



A Critical Review of Existing Views on the Problem of Paronymy and Related events

Iroda Akhmedovna Juraeva, Associate professor, PhD, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, irodajuraeva@gmail.com

Nilufar Karimbaevna Sabirova, Doctoral Student, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirza Ulug'bek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, sab-nilufar.88@mail.ru

Abstract. This article discusses a critical review of existing views on the problem of paronymy and related events. Paronyms are defined as words that may be mispronounced or punctuated in speech as a result of partial matching of phoneme and morphological content. A word game that is organically related to the structure of a particular language, or a pun, demonstrates the creative potential of the language with particular brilliance. If the humor generated by the situation, the context, is truly universal for understanding, then this is a special privilege for a relatively small number of people who perfectly know all the riches of the comic language created with the help of linguistic means. This is especially true of the authors of the puns, however, the perception of extraordinary humor requires a certain linguistic knowledge.

Keywords: Paronymy, core, linguistic thinking, critical analysis, thematic principle, concept, speech culture.

I. INTRODUCTION

Paronymy is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon whose roots go back to very ancient times. If the history of linguistic thinking is thought of as a branched network of paths, the path traversed by researchers on the problem of paronymy can be defined by a line that intersects with thin but large trunks and their countless branches. Continuing to move in this direction, it is first necessary to identify the main periods that indicate the development of research thinking in this area.

Our critical analysis is built on a thematic principle - without taking into account the historical sequence of the works presented. The view of modern concepts of paronymy given by I.N. Kuznetsova (Kuznetsova, 1981) seems to be the most informative. The author identifies three main areas of research in this area:

1. Research on speech culture initiated under S.I. Ojegov;
2. Lexicographic description of paronymic evidence; compiling dictionaries of language "difficulties";
3. Theoretical understanding of linguistic phenomena in relation to paronymic arguments, primarily in terms of comparison with homonymy and synonymy.

Indeed, paronymic confusion can be assessed as pathology of language as a known violation of the language norm and belongs to the cultural-speech aspect of linguistics. On the need to study "negative" language material in Russian linguistics V. Shcherba, G.S. Vinokur, A.M. Peshkovekiy, V.V. Vinogradov and others have written many times. Without giving in to the essence of paronymic processes, V.V. Vinogradov focuses on limiting paronymy ("similar pronunciation of words") and homonymy: "Homophony is a much broader concept than homonymy. It uses all forms of the same sound or melody, both in all constructions, and in word connections, and in their parts, in separate parts of speech, in separate morphemes, and even in close sound combinations. Thus, with homonymy, it is impossible to mix and even bring together the different types of homophony, harmony, and similar sounds that appear in speech in the true sense of the word or even in the language system" (Vinogradov, 1960: 4-6). It is also important to note that the similarity of the form of melodic words requires their spiritual "attraction", which is "reflected in their understanding, in their semantic relations" (Vinogradov, 1960: 6).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

On the need to study language pathologies Sh. Balli had written: "Language anomalies deserve to be used experimentally: they belong to a alive language and indirectly illuminate its nature and function, as well as the direction of the changes it undergoes", the linguist should be interested in speech defects "because of a hidden desire to fill a gap in language accuracy" (Balli, 1959: 35-36). Balli considers paronyms ("pseudo-names") only in terms of form similarity, regardless of the semantic relationships that may exist between them. Interestingly, according to I. N. Kuznetsova, the Sh. Balli example is a paronymic unit in the French language characterized by significant semantic differences between the two components (French allocation: "allocated, withdrawn money, funds: speech"). However, according to the consensus of researchers of this problem, such, semantically unrelated paronyms represent their least typical appearance. In most cases, paronyms exhibit mutual semantic correlations.

Other definitions of paronyms are also based on the principle of formal (phonetic-orthographic) similarity:

J. Maruzo: "a word close to another word in its external form" (Maruzo, 1960: 202);

O.S. Akhmanova: "Words that can be used in speech either incorrectly or in punctuation due to the similarity of their pronunciation or partial matching of the morpheme structure" (Akhmanova, 1969: 313). The latter definition shows not only the fact of the phonetic similarity of paronyms, but also the result of such closeness - the confusion of paronyms in speech. On the importance of confusing paronyms in speech, Yu. A. Belchikov (Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. P. 368) and N.I. Kolesnikov (Dictionary of Russian paronyms. S.Z).

In the 70s and 80s O.V. Vishnyakova, A.G. Bagaturova, L.G. Yarkova, K.B. Golub, S.M. Grabchikov, V.P. Grigorev, A number of special studies by A.A. Evgrafova and other authors devoted to the problem of paronymy emerge. In these works, the definition of the paronym itself is also narrow (only the same basic words: O.V. Vishnyakova, M.I. Fomina et al.), Both broad (excluding etymological similarity: V.I. Grigorev, I.B. Golub et al.) Capture the comment.

According to O.V. Vishnyakova (author of numerous works on the problem of paronymy in Russian), paronymy is limited to the field of "melodic monosyllabic words with different meanings belonging to the same lexical-grammatical category" (Vishnyakova, 1984: 5). This definition takes into account both functional and semantic characters. Lexical paronyms, par excellence paronyms - "single-rooted words with lexical-semantic similarity and belonging to the same semantic field" (Vishnyakova, 1984: 7) are highlighted by the author.

M.I.O. about Fomina paronymy Speaking on V. Vishnyakova's terms, the definition emphasizes the lexical-grammatical relevance of words-paronyms and the similarity of cores (Fomina, 1990: 129). Paronymy, within the framework of such an approach, is undoubtedly regarded as a manifestation of the structural relations of language, has a regular and legitimate character, and occupies a certain place in the structure of language. In this case, the following serve as examples:

(in Russian) addressee - addressee

sunrise - shoot

unrequited - irresponsible.

In English, the following types of pairs could match them:

amiable - amicable

credible - credulous.

However, such a lexical-morphological approach does not seem accurate enough to us. An important moment in understanding the paronymic process is, in our opinion, the semantic confusion of words based on the closeness of language forms, the transfer of the formal similarity of the two paronyms to the semantic relationship leads to a violation of the language norm.

Subsequent research, continuing to develop general theoretical aspects of paronymy, in this regard paid great attention to the idiom of a particular language and gradually went beyond the narrow scope of the etymological criterion. L. G. Yarkova's work based on German language material is of great interest. Paronymy is defined in the work as "similar (but not exactly the same as lexical) sounds of lexical units and semantic differences that enter into an unexpected semantic relationship in speech, or lead to erroneous substitution, or punctuation" (Yarkova, 1979: 1). Paronymic relations are considered by the author as a type of paradigmatic relations in the lexicon of language, as well as homonymy, synonymy, antonymy, variability. In the study, for paronyms, the difference of stems or affixes in two or three phonemes, vowels and consonants is considered as possible. It can be said whether such a restriction is fully justified on the basis of Russian, English, German or any other language.

The author of another special study on the problem of paronymy ("Manual on French Lexicology") As I.K. Kuznetsova rightly points out, "the phonetic differences of paronyms are not a priori quantity (with an arbitrary limitation of the number of different phonemes), rather, it should be determined by

analyzing the linguistic realities given in the paronymic material itself (Kuznetsova, 1991: 28). Paronymy is defined within this concept not by a single formal sign, but by a combination of formal, semantic, and primarily functional (the possibility of erroneous substitution as a diagnostic feature of paronymic pair in speech) signs.

This view differs from other definitions that take into account a semantic criterion that includes certain synonymous words that indicate the proximity of a sound to the paronymic field. With it, the areas of paronymy and synonymy are not separated from each other in some passages, but, conversely, intersect. The paronymic process is thus embodied as a manifestation of lexical interference. Lexical interference I. N. Kuznetsova describes the two-sided (in terms of expression and content) lexical units of one or different languages as initially shaped, as well as semantic similarity, which leads to involuntary (wrong) or voluntary (stylistic) distortion of the language norm "(Kuznetsova, 1991:27). Based on this definition, language is evaluated as a phenomenon of internal interference. Interlingual interference is shaped by "fake friends of the translator" in the communication of languages.

- The empirical material collected in I.N. Kuznetsova's manual convincingly proves that one phonetic criterion is not relevant to limit paronyms from other melodic words. Among the undoubted paronyms recognized by most researchers, words with a large number of phonemes have also been identified: French *allonger* "to lengthen, extend, spindle"/ *prolonger* "stretch, elongate" *lecteur* "student, reader" / *liseur* "reader, book lover". The following pairs can serve as similar examples in English: adjacent/adjoining; admittance/admission and etc.

On the other hand, one can find many words that are distinguished by one or two phonemes, but not paronyms: french *vase/case*; english *meat/seat*; russian *table / chair* and etc. Therefore, we tend to agree with N. Kuznetsova that "specific for paronymy is a combination of several signs, in which the main role belongs to the functional sign of paronyms, which is expressed in the wrong mix of speech" (Kuznetsova, 1991: 29). Involvement of the functional sign paronymy expresses not only the participation of the melody of words in the language, but also the active participation of the speakers in the language, thus representing a specific phenomenon that needs linguistic analysis and interpretation "(Ibid P. 39).

Actually, V.B. Fedenev draws a similar conclusion in his PhD dissertation on the phenomenon of paronymic attraction in English (Fedenev, 1982). The author of the work paronymy based on A. I. Smirnitsky's research on word variants, he draws attention to the methodology of the study of this phenomenon as one of the most complex cases of violation of the law of sign in the lexicon.

The position of the phenomenon of paronymy it is described by V.E. Fedenev as follows: "Paronyms can be identified uniformly and thus distinguished from all other lexical categories of a language only by their function, which clearly and distinctly reflects their speech character (Fedenev, 1982: 10). The linguistic position of paronymy is denied by the author on the grounds that there is no external criterion for English, a criterion on which a pair of melodic words can be called paronymic words. In the words being compared, the author thinks that very different situations are confused:

- options of words (unalienable/inalienable),
- noomographic homonyms (alimentary/elimentary),
- monosyllabic words (contemptible/contemptuous),
- synonyms (sensible/sensitive),
- words combined with a single phonesema (glance/glimpse),
- only couples who are confused by completely illiterate people (Russian: *ampula / amplua*: English: *absence / abstinence*).

The common denominator for all of these cases is that colorful melodies come first, while semantic approximations are secondary. The focus is on the study of speech (syntagmatic aspect), which allows the researcher to conclude that the separation of paronymy as an independent subsystem of language lexicon is in principle impossible.

There is every reason to assume that the lack of clear criteria is not unique to the English language system. Its causes are hidden in the complex nature of the phenomenon of paronymy, in its complete description taking into account only one (formal or semantic) factor. By its very nature, paronymy is located at the intersection of formal and semantic associative relations that are not subject to strict determination. The semantic effect of paronymy is undoubtedly stochastic in nature.

L.K. Fedotova (1989) analyzes the phenomenon of paronymy in terms of structural-functional criteria. This implies at least two main aspects: 1) first, paronymy is recognized as a speech phenomenon; 2) The author suggests a number of grounds for determining the degree of formal and semantic similarity of paronyms. L.K. Fedotova defines its linguistic position by including more complex parasntagmatic relations in the line of paronymy: "This relationship consists of a synthesis of paradigmatics and syntagmatics, which occurs when elements of different paradigmatic classes occur simultaneously within

a single syntagmatic series" (Fedotova, 1989: 11). It is suggested to identify paronyms in one sense and thereby limit them from other lexical groups through the function of indicating the position of speech.

Analyzing the content plan of paronyms, the author uses the concept of "integral sign" (IS). L. N. Fedotova distinguishes 4 categories of integral symbols according to the degree of generalization: for example, category 3: metronomic/metonymic (IS - of quality), nitigate/militate (IS - action); less common category 2 - day/date (IS - time); special integral characters (correspondingly less generalized level of the character); abyssal/abysmal (IS - deep)/ amiable/ amicable (IS - friendly).

The author rightly points out that the vast majority of paronyms, both occasional and recursive, have a private IS, only the ad hoc, characteristic of this series, indicates that paronymy is in many respects a speech phenomenon rather than a linguistic phenomenon, although in 20% of units it is systemic (linguistic) similarity is not excluded. The commonality of paronyms in the content plan is covered by the concept of sound proximity level (TYaD) and is calculated on the basis of the formula $TYaD = n$ (number of phonetic stratifiers) distribution m (maximum number of word sounds). Based on the above considerations, paronyms are defined in this concept as "melodic words that have a sound affinity of 10% to 20% in the plan of expression and have at least one integral sign in the content structure" (Fedotova, 1980: 4).

III. THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RESULTS

The very idea of distinguishing clear formal-semantic criteria for delimiting paronymic and nonparonymic pairs is, of course, overly appealing. However (as discussed earlier), if natural language were to be placed in the "Procrust bed" of one hundred percent of linguistic-mathematical operations (forcibly modeling everything, whether it is correct or not), it could not be a living functional product. The material of our work, like many others, it is an additional confirmation of A. A. Leontev's rational view that "any study of language is to model it for certain purposes" (Leontev, 1965: 27). The analysis of factual material identifies a number of words that are difficult to include in this or that lexical category. On the one hand, the range of phonetic change is extremely wide (10 - 90%): assent/consent vs defective/deficient compare cases of type. The transition of differences to the morphological stage is not taken into account here. On the other hand, the semantic criterion of inserting / not inserting a word into paronyms is occasional: it does not always work in both intentional (paronomasia) and accidental, unintentional (speech errors) applications. The level of content closeness is generally not subject to a clear measure. This is especially true for a poetic text, because "most poets contrast paronyms in the text, not asking themselves about the origin of their sound proximity, but only figuratively and worrying about the functional spiritual function of the paronymic effect in the dynamic synchronicity of the work" (Grigorev, 1977): 191).

For example, the words paraphrase (consonance carcass when the vowels do not match) voice and verse reinforce their spiritual dimension because they reciprocate in the context given by L. Milton:

Blest pair of Sirens, pledges of
Heaven's joy,
Sphere-born harmonious sisters,
Voice and Verse.

(Concise dictionary of quotations, 1986:214).

These words, which have a stable (based on IS) spiritual correlation, are not recorded as members of the paronymic series. At the same time, the pair, which is semantically completely incomparable, such as accept and except, is given in almost all English "difficulty" dictionaries.

In the philological tradition of Western Europe, the understanding of paromia is much narrower. They use the term "confusable" to denote paronyms, or to include them in the more general notion of "malaprop", that is, the misuse of a word:

Russian: ampoule - ampula; effective - virgin
English: absence - abstinence; costume - custom.

The author of the relevant dictionary A. Room (Room, 1980), "confusable" recognizing the non-linguistic nature of the concept and equating it with the definition we call paronyms: "A word that has a general or associative meaning with another, not just in spelling or pronunciation". ("It is a word having a lexical and semantic (but not necessarily etymological) affinity with another" (Room, 1980: 15). Thus, the main criteria remain the same: similarity in pronunciation, spelling, contextual spiritual closeness. A. Room adds to the traditional list again the approximate equality of the number of syllables in words, belonging to one functional style, and a number of others, making them one common motto: sight - sound - sense criterion combines under.

A. Room uses another, less specific concept – “suggestible” a word which is unvoluntarily evoked by another, although unrelated to it in origin or even in meaning” (Room, 1980:1). The concept of “suggestible” is very complex in its content and therefore very diverse: paronymy (jubilee/jubilant); homophony (whet/wet), socialisms, i.e., accidental speech errors, mispronounced words (calvary/cavalry), false etymology (taper - tapir: animal with tapering nose) does not have terminological force. A. Room hypothesis about the possible stratification of the concepts “confusable” and “suggestible” with respect to frequency seems to suggest that the author refers to a sufficiently common word that is functionally and methodologically derived from the term “suggestible” with a rather unique word in association (“conjured up”); “confusable” or narrowly meaning “specialist”, or it can have a meaning that everyone knows (Room, 1980: 3).

The nolingistic nature of both terms (which, it seems to us, no doubt) is probably explained by the fact that the dictionary is clearly pragmatic intended for a wide readership. The transparent semantics of the title provide the key to understanding the orthogonal orientation of this research.

Another foreign researcher, U. Coates stubbornly does not recognize the term “paronym” but connects its meaning with homonymy and the phenomena associated with it. Coates of paronyms (“near-homonyms”) are words in which two or more phonetically close, as a rule, have different meanings (although there are cases when, paronyms are synonyms; it is one of the results of a possible paronym collision (“clash of near-homonyms”)(Coates, 1968: 468). In addition to paronymy, quasi-mononymy, according to Coates, can have at least two consequences: 1) loss of one of the words and 2) complete homonymy. In the latter case, the phonetic form of a word is mastered to give it a historically attached meaning to its quasi-synonym, i.e., paronymy.

Coates' final conclusion is difficult to agree with, arguing that homonymy and the events that accompany it undermine the very foundations of language communication: “The tidiness of the system is disturbed by both neutralization and near-homonyms” (Coates, 1968: 477). This idea could be correct if the language system was conceived as a self-sufficient, self-directed, indifferent system to the activities of the speaker. It is well known that the types of paronymy and similar vowels used for stylistic purposes become one of the sources in the enrichment of literary language, one of the means of verbal expression. The judicious use of paronyms, as a rule, testifies to a proficient knowledge of the language (culturally and orally) and to the author's ability to express ideas clearly and expressively; helps to “lighten it up a bit” (stylistically) with unexpected subtle spiritual differences and associations.

Concluding the analysis of the general meaning of the term “paronym” expressed in the work of our colleagues in this field before us, we highlight the following important aspects:

The following are paronyms:

1. words of the same lexical-grammatical class, usually of the same root, usually etymologically close;
2. various root words that are subject to paronymic shift in speech;
3. words in which any melody (in the widest range) has at least one integral character in its semantic structure;
4. intentionally / punctuation or accidental / paronymic error / phonetically close words in speech.

Our view of paronymy takes into account all the experience discussed above in the study of this problem, and includes the whole complex of phenomena connected with either the misinterpretation of words, or the approach of sound, which leads to a pun. The closeness of the forms leads to the semantic contamination of the melodic words. Correspondingly, we distinguish the following qualifying features of paronyms:

1. as a consequence of paronimization of the possibility of misinterpretation or reciprocity aimed at a specific goal in speech;
2. formal / phonetic-spelling / similarity of words;
3. the spiritual difference of the components of paronymic pairs;
4. frame, equation model: units inserted into it in a certain position approach the equation.

They often highlight another character - words that belong to the same word group. We also accept it, but as an optional. Among all the characteristics listed by most researchers, the first with all its validity is noted separately, because “in paronymy, the proximity of a sound should stimulate and simulate semantic uniformity in its real absence” (Evgrafova, 1975: 5).

Each word included in the paronymic visit has an area of usability that can be used in conjunction with an independent lexicon. Real joining together is a reliable criterion for distinguishing paronyms. This is easily seen in concrete examples:

Russian: diplomatic: man
answer
act

diplomatic: employee
body
protocol
English: amiable: person
nature
smile
disposition

Amicable: “something done with good will” (Room). e.g. “It is always pleasant when differences can be settled in an amicable way”.

IV. CONCLUSION

Hence, we distinguish two centers of attraction force: from the shape of the word and from the exact same position in the same model.

The clear pragmatic connection of Calambur (Eliseeva, 1990: 148) also determines its specific structural characteristics. It is known that the structure that achieves “maximum semantic filling of the minimum text level” has the greatest expressiveness (Eliseeva, 1990: 148). This means that for a pepper to be in this state, on the one hand, it must be extremely low-articulated and, on the other hand, extremely meaningful. The structural basis of the vocal clamor is represented by two constituents. The first component is called the core of the pun or the “stimulator” of the game construction, which always corresponds to the existing spelling, orthoepic and word usage norms of the language (Vinogradov, 1972: 201). The second element of the paronymic pair (“binaries”: Kolesnikov, 1973: 87) is an effective element. It is in speech itself that the humorous effect arises due to the presentation of this second element and its parallel interaction with the first, normative component (Vinogradov, 1972). It should be noted that the stimulator of the calamus does not have to be located in the immediate vicinity of the effective element. As noted earlier in the theoretical part of the study, paronymic word play can take place at both syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels. In other words, the vocal punch text can have an internal and intertextual nature (contact and distant puns, respectively, according to the term of V. V. Fedenev).

REFERENCES

1. Nikol'yukina, A.N. (2001). Paronymy, Literary encyclopedia of terms and concepts. Ed- Institute for Scientific Information on Social Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences: Intelvac, 2001. - Stb. 722 — 1596. - ISBN 5-93264-026-X
2. Vishnyakova, O.V. (1981). Paronyms of the modern Russian language, M., 1981;
3. Grigoriev V.P. (1977). *Paronymy, in the book: Language processes of modern Russian fiction*. Poetry, Moscow.
4. Rosenthal D.E., & Telenkova, M.A. (1976). Dictionary-reference book of linguistic terms. Ed. 2nd. - Moscow: Education 1976.
5. Paronyms and their use - Vocabulary. Phraseology. Lexicography grade 10.
6. Ivanova, D.A. (2013). Paronymy in a series of related phenomena in modern Russian. *Philology and culture*, (4), 52-56.
7. Arnold, I.V. (2017). *Lexicology of modern English: textbook*. Flint, 2017. Mode of access to the resource: <http://biblioclub.ru/index.php?page=book&id=103311>
8. Akhmanova, O.S. (2010). *Dictionary of linguistic terms*. 5th ed. Moscow: publishing house LLC “Pilgrim”, 487 p.
9. Ahror Marufov Dictionary of Paronyms. (Pronunciation words), UzSSR. Approved by the Ministry of Education. Teacher Publishing House Tashkent – 1974
10. Rustamiy, S., Lutfullaeva, D., & Gulomova, H. (2020). The Importance of Balagha Science in Aesthetic Education. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(6), 8882-8886.
11. Lutfullayeva, D. (2017). Associative dictionaries as a mirror of reflecting native speakers' word stock. *Modern Research and Development*, (2), 10-13.
12. Lutfullayeva, D.E. (2016). The Role of Associative Experimental Method in the Study of Human Linguistic Memory. In *Modern problems of Turkology: language-literature-culture*, 452-457.
13. Haydarovna, D.R. (2020). Pragmatic analysis of the linguistic concept of person-referencing deixis and pronouns referring to it in the Uzbek language. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(5), 350-354.
14. Haydarovna, D.R. (2020). Social condition deixis and its expression in Uzbek language. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(4), 259-265.

15. Rustamiy, S. (2020). Mahmud Koshgariy's views on Fonetice, Graphic and Morphological Characteristics of Turkic Languages. *The Light of Islam*, 2020(2), 37-44.
16. Rustamiy, S. (2019). On significance of science of Balāğat in achieving linguistic aesthetic perfection. *The Light of Islam*, 2019(4), 14.
17. Davlatova, R.H. (2020). Using Uzbek National Games in Pre-school Educational Institutions. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (4), 112-114.
18. Lutfullaeva, D. (2020). *Associative Meaning and Verbal Associations Language Properties*. In Conference.
19. Odilov, B.A., & Karimov, N.R. (2020). Analysis of Targeted Research in 20-30 Years of the XX Century. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(6), 8887-8893.
20. Sayfullaev, N. Current Issues on Fine ARTS Education: Continuity and Prospects for Development. *Religion*, 4, 192-194.