

Katarzyna Wojan

An analysis of the homonymic community of the finnish and russian languages

Studia Rossica Gedanensia 1, 142-155

2014

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE HOMONYMIC COMMUNITY OF THE FINNISH AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

KATARZYNA WOJAN

University of Gdańsk
Faculty of Languages, Institute of East Slavic Philology
Division of Eastern-Slavic Languages and Translation Studies,
Finnish Language Laboratory
Wita Stwosza 55, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland
e-mail: finkw@univ.gda.pl
(received 7.05.2014; accepted 17.11.2014)

Abstract

The subject of the analysis is the phenomenon of parallel presence of lexemes which fulfill the criteria of formal identicalness of sound (or its record) and are, at the same time, interlingual homonyms of two linguistic systems. The phenomenon is known as *interlingual homonymy* ('homonymy of homonyms'). Those are complete sets of interlingual homonyms, obtained after the formal classification of lexical sets of the two languages. The structural unit is a linguistic homonem, the complete set of interlingual homonymic pairs which have the origins in the formal convergence of two interlingual homonymic sets. Formal criteria are treated flexibly, although they are superordinate to the issues connected with homonymy.

The article contains the results of quantitative analysis concerning the homonymic community of the Finnish and Russian languages — up till now 295 converging sets have been recognized. From the presented quantitative data of relations between semantic homonymic Finnish and Russian sets, the medium values of convergent and non-convergent meanings will be calculated.

Key words

Lexical homonymy, Finnish and Russian languages, comparative analyses, interlingual classification.

Abstrakt

Analiza wspólnoty homonimicznej języka fińskiego i rosyjskiego

Przedmiotem opisu jest zjawisko paralelnego występowania w dwóch odmiennych systemach językowych leksemowych zbiorów homonimów wewnątrzjęzykowych. Zjawisko to określane jest mianem homonemii międzyjęzykowej ('homonimii homonimów'). Stanowią ją międzyjęzykowe zbiory homonimów leksemowych, spełniających kryteria formalne (wymóg identyczności / podobieństwa fonetyczno-graficznego). Jednostką nadrzędną (strukturalną) zbioru jest homonem wewnątrzjęzykowy, którym określa się pełny zbiór homonimów danego systemu języka o wspólnej formie. Z kolei pełny zbiór par homonimów międzyjęzykowych, powstałych w wyniku konfrontacji zgodnych formalnie leksemów lub/i homonemów wewnątrzjęzykowych dwóch systemów języka, nazwano homonemem międzyjęzykowym o krotności par będącej iloczynem krotności znaczeń obu homonemów (lub/i leksemów) wewnątrzjęzykowych.

Artykuł prezentuje dane analizy ilościowej wyłonionej wspólnoty homonemowej pary języków: fińskiego i rosyjskiego. Na obecnym etapie wyekstrahowano 295 całkowitych homonemów międzyjęzykowych. W oparciu o rezultaty klasyfikacji formalnej oraz semantycznej wyliczono średnią znaczeń zbieżnych i niezbieżnych dla danej międzyjęzykowej wspólnoty homonimicznej.

Słowa kluczowe

Homonimia leksykalna, język fiński i rosyjski, analiza porównawcza, klasyfikacja międzyjęzykowa.

Introduction

An growing interest in the issues connected with the relations between different languages as well as with some specific processes and the convergence of the phenomena which are present in lexicons can recently be observed. Lexical homonymy has gained a strong position in this research area.

The phenomenon of homonymy (from Greek *homos* 'identical' and *onoma* 'name') is present in most natural languages. Researchers have carried out numerous comparative analyses of the semantic level of pairs of words that represented either related languages or languages of different families. These analyses enable to form conclusions based on a wide area of relationships between these languages, also as regards the phenomenon of homonymy. Lexical and semantic relationships between entire language families or groups, for example, Slavonic and Finno-Ugric languages, are — on the other hand — very rare. A thorough investigation of the phenomenon is difficult due to the large number and the diversity of the languages in each family as well as due to the mental and cultural differences.

Most researchers are interested in the parallel presence of formally identical lexical forms in different languages. The research material can be illustrated with the following

example: the form *matka* is present both in Russian and Finnish. In Finnish, the lexeme *matka* means 'road, cruise; ride, journey', in Russian (*матка*), 'female; a woman who has a child; queen bee; womb'. Both these lexemes are polysemes of a narrow semantic area. The only reason why researchers are interested in this phenomenon is the fact that lexemes from different languages are identical in form. Other issues, such as the convergence of meanings, interlingual migrations of lexemes or linguistic and cultural relations between nations, are analysed after selecting common sets of forms. Linguists also concentrate on the phenomenon of correspondence of forms of the lexemes belonging to the language systems under analysis which, at the same time, are parts of the homonymic sets in their own languages. The research material is quite different in this case.

A contrastive analysis of the homonymic resources of Finnish and Russian leads to distinction of the phenomenon of identicalness or convergence of lexemes on the interlingual level, while the lexemes enter homonymic relations with other lexemes inside a given language system¹. For example, *aura* in Finnish may have the following meanings:

- I *aura* 1. 'weather', 2. 'climate, mood',
- II *aura* 1. 'neuro-psychological state', 2. 'in spiritualism: part of astral body',
- III *aura* 1. 'plough', 2. 'snow-plough',
- IV *aura* 'tax paid by peasant'.

Finnish *aura* has the identical phonic form with Russian homonyms:

- I *аура* 1. 'weather', 2. 'climate, mood',
- II *аура* 1. 'neuro-psychological state', 2. 'in spiritualism: part of astral body'.

Another example is the form *kara* which has following meanings in Finnish:

- I *kara* 1. 'thorn; spine', 2. 'mandrel',
- II *kara* 'Cinclus cinclus, dipper',

and has the identical phonic form with Russian homonyms meaning:

- I *капа* 1. 'a bay in a river or a lake', 2. 'rectangular board with a cavity for fish or meat' (from Veps *kar* 'sea transgression, hole'),

¹ K. Wojan. *The Genesis of Homonymy of the Finnish Language*. "Fenno-Ugristica" 2003, No 25, p. 180–187; K. Wojan. *The Lexical Homonymy of the Finnish Language*. [In:] *Grammatika és kontextus. Új szempontok az uráli nyelvek kutatásában* (= *Grammatika ja kontekst. Uued vaatenurgad uurali keelte uurimises*. = *Grammar and Context. New Approaches to the Uralic Languages*). Eds. by M. Csepregi, V. Masonen. Budapest: Urálistikai Tanulmányok 17, 2007, p. 348–358; K. Wojan. *Wspólnota homonimiki języków europejskich (na przykładzie polskiego, rosyjskiego i fińskiego [The homonymic community of the European languages (on the material of Polish, Russian and Finnish)]*. Vol. 1–3. Unpublished Doctor Dissertation. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University, 2007; K. Wojan, Z. Wojan. *Сравнительно-сопоставительный анализ цифровой репрезентации лексем с дифференцированной акцентуацией*. [In:] *Congreso Internacional «La lengua y literatura rusas en el espacio educativo internacional. Estado actual y perspectivas. Granada, 7–9 mayo 2007»*. *Ponencias y comunicaciones*. Vol. 2. Ed. by R. Guzmán Tirado et al. Sankt-Peterburg – Granada: MIRS, 2007, p. 1243–1249.

- II *кара* 1. 'low wooden trough for fish', 2. 'bulkhead of fishing boat', 3. (dialect) 'bowl (sailor's)' (from Finnish *kara* 'bowl, trough' or Saamic *kārre* 'ts.'),
 III *кара* 'penalty, revenge'.

Complex research into the homonymic community of different languages is carried out mainly to show the gradual, mutual process of penetration of differentiated linguistic influences, especially concerning the consolidation of the perception of the world among users of these languages. For practical reasons, the formal criteria are applied with considerable flexibility (the Russian lexemes are transcribed in the Roman alphabet)².

The main purpose of this paper is to present the results of the research on the lexical material which is the homonymic community of Russian and Finnish, the representatives of two different language families but the same *European language league*³. The selected languages are those of the nearest neighbours. The aim of the research is to prove existence of semantic convergences and divergences between the homonymic communities, which is achieved by comparing homonymy in each of the linguistic systems.

An overview of publications

So far, the phenomenon of the *homonymy of homonyms* has not been extensively investigated in comparative linguistics. It was first described by Danuta Buttler⁴ who used the term *homonymy of homonyms* in reference to the occurrence of pairs of homonyms in different languages; in the pairs, one element or both had the same or different meanings. Buttler drew attention to the presence of homonyms common to Polish and Russian, claiming that they were examples representing a specific subset of the lexicon, namely terminology. Buttler carried out her analysis basing on selected homonyms listed in the dictionaries of Russian and Polish homonyms⁵. She distinguished three types of homonymic pairs and sets: (1) convergent, (2) partially convergent and (3) divergent. However, the scope of Buttler's analysis was limited, and therefore, it may only be treated as an introduction to broader interlexicological research.

² K. Wojan, Z. Wojan. *Сравнительно-сопоставительный анализ цифровой репрезентации лексем...*

³ J. Maćkiewicz. *Wyrazy międzynarodowe (internacjonalizmy) we współczesnym języku polskim*. [In:] *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej 2. Współczesny język polski*. Ed. by J. Bartmiński. Wrocław: Wiedza o Kulturze, 1993, pp. 555–562; J. Maćkiewicz. *Polszczyzna w europejskiej lidze językowej*. [In:] *Symbioza kultur słowiańskich i niesłowiańskich w Europie Środkowej*. Ed. by M. Bobrownicka. Kraków: Universitas, 1996, pp. 197–202.

⁴ D. Buttler. *Polskie i rosyjskie homonimy rzeczownikowe*. [In:] *Paralele w rozwoju słownictwa języków słowiańskich*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1989, pp. 95–103.

⁵ Н.П. Колесников. *Словарь омонимов русского языка*. 2-е изд. Тбилиси: Тбилисский государственный университет, 1976; D. Buttler. *Słownik polskich homonimów całkowitych*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1988.

The scope of the research conducted by Vladimir V. Dubichynsky⁶ is much broader as he analyses homonymic sets found in several European languages. Dubichynsky introduced the term *international interlingual homonymy* to refer to the phenomenon of convergent and semantically parallel oppositions in two (or more) related languages, which yields a structure with a minimal number of four elements. According to Dubichynsky⁷, investigating homonymy requires comparing homonymic parallels (which may be full, partial and false). Dubichynsky proposes two types of classification of homonyms, taking semantic and formal criteria into consideration. As regards the semantic criteria, he distinguishes the following types of homonymy: (1) correlative interlingual lexical homonymy in which all the elements are convergent, (2) partially correlative interlingual lexical homonymy in which not all the elements of a homonymic set are convergent and (3) non-correlative interlingual lexical homonymy in which the elements of a homonymic set have different meanings.

A similar approach to the classification of homonyms is found in numerous works by the present author, especially in her unpublished doctoral dissertation entitled *The Homonymic Community of the European Languages (On the Material of Polish, Russian and Finnish)*⁸ in which, apart from theoretical foundations, the results of the pioneering investigation of homonymic pairs in the three languages are discussed. The present author also analyses the directions of borrowing in each pair of the languages (Russian and Finnish, Finnish and Polish, Polish and Russian)⁹ as well as selected semantic issues connected with homonyms (e.g. homonymy v. polysemy)¹⁰.

Terminology

As has already been mentioned, the theoretical foundations of the research into homonymy across languages are presented in the unpublished doctoral dissertation¹¹, in which (and in several other papers) the present author proposes a number of definitions of terms which — according to her — may be universally used. These terms will be employed below.

The subject of the analysis is the phenomenon of parallel presence of lexemes which fulfill the criteria of formal identicalness of sound (or its record) and are, at the same time, interlingual homonyms of the each linguistic system. The phenomenon is known as “interlingual homonymy” (i.e. homonymy of homonyms). Those are complete sets

⁶ В.В. Дубичинский. *Лексические параллели*. Харьков: 1993.

⁷ Ibidem.

⁸ K. Wojan. *The Homonymic Community of the European Languages (On the Material of Polish, Russian and Finnish)*. 1–3. Unpublished Doctor Dissertation. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University, 2007.

⁹ K. Wojan. *The homonymic community of the European languages...*; K. Wojan. *Przypadkowe i nieprzypadkowe wędrówki leksemów*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2010.

¹⁰ K. Wojan. *Wstęp do badań wieloznaczności leksemów w ujęciu kontrastywnym*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2010.

¹¹ K. Wojan. *The homonymic community of the European languages...*

of interlingual homonyms, obtained after the formal classification of lexical sets of the two languages.

Table 1. Interlingual homonymy

Finnish	Convergence of meaning	Russian
Homonem <i>LAMA</i>		Homonem <i>ЛАМА</i>
1. 'buddhist priest'	convergence	1. 'buddhist priest'
2. 'depression, fall, stagnation'	no convergence	2. 'animal from family of camels'

Table 2. Interlingual homonymy

Finnish	Convergence of meaning	Russian
Homonem <i>KOKKI</i>		Homonem <i>KOK</i>
1. 'cook'	convergence	1. 'cook'
2. 'a type of bacteria'	convergence	2. 'a type of bacteria'
3. 'attic'	no convergence	3. 'iron hook for nets'
∅	no convergence	4. 'bob; bun; chignon'
∅	no convergence	5. jarg. 'cocaine'

A *homonem* is a complete set of homonyms of a given language. Lexemes must be formally identical. This is a set of homonyms of identical form, recorded as H_n , which means that this homonem includes the n -product of homonyms (according to definition 2), for example, a set of three Finnish lexemes of J-form = *alpukka* (1. 'Lama pacos, alpaka', 2. 'kind of wool', 3. 'nickel silver').

An *interlingual homonem*, as a structural unit, is a complete set of pairs of interlingual homonyms which have resulted from the formal convergence of two intralingual homonems; thus an interlingual homonem is characterized by the product of pairs, i.e. the ratio of meanings of both intralingual homonems. We distinguish *complete interlingual homonems* and *incomplete interlingual homonems* of the same product - n of pairs of homonyms being part of homonems belonging to two linguistic systems. For example, the Finnish and Russian interlingual homonem of A-representation *filee/филе* can be symbolically recorded as $M^{A1,2}H_2C$. The *incomplete interlingual homonem* with a different product of sets of homonymic meanings, which is a part of homonems of both languages, for example Finnish and Russian B = *bitti/бум*, is symbolically recorded as $M^{B2,3}H_2N_1$. The record gives us information about the product of pairs of meanings $p=2$ (1. 'binary digit', 2. 'basic indissoluble information unit'), and about the total number of meanings of both languages which do not make pairs of homonems, $q=1$ (music 'big-beat').

Method

The first stage was to create primary lexical resources for Finnish and Russian separately. The present author compiled sets of homonyms, found in monolingual dic-

tionaries of the Finnish language¹² and monolingual dictionaries of the Russian language¹³, a bilingual dictionary¹⁴, and dictionaries of Russian homonyms¹⁵. As a result, two works containing intralingual homonyms were published: a dictionary of Finnish homonyms¹⁶ and a dictionary of Russian homonyms¹⁷. The meanings of homonyms were analysed on the basis of the definitions found in the source dictionaries. It is worth stressing that Finnish homonymy had not been extensively investigated before¹⁸.

The lexical basis of Finnish included 3435 lexical homonyms, further arranged by the present author into 1578 intralingual homonemes, present in modern Finnish; for the Russian language there were 5951 lexical homonyms, arranged into 2757 intralingual homonemes. The selection of the sets was made in accordance with the following criteria:

- (1) formal criteria,
- (2) semantic criteria,
- (3) linguistic consciousness (intuition) of the users.

The next stage was the comparison of intralingual homonemes of Finnish and Russian. This process was reduced to two classifications on the interlingual level — formal and semantic ones, which implied the recognition of *interlingual homonemes* of the specific product of sets of meanings.

After the formal analysis (which made use of phonetic and phonological, graphic and morphological parameters), the sets of interlingual homonemes were recognized for this pair of languages. The grade of identicalness of formal homonemes, specified as “identicalness” or “convergence” was also established. The criterion of convergence is

¹² K. Koukkunen. *Atomi ja missi. Vierassanojen etymologinen sanakirja*. Porvoo: WSOY, 1990; *Nyky-suomen sanakirja*. 1–4. Toim. M. Sadeniemi. Porvoo — Helsinki — Juva: WSOY, 1992; *Sivistysnasto. Joka kodin suomen kielen opas*. Toim. K. Turtia. Helsinki: Otava, 1995, pp. 437–669; T. Nurmi. *Uusi suomen kielen sanakirja ulkomaalaisille*. Helsinki: Gummerus, 1999; Terho Itkonen. *Uusi kielio-pas*. Uudistanut S. Maamies. Helsinki: Tammi, 2002.

¹³ *Словарь русского языка*. 1–4. Под ред. А.П. Евгеньевой. 2-е изд. Москва: Русский язык, 1981; С.И. Ожегов, Н.Ю Шведова. *Толковый словарь русского языка*. Москва: Русский язык, 1993; Н.Г. Комлев. *Словарь иностранных слов*. Москва: Издательство Московского университета, 1995; *Большой толковый словарь русского языка*. Под ред. С.А. Кузнецова. Санкт-Петербург: Норинт, 2000.

¹⁴ *Uusi venäläis-suomalainen suursanakirja*. 1–2. Toim. M. Kuusinen. 2. pain. Porvoo — Helsinki — Moskova: WSOY, 2000.

¹⁵ Н.П. Колесников. *Словарь омонимов русского языка*. Ред. Н.М. Шанский. 2-е изд. Тбилиси: Тбилисский государственный университет, 1976; О. Ахманова. *Словарь омонимов русского языка*. Москва: Русский язык, 1986; А. Окунева. *Словарь омонимов современного русского языка*. Москва: Русский язык, 2002.

¹⁶ K. Wojan. *Homonimika leksemowa języka fińskiego (= Suomen kielen leksikaalisia homonyymejä)*. Unpublished dictionary (in typescript).

¹⁷ K. Wojan, E. Skupińska-Dybek. *Słownik homonimów leksemowych języka rosyjskiego z polskimi ekwiwalentami tłumaczeniowymi (= Словарь лексемных омонимов русского языка с польскими переводными эквивалентами)*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2011.

¹⁸ K. Laalo. *Homonymiasta ja polysemiasta*. “Virittäjä” 1989, No 2, pp. 220–235; K. Laalo. *Säikeistä patoihin. Suomen kielen monitulkintaiset sananmuodot*. Vaasa: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1990.

more important in the classification of the sets. As a result, two basic groups of homonyms were specified:

- (1) interlingual, formally identical homonyms, and
- (2) interlingual, formally convergent homonyms.

The latter group had three subgroups, depending on the grade of convergence:

- (1) interlingual convergent homonyms (grade one convergence),
- (2) interlingual convergent homonyms (grade two convergence),
- (3) interlingual convergent homonyms (grade three convergence).

The semantic classification led to the recognition of semantic commonness, convergence and divergence of the semantic structures of specified interlingual homonymic sets. Next, three types of interlingual homonyms were specified:

- (1) complete homonyms (complete convergence of meanings),
- (2) incomplete homonyms (partly convergent meanings),
- (3) zero homonyms (complete divergence of meanings).

For the zero homonyms, the resemblance is solely formal.

After the addition of all the products of meanings of, first, the complete and, then, the incomplete interlingual homonyms typical of the microsystems, the general number of convergent and divergent meanings was established, thus enabling a comparison of the given pair of languages.

The results of interlingual formal classification

The formal classification of the lexical resources of Finnish and Russian led to the recognition of 295 interlingual homonyms, of which 41 were formally identical (14%) and 254 were formally convergent (86%) (see Table 3).

Table 3. The total number of interlingual homonyms of Finnish and Russian recognized after the formal analysis

Lang. pair	NUMBER OF INTERLINGUAL HOMONYMS				
	TOTAL	FORMALLY IDENTICAL		FORMALLY CONVERGENT	
Finnish – Russian	295	41	13.89%	254	86.10 %
				Grade 1 – 34	13.38 %
				Grade 2 – 106 Gra-	41.73 %
				de 3 – 114	44.88 %

In the set of the complete interlingual homonyms only 9 were morphologically identical (e.g. *allegro*, *bolero*, *boston*, *domino*, *lori*, *sambo*), which was approx. 16% (see Table 4). The other 48 (84%) complete homonyms were classified as formally convergent. Of those, 11 were defined as representing grade one convergence (e.g. Fin. *autonomia* — Rus. *автономия*, Fin. *aristokratia* — Rus. *аристократия*, Fin. *kiivi* — Rus. *киви*, Fin. *logistiikka* — Rus. *логистика*, Fin. *menu* — Rus. *меню* etc.); grade two convergence was found in 32 interlingual homonyms (e.g. Fin. *bergamotti* — Rus. *бергамот*, Fin. *granaatti* — Rus. *гранат*, Fin. *delfiini* — Rus. *дельфин*, Fin. *divaani* — Rus. *диван*, Fin. *fregatti* — Rus. *фрегат* etc.); and grade three convergence — in

5 homonems (e.g. Fin. *trapetsi* — Rus. *трапещия*, Fin. *tryffeli* — Rus. *трюфель*, Fin. *kondriitti* — Rus. *хондрит*, Fin. *sahrami* — Rus. *шафран*).

Table 4. Results of the formal interlingual classification of homonems

Type MH ^{r-f}	MH ^{r-f} complete		MH ^{r-f} incomplete		MH ^{r-f} zero	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total	57	100%	128	100%	110	100%
Formally identical	9	15.78%	24	18.7%	8	7.27%
Formal convergence:	48	84.21%	104	81.25%	102	92.72%
grade one convergence	11	22.91%	16	15.38%	7	6.86%
grade two convergence	32	66.66%	48	46.15%	26	25.49%
grade three convergence	5	10.41%	40	38.46%	69	67.64%

In the group of incomplete interlingual homonems, 24 formally identical units were recognised (Fin. *kivi* — Rus. *киви*, Fin. *lama* — Rus. *лама*, Fin. *manna* — Rus. *манн*, Fin. *pas* — Rus. *пас*, Fin. *pora* — Rus. *пора* etc.). Most of them are interlingual formally convergent homonems — 104 units, of which 16 are characterised by grade one convergence (e.g. Fin. *alpakka* — Rus. *альпака*, Fin. *iiris* — Rus. *ирис*, Fin. *kartta* — Rus. *карта*, Fin. *miina* — Rus. *мина*, Fin. *saikka* — Rus. *сайка*); 48 units are characterised by grade two convergence (e.g. Fin. *banketti* — Rus. *банкет*, Fin. *baari* — Rus. *бар*, Fin. *boksi* — Rus. *бокс*, Fin. *voltti* — Rus. *вольт*, Fin. *haka* — Rus. *зак*) and 40 units — by grade three convergence (e.g. Fin. *pakka* — Rus. *бак*, Fin. *pora* — Rus. *пора*, Fin. *paatti* — Rus. *бот*, Fin. *kalikka* — Rus. *калитка*, Fin. *ratti* — Rus. *шпат*). In the subset of interlingual zero homonems, we find only 8 formally identical homonems (e.g. Fin. *kara* — Rus. *кара*, Fin. *karta* — Rus. *карта*, Fin. *maiija* — Rus. *майя*, Fin. *runo* — Rus. *руно*, Fin. *sila* — Rus. *сила*) and 102 homonems that are characterised by formal convergence (e.g. Fin. *kasa* — Rus. *касса*, Fin. *mana* — Rus. *манна*, Fin. *pilkka* — Rus. *пилка*, Fin. *polkka* — Rus. *полька*, Fin. *talja* — Rus. *талия*).

Interlingual semantic classification

As a result of interlingual semantic classification of homonems, the semantic community was recognised in the interlingual homonymy of Finnish and Russian. The ultimate product of the analysis was the identification of 57 complete interlingual homonems (approx. 20% of compared lexical sets), 128 incomplete interlingual homonems (approx. 43.4%), interlingual units characterized by partial convergence of meanings and 110 zero interlingual homonems (approx. 37.3%), of excluded meanings (see Table 5).

Table 5. Results of the interlingual semantic classification of homonems

Type MH ^{r-f}	Number MH ^{r-f}	%
MH ^{r-f} complete	57	19.32 %
MH ^{r-f} incomplete	128	43.38 %
MH ^{r-f} zero	110	37.28 %
Total	295	100%

The **complete** interlingual homonems which are formally identical, with all of the common meanings, are represented by units such as *allegro/аллегро* MH₃C, *bolero/болеро* MH₆C, *domino/домино* MH₂C, *lori/лори* MH₂C, *sambo/самбо* MH₂C etc.; formally convergent interlingual complete homonems of grade one convergence which are semantically identical are the following: *autonomia/автономия* MH₃C, *apollo/аполлон* MH₃C, *baccara/баккара* MH₂C, *kiivi/киви* MH₃C, *logistiikka/логистика* MH₄C; those of grade two convergence include *kurssi/курс* MH₆C, *moduuli/модуль* MH₆C, *motiivi/мотив* MH₄C, *kutteri/куттер* MH₃C, *šeriffi/шериф* MH₅C etc.; and those of grade three convergence include *trapetsi/трапеция* MH₂C, *tryffeli/трюфель* MH₂C, *kondriitti/хондрит* MH₂C, *sahrami/шафран* MH₃C. The formally identical **incomplete** interlingual homonems with partly common meanings are the following: *aura/аура* MH₃N₅, *iiris/ирис* MH₂N₂, *massa/масса* MH₅N₃, *rapana/панана* MH₄N₁, *soli/соль* MH₃N₄. The formally convergent incomplete interlingual homonems of grade one convergence, with some common meanings, are the following: *alpakka/альпака* MH₃N₁, *laama/лама* MH₂N₄, *metriikka/метрика* MH₃N₃, *miina/мина* MH₄N₅, *saiikka/сайка* MH₁N₂; those of grade two convergence include *friisi/фриз* MH₃N₄, *halssi/галс* MH₂N₃, *poliisi/полис* MH₃N₁, *posti/пост* MH₂N₁₁, *sireeni/сирена* MH₄N₂; and those of grade three convergence include *kruuni/крона* MH₃N₅, *lakka/лак* MH₂N₇, *ruusu/роза* MH₂N₂, *punta/фунт* MH₂N₄, *talentti/талант* MH₃N₁.

The cases of formally identical interlingual zero homonems, with divergent meanings are the following: *kara/кара* MH₀N₉, *karta/карта* MH₀N₇, *runo/руно* MH₀N₇, *sila/сила* MH₀N₁₀, *top/тон* MH₀N₉; whereas the formally convergent interlingual zero homonems, with divergent meanings, include *vintti/винт* MH₀N₇, *lasta/ласт* MH₀N₉, *raali/нал* MH₀N₇, *piki/пик* MH₀N₉, *sakki/сак* MH₀N₅.

Synonymic sets of homonems representing the two languages

The analysis of the lexical sets has proved that some homonymic sets present in the different linguistic systems do not obey the rules of classification of formal “identicalness” but that they follow the rules of formal “convergence”, creating the sets of interlingual homonems which cannot be included in interlingual homonymy; in the analysed sets of pairs of Finnish and Russian homonems, we observe some convergences of sets of meanings accompanying lexemes. This phenomenon is described as *interlingual synosemy* in this paper and can be illustrated with the example presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Interlingual synosemy

Finnish language	Semantic relations	Russian language
Homonem <i>ANKKA</i>	Convergence	Homonem <i>UTKA</i>
1. 'bird from the family of ducks'	convergence	1. 'bird from a group'
2. 'rumour, gossip'	convergence	2. 'rumour, gossip'
3. 'to play at ducks and drakes'	no convergence	3. 'urinal'
∅	no convergence	4. 'part of a plane'

The analysis allowed us to distinguish 25 sets representing semantic relations. Those were the semantic relations of *interlingual synosemy* (7.81% of all analysed interlingual sets). Here are some examples of interlingual synosemy: *akka/баба* МН₄Н₁₀С, *kieli/jazyk* МН₆Н₆С, *lehti/лист* МН₃Н₈, *lukko/замок* МН₂Н₂С, *sihteeri/секретарь* МН₄Н₂С, *sika/свинка* МН₃Н₁С.

The results of the analysis of the homonymic community in Finnish and Russian

1660 meanings of interlingual homonems of Finnish and Russian were analysed, of which 167 meanings proved complete homonems, 698 — incomplete homonems and 795 — zero homonems. The analysis revealed 416 common meanings of interlingual homonems (25.06%), 167 (10.06%) complete homonems and 249 (15%) incomplete homonems. The number of dissimilar meanings of incomplete and zero interlingual homonems was 1244 (74.93%), whereas 449 (27,04%) were incomplete homonems (see Table 7).

Table 7. Community of meanings

Pair of languages	CONVERGENCE OF MEANINGS				
	Total	Common meanings		Uncommon meanings	
Finnish–Russian	1660	416	25.06%	1244	74.93 %
	[167]	[167]	[10.06]	[–]	[–]
	[698]	[249]	[15.00]	[449]	[27.04]
	[795]	[–]	[–]	[795]	[47.89]

It was found out that in the set of interlingual homonems there were 79 (4.75%) formally identical common meanings and 143 dissimilar meanings (8.61%), whereas in the set of formally convergent interlingual homonems — 337 (20.3%) common meanings. In the group of formally convergent interlingual homonems the predominant group among those with divergent meanings was that with dissimilar meanings 1101 (66.32%).

The average value for the common meanings of interlingual homonems of Finnish and Russian is 1.41; the average value for the dissimilar meanings is 4.21. The average for all the analysed homonymic meanings is 5.62. If the semantic analysis includes

synosemic interlingual sets, the average will increase: for the common meanings up to 1.49; for dissimilar meanings up to 4.22 and the overall average — up to 5.72.

It should be explained that establishing the average of meanings makes sense only if we compare homonymic sets of different languages. The research made by the present author includes a wide range of contrastive research in the field of the community of such language pairs as Finnish and Russian, Finnish and Polish, Russian and Polish.

Summary

The analysis of the gathered material shows some systematic formal and semantic convergences between homonemic sets of Finnish and Russian as well as a convergence of linguistic phenomena. It can be stated on this basis that Finnish-Russian homonymy mainly concerns internationalisms. Lexical Europeanisms or internationalisms present in homonymic sets of the different languages are factors that serve the gradual integration of languages, and enable international communication and exchange of ideas of the modern world. The results of the research are valuable not only from the scholarly point of view, but also socially, as they can be conducive to a better understanding and communication between people speaking different languages living in the same geographical area. The homonymic community which has developed during the ages in different linguistic systems and the dynamics of modern, conscious acquisition of complete homonyms formed in one language by another language may be seen as a measure of the degree of common mentality of the nations. The account of the mental relationship of users of different languages may become a key to defining proper criteria in the process of translation.

References

- Buttler D. *Słownik polskich homonimów całkowitych*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1988.
- Buttler D. *Polskie i rosyjskie homonimy rzeczownikowe*. [In:] *Paralele w rozwoju słownictwa języków słowiańskich*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1989, pp. 95–103.
- CD-Perussanakirja. Uusin tieto nykysuomen sanoista*. CD-ROM PC/Windows. Helsinki: Edita, 1996.
- Handke K. *Perspektywa paraleli, czyli sposób badania zjawisk językowych*. [W:] *Paralele w rozwoju słownictwa języków słowiańskich*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1989, pp. 7–17.
- Itkonen Terho. *Uusi kieliopas*. Uudistanut Sari Maamies. Helsinki: Tammi, 2002.
- Koukkunen K. *Atomi ja missi. Vierassanojen etymologinen sanakirja*. Porvoo: WSOY, 1990.
- Kudzinowski Cz. *Słownik fińsko-polski (Suomalais-puolalainen sanakirja)*. 1–2. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, 1988.
- Uusi venäläis-suomalainen suursanakirja*. 1–2. Toim. M. Kuusinen. 2. pain. Porvoo — Helsinki — Moskova: WSOY, 2000.
- Laalo K. *Homonymiasta ja polysemiasta*. “Virittäjä” 1989, No 2, pp. 220–235.
- Laalo K. *Säkeistä patoihin. Suomen kielen monitulkintaiset sananmuodot*. Vaasa: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1990.
- Laalo K. *Huvitav lugu — kiinnostava juttu. Suomen ja viron välinen sanaston riskiryhmä ja sen taustaa*. Tampere: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1992.

- Leino P. *Polysemia — kielen moniselitteisyys*. Kieli 7. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos, 1993.
- Maćkiewicz J. *Wyrazy międzynarodowe (internacjonalizmy) we współczesnym języku polskim*. [In:] *Encyklopedia kultury polskiej. 2: Współczesny język polski*. Ed. by J. Bartmiński. Wrocław: Wiedza o Kulturze, 1993, pp. 555–562.
- Maćkiewicz J. *Polszczyzna w europejskiej lidze językowej*. [In:] *Symbioza kultur słowiańskich i niesłowiańskich w Europie Środkowej*. Ed. by M. Bobrownicka. Kraków: Universitas, 1996, pp. 197–202.
- Majewska M. *Homonimia i homonimy w opisie językoznawczym*. Warszawa: Elipsa, 2002.
- Nurmi T. *Uusi suomen kielen sanakirja ulkomaalaisille*. Helsinki: Gummerus, 1999.
- Nykysuomen sanakirja*. 1–4. Toim. M. Sadeniemi. Porvoo — Helsinki — Juva: WSOY, 1992.
- Saukkonen P. et. al. *Suomen kielen homonyymejä*. [In:] *Språkhistoria och språkkontakt i Finland och Nord-Skandinavien. Studier tillägnade Tryggve Sköld den 2 november 1982*. Stockholm: Kungliga Skytteanska samfundets handlingar 26, 1982, pp. 255–272.
- Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja*. 1–3. Toim. Erkki Itkonen, U.-M. Kulonen 2. pain. Jyväskylä: Gummerus. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2001.
- Sivistyssanasto*. [In:] *Joka kodin suomen kielen opas*. Toim. K. Turtia. Helsinki: Otava, 1995, pp. 437–669.
- Weinreich U. *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*. Mouton: The Hague, 1963.
- Wojan K. *The Genesis of Homonymy of the Finnish Language*. “Fenno-Ugristica” 2003, No 25, pp. 180–187.
- Wojan K. *The Lexical Homonymy of the Finnish Language*. [In:] *Grammatika és kontextus. Új szempontok az uráli nyelvek kutatásában (= Grammatika ja kontekst. Uued vaatenurgad uurali keelte uurimises = Grammar and Context. New Approaches to the Uralic Languages)*. Eds. by M. Csepregi, V. Masonen. Budapest: Urálistikai Tanulmányok 17, 2007, pp. 348–358.
- Wojan K. *Wspólnota homonimiki języków europejskich (na materiale języków: polskiego, rosyjskiego i fińskiego)*. [The Homonymic Community of the European Languages (On the Material of Polish, Russian and Finnish)]. 1–3. Unpublished Doctor Dissertation. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University, 2007.
- Wojan K., Wojan Z. *Сравнительно-сопоставительный анализ цифровой репрезентации лексем с дифференцированной акцентуацией*. [In:] *Congreso Internacional «La lengua y literatura rusas en el espacio educativo internacional: estado actual y perspectivas. Granada, 7–9 mayo 2007»*. Ponencias y comunicaciones. Tomo II. Ed. R. G. Tirado et al. Sankt-Peterburg — Granada: MIRS, 2007, pp. 1243–1249.
- Wojan K. *Wstęp do badań wieloznaczności leksemów w ujęciu kontrastywnym*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2010.
- Wojan K. *Przypadkowe i nieprzypadkowe wędrówki leksemów*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2010.
- Wojan K. przy udziale E. Skupińskiej-Dybek. *Słownik homonimów leksemowych języka rosyjskiego z polskimi ekwiwalentami tłumaczeniowymi (= Словарь лексемных омонимов русского языка с польскими переводными эквивалентами)*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2011.
- Wojan K. *Rosyjskie leksemy homonimiczne w teorii językoznawczej i praktyce leksykograficznej*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 2011
- Wojan K. *Homonimika leksemowa języka fińskiego (= Suomen kielen leksikaalisia homonyymejä)*. Unpublished dictionary (in typescript).

- Ахманова О. *Словарь омонимов русского языка*. Москва: Русский язык, 1986.
- Большой толковый словарь русского языка*. Под ред. С.А. Кузнецова. Санкт-Петербург: Норинт, 2000.
- Воян К. *Явление омонимии и сравнительное языкознание (на материалах русского, польского и финского языков)*. “Съпоставително езикознание” 2004, No 1, XXIX, pp. 24–35.
- Дубичинский В.В. *Лексические параллели*. Харьков 1993.
- Дубичинский В.В. *Лексические параллели украинского, польского и немецкого языков*. [In:] *Język, tożsamość i komunikacja międzykulturowa. Księga Pamiątkowa ofiarowana Doktor Bożenie Zinkiewicz-Tomanek*. Eds. by E. Komorowska, D. Stanulewicz. Szczecin: Volumina.pl Daniel Krzanowski, 2011, pp. 75–86.
- Колесников Н.П. *Словарь омонимов русского языка*. Ред. Н.М. Шанский. 2-е изд. Тбилиси: Тбилисский государственный университет, 1976.
- Комлев Н.Г. *Словарь иностранных слов*. Москва: Издательство Московского университета, 1995.
- Малаховский Л.В. *Теория лексической и грамматической омонимии*. Ленинград: Наука, 1990.
- Ожегов С.И., Шведова Н.Ю. *Толковый словарь русского языка*. Москва: Русский язык, 1993.
- Окунева А. *Словарь омонимов современного русского языка*. Москва: Русский язык, 2002.
- Словарь иностранных слов*. 11. изд. Москва: Русский язык, 1984.
- Словарь русского языка*. 1–4. Под. ред. А.П. Евгеньевой. 2-е изд. Москва: Русский язык, 1981.
- Фасмер М. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. 1–4. Москва: Прогресс, 1986–1987.