

DİLÇİLİK

<https://doi.org/10.62837/2026.3.3>

AUL, Doctor of Science, prof. NİGAR CHINGIZ VALIYEVA
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-9809-7688>

DIFFICULTIES CREATED BY HOMONYMY IN UNDERSTANDING

Key words: intercultural communication, homonyms, homographs, homophones, context.

Açar sözlər: mədəniyyətlərarası ünsiyyət, omonimlər, omoqraflar, omofonlar, kontekst.

Ключевые слова: межкультурная коммуникация, омонимы, омографы, омофоны, контекст.

The flowing current events in the policy of modern world show us that the activity of the countries and international organizations in the international relations includes not only the spheres of policy and economy, but at the same time also of culture. Intercultural communication between peoples is an integral attribute of the human society development. Not a single country, even the one considered most powerful in political and economic aspect, can meet cultural and aesthetic requests and needs of the humankind without applying to the world cultural heritage, spiritual heritage of other countries and peoples. The modern world is developing towards globalization. In this regard, the issues about the role and the place of intercultural communication become an integral part of life both the humankind in general, as well as for the individual [Valiyeva: 2016, 116]. Languages are the most powerful instruments of preserving and developing our tangible and intangible heritage. All moves to promote the dissemination of mother tongues will serve not only to encourage linguistic diversity and multilingual education but also to develop fuller awareness of linguistic and cultural traditions throughout the world and to inspire solidarity based on understanding, tolerance and dialogue. Learning foreign languages gives the learners insight into the people, culture and traditions of other countries and helps them to understand their own language and culture. Language is the means of the forming, developing and keeping of the culture. Language and culture are closely interrelated. Culture is the foundation of communication. Cultures provide people with ways of thinking, seeing, hearing and interpreting the world. Thus, the study of cross-cultural communication is fast becoming a global research area. As a result cultural differences in the study of cross-cultural communication can

already be found. The role of cultural learning in the foreign language auditorium has been the concern of many scholars and teachers and has sparked considerable controversy, yet its validity as an equal complement to language learning has often been overlooked or even impugned [Valiyeva: 2016, 129-130].

In our global world intercultural communication is developing every year. It unites people of diverse cultures, customs, ways of thinking, social norms, habits and language skills. However, one must take into account the various difficulties in understanding some words, especially homonyms in global English. Homonyms are the words and other units of language that are identical in spelling and pronunciation but different in meaning. The term was introduced by Aristotle. The term is derived from Greek “homonymous” by means of the words “homos” means “the same” and “onoma” means “name”, and thus expresses very well the sameness of name combined with the difference in meaning. Not to be confused with homophones, homographs, paronyms, and a subtype of homonyms, homoforms. The traditional approach is based on historical criteria. Lexemes with the same form but different origin are treated as homonyms and presented in separate entries. The word “ball” noun is a sphere, any spherical body; “ball” noun as “round object” has the Germanic origin; “ball” noun is a large dancing party; “ball” noun as “dance” is of Romance origin. In linguistics, homonyms are words which are either homographs - words that have the same spelling (regardless of pronunciation) or homophones - words that have the same pronunciation (regardless of spelling) or both. Using this definition, the words “row” (propel with oars), “row” (a linear arrangement) and “row” (an argument) are homonyms because they are homographs (though only the first two are homophones); so are the words “see” (vision) and “sea” (body of water), because they are homophones (though not homographs). 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 the 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, 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: “Is life worth living.” - “It depends upon the liver.” “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.

From the viewpoint of their morphological structure, they are mostly one-morpheme words. 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 “caru” and “care” from “carian”. 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” is 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/; “bank”, noun – a shore; “bank”, noun – an institution for receiving, lending, exchanging money. A native word and a borrowing can coincide in their outer aspects, e.g. “fair” from Latin “feria” and “fair” from native “fager” /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”. Most words differ from each other in both spelling and pronunciation, therefore they call them allonyms. Not so many linguists distinguish this category. But it must be admitted that Keith C. Ivey, in his discussion of homonyms, recognizes this fact and writes: “These familiar with combinatory may have noticed that there is a fourth possible category based on spelling and pronunciation: words that differ in spelling and pronunciation as well as meaning and origin (alligator/true). These pairs are technically known as different words” [Smirnitsky: 1956, 96].

Unfortunately, this seemingly neat solution doesn’t work because all heteronym are different words as Ivey’s examples show. He illustrates homophones with board / bored, clearly two different words though pronounced alike, and his example of homographs (the verb “desert” / the noun “desert”) again shows, by their pronunciation, that they are different words. Even his example of homonyms - words having both the same sound and spelling, as illustrated by “to quail” and “a quail” clearly shows they are different words. Lexicographers underline this point by writing separate entries for different words, whether or not they have the same

spelling and pronunciation. An allonym is a word that differs in spelling and pronunciation from all other words, whereas both homonyms and heteronyms identify words that are the same, in some ways, as other words. No doubt in ordinary usage, we will have little need for this term, although it would simplify lexical explanation if one could start by making the claim that the most words in English are allonyms. The clear exceptions are other groups.

Different words that are spelled and pronounced the same way are correctly called homonyms proper-but some writers, confusingly, call them heteronyms. When different words are spelled the same way but pronounced differently. It is precise to call them homographs and they are sometimes misleadingly called heteronyms. By contrast, when different words are pronounced the same way but spelled differently, we may properly call them homophones, rarely, they have also been called heteronyms. Homonyms proper are words, as I have already mentioned, identical in pronunciation and spelling, like fast and live above. Other examples are: “back” noun in the meaning of “part of a body” – “back” adverb in the meaning of “a way from the front” – “back” verb in the meaning of “go back”; “ball” noun in the meaning of “a gathering of people for dancing” – “ball” noun in the meaning of “round object used in games”; “bark” noun in the meaning of “the noise made by dog” – “bark” verb in the meaning of “to utter sharp explosive cries”- “bark” noun in the meaning of “the skin of a tree”- “bark” noun in the meaning of “a sailing ship”; “base” noun in the meaning of “bottom”- “base” verb in the meaning of “build or place upon”- “base” in the meaning of a “mean”; “bay” noun in the meaning of “part of the sea or lake filling wide - mouth opening of land”- “bay” noun in the meaning of “recess in a house or room”- “bay” verb in the meaning of “bark”- “bay” noun in the meaning of “the European laurel.” The important point is that homonyms are distinct words: not different meanings within one word. Homophones are words of the same sound but of different spelling and meaning: “air-hair, arms-arms, buy-by, him-hymn, knight-night, not-knot, or-oar, piece-peace, rain-reign, scent-cent, steel-steal, storey-story, write-right” and many others. In the sentence “the play-wright on my right think it right that some conventional rite should symbolize the right of every man to write as he pleases the sound complex [rait] is a noun, an adjective, an adverb and a verb, has four different spellings and six different meanings. 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.”

On the other hand, whole sentence may be homophonic: The sons raise meat - The sun’s rays meet. To understand these one needs a wider context. If you hear the second in the course of a lecture in optics, you will understand it without thinking of the possibility of the first. Homographs are words different in sound and in meaning but accidentally identical in spelling: bow [bou] - bow [bau]; lead [li:d] - lead [led]; row [rou] - row [rau]; sewer [‘soue]- sewer [sjue]; wind [wind] - wind [waɪnd] 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 can 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 terms 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. The classification, which I have mentioned above, is certainly not precise enough and does not reflect certain important features of these words, and, most important of all, their status as parts of speech. The examples given their show those homonyms may belong to both to the same and to different categories of parts of speech. Obviously, the classification of homonyms should reflect this distinctive feature. Also, the paradigm of each word should be considered, because it has been observed that the paradigms of some homonyms coincide completely, and of others only partially. According to A.I.Smirnitskiy classifies homonyms into two large classes: full homonyms and partial homonyms [Smirnitsky: 1956]. The most widely accepted classification is that recognizing homonyms proper, homophones and homographs. A comprehensive system may be worked out if we are guided by the theory of opposition and in classifying the homonyms take into consideration the difference and sameness in their lexical and grammatical meaning, paradigm and basic form.

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 phonetic and graphical, the meaning- lexical and grammatical, a word may also have a paradigm of grammatical forms different from the basic form. The term “nearly same lexical meaning” must 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. Same paradigm comprises also cases when there is only one word from, 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 twelve possible cases. There are a lot of different sources of homonyms in English language, so let’s talk about some of them, which are the most important ones, due to my point of view. One source of homonyms is phonetic changes, which words undergo in the course of their historical development. As a result of such changes, two or more words, which were formally pronounced differently, may develop

identical sound forms and thus become homonyms. “Night” and “knight”, for instance, were not homonyms in Old English as the initial “k” in the second word was pronounced, and not dropped as it is in its modern sound form: O.E. “kniht” (cf. O.E. “niht”). A more complicated change of form brought together another pair of homonyms: “to knead” (O.E. “cneadan”) and “to need” (O.E. “neodian”). In Old English the verb “to write” had the form “writan”, and the adjective right had the forms “reht, riht”. The noun “sea” descend from the Old English form “sae”, and the verb “to see”- from O.E. “seon”. The noun “work” also had different forms in Old English: “wyrkean” and “weork” respectively.

Borrowing is another source of homonyms. A borrowed word may, in the final stage of its phonetic adaptation, duplicate in form either a native word or another borrowing. So, in the group of homonyms: “rite” noun – “to write” verb – “right” adjective. The second and the third words are of native origin whereas “rite” is a Latin borrowing “ritus”. In the pair “piece” noun – “peace” noun, the first originates from Old French “pais”, and the second from Old French Gualish “pettia”. “Bank” noun in the meaning of “a shore” is a native word, and “bank” noun in the meaning of “a financial institution” is an Italian borrowing. “Fair” adjective as “in fair deal, it’s not fair” is native and “fair” noun in the meaning of “a gathering of buyers and sellers” is a French borrowing. “Match” noun in the meaning of “a game: a contest of skill, strength” is native and “match” noun in the meaning of “a slender short piece of wood used for producing fire” is a French borrowing. Word building also contributes significantly to the growth of homonymy, and the most important type in this respect is undoubtedly conversion. Such pairs of words as “comb” noun – “to comb” verb; “pale” adjective – “to pale” verb; “make” noun - “to make” verb are numerous in the vocabulary. Homonyms of this type, which are the same in sound and spelling but refer to different categories of parts of speech, are called lexico-grammatical homonyms. Shortening is a further type of word building, which increases the number of homonyms. “Fan” noun in the meaning of “enthusiastic admirer of some kind of sport or of an actor, singer” is a shortening produced from fanatic. Its homonym is a Latin borrowing “fan” noun, which denotes “an implement for waving lightly to produce a cool current of air”. The noun “rep” denoting “a kind of fabric” has three homonyms made by shortening: “rep” noun (repertory), “rep” noun (representative), “rep” noun (reputation); all the three are informal words. During World War II girls serving in the Women’s Royal Naval Service (an auxiliary of the British Royal Navy) were jokingly nicknamed Wrens (informal). This neologistic formation made by shortening has the homonym “wren” in the meaning of “a small bird with dark brown plumage barred with black”, in Azerbaijani: “gicitkən”; in Russian: “красивник”. Words made by sound-imitation can also form pairs of homonyms with other words: “bang” noun in the meaning of “a loud, sudden, explosive noise”- “bang” noun in the meaning of “a fringe of hair

combed over the forehead”. Also “mew” noun in the meaning of “the sound that the cat makes” – “mew” noun in the meaning of “a sea gull”- “mew” noun in the meaning of “a pen in which poultry is fattened”- “mews” in the meaning of “small terraced houses in Central London”. The above-described various sources of homonyms have one important feature common. In all the mentioned cases the homonyms developed from two or more different words, and their similarity is purely accidental. In this respect, conversion certainly presents an exception for in pairs of homonyms formed by conversion one word of the pair is produced from the other: “a find - to find”.

Now we come to a further source of homonyms, which differs essentially from all the above cases. Two or more homonyms can originate from different meanings of the same word when, for some reason, the semantic structure of the word breaks into several parts. This type of formation of homonyms is called disintegration or split of polysemy. From what has been said above about polysemantic words, it should become clear that the semantic structure of a polysemantic word presents a system within which all its constituent meanings are held together by logical associations. In most cases, the function of the arrangement and the unity is determined by one of the meanings: “Fire” noun in the meaning of “flame” – which is an instance of destructive burning, a forest fire. Or “fire” noun in the meaning of “burning material in a stove, fireplace”. E.g.: “There is a fire in the next room. A camp fire. The shooting of guns: to open (cease) fire. Strong feeling, passion, and enthusiasm: a speech lacking fire”. If this meaning happens to disappear from word’s semantic structure, associations between the rests of the meanings may be served; the semantic structure loses its unity and fails into two or more parts which then become accepted as independent lexical units. There are different classifications of homonyms. Homonyms are distinguished into three types: homonyms proper; homophones; homographs. Homonyms are the same in sound and spelling are traditionally termed homonyms proper. E.g.: match, (n.) – a game, match, (n.) – thing is used for producing fire. Homonyms proper can be named by other terms. As for definition of I.A. Arnold these words are perfect homonyms [Arnold: 1986], A.I. Smirnitsky called them full homonyms. Homonyms are the same in sound but different in spelling can be defined as homophones. E.g.: a piece (n.) – peace (n.); cent (n.) – sent (v.); write (v.) – right (adj.); maid (n.) – made (v.). The examples here show that homophones may be belong both to the same and to different categories of parts of speech. A.I. Smirnitsky offered the following definition, “Homonyms belonging to different categories of parts of speech and possessing one identical form in their paradigms are called partial homonyms” [Smirnitsky: 1956, 96]. Homographs are words with the same spelling but pronounced differently. E.g. bow –[bau]- (v.) – to incline the head or body in salutation, bow – [bəu] – (n.) – a flexible strip of wood for propelling arrows; to lead

[li:d] – (v.) – to conduct on the way, go before to show the way, lead [led] – (n.) – a heavy, rather soft metal. A more detailed classification was given by I.V. Arnold. She classified only perfect homonyms and suggested four criteria of their classification: lexical meaning, grammatical meaning, basic forms and paradigms. According to these criteria I.V. Arnold pointed out the following groups: homonyms are identical in their grammatical meanings, basic forms and paradigms (a typical example or model of a word) and different in their lexical meanings, e.g. a board in the meanings a council and “a thin flat piece of wood”; homonyms are 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; homonyms are different in their lexical meanings, grammatical meanings, paradigms, but coinciding in their basic forms, e.g. light – lights, light – lighter – lightest; homonyms are different in their lexical meanings, grammatical meanings, in their basic forms, but coinciding in one of the forms of their paradigms, e.g. a bit and bit (from “to bite”) [Arnold: 1986]. Let us consider the history of three homonyms: “board” noun in the meaning of “a long and thin piece of timber”; “board” noun in the meaning of “daily meals, esp. as provided for pay”, e.g. “room and board”; “board” noun in the meaning of “an official group of persons who direct or supervise some activity”, e.g. “a board of directors”. It is clear that the meanings of these three words are in no way associated with one another. Yet, larger dictionaries still enter a meaning of board that once held together all these other meanings “a table”. It developed from the meaning “a piece of timber” by transference based on contiguity - association of an object and the material from which it is made. The meanings “meals” and “an official group of persons” developed from the meaning “table”, also by transference based on contiguity: meals are easily associated with a table, on which they are served; an official group of people in authority are also likely to discuss their business round a table. Nowadays, however the item of the furniture, on which meals are served and round which boards of directors meet, is no longer denoted by the word board but by the French Norman borrowing “table” and “board” in this meaning, though still registered by some dictionaries, can very well be marked as archaic as it is no longer used in common speech. That is why, with the intrusion of the borrowed “table” the word “board” actually lost its corresponding meaning. But it was just that meaning which served as a link to hold together the rest of the constituent parts of the word’s semantic structure. With its diminished role as an element of communication, its role in the semantic structure was also weakened. The speakers almost forgot that “board” had not ever been associated with any item of furniture, nor could they associate the notions of meals or of a responsible committee with a long thin piece of timber, which is the oldest meaning of “board”. Consequently, the semantic structure of “board” was split into three units. The following scheme illustrates the process: historically all three nouns originate from the same verb with the meaning of “to

jump. “To leap” (O.E. “springan”), so that the meaning of the first homonym is the oldest. The meanings of the second and third homonyms were originally based on metaphor. For example: “At the head of a stream the water sometimes leaps up out of the earth, so that metaphorically such a place could well be described as a leap”. On the other hand, the season of the year following winter could be poetically defined as “a leap from the darkness and cold into sunlight and life”. Such metaphors are typical enough of Old English and Middle English semantic transferences, but not so characteristic of modern mental and linguistic processes. The poetic associations that lay in the basis of the semantic shifts described above have long since been forgotten, and an attempt to reestablish the lost links may well seem far-fetched. It is just the near-impossibility of establishing such links that seems to support the claim for homonymy and not for polysemy with these three words.

However, it should be stressed that split of the polysemy as a source of homonyms is not accepted by all scholars. It is really difficult sometimes to decide whether a certain word has or has not been subject to the split of the semantic structure and whether we are dealing with different meanings of the same word or with homonyms, for the criteria are subjective and imprecise. The imprecision is recorded in the data of different dictionaries, which often contradict each other on this very issue, so that board is represented as two homonyms in V.K.Muller’s dictionary, as three homonym in V.D.Arakin’s and as one and the same word in Hornby’s dictionary [Muller: 1960; Hornby: 1967; Arakin: 1987]. “Spring” also receives different treatment V.K.Muller’s and Hornby’s dictionaries acknowledge but two homonyms: “a season of the year” - the act of springing, a leap; - a place where a stream of water comes up out of the earth. And some other meanings, whereas V.D.Arakin’s dictionary presents the three homonyms as given above [Arakin: 1987]. 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 information retrieval. These problems are: the criteria distinguishing homonym 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 non-patterned 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 thought; they exist for the speaker though in so far as must contrast 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 one is justified in taking into one entry match, as in football match, and match in meet one's match "one's equal". 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. Nevertheless the problem cannot be dropped altogether as upon an efficient arrangement of dictionary entries depend the amount of time spent by readers in looking up a word: a lexicographer will either save or waste his reader's time and effort. Actual solutions differ. It is a wildly 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 they belong to different parts of speech. 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 A.S.Hornby [Hornby: 1967]. The truth is that there exists no universal criterion for distinction between polysemy and homonymy. Polysemy characterizes words that have more than one meaning; any dictionary search will reveal that most words are polysemes-word itself as twelve significant senses, according to Word Net1. This means that the word is used in texts scanned by lexicographers to represent twelve different concepts. The point is that words are not meanings, although they can have many meanings. Lexicographers make a clear distinction between different words by writing separate entries for each other of them, whether or not they are spelled the same way. The dictionary of Fred W. Riggs has five entries for the form, bow- this shown that lexicographers recognize this form (spelling) as a way of representing five different words [Riggs: 1999]. Three of them are pronounced "bo" and two "bau", which identify two homophones in this set of five homographs, each of which is a polyseme, capable of representing more than one concept. To summarize: "bow" is a word-form that stands for two different homophones, and, as a homograph, represents five different words. Moreover the form "bow" is polysemic and can represent more than 200 concepts, its various meanings or senses. By gratuitously putting meaning in its definition of a homograph, word "net" can mislead readers who might think that a word is a homonym because it has several meanings, but having one word represent more than one concept is normal, just consider term as an example: it can not only refer to the designator of a concept, but also the duration of something, like the school year or a politician's hold on office, a legal stipulation, one's standing in a relationship (on good terms) and many other notions, more than seventeen are identified in the dictionary edited by Fred W. Riggs [Riggs: 1999]. By contrast, homonyms are different words and each of them, as a polyseme, can have multiple meanings. To make their definitions precise, lexicographers need criteria to distinguish different words from each other even though they are spelled the same way. This usually

hinges on etymology and, sometimes, parts of speech. One might, for example, think that firm “steadfast” and firm “business unit” is two senses of one word (polyseme). Lexicographers class them as different words because the first evolved from a Latin stem meaning throne or chair, and the latter from a different root in Italian meaning signature. Dictionaries are not uniform in their treatment of the different grammatical forms of a word. In some of them, the adjective firm (securely) is handled as a different word from the noun firm (to settle) even though they have the same etymology. Fred W. Riggs isn't persuaded such differences justify treating grammatical classes (adjectives, nouns and verbs) of a word-form that belongs to a single lexeme as a different words- the precise meaning of lexeme is Word Net is a Lexical Database for English prepared by the Cognitive Science Laboratory at Princeton University. The relevant point here is that deciding whether or not a form identifies one or more than one lexeme does not hinge on meanings. There is agreement that a word-form represents different words when they evolved from separate roots, and some lexicographers treat each grammatical use of a lexeme (noun, verb, adjective) a though it were a different word. The etymological criterion may lead to distortion of the present day situation. The English vocabulary of today 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 lexicographers guided by etymological criteria only. A more or less simple, if not very rigorous, procedure based on purely synchronic data may be prompted by analysis of dictionary definitions. 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: a) “A child's voice is heard”. b) “His voice... was... annoyingly well-bred”. We have mention that the voice-voicelessness distinction sets up some English consonants in opposed pairs. “In the voice contrast of active and passive... the active is the unmarked form”. The first variant may be defined as “sound uttered in speaking or singing as characteristic of a particular person”, the second variant as “mode of uttering sounds in speaking or singing”, the third sentence 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 form 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 local chords” Maugham W.S. “The Kite”. This brings us to the problem of patterned homonym, 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 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 and adverb. English lexicographers think it quite possible for one and the same word to function as different parts of speech. Such pairs as act n- act v; back n- back v; drive n- drive v; the above mentioned after and before and the like, are all treated as one word functioning as different parts of speech. 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 word 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 head” will be one word, an uncountable noun; whereas “a single thread of hair” will be denoted by another word (the second “hair”) 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 following jocular example: I think that this “that” is a conjunction, but that “that” man used as 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’s example: Will change of air cure love? 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” - preposition, adverb; “act” – noun, verb; “after” - preposition, adverb, conjunction; “age” - noun, verb; “back” - noun, adverb, verb; “ball” - noun, verb; “bank” - noun, verb; “before” - preposition, adverb, conjunction; “besides” - preposition, adverb; “bill” - noun, verb; “bloom” - noun, verb; “box” - noun, verb. The other examples are: “by, can, 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, 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". 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 grammatical but possess some lexical invariant. That is to say, "act" verb follows the standard four-part system of forms with a base form "act", as s-form (act-s), a Past Indefinite Tense form ("acted") and an "ing"-form ("acting") and takes up all syntactic functions of verbs, whereas "act" noun can have two forms, "act" (sing.) and "act" (pl.). 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.

We may sum up our discussion by pointing out that whereas distinction between polysemy homonyms 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 undertreat 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.

References:

- Arakin, V.D., Vigodskaya, N.N.; Iljina, Z.S. English-Russian Dictionary. M.:Russ.Yaz, 1987.
Arnold, I.V. The English Word. M.:V.S., Prosvesceniye, 1986, 296 p.
Hornby, A.S., Gatenby, E.V., Wakefield, H. The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. – Ldn. – 1967.
Kelly, M.H., Ragade, A. Grammatical relationships between homonyms: effects on language comprehension and the structure of the English vocabulary. 2000.
Maugham, W.S. The Kite. In: Stories by Modern English Authors. M. 1961.

Muller, V.K., Riggs, Fred, W. Lexicographical Terminology: Some Observations. pp.400-412.

Riggs, Fred, W. Homonyms, Heteronyms and Allonyms. - 1999.

Valiyeva, N.Ch. Synergetics of the Language, National Consciousness and Culture by Globalization. Baku: Nurlar, 2016. 232 p.

Арнольд, И.В. Лексикология современного английского языка. М., 1959 г. 69.

Мюллер, В.К. Англо-русский словарь. М.1960.

Смирницкий, А.И. Лексикология английского языка. М.: Изд. лит. на ин. языке, 1956.

RESUME

Difficulties Created by Homonymy in Understanding

Given the rapid development of intercultural dialogue and various problems in the correct understanding of the context, it is necessary to consider the specific features of homonyms in global English. The article examines the etymology of the term “homonym”, based on historical criteria the traditional approach to homonyms and different lexemes with the same form but different origins. In the given article the responsibility of lexicographers is particularly emphasized: to determine the boundaries of each word, i.e. to distinguish homonyms and combine variants. Here we consider the classifications of homonyms by various linguists. Different sources of homonyms in the English language such as the phonetic changes, borrowings, conversion as one of the main characteristic feature of the English word-building system, shortening, sound-imitation are described in this scientific research. The other type of formation of homonyms, which is called disintegration or split of polysemy, is investigated here too. Some metaphors are typical of Old English and Middle English semantic transfers, but are not so characteristic of modern mental and linguistic processes. The poetic associations underlying the semantic shifts have long been forgotten, and attempting to restore the lost connections may seem far-fetched. It is precisely the practical impossibility of establishing such connections that confirms the assertion of homonymy. As a result of practical research we came to the conclusion that those who teach English as a foreign language are interested in template homonymy.

РЕЗЮМЕ

ТРУДНОСТИ ПОНИМАНИЯ, СОЗДАВАЕМЫЕ ОМОНИМИЕЙ

Учитывая стремительное развитие межкультурного диалога и различные проблемы в правильном понимании контекста, необходимо учитывать специфические особенности омонимов в глобальном английском языке. В статье исследуется этимология термина “омоним”, на основе исторических критериев рассматривается традиционный подход к омонимам и различным лексемам с одинаковой формой, но разным происхождением. В данной статье особо подчеркивается ответственность лексикографов:

определять границы каждого слова, т.е. различать омонимы и объединять варианты. Здесь мы рассматриваем классификации омонимов различных лингвистов. В данном научном исследовании описываются различные источники омонимов в английском языке, такие как фонетические изменения, заимствования, конверсия как одна из основных характерных черт английской словообразовательной системы, сокращение, звукоподражание. Здесь же исследуется и другой тип образования омонимов, который называется распадом или расщеплением полисемии. Некоторые метафоры типичны для древнеанглийского и среднеанглийского семантических переносов, но не столь характерны для современных мыслительных и языковых процессов. Поэтические ассоциации, лежащие в основе семантических сдвигов, давно забыты, и попытки восстановить утраченные связи могут показаться надуманными. Именно практическая невозможность установления таких связей подтверждает утверждение об омонимии. В результате практического исследования мы пришли к выводу, что преподаватели английского языка как иностранного заинтересованы шаблонной омонимией.

XÜLASƏ

OMONIMIYANIN YARATDIĞI ANLAMA ÇƏTİNLİKLƏRİ

Mədəniyyətlərarası dialoqun sürətli inkişafını və kontekstin düzgün başa düşülməsində müxtəlif problemləri nəzərə alaraq qlobal ingilis dilində omonimlərin spesifik xüsusiyyətlərini nəzərə almaq lazımdır. Məqalədə “homonim” termininin etimologiyası araşdırılır; tarixi meyarlar əsasında eyni formaya malik, lakin mənşəyi müxtəlif olan omonimlərə və müxtəlif leksemələrə ənənəvi yanaşma nəzərdən keçirilir. Bu məqalədə leksikoqrafların məsuliyyəti xüsusilə vurğulanır: hər bir sözün həddlərini müəyyən etmək, yəni omonimləri ayırd etmək və variantları birləşdirmək. Burada müxtəlif dilçilər tərəfindən verilən omonimlərin təsnifatlarının təhlili verilir. Bu elmi araşdırmada ingilis dilində homonimlərin müxtəlif mənbələri, onlarda baş verən fonetik dəyişikliklər, alınma, konversiya kimi müxtəlif omonim mənbələri ingilis söz yaradıcılığı sisteminin əsas xarakterik xüsusiyyətlərindən biri kimi, abbreviatura, səs təqlidi təsvir edilmişdir. Burada omonimlərin əmələ gəlməsinin başqa bir növü də araşdırılır ki, bu da polisemiyanın parçalanması adlanır. Bəzi metaforalar qədim ingilis və orta ingilis semantik köçürmələri üçün xas, lakin müasir düşüncə və dil prosesləri üçün o qədər də xarakterik deyil. Semantik dəyişikliklərin əsasında duran poetik assosiasiyalar çoxdan unudulub və itirilmiş əlaqələri bərpa etmək cəhdləri çox uzaq görünə bilər. Məhz bu cür əlaqələrin qurulmasının praktiki mümkünsüzlüyü omonimliyin varlığını təsdiq edir. Praktiki araşdırmalar nəticəsində belə qənaətə gəldik ki, xarici dil kimi ingilis dili müəllimləri şablon omonimiyaya daha çox maraq göstərir.

Rəyçi: filologiya elmləri doktoru, professor Nadir Məmmədli