



IRAQI
Academic Scientific Journals



العراقية
المجلات الأكاديمية العلمية



ISSN: 2663-9033 (Online) | ISSN: 2616-6224 (Print)

Journal of Language Studies

Contents available at: <https://jls.tu.edu.iq/index.php/JLS>

Polysemy in English and Kurdish Languages: Some Selected Words

Dlshad Ghali Salih *

Kurdish Department, College of Education, University of Garmian

dlshad.ghali@gmail.edu.krd

&

Hemn Adil Karim

English Department, College of Education, University of Garmian

hemn.adil@garmian.edu.krd

Received: 18\9\2024, Accepted: 10\11\2024, Online Published: 30 / 11 /2024

ABSTRACT

Polysemy is a universal phenomenon which shows economical, creative, flexible of human language and reflects the approach people use for cognition. This research compares English to Kurdish language of selecting human body parts, namely mouth, heart and eye for the process and the ways of human body words. From the perspective of lexical semantics and prototype theory, the study of the semantic extension of polysemy in both languages explores the process of meaning extension and the reasons for meaning extension. The method of the present research is a descriptive and comparative in nature. The objective of the study is comparing two distinct cultures using polysemy and depending on the lexemes of English and Kurdish languages. The data of this research are collected from dictionaries of the English and Kurdish languages. The significance of this research is the investigation of relation between English and Kurdish languages in terms of polysemy. On the other hand, linguistic researches across cultures are not easy tasks when they concern polysemy, because it needs to study enough about both languages. The essential point is that to note any differences in the domain and to show

* **Corresponding Author:** Dlshad Ghali, **Email:** dlshad.ghali@gmail.edu.krd

Affiliation: Garmian University - Iraq

© This is an open access article under the CC by licenses <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



certain similarities underlying the phenomena as a frame against which to compare them. Comprehending the research procedures is vital, especially to start with a brief presentation of theoretical models and measurement implications of polysemy in English and Kurdish language. From polysemous point of view, the study depends on Henbaneborine Dictionary and Cambridge Dictionary.

Keywords: Meaning Extension, Prototype Theory, English Language, Kurdish Language, Body Organs

التعدد في المعاني في اللغتين الإنجليزية والكردية: بعض الكلمات المختارة

دلشاد غالي صالح

قسم اللغة الكردية، كلية التربية، جامعة كرميان، إقليم كردستان

و

هيمن عادل كريم

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية، جامعة كرميان، إقليم كردستان

المستخلص

تعد تعدد المعاني ظاهرة عالمية تظهر اقتصاد اللغة البشرية وإبداعها ومرونتها وتعكس النهج الذي يستخدمه الناس للإدراك. يقارن هذا البحث بين اللغة الإنجليزية واللغة الكردية في اختيار أجزاء الجسم البشري، وهي الفم والقلب والعين لعملية وطرق كلمات الجسم البشري. من منظور الدلالات المعجمية ونظرية النموذج الأولي، فإن دراسة الامتداد الدلالي لتعدد المعاني في كلتا اللغتين تستكشف عملية توسيع المعنى وأسباب توسيع المعنى. طريقة البحث الحالي وصفية ومقارنة بطبيعتها. الهدف من الدراسة هو مقارنة ثقافتين متميزتين تستخدمان تعدد المعاني وتعتمد على معجم اللغتين الإنجليزية والكردية. تم جمع بيانات هذا البحث من قواميس اللغتين الإنجليزية والكردية. تكمن أهمية هذا البحث في التحقيق في العلاقة بين اللغتين الإنجليزية والكردية من حيث تعدد المعاني. من ناحية أخرى، فإن الأبحاث اللغوية عبر الثقافات ليست بالمهمة السهلة عندما يتعلق الأمر بتعدد المعاني، لأنها تحتاج إلى دراسة كافية عن كلتا اللغتين. النقطة الأساسية هنا هي ملاحظة أي اختلافات في المجال وإظهار أوجه تشابه معينة تكمن وراء الظواهر كإطار يمكن مقارنتها به. إن فهم إجراءات البحث أمر حيوي، وخاصة البدء بعرض موجز للنماذج النظرية وتداعيات القياس على تعدد المعاني في اللغتين

الإنجليزية والكردية. ومن وجهة نظر تعدد المعاني، تعتمد الدراسة على قاموس (همنبانه بؤرينه) و قاموس (كامبريدج).

الكلمات الدالة: أعضاء الجسم، اللغة الإنجليزية، اللغة الكردية، امتداد المعنى، نظرية النموذج الأولي

1. INTRODUCTION

Polysemy is one of the main prominent kinds of lexical relations, which reflects the economical principle of language. In simpler words, polysemy makes easier to remember words through reducing the quantity of words, that is a word with more than one meaning. The research focuses on polysemy as lexical ambiguity and selects some body parts of human being. This paper depends on classical theory of categorization, which goes back to the Greek antiquity, particularly it begins with Aristotle. Besides, the study also relies on prototype theory where some members of a category are more central than others. For this reason, the research selects body parts as basic lexemes of new words in which the theory refers to a mode of graded categorization in cognitive science. It is important to mention that, people conceptualize the world based on their experience; 'human body' plays an essential role in the process of people's categorization of the world. People's particular opinion or idea about someone or something are necessary for extending an expression; the meanings of human organs extend as a phenomenon of polysemy. Therefore, analyzing human cognition system is important to be explored and the reasons for the occurrence of polysemy. In order to analyze the data of polysemy, the study depends on dictionaries and previous researches in both languages and find out how close or far the languages are from each other in terms of polysemy. The study aims to analyze polysemy from different perspectives, focusing on the comparison usage of polysemy between English and Kurdish languages. Further, this paper collects data of using body parts as polysemy from both languages and discuss the findings. Comparative studies in semantics, especially in polysemy are interesting for readers across cultures. The significance of this research is the investigation of relation between English and Kurdish languages in terms of polysemy. On the other hand, linguistic researches across cultures are not easy tasks when they concern polysemy, because it needs to study enough about both languages. However, the difficulties are attributable to the fact that nonmaterial traits must often be assessed through the medium of language.

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS, HYPOTHESES AND PREDICTIONS

The study shows a detailed examination on polysemous nature of some selected words in both English and Kurdish languages. Polysemy is a global phenomenon and it is clearly visible in most languages of the world. Kurdish is a language with lexical extension, particularly polysemy. Further, English language is also widely rich in manipulating polysemy by the first language users. For this purpose, the following research questions are formulated:

i. How does cultural background of Kurdish language differ from English language in terms of polysemy?

ii. How do the human body words of Kurdish language have the same senses as English language?

From these questions, the coming hypotheses were composed:

Hypothesis 1: Assuming human body words have the same senses in English and Kurdish. This will be showed in both Kurdish language and English language.

Hypothesis 2: Assuming human body words does not have the same senses in English and Kurdish. This will be true for Kurdish language and English language.

Predictions:

1. The study predicts that, Kurdish language and English language will have the same senses to utilize polysemy.
2. There will be differences between English and in terms of performing polysemy in spontaneous language production.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 What is semantics?

Semantics is a branch of linguistics and it associates with meaning communication through language. It is an investigation of meanings across almost all the components of language and it is an essential part of linguistics. The word “Semantics” comes from Greek which means “symbol” and is the study of word relations or other symbols and objects or concepts to which they refer (Pardede, 2016). The term is used for the first time by Michel Breal, who is a French linguist in 1890 (Crystal, 2010). Semantics concerns with the mental representation of humans to explain how segments of speech and sentences are understood by the speakers of a certain language. Further, meaning plays a crucial role in human communication speeches and interaction without meaning is useless.

To understand a sentence, we must know much more than the analysis of this sentence on each linguistic level. We must also know the reference and meaning of the morphemes and words of which it is composed, naturally, grammar cannot be expected to be of much help here. These notions form the subject matter for semantics. (Chomsky, 2002, p. 9)

Semantics as a component of linguistics studies from the smallest meaningful item to context as the largest unit of linguistics and it also analyzes alongside phonetics, phonology, morphology and syntax in Leonard Bloomfield's 1933 *Language*, but the abstract and indeterminate nature of “meaning” meant that it remained a neglected branch of linguistics for many decades (Crystal, 2010). Moreover, Phonetic forms of a language create morphemes and the entire collection of morphemes in a specific language in its lexicon. In addition, the arrangement of morphemes constructs different meanings in every language. For example, *Azad hit Ali* and *Ali hit Azad* contradict in their meanings, because of the different ordering in which the morphemes are uttered.

3.2 Cognitive Semantics

Cognitive linguistics has its roots in the linguistic discussions as well as the recent cognitive sciences which appeared in 1960's and 1970's, particularly, in investigating categorization and conceptualization in human's mind and Gestalt psychology (Evans & Green, 2006, p. 6, cited by Hazrati, Yousefirad, Rovshan & Ahmadkhan, 2016). They added that based on this approach, language knowledge is not separate from thinking and cognition. Cognitive semantics is one of the most crucial topics in cognitive linguistics and studying it is considered as one of the most basic discussions in this domain. The terminology of cognitive semantics was proposed for the first time by Lakoff (1980).

In cognitive semantics there are some concepts that most prominent one is polysemy. It has been defined as the phenomenon of a single word having two or more meanings, no matter how meaning is defined in a given approach; those two or more meanings should be related to each other (Pethö, 2001). According to Lopukhina, [Laurinavichyute](#), [Lopukhin](#) and [Dragoy](#) (2018) polysemy is one of the fundamental properties of the lexical system of a language. The most common words of a language are polysemy. That is, they have a number of related senses. Psycholinguistic research of polysemy addresses two major questions: how senses of a word are stored in the mental lexicon and how they are processed during language comprehension.

In addition, Falkum (2011) added that a single word form can be associated with several different meanings is a well-known fact about language. Take the word *run*. Its meaning in the verb phrase *run a half marathon* is clearly different from the one it has in *run some water*, or, for that matter, *in run on gasoline*, *run on empty*, *run a shop*, *run late*, *run away from responsibilities*, *run in the family*, *run for President*, and so on. This phenomenon is described as polysemy.

Moreover, Goddard (2000) states that polysemy is a situation where a single word has several meanings. In other words, polysemy is a phenomenon in which a single language unit possesses several separate meanings that are related to each other (cited by Hazrati et al., 2016). As mentioned by Cuyckens and Zawada (1997) polysemy is characterized as the phenomenon whereby a single word form is associated with two or several related senses. It is distinguished from *monosemy*, where a word form is associated with a single meaning, and *homonymy*, where a single word form is associated with two or several unrelated meanings. Lopukhina et al., (2018) polysemy may also be motivated by metaphor. Metaphor is the mechanism for seeing one thing in terms of another. A new sense is derived from the literal sense of a word through metaphorical mapping: the word's existing sense is transferred from its own source domain to another target domain, based on structural similarities between the domains (e.g., if one calls an aggressive opponent a *crocodile*, s/he metaphorically maps the animal domain onto the human domain).

Further, according to Pethö (2001) there are two kinds of polysemy: regular (or systematic) polysemy and irregular (or non-systematic) polysemy. Systematic polysemy is that kind of polysemy where the relation between the interpretations a and of a word A is the same as between the interpretations b and of a word B, and there are parallel sets of meanings for several further words as well. So, for example, *bottle* can refer both to a container (of liquids) - as in *This bottle is full of water* - and to a quantity (of liquids) - as in *I would like to buy half a bottle of wine*. Accordingly, *bucket* can have the same two interpretations, as can have *glass*, *flask*, *box*, *crate*, etc. Therefore, *bottle* is to be

considered to be systematically polysemous with respect to these two readings, as are the other words mentioned. Systematic polysemy is also systematic cross linguistically, i.e. it usually occurs with the same words in several languages. On the other hand, *glass* can both refer to a certain material, or to a certain kind of container and to a certain optical aid which are often made of this material. But although these three meanings of the word are therefore related to each other, the relations among them are not systematic, since you can't give rules that would account for these three meanings of *glass*, but you rather have to include them in the lexicon. So, for example, it is impossible to say why it is glasses as containers and glasses as optical aids that are called glass and not, say, bottles or windows, even though they are often made of glass as well. Furthermore, non-systematic polysemy is specific to individual languages. It is quite accidental which of the objects that are usually made of glass are referred to by the same word as the material, if any at all, in a given language. As cited by Vicente and Falkum (2017), Apresjan (1974, p. 16) defined the polysemy of a word *a* with the senses A_i and A_j as *regular* if there exists at least one word *b* with the polysemous senses B_i and B_j , being semantically distinguished in exactly the same way as A_i and A_j , and *irregular* if the semantic distinction between A_i and A_j is not exhibited by any other word in the language, exemplified by patterns such as: author for works of author (*Beethoven*); container for content (*bottle*), animal for meat of animal/fur of animal (*rabbit*), tree for wood (*oak*), liquid for portion of liquid (*beer*).

Besides, in cognitive linguistics, the area of cognitive semantics is one of the most basic parts to investigate, particularly polysemy. According to Lakoff, G., (1980a) cognition is the source of thinking and language knowledge is one of the main parts of cognitive linguistics. Cognitive semantics experts believe that polysemy is completely systematic and this is the human cognition that monitors the type and extent of polysemy. Polysemy is the lexical relation in semantics that refers to the phenomenon that one and the same word acquires different, though obviously related, meanings, often with respect to particular contexts. As Rushdi (2024, p. 140) found that the scope of use encompasses the immediate linguistic surroundings, where linguistic environment can play its role in polysemous sense. In theoretical linguistics, polysemy is considered as the phenomenon whereby a word is associated with two or several related senses that arise through processes of semantic change and extension of literal meaning. According to Falkum and Vicente (2015) polysemy is used widely in natural languages and affects both content and function words.

The two main lexical devices that consist in the process of polysemy are metonymy and metaphor. Metaphor is not only a device that is used to deliver a message by directly pointing to something else, but it is an essential way of thinking and understanding the world. Besides metaphor, metonymy is another aspect of deriving meaning. In cognitive literature metonymy is defined as a process in which the vehicle leads mental access to the target within the same domain. Metonymy is away that people use to understand the world.

Metonymy is a cognitive phenomenon and it is an object or idea which is called by the name of something closely related with it. In simpler terms, it is a word used in place of another which is closely associated to daily experience. Metonymy has a great role in semantics and it is described as “a conceptual and syntactic abbreviation device”; “a strategy to extract more information from fewer words” (Nerlich, 2006, p. 111), or “to

avoid unnecessary wordiness” (Deignan, 2005, p. 54). For example, *he drunk the whole bottle* means he dunk the whole water inside the bottle.

Metaphor is one of the crucial issues in cognitive linguistics and it is the roots of human conceptual system. Further, Metaphor relates to lexical relations and creates new meanings semantically. This phenomenon leads semantic expansion in the area of related words. According to Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) metaphor is the relation between two semantic areas in which one semantic area depends on the other and the abstract object based on a more tangible object. For example, the sentence *Azad is a cold person* means Azad is unemotional. The sentence has two meanings one of them is literal meaning “Azad is cold bodily”, but it is not true literally, because Azad is not actually cold, the sense he is cold is not literal, but metaphorical.

Polysemy shares the same orthography and phonology, also shares some semantic connection that are semantically related. In other words, when a word has the only one form, but related meanings is considered a lexical ambiguity type where the same word shares the same phonology and orthography including some semantic relation, in other words, whose different senses are semantically related. The word *mouth*, for instance is considered a polysemous word as it comprises some different meanings as:

I open my *mouth* (*cavity*)

She has a nice *mouth* (*lips*)

Interesting words come out of his *mouth* (*speech organ*).

As illustrated above, the possible senses of the word *mouth*, are somehow related and all of them have the same source which is a part of body. For this reason, a lexicographer who compiles words related to the same origin puts them in the same lexical entry.

Further, there are two main ways to differentiate polysemy from other lexical relations in semantics:

- 1- Etymology is concerned, because this way shows the origin of words as many words have unknown background.
- 2- Ambiguous word senses are easily defined as related or unrelated.

Moreover, there is an evident relation between words’ senses of polysemy and this relatedness or un-relatedness does not look to be appropriate terms for lexical ambiguity distinction. Nonetheless, in natural languages lexical ambiguity is common and a single word can be interpreted in different ways, simply because of having more than one meaning. In semantics, lexical meaning is different from other meanings. Words in lexical meaning relate to certain word groups in specific fields, but meaning of words create to expand their lexical meanings and these types of words become polysemic. In other words, polysemy means expressing by current words in language, not creating a new name for each new notion and meaning. Consequently, due to polysemy, lexical meaning become wider and can contribute to comprehension and retrieval processes accordingly (Israa & Istabraq, 2017, p. 120).

3.3 Prototype theory view on polysemy

The classical approach of categorization can be taken back to Greek antiquity. However Aristotelian Theory sheds light on the classification of different chaotic objects around the world that cannot be used in explaining some words, mostly polysemous lexemes. In *Philosophical Investigations* book Ludwig Wittgenstein claims that family resemblance should be taken into consideration, while dealing with a lexeme. As he pointed to “game” will have different meanings in different cases and all the sub-senses of subordinate are linked to the help of family resemblance (Li & Yujuan, 2018, p. 386). Moreover, the psychologist Eleanor Rosch arose prototype theory which is one of the most significant theories in cognitive linguistics. The main points of prototype theory can be mentioned briefly, as follow;

- 1- Each member of a category can be either typical or non-typical. The typical ones represent all the characteristics of the category, while the non-typical ones include only some characteristics.
- 2- All the concepts may not have a clear-cut boundary which means they may overlap with one another.
- 3- Family resemblance will characterize the members of a category which means that, all the members share one or more aspect among themselves.

In addition, polysemy is mostly related to having different meanings of a single lexeme. It is different from other types of lexical ambiguity. Polysemy is a motivation relationship between senses. Cognitive linguists studied polysemy as one form of categorization (Lewandoska-Tomaszczyk, 2007, p. 140). Polysemy is the speaker’s ability to realize entities as members of special categories, that each one of them has its own characteristics. Depending on her psychological experiments, Rosch (1977) concluded that, people categorize entities according to their similarity of the most suited example of the given category that is shown as the best remarkable characteristics of the category, while other members of the category have different degrees of their similarity with the prototype. For instance, if the categories of “birds” is taken as an example, a “sparrow” can be marked as the prototypical bird. A pigeon and canary have more similarities with the prototype, because of the visual representation of the category that they must be considered as closer to the center, while some other types of birds, like penguin or a platypus have less similarities with the prototype, that is why they marked as peripheral members of the category. Further, the internal structure of the category depends on its core, which means the prototype and extends will mark by knowing which members are more typical ones and which are peripheral less typical members.

The key aspects of the prototype-based view of categories can be summarized in four prototypical effects or features formulated by Geeraets (1989):

- 1- Prototypical categories exhibit degrees of typicality.
- 2- Prototypical categories are blurred of the edges.
- 3- Prototypical categories cannot be defined by a single set of (necessary and sufficient) features.
- 4- Prototypical categories exhibit of family resemblance structure. (Halas, 2016, p. 127)

It is fact that, polysemy is considered as a form of categorization within cognitive linguistic framework and the prototypical features can be applied to a polysemous structure as well. The first feature relates to the differences among senses in their structural weight. In addition, the second feature of a prototypical sense is lying on the care of the structure, while other senses can be more or less central to the number of characteristics. The third feature includes resilience of prototypical categories, which means new members can be included without reestablishing of category (Taylor, 1989, p. 53). Lastly, in the feature of polysemous structure, this can point to new derived senses, because a polysemous structure can expand through meaning extension. Additionally, polysemous structure is known as a cluster of partial descriptions, which indicates that none of the members of a category exists all of the typical characteristics. According to Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (2007) there is not a characteristic can be defined and all the senses of a particular polysemous structure are derived from the same prototype in which they share some common points.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE POLYSEMIOUS WORDS “ The parts of human body”

Depending on the Henbaneborine Dictionary and Cambridge Dictionary the main meanings of the polysemy “the human body parts” are analyzed in this research. All the meanings of these words are derived from the basic ones which are the human body parts. From cognitive point of view, the study focuses on polysemy in terms of metaphor and metonymy as central parts of cognitive linguistics.

Table 1. Meanings of “دهم : mouth” given by Henbaneborine Dictionary

1	The part of human body and it is in the middle of face	دهم (ئەندامی جەستە)
2	Time	دهم (كات)
3	Entrance of cave	دهمی ئەشكەوت
4	Head of bottle and teapot	دهمی دەبە و قۆری

Table 1 examples show the word “dem: mouth” as a part of human body and it is the basic meaning in Kurdish language. It can also illustrate the process of meaning altering from prototypical to the peripheral ones. Basically, the other meanings are extension of the word “mouth”. With the help of metaphor, the meaning of “mouth” is “time” in Kurdish language. Metonymically the examples three and four, are derivations of the prototypical meanings. It is clear that, examples of two, three and four are derived from the example one. From prototypical point of view, the word mouth is also expanded as “Entrance of cave” and “Head of bottle and teapot” in Kurdish language.

Table 2. Meanings of “دل : heart” given by Henbaneborine Dictionary

1	Human body part	دل (ئەندامی جەستە)
2	Capital city	دلی ولات

3	Love	دل (خوشهویست)
4	The main source of a job	دلی کارمه
5	Dependable	دل (پهيوهستبون)

When one talks about concrete meaning, semantics is the relation between words and objects to which they refer. Heart is an important organ in human body and it has different meanings based on the concrete one. Examples from Table 2 show the meanings of “heart”, where the first one is the prototype, while others peripheral. The meaning of “Heart” in example one is expanded for different purposes depending on the basic one. Examples two and three have metaphorical meaning cognitively; they show the importance of a place in a country and great emotion in human’s feeling respectively. Furthermore, the fourth and fifth demonstrate metonymical extension. Example four (The main source of a job) can be derived from the metonymical use of prototype and it is considered as the core of a job in value. Lastly, example five refers to a part of body and it is demonstrated to depend on something strongly.

Table 3. Meanings of “چاو: eye” given by Henbaneborine Dictionary

1	Body part of human and other creatures	چاو (نهدامی جهسته)
2	A represented of a company, organization or country	چاوی کۆمپانیا، ریکخراویک یان دهولمهتیک
3	An old money of Mongol empire	(چاو) پارهیەکی کۆنی ئیمپراتۆریهتی مهنگولیا
4	News of dead from somewhere far	(چاو) ههوالی مردن له شویننیکێ دورهوه
5	A part of oven or furnace	(چاو) بهشیکێ فرن یان تهنوور

Semantics and meaning in general associate words and objects in which humans are in contact with them. For this reason, the word “eye” is one of the main essential parts of human body that Kurdish people use them for metaphorical and metonymical extensions. Example one has concrete meaning and it is one of the two eyes in the face of humans and animals, while example two (A representor of a company, organization or country) in table 3 is the metaphorical extension of example one. The meaning of example two has metaphorical purpose, which is taken from prototypical meaning of the word “eye”. With the help of metonymy, examples of three, four and five demonstrate meaning extension and they are taken from the basic sense of the word “eye”. That is, the third example shows the derived meaning of metonymy, where human mind can access the meaning of “an old money of Mongol empire” from the basic one. Finally, the fourth and fifth examples reveal metonymical use of prototype “eye”. The former indicates to an organ of human body and it can be related to sad news from somewhere far. Lastly, the fifth example of table 3 (A part of oven or furnace) can be referred to the metonymical where is widely used in Kurdish culture as part of objects such as oven and furnace.

Table 4. Meanings of “Mouth” given by Cambridge Academic Dictionary

1	the opening in the face used by a person or animal to eat and drink	دهم (نەندامی جەستە)
2	the opening of a hole or cave	دهمی چالیک یان ئەشکەوتیک
3	the opening of a bottle or jar is also called a mouth	دهمی دەبە یان گۆزەیهک
4	the mouth of a river is the place where it flows into the sea	دهمی رۆباریک

Depending on Cambridge Dictionary examples from table 4 show the meaning of the word of “mouth” as a part of human body and other meanings depend on the concrete one. The first example depicts the word “mouth” as the basic meaning, which is the opening in the face used by a person or animal to eat and drink. The examples two, three and four in Table 4 are derived from the example one. The meanings of example two (the opening of a hole or cave) and example three (the opening of a bottle or jar is also called a mouth) have the metonymical sense of prototypical meaning. Finally, the meaning of example four (the mouth of a river is the place where it flows into the sea) can be regarded as a metonymical extension of the word.

Table 5. Meanings of “Heart” given by Cambridge Academic Dictionary

1	the organ in your chest that sends the blood around your body	دەل (نەندامی جەستە)
2	used to refer to a person's character, or the place within a person where feelings or emotions are considered to come from	دەل (کاراکتەری کەسێک، شوێنی کەسێک)
3	courage, determination, or hope	دەل (نازایەتی، هەوڵدانی سەخت، یان هیوا)
4	the central or most important part	دەل (کرۆک یان گەرنگترین بەش)

In accordance with Cambridge Dictionary the main meaning of the polysemy lexeme “heart” in example one is a human body that sends blood around the body. All the other meanings are derived from the word “heart” in Table 5 with the help of metaphor and metonymy. To illustrate, examples two and three demonstrate the meaning extension of the word “heart” metaphorically. From cognitive point of view, the word “heart” in example two and three have metaphorical senses; they refer to person’s feeling or emotion and the ability of doing difficult things respectively. Example four of the table is the metonymical extension of the word “heart” as it shows the importance of this part of body and generalizes to important part of specific places or things.

Table 6. Meanings of “Eye” given by Cambridge Dictionary

1	one of the pair of organs of seeing in the faces of humans and animals	چاو (نەندامی جەستە)
---	--	---------------------

2	a dark spot on a potato or similar plant part, from which a new stem and leaves will grow	چاوی پەتاتە یان ھەر رومکیکی تر، کاتیک چرۆ دەکات
3	The eye of a needle is the hole through which you put the thread	چاوی دەرزیی، که له ریگەپهوه دەزوو دەخرێتە کونی دەرزیپهکهوه

The meaning of word “eye” in Table 6 refers to one of the pair of organs of seeing in faces of humans and animals, where example one is the basic meaning. Further, example two and three depend on the basic level meaning. From a cognitive point of view, the process of meaning extension starts from the prototypical one to the peripheral ones. That is, the second example (a dark spot on a potato or similar plant part, from which a new stem and leaves will grow) can be regarded as a metaphorical use of the word “eye” and it refers to a part of body. The third example (The eye of a needle is the hole through which you put the thread) can also be seen metaphorically, because it is derived from the prototypical one and it extends from a part of human organ to a part of an object.

5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The prototype-based model presents a deeper understanding into the internal arrangement of a polysemous structure that focuses on its center. An important point needs to take into consideration is that the prototype-based model summarizes that there are some disagreements among senses in their structure weight. The differences in structural weight and centrality among senses mention that a polysemous structure is hierarchically arranged.

Depending on Henbaneborine Dictionary for the Kurdish examples and the meaning of the polysemy “dem: mouth” is “the part of body on lower face”. The study also chooses the word “dil: heart” and “çaw: eye” as body organs. These meanings are the most typical ones and all the meanings of the body parts of mouth, heart and eye are derived from them, where people are inclined to categorize new concepts in terms of familiar and old concepts. Based on collected data from Cambridge Dictionary for the body parts of mouth, heart and eye in English speakers’ repertoire. The data analysis shows the body organs of mouth, heart and eye have multiple meanings in Kurdish and English languages, which are related in systematic ways and the information about the aforementioned parts, are a way of meaning extension. For this reason, the research depends on two cognitive mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy to motivate the meaning extension and this is because the two languages have similarities and differences regarding the body part terms of mouth, heart and eye.

In addition, the different meanings of the body organs in English and Kurdish languages show that there is more convergence in meaning than divergence when it comes to the lexemes. Moreover, the body organs of mouth, heart and eye are used as polysemy in the two languages, but they are not used equally in terms of metaphor and metonymy. The body organs are used to express more metaphorical purposes rather than metonymical purposes. The Kurdish and English cultures are different; however, they are in the same family language, which is Indio-European family languages. It can be seen that English and Kurdish own different cultures, but

still, they use the same body organs to express the same metaphorical purpose. The cultural relatedness between Kurdish and English societies is vague and there is no concrete document to support closeness of culture between them. However, the only evidence between the two languages is that they are in the same family languages and this could be the only reason for this relation between the two languages.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Depending on the characteristics of classical theory and prototype theory in cognitive linguistics, the study analyzes the polysemy “mouth, eye and heart as human body organs”.

1. All the peripheral meanings of these body parts are derived from basic ones and their formation process are explained to the cause of polysemy.
2. Based on the prototypical meaning, each of these human body parts are relevant in one aspect or another to their sense extension and the extended meanings are depended on the basic words.
3. Based on sharing features with the prototypical member, the members of the semantic category of each of the body organs of mouth, eye and heart are either typical or non-typical. That is, people in general want to materialize concepts and this is the characteristics of typical category.
4. People in the world mostly conceptualize the world based on their bodily experience and these kind of meaning expansions are typical of the human body parts “mouth, eye and heart”.
5. Concrete objects like human body organs are easy to understand and most people tend to conceptualize new or less familiar concepts and ideas in terms of familiar and concrete concepts, particularly human body organs.
6. The cognitive devices, metaphor and metonymy, play a pivotal role in developing human’s cognitive process in terms of meaning extension such as the semantic extension of the words of mouth, eye and heart as three important organs of human body. In simpler terms, emergence of polysemy and meaning change are the main reasons to develop human cognition.

References

- 1- Bréal, M. (1900). *Semantics: Studies in the science of meaning*. W. Heinemann.
- 2- Chomsky, N. (2002). Syntactic Structures. Mouton de Gruyter. *Mouton de Gruyter*.
- 3- Crystal, D. (2010, July). Semantic targeting: past, present, and future. In *Aslib proceedings* (Vol. 62, No. 4/5, pp. 355-365). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- 4- Cuyckens, H. & Zawada, B. (Eds.). (1997). *Polysemy in cognitive linguistics: Selected papers from the Fifth International Cognitive Linguistics Conference*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 5- Dabrowska, E., & Divjak, D. (Eds.). (2015). *Handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

- 6- Dictionary, C. (2024). "Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary." <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/nice>.
- 7- Eco, U. (1986). *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* (Vol. 398). Indiana University Press.
- 8- Falkum, I. L., & Vicente, A. (2015). Polysemy: Current perspectives and approaches.
- 9- Falkum, I. L. (2011). *The semantics and pragmatics of polysemy: A relevance-theoretic account* (Doctoral dissertation, UCL (University College London)).
- 10- Geeraerts, D. & H. Cuyckens (Eds.) (2007), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*: 139-169. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 11- Halas, A. (2016). The application of the prototype theory in lexicographic practice: a proposal of a model for lexicographic treatment of polysemy. *Lexikos*, 26, 124-144.
- 12- Hazrati, Y., Yousefirad, F., Rovshan, B., & Ahmadkhani, M. R. (2016). The Study of Polysemy in the Framework of Cognitive Semantics in Azerbaijani Turkish. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(5), 130-138.
- 13- Israa, B. A., & Istabraq, T. J. (2017). The Ability of EFL Students to Differentiate between Homonymy and Polysemy. *Journal of Language Studies*, 1(1), 92-126.
- 14- Klepousniotou, E. (2002). The processing of lexical ambiguity: Homonymy and polysemy in the mental lexicon. *Brain and language*, 81(1-3), 205-223.
- 15- Johnson, M., & Lakoff, G. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago press.
- 16- Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2007). Polysemy, Prototypes, and Radial Categories.
- 17- Li, Y., & Feng, Y. (2018, July). An Analysis of the Polysemy "HEAD" Based on Prototype Theory. In *4th International Conference on Arts, Design and Contemporary Education (ICADCE 2018)* (pp. 386-389). Atlantis Press.
- 18- Lopukhina, A., Laurinavichyute, A., Lopukhin, K., & Dragoy, O. (2018). The mental representation of polysemy across word classes. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 192.
- 19- Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics* (Vol. 510). Cambridge university press.
- 20- Murphy, M. L., & Koskela, A. (2010). *Key terms in semantics*. A&C Black.
- 21- Nerlich, B. (2010). Metaphor and metonymy. *Historical pragmatics*, 193-215.
- 22- Pardede, H. (2016). Semantics: a view to logic of language. *Pematang Siantar: FKIP Nommensen*.
- 23- Pethő, G. (2001). WHAT IS POLYSEMY?-A SURVEY OF CURRENT RESEARCH AND RESULTS¹. *Pragmatics and the flexibility of word meaning*, 8, 175.

- 24- Rushdi, A. E. (2024). 4th Year EFL Iraqi Learners' Pragmatic Failure in Polysemy. *Journal of Language Studies*, 8(10), 136-149.
- 25- Sharafkandi, A. (1990). Henbaneborine, Ferheng. "Ferhengi Henbaneborine".
- 26- Stanojević, M. (2009). Cognitive synonymy: A general overview. *FACTA UNIVERSITATIS-Linguistics and Literature*, 7(2), 193-200.
- 27- Taylor, J. R. (1989). *Linguistic Categorization. Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 28- Vicente, A., & Ingrid L. F. (2017). "Polysemy." *Oxford research encyclopedia of linguistics*.