homonyms (Lyons, 1995:27). They have been classified by lexicographers as separate words and therefore were given separate entries in dictionaries.

Lyons stresses that homonymy results in lexical and grammatical ambiguity. He illustrates such ambiguity in the following example:

They found hospitals and charitable institutions.

The above example can be construed as a present tense sentence containing a form of the verb *found* or, alternatively, as a past tense utterance containing a form of *find*. The ambiguity is partly lexical since the two lexemes hold different meanings, and is partly grammatical in so far as its ambiguity depends upon the grammatical non-equivalence of *found* construed as a form of *found* and of *found* construed as a form of *find* (ibid: 56).

By the same token, Hutchins and Somers (1992) believe that the first and most obvious is the problem of homonyms or, more specifically, homographs. Homographs are two or more words that are spelled alike but pronounced differently, such as *tear* (the byproduct of crying) and *tear* (rip). Choosing the right equivalent according to the context has proven to be problematic in the current research. This shortcoming could be attributed to the fact that *Google Translate* adopts a statistical approach in which the semantic analysis does not take place.

Al-Najjar (2004) stresses that homonymy as well as polysemy are the main obstacles that face MT in disambiguating word senses. He gives the example of *water* as a noun and *water* as a verb to indicate polyesmy. *right* as an adjective to mean a direction opposite to left and *right* the opposite of *wrong* is furnished to refer to homonymy. He adds that acronyms constitute a problem to MT as there is no specialized lexicon that states what such abbreviations stand for.