



CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY

Journal homepage: <https://cajssh.centralasianstudies.org>



The Phenomenon of Ambiguity in the Phraseological System of the Russian Language

Yuldasheva Sabina Yusufovna

Teacher at Department of Russian Language and Literature at Kokand State Pedagogical Institute
Kokand, Uzbekistan

Abstract:

This article deals with the phenomenon of polysemy, polysemy and monosemy in the phraseological system of the Russian language.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 25-Sep-22

Received in revised form 28-Sep-22

Accepted 15-Oct-22

Available online 21-Nov-2022

Keywords: phraseological unit, monosemic and polysemic phraseological units, phraseological synonymy, sememe, phraseosememe.

The phraseological fund of the Russian language, which is widely used in many functional styles of the language, is one of the most important components of language communication, and without the ability to use it, a culture of speech cannot be provided. The semantic paradigm in the field of phraseology is formed by separate meanings of a multi-valued phraseological unit, between which certain semantic connections and relationships are established. True, the vast majority of phraseological units of the Russian language are unambiguous. Thus, in the Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language, there are 660 multi-valued phraseological units for 4000 phraseological units, which is about 17%.

The development of polysemy is hindered by the fact that phraseological units are often formed as a result of a metaphorical rethinking of a free phrase of the same lexical content. In this situation, each individual meaning must be generalized metaphorically. In other words, as a result of repeated metaphorization of the same free phrase, which is most convenient for generalization, such multi-valued phraseological units appear that consist of the same metaphorical meanings. Such, for example,

is the phraseological unit to drive a wedge (between whom, what), which has the following meanings:

- 1) 'to separate, to separate someone or something (for example, parts of a military unit)' and
- 2) 'by separating, to make alien, hostile to each other '. In contrast to this, there are not and cannot be in the Russian language such polysemantic words that would consist of only figurative meanings. Ignorance of phraseology impoverishes speech, makes it inexpressive, makes communication difficult, and prevents the correct understanding of fiction and special literature.

There are phraseological units in the language that function with only one meaning (one phrase sememe), and units with two or more phrase sememes, i.e., like lexical units, they can be single-valued (monoseme) or multi-valued (polyseme).

However, not all scientists agree that phraseological units can have more than one sememe in terms of content. In their opinion, phraseological units are always unambiguous (Yu. A. Gepner. V. F. Rudov). Such an opinion is more characteristic of the period of the formation of phraseology as a science. At present, almost all linguists, on the basis of reliable facts, believe that the phenomenon of polyseme is inherent not only in words, but also in phraseological units. Phraseological polysemy was first discovered by lexicographers. So, L.E. Binovich [1] was one of the first to pay attention to phraseological polysemy. Based on the study of texts belonging to different genres, he comes to the conclusion that phraseological polysemy in the German language is universal. The article by N. V. Kirsanov [3] summarizes the previous works on phraseological polysemy.

We examined the study of phraseological polysemy from the following points of view:

- a) the extent of phraseological polysemy;
- b) the nature of phraseological units according to the number of their meanings;
- c) characteristics of phraseological units from the point of view of the relationship of their meanings , and a number of others, widely use synonymous phraseological units, in some cases update phraseological units, creating synonymous variants of commonly used formulas.

The phenomenon of ambiguity is not characteristic of all types of phraseological units. So, for example, phraseological units of a terminological nature, like words-terms, do not have several meanings (meaning such terms as crankshaft, gear box, oxalic acid, or geographical names: the Pacific Ocean, the Black Sea, the Red Sea, etc. ; the same applies to other terms from various fields of science, technology, administrative, economic, political spheres, etc.).

The very semantic nature of the term, its function in speech, prevents its use in several meanings. Such more complex phraseological units as proverbs, aphorisms, winged words are not used in several meanings, although the generalizing nature inherent in these units contributes to their use in different contexts and in different situations. Basically, the phenomenon of polysemy is characteristic of phraseological units such as fusions and unities. Consider examples.

Selective viewing of dictionary entries of the Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language, ed. prof. D. N. Ushakova gives material on the polysemy of phraseological units. So, for example, the phraseological unit show the nose has two meanings: 1) “tease someone by putting a hand with extended fingers to your nose”; 2) “to go, go somewhere, appear somewhere”: “We are already ashamed to show our nose to Europe” (Saltykov-Shchedrin) [4].

Phraseologism in the hands has the following meanings: 1) “fully mastered something, mastered

something”: “This play is not yet in my hands” (Chekhov; Ushakov, III, 1398); 2) “to be in the hands” - “to depend on someone”: “Half of the village was in his hands” (F. Gladkov). Phraseologism on the legs has the following meanings: 1) “in a standing position”: “Everyone was on their feet, and only Kraft and Vasin were sitting” (Dostoevsky); 2) “without going to bed”: He suffered the disease on his feet”; 3) “getting out of bed”: “A little light is already on my feet” (Griboedov).

The phraseological unit also has several meanings to put an end to the “and”: 1) “clarify something unnecessarily, explain what is already clear”; 2) “leave nothing unsaid, emphasize the most essential”; 3) “to bring (to bring) something to its logical conclusion, to draw all the conclusions arising from something.” Such phraseological units have different meanings as come to your senses, take your soul away, mumble grief, poke your nose, play the fool, etc.

Some of these phraseological units appear in two, three or more meanings, and individual meanings are not noted in the Explanatory Dictionary, ed. D. N. Ushakova. Limiting ourselves to the above examples, in which phraseological units appear in different meanings (or with different shades of meaning), it should be noted that the material confirms the provision on the ambiguity of phraseological units in the modern Russian language.

True, it is not always possible to answer in the affirmative whether we are dealing with different meanings of this or that phraseological unit or with different shades of the same meaning. As our observation has shown, the ability to have more than one sememe, as a rule, can be used by phraseological units that have lost their connection with the primary image. The integrity of the meaning of such units is achieved by partial or complete rethinking of their constituent components, i.e. phraseological unions and unities.

Another feature that hinders the emergence of ambiguity in phraseological units is the limitation of their compatibility possibilities. In the language system, we also found units that are actualized in speech simultaneously with several semes (more often with two) that equally affect its implementation in speech. For example, phraseological units have nowhere to turn, like a herring in a barrel, they simultaneously carry two semes: “a lot” and “crampedly”, thereby showing both quantitative and qualitative characteristics.

The actualization of two semes in one sememe is facilitated by the fact that a large gathering of people also implies their crowding, close contact with each other. Consequently, these semes in the semantic structure of the sememe carry a different load: one of them (“a lot”) performs a dominant function, and the other (“closely”) performs an accompanying, secondary function. Therefore, in a semantic classification of this kind, units should be classified as quantitative.

Usually, in the scientific literature and in lexicographic reference books, when delimiting the meanings of phraseological units, the different categorical attribution of sememes belonging to the same phraseological unit-sign is not taken into account. We adhere to the point of view of those scientists who believe that different phraseological and grammatical classes represent different phraseological units, and, consequently, phraseological units that differ in categorical features are always different phraseological units. Thus, phraseological units of the Russian language can be monoseme and polyseme.

When determining the meanings of monosemical phraseological units, preference should be given to the internal content of the units themselves, and also take into account the semantics of the word with

which it enters into a distributive relationship.

When distinguishing between homonymous and polyseme NPU, the semantic factor is essential for us, i.e. if in the semantic structure of each of the phrase-sememes related to one phraseological unit-sign, there is at least one seme (with the exception of the categorical seme) common to the selected phrase-sememes, then this will be one unit with more than one phrase-semememe; if there is not a single common seme (the categorical seme may be an exception), then these are different units, the meanings of which are in homonymous relations with each other. Based on this point of view, it would be legitimate to consider units of the type: what is in the spirit, what is urine, in the whole spirit - polysemantic.

Since, despite the fact that they are realized in speech with different differential semes, in the semantic structure of each of the above units there are other semantic components that unite them. So, in V.P. Zhukov's "School Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language" NPE what is in the spirit and in the whole spirit are presented as two homonymous units with the main semantic semes "very quickly" and "very loudly", and the unit has "what is urine", in addition to the indicated homonymous relationship between its individual meanings, there is another seme with a semantic seme "with ultimate stress", which is in relation to polyseme with the seme "very quickly".

Consequently, the semes "very fast" and "with extreme tension" are polysemantic on the basis of the more general concept they designate, which can be marked by the seme "intensity of action". But, on the other hand, this seme is also present in the semantic structure of the NPE with the differential seme "very quickly", since the semes "very quickly" and "very loudly" are combined in a broad sense with action verbs, indicating its intensity.

Based on this judgment, we believe that such units have phraseosememes that are in polyseme relations among themselves, i.e. In this case, we are dealing with multivalued NFU. The situation is different with two other units: for a sweet soul and to the nines. In our opinion, their phraseosemes should be considered homonymous (we are talking about the meanings related to one phraseological unit-sign), since in the semantic structure of each of them there is not a single common seme, except for the categorical one. It should be noted that phraseological homonymy for the circle only NPU is a very rare phenomenon. In Russian, in addition to the spirit units mentioned above, homonyms also include such NPEs as: absolutely, for chickens to laugh at, with one manhole, like a gray gelding, etc. (total 8 units). Due to the fact that the object of our study are units belonging to only one phraseological and grammatical category, from the standpoint of phraseological homonymy of us, first of all, it is important to point out the following feature of individual NPUs that have one sememe. In the Russian language, we found such units that are actualized in speech simultaneously with several phraseosemes (usually with two), equally affecting its implementation in speech. So, units of the type: nowhere to turn around, nowhere to spit, like a herring in a barrel, etc. - carry in their semantic structure two semes at the same time: "a lot" and "crampedly", thereby showing both quantitative and qualitative characteristics. For example: - Well! There is nowhere to spit, all the people (F. Abramov. Brothers and sisters, p. 704), ... to the people at the vigil ... that church, where tomorrow the throne, even in the fence there is nowhere for an apple to fall (N. Leskov. Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk district, p. 59) The actualization of two semes in one sememe contributes to the fact that a large gathering of people implies their crowding, close contact with each other.

Consequently, these semes in the semantic structure of the sememe carry an unequal load: one of them ("many") performs a dominant function, and the other ("closely") performs an accompanying,

secondary one. The prevalence of syncretism in the circle of NPE is not accidental, since these linguistic units are characterized by the use of various circumstances in the function, which "... turn out to be so complex, and sometimes very often go beyond these categories or create a number of transitional, mixed types" [2].

In the semantic classification of this kind, the units were assigned to one FSG. In addition, only in Russian there is one NPE, which has six phraseemes: so-so. In each of these phraseemes of a given unit, the following semes perform the main semantic-distinctive function: 1. "it doesn't matter"; 2. "medium"; 3. "without special goals"; 4. "slow" or "waddle"; 5. "for no apparent reason"; 6. "without much effort" or "easily." Phraseological synonyms and variants of phraseological units are widely used in the language of works of art, as they make speech more vivid, expressive and accurate.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. L. E. Binovich. Let's talk about ambiguity. M.: "Foreign languages at school", 1952, No. 5
2. Grammar of the Russian language. In the 20s, vol. 0, vol. 2. - Part I. - M.: Ed.1954. With. 95
3. N. A. Kirsanova. On some semantic features of phraseological units (on the issue of polysemy and synonymy in the field of phraseology) in the book: "Problems of Phraseology", M. - L., 1964.
4. D. Ushakov. Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language. Under the editorship of prof. D. N. Ushakov, in 4 volumes - 1970-1980
5. Zhukov V.P. Semantics of phraseological turns. - M.: Education, 1978. - P.27.
6. Kravtsova S.I. Phraseological units with the meaning of quantity in Russian (in comparison with Ukrainian). - Abstract. dis. ...cand. philol. Sciences. - Rostov-on-Don, 1980. - 21 p.
7. Krongauz M.A. Semantics: monograph. M., Publishing Center "Academy", 2005. p.130
8. M. Kuznetsov. Structural-semantic parameters in vocabulary / A.M. Kuznetsov.-M., 1980, p.42
9. Kuznetsova E.V. Lexicology of the Russian language. M.: 2009