

## POLYSEMY IN THE PHONETIC TERMINOLOGY OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

**Kamalova Dilovar Azatkhanovna-senior teacher**

Department of English Applied Sciences 3

English language faculty - 3

Uzbekistan state world languages university

**Abstract.** *The article deals with polysemy in the phonetic terminology of English and Uzbek languages. Polysemy, as an ordinary and integral process of a literary language, can penetrate into the general scientific and highly specialized layers of the language, since terminological units, due to extra linguistic factors in the process of terminology, move from the category of commonly used words to the category of terms.*

**Keywords:** *polysemy, phonetic terminology, integral process, process of terminology, category of terms, lexical-semantic features, polysemy of a word.*

Many linguists as shortcomings of terminology recognize semantic processes. These processes are still one of the most important and at the same time debatable in terminology. Despite the fact that lexical-semantic, processes are present in any terminology, these processes are distinguished from phenomena in general literary vocabulary. They do not interfere with the lexical-semantic features of terminology and do not destroy the semantic definitions of the term. The specific logical-semantic boundaries of the term do not allow the manifestation of these processes in all their volumes. These lexical-semantic processes do not perform stylistic functions in terminology; they have a different nature and other functions. These processes in the formation of scientific and industrial terminologies are of an active nature. Despite the requirement for unambiguity on the part of linguists and their efforts to attach one meaning to one term, the same processes are observed in terminology as in the language as a whole.

These processes are natural linguistic phenomena that are closely related in the process of formation and development of phonetic terminology in the compared languages. It is known that a word can enter into any relationship, including polysemy. However, a term as a special sign intended to name a specific concept must be unambiguous. In terminology, ambiguity is not desirable. However, because of the study of the macro term system of English and Uzbek phonetic terminology, it is discovered that in the scope of this terminology, a certain law of terminology is not fully implemented, with an established order: one concept - one sign. A study of the literature shows that currently there is a large number of works devoted to the study of terminological semantics.

A number of scientists are of the opinion that semantic processes in terminology are manifested because the term is an element of the general literary language and thus have a positive attitude towards these processes. Other researchers

deny the development of these phenomena in terminology. However, the semantic method of term formation is one of the productive methods. Whether these methods are acceptable or not in terminology is still a controversial issue in the scientific literature, and there is no clear answer yet. In the dictionary of “Linguistic terms” the definition of polysemy is given as follows: “The polysemy of a word, the presence of several (many) meanings in one word” [4, p. 268].

O.S. Akhmanova understands the phenomenon of polysemy as “The presence of several interconnected meanings for the same word, usually arising as a result of modification and development of the original meaning of this word.” [1, p.323]. Polysemy of terms is considered the most significant drawback, since a term as a means of expressing special fields and sciences, as a special language naming these concepts, must be unambiguous. But nevertheless, polysemy as an “inevitable and natural process” [4] exists in terminology.

According to S.V. Grinev, the most reliable method for determining polysemy is the method of studying the peculiarities of the functioning of terms in special texts. As the study of English law enforcement terms shows, the difference in the meanings of the terms is reflected in the different terminological environment in the text. For example: How long does it take the police officer to get to the scene? The investigator examines the scene. Obviously, in the first example the word scene means place, and in the second example it means crime scene.

The presence of a certain context, as well as knowledge of the compatibility features of a given polysemantic term, allows you to select the necessary meaning of the term. For example: It means a search for the truth, for the offender, for witnesses who help to reconstruct the happening and will present evidence of it in the court. This means searching for the truth, the criminal, and witnesses who will help restore what happened and will present evidence in court [2, p. 253].

He collects and protects evidence, interviews witnesses and details a number of other factors e.g. search of the premises and persons for discovery of stolen property and instruments of the crime. He collects and preserves evidence, interviews and examines a number of other factors in detail, such as examining premises and persons, in order to find stolen property and weapons of crime.

A.V. Superanskaya believes that words of equal meaning can only exist in the language of science, and in the general language only words with similar meanings predominate [4, p. 51]. V. M. Leichik identifies several cases of polysemy. The most common phenomenon can be considered the use of a term in related branches of knowledge, and the reason for this ambiguity is intersystem borrowing. Categorical ambiguity, in his opinion, is secondary (for example, the process and the result are denoted by the same term) [3, p. 45]. In this case, metonymic relationships are established between meanings; one term serves to name both a science and an aspect of language (phonetics, morphology).

Categorical polysemy, according to E. N. Tolikina, belongs to the category of true polysemy, and only this type has the right to exist in terminological systems [1, p. 60].

Metaphor is also considered a source of polysemy in scientific literature. Metaphorical transfer is the transfer of the name of one concept to another based on

the similarity of the characteristics of these two concepts. Some linguists argue that the phenomenon of polysemy is harmful and causes difficulties in reading literature, in communication, disrupts mutual understanding, and leads to unsteady ideas. As a result, the inevitable conclusion is that polysemy in terminology should ideally be eliminated [2, p. 20]. Polysemy, as an ordinary and integral process of a literary language, can penetrate into the general scientific and highly specialized layers of the language, since terminological units, due to extralinguistic factors in the process of terminology, move from the category of commonly used words to the category of terms. Since the middle of the twentieth century, a new cognitive paradigm of polysemy in terminology has appeared in linguistics, which is reflected in the work of domestic and foreign linguists. “As is known, polysemy is an integral feature of natural languages, their constitutive means. On the one hand, it is a consequence arising from the nature of language, and on the other, it comes from the peculiarities of the functioning of consciousness.

Words of natural languages represent a universal basis for the development of polysemy; almost any unit of language has sufficient potential for the development of meanings denoting various concepts...” [3, p. 19]. Thus, in his work “Lexical polysemy in the cognitive aspect” L.M. Leshcheva draws attention to the fact that polysemy, being in a new linguistic paradigm, broadly called cognitive, considers the semantic structure of a word exclusively as an internal, internalized phenomenon, as a conceptual cluster that unites concepts of different nature on the principle of family resemblance [4, p. 10]. For the successful functioning of the term system, the process of polysemy is necessary, so we can conclude that the polysemy of terms is a common manifestation of the natural laws of vocabulary development, which has access to terminology as an integral part of the language system.

#### Reference

1. Lotte, D.S. Fundamentals of constructing scientific and technical terminology. Questions of theory and methodology / D. S. Lotte. – M., 1961. – 159 p.
2. Tatarinov, V. A. Theory of terminology. In three volumes. T. 1. Theory of the term: history and current state / V. A. Tatarinov. – M., 1996. – 311 p.
3. Grinev, S.V. Introduction to terminology / S.V. Grinev. – M., 1993. – 309 p.
4. Reformatsky, A. A. Introduction to linguistics / A. A. Reformatsky. – M., 2003. – 536 p.
5. Bakirova H.B. Development of lexical competence based on content-based approach in ESP teaching. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*: Vol. 2021: Iss. 5, Article 19. Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj/vol2021/iss5/19>. (13.00.00; № 29)
6. Bakirova H.B. Teaching Power Engineering Terminology at the Technical Universities. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd)*, ISSN: 2456-6470, Special Issue | Modern Trends in Science, Technology and Economy, February 2023, URL: <https://www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd53891.pdf>
7. Bakirova H.B. The content of teaching foreign languages. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*. Vol.2. [www.geniusjournals.org](http://www.geniusjournals.org), ISSN: 2795-739X. Belgium. 10-14p. (SJIF: 8.115.)

8. Botirovna, S. Kh., & M. B, A. (2022). Expressiveness in English and Uzbek Languages. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 3(3), 16-21. Retrieved from <https://www.cajlpc.centralasianstudies.org/index.php/CAJLPC/article/view/299>
9. Kurganov, A., & Samigova, H. (2022). Dialogical rhetoric: tadcits and conversations. in *Library*, 22(2), 1–266. retrieved from <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/archive/article/view/12349>
10. Samigova, H., Guo, T., & Zhao, Y. (2022). Dialogic rhetoric of English and Uzbek. *Translation Studies: Problems, Solutions and Prospects*, (1), 304–307. retrieved from [https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/translation\\_studies/article/view/6101](https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/translation_studies/article/view/6101)

