



The Phenomenon of Polysemy and Different Aspects of Conversion

Yunus Jummayevich Davidov

Uzbek linguist and literature department, Lecturer, Termez state university

Abstract: This article explains the dissimilarity between polysemy and conversion by giving examples. In this study we can see that controversial aspects of the essence of polysemous words, such as metaphors, synecdoche, etc., and types of semantic transitions are discussed in detail. The concluding part of the article argues that polysemy is a multi-meaning of words within one category, and that the transfer of words to another category does not lead to the phenomenon of polysemy.

Keywords: Polysemy, Metaphor, Affix, Adjectivalization, Conversion, Synecdoche

Date of Submission: 07-11-2021

Date of Acceptance: 10-12-2021

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of more than one meaning is called polysemy. Such a linguistic unit is also specific to the lexeme. The use of a newly formed lexeme (even a newly mastered lexeme, or lexeme from other languages) is monosemantic one at its initial use. Emerging as the name of a reality, it then undergoes various changes in its content, as a result of which a unambiguous lexeme discovers a new lexical meaning and becomes a polysemous lexeme. The term is also often monosemantic word. The narrowest contextual lexeme is usually unambiguous, and such a lexeme is associated with lexemes in only one semantic direction (sometimes with only one lexeme) and may not be used independently outside such a connection. For example, the word "O'taka" (only in Uzbek language) has a very narrow context and is monosemantic: "O'taka" is used in the phrase "o'takasi yorildi" (extremely terrified) and means a bubble ball formed yellowish-bitter liquid from liver. In fact, the meanings of a lexeme are formed and expressed in a context; the more varied the context, the more meanings of the lexeme are. In this case, not the number of the lexemes associated with this lexeme, but the presence of lexemes of different semantic orientations is important. Lexical ambiguity is a multifaceted, complex phenomenon. Moreover, the semantic development of lexical meaning of each lexeme requires a specific approach and interpretation. Concomitant events that are confused with polysemy are mainly followings:

1) conversion, 2) homonymy, 3) phrase.

One of the phenomena that creates homonymy is the result of the development of polysemy. When the interconnection between polysemantic word meanings is broken, homonym is formed. As a result of such a break, only a lexical homonym is formed from the polysemantic word. The results of polysemantic word development can be the basis for the emergence of homonyms. If the figurative meaning in a polysemantic word is formed by subordination, and it develops from such precision to generality, the basic and subordinate meanings are interrelated. That is, by being a

differentiation into two words of polysemy, it forms homonym. Homonyms, such as "kun"(a day, the sun), "chaqirim"(mile, calling), and "til"(language, tongue)came into being in the same way. Hence, the rupture of the connection between the lexical meanings of the polysemantic word is the first of the phenomena of the emergence of the homonym, one of the portable meanings of the polysemantic word being formed as a result of dependence and its evolution from specificity to generality.

DISCUSSION

Polysemy is a phenomenon in which a particular word has more than one lexical meaning, while a conversion is a phenomenon in which a particular word without any affix comes in the function of another word group. Polysemy is the result of the formation of lexical meanings. Lexical meanings can be formed with semantic changes. Some aspects of the formation of this portable meaning are similar to some aspects of conversion. There are cases where the formation of a portable meaning through metaphor is close to conversion.

Since the objects are so similar to each other in relation to a particular sign, a metaphor is considered to have arisen when the name of the former remains the same as that of the latter. Apparently, the character of the object plays a key role in this phenomenon. This character can be according to the object property, appearance, function, etc. That is why some linguists, often literary critics, confuse metaphor with the types of conversions that occur on a symbolic basis.Character-based conversions are specific to the scope of the word adjective type of the conversion noun.

In Turkish, it is an active phenomenon to call important signs of an object or reality by the name of that thing or reality. As a result of this phenomenon, there are cases when the metaphor is confused with the adjectival of words belonging to the category of nouns. Here we analyze the following example: steel wrist, silk hair. At this point there was no semantic change in the words steel, silk, but adjectivation. That is, because the nominative and the nominative are similar, the name change does not occur — the formation of a figurative meaning. Perhaps the words steel and silk have only expressed the sign of what they represent, that is, they have become qualitative. In linguistics, this phenomenon is called adjectivalization., Since naming an object by its feature cannot be a synecdoche, it goes without saying that naming any of its symbols by the name of an object cannot be synecdoche. For example, the function of words such as fox, lion in compounds such as fox man, lion warrior should be synecdoche considered.

This phenomenon in language also applies to syntactic adjectivalization. This means that it has nothing to do with the which forms a portable meaning, does not form a lexical meaning, and does not play a role in the formation of a polysemous word. Just as the transfer of a name from an object to its sign, the transfer of a name from a sign to something, that is not the same as synecdoche. For example, calling a person lame, blind, or scarred is not synecdoche. Also, naming people and things by external signs, diseases, and abnormal conditions is also not considered synecdoche. Because naming something or someone by the name of a sign is considered as nounalisation phenomenon in linguistics. In the nounalisation, however, no new lexical meaning is formed. For example, when naming a person with such features as lame, blind they do not give a new meaning, but signify a sign with their own meaning. The thing or person to which the symbol belongs is logically understood from the text. This means that as long as the lexicon does not create a new lexical meaning, it has nothing to do with the formation of a portable meaning and the emergence of polysemy. While the formation of a figurative meaning is a purely semantic phenomenon, the syntactic type of conversion is a change in the syntactic functions of words.

Therefore, the formation of a transitive meaning is polysemy, that is, a change in the syntactic functions of words, i.e., the acquisition of a new syntactic function, while the semantic phenomenon

gives rise to polysemy has nothing to do with meaning. In the conversion of words, too, certain processes of semantics take place, that is, when words are converted, they can be semantically pushed, expanded or narrowed, concretized. This leads to a loss of the basic meaning of the word being converted. But this phenomenon also does not create a figurative meaning. The name of the action, the name of the reality that is the product of this action (such as "to'y-to'y" and "ko'ch-ko'ch" in Uzbek language), the name of the object with the name of the sign (ko'k//ko'k in Uzbek language), etc. can not be a metonymy. All such pairs are the result of verb development. But if words belonging to a category of verbs form words belonging to other categories as a result of development, it is a verb conversion, not a metonymy. Because as a result of zero affixation from the verb a word belonging to another category is formed. Word formation as a result of zero affixation is called conversion. When a word is converted, the occurrence of such a change in meaning cannot be a basis for the polysemantic nature of the word. Because when its conversion takes on a new meaning, it becomes an entirely new word. The meaning of a new word is not part of the semantic structure of the word that expresses the underlying meaning. The formation of a new word as a result of conversion is called lexical conversion in linguistics. Lexical conversion also has nothing to do with polysemy.

There is another type of conversion in which the word becomes an "auxiliary word"(this phenomenon exists in Turkish but not in English). This phenomenon is also confused by some linguists with the formation of a figurative meaning. Some linguists understand the transformation of independently meaningful words into auxiliary words as metaphors. S. Usmanov metaphorically uses auxiliary words such as "oldin", "keyin", "qarab", "tomon", "tag", "ustid", "qosh"(these also exist only in Turkish not in English) grammatical- can be used as a means of communication. Metaphor, on the other hand, is the formation of a new portable meaning of a lexical character based on the lexical meanings of a word. The use of the word as an auxiliary word, that is, the transition to the auxiliary word state, is another phenomenon. The transition of a word to an auxiliary word state is when its lexical meaning is lost and it is used in the case of a grammatical meaning, at the expense of that meaning. There is also no meaning shift in the formation of auxiliary verbs.

CONCLUSION

We can come to this conclusion in our article, that phenomenon is similar to the phenomenon of the use of independent words. The formation of verb auxiliaries is also completely unrelated to the formation of a portable meaning. In general, as words move to the auxiliary function, the lexical meaning is not formed, but the lexical meaning of the word itself disappears. The structure of polysemantic words consists of lexical meanings. Hence, the transfer of words to the auxiliary has nothing to do with polysemy. So polysemy is the ambiguity of words within a category. Moving words to another category does not create a phenomenon of polysemy.

REFERENCES:

1. M. Mirtojiev Polysemy in the Uzbek language. 1975.
2. O. Azizov., Introduction to Linguistics, Tashkent, 1963
3. Alikulov T., On the issues of limiting the meanings of words, "Studies in Linguistics and Literary Studies", Collection, Tashkent, 1965.
4. Mirzaev M., Usmonov S., Rasulov T., Uzbek language, Tashkent, 1966.
5. Tursunov U., Mukhtorov J., Rakhmatullayev SH., Modern Uzbek literary language, Tashkent, 1965.
6. Hojiev A., Auxiliary verbs in the Uzbek language, Tashkent, 1966.
7. Modern Uzbek literary language, G '. Edited by Abdurahmanov, Volume I, Tashkent, 1966.
8. Modern Uzbek literary language (textbook), Rahmatullaev SH., Tashkent, 2006.