



## HOW HOMONYMS ARE CREATED IN ENGLISH COMPARED TO UZBEK LANGUAGE

*Umaraliyeva Munajat, Abdulimova Maftuna, Kosimov Abdulkhay*  
*Teachers of Applied English Department, FSU*

Almost every language in the world has always been trying to enrich their dictionary. Therefore, the development of every language is reflected in its word treasure. The semantical and grammatical structure of lexis, its general and specific features, origin and current use are studied in **lexicology**. The literal meaning of the term lexicology is 'the study of the word' (made of by joining two ancient Greek words: lexis – 'word, phrase' and logos – 'learning, knowledge' [3, 7]). Words are lexically and semantically related to each other in different ways. The term that is used to describe this concept is **lexical relationship**. The common types of lexical relationships are: synonymy, antonymy, homonymy and polysemy. In this article, homonyms are investigated in the base of English and Uzbek languages to distinguish their certain similarities and disparate features.

According to Kazan philology Davletbayeva **homonyms** are words which are identical in form but distinctive in meaning. She emphasized that three main aspects must be taken into consideration: sound features, graphic form and meaning. It means that without studying these phases of homonyms, this can be holding still abstract ideas. [2, 31]. The research shows that modern English is exceedingly richer in homonymous lexical items than Uzbek language. In fact, "Oxford English Dictionary" (2<sup>nd</sup> edit.1989) 2540 listed homonyms [2, 30], while in homonymy dictionary of Uzbek language – "O'zbek tili omonimlarining izohli lug'ati" (Sh.Rahmatullayev. 1984) it has been registered 497 homonym words.

When analyzing the origin of homonymy, there are various linguistic points of view in both languages. Linguists of Moscow state university suggest that, there are mainly **five sources** of homonymous words in English: *phonetic changes, borrowings, sound imitation and conversion*.

**1. Phonetic changes.** Etymological investigations of some homonymous words reveal that the words that were historically pronounced differently might develop similar sound-forms as a result of later changes in phonetics, and so they become homonyms. For example, *ic* and *eaze* were not homonyms in Old English, these words have become the same in pronunciation I-eye [ai]. It leads to the idea that converging sound development is the most influential factor in the creation of homonymous words.

**2. Borrowing.** Most of linguists agree that Latin and French borrowings are important for the research of English word relations because of their potential influence. Majority of borrowed words were adopted to English pronunciation norms and this procedure caused the formation of new homonyms in the language. For instance *post1* (a vertical stick or pole fixed into the ground, usually to support something or show a position) and *post2* (letters and parcels that are delivered to homes or places of work). Originally first lexeme was borrowed from Latin *postis* and the second lexeme from French *poste*.

**3. Sound-imitation.** Onomatopoeic words can be alike sometimes with other available words in the language that makes new homonym. Even words made by sound-imitation can also duplicate with the other parts of speech, like a *ring n.* (the sound a bell makes) – a *ring n.* (a circle of any material,



or any group of things or people in a circular shape or arrangement) – *to ring v.* (to make a telephone call to someone).

**4. Conversion** is the most essential way of enriching English language with homonyms. According to Ginzburg ‘conversion’ is characterized as the phonetic identity of two words belonging to different parts of speech unless they have the same form[3, 127], and it appears in everyday vocabulary: *work – to work; paper – to paper, love – to love*. As such group of words are very numerous in English lexis, it is clear that, it highly affects to the growth of homonymy.

**5. Shortening**, to put in another way, monosyllabism. According to some linguists *monosyllabism*, loss of inflections and shortening, significantly increased the number of one-syllable homonyms in English [2, 31]. To give an instance, *fan n.* – ‘an enthusiastic admirer of something or someone’ is shortened from *adj. fanatic* and duplicate in form Latin borrowing *fan v.* which means ‘waving lightly to produce a cool current of air’. There is no doubt that, shortening is the most productive source of homonymy. In fact, almost 89% of homonyms that is registered in “Oxford English Dictionary” (2<sup>nd</sup> edit.1989), which have been stated, are one-syllable, 9,1% – two-syllable and 1,9% of them three and more syllable words. [2, 30]

In accordance with above discussion, we can conclude that, although there are wide range of capabilities of language, they are not boundless. All the more so, not any sequence of letters could be a ‘word’. Even foreign borrowings sometimes may duplicate in form native words. Thus, forming homonyms is one of the most urgent language necessities, which helps to express lexical meanings.

## References:

1. Rahimov, N. Turniyozov. O‘zbek tili (ma’ruzalar matni). – Samarqand, 2006
2. Давлетбаева Д.Н. Lectures on English lexicology. Курс лекций по лексикологии английского языка. Учебное пособие для студентов иностранных языков. – М.: Казань, 2010
3. R. S. Ginzburg, S. S. Khidekel, G. Y. Knyazova, A. A. Sankin. A course in modern English lexicology. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. – Moskow: “Vysšaja škola”, 1979
4. Alimardon, T., Sherzod, L., & Umida, H. (2022, December). UTILIZING DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " ONLINE-CONFERENCES" PLATFORM (pp. 45-47).
5. Sotvoldievich, T. A. (2022). Linguistic and Didactic Factors of Improving the Writing Competence of Future English Language Teachers. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS*, 1(3), 1-9.
6. Abduolimova, M. N. Q. (2022). KOGNITIV METAFORA NAZARIYASI: YANGI YO ‘NALISHLAR. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 2(3), 153-161.
7. Abdulkhay, K., Shaxriyor, X., & Nasibullo, Q. (2022, December). LISTENING AND NOTE TAKING SKILLS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " ONLINE-CONFERENCES" PLATFORM (pp. 38-40).
8. Gafforov, I., & Abdulkhay, K. (2022). The Role of Assessment in Language Teaching. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION*, 1(4), 31-34.



9. Gafforov, I., & Kosimov, A. (2022, September). LANGUAGE ENVIRONMENT, LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY AND PREJUDICE IN UZBEKISTAN. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE" THE TIME OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS"* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 82-86).
10. Haydarova, U., & Umarova, M. (2022). YAPON MUTOZ MANBALARIDA QO'LLANGAN METAFORALARNING TURLARI TASNIFI. *Science and innovation*, 1(B3), 599-603.
11. Igamberdieva, S. (2022, September). PRINCIPLES FOR TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE" INNOVATIVE TRENDS IN SCIENCE, PRACTICE AND EDUCATION"* (Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 212-216).
12. Jurayeva, K., & Shakhnoza, I. (2022). IMPLICATIONS OF MACRO AND MICRO LANGUAGE PLANNING IN UZBEKISTAN. *BARQARORLIK VA YETAKCHI TADQIQOTLAR ONLAYN ILMIIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 330-333.
13. kizi Shermamatova, S. U. NEOLOGISMS IN MODERN UZBEK AND ENGLISH AND THE HISTORY OF THEIR ORIGIN.
14. Kholmatov, S., & Yuldosheva, M. (2022). HOMONYMY IN ITS STYLISTIC USE: ANALYSIS OF PUNS. *Involta Scientific Journal*, 1(7), 178-181.
15. Kosimov, A., & Latipov, S. (2022). THE IMPORTANCE OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY AND PRACTICE IN STATE EDUCATION SYSTEMS. *Involta Scientific Journal*, 1(9), 23-27.
16. Kosimov, A. Digital and Media Literacy: The Importance of Using Networking Sites and Digital Technologies in Language Learning. *Procedia of Philosophical and Pedagogical Sciences ISSN, 2795(546X)*, 101.
17. Foziljon o'g'li, L. S. (2022). LAKUNALAR–MILLIY-O'ZIGA XOS ELEMENTLAR TIZIMI.
18. Latipov, S. (2022, February). TEACHING ENGLISH IN A NATURAL WAY. In *Multidiscipline Proceedings of Digital Fashion Conference* (Vol. 2, No. 1).
19. Luiza, G., Nigora, A., & Gulbaxor, M. (2022, December). THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MICRO AND MACRO LANGUAGE PLANNING. In *" ONLINE-CONFERENCES" PLATFORM* (pp. 109-112).
20. Mansurjonova, G. (2020). The Main Notions Of Linguoculturology. *Интернаука*, (27), 85-86.
21. Mashrabovna, U. M., & Mohlaroyim, E. (2022). Individual differences in foreign language learning. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(5), 751-757.
22. Munajat, U., Xurshida, U., & Sevara, S. (2022, December). CHALLENGES IN USING MODERN TECHNOLOGIES IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In *" ONLINE-CONFERENCES" PLATFORM* (pp. 30-33).
23. Qurbonov, N. X. U. (2022). EXPRESSION OF THE PHENOMENON OF INTENSIFICATION/DEINTENSIFICATION AT THE PHONETIC LEVEL. *Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies (CARJIS)*, 2(4), 271-275.
24. Sevara, U., Muhayyo, U., & Maftuna, A. (2022, December). THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DIGITAL LITERACY IN THE EFL CLASSROOM. In *" ONLINE-CONFERENCES" PLATFORM* (pp. 41-44).



25. Sevara, S., Shakhriyor, K., & Kosimov, A. (2022, December). IMPLEMENTATION OF DIGITAL TOOLS IN THE EFL CLASSROOM. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 34-37).
26. Shermamatova, S., & Ibrokhimova, M. (2022). THE RENAISSANCE PERIOD IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERATURE. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 2(11), 510-518.
27. Shavkatovna, A. N., & Sharifovna, S. M. (2022). The Role of Electronic Resources in English Language Teaching. *International Journal of Discoveries and Innovations in Applied Sciences*, 2(4), 79-83.
28. Sharifovna, S. M., & Maksudovna, J. H. METHODOLOGICAL OPPORTUNITIES TEACHING ENGLISH IN NON-PHILOLOGICAL HIGHER EDUCATION. *ЎЗБЕКИСТОНДА ИЛМИЙ ТАДҚИҚОТЛАР: ДАВРИЙ АНЖУМАНЛАР: 10-ҚИСМ*, 66.
29. Shokirova, M. (2021). Paragraph-syntactic compositional unit. In *НАУКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ, ИННОВАЦИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ* (pp. 124-126).
30. Sevara, U., & Jurayeva, K. (2022). LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY AND LANGUAGE PREJUDICE IN UZBEKISTAN. *BOSHQARUV VA ETIKA QOIDALARI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 16-18.
31. Sultanovna, U. S., & Dilnavoz, Y. (2022). DANIEL DEFOE'S CREATION IN ENGLISH LITERATURE. *IJTIMOIIY FANLARDA INNOVASIYA ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 9-11.
32. Turdimatova, M. (2021). SEMANTIC NOTION OF DIMINUTIVES IN THE FORMATION OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH. *Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики*, 2(2).
33. Toirova, N. I., & Irisova, M. B. R. Q. (2022). LEXICAL AND STYLISTIC PECULIARITIES OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 2(11), 818-828.
34. Umarova, M. (2021). THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT. *Frontline Social Sciences and History Journal*, 1(08), 90-99.
35. Umarova, X. (2020, December). A WORK OF ART IN OKTAM USMANOV'S NOVEL " GIRDOB" EXPRESSION OF LANGUAGE FEATURES. In *Конференции*.
36. Usmanova, S. S., & qizi Xamrokulova, S. I. (2022). EKSPRESSIV NUTQIY AKTLARNING PRAGMATIK XUSUSIYATI. *Results of National Scientific Research International Journal*, 1(8), 102-115.
37. Галимуллина, Л. (2021). Некоторые особенности в переводе фразеологических единиц с английского языка на узбекский язык. *Общество и инновации*, 2(8/S), 205-213.
38. Xolmatov, S., & Yuldosheva, M. (2022). О 'ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDA OMONIMLARNING USLUBIY XUSUSIYATLARI. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 2(7), 144-149.