



Interlanguage Interference of English and Russian Homonyms

**Mamedova Madina
Ashuraliyevna**

Docent of Foreign Languages department
Bukhara Engineering-Technological Institute
Bukhara, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the interlingual interference of Russian and English homonyms. A comparative study of homonymy in English and Russian shows that, in general, lexical homonymy is manifested equally in both languages. The phenomenon of interlingual homonymy presents a significant difficulty in translating and learning a foreign language. At the same time, it does not lend itself to systematization and does not allow developing effective methods to overcome it. This gives particular importance to such a tool for describing and learning a language as a dictionary.

Keywords:

interference, interlingual interference, intralingual interference, language system, speech skills, linguodidactics.

I. Introduction

Interference is the influence of the native language of a bilingual or learner of another language on his speech in another language or on its perception. Usually this term is understood as a negative influence leading to errors, distortions. Interference can be understood more broadly: and as the influence of a non-native, second language on the native; and also as the influence of one studied (or studied) language on another studied (their words, grammatical rules, etc. are mixed).

Interlingual interference in the case of homonyms is manifested in the coincidence of the sound and/or spelling of words in different languages (the so-called "false friends of the translator"). [12] Interlingual correspondences, as an important component of the theory and practice of translation, cannot but attract the interest of linguists and just language users, since an inaccurate choice by a translator of a correspondence in the target language can lead to an effect that is far, if not polar opposite, to that which the original author was trying to achieve. Translation by replacement or omission of a lexical unit can also lead to a

change in stylistic coloring and even to the loss of the original semantics of the statement. This is especially true in cases of homonymy.

II. Literature review

A significant contribution to the study of the phenomenon of interference was made by both foreign and domestic researchers V.V.Alimov, U.Weinreich, E.M.Vereshchagin, V.A.Vinogradov, V.N.Komissarov, N.A.Lyubimova, R.K.Minyar-Beloruhev, N.B.Mechkovskaya, V.Yu.Rosenzweig, L.V.Shcherba, U.K.Yusupov, M.Dzhusupov, Zh.Zh.Zhalolov and others. [6]

So, the monograph by U.K. Yusupov is largely devoted to the problems of interlingual interference. In particular, he writes: "The reasons for interlingual interference, in our opinion, are in the difference between the contacting languages (between language systems and between operations performed at different levels of generating and understanding speech), in the degree of strength of speech skills, or in the absence of skills in foreign language. The first reason is linguistic, and the second is psychological". [10]

It is interesting to note that U.K. Yusupov has an interesting idea that one of the manifestations of interference is silence: "It has been established that interlingual interferences manifest themselves in speech not only in the form of a deviation from the norm of one or each of the contacting languages (in the linguistic sense) or in the form of a negative transfer of speech skills (in the psychological sense), but can also manifest itself in the form of silence (in the linguistic sense) or an unsuccessful attempt to transfer the skills of the native language (in the psychological sense), i.e. in the form of zero carry". [9]

In the works of Zh.Zh. Zhalolov develops the idea that, in addition to linguistic interference, the concepts of cultural and methodological interference are relevant for linguodidactics: "The fact is that a language, including a non-native one, is assimilated simultaneously as a reflection of the culture of the country or native speaker. Therefore, over the past two decades, issues of teaching language along with culture have been intensively developed, for example, teaching English and culture. In our opinion, this is how the subject should be called. All this suggests that when mastering the culture of a native speaker, the so-called cultural interference is also manifested, the overcoming of which is of linguodidactic importance. [11]

III. Analysis

Meanwhile, in the process of translation (and the process of language learning), such consonances and unwanted associations can lead to errors and communicative failures. These linguistic aberrations are based on what is usually called literalism, i.e. "formal adherence to something, strict observance of the external side of something to the detriment of the essence of the matter." [5]

So, despite the fact that there are significantly more homonyms in English than in Russian, their collision in the text occurs relatively rarely. This is explained by the fact that in the process of speech implementation, homonymy, fixed at the level of the language system, is removed as a result of form formation. For example, most English verbs that are homonymous to each other in the infinitive form no longer coincide in other

forms. As an infinitive, they are used only in certain cases, for example, if they stand in Present Indefinite Tense or Future Indefinite Tense, coinciding in sound and spelling with the forms of the 1st and 2nd person singular and plural and the 3rd person plural.

Another, more common in English than in Russian, way of the emergence of homonyms is the "splitting of polysemy". [3] As an illustration of such a process, I.V. Arnold gives the word capital (main), the lexical-semantic variation of which led to the emergence of three homonyms: capital (the city or town that functions as the seat of government and administrative center of a country or region), capital (capital letter), capital (wealth in the form of money or other assets owned by a person or organization or available for a purpose such as starting a company or investing). [1]

In general, the nature of the differences between Russian and English homonyms is rooted primarily in morphology and word formation. If English is analytical, then Russian functions as a synthetic language with a tendency towards analytics. [4] This means that the synthetic grammatical method dominates in Russian and inflexion is actively used. In English, inflection has lost its meaning and function.

The case endings of a number of cases - nominative and accusative singular, genitive and dative singular, on the one hand, nominative, genitive and accusative plural, on the other, came to one form, i.e. became homonymous as a result of the gradual erasure of the meaning and form of the basic affix and the loss of the case ending, or its merger with the basic affix, as a result of which case endings of a new type were created, homonymous in their form for a number of cases. [2]

This led to a sharp increase in the possibilities for the emergence of homonyms as a result of syntactic transposition, that is, the transition of words from one part of speech to another.

For example, bill (the beak of a bird) - bill (peck), bowl (a round, deep dish or basin used for food or liquid.) - bowl (to roll a ball), break (an act or action of breaking) - break (to

separate into parts with suddenness or violence), brush (brush, brush) - brush (write with a brush, brush). It is quite obvious that there are much fewer such examples in the Russian language - cf. homonymy of the word one (num.) - one (adj.) - one (pronoun). [7]

Over the centuries, numerous changes took place in the English language at the level of phonetics, morphology and morphonology, while the spelling appearance of words remained practically unchanged. As a result, this led to the emergence of a truly colossal (compared to the Russian language) number of homographs and homophones. For example, many English homographs arose as a result of historical changes in vowels and diphthongs: [ə] - [eɪ], [e] - [ɪ], [ɪ] - [eɪ], [e] - [i:], [ou] - [au], [ɛə] - [tɪə] and others. [8]

In modern English, this is due to the fact that in it vowels and vowel combinations have several readings. For example:

a) content: 1) [kɒntent] content, essence, being; meaning; 2) [kəntént] satisfaction, pleasure; satisfied.

b) defect: 1) ['di:fekt] or [dɪ'fekt] lack, deficiency, flaw, vice; 2) [dɪ'fekt] leave, change, desert, go over to the side of the enemy.

c) grave: 1) [grɛv] burial; 2) [grɑ:v] low (about tone), descending (about the type of stress).

d) pasty: 1) ['pæstɪ] stuffed pie; 2) ['peɪstɪ] viscous, pale, unhealthy (about complexion).

Similarly homophones:

a) air (the invisible gaseous substance surrounding the earth) - heir (a person legally entitled to the property or rank of another on that person's death) - [eə];

b) cent (cent) - scent (smell) - [sent];

c) heal (to make healthy) - heel (the back of the human foot below the ankle and behind the arch) - [hi:l]

d) sea (a large lake) - see (to apprehend objects by sight) - ['si:].

Thus, if homographs and homophones in Russian arise under the influence of living phonetic processes, then in English they are the result of historical processes. This directly affects the strategy of teaching Russian and English homographs and homophones. If, when teaching Russian homographs and

homophones, the emphasis should be placed on studying the synchronic aspect of phonetics and morphemics, then when teaching English, it should be on studying the diachronic aspect of phonetics and onomasiology.

IV. Conclusion

Summarizing, we can say that from a pragmlinguistic point of view, the nature of errors when using homophones and homographs in both English and Russian is the same. It lies in the tendency of a linguistic personality to memorize only one spelling / phonetic appearance of a word. To overcome this interference, it is necessary to purposefully compare homographs and homophones, activating visual and auditory memory and relying on memorable contextual realizations of the studied words.

Reference

1. Arnold I.V. Lexicology of Modern English. - 2nd ed. revised - M.: FLINTA: Nauka, 2012. - 377 p.
2. Fatilloevna, K. Z. (2022). Russian Elegy Of The NonCanonic Period: Typology, History, Poetics. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 5, 109-111.
3. Fatilloevna, Z. K. (2022). Features of Elegy and Ode in World and Uzbek Literature. International journal of inclusive and sustainable education, 1(4), 331-334.
4. Karamatova Z.F. (2022, (No1)). Typological features of the genre elegy / Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University/ Namangan, Uzbekistan.
5. Mamedova, M. (2021, May). SOURCES OF HOMONYMY AND THEIR VARIETIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE. In *E-Conference Globe* (pp. 190-194).
6. Mamedova, M. A. (2021, May). PROBLEMS OF THE TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH HOMONYMS. In *Euro-Asia Conferences* (Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 135-139).
7. Mamedova, Madina. "COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF HOMONYMS OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES FOR METHODOLOGICAL PURPOSES." *Theoretical & Applied Science* 3 (2020): 401-404.

8. Mukhamedjanova Sitorabegim "Non-traditional methods of communicative culture in English lessons". 6th International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Innovative Technology San Francisco, USA. March, 31st 2021. 60-62 pp.
9. Yusupov U.K. Theoretical Foundations of Comparative Linguistics. - Tashkent, 2007. - 127 p.
10. Yusupova, K.U. (2021, April). GIVING STABLE COMPOUNDS AND EXPRESSIONS IN TRANSLATION. In E-Conference Globe (pp. 477-481).
11. Zhalolov Zh.Zh. Interference in the methodology of teaching a non-native language // "Uzbekistonda horizhiy tillar" ilmiy-techniques electron journal No. 5-6/2017 (E-resource) - URL <https://journal.fledu.uz/ru/interferentsiya-v-metodike-obucheniya-nerodnomu-yazyku>.
12. Мамедова, М. А. (2021). Компьютерные технологии в сфере образования и их этапы развития. *Ученые записки университета им. ПФ Лесгафта*, (3 (193)), 264-267.