TRADITIONAL AND MODERN CLASSIFICATIONS OF HOMONYMS

Egamberdiyeva Irodaxon

Teacher of Andijan State Foreign Language Institute

Mirolimova Rahnamo

Student of Andijan State Foreign Language Institute

Abstract: This article explores the phenomenon of homonymy, a subject of enduring interest in the fields of linguistics and lexicography. Homonyms-words identical in form but different in meaning-pose considerable challenges and opportunities in linguistic analysis. The paper examines both traditional and modern classifications of homonyms, analyzing their typological features, theoretical underpinnings, and the evolution of their treatment in linguistic thought. Traditional approaches primarily focus on formal similarities, while modern classifications incorporate structural, semantic, and cognitive dimensions. This comprehensive analysis illuminates the dynamic and multifaceted nature of homonymy, providing insights into its role in language development, lexicography, and communication.

Keywords: homonymy, polysemy, lexical semantics, traditional classification, modern linguistics, ambiguity, cognitive linguistics, structural semantics.

The traditional classification of homonyms is rooted in the formalist approach to linguistic analysis, emphasizing morphological and phonological identity. Early grammarians and lexicographers such as Henry Sweet and Otto Jespersen contributed to foundational ideas that would shape traditional categorization. Homonyms are generally divided into three principal types:

1. Perfect Homonyms Complete Homonyms: These are words that are identical in both spelling and pronunciation but have unrelated meanings. For instance: 'Bank' the side of a river vs. 'Bank' a financial institution.

2. Homophones: These words share pronunciation but differ in spelling and meaning. Examples include: 'Pair' vs. 'Pear', 'Knight' vs. 'Night'.

3. Homographs: These words share spelling but have different pronunciations and meanings, such as: 'Lead' to guide vs. 'Lead' a metal.[1,2]

Traditional approaches often relied on etymological criteria to differentiate homonymy from polysemy. If the meanings of a word could be traced to a single source, it was deemed polysemous; otherwise, the term was treated as homonymous. This view, however, has been increasingly questioned [1] For example, the word 'mouth'-as in 'mouth of a river' and 'mouth of a person'-was traditionally considered polysemous due to the shared conceptual base. However, when two words like 'bark' the sound a dog makes and 'bark' the outer covering of a tree have entirely distinct etymologies, they are seen as true homonyms.

The evolution of structuralist and generative linguistics led to more sophisticated frameworks for analyzing homonymy. Modern linguists such as Lyons, Cruse, and Murphy have refined homonym classification by considering semantic, syntactic, and cognitive factors.

1. Lexical vs. Grammatical Homonymy: Lexical Homonymy involves content words such as 'bat' animal vs. 'bat' sports equipment. Grammatical Homonymy involves function words or inflectional morphemes. For instance, 's' in 'he walks' vs. 'cats' particularly salient in inflectionally rich languages.

2. Absolute vs. Partial Homonymy: Absolute homonyms are fully identical in all grammatical forms and categories. Partial homonyms may differ in some aspects, such as inflectional paradigms. Consider 'row' a line vs. 'row' to paddle, which differ in stress and usage.

3. Paradigmatic vs. Syntagmatic Homonymy: Paradigmatic homonymy refers to forms that are homonymous across paradigms, such as 'left' past of leave vs. 'left' opposite of right. Syntagmatic homonymy focuses on homonymy that creates ambiguity within a specific syntactic context [2]

4. Cognitive and Contextual Classification: Langacker introduced the concept of conceptual polysemy, where in meanings that appear homonymous may share a cognitive base. Consequently, classification depends not only on form and etymology but also on conceptual integration and usage patterns. [5]

5. Diachronic vs. Synchronic Homonymy: Diachronic homonymy examines how homonyms emerge through historical phonetic convergence. Synchronic homonymy focuses on the coexistence of identical forms in a language at a given point in time.

The classification of homonyms has implications across several domains:
Lexicography: Dictionary compilers must decide whether to list meanings under one entry as polysemes or separate entries as homonyms.
Language Teaching: ESL learners often struggle with homonyms; a precise understanding can aid vocabulary acquisition and reduce confusion.
Natural Language Processing (NLP): Disambiguating homonyms is a major task in computational linguistics, essential for machine translation, voice recognition, and AI systems [3]

Literary Studies: Homonymy contributes to ambiguity, wordplay, and stylistic effects in literature, necessitating nuanced interpretive strategies.
The study of homonymy, while rooted in traditional formalism, has undergone substantial evolution through modern linguistic thought. From straightforward phonological criteria to multifaceted semantic and cognitive perspectives, the classification of homonyms reflects the complexity of language itself. While traditional models provide a foundational taxonomy, modern approaches offer a

richer, context-sensitive understanding that aligns with contemporary linguistic theory and real-world language use.

References

1. Jespersen, O. (1924). The Philosophy of Grammar. Allen & Unwin, Sweet, H. (1891). A New English Grammar: Logical and Historical. Oxford University Press.

2. Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics (Vols. 1–2). Cambridge University Press.

3. Cruse, D. A. (1986). Lexical Semantics. Cambridge University Press.

4. Murphy, M. L. (2010). Lexical Meaning. Cambridge University Press.

5.Langacker, R. W. (1987). Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Stanford University Press.