a piece of land, a zone used for relaxing and waiting. According to “The Free Dictionary by Farlex” a *recreational facility* is “a public facility for recreation” (The Free Dictionary by Farlex. URL: <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/recreational+facility>). Consequently, the *lounge area* is a part of the territory of the object and *recreational facilities* are the entire territory of the object.

There are also hypo-hypernymic relationships within the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”, for example, between the lexeme *organic materials* (hypernym) and such lexical units as *plywood, rubber, natural wood, lumber, metal* (hyponyms); between the lexeme *shrubs* (hypernym) and lexical units *vine* and *vegetables* in the meaning of “vegetable crops” (hyponyms), etc.

Thus, in this article, we identified and described the main lexico-semantic groups of the semantic field “Landscape architecture”, their lexical units and semantic relations between particular units in the subgroups and sub-subgroups. The inclusion of more representative practical material in the analysis can give us the opportunity to broaden and consolidate the proposed description of the lexico-semantic groups belonging to the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”.

## Conclusion

Landscape lexical units were collected from a professional article focused on landscape architecture. These lexical units were both words and word combinations.

Research findings show that the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture” has a complex and multicomponent organization, which includes different lexico-semantic groups, subgroups and sub-subgroups. The main groups identified are the following: *Landscape materials, Professions and statuses associated with landscape architecture, Landscape design-build process, Zones of the landscape object, Landscape object’s components, Components of landscape constructions, Recreational facilities, Landscape architecture project, Land forms.*

The relations of inclusion and intersection based on such paradigmatic relationships between lexical units as synonymy, antonymy, hypo-hypernymic and part-whole relationships are typical of the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”. As we have seen, the most common types of relationships are relations of inclusion, the hypernymic relationship and synonymy. Relations of intersection, antonymy and part-whole relations are rarer phenomena. We suppose that the same types of semantic relations are typical not only of the lexico-semantic field “Landscape architecture”, but also of lexico-semantic fields of other professional areas.

It should be noted that there are further research perspectives for this topic. Thus, the classification can be extended by a thorough analysis of landscape architecture lexical units from other sources. In this case, the results may be more informative. The core and the periphery of the field are still to be investigated.

## Источники | References

1. Денисов П. Н. Лексика русского языка и принципы ее описания. М.: Русский язык, 1980.
2. Караулов Ю. Н. Общая и русская идеография. М.: Наука, 1976.
3. Кобозева И. М. Лингвистическая семантика. М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2000.
4. Кольцова О. В. Лингвокогнитивный анализ лексико-семантических групп (на материале ЛСГ «Возвышенности» в русском и немецком языках): дисс. ... к. филол. н. Саратов, 2011.
5. Куренкова Т. Н. Лексико-семантическое поле и другие поля в современной лингвистике // Вестник Сибирского государственного аэрокосмического университета им. академика М. Ф. Решетнева. 2006. № 4 (11).
6. Кыркбаева Г. Н. Структурные особенности понятий «семантическое поле» и «лексико-семантическое поле» // Наука, новые технологии и инновации Кыргызстана. 2017. № 12.
7. Лавренова О. А. Семантика культурного ландшафта: автореф. дисс. ... д. филос. н. М., 2010.
8. Медведева Н. А. Анализ лексико-семантической группы слов (композигов) с общим компонентом «фитнес» // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. № 10-2 (76). URL: <http://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2017/10-2/33.html>
9. Петерс Л. П., Филатова Н. И. К вопросу о лексико-семантическом поле «Пища» в испанском языке // Университетские чтения - 2015: мат. науч.-метод. чтений ПГЛУ. Пятигорск: Изд-во Пятигорского государственного лингвистического университета, 2015.
10. Романова Т. В., Хоменко А. Ю. Функционирование элементов семантического поля «Социальная значимость» в русском и английском языках по данным словарных и корпусных источников // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Язык и литература. 2020. Т. 17. № 1.
11. Рублева О. Л. Лексикология современного русского языка. Владивосток: Изд-во Дальневосточного университета, 2004.
12. Филин Ф. П. О лексико-семантических группах слов // Очерки по теории языкознания. 1982. № 8.
13. Чистякова Е. В. Ландшафтная категоризация и оценка потенциала ландшафтной лексики в современном английском языке: дисс. ... к. филол. н. Тамбов, 2015.
14. Эгамназаров Х. Х. О понятии лексико-семантического поля в лингвистике // Ученые записки Худжандского государственного университета им. академика Б. Гафурова. Гуманитарные науки. 2018. № 1 (54).

15. Anićić B., Rechner I., Perica D. Structural Vocabulary of Cultural Landscape on the Island of Krk (Croatia) // Acta-carasologia. 2004. No. 33/1. DOI: 10.3986/ac.v33i1.318
16. Horowitz S. Therapeutic Gardens and Horticultural Therapy: Growing Roles in Health Care // Alternative and Complementary Therapies. 2012. No. 18 (2). DOI: 10.1089/act.2012.18205
17. Jørgensen K. Semiotics in Landscape Design // Landscape Review. 1998. Vol. 4. No. 1.
18. Kreitzer M. J. What Are Healing Gardens. Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 2016. URL: <https://www.takingcharge.csh.umn.edu/explore-healing-practices/healing-environment/what-are-healing-gardens>
19. Mumcu S., Tarakci E., Yilmaz S. Symbolic Landscapes and Their Spatial Components: Understanding the Environmental Design Vocabulary of Place Identity // Current World Environment. 2017. No. 12 (3). URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320878218\\_Symbolic\\_Landscapes\\_and\\_Their\\_Spatial\\_Components\\_Understanding\\_the\\_Environmental\\_Design\\_Vocabulary\\_of\\_Place\\_Identity](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320878218_Symbolic_Landscapes_and_Their_Spatial_Components_Understanding_the_Environmental_Design_Vocabulary_of_Place_Identity). DOI: 10.12944/CWE.12.3.11
20. Winterbottom D. Landscape of Home, Landscape of Escape. Landscape Architecture Students Design and Build Gardens in Health Care Settings // Landscape Architecture Magazine. 2009. No 2.

### Информация об авторах | Author information

**RU****Канеева Анастасия Сергеевна<sup>1</sup>****Боднарук Елена Владимировна<sup>2</sup>**, д. филол. н., доц.<sup>1,2</sup> Северный (Арктический) федеральный университет имени М. В. Ломоносова, г. Архангельск**EN****Kaneeva Anastasia Sergeevna<sup>1</sup>****Bodnaruk Elena Vladimirovna<sup>2</sup>**, Dr<sup>1,2</sup> Northern Arctic Federal University named after M. V. Lomonosov, Arkhangelsk<sup>1</sup> [anastasi47644@yandex.ru](mailto:anastasi47644@yandex.ru), <sup>2</sup> [e.bodnaruk@narfu.ru](mailto:e.bodnaruk@narfu.ru)

### Информация о статье | About this article

Дата поступления рукописи (received): 08.11.2022; опубликовано (published): 30.12.2022.

**Ключевые слова (keywords):** лексико-семантическое поле; лексико-семантическая группа; семантические отношения; лексика сферы ландшафтной архитектуры; lexico-semantic field; lexico-semantic group; semantic relations; landscape architecture vocabulary.