



THE STATUS OF POLYFUNCTIONAL WORDS IN THE LANGUAGE SYSTEM

Shoira Xonboboeva

orcid: 0009-0008-2362-8673

e-mail: shairaxan2015@gmail.com

University of Tashkent for Applied Sciences, Tashkent, 100149, Republic of Uzbekistan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14875225>

Annotation: Different approaches to the description of linguistic units, in particular, service words are being examined. The author substantiates the status of polyfunctional function words as a special class, identifies the criteria for including units in this class.

The status of polyfunctional words as a special class is substantiated. The principles of description system of polyfunctionality, service words on the basis of polyfunctionality/ polysemantics/monosemantics. It has been established that the proposed approach allows describing other units of the language system (service and full denominative), which meets the need for an integrative description of the language system.

Keywords: Polyfunctional service words, functional-communicative and pragmatic potential, semantics.

1 Introduction.

Polyfunctionality can be located within a single grammar class. Polyfunctionality is common in the field of auxiliary words. This is especially true for unions and particles. The semantic unit of Such words was reliably proved by Cheremisina that: "in a given position, the Union assumes the function of the particle, and Vice versa, in certain positions, the particle assumes the function of the Union"[1]. The phenomenon of polyfunctionality is otherwise called grammatical homonymy, these terms are completely synonymous. V.V. Vinogradov divides homonymy into grammatical homonymy (polyfunctionality) and lexical homonymy (homonymy). A.T. Krivonosov writes: "If we follow the tradition, we can assume that polyfunctional lexemes that preserve the semantic invariant during the transition from class to class are homonymous lexemes". In modern English, there are categories of words that have the property of polyfunctionality. In English, the problem of polyfunctionality is related to the division of words into lexical and grammatical categories. In English, where there is no system of morphological oppositions, but the types of expanded and syntactic connections are not always clearly defined, one or more of these parts of speech in a word can cause difficulties both in theory and in practice [8].

Consideration of the problem of the status of various units in the language system is naturally connected with the concepts of classification and systematization. Classification defines non-ranking set of features; systematization provides an opportunity to build a hierarchical system [1]. Determination of the status of both a language unit and a certain class of such units should take into account both classification and systematization as approaches, which will help to provide a sufficient degree of confidence in the classification and systematization.

At the present stage of development of linguistics, there are several main approaches to the description and differentiation of linguistic units, in particular, service words. Different research directions use the terms "discursive words", "structural words", 'incompletely meaningful words', etc. It can be noted that these terms are to a large extent apply to the same linguistic units, are in relations of intersection. It seems most convenient and logical to use the term "service words". The possibility of using the term "word" in relation to service units is determined, as F. A. Litvin notes, "the initial positions of the researcher, the system of concepts in which he works, how, in particular, he imagines the concept of "word". Choosing the term "service words", we are based on the definition, which fixes the most essential features of the word: "A word is a basic semantic unit of language, serving for the naming of objects and their properties, phenomena, relations of reality

In recent decades, there has been an increasing interest in describing the system of service words in general and its individual elements. Since the traditional particle approach does not allow to fully describe the specifics of the units of this system, various approaches to their differentiation have been proposed: structural words, relatives, etc. are distinguished. Thus, it is proposed to distinguish the following types of structural



words: "operative pragmatic parts of speech (modal words, particles) and operative grammatical parts of speech (prepositions, conjunctions)" [4].

However, there are syncretic units in the system of service words of the Russian language, which according to this classification will be both operative pragmatic and grammatical. In modern linguistics, as it is known, there are two basic paradigms: word-centered and text-centered. Polyfunctional service words as a special class of units require for a full description the integration of these two approaches. Traditionally, function words are considered within the framework of a sentence, however, this does not allow us to present their complex consistent description. The use of functional approach, in our opinion, meets the needs of a holistic systemic study of linguistic facts, allows us to take into account and adequately analyze various transitional and syncretic words.

We propose the following criteria for differentiation monofunctionality; similar polysemantics units: / polyfunctionality monosemanticism; / system paradigmatic and syntagmatic.

2 Technology for obtaining materials and research method

We consider it possible to distinguish as a special class of linguistic units polyfunctional service words. As criteria that allow us to attribute specific linguistic units to this class, we propose the following set of attributes:

- these units represent a functional homocomplex (term of V.V. Babaitseva's term);
- include various transitive and syncretic phenomena; as a rule, paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations;
- have a special functional, communicative and pragmatic potential.
- communicative and pragmatic potential;
- are capable of functioning in syntactic constructions of various types, including transitional ones;
- often retain etymological connection with the words or forms on the basis of which they were formed.

The first criterion is obligatory. The class of polyfunctional words unites subordinating conjunctions, particles, composing conjunctions, various combinations of these units, which possess the above-mentioned features. In our opinion, an open system, the composition of which has recently been actively replenished.

Functional homonymy is characteristic of the system of service words of the Russian language, such units fully meet the criteria of functional homonymy, as they represent "different words, but retaining alive semantic relations" [6: 88]. We propose to distinguish the following types of homocomplexes according to their structure:

1) including two elements that are functional homonyms and various kinds of syncretic units (union, union-particle, particle-union, particle). Such homocomplexes include only service words. An example is the homocomplex **if**;

2) including three elements (initial pronoun or pronoun adverb, union, syncretic units and a particle. Such homocomplexes are created on the basis of external homonymy, go partially beyond the system of service words. For example, homocomplex **as**;

3) including three elements, but differing in their set: union, union-particle, particle-union, particle, interjection. For example, the homocomplex **to**.

Such homocomplexes are also created on the basis of external homonymy and, in our opinion, are in the stage of formation. The presence of a modal seme can also be considered a distinctive feature of the class of polyfunctional service words. However, in some units of the class the modal seme is a part of the invariant semantics, while in others it is variable. Besides, there is a distinction between polyfunctional service words having a specialized modal seme, capable of representing objective real or unreal modality.

3 Experimental results and their discussion

The complexity of paradigmatic relations of polyfunctional service words is determined by several factors. First, the presence of internal and external synonymy. External synonymy is also possible, when one of the units is outside the class of polyfunctional function words.

Secondly, the presence of transitive and syncretic phenomena. It seems necessary to distinguish between internal and external transitivity. External and internal synonymy and transitivity are differentiated on the basis of realization within one type of units (e.g., subordinating conjunctions or subordinating and composing conjunctions) within the class of polyfunctional units or between different types of units.



External transitivity is also represented in constructions where particle-particles (only=but) function, conjunctions-particles (to, if, though), as well as in the case of transition of conjunctions into particles or vice versa. As a result of such processes, syncretic phenomena arise that have not been sufficiently described in linguistics.

As F.I. Pankov notes, "there is a wide zone of overlap between the categories of service words: many prepositions are part of unions, conjunctions, e.g.: in spite of the rain - in spite of the fact that it rained; because of the breakdown of the bus - because the bus broke down; during the lesson - while the lesson was going on" [7: 111]. In our opinion, the presence of such zones of intersection largely ensures both the synonymy of syntactic constructions, and in a number of cases allows us to speak about external synonymy of service units (with certain changes in syntagmatics).

Consideration of polyfunctional service words as a special class does not contradict the distinction of other associations of service units, both on the basis of the principles of categorization and systematization.

Thus, for example, F.I. Pankov proposes to distinguish "more specific categorical classes" (CCW), i.e. functional-grammatical discharges, uniting lexemes primarily on the basis of formal features, in particular, word-pronunciation potencies and some functional characteristics" [8: 8: 8]. [8: 6]. Presenting the system of KKS as a whole, the author emphasizes that "independent classes constitute the core of the ICC category, and the nonindependent ones - its periphery" [8: 7] [8: 7].

In the composition of non-independent ICCs are defined as classes (subclasses) and conjunctions and particles, but interjections are not described [8: 7], interjections are not described [7]. The approach we propose allows us to describe the specificity of these units in many respects describe the specificity of these units. Thus, the system of service words in modern Russian language can be presented in the following form: polyfunctional and polysemantic words; polyfunctional and monosemantic; monofunctional and polysemantic; monofunctional and monosemantic.

As an additional classifying criterion in this approach, the specificity of the pragmatic potential of a linguistic unit can be used as an additional categorizing criterion in this approach. This attribute is understood broadly and includes, in particular, text-forming potential. Text-forming potential of these units is realized in a certain set of textual zones and through the representation of constructions of a certain type.

Traditionally, it is customary to distinguish in the text between authorial and character zones in a text. In our opinion, we can talk about syncretic textual zones, for example, in the case of the representation of constructions of a certain type and in the case of representation of indirect speech and dialog accompanied by the author's commentary.

In all textual zones there can be presented constructions with polyfunctional service words, which naturally realize the text-forming potential of this class of words: dialogic unities, constructions close to introductory and insertion constructions, constructions with parcels.

Polyfunctional service words actualize both their own semantics and the semantics of the construction as a whole, providing the possibility of different "deployment" of the text.

On the multifunctional nature of immutable words of V. V. Vinogradov writes: "the function of adverbs, prepositions, conjunctive and modal words can be combined in a single word" A.S. Akhmanov understand the connection between meaningful and non-words like multifunctionality, including, if "verbal similarity" is not broken: how (adverb and conjunction) when (adverb and conjunction), well (adverb and particle) etc. Similarly, this phenomenon is evaluated by other researchers [11].

Polyfunctionality can be located within a single grammar class. Polyfunctionality is common in the field of auxiliary words. This is especially true for unions and particles. The semantic unit of Such words was reliably proved by Cheremisina that: "in a given position, the Union assumes the function of the particle, and Vice versa, in certain positions, the particle assumes the function of the Union"[12]. The phenomenon of polyfunctionality is otherwise called grammatical homonymy, these terms are completely synonymous. V.V. Vinogradov divides homonymy into grammatical homonymy (polyfunctionality) and lexical homonymy (homonymy). A.T. Krivonosov writes: "If we follow the tradition, we can assume that polyfunctional lexemes that preserve the semantic invariant during the transition from class to class are homonymous lexemes".

In modern English, there are categories of words that have the property of polyfunctionality. In English, the problem of polyfunctionality is related to the division of words into lexical and grammatical categories. In



English, where there is no system of morphological oppositions, but the types of expanded and syntactic connections are not always clearly defined, one or more of these parts of speech in a word can cause difficulties both in theory and in practice.

Uzbek linguistics also studies the polysemantics of suffixes, syntactic constructions, and terms [2]. Terms are polysemous, polyfunctional, and homonymous. Polyfunctional terms in which the property of polysemy is reduced, but does not reach the degree of homonymy, are used in different areas with separate meanings. For example: morphology 1 (in biology), morphology 2 (in linguistics) [3]. M. Ernazarova points out that the plural indicator [s] is a system consisting of the integrity of form and meaning, that is, a system of speech events, that is, the position of the speech system as an element, and the very presence in the structure of this dynamic system as a Microsystem occurs on the basis of synergetic laws. This indicates that there is a phenomenon of polyphony in the indicative, that is, its General grammatical meaning is decomposed in the process of speech outcome – it is initially divided into intermediate grammatical values, and intermediate grammatical values, respectively, into particular grammatical values [16]. The conclusion is that language, which is the most important means of communication between people, has a multifunctional property [6]. Indeed, it is characterized not only by performing a communicative task, but also by preserving native speakers' knowledge about the object, transmitting it to the future generation, influencing the listener, and evaluating it in relation to a certain information object. It is correctly noted that "the international artificial language, despite some advantages of its system, does not function as a multifunctional language of the individual. It is secondary, an assistant in relation to natural national languages [12]. Apparently, as a social phenomenon, language itself has a multifunctional nature. Therefore, it is natural that its units of internal structure also acquire a polyfunctional property.

4 Conclusions

Consideration of service units on the basis of the proposed approach makes it possible to describe similar phenomena not only in a particular language, but also in closely related languages (e.g., Slavic), as well as in different languages.

Thus, studies devoted to syntax of different languages, confirm the presence of syncretic and transitional phenomena both in the sphere of complex sentences and in constructions lying in the zone of transitivity between complex and simple sentences, which can lead to changes in the functional-communicative and pragmatic character of the sentence.

The proposed approach allows for a fairly consistent description of the functional-communicative and pragmatic potential of various kinds of linking means, including proper function words [9]. And allows to describe other classes of units (both service and full denominative) in a consistent enough way and full-nominal units), which meets the need for an integrative description of the language system.

Literature:

1. Vsevolodova M.V. Theory of functional and communicative syntax: a textbook. M., 2000. 502 pp.
2. Litvin F.A. Polysemy and homonymy of syntactic words // Syntactic words. Novosibirsk, 1987. P. 76-83.
3. Gak V.G. A word // Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. M., 1990. P. 466.
4. Gladrov V. What are structural words? On the problem of parts of speech as a problem of interconditionality of language levels: materials of the II International congress of specialists in Russian philology «The Russian language: historical destinies and the present». M., 2004. P. 218-219.
5. Leykina B.M. Some functions of the word «and» // Linguistic problems of functional modeling of speech activity. L. 1979. Issue 4. P. 38-46.
6. Kim O.M. Transposition at the level of parts of speech and the homonymy phenomenon in modern Russian. Tashkent, 1978. 227 pp.
7. Punkov F.I. System of categorial classes of words in the Russian language (on the problem of grammatical classifications of lexicon) // Лінгвістичні студії і : зб. sciences. праць / укл.: Anatol_y Zagn_tko (sciences. edition) that ін. Donetsk, 2006. Issue 14. P. 103-111.



8. Punkov F.I. Functional and communicative grammar of the Russian adverb: Diss. abstract for the Dr. of Philology degree. M., 2009. 44 pp.
9. See, for example, Shkhapatseva M.Kh. A compound sentence as a special structural and semantic type in the Russian and Adyghe languages // The Bulletin of the Adyghe State University. Series «Philology and the Arts». 2012. Issue 3; Bedanokova S.K. Pragmatical functions of the conjunction «si» in a dialogue // The Bulletin of the Adyghe State University. Series «Philology and the Arts». 2013. Issue 1.
10. Nurmonov A. O'zbek tilshunosligi tarixi. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston, 2002.
11. V.V. Vinogradov Leksikologiya i leksikografiya izbranniye trudi.- Moskva, 1977.
12. Cheremisina M.I. Sravnitelniye konstruksii ruskogo yazika. – Moskva, 1976.
13. Mirtojiev M. Semasiologiya. – Toshkent: Mumtoz soz, 2010.
14. Vinogradov V.V. Osnovniye tipi leksicheskix znacheniy slova // Voprosi yazikoznaniya. – 1953.
15. Krivosov A.T. Filosofiya yazika. - Moskva, 2012.
16. Qodirova N.A. O 'zbek tilidagi affikslarda polifunksionallik: Filol. fan. nomz. diss. avtoref. – Toshkent, 2002;
17. Sulaymonova G.A. O 'zbek tilida ot turkumidagi so'zlarning polifunksionalligi: Filol. fan. nomz. diss. avtoref. – Toshkent, 2010.
18. Mirtojiev M. O 'zbek tili semasiologiyasi. - Toshkent: Mumtoz so'z, 2010.
19. Eltazarov J.D So'z turkumlari paradigmasidagi o'zaro aloqa va ko'chish. Monografiya. Toshkent, 2005.
20. Botirova A. O'zbek tilida so'z turkumlarining birlamchi va ikkilamchi vazifasining funksional-sintaktik tahlili: Filol.fanlari bo'yicha falsafa dok. Diss. Aftoreferat. Qarshi, 2018.
21. Bakhodir T., Amonturdiyev N. R. LEXICO-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF TRADER SPEECH //Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal. – 2022. – T. 3. – №. 5. – C. 2122-2125.
22. Rakhimova Z. S. ARGO AS A SOCIALLY LIMITED LEXICAL UNIT //CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (2767-3758). – 2021. – T. 2. – №. 12. – C. 146-150.
23. Rashidovich, Amonturdiyev Nurali. "LINGUISTIC STUDY OF MERCHANT SPEECH." (2022).
24. Wang, L. & Guo, Y. (2018). Polyfunctionality Studies in German, Dutch, English and Chinese. In: L. Wang, R. Köhler & A. Tuzzi (eds.), Structure, Function and Process in Texts. Germany: RAM-Verlag, 55–66.
25. Zawada, B. (2005). Linguistic creativity and mental representation with reference to intercategoryal polysemy. University of South Africa.