

<https://doi.org/10.62837/2024.6.203>

**MƏMMƏDOVA ŞƏLALƏ ADIŞIRIN QIZI
OYU**

Mammadovashalala@gmail.com

**THE STRUCTURE PROBLEMS OF HOMONYMY AND
POLYSEMY IN MODERN ENGLISH
SUMMARY**

The article is devoted to the issues of polysemy and methods of its differentiation. The purpose of this work is a multifaceted review of existing concepts on the problems of polysemy and on the study of the semantics of polysemantic verbs in a cognitive aspect. The study allows us to identify and approve that polysemy serves as a means of language economy in the language. One of the central concepts of lexical semantics is polysemy as a phenomenon of a language system formed by polysemantic words. Polysemy "began to be perceived not as a deviation from the norm, but as one of the most essential properties of all significant units of the language, as an inevitable consequence of the main features of the structure and functioning of natural language" [13, p. 4], it was the phenomenon of polysemy from the very beginning that was the central problem of cognitive linguistics. The purpose of this work is a multilateral review of various concepts on polysemy and on the study of the semantics of polysemantic verbs with the meaning "to mix" in the light of the cognitive paradigm. It is known that any new direction is based on the best that was presented in the course of research of the past. This is what predetermines the coverage of the fundamental problems raised in linguistic literature from the standpoint of the traditional approach. Therefore, it seems relevant to consider the phenomenon of lexical polysemy from the point of view of structure and function, determine the composition of the semantic structure of the word, identify the ratio of meanings in the structure of a polysemantic word, and also describe the meaningful core at the level of a separate meaning of a polysemantic verb with the semantics of "mix". It is known that vocabulary is not just a set of lexical units.

Key words: ambiguity, polysemy, polysemantic verb, cognitive linguistics, lexical polysemy, substantial core of a word

It is a structural unity, the parts of which interact with each other. Lexico-semantic variants of a polysemantic word are units of the lexico-semantic system, which reflects both objective reality and the fantasy world of a person. Therefore, researchers of polysemy are faced with complex problems: on the one hand, there are grounds for distinguishing between individual meanings of a polysemantic word, and on the other, the probability of the existence of a common meaning. (Arkhipov I.K., Kiseleva S.V., Pesina S.A.), which combines all the meanings of the word, in this

case, the verb with the meaning of “mix”. The concept of polysemy is based on the notion of a discrete organization of lexical meanings. G. Stern tried to explain the nature of the linguistic facts that are in this intermediate area, and at the same time not to destroy the traditional idea of the discreteness of values [1, p. 190]. D.N. Shmelev believed that “the principle of the diffuseness of the meanings of a polysemantic word is the decisive factor that determines its semantics. The fact that lexicographic descriptions do not reflect this significantly distorts the idea of the semantic structure of the described words” [13, p. 18]. According to J. Casares, polysemy or ambiguity is an inevitable consequence of the disproportion between the number of speech signs and the number of concepts seeking expression in the language [2, p. 70]. The more often a word is used in speech, the more reason to expect the emergence of an extended polysemy in it. In this work, we adhere to the opinion of V.V. Vinogradov, who considers lexical polysemy to be the concept of similarity of meanings [15, p. 186]. This implies that all meanings of a polysemantic word have a common part. One of the conditions for polysemy is the presence of a connection of each of the values with at least one other value. The existence of a common part in the meanings of a polysemantic word is a prerequisite for a successful search for its meaningful core. From the point of view of topology, three types of polysemy were distinguished and studied (for the first time on diachronic material): 1) radial polysemy: all meanings of a word are motivated by the same - central - meaning; 2) chain polysemy (rare in its pure form): each new meaning of a word is motivated by another - closest to it - meaning, but extreme meanings may not have common semantic components; 3) radial chain polysemy (the most typical case) [15, p. 122]. P. Dean singles out regular and lexical polysemy. Regular polysemy is a kind of ambiguity in which the relationships between meanings are predictable, the derivational meanings belong to different categories, and each single meaning includes all the information supplied by the other meaning. In the case of lexical polysemy, the meanings are connected, the necessary information is superimposed on the derived meanings. At the same time, there is only a conceptual area where the important information of a given sense coincides with the necessary information of another derived sense [10, p. 340–355]. There is no place for ambiguity in a formalized language. It is regarded as a violation of the law of the sign, i.e. unambiguous correspondence of expression and content. More than half a century ago, most linguists argued that every word should be unambiguous. Among domestic linguists, polysemy was denied by A.A. Potebnya and L.V. Shcherba. The opposite point of view is held by V.V. Vinogradov, who believes that more words are polysemantic: “Language is forced to distribute an innumerable set of meanings according to one or another rubric of basic concepts” [13, p. 118] H.Seliverstova believes that “a word is polysemantic or polysemantic if the information introduced by the lexeme of this word in different contexts is not the same” [12, p. 131]. According to E.V. Paducheva, a word in a natural language is characterized by

polysemy, and, above all, regular polysemy, i.e. polysemy. From her point of view, regular polysemy can be represented as a consequence of semantic derivation, which is determined by the dynamic model of polysemy. D.N. Shmelev (Shmelev, 1964: 56; Shmelev, 1973) introduced the term semantic derivation, which is convenient because it equates the relationship between two meanings of a polysemantic word to the relationship between a word and its derivational derivative: semantic derivation is a special case of ordinary lexical derivation - word formation [9, p. 147–148]. As is known, polysemy is inseparable from synonymy; both phenomena reflect the absence of a one-to-one correspondence between the set of linguistic signs and the set of meanings expressed by them, which is characteristic of a language as a sign system. Moreover, as V.V. Vinogradov the fundamental structure of the synonymic series and the set of meanings of a polysemantic word reveal a deep parallelism. Namely: the dominant word of a synonymic series, as well as the main meaning of a polysemantic word, differ from the peripheral ones (respectively, members of the series and meanings) in that it is semantically, stylistically and communicatively less specific, has a more complete grammatical paradigm, has a wider compatibility and etc. [15, p. 47]. Thus, a brief summary of some points of view is that polysemy is an effective means of conveying various thoughts and sense perceptions of a person. Often, in some works on polysemy, the extralinguistic factor was deliberately not taken into account in studies on linguistics. This led to the idea that the meanings of words are formed and interact in some way on their own, without human participation, and the ambiguity itself is based on the logical-conceptual, theoretical modeling of the connection between language and cognition. In fact, polysemy serves the economy of language. Recognizing in polysemy a constructive property of natural language, M.V. Nikitin admits that: 1) the meanings of a polysemantic word are meaningfully related, 2) their meaningful interaction is possible, 3) the commonality of the form affects the content of individual meanings, their onomasiological potential and comprehension in a feedback way, and 4) there is some measure of meaningful proximity - distance meanings, allowing to distinguish between polysemy and homonymy [8, p. 203]. Thus, polysemy confronts the researcher with the most difficult problems: on the one hand, with the division of polysemy and the search for real grounds for distinguishing individual meanings, on the other hand, with the correlative characteristics of the meanings of a polysemantic word as elements of the semantics of the word and the system of nominative means of the language. At the heart of the distinction of a polysemantic word are those mechanisms that govern the distinction - the identification of concepts and the very essences of the world reflected by the consciousness. Making a distinction between the meanings of a polysemantic word, establishing their content and comparing them in terms of content, we can say that the meanings are related to each other by relations of semantic derivations. The author is convinced that one meaning arises from another according to certain models of semantic word formation, and that all of

them together form the semantic structure of a word with their connections. Unlike homonymy, different meanings of one polysemantic word are connected into a single structure by the fact that they have an essential common part in their content. Since the process of forming the meanings of a polysemantic word occurs in the mind of a person, it is necessary to solve the problem of the meaningful core of the word by referring to how a native speaker sees it, what is the place of the meaningful core in the mental lexicon, what is the ratio of lexical and cognitive prototypes, etc. The study of these issues helps to penetrate deeper into the problems of the relationship between language and reality, as well as the mental representation of the meanings of polysemantic words. Some scientists are looking for similarities and differences between the conceptual categories of the prototypical type and the structure of a polysemantic word, which is inadequate to traditional semasiological descriptions of the mechanisms of polysemy.

Conclusion.

Accounting for conceptual categories allows you to better understand the essence of the linguistic phenomenon of polysemy, identify and describe its properties. So, in earlier publications on this problem, in accordance with the theory of prototypes, the derived meanings of a polysemantic word are determined by the typicality of this meaning in relation to the original meaning. The connection between the meanings of a polysemantic word is based on cognitive operations of a logical and associative nature. According to E. Roche and S. Mervis, the derived meanings of a polysemantic word form a certain “category” containing one or more central meanings, as well as peripheral meanings, interconnected by cognitive mechanisms of name transfer. Within the framework of traditional linguistics, polysemy is characterized by typicality, repetition, non-uniqueness of connections between two meanings, when compared with homonymy, which is characterized by singularity, exclusivity and uniqueness of the connection. However, everything is not so simple here: “such an approach satisfactorily explains only the simplest case of polysemy - two-term polysemy.” The question of what ensures the semantic unity of the word in case of numerous polysemy, when the composition contains meanings that are not directly related to each other, remains open. According to J. Lakoff, the phenomenon of polysemy is closely related to the conceptual organization, and the polysemantic structure is a category of prototypical character. The meanings of a polysemantic word are included in its composition on the rights of its members. Considering the ambiguity from the standpoint of the theory of prototypes. D. Geeraerts comes to the conclusion that the prototype theory is “a model of the polysemy of lexical items” [4, p. 223–272].

Thus, it is widely believed that the semantic structure of a polysemantic word is a real fact of consciousness and serves as the source material for choosing actual meanings from it [4, p. 87–96]. According to I.K. Arkhipov, in the function of knowing the properties of real objects, on which the survival of a biological species

depends, consciousness receives from the outside world not ready-made information, but only signals, the disclosure of the meaning of which depends on the “quality” of individual consciousness. Consciousness, relying on memory, is able to build fantasy ideas about the present, past and future time, as well as invent concepts about unreal objects and entities (monsters, witches, kikimors, werewolves, ghouls). This gives great opportunities for the knowledge of man. Humanity subconsciously feels that all knowledge is stochastic, so the interlocutors in most cases are well aware of the boundaries of the display of the real world, and this, in turn, allows them to guess the meaning of statements [1]. Due to the limited amount of memory, as well as the short time to update a word or meaning, the image of the form is associated with only one meaning at the level of the language system. Therefore, at the level of speech, the perceiver of information (hearer) associates with the image of the form the meaning that, from his point of view, corresponds to the system meaning, on the one hand, and the speech and language context, on the other.

LITERATURE.

1. Arkhipov I.K. Conceptual integration and “boundaries” of lexical meaning // Questions of German and Romance philology. Vol. 2. Scientific notes. T. IX. – SPb.: Leningrad State University named after. A.S. Pushkina, 2003. – pp. 46–56.
2. Casares J. Introduction to modern lexicography. – M.: Progress, 1958. – 318 p.
3. Deane P. Polysemy and cognition // *Lingua* Vol. 75, 1988 – P. 325–361.
4. Geeraerts D. Vagueness’s puzzles, polysemy’s // *Cognitive linguistics* 4 (3), 1993. – P. 223–272.
5. Katsnelson S.D. Word content, meaning and designation. – M.; L., 1965. – 109 p.
6. Kiseleva S.V. The essence of a polysemantic word in the English language: monograph. – St. Petersburg: Asterion, 2009. – 216 p.
7. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago; London, 1980. – P. 2–247.
8. Nikitin M.V. *Course of linguistic semantics*. – St. Petersburg, 1996. – 756 p.
9. Paducheva E.V. Paradigm of regular polysemy of sound verbs // *Issues. Linguistics*. – 1998. – No. 5. – P. 3–23.
10. Paducheva E.V. *Dynamic models in the semantics of vocabulary*. – M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. – 607 p.
11. Rosch E., Mervis C., *Family resemblances: Studies in the internal structure of categories* // *Cognitive Psychology*, 1975. – Vol. 7. – P. 573–605.
12. Seliverstova O.N. *Works on semantics*. – M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004. – 960 p.
13. Shmelev D.N. – *Essays on the semasiology of the Russian language*. – 2nd ed., revised. – M.: Editorial URSS, 2003. – 244 p.
14. Stern G. *Meaning and change of meaning*. Goteborg, 1931. – 449

15. Vinogradov V.V. Russian language. Grammatical doctrine of words. – M.: Higher. school, 1972. – 398

Məmmədova Ş.

Müasir ingilis dilində homonimiya və polisemiyanın struktur problemləri.

XÜLASƏ

Müasir ingilis dilində homonimiya və polisemiyanın struktur problemləri hər bir sisteminin müəyyən vəziyyətinə uyğun gəldiyi üçün sistemə və faktiki şəraitə uyğun gələn iki halın eyni vaxtda saxlanması hesabına qeyri-hərfi mənası dinləyicilər tərəfindən başa düşülür. Daşınan mənalar dünyanın mənzərəsi və dinləyicinin pragmatik münasibəti ilə uyğunluq və ya uyğunsuzluq əsasında alınır. Buna görə də belə bir nəticə çıxara bilərik: qeyri-müəyyənlik insanın sonsuz müxtəlif düşüncə və hisslərini çatdırmaq üçün təsirli vasitədir. Məlumdur ki, hər bir obyekt və ya hadisə üçün ayrıca təyinatın yaradılması leksik sistemin həddən artıq artmasına gətirib çıxaracaq ki, bu da ondan istifadəni çətinləşdirəcək. Buna görə də çoxmənalılığa dair əksər əsərlərdə dil amili nəzərə alınmasa da, çoxmənalılıq dil təsərrüfatı vasitəsi kimi çıxış edir. Bu yanaşma ilə mənalar insan şüurunun heç bir iştirakı olmadan nisbətən özbaşına əmələ gəlir və qarşılıqlı əlaqədə olur, qeyri-müəyyənliyin özü isə dil və idrak arasındakı əlaqənin məntiqi-konseptual, nəzəri modelləşdirilməsinə əsaslanır: sözün bir sistemli mənası yoxdur; lakin bir neçə mənaya malikdir.

Acar sözlər: çoxmənalılıq, çoxmənalı fel, koqnitiv dilçilik, leksik çoxmənalılıq, sözün əsas özəyi

Маммедова Ш.

Проблемы структуры омонимии и полисемии в современном английском языке.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Поскольку структурные проблемы омонимии и полисемии в современном английском языке соответствуют конкретной ситуации каждой системы, небуквальный смысл понимается слушателями благодаря одновременному поддержанию двух ситуаций, соответствующих системе и действительным условиям. Передаваемые смыслы приобретаются на основе соответствия или несоответствия мировоззрению и прагматической установке слушателя. Поэтому можно сделать следующий вывод: неопределенность является эффективным средством передачи бесконечного разнообразия человеческих мыслей и чувств. Известно, что создание отдельного определения для каждого предмета или события приведет к чрезмерному увеличению лексического строя, что затруднит его использование. Поэтому, хотя в большинстве работ по полисемии языковой фактор не учитывается, полисемия выступает

инструментом языковой экономики. При таком подходе значения формируются и взаимодействуют относительно независимо, без всякого участия человеческого сознания, а сама неопределенность базируется на логико-понятийном, теоретическом моделировании взаимоотношений языка и познания: слово не имеет одного систематического значения; но имеет несколько значений.

Ключевые слова: многозначность, многозначный глагол, когнитивная лингвистика, лексическая полисемия, содержательное ядро слова

Redaksiyaya daxil olma tarixi: 03.06.2024

Çapa qəbul olunma tarixi: 28.06.2024

**Rəyçi: f.ü.f.d,prof Allahverdiyeva Fəridə
tərəfindən çapa tövsiyə olunmuşdur**