MODERN APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF POLYSEMY IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Supervisor: UzSWLU, Senior teacher, **Mamatqulova F.A**
Student: 2nd course of Master's faculty, **Tojiddinova D.Y**

As a result of the aforementioned studies, methods to the study of polysemy in English and Uzbek can be seen in two ways: diachronically and synchronously.

If polysemy is analyzed diachronically, it is understood as the evolution of the semantic structure of the term or how the meaning of the word has changed or whether it has acquired new meanings as the language has evolved. One of the meanings of the word will be basic meanings; that is, the meaning of a word that was initially registered. All other interpretations are secondary. The word secondary meanings indicates that the meaning appeared in the language after the fundamental meaning had already been established.

Example: The primary meaning of the word

a) fox is tulki in Uzbek language, but such meaning of this word as ayyor is secondary meaning.

b) Another example is "ko'z 1" - "a part of human's body" and "ko'z 2" - "a sign on wood".

c) "uzuk 1" - "one of the jewelry things" and "uzuk 2" - "a shape of something.

d) the word —dum 1 - "a part of animal's body" and —dum 2 "a partial comet".

It means that these two meanings we can be substitutive with synonymy "the end of the body". It means that these words are polysemantic in their lexical meaning.

If we take another pair of words, e.g. "yoz 1" - "summer" and "yoz 2" - 'the form of the verb which expresses the order".

Ethimological method can be shown in the following: For example, the word —ovoz 1 used in the meaning of "sounds which are created when we speak", and the word —ovoz 2 in the meaning of "sounds which appear in the course of vibration of humans' vocal cords" and —ovoz 3 in the meaning of "to give your vote on election". The words —ovoz 1 and —ovoz 2 can be substituted by the synonym common for both these words -"sound", while the third meaning of this word has nothing in common with the mentioned synonym. So we are able to draw the following conclusion: the first mentioned two meanings of the word "ovoz" are synonymic to each other, while the third mentioned meaning is homonymic to the previous twos.

The semantic criterion can also be compared in both English and Uzbek languages.The same example we can find in Uzbek. For instance, the word —bosh 1 used in the meaning of "the beginning of human's body" and the word —bosh 2 used in the meaning of —the main person in a work, e.g."ishning boshi". These two meanings are alike because they do the same function, so they are not homonymic, they are polysemantic words.

Morphological method can also be demonstrated in the Uzbek language compared. For example, in Uzbek the word ―oy 1 – e.g. ―Yilda o'n ikkita oy bor and―oy 2 – e.g. ―oy – yerningyo'ldoshi‖ form the new word with the help of the suffix ―lik : Cf.: ―Oylik maoshi and ―Biroylik 14 kundan iborat.

It is sometimes maintained that the distinction between related and unrelated polysemantic words is, on average, relevant. It has been noted that distinct meanings have specific stable links that do not exist between the meanings of homonymous words. A clear linkage of such semantic relationships is usually seen in the meanings of one term and is thought to be suggestive of polysemy. It is also proposed that the semantic relationship be characterized in terms of such characteristics.

For example, we may give the following word :"face1" - 'the front part of human's head" ; "face2" – ―playing card, building, watches.

In this example, we can see that meanings constitute a logical structure. Homonymy and polysemy are two distinct categories. In polysemy, we deal with diverse interpretations of the same term. various words with various meanings are used in homonymy. In Modern English, for example, the term "man" has ten different meanings: 1 – kish,erkak; 2 - inson; 3 – er,qalliq; 4 - xizmatkor; 5-oddiy askar; 6 –(shaxmatda) piyoda.

Because all meanings are linked to the main meaning "erkak,kishi". A word's semantic development is divided into two stages: radiation and concatenation. In the instance of radiation, the primary meaning is in the center, while the subsidiary meanings radiate outward like rays. Each secondary meaning is related to the fundamental meaning. For example, the basic definition of the term "face" is "the front part of the human head." The front position was associated with the following meanings: the front part of a timepiece, the front part of a building, and the front part of a playing card. The following meanings are associated with the term "face": expression of the face, formation of exterior beauty look.

Synchronically, polysemy is defined as the coexistence of many meanings of the same term throughout a specific historical period in the history of English. Also, the major challenge of polysemy is determining whether all interpretations of a polysemantic word are equally essential. Linguists divide the meanings of polysemantic words into two categories: the main meaning and the secondary meaning. In most circumstances, the context plainly indicates which of the polysemantic word's meanings is intended:

She will fox him. We find the meaning from the position of fox. It stands after the auxiliary verb will and the direct object him. Here it is used in the meaning of "aldamoq".

The meaning that is not dependent on context is the major meaning of a polysemantic word, and the meanings that are dependent on context are minor meanings. By context, we mean the shortest possible stretch of speech that determines each distinct meaning of the word. The comparative study of the frequency value of different meanings of polysemantic words shows that the frequency value of individual meanings is different. Example: the meaning of the word table- стол (a piece of furniture) possesses the highest frequency value and comprises 52% of all uses of this word. The

frequency of polysemy in different languages varies according to numerous types of criteria. The advancement of civilization requires not only the creation of new words, but also the addition of new meanings to old ones; according to Breal's formula, the more senses a phrase has acquired, the more diverse aspects of intellectual and social activity it symbolizes. It would be fascinating to investigate the relationship between polysemy and progress in culture in a broader context. Meanwhile, the prevalence of polysemy will be determined by solely linguistic criteria. As previously stated, languages that utilize derivation and composition sparingly will tend to fill vocabulary shortages by adding new meanings to existing terms. Similarly, polysemy occurs more frequently in generic phrases whose meaning varies depending on context than in specialized terms whose connotation is less subject to modification. The relative frequency of polysemy in various languages may thus provide a further criterion for semantic typology, though once again it is hard to see now this feature could be exactly measured. M. Breal was perhaps the first to underline the fact that when a term moves from wide usage to a specific sector of communication, its meaning is usually specialized. Polysemantic word case, for example, has unique meanings in law (a law suit), grammar (possessive case), and medicine (a patient, an ailment) in addition to its broad meaning of conditions in which a person or object is.

It might be difficult to differentiate instances of generalization that are combined with a weakening of lexical meaning that is replaced by grammatical or emotional meaning. These events are inseparably associated with the unique grammatical structure characteristics of each specific language. One can see them while researching the semantic history of English auxiliary and semi-auxiliary verbs, particularly have, do, shall, will, turn, and go, as well as several English prepositions and adverbs that have evolved to indicate grammatical links through time.

A precise definition of any basic concept is a difficult endeavor in and of itself. The complexity of the process by which language and human conscience serve to represent outward reality and adjust it to human needs makes lexical meaning extremely challenging. The definition of lexical meaning has been proposed several times in accordance with the major ideas of various linguistic schools. According to F. de Saussure's followers, meaning is the relationship between the thing or thought named and the name itself. Bloomfieldian descriptive linguistics defines meaning as the situation in which the word is uttered. Both approaches preclude further exploration of semantic difficulties in strictly linguistic terms, and hence, if used as a basis for general linguistic theory, provide no insight into the process of meaning.

Taking everything into consideration, polysemy as the coexistence of many meanings of the same term at a specific point in the evolution of the English language. These two methods to polysemy research are promising since they are among the first to propose more rigorous decision principles to the problem of polysemy in the English and Russian language systems. On the other hand, it is clear that the concept elaboration and grammatical criterion, as well as many of the prototype criteria (which, curiously, do not feature acquired primacy, despite the fact that this should be more relevant to speakers

than etymology) are gradable and may not converge in the same way as the more traditional criteria. Nonetheless, the proposed criteria will most likely help to make decisions easier to duplicate, particularly as more empirical information guides linguists' decisions.

REFERENCES:

1. Аполлова М.А. SpecificEnglish (Грамматические трудности перевода).– М.: Международные отношения, - 1977 – 135p.
2. АпресянЮ.Д. Lexicalsemantics. – М.: Просвещение, - 1992 – 583p.
3. БархударовЛ.С. Language and translation. –High school, - 1975 – 512p.
4. Дольгова О.В. Семиотика неправильной речи. - М.: Просвещение, - 1980 – 272c
5. Lyons J. Linguistic Semantics.— Cambridge University Press, 1995. — 376p.
6. Visson L. The problems of polysemy. – Progress, - 2003 – 522p.