

SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF MULTIPLE-VALUED ADJECTIVES

Nigina Mirsalikova

Student, Chirchik State Pedagogical University

Scientific adviser: Diana Valeryevna Abduramanova

Senior teacher, Chirchik State Pedagogical University

diana1207saliyeva@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The polysemy of feature words is considered. A polysemantic word is considered as a complicated semantic network (semantic field) that is verbalized manifestation of interrelationships of ideas. The major kinds of semantic derivation are metaphorical and metonymic transfers.

Keywords: polysemy, perceptual adjectives, metaphor, metonymy.

Introduction

Linguists have paid particular attention to lexical polysemy for centuries. Even Aristotle revealed the reasons for the emergence of multiple meanings for a single word, stating that since the number of words in a language is limited and the number of objects is unlimited, it is inevitable that a single word can refer to multiple objects.

There are numerous works devoted to the subject of polysemy. Nonetheless, a number of linguists dispute polysemy's very existence. For instance, V.A. Zvegintsev wrote: "A word cannot have multiple "meanings" resembling a specific set of counterparts connected by well-established semantic relationships. Since the result of a particular generalization is fixed in the lexical meaning of the word, and this process of generalization continues as long as the language lives and develops, it is impossible for multiple generalizations to occur simultaneously in a single word, passing in different directions, which would result in the formation of a word with multiple lexical meanings.

However, the majority of linguists recognize the polysemy of lexical units as an efficient and practical method for storing information, reflecting the most essential property of cognition and thought, which is to reproduce reality in a generalized manner. A word's polysemy is a semantic universal



that enables a condensed reflection of multiple interconnected concepts.

Literary analysis and methodology

Moreover, in linguistic practice, there are various perspectives. Both on the status of meanings and inter-meaning relationships within a polysemantic word. Some researchers believe that all meanings of a polysemantic word are equivalent, but there is a common meaning (invariant) to which all other meanings function as variants. Others, while opposing the notion of a common meaning, believe that all meanings of a polysemantic word share a component that enables you to combine these values in the word's composition. In the meantime, it is practically impossible to identify a common meaning (or a common component) for all lexical-semantic variants (LSV) of a word, particularly in the case of a chain connection of sememes: the meanings at the different ends of the chain turn out to be too far apart in terms of meaning, making it extremely difficult to identify the invariant for them.

Consequently, "... all meanings and uses are not random and involuntary - they are semantically related to one another, so that each meaning can 'give birth' to one or more new ones, and they ultimately form a 'chain' or 'network' of meanings for a given language unit"

This perspective on ambiguity has been articulated numerous times in the works of other linguists.

A number of works use the term lexical-semantic variants coined by A.N. Smirnitsky to refer to individual meanings that are related in terms of semantic derivative and are expressed by a single sound shell. "Lexico-semantic variants are opposed in the language not only to each other within the semantic structure of the word, but also to other semantically correlated units of the lexical system. LSV of a polysemantic word are included in intersecting rows oppositions: inside the word – with other LSV, outside it – with members of a particular LSW (i.e., lexical-semantic variants of a particular semantic field), which provides a versatile 'fixation' in the system of each of the LSWs as an elementary constructive unit". In the word's structure, semantically related lexical meanings are unequal; they distinguish between free and phraseologically related meanings, primary and derivative, direct and figurative.

In a multi-valued word, the common part of the meanings must be non-elementary and non-trivial [1. p. 185], and the corresponding semantic opposition must be repeated, or non-unique. For instance, two sentences contain the word plant. The phrases Our factory produces televisions and the entire plant is on strike today should be



merged into a single lexeme because the semantic opposition 'institution' – 'people working in an institution' is not only not unique, but also common: (Examples from [6.C. 151]) Compare factory, ministry, etc. These criteria enable us to differentiate between homonymy and polysemy.

Methods for isolating individual meanings within a polysemantic word pose a second challenge for the study of polysemy. This issue is related to the haziness of values and the absence of distinct boundaries between them. Several methods are proposed for distinguishing the multiple meanings of a polysemantic term. Therefore, Yu. Naida suggests isolating them through "appropriate semantic substitution of synonyms." [16. S. 2]. The majority of linguists came to the conclusion that when distinguishing between the main and derived values, it is necessary to consider the paradigmatic and syntagmatic conditionality of the word in separate meanings. [15. S. 38].

Formally, a radial structure of a polysemantic word is distinguished from a chain structure. Using a radial form of connection, multiple values share a nontrivial common component (invariant), which may coincide with one of the values. With a chain type of connection, values A and B share a common component; values B and C also share a common component, so values A and C are indirectly related. However, frequently the meanings of a polysemantic word are linked by both types of relations; in this instance, we have a radial-chain connection.

"Because the structures of word values can be quite complex, the term semantic network is applied to them. A network is a structure of interconnected values and relationships."

Results and discussion

In cognitive linguistics, a polysemantic word is also viewed as a complex structural-semantic node that contains frames of differing degrees of complexity within its semantic space. Classification the actional portion of the frames is realized by the motivational word's meaning, and the actional portion is realized by lexico-semantic variants.

In close proximity to the invariant point of view is the prototypical concept of polysemy, according to which there exists within the structure of a word a prototypical meaning with the most distinctive typical characteristics. All other meanings are linguistic manifestations of the original meaning. I.K. Arkhipov, for instance, proposes introducing the concept of the lexical prototype of the word, the finest representative of the word's semantics. For one - of an ambiguous word, the lexical prototype will be its

nominative non-derivative meaning, while for a polysemantic word "the best representative of its content is a different kind of lexical prototype, namely the bundle of minimally necessary integral and differential components interpreted at the level of ordinary consciousness, a semantic version of all lexico-semantic variants of a word and thus a construct."

N.N. Boldyrev employs the concept of a prototype when devising a functional - semiological approach to the analysis of language units. "Each linguistic sign's meaning can also be represented as a category and, consequently, as a probabilistic set of prototypical characteristics. In the process of generating an utterance, the same linguistic sign can be used to express different meanings through redemption or, alternatively, by attributing to it with the aid of specific linguistic means (words combined with it, the type of construction used, etc.) prototypical characteristics of various categories (in this case, different values).

Nevertheless, the prototypical polysemy theory only considers the most frequent and typical values. In addition, it is impossible to explain figurative meanings based on associative connections, such as bitter taste and bitter fate, by a straightforward variation of the prototypical meaning.

This paper considers a polysemantic term to be a compound word. Semantic network (semantic field) is a linguistic representation of the relationship between concepts. Man, in perceiving the world around him, categorizes and classifies phenomena and objects in accordance with previously acquired knowledge and allocates them names from the existing arsenal of names based on similarities or actual connections between new and old objects. According to M. Minsky, "the mind typically interprets perception data in terms of previously acquired and intended-for-descriptions-frames... Each frame contains numerous terminals to which other frames are affixed, among other elements. Thus, the information held in memory as systems of interconnected frames is objectified in a word with multiple meanings.

The literal and figurative meanings of a polysemantic word are connected by epidegmatic relations: one of the literal meanings provides support for the figurative meanings. Among the latter, one can differentiate figurative meanings of the first degree, that is, ascending directly to direct, figurative meanings of the second degree, meanings derived from figurative meanings of the first degrees, etc. Metaphor and metonymy are the primary means of constructing figurative values.

Metaphorical and metonymic transfers constitute the primary categories of semantic derivation. The metaphorization mechanism is more complex than the metonymization



mechanism. On the basis of numerous attributes, the essence of objective reality can be compared to other essences, and the selection of the attribute by which the comparison is made can be arbitrary. The analogy underlying the metaphor contributes to the realization of various associative connections of the term, which imparts a probabilistic nature to the metaphorical transfer. As a consequence, it is more difficult to identify the regularity of transfers in metaphor than in metonymy, where the regularity of transfers is readily apparent.

The capacity of human consciousness for associative thought underlies metaphorical and metonymic processes. It is known that relationships can be temporary or permanent. However, selection permanent and random associations cannot be used to differentiate between metaphorical and metonymic processes, as the associative connection underlying the fixed in the language and included in the dictionary metaphor fund is also constant. The permanent association serves as the basis for the common (linguistic) trope, whereas the random association serves as the basis for creating (occasional) original metaphors and metonyms. The regularity of metonymic and metaphorical transfers resulting from the stability of associative links.

The peculiarity of metonymic transfer is that the derived meaning is always included as a potential seme in the implicative of the primary meaning. The relationship between the adjective's primary and derived meanings reflects the actual relationship between the features. On the basis of this relationship between characteristics, the transfer is carried out.

In contrast to metonymy, metaphor is based on the subjective similarity of signs established through the perception of signs and abstraction from various components. A prevalent seme that connects the adjective's primary and derived meanings are typically the most abstract semes: evaluation and/or intensity.

At the center of the metaphorical transfer are indicators of the emotional perception of reality. Due to this subjectivity, a sign can practically move freely from one subject concept to another when metaphorizing adjectives.

Conclusion

In contrast to metaphor, metonymic transfers of adjectives are constrained by the possibilities of associative relations of names, owing to actual situational connections, and thus depend on general presuppositions regarding the world order.

The most significant distinction between the metaphorical and metonymic models is that the denominator of the first model is the act of subjective perception, whereas the denominator of the second model is a specific subject area.



REFERENCES:

1. Abduramanova, D., & Rasulmetova, S. (2020). Understanding the relationship of language culture and society. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 1 (3), 1262-1265.
2. Abduramanova, D. V. , Юсупова Н. The significance of linguistic information in the English language classroom. *Academic research in educational sciences*, Volume 3, Issue 3, Uzbekistan, pp. 478-482.
3. Abduramanova, D. V. , Yusupova N. (2022). Application features method in process of educational discussion in the foreign language classroom . *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 4(3), Uzbekistan, pp. 62–67.
4. Abduramanova, D. V. , Юсупова Н. (2022). Self-esteem formation in preschool children. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 4(3), Uzbekistan, pp. 68–72.
5. Abduramanova, D. V., Ruzikulova Sh. (2022). The problem of ethnic lexicography. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences*, 3(4), Uzbekistan, pp. 1072-1075.
6. Apresyan Yu.D. Lexical semantics. Synonymous means of language. M.: Nauka, 1974. 367p.
7. Arkhipov I.K. Lexical prototype and its historical roots // Problems of semantic description of units of language and speech: Proceedings. report International scientific conf. Minsk, 1998.
8. Boldyrev N.N. Functional-semiological approach to the analysis of linguistic units //Problems of semantic description of language and speech units: Proc. Report International scientific conf. Minsk, 1998.
9. Zvegintsev V.A. Semasiology. M.: Publishing House of Moscow. un-ta, 1957. 323 p.
10. Kobozeva I.M. Linguistic semantics: Proc. allowance M .: Editorial URSS, 2000. 352 p.
11. Krongauz M.A. Semantics: Textbook for universities. M., 2001. 399s.
12. Levitsky V.V. Experimental data on the problem of semantic structure words // Semantic structure of the word. Moscow: Nauka, 1971.
13. Minsky M. Wit and logic of the cognitive unconscious // New in foreign linguistics. M.: Progress, 1988. Issue. 23.
14. Novikov I.A. Problems of linguistic meaning // Selected works. M.: Publishing house RUDN University, 2001. V.1. 672 s
15. Paducheva E.V. On semantic derivation: the word as a paradigm of lexemes // Russian language today. Sat. Art. M.: Azbukovnik, 2000. Issue 1.

