

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION
REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN
ANDIZHAN STATE UNIVERSITY**

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH PHONETICS AND LEXICOLOGY

QUALIFICATION WORK ON SPECIALTY ENGLISH PHILOLOGY

ON THE THEME:

**“Semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and
Uzbek”**

*Done by student of the
4th year Abdumominova M
Scientific supervisor:
Yuldasheva Oistahon*

Graduate paper has been passed preliminary defense.

Protocol № _____ 2014

Andizhan 2014

Introduction

The State Testing Centre, along with other relevant agencies, is tasked with preparing draft proposals on introducing foreign languages testing to the entrance examinations for all higher educational institutions.

In order to increase teaching standards in distant rural areas, the higher educational institutions are allowed targeted admission of people living in distant areas to foreign language programs on the condition that they will oblige themselves to work in the acquired specialty at their residence area for at least 5 years after graduation. The decree also envisages 30% salary increase for foreign language teachers in rural areas, 15% increase for those in other areas.

The National Teleradio Company, State Committee for communications, informatisation and telecommunication technologies, Agency for Press and Information of the Republic of Uzbekistan are tasked to prepare and broadcast language-learning programs, significantly increase access to international educational resources via “Ziyonet” educational network, promote publication of foreign language textbooks, magazines and other materials.

Special attention must be given to education, literature, art and others. Education provides creative inspiration for the spirituality of the people of Uzbekistan. It helps us discover the best abilities of the up and coming generation, while continuously improving the skills of professionals. Education helps elucidate and pass down the wisdom and experiences of the older generation to the younger. Young people, with their budding talents and thirst for knowledge begin to understand spirituality through education. [1,22]

Our state will attract on a broad – scale the experience of advanced countries in training specialists and establishing conditions for high – quality education in itself. As our president I.A.Karimov suggested personal readiness to work for one’s own benefit and for the benefit of one’s family makes up the inner potential of the individual. Large – scale socio – economic plans grew from our people’s love for life. The pride of our citizens for their independent state feed their citizens

for their readiness to personally contribute to its strengthening and prosperity. Only thus can a citizen become the backbone of the state.

In case these principles are not implemented into reality, this sort of ideology will stay only on a piece of paper. In order to shape up our ideology it is necessary to focus, first of all, on progressing outlooks and mentality of that part of society which does not separate its fate from the fate of its motherland, sincerely suffers when they see what is happening today and fights for its future. It is necessary to have an overall study of philosophical views, ideological outlooks of scientists who made Valuable contributions into our national history and all-humane progress, into advancing development of life in the society. We keep in mind the works of our great ancestors, such as abu Nasr Faraby, Beruny, Ibn Sino, Akhmad Yassaviy, Alisher Navoi, Bahouddin Naqshband, Najjmiddin Kubro and other scientists of Uzbek people.

Nowadays it became obvious how necessary it was to introduce reforms into the education sphere, to obtain scientific knowledge, to have good professional training all over the country. Without these reforms we could not start any other changes in our society. The fate of reforms and their consequences depended on how the level of our life and progress. [1, 23]

Any thinking individual can easily understand that the future life and fate of our country, is inseparably linked with successful execution of these problems. The most important thing for us is to give young people an opportunity to master a certain specialty, to provide them with a reliable start in life. If a young man, full of hope, makes his first steps in life and finds his proper place in the society, it is quite natural that he will be satisfied with his work and his fate.

In his speech our president pointed out, that realization of national education model and training of cards will permit to occupy a deserving place on the national arena. Today international life and humane development have reached that stage when not military power but intellectual potential, mind, thought and advanced technology become the most decisive factors. Our great ancestor Amir Temur said: "Strength is in justice" and our President I.A. Karimov said that it

can be applied to the real in of modern life with a slight modification “Strength is in knowledge and mind”.

In future this principle will be important and will penetrate into all spheres of our social life. It means that we’ll have to complete intellectual thought, to go through creative tests with other countries on the international arena. Our future depends on how strong we’ll be in these competitions and tests. Following the steps of our famous ancestors, and the fame have achieved in the world, we should pay more attention to the development of modern scientific schools and strengthen in the minds of our children how important are these tasks.

As the President of our Republic I. A. Karimov emphasized that while life is going on, education, depending on the demands of time, will gradually develop and renovate, and the modern generation would be able to use results of the reforms, and the future generation with respect and gratitude. Humane beings need spirituality like they need to breathe air and drink water. Like traveler in the desert who quenches his thirst at a life giving spring, humanity is also in constant, sometimes painful and arduous, search of a spiritual source.

The land, family, mother, children, nigh ours relatives, devotion to our independent state, respect for others, faith, memory, conscience, beauty there is so much wisdom in spirituality. Man can hardly grasp the entire essence of this primary principle, which actually makes him a human being.

The potential of the individual has a most favorable genetic base with the Uzbeks. The Republic is rich in capable, gifted people who have managed to associate themselves with the best achievements of the world in science, technology, philosophy, and law while retaining their affiliation with their people. They are the most enterprising section of the society and have the most positive impact on the whole of the nation, instilling confidence in its capabilities. [2, 15]

Students should leave schools with the Uzbek language as a language of instruction experience while studying foreign languages. We should prepare in our country in the shortest time the methods of intensive foreign languages learning based on our national peculiarities.

It's becoming clear that the acquired profession and preparation of graduate students and secondary graduates don't answer the requirements of the market economy. We didn't work out the state standards in the educational field on the basis of the international norms and models and in Conformity with it, we didn't provide institutions and schools with modern equipment, didn't create the proper material basis, and the reason is that education programs remained obsolete, they exercise a negative influence on the quality of prepared specialists for today.

The responsibility for making contracts and external economic problems must be taken by the rector. It's expedient to organize the scientific Academic Board Committees united with foreign educational institutions. One of the most important tasks is to create conditions for the improvement of teachers' knowledge. Without the efficient work of our teachers, professors and heads of departments, without the improvement of their qualifications and exchanges of experience with foreign colleges, the educational process and its effectiveness will be negatively influenced.

In the process of higher school reformation, we must consolidate their contacts with higher educational institutions in other countries. It's necessary to promote the encouragement of foreign teachers in Uzbekistan. It would be expedient to organize the education of our graduate students in the educational canters of developed countries without interference of any ideology.

Teaching a foreign language means first and foremost the formation and development of pupils' habits and skills in listening; speaking, reading and writing. Effective learning of a foreign language depends to a great extent on the pupils' memory. That is why a teacher must know he can help his pupils to successfully memorize and retain in memory the language material they learn. In order to know a language better, one should know its grammar, lexicology, stylistics, phonetics and others. [2, 17]

In order to ascertain the borders of lexicology it is necessary to go at some length into the question of what is homonymy, types of homonymy and semantic peculiarities of homonymy.

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

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

Not only words but other linguistic units may be homonymous. Here, however, we are concerned with the homonymy of words and word-forms only, so we shall not touch upon the problem of homonymous affixes or homonymous phrases.

Modern English has a very extensive vocabulary; the number of words according to the dictionary data is no less than 400, 000. A question naturally arises whether this enormous word-stock is composed of separate independent lexical units, or may it perhaps be regarded as a certain structured system made up of numerous interdependent and interrelated sub-systems or groups of words. This problem may be viewed in terms of the possible ways of classifying vocabulary items.

Words can be classified in various ways. Here, however, we are concerned only with the semantic classification of words which gives us a better insight into some aspects of the Modern English word-stock. Attempts to study the inner structure of the vocabulary revealed that in spite of its heterogeneity the English word-stock may be analyzed into numerous sub-systems the members of which have some features in common, thus distinguishing them from the members of other lexical sub-systems. Classification into monosynaptic and polysemantic words is based on the number of meanings the word possesses. More detailed semantic classifications are generally based on the semantic similarity (or polarity) of words or their component morphemes.

The theme of our diploma work is “Semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek”. While investigating this theme we came across to different

problems, because there are some peculiarities of homonymy which are not clarified nowadays and this theme is one of the most difficult ones.

So, **the actuality** of this theme is that this theme should be investigated deeply, because the semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek is of the most difficult themes, and we got some difficulties while writing this theme, because lack of information. We think that this theme is very disputable, and it needs the further investigation. The actuality of this work caused by several important points. We seem to say that the appearance of new, homonymic meanings is one of the main trends in development of Modern English, especially in its colloquial layer, which, in its turn at high degree is supported by development of modern informational technologies and simplification of alive speech. So the significance of our work can be proved by the following reasons:

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

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

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

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

e) The investigation of homonyms and their differentiation with polysemantic words is not being still investigated in the sufficient degree and this problem is still waiting for its investigator.

The main aim of our qualification paper is to give information about homonymy of words and homonymy of word-forms, types of homonyms in English and Uzbek, classifications of homonyms, semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek, some peculiarities of lexico-grammatical homonymy, homonymy and polysemy and etymological and semantic criteria.

The main aim of our research puts forward the following **tasks** to fulfill:

- Homonymy of words and homonymy of word-forms
- Types of homonyms in English and Uzbek

- Classifications of homonyms
- Semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek
- Some peculiarities of lexico-grammatical homonymy
- Homonymy and polysemy. Etymological and semantic criteria

Literature overview. While writing present qualification work I used the books written by great scholars such as: The English Word by Arnold I.V, A Course of Lexicology by Ginsburg R.S, and A Course in Modern English Lexicology by S.R. Rakhimov and Course of Lexicology by Buronov J.B. Besides above mentioned literatures I took information from Internet, Word Book Encyclopedia. Having said about the linguists studied the material before we can mention that our qualification work was based upon the investigations made by a number of well known English, Russian and Uzbek lexicologists as A.I.Smirnitsky, B.A. Ilyish, N.Buranov, V.V. Vinogradov, O.Jespersen and some others.

The theoretical value of the present course paper is that the theoretical part of the work can be used in delivering lectures and seminars on lexicology and in oral speech practice.

The practical value of the present qualification paper is that the practical results gained by investigating the giving problem may be used as examples or mini-tests in seminars and practical lessons of English Lexicology and in oral speech practice. The practical significance of the work can be concluded in the following items:

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

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

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

The subject matter of the research paper is to study types of homonyms, classifications of homonyms and the semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek.

The object of analysis of the graduation paper is to investigate the semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek.

The novelty of our research work is to investigate about the classifications of homonyms, the semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek and some peculiarities of lexico-grammatical homonymy.

The sphere of usage of the results of graduation paper: the results of the graduation paper are extensive used in the process of teaching English learning students at Universities, pupils at schools as well as how to motivate students or pupils to learn homonyms and the semantic peculiarities of homonyms and their usage in oral speech.

Structurally the present research work consists of an Introduction, Two chapters, Conclusion, Methodological recommendation and Bibliography.

In introductory part we'll investigate about the education system, improving and advancing it, paying attention to youth education and teaching students foreign languages, improving the quality of education in our country and other issues. Besides of this information there can be said about the actuality of the theme, the theoretical and practical value of the theme, the novelty of the theme, the literature overview, the aim and tasks of the theme and the structure of our qualification work.

The first chapter gives a detailed review of the study homonymy of words and homonymy of word-forms, types of homonyms in English and Uzbek and the classifications of homonyms. Homonymy of words and homonymy of individual word-forms may be regarded as full and partial homonymy. Cases of full homonymy are generally observed in words belonging to the same part of speech. Partial homonymy is usually to be found in word-forms of different parts of speech.

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

The second chapter deals with the detailed study of the semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek, some peculiarities of lexico-grammatical homonymy, homonymy and polysemy and Etymological and semantic criteria. In grammatical and lexico-grammatical homonymy the reliable criterion is the criterion of distribution. In lexical homonymy there are cases when none of the criteria enumerated above is of any avail. In such cases the demarcation line between polysemy and homonymy is rather fluid.'

In the end of our research work we'll give a total conclusion about the qualification work and the list of used literature.

In conclusion we have summed up the results of our laborious investigation of the theme "Semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek" and all chapters.

At the end of the research paper we have attached the bibliography list to enable the future translator to use information sources used in this qualification work.

We hope this research work achieved to its purpose and its end. And I believe that in future I will continue this theme on my next studies and research works.

Chapter I. Homonymy of words and homonymy of word-forms

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 prevalent. Therefore it is sometimes suggested that abundance of homonyms in Modern English is to be accounted for by the monosyllabic structure of the commonly used English words.

Not only words but other linguistic units may be homonymous. Here, however, we are concerned with the homonymy of words and word-forms only, so we shall not touch upon the problem of homonymous affixes or homonymous phrases. When analyzing different cases of homonymy we find that some words are homonymous in all their forms, 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. [19,246] This is true of a number of other cases, for example, compare *find* [faɪnd], *found* [faʊnd], *found* [faʊnd] and *found* [faʊnd], *founded* ['faʊndɪd],

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. [19,249]

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. [30,147] 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. [30,148]

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).

I.1 Classifications of homonyms

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. **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**₁ *n* — **seal**₃ *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 **lie** [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.[23,123]

Homonyms may be also classified by the type of meaning into lexical, lexico-grammatical and grammatical homonyms. In **seal**₁ *n* and **seal**₂ *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 **seal**₁ and **seal**₂). The difference is confined to the lexical meaning only: **seal**₁ denotes ‘a sea animal’, ‘the fur of this animal’, etc., **seal**₂ — ‘a design printed on paper, the stamp by which the design is made’, etc. So we can say that **seal**₂ and **seal**₁ 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 **seal**₁ — ‘a sea animal’, and (to) **seal**₃ — ‘to close tightly, we shall observe not only a difference in the lexical meaning of their homonymous word-forms but a difference in their grammatical meanings as well. Identical sound-forms, **seals** [si:lz] (Common Case Plural of the noun) and (he) **seals** [si:lz]

(third person Singular of the verb) possess each of them different grammatical meanings. As both grammatical and lexical meanings differ we describe these homonymous word-forms as *lexico-grammatical*.

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** [faɪnd] and (to) **found** [faʊnd], where the homonymic word-forms: **found** [faʊnd] — Past Tense of (to) **find** and **found** [faʊnd] — 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** [ɑːskt] — **asked** [ɑːskt]; 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 *grammatical homonymy* 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't- IV* (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.[23,127]

The two classifications: full and partial homonymy and lexical, *lexico-grammatical* and *grammatical homonymy* are not mutually exclusive. All homonyms may be described on the basis of the two criteria — homonymy of all forms of the word or only some of the word-forms and also by the type of meaning in which homonymous words or word-forms differ. So we speak of the full lexical homonymy of **sea**₁ *n* and **seal**₂ *n*, of the partial lexical homonymy of **lie**₁ *v* and **lie**₂ *v*, and of the partial *lexico-grammatical* homonymy of **seal**₁ *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). [25,37]

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

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‘kintir') - *sur- III* ('quritilgan') - *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: *spring*₁ 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. .

ABCD. 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. Actually a group of homonyms may contain members belonging to different groups in this classification. [27,342] Take, for example, *fell*₁ 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, *fell*₁ :: *fell*₂ may be characterised as **ABCD**, *fell*₁ :: *fell*₄ as **ABCD** and *fell*₄ :: *fell*₅ as **ABCD**.

I.2. Homographs

The most widely accepted classification is that recognising homonyms proper, homophones and homographs. Homonyms proper are words identical in pronunciation and spelling, like *fast* and *liver* above. Other examples are: *back* n ‘part of the body’ :: *back* adv ‘away from the front’ :: *back* v ‘go back’; *ball* n ‘a round object used in games’ :: *ball* n ‘a gathering of people for dancing’; *bark* n ‘the noise made by a dog’ :: *bark* v ‘to utter sharp explosive cries’ :: *bark* n ‘the skin of a tree’ :: *bark* n ‘a sailing ship’; *base* n ‘bottom’ :: *base* v ‘build or place upon’ :: *base* a ‘mean’; *bay* n ‘part of the sea or lake filling wide-mouth opening of land’ :: *bay* n ‘recess in a house or a room’ :: *bay* v ‘bark’ :: *bay* n ‘the European laurel’. The important point is that homonyms are distinct words: not different meanings within one word. [3,126]

In the discussion of the problem of types of homonymy we proceeded from the assumption that words are two-facet units possessing both sound-form and meaning, and we deliberately disregarded their graphic form. Some linguists, however, argue that the graphic form of words in Modern English is just as important as their sound-form and should be taken into consideration in the analysis and classification of homonyms.

Consequently they proceed from definition of homonyms as words identical in sound-form or spelling but different in meaning. It follows that in their classification of homonyms all the three aspects: sound-form, graphic form and meaning are taken into account. Accordingly they classify homonyms into homographs, homophones and perfect homonyms. [3, 129]

Homographs are words identical in spelling, but different both in their sound-form and meaning, for example, **bow** n [bou] — ‘a piece of wood curved by a string and used for shooting arrows’ and **bow** n [bau] — ‘the bending of the head or body’; **tear** n [tia] — ‘a drop of water that comes from the eye’ and **tear** v [tea] — ‘to pull apart by force’. 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-’) kabi.

Birinchi juft ham, ikkinchi juft ham o‘zaro barcha muqobil shakllarida teng keladi: *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.

Omonim omoleksemalar asosan bir turkum leksemalari bo‘ladi. Bunday omonimiya ko‘pincha ot, fe'l turkumi leksemalarida uchraydi: *oy- I* (planeta nomi) - *oy- II* ('yilning o‘n ikkidan bir qismi'), *chop- I* ('yugur-') – *chop- II* ('yer sathini qirqib ag‘dar-') kabi. Omonim omoleksemalar sifat turkumi leksemalarida ham uchraydi: *och- I* ('ochqagan') - *och- II* ('me'yorga yetmagan' - rang haqida: *och ko‘k*) kabi.

Har xil turkum leksemalari o‘zaro omonim omoleksema bo‘lishi uchun ular grammatik shakllanishga ega bo‘lmasligi kerak. Masalan, *albatta I* (*Albatta boraman* – ravish) – *albatta II* (*Boraman, albatta* – modal birlik). Bunday munosabat *balki I* modal birligi bilan *balki II* bog‘lovchisi orasida ham voqe bo‘lgan.

2. Omoforma omoleksemalar deb o‘zaro ba'zi grammatik shakllarida-gina teng keladigan omoleksemalarga aytiladi: *burun- I* (kishi tanasidagi a'zoning nomi) - *burun- II* (payt ravishi - 'ilgari'), *soz- I* (muzika asbobining nomi) – *soz- II* ('yaxshi') kabi.

Birinchi juftda ot leksema bilan ravish leksema o‘zaro bir necha shaklida teng keladi (*burun I – burun II, burundan I – burundan II, burunlari I – burunlari II* kabi), lekin boshqa shakllarida farqlanib turadi: ot leksemada *burnim, burning, burnimni* kabi shakllanishlar voqe bo‘lsa, ravish leksemada *burunroq* kabi shakllanish voqe bo‘ladi, demak, bu ikki leksema faqat ayrim grammatik shakllarida-gina teng keladi.

Ikkinchi juftda esa ot leksema bilan sifat leksema o‘zaro ikki shaklida teng keladi (*soz- I – soz- II, sozlar I – sozlar II*), boshqa shakllarida esa farqlanib turadi: ot leksemada *sozni, sozim, sozlarimni* kabi shakllanishlar voqe bo‘lsa, sifat leksemada *sozroq, juda soz* kabi shakllanishlar voqe bo‘ladi.

The two main sources of homonymy are: 1) diverging meaning development of a polysemantic word, and 2) converging sound development of two or more different words. [5, 59]

The process of diverging meaning development can be observed when different meanings of the same word move so far away from each other that they come to be regarded as two separate units. This happened, for example, in the case of Modern English **flower** and **flour** which originally were one word (*ME. flour*, compare. *OFr. flour, flor, L. flos — florem*) meaning ‘the flower’ and ‘the finest part of wheat’. The difference in spelling underlines the fact that from the synchronic point of view they are two distinct words even though historically they have a common origin.

C o n v e r g e n t s o u n d d e v e l o p m e n t is the most potent factor in the creation of homonyms. The great majority of homonyms arise as a result of converging sound development which leads to the coincidence of two or more words which were phonetically distinct at an earlier date. For example, *OE. ic* and *OE. eaze* have become identical in pronunciation (*MnE. I* [ai] and **eye** [ai]). A number of lexico-grammatical homonyms appeared as a result of convergent sound development of the verb and the noun (compare. *MnE. love* — **(to) love** and *OE. lufu* — **lufian**).

Words borrowed from other languages may through phonetic convergence become homonymous. *ON. ras* and *Fr. race* are homonymous in Modern English (compare. **race₁** [reis] — ‘running’ and **race₂** [reis] — ‘a distinct ethnical stock’).

Modern English has a very extensive vocabulary; the number of words according to the dictionary data is no less than 400, 000. A question naturally arises whether this enormous word-stock is composed of separate independent lexical units, or may it perhaps be regarded as a certain structured system made up of numerous interdependent and interrelated sub-systems or groups of words. [5,66] For example in Uzbek: *bel- I* (kishi tanasining a'zosi) - *bel- II* (ish quroli), *yoz- I* (fasl nomi) - *yoz- II* (*xatni yoz-*) - *yoz- III* (*dasturxonni yoz-*), *ellik- I* (beshinchi o'nlikning nomi) - *ellik- II* (*ikki ellik xat*) kabi;

This problem may be viewed in terms of the possible ways of classifying vocabulary items. Words can be classified in various ways. Here, however, we are concerned only with the semantic classification of words which gives us a better insight into some aspects of the Modern English word-stock. Attempts to study the inner structure of the vocabulary revealed that in spite of its heterogeneity the English word-stock may be analyzed into numerous sub-systems the members of which have some features in common, thus distinguishing them from the members of other lexical sub-systems. An example in Uzbek: *yosh- I* ('umr') - *yosh- II* ('hali ko'p yashamagan'); *boq- I* ('qara-') - *boq- II* ('tarbiyala-', 'o'stir-'); *band- I* ('egallangan') - *band- II* ('tutqich', 'dum': *band bergan qovun*) kabi.

Classification into monosynaptic and polysemantic words is based on the number of meanings the word possesses. More detailed semantic classifications are generally based on the semantic similarity (or polarity) of words or their component morphemes. Below we give a brief survey of some of these lexical groups of current use both in theoretical investigation and practical class-room teaching. The following diagram shows the relationships between homonyms (between blue and yellow) and related linguistic concepts. Several similar linguistic concepts are related to homonymy. [10,47] These include:

Homographs (literally "same writing") are usually defined as words that share the same spelling, regardless of how they are pronounced. If they are pronounced the same then they are also homophones (and homonyms) - for example, bark (the sound of a dog) and bark (the skin of a tree). If they are pronounced differently then they are also heteronyms - for example, bow (the front of a ship) and bow (a type of knot).

Polysemes are words with the same spelling and distinct but related meanings. The distinction between polysemy and homonymy is often subtle and subjective, and not all sources consider polysemous words to be homonyms. Words such as mouth, meaning either the orifice on one's face, or the opening of a cave or river, are polysemous and may or may not be considered homonyms.

Capitonyms are words that share the same spelling but have different meanings when capitalized (and may or may not have different pronunciations). Such words include polish (to make shiny) and Polish (from Poland); march (organized, uniformed, steady and rhythmic walking forward) and March (the third month of the year in the Gregorian Calendar). However, both polish and March at the beginning of sentences still need to be capitalized. For example: *boshliq- I* (*bosh-* - 'boshlang'ich' + *liq*) – *boshliq- II* (*bosh-* - 'asosiy' + *liq*); *betla- I* (*bet-* - 'yuz' + *la*) – *betla- II* (*bet-* 'sahifa' + *la*).

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

The two main sources of homonymy are:

- 1) Diverging meaning development of one polysemantic word, and
- 2) Convergent sound development of two or more different words. The latter is the most potent factor in the creation of homonyms.

Homonyms can develop through shortening of different words, for example, «cab» from «cabriolet», «cabbage», «cabin». A more detailed classification was given by I.V. Arnold. He classified only perfect homonyms and suggested four criteria of their classification: lexical meaning, grammatical meaning, basic forms and paradigms. [7,123] For example: *ayri- I* (<*ayir-* + *i* sifat yasovchisi) - *ayri- II* (ot); *kecha- I* (*kech-* + *a* ot yasovchisi) – *kecha- II* (ravish); *tepki- I* (*tep-* + *ki*) – *tepki- II* (ot) and others.

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

- a) Homonyms identical in their grammatical meanings, basic forms and paradigms and different in their lexical meanings, for example, «board» in the meanings «a council» and «a piece of wood sawn thin»; *tiqin- I* (*tiq-* + *in* narsa-qurol oti yasovchisi) – *tiqin- II* (*tiq-* + *in* sifat yasovchisi); *solliq- I* (*sol-* + *iq* ot yasovchisi) – *solliq- II* (*sol-* + *iq* sifat yasovchisi) kabi.

b) Homonyms identical in their grammatical meanings and basic forms, different in their lexical meanings and paradigms, for example, to lie - lied - lied, and to lie - lay - lain; *sochiq- I* (*soch- I* - 'boshdagi tuklar' + *iq* narsa oti yasovchisi) – *sochiq- II* (*soch- II* - 'har tomonga otib tashla-' + *iq* narsa oti yasovchisi), *chog 'la- I* (*chog* '- - 'chama' + *la*) – *chog 'la- II* (*chog* '- - 'yaxshi holat' + *la*) kabi.

c) Homonyms different in their lexical meanings, grammatical meanings, paradigms, but coinciding in their basic forms, for example, «light» / «lights»/, «light» / «lighter», «lightest»/; *kechik- I* (*kech-* - 'birin-ketin o't-' + *ik* ot yasovchisi) - *kechik- II* (*kech-* ravishi + *ik* fe'l yasovchisi), *ochiq- I* (*och-* fe'li + *iq* sifat yasovchisi) – *ochiq- II* (*och-* sifati + *iq* fe'l yasovchisi) kabi.

d) Homonyms different in their lexical meanings, grammatical meanings, in their basic forms and paradigms, but coinciding in one of the forms of their paradigms, for example, «a bit» and «bit» (from «to bite»). *karam- I* ('mehrshafqat') - *karam- II* (sabzavotning nomi) kabi.

In I. V. Arnold's classification there are also patterned homonyms, which, differing from other homonyms, have a common component in their lexical meanings. These are homonyms formed either by means of conversion, or by leveling of grammar inflexions. [7,129]

These homonyms are different in their grammar meanings, in their paradigms, identical in their basic forms, for example, «warm» - «to warm». Here we can also have unchangeable patterned homonyms which have identical basic forms, different grammatical meanings, a common component in their lexical meanings, for example, «before» an adverb, a conjunction, a disposition.

There are also homonyms among unchangeable words which are different in their lexical and grammatical meanings, identical in their basic forms, for example, «for» - «uchun» and «for» - «-ga».

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

Based on the degree of similarity, homonyms fall into three classes: perfect homonyms, homographs and homophones. [8,49]

1. Perfect homonyms are words identical both in sound and spelling, but different in meaning, for example,

bank n. the edge of the river, lake, etc.

bank n. an establishment for money business

bear n. a large heavy animal

bear v. to put up with

date n. a kind of fruit

date n. a boy or girl friend

bark v.

bark n.

fan n.

fan n.

2. Homographs [homo (same) +graph (writing)] are words identical only in spelling but different in sound and meaning, for example,

bow /bau/ n. bending the head as a greeting

bow /bou/ n. the device used for shooting arrows

sow /sou/ v. to scatter seeds

sow /sau/ n. female adult pig

row v.

row n. /rau/

lead v. /li:d/

lead n. /led/

So, 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* [ˈsouə] :: *sewer* [sjuə]; *tear* [tiə] :: *tear* [tea]; *wind* [wind] :: *wind* [waind] and many more.

I.3 Homophones

H o m o p h o n e s are words of the same sound but of different spelling and meaning: *air: heir; arms: alms; 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 thinks it right that some conventional rite should symbolise 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. [4, 72]

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 sentences 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.

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 generalised national form of expression. An average speaker does not separate the written and oral form. On the contrary he is more likely to analyse 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 analysing cases of identity of form and diversity of content. [13, 78]

H o m o p h o n e s are words identical in sound-form but different both in spelling and in meaning, For example, **sea** *n* and **see** *v*; **son** *n* and **sun** *n*.

P e r f e c t h o m o n y m s are words identical both in spelling and in sound-form but different in meaning, for example, **case**₁ *n* — ‘something that has happened’ and **case**₂ *n* — ‘a box, a container’.

The description of various types of homonyms in Modern English would be incomplete if we did not give a brief outline of the diachronic processes that account for their appearance.

Homophones (literally "same sound") are usually defined as words that share the same pronunciation, regardless of how they are spelled. If they are spelled the same then they are also homographs (and homonyms); if they are spelled differently then they are also heterographs (literally "different writing"). Homographic examples include rose (flower) and rose (past tense of rise). Heterographic examples include to, too, two, and there, their, they're.

Heteronyms (literally "different name") are the subset of homographs (words that share the same spelling) that have different pronunciations (and meanings). That is, they are homographs which are not homophones. Such words include desert (to abandon) and desert (arid region); row (to argue or an argument) and row (as in to row a boat or a row of seats - a pair of homophones). Heteronyms are also sometimes called heterophones (literally "different sound").

Homophones [home (same) +phone (sound)] are words identical only in sound but different in spelling and meaning, e.g.

dear /diə/ n. a loved person

deer /diə/ n. a kind of animal

right /rait/ a. correct

write /rait/ v. to put down on paper with a pen

rite /rait/ n. a ceremonial procedure

son /s^n/ n. a male child of someone

sun /s^n/ n. the heavenly body from which the earth gets warmth and light

air

heir

sell

cell

Of the three types, homophones constitute the largest number and are most common.

Chapter II. Semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek

It should be pointed out that in the classification discussed above one of the groups, namely lexico-grammatical homonymy, is not homogeneous. This can be seen by analysing the relationship between two pairs of lexico-grammatical homonyms, for example,

1. *seal*₁ *n* — ‘a sea animal’; *seal*₃ *v* — ‘to close tightly as with a seal’;

2. *seal*₂ *n* — ‘a piece of wax, lead’; *seal*₃ *v* — ‘to close tightly as with a seal’.

We can see that *seal*₁ *n* and *seal*₃ *v* actually differ in both grammatical and lexical meanings. We cannot establish any semantic connection between the meaning ‘a sea animal’ and ‘to close tightly’.

The lexical meanings of *seal*₂ *n* and *seal*₃ *v* are apprehended by speakers as closely related. The noun and the verb both denote something connected with “a piece of wax, lead, a stamp by means of which a design is printed on paper and paper envelopes are tightly closed”. [14,72]

Consequently the pair *seal*₂ *n* — *seal*₃ *v* does not answer the description of homonyms as words or word-forms that sound alike but differ in lexical meaning. This is true of a number of other cases of lexico-grammatical homonymy, e.g. **work** *n* — (to) **work** *v*; **paper** *n* — (to) **paper** *v*; **love** *n* — (to) **love** *v* and so on. As a matter of fact all homonyms arising from conversion have related meanings. As a rule however the whole of the semantic structure of such words is not identical. The noun **paper**, for example, has at least five meanings (1. material in the form of sheets, 2. a newspaper, 3. a document, 4. an essay, 5. a set of printed examination questions) whereas the verb (to) **paper** possesses but one meaning ‘to cover with wallpaper’.

Considering this peculiarity of lexico-grammatical homonyms we may subdivide them into two groups: A. identical in sound-form but different in their grammatical and lexical meanings (*seal*₁ *n* — *seal*₃ *v*), and B. identical in sound-form but different in their grammatical meanings and partly different in their lexical meaning, i.e. partly different in their semantic structure (*seal*₃ *n* — *seal*₃ *v*; **paper** *n* — (to) **paper** *v*). Thus the definition of homonyms as words possessing

identical sound-form but different semantic structure seems to be more exact as it allows of a better understanding of complex cases of homonymy, e.g. **seal₁ n** — **seal₂ n**; **seal₃ v** — **seal₄ v** which can be analysed into homonymic pairs, e.g. **seal₁ n** — **seal₂ n** lexical homonyms; **seal₁ n** — **seal₃ v** — lexico-grammatical homonyms, subgroup A; **seal₂ n** — **seal₃ v** — lexico-grammatical homonyms, subgroup B.

Thus the semantic criterion implies that the difference between polysemy and homonymy is actually reduced to the differentiation between related and unrelated meanings. This traditional semantic criterion does not seem to be reliable, firstly, because various meanings of the same word and the meanings of two or more different words may be equally apprehended by the speaker as synchronically unrelated/ For instance, the meaning 'a change in the form of a noun or pronoun' which is usually listed in dictionaries as one of the meanings of case1-- 'something that has happened', 'a question decided in a court of law' seems to be just as unrelated to the meanings of this word as to the meaning of case2 --'a box, a container', [18,145] etc. Examples in Uzbek:

1) *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;

2) *o't- I* ('maysa') - *o't- II* ('olov') - *o't- III* (kishi tanasidagi a'zoning nomi) - *o't- IV* (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;

3) *suz- I* (*sutni suz-*) - *suz- II* ('ovqatni idishlarga sol-') – *suz- III* (*ko'zini suz-*) – *suz- IV* (*suvda suz-*) - *suz- V* (*shoxi bilan suz-*); bunda voqe bo'ladigan o'n munosabatning har biri – omonim omoleksemalar;

4) *sur- I* (qorako'lining navi) - *sur- II* ('och kulrang, ko'kimtir') - *sur- III* ('quritilgan') – *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.

Secondly in the discussion of lexico-grammatical homonymy it was pointed out that some of the mean of homonyms arising from conversion (seal n--seal 3 v; paper n--paper v) are related, so this criterion cannot be applied to a large group of homonymous word-forms in Modern English. This criterion proves insufficient in the synchronic analysis of a number of other borderline cases, brother--brothers--'sons of the same parent' and brethren--'fellow members of a religious society'. [16,112]

The meanings may be apprehended as related and then we can speak of polysemy pointing out that the difference in the morphological structure of the plural form reflects the difference of meaning. Otherwise we may regard this as a case of partial lexical homonymy. The same is true of such cases as hang--hung--hung--'to support or be supported from above' and hang--hanged--hanged--'to put a person to death by hanging' all of which are traditionally regarded as different meanings of one polysemantic word. For example: *bek- I* ('hukmdor') - *bek- II* (be- - 'mustahkam qil-' + *k* sifat yasovchisi: 'yopiq'); *kuya- I* ('yungli matoga tushadigan zararkunanda hasharot') - *kuya- II* (*kuy-* - '*kuyib ko'mir bo'l-*' + *a* ot yasovchisi: 'kuyish natijasida hosil bo'ladigan qora zarralar') kabi.

It is sometimes argued that the difference between related and unrelated meanings may be observed in the manner in which the meanings of polysemantic words are as a rule relatable. It is observed that different meanings of one word have certain stable relationships which are not to be found between the meanings of two homonymous words. A clearly perceptible connection, for example, can be seen in all metaphoric or metonymic meanings of one word (for example, foot of the man-- foot of the mountain, loud voice--loud colors, etc., if we compare *also deep well* and *deep knowledge*, etc.). For example: *ko'z-* leksemasining bosh leksik ma'nosi - 'qarash, ko'rish a'zosi'. Bu leksema bilan yana bir necha leksik ma'nolar anglatiladi. Quyidagi birikmalarda bu leksemaning turli leksik ma'nolari namoyon bo'ladi: *tizzaning ko'zi, taxtaning ko'zi, buloqning ko'zi, ignaning ko'zi, xurjunning ko'zi, uzuk-ning ko'zi, derazaning ko'zi, kartoshkaning ko'zi*.

Such semantic relationships are commonly found in the meanings of one word and are considered to be indicative of polysemy. It is also suggested that the semantic connection may be described in terms of such features as form and function (for example, horn of an animal and horn as an instrument), process and result (to run--'move with quick steps' and a run--act of running). [22,154]

Similar relationships, however, are observed between the meanings of two homonymic words, for example, to run and a run in the stocking; *alpoz-* ('ahvol', 'yo'sin') - *alfoz-* (*lafz-* leksemasining ko'pligi), *abzal-* (asli *afzor:* 'asbob', 'egar-jabduq') - *afzal-* ('yaxshi', 'ortiq'), *xalos-* ('ozod': *xalos qil-*) - *xolos-* ('faqat'), *tiz-* ('ipga shodala-') - *chiz-* ('chiziq tushir-'), *xush-* ('yaxshi', 'yoqimli') - *hush-* ('kishining sezish, idrok etish, anglash qobiliyati'), *rux* (shaxmat donalaridan birining nomi) - *ruh* ('kishining his-tuyg'ularini aks ettiruvchi kayfiyati'), *obba* (hayrat ifodalaydi) - *obbo* (tashvish ifodalaydi) and others.

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*l--*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*.

It may be easily observed that grammatical homonymy is the homonymy of different word-forms of one and the same word. The two classifications: full and partial homonymy and lexical, lexico-grammatical and grammatical homonymy are not mutually exclusive.

II.1 Some peculiarities of lexico-grammatical homonymy

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

In seal n and seal n, for example, the part-of-speech meaning of the word and the grammatical meanings of all its forms are identical. (seal [si:l] Common Case Singular, seal's [si:lz] Possessive Case Singular for both seal 1 and seal 2). The difference is confined to lexical meaning only or, to be more exact, to the denotational component: seal denotes 'a sea animal', 'the fur of this animal', etc., seal 2--'a design printed on paper, the stamp by which the design is made', etc. So we can say that seal 2 and seal are lexical homonyms as they differ in lexical meaning. [11, 45]

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

Lexico-grammatical homonymy generally implies that the homonyms in question belong to different parts of speech as the part-of-speech meaning is a blend of the lexical and grammatical semantic components. There may be cases however when lexico-grammatical homonymy is observed within the same part of speech as in the verbs (to) find [faɪnd] and (to) found [faʊnd], where homonymic word-forms: found [faʊnd] – Past Tense of (to) find and found [faʊnd] – Present Tense of (to) found differ both grammatically and lexically. [11, 47]

All homonyms may be described on the basis of the two criteria--homonymy of all forms of the word or only some of the word-forms and the type of meaning in which homonymous words or word-forms differ.

So we speak of full lexical homonymy of seen and seal 2 n, of partial lexical homonymy of live and leave, and of partial lexico-grammatical homonymy of seen

and seal 3. It should be pointed out that in the some classification discussed above one of Peculiarities the groups, namely lexico-grammatical of Lexico-Grammatical homonymy, is not homogeneous. This can be seen by analyzing the relationship between two pairs of lexico-grammatical homonyms, for example,

1. *seal a sea animal'*--*seal 3 v--'to close tightly as with a seal*;
2. *seal 2 n--'a piece of wax, lead'*--*seal 3 v--'to close tightly as with a seal'*.

We can see that seal n and seal 3 v actually differ in both grammatical and lexical meanings. We cannot establish any semantic connection between the meaning «a sea animal" and "to close tightly".

The lexical meanings of seal 2 n and seal 3 v are apprehended by speakers as closely related for both the noun and the verb denote something connected with "a piece of wax, lead, etc., a stamp by means of which a design is printed on paper and paper envelopes are tightly closed".

Consequently the pair seal 3 n - seal 3 v does not answer the description of homonyms as words or word-forms that sound alike but differ in lexical meaning. This is true of a number of other cases of lexico-grammatical homonymy, for example, work n-(to) work (v); paper (n)-(to) paper (v); love (n)-(to) love v and so on. As a matter of fact all homonyms arising from conversion have related meanings. [14, 82]

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

terim I (ter- ot leksemasi + im nisbatlovchisi = leksemashakl) – terim II (teri- ot leksemasi + m nisbatlovchisi = leksemashakl); yer I (ot leksemashakl) – yer II (ye- fe'l leksemasi + r sifatdosh shakli yasovchisi : zamon shakli yasovchisi = leksemashakl); yoqamiz I (yoq- fe'l leksemasi + a zamon shakli yasovchisi + miz

tuslovchisi = leksemashakl) – *yoqamiz II* (*yoqa-* ot leksemasi + *miz* nisbatlovchisi = leksemashakl)

Considering this peculiarity of lexico-grammatical homonyms we may subdivide them into two groups: A. identical in sound-form but different in their grammatical and lexical meanings (*seal n-seal v*), and B. identical in sound-form but different in their grammatical meanings and partly different in their lexical meaning, partly different in their semantic structure (*seal v; paper n-(to) paper v*).

Thus the definition of homonyms as words possessing identical sound-form but different semantic structure seems to be more exact as it allows of a better understanding of complex cases of homonymy, for example, *seal n--seal n--seal v --seal v* which can be analyzed into homonymic pairs, for example, *seal n-seal n-*lexical homonyms; *seal n-seal v*-lexico-grammatical homonyms, subgroup A; *seals n—seal v* – lexico-grammatical homonyms, subgroup B; etc.

In the discussion of the problem of graphic homonymy we proceeded from the as possessing both sound-form and meaning, and we deliberately disregarded their graphic form. Some linguists, however, argue that the graphic form of words in Modern English is just as important as their sound-form and should be taken into consideration in the analysis and classification of homonyms. [20,123]

Consequently they proceed from the definition of homonyms as words identical in sound-form or spelling but different in meaning. It follows that in their classification of homonyms all the three aspects: sound-form, graphic-form and meaning are taken into account. Accordingly they classify homonyms into homographs, homophones and perfect homonyms.

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

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

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

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

For example: Old English I can be Old English cage have become identical in pronunciation (Modern English I [ai] and eye [ai], A number of lexicogrammatical homonyms appeared as a result of convergent sound development of the verb and the noun (compare Modern English *love--(to) love and OE. lufu--lufian*).

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. [12,284]

II.2. Homonymy and polysemy. Etymological and semantic criteria

One of the most debatable problems in semasiology is the demarcation line between homonymy and polysemy, between different meanings of one word and the meanings of two homonymous words.

If homonymy is viewed diachronically then all cases of sound convergence of two or more words may be safely regarded as cases of homonymy, as in the example, **race**₁ and **race**₂ can be traced back to two etymologically different words. The cases of semantic divergence, however, are more doubtful.

The transition from polysemy to homonymy is a gradual process, so it is hardly possible to point out the precise stage at which divergent semantic development tears asunder all ties between the meanings and results in the appearance of two separate words.

In the case of **flower, flour, for example**, it is mainly the resultant divergence of graphic forms that gives us grounds to assert that the two meanings which originally made up the semantic structure of one word are now apprehended as belonging to two different words. For example: *bel- I* (kishi tanasining a'zosi) - *bel- II* (ish quroli), *yoʻz- I* (fasl nomi) - *yoʻz- II* (*xatni yoʻz-*) - *yoʻz- III* (*dasturxonni yoʻz-*), *ellik- I* (beshinchi oʻnlikning nomi) - *ellik- II* (*ikki ellik xat*).

S y n c h r o n i c a l l y the differentiation between homonymy and polysemy is as a rule wholly based on the semantic criterion. It is usually held that if a connection between the various meanings is apprehended by the speaker, these are to be considered as making up the semantic structure of a polysemantic word, otherwise it is a case of homonymy, not polysemy. [33,167]

Thus the semantic criterion implies that the difference between polysemy and homonymy is actually reduced to the differentiation between related and unrelated meanings. This traditional semantic criterion does not seem to be reliable, firstly, because various meanings of the same word and the meanings of two or more different words may be equally apprehended by the speaker as synchronically unrelated. For instance, the meaning 'a change in the form of a noun or pronoun' which is usually listed in dictionaries as one of the meanings of

case₁ seems to be synchronically just as unrelated to the meanings of this word as 'something that has happened', or 'a question decided in the court of law' to the meaning of **case**₂ — 'a box, a container', etc.

Secondly, in the discussion of lexico-grammatical homonymy it was pointed out that some of the meanings of homonyms arising from conversion (for example, *seal*₂ *n* — *seal*₃ *v*; *paper* *n* — *paper* *v*) are related, so this criterion cannot be applied to a large group of homonymous word-forms in Modern English. This criterion proves insufficient in the synchronic analysis of a number of other borderline cases, for example, *brother* — *brothers* — 'sons of the same parent' and *brethren* — 'fellow members of a religious society'.

The meanings may be apprehended as related and then we can speak of polysemy pointing out that the difference in the morphological structure of the plural form reflects the difference of meaning. Otherwise we may regard this as a case of partial lexical homonymy.

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

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

Similar relationships, however, are observed between the meanings of two partially homonymic words, for example, *to run* and *a run* in the stocking.

Moreover in the synchronic analysis of polysemantic words we often find meanings that cannot be related in any way, as the meanings of the word **case** discussed above. Thus the semantic criterion proves not only untenable in theory but also rather vague and because of this impossible in practice as in many cases it cannot be used to discriminate between several meanings of one word and the meanings of two different words. [31,139]

The criterion of distribution suggested by some linguists is undoubtedly helpful, but mainly in cases of lexico-grammatical and grammatical homonymy. For example, in the homonymic pair *paper n* — (*to*) *paper v* the noun may be preceded by the article and followed by a verb; (*to*) *paper* can never be found in identical distribution. This formal criterion can be used to discriminate not only lexico-grammatical but also grammatical homonyms, but it often fails in cases of lexical homonymy, not differentiated by means of spelling.

Homonyms differing in graphic form, such lexical homonyms as *knight* — *night* or *flower* — *flour*, are easily perceived to be two different lexical units as any formal difference of words is felt as indicative of the existence of two separate lexical units. Conversely lexical homonyms identical both in pronunciation and spelling are often apprehended as different meanings of one word.

It is often argued that in general the context in which the words are used suffices to establish the borderline between homonymous words, for example, the meaning of *case₁* in *several cases of robbery* can be easily differentiated from the meaning of *case₂* in *a jewel case, a glass case*. This however is true of different meanings of the same word as recorded in dictionaries, e.g. of case, as can be seen by comparing the case will be tried in the law-court and the possessive case of the noun.

Thus, the context serves to differentiate meanings but is of little help in distinguishing between homonymy and polysemy. Consequently we have to admit that no formal means have as yet been found to differentiate between several meanings of one word and the meanings of its homonyms.

In the discussion of the problems of polysemy and homonymy we proceeded from the assumption that the word is the basic unit of language. Some linguists hold that the basic and elementary units at the semantic level of language are the lexico-semantic variants of the word, individual word-meanings. In that case, naturally, we can speak only of homonymy of individual lexico-semantic variants, as polysemy is by definition, at least on the synchronic plane, the coexistence of several meanings in the semantic structure of the word.

Many words, especially those characterized by a high frequency rating, are not connected with meaning by a one-to-one relationship. On the contrary, one symbol as a rule serves to render several different meanings. The phenomenon may be said to be the reverse of synonymy where several symbols correspond to one meaning.

Words borrowed from other languages may through phonetic convergence become homonymous. Old Norse *has* and French *race* are homonymous in Modern English (compare. *race*₁ [reis]--'running' and *race*₂ [reis] 'a distinct ethnical stock'). There are four homonymic words in Modern English: *sound* --'healthy' was already in Old English homonymous with *sound*--'a narrow passage of water', though etymologically they are unrelated. Then two more homonymous words appeared in the English language, one comes from Old French *son* (L. *sonus*) and denotes 'that which is or may be heard' and the other from the French *sunder* the surgeon's probe.

One of the most debatable problems in semasiology is the demarcation line between homonymy and polysemy, between different meanings of one word and the meanings of two homonymous words. Synchronically the differentiation between homonymy and polysemy is wholly based on the semantic criterion. It is usually held that if a connection between the various meanings is apprehended by the speaker, these are to be considered as making up the semantic structure of a polysemantic word, otherwise it is a case of homonymy, not polysemy.

Thus the semantic criterion implies that the difference between polysemy and homonymy is actually reduced to the differentiation between related and

unrelated meanings. This traditional semantic criterion does not seem to be reliable, firstly, because various meanings of the same word and the meanings of two or more different words may be equally by the speaker as synchronically unrelated/ For instance, the meaning 'a change in the form of a noun or pronoun' which is usually listed in dictionaries as one of the meanings of case!--'something that has happened', 'a question decided in a court of law' seems to be just as unrelated to the meanings of this word as to the meaning of case 2 --'a box, a container', etc.

Secondly in the discussion of lexico-grammatical homonymy it was pointed out that some of the mean of homonyms arising from conversion (e.g. seal in--seal 3 v; paper n--paper v) are related, so this criterion cannot be applied to a large group of homonymous word-forms in Modern English. This criterion proves insufficient in the synchronic analysis of a number of other borderline cases, e.g. brother--brothers-- 'sons of the same parent' and brethren--'fellow members of a religious society'.

The meanings may be adapted as related and then we can speak of polysemy pointing out that the difference in the morphological structure of the plural form reflects the difference of meaning. Otherwise we may regard this as a case of partial lexical homonymy. The same is true of such cases as hang--hung--hung--'to support or be supported from above' and hang--hanged--hanged--'to put a person to death by hanging' all of which are traditionally regarded as different meanings of one polysemantic word. [28, 39]

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

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

A more objective criterion of distribution suggested by some linguists is criteria: undoubtedly helpful, but mainly increase-distribution of lexico - grammatical and grammatical homonymy. In the homonymic pair paper n--(to) paper v the noun may be decided by the article and followed by a verb; (to) paper can never be found in identical distribution. This formal criterion can be used to discriminate not only lexico-grammatical but also grammatical homonyms, but it often fails the linguists in cases of lexical homonymy, not differentiated by means of spelling. For example: *yor- I* ('ikkiga ajrat-') - *yor- II* ('mahbuba'); *bog ' I* (*bir bog ' piyoz*) – *bog ' - II* ('meva- zor') and others.

Some linguists hold that the basic and elementary units at the semantic level of language are the lexico-semantic variants of the word, i.e. individual word-meanings. In that case, naturally, we can speak only of homonymy of individual lexico-semantic variants, as polysemy is by definition, at least on the synchronic plane, the co-existence of several meanings in the semantic structure of the word. The criticism of this viewpoint cannot be discussed within the framework different semantic structure. The problem of homonymy is mainly the problem of differentiation between two different semantic structures of identically sounding words. [29, 68]

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

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

grammatical meaning, whereas grammatical homonyms are those that differ in grammatical meaning only.

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

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

The criteria used in the synchronic analysis of homonymy are:

- 1) The semantic criterion of related or unrelated meanings;
- 2) The criterion of spelling;
- 3) The criterion of distribution, and
- 4) The criterion of context.

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

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

In applied linguistics this problem is of the greatest importance in lexicography and also in machine translation. Homonyms are words different in meaning but identical in sound or spelling, or both in sound and spelling. Homonyms can appear in the language not only as the result of the split of polysemy, but also as the result of leveling of grammar inflexions, when different parts of speech become identical in their outer aspect, for example, «*care*» from «*care*» and «*care*» from «*careen*». They can be also formed by means of conversion, for example, «*to slim*» from «*slim*», «*to water*» from «*water*». They

can be formed with the help of the same suffix from the same stem, for example, «reader» - *a person who reads and a book for reading.*

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

The lexical method of distinction of homonymy and polysemy. This method is concluded in revealing the synonymic connection of polysemy and homonymy. If consonant units are get in one synonymic row when different meanings of words remain still the semantic intimacy and, there fore, it is early to say that polysemy is transferred in to homonymy. If the consonant words are not get in one synonymic row that words are homonymy. [26, 22]

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

- 1) odam
- 2) advokat
- 3) erkak
- 4) qo'rqmas odam
- 5) odamiylik
- 6) xizmatkor
- 7) ishchi
- 8) er
- 9) dengizchilar
- 10) vassal
- 11) peshka piyoda (shaxmatda)

As the all meanings are connected with the major meaning "*odam*". But homonyms are different words which have nothing in common between themselves. For example "*bark1*" - "*itning hurishi*" and "*bark2*" - "*suzayotgan kema*". In this example we can see that homonymy words coincide only in pronunciation and writing. [26,23]

Some scientists say that the substitution of different meanings of words by the synonyms may help to differ the homonyms from polysemantic words. This way of distinction of polysemy and homonymy gets its name in literature as "etiological criterion". For example "voice 1 - "sounds uttered in speaking" (sound); "voice 2" - "mode of uttering sounds in speaking" (sound); "voice 3" - "the vibration of the vocal cords in sounds uttered" (sound); "voice 4" - "the form of the verb that excises the relation of the subject to the action". "Voice 1" - "voice 2" - "voice 3" are not homonymic in their character although they have different meanings because of the reason that they can be substituted by the synonymic word "sound". As far as "voice 4" is concerned as homonymic to the devious three meanings because the fourth meaning of the word "sound" can not be substituted by the word common to the devious three meanings of the word "voice" (the analyzed meaning of the word "sound").

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

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

There is a fourth method of distinction of polysemy and homonymy. It is morphological method. It means that polysemy and homonymy are characterized

by the various word-building. So some words which have a few meanings the new word is formed with the same suffix.

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

Perfect homonyms and polysemants are fully identical with regard to spelling and pronunciation. This creates the problem of differentiation. The fundamental difference between homonyms and polysemants lies in the fact that the former refers to different words which happen to share the same form and the latter is the same word which has several distinguishable meanings.

One important criterion is to see their etymology, homonyms are from different sources whereas a polysemant is from the same source which has acquired different meanings in the course of development. The second principal consideration is semantic relatedness.

The various meanings of a polysemant are correlated and connected to one central meaning to a greater or lesser degree, for example, *neck*. On the other hand, meanings of different homonyms have nothing to do with one another. In dictionaries, a polysemant has its meanings all listed under one headword whereas homonyms are listed as separate entries. Here are the characteristics of each:

polysemant: (1) same source, different meaning

(2) meanings related

homonyms: (1) different source, different meanings

(2) meanings not related

As homonyms are identical in sound or spelling, particularly homophones, they are often employed to create puns for desired effect of, say, humour, sarcasm or ridicule. Consider the following conversation that took place between a waitress and a customer in a restaurant.

"You're not eating your fish," the waitress said to him. "Anything wrong with it?" "Long time no sea," the man replied.

Long time no see is usually said as a form of greeting between two friends when they meet after a long time. Here the customer cleverly employed the structure of the idiom to his advantage to criticize in a humorous way the bad quality of the food served at the restaurant. Long time no sea implies that 'sea food kept for a long time is not fit for eating'.

Here is another example.

"On Sunday they pray for you and on Monday they prey on you."

This was the remark made by a London worker on one Sunday morning when he saw groups of the so called pious gentlemen and ladies entering the church for prayer. Prey meaning 'plunder' or 'rob' sounds the same as pray. In the church, the gentlemen and ladies pray for blessing from the God, but once out of church, they show their true features, ruthlessly exploiting the working people like ferocious animals preying on their victims. The sardonic tone is unmistakable.

Words borrowed from other languages may through phonetic convergence become homonymous. Old Norse has and French race are homonymous in Modern English (compare. race1 [reis]--'running' and race 2 [reis] 'a distinct ethnical stock'). There are four homonymic words in Modern English: sound --'healthy' was already in Old English homonymous with sound--'a narrow passage of water', though etymologically they are unrelated.

Then two more homonymous words appeared in the English language, one comes from Old French son (L. sonus) and denotes 'that which is or may be heard' and the other from the French sunder the surgeon's probe.

One of the most debatable problems in semasiology is the demarcation line between homonymy and polysemy, between different meanings of one word and the meanings of two homonymous words.

If homonymy is viewed diachronically then all cases of sound convergence of two or, more words may be safely regarded as cases of homonymy as, *sound 1, sound 2, sound 3, and sound 4* which can be traced back to four etymologically different words. The cases of semantic divergence, however, are more doubtful.

The transition from polysemy to homonymy is a gradual process, so it is hardly possible to point out the precise stage at which divergent semantic development tears asunder all ties of etymological kinship and results in the appearance of two separate words. In the case of flower, flour e.g., it is mainly the resultant divergence of graphic forms that gives us grounds to assert that the two meanings which originally made up the semantic structure of one word are now apprehended as belonging to two different words.

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

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

A more objective criterion of distribution suggested by some linguists is criteria: undoubtedly helpful, but mainly increase-distribution of lexico-grammatical and grammatical homonymy. When homonymic words of Context, belong to different parts of speech they differ not only in their semantic structure, but also in their syntactic function and consequently in their distribution.

In the homonymic pair paper n--(to) paper v the noun may be preceded by the article and followed by a verb; (to) paper can never be found in identical distribution. This formal criterion can be used to discriminate not only lexico-grammatical but also grammatical homonyms, but it often fails the linguists in cases of lexical homonymy, not differentiated by means of spelling.

Homonyms differing in graphic form, e.g. such lexical homonyms as knight-night or flower--flour, are easily perceived to be two different lexical units as any

formal difference of words is felt as indicative of the existence of two separate lexical units.

Conversely lexical homonyms identical both in pronunciation and spelling are often apprehended as different meanings of one word. It is often argued that the context in which the words are used suffices to perceive the borderline between homonymous words, the meaning of case in several cases of robbery can be easily differentiated from the meaning of case in a jewel case, a glass case. This however is true of different meanings of the same word as recorded in dictionaries, e.g. of case as can be seen by comparing the case will be tried in the law-court and the possessive case of the noun.

Thus, the context serves to differentiate meanings but is of little help in distinguishing between homonymy and polysemy. Consequently we have to admit that no formal means have as yet been found to differentiate between several meanings of one word and the meanings of its homonyms. We must take into consideration the note that in the discussion of the problems of polysemy and homonymy we proceeded from the assumption that the word is the basic unit of language.

It should be pointed out that there is another approach to the concept of the basic language unit which makes the problem of differentiation between polysemy and homonymy irrelevant. [13, 80]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As it was mentioned above the lexical categories of homonyms and polysemantic words exist in all three languages, so we must, firstly, know what it meant by homonymy and polysemy. [25, 54]

Homonyms are words different in meaning but identical in sound or spelling, or both in sound and spelling. Homonyms can appear in the language not only as the result of the split of polysemy, but also as the result of leveling of grammar inflexions, when different parts of speech become identical in their outer aspect, for example, «care» from «care» and «care» from «careen». They can be also formed by means of conversion, for example, «to slim» from «slim», «to water» from «water».

They can be formed with the help of the same suffix from the same stem, for example, «reader» - a person who reads and a book for reading. For example in Uzbek: *yosh- I* ('umr') - *yosh- II* ('hali ko'p yashamagan'); *boq- I* ('qara-') – *boq- II* ('tarbiyala-', 'o'stir-'); *band- I* ('egallangan') – *band- II* ('tutqich', 'dum': *band bergan qovun*).

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

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

Classifications of homonyms:

Walter Skeat classified homonyms according to their spelling and sound forms and he pointed out three groups: perfect homonyms that is words identical in sound and spelling, such as: «*school*» - «*baliq qiltanog'i*» and «*maktab*»; homographs, that is words with the same spelling but pronounced differently, for example, «*bow*» -/bau/ -«*egilish*» and /bou/ - «*yoy*»; homophones that is words pronounced identically but spelled differently, for example, «*night*» - «*tun*» and «*knight*» -«*sipoh*».

Another classification was suggested by A.I Smirnitsky. [29, 72] He added to Skeat's classification one more criterion: grammatical meaning. He subdivided the group of perfect homonyms in Skeat's classification into two types of homonyms: perfect which are identical in their spelling, pronunciation and their grammar form, such as «*spring*» in the meanings: the season of the year, a leap, a source, and homo-forms which coincide in their spelling and pronunciation but have different grammatical meaning, for example, «*reading*» - *Present Participle, Gerund, Verbal noun., to lobby - lobby.*

A more detailed classification was given by I.V. Arnold. He 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:

- a) Homonyms identical in their grammatical meanings, basic forms and paradigms and different in their lexical meanings, for example, «*board*» in the meanings «*a council*» and «*a piece of wood sawn thin*»;
- b) Homonyms identical in their grammatical meanings and basic forms, different in their lexical meanings and paradigms, for example, to lie - lied - lied, and to lie - lay - lain;
- c) Homonyms different in their lexical meanings, grammatical meanings, paradigms, but coinciding in their basic forms, for example, «*light*» / «*lights*»/, «*light*» / «*lighter*», «*lightest*»/;

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

These homonyms are different in their grammar meanings, in their paradigms, identical in their basic forms, for example, «warm» - «to warm». Here we can also have unchangeable patterned homonyms which have identical basic forms, different grammatical meanings, a common component in their lexical meanings, for example, «before» an adverb, a conjunction, a preposition. There are also homonyms among unchangeable words which are different in their lexical and grammatical meanings, identical in their basic forms, for example, «for» - «для» and «for» - «ибо».

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The semantic criterion implies that the difference between polysemy and homonymy is actually reduced to the differentiation between related and unrelated meanings. This semantic criterion does not seem to be reliable, firstly, because

various meanings of same word and the meanings of two or more different words may be equally apprehended by speaker.

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

For example, we may give the following word

"face 1" - 'the front part of human's head'.

"face 2" - "playing card, building, watches".

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

For example, the word *"fair1" which means "a person with light hairs" and "fair 2" which means "just, honest"*. In this example the meanings except to each other and do not keep the semantic intimacy.

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

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

If we analyze homonymy and polysemy in three languages we can say that polysemy and homonymy in both Russian and Uzbek. As in English, in Russian and Uzbek homonyms are words identical in sound and spelling but different in meaning. For example, *"завод 1" - "an industrial undertaking" and "завод 2" - "a device which brings an action of a mechanism"*.

"o't 1" - "firewood", "o't 2" - "grass" and "o't 3" - "the verb which means movement".

In this chapter we partially used the materials of the investigations of Prof. Buranov. As in English and Uzbek we correspond to polysemantic words the words which have several connected meanings. For example, "uzuk" - "one of the jewelry things" and "uzuk" - "broken, cut something, e.g. thread". Another example is "ko'z 1" - "a part of human's body" and "ko'z 2" - "a sing on wood".

In Uzbek we have the same phenomenon: For example, the word "dum 1" - "a part of animal's body" and "dum 2" - "a partial comet".

It means that these two meanings we can be substitutive with synonymy "the end of the body". It means that these words are polysemantic in their lexical meaning. [31,141]

If we take another pair of words, for example, "yoz 1" - "summer" and "yoz 2" - "the form of the verb which expresses the order".

Such kind of examples we can find in the Uzbek language as well. For instance, the words "ovoz 1" we can substitute into the synonym "sound" while the word "ovoz 2" in the meaning of "opinion a group of people" is homonymic to the first one, for example, "yoshlar ovozi".

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

In Uzbek the word "oy 1" - for example, "Yilda un ikkita oylar bor" and "oy 2" - for example, "oy - yerning yo'ldoshi" form the new word with the help of the suffix "lik": Compare: "Oylik maoshi" and "Bir oylik 14 kundun iborat".

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

Conclusion

In the conclusion section I'd like to write brief information about the semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek languages with some examples.

In our graduating qualification paper we attempted to investigate homonymy of words and homonymy of word-forms, types of homonyms in English and Uzbek, the classifications of homonyms, semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek, some peculiarities of lexico-grammatical homonymy, homonymy and polysemy and the etymological and semantic criteria. We were interested in this theme that's why we chose it and investigated it deeply. We used different kinds of references to investigate the semantic peculiarities of homonyms in three languages.

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

Polysemy is characteristic of most words in many languages, however different they may be. But it is more characteristic of the English vocabulary as compared with Uzbek, due to the monosyllabic character of English and the predominance of root words. The greater the relative frequency of the word, the greater the number of variants that constitute its semantic structure, the more polysemantic it is. This regularity is of course a statistical, not a rigid one.

Polysemy is viewed as the coexistence of various meanings of the same word in a certain historical period of time, say, Modern English. In this way, the primary meaning of a word is the core of word-meaning called the central meaning. However, the following conclusion can also be drawn: the problem of distinction of homonymy and polysemy in all the languages compared has not been

investigated thoroughly yet and there are still many opportunities to discover new fields of approaches and this problem is still waiting its salvation.

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

There are various sources of homonyms: change in sound and spelling, borrowing, etc.

1. Change in sound and spelling. Some homonyms are native by origin, derived from different earlier forms in Old English. The change in sound and spelling gradually made them identical in modern English.

2. Borrowing. As a result of heavy borrowing from other languages, many words of foreign origin coincide in sound and/or spelling with those of native origin or with those of other foreign origin.

3. Shortening. Many shortened forms of words happen to be identical with other words in spelling or sound.

In the end of our research work we gave a total conclusion and the list of used literature. We hope this research work achieved to its purpose and its end. And I believe that in future I will continue this theme on my next studies and research works.

The present material can be used at the lessons of lexicology, practical course of English language, stylistics, and speech practice in both: universities and English classes at schools. This paper can help to create the teaching aids, textbooks, and others. Teachers and students might use the results of the present work for the further investigations.

Methodological recommendation on the theme “Semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek”

The requirements for listening and reading skills differ in the ninth and tenth forms. In the ninth form pupils should be able to understand oral language on the basis of the material previously learned and within the topics covered, while in the tenth form the material for hearing should include one or two unfamiliar words for pupils to guess their meaning, and to understand a text received by ear, based on the material learned and on a topic close to those pupils have worked at. This is a new “qualitative step” for pupils in understanding oral language. If in the ninth form pupils should read with the speed of 1000 signs per academic hour, in the tenth form the speed of reading hour is 1300.

The second component of “what to teach” is language (textual) material, arranged in topics and serving as starting points for the development of oral language and written language, which allows for teacher to reach the practical, educational, and cultural aims set by the syllabus. For example: in the junior stage pupils should speak and read about school, home, town and countryside, nature, physical training and sports. In the senior stage the textual material should cover the following topics: the life of the youth in Uzbekistan or in abroad, sport in Uzbekistan and abroad, industry, agriculture, and science in Uzbekistan and abroad, the history and geography of the country whose language pupils study, art and literature in Uzbekistan and abroad. Topics for speaking and reading are developed from form to form; the pupil’s ability to read and speak on a certain topic is widened as his vocabulary and grammar are enriched. [15,17]

The third component of the content of foreign language teaching is linguistic material, phonology, grammar, and vocabulary carefully selected for the purpose. The selection of linguistic material, the compiling of the so-called minima, for instance, minimum vocabulary and minimum grammar, has always been one of the most important and difficult problems to be solved and, although a great deal of work has been done in this respect, we are still on the way to its solution. A limited body of linguistic material is required by pupils’ language skills.

To sum up what has been said above, the content of foreign language teaching involves:

1. Language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing;
2. Language (textual) material;
3. Linguistic material; vocabulary; grammar, phonological minima.

In conclusion it should be said that content of teaching in our schools is laid down in the syllabus and realized in teaching materials and the teacher's own speech.

A great number of monographs, textbooks, articles and dissertation papers are now at the disposal of a scholar in stylistics. The stream of information grows larger every month. So, it should be taught pupils at schools for the classification of the vocabulary. One of the types of literary layer of the vocabulary is terminological words and this theme must be studied at schools and Universities.

Teaching a foreign language means first and foremost the formation and development of pupils' habits and skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing. We can not expect to develop such habits and skills of our pupils effectively if we do not know and take into account the psychology of habits and skills, the ways of forming them, the influence of formerly acquired habits on the formation of new ones, and many other necessary factors that psychology can supply us with.

Thus, if a teacher wants his pupils to speak English he must use all the opportunities he has to make them hear and speak it.

Effective learning of a foreign language depends to a great extent on the pupils' memory. That is why a teacher must know how he can help his pupils to successfully memorize and retain in memory the language material they learn.

The first component of "what to teach" is habits and skills which pupils should acquire while learning a foreign language. According to the aims of learning this subject they are: listening, speaking, reading and writing. The level of habits and skills and determined by the syllabus for each form. [15,19]

However, quantitative and qualitative characteristics of skills, or the so-called terminal behavior, are not defined yet for different types of schools and

stages of instruction. This is one of the problems for methodologists to investigate and solve. Nevertheless, some attempts have been made in this respect. Thus in school syllabi we can find some directions as to the level of skills that should be reached in each particular form and their development from form to form.

At schools, pupils are taught also some branches of lexicology. They are taught to homonymy, types of homonymy, polysemy, and the difference of homonymy with polysemy.

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.

This theme can be taught by asking some questions like the following:

1. What is homonymy? How many types of homonyms do you know? Which ones of them are the most frequently used?
2. Describe the difference between homonymy and polysemy.
3. Speak about the classifications of homonyms.
4. What kinds of semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek do you know?
5. Give more examples to the types of homonyms.

So, teaching homonyms, types of homonyms at schools and Universities are very important, because while reading any book, the reader must understand the meanings of the words and their correct translations. Undoubtedly, there used a lot of homonyms, homophones, homographs, homonyms proper in novels, stories and in books, that's why everybody should know homonyms, their types and the semantic peculiarities of homonyms in English and Uzbek languages very well.

Bibliography:

1. Karimov I.A., UZBEKISTAN: The Road of Independence and Progress. -T: Uzbekistan, 1992. pp. 22-23
2. Karimov I.A. Independent Uzbekistan Today. –Toshkent: Uzbekiston, 1993. p.15 -17
3. Abayev V.I. Homonyms T. O'qituvchi 1981 pp. 4-5, 8, 126-129
4. Adams V. Introduction to Modern English Word Formation. -L., 1973. p. 72
5. Akhmanova O.S. Lexicology: Theory and Method. M. 1972 pp. 59-66
6. Arakin V.D. English Russian Dictionary. -M :Russky Yazyk 1978 pp. 123–124
7. Arnold I.V. The English Word. –M: High School, 1986 pp. 123-129
8. Bankevich L. English Word-Building. -L., 1961. p. 49
9. Bloomsbury Dictionary of New Words. M. 1996 стр. 276-278
10. Buranov, Muminov Readings on Modern English Lexicology T. O'qituvchi 1985 p. 47
11. Burchfield R.W. The English Language. Lnd., 1985 pp45-47
12. Canon G. Historical Changes and English Wordformation: New Vocabulary items. N.Y., 1986. p.284
13. Dubenets E.M. Modern English Lexicology (Course of Lectures) –M: Moscow State Teacher Training University Publishers 2004. p. 78-80
14. Ginzburg R.S. et al. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. M., 1979 pp.72-82
15. Gurrey P. Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Longmans, -London, 1963. pp.17-19
16. Halliday M.A.K. Language as Social Semiotics. Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. Lnd., 1979.p.112
17. Hornby The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. -Lnd. 1974 c. 96–97
18. Howard Ph. New words for Old. -Lnd., 1980. p. 145
19. Jespersen ,Otto. Growth and Structure of the English Language. Oxford, 1982 pp.246-249

20. Jespersen O. Linguistics. -London, 1983. p. 123
21. Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English. Longman. 1981pp.23-25
22. Maurer D.W., High F.C. New Words – Where do they come from and where do they go. -American Speech. 1982. p. 154
23. Mednikova E.M. Seminars in English Lexicology. -Т., 1978 pp. 123-127
24. O. Jespersen. Linguistics. London, 1983, pp. 395-412
25. Potter S. Modern Linguistics. Lnd., 1957 pp.37-54
26. Rakhimov S.R. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. -Andijon 2011 pp. 22-23
27. Schlauch, Margaret. The English Language in Modern Times. Warszawa, 1965. p.342
28. Sheard, John. The Words we Use. N.Y.,1954. p.39
29. Smirnitsky A.I. Homonyms in English. -M. 1977. p. 68-72
30. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. -Oxford 1964. pp. 147-148
31. Ullmann S. Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. -Oxford, 1962. p. 139-141
32. V.D. Arakin English Russian Dictionary M.Russky Yazyk 1978 pp. 23-24, 117-119, 133-134
33. Vesnik D., Khidekel S. Exercises in Modern English Word-Building. -M., 1964. p. 167
34. World Book Encyclopedia. -NY Vol 8 1993 p. 321

Internet sources:

35. <http://www.ledonline.it/mpw/>
36. Internet: http://www.mpsttu.ru/works/english_philology/ Э. М. Дубенец. Курс лекций и планы семинарских занятий по лексикологии английского языка.htm
37. Internet: <http://www.wikipedia.com/English/articles/homonymy.htm>
38. Internet:[http://www.freeessays.com/english/M.Bowes Quantitative and Qualitative homonymy.htm](http://www.freeessays.com/english/M.Bowes_Quantitative_and_Qualitative_homonymy.htm)