

# Polysemy in the Phonetic Terminology of English, Russian and Uzbek Languages

Kamalova Dilovar Azatkhanovna

Senior Teacher, English Language Department of Applied Disciplines 3,  
English Language Faculty 3, Uzbekistan State World Language University

## ABSTRACT

The article presents the results of a study of phonetic terminology in English, Uzbek and Russian languages. In particular, polysemy is considered as a type of semantic variation of phonetic terms, in which the formal structure of the term is invariant, and the content plan varies. In the languages being compared, polysemy is represented primarily by categorical polysemy based on metonymic transfer. In addition, polysemy is highlighted, associated with the use of the term in the narrow and broad senses.

**KEYWORDS:** structural unit, semantic unit of language, particular language, units of vocabulary, polysemy, phonetic terminology, phenomena of reality, ambiguity of terms.

Modern linguistics is characterized by a synthetic, inter-tier approach, closely related to the functional aspect of language, and the study of the interaction of different linguistic tiers, including vocabulary, morphology and word formation gives a more adequate and in-depth understanding of the systemic relationships in the language.

The word is the main structural and semantic unit of language, which serves to name objects, phenomena, and relations of reality. A word has a set of semantic, phonetic and grammatical features specific to a particular language. Polysemy (from the gr. poly - many, sema - sign) means the ability of a word to have several meanings at the same time. The phenomenon of polysemy, or polysemy, is one of the most important problems of semasiology and is constantly in the focus of attention of linguists. Often, when they talk about polysemy, they primarily mean the polysemy of words as units of vocabulary. Lexical polysemy is the ability of one word to serve to designate different objects and phenomena of reality, associatively connected with each other and forming a complex semantic unity. It is the presence of a common semantic feature that distinguishes polysemy from homonymy and homophony: for example, the numeral "three" and "three", one of the forms of the imperative mood of the verb "to rub", are not semantically related and are homoforms (grammatical homonyms).

Polysemy or polysemy of a word is the presence of several interrelated meanings in a word, characterized by the commonality of one or more semantic components [4, p.43]. The ambiguity of terms is considered the main drawback of terminology, which, however, does not complicate understanding if different meanings of a word relate to different branches of scientific knowledge. Special vocabulary borrows a significant part of its composition from general vocabulary, while combining various elements in a new way and rethinking them, and later returns a number of

words with new meanings. Currently, the issue of polysemy of terms is practically not disputed in modern linguistics. Moreover, the concept of "terminological ambiguity" appeared. This is "the designation by one term of different denotations or concepts relating to one or several related areas of knowledge, reflecting the logical and meaningful connections of the general cognitive characteristics of the concepts of a given area (areas) of knowledge, which is manifested in the meanings by the presence of common semes" [5, p. 16].

## Reasons for the polysemy of the term:

- the existence of different terminological systems, where the same sound complexes are used to denote different concepts (interdisciplinary polysemy);
- division of a concept into two or more independent concepts in connection with the development of scientific knowledge; to express them within the same microsystem, the same sound complex is used (intradisciplinary polysemy);
- categorical ambiguity: when one and the same sound complex, due to its word-formation structure, expresses categorically different meanings (of an object and a process, a state and an action, an action and its result, etc.) [6, p. 423].

S.V. Grinev identifies two main reasons for the development of terminological polysemy: "the emergence of a new concept that has similar features to the concept called a given term, and the development and modification of the concept, which necessitates splitting the semantics of the term that names it" [1, p. 101].

The comparative method allows the teacher to predict the difficulties that students will encounter and, on this basis, to develop appropriate work methods. It is necessary to create a description of the language "that could serve as a reliable and convenient basis for identifying appropriate, effective ways of selecting grammatical and lexical material for a particular group of students, taking into account their native language, age, specific interests, etc." [3]. The meanings of polysemantic words in the Russian and Uzbek languages may not coincide not only in semantic scope, but also in methods of expression. To transfer individual meanings of words from one language to another, complex words and phrases, and entire sentences can be used: *взаимодействовать* — *o'zaro ta'sir qilmoq*; *возразить* — *qarshiliq qilmoq*; *возмужать* — *voyaga etmoq*; *изобрести* — *ih tiro qilmoq*; *осуществить* — *amalga oshirmoq*; *отомстить* — *o'ch olmoq* and so on.

**This type has two independent subspecies:**

1. The meanings of a polysemantic Uzbek word are expressed in Russian in one word (unified), and in Uzbek - in several words (differentiated): *door handle - eshiq ruchkasi (dastasi), knife handle - pichoq sopi (dastasi), briefcase handle - portfelning bandi, chair handle - kreslo yondori*.
2. Differences in methods of expression are characteristic not only of individual meanings of polysemantic words, but also of the words themselves.

This fact allows us to identify another special category of vocabulary, in which one word corresponds to different Russian words in the Uzbek language. Most polysemous verbs belong to this subtype: (*брать, получать — олмақ, положить, поставитъ — қуymoқ*).

So, an important basis for the linguistic basis of the methodology for teaching Uzbek students Russian polysemantic vocabulary (along with taking into account the specific features and originality of this layer of vocabulary in the system of the Russian language itself) is the reliance on data from a comparative analysis of the named phenomenon in the Russian and Uzbek languages. The development of issues of teaching the correct, accurate perception and use of a polysemantic word in its possible semantic implementations is inextricably linked with the preliminary identification of similarities and divergences in the scope of meanings activated by polysemantic Russian words and their equivalent in the students' native language.

Our task in this case is to take into account as much as possible both the phenomenon of transposition and interference in the compared languages and, with the help of effective methodological means, help students overcome specific difficulties that arise, in particular, when mastering polysemantic verbal vocabulary. An analysis of linguistic literature has shown that polysemy is an integral feature of natural language. In its system, a hierarchy of meanings and the subordination of basic (direct) and derived (figurative) meanings are clearly visible. The description of a polysemantic word as a system of meanings makes it possible to reveal in the learning process their connections and relationships as the initial basis for the free orientation of non-Russian students in the vocabulary of the Russian language, in the ways of denoting concepts and methods of transferring and rethinking words. The latter is directly related to solving the problem of not only quantitative, but also qualitative enrichment of the vocabulary of Uzbek school students, including the material of polysemy.

The conducted comparative study of polysemous words in the Russian and Uzbek languages revealed the need to use correct interlingual comparisons of polysemic billexemes in teaching the Russian language, based on taking into account the specific features of the lexical system of the native (Uzbek) language. Conscious and systematic study of lexical-semantic groups in Russian and native languages contributes to a deeper disclosure of the semantics and functional uniqueness of the vocabulary of each of the compared languages, which in turn is the basis for the creation of a scientifically based methodology for mastering Russian polysemantic vocabulary by graduating students of the Uzbek school.

**Reference**

- [1] Azizov A. A. Russian-Uzbek short dictionary. - Tashkent: Okituvchi, 1989. - 510 p.
- [2] Grinev, S.V. Introduction to terminology / S.V.Grinev. - M.: Moscow Lyceum. - 1993. - 309 p.
- [3] Kharitonchik, Z.A. Lexicology of the English language: textbook / Z.A. Kharitonchik. - Minsk: Higher School, 1992. - 229 p.
- [4] Khasanov, E. R. On the issue of polysemy in languages of different systems (on the example of the Uzbek and Russian languages) / E. R. Khasanov. — Text: immediate // Young scientist. - 2017. - No. 12 (146). — P. 658-659. — URL: <https://moluch.ru/archive/146/38569/> (access date: 05/02/2024).
- [5] Lotte, D.S. How to work on terminology. Fundamentals and methods. /D.S. Lotte. - M.: Publishing house "Nauka", 1968. - 76 p.
- [6] Mechkovskaya, N.B. Social linguistics A manual for students of humanities universities and lyceum students. - 2nd ed., revised / N.B. Mechkovskaya. - M.: Aspect-Press, 2000. - 206 p.
- [7] Vygotsky L. S. Thinking and speech. Ed. 5, rev. - Moscow: Labyrinth, 1999. T.2. — 352 p.
- [8] Bakirova H.B. Development of lexical competence based on content-based approach in ESP teaching. Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal: Vol. 2021: Iss. 5, Article 19. Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj/vol2021/iss5/19>. (13.00.00; № 29)
- [9] Bakirova H.B. Nofilologik OTmlarda chet tillarni o'qitishda kontentga asoslangan yondashuv. "Uchinchi renessans: ta'lim, tarbiya va pedagogika." Respublika miqyosidagi ilmiy-amaliy anjuman tezislari to'plami. 2022 y. 10-noyabr'. 41b.
- [10] Bakirova H.B. The content of teaching foreign languages. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching. Vol.2. [www.geniusjournals.org](http://www.geniusjournals.org), ISSN: 2795-739X. Belgium. 10-14p. (SJIF: 8.115.)
- [11] Botirovna, S. Kh., & M. B, A. (2022). Expressiveness in English and Uzbek Languages. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture, 3(3), 16-21. Retrieved from <https://www.cajlpc.centralasianstudies.org/index.php/CAJLPC/article/view/299>
- [12] Kurganov, A., & Samigova, H. (2022). Dialogical rhetoric: tadcits and conversations. in Library, 22(2), 1-266. retrieved from <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/archive/article/view/12349>
- [13] Samigova, H., Guo, T., & Zhao, Y. (2022). Dialogic rhetoric of English and Uzbek. Translation Studies: Problems, Solutions and Prospects, (1), 304-307. retrieved from [https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/translation\\_studies/article/view/6101](https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/translation_studies/article/view/6101)