CONTAMINATION AND AMBIVALENCE: MEANING CREATION THROUGH WORD FORM

Ikromov Shokhrukhbek Dilshodjon o'g'li
PhD student, Andijan state institute of foreign languages

Abstract: The article analyzes the phonetic convergence of linguistic units, contamination processes, and the phenomenon of ambivalence arising from them. It demonstrates how new expressive meanings and stylistic possibilities are created through the alteration of a word's form or its association with related linguistic systems. At the same time, the pun — wordplay — is interpreted as an important type of ambivalent text, and its communicative and pragmatic value is highlighted. Through examples, the duplication of denotative meaning and the emergence of additional meanings derived from word form are revealed.

Keywords: phonetic convergence, contamination, ambivalence, pun, expressive meaning, pragmatic value, linguistic units.

In cases of phonetic convergence, that is, when a word is contrasted with other words with which it is usually unrelated, new additional expressive-semantic nuances emerge within that word.

Contamination is the alteration of a word's form or meaning under the influence of another word, that is, the blending of two (or several) words resulting in the creation of a new form or meaning. Contamination can be considered one of the methods of reshaping a word's form. Since new elements in a language are perceived in a familiar, conventional framework, speakers naturally tend to associate unfamiliar words with familiar ones, and to "justify" the unfamiliar sound form of a word through known, conventional means. This often occurs either through the modification of sound form to link a word with an adjacent system, or through dividing a word into parts. As a result, some of its components may remain unmotivated from the standpoint of the word-formation models of the given language.

The accidental "justification" of a word may take place in one or both of these planes. Adapting such a word to a humorous context leads to the emergence of the phenomenon of ambivalence.

In ambivalent texts, linguistic units easily merge with other units at the level of expression, and this merging is accompanied by additional semantic and stylistic meanings. In such texts, a word, interacting simultaneously with two denotata, loses its communicative function of conveying a single meaning, as its denotative capacity is, as it were, split in two. The communicative denotation with a single meaning serves as an intermediate stage, while at another stage, reference to two denotata creates a new communication. Here, the expressive aspect of the utterance comes to the fore. The pun (wordplay), as a type of ambivalent text, "...renders the very form of speech reasoning communicatively relevant" [1;156].

In an ambivalent text, one or two similar forms based on the same material may be used; they can be equated with one another, while in this case an independent denotative meaning does not play an essential role [1;156].

A Real Ghost Story.

Mistress (returning): "Any one to see me, Mary?"

Mary: "Yes, mem. An Insanitary Spectre."

Although the word inspector is not used in the text, its substitution with spectre becomes evident. The point is that the maid, for whom the word inspector is not very familiar, interprets it as semantically close. As a result, two words that are similar in their expression plane overlap. Through the denotative meanings of these words, two pieces of information are conveyed, upon

155

which a third piece of information is constructed. The recipient draws conclusions about the maid's illiteracy and her susceptibility to superstitions. Thus, in this case, the material form serves to transmit (or express) pragmatic information.

Even if linguistic units in the text undergo deformation, its integrity is not disrupted, since their modification is justified by the context. Contamination of linguistic units lacking a supporting context constitutes an exception. However, in the process of contamination, the modified units retain material similarity sufficient for the recipient to establish a connection with the original forms, and the contaminated units mutually reinforce one another.

Linguistic units in a text undergo certain modifications, which may or may not be codified. The updates established in the rules of code usage include grammatical changes of words, transformations of phraseological components, and constant substitutions of components. In all these cases, words are regularly repeated in their original form. The introduction of regularly updated units into speech should not lead to exceeding the framework of the modifications envisaged in the code.

If modifications go beyond the code, then the relationship of the updated unit with its original must be preserved. In such cases, the sender of the message must take into account that the recipient will inevitably equate two units – the original and the deformed one – both realized in a single material form.

In ambivalent texts, under the influence of context, the semantics of a word may also undergo modification. This can occur in occasional meanings, in the actualization of derivational relations, and in occasional words. For example:

Mr. Swiveller rained down such a shower of blows, that the noise of the bell was drowned.

In this text, the verb to rain acquires an occasional transitive meaning. English dictionaries register only intransitive meanings for this word. This new meaning is created through the occasional combination of to rain with the postpositive down. The verb to rain is semantically reinforced by a shower and to drown. The words to rain, a shower, and to drown belong to the same paradigm in their original meanings; their use within the text contributes to the emergence of a common group meaning – a "semantic theme." The figurative meaning, however, is realized through the words blows, bell, and noise.

The basis of such a modification of word semantics is its general or invariant meaning, which expresses the significant core of the word [2;79].

In the following text, the formation of ambivalence is observed in an occasional word:

The rumour that Mr. Brodrick's impending resignation are untrue. Mr. Brodrick does not intend to retire until the War Office system has been entirely remuddled.

The word to remuddle in the text, although formed by analogy, is considered occasional. The semantics of the verb to muddle is not normally used together with the prefix re-. The meaning of this occasionalism is perceived by the recipient through its association with verbs such as reorganize, remake, reshuffle, which share the general derivational meaning "to do something again". The verb to muddle, however, carries the meaning "to spoil, to mess up, to throw into disorder." Ambivalence here is constructed on the basis of both the derivational-occasional and denotative meanings of the word.

Defining language as a system of discrete signs organized by structural relations is one of the fundamental principles of modern linguistics. Language is evaluated as an objectively existing system. The elements of this system, united by stable, invariant relations, form an integral whole and constitute the general structure of language.

Among all the units of language, the most essential one is the word. The function of lexical units is to denote objects and events, that is, to indicate their belonging to a particular group.

Through this, the extralinguistic orientation of the lexicon can be observed. In the words of D.N. Shmelev, they express a "semantic space" that is interconnected with a certain extralinguistic continuum.

In modern linguistics, vocabulary is regarded as a system, and its units stand in specific hierarchical relations to one another, which manifest in texts in various forms. The systemic approach is based on the perspective that relations exist among words, grounded in their similarities and differences. Words are distinguished by grammatical, semantic, stylistic, and other features, and they are interconnected through oppositional relations, which are usually referred to as lexical-semantic relations.

By lexical-semantic relations the following types of relations are understood:

1. similarity of word meanings – synonymy, antonymy, and the inclusion of the meaning of one word in another in terms of genus and species relations (superordinate, subordinate, and dependent words – i.e., hyponymy in the broad sense);

2. morphological (word-formation) and semantic (figurative usage of words) derivation;

3. repetition of words with overlapping semes in the speech chain (for example, the words dog and bark, connected by syntagmatic relations, share common semes – the second word repeats the first) [3;91];

4. shared emotional overtones and stylistic coloring [4;131].

Only the first three types of relations are considered genuine semantic relations, and they correspond to the three types distinguished by D.N. Shmelev [2;173].

The lexical-semantic system, as is well known, consists of a set of subsystems – various groups of lexical units united by certain semantic commonalities. At the same time, the degree of systematicity varies. The generally acknowledged principle (point of view) is the distinction of synonymic and antonymic series, while the systematicity of thematic groups is not recognized by all researchers [5;86]. However, a number of psycholinguistic and linguistic experiments have shown that within the units of lexical thematic, hyponymic, conversive, and other groups, there exist not only extralinguistic connections, but also genuine linguistic relations [2;13–14].

Psycholinguistic experiments indicate that the grouping of words distinguished by linguistic methods is not built upon unfounded assumptions or the subjective impressions of the researcher, but rather reveals certain mnemonic associations. These associations allow words to be linked into a single hierarchical structure. They also serve as the foundation for the semantic regularities existing among words—that is, among the units of the lexical-semantic system.

Literature:

1. A.D. Shveyser. Perevod i lingvistika. M., 1973. – 280 p.
2. D.N. Shmelev. Problemы semanticheskogo analiza leksiki. M., 1973. – 278 p.
3. V.G. Gak. Semanticheskaya struktura slova kak komponent seman¬ticheskoy strukturы vyskazyvaniya, "Semanticheskaya struktura slova", M., 1971. – 217 p.
4. I.V. Arnold. Stilistika sovremennogo angliyskogo yazыka, L., 1973. – 303 p.
5. G.S. Shur. Teorii polya v lingvistike, M.,1974. – 253 p.