

Aliyeva G. S.

Baku State University

CASES OF RANDOM DIVERSITY OF MEANING NOT INCLUDED IN SENTENCE HOMONYMY (BASED ON THE MATERIALS OF THE MODERN AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGE)

The article deals with cases of random meaning diversity that are not included in sentence homonymy based on the materials of the modern Azerbaijani language. Homonymous sentences are characterized by the sameness of their lexical composition, spelling and pronunciation conditions, as well as their grammatical structures. Active participation of syntactic means is observed in the emergence of sentence homonymy. The study of language materials shows that there are enough cases of random meaning diversity, which at the level of the sentence is apparently similar to syntactic homonymy, but in fact has nothing to do with it and does not correspond to the listed criteria. In the article, those random instances of meaning diversity are grouped under twelve different headings. The title “Accidental variations of meaning based on intonation” suggests that intonation, which is one of the factors that create optimal conditions for the occurrence of syntactic homonymy, is also active in the emergence of such accidental variations of meaning. Small sub-headings are also presented within some headings. Selected examples from the literature are analyzed. The study of these sentences is quite necessary in terms of specifying the boundaries of the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy. To be more precise, it has an important scientific importance in determining the features that characterize the mechanism of syntactic homonymy, the possibilities of its manifestation in the language, and the factors that encourage its emergence. In the study of homonymous sentences, first of all, the question of the possibility of multiple interpretations of syntactic units of this homonymous nature attracts attention. The results of our research based on the materials of the modern Azerbaijani language show that there are enough cases of a variety of meanings in our language, which outwardly resemble syntactic homonymy at the sentence level, but in fact have nothing to do with it and are random in nature.

Key words: syntactic homonymy, variety of meaning, sentence, homonymous sentence, text, intonation.

Problem statement. Although sentences with random meaning diversity are not considered homonyms, they can also be interpreted in two or more ways. This fact gives reason to say that a strict definition of the boundaries of the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy, that is, its differentiation from random cases of the variety of meaning in the sentence, is extremely necessary from the point of view of clarifying the essence, mechanism of occurrence and characteristic features of this linguistic phenomenon.

The purpose of the work. The purpose of the work is to identify the phenomena of random diversity of meaning that are not included in the homonymy of sentences based on the materials of the modern Azerbaijani language.

Presentation of the main material. It is possible to talk about the homonymy of the sentence only if the fact of making different comments on these sentences is conditioned by the joint observation of the aspects mentioned below:

- 1) the identity of the lexical components of the sentences;
- 2) the same conditions of writing and pronunciation of sentences;
- 3) the sameness of sentences in terms of grammatical structure;
- 4) the meaning (information) aspect of sentences, which can be reflected in the objective reality as well as the linguistic reality;
- 5) active participation of syntactic means in the formation of sentence homonymy.

As H.A. Hasanov also noted, “word combinations and sentences with the same form and different meanings corresponding to these signs can be explained as homonymous word combinations and sentences” [2, p. 39].

Although the author has correctly defined the main signs for syntactic homonyms and noted that they should match each other in lexical composition, he considers the random meaning diversity caused by

homonymous words in a part of simple sentences, as well as the similarity of form of free and fixed word combinations, to be syntactic homonymy, which this kind of approach is not correct [2, p. 39, 46].

During the study of the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy, it is often observed that the boundaries of this language phenomenon are not clearly defined, and some existing linguistic facts related to random meaning diversity are explained as syntactic homonymy. From this point of view, the examples presented by F.A.Jalilov when talking about the meaningful role of the intellectual-grammatical function of intonation are interesting. F.A.Jalilov notes that this function of intonation is activated where there is syntactic homonymy, that is, it does its job when the sentence with the same lexical-grammatical content has the possibility of carrying different meanings [3, p. 40].

Let's look at the examples presented by the author: "1) The bird flies. Does the bird fly? The bird flies! 2) Read like your brother || don't be ignorant. Read || don't be ignorant like your brother. 3) That apple || should eat. That || must eat an apple. 4) My son Arif || calls me. My son || Arif calls me. 5) You work || please him. You || work to please him. 6) The hero is || it goes forward. Hero || it is || goes forward" [3, p. 40].

As it can be seen, although the author presents these examples when talking about sentences with the same lexical-grammatical content, not every one of those examples meets this requirement. In our opinion, only the 2nd, 4th and 6th of these sentences can be given an example of the case of syntactic homonymy. In example 1, there are no dual syntactic relations and different syntagmatic membership, which are typical for syntactic homonymy, where it is possible to talk only about shades of meaning created by intonation. In the 3rd example, the homonymy of *-malı²*, which is the suffix of the verb adjective, with the special sign of the essential form of the verb, and in the 5th example, the homonymy of the suffixed form of the suffix *-la²*, which forms a verb from the noun, is possible to talk about the ambiguity that has arisen as a result of the syntactic homonymy phenomenon. We have grouped them as cases of random meaning diversity that are not related to.

Cases of random meaning diversity observed at the sentence level in the modern Azerbaijani language include the following:

1) Random variation of meaning in sentences containing a lexical homonym or polysemous word. As we mentioned, homonymous sentences are sentences characterized by the same lexical content.

Homonymous words are independent units of the lexical level of the language, so it is impossible to speak of the same lexical composition in sentences containing homonymous words. In sentences containing a polysemous word, the variety of meaning appears each time on the basis of one of the shades of meaning of that polysemous word. Therefore, the meanings in those sentences are manifested in the form of shades that are closely related to each other.

Consider the following examples:

a) Sentences containing homonymous words:
1) – ... A brave man riding a blue-spotted horse wanders by. Mehdi son Khalil. Which of these young men is he? – ... He is not by my side, I am wandering by his side (F. Karimzade, the novel "Snowy Pass"): 1. to wander, wander (in the text); 2. to live, to lead a life; 2) My wife is tall. She has a six-month-old child in her womb (S. Ahmadli, "Kef" novel): 1. twin, pregnant (in the text); 2. tall, stout;

b) Sentences containing ambiguous words:
1) – Yes, Najaf Komsomol, why are you looking at me crookedly? / – ... I look at you very straight (M.Ibrahimov, the novel "Big pillar"): 1. to pay attention, fix your eyes on him (in the text); 2. take care of, take care of; 2) – But you are the one who laughs! – the wife could not hide what was in her heart. The girl next door was caught (S. Gadirzade, the story "A person lived here"): 1. to be drunk (in the text); 2. to be arrested.

A.Z. Abdullayev touched on such sentences with polysemous verbs when he noted that the semantics of the verb plays an important role in defining the same word as a sentence member. The examples presented by A.Z. Abdullayev are also noteworthy: "1. I gave the money to the house (that is, I gave it to keep); 2. I gave the money to the house (that is, I bought a house). Where is the word "home" in the first sentence? the question, what in the second? begs the question. These, of course, depend on the semantics of the verb" [1, p. 150].

As it can be seen, random meaning diversity is observed in the examples presented by the author, due to the nuances of the ambiguous verb "to give" such as "to entrust, deliver" and "to pay with money, to buy at a certain price". The accidental variety of meanings observed in the sentence "I am looking at the house" presented by A.Z. Abdullayev is related to the shades of meaning of the polysemous verb "to look" such as "to watch" and "to keep, support" [1, p. 150].

Noting that concrete sentence structures create conditions for the narrowing of the meaning of words, Mark K. Baker writes: "Although the meaning of a word out of context is variable and unclear,

determining the meaning of the same word in context is much easier. In the context, its meaning is limited both by the structure of the sentence as a whole and by the meaning of other words of this sentence” [5, p. 200].

Homonymous and polysemous words sometimes do not gain semantic certainty even within a sentence, and in this case there is a need to go beyond the sentence boundary and refer to a wider context. This can be clearly observed in the sentences mentioned above. That is why we considered it more appropriate to present those sentences together with other sentences located in their neighboring positions, because only then it is possible to ensure full semantic clarity and comprehensibility of the selected artistic examples.

2) Random variation of meaning in sentences containing homoforms or homographs. This language fact cannot be presented as syntactic homonymy precisely because of the violation of the condition of the identity of the lexical and grammatical contents of homonymous sentences. It is impossible to talk about the sameness of the conditions of writing and pronunciation in those sentences. Consider the following examples:

a) Sentences containing homoforms: 1) Justice. The future is still far away... (I. Efendiyev, the play “Destroyed diaries”): 1. the future (as in *mubta* – in the text); 2. (It) will come (as news); 2) My lines that are hostile to blood are drowned in blood (M. Araz, “If I believe in this definition...”): 1. My lines that are hostile to blood are drowned in blood (in the text); 2. Enemy blood that my lines are soaked in blood;

b) Sentences containing homographs: 1) – Chairman, are you at home? – said the old man from Duniyamal. Uncle Nariman answered nervously: – I’m at home, come (I. Efendiyev, “Willow Arch” novel): 1. come + in (command form – in the text); 2. bride (noun – address); 2) – Mrs. Agabaji, the song is in my heart. ... But let the sheep remain with me (H. Abbaszadeh, “The nightingale read”): 1. sheep (imperative habit – in the text); 2. sheep (noun);

3) The variety of meaning resulting from the random correspondence of personal names, surnames and nicknames (or vice versa) with a certain word that has received any grammatical suffix. Unlike homonymous sentences, it is impossible to talk about the sameness in these sentences in terms of lexical composition, grammatical structure and spelling. Consider the following examples:

1) – ... When the training is completed, Amin Mahram himself should take the reins and take Fazli to a new residence! (I. Huseynov, “Mahshar” novel): 1. Amin (as the secret name of Govharshah – in the

text); 2. (your) uncle+n; 2) Ali was also cold from work (H. Ibrahimov, historical novel “Tenth of a century”): 1. (his) hand+i (in the text); 2. Ali (personal name);

4) The variety of meaning resulting from the accidental matching of some words with personal names without the help of any grammatical suffix. Here, the reason for the random meaning difference is the appellative-personal anthroponym pair. In this regard, the following sentences are interesting:

1) – It was unfair, uncle Mehbali. / – What justice!.. Justice went to the fight that their fathers fought! (I. Huseynov, “Tütek səsi” story): 1. justice (in the text); 2. Justice (personal name); 2) The soldier raised his head and looked at him with loving and adoring eyes (A. Nijat, “Kızılbaşar” novel): 1. Soldier (personal name – in the text); 2. soldier (military); 3) At that moment, Gulam Huseynli realized that the academics who were sitting next to the speaker in the front row and gazing at the stage were making dull faces that did not express anything (A. Masud, Writing (Novel, essay, story)): 1. speaker (speech – in the text) ; 2. Speaker (personal name); 4) He did not reconcile with his only son Asif, he continued his claim like a camel (R. Garaja, “If your closest friend...” story): 1. The mother did not reconcile with her only son (in the text); 2. Unique (personal name).

The fourth sentence stands out somewhat from the others. The reason for the diversity of meanings in this sentence is not only the fact that the word “only” is thought of as both an appellative and a personal name, but also the omitted words “o” (he didn’t reconcile) and “self” (his son) are pronouns. Therefore, it is possible to talk about the variety of situational meaning in this sentence.

5) Random variety of meaning in sentences containing abstract noun + “with” conjunction. The main factor that causes random meaning differences in these sentences is that the abstract nouns used in them consist of words that can be thought of as personal names. Let’s look at the examples: 1) They entered slowly as if they sensed something. ...; they looked at the chair with anticipation (M. Ibrahimov, the novel “Big pillar”): 1. with anticipation (in what manner?) – in the text; 2. Wait (with whom?); 2) Someone was kinder to this man. He met and greeted politely (S. Ahmadli, “Kef” novel): 1. politely (in what manner?) – in the text; 2. Politely (with whom?);

6) Accidental difference of meaning resulting from the coincidence of the male surname used in the case of the noun with the female surname: The sanitary woman approached Nesterov and said

(Kh. Hasilova, the story “Along the difficult roads”):
1. Nesterov+a (to whom?) – Sanitary woman←said (in the text); 2. Sanitary woman → Nester+ova (who?);

7) Random meaning diversity of some professions and personal names determined by the concept of gender: 1) He gives a bunch of flowers to the poet, / With the fragrance of flowers, he brings / Azerbaijan to the country of Iraq (B. Vahabzadeh, poem “Shabi-hijran”): 1. to the poet (to whom?)→gives (in the text); 2. poet (who?); 2) Kamila does not answer (S. Rahman, play “Wedding”): 1. Kamila does not answer her uncle Karamov (in the text); 2. Kamil+a (to whom?);

8) Accidental meaning diversity resulting from different pronunciation of the sentence. It is possible to observe that in some sentences the diversity of meaning arising from pronunciation is evident, and this linguistic fact should not be explained as syntactic homonymy. Let’s take a look at the examples: 1) Bakhish took his son’s arm and left the office (I. Malikzade, “The Man of the House” story):

1. There are two separate persons: Bakhish and his son – in the text; 2. Bakhisoglu (as last name); 2) He felt what was going through the heart of Vali Agha Bey (A. Abbas, the novel “Batmankilinc”):

1. Vali Agha (in the text); 2. Agha+bey (personal name);

9) Random variety of meaning in sentences containing phraseological units. The difference in meaning here appears either on the basis of the homonymy of phraseological units or their similarity of form with free word combinations, for example: a) homonymy of phraseological units: – No, Haji, I can’t work with your watch. Bye! The pilgrim’s speech was interrupted (Mir Jalal, the novel “Manifesto of a young man”): 1. he had no words to say (in the text); 2. they did not allow to speak; b) similarity of form with free word combinations of phraseological units (accidental meaning diversity resulting from the fact that sentences can be understood both literally and figuratively): – ... Odu ey, grandfather digs a well (I. Malikzade, the story “The Well”): 1. literally (in the text); 2. in a figurative sense (to do something secretly against someone from among the subordinates);

10) Random variations of meaning based on intonation:

a) Depending on the intonation, as well as the time and the homonymy of some verb-adjective suffixes, the random meaning difference resulting from the understanding of the same part of the sentence both as one of the same-gender verb news and as a designation expressed by the verb adjective: 1) Pahlavan

Muhammad ten years ago Sardar – he joined the militias of his country, gained unforgettable fame as a mujahid and a devotee in fierce battles against the Qajar troops (S. Rahimov, the story “Mahtaban”):

1. as two identical news (in the text); 2. (Joined the troops of Sardar-Milli)→(as a mujahid and devotee); 2) He couldn’t calm down his nerves for a long time because of the previous conversation (Y. Samadoglu, “Astana” story): 1. (nervous)→nerves (in the text); 2. as two news of the same sex;

b) Cases of accidental diversity of meaning, depending on the intonation, resulting from the change of the sentence structure: 1) It is not the place to be offended (A. Jafarzadeh, the novel “Do it from the hand”): This sentence can also be used in the form “It is not the place to be offended”. At this time, a simple sentence with one component will be used as a complex sentence; 2) – ... It is not the place to fuss (K. Abdulla, novel “Half-manuscript”): 1. as a simple sentence – in the text; 2. Do not shout, (because) it is not appropriate.

G.S. Kazimov also mentions sentences similar to the examples mentioned above. G.Sh.Kazimov gives an example of the sentence “It’s no good for you to kill me” and notes that in such sentences, even the word order does not help to understand the author’s idea, as well as the rhythmic-melodic flow and pause corresponding to the author’s desire, in this case, the punctuation mark (comma) pays special attention to the importance of using it correctly [4, p. 27].

c) Sometimes, depending on the intonation, the word or combination at the beginning of the sentence can become independent in the form of a sentence by gaining a predicative feature, which should be explained not as a syntactic homonymy, but as an accidental variety of meaning. Let’s take a look at the examples: 1) – ... Will you return to that job?.. / – Why, are we going back? (F. Karimzade, novel “Snowy Pass”): 1. Why? – as a separate sentence (in the text); 2. why – as an interrogative pronoun of a simple sentence; 2) Intelligence. ... But why, after all, you commissioned me? (A. Amirli, play “Missing husband or ufological passions”): 1. After all, you commissioned me, so why didn’t they take me away (in the text); 2. Why did you entrust me and not someone else?

11) Random variety of meanings created in a sentence by words that cannot be distinguished at first glance to which person they belong to:

a) Random meaning diversity created by nouns that cannot be distinguished at first sight to which person they belong: 1) Firuza. ... So much profit slips through your fingers and falls into his pocket

(S. Rahman, play “The Living”): 1. Through (your) fingers (in the text); 2. through (his) fingers; 2) – It seems that the khanate passes through his heart (A. Abbas, the novel “Batmankilinc”): 1. From (his) heart (in the text); 2. from (your) heart;

b) Random variety of meanings created by the infinitive and some combinations with time content in the sentence: 1) Mirza Garanfil. ... But I won't be able to listen to your reading (S. Rahman, play “The Happy”): 1. (your) reading (in the text); 2. to (his) reading; 2) Gajar. ... After returning from the trip to Karabakh, we will, inshallah, exile him to the village of Safali, let him remember his life in the royal palace with his concubine and be happy (A. Amirli, play “Despite everything said or Agha Muhammad Shah Qajar”): 1. (we) return then (in the text); 2. (o) after returning;

12) Random diversity of meaning resulting from homonymy of morphological units. This case should be considered only as a difference of meaning arising on the basis of the functional homonymy of the same word. G. Sh. Kazimov notes that this situation causes a change in the lexical semantics of the sentence [4, p. 28]. The following cases of random meaning diversity related to the functional homonymy of words are more often observed in our language:

a) The variety of meanings observed in the sentences containing the word “with” (depending on whether it is a conjunction or a conjunction): – Hey, did you forget that we forced you to write a letter with your sister? (Kh. Hasilova, the story “No one was a stranger”): 1. Have you forgotten how we forced you

to write a letter together with your sister? (in the text); 2. Have you forgotten that we forced you and your sister to write a letter?;

b) The variety of meanings observed in the sentences containing the word “but”: 1) He moved forward with a lot of noise and hiccups. However, after making sure that no one came after him, he slowed down his horse (I. Shikhli, “Dəli Kür” novel): 1. but (habit) – in the text; 2. but (conjunction); 2) The girls screamed and scattered around. But Sayalı did not go astray (I. Shikhli, “Ayrılan yollar” novel): 1. but (connector) – in the text; 2. but (custom);

c) The variety of meanings observed in sentences containing the word “already”：“: 1) Jamal. ... Have we already paid the foreman? (S. Rahman, play “The Betrothed Girl”): 1. already (adjective – in the text); 2. already (custom); 2) Karbalai didn't say a word to Muharram anymore (F. Karimzade, the novel “Snowy Pass”): 1. already (custom – in the text); 2. more (unnecessary).

Conclusion. As it can be seen, in the modern Azerbaijani language, it is possible to find quite different examples of cases of random meaning diversity that are apparently similar to syntactic homonymy. If such sentences are not included in the research during the investigation of the phenomenon of homonymy manifested at the syntactic level of the language, this may prevent the issue from being looked at from a wider and more comprehensive aspect, it will create difficulties in determining the aspects that characterize the mechanism of syntactic homonymy and the factors that encourage its emergence.

Bibliography:

1. Abdullayev A.Z. Azerbaijani language issues. Baku: Baku University publishing house, 1992. 329 p.
2. Dictionary of homonyms of the Azerbaijani language / tert. ed. H.A. Hasanov. Baku : East-West, 2012. 168 p.
3. Jalilov F.A. Complex sentence syntax. Resources for teachers. In Azerbaijani. Baku : Maarif, 1983. 116 p.
4. Kazimov G.Sh. Modern Azerbaijan language. Syntax. Baku : Education, 2007. 496 p.
5. Baker Mark K. Atoms of Language: Grammar in the Dark Field of Consciousness. Перевод с англ. / Mark K. Baker, editor. O. V. Mitrenina, O. A. Mitrofanova. Москва : ЛКИ, 2008. 272 с.

Алієва Г. С. ВИПАДКИ ВИПАДКОВОГО РІЗНОМАНІТТЯ ЗНАЧЕНЬ, НЕ ВКЛЮЧЕНИХ В ОМОНІМІЮ РЕЧЕННЯ (НА МАТЕРІАЛАХ СУЧАСНОЇ АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСЬКОЇ МОВИ)

У статті на матеріалах сучасної азербайджанської мови розглядаються випадки випадкового розмаїття значень, не включені в омонімію речення. Омонімічні речення характеризуються однаковістю їх лексичного складу, умов написання і вимови, а також їх граматичних структур. У виникненні омонімії речень спостерігається активна участь синтаксичних засобів. Вивчення мовних матеріалів показує, що існує достатньо випадків випадкового смислового розмаїття, яке на рівні пропозиції зовні схоже на синтаксичну омонімію, але насправді не має до неї ніякого відношення і не відповідає перерахованим критеріям. У статті ці випадкові приклади смислового різноманіття згруповані під дванадцятьма різними заголовками. Назва «випадкові варіації значення, засновані на інтонації» передбачає, що інтонація, яка є одним з факторів, що створюють оптимальні умови для виникнення синтаксичної омонімії, також активно бере участь у виникненні таких випадкових варіацій значення. У деяких рубриках також представлені невеликі підзаголовки. Аналізуються вибрані

приклади з літератури. Вивчення цих пропозицій абсолютно необхідно з точки зору уточнення меж явища синтаксичної омонімії. Якщо бути більш точним, це має важливе наукове значення для визначення особливостей, що характеризують механізм синтаксичної омонімії, можливостей її прояву в мові і факторів, що сприяють її виникненню. При вивченні омонімічних речень, перш за все, привертає увагу питання про можливість множинних інтерпретацій синтаксичних одиниць такого омонімічного характеру. Результати нашого дослідження, заснованого на матеріалах сучасної азербайджанської мови, показують, що в нашій мові досить випадків різноманітності значень, які зовні нагадують синтаксичну омонімію на рівні пропозиції, але насправді не мають до неї ніякого відношення і носять випадковий характер.

Ключові слова: синтаксична омонімія, багатозначність, речення, омонімічне речення, текст, інтонація.