4. Hollett V. Business Objectives / V. Hollett. – Oxford : OUP, 2001. – 191 p.

5. Pothier M. Multimédias, Dispositifs D'apprendre et Acquisition des Langues. Ochrys / M. Pothier. – 140 p.

6. Olsen D. M. Strategic management in the hospitality industry / Michael D. Olsen, Eliza Ching-Yick Tse, Joseph J. West. – 2 ed. – John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2006. – 385 p.

7. Абдуллина О. А. Общепедагогическая подготовка учителя в системе высшего педагогического образования : [для пед. спец. высших учебных заведений] / О. А. Абдуллина. – 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. – М. : Просвещение, 1990. – 141 с.

8. Абрамова Г. С. Возрастная психология / Г. С. Абрамова. – Екатеринбург : Деловая книга, 1999. – 360 с.

9. Аванесова А. С. Основы педагогики и психологии высшей школы / А. С. Аванесова, А. А. Вербицкий. М. : МГУ, 1986. – 302 с.

Л.В. Саватєєва, ст. викл.
О.М. Тріщ, доц.
М.В. Кондратенко, викл.

WORDBUILDING IN MODERN ENGLISH

Досліджено словотворення в сучасній англійській мові, а саме: полісемію, омонімію. Надано класифікацію омонімів у різних частинах мови, проаналізовано лексико-граматичні омоніми за звуковими та графічними ознаками. Наведено омоніми лексичних одиниць, запозичених з інших іноземних мов. Розглянуто питання порівняння полісемії та омонімії, а також відмінності їх значень.

Исследовано словообразование в современном английском языке, а именно: полисемия, омонимия. Представлена классификация омонимов в разных частях речи, проанализированы лексико-грамматические омонимы по звуковым и графическим признакам. Приведены омонимы лексических единиц, заимствованных из других иностранных языков. Рассмотрен вопрос сравнения полисемии и омонимии, а также различия их значений.

Wordbuilding of Modern English is investigated in this article. The phenomenon of polysemy and homonymy, sources of homonymy, their etymological

472

and semantic criteria are studied. Words, borrowed from other languages, some peculiarities of lexico-grammatical homonymy are investigated. Graphic and sound-form of homonyms are classified.

Постановка проблеми у загальному вигляді. 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 [1].

Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій. 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 analysing different cases of homonymy we find that some words are homonymous in all their forms, i.e. we observe full homonymy of the paradigms of two or more different words as, e.g., 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 or seal that we are analysing. In other cases, e.g. seal – 'a sea animal' and (to) seal – '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:

seal,	(to)seal
seal	seal
seal's	seals
seals	sealed
seals'	sealing, etc.

It is easily observed that only some of the word-forms (e.g. seal, seals, etc.) are homonymous, whereas others (e.g. 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 is true of a number of other cases, e.g. compare find [faind], found [faund], found [faund] and found [faund], founded ['faundid], founded [faundid]; know [nou], knows [nouz], knew [nju:], and no [nou]; nose [nouz], noses [nouziz]; new [nju:] in which partial homonymy is observed [2].

473

Consequently all cases of homonymy may be classified into full and partial homonymy – i.e. homonymy of words and homonymy of individual word-forms.

Мета та завдання статті. 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 (e.g. seal *n*-seal *n*), partial homonymy as a rule is observed in word-forms belonging to different parts of speech (e.g. 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, e.g., for [for] – preposition, for [fo:] – conjunction and four [fo:j] – numeral, as these parts of speech have no other word-forms. Homonyms may be also classified by the type of meaning into lexical, lexico-grammatical and grammatical homonyms. In seal *n* and seal *n,* e.g., the part-of-speech meaning of the word and the grammatical meanings of all its forms are identical (cf. seal [si:l] Common Case Singular, seal's [si:lz] Possessive Case Singular for both seal and seal). 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-design printed on paper, the stamp by which the design is made', etc. So we can say that seal and seal are lexical homonyms as they differ in lexical meaning.

Виклад основного матеріалу дослідження. If we compare seal – 'a sea animal' and (to) seal – '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, i.e. **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** [3].

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, e.g., in the verbs (to) **find** [faind] and (to) **found** [faund], where homonymic word-forms: found [faund] – Past Tense of (to) **find** and **found** [faund] – 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, e.g. asked [a:skt] – asked [a:skt]; in the paradigm of nouns we usually find homonymous forms of the Possessive Case Singular and the Common Case Plural, e.g. **brother's** ['brathaz] – **brothers** ['brathaz]. 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. 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 seah *n* and seal *n,* of partial lexical homonymy of **lie** *v* and **lie** *v,* and of partial lexico-grammatical homonymy of seal *n* and **seal** *v.*

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, e.g. 1. seal n – 'a sea animal' – **seal** *v* – 'to close tightly as with a seal'; 2. **seal** *n* – 'a piece of wax, lead' – **seal** *v* – 'to close tightly as with a seal'. We can see that **seal** *n* and **seal 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** *n* and **seal 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** *n* – **seal *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.

It is sometimes argued that as a rule the whole of the semantic structure of such words is not identical. The noun **paper,** e.g., has at least five meanings (1. material in the form of sheets, 2. a newspaper, 3. a document, 4. an eassay, 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.

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, i.e. partly different in their semantic structure (**seal** *n* – **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, e.g. **seal** *n* – **seal *n*** – **seal *v*** – **seal *v*** which can be analysed into homonymic pairs, e.g. **seal** *n* – **seal** *n* – lexical homonyms; **seal** *n* – **seal *v*** – lexico-grammatical homonyms, subgroup A; **seal** *n* – seal v – lexico-grammatical homonyms, subgroup B; etc. [4].

In the discussion of the problem 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 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, e.g. **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'.

Homophones are words identical in sound-form but different both in spelling and in meaning, e.g. 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, e.g. case *n* – '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 homonyms in Modern English would be incomplete if we did not give a brief outline of the diachronic processes that account for their appearance.

The two main sources of homonymy are: 1) diverging meaning development of one polysemantic word; 2) converging sound development of two or more different words. 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,** cf. *OFr.* **flour, flor,** *L.* **f los – f Iorem)** 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.

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 earlier date. For example, *OE.* ic and OE. **ease** 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 (cf. *MnE.* **love – (to) love** and *OE.* **lufu-lufian).**

Words borrowed from other languages may through phonetic convergence become homonymous. Old Norse **ras** and French **race** are homonymous in Modern English (cf. race [reis] – 'running' and **race** [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 **sonder** – 'the surgeon's probe'. One of the most debatable problems in semasiology is the demarcation line between homonymy and polysemy, i.e. 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, e.g., **sound**, **sound, sound,** and **sound** 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 [5].

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,

477

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 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 **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 case2 – '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 (e.g. **seal** *n* – **seal 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 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.

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, e.g., can be seen in all metaphoric or metonymic meanings of one word (cf., e.g., **foot** of the man – **foot** of the mountain, **loud** voice – **loud** colours, etc., cf. 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, e.g., form and function (cf. **horn** of an animal and **horn** as an instrument), 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 homonymic words, e.g. **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, e.g., 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.

Список літератури

1. Watson George G. English Grammar / George G. Watson. – Evanston : McDougal, Little & Company, 2004. – P. 132–135.

2. Byrrns Ralph T. English for Learners of English / Ralph T. Byrrns. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2000. – P. 89–93.

3. Byrrns Ralph T. Student Guide for Learning English / Ralph T. Byrrns. – Harper : Collins Colleger Publishers, 2005. – P. 118–131.

4. Schiller Bradley R. Essentials of English / Bradley R. Schiller. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2003. – P. 281–288.

5. Schiller Bradley R. English Lexicology / Bradley R. Schiller. – London : London Press, 2004. – P. 345–350.

І.І. Ков'ях, ст. викл.

ДО ПИТАННЯ ПРО КОНВЕРСНУ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЮ ПІД ЧАС ПЕРЕКЛАДУ З АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ НА УКРАЇНСЬКУ ТА З УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ НА АНГЛІЙСЬКУ

Розглянуто один з аспектів питання конверсної трансформації під час перекладу з англійської мови на українську та з української на англійську з метою проаналізувати процес підбору еквівалента, застосовуючи лексичні одиниці, які не зажди входять до синонімічного ряду слова або словосполучення, що перекладається.