HOMONYMY IN VERBAL WORD COMBINATIONS

Pukaliak M. V.

Lecturer at the Department of Foreign Languages
Lviv Polytechnic National University
S. Bandera str., 12, Lviv, Ukraine
orcid.org/0000-0002-0682-4647
martapukaliak@gmail.com

Key words: *polysemy, paradigm, syntactic, synchrony, method, analysis.*

The article is aimed at investigating grammatical homonymy in the Modern English language, types and peculiarities of the homonymous structures functioning in the literary texts. Homonymy is analyzed as a phenomenon of synchrony and viewed as a result of opposite processes of semantic divergence of words, etymologically coming from one and the same source. Homonyms are linguistic units different in meaning but identical in their form. In case of polysemy, different meanings of the same grammatical form are mutually dependent and proceed from the same meaning. In case of homonymy, the primary (invariant) meaning of a given grammatical form is no longer traced in different uses of this form. Syntactical homonymy is more complicated in its general features than morphological homonymy: identity of homonymous structures is not of absolute, all-embracing character and along with the prevailing identity there are also some differences, which are explicit indicators of deep non-identity of syntactical constructions. Structural non-identity of syntactical homonyms reveals itself in the process of their formation. Syntactical homonyms are such units in which surface structures coincide but deep semantic structures are different. It is the syntactical paradigm that makes it possible to reveal homonymy of the syntactic structure. If paradigmatic connection is considered to be a connection of a language element with other elements, then besides usual paradigmatic connections inside their syntactic paradigm, homonymy of syntactical units has connections with other elements of homonymous row. These connections are called homonymous collisions. It is transformational analysis that helps to differentiate homonymous constructions. In the frame of homonymy phenomena of morphological and syntactical homonymy stand apart from each other. Morphological homonymy includes separate parts of morphological paradigm and in such a way becomes an inalienable feature of all the morphological system of the language. Syntactical homonymy is more complicated in its general features than morphological homonymy: identity of homonymous structures is not of absolute, all-embracing character and along with the prevailing identity there are also some differences, which are explicit indicators of deep non-identity of syntactical constructions. Structural non-identity of syntactical homonyms reveals itself in the process of their formation.

ОМОНІМІЯ В ДІЄСЛІВНИХ КОМБІНАЦІЯХ

Пукаляк М. В.

викладач кафедри іноземних мов
Національний університет «Львівська політехніка»
вул. С. Бандери, 12, Львів, Україна
orcid.org/0000-0002-0682-4647
martapukaliak@gmail.com

Ключові слова: *полісемія, парадигма, синтаксис, синхронія, метод, аналіз.*

Стаття спрямована на дослідження граматичної омонімії в сучасній англійській мові, типів та особливостей омонімічних структур, що функціонують у літературних текстах. Омонімія аналізується як явище синхронії і розглядається як результат протилежних процесів семантичної розбіжності слів, етимологічно що походять з одного і того ж джерела. Омоніми – це мовні одиниці, різні за значенням, але однакові за своєю формою. У випадку багатозначності різні значення однієї і тієї ж граматичної форми взаємозалежні і виходять з одного і того ж значення. У випадку омонімії первинне (інваріантне) значення цієї граматичної форми не простежується в різних видах використання цієї форми.

Синтаксичні омоніми – це такі одиниці, в яких поверхневі структури збігаються, але глибокі семантичні структури різні. Саме синтаксична парадигма дає змогу виявити омонімію синтаксичної структури. Якщо парадигматичним зв'язком вважається зв'язок мовного елемента з іншими елементами, то, крім звичайних парадигматичних зв'язків усередині їх синтаксичної парадигми, омонімія синтаксичних одиниць має зв'язки з іншими елементами омонімічного рядка. Ці зв'язки називаються омонімічними зіткненнями. Саме трансформаційний аналіз допомагає диференціювати омонімічні конструкції. У рамках омонімії явища морфологічної та синтаксичної омонімії стоять окремо один від одного. Морфологічна омонімія включає окремі частини морфологічної парадигми і таким чином стає невід'ємною ознакою всієї морфологічної системи мови. Синтаксична омонімія складніша за своїми загальними ознаками, ніж морфологічна омонімія: тотожність омонімічних структур не має абсолютного, всеохоплюючого характеру, і поряд із переважаючою ідентичністю існують також деякі відмінності, які є явними показниками глибокої неідентичності синтаксичних конструкцій. Структурна нетотожність синтаксичних омонімів виявляється в процесі їх формування.

Formulation of the scientific problem. A wide range of valency of a verb results in a great variety of word combinations. External coincidence of adjuncts causes such a type of homonymy, which could be called grammatical homonymy of the first degree. But homonymy of verbal word combinations is not exhausted by the coincidence. Grammatical analysis shows that the relations between components can differ in the frames of a certain type of word combinations that falls under a certain structural formula. And this is homonymy of the second degree. In the sphere of verbal word combinations, we can differentiate two types of syntactical homonymy: external and internal homonymy.

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

All of these problems were dealt with separately as they arose in the course of linguistic studies of the verb system.

The aim and the task of the article is to investigate the homonymy in verbal word combinations and differentiate between external and internal homonymy.

The subject of the investigation and the tasks set are achieved by using such linguistic methods as descriptive method, methods of transformational and distributional analysis.

The object of the investigation is paradigmatic connections of the homonymous verbal word combinations, their functioning on the syntactic level and methods of their differentiating.

Presentation of the basic material and interpretation of the results of the investigation. External homonymy is the result of the morphological poverty and insufficient differentiation of those classes of words that have functions of adjuncts in verbal word combinations. This type of homonymy is rather provincial in character. Here homonymous collisions are theoretically possible in eight pairs of verbal word combinations.

1.1. V+D – V+A

1. This case may appear if the words of class D and class A do not have any formal indicator:

runs fast – grows old;

speaks loud – becomes distant;

opens wide – turns warm.

In order to reveal differences between those models, it is necessary to use the transformational procedure and observe models' behaviour to reveal possible differences.

The procedures used for differentiation are as follows:

1) Nominalization with expansion :

grows old – the man`s growing old;

runs fast – the man`s running fast;

speaks loud – the man`s speaking loud;

becomes distant – the man becoming distant;

opens wide – the man`s opening wide;

2) Addition of intensifier:

grows too old;

runs too fast;

speaks too loud;

becomes too distant;

opens too wide;

turns too warm.

3) Passive transformation and decomposition into NS:

X grows old – *X is grown old;

X runs fast – *X is run fast;

X speaks loud – *X is spoken loud;

X becomes distant – *X is become distant;

X opens wide – *X is opened wide;

X turns warm – *X is turned warm.

Differentiation of homomodels can be carried out by means of the following procedures:

1) exchange of the words that cause difficulties for their synonyms or antonyms. This can more explicity indicate lexico–grammatical class:

grows old – grows ancient, time honored, venerable;

grows young, youthful, ageless.

Runs fast – runs quickly, swiftly, rapidly; runs slowly.

Belonging of *"old"* to the class of adjectives is confirmed by the fact, that most synonyms and antonyms have word–building affixes of adjective; when *"fast"* is concerned, then most of its synonyms and antonyms are marked as adverbs.

2) crossing out words that result in difficulties with the aim to find any changes in the semantics of the verbal core:

grows old – X grows;

runs fast – X runs;

speaks loud – X speaks;

becomes distant – X becomes;

opens wide – X opens;

turns warm – X turns.

If the models were identical, then the procedure of crossing out adjuncts would be reflected to the same extent on the semantics of the verbal core. The meanings of verbs *"run, speak, open"* do not undergo significant changes, while those of the verbs *"grow, become and turn"* do.

1.2. V+D – V+N

This case may appear, if words of class D and N do not have any formal indicators of their belonging to those classes:

1) feels good – names Good.

Classes of adverbs and nouns stand so far apart from each other and differ so much, that they are distinguished easily with the help of:

a) nominalization:

*runs fast – the running fast, calls fast – *the calling Fast;*

*feels good – the feeling good, names Good – *the naming Good;*

b) addition of intensifier:

*runs fast – runs too fast, calls Fast – *calls too Fast;*

*feels good – feels too good, names Good – *names too Good;*

c) passive transformation:

*X runs fast – *fast is run by X, X calls Fast – Fast is called by X;*

*X feels good – *good is felt by X, X names good – Good is named by X.*

1.3. V+D – V+Ven

This case may occur when the adverb and participle II do not have any special formal indicators:

runs fast – seems lost.

Usage of all the procedures (nominalization, nominalization with expansion, decomposition into NS, passive transformation, addition of intensifier) does not give any result because of significant coincidence of distributional features of adverb and participle. Expansion of models by using *"very"* cannot serve to delimit them because both *"seems very lost"* and *"seems very much lost"* are widely used.

It appears useful to restore homomodels prior to the sentence restoration in order to observe if the received derivational history of sentences differ:

runs fast – X runs fast – X runs, the running is fast;

*seems lost – X is lost, it seems so, * the seeing is lost.*

1.4. V+A – V+N

This case appears when the adjunct and noun, which belong to verbal word combinations do not

have any formal indicators of belonging to definite lexico–grammatical class. It is characteristic of a noun not to have any determinants:

grows old – calls Tom.

For differentiation of these homomodels we can use addition of intensifier *"very"* and passive transformation:

grows old – grows very old,
calls Tom –*calls very Tom;
sounds beautiful – sounds very beautiful,
names Tornful – *names very Tornful.
X grows old – *old is grown by X,
X calls Tom – Tom is called by X;
X sounds beautiful – *beautiful is sounded by X,
X names Tornful – Tornful is named by X.

1.5. V+A – V+Ving

It appears when adjective with –ing ending is used in verbal word combinations and this adjective does not formally differ from corresponding non predicative form:

seems interesting – sits reading,
looks charming – stands thinking,
becomes fascinating – speaks boasting.

Procedures of differentiation can be one of two types:

1) The first procedure is directed at revealing differences between adjective and –ing form:

seems interesting – seems more interesting, sits reading – sits more reading;
looks charming – looks more charming, stands thinking – *stands more thinking;
becomes fascinating – becomes more fascinating, speaks boasting – *speaks more boasting.

2) The second is directed at showing different derivational history of homomodel:

X seems interesting – X is interesting, it seems so;
X sits reading – X sits. X reads.
X looks charming – X is charming, it looks so;
X stands thinking – X stands. X thinks.
X becomes fascinating – X is fascinating, it becomes so;
X speaks boasting – X speaks. X boasts.

1.6. V+A – V+Ven

This case occurs when the adjective and participle, which have similar or identical formal structure or are deprived of any identification marks, are included into verbal word–combinations as adjuncts:

grows old – seems lost,
looks sodden – gets written.

For the differentiation of these homomodels we should use procedures, which reveal specific distributional quality of adjectives. This allows distinguishing them from participles as verbal forms. These procedures constitute the essence of expansion of word combinations by:

1) using intensifier *"very"*

Examples*: grows old – grows very old,*
seems lost – *seems very lost;

looks sodden – looks very sodden,
gets written – *gets very written.

2) transformation of the degree of comparison. Examples*: grows old – grows older,*
seems lost – *seems loster;
looks sodden – looks more sodden,
gets written – *gets more written.

1.7. V+N – V+Ving

This case is unlikely to create homonymous collision. Noun included as an adjunct in verbal word combinations, is to be a proper noun, to be used with zero article, to be in the singular form and with –ing ending:

calls Browing – sits reading,
keeps Karting – stands thinking.

For the differentiation of these homomodels we can use the following procedures:

1) passive transformation:

X calls Browning – Browning is called by X;
X sits reading – *reading is sat by X;
X keeps Karting – Karting is kept by X,
X stands thinking – *thinking is standed by X.

2) transformational expansion by introducing conjunction *"and"*:

calls Browning – *calls and Browns,
sits reading – sits and reads;
keeps Karting – *keeps and Karts,
stands thinking – stands and thinks.

1.8. V+N – V + Ven

This case occurs when a proper noun, which is included in verbal word combination can have different endings. As morphological structure of the Past participle has some variants, it creates a great variety of homonymous collisions:

calls Frost – seems lost,
names Bridged – feels changed.

Distinction can be carried out with the help of two procedures, which clearly show different semantico–syntactical relations within the word combination and categorial properties of an adjunct.

expansion of word combination by using adjectives:

calls Frost – calls young Frost,
seems lost – *seems young lost;
names Bridged – names young Bridged,
feels changed – *feels young changed.

passive transformation:

X calls Frost – Frost is called by X,
X seems lost – *lost is seemed by X;
X names Beidged – Bridged is named by X,
X feels changed – *changed is felt by X.

Conclusions. The article was aimed at investigating grammatical homonymy in the Modern English language, types and peculiarities of the homonymous structures functioning in the literary texts.

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

A wide range of valency of a verb results in a great variety of word combinations. Grammatical analysis shows that the relations between components can differ in the frames of a certain type of word combinations that falls under a certain structural formula. In the sphere of verbal word combinations two types of syntactical homonymy are differentiated: internal and external homonymy.

Perspectives for further investigations. One of the most debatable problems is the problem between homonymy and polysemy i.e. between different meanings of a polysemantic word and the meanings of two or more different homonymous words. To solve a problem a number of criteria must be applied. It is still waiting for its salvation. Also distinguishing between polysemantic words takes its special place. I hope that this article will be useful for both teachers and students, everyone who is interested in the field of homonymy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Василевский А.Л. Полисемия и омонимия конструкций с субстантивным сказуемым в современном английском языке : автореф. дис. … канд. филол. наук :10.02.04. Москва, 1962. 23 с.
2. Гендельман Ж.А. Глаголы с включенным временным признаком действия/состояния в английском языке: семантика и функционирование : автореф. дис. … канд. филолог. Наук : 10.02.04. Киев, 1991. 17 с.
3. Карцевський С. Введение в изучение междометий. *Вопросы языкознания.* 1984. № 6. С. 127–137.
4. Маулер Ф.И. Грамматическая омонимия в англ. языке. Ростов, 1983. 136 с.
5. Сухорольська С.М., Федоренко О.І. Методи лінгвістичних досліджень : *навч. посібник для студентів, аспірантів і науковців.* Львів : ВІД ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 2005. 378 с.
6. Christie A. Selected Stories. M.: Progress, 1976. 334 p.
7. Fowles J. The Ebony Tower. Eliduc. Enigma. M.: Progress, 1980. 246 p.
8. Hemingway E. A Farewell To Arms. M.: Progress, 1976. 320 p.
9. Maugham W.S. Rain and Other Short Stories. M.: Progress, 1977. 406 p.

REFERENCES

1. Vasilevskiy A.L. (1962) Polisemiya i omonimiya konstruktsiy s substantivnym skazuemym v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke [Polysemy and homonymy of constructions with a substantive predicate in modern English]: Avtoref. Dis. … kand. filol. Nauk : 10.02.04. Moskva.
2. Gendel'man Zh.A. (1991) Glagoly s vklyuchennym vremennym priznakom deystiya/sostoyaniya v angliyskom yazyke: semantika i funktsionirovanie [Action / State Verbs in English: Semantics and Functioning]: Avtoref. Dis. … kand. filolog. Nauk : 10.02.04. Kiev.
3. Kartsevs'kiy S. (1984) Vvedenie v izuchenie mezhdometiy. [Introduction to the study of interjections]. *Vopr. Yazykoznaniya.* № 6. 127–137 pp.
4. Mauler F.I. (1983) Grammaticheskaya omonimiya v angl. yazyke. [Grammatical homonymy in English language]. Rostov,136 p.
5. Sukhorol's'ka C.M., Fedorenko O.I. (2005) Metodi lingvistichnikh doslidzhen' [Methods of linguistic analysis]: navch. posibnik dlya studentiv, aspirantiv i naukovtsiv. L'viv: VID LNU im. Ivana Franka, 378 p.
6. Christie A. (1976) Selected Stories. M.: Progress. 334 p.
7. Fowles J. (1980) The Ebony Tower. Eliduc. Enigma. M.: Progress. 246 p.
8. Hemingway E. (1976) A Farewell To Arms. M.: Progress. 320 p.
9. Maugham W.S. (1977) Rain and Other Short Stories. M.: Progress. 406 p.