A Semantic Analysis of Homonyms, Heteronyms & allonyms With Some Reference to Word Net

Sarab Kadir Mugair   Diyala University
                             Basic Education College

Introduction

This research explains how the terminological (lexicographic or semantic) analysis of concepts contrasts with the conceptual (ornomantic) approach. The two models complement each otherand shold be used together. The onomantic model produces a two- by- two table which identifies a logically necessary fourth concept (here called allonym) which completes the scheme containing homonyms and two types of heteronyms (homographs and homophones). Conventionally, however, only the word- to- meanings paradigm is followed, producing the illogical results generated by this example derived from world net. Some word game enthusiasts enjoy listing homonyms and heteronyms. Their lexicological focus is reflected in virtually all glossaries for special language.. they also follow the orthographic (semantic) paradigm, with only an occasional step towards the logical classification concept, as one see by viewing specialized glossaries. By the way

This study is strictly semantic and not onomantic it starts with words and their definitions, as taken from dictionaries. This means that logical problems involving relationships between concepts and the terms used to represent them are not considered, except in the determination of hyponym hierarchs. In short, the "net" in word Net applies only to lexical definitions, not to the under lying logical of relations between concepts.

By reversing this semantic model, the onomantic (anasemantic) paradigm permits us to analysis sets of related concepts ask whether or not the existing terminology adequately represents them- where deficiencies are identified, it provokes inquiry into possibility of adding new terms that would permit clear representation of useful but hitherto undesignated concepts. When this analysis reveals that aword

is being used in more than one sense and to justify suggested neologisms that could be added. A table is used to identify conceptual relationship, and one bold face word in each cell indicates the word we prefer to use for that concept. Neologisms are underlined to identify them as suggestions not supported by dictionary entire.

To illustrate this approach we append a set of terms from word Net data, using homonym/ hypernym, and homography homophone as a starting point. The analysis that follows uses the onomantic approach.

1.2 Excerpts from world Net

Heteronym.. (two words are hetronyms if they are spelled the same way but differ in pronunciation (e. g bov))

Homonyms. (two words are homonyms if they are pronounced or spelled the same way but have different meaning or the terms which have the same form but differ in meaning) (see crystal (1988: 149) e. g mogul, an emperor, or mogul, sbump on a ski piste), while a word with several related sense is said to be ploysemous (e. g mouth, an organ of the body, the entrance of cave, etc)

Homograph. (Two words are homograph if they are spelled the same way put differ in meaning (e. g fair) Lyons,
1977: 79)

Homophone.. (Two words are homophones if they are pronounced the same way but differ in meaning or spelling or both (e. g bare and bear) (Rigges, 2005, 2)

The treatment of homonym and heteronym illustrate well the bind generated by a purely semantic approach. The supplementary onomantic approach can clarify some issues posed by these definition, using spelling and pronunciation as the two variables.

Meaning is not included in this table because we may assume that the meanings of any one word differ from those of any other word.. even the must exact synonyms typically have different connotation. The definition of synonym offered by word Net makes this clear it reads

Synonym, equivalent word.. (two words that can be interchanged in a context are said to be synonmymous relative to that context) (Riggs, 2005:3) In the other hand, Palmer (1988: 88)

considers synonymy as 'sameness of meaning' ,i. e, sets of words have the same have the same meaning, for example, book, work, and text could be used as synonyms in some contexts, each word has other meaning which would make them not synoymus in other contexts. If two words can be found that could be interchanged in all contexts, that would be remarkable indeed. By contrast, In an onomantic context, we can say that any term that can replace another to designate a defined concept is an equivalent. This just reverses the semantic perspective: instead of defining the established meaning of a word, it describes a concept and presents one or more terms that can be used to represent it. To illustrate, consider first the following word Net definition:

From, word- form .. the phonological or orthographic sound or appearance of a word ("the inflected forms of a word can be represented by a stem and list of inflectionto be a Hached") (Riggs, 2005: 3) What we find here that both form and word- form can be used as equivalents to represent the concept described in the text that precedes it. This is not a claim that text defines a meaning of the term. Riggs (ibid) states that, if we accept WF as an abbreviation or a cronym to represent this concept, we will see that these two letters can be used as equivalent of form and word- form to designate concepts described in this text. Formally speaking, the text does not define a word. Instead, it identifies a concept with or without a name.. thus form, which has many possible meaning, will be unambiguous only if anyone using it to mean a WF makes certain that it can be so understood, in context.

Every word normally has several forms (word and words, or run, ran, running, for example) and a word- form may well represent several words such as fair (impartial) and fair (event. Ay how, The important point is that a two- by- two table can represent all possible combinations of pronunciation (sound) and spelling (appearance) of words. To put it the other way around, different words may have the same spelling, and or the same pronunciation, or they may be spelled and pronounced differently. The semantic point may also be inverted.. different words always have different meanings (including synonyms) but one concept may be represented by different word.. thus word, word- form and WF are different way (spelling and pronunciation) of

representing one idea (notion, concept) .. this makes them equivalents but not synonyms,. To visualize this basic distinction graphically, consider the following table:

1.3 Homonym/ Heteronym/ Allonym: The Logic of word- forms.

Riggs(2005: 4) presents what is called the logical of word-forms as follows:

	pronunciation	pronunciation
spelling	same	Different
same	A homonym	B Homograph (or heteronym)
Different	C homophone (or heteronym)	D allonym

He (ibid) states that most words differ from each other in both spelling and pronunciation.. therefore they belong to cell D in this table.. we shall call them allonyms. Different words that are spelled and pronounced the same way are classed in cell A and are correctly called homonyms.. but some writers call them heteronyms.

When different words are spelled the same way but pronounced differently, the belong to category B and called homographs and they are sometimes called heteronyms. By contrast, when different words are pronounced the same way but spelled differently, we may properly (all them homophones,. Rarely, they have also been called hetronyms, In the rest of this paper, we shall use heteronym (rarely) as a broad term to include both homographs and homophones, but not homonyms.

1.Heteronyms: Homographs and Homophones

B: Homograph/ Two or more words spelled the same way but pronounced differently ; as in :

Bow /bau/ means low or front forward end of a ship.

Bow /bou/ means arrow (see Roach, 1988)

Un fortunately, homonym and heteronym are both used, in some contexts, to refer to B.

C: Homophone, Two or more words pronounced the same way but

spelled differently, as in:

 To

Too /tu   /

Two

2

(For Homophone, see suber, p's English Homophone Dictionary and cooper, A's Homonym/ Homophone page)

When different words are spelled and pronounced the same way, we call them homonyms(1) as in A. And sad to say, homonym (2) is equivocal when used to mean (A, B, OR C). because equiv-t ocal is used in Onomantics to make un important point, let us digress to say a few words about it, and to distinguish it from polysemy and ambiguity.

Homonymy.

We can represent this as follows:

A. Homonym(1) Different words pronounced and spelled the same way.

B. C. Homonym (2) Different words pronounced and/ or spelled the same way.

One of the most commonly cited examples of a homony(1) is bank, which has a financial institution sense and a edge of river sense. These senses seem clearly unrelated and the fact they are associated with the same word from seems purely accidental. However, historical linguistics research on Italian has revealed that some point in the development of the Italian language, these two senses of bank actually coincided by virtue of the fact that bankers (lenders money) sat on the riverbanks while doing their business. So going to the financial institution meant going to the edge of the river, hence to the bank.

Heteronymy :

As defined by word Net, it means: "two words are heteronymys if they are spelled the same way but differ in pronunciation." It is, therefore, equivalent to homograph consider the previous example of "bow"

Allonyms: words that differ in spelling and pronunciation as well as meaning and origin (alligator/ true). These pairs are technically known as "different words"

To illustrate the above, consider the following
Homophones with board/ bored, clearly two different words though pronounced alike.
Homographs (the verb desert/ the noun desert) again shows, by their pronunciation, that they are different words.
Homonym.. words having both the same sound and spelling as illustrated by "to quail an a quil" .. clearly they shows they are different words texicoraphers underline this point by writing separate entries for different words whether or not they have the same spelling and pronunciation. In short, we can define Allonym as "any lexeme (word or phrase)" that is both spelled and pronounced differently from all others. For example the compound, east- west, represents the concept of a thing in Chinese, just as harder rockin Englaish refers to kind of music, not a solid object: Such phrases are all onymic in Chines where each of them has only one meaning. We do not think of them as asingle word because they cannot written to gether but must retain their from as separate character. It's as though we could not write understand as a single word, but had to see it as a phrase composed of under and stand. (Palmer,1988:90)

Conclusion :

The purpose of this note is not to focus on homonymy/ allonymy. these are marginal curiosities of language, we discuss them, instead, as a concrete examples used to clarify the far more important contrast between a purely semantic approach which limits itself to the cognitive analysis of words as established and defined in dictionaries, and a supplementary onomantics approach that can angment (not replace) semantic analysis by investigating the logical structure of related concepts evaluate the established terminology, and propose additional terms for missing items: for example, allonym for D. Sometimes a useful distinction can be made simply by borrowing a technical term already in use by specialists, or just by writing a word in different way. For example, the use of lexeme by contrast with word. From enables us to clarify the important distinction between SING (a word set which includes sing, sang, sung, and singing) and sing as just one item in this list. We have also tried to show that although word, as a polyseme, need not cause confusion, WORD(1) is

used equivocally by lexicographers and terminologists, leading some times to ambiguity.

The solution to such ambignities caused by using words that have several relevant meaning in the same sphere of discourse can be found by anyone using an onomantic approach to make useful conceptual distinctions and find suitable terms to represent them, thereby supplementing the familiar semantic mythology employed by word Net.

References

Crystal, D(1988) A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. 2n ed. Basil Blackwell: Association with Adre` Deutch.

Palmer, T. R. (1988) Semantics. 2nded. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roach, P. (1988) English Phonetics and Phonology: Apractical Course. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, A (1977) The study of language. London: language. London: Longman.

Riggs, F. W.(2005) 'A semantic/ Onomantic Puzzele on Homonyms, Heteronyms and Allonyms' In Homonymy. htm.

File: // C:\ My Documents\ Homonymy vs Polysemy. Htm: 2005