

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://doi.org/10.1177/1077558720938383) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 03 Volume: 83

Published: 30.03.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Madina Mamedova

Bukhara Engineering and Technological Institute

A teacher of
Foreign Languages Department

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF HOMONYMS OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES FOR METHODOLOGICAL PURPOSES

Abstract: to answer the question in which of the two unrelated languages, homonyms have greater or lesser semantic productivity, we conducted an appropriate analysis and divided the studied homonyms into three groups - with a high, medium, and low degree of semantic productivity. Genetically unrelated homonyms were selected for analysis.

Key words: homonyms, analysis, dictionaries, terminological, idiomatic meanings, semantic, pragmatic features of homonyms, artistic language, dialects, professional vocabulary, jargon, argo, barbarism, vulgarism.

Language: English

Citation: Mamedova, M. (2020). Comparative analysis of homonyms of English and Uzbek languages for methodological purposes. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 03 (83), 401-404.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-03-83-74> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.03.83.74>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

A continuous sample of all dictionaries showed that in English, genetically unrelated homonyms-nouns constitute a larger number in relation to the Uzbek language. This indicates the high semantic productivity of genetically unrelated homonyms in the English language. For comparison: in the Uzbek language there are 32 homonyms, while in English there are 72. There are a number of English homonyms-nouns with 24 meanings. This is a unique homonymous series of pitch. This row consists of two chains. It should be noted that the chain of the first meaning includes archaisms, American slangisms, terminological, idiomatic meanings, marked in dictionaries. This fact reveals a rather active ability of English words in the formation of homonyms.

II. Literature review

The material for analysis was genetically unrelated homonyms - nouns registered in the Oxford English Dictionary by A. S. Hornby in 13 volumes, as well as in A. Webster's dictionaries, H. S. Wilford, H. S. Barrett, The World Book Dictionary: volume 2, in the dictionary "O'zbek tili omonimlar lug'ati" ("Dictionary of homonyms of the Uzbek language") S. Rakhmatullaev and in the manual "O'zbek tili

izohli lugati" ("Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language"). It should be noted that the above-mentioned dictionaries of the English language are the most comprehensive and authoritative sources, unlike the Uzbek dictionaries, which at the moment do not cover all the rich vocabulary of the Uzbek language.

III. Analysis

Among the meanings of pitch homonyms, there is a semantic disconnection between the chains, for example, pitch in the third meaning has branches - points "a" and "b":

a - to throw (the ball) to the batter in a game of baseball: to pitch curves and fast balls;

b - to loft (a golf ball) so that it alights with little roll.

The reason for dividing into two points is intrinsic motivation, belonging to one archaism. In addition, observations showed that the word in question has high productivity in both synchronous and diachronic aspects.

The analyzed genetically unrelated homonyms have different semantic productivity. In the group of a high degree of semantic productivity, we included homonyms-nouns with 30 to 20 semantic meanings; in the group with average semantic productivity,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

homonyms are nouns with 20 to 10 semantic meanings; in the group with a low degree of semantic productivity - homonyms having from 10 to 2 meanings.

It should be noted that in the Uzbek language, except for isolated cases, there are practically no monographic studies in the field of lexical-semantic, pragmatic features of homonyms. There is no specific description and information about homonyms in dictionaries. The fact is that the dictionaries of the Uzbek language to this day have been compiled on the basis of a written artistic language. Meanwhile, the materials of the artistic language are only "the tip of the iceberg". The actual problem of the Uzbek language is the compilation of dictionaries with the greatest number of homonymic series, covering all areas of life, especially in oral speech. This will enable researchers to rely on all existential forms: artistic language, dialects, professional vocabulary, jargon, argo, barbarism, vulgarism and exotic vocabulary. Studies have shown that in the dictionary "O'zbek tilining omonimlar lug'ati" ("Dictionary of homonyms of the Uzbek language"), the number of genetically unrelated homonyms is from one to five members of the series. So, the homonyms of the word zil (in the Uzbek language) are three rows. Each row has one member and belongs to separate groups according to the source language. In the first meaning, the word zil is borrowed from the German language and is used in the meaning of "og'ir"(heavy). The second homonym is borrowed from the Turkish language and means "musiqqa asbobi" (musical instrument). The third homonym zil is borrowed from the Arabic in the meaning of "kamsitish" (humiliation). Genetically unrelated homonyms of the words aliph, gas, termite, farm make up two homonymous series, having in the first row - 1, in the second - 2 unmotivated meanings.

1. Alif1 (Arabic) 1. "The first letter of the Arabic alphabet." Alif (Rus.) 1. "Flaxseed oil." 2. "Hashish oil."

2. Gas1 (Persian-Taj.) 1. "Measure of length." Gas2 (French) 1. Fashion. 2. "Silk fabric." From these examples, we can conclude that second-line homonyms have two meanings, but from a semantic point of view there is an internal relationship. For example, the homonym alif2 is used in the meanings "linseed oil" and "hash oil". The common, uniting these values is seme "oil". The second component of seme is the belonging of "oil" to a particular plant. In the words gas, termite is also observed the above situation. The appearance of these homonyms can be considered as the result of the relationship between the integral and differential sem, which led to the formation of values independent of each other. Among the units under consideration in terms of semantic productivity, it is necessary to note words that cannot be combined into a single group. These include specific homonyms for bass and baur.

1. Bass1 (Persian-Taj.) 1. "Enough."
2. "In this way." Bass2 (Italian) 1. "The lowest voice." 2. "Basta." Bass3 (Arabic) 1. "Dispute." 2. "Cope." 2. Baur1 (Arabic)

1. (unprotected) "Ocean". Baur2 (Arabic)
1. "A measure of poetic size in Uzbek literature."

Baur3 (Persian-Taj.)

1. "Share."
2. "Usefulness."
3. "Benefit."
4. "Rejoice."

Baur4 (Persian-Taj.)

1. "Interest."
2. "Envy."
3. "Joy."
4. "Calm."

Semantic productivity of genetically unrelated homonyms. The baur word consists of four homonymic series, having the first two one by one, the next two four values. It should be noted that the original lexical meaning of this word is borrowed from the Arabic language and means "sea". In the future, this word more often began to be used as a literary term. In the Uzbek language, the highest indicator of the degree of semantic productivity is five meanings; groups of homonyms of an average degree of semantic productivity have from three to five meanings.

IV. Discussion

The analysis of genetically unrelated homonyms of nouns in the English and Uzbek languages, in particular the features of their semantic productivity, allows us to draw the following conclusions:

a) the presence of a rich vocabulary in the English language determines the presence in it of a large number of genetically unrelated homonyms in comparison with the Uzbek language. In the English language there are 153 series of genetically unrelated lexical homonyms derived from nouns, while in the Uzbek language their number is 20;

b) in connection with the development of lexicography in English dictionaries, all phonetic possibilities, normal and occasional, denotative and connotative meanings, differential and integral semes are taken into account. Due to this, the semantic productivity of genetically unrelated homonyms in the English language covers a greater number of tokens in comparison with the homonymy of the Uzbek language. In English, the maximum semantic productivity of genetically unrelated lexical homonyms is 24 values, the least - two values. In the Uzbek language, the maximum semantic productivity of genetically unrelated lexical homonyms is 5 values, the smallest amount is two values;

c) the semantic development of language includes evolutionary changes in the meanings of lexical units. This situation is present to varying degrees in all languages of the world. Further

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

thorough analysis of genetically unrelated lexical homonyms will provide an idea of the possible ways of further evolution of languages and inter language relations.

In linguistic literature, the terms "homonyms", "homonymy of linguistic units" and "homonymy" are used. In a dissertation, such an understanding of homonymy is criticized. Homonymy of linguistic units is a more general concept. This term in lexical meanings covers the entire process of homonymy that exists in the language. These include homonymous morphemes and root morphemes, and affixal morphemes, i.e. this process occurs at the morpheme level. The second group of homonymy occurs at the word level. We conditionally divide this current into two more groups, actually homonyms - lexical and lexical-grammatical and, with them, homonymous phenomena: homofoms, homophones, homographs. The third large group at the level of collocations, this phenomenon is divided into two subgroups: combined and phraseological homonymy. The fourth group of homonymy consists of the homonymy of sentences. This phenomenon can be called syntactic homonymy. This current process is subdivided into two subgroups: the homonymy of simple sentences and the homonymy of complex prepositions. Here is an overview of homonymy in four directions. In detail, we focused on the analysis of homonymy at the word level. The second section describes homonymous phenomena.

Different researchers treat differently homonymous phenomena. Based on factual material, some of them prove that homonymous phenomena exist in the modern Uzbek language. Others do not recognize the existence of homonymous phenomena in the modern Uzbek language (M.Mirtadzhiev). There are also scientists who recognize these phenomena, but attribute homonymous phenomena to homonyms. We do not belong to the supporters of both the first and the second groups, recognizing that homonymous phenomena exist in the language, in form and function have similarities with homonyms, but do not coincide with them in semantic terms. These signs give sufficient reason not to attribute them to homonyms, therefore they received the name "related phenomena" (V.V.Vinogradov).

Homofoms. Different words can sound the same due to phonetic and grammatical patterns. The coincidence of sounding homofoms is explained not by phonetic but by grammatical factors. Homofoms sound the same only thanks to grammatical forms, and sound matches can occur both in separate forms and in a number of forms of different words belonging to the same part of speech, or to different parts of speech. Homofoms should be distinguished from homonyms. Homofoms differ from homonyms in the following features:

1. Homofoms coincide only syntagmatically.

2. Words come together only in form, for example, *terim / existing / - terim / noun /*. The first of them is formed from the stem of the verb *ter - forming nouns* by the affix, the second - from the noun by the possessive affix - to them.

3. One of the members of the pair stands out "lexically, the other grammatically, o't /noun./ - o't /v./ in the imperative mood.

Coincide in the roots and grammatically: *oqar / communion / - . oqar / imperative of the verb oqarmoq /*,

5. Homofoms belong only to different parts of speech. This last point is correct only on the material of the Uzbek language.

Homophones. Homophones are characterized by different morphological composition differ in writing and are similar only in sound: *adib - adip; bob-bop, etc.)*

Homographs. These words are graphically identical, but different in pronunciation and meaning. Their first component is lexical, and the second grammatical, or both components are lexical. At the same time, homographs differ in semantic content, communicative function, and stress:

- atlas // atlas;
- technician // technician.

The third section analyzes the definitions, development and emergence of the classification of homonyms in the modern Uzbek language. (The existing definition and classification of the emergence and formation of homonyms in the modern Uzbek language is not acceptable in lexicographic practice. We were forced to re-create the aforementioned directions of homonyms taking into account lexicography. When defining homonyms, we distinguished linguistic criteria. Homonymy covers whole lexical and grammatical classes of words. Homonymization coins to be the result of:

- a) the peculiarity of the morphological structure;
- b) lexical innovations;
- c) the breakdown of polysemy.

V. Conclusion

The definition of homonyms has both practical and great theoretical significance. In most existing definitions, the emphasis is on the general semantic properties of homonyms, and not on the differences between them. Words that completely coincide in form and sound are increasingly regarded as homonyms. In linguistic literature, homonyms are usually defined as words that are identical in sound but different in meaning. In the dissertation, this approach to homonyms is criticized, since such an understanding of the essence of the phenomenon leads to a mixture of homonyms with different harmonies. When determining homonyms, the following signs should be taken into account:

- 1) difference in meanings;
- 2) identity-forms;

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

3) the same pronunciation;
4) coincidence of graphic properties;
5) belonging to one or different parts of speech;
6) coincidence or mismatch of syntactic functions;

7) lack of associative connection;
8) origin from one or different sources;
9) all their components must be lexical;
10) components of homonyms. Pairs of characters can take different grammatical affixes.

References:

1. Abaev, V.I. (1960). *Vystuplenie na diskussii po omonimii*. Leksikograficheskij sbornik. (p.198).
2. Navoiy, A. (1948). *"Tanlangan Asarlar"*. Tashkent.
3. Ahtjamov, M. H. (1966). *Problemy omonimii v sovremennom bashkirskom literaturnom jazyke* : avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. (p.31). Moscow.
4. Gudilova, S. V. (2005). *Produktivnye tipy obrazovanija slozhnyh slov v sovremennom russskom jazyke* : dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. (p.306). Moscow.
5. Kalinin, A. V. (1973). *Leksika russkogo jazyka*. (p.232). Moscow.
6. Rahmatyllayev, Sh. (1984). *"Omonimlarning izohli lug'ati"*.
7. Smirnickij, A. I. (1956). *Leksikologija anglijskogo jazyka*. (p.260). Moscow.
8. Shanskij, N. M. (1964). *Leksikologija russkogo jazyka*. (p.328). Moscow.
9. Shevcova, N. N. (2007). *Jetimologicheskaja i strukturno-semanticheskaja harakteristika slovoobrazovatel'nogo polja sushhestvitel'nyh v anglijskom jazyke* : dis. ... kand. filol. nauk., p.177.
10. Shmeljov, D. N. (1990). *Omonimija*. Lingvisticheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar', p.244.
11. Mamedova, M. A. (2020). "Homonyms their types and sources", *Modern problems of philology and linguistics*. Vol.1, Issue 1, February, 2020.
12. Mamedova, M.A. (2020). "Methodical features of teaching homonyms of English language using computer technology", *International Journal of psychosocial Rehabilitation*, Vol., Issue 1, January 2020.
13. Mamedova, M.A. (2019). "Classification of homonyms of the English language",- *UK*, Vol. 7, No 12.
14. Akhmedova, M. B. (2020). Typological Aspects of Adequate Translation Methods of "Spirituality" Nominative Units into English. - *Psychosocial Rehabilitation journal*. Volume 24, Issue 3, UK, pp. 386-393.