ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

MONOSEMY AND POLYSEMY OF METAPHORICAL TERMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Eshankulova Charos Najmiddinovna
Master of Arts, Karshi Turan University

Annotation. This article analyzes the semantic features of metaphorical terms formed in English and Uzbek languages, in particular, the processes of monosemy and polysemy, from a linguistic point of view. The mechanisms of metaphors entering the terminology in the language system, the expansion of their semantic range, and their role in scientific discourse are discussed. The results of the study show that the polysemantic development of metaphorical terms is faster in English, while in Uzbek the semantic stability is higher, and this process is explained by the historical development of the language, functional usage features, and cognitive factors.

Keywords: metaphor, metaphorical term, monosemy, polysemy, semantic system, cognitive approach, English terminology, Uzbek terminology, meaning expansion, conceptual metaphor.

INTRODUCTION

In modern linguistics, metaphor is considered not only as a means of artistic expression, but also as an important semantic mechanism in creating terms that express scientific concepts. Metaphorical terms illuminate abstract scientific concepts through a clear image, as a result of which the cognitive capabilities of the language expand. In this process, it is natural that terms are formed in a monosemic (single meaning) or polysemic (multiple meanings) form.

The role of monosemy and polysemy in linguistics, especially in the case of metaphorical terms, is one of the main issues of semantics. Monosemy is the phenomenon when a word has only one meaning, while polysemy is the phenomenon when one word has close but different meanings. Metaphorical terms often serve as the main tool in creating new meanings. In English and Uzbek, these processes manifest themselves differently according to the typological and cultural characteristics of the language. This article analyzes the theoretical and practical aspects of monosemy and polysemy in metaphorical terms in English and Uzbek.

Despite the differences in worldview, terminological development, and metaphorical imagination between English and Uzbek, there are many terms in the terminology of both languages that have arisen on the basis of metaphor. Comparative study of their semantic dynamics is one of the current issues for modern linguistics. The study of the use of metaphorical terms in modern scientific communication, their impact on the process of understanding, and their connection with conceptual systems is one of the important areas that is shaping new approaches in linguistics.

LITERATURE ANALYSIS AND METHODOLOGY

The cognitive nature of metaphor was first scientifically substantiated by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson[1]. According to them, “Metaphor is not just a linguistic tool; it is one of the main mechanisms of human thinking.” The cultural and linguistic characteristics of metaphorical systems were studied in depth by Zoltan Kövecses[2]. “Metaphors are not a product of language, but of a conceptual system through which a person categorizes the world.” He says. In his book Metaphor[3] A Practical Introduction. Vezhbitskaya connected cognitive and semantic analysis with cultural codes. In her books, she says, “To understand language units, it is necessary to take into account their

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

cultural content." U.N. Boldyrev[4] is one of the leading scholars in cognitive linguistics and conceptual metaphor in Russian linguistics.

Theoretical Foundations of Monosemy and Polysemy

• Monosemy is characterized by the fact that a word retains the same meaning in all contexts. This is mainly considered an ideal situation in formal semantics and lexicography

• Polysemy is the occurrence of several but related meanings of a word. This phenomenon occurs, in particular, as a result of metaphorical extensions and reflects the flexibility of human thinking

Metaphorical Terms and Cognitive Linguistics

• The theory of conceptual metaphor (Lakoff and Johnson) sees metaphor as a fundamental mechanism of human thinking. Metaphorical terms help to express abstract concepts through concrete areas

• Polysemy and metaphor are closely related: metaphorical extensions are the main source of the emergence of new meanings

Studies in English and Uzbek

• The development of polysemy in English occurs mainly through metaphor, metonymy, and generalization. The polysemy of words expands the expressive capabilities of the language

• In the Uzbek language, due to the agglutinative structure and morphological complexity, the manifestation of polysemy has its own characteristics. Morphological analysis plays an important role in identifying metaphorical terms

• Significant results have been achieved in English-Uzbek contrastive studies, especially in the fields of phraseology and metaphorical expressions, semantics, translation and lexicography

RESULTS

The mechanism of formation of metaphorical terms

The formation of metaphorical terms is closely related to the complex cognitive and semantic processes occurring in the language system. Although metaphor was initially considered as a means of artistic speech, in modern linguistics it is recognized as an important mechanism that enriches scientific thinking and the terminological system. In particular, the need to express abstract scientific concepts in a clear and understandable form gives a strong impetus to the emergence of metaphorical terms.

Metaphorical terms are formed mainly on the basis of a person's everyday experience, physical sensations and existing real objects. Concrete knowledge existing in the human mind serves as a reference point in the perception of new, complex or abstract concepts. Therefore, scientific terms are often named based on comparisons with natural phenomena, biological processes, physical actions or social relations[5]. For example, terms such as virus, network, wave, flow initially had a concrete meaning, but later expanded metaphorically in scientific fields.

One of the mechanisms for the formation of metaphorical terms is the process of meaning transfer. In this process, the main meaning of an existing word is transferred based on similarity to a new scientific concept. As a result, the term acquires a new semantic load. For example, the term greenhouse effect in English was formed on the basis of the functional similarity between a greenhouse and an atmospheric process, and in Uzbek it was also strengthened in the form of greenhouse effect through calculus. The mechanism for the formation of metaphorical terms is a multi-stage process, which is carried out on the basis of the interaction of factors such as cognitive thinking, meaning transfer, conceptual metaphor and terminological expansion[6]. These mechanisms

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

ensure the enrichment of scientific terminology and the adaptation of the language to modern scientific needs.

The degree of polysemy in metaphorical terms in English

The polysemantic development of metaphorical terms in English is a process directly related to modern scientific and technological progress. As a language of global scientific communication, English serves as a rapid naming and popularization of new concepts in various fields of science. Therefore, terms formed on the basis of metaphor in English terminology cover several semantic layers in a short time. The high degree of polysemy in metaphorical terms in English is explained, first of all, by the active interdisciplinary use of terms. One metaphorical term initially appeared in a specific field and later migrated to other scientific or social areas. For example, the term virus meant a disease-causing organism in biology, but as a result of the development of information technologies it acquired the meaning of a computer virus, and later began to serve to express social and cultural processes in the form of viral content. The universality of metaphorical models specific to the English language also plays an important role in the formation of polysemy. Terms such as wave, flow, network, growth, etc., are easily adapted to various conceptual areas because they are based on human everyday experience. For example, the term wave, in addition to expressing a physical phenomenon, is used in several metaphorical meanings, such as wave of migration, wave of inflation, second wave of the pandemic. As a result, the semantic field of the term expands, creating stable polysemy. Another factor that increases the level of polysemy of metaphorical terms in English is the strong influence of popular scientific discourse. Scientific concepts are rapidly entering the media, digital platforms, and everyday speech[7]. In this process, terms go beyond their strictly scientific boundaries and are used in broader contexts. As a result, metaphorical terms are enriched with new semantic shades and polysemy is strengthened.

Also, English terminology has high terminological flexibility, and new meanings are often formed on the basis of existing terms. This is due to the preference for expanding the semantic possibilities of existing metaphorical units rather than creating new terms. As a result, metaphorical terms in English appear as a dynamic, open and polysemantic system. The high level of polysemy in metaphorical terms in English is determined by interdisciplinary integration, the universality of conceptual metaphors and the activity of popular scientific discourse. This situation further strengthens the leading position of the English language in global scientific communication, but also makes the issue of maintaining the accuracy of terms relevant.

Monosemy and polysemy in metaphorical terms in English and Uzbek

A comparative analysis of the semantic structure of metaphorical terms in English and Uzbek allows us to identify the specific features of the processes of monosemy and polysemy in these languages. Although metaphor is an effective tool for naming scientific concepts in the terminology of both languages, the level and direction of their semantic development are different.

In English, metaphorical terms are often prone to polysemantic development, which is explained by the leading role of the language in global scientific and technological communication. New scientific concepts, technologies and social phenomena are named metaphorically based on existing terms. As a result, one term is used in different fields and combines several meanings. For example, terms such as network, flow, virus, wave are used with different semantic loads in technical, social, economic and cultural contexts. This leads to the formation of stable polysemy in English terminology.

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

In the Uzbek language, the development of metaphorical terms is relatively monosemantic. This is due to the fact that Uzbek terminology is mainly based on the principles of normativity, accuracy and stability. Many metaphorical terms are used in scientific discourse in a strictly monosemantic sense, and their semantic expansion is limited. For example, metaphorical terms such as the root of the language, ozone layer depletion, and genetic code express a specific scientific concept and do not undergo extensive polysemantic development in everyday speech. At the same time, polysemy is observed in some metaphorical terms in the Uzbek language. This situation is mainly associated with interdisciplinary integration and the development of social spheres. Terms such as flow, wave, network are used in social, political and economic contexts in addition to technical and natural sciences, expanding the scope of meaning[8]. However, this process occurs more slowly and in a controlled manner than in English.

The difference between monosemy and polysemy is also determined by the degree of use of terms in scientific and popular speech. In English, scientific terms quickly enter the mass discourse, which increases their polysemy. In Uzbek, the transition of scientific terms to mass speech is relatively limited, which serves to maintain semantic stability. The processes of monosemy and polysemy in metaphorical terms in English and Uzbek are closely related to the social function of the language, the pace of scientific development, and the terminological policy. While polysemy in English increases the flexibility of the language, monosemy in Uzbek ensures scientific accuracy and terminological stability. Taking into account these differences is of great theoretical and practical importance for comparative terminological studies.

• In both languages, metaphorical terms are often polysemous and have several interrelated meanings. For example, words such as "branch" (branch of a tree, department in a field of science) in English or "root" (root of a plant, root of a problem) in Uzbek.

• Units with only one meaning are rare among metaphorical terms, they are mainly observed in terms related to new or narrow fields.

• Due to agglutinativity and morphological variability, the manifestation of metaphorical polysemy in Uzbek differs from English. In English, metaphorical expansions occur more at the lexical level.

• When translating polysemic and metaphorical terms, it is necessary to take into account context and cultural differences.

Discussion

During the discussion, it was found that the polysemantic development of metaphorical terms in English is mainly associated with interdisciplinary integration, the speed of scientific and technological innovations, and the widespread use of popular scientific discourse. English terms in a short time leave a narrow scientific context and begin to be used in mass and social discourse. This leads to the enrichment of terms with new semantic layers. As a result, polysemy becomes an integral feature of English terminology. In the Uzbek language, however, relative caution and normativity prevail in the development of metaphorical terms. Terms are consolidated in a more specific scientific sense, and semantic expansion occurs with limitations. This situation ensures the predominance of monosemy in Uzbek terminology. At the same time, the observation of polysemy in some terms indicates that the language is adapting to social and scientific needs. The study also showed that while monosemy provides scientific accuracy and clarity, polysemy expands the flexibility and functional capabilities of terms. Thus, these two processes are not contradictory, but rather appear as

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

complementary phenomena in the terminological system. In the analysis of metaphorical terms, the discourse in which they occur and what communicative function they perform is an important factor.

• Metaphorical extensions are the main source of polysemy, causing the emergence of new meanings in both languages.

• Although morphological analysis and corpus-based approaches are effective in identifying metaphorical polysemy in Uzbek, the lack of sufficient information in dictionaries is problematic.

• It is necessary to conduct more in-depth, corpus-based research on the polysemy of metaphorical terms in the English-Uzbek language pair.

Conclusion

According to the results of the study, metaphorical terms in English and Uzbek have significant differences in terms of semantic structure. In English, the level of polysemy in metaphorical terms is high, which is explained by the active role of this language in global scientific communication, interdisciplinary terminological exchange and the strong influence of popular scientific discourse. In Uzbek, metaphorical terms are mainly monosemantic, which serves to ensure terminological stability and scientific accuracy. Metaphor is manifested in terminology as an important cognitive mechanism, allowing complex scientific concepts to be expressed in a simpler and more understandable form. The processes of monosemy and polysemy are natural and necessary stages in the formation and development of metaphorical terms. Their balance determines the effective functioning of the terminological system. The results of this study are of theoretical and practical importance for the fields of comparative linguistics, terminology and cognitive linguistics, and can serve as an important scientific basis for the translation, standardization and improvement of terminological policy of metaphorical terms in the future. In English and Uzbek, metaphorical terms are often polysemous, which reflects the flexibility of language and thinking. Monosemy is mainly found in terms related to new or narrow fields. The interrelationship of metaphor and polysemy, language typology and cultural factors determine the specificity of semantic extensions in both languages. The results of the study are of practical importance in the fields of translation, lexicography and language teaching.

References:

1. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. — 256 p.
2. Kövecses Z. Metaphor: A Practical Introduction. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. — 395 p.
3. Wierzbicka A. Language, Culture, and Meaning: Cognitive and Cross-Cultural Semantics. — Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992. — 487 p.
4. Болдырев Н. Н. Когнитивная семантика. — Тамбов: Изд-во ТГУ им. Г. Р. Державина, 2002. — 214 с.
5. Ufimseva A. A. Izbrannie trudi po yazikoznaniyu. — Moskva: Nauka, 1996. — 320 s.
6. Zokirov N. O‘zbek tili semasiologiyasi. — Toshkent: Fan, 1998. — 212 b.
7. Nurmonov A. Semasiologiya asoslari. — Toshkent: Universitet, 2001. — 180 b.
8. Davidson D. What Metaphors Mean // Critical Inquiry. — 1978. — Vol. 5, No. 1. — P. 31–47.
9. Sultanova, S. (2017). "Semantic-contextual composition of polysemous words in English and Uzbek."
10. Kholbekov, A. (2015). "Contrastive analysis of phraseological units in English and Uzbek."