

## THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM OF HOMONYMY IN ENGLISH

**Formulation of the scientific problem.** Modern lexicology has in many cases to solve the problem whether we have to deal with two or more meanings of one word or with two or more different words sounding the same. Such questions arise concerning, for example, the nouns *hand, head, board*, the verbs *draw, bear, plant*, and a number of other words.

There exists an opinion that homonyms may be created through the break-up of a former case of polysemy. Form-words, prepositions and conjunctions give sufficient evidence to this: *provided*, past participle of *provide*, and a conjunction provided meaning *on the condition that* [4, p. 118].

Each of these problems was dealt with separately as they arose in the course of linguistic studies of the verb system [3; 6; 8; 12; 13; 14; 15; 16; 17]. It may prove expedient to cast a look at the problem in its entirety.

**Analysis of the latest investigations of the question.** Whether we think it necessary to find an invariable structural meaning which manifests itself in different ways in different applications of a grammatical category, or whether we deny the necessity of such an invariable meaning, is a matter which largely depends on a scholar's theoretical views on the meaning of grammatical categories and grammatical forms in general [9, p. 23]. We can hardly expect either of these views (for or against an invariable structural meaning for every category and every form) to be definitely proved as the only right one. We will proceed from the assumption that an invariable meaning does exist.

Let us look for an invariable meaning of the *ing*-form or *ing*-forms in their different applications. The traditional view is, that we have two homonymous forms: the participle (present or perfect) and the gerund (present or perfect) [1, p. 141]. A more recent view, put forward by E. Kruisinga, is that there are not two different forms sounding the same but one form, which he shortly terms "the *-ing*", being used in different ways in the sentence [11, p. 57].

**The novelty (newness)** of this article consists in identifying homonymous models and systemizing the procedures for their differentiation, and 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 aim** of the article is to investigate systemic and pragmatic character of the homonymy in grammar, analyze paradigmatic connections and establish the procedures for their differentiating homonymous structure.

**Presentation of the basic material and interpretation of the results of the investigation.** Proceeding from the general concept of language as the system of material signs, we accept the following fundamental thesis:

- a) all the lingual formations have sign status;
- b) informative aspect is ontologically inseparably connected with material aspect and they are integrated.

A linguistic sign is a bilateral linguistic unit having its content and expression sides. Correlation between content and its lingual expression is rather complicated. The limits of conceptual content and expression do not coincide in all the points: one and the same form has several functions, one and the same meaning is expressed by several forms [17, p. 1115]. Any sign is potentially «homonym» and «synonym» at one and the same time that is, it is formed by the intersection of those two rows of phenomena. The nature of the lingual sign is both constant and variable.

Correlations between two sides of a sign are very complicated and controversial. Controversy between them is caused by its dual nature and the absence of the isomorphism between the two sides of the sign. Absence of the isomorphism of the sides of a sign is known as asymmetric dualism of the linguistic sign [7, p. 130].

There are two types of asymmetry: *qualitative* and *quantitative*.

a) *Qualitative* asymmetry is the discrepancies, which are observed between the sides of a language sign without taking into consideration their indissoluble integrity.

b) *Quantitative* asymmetry reveals itself in the fact that two or more units from one set may correspond to one unit from another set. These relations are of reverse character in respect to each other. As a rule they are called ambiguity and synonymy.

Ambiguity is not only objectively possible but also objectively necessary as a result of the law of the economy of speech and psychological characteristics of the human's thinking.

The question to what extent phenomena, which represent ambiguity are homogenous and whether there are qualitative differences between separate expressions of ambiguity is very important.

There are two points of view on this problem:

- linguists, clearly seeing difficulties, which are connected with additional division of polysemy, declare their unwillingness to define differentiation of the peculiar cases of ambiguity: polysemy and homonymy;
- other linguists insist on the necessity of differentiation of homonymy and polysemy.

In the linguistic literature a lot of methods of differentiating of homonymy and polysemy are described; most of them are of the psychological and semantic character and most of them work on the lexical material [1; 4].

There are two aspects according to which the problem of homonymy is discussed:

a) *nessesity/occasionality*

Homonymy (as well as polysemy) is not an occasional phenomenon, it can not be taken away from the natural language.

b) *usefulness/harm*

First of all we can speak of usefulness and harm of homonymy in diachrony and synchrony. Bloomfield L. showed in his work that in the process of language development homonymization plays a positive role: it is a stimulus to the vocabulary renovation and one of the sources of its renovation. In synchrony homonymization can be estimated in different ways [8, p. 450].

If we consider homonymy from the standpoint of language as an implement, then it helps language to be compact in the sense of reduction of definitions and this is a positive feature.

Homonymy is the hindrance in communication. Participants, which are the necessary prerequisites of any communicative act, include a sender of the message, its recipient and hindrances that homonymy brings in. Due to hindrances the message is perceived by the recipient with such a meaning, which was not foreseen by a sender.

Theoretical difficulties, which are connected with the studying of grammatical homonymy in many aspects are like those difficulties, which the investigator of lexical homonymy encounters.

Isomorphism, which is usual for units of different levels of language structure, causes the following common features of both grammatical and lexical homonymy:

1) material (phonetic) coincidence of units that have different meanings;

2) both kinds of homonymy arise as a result of the divergence and promote more economical usage and distribution of language means;

3) two kinds of homonymy are widespread in the language;

4) homonymous grammatical units also exist along with the polysemantic units, moreover one and the same phonetic system may be a part of both homonymous and polysemantic group.

It should be taken into consideration that there exist significant differences between the two types of homonymy. Thus, lexical homonymy is always individual, while grammatical homonymy is the type of relations that includes more or less significant spheres of the lexical material. Grammatical homonymy can only occasionally be of the individual character and only in the system, against the background of the absence of homonymy in the frames of the same type. Such grammatical homonymy that is close to lexical homonymy is observed in the classes of words that are closed and given in the list. For instance: homonymy in the personal pronouns *you<sub>1</sub>*, *you<sub>2</sub>*, *you<sub>3</sub>* exists on the background of the absence of homonymy in other personal pronouns.

In the frame of homonymy which is characteristic of grammatical units, phenomena of morphological and syntactical homonymy stand apart from each other. Godel R. considers that homonymous are monemes which have phonological coincidence but differ in their associative relations [33, p. 32].

Shendels E.I. gives the following definition of the basic unit of the morphological homonymy: “homophorms are different grammatical forms of one word with different grammatical meanings” [10, p. 106].

Levin S.R. gives extremely general definition: “two linguistic forms that are identical in their phonetic structural building but different in their meaning are considered to be homonyms” [12, p. 4 6].

Homonymous units are identified as those which display a certain distinguishing feature against the background of other units in spite of their material identity.

To the problems of the morphological homonymy belong:

- systematic and pragmatic character of the morphological homonymy; its limits and dependence on redundancy characteristic of morphological system; connection of homonymy with durability of the morphological oppositions;
- correlation between homonymy and polysemy on the morphological level and categories of their differentiation;
- analysis of the units which have homonymous charge;
- correlation between conversion and homonymy;
- connection between morphological homonymy and lexical semantics of a word;
- the question whether it is legitimate only about intraclass morphological homonymy or also about interclass homonymy.

Homonymy includes separate parts of morphological paradigm and in such a way becomes an inalienable feature of all the morphological system of the language.

Any unit of the morphological structure, which is marked by homonymy, besides its basic paradigmatic connections also has an additional one. For instance: phonetic system [kam] is the member of two paradigms, which differ from each other and are built on different basis:

1) *come – comes – come*;

2) *come<sub>1</sub> – come<sub>2</sub> – come<sub>3</sub>*.

In the first case we have a conventional morphological paradigm. If a unit is also marked by lexical homonymy then it is also a member of a lexical homonymous paradigm.

Limits of expansion of homonymous charge of the morphological paradigm are strictly determined by the morphological system of the language.

**Conclusion.** Homonymy was analyzed as a phenomenon of synchrony and viewed as a result of opposite processes of semantic divergence of words, etymologically coming from one and the same source.

Isomorphism, which is usual for units of different levels of language structure, causes common features of both grammatical and lexical homonymy, yet there exist considerable differences between the two types of homonymy. Lexical homonymy is always individual, while grammatical homonymy can only occasionally be of individual character.

We could see that Bloomfield L. stated that in the process of language development homonymization plays a positive role: it is a stimulus to the vocabulary renovation and it is also its source.

**Perspectives for further investigations.** The problem of homonyms is very actual nowadays. There are several problematic questions in the field of homonymy the major of which is the problem of distinguishing of homonyms and polysemantic words. The problem of homonymy is still waiting for its detail investigation. Also must be said that whereas distinction between polysemy homonymy is relevant and important for lexicography it is not relevant for the practice of either human or machine translation. We hope that this article will be applied at high education by both teachers and students of English, or those who are interested in the field of homonymy. The problem of distinction of homonymy and polysemy in all the languages has not been investigated thoroughly yet and there are still much opportunities to discover new fields of approaches and this problem is still waiting its salvation.

#### References:

1. Иванова И.П. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. Москва, 1981. 285 с.
2. Карцевский С. Введение в изучение междометий. Москва, 1984. С. 127–137.
3. Райхель Г.М. К вопросу о грамматическом значении сочетания to be + причастие II в современном английском языке: автореф. дисс. канд. филолог. наук: спец. 10.02.04 – германские языки, Калинин, 1954. 19 с.
4. Сухорольська С.М., Федоренко О.І. Методи лінгвістичних досліджень: Навч. посібник для студентів, аспірантів і науковців. Львів: ВІД ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2005. 378 с.
5. Шендельс Е.И. Транспозиция морфологических форм (на материале современного немецкого языка), 1964, С. 104–110.
6. A Grammar of Contemporary English. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. London: Longman group, 1972, 1120 p.
7. Bloomfield L. Language N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1933, 564 p.
8. Chafe W.L. Meaning and the Structure of Language. London Un. Of Chicago Press, 1976, 360 p.
9. Godel R. Homonymie et identite, 1948, p. 5–15
10. Kruisinga E. A Handbook of Present – Day English: In 2 vol, 1925, 357 p.,
11. English Grammar. Collins Publishers, The University of Birmingham. 1990. P. 437. URL: <http://www.stiba-malang.com/uploadbank/pustaka/ENGLISH%20GRAMMAR%20BOOK.pdf>.
12. G. Yule Oxford Practice Grammar for Advanced Learners. Oxford University Press, 2012. P. 228. URL: [https://vk.com/doc231197793\\_306458893?hash=f49e975908c04e2701&dl=b9ece635472e424b73](https://vk.com/doc231197793_306458893?hash=f49e975908c04e2701&dl=b9ece635472e424b73).
13. John P. Broderick English Grammar: Patterns and Choices. Old Dominion University. January 1, 2005. URL: <http://ww2.odu.edu/al/jpbroder/egpc.html>
14. al/jpbroder/egpc.html
15. M. Foley My Grammar Lab for Advanced Learners. Pearson Education Limited. 2012. P. 410. URL: [https://vk.com/doc8069473\\_319475897?hash=8aca6f44c58618e958&dl=fc9459a364b312295a](https://vk.com/doc8069473_319475897?hash=8aca6f44c58618e958&dl=fc9459a364b312295a).
16. 319475897?hash=8aca6f44c58618e958&dl=fc9459a364b312295a.
17. M. Hewings Advanced Grammar in Use. Cambridge University Press, 2013. P. 295. URL: [https://vk.com/doc8069473\\_210990824?hash=60113fc122a523aa05&dl=b30aab792bf36a3b8b](https://vk.com/doc8069473_210990824?hash=60113fc122a523aa05&dl=b30aab792bf36a3b8b).
18. Theory and Practice in Language Studies. 2012. URL: <http://www.academypublisher.com/tpls/vol02/no06/tpls0206.pdf>.

#### Summary

#### M. PUKALIAK, I. ZINCHUK. THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM OF HOMONYMY IN ENGLISH

The article explores the problem of homonymy in grammar. It also provides the analysis of paradigmatic connections and establishes the differentiation of homonymous structure as well as theoretical difficulties. Morphological and grammatical homonymy as a system of modern language is also discussed.

**Key words:** homonymy, grammar, polysemy, morphology, paradigm, system.

#### Анотація

#### М. ПУКАЛЯК, І. ЗІНЧУК. ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ ПРОБЛЕМИ ОМОНІМІЇ В АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ

У даній статті досліджується проблема омонімії у граматиці. Також у даній статті надано аналіз парадигматичних зв'язків та висвітлюється проблема омонімічної структури, а також теоретичні труднощі. Досліджується морфологічна та граматична омонімія як система сучасної мови.

**Ключові слова:** омонімія, граматики, полісемія, морфологія, парадигма, система.

**Аннотация**

**М. ПУКАЛЯК, И. ЗИНЧУК. ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ  
ПРОБЛЕМЫ ОМОНИМИИ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ**

В данной статье исследуется проблема омонимии в грамматике. Также в данной статье дан анализ парадигматических связей и освещается проблема омонимических структур, а также теоретические трудности. Исследуется морфологическая и грамматическая омонимия как система современного языка.

**Ключевые слова:** омонимия, грамматика, полисемия, морфология, парадигма, система.