International Journal of Arts and Humanities

ISSN: 2581-3102

Volume:03, Issue:04 "April 2019"

STYLISTIC INTERRELATIONS BETWEEN THE POLYSEMY OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Behbudova Esmira Shefa

Ph.d on philology

ABSTRACT

This scientific article deals with the polysemy in phraseology by stylistic aspect. The aim of this article is to research the stylistic interrelations between the polysemy of phraseological units and their influence to contextual style as context-based network of semantic variants. More attention is drawn to conceptual methopor and methonomy and their role in creating in polysemy.

Keywords: polysemy, word-combination, phraseological unit, semantic, context-based network, stylistic method

INTRODUCTION

We'll critically study the polysemy and stressed cognitive views on polysemy. Here we illustrate polysemy and cognitive theories, samples by quoting some researcher's thoughts. Lexical semantic views of polysemy assume that an abstract set of features is shared by all polysemes. Cognitive view argues that the meaning of polysemes can be characterized by metaphor, metonymy and cognitive models as mechanisms of sense extension which motivate the relations between the polysemes. According to Lakoff adjacent chain links are clearly related in meaning [1, p.266-267]. Polysemy is based on correspondences within and across idealized cognitive models.

Another development in cognitive theory views polysemy as a result of conceptual integration, in the process of which words accumulate or develop new meanings through some sort of accommodation to new contexts in the process of on-line meaning construction. According to Cruse different senses of the same word may have either a linear or a non-linear relation [2, p.78-81]. Linear polysemy is found when one polysemy is a specialization of the other and it occurs as;

a) autohyponymy – narrowing down to a sub-type *dog* in general and *dog* - *bitch*; b) automeronymy – narrowing down to a sub-part *window* – *window* - *glass pane;* c)

autosuperordination – *man* to denote mankind including women; d) autoholonymy – *hand* in *He lost an arm in the accident*.

Non-linear polysemy occurs as either metaphor (a good position to, what's your position on, have an excellent position, to position yourself…) or metonymy (She has a large bank account, she married a large bank account). Both metonymy and metaphor may result in systematic polysemy, with many instantiations of metaphor, or same type of metonymy ("paint" for "painting")

Polysemy in phraseology – According to Palm polysemy in phraseology as multiple meanings of units in the phrase-lexicon, English and Swedish phraseological dictionaries or vice-versa to expectations, polysemy in phraseology is a widespread and well developed phenomenon [3, p.216-217].

Above mentioned researchers stressed that it gives rise to polysemy paying no heed to other polysemy-triggering mechanisms. Semantic links between the literal and idiomatic readings of an expression should be considered cases of polysemy.

Phraseological units may contain different figures of speech. metaphor, i.e. the transference of the name based on the association of similarity between two referents, e.g. *a lame duck, in a nutshell, to swallow the pill*; simile, e.g. *as old . all ears, all eyes for, cat's paw*; hyperbole, i.e. deliberate exaggerated statement not meant to understood literally, but expressing an intensely emotional attitude, e.g. *a whale of time; a drop in the ocean. as the hills, as good as gold, as cross as two sticks*; metonymy, i.e. the transference of name based on the association f contiguity (an attribute or adjunct is substituted for the thing meant). -film production, e.g. *Elementary, my dear Watson! home alone.* Polysemy of phraseological units: *to be on the go* – 1) be energetic; 2) keep doing smth; 3) be in a hurry; 4) be drunk.

Stylistic Aspect of Phraseology - Not all phraseological units bear imagery: clichés / stock phrases (*see you later, take it easy, joking apart* etc.); some proverbs (*better late than never*); some euphonic units: - rhyme (*out and about*); - alliteration (*forgive and forget, now or never, safe and sound*); - repetition (*little by little, inch by inch*); - with archaic words (*to buy a pig in a poke*). [3, p.34].

According to their origins, phraseological units in Modern English may be divided into: native, e.g. *to eat the humble pie* 'to submit to humiliation' < ME *to eat umble pie* (*umbles* 'the internal organs of a deer'); *to save for a rainy day*; *to beat about the bush* 'not to speak openly and directly'; *to lose one's rag* 'to lose one's temper' etc.; *Borrowed,* which, in their turn, can be either *intralingua* (borrowed from American English and other variants of English) or *interlingua* (borrowed from other languages). *Intralingua* borrowings: e.g. *to bite off more*

ISSN: 2581-3102

Volume:03, Issue:04 "April 2019"

than one can chew; *to shoot the bull* ‘’to talk nonsense’ (from American English); *to pull sb’s leg* (from Scottish Gaelic); *a knock back* (from Australian English) etc [3, p.18-25].

Interlingual borrowings: -translation loans from Latin, e.g. *to take the bull by the horns, a slip of the tongue* (Lat. *lapsus linguae*), *with a grain of salt* (Lat. *cum grano salis*), *second to none* (Lat. nulli secundus); from French, e.g. *by heart* (Fr. *par coeur*), *that goes without saying* (Fr. *cela va sans dire*); from Spanish, e.g. *the moment of truth* (Sp. *el momento de la verdad*), *blue blood* (Sp. *la sagre azul*) etc; -barbarisms (non-assimilated loans), e.g. *sotto voce* (It.) ‘quietly, in a low voice’, *la dolce vita* (It.) ‘the good life full of pleasure’, *al fresco*(It.) ‘in the open air’, *cordon bleu* (Fr.) ‘high quality, esp. of cooking’.

Phraseological units based on real events: -everyday life, e.g. *to be packed like sardines; to play cat and mouse; to be wet behind the ears; to go to bed with the chickens*; professional jargon, e.g. *to be in deep waters, to be in the same boat with sb* (nautical sphere); *to nip smth in the bud* (agriculture and gardening); *to keep one’s finger on the pulse* (medical sphere); *fair play* (sports); *to come up against a brick wall* (building); *flavour of the month* (cooking) etc.; -historic references: *to throw someone to the lions* (Roman entertainment of putting people in the arena with wild animals); *Baker’s dozen* (to guard against miscounting, bakers habitually gave thirteen loaves when selling a dozen), *red tape* (legal documents were bound with a red tape), *white elephant* (a precious gift given by a Thai King to a sub-king to ruin the latter) etc.

Phraseological units based on folklore and literary sources:

- national folklore, e.g. *to rain cats and dogs, to have nine lives* etc.; proverbs, e.g. *the last straw, to catch at a straw* etc.;
- antique myths and legends, e.g. *a swan song* (Ancient Greece)*; the Trojan horse* (Rome); *crocodile tears* (Egypt); *the lion’s share, a dog in the manger* (Aesop’s fables) etc.; - the Bible, e.g. *an eye for an eye*; *a wolf in sheep’s clothing* etc.;
- literature, e.g. *to be as busy as a bee* (G. Chaucer); *to fight the windmills* (M. de Cervantes); *an albatross around one’s neck* (S. T. Coleridge);
- *something is rotten in the state of Denmark* (W. Shakespeare); *to grin like a Cheshire cat* (L. Carroll) etc.; [8. internet].

Some authors distinguish polysemy from vagueness (or generality). Lewandowska -Tomaszczyk exemplifies with the noun *student* [4, p.140-143]. It can be used equally well to describe a man or a woman. That does not necessarily mean that *student* has two senses, one for ‘male student’ and another for ‘female student’. Instead, this verb is vague regarding gender; it is unmarked for

ISSN: 2581-3102

Volume:03, Issue:04 "April 2019"

this characteristic. In that spirit, many different types of linguistic tests have been proposed in order to distinguish cases of polysemy from vagueness.

Pustejovsky proposes a classification of polysemy, distinguishing two types. The first type is what he terms complementary polysemy. This involves cases where the senses of a word are overlapping, dependent or shared. An example of complementary polysemy can be seen with the word *hammer*. It can refer to a physical object and to an action. The sense difference is accompanied with a change in category, the first sense associated with usage as a noun, and the second as a verb [6, p.410-413].

A more specific type of complementary polysemy is logical polysemy which is constrained to cases where there is no change in lexical category. The noun *door* can refer to an opening and to a physical object. The senses are related since one can refer to both senses within a single sentence without any problem: *He walked through the red door.* The phrase *walked through* evokes the opening sense, while the adjective *red* evokes the physical object sense.

Complementary polysemy contrasts with contrastive polysemy. The latter includes lexical items that carry distinct and unrelated meanings. Examples include: *plane* referring to an airplane and to the tool used by architects, and *bar* as in a metal object and an establishment that sells alcoholic beverages.

Pustejovsky argues that contrastive senses are contradictory and that one sense is available only if the other senses are not. Note that what Pustejovsky terms contrastive polysemy lines up with what others describe as homonymy. It is important to highlight, then, that there are differing positions on where polysemy ends, since Pustejovsky treats homonymy as a type of polysemy [6, p.420-423]..

The major problem with this approach is that it cannot account for cases where the senses are clearly related. With the word *bank* this model is acceptable, since most speakers do not view the senses as related. But often, the two meanings are in fact connected. Pustejovsky exemplifies this with the adjective *noisy*. A *noisy car* is an object that makes noise, while a *noisy cafeteria* is a location that is characterized by noise. If we represent these two senses of *noisy* as distinct lexical items we do not capture the fact that they are clearly related. The model with multiple listings does not represent any connections between lexical items and therefore cannot capture cases where there is a semantic association.

Most of polysemy in phraseology derive from the Russian and Germanic tradition of “doing phraseology”, and do not take any the cognitive approaches into consideration. Researchers had shown that idioms are neither dead metaphors nor phrases with special meanings, completely devoid of individual word meanings.

ISSN: 2581-3102

Volume:03, Issue:04 "April 2019"

But in this point of view, Gluckberg argues that the repeated idiomatic use leads to what he calls "phrase-induced polysemy", which adds additional senses to idiom constituents, allowing the processing of modified idioms [7, p.18-20]. Polysemy should be able to deal with at different levels.

REFERENCES

1. Lakoff G. The contemporary theory of metaphors. Cambridge University Press. 2-nd edition, 1993. 287 p.
2. Cruse A.D. Meaning in language. An introduction to semantic and Pragmatic. Oxford University Press. 2000. 357 p.
3. Palm C. Phraseologie. Eine einfuhrung. Tubingen; Gunther Narr Verlag, 2-nd edition, 1997. 276 p
4. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. Polysemy, prototypes and radial categories. In D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2007. 139-169 p.
5. Atkins, S., Fillmore, C.J. & Johnson, C.R. Lexicographic relevance: Selecting information from corpus evidence. *International Journal of Lexicography*: 16(3). 2003. 251-280 p.
6. Pustejovsky, J. The Generative Lexicon. *Computational Linguistics*: 17(4). 1991 409-441 p.
7. Gluckberg S. Idioms meanings and allusional content. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1993. 3-26 p.
8. Internet: https://studfiles.net/preview/5115649/page:15/

