

**INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN POLYSEMY AND HOMONYMY IN AMBIVALENCE:
ISSUES OF LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS***Ikromov Shokhrukhbek Dilshodjon ugli**PhD student, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages*

Abstract: This article addresses the issue of the interrelation between polysemy and homonymy in the process of analyzing ambivalent texts. On the basis of the phenomenon of wordplay (pun), various scholarly perspectives are examined, highlighting the differences between the terms pun and wordplay, as well as the role of polysemy and homonymy in determining aesthetic value. Moreover, contradictions in evaluating homonymy as a systemic phenomenon and its significance in shaping ambivalent texts are discussed on a scientific basis.

Keywords: ambivalence, polysemy, homonymy, wordplay, pun, aesthetic value, linguistic system, semantic analysis.

In the process of analyzing the devices that generate ambivalence, it is necessary to focus on certain aspects of the interrelations between polysemy and homonymy. Indeed, in studies devoted to wordplay (pun), some authors argue that there is no fundamental (substantial) difference between the use of homonyms and the meanings of the same word. However, such claims are not substantiated by factual material and, moreover, distinguish homonymy and polysemy as separate means of creating wordplay (puns) [1;10-11]. In addition, for the aesthetic value of wordplay, there is essentially no significant difference between the use of homonyms and the exploitation of different meanings of words [1;5].

However, it seems reasonable to restrict the application of these phenomena to puns (wordplay) and, in this case, to ambivalent texts. There are certain grounds for this, which will be discussed below.

First, authors often use the terms pun and wordplay without differentiation, designating the same phenomenon with both terms. In polysemy, however, what is at stake is not “the play of words” but rather “the play of meanings”. This was pointed out some time ago by V. I. Zueva [2;146].

Second, there are contradictions concerning the recognition of homonymy as a systemic phenomenon. For some scholars, homonymy appears as an “extra-systemic phenomenon,” since the similarity (or complete identity) of homonyms on the plane of expression is not reinforced by semantic associations. “The deliberate collision of homonyms is always unexpected in the semantic plane, always surprising in terms of meaning” [3;97]. Yet, in analyzing ambivalent texts, we adhere to the viewpoint that regards the formal value of a word as an inseparable property of the system [4;79], and therefore homonymy and similar phenomena should be considered linguistic signs.

The similarity or identity of material form is interpreted by some researchers as a pragmatic aspect of the word and as one of its distinctive features. Supporting this position is the fact that language users tend to seek semantic commonality in homonymous words and to perceive semantic relatedness in words that are similar or identical in their material form.

St. Ullmann argues that puns based on polysemy are considerably more engaging than those employing homonyms, since polysemy achieves a higher degree of subtlety compared with the accidental collisions of materially identical words [5;188]. Such an observation is particularly intriguing if one takes into account that a word, as a member of the lexical-semantic system, enters into various interrelations with other words across the entire set of meanings it embodies on the content plane.

The principal distinction between polysemy and homonymy as systemic phenomena lies in the fact that polysemy represents the capacity of a word to designate different referents while at the same time actualizing one of its meanings, known as a “lexical-semantic variant”. Homonyms, by contrast, refer to different referents, but there is neither commonality among their meanings nor a shared feature in the entities they denote. “The very recognition of lexical-semantic

variants necessarily entails a differentiation between the phenomena of polysemy and homonymy” [3;67]. The meanings of a polysemous word are interconnected in such a way that one meaning imperceptibly shifts into another according to semantic models inherent to the language; there are no rigid boundaries between individual lexical-semantic variants, and they are instead characterized by overlapping and fluidity [3;76-77]. The denotative commonality of the various meanings of a word plays an important role in preserving its semantic unity. However, this principle does not apply universally, since in some words the meanings cohere into a whole through associative connections.

The indeterminacy of lexical semantics manifests itself in the fact that in every usage of a polysemous word, all of its meanings are present in the speaker’s mind. V. N. Komissarov [6;4] points out this particular property of polysemous words and its realization in puns (wordplay). In ambivalent texts, the indeterminacy of lexical-semantic variants is neutralized, giving rise to what might be termed “contextual homonymization”. The indeterminacy of lexical semantics facilitates the perception of semantic duality. However, its realization typically involves the sharp juxtaposition and delimitation of two meanings in the text (very rarely three).

Polysemy and homonymy, sharing a common material form, are sometimes examined under a single heading: synonymy of form or polyvalence. V. V. Lemeshevskaya and S. N. Sirovatkin refer to polysemy and homonymy in both language and speech as formal synonymy. In other studies, the same authors designate this phenomenon as ambivalence.

S. N. Sirovatkin and V. V. Lemeshevskaya distinguish between the particular mechanisms through which homonymy and polysemy underlie ambivalence. In the case of polysemy, the authors defend the notion of “significative equivalence”, which holds that across all of a word’s meanings – despite the absence of denotative commonality – there exists an invariant of significative meaning [7;180]. The existence of such an “invariant” or “general” meaning in words, however, is denied by some linguists [3;69-72].

Since the discussion concerns the means by which ambivalence, or semantic multiplicity in discourse, is created, the question arises whether formal synonymy (polyvalence) can itself be regarded as a device. As a result, linguistic polysemy is transformed into discursive “bivalence”: that is, the context not only contributes to the neutralization of polysemy but, on the contrary, supports two meanings simultaneously. In such a context, the principle universally accepted in semantics – that a unit in use should be unambiguous – is violated. Thus, polysemy simultaneously functions as both a means and a result. I. V. Abramec has noted this, but did not indicate how one might resolve this paradoxical situation [8;3].

Formal synonymy is a property of the language itself, and it becomes neutralized therein. However, in such cases either more than two meanings of a polysemous word or two internal forms of a homonym are preserved, whereas not all meanings and forms of a word as a unit of language remain intact. At the intersection of synonymy of form and ambivalence – when two or more units of the content plane correspond to a single unit of the expression plane – there arises an organic interrelation between the linguistic and the discursive, between paradigmatic and syntagmatic dimensions. Here we encounter what A. K. Zholkovsky describes as the effect produced by “intensification”, a type of which he terms the pun. In intensification, “the gap between form and content is eliminated”, and it becomes “at once both a device and a result” [9;171]. As a device, synonymy of form cannot itself be the result. The transition to ambivalence requires contextual support, that is, the involvement of additional devices. Moreover, the actualization of homonymy requires more devices than the activation of the meanings of polysemous words.

From the perspective of whether both meanings are supported by the context, two types of puns (wordplay) can be distinguished. According to St. Ullmann, puns based on homonymy and polysemy fall into two types: explicit puns and implicit puns. In implicit puns, a word that is not understood in the same sense is used once; in explicit puns, however, the word or homonym is

used twice, and each occurrence carries a different meaning [5;188-190].

If an ambivalent text is approached as a bipartite structure, then two contexts can be identified, each of which highlights one of the meanings of the word. A pun is implicit when the second meaning or its activators are not explicitly present in the text. In most cases, however, ambivalent texts tend to support the second meaning synchronically. The primary meaning, by contrast, is sometimes realized simply by virtue of its central position within the semantic structure of the word. The primary meaning is often less dependent on context than the secondary meaning. Outside of context, this meaning is the first to be retrieved from the speaker's memory.

E. Kurylowicz once wrote: "... what is most important about the primary meaning is that it is not determined by context, whereas the remaining (secondary) meanings merely add 'contextual elements' to the semantic elements of the primary meaning" [10;246]. D. N. Shmelev likewise argued that the primary meaning of a word possesses a higher degree of paradigmatic reinforcement compared to its secondary meanings [3;190]. Although distinguishing between the primary and secondary meanings of a word is not always carried out with sufficient consistency, it is, nonetheless, entirely possible – drawing on dictionaries – to determine which meaning is primary, and this proves to be sufficient for the analysis of ambivalence.

REFERENCES:

1. V. Vakurov. *Rechevye sredstva humor and satire*. M., 1969. – 54 p.
2. V. Zueva. *K voprosu o stylisticheskom usepolzovanii mnogoznachnosti i homonymii v zhye khodojestvennoy literatury*. M., 1952. – 146 p.
3. D. Shmelev. *Lexicon of problematic semantic analysis*. M., 1973. – 278 p.
4. Y. Balaj. *Syntagmatization and lexicalization*. Ob.: "Lexicology and lexicography", M., 1972. - 198 p.
5. S. Ullmann. *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford, 1962. – 278 p.
6. V. Komissarov. *Slovo o perevode*. M., 1972. - 215 p.
7. Y. Apresyan. *Lexical semantics*. M., 1974. – 366 p.
8. I. Abrames. *Semanticheskie osnovy phraseologicheskogo pun*. "Trudy SamGU, Nov. Series," vol. 205. – 286 p.
9. A. Zholkovsky. *Ob usilenii*. "Strukturno-typologicheskie issledovaniya", M., 1972. - 431 p.
10. Y. Kurilovich. *Essay on linguistics*. M., 1962. – 463 p.