Gojayeva Metanet
Degree Candidate at the General Linguistics Department

Syntactic Homonymy

The article deals with the content and investigation of syntactic homonymy in linguistics.As we know the study of syntactic homonymy improved depending on the realization of the Chomiskian transformational generative method.The author of the article gives some information about the complex nature of the syntactic homonymy and its differences from other forms of the homonyms.The syntactic homonymy and syntactic ambiquity,their similarities and differences are stressed in the article.

Keywords: *transformational generative grammar, syntactic homonymy, syntactic ambiguity, deep structure, surface structure*

The study of the phenomenon of homonymy in the language has been conducted for many years. Particularly, homonyms at the morphological levels have been involved in a broader form of scientific research. But since the 60s of the last century, the study of syntactic homonymy has begun to revive. However, the study of syntactic homonymy lags behind the morphological one in terms of time and scale. L.N.Iordanskaya shows two main reasons for this retard: "First, syntactic homonymy is less noticeable than the lexical and morphological one, and second, methods that reveal the polysemy based on the syntactic structure of the sentence have not been developed. "[3,1]

When we say syntactic homonymy, we mean word combinations, especially free word combinations and homonymy at the sentence level. Although this form of homonymy is characterized by its complex features, the main reason for its research is the need to study this field and the syntactical structure of the sentence with the new method called "derivative grammar". The Transformation Generative Grammatical method developed by N. Khomsky allowed to show the hidden meanings of the "deeper layer" in the "upper layer" by penetrating the syntactic structure of the sentence. Thus, the meaning of the

same sentence can be interpreted in two or more ways, which is called syntactic ambiguity, depending on the syntactic structure of some sentences at the conversation, such as the renewal of syntactic and paradigmatic relationship between sentences, intonation, change of syntagmatic distribution, logical emphasis, punctuation marks and so on.

Thus, the syntactic ambiguity which is formed from the syntactic connection within the sentence comes out as a result of syntactic homonymy. Any kind of ambiguity is expressed in semantics, so calling this kind of ambiguity syntactic is relative. In affect, when we say "there is syntactic homonymy in the expression or sentence", we must mean they have unchangeable lexical composition, yet variable syntactic sequencing. The very variability of syntactic relationships within the sentence reveals other meanings in the deeper layers of that sentence. It should be noted that in such sentences it is not necessary to have homonyms or polysemic words. In this type of homonymy the dominant position belongs to a felxible syntactic structure. The syntactic homonymy of the sentence is not a language phenomenon that extends itself to a degree of lexicism, perhaps because it is derived from the complex and secret nature of syntactic homonymy that it has been left out of research for many years compared to the lexical homonymy.

Although syntactic homonymy was on the spotlight as a language phenomenon, none of the scientific concepts up to the derivative grammatical theory could define with which criterion it could be explained. For example, in English in sentences like *He fed her dog biscuits; I saw them sitting on the bench in the park; She grows flowers in front of her house; Growing children can demand a lot of time and energy, She cares her flowers more than her daughter* and so on syntactic homonymy is clearly seen. However, in the period until N. Khomsky's generative grammatical method, even though there were certain opinions on syntactic homonymy in traditional and structural grammar, its scientific and practical disclosure was made possible by the derivative method.

Although N. Khomski used L. Bloomfield's immediate constituent method and distributive analysis in his new concept [4, 155], he did not consider these methods to be sufficient for deep analysis of the syntactic structure of the sentence. He considers the phrase model and transformation structures to be essential for the creation of new derivative sentences in the "Phrase structure" section [1, 26-33] of his book called "Syntactic Structures". But the core of all these structures is the transformed nuclear sentence (Kernel sentence). [1, 92]

According to the new transformation concept of N. Khomsky, derivative sentences are obtained through expansion, substitution and pemutation in the kernel sentence by preserving the initial base semantically. Moving from left to right, with the finite number of linguistics rules the infinite number of expressions and sentences are formed, this shows the creative quality of the language, in other words, the language keeps itself alive by producing the infinite number of sentences. N.Khomsky calls this peculiarity by the mathematical terminology "recursion" which means repetition referring to those that came before.

Since L.Bloomfield's immediate constituent analysis (IC method) was not able to cope with these features, N. Khomsky considered the new derivative grammar method to be more reliable and powerful. It is possible to penetrate into the sentence with the new grammatical method and discover other concealed meanings.

N. Khomsky notes that the ambiguity of the sentence is not related with lexical homonymy (*"son"-oğul, "sun" – günəş; light (yüngül) – light (işıqlı)* etc. (of course, lexical homonymy creates semantic ambiguity – G.M.)), but with syntactic structure of the sentence, word order, syntactic relationship between words, syntagmatic distribution, change of intonation, and so on referring to the idea of Hokket (Two models of grammatical description, "Linguistics Today", Word 10.210-33, 1954) [1, 68]. In his work "Syntactic Structures," N. Khomski points out that "homonymy that was formed because of the syntactic structure of the sentence and can only be analyzed at level of phrase

structure and the transformation sentences. Otherwise, it is impossible to understand the semantic polygamy in the same sentence. "[1, 87]

As mentioned above, N. Khomski turned to L.Bloomfield's immediate constituent method (ICM) while working on his consept of derivative grammar.

Although N. Khomski applied the IC method to his new theory, no transformational - derivative method was applied to any of the earlier grammatical theories. From this point of view, N. Khomski considered the new grammatical concept to be a more powerful theory in terms of penetrating deeper into the grammatical structure and semantic meaning calling L.Bloomfield's IC theory as a taxonomic, spectacular concept.

Homonymy at the word combination and sentence level in language has been met with hesitation by many scholars. For example, M. Musayev writes: "Even though the word can be homonym by exlpanding its meaning in the historical development of the language, in the syntax, especially at the simple and complex sentence levels such semantic-functional development is impossible." [5,209]

However, it is impossible to fully agree with this idea. The phenomenon of homonymy in the language is a historical category observed in different languages, and as a language phenomenon homonyms have solidified its position in the vocabulary long before. This feature applies to all lexical, lexical-grammatical and grammatical homonyms at the word level. This was studied as a linguistics phenomenon and prooved. Nevertheless, homonymy of word combinations (especially free word combinations) and sentences is completely a speech phenomenon, and a context-dependent phenomenon., because the sentence is a speech unit. There is no ready homonym sentence in the language so that we can exemplify it (as lexical units). A sentence is formed a result of the thinking process and it sounds phonetically. In this case, it becomes a speech unit that serves communication. In the performance depending on the language competence, knowledge and awareness of the speaker or the listener, the meaning of the same sentence can be

understood in two or more ways which is called the homonymy of the very word combination or sentence in the context in question. Since this kind of sentence homonymy is a context-dependent phemonenon, it "appears" and "disappears" within the context. The sentence homonymy cannot solidfy itself in the language (sometimes as it is the polysemy of the same sentence, it is called ambuigity), because the formation of every sentence is individual, it is developed in the speech of individual people. There is no ready homonym sentences in the language that we can use in our speech. Therefore, the sentence's homonymy is a language factor that occurs in the speech, depending on the semantic meaning of the sentence and its structural structure.

Let's try to explain the above-mentioned sentences: the sentence *He gave her cat food* is understood like *O, onun pişiyinə yemək verdi* in the first reading. In this case *her cat* has been taken in the same syntagma and *her* is a possesive pronoun in the role of the attribute of *cat.* According to all, the diagram of the sentence is drawn this way: *He(NP)/gave(VP)/her cat(NP)/food(NP)//.* If we take *her* as an object case of the personal pronoun (she) in the role of the object, the new diagram and meaning of the sentence will be revealed: *He(NP)/gave(VP)/her(NP)/cat food(NP)//-O,ona pişik yeməyi verdi.* Apparently, with the renewal of a syntactic relationship in the sentence, a second meaning of the sentence was revealed, and this is called syntactic ambiguity.

In the sentence *She grows flowers in front of the house* word combination with preposition *in front of the house* creates syntactic homonymy. Thus, this sentence can be understood differently depending on this word combination either being a place of adverbial, or a postpositive attribute of *flowers*. When *in front of the house* is a place of adverbial, the diagram of the sentence is drafted in this way: *She(NP)/grows(VP)|flowers(NP)|in front of the house(NP)||-O,evin qarşısında çiçəklər yetişdirir (in Azerbaijani).* However, when it is an attribute, the sentence gets a different semantic structure. Let's turn it into the attributive clause: *She grows flowers which are in front of the house - She(NP)|grows(VP)| flowers in front of*

the house(NP)||-Evin qarşısındakı çiçəkləri o yetişdirir. In this example we see syntactic homonymy which results in a renewal of the sentence semantics.

LITERATURE

1. Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures. Mouton Publishers,the Hague.Paris, 1957.115p.
2. Hocket Ch.F. A Course in Modern Linguistics.Prentice Hall College.1958.621p.
3. Иорданская Л.Н. Синтаксическая омонимия в русском языке.//Научно-тех. Информация.-1967,№5. стр.9, с.9-17.
4. Veysalli F.Y. The basic of Structural Language.Studia Philologica.II Morphemic Syntactic. Textbook.Baku:Mutercim, 2008.308p.
5. Musayev M. Syntax of the complex sentence in Turkic languages.Baku,2010. 405p.
6. Oxford Advanced Learner`s Dictionary.New 8th Edition.Oxford University Press. 2010.
7. Hornby A.S. Oxford Advanced Learner`s Dictionary of Current English.Oxford University Press. 1982.2 volumes.

Данная статья посвящена содержанию и расследованию синтаксической омонимии в лингвистике. Поскольку мы знаем, что исследование синтаксической омонимии улучшило в зависимости от реализации трансформационный порождающий метод Хомского. Автор статьи дает некоторую информацию о сложном характере синтаксической омонимии и ее различий от других форм омонимов. Синтаксическая омонимия и синтаксическая двусмысленность, их сходства и различия подчеркнуты в статье.

Ключевые слова: *трансформационная порождающая грамматика, синтаксическая омонимия, синтаксическая неоднозначность, глубинная структура, поверхностная структура*