



USING HOMONIC WORDS IN ENGLISH

Tashmetova Umida Zakirjanovna

Olmazor district of Tashkent city

of the 234th general education school a high-class English teacher

Annotation: *Modern English has a highly developed homonymy phenomena. Several linguists are drawn to this phenomena in order to investigate its issues and attempt to categorize English homonyms. There is still no widely agreed definition of homonyms and established terminology in this subject, despite the fact that the research of homonymy has been conducted for a long time. Learning homonymy is especially important for understanding a foreign language because different grammatical forms can have the same sound or spelling.*

Key words: *homonyms, English language, linguistics, words, homographs, language, communication, speech, learning, homonymy.*

Also, as there are far more homonyms in the English language than there are in the Russian, it is imperative to be familiar with them. Homonymy becomes a clear barrier to communication when it becomes required to establish how a word's meaning relates to the speech context. Homonyms also present a challenge for the speaker, who is compelled to select words that will allow his comments to be interpreted in a single sense. The study of homonyms is extremely interesting from the point of view of observing the historical meaning of the word and its changes in the process of language development.

More homonyms than any other language are a feature of modern English. Due to the randomness of homonyms between languages, there is never and cannot be any similarity across collections of homonyms. In the linguistic description of homonyms, the issue of their classification is crucial. Numerous eminent linguists have made efforts to recognize and categorize English homonyms, including Arakin, Arnold, Lyons, Skeet, and Smirnitsky. On this idea, everyone of them had a unique personal perspective. The most complete classification of homonyms is Smirnitsky and Arnold, proposed by Smirnitsky, divides full and partial homonyms and identifies three subgroups of partial homonyms.

Arnold divides homonyms into 12 categories for his classification. It should be mentioned that scientists' perspectives on the subject of language comprehension slightly vary. Some of them focus on the word's acoustic properties and relate the idea of homonymy to it, while others see the idea as much broader and combine the word's acoustic and graphic properties. As a result, you can find lexical, grammatical, graphic, absolute, homophone, and homoform homonyms in Rosenthal's dictionary-reference of linguistic words.

All facets of categorization and all varieties of homonymy, even those that are extremely uncommon, are thoroughly examined in Arnold's classification. According to the degree of specificity, Kabanov distinguishes between three categories of correspondences between the sound and letter forms of various words: complete and incomplete homonyms



(homophones and homographs). Full homophones are words that sound and look alike but have diverse meanings. Homophones are units that sound similar, but differ in spelling and meaning, for example: air - heir; buy - by; hymn - hymn; knight - night; not - knot; or - oar; peace - piece; rain - reign; steel - steal; storey - story; write - right. According to Smirnitsky, partial homonyms are divided into three subgroups:

- simple lexical-grammatical (a part of speech whose paradigms have one form): to found-found;
- complex lexical-grammatical (units belonging to different parts of speech and having the same form in their paradigms): maid-made, bean-been;
- lexical (words in one part of speech and the same only in initial form): tp can-can.

The phenomenon of homonymy is widely developed in modern English. This phenomenon attracts many linguists to study its problems and try to classify English homonyms. But despite the fact that the study of homonymy has been carried out for a long time, there is still no generally accepted definition of homonyms and established terminology in this field. The study of homonymy is especially important for understanding a foreign language, because in it different grammatical forms have the same sound. or may have a spelling. In Russian, this is usually ignored. In addition, knowledge of homonyms is very necessary in the practice of the English language, where their number is much higher than in the Russian language.

Homonymy becomes a clear barrier to communication when it becomes required to establish how a word's meaning relates to the speech context. Homonyms also present a challenge for the speaker, who is compelled to select words that will allow his comments to be interpreted in a single sense. From the standpoint of examining a word's historical meaning and how it evolves as a language develops, the study of homonyms is incredibly fascinating. Modern English is characterized by more homonyms than any other language. Homonyms in different languages are always unique. lib, due to its random nature, there will not and cannot be any overlap between groups of homonyms. The problem of their classification plays an important role in the linguistic description of homonyms.

In conclusion, a unified definition of homonyms recognized by all linguists has not yet been developed. There are different approaches to classifying homonyms that can be successfully used to describe the homonyms of different languages, particularly English. In the process of language communication, the phenomenon of homonymy can cause certain difficulties, but they are removed when considering the context of communication. Throughout its history, English has undergone and continues to undergo language changes related to the phenomenon of homonymy.

REFERENCES:

1. Rahmatullayev Sh. Explanatory dictionary of homonyms of the Uzbek language. Tashkent: Teacher, 1984. - B.5.
2. Rizayev S. Basics of linguistic statistics in Uzbek linguistics. Tashkent: Science, 2006.



3. Bell R.T. Translation and Translating Theory and Practice. London, New York. Longman, 2021. 298 p.
4. Brewka G. Principles of Knowledge Representation. California, 1996.
5. Charniak E. On the Use of Framed Knowledge in Language Comprehension Artificial Intelligence, 2008.
6. Charniak E. Organization and Inference in a Frame-Like System of Common Sense Knowledge. Castagnola, 1999.