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**Introduction**

**1.1 The tasks and purposes of the work**

The theme of my qualification work sounds as following: “Homonyms in English and their Specific Features”. This qualification work can be characterized by the following:

The actuality of this work caused by several important points. We seem to say that the appearance of new, homonymic meanings is one of the main trends in development of Modern English, especially in its colloquial layer, which, in its turn at high degree is supported by development of modern informational technologies and simplification of alive speech. So the significance of our work can be proved by the following reasons:

a) Studying of homonyms of words is one of the developing branches of lexicology nowadays.

b) Homonyms reflect the general trend of simplification of a language.

c) Homonymic meanings of words are closely connected with the development of modern informational technologies.

d) Being a developing branch of linguistics it requires a special attention of teachers to be adequated to their specialization in English.

e) The investigation of homonyms and their differentiation with polysemantic words is not being still investigated in the sufficient degree and this problem is still waiting for its investigator. Our qualification work is one another attempt to investigate this problem.

Having based upon the actuality of the theme we are able to formulate the general goals of our qualification work.

a) To study, analyze, and sum up all the possible changes happened in the studied branch of linguistics for the past fifty years.

b) To teach the problem of homonyms to young English learners.

c) To demonstrate the significance of the problem for those who want to brush up their English.

d) To mention all the major linguists’ opinions concerning the subject studied.

If we say about the new information used within our work we may note that the work studies the problem from the modern positions and analyzes the modern trends appeared in this subject for the last ten years. In particular, the new meanings of the old habitual words were mentioned in our qualification work.

The practical significance of the work can be concluded in the following items:

a) The work could serve as a good source of learning English by young teachers at schools and colleges.

b) The lexicologists could find a lot of interesting information for themselves.

c) Those who would like to communicate with the English-speaking people through the Internet will find new causing homonymic terms in our qualification work.

Having said about the linguists studied the material before we can mention that our qualification work was based upon the investigations made by a number of well known English, Russian and Uzbek lexicologists as A.I.Smirnitsky, B.A. Ilyish, N.Buranov, V.V. Vinogradov, O.Jespersen and some others.

If we say about the methods of scientific approaches used in our work we can mention that the method of typological analyses was used.

The newality of the work is concluded in including the new homonymic meanings of words appeared during for the last ten years by means of development and applying of the internet technologies.

The general structure of our qualification work looks as follows:

The work is composed onto three major parts: introduction, main part and conclusion. Each part has its subdivision onto the specific thematically items. There are two points in the introductory part: the first item tells about the general content of the work while the other gives us the general explanation of the lexicological phenomenon of homonymy in a language. The main part bears two chapters itself which, in their turn, are subdivided onto several specific items. The first chapter it explains the common analysis of homonyms in Modern English. Here we analyzed phonetic coincidence and semantic differentiation of homonyms in Modern English (the first item), accepted classification of the homonymic units of a language (the second item), diachronic and synchronic research to the problem studied (third and fourth items subsequently). The second chapter shows the interrelations between homonyms and polysemantic words. In the first item we made the etymological and semantic criteria of distinguishing of homonyms and polysemantic words in the English language. The second item of the work shows the typological analysis of the two linguistic phenomena in the three languages compared: English, Russian and Uzbek. The third and the fourth items summarize the ideas concerning the modern methods and practical approaches in investigating the linguistic phenomenon of homonyms and polysemantic words.

The conclusion of the qualification work sums up the ideas discussed in the main part (the first item) and shows the ways of implying of the qualification work (in the second item).

**2.1. The main items of the work.**

Words identical in sound-form but different in meaning are traditionally termed homonymous.

Modern English is exceptionally rich in homonymous words and word-forms. It is held that languages where short words abound have more homonyms than those where longer words are prevalent. Therefore it is sometimes suggested that abundance of homonyms in Modern English is to be accounted for by the monosyllabic structure of the commonly used English words.1

Not only words but other linguistic units may be homonymous. Here, however, we are concerned with the homonymy of words and word-forms only, so we shall not touch upon the problem of homonymous affixes or homonymous phrases. When analyzing different cases of homonymy we find that some words are  
homonymous in all their forms, i.e. homonymy of the paradigms of two or more different words as, e.g., in seal!—'a sea animal' and seal2—'a design printed on paper by means of a stamp'. The paradigm "seal, seal's, seals, seals'" is identical for both of them and gives no indica­tion of whether it is sea or seal that we are analyzing. In other cases, e.g. seal—'a sea animal' and (to) seal—'to close tightly', we see that although some individual word-forms are homonymous, the whole of the paradigm is not identical. Compare, for instance, the paradigms:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| seal | (to)seal3 |
| seal | seal |
| seal's | seals |
| seals | sealed |
| seals' | sealing, etc |

It is easily observed that only some of the word-forms (e.g. seal, seals, etc.) are homonymous, whereas others (e.g. sealed, sealing) are not. In such cases we cannot speak of homonymous words but only of homonymy of individual word-forms or of partial homonymy. This is true of a number of other cases, e.g. compare find [famdj, found [faund], found [faund] and found [faundj, founded ['faundidj, founded [faundid]; know [nou], knows Jnouz], knew [nju:], and no [nou]; nose [nouz], noses [nouzizj; new [nju:J in which partial homonymy is observed. Consequently all cases of homonymy may be classified into full and partial homonymy, homonymy of words and homonymy of individual word-forms.

1) Professor 0. Jespersen calculated that there are roughly four times as many monosyllabic as polysyllabic homonyms. 0. Jespersen. Linguistics. Copenhagen-London, J933, p. 398.

**MAIN PART**

**1.1.2 Words identical in sound-form but different in meaning are traditionally termed homonymous**

Modern English is exceptionally rich in homonymous words and word-forms. It is held that languages where short words abound have more homonyms than those where longer words are prevalent. Therefore it is sometimes suggested that abundance of homonyms in Modern English is to be accounted for by the monosyllabic structure of the commonly used English words.

Not only words but other linguistic units may be homonymous. Here, however, we are concerned with the homonymy of words and word-forms only, so we shall not touch upon the problem of homonymous affixes or homonymous phrases When analyzing different cases of homonymy we find that some words are homonymous in all their forms, i.e. we observe full homonymy of the paradigms of two or more different words as, e.g., in seal a sea animal and seal—a design printed on paper by means of a stamp'. The paradigm "seal, seal's, seals, seals'" is identical for both of them and gives no indication of whether it is seal (1) or seal (2) that we are analyzing. In other cases, e.g. seal—a sea animal' and (to) seal (3)—'to close tightly, we see that although some individual word-forms are homonymous, the whole of the paradigm is not identical. Compare, for instance, the-paradigms:

1. (to)seal-seal-seal's-seals-seals'

2. seal-seals-sealed-sealing, etc.

1 Professor O. Jespersen1) calculated that there are roughly four times as many monosyllabic as polysyllabic homonyms. It is easily observed that only some of the word-forms (e.g. seal, seals, etc.) are homonymous, whereas others (e.g. sealed, sealing) are not. In such cases we cannot speak of homonymous words but only of homonymy of individual word-forms or of partial homonymy. This is true of a number of other cases, e.g. compare find [faind], found [faund], found [faund] and found [faund], founded ['faundidj, founded [faundid]; know [nou], knows [nouz], knew [nju:], and no [nou]; nose [nouz], noses [nouziz]; new [nju:] in which partial homonymy is observed.

From the examples of homonymy discussed above it follows that the bulk of full homonyms are to be found within the same parts of speech (e.g. seal(1) n—seal(2) n), partial homonymy as a rule is observed in word-forms belonging to different parts of speech (e.g. seal n—seal v). This is not to say that partial homonymy is impossible within one part of speech. For instance in the case of the two verbs Me [lai]—'to be in a horizontal or resting position'—lies [laiz]—lay [lei]—lain [lein] and lie [lai]—'to make an untrue statement'—lies [laiz]—lied [laid]—lied [laid] we also find partial homonymy as only two word-forms [lai], [laiz] are homonymous, all other forms of the two verbs are different. Cases of full homonymy may be found in different parts of speech as, e.g., for [for]—preposition, for [fo:]—conjunction and four [fo:] —numeral, as these parts of speech have no other word-forms.

**2.1.2 Classification of homonyms**

Modern English has a very extensive vocabulary; the number of words according to the dictionary data is no less than 400, 000.A question naturally arises whether this enormous word-stock is composed of separate independent lexical units, or may it perhaps be regarded as a certain structured system made up of numerous interdependent and interrelated sub-systems or groups of words. This problem may be viewed in terms of the possible ways of classifying vocabulary items. Words can be classified in various ways. Here, however, we are concerned only with the semantic classification of words which gives us a better insight into some aspects of the Modern English word-stock. Attempts to study the inner structure of the vocabulary revealed that in spite of its heterogeneity the English word-stock may be analyzed into numerous sub-systems the members of which have some features in common, thus distinguishing them from the members of other lexical sub-systems. Classification into monosynaptic and polysemantic words is based on the number of meanings the word possesses. More detailed semantic classifications are generally based on the semantic similarity (or polarity) of words or their component morphemes. Below we give a brief survey of some of these lexical groups of current use both in theoretical investigation and practical class-room teaching.

**3.1.2 Diachronically approach of homonyms**

Now let us analyze the semantic similarity of morphemes. Lexical groups composed of words with semantically and phonemically identical root-morphemes are usually described as word-families or word-clusters. The term itself implies close links between the members of the group. Such are word-families of the type: lead, leader, leadership; dark, darken, darkness; form, formal, formality, and others. It should be noted that members of a word-family as a rule belong to different parts of speech and are joined together only by the identity of root-morphemes. In the word-families discussed above the root-morphemes are identical not only in meaning but also in sound-form[[1]](#footnote-1). There are cases, however, when the sound-form of root-morphemes may be different, as for example in sun, sunny, solar; mouth, oral, orally; brother, brotherly, fraternal, etc.; their semantic similarity however, makes it possible to include them in a word-family. In such cases it is usual to speak of lexical supplementation, i.e. formation of related words of a word-family from phonemically different roots. As a rule in the word-families of this type we are likely to encounter etymologically different words, e.g. the words brother and mouth are of Germanic origin, whereas fraternal and oral can be easily traced back to Latin. We frequently find synonymic pairs of the type fatherly — paternal, brotherly—fraternal. Semantic and phonemic identity of affixation morphemes can be observed in the lexical groups of the type darkness, cleverness, calmness, etc.; teacher, reader, writer, etc. In such word-groups as, e.g. teacher, doctor, musician, etc., only semantic similarity of derivational affixes is observed. As derivational affixes impart to the words a certain generalized meaning, we may single out lexical groups denoting the agent, the doer of the action (Nomina Agenti)—teacher, reader, doctor, etc. or lexical groups denoting actions [Nomina

Acti] — movement, transformation, and others.

Now we shall study the semantic similarities and polarities of words. Semantic similarity or polarity of words may be observed in the similarity of their denotational or connotation meaning. Similarity or polarity of the denotational component of lexical meaning is to be found in lexical groups of synonyms and antonyms. Similarity or polarity of the connotation components serves as the basis for stylistic stratification of vocabulary units. Stylistic features of words and problems of stylistic stratification in general were discussed in connection with different types of meaning. So here let us confine ourselves mainly to the discussion of the problems of the main word phenomena containing the English word stock: i.e. we mean synonyms and antonyms.

**4.1.2 Synchronically approach in studying homonyms**

Synonymy, polysemy and homonymy in the language hierarchy are usually felt to be correlative notions: firstly because the criterion of synonymy is semantic similarity which is in exact opposition to the criterion of antonym—semantic polarity. Secondly, because synonyms and polysemantic words seem to overlap in a number of cases. For instance, when we speak of the words “daddy” and “parent” as synonyms, we do so because of the similarity of their denotational meaning and polarity of their stylistic reference (cf. daddy—colloquial, parent—bookish).

The problem of synonymy is treated similarity differently by different linguists. The most debatable problem is the definition of synonyms. Synonyms are traditionally described as words different in sound-form but identical or similar in meaning. This definition has been severely criticized on many points. Firstly it seems impossible to speak of identical or similar meaning of words as such, as this part of the definition cannot be applied to polysemantic words. It is inconceivable that polysemantic words could be synonymous in all their meanings. The verb “look”, for instance, is usually treated as a synonym of the following words:”see”, “watch”, “observe”, etc., but in another of its meanings it is not synonymous with this group of words but rather with the verbs seems, appear (cf. to look at smb. and to look pale). The number of synonymic sets of a polysemantism word tends as a rule to be equal to the number of individual meanings the word possesses.

**5.1.2. Lexical, grammatical and lexico-grammatical**

In the discussion of polysemy and context we have seen that one of the ways of discriminating between different meanings of a word is the interpretation of these meanings in terms of their synonyms, e.g. the two meanings of the adjective handsome are synonymously interpreted as handsome—'beautiful' (usually about men) and handsome—'considerable, ample' (about sums, sizes, etc.).

Secondly it seems impossible to" speak of identity or similarity of lexical meaning as a whole as it is only the denotation component that may be described as identical or similar. If we analyses words that are usually considered synonymous, e.g. to die, to pass away; to begin, to commence, etc., we find that the connotation component or, to be more exact, the stylistic reference of these words is entirely different and it is only the similarity of the denotation meaning that makes them synonymous. The words, e.g. to die, to walk, to smile, etc., may be considered identical as to their stylistic reference or emotive charge, but as there is no similarity of denotation meaning they are never felt as synonymous words.

Thirdly it does not seem possible to speak of identity of meaning as a criterion of synonymy as identity of meaning is very rare even among monosynaptic words. In fact, cases of complete synonymy are very few and are, as a rule, confined to technical nomenclatures where we can find monosynaptic terms completely identical in meanings as, for example, spirant and fricative in phonetics. Words in synonymic sets are in general differentiated because of some element of opposition in each member of the set. The word handsome, e.g., is distinguished from its synonym beautiful mainly because the former implies the beauty of a male person or broadly speaking only of human beings, whereas beautiful is opposed to it as having no such restrictions in its semantic structure[[2]](#footnote-2).Thus it seems necessary to modify the traditional definition and to word it as follows: synonyms are words different in sound-form but similar in their denotational meaning or meanings. Synonymous relationship is observed only between similar denotational meanings of phonemically different words.Differentiation of synonyms may be observed in different semantic components—denotational or connotation.

It should be noted, however, that the difference in denotation meaning cannot exceed certain limits and is found only as a variation of some common denotational component. The verbs look, seem, appear, e.g., are viewed as members of one synonymic set as all three of them possess a common denotational semantic component "to be in one's view”. Semantic similarity of affixation morphemes is treated in more detail in the chapter about Word-Formation in Prof. Ginsburg’s textbook on lexicology, judgment, but not necessarily in fact" and come into comparison in this meaning (cf. he seems (looks) (appears) tired). A more detailed analysis shows that there is a certain difference in the meaning of each verb: seem suggests a personal opinion based on evidence (e.g. nothing seems right when one is out of sorts); look implies that opinion is based on a visual impression (e.g. the city looks its worst in March), appear sometimes suggests a distorted impression (e.g. the setting sun made the spires appear ablaze). Thus similarity of denotational meaning of all members of the synonymic series is combined with a certain difference in the meaning of each member.[[3]](#footnote-3)

It follows that relationship of synonymy implies certain differences in the denotational meaning of synonyms. In this connection a few words should be said about the traditional classification of vocabulary units into ideographic and stylistic synonyms. This classification proceeds from the assumption that synonyms may differ either in the denotational meaning (ideographic synonyms) or the connotation meaning, i.e. stylistic reference (stylistic synonyms). This assumption cannot be accepted as synonymous words always differ in the denotational component irrespective of the identity or difference of stylistic reference. The stylistic reference in the synonymous verbs seem, appear, look may be regarded as identical though we observe some difference in their denotational component. Difference in the denotational semantic component is also found in synonymous words possessing different connotational components. The verbs see and behold, e.g., are usually treated as stylistic synonyms; see is stylistically neutral and behold is described as bookish or poetic. It can be readily observed, however, that the difference between the two verbs is not confined solely to stylistic reference. Though they have a common denotational component 'to take cognizance of something by physical (or mental) vision', there is a marked difference in their comparable meanings. The verb behold suggests only 'looking at that which is seen', e.g. "behold them sitting in their glory" (Shelley), The verb see denotes 'have or use power of sight' (e.g. the blind cannot see), 'understand' (e.g. don't you see my meaning?), have knowledge or experience of (e.g. he has seen a good deal in his long life) and others.

Consequently, the interrelation of the denotational and the connotational meaning of synonyms is rather complex. Difference or rather variation of the denotational component does not imply difference in either the stylistic reference or the emotive charge of members of synonymic series. Difference of the connotational semantic component is invariably accompanied by some variation of the denotational meaning of synonyms. Therefore it would be more consistent to subdivide synonymous words into purely ideographic (denotational) and ideographic-stylistic synonyms. It should be pointed out that neither criterion the traditional definition of synonyms modified version suggested here provide for any objective criterion of similarity of meaning. Judgment as to semantic similarity is based solely on the linguistic intuition of the analyst.[[4]](#footnote-4)

It is sometimes argued that the meaning of two words is identical if they can denote the same referent, in other words, if an object or a certain class of objects can always be denoted by either of the two words. For example in the sentence "Washington is the capital of the United States"—"Washington" and "the capital of the United States" have obviously the same referent, but there is no linguistic relationship of synonymy between the two lexical units.

Recently attempts have been made to introduce into the definition of synonymy the criterion of interchangeability in linguistic contexts. It is argued that for the linguistic similarity of meaning implies that the words are synonymous if either of them can occur in the same context. In this case the relationship of synonymy is defined as follows: "If A and B have almost identical environment except chiefly for sentences which contain both, we say they are synonyms" (cf. eye-doctor, oculist).

Another well-known definition also proceeding from the contextual approach is the definition of synonyms as words which can replace each other in any given context without the slightest alteration either in the denotational or connotational meaning.

The contextual approach also invites criticism as words interchangeable in any given context are rarely found. This fact may be explained as follows: firstly, words synonymous in some lexical contexts may display no synonymity in others. As one of the English scholars aptly remarks, the comparison of the sentences "the rainfall in April was abnormal" and "the rainfall in April was exceptional" may give us grounds for assuming that exceptional and abnormal are synonymous. The same adjectives in a different context are by no means synonymous, as we may see by comparing "my son is exceptional" and "my son is abnormal".[[5]](#footnote-5)

Secondly, it is evident that interchangeability alone cannot serve as a criterion of synonymity. Werner safely assumes that synonyms are words interchangeable in some contexts. But the reverse is certainly not true as semantically different words of the same part of speech are, as a rule, interchangeable in quite a number of contexts. For example, in the sentence "I saw a little girl playing in the garden" the adjective little may be formally replaced by a number of semantically different adjectives, e.g. pretty, tall, English, etc.

Thus a more acceptable definition of synonyms seems to be the following:

synonyms are words different in their sound-form, but similar in their denotational meaning or meanings and interchangeable at least in some contexts.

Theoretically, the degree of synonymity of words may be calculated by the number of contexts in which these words are interchangeable. The simplest technique of such semantic analysis is substitution in various contexts. It is argued that two synonymous adjectives, e.g. deep and profound, could be analyzed in relation to each other by ascertaining how far they are interchangeable in different contexts, say, in combination with water, voice, remark, relief; what changes of denotational meaning and emotive charge occur when they are interchanged (cf. deep relief—profound relief); what is their proper antonym in each of these combinations (shallow, high, superficial); in how many of the possible contexts they are interchangeable without any considerable alteration of the denotational meaning, etc.

The English word-stock is extremely rich. Synonymic accounted for by abundant borrowing. '" English Quite a number of words in a synonymic set are usually of Latin or French origin. For instance, out of thirteen words making up the set see, behold, descry, espy, view, survey, contemplate, observe, notice, remark, note, discern, perceive only see and behold can be traced back to Old English (OE. seen and beheading), all others are either French or Latin borrowings[[6]](#footnote-6).

Thus, a characteristic pattern of English synonymic sets is the pattern including the native and the borrowed words. Among the best investigated are the so called double-scale patterns: native versus Latin (e.g. bodily—corporal, brotherly— fraternal); native versus Greek or French (e.g. answer— reply, fiddle—violin). In most cases the synonyms differ in their stylistic reference, too. The native word is usually colloquial (e.g. bodily, brotherly), whereas the borrowed word may as a rule be described as bookish or highly literary (e.g. corporal, fraternal).

Side by side with this pattern there exists in English a subsidiary one based on a triple-scale of synonyms: native— French and Latin or Greek [e.g. begin (start)—commence (Fr.)—initiate (/.); rise—mount (Fr.)—ascend (/,)]. In most of these sets the native synonym is felt as more colloquial, the Latin or Greek one is characterized by bookish stylistic reference, whereas the French stands between the two extremes.

There are some minor points of interest that should be discussed in connection with the problem of synonymy. It has often been found that subjects prominent in the interests of a community tend to attract a large number of synonyms. It is common knowledge that in Beowulf there are 37 synonyms for hero or prince and at least a dozen for battle and fight. The same epic contains 17 expressions for sea to which 13 more may be added from other English poems of that period. In Modern American English there are at least twenty words used to denote money: beans, bucks, the chips, do-re-mi, the needful, wherewithal, etc. This linguistic phenomenon is usually described as the law of synonymic attraction,

It has also been observed that when a particular word is given a transferred meaning its synonyms tend to develop along parallel lines. We know that in early New English the verb overlook was employed in the meaning of 'look with an evil eye upon, cast a spell over' from which there developed the meaning 'deceive' first recorded in 1596. Exactly half a century later we find oversee a synonym of overlook employed in the meaning of 'deceive'.1 This form of analogy active in the semantic development of synonyms is referred to as "radiation of synonyms".

**1.2.2 Etymological and semantic criteria in polysemy and homonymy**

As it was mentioned before, two or more words identical in sound and spelling but different in meaning, distribution and (in many cases) origin are called homonyms. The term is derived from Greek (homos 'similar' and onoma 'name') and thus expresses very well the sameness of name combined with the difference in meaning.

There is an obvious difference between the meanings of the symbol fast in such combinations as run fast 'quickly' and stand fast 'firmly'. The difference is even more pronounced if we observe cases where fast is a noun or a verb as in the following proverbs: A clean fast is better than a dirty breakfast; Who feasts till he is sick, must fast till he is well.

Fast as an isolated word, therefore, may be regarded as a variable that can assume several different values depending on the conditions of usage, or, in other words, distribution. All the possible values of each linguistic sign are listed in dictionaries. It is the duty of lexicographers to define the boundaries of each word, i.e. to differentiate homonyms and to unite variants deciding in each case whether the different meanings belong to the same polysemantic word or whether there are grounds to treat them as two or more separate words identical in form. In speech, however, only one °f all the possible values is determined by the context, so that no ambiguity may normally arise. There is no danger, for instance that the listener would wish to substitute the meaning 'quick' into the sentence: It is absurd to have hard and fast rules about anything or think that fast rules here are 'rules of diet'. Combinations when two or more meanings are possible are either deliberate puns, or result from carelessness. Both meanings of liver, i.e. 'a living person' and 'the organ that secretes bile' are, for instance, intentionally present in the following play upon words: "7s life worth living?" "It depends upon the liver.''

Very seldom can ambiguity of this kind interfere with understanding. The following example quoted from lies, 1 sound somewhat artificial, but may him also a deliberate joke and not carelessness: The girls will be playing cricket in white stockings. We hope they won't get too many runs. Runs in this context may mean either 'ladders in stockings' or 'the units of scoring, made by running once over a certain course' (a cricket term).

Homonymy exists in many languages, but in English it is particularly frequent, especially among monosyllabic words. In the list of 2540 homonyms given in the Oxford English Dictionary 89% are monosyllabic words and only 9,1% are words of two syllables. From the viewpoint of their morphological structure, they are mostly one-morpheme words. Many words, especially those characterized by a high frequency rating, are not connected with meaning by a one-to-one relationship. On the contrary, one symbol as a rule serves to render several different meanings. The phenomenon may be said to be the reverse of synonymy where several symbols correspond to one meaning.

**2.2.2 Comparative typological analysis of two linguistic phenomena in English, Russian and Uzbek**

The most widely accepted classification is that recognizing homonyms proper, homophones and homographs. Homonyms proper are words identical in pronunciation and spelling, like/as if and liver above or like scale 'one of the thin plates that form the outer covering of most fishes and reptiles' and scale, 'a basis for a system of measuring'. Homophones are words of the same sound but of different spelling and meaning: air :: heir; arms :: alms; buy :: bye : by; him :: hymn; knight :: night; not :: knot; or :: ore :: oar; piece ; peace; rain :: reign; scent :: cent :: sent; steel :: steal; storey ;: story write :: right :: rite and many others.

For example, in the sentence “The millwright on my right thinks it right that some conventional rite should symbolize the right of every man to write as he pleases.” the sound complex [rait] is noun, adjective, adverb and verb, has four different spellings and six different meanings[[7]](#footnote-7).

The difference may be confined to the use of a capital letter as in bill and Bill, in the following example: "How much is my milk bill?" "Excuse me, Madam, but my name is John." Homographs are words different in sound and in meaning but accidentally identical in spelling: bow [bou] :: bow IbauJ; lead [li:d] :: lead [led]; row [rouj :: row [rau]; sewer I'soua] :: sewer [sjual; tear [tea] :: tear [tia]; wind [wind] :: wind [wand] and many more.

It has been often argued that homographs constitute a phenomenon that should

be kept apart from homonymy as the object of linguistics is sound language. This viewpoint cans hardly be accepted. Because of the effects of education and culture written English is a generalized national form of expression. An average speaker does not separate the written and oral form. On the contrary he is more likely to analyze the words in Terries of letters than in terms of phonemes with which he is less familiar. That is why a linguist must take into consideration both the spelling and the pronunciation of words when analyzing cases of identity of form and diversity of content.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Various types of classification for homonyms proper have been suggested. The one most often used in present-day Annalistic in Russia it is that suggested by Prof. A. I. Smirnitsky1). It has been criticized for failing to bring out the main characteristic features of homonyms.

A more comprehensive system may be worked out on the same basis if we are guided by the theory of oppositions and in classifying the homonyms take into consideration the difference or sameness in their lexical and grammatical meaning, paradigm and basic form. The distinctive features shown in the table on lexical meaning (different denoted by A, or nearly same denoted by A l) grammatical meaning (different denoted by B, or same denoted by B), paradigm (different denoted by C or same denoted by C), and basic form (different D and same D).

The term "nearly same lexical meaning" must not he taken too literally. It means only that the corresponding members of the opposition have some important invariant components in common. "Same grammatical meaning" implies that both members belong to the same part of speech.

Same paradigm comprises also cases when there is only one word form, i.e. when the words are unchangeable. Inconsistent combinations of features are crossed out in the table. It is, for instance, impossible for two words to be identical in all word forms and different in basic forms, or for two homonyms to show no difference either in lexical or grammatical meaning, because in this case they are

not homonyms. That leaves seven possible classes.

ABCD, Members of the opposition “light” (noun) – “light” (adjective) are different in lexical and grammatical meaning, have different paradigms but the same basic form. The class is very numerous. A further subdivision might take into consideration the parts of speech to which the members belong, namely the oppositions of noun vs. verb, adjective vs. verb, noun vs. adjective, etc.

ABCD. Same as above, only not both members are in their basic form. The noun (here might) is in its basic form, the singular, but the verb will coincide with it only in the Past Tense. This lack of coincidence between basic forms is not frequent, so only few examples are possible.

Cf. also “bit” (noun) - 'a small piece' and “bit” - Past Tense and Participle II of “bite”.

ABCD, Represents pairs different in lexical and grammatical meaning but not in paradigm, as these are not changeable words. For example, “for” (preposition) contrasted to “for” - conjunction.

ABCD. Patterned homonymy.1 Differs from the previous (i.e. ABGD) in the presence of some common component in the lexical meaning of the members, some lexical invariant:

For example, the word “before” has the following lexical invalidations: “before” (prep.), “before” (adv), “before” (conj.), though they all express some priority in succession. This type of opposition is regular among form words.

ABCD. Contains all the cases due to conversion:

For example, “eye” (noun) vs. “eye” (verb). These members differ in grammatical meaning and paradigm. It should be borne in mind that they also belong to patterned homonymy. Examples of such noun-to-verb or verb-to-noun homonymy can be augmented almost indefinitely The meaning of the second can always be guessed if the first is known.

ABCD. Different lexical meaning, same grammatical meaning; and different paradigm:

e.g. lie ~ lay ~ lain and lie - lied - lied in many cases belong to this group. We should also underline the configuration of cases of double plural

cf.: “genius” – “geniuses” and “genius” – “genii”.

ABCD. The most typical case of homonymy accepted by everybody and exemplified in every textbook. Different lexical meanings but the homonyms belong to the same part of speech: For example, the word “spring” can be understood as a leap, “spring” as a source and “spring” as the season in which vegetation begins.

It goes without saying that this is a model that gives a general scheme. Actually, a group of homonyms may contain members belonging to different groups in this classification.

**3.2.2 Modern methods of investigating homonyms**

The intense development of homonymy in the English language is obviously due not to one single factor but to several interrelated causes, such as the monosyllabic character of English and its analytic structure. Inflections have almost disappeared in present-day English and have been superseded by separate words of abstract character (prepositions, auxiliaries, etc.) stating the relations that once expressed by terminations.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The abundance of homonyms is also closely connected with a characteristic feature of the English language as the phonetic unity of word and stem or, in other words, the predominance of forms among the most frequent roots. It is very obvious that the frequency of words stands in some inverse relationship to length, the monosyllabic words will be the most frequent moreover, as the most frequent words are also highly polysemantic, It is only natural that they develop meanings which in the course of time may deviate very far from the central one. When the inter-mediate links fall out, some of these new meanings lose all with the rest of the structure and start a separate existence. Phenomenon is known as disintegration or split of polysemy, Different causes by which homonymy may be brought about subdivided into two main groups:

1) Homonymy through convergent sound development, when or three words of different origin accidentally coincide in sound;

2) Homonymy developed from polysemy through divergent development. Both may be combined with loss of endings and 0tJier morphological processes.

In Old English the words “gesund”- 'healthy' and “sund”- 'swimming' were separate words both in form and in meaning. In the course of time they have changed their meaning and phonetic form, and for latter accidentally coincided: OE “sund” in ME “sound” 'strait’. The group was joined also accidentally by the noun sound 'what is or may be heard' with the corresponding verb that developed from French and ultimately the Latin word “sonus”, and the verb sound 'to measure the depth' of dubious etymology. The coincidence is purely accidental.

Two different Latin verbs: “cadere”-'to fair and “capere”- 'to hold' are the respective sources of the homonyms In case1 'instance of thing's occurring' and case a box. Homonymy of this type is universally recognized. The other type is open to discussion.

Unlike the homonyms case and sound all the homonyms of the box group due to disintegration or split of polysemy are etymologically connected. The sameness of form is not accidental but based on genetic relationship. They are all derived from one another and are all ultimately traced to the Latin “buxus”. The Concise Oxford Dictionary1) has five separate entries for box: 1.box n. - 'a kind of small evergreen shrub';

2. box n. 'receptacle made of wood, cardboard, metal, etc. and usually provided with a lid';

3. box v. 'to put into a box';

4. box n. 'slap with the hand on the ear';

5. boxt v. ‘a sport term meaning 'to fight with fists in padded gloves'.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Such homonyms may be partly derived from one another but their common point of origin lies beyond the limits of the English language. In these with the appearance of a new meaning, very different from the previous one, the semantic structure of the parent word splits. The new meaning receives a separate existence and starts a new semantic structure of its own. Hence the term disintegration or split of polysemy. It must be noted, however, that though the number of examples in which a process of this sort could be observed is considerable, it is difficult to establish exact criteria by which disintegration of polysemy could be detected. The whole concept is based on stating whether there is any connection between the meanings or not, and is very subjective. Whereas in the examples dealing with phonetic convergence, i.e. when we said that “case1” and “case2” are different words because they differ in origin, we had definite linguistic criteria to go by, in the case of disintegration of polysemy there are none to guide us; we can only rely on intuition and individual linguistic experience. For a trained linguist the number of unrelated homonyms will be much smaller than for an uneducated person. The knowledge of etymology and cognate languages will always help to supply the missing links. It is easier, for instance, to see the connection between beam 'a ray of light' and beam 'the metallic structural part of a building' if one knows the original meaning of the word, i.e. 'tree' (OE beam, Germ Baum), and is used to observe similar metaphoric transfers in other words. The connection is also more obvious if one is able to notice the same element in such compound names of trees as hornbeam, white beam, etc.

The conclusion, therefore, is that in diachronistic treatment the only rigorous criterion is that of etymology observed in explanatory dictionaries of the English language where words are separated according to their origin,

For example, in the words match1 'a piece of inflammable material you strike fire with' (from OFr “mesche”, Fr “meche”) and match2 (from OE “gemcecca” 'fellow').

It is interesting to note that out of 2540 homonyms listed in a dictionary1) only 7% are due to disintegration of polysemy, all the others are etymologically different. One must, however, keep in mind that patterned homonymy is here practically disregarded. This underestimation of regular patterned homonymy tends to produce a false impression. Actually the homonymy of nouns and verbs due to the processes of loss of endings on the one hand and conversion on the other is one of the most prominent features of present-day English. . It may be combined with semantic changes as in the pair “long” (adj.) – “long” (verb). The explanation is that when it seems long before something comes to you, you long for it (long (adj.) comes from OE “lang”, whereas “long” (v.)comes from OE “langian”, so that the expression “Me longs” means 'it seems long to me'.

The opposite process of morphemic addition can also result in homonymy. This process is chiefly due to independent word-formation with the same affix or to the homonymy of derivational and functional affixes. The suffix -er forms several words with the same stem: trail — trailer 'a creeping plant' vs. trailer 'a caravan', i.e. 'a vehicle drawn along by another vehicle'. The suffix -s added to the homonymous stems -arm- gives “arms” (n.) 'Weapon' and “arms” (v.) 'Supplies with weapons'. In summing up this dichromatic analysis of homonymy it should be emphasized that there are two ways by which homonyms come into being, namely convergent development of sound form and divergent development of meaning (see table below). The first may consist in

(a) phonetic change only,

(b) phonetic change combined with loss of affixes,

(e) independent formation

from homonymous bases by means of homonymous morphemes. The second, that is divergent development of meaning may be

(a) limited within one lexico-grammatical class of words,

(b) combined with difference in lexico-grammatical class and therefore difference in grammatical functions and distribution,

(c) based on independent formation from the same base by homonymous morphemes.

The process can sometimes be more complicated. At present there are at least two homonyms: “stick”(noun1) - 'insert pointed things into', a highly polysemantic word, and the no less polysemantic “stick” (noun) 'a rod'.

In the course of time the number of homonyms on the whole increases, although occasionally the conflict of homonyms ends in word loss.

**4.2. 2 Practical approach in studying homonyms**

The synchronic treatment of English homonyms brings to the forefront a set of problems of paramount importance for different branches of applied linguistics: lexicography, foreign language teaching and machine translation. These problems are: the criteria distinguishing homonymy from polysemy, the formulation of rules for recognizing different meanings of the same homonym in terms of distribution, and the description of difference between patterned and irregular homonymy. It is necessary to emphasize that all these problems are connected with difficulties created by homonymy in understanding the message by the reader or listener, not with formulating one's thoughts; they exist for the speaker only in so far as he must construct his speech in a way that would prevent all possible misunderstanding.

All three problems are so closely interwoven that it is difficult to separate them. So we shall discuss them as they appear for various practical purposes. For a lexicographer it is a problem of establishing word boundaries. It is easy enough to see that match, as in safety matches, is a separate word from the verb match 'to suit'. But he must know whether he is justified in taking into one entry match, as in football match, and match in meet one's match 'one's equal'. Can the English verb bear in bear a burden, bear troubles, bear fruit, bear offspring be viewed as a single word or as a set of two or perhaps even more homonyms? Similarly, charge, in charge the gun, charge the man with theft, charge somebody a stiff price can be viewed in several ways.

On the synchronic level, when the difference in etymology is irrelevant, the problem of establishing the criterion for the distinction between different words identical in sound form, and different meanings of the same word becomes hard to solve. The semantic criterion which ultimately is reduced to distinguishing between words that "have nothing in common semantically" and those that "have something in common" and therefore must be taken as one lexical unit, is very vague and hopelessly subjective. Nevertheless the problem cannot be dropped altogether as upon an efficient arrangement of dictionary entries depends the amount of time spent by the readers in looking up a word: a lexicographer will either save or waste his readers' time and effort.

Actual solutions differ. It is a widely spread practice in English lexicography to combine in one entry words of identical phonetic form showing similarity of lexical meaning or, in other words, revealing a lexical invariant, even if they belong to different parts of speech. In post-war lexicography in our country a different trend has settled. The Anglo-Russian dictionary edited by V. D. Arakin makes nine separate entries with the word “right” against four items given in the dictionary edited by Hornby.

The truth is that there exists no universal criterion for the distinction between polysemy and homonymy, unless one accepts the solution offered by V. I. Abayev and follows the data of etymology, separating as homonyms only those words that have different sources and only accidentally coincided phonetically. The necessary restriction is that different sources must be traced within the history of the language. Words that coincided phonetically before they penetrated into the English vocabulary are not taken into account. The etymological criterion, however, may very often lead to distortion of the present-day situation. The English vocabulary of to-day is not a replica of the Old English vocabulary with some additions from borrowing. It is in many respects a different system, and this system will not be revealed if the lexicographer is guided by etymological criteria only. A more or less simple, if not very rigorous, procedure based on purely synchronic data may be prompted by transformational analysis. It may be called explanatory transformation. It is based on the assumption that if different senses rendered by the same phonetic complex can be defined with the help of an identical kernel word-group, they may be considered sufficiently near to be regarded as variants of the same word; if not, they are homonyms.

Consider the following set of examples:

1. A child's voice is heard. 2. His voice ... was ... annoyingly well-bred.

3. The voice-voicelessness distinction ... sets up some English consonants in opposed pairs...

4. In the voice contrast of active and passive ... the active is the unmarked form.

The first variant (voice1 may be defined as 'sounds uttered in speaking or singing as characteristic of a particular person', voice2 as 'mode of uttering sounds in speaking or singing', voice3 as 'the vibration of the vocal chords in sounds uttered'. So far all the definitions contain one and the same kernel element rendering the invariant common basis of their meaning. It is, however, impossible to use the same kernel element for the meaning present in the fourth example. The corresponding definition is: "Voice — that forms of the verb that expresses the relation of the subject to the action". This failure to satisfy the same explanation formula sets the fourth meaning apart. It may then be considered a homonym to the polysemantic word embracing the first three variants.

The procedure described may remain helpful when the items considered belong to different parts of speech; the verb voice may mean, for example, 'to utter a sound by the aid of the vocal chords'.

This brings us to the problem of patterned homonymy, i. e. of the invariant lexical meaning present in homonyms that have developed from one common source and belong to various parts of speech.

Is a lexicographer justified in placing the verb to voice with the above meaning into the same entry with the first three variants of the noun? The same question arises with respect to after or before — preposition, conjunction and adverb.

The elder generation of English linguists thought it quite possible for one and the same word to function as different parts of speech.1 Such pairs as act n — act v, back n — back v, drive n — drive v, the above mentioned after and before and the like, were all treated as one word functioning as different parts of speech. Later on this point of view was severely criticized. It was argued that one and the same word could not belong to different parts of speech simultaneously because this would contradict the definition of the word as a system of forms. This viewpoint is not faultless either: if one follows it consistently one should regard as separate words all cases when words are countable nouns in one meaning and uncountable in another, when verbs can be used transitively and intransitively, etc.

In this case hair 'all the hair that grows on a person's head7 will be one word, an uncountable noun; whereas a single thread of hair will be denoted by another word (hair2) which, being countable, and thus different in paradigm, cannot be considered the same word. It would be tedious to enumerate all the absurdities that will result from choosing this path. A dictionary arranged on these lines would require very much space in printing and could occasion much wasted time in use. The conclusion therefore is that efficiency in lexicographic work is secured by a rigorous application of etymological criteria combined with formalized procedures of establishing a lexical invariant suggested by synchronic linguistic methods.

As to those concerned with teaching of English as a foreign language, they are also keenly interested in patterned homonymy. The most frequently used words constitute the greatest amount of difficulty, as may be summed up by the following example: I think that this "that" is a conjunction but that «that" man that used was a pronoun.

A correct understanding of this peculiarity of contemporary English should be instilled in the pupils from the very beginning, and they should be taught to find their way in sentences where several words have their homonyms in other parts of speech, as in Jespersen's1) example: Will change of air cure-love? l To show the scope of the problem for the elementary stage a list of homonyms that should be classified as patterned is given below:

“Above” – prep., adv., adj.; “act”- n., v.; “after” - prep., adv., conj.; “age” – n., v.; “back” – n., adv., v.; “ball” – n., v.; “bank”

We may give the other examples: by, can, case, close, country, course, cross, direct, draw, drive, even, faint, flat, fly, for, game, general, hard, hide, hold, home, just, kind, last, leave, left, lie, light, like, little, lot, major, march, match, may, mean, might, mind, miss, part, plain, plane, plate, right, round, sharp, sound, spare, spell, spring, square, stage, stamp, try, type, volume, watch, well, will, etc.

For the most part all these words are cases of patterned lexico-grammatical homonymy taken from the minimum vocabulary of the elementary stage: the above homonyms mostly differ within each group grammatically but possess some lexical invariant. That is to say, act v follows the standard four-part system of forms with a base form act, an s-form (act-s), a Past Tense form (acted) and an -ing- form (acting) and takes up all syntactic functions of verbs, whereas act n can have two forms, act (singular.) and acts (plural). Semantically both contain the most generalized component rendering the notion of doing something.

Recent investigations have shown that it is quite possible to establish and to formalize the differences in environment, syntactical or lexical, serving to signal which of the several inherent values is to be ascribed to the variable in a given context.

An example of distributional analysis will help to make this point clear. The distribution of a lexico-semantic variant of a word may be represented as a list of structural patterns in which it occurs and the data on its combining power. Some of the most typical structural patterns for a verb are: N + V -f- N, N + V –f- Prep.; V- N, N-f-V-f-Adj., N + V + Adv., N + V + t o –f- V and some others. Patterns for nouns are far less studied, but for the present case one very typical example will suffice. This is the structure article for A + N. In the following extract from "A Taste of Honey" by Sheath

Delaney the morpheme “laugh” occurs three times:

1.I can't stand people who laugh at other people.

2. They'd get a bigger laugh, if they laughed at themselves.

We recognize laugh used first and last here as a verb because the formula is N + laugh + prep + N and so the pattern is in both cases \ -[-V H-prep — N. In the beginning of the second sentence laugh is a noun and the pattern is article -f- A -J- N.

This elementary example can give a very general idea of the procedure which can be used for solving more complicated

99Distributional analysis of this type is of great practical importance both in foreign language teaching and in machine translation. In order to translate a sentence the machine must analyze it, i.e. determine the types of elementary configurations that constitute it. Practically speaking, the pupil even if taught by patterns, must do the same. Elementary configurations are not mere word-groups but combinations of word classes. Therefore in the process of identification of the symbols given, it is necessary to establish to what classes they belong. As homonymy prevents this, the first step to be taken in machine translation aims at getting rid of homonymy. The system of formal rules aimed at revealing and eliminating lexico-grammatical homonymy in machine translation has been described by T. Moloshnaya. l These rules begin with morphological criteria: if the word form considered has an ending typical of one class and impossible in all others, its class is thus determined. Laughed is obviously a verb, as the noun does not take the ending -ed. Of the two homonyms complete v and complete adj. only the verb can have such endings as -ed, -ing. When the morphological data are exhausted, syntactical combinations are analyzed.

Without attempting to give a more detailed analysis of these operations since they belong rather to grammar than to lexicology, we may sum up our discussion by pointing out that whereas distinction between polysemy and homonymy is relevant and important for lexicography it is not relevant for the practice of either human or machine translation. The reason for this is that different variants of a polysemantic word are not less conditioned by context than lexical homonyms. In both cases the identification of the necessary meaning is based on the corresponding .distribution that can signal it and must be present in the memory either of the pupil or the machine. The distinction between patterned and non-patterned homonymy, greatly underrated until now, is of far greater importance. In non-patterned homonymy every unit is to be learned separately both from the lexical and grammatical points of view. In patterned homonymy when one knows the lexical meaning of a given word in one part of speech, one can accurately predict the meaning when the same sound complex occurs in some other part of speech, provided, of course, that there is sufficient context to guide one.

**5.2.2 Homonyms may be also classified by the type of meaning into lexical, lexico-grammatical and grammatical homonyms**

In seal n and seal n, e.g., the part-of-speech meaning of the word and the grammatical meanings of all its forms are identical. (cf. seal [si:l] Common Case Singular, seal's [si:lz] Possessive Case Singular for both seal\* and sea!2). The difference is confined to lexical meaning only or, to be more exact, to the denotational component: seal denotes 'a sea animal', 'the fur of this animal', etc., seaI2—'a design printed on paper, the stamp by which the design is made', etc. So we can say that seal 2 and seal are lexical homonyms as they differ in lexical meaning.

If we compare seal —'a sea animal' and (to) seal 3—'to close tightly', we shall observe not only a difference in the lexical meaning of their homonymous word-forms, but a difference in their grammatical meanings as well. Identical sound-forms, i.e. seals [si:lz] (Common Case Plural of the noun) and (he) seals [si:lz] (third person Singular of the (verb) possess each of them different grammatical meanings. As both grammatical and lexical meanings differ we describe these homonymous word-forms as lexico-grammatical homonymy.

Lexico-grammatical homonymy generally implies that the homonyms in question belong to different parts of speech as the part-of-speech meaning is a blend of the lexical and grammatical semantic components. There may be cases however when lexico-grammatical homonymy is observed within the same part of speech as, e.g., in the verbs (to) find [faind] and (to) found [faund], where homonymic word-forms: found [faund]—Past Tense of (to) find and found [faund]—Present Tense of (to) found differ both grammatically and lexically. Modern English abounds in homonymic word-forms differing in grammatical meaning only. In the paradigms of the majority of verbs the form of the Past Tense is homonymous with the form of Participle II, e.g. asked [a:sktl—asked [a:skt]; in the paradigm of nouns we usually find homonymous forms of the Possessive Case Singular and the Common Case Plural, e.g. : brother’s . It may be easily observed that grammatical homonymy is the homonymy of different word-forms of one and the same word. The two classifications: full and partial homonymy and lexical, lexico-grammatical and grammatical homonymy are not mutually exclusive. All homonyms may be described on the basis of the two criteria—homonymy of all forms of the word or only some of the word-forms and the type of meaning in which homonymous words or word-forms differ. So we speak of full lexical homonymy of seen and seal 2 n, of partial lexical homonymy of live and leave, and of partial lexico-grammatical homonymy of seen and seal 3 It should be pointed out that in the some classification discussed above one of Peculiarities the groups, namely lexico-grammatical of Lexico-Grammatical homonymy, is not homogeneous. This can be seen by analyzing the relationship between two pairs of lexico-grammatical homonyms, e.g.

1. seal a sea animal'—seal 3 v—'to close tightly as with a seal;

2. seal 2 n—'a piece of wax, lead'—seal 3 f—'to close tightly as with a seal'.

We can see that seal n and seal 3 v actually differ in both grammatical and lexical meanings. We cannot establish any semantic connection between the meaning «a sea animal" and "to close tightly". The lexical meanings of seal 2 n and seal3u are apprehended by speakers as closely related for both the noun and the verb denote something connected with "a piece of wax, lead, etc., a stamp by means of which a design is printed on paper and paper envelopes are tightly closed". Consequently the pair seal 3 n—seal 3 v does not answer the description of homonyms as words or word-forms that sound alike but differ in lexical meaning. This is true of a number of other cases of lexico-grammatical homonymy, e.g. work n—(to) work o; paper /i—(to) paper v; love n—(to) love v and so on. As a matter of fact all homonyms arising from conversion have related meanings.

It is sometimes argued that as a rule the whole of the semantic structure of such words is not identical. The noun paper, e.g., has at least five meanings (1. material in the form of sheets, 2. a newspaper, 3. a document, 4. an essay, 5. a set of printed examination questions) whereas the verb paper possesses but one meaning "to cover with wall-paper". It follows that the whole of the semantic structure of the two words is essentially different, though individual meanings are related.

Considering this peculiarity of lexico-grammatical homonyms we may subdivide them into two groups: A. identical in sound-form but different in their grammatical and lexical meanings (sea n—seal3 v), and B. identical in sound-form but different in their grammatical meanings and partly different in their lexical meaning, i.e. partly different in their semantic structure (seal2 v; paper n—(to) paper v). Thus the definition of homonyms as words possessing identical sound-form but different semantic structure seems to be more exact as it allows of a better understanding of complex cases of homonymy, e.g. seah n—seah n—sealx v —seal3 u which can be analyzed into homonymic pairs, e.g. seal n—seal n—lexical homonyms; seal n—seal 3 v—lexico-grammatical homonyms, subgroup A; seals n—seal3y— lexico-grammatical homonyms, subgroup B; etc.

In the discussion of the problem of graphic homonymy we proceeded from the as possessing both sound-form and meaning, and we deliberately disregarded their graphic form. Some linguists, however, argue that the graphic form of words in Modern English is just as important as their sound-form and should be taken into consideration in the analysis and classification of homonyms. Consequently they proceed from the definition of homonyms as words identical in sound-form or spelling but different in meaning. It follows that in their classification of homonyms all the three aspects: sound-form, graphic-form and meaning are taken into account. Accordingly they classify homonyms into homographs, homophones and perfect homonyms.

Homographs are words identical in spelling, but different both in their sound-form and meaning, e.g. bow n [bouj— 'a piece of wood curved by a string and used for shooting arrows' and bow n (bail—'the bending of the head or body'; tear n [tiaj—'a drop of water that comes from the eye' and tear v [tesj—'to pull apart by force'.

Homophones are words identical in sound-form but different both in spelling and in meaning, e.g. sea n and see v; son n and sun n.

Perfect homonyms are words identical both in spelling and in sound-form but different in meaning, e.g. case in something that has happened' and case n—'a box, a container’. It may be readily observed that in this approach no distinction is made between homonymous words and homonymous word-forms or between full and partial homonymy. The description of various types of Sources homonyms in Modern English would of Homonymy incomplete if we did flat give flat brief outline of the diachronic processes that account for their appearance.

**6.2.2 The two main sources of homonymy are:**

1) diverging meaning development of one polysemantic word, and 2) converging sound development of two or more different words. The process of diverging meaning development can be observed when different meanings of the same word move so far away from each other that they come to be regarded as two separate units. This happened, for example, in the case of Modern English flower and flour which originally were one word meaning 'the flower' and 'the finest part of wheat'. The difference in spelling underlines the fact that from the synchronic point of view they are two distinct words even though historically they have a common origin.

Convergent sound development is the most potent factor in the creation of homonyms. The great majority of homonyms arise as a result of converging sound development which leads to the coincidence of two or more words which were phonetically distinct at an earlier date.

For example: OE. Icand OE cage have become identical in pronunciation (MnE. I [ai] and eye [ai], A number of lexico-grammatical homonyms appeared as a result of convergent sound development of the verb and the noun (cf. MnE. love—(to) love and OE. lufu—lufian).

**5.2.2 Polysemy and Homonymy: Etymological and Semantic Criteria**

Words borrowed from other languages may through phonetic convergence become homonymous. Old Norse has and French race are homonymous in Modern English (cf. race1 [reis]—'running' and race2 [reis] 'a distinct ethnical stock'). There are four homonymic words in Modern English: sound —’healthy’ was already in Old English homonymous with sound—'a narrow passage of water', though etymologically they are unrelated. Then two more homonymous words appeared in the English language, one comes from Old French son (L. sonus) and denotes 'that which is or may be heard' and the other from the French sunder the surgeon's probe. One of the most debatable problems in semasiology is the demarcation line between homonymy and polysemy, i.e. between different meanings of one word and the meanings of two homonymous words.

If homonymy is viewed diachronically then all cases of sound convergence of two or, more words may be safely regarded as cases of homonymy as, e.g., sound i, sound2, sound-e, and sound4 which can be traced back to four etymologically different words. /fie cases of semantic divergence, however, are more doubtful. The transition from polysemy to homonymy is a gradual process, so it is hardly possible to point out the precise stage at which divergent semantic development tears asunder all ties of etymological kinship and results in the appearance of two separate words/ In the case of flower, flour,1 e.g., it is mainly the resultant divergence of graphic forms that gives us grounds to assert that the two meanings which originally made up the semantic structure of one word are now apprehended as belonging to two different words.

Synchronically the differentiation between homonymy and polysemy is wholly based on the semantic criterion. It is usually held that if a connection between the various meanings is apprehended by the speaker, these are to be considered as making up the semantic structure of a polysemantic word, otherwise it is a case of homonymy, not polysemy.

Thus the semantic criterion implies that the difference between polysemy and homonymy is actually reduced to the differentiation between related and unrelated meanings. This traditional semantic criterion does not seem to be reliable, firstly, because various meanings of the same word and the meanings of two or more different words may be equally apprehended by the speaker as synchronically unrelated/ For instance, the meaning 'a change in the form of a noun or pronoun' which is usually listed in dictionaries as one of the meanings of case!—'something that has happened', 'a question decided in a court of law' seems to be just as unrelated to the meanings of this word as to the meaning of case2 —'a box, a container', etc

Secondly in the discussion of lexico-grammatical homonymy it was pointed out that some of the mean of homonyms arising from conversion (e.g. seal in—seal 3 v; paper n—paper v) are related, so this criterion cannot be applied to a large group of homonymous word-forms in Modern English. This criterion proves insufficient in the synchronic analysis of a number of other borderline cases, e.g. brother—brothers— 'sons of the same parent' and brethren—'fellow members of a religious society'. The meanings may be apprehended as related and then we can speak of polysemy pointing out that the difference in the morphological structure of the plural form reflects the difference of meaning. Otherwise we may regard this as a case of partial lexical homonymy. The same is true of such cases as hang—hung—hung—'to support or be supported from above' and hang—hanged—hanged—'to put a person to death by hanging' all of which are traditionally regarded as different meanings of one polysemantic word.

It is sometimes argued that the difference between related and unrelated meanings may be observed in the manner in which the meanings of polysemantic words are as a rule relatable. It is observed that different meanings of one word have certain stable relationships which are not to be found between the meanings of two homonymous words. A clearly perceptible connection, e.g., can be seen in all metaphoric or metonymic meanings of one word (cf., e.g., foot of the man— foot of the mountain, loud voice—loud colors, etc.,1 cf. also deep well and deep knowledge, etc.).

Such semantic relationships are commonly found in the meanings of one word and are considered to be indicative’ of polysemy. It is also suggested that the semantic connection may be described in terms of such features as, e.g., form and function (cf. horn of an animal and horn as an instrument), process and result (to run—'move with quick steps' and a run—act of running).

Similar relationships, however, are observed between the meanings of two homonymic words, e.g. to run and a run in the stocking.

Moreover in the synchronic analysis of polysemantic words we often find meanings that cannot be related in any way, as, e.g., the meanings of the word case discussed above. Thus the semantic criterion proves not only untenable in theory but also rather vague and because of this impossible in practice as it cannot be used in discriminating between several meanings of one word and the meanings of two different words.

A more objective criterion of distribution suggested by some linguists is criteria: undoubtedly helpful, but mainly increase-distribution of lexico - grammatical and grammatical homonymy. When homonymic words of Context, belong to different parts of speech they differ not only in their semantic structure, but also in their syntactic function and consequently in their distribution. In the homonymic pair paper n—(to) paper v the noun may be preceded by the article and followed by a verb; (to) paper can never be found in identical distribution. This formal criterion can be used to discriminate not only lexico-grammatical but also grammatical homonyms, but it often fails the linguists in cases of lexical homonymy, not differentiated by means of spelling.

Homonyms differing in graphic form, e.g. such lexical homonyms as knight—night or flower—flour, are easily perceived to be two different lexical units as any formal difference of words is felt as indicative of the existence of two separate lexical units. Conversely lexical homonyms identical both in pronunciation and spelling are often apprehended as different meanings of one word. It is often argued that the context in which the words are used suffices to perceive the borderline between homonymous words, e.g. the meaning of case in several cases of robbery can be easily differentiated from the meaning of case2 in a jewel case, a glass case. This however is true of different meanings of the same word as recorded in dictionaries, e.g. of case as can be seen by comparing the case will be tried in the law-court and the possessive case of the noun. Thus, the context serves to differentiate meanings but is of little help in distinguishing between homonymy and polysemy. Consequently we have to admit that no formal means have as yet been found to differentiate between several meanings of one word and the meanings of its homonyms. We must take into consideration the note that in the discussion of the problems of polysemy and homonymy we proceeded from the assumption that the word is the basic unit of language.1 It should be pointed out that there is another approach to the concept of the basic language unit which makes the problem of differentiation between polysemy and homonymy irrelevant.

Some linguists hold that the basic and elementary units at the semantic level of language are the lexico-semantic variants of the word, i.e. individual word-meanings. In that case, naturally, we can speak only of homonymy of individual lexico-semantic variants, as polysemy is by definition, at least on the synchronic plane, the co-existence of several meanings in the semantic structure of the word. The criticism of this viewpoint cannot be discussed within the framework different semantic structure. The problem of homonymy is mainly the problem of differentiation between two different semantic structures of identically sounding words.

2. Homonymy of words and homonymy of individual word-forms may be regarded as full and partial homonymy. Cases of full homonymy are generally observed in words belonging to the same part of speech. Partial homonymy is usually to be found in word-forms of different parts of speech.

3. Homonymous words and word-forms may be classified by the type of meaning that serves to differentiate between identical sound-forms. Lexical homonyms differ in lexical meaning, lexico-grammatical in both lexical and grammatical meaning, whereas grammatical homonyms are those that differ in grammatical meaning only.

4. Lexico-grammatical homonyms are not homogeneous. Homonyms arising from conversion have some related lexical meanings in their semantic structure. Though some individual meanings may be related the whole of the semantic structure of homonyms is essentially different.

5. If the graphic form of homonyms is taken into account, they are classified on the basis of the three aspects — sound-form, graphic form and meaning — into three big groups: homographs (identical graphic form), homophones (identical sound-form) and perfect homonyms (identical sound- and graphic form).

6. The two main sources of homonymy are:

1) diverging meaning development of one polysemantic word, and

2) convergent sound development of two or more different words. The latter is the most potent factor in the creation of homonyms.

7. The most debatable problem of homonymy is the demarcation line between homonymy and polysemy, i.e. between different meanings of one word and the meanings of two or more phonemically different words.

8. The criteria used in the synchronic analysis of homonymy are:

1) the semantic criterion of related or unrelated meanings;

2) the criterion of spelling;

3) the criterion of distribution, and

4) the criterion of context.

In grammatical and lexico-grammatical homonymy the reliable criterion is the criterion of distribution. In lexical homonymy there are cases when none of the criteria enumerated above is of any avail. In such cases the demarcation line between polysemy and homonymy is rather fluid.'

9. The problem of discriminating between polysemy and homonymy in theoretical linguistics is closely connected with the problem of the basic unit at the semantic level of analysis.

In applied linguistics this problem is of the greatest importance in lexicography and also in machine translation.

During several scores of years the problem of distinction of polysemy and homonymy in a language was constantly arising the interest of lexicologists is in many countries. The English language as well as Russian and Uzbek ones could not escape this arguable question too. In my work I should like to sum up the experience concerning this field of study and make a comparative analysis of it on the basis of three languages.

**2.3.2 As it was mentioned above the lexical categories of homonyms and polysemantic words exist in all three languages, so we must, firstly, know what it meant by homonymy and polysemy**

Homonyms are words different in meaning but identical in sound or spelling, or both in sound and spelling. Homonyms can appear in the language not only as the result of the split of polysemy, but also as the result of leveling of grammar inflexions, when different parts of speech become identical in their outer aspect, e.g. «care» from «care» and «care» from «careen». They can be also formed by means of conversion, e.g. «to slim» from «slim», «to water» from «water». They can be formed with the help of the same suffix from the same stem, e.g. «reader» - a person who reads and a book for reading.

Homonyms can also appear in the language accidentally, when two words coincide in their development, e.g. two native words can coincide in their outer aspects: «to bear» from «beran» /to carry/ and «bear» from «bera» /an animal/. A native word and a borrowing can coincide in their outer aspects, e.g. «fair» from Latin «feria» and «fair « from native “fagen” /blond/. Two borrowings can coincide e.g. «base» from the French «base» /Latin basis/ and «base» /low/ from the Latin «bas» /Italian «basso»/.

Homonyms can develop through shortening of different words, e.g. «cab» from «cabriolet», «cabbage», «cabin».

Classifications of homonyms:

Let us give us the classification of homonyms according to the point of view of famous British lexicologist Walter Skeat1).

So Walter Skeet classified homonyms according to their spelling and sound forms and he pointed out three groups: perfect homonyms that is words identical in sound and spelling, such as : «school» - «косяк рыбы» and «школа» ; homographs, that is words with the same spelling but pronounced differently, e.g. «bow» -/bau/ -«noклон» and /bou/ - «лук»; homophones that is words pronounced identically but spelled differently, e.g. «night» - «ночь» and «knight» -«pыцарь».

Another classification was suggested by A.I Smirnitsky 2). He added to Skeat's classification one more criterion: grammatical meaning. He subdivided the group of perfect homonyms in Skeat's classification into two types of homonyms: perfect which are identical in their spelling, pronunciation and their grammar form, such as «spring» in the meanings: the season of the year, a leap, a source, and homo-forms which coincide in their spelling and pronunciation but have different grammatical meaning, e.g. «reading» - Present Participle, Gerund, Verbal noun., to lobby - lobby.

A more detailed classification was given by I.V. Arnold1). He classified only perfect homonyms and suggested four criteria of their classification: lexical meaning, grammatical meaning, basic forms and paradigms.

ccording to these criteria I.V. Arnold pointed out the following groups:

a) homonyms identical in their grammatical meanings, basic forms and paradigms and different in their lexical meanings, e.g. «board» in the meanings «a council» and «a piece of wood sawn thin»;

b) homonyms identical in their grammatical meanings and basic forms, different in their lexical meanings and paradigms, e.g. to lie - lied - lied, and to lie - lay - lain;

c) homonyms different in their lexical meanings, grammatical meanings, paradigms, but coinciding in their basic forms,

e.g. «light» / «lights»/, «light» / «lighter», «lightest»/;

d) homonyms different in their lexical meanings, grammatical meanings, in their basic forms and paradigms, but coinciding in one of the forms of their paradigms, e.g. «a bit» and «bit» (from «to bite»).

In I. V. Arnold's classification there are also patterned homonyms, which, differing from other homonyms, have a common component in their lexical meanings. These are homonyms formed either by means of conversion, or by leveling of grammar inflexions. These homonyms are different in their grammar meanings, in their paradigms, identical in their basic forms, e.g. «warm» - «to warm». Here we can also have unchangeable patterned homonyms which have identical basic forms, different grammatical meanings, a common component in their lexical meanings, e.g. «before» an adverb, a conjunction, a preposition. There are also homonyms among unchangeable words which are different in their lexical and grammatical meanings, identical in their basic forms, e.g. «for» - «для» and «for» - «и6o».

The word «polysemy» means «plurality of meanings» it exists only in the language, not in speech. A word which has more than one meaning is called polysemy.

Different meanings of a polysemantic word may come together due to the proximity of notions which they express.

E.g. The word «blanket» has the following meanings: a woolen covering used on beds, a covering for keeping a horse warm, a covering of any kind /a blanket of snow/, covering all or most cases /used attributively/, e.g. we can say «a blanket insurance policy».There are some words in the language which are monosynaptic, such as most terms, /synonym, molecule, bronchitis, some pronouns /this, my, both/, numerals, and so like.

There are two processes of the semantic development of a word: radiation and concatenation. In cases of radiation the primary meaning stands in the centre and the secondary meanings proceed out of it like rays. Each secondary meaning can be traced to the primary meaning. E.g. in the word «face» the primary meaning denotes «the front part of the human head» Connected with the front position the meanings: the front part of a watch, the front part of a building, the front part of a playing card was formed. Connected with the word «face» itself the meanings: expression of the face, outward appearance is formed.

In cases of concatenation secondary meanings of a word develop like a chain. In such cases it is difficult to trace some meanings to the primary one. E.g. in the word «crust» the primary meaning «hard outer part of bread» developed a secondary meaning «hard part of anything /a pie, a cake/», then the meaning »harder layer over soft snow» was developed, then «a sullen gloomy person», then «impudence» were developed. Here the last meanings have nothing to do with the primary ones. In such cases homonyms appear in the language. It is called the split of polysemy.

In most cases in the semantic development of a word both ways of semantic development are combined.

Nowadays methods of distinction of homonymy and polysemy were worked out. This helps us to differ the meaning of the same word and homonymy which formed in a result of the complete gap of polysemy. Below let us study the methods of studying of synonymy and homonymy.

1. The lexical method of distinction of homonymy and polysemy. This method is concluded in revealing the synonymic connection of polysemy and homonymy. If consonant units are get in one synonymic row when different meanings of words remain still the semantic intimacy and, there fore, it is early to say that polysemy is transferred in to homonymy. If the consonant words are not get in one synonymic row that words are homonymy.

Homonymy and polysemy are different categories in polysemy we deal with the different meanings of the same word. In homonymy we have different words which have their own meanings. For example, the word "man" has ten meanings in Modern English:

1 - человек; 2 - мужчина; 3 - адвокат; 4 - мужественный человек;5-человечество; 6 - слуга; 7 - рабочий; 8 - муж; 9 - вассал; 10 - пешка.

As the all meanings are connected with the major meaning "чeлoвeк". But homonyms are different words which have nothing in common иуецуут themselves.

For example "bark1” - "лай собаки" and "bark2" - "плывущий корабль". In this example we can see that homonymy words coincide only in pronunciation and writing.

2. Some scientists say that the substitution of different meanings of words by the synonyms may help to differ the homonyms from polysemantic words. This way of distinction of polysemy and homonymy gets its name in literature as “etiological criterion”.For example "voice1 - "sounds uttered in speaking" (sound); "voice2" - "mode of uttering sounds in speaking" (sound); "voice3" – “the vibration of the vocal cords in sounds uttered” (sound); "voice4" - "the form of the verb that express the relation of the subject to the action". "Voice1" - "voice2" - "voice3" are not homonymic in their character although they have different meanings because of the reason that they can be substituted by the synonymic word "sound". As far as "voice4" is concerned as homonymic to the previous three meanings because the fourth meaning of the word “sound” can not be substituted by the word common to the previous three meanings of the word “voice” (i.e. the analyzed meaning of the word "sound").

V. Abaev1) gave etymological criterion of distinguishing homonymic and polysemantic words. He says that homonyms are words which have different sources and only coincided phonetically.

3. We also use the semantic method of distinction of these occurrences. The meaning of homonyms always mutually excepts each other and the meaning of polysemantic words airs formed by one sensible structure keeping the semantic intimacy: one of the meanings assumes, while the other is non-irresistible limit.

The semantic criterion implies that the difference between polysemy and homonymy is actually reduced to the differentiation between related and unrelated meanings. This semantic criterion does not seen to be reliable, firstly, because various meanings of same word and the meanings of two or more different words may be equally apprehended by speaker.

It is some times argued that the difference between related and unrelated polysemantic words is, as a rule, relatable. It is observed that different meanings have certain stable relationships which are not to be found between the meanings of homonymous words. A clearly perceptible connection of such semantic relationships is commonly found in the meanings of one word and is considered to be indicative to polysemy. It is also suggested that the semantic connection may be described in terms of such features.

For example, we may give the following word

"face1" - 'the front part of human's head".

"face2" – “playing card, building, watches”.

In this example we can find that meanings form one sensible structure. Another example shares the same idea:

E.g. The word "fair1" which means "a person with light hairs" and "fair2" which means "just, honest". In this example the meanings except to each other and do not keep the semantic intimacy.

4. There is a fourth method of distinction of polysemy and homonymy. It is morphological method. It means that polysemy and homonymy are characterized by the various word -building. So some words which have a few meanings the new word is formed with the same suffix.

For example, for the word "park1" - "place of rest" we form a new word by ending “-ed-“: "parked" while in the word "park2'' - "a place of keeping automobiles" the new word is formed by “-ing-“ ending : "parking".

**6.2.2 Typological analysis of homonymy and polysemy in three languages**

Below we would like to compare the English differences between homonymy and polysemy with Russian and Uzbek equivalents.[[11]](#footnote-11)

As it was noticed above we have polysemy and homonymy in both Russian and Uzbek. As in English, in Russian and Uzbek homonyms are words identical in sound and spelling but different in meaning.

For example, "завод1” - "an industrial undertaking" and "завод2" - "a device which brings an action of a mechanism".

"o’t1" - "firewood", "o’t2" - "grass" and "o’t" - "the verb which means movement".

1) In this chapter we partially used the materials of the investigations of Prof. Buranov

As in English, in Russian and Uzbek we correspond to polysemantic words the words which have several connected meanings.

For example, "кольцо" - "one of the jewelry things" and "кольцо" - "a shape

of something, e.g. smoke". Another example is "ko’z1" - "a part of human's body" and "ko’z2" - "a sing on wood".

As in, English there is the lexical method of distinction of polysemy and homonymy is used in Russian and Uzbek in the same degree.

For example, in Russian the word "коренной1” – used in the meaning of "коренной житель” is referred to its synonym “исконный, основной” and the word "коренной2" in еру meaning of “коренной вопрос” corresponds to the synonym “главный”. The words “основной” “главный” used in this sense are synonymic in their character, so we may conclude, therefore, that in this example we have two meanings of one word.

The word "худой1" –used in the meaning of “не упитанный” is formed in the synonymic row with the adjectives “тощий, щуплый, сухой” while the word “худой2” forms its meaning with the adjectives “плохой”, “скверный”, “дурной”. So we can draw a conclusion that the words “тощий”, “щуплый” are not synonyms with the words “плохой”, “скверный” So in this case the words “худой1” and “худой2” are homonyms.

In Uzbek we have the same phenomenon: For example, the word “dum1” - "a part of animal's body" and “dum2” "a partial comet".

It means that these two meanings we can be substitutive with synonymy "the end of the body". It means that these words are polysemantic in their lexical meaning.

If we take another pair of words, e.g. "yoz1" - "summer" and "yoz2" - 'the form of the verb which expresses the order".

2. Ethimological method can be shown in the following:

For example, the word “голос1” used in the meaning of "sounds which are created when we speak", and the word “голос2” in the meaning of "sounds which appear in the course of vibration of humans’ vocal cords" and “голос3” in the meaning of "to give your vote on election". The words “голос1”and “голос2” can be substituted by the synonym common for both these words -"sound", while the third meaning of this word has nothing in common with the mentioned synonym. So we are able to draw the following conclusion: the first mentioned two meanings of the word “голос” are synonymic to each other, while the third mentioned meaning is homonymic to the previous twos.

Such kind of examples we can find in the Uzbek language as well. For instance, the words “ovoz1” we can substitute into the synonym "sound" while the word “ovoz2” in the meaning of “opinion a group of people” is homonymic to the first one, e.g. “yoshlar ovozi”.

3. The semantic criterion can also be compared in all three languages.

For example, in Russian the word “шляпка1” used in the meaning of "one of the things of woman's clothes and the word “шляпка2”used in the meaning of "the top beginning of a mushroom or a nail" can be compared as following: these two meanings mean “something round and located on the top”. So these two meanings are synonymic between each other.

The same example we can find in Uzbek. For instance, the word “bosh1”used in the meaning of "the beginning of human's body" and the word “bosh2” used in the meaning of “the main person in a work, e.g.”ishning boshi”. These two meanings are alike because they do the same function, so they are not homonymic, they are synonyms.

4. Morphological method of distinction of polysemy and homonymy can also be demonstrated in all the languages compared.

For example, in Russian, the noun “хлеб1” used in the meaning of “хлебный злак” and “хлеб2” used in the meaning of “пищевой продукт, выпекаемый из муки” form the adjective with the help of the suffix “-н“.

Cf.: “Хлебные всходы” and “Хлебный запах”.

In Uzbek the word “oy1” – e.g. “Yilda un ikkita oylar bor” and “oy2” – e.g. “oy – yerning yo’ldoshi” form the new word with the help of the suffix “lik”:

Cf.: “Oylik maoshi” and “Bir oylik 14 kundan iborat”.

So having analysed the phenomenona of homonymy and polyseny in the three languages we can draw the following conclusion to this chapter: there are no so big differences in these languages in respect to the linguistic phenomena analysed.

However, the following conclusion can also be drawn: the problem of distinction of homonymy and polysemy in all the languages compared has not been investigated thoroughly yet and there is still much opportunities to discover new fields of approaches and this problem is still waiting its salvation.

**Conclusion**

**1.3 Common review of the essence of the work**

Having analyzed the problem of homonyms in Modern English we could do the following conclusions:

a) The problem of homonyms in Modern English is very actual nowadays.

b) There are several problematic questions in the field of homonymy the major of which is the problem of distinguishing of homonyms and polysemantic words..

c) A number of famous linguists dealt with the problem of homonyms in Modern English. In particular, Profs. A. Buranov and J.Muminov were the first who dealt with this problem in our Republic, .Moloshnaya, V.I. Abaev etc.

d) The problem of homonymy is still waiting for its detail investigation.

**2.3 Perspectives of the qualification works**

Having said about the perspectives of the work we hope that this work will find its worthy way of applying at schools, lyceums and colleges of high education by both teachers and students of English. We also express our hopes to take this work its worthy place among the lexicological works dedicated to the types of shortening.
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