MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SPECIALISED SECONDARY EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

FERGHANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FOREIGN LANGUAGES FACULTY

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

This is submitted for

BACHELOR'S DEGREE DIPLOMA PAPER

Theme: "The problems of polysemy in English and Uzbek languages"

By: Askaralieva (Safaralieva) Khayotkhon

Group 14.48

Supervisor: Ibragimova D

Ferghana-2018

CONTENTS

Introduction

Development of a science as a whole and a linguistic science, in particular, is connected not only to the decision of actual scientific problems, but also with features internal and foreign policy of the state, the maintenance of the state educational standards which are to the generators of progress providing social, economic society. It forms the society capable quickly to adapt in the modern world. Declaration of Education by the Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan the priority sphere of social and economic development, democratization, humanization of all spheres of public life, adoption of the National Program for Personal Training have given new effects to the development of educational system and emergence of new types of educational institutions.

After the independence of our republic there have been adopted new Laws and new Resolutions. For the first time in the history of our country, there was adopted "The Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Education" and "The Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan on the National Program of Personnel Training System". Therefore the task of education, the task of upbringing a new generation capable of national renaissance will remain the prerogative of the state and constitute a priority. At the present time great importance is attached to learning and teaching foreign languages.

The problem has become more actual after December 10, 2012 when the resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.A. Karimov "On the measures of improving the system of foreign languages" PR – 1875 was issued [1].

---

[1] The Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Measures for Further Enhancement of Teaching Foreign Languages" (PD №1875 Issued in December, 2012)

As The First President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.A. Karimov states: "Currently it is difficult to assess the value of a profound knowledge of foreign languages of our people for our country which is striving to take a worthy place in the world community; for our nation sees its great future in harmony and cooperation with foreign partners"[2] .

The theme of my qualification work is "The problems of polysemy in Englishand Uzbek languages" This qualification work can be characterized by the following:

The present diploma work deals with the problems of polysemanticwords in the English and uzbek languages which presents a certain interest both for theoretical investigation and for practical usage of the language.

The topicality of the investigation is expressed on the one hand by the profound interest in learning the semantic structure of the polysemantic words which are widely used to demonstrate linguistic richness of modern English vocabulary on the other hand by the necessity of further improvement of the investigation on the ways of polysemantic words translation from one language into another.

The object of the given investigation isto investigate the problems of polysemy in the English and Uzbek languages .

The subjectis lexical, grammatical difficulties of the translation of polysemantic words from English into Uzbek.

The scope of this research is based on detailed study of lexical, grammatical difficulties of the translation of polysemantic words from English into Uzbek, differences in the shades of their meanings and the frequency of their usage in different types of the discourse.

---

[2]Karimov I.A. Uzbekistan on the threshold of the twenty-first century. – T.: Uzbekistan, - 1997 – 235p.

According to the general aim the following particular tasks are put forward:

1. To give a detailed analyses of the theoretical basis of the research of polysemantic words.

2. To analyse the problem of polysemy in the English language system.

3. To describe the investigation of the problem of polysemy by English linguists.

4. To reveal lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words from English into Uzbek.

5. To represent methodological issues and suggestions in teaching polysemantic words .

The hypothesis of this research is that the linguistic phenomenon named as polysemy, that is the words having more than two meanings in the dictionary are greatly used in the language, creating great difficulties not only for the learners of the language but also for the speakers of the language whom the language is called a native one. The problem of correct translation of the polysemantic words can only be solved if we apply the newest and the latest method of investigation applied in lexicology and in linguistics in general. Comprehensive analyses should be used and corresponding tasks put forward in the investigation due to the complexity of the problem under discussion in this work.

Methodological basis of research is decrees and orders of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan about the development of languages, education and science, the national program on a professional training and also basic researches in the field of the theory of linguistics, in particular lexicology and translation theory. If we say about the new information used within our work we may note that the work studies the problem from the modern positions and analyzes the modern trends appeared in this subject for the last ten years.

The methods of investigation used in this research are as following:

-Complex approach to the study of polysemantic words in English and Uzbek.

-Translational method to analyse the difficulties of translation of polysemantic words.

-Componential analysis, applied to investigate the semes in the semantic structure of the words.

Theoretical value of the qualification work is that it can serve as a basis for studying lexical, grammatical structure of polysemantic words using the new methods of investigation applied in linguistics. It will allow obtaining a deep understanding on the importance of the functional aspect and translation problems of polysemantic words, because this kind of words are most commonly used in the language developing more and more new meanings in different types of discourse.

Practical value of this work is that the material results and practical recommendations can be used in planning and delivering lectures and practical classes on translation theory, lexicology and linguistic typology of the English and Uzbek languages.

The scientific novelty of the work is determined by the new approach to the analysis of translation difficulties of polysemantic words using the methods and procedures of analysis applied in translation theory, also by the concrete results of investigation which give light to some problems of lexical, grammatical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words.

The source:Having said about the linguists studied the material before we can mention that our qualification work was based upon the investigations made by prominent linguistics. We have the full ground to approve that many linguists have brought their invaluable contribution to studying the various properties of polysemantic words used in the language with great frequency. Their works have

created necessary theoretical preconditions for the analyses of the semantic structure of the words in the present day English.

According to the theme the present qualification work includes the following materials:

1.   Scientific articles on linguistics, translation theory and neighboring fields written by foreign scholars.

2.   Different types of explanatory, encyclopedic and translation dictionaries of the English language compiled in the last two decades.

The general structure of our qualification work looks as follows: The work includes the three major parts: introduction, main part and conclusion. Each part has its subdivision onto the thematically specific items. There are two points in the introductory part: the first item tells about the general content of the work while the other gives us the general explanation of the problems of polysemy in the English language. The main part bears the two chapters, containing several paragraphs. Introduction tells us about the brief plot of this work. It contains the information about the actuality of the qualification work, the object and subject of this work, the aims and tasks, the main hypothesis and problems, methodological basis and the materials used in the work, methods of the investigation, theoretical and practical values, the scientific novelty and the structure of the work.

The brief contents of the research:

Language is defined as a human system of communication that uses arbitrary signals, such as voice sounds, gestures, or written symbols. But frankly speaking, language is far too complicated, intriguing, and mysterious to be adequately explained by a brief definition. The organic function of the language is to carry meaning. Most of the problems in linguistic science are intimately bound to question of semasiology and call for scientific analysis of communication in

words. The study of words is not exclusively a study of roots and stems, of prefixes or suffixes. The mysterious world of words is an object of scientific investigation [3].

Theoretical problems of linguistic form and meaning as relevant to the progressive development of language have attracted the attention of scholars, philosophers and grammarians since the times of Plato and Aristotle. From those times sameness of meaning was not very easy to deal with but there seemed nothing inherently difficult about difference of meaning. The situation is the same nowadays. Not only different words have different meanings; it's also the case that the same word may have a set of meanings. This phenomenon is called polysemy.

Polysemy is the coexistence of many possible meanings for a word or phrase. Most words of the English language are polysemantic. Highly developed polysemy is one of the characteristic features of the English language. The system of meanings of any polysemantic word develops gradually, mostly over the centuries, as more and more new meanings are either added to old ones, or out some of them. We say that the word is polysemantic when it has many meanings. In the word the main and the secondary meanings are distinguished. Thus, the word is polysemantic in the language but in actual speech it is always monosemantic, that is, it has only one meaning. It is in the context that makes the polysemantic word monosemantic. The researches of polysemy are also significant in grammar, as most grammatical forms are polysemantic. Even a single grammatical form can be made to express a whole variety of structural meanings.

The conclusion contains information about the main results of the diploma work, their scientific and practical value and the solution of investigated problem. All the references are given in the list of used literature. The tables with the most common and frequently used polysemantic words and their meanings are presented in tables of appendix.

---

[3] Lyons J. Linguistic Semantics.— Cambridge University Press, 1995. — 376p.

I Chapter. Theoretical basis of the research of polysemantic words

1.1.   The problem of polysemy in the English language system

Language is defined as a human system of communication that uses arbitrary signals, such as voice sounds, gestures, or written symbols. But frankly speaking, language is far too complicated, intriguing, and mysterious to be adequately explained by a brief definition. The organic function of the language is to carry meaning. Most of the problems in linguistic science are intimately bound to question of semasiology and call for scientific analysis of communication in words. The study of words is not exclusively a study of roots and stems, of prefixes or suffixes. The mysterious world of words is an object of scientific investigation [4].

Theoretical problems of linguistic form and meaning as relevant to the progressive development of language have attracted the attention of scholars, philosophers and grammarians since the times of Plato and Aristotle. From those times sameness of meaning was not very easy to deal with but there seemed nothing inherently difficult about difference of meaning. The situation is the same nowadays. Not only different words have different meanings; it's also the case that the same word may have a set of meanings. This phenomenon is called polysemy.

Polysemy is the ability of words to have more than one meaning and the words having several meanings are called polysemantic. Most words of the English and Uzbek languages are polysemantic. Highly developed polysemy is one of the characteristic features of the English and Uzbek language systems. It should be noted that the wealth of expressive resources of a language largely depends on the degree to which polysemy has developed in the language. Sometimes people who are not very well informed in linguistic matters claim that a language is lacking in

---

[4]Lyons J. Linguistic Semantics.— Cambridge University Press, 1995. — 376p.

words if the need arises for the same word to be applied to several different phenomena. In actual fact, it is exactly the opposite: if each word is found to be capable of conveying at least two concepts instead of one, the expressive potential of the whole vocabulary increases twofold. Hence, a well-developed polysemy is a great advantage in a language.

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that the number of sound combinations that human speech organs can produce is limited. Therefore at a certain stage of language development the production of new words by morphological means is limited as well, and polysemy becomes increasingly important for enriching the vocabulary. From this, it should be clear that the process of enriching the vocabulary does not consist merely in adding new words to it, but, also, in the constant development of polysemy.

The system of meanings of any polysemantic word develops gradually, mostly over the centuries, as more and more new meanings are added to old ones, or out some of them. So the complicated processes of polysemy development involve both the appearance of new meanings and the loss of old ones. Yet, the general tendency with English and Uzbek vocabulary systems at the modern stage of their history is to increase the total number of its meanings and in this way to provide for a quantitative and qualitative growth of the language's expressive resources.

There are two causes of development of new meanings. First is the historical one: different kinds of changes in a nation's social life, in its culture, knowledge, technology, arts lead to gaps appearing in the vocabularies which beg to be filled. Newly created objects, new concepts and phenomena must be named: word-building and borrowing foreign ones. New meanings can also be developed due to linguistic factors - the second cause. Linguistically speaking, the development of new meanings, and also a complete change of meaning, may be caused through the influence of other words, mostly of synonyms.

The process of development of a new meaning is traditionally termed transference. Some scholars mistakenly use the term "transference of meaning" which is a serious mistake. It is very important to note that in any case of semantic change it is not the meaning but the word that is being transferred from one referent into another (from a horse-drawn vehicle into a railway car). The result of such transference is the appearance of new meaning [5].

Words often sign not of one but of several things. The linguistic mechanism works naturally in many ways to prevent ambiguity and provide the clue to distinguish the necessary meaning. It's also important to take into consideration the significance of the context, linguistic or non-linguistic; many ambiguities are never noticed because the various possible meanings are excluded by the situation. Important observations in this area of the vocabulary have been made by contextual, distributional and transformational analysis [6].

The problem of polysemy, in other words, the use of the same word in two or more distinct meanings in relevant to a number of other important questions. These are: the development of different types of synonyms, as a result of semantic transpositions of lexical units and homonymy.

Defining polysemy as a linguistic development, Charles Bally made distinction between its two aspects: first, when one linguistic sign has several meanings, and then, when meaning is expressed by several linguistic signs.

Words may grow in connotative power in accordance with the nature with the meanings connected with them. In the power of connotation lies the reserve force of language. Without this language would lose much of its expressivity and flexibility.

---

[5] БархударовЛ.С. Language and translation. –High school, - 1975 – 512p.
[6] Visson L. The problems of polysemy. – Progress, - 2003 – 522p.

The frequency of polysemy in different languages is a variable depending on various factors. Languages where derivation and composition are sparingly used tend to fill the gaps in vocabulary by adding new meaning to existing terms.

Polysemy more often occurs in generic words than in specific terms whose meanings are less subject to variation [7].

It is extremely important not to lose sights of the fact that few words have simple meanings. Practically most words have, besides their direct meaning, a fringe of associated meanings. As a matter of fact, language owes very much of its expressive power to the ideas and emotions associated with words. There are usually a variety of associated meanings which appear in varying degrees of prominence determined by the context.

The course followed by words used in different context and the shifts of meaning presents a major interest in contrastive lexicology and typological study of languages.

Some meanings invariably come to the fore when we hear the word in actual speech or see in written. Other meanings make themselves evident only when the word is used in certain contexts. The context makes the meaning explicit, in other words, brings them out. This is not to say that polysemantic words have meanings only in context. As has already been emphatically stressed the semantic structure of the word is a dialectic entity and involves dialectical permanency and invariability [8].

Meaning should always be understood as involving the relation of language to the rest of the world and such meaningfulness is an essential part of the definition of language.

[7] АпресянЮ.Д. Lexicalsemantics. – М.: Просвещение, - 1992 – 583p.
[8] Ванников Ю.В. Оедином комплексе переводческих дисциплин. Вопросы теории и техники перевода. - М.: МГУ, - 1970 – 325с.

The distributional analysis of meaning makes it possible to reveal a great deal about the total functioning and use of words in a language. It gives sufficient evidence to recognize that part of the total meaning of many words in all languages is to be determined by their relations with other words in both the basic dimensions of linguistic analysis, syntagmatic and paradigmatic. Words as individual lexical items are structurally related to each other [9].

A special interest is presented by the polysemantic words whose meaning is based on a wide notional basis. Such lexical units can be used as function words revealing the tendence to partial or complete semantic depletion.

The importance of studying the phenomenon of polysemy is obvious because it is the object of confusion and in order to provide a quantitative and qualitative growth of the language's expressive resources it is extremely important to investigate the semantic changes in the system of meanings in the English and Uzbek language systems. To understand a text, learners need to know words and knowing a word involves knowing: its spoken and written contexts of use its patterns with words of related meaning.

1.2. Investigation of the problem of polysemy by English and Russian linguists

The researches of the multiplicity of meanings began in eighteenth century and were continued in the nineteenth century. The most important investment in this century was made by Bréal whose research into polysemy marked a new starting point: he shifted the study of polysemy away from lexicography and etymology and investigated polysemy as the always synchronic pattern of meaning surrounding a word is itself he ever changing result of semantic change [10].

[9] Ванников Ю.В. О едином комплексе переводческих дисциплин. Вопросы теории и техники перевода. - М.: МГУ, - 1970 – 325с.

[10] Аполлова М.А. SpecificEnglish (Грамматические трудности перевода).

– М.: Международные отношения, - 1977 – 135p.

The important researches in the sphere of polysemy were also made by Lyon who considers polysemy and homonymy as two types of lexical ambiguity and introduce some criteria for deciding when it is polysemy and when it is homonymy. One criterion is etymological information about the lexical item in question. Lexical items with the same origin are considered as polysemantic, whereas if they have evolved from distinct lexemes in some earlier stage of the language then they are regarded as homonymous [11].

Lexical meaning of every word depends upon the part of speech to which the word belongs. Every word may be used in a limiting set of syntactical functions, and with the definite valency. It has a definite set of grammatical meanings, and a definite set of forms.

Every lexico-grammatical group of words or class is characterized by its own lexico-grammatical meaning, forming, as it were, the common denominator of all the meanings of the words which belongs to this group. The lexico-grammatical meaning may be also regarded as a feature according to which these words are grouped together. Many recent investigations are devoted to establishing word classes on the basis of similarity of distribution.

In the lexical meaning of every separate word the lexico-grammatical meaning common to all the words of the class to which this word belongs is enriched by additional features and becomes particularized [12].

In summing up this point, we note that the complexity of the notion is determined by the relationships of the extra-linguistic reality reflected in human consciousness. The structure of every separate meaning depends on the linguistic syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships because meaning is an inherent component of language. The complexity of every word meaning is due to the fact

[11]Lyons J. Linguistic Semantics.— Cambridge University Press, 1995. — 376p.
[12]Аполлова М.А. SpecificEnglish (Грамматические трудности перевода).
– М.: Международные отношения, - 1977 – 135p.

that it combines lexical meaning with lexico-grammatical meaning and sometimes with emotional coloring, stylistic peculiarities and connotations born from previous usage.

Defining polysemy as a linguistic development, Charles Bally made distinction between its two aspects: first, when one linguistic sign has several meanings, and then, when meaning is expressed by several linguistic signs.

Words may grow in connotative power in accordance with the nature with the meanings connected with them. In the power of connotation lies the reserve force of language. Without this language would lose much of its expressivity and flexibility.

The frequency of polysemy in different languages is a variable depending on various factors. Languages where derivation and composition are sparingly used tend to fill the gaps in vocabulary by adding new meaning to existing terms.

The modern term polysemy was popularized by Bréal in 1887. Most modern linguists dealing with the problem of polysemy refer to the crucial date, but they rarely look further back into the past.

The "roots" of the concept of polysemy lie in the Greek philosophy, that is, the debate surrounding the problem of naturalness or arbitrariness of signs as debated in Plato's (429-347B.C.) Cratylus. In his account of Plato's contribution to linguistics, Fred Householder points out that Democritus (460-mid-4th century B.C.) offered four arguments in favour of arbitrariness:

1)   homonymy or polysemy — the same sequence of phonemes may be associated with two or more unrelated meanings;

2)   polyonymy or isorrophy — the existence of synonyms;

 3)   metonymy — the fact that words and meaning change;

4)   nonymy — the non-existence of single words for simple or familiar

Polysemy meant primarily what was later to be called "homonymy", referring to the multiple, but unrelated meaning of a word. Bréal still subsumed homonymy under the heading of polysemy [13].

As it was mentioned before, two or more words identical in sound and spelling but different in meaning, distribution and (in many cases) origin are called homonyms. The term is derived from Greek (homos 'similar' and onoma 'name') and thus expresses very well the sameness of name combined with the difference in meaning.

According to Lyons lexicographers generally apply two important criteria to lexemes when deciding polysemy and homonymy. One is the 'historical derivation of words and the other 'in drawing the distinction between homonymy and polysemy is unrelatedness vs. relatedness of meaning.In polysemy meanings are usually etymologically and semantically related and have often at one point been used in metaphors. In homonymy, they are etymologically unrelated. A homonym is a word that has the same pronunciation and spelling as another word but has a different meaning. An example of homonymy in English is the word stalk which means to follow someone around and it also refers to a part of a plant or flower. The meanings, unlike in cases of polysemy, are not related to each other in any way semantically, they are completely different.

Synchronically the differentiation between homonymy and polysemy is wholly based on the semantic criterion. It is usually held that if a connection between the various meanings is apprehended by the speaker, these are to be considered as making up the semantic structure of a polysemantic word, otherwise it is a case of homonymy, not polysemy.

---

[13] Гальперин И.Р. Очерки по стилистике английского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1958 – 245с.

Thus the semantic criterion implies that the difference between polysemy and homonymy is actually reduced to the differentiation between related and unrelated meanings. This traditional semantic criterion does not seem to be reliable, firstly, because various meanings of the same word and the meanings of two or more different words may be equally apprehended by the speaker as synchronically unrelated/ For instance, the meaning 'a change in the form of a noun or pronoun' which is usually listed in dictionaries as one of the meanings of case!—'something that has happened', 'a question decided in a court of law' seems to be just as unrelated to the meanings of this word as to the meaning of case2 —'a box, a container', etc

The term polyonymy was also used by the Stoics studying how one and the same object may receive many different names, how it can become "manynamed" or polyonomous.

During the Middle Ages the interpretation by the Holy Scriptures came up against the problem of polysemy that was acknowledged, but one that had been tampted (by the theory of four senses).

The first who used the term polysemous in a relatively modern sense was Dante, who wrote about polysemous character of a poem: "Istiusoperis non est simplex sensus, immodicipotestpolysemum, hoc estpluriumsensum" ("this work doesn't have one simple meaning, on the contrary, I say that it can be polysemous, that is can have many meanings") [14].

When presenting his poem to CangrantedellaScala, Dante makes immediately clear that it has to be read as a "polysemous" ("polysemantic") message. One of the most celebrated examples of what Dante means of polysemy is given in his analyses of some verses of Psalm, in "Exit Israel de Aegypto". Following the medieval theory, Dante says concerning the fierst verse of the Psalm: " If we look

---

[14]ГинзбургР.С. Modern English lexicology. – M.: High school, - 1983 – 321p.

at the letter it means the exodus of the sons of Israel from Egypt at the time of Moses; if we look at the allegory, it means our redemption through Christ; if we look at the moral sense it means the conversation of soul from the misery of sin to the state of grace; if we look at the mystical sense it means the departure of sanctified spirit from the servitude of his corruption to the freedom of eternal glory" [15].

Thinking about meaning, language and it's relation to the real and figurative word advanced enormously during the Renaissance, but real research into the multiplicity of meaning only began in the 18th century, with the study of neologisms, synonyms and the figures of speech.

Bréal observed modern meaning of the word, yesterday's and today's meaning, with which we first become familiar—something recently rediscovered in England. In 1985, the department of English at the Birmingham ran of computer analysis of words as they are actually used in English and came up with the surprising results. The primary dictionary meanings of words are often far from the sense in which they were actually used. Keep, for instance, is usually defined as to retain, but in fact the word is much more often employed in the sense of continuing, as in "keep cool" and "keep smiling". See is only rarely required in the sense of utilizing one's eyes, but much more often used to express the idea of knowing, as in "I see what you mean" [16].

Language understanding and language acquisition follow the opposite route of language change. In both cases, the last, not the first or primitive meaning of a word is a basic meaning.

In Anglo-American world, polysemy was rediscovered with the advent of cognitive semantics in 1980s. Cognitive linguists began to reconnect synchronic and diachronic research into meaning.

[15]ГинзбургР.С. Modern English lexicology. – M.: High school, - 1983 – 321p.
[16] Блох М.Я. Вопросы изучения грамматического строя языка. - М.: Просвещение, - 1976 – 312с.

Bréal knew that, diachronically, polysemy stems from the fact that the new meaning or values that words acquire in use do not automatically eliminate the old ones — polysemy is therefore the result of semantic innovation. The new and the old meanings exist in the parallel. And yet, synchronically, or in language use, polysemy doesn't really exist — sense selection in the comprehension process is not a problem at all. In the context of discourse a word has one meaning — except, one should point out, in jokes and puns. The most important factor that brings about the multiplication of meaning diachronically and that helps to "reduce" the multiplicity of meaning synchronically is the context of discourse. We understand polysemantic words because the words are always used in the context of a discourse and a situation, which eliminate all the adjoining meaning in favourof only one in question [17].

However, in the constant dialectical relation between synchrony and diachrony, and between meaning and understanding incremental changes in the meaning of words occur having understood a word in a certain context in a slightly divergent way, become themselves speakers and might use a word in the newly understood way in yet another context, which again bring about different types of understanding, and so on. In the long run, these slightly variations in use and uptake may lead to major semantic changes.

Bréal was fascinated by the fact that when talking to each other we neither get confused by the multiplicity of meaning that a word may have, nor are we bothered with the etymological ancestry of a word, traced by historical dictionaries. The scientist was acutely aware of the fact that semantic, cognitive and developmental side of the language was not yet on a far with the advances made in the study of phonetics, of the more physiological side of language. With Bréal semantics as a linguistic discipline made a first step into the future, the future in which we are still

---

[17] Блох М.Я. Вопросы изучения грамматического строя языка. - М.: Просвещение, - 1976 – 312с.

participating and to which we are still contributing beyond the end of the 20th century.

There followed a period of polysemous latency, so to speak, after the advent of transformational generative grammar with its focus on syntax and later feature semantics. Polysemy was illustrated by the research undertaken by Hans Blumerberg, UrielWeireich, HaraldWeireich, James McCawley, and Charles Fillmore.

Russian linguists also paid great attention to the investigations in the semantic sphere. The linguists who devoted numbers of their researches to the problem of polysemy were A.I. Smirnitsky, A.A. Shakhmatov, D.N. Ushakov,

A.A. Peshkovskiy, R.S. Ginsburg, G.Y. Knyazeva, A.A. Reformatskiy, L.Y. Maksimov, A.N. Koonin, A.N. Ivanov.

In their works they presented an overview of polysemy with reference to different models employed for understanding and interpreting the problem at hand. For example D.N. Ushakov in his work discusses the word meanings. He addresses one of the central problems of lexical semantics: the sensitivity of word meaning to context which creates difficulties for the description of the content of the meaning of a word. There, he illustrates the symptoms of distinctness in sense modules of words with close reference to antagonism and discreteness. Ushakov suggests for unity/integrity of the meaning of a word. He illustrates the difference of views of a single element by different perceptors, introduces the idea of discontinuity in word meaning where he argues that there are a few factors which play important roles in case of discontinuity of word meaning. The first source of discontinuity is sub-sense of words; the second one is the facets, while the third one is what he calls 'ways of seeing' (WOS). To substantiate his first proposition (sub-sense), he furnishes some examples which support his argument. The idea of superordinate and co-hyponyms further strengthens his proposition. The properties of facets,

illustrated here, are based on discreteness and unity. The WOS are classified as seeing something meronymically, taxonomically, and in terms of its interactions with other things. In conclusion, following Lyons, Ushakov states that there is no such thing as 'the meaning of a word' in isolation from particular contexts: decontexualization of meaning is variable, and in principle, always incomplete[18].

A.N. Koonin describes polysemy with an example of a lexical item obtained from different dictionaries either compiled manually or developed compiling data. In his works he showed how dictionaries can recognize multiple senses of a single word. He observed and analyzed corpus attestations of a word comparing with the citations obtained from major dictionaries of Russian. Different figures and tables are furnished to support his argument that the number of sense distinctions that show up in the corpus far exceeds the number of distinctions that are provided in the dictionaries. Moreover, the dictionaries fail to capture many varied metaphorical uses of the words to be found. He argues that lexical semantics is in a poor position to solve the problem of polysemy because polysemy is a prototypical concept having a few marked features which probably can be accessed if an investigation on polysemy includes corpus-based lexicography, combinational properties of lexical items and the design of inference systems built on natural language texts [19].

A.I. Smirnitsky considered polysemy as a processing system, the goal of which is to produce a useful linguistic analysis of any piece of text passed to it. He refers to a system he uses for word sense disambiguation and postulate if word sense disambiguation is at all feasible. He described his system which encompasses a set of methodologies for sorting, weighing and navigating through linguistic representations produced during the analysis of a corpus. His system combines in a natural way paradigmatic,

[18]Nida.E. Towards a Science of Translation. – Nashville: Abingdon Press, - 1964 – 448p.
[19]ДубенецЭ.M. Modern English language.Lexicology. – M.: High school, - 1985 – 327p.

syntagmatic, and statistical information, encoding a sophisticated analysis of the linguistic context in which each corpus token appears. He shows how his system can efficiently deal with polysemy and word sense disambiguation. His works are mainly concerned with different distribution of words in topical context, and sense discrimination and labeling. In conclusion, he argues that his system provides the representational capabilities needed to capture sense modulation to allow the free acquisition of new words, new meanings, and information about how words are actually used by speakers [20].

This principled polysemy approach was also considered by British linguists Tyler and Evan who targeted the first of the two problem areas. First, they proposed criteria to determine when two usages constitute different senses, aiming at doing more justice to the role of context and distinguishing polysemy from vagueness;second, they proposed criteria to identify the prototype, or sanctioning sense, of a polysemantic category. As for the former, for some usage to count as a distinct sense of word it must contain additional meaning not apparent in other senses associated with this word (the meaning criterion) and it will feature unique or highly distinctive syntagmatic/collocational patterns (the concept elaboration criterion) and similarly distinctive structural dependencies (the grammatical criterion); the latter two criteria, thus, make an implicit reference to the study of corpus data. As for the latter, Evans (2004) lists four linguistic criteria (mentions additional empirical evidence of the type discussed by Lakoff) diachronic primacy, predominance in the lexical network, predictability regarding

other senses, and – for time – a sense involving experience at the phenomenological level for over – relations to other prepositions.

---

[20]Пешковский А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. – М.: Радуга, - 1956 – 165с.

This approach is promising as it is among the first to propose more rigorous decision principles; on the other hand, it is clear that the concept elaboration and the grammatical criterion as well as many of the prototype criteria (which, curiously, do not feature acquisitional primacy although this should be more relevant to speakers than etymology) are gradable and may not converge just as the more traditional criteria. Nonetheless, the proposed criteria will probably help make decisions more replicably especially as more empirical evidence guiding linguists' decision is gathered.

The majority of the contributors have rightly appreciated the importance of a huge database in the form of meaning in the whole process of sense disambiguation of polysemantic words. Let us hope that such recognition of meaning will enable researchers to be more empirical in approach towards linguistic studies both in theoretical and applied domains.

In the context of corpus-based computational analysis of meanings of words, the last principle of the classical approach is probably defunctional because corpus-based approach is entirely empirical where multiple finer shades of sense of particular words can be retrieved if its different contextual uses are appropriately referred. It is now almost certain that the context of words can provide so much of information which might not be available from the words if isolated form their contexts of occurrence. Moreover, contextual information performs an important role in word sense disambiguation as well as in actual sense retrieval. This notion might have inspired J.R. Firth to make such proverbial comments like "Meaning is not a hidden mental process. It is simply a complex of contextual relations the meaning of a word can be known by the company it keeps. The main concern of descriptive linguistics is to make statements of meaning. There is no meanings of words, apart from human participants in a social context" [21]etc.

---

[21]Жегадло В.Я. Иванова И.Я. ИофикЛ.Л. ModernEnglishlanguage. - М.: Титул, - 1956 – 376p.

It is understood that the approaches proposed by Dolan and Schuetze can be relevant and useful for information retrieval where the task is to match the query context similar to contexts in the database of documents, but is not clear to us how the application of such models would be fruitful in machine translation without extensive manual intervention in the form of encoding (at word, phrase or sentence level).The description of the factors involved is really an essential aspect for matching of senses of the translation-equivalents in bilingual corporations. It is equally important, as Biber, Conrad and Reppen show, for capturing multiple semantic senses of a single word even in a monolingual corpus.

Most of scientists consider term as a word or word-group, denoting special notions in the definite sphere of knowledge or professional activity [22]. But translational and lexico-graphic practice shows that many of them are used in different spheres of science and life and have more than one meaning. An important feature of the modern stage of scientific and technical progress is in the mutual penetration of special terminology from one sphere of knowledge into others. That is why great attention is paid to the contro-versial problem of polysemy in English terminology.

One of the most important drawbacks of polysemantic words is that there is sometimes a chance of misunderstanding when a word is used in a certain meaning but accepted by a listener or a reader in another [23]. Generally speaking, it is common knowledge that context is a powerful preventative against any misunderstanding of meanings [24]. Each individual meaning of the word can be determined by a context, the minimal stretch of speech. This is not to imply that polysemantic words have meanings only in context. The semantic structure of the word has an objective existence as a dialectical entity which embodies dialectical permanency and variability.

[22]МинаевЛ.В. Vocabulary in language and teaching. – M.: High school, - 1986 – 213p.
[23]Бархударов Л.С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1966 – 321с.
[24]Visson L. The problems of polysemy. – M.: Progress, - 2003 – 522p.

1.3. New approaches to the study of polysemy in the present day English and Uzbek languages

As a result of the researches mentioned above approaches to the study of polysemy in English and Uzbek can be seen from two ways: diachronically, synchronically. If polysemy is analyzed diachronically it is understood as the development of the semantic structure of the word or we establish how the meaning of the word has changed whether it has got new meanings in the course of the development of the language. From the point of view one of the meanings of the word will be primary meanings; that is such a meaning of a word which was first registered. All other meanings are secondary meanings. The term secondary meanings show that the meaning appeared in the language after the primary meaning was already 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'z1" - "a part of human's body" and "ko'z 2" - "a sing on wood".

c)   "uzuk1" - "one of the jewelry things" and "uzuk 2" - "a shape of something.

d)   the word "dum1" - "a part of animal's body" and "dum2" "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. "yoz1" - "summer" and "yoz2" - 'the form of the verb which expresses the order".

Ethimological method can be shown in the following:

For example, the word "ovoz1" used in the meaning of "sounds which are created when we speak", and the word "ovoz2" in the meaning of "sounds which appear in the course of vibration of humans' vocal cords" and "ovoz3" in the meaning of "to give your vote on election". The words "ovoz1"and "ovoz2" 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 all three languages.

For example, in Russian the word "шляпка1" used in the meaning of "one of the things of woman's clothes and the word "шляпка2"used in the meaning of "the top beginning of a mushroom or a nail" can be compared as following: these two meanings mean "something round and located on the top". So these two meanings are synonymic between each other.

 The same example we can find in Uzbek. For instance, the word "bosh1"used in the meaning of "the beginning of human's body" and the word "bosh2" used in the meaning of "the main person in a work, e.g."ishningboshi". 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 "oy1" – e.g. "Yilda un ikkitaoylarbor" and "oy2" – e.g. "oy – yerningyo'ldoshi" form the new word with the help of the suffix "lik":

Cf.: "Oylikmaoshi" and "Biroylik 14 kundaniborat".

It is some times argued that the difference between related and unrelated polysemantic words is, as a rule, relatable. It is observed that different meanings have certain stable relationships which are not to be found between the meanings of homonymous words. A clearly perceptible connection of such semantic relationships is commonly found in the meanings of one word and is considered to be indicative to polysemy. It is also suggested that the semantic connection may be described in terms of such features.

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 find that meanings form one sensible structure.

Homonymy and polysemy are different categories in polysemy we deal with the different meanings of the same word. In homonymy we have different words which have their own meanings. For example, the word "man" has ten meanings in Modern English:

1 – kish,erkak; 2 - inson; 3 – er,qalliq; 4 - xizmatkor;5-oddiy askar; 6 –(shaxmatda) piyoda.

As the all meanings are connected with the major meaning "erkak,kishi". But homonyms are different words which have nothing in common with themselves.

There are two processes of the semantic development of a word: radiation and concatenation. In cases of radiation the primary meaning stands in the centre and the secondary meanings proceed out of it like rays. Each secondary meaning can be traced to the primary meaning. E.g. in the word «face» the primary meaning denotes «the front part of the human head» Connected with the front position the meanings: the front part of a watch, the front part of a building, the front part of a

playing card was formed. Connected with the word «face» itself the meanings: expression of the face, outward appearance is formed.

Synchronically polysemy is understood as the coexistence of various meanings of the word at a certain historical period of the development of English. Synchronically the main problem of polysemy is to establish whether all the meanings of polysemantic word are equally important. Linguists divide the meanings of polysemantic word into two: the major meaning of a word, the miner meaning of a word. In most cases the surrounding context points out quite clearly which of the meanings of polysemantic word 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 обманывать.

The meaning which is not dependent on context is the major meaning of polysemantic word and the meanings which are dependent on the context are minor meanings. By context we mean the minimal stretch of speech determining each individual 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 [25].

The frequency of polysemy in different languages is a variable depending on a number of factors. The progress of civilization will make it necessary not only to form new words but to add fresh meanings to old ones; in Breal`s formula, the more senses a term has accumulated the more diverse aspects of intellectual and social activity it represents. It would be interesting to explore over a wider field the

[25] Дольгова О.В. Семиотика неправильной речи. - М.: Просвещение, - 1980 – 272с.

relation between polysemy and cultural progress. Mean while, the frequency of polysemy will also depend on purely linguistic factors. As already noted, languages where derivation and composition are sparingly used will tend to fill gaps in vocabulary by adding new meanings to existing terms. Similarly polysemy will arise more often in generic words whose meaning varies according to context than in specific terms whose sense is less subject to variation. 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 [26].

All the types discussed depend upon some comparison between the earlier (whether extinct or still in use) and the new meaning of the given word. This comparison may be based on the difference between notions expressed or referents in the real word that are pointed out, on the type of psychological association at work, on evaluation of the latter by the speaker or, possibly, on some other feature. The order in which various types are described will follow more or less closely the diachronic classifications on M. Breal and M. Paul. No attempt at a new classification is considered necessary. There seems to be no point in augmenting the number unsatisfactory schemes already offered in literature. The treatment is therefore traditional.

M. Breal was probably the first to emphasize the fact that in passing from general usage into special sphere of communication a word as a rule undergoes some sort of specialization of its meaning. Polysemantic word case, for instance, alongside its general meaning of circumstances in which a person or a thing is possesses special meanings; in law (a law suit), in grammar (possessive case), in medicine (a patient, an illness) [27].

---

[26]ДубенецЭ.М. Modern English language .Lexicology. – M.: High school, - 1985 – 327p.
[27]Гальперин И.Р. Очерки по стилистике английского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1958 – 245с.

The general not specialized meaning is also very frequent in present day English. The process reverse to specialization is termed generalization and widening of meaning. In that case the scope of the new notion is wider than that of the original one whereas the content of the notion is proper. In most cases generalization is combined with a higher order of abstraction than in the notion expressed by the earlier meaning. The transition from a concrete meaning to an abstract one is a most frequent feature in the semantic history of words. The change may be explained as occasioned by situations in which not all the features of the notions rendered are of equal importance for the message [28].

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish the instances of generalization combined with a fading of lexical meaning ousted by the grammatical or by the emotional meaning that take its place. These phenomena are closely connected with the peculiar characteristics of grammatical structure typical of each individual language. One observes them, for instance, studying the semantic history of the

English auxiliary and semi –auxiliary verbs, especially have, do, shall, will, turn, go and that of some English prepositions and adverbs which in the course of time have come to express grammatical relations.

An exact definition of any basic term is no easy task altogether. In the case of lexical meaning it becomes especially difficult due to the complexity of the process by which language and human conscience serve to reflect outward reality and to adapt it to human needs. The definition of lexical meaning has been attempted more than once in accordance with the main principles of different linguistic schools. The disciples of F. de Saussure consider meaning to be the relation between the object or notion named and the name itself. Descriptive linguistics of the Bloomfieldian trend defines the meaning as the situation in which the word is

---

[28] Гальперин И.Р. Очерки по стилистике английского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1958 – 245с.

uttered. Both ways of approach afford no possibility of a further investigation of semantic problems in strictly linguistic terms and therefore, if taken as a basis for general linguistic theory, give no insight into the mechanism of meaning.

Synchronically we understood polysemy as the coexistence of various meaning of the same word at a certain period of the development of the English language. These two approaches are promising in the study of polysemy as 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 the grammatical criterion as well as many of the prototype criteria (which curiously do not feature acquisitioned primacy although this should be more relevant to speakers than etymology) are gradable and may not converge just as the more traditional criteria. Nonetheless, the proposed criteria will probably help to make decisions more replicable especially as more empirical evidence guiding linguists' decisions.

Language tends to change in time and space. These universal characteristics of language are permanent interest of scholarship. The most important function of any language is to carry the meaning. But as we know not only the sound-form but also the meaning of the word is changed in the course of historical development of a language. It happened under the influence of many factors. Change of meaning is affected through association between the existing meaning and the new one. This association is generally based on the similarity or the contiguity of meanings. Due to numeral changes of meaning such a phenomenon as multiplicity of word meanings or polysemy appeared.

We analyzed the problem of polysemy in the English language system and made following conclusions: polysemy is certainly not an anomaly. Most English and Russian words are polysemantic. It should be commented that the wealth of representative resources of a language largely depends on the extent to which polysemy has developed in the language. Sometimes uninformed in linguistic

people claim that a language is lacking in words if the need arises for the same word to be laid on to several different phenomena. In real fact it is exactly the opposite: if each word is found to be capable of conveying at least two concepts instead of one, the expressive potential of the whole vocabulary increases twofold. Hence, well-developed polysemy is a great advantage in a language.

Polysemy is inherent in the very nature of words and concepts as every object and every notion has many features and a concept reflected in a word always contains a generalisation of several traits of the object. Some of these traits or components of meaning are common with other objects. Hence the possibility of using the same name in secondary nomination for objects possessing common features which are sometimes only implied in the original meaning. A word when acquiring new meaning or meanings may also retain, and most often retains the previous meaning.

We provided the information about the investigation of the problem of polysemy by English and Russian linguists. Here we presented the information about the depth of the investigation made in this sphere of the research, compared opinions of English and Russian linguists and analyzed the existing results.

Although only in the nineteenth century Bréal turned to polysemy as a phenomenon of language use, language acquisition and language change. The linguist wanted to establish semantics as a new branch of general linguistics, independent of etymology and lexicography. Bréal stated that new meanings of words eliminate old ones or exist with them in parallel. It means that the main source of the polysemy is the semantic innovation. Many other famous linguists were engaged in the studies of meaning and polysemy. If polysemy is analyzed diachronically it is understood as the development of the semantic structure of the word or we establish how the meaning of the word has changed whether it has got new meanings in the course of the development of the language. Synchronically

we understood polysemy as the coexistence of various meanings of the same word at a certain period of the development of the English language.

A.N. Koonin describes polysemy with an example of a lexical item obtained from different dictionaries, while A.I. Smirnitsky considered polysemy as a processing system, the goal of which is to produce a useful linguistic analysis of any piece of text passed to it. The majority of the contributors have rightly appreciated the importance of a huge database in the form of meaning in the whole process of sense disambiguation of polysemantic words.

So, in general both English and Russian linguists examined polysemy, and contrasted a range of current approaches, and highlighted many unresolved problems in the theoretical understanding of polysemy and the present computational challenges. In essence, their works will be highly useful for those who are working in the area of polysemy and word sense disambiguation.

Summary

The XX century brought considerable changes and innovations to the theory and practice of the word study.Investigations on functional linguistics affected on an integral and innovative linguistic investigation. Language tends to change in time and space. These universal characteristics of language are permanent interest of scholarship. The most important function of any language is to carry the meaning. But as we know not only the sound-form but also the meaning of the word is changed in the course of historical development of a language. It happened under the influence of many factors. Change of meaning is affected through association between the existing meaning and the new one. This association is generally based on the similarity or the contiguity of meanings. Due to numeral changes of meaning such a phenomenon as multiplicity of word meanings or polysemy appeared. Polysemy is inherent in the very nature of words and concepts as every object and every notion has many features and a concept reflected in a word

always contains a generalisation of several traits of the object. Some of these traits or components of meaning are common with other objects. Hence the possibility of using the same name in secondary nomination for objects possessing common features which are sometimes only implied in the original meaning. A word when acquiring new meaning or meanings may also retain, and most often retains the previous meaning.

II Chapter. Translation problems of polysemantic words .

2.1. Lexical difficulties of translation of polysemanticwords .

Due to the semantic features of language the meaning of words, their usage, ability to combine with other words, associations awakened by them, the "place" they hold in the lexical system of a language do not concur for the most part. All the same "ideas" expressed by words coincide in most cases, though the means of expression differ. While translating the lexical units partial correspondences mostly occur. That happens when a word in the language of the original conforms to several equivalents in the language it is translated into. The reason of this fact is most words in a language are polysemantic, and the system of word – meaning in one language does not concur with the same system in another language completely.

 In order to attain equivalence, despite the differences in formal and semantic system of two languages, the translator is obliged to do various linguistic transformations. Their aims are to ensure that the text imparts all the knowledge inferred in the original text, without violating the rules of the language it is translated into. Lexical transformations change the semantic core of a translated polysemantic word. They can be classified into the following groups:

1.   Lexical substitution or putting one word in place of another. It often results from the different semantic structures of the source language and target language words. Thus polysemantic word young is not always translated as молодой; rather, it depends on its word combinability: молодойкартофель is equal to new potatoes. This translation equivalent is predetermined by the word combination it is used in.

Deliberate lexical substitution as a translation technique of polysemantic words can be of several subtypes:

a)   Specification or lexical transformation of polysemantic words with a wider meaning with words of a narrower meaning: Will you do the room? – Senxonanitozalaysanmi? I'll get the papers on the way home. – Men uygaketishdagazetalarsotibolaman. The underlined English polysemantic words have larger scopes of meaning than their Uzbek counterparts and their particular semantics is recognized from the context.

b)   Generalization or lexical transformation of polysemantic words of a narrower meaning with those of a wider meaning: People don't like to be stared at. – Odamlarulargatikilibqarashlariniyoqtirishmaydi. If we compare the semantic structure of the English and Uzbek verbs, we can see that the English polysemantic verb stare specifies the action of seeing expressed by the Uzbek verb. The Uzbek tikilibqaramoq can imply staring, facing, eyeing, etc.

c)   Differentiation is a rather rare technique of lexical transformation. It takes place when we substitute polysemantic word by another one with parallel meaning, denoting a similar species: bamboo curtain – temirparda. Both bamboo and железо (iron) are materials known for their hard nature. They are used figuratively to denote the barriers between the Western and Communist countries (bamboo curtain in reference to China, железныйзанавес in reference to other Comecon (Council for Mutual Economic Aid) states. There are no hyponymic relations between the notions of bamboo and iron (though the referential area of железныйзанавес is of course much wider than that of bamboo curtain.)

d)Modulation is a logical development of the notion expressed by the word: But outside it was raining. –Ammo tashqaridayomg'iryog'ayotgandi. The primary equivalent of the polysemantic word outside is tashqari. By means of unsophisticated logical operation the translator finds another equivalent: ko'chada. Thus he takes into consideration a tradition of the word combination and acceptability of collocation. He is aided in this by the metonymical closeness of word meanings based on contiguity of the two notions.

2.   Lexical compensation is a deliberate introduction of some additional element in the target text to make up for the loss of a similar element in the source text. The main reason for this transformation is a vocabulary lacuna in the target language. For example, one of the Galsworthy's characters was called a leopardess. But there is no one-word equivalent of the same stylistic coloring in Uzbek. Therefore, the translator compensated the word by using the word leopard to characterize the lady.

3.   Metaphoric transformations are based on transferring the meaning due to the similarity of notions. The target language can re-metaphorizepolysemantic word or a phrase by using the same image Don't dirty your hands with that money!

–   Anavipulbilanqo'lingnikirqilma!   The source language metaphor can be destroyed if there is no similar idiom in the target language: Bahortezoradakelmoqda. – Spring is coming very soon. Or, on the contrary, the target text is metaphorized either to compensate a stylistically marked word or phrase whose coloring was lost for some reason, or merely to express a source language lacuna: U yangihayotboshlashgaqarorqildi. – He decided to turn over a new life.

Lexical transformations are also caused by necessity to concretize polysemantic word while translating. It is characteristic to English language the availability of polysemantic words with wide spread meaning. They can be nouns, adjectives and verbs, for example: thing, point, stiff; nice, fine, bad; to say, to go, to come, to get.

Translation of these polysemantic words depends on the context, which helps to identify their concrete meaning. Usually they are translated by various Uzbek words that have concrete meaning (importance). Practically it refers to verbs – to verbs of speech and verbs of movement. Concrete lexical meaning (importance), this or that the lexical-semantic variant of a verb depends on structure and lexical meaning of polysemantic words that distribute them.

At the by-election victory went to the Labor candidate.

Qo'shimchasaylovdaleyboristlarpartiyasidannomzodg'alabaqozondi.

Sometimes it is necessary to concretize some polysemantic words due to different qualitative distinction the generalizing words have in languages. The following polysemantic words belong to them: meal and трапеза that usually illustrate this phenomenon and the words limbs and shox-shabbalar, from which limbs is widely common, and Uzbek word the shox-shabbalar has much narrower usage.

The following problem which demands careful consideration in lexical transformations of translation is problem of polysemantic words combinability. In all languages there are typical norms of polysemantic word combinability. The concept of norm is relative, on the one hand, with system of language, and on the other hand, it is closely connected with speech, in which the originality of speech formation is displayed. Each language can form uncountable number new polysemantic word combinations that will be understood by its bearers. In any language there exists generally accepted tradition of polysemanticword combinations, which do not coincide with the corresponding tradition of word combinations in the other languages.

And it makes look for similarly accepted polysemantic word combinations in the target language. The main part combined words usually coincides in translation, but the second one is frequently translated by a word possessing other logical meaning, but performing the same function, as for example, trains run – poyezdyuradi, rich feeding – to'yimliovqatlanish.

The wider is the semantic volume of polysemantic word, the wider is its combinability, thus due to this feature it can interact with various word forms and word combinations. And this feature enables the translator to use his creativity in translation.

Along with traditional combinations in languages unexpected combinations are also possible, but they are quite clear, for they follow generally accepted semantic models of polysemantic word combinability. This phenomenon – the connection of polysemantic words with completely various semantic features – is peculiar to all languages, but in each language it has various rules and traditions. In English language such unexpected polysemantic word combinations are formed very easily. It is probably caused by conversion and easiness in formation of new words in various ways, heterogeneity of languages vocabulary and some other reasons. Not only poets and writers, but also journalists frequently create unexpected polysemantic word combination that makes their statements significantly vivid and original. The unexpectedness of word usage is closely connected with expressiveness of the statement.

Unexpected usage of polysemantic word combinations hardens the task of translators, for words interrelate in combinations not only with one word, but also with a large number of other words of the sentence.

The use of polysemantic adjective sharp in particular context can be unexpected: none of its meanings given in dictionaries gives the description of a hand. The difficulty of its translation is aggravated by presence of the second definition white, which excludes translation by words костлявый and сухой.

The last feature of lexical transformations in translation of polysemantic words to be discussed in this diploma work is traditional word usage for every language and which causes frequent lexical transformations. This traditional usage is to some extent related to another approach to the phenomena of reality. For example: The military base is built on terraces rising from the lake. For Uzbek the traditional use will be: Xarbiybo'linmako'lyaqinidagiterrasadaqurildi. In this case preposition is omitted in translation because as the originality of the English word usage required complete transformation.

Divergences in the semantic structure of polysemantic words of the source and target languages are one of the primary cases of lexical transformations. These divergences or dissmilitudes are connected with certain peculiar features of polysemantic word or a group of words. Even words which seem to have the same meaning in the two languages are not semantically identical. The primary meanings of correlated polysemantic words often coincide while their derivative meanings do not. Thus there is only partial correspondence in the structures of polysemantic words as their lexical semantic variants do not cover one another. Semantic correlation is not to be interpreted as semantic identity and one-to-one correspondence between the semantic structures of correlated polysemantic words in the two languages is hardly ever possible.

Such partial correspondence may be illustrated by the following analysis of the correlated words table and стол. Their primary meanings denoting the same article of furniture are identical. But their secondary meanings diverge. Other lexical semantic variants of the word table are: part of the machine-tool; slab of wood (stone); matter written on this; level area, plateau; palm of hand, indicating character of fortune, etc. Lexicalsemanticvariantsoftheword стол are: еда, пища, (шведский стол, диетический стол); учреждение, отдел в канцелярии (паспортный стол, стол находок) etc.

Not infrequently the primary meaning (and sometimes the derivative meanings as well) of an English polysemantic word consist of more than one semantic component or some, forming the so-called "bundles" of semantic elements. This is usually reflected in dictionaries which give more than one Uzbek equivalent of each English polysemantic word.

A polysemantic word, as has been shown, is a word having several meanings or lexical-semantic variants. These lexical-semantic variants possess both lexical and grammatical features which are closely interwoven. These different meanings or lexical-semantic variants of polysemantic words are revealed in the context. By the

term "context" is understood the minimum stretch of speech determining each individual meaning of a word.

The context individualizes the meaning of polysemantic word, brings it out and reveals the intended lexical-semantic variant. It is in this sense that we say that the meaning of a polysemantic word is determined by the context. The term context comprises both the narrow or micro context and the wide or macro context. The narrow context implies sentence or even a word combination, e.g.: bright star – Yorqinyulduz; bright wine – bayramona vino; bright day – ajoyibkun; bright reply – yoqimlijavob; a bright boy – aqlli bola. The following examples illustrate the importance of the context in translation.

The construction of the UNO was no simple or easy task.

This explains the peculiar construction of the Security Council.

In the first sentence the word construction has the meaning of "act of devising and forming" in the second sentence the meaning is "structure".

These different contexts bring out different lexical-semantic variants of the word construction which are reflected in the Uzbek translation.

UNO niqurilishiosonishemas.

Bu xavfsizikkonsulinio'zigaxosqurilishinianglatadi.

The importance of the context for translation is obvious. The micro context implies not only lexical but also syntactical ambient elements, e.g.: the elm stood before the house – Uynioldidaqayrag'ochturibdi; he stood a whisky – U mengaviskiquydi.

The context or the situation not only reveals the intended meaning of a polysemantic word but also its concrete or abstract, its direct or transferred meaning.

A dictator relies upon his army and police force. – direct meaning

Диктатор опирается на свою армию и полицию.

The whole army of words – всямассаслов – transferred meaning.

An army of insects – тучанасекомых – transferred meaning

The so-called contextual meaning is always individual, occasional and context-bound. It lives only in its context and disappears if the context is altered. The contextual meaning of polysemantic word is usually semantically richer than the dictionary meaning because of the connections which it arouses.

In an atomic war women and children will be the first hostages.

Birinchi atom bombasiurushidaayollarvabolalarvafotetishgandi.

The dictionary meaning of the word hostage is заложник, but in this context it is synonymous with victim as every hostage might become a victim and die. Thus the contextual meaning of polysemantic word is not arbitrary; it is inherent in its semantic structure and is brought out by the writer who is able to perceive its potentialities.

In translation polysemantic words context is essential for guessing the meaning of a word. For example, a macrocontext is very important for translating newspaper headlines which are characterized by ellipses not only of structural polysemantic words but also of notional parts of the sentence.

It is obligatory for a translator to take into account, along with the context, the contextual situation, which is often called background knowledge.

Over time, a contextual meaning may become a normative meaning fixed by the dictionary. This occurred, for instance, with the word dear. All dictionaries

translated it as дорогой, милый, любимый. But in the phrase my dear this word is used as a term of a very formal address and, therefore, corresponds to the Russian

глубокоуважаемый, which has recently been fixed by the 3-volume New English-Russian Dictionary, edited by Y. Apresyan.

To find an occasional equivalent to a word, a logical method of interpolation is used. The contextual meaning of a word, expressed by the occasional equivalent, is found by studying the whole semantic structure of the word and deducing the appropriate meaning from the two adjacent meanings fixed in the dictionary.

For example, in the sentence the waves lap the granite of the embankment the word lap contextualizes its two meanings at the same time: to drink by taking up with quick movements of the tongue, which corresponds to the Russian лакать, жаднопить, глотать and to move or hit with little waves and soft sounds, corresponding to the Russian плескаться. The first meaning brings up an image of some kind of creature. The image is retained with the interpolated equivalent in translation: волнылижутгранитнабережной.

Above mentioned examples clearly show that context prevents from any misunderstanding of meanings. For instance, polysemantic adjective dull, if used out of context, would mean different things to different people or nothing at all. It is only in combination with other words that it reveals its actual meaning: a dull pupil, a dull play, dull weather, etc. Sometimes, however, such a minimum context fails to reveal the meaning of the word, and it may be correctly interpreted only through a second-degree context as in the following example:

The man was large but his wife was even fatter.

The word fatter here serves as a kind of indicator pointing that large describes a stout man and not a big one.

Current research in semantics is largely based on the assumption that one of the more promising methods of investigating the semantic structure of a word is by

studying the word's linear relationships with other words in typical contexts - its combinability or collocability.

Scholars have established that the semantics of polysemantic words which regularly appear in common contexts are correlated and, therefore, one of the words within such a pair can be studied through the other [29].

In lexical contexts of primary importance are the lexical groups combined with the polysemantic word under consideration. This can be shown by analyzing different lexical contexts in which polysemantic words, e. g. heavy or come are used. The adjective heavy in isolation is understood as meaning of great weight heavy cargo, heavy book etc. When combined with the lexical group of words denoting natural phenomena such as wind, storm, snow, it means striking, falling with force, abundant as can be seen from the contexts heavy rain, wind, snow etc. In combination with the words industry, arms, artillery polysemantic adjective heavy has the meaning of the larger kind of something as in heavy artillery.

The polysemantic word come in isolation has primarily the meaning to arrive, move toward. When we join it the lexical group of prepositions we have more meanings we can imagine, even one preposition, for example in and we have nine meanings: come in: a) to enter, b) sport to get finish, c) to become fashionable, d) to be found as useful, etc.

In grammatical contexts it is the grammatical structure of the context that serves to determine various individual meanings of a polysemantic word. One of the meanings of polysemantic verb to make is to force and can be found only in the grammatical context possessing the structure to make somebody to do something or in simpler terms this particular meaning occurs only if the verb to make is followed by a noun and the infinitive of some other verb, e.g. to make somebody laugh, go, write. Another meaning of this polysemantic verb is to become, to turn

[29]Дубенец Э.М. Современный английский язык. Лексикология. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1985 – 327с.

out to be is observed in the contexts of a different structure, e. g. make followed by an adjective and a noun to make a good wife, to make a good teacher.

In a number of contexts, however, we find that both the lexical and grammatical aspects should be taken into consideration. The grammatical structure of the context although indicative of the difference between the meaning of the word in this structure and the meaning of the same word in a different grammatical structure may be insufficient to indicate in which of its individual meaning of the word in question is used.

Dealing with verbal contexts we consider only linguistic factors: lexical groups of words, syntactic structure of the context and so on. There are cases, however, when the meaning of polysemantic word is ultimately determined not by these linguistic factors, but by the actual speech situation in which this word is used.

The polysemantic noun ring in such context may possess the meaning a cricket of precious metal or a call on the telephone. The meanings of the verb to get in this linguistic context may be interpreted as possess or understand depending on the actual situation in which these words are used. It should be pointed out however such cases, though possible, are not actually very numerous. The linguistic context is by far a more potent factor in determining word meaning.

It is of interest to note that not only the denotational but also the connotational component of meaning may be affected by the context. Any polysemantic word which as a language unit is emotively neutral may in certain contexts acquire emotive implications. Compare fire in to insure ones property against fire and fire as a call for help. Another good example is stylistically and emotively neutral polysemantic noun wall acquires laughable emotive implication in William Shakespeare's "Midsummer Night's Dream" in the context: "O wall, o sweet and lovely wall". Here we clearly perceive the combined effect of both the linguistic and the extra-linguistic contexts. The polysemantic word wall doesn't ordinarily

occur in combination with the adjectives, sweet and lovely. So the peculiar lexical context accounts for the possibility of emotive overtones which are made explicit by the context of situation.

Contextual meaning of polysemantic word in many instances depends on the character of semantic context, on the semantics of the words combining with it. Occasional meanings, suddenly originated in the context are not always arbitrary – it is based into the semantic structure of polysemantic word. In contextual usage of a word in poetry or prose – often point to the author's penetration into the depth of the word's semantic structure. For paradigmatic and semantic relations it is characteristic to any polysemantic words and the lexical potential of words to be revealed in both cases. But revealing these potentials of polysemantic words is closely connected with the specificity of lexical-semantic aspects of every language and here forth we may observe the difficulty of translation of contextual meaning of words. What is possible in one language maybe impossible in another because of its difference in semantic structure and its usage.

Another one very interesting contextual meaning of exploitation will be given in the following example:

Britain's worldwide exploitation was shaken to the roots by Colonial Liberation Movements.

The contextual meaning of the given polysemantic word originated metonymically – any colonial system lives on exploitation, which comprises basis of colonial power. The corresponding Russian эксплуатациясаn not be used in this contextual meaning, the contextual surroundings of exploitation (worldwide, shaken to the roots) also prevents it. The only possible variant of translation is by means of metonymic transposition – substitution:

Колониальное   могущество   Англии   было подорвано (потрясено до основания) национально-освободительным движением во всех колониях.

Contextual meaning of polysemantic word is always effective semantically and stylistically owing to its unexpectedness as well. It often used in stylistic purposes and therefore a translator runs into two obstacles: he should avoid and at the same time not to break the norms of translation. The meanings determined by lexical contexts are sometimes referred to as lexically bound meanings which imply that such meanings are to be found only in certain lexical contexts.

All this leads us to the conclusion that context is a good and reliable key to the meaning of the polysemantic word.

The semantic structure of polysemantic word is a set of regular meanings featured in a dictionary's entry. Polysemantic words corresponding to each other in their primary meanings are usually non-equivalent in other meaning, which is seen in their word combinations. Let us, for example, compare the translation of polysemantic words brother and брат. They correspond in their primary meaning: a man or boy with the same parents as another person but in other meanings there are different equivalents:

Брат: 2. a son of one's aunt or uncle = двоюродныйбрат – cousin

3.   people sharing the same job = братья-писатели – fellow-writers

4.   familiar or patronizing term of address = Ну, брат…– old man, my lad

5.   a man whose job is to care for people who are ill or injured, especially in hospital = братмилосердия – male nurse

6.   a person = (дваяблока) набрата – (two apples) a head

Brother: 2. a person sharing the same job = brother in arms – собратпооружию

brother-doctor – коллега-доктор

3. one who lives in a monastery or convent but is at a low level and usually does the simplest work for the organization = lay brother – послушник

4. a man who is married to one's sister, or to the sister of one's wife or husband = brother-in-law – (sister's husband) зять, (wife's brother) шурин, (husband's brother) деверь, (wife's sister's husband) свояк

Even those polysemantic words having the same referential meaning are not full equivalents as far as their connotation is concerned. Thus, an English-Uzbek dictionary gives two translations for the polysemantic word dog: it. The former translation equivalent is neutral; the latter is colloquial, expressive. Since the English word dog is more general, it is only a partial equivalent to пёс.

Another example: in English, a chicken is used derogatory to refer to a cowardly person: Why won't you jump? Are you a chicken? In Uzbek, jo'ja is associated with a helpless little creature and is often referred to a small child that needs help.

2.2. Some methodological issues in teaching polysemantic words .

Practicing polysemy is distinguishing between the various meaning of a single word form with several but closely related meanings (head: of a person, of a pin, of an organization). In my opinion the most important aspect of vocabulary teaching for intermediate learners is to foster learner independence so that learners will be able to deal with new lexis and expand their vocabulary beyond the end of the course. Therefore guided discovery, contextual guesswork and using dictionaries should be the main ways to deal with discovering meaning. Teachers can help students with specific techniques and practice in contextual guesswork, for example, the understanding of discourse markers and identifying the function of the word in the sentence .

In my opinion the most important aspect of teaching polysemy for learners is to foster independence so that learners will be able to deal with new lexis and expand their vocabulary beyond the end of the course. Therefore guided discovery, contextual guesswork should be the main ways to deal with discovering meaning.

Intermediate level includes the 5th — 9th form pupils. They already have some basic knowledge in studying a foreign language. If pupils have had good achievements in language learning, they are usually interested in the subject and work willingly both in class and at home. The desire to learn depends fully on the teacher's ability to involve each pupil in language activities during the lesson. Pupils give preferences to those exercises which require thinking [30].

Exercise 1

Give all the meanings you know to the following verbs, illustrating them with examples: to get; to go; to bring; to make; to do; to let; to buy; to begin; to feel.

Exercise 2

The noun leg has several meanings: 1) one of the long parts of your body that your feet are joined to; 2)one of the series of games in a football competition played between two teams; 3) one of the upright parts that support a piece of furniture; 4) the part of your trousers that covers your leg; 5) one part of a long journey or race.

Match the meanings of the word face with the sentences given below:

1)   One of the legs on the table was a bit wobbly.

2)   Here, pull up your pant legs and let me see if your knees are hurt.

3)   The legs of my jeans were covered in mud.

4)   Leeds will have to win the second leg if they are to go forward to the finals.

[30]ДацькоЮ.М, БабенкоТ.В. MethodologyinEnglish teaching— Л.: ЛНУ, 2000. — 118p.

5)   The men looked pensive as the carriage approached the final leg of the trip to the big house on the hill.

6)   When this can expand no further, it splits and is rolled off, like a nylon stocking from a leg.

7)   Raise the leg a fraction higher and repeat this tiny movement 15 times, holding each raise for 1 second.

8)   Officers then shot Mao in the leg several times and he collapsed.

9)   Breathing through his mouth, he manipulated his probe between her legs.

10) Another screaming beast collapsed on broken hind legs.

Exercise 3

How many meaning of the following words do you know? Name them:

head, bench, to feel, to dress, hand, leg, power.

Teaching polysemy on advanced level

Pupils can realize the importance of studying language more thoroughly. However, their attitude to foreign language depends on the achievements they have attained during the previous years of studying the subject. While explaining the material, teacher should take into account everything: pupils age, the material they deal with, their previous knowledge, etc.

So, the exercise should be of various kinds, they have to be creative and develop pupils critical thinking and memory. Teacher should encourage his/her pupils, get them interested in learning the language on deeper level [31]. Below, there are exercise, which are suitable for this level of language learning. They will help

---

[31]БабенкоТ.В. Lexicology . — Л.: ЛНУ, 2000. — 118p.

pupils to adopt more material, to be able to differentiate polysemantic meanings of the words through the context of the sentences.

Exercise 1

Comment on the meaning of the following adjectives in the given phrases.

Bad — behaviour, boy, case, day, debt, dream, experience, faith, guy, habit, idea, luck, mood, name, news, press, publicity, shape, situation, start, taste, temper, thing, things, time, way, weather.

Bitter — argument, attack, battle, blow, cold, conflict, debate, disappointment, dispute, end, enemy, experience, fight, flavour, irony, laugh, memory, opponent, pill, rival, smile, struggle, taste, tear, wind, winter.

Fresh — air, approach, basil, blood, bread, breeze, election, evidence, face, fish, flower, food, fruit, herb, idea, look, meat, parsley, produce, salmon, start, thyme, water, weight.

Good — chance, condition, day, deal, example, faith, fortune, friend, health, idea, job, life, luck, man, news, night, part, performance, place, position, practice, quality, reason, sense, service, shape, start, thing, time, use, value, way, work.

Green — bean, belt, bottle, card, field, form, grass, hill, leave, light, onion, paper, pasture, pepper, revolution, room, salad, shoot, space, tea, water.

New — era, generation, government, home, idea, job, law, legislation, life, member, owner, product, school, system, technology, town, version, world, year.

Old — age, boy, brother, child, daughter, day, friend, generation, day, lady, man, people, school, sister, son, woman.

Round — face, figure, head, neck, robin, table, trip.

Thick — carpet, cloud, fog, forest, glass, hair, skin, skull, smoke, soup, wall.

Thin — air, cotton, face, finger, forest, ice, line, lip, mist, sheet, skin, slice, paper, thread, veneer, voice.

Exercise 2

Paraphrase the italicized words and phrases by those given below the sentences:

1. From the tower, you can see for miles.

2. Having a child makes you see things differently.

3. He could see a great future for her in music.

4. I don't know. We'll just have to see how it goes on Sunday.

5. I have to see my teacher about my grades.

6. I just can't get her to see reason!

7. I'll be seeing her tomorrow night.

8. I'll call him and see how the job interview went.

9. I saw Jane while I was out.

10. I see what you mean.

11. It will be interesting to see if he makes it into the team.

12. Leave the papers with me and I'll see what I can do.

13. More money must be invested if we are to see an improvement in services.

14. Mr. Thomas is seeing a client at 2:30.

15. Please see that the lights are switched off before you leave.

16. See press for details.

17. See you Friday - your place at 8:30.

18.   The moment we saw the house, we knew we wanted to buy it.

19.   The results are shown in Table 7a (see below).

20.   We're going to see 'Romeo and Juliet' tonight.

to notice or examine someone or something, using your eyes; to notice that something is happening or that something is true; to be able to see; to find out information or a fact; to find out about something in the future; to see how things go; used to tell you where you can find information; see above/below; to understand something; to see reason/sense; to watch a television programme, film; to consider something; used to say that you will try to help someone; used to say goodbye; to visit or meet someone; to meet someone by chance; to have an arranged meeting with someone; to see someone to discuss something; to imagine that something may happen in the future; to make sure.

Recomendations for teaching polisemantic words

The type of lexis I wish to focus on in this section is one that generally conveys a great deal of metaphoricity – this is the case of polysemous words. There are several reasons for this choice. Firstly, the treatment of polysemous words in EFL contexts, as pointed out earlier, is typically by means of what Nerlich[32] calls a 'translation-based vocabulary instruction method' (TBM). It is not unusual to come across translation-based practices in situations where teachers are faced with words with multiple meanings. Secondly, the problematic nature behind the teaching and learning of these words requires a systematic analysis of ways that facilitate their delivery and acquisition. In relation to the problems associated with polysemous words, Thornburydescribed them as a complete headache for students. Finally, the various meanings of a polysemous item and the relations between them are rarely treated as metaphorical extensions of their literal bases. I would doubt if extended meanings are, in practice, actually treated as metaphorical realizations

---

[32]Nerlich B., Todd Z. Trends in modern linguistics. Polysemy. — Berlin, 2003 — 272p.

originating from our early and primary bodily experiences with the world around us. In a nutshell, due to the pervasive nature of polysemy in English and the problems for teaching and learning, language teachers, especially in EFL contexts, need to deepen their understanding of alternatives ways to treat this ubiquitous lexical phenomenon to avoid traditional translation-based practices.

To assist in the teaching and learning of polysemous items I wish to make two interrelated teaching suggestions, both of which base their principles on raising learners' awareness of core literal meanings. The first suggestion focuses on developing awareness of how literal meanings extend into metaphorical extensions. To do this, teachers must have some understanding of certain CL principles, especially those relating to embodied cognition, as briefly discussed earlier. Raising learners' awareness of the literal core meaning would help them understand the motivations behind metaphorical extensions. Such awareness-raising process can be done by means of drawing students' attention to the prototypical meanings of the polyseme. For example, in teaching the polysemous item 'hold', teachers would have to signal such prototypes as 'hand' and 'control'. These can be written on the whiteboard, shown in a flashcard or slide, or explained with the assistance of body language. The same simple procedure can be utilized with any other polysemous item. Take for example the polyseme 'break'. Students can be asked to think of one or two prototypical words that best describe the core meaning of break. Some of the prototypes that can be written on the board are, for instance, 'separate', 'pause' or 'interruption'. Once teachers and students have one or two prototypes of the concept, teachers should pro- vide examples of literal uses of the polysemes as in:

(i)   'The child broke the plate on the ground'

(ii)   'The girl fell and broke her arm'.

It is important to begin to raise students' awareness of how prototypical meanings become realised in the liter- al uses of the concept as shown in the example sentences. Then, the use of the word can be extended to more abstract domains to show students metaphorical meaning extensions. In this context, examples such as these may be given:

(i)   The news broke my mother's heart

(ii)   The student comes from a broken home.

Having provided students with some examples of metaphorical uses of the word, it is time to discuss with the students the features of the concrete domain (e.g. break an arm) that map onto the abstract/metaphorical domain (e.g. broken home). Do any of the prototypes of the polyseme 'break' (e.g. separation, pause, interruption) written on the board map onto the metaphorical uses? By raising awareness of our literal uses of words, students may come to understand how features of literal meanings are extended to metaphorical domains. In this way, teachers may use this simple procedure to show the systematicies of metaphorical meanings, and, thus, understand that literal and metaphorical senses are not to be understood as conflicting or contradictory.

Another approach I wish to suggest has its roots in a procedure that was designed by metaphor scholars to identify metaphorically-used words in naturally-occurring discourse. Although the procedure, called the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP), was not originally intended to be a teaching tool for raising metaphor awareness, its effectiveness has been documented in studies looking at the role of metaphor awareness in understanding of text .

The original version of the procedure is realised in four different steps where the third is sub-divided into three . Since the MIP was devised to be used as a metaphor identification tool, not for metaphor-awareness raising purposes, the steps relevant to the present discussion are only two. These include:

1.   For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. Basic meanings tend to be:

•   More concrete; what they evoke is easier to imagine, see, hear, feel, smell, and taste.

•   Related to bodily action.

•   More precise (as opposed to vague).

•   Historically older.

Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

2.   If the lexical unit has a more basic-contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

Despite the simplicity of these steps, they help teachers and learners focus on and attend to what Ravin[33] calls 'basic meanings'. Basic meanings are not only more concrete, literal, salient and more precise but connected with how individuals actually experience and interact with the world. This means that attending to the nature of basic meanings sheds light on how our physical and bodily relations with the world shape and frame both our conceptual system and our use of language. It is important to remember that, according to several metaphor scholars Shread[34], metaphor is experientially motivated. That is, the ways in which we have experienced and interacted with the world have an important role in how we not only talk about the world but in how we think about it. The implication of this for the teaching of metaphor-related words is that language teachers must rely upon their understanding of how language, especially metaphorical words, is rooted in our primary bodily and sensorimotor experiences with the world.

[33]Ravin Y. Leacock C. Polysemy: Theoretical and computational approaches. — Oxford University Press, 2000. — 105p.
[34]Shread J.A. The words we use. — London, 2001 — 344p.

In trying to apply the above steps of the MIP, the language teacher must begin by compiling words often used metaphorically. While doing the compilation, you may realise that several of the words you have thought of are not traditionally considered metaphorical. Think, for instance, of the word 'close'. This is a word that comes up so regularly in our everyday conversations, and in language in general, that you would probably not consider metaphorical. What has happened? Metaphor scholars Arnold[35] believe that words such as 'close', 'head', and others have become so coventionalised in language that their metaphoricity seems to have disappeared and are, therefore, better referred to as 'dead metaphors'. Nevertheless, when we look at the multiple ways in which the word 'close' can be used, i.e. the different domains of use, one can observe that 'close' does have a great deal of metaphorical load. Consider the following examples:

(i)   My cousin's son lives close to the main campus of Charles University

(ii)   A close friend of mine visited us last week.

The first step recommends looking at the basic (con- crete) meaning of the word. Students would, for example, read and discuss the two sentences and decide which use of the word yields more salient, familiar and concrete meanings to them – which one is easier to imagine or see? It is likely that most answers would indicate that the first sentence evokes more familiarity and salience. The reason being is mainly due to the experiential basis of language as discussed earlier. In this context, it is important that teachers be able to, first of all, identify the different domains of use in the example sentences. In the first sentence, the use of 'close' alludes to the concrete domain of 'physical space' and 'proximity', while in the second sentence it refers to the abstract domain of 'affection'. The cross-mapping of features from the concrete domain to the abstract domain is central to understanding metaphorical extensions of polysemous words. Some of the critical questions that arise here relate to whether students and teachers themselves are

---

[35]Arnold I.V.The English word. — M.: High School, 1979. — 302p.

aware of these intricacies of language, and whether these are taught in any way to learners.

The application of the second step of the procedure consists of comparing basic or prototypical meanings of the item with the contextual meaning in the sentence. If students were trying to understand the metaphoricity underlying the second sentence, they should be asked to conjure up familiar contexts and situations in which they would use the word 'close'. Then, the teacher would ask them to compare their uses and meanings of the word with that of the context of the sentence. This should enable teachers and students to develop an awareness of the interplay of literal and metaphorical meanings, which, in turn, should make the metaphor more visible and comprehensible to the learners.

In conclusion, despite the pedagogical simplicity of the suggestions described above, it is critical that teachers begin to adopt and implement teaching approaches that assist their learners in identifying and understanding the systematicities of metaphorical words. A possible path to a successful pedagogy may be the implementation of a metaphor-awareness raising approach. Whether it be by drawing learners' attention to the prototypes of polysemous words or by the application of the first two steps of the MIP, students and teachers alike must come to an understanding of how metaphor is not an arbitrary phenomenon, but a systematic way of thinking and speaking that is both embodied in our early physical experiences with the world and embedded in our socio-cultural contexts.

Summary

The second chapter of present dissertation is devoted to the lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words from English into Uzbek. In 2.1.we analyzed lexical transformations in translation of polysemantic words from English into Uzbek and came to the following conclusions: in order to attain equivalence, despite the differences in formal and semantic system of two languages, the

translator is obliged to do various linguistic transformations. In 2.2. we presented some methodological approaches during teaching polysemantic words .We described also learners' ability to learn and understand vocabulary as well .

In addition to this in this part we use some recommendations for teaching polysemantic words .It is beneficial and crucial for teachers to use methods and new pedagogical technologies during teaching polysemantic words .As well as this some translation difficulties of polysemy are described in this chapter .

Conclusion

The present diploma work has investigated the problem of polysemantic words in the English language . In this investigation, the aim was to assess detailed study of lexical, grammatical difficulties of polysemantic words from English into Russian, differences in the shades of their meanings and the frequency of their usage in different types of the discourse. In this research work we tried to make new approaches to the analysis of translation difficulties of polysemantic words using the methods and procedures of analysis applied in translation theory.

Language tends to change in time and space. These universal characteristics of language are permanent interest of scholarship. The most important function of any language is to carry the meaning. But as we know not only the sound-form but also the meaning of the word is changed in the course of historical development of a language. It happened under the influence of many factors. Change of meaning is affected through association between the existing meaning and the new one. This association is generally based on the similarity or the contiguity of meanings. Due to numeral changes of meaning such a phenomenon as multiplicity of word meanings or polysemy appeared.

In chapter one we studied theoretical basis of the research of polysemantic words and revealed different opinions and approaches of English linguists according to the given problem. Both English and Russian linguists examined polysemy, and contrasted a range of current approaches, and highlighted many unresolved problems in the theoretical understanding of polysemy and the present computational challenges.

In my investigation I also touched upon the problem of polysemy in diachronic and synchronic dimensions. Diachronic approach considers polysemy as historical change in the semantic structure of the word resulting in new meanings being added to the ones already existing and in the rearrangement of these meanings in its semantic structure. While synchronic one understands it as a co-existence of the various meanings of the same word at a certain historical period and the arrangement of these meanings in the semantic structure of the word. As the semantic structure is never static the relationship between the diachronic and synchronic evaluation of individual meanings of the same word may be different in different periods of the historical development of language. Diachronic and synchronic ties are closely interconnected as the new meanings are understood thanks to their motivation by the older meanings.

In chapter two of our work we analyzed lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words. The analyse has shown that in order to attain equivalence, despite the differences in formal and semantic system of two languages, the translator is obliged to do various linguistic transformations. Their aims are to ensure that the text imparts all the knowledge inferred in the original text, without violating the rules of the language it is translated into. The following three elementary types are seemed most suitable for describing all kinds of lexical transformations: lexical substitution, lexical compensation and metaphoric transformations. Then in this chapter we presented some methodological issues in teaching polysemy and gave some recommendations for teaching polysemantic words .

Polysemy is characteristic of most words in many languages. All the lexical and lexico-grammatical variants of the word taken together form its semantic structure or semantic paradigm. The phenomenon of polysemy was broadly investigated in the historical development of the language. The word "polysemy" comes from Latin, but the roots of the concept of polysemy lie in Greek philosophy.

Polysemy is inherent in the very nature of words and concepts as every object and every notion has many features and a concept reflected in a word always contains a generalisation of several traits of the object. Some of these traits or components of meaning are common with other objects. Hence the possibility of using the same name in secondary nomination for objects possessing common features which are sometimes only implied in the original meaning. A word when acquiring new meaning or meanings may also retain, and most often retains the previous meaning.

Although only in the nineteenth century Bréal turned to polysemy as a phenomenon of language use, language acquisition and language change. The linguist wanted to establish semantics as a new branch of general linguistics, independent of etymology and lexicography . Bréal stated that new meanings of words eliminate old ones or exist with them in parallel. It means that the main source of the polysemy is the semantic innovation. Many other famous linguists were engaged in the studies of meaning and polysemy.

This research also highlights the significance of polysemy in grammar. Most grammatical forms are polysemantic. It is sometimes maintained that the case of grammatical polysemy can be observed in various structural meanings inherent in the given form, one of them being always invariable, found in any context of the use of the form. The semantic structure of polysemantic words is not homogeneous as far as the status of individual meaning is concerned. Some meanings are representatives of the word in isolation, others are perceived only in certain contexts. Context is a minimal stretch of speech necessary to determine individual meanings.

In the conclusion, I can say that the problem of polysemy may cause difficulties during the translation or communication. To overcome them pupils need to see and practice words in context, since it is the context that allows them to understand the meaning of the word.The problem of polysemy is mainly the problem of

interrelation and interdependence of various meanings of the same word. Though it is the object of confusion and one of the most controversial problems in linguistics. It is of great importance in studying English as it presents the diverse meanings of expressive layer.

Bibliography

1. The Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Measures for Further Enhancement of Teaching Foreign Languages" (PD №1875 Issued in December, 2012)

2. Karimov I.A. Uzbekistan on the threshold of the twenty-first century. – T.: Uzbekistan, - 1997 – 235p

3. Апресян Ю.Д. Lexical semantics. – M.:Просвещение, - 1992 – 583p.

4. Аполлова М.А. SpecificEnglish (Грамматические трудности перевода)– М.: Международные отношения, - 1977 – 135p.

5. Arnold I.V. The English word. — M.: High School, 1979. — 302p.

6. Бархударов Л.С. Language and translation. – High school, - 1975 – 512p.

7. Блох М.Я. Вопросы изучения грамматического строя языка. - М.: Просвещение, - 1976 – 312c.

8. БархударовЛ.С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1966 – 321c.

9. Бабенко Т.В. Lexicology . — Л.: ЛНУ, 2000. — 118p.

10. Дубенец Э.М. Modern English language.Lexicology. – M.: High school, - 1985 – 327p.

11. Дольгова О.В. Семиотика неправильной речи. - М.: Просвещение, - 1980 – 272c.

12. ДубенецЭ.М. Modern English language .Lexicology. – M.: High school, - 1985 – 327p.

13. Дацько Ю.М, Бабенко Т.В. Methodology in English teaching— Л.: ЛНУ, 2000. — 118p.

14. Дубенец Э.М. Современный английский язык. Лексикология. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1985 – 327с.

15. Гальперин И.Р. Очерки по стилистике английского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1958 – 245с

16. Lyons J. Linguistic Semantics. — Cambridge University Press, 1995. — 376p.

17. Nerlich B., Todd Z. Trends in modern linguistics. Polysemy. — Berlin, 2003 — 272p.

18. Nida.E. Towards a Science of Translation. – Nashville: Abingdon Press, - 1964 – 448p.

19. Пешковский А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. – М.: Радуга, - 1956 – 165с.

20. Ravin Y. Leacock C. Polysemy: Theoretical and computational approaches. — Oxford University Press, 2000. — 105p.

21. Shread J.A. The words we use. — London, 2001 — 344p.

22. Visson L. The problems of polysemy. – Progress, - 2003 – 522p.

23. VissonL.Semantics of lexicology.-Progress,-2003-260 p

24. Ванников Ю.В. О едином комплексе переводческих дисциплин. Вопросы теории и техники перевода. - М.: МГУ, - 1970 – 325с.

Appendix

Appendix 1

Statistical investigation of the functional aspect of the common polysemantic words in discourse.

N	The Verb	Number of occurrences in a million words of text	The number in percentage
1	To be	39.175	3,9 %
2	To have	12.458	1,25%
3	To do	4.367	0,43%
4	To say	2.765	0,27%
5	To make	2.312	0,23%
6	To go	1.844	0,18%
7	To take	1.575	0,16%
8	To come	1.561	0,15%
9	To see	1.513	0,15%
10	To get	1.486	0,15%

Appendix 2

The quantity of meanings of the most frequently used polysemantic verbs in English (Oxford English Dictionary 2008)

N	The Verb	Meanings	Lexico-semantic variants
1	To make	41	105
2	To do	12	45
3	To come	51	96
4	To get	72	145
5	To go	35	129

Appendix 3

Aspects of analyzing polysemy in semantics.

The distinction between polysemy and homonymy
A. Smirnitsky, I. V. Arnold, R. S. Ginsburg, G. Dunbar, R. Geeraerts

Analysis of theoretical developments
G. Y. Knyazeva, A. Ivanov, A. Muminov, L. Croft, R. Sandra

The development of the radial categories model of word meaning
A. Nikitin, Y. Apresyan, I. Novikov, J. Lakoff

The principled polysemy approach
J. Evans, E. Mednikova, A. Ufimtseva, A. Smirnitsky

The polysemy of spatial particles
G. Brugman, J. Lakoff, Herskovits