

Semantic Peculiarities of Homonymy in English and Uzbek

Pazilova Nasibaxon Muhammadqosimovna

Andijan State Foreign Languages Institute, Docent
npazilova304@gmail.com

Mamanazarova Sevinchxon Axmadjon qizi

Fergana State University
First-Year-Student Of Master's Degree
mamanazarovasevinchxon@gmail.com

Annotation. This article is devoted to the problems of the homonym, its forms, classifications of homonymous words and specific features of these words. Thus, it discusses semantic peculiarities of lexico-grammatical homonymy in English and Uzbek.

Key words: homonym, spelling, sound-form, spelling, monosyllabic structure, monosyllabic and polysyllabic homonyms.

It is clear that homonyms are generally defined as words different in meaning but either identical both in sound and spelling or identical only in sound or spelling. 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 divalent. 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, we observe full homonymy of the paradigms of two or more different words as 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, for example, 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. Professor O. Jespersen calculated that there are roughly four times as many monosyllabic as polysyllabic homonyms. It is easily observed that only some of the word-forms (for example, seal, seals, etc.) are homonymous, whereas others (for example, 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. [1,246]

This is true of a number of other cases, for example, compare find [faind], found [faund], found [faund] and found [faund], founded ['faundidj], 14 founded [faundid]; know [nou], knows [nouz], knew [nju:], and no [nou]; nose [nouz], noses [nouziz]; new [nju:] in which partial homonymy is observed. Some examples in Uzbek: qovoq- I (ko_z ustidagi qovoq) - qovoq- II (o'simlik nomi), chaq- I (zarb bilan yor-, parchala-) - chaq- II (nayza sanchib ozor ber-) 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 (for example seal(1) n – seal(2) n), partial homonymy as a rule is observed in word-forms belonging to different parts of speech (for example, 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 lie [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, for example, for [for] – disposition, for [fo:] – conjunction and four [fo:] – numeral, as these parts of speech have no other word-forms. Another example in Uzbek: tuy- I (kukun holatga keltir-) leksemasi bilan tuy- II (his et-) leksemasi, yon- I (predmetning o_ng yoki chap tomoni) leksemasi bilan yon- II (o_t ol-) and others. [2,249]

In a simple code each sign has only one meaning, and each meaning is associated with only one sign. This one-to-one relationship is not realised in natural languages. When several related meanings are associated with the same group of sounds within one part of speech, the word is called *p o l y s e m a n t i c*, when two or more unrelated meanings are associated with the same form — the words are *h o m o n y m s*, when two or more different forms are associated with the same or nearly the same denotative meanings — the words are *s y n o n y m s*. Actually, if we describe the lexical system according to three distinctive features, each of which may be present or absent, we obtain the possible combinations. To represent these usual tables with only horizontal and vertical subdivisions are inadequate, so we make use of a mapping technique developed for simplifying logical truth functions by E.W. Veitch that proved very helpful in our semantic studies. In the example below a small section of the lexico-semantic system of the language connected with the noun sound (as in sound of laughter) is represented as a set of oppositions involving phonetical form, similar lexical meaning and grammatical part-of-speech meaning. Every pair of words is contrasted according to sameness or difference in three distinctive features at once.

For example: qovoqni I - qovoqni II, qovog__ini I - qovog__ini II, qovoqlarimni I - qovoqlarimni II; chaqdi I – chaqdi II, chaqadi I – chaqadi II, chaqibdi I – chaqibdi II kabi. So, two or more words identical in sound and spelling but different in meaning, distribution and (in many cases) origin are called *h o m o n y m s*. The term is derived from Greek homonymous (homos ‘the same’ and ‘onoma’ name’) and thus expresses very well the sameness of name combined with the difference in meaning. [3,147]

For example, oy- I (planeta nomi) - oy- II (yilning o’n ikkidan bir qismi), chop- I (yugur-) – chop- II (yer sathini qirqib ag’dar-) and others. 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; that 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, as a rule only one of 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 (Wilde), 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, a living person’ and the organ that secretes bile’ are, for instance, intentionally present in the following play upon words: —Is life worth living? —It depends upon the liver.

Compare: —What do you do with the fruit? —We eat what we can, and what we can’t eat we can. Very seldom can ambiguity of this kind interfere with understanding. The following example is unambiguous, although the words back and part have several homonyms, and maid and heart are polysemantic: Maid of Athens, ere we part, Give, oh give me back my heart (Byron). 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. [3,148]

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 (compare. daddy--colloquial, parent--bookish).

Consequently, all cases of homonymy may be classified into full and partial homonymy — i.e. homonymy of words and homonymy of individual word-forms. The bulk of full homonyms are to be found within the same parts of speech (e.g. seal1 n — seal2 n), partial homonymy as a rule is observed in word-forms belonging to different parts of speech (for example, seal1 n — seal3 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 — lie [lai] — to be in a

horizontal or resting position' and He [lai] — to make an untrue statement' — 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 too; for example, for [fo:] — preposition, for [fo:] — conjunction and four [fo:] — numeral, as these parts of speech have no other word-forms.[4,123]

Homonyms may be also classified by the type of meaning into lexical, lexico-grammatical and grammatical homonyms. In seal1 n and seal2 n, for example, the part-of-speech meaning of the word and the grammatical meanings of all its forms are identical (compare. seal [si:l] Common Case Singular, seal's [si:lz] Possessive Case Singular for both seal1 and seal2). The difference is confined to the lexical meaning only: seal1 denotes 'a sea animal', 'the fur of this animal', etc., seal2 — 'a design printed on paper, the stamp by which the design is made', etc. So we can say that seal2 and seal1 are *l e x i c a l h o m o n y m s* because they differ in lexical meaning. An example in Uzbek: ot- I (ism) – ot- II (ish hayvoni) – ot- III (fe'l); bunda ot- I – ot- II munosabati – omonim omoleksemalar; ot- I - ot- III va ot II – ot III munosabati – omoforma omoleksemalar If we compare seal1 — 'a sea animal', and (to) seal3 — '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, 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 *l e x i c o - g r a m m a t i c a l*.

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, for example, in the verbs (to) find [faind] and (to) found [faund], where the 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, for example, asked [a:skt] — asked [a:skt]; in the paradigm of nouns we usually find homonymous forms of the Possessive Case Singular and the Common Case Plural, for example, brother's — brothers. It may be easily observed that *g r a m m a t i c a l h o m o n y m y* is the homonymy of different word-forms of one and the same word. For example, o_t- II (olov) - o_t- III (kishi tanasidagi a'zoning nomi) - o_tIV (fe'l); bunda o_t- I - o_t- II, o_t- I - o_t- III, o_t- II - o_t- III munosabati – omonim omoleksemalar; o_t- I - o_t- IV, o_t- II - o_t- IV, o_t- III - o_t- IV munosabati – omoforma omoleksemalar and others.[5,127]

The two classifications: *f u l l* and *p a r t i a l h o m o n y m y* and *l e x i c a l*, *l e x i c o - g r a m m a t i c a l* and *g r a m m a t i c a l h o m o n y m y* 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 also by the type of meaning in which homonymous words or word-forms differ. So, we speak of the full lexical homonymy of seal1 n and seal2 n, of the partial lexical homonymy of lie1 v and lie 2 v, and of the partial lexico-grammatical homonymy of seal1 n and seal 3 v. Various types of classification for homonyms proper have been suggested.

A comprehensive system may be worked out 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. For the sake of completeness, we shall consider this problem in terms of the same mapping technique used for the elements of vocabulary system connected with the word sound. As both form and meaning can be further subdivided, the combination of distinctive features by which two words are compared becomes more complicated — there are four features: the form may be phonetical and graphical, the meaning — lexical and grammatical, a word may also have a paradigm of grammatical forms different from the basic form. The distinctive features are lexical meaning (different denoted by A, or nearly the same denoted by A), grammatical meaning (different denoted by B, or same by B), paradigm (different denoted by C, or same denoted by C), and basic form (different D and same D). [6,37]

The term —nearly same lexical meaning‖ must not be taken too literally. It means only that the corresponding members of the opposition have some important invariant semantic components in common. —Same grammatical meaning‖ implies that both members belong to the same part of speech. For example: suz- I (sutni suz-) - suz- II (ovqatni idishlarga sol-) – suz- III (ko_zini suz-) – suz- IV (suvda suz-)

- suz- V (shoxi bilan suz-); Same paradigm comprises also cases when there is only one word form, 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 twelve possible classes. The 12 classes are: ABCD. Members of the opposition light n the contrary of darkness': light a _not heavy' are different in lexical and grammatical meaning, have different 20 paradigms but the same basic form. The class of partial homonymy is very numerous. A further subdivision might take into consideration the parts of speech to which the members belong, namely the oppositions of noun: verb, adjective: verb, n: adjective, etc. For example: sur- I (qorako _lning navi) - sur- II (och kulrang, ko _kimtir) - sur- III (qurtilgan) – sur- IV (beti qattiq) - sur- V (siljit-) – sur- VI (ishqa-); bunda sur- II - sur- III, sur- II – sur- VI, sur- III – sur- VI munosabatlari , shuningdek sur- V – sur- VI munosabati – omonim omoleksemalar, sur- I bilan sur- II, sur- III, sur- IV, sur- V, sur VI munosabatlarining har biri – omoforma omoleksemalar. BCD. Same as above, only not both members are in their basic form. The noun (here might "power") is in its basic form, the singular, but the verb may 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. Compare also bit n a small piece' and bit (the Past Indefinite Tense and Participle II of bite). ABCD. Contains pairs of words belonging to the same part of speech, different in their basic form but coinciding in some oblique form, e. g. in the plural, or in the case of verbs, in the Past Tense. Axe — axes, axis — axes. The type is rare. ABCD.

Different lexical meaning, same basic form, same grammatical meaning and different paradigm: lie — lay — lain and lie — lied — lied. Not many cases belong to this group. ABCD. Represents pairs different in lexical and grammatical meaning but not in paradigm, as these are not changeable form words. Examples: for prp contrasted to for cj. ABCD. The most typical case of full homonymy accepted by everybody and exemplified in every textbook. Different lexical meanings, but the homonyms belong to the same part of speech: spring1 n a leap': spring 2 a source': spring 3 n the season in which vegetation begins'. ABCD.

Patterned homonymy. Differs from the previous (ABCD) in the presence of some common component in the lexical meaning of the members, some lexical invariant: before prp, before adv, before cj, all express some priority in succession. This type of opposition is regular among form words. Pairs showing maximum identity. But as their lexical meaning is only approximately the same, they may be identified as variants of one polysemantic word. ABCD. Contains all the cases due to conversion: eye n: eye v. The members differ in grammatical meaning and paradigm. This group is typical of patterned homonymy. Examples of such noun-to-verb or verb-to-noun homonymy can be augmented almost indefinitely. The meaning of the second element can always be guessed if the first is known. ABCD. Pairs belonging to different parts of speech and coinciding in some of the forms. Their similarity is due to a common root, as in thought n: thought v (the Past Indefinite Tense of think). ABCD. Similarity in both lexical and grammatical meaning combined with difference in form is characteristic of synonyms and hyponyms. ABCD. The group is not numerous and comprises chiefly cases of double plural with a slight change in meaning such as brother — brothers: brother — brethren. It goes without saying that this is a model that gives a general scheme.

To sum up, a group of homonyms may contain members belonging to different groups in this classification. [7,342] Take, for example, fell1 n _animal's hide or skin with the hair'; fell 2 n hill' and also a stretch of North-English moorland'; fell 3 a fierce' (poet.); fell 4 v to cut down trees' and as a noun amount of timber cut'; fell 5 (the Past Indefinite Tense of the verb fall). This group may be broken into pairs, each of which will fit into one of the above described divisions. Thus, fell1 : fell 2 may be characterised as ABCD, fell1 : fell4 as ABCD and fell 4 : fell 5 as ABCD.

References

1. Potter S. Modern Linguistics. Lnd., 1957 pp.37-54
2. Rakhimov S.R. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. -Andijon 2011 pp. 22-23.
3. Schlauch, Margaret. The English Language in Modern Times. Warszawa, 1965. p. 342.
4. Sheard, John. The Words we Use. N.Y. 1954. p.39.
5. Smirnitsky A.I. Homonyms in English. -M. 1977. p. 68-72.
6. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. Oxford 1964. pp. 147-148
7. Ullmann S. Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. -Oxford, 1962. p. 139-141.

8. Pazilova N. TEACHING SPEAKING SKILLS - OVERCOMING CLASSROOM PROBLEMS. TEACHING SPEAKING SKILLS - OVERCOMING CLASSROOM PROBLEMS. ResearchJet Journal of Analysis and Inventions. VOLUME 2, ISSUE 5, MAY-2021.
9. Pazilova N. EFFECTIVE METHODS OF TEACHING WRITING SKILLS IN DIFFERENT CLASSES. EFFECTIVE METHODS OF TEACHING WRITING SKILLS IN DIFFERENT CLASSES. ResearchJet Journal of Analysis and Inventions. VOLUME 2, ISSUE 5, MAY-2021.
10. Pazilova N. EFFECTIVE WAYS OF TEACHING AND EXPANDING VOCABULARY. ResearchJet Journal of Analysis and Inventions. VOLUME 2, ISSUE 5, MAY-2021.
11. Pazilova N. EFFECTIVE METHODS OF TEACHING WRITING (THE USE OF “CHARACTER WHEEL” METHOD). EURASIAN JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH. Volume 1, Issue 2. Part 2. May 2021. Volume 1 Issue 02, May 2021. ISSN 2181-2020. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4904069>
12. Pazilova N. “O’RGANILAYOTGAN TIL STILISTIKASI FANIDAN ELEKTRON QO’LLANMA”. Электрон ўқув қўлланма. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Адлия вазирлиги ҳузуридаги интеллектуал мулк агентлиги. №ДГУ 14247. 17.12.2021.
13. Pazilova N. THE INVESTIGATION OF SYNTACTICAL EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYLISTIC DEVICES IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UZBEK. International Journal of Research in commerce, IT, Engineering and Social Sciences ISSN No: 2349-7793 VOLUME16, Issue 01 January, 2022.