

# The Difficulty of Distinguishing Homonyms and Polysemies As Actual Problems in The Modern Karakalpak Language

Ali Kaljanov

PhD student, Karakalpak Scientific-Research Institute of Humanitarian Sciences, Nukus, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 26 February 2026; **Accepted:** 23 March 2026; **Published:** 13 April 2026

**Abstract:** Among the issues concerning the internal structure and essence of language, the problems of polysemy and homonymy are of considerable importance. At the same time, the formation of homonyms from polysemy is of particular significance. Without addressing the general nature of these two phenomena, this paper focuses on a specific practical issue: methods for distinguishing between them. It is well known that, in the Karakalpak language, homonyms that arise due to the loss of semantic connection between meanings of the same word are especially difficult to study. This process reflects the internal laws of the language, contributing to the enrichment of its vocabulary through its own resources. Therefore, distinguishing between polysemy and homonymy is of great theoretical and practical importance for understanding the internal structure, capabilities, and development tendencies of the language. The aim of this article is to investigate homonymy and polysemy in the Karakalpak language and to establish optimal methods for their differentiation.

**Keywords:** Karakalpak language, homonymy, polysemy, differentiation.

**Introduction:** The main types of semantic ambiguity are polysemy and homonymy. Polysemy of a word is the presence of several interrelated meanings, characterized by the commonality of one or more semantic components. Homonymy differs from polysemy in the absence of such a relationship: meanings are associated with the same language form. This fundamental difference is determined by differences in the processes of restoring these types of semantic ambiguity.

For several decades, linguists in our country and abroad have been dealing with the problem of "polysemy and homonymy," i.e., determining the semantic boundary between lexical units. It is well known, for example, that the inconsistency in the interpretation of homonymy and polysemy in the Karakalpak language is mainly due to the objective complexity of the still unresolved issues of semasiology, in particular, the distinction between the phenomena of homonymy and polysemy and the lack of reliable criteria for distinguishing individual meanings of words.

The main problem in the study of homonyms is distinguishing between polysemy and homonymy; it is difficult to say exactly where polysemy ends and homonymy begins.

The problem of homonymy and various aspects of its semantics have attracted the attention of foreign researchers for many years. There are various works devoted to the problem of distinguishing homonyms, language reactions to homonymy, structural differences between homonymy and polysemy, the limits of homonymy in the sign system, and many others. Homonyms are closely related to the needs of applied linguistics.

According to the explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms edited by Darigul Seidullaeva, polysemy is the presence of different lexical meanings in the same word. Homonyms are of the same form but have different meanings (Seidullayeva, 2018, p. 76-82).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Polysemy and homonymy provide systematic

vocabulary at the level of paradigmatics. The question of the distinction between homonymy and polysemy has been discussed in linguistics for a long time. However, the difference between homonymy and polysemy, intuitively recognized by most researchers, is not clearly reflected in the existing definitions of homonyms. In connection with these difficulties, attempts have been repeatedly made to find a criterion for distinguishing polysemy from homonymy on the basis of formal, externally expressed features — features of the paradigm, entry into different synonymic series, differences in transformations, word-formation series, spelling, etc. All attempts have been unsuccessful since the formal signs that sometimes accompany the difference in meanings in homonymy can also occur in polysemy. Precisely because of the absence of a mandatory external expression of homonymy — i.e., there are no formal grounds for distinguishing between homonymy and polysemy — some researchers believe that there are no significant differences between these two phenomena. Thus, G. Paul refers to both homonymy and polysemy as the same linguistic phenomenon — polysemy (Paul, 1960, p. 96). In fact, authors who consider homonymy a kind of polysemy, or vice versa, stand on the same point of view.

A. I. Smirnitsky objected to this approach, writing that if we deny polysemy and consider all cases of semantic differences as homonyms, then the language will contain homonyms that are related in meaning and homonyms that are semantically unrelated, which only leads to an unjustified change in terminology, since it obscures the fundamental differences between polysemy and homonymy — i.e., between the typicality of semantic connections in the first case and their random nature in the second (Smirnitsky, 1998, p. 163). We must agree that homonymy and polysemy are different concepts. But these concepts also have a common feature — the difference in meanings when the form is identical — which allows us to combine them into a broader concept of ambiguity. A number of scientists motivate such a combination by the convenience of description, but the point is not convenience, but the objective allocation of the concept in the system of formal-semantic relations between words as a member of the binary opposition that opposes the concept of synonymy.

In his book, Karakalpak linguist Urakbay Dospanov provides information about such problems: The problem of distinguishing polysemy from homonymy is one of the most difficult in linguistics. In compiling dictionaries, no lexicographer can fail to dwell on the problem of the mutual difference between polysemy and homonymy. Hence, as long as words that sound

alike retain a common meaning, though distant, and are united by a single semantic core, only moving away from it to a greater or lesser extent, we are dealing with polysemy. When individual words that sound the same do not have a connection in meaning, homonyms arise. How to distinguish between cases of polysemy and homonymy? You can check whether it is homonymy or polysemy by selecting synonyms for the same-sounding words. If the selected synonyms are not synonymous with each other, then we have homonymous words. The second principle of identifying homonyms is the presence of different word-formation series in two equally sounding words (Dospanov, 1980, p. 77).

The boundary between homonyms and polysemies is unstable and permeable. It is constantly violated, not only on the part of polysemy — when due to the loss of an intermediate link, the connection between the individual meanings of a polysemantic word is lost and it breaks up into two different homonyms — but also on the part of homonymy, when a semantic connection arises between homonymous words and they merge into one polysemantic word. As a result, at any given moment in the language, there are many borderline cases, the qualification of which inevitably causes difficulties.

The presence of such cases does not mean that there is no border between homonymy and polysemy. Both homonymy and polysemy have a field structure: the center, where the specific features of this phenomenon are most pronounced, and the periphery, where they are less clearly manifested. A. V. Bondarko says that when defining phenomena, it is important to focus on the center. It is not always possible to give a definition that would be valid for peripheral zones, where features collide with those of related phenomena. Definitions that tend to cover these peripheral areas often lose content certainty. The difficulties associated with borderline cases between homonymy and polysemy are of a particular nature and should not interfere with the solution of the question of the principles of distinguishing homonymy and polysemy (Bondarko, 2008, p. 100-101).

As D. N. Shmelev notes, the semantic unity of a word lies not in the presence of a certain common meaning, but in a certain connection of these independent meanings with each other and their attachment to the same sign (Shmelev, 1973, p. 76). The unity of the signified in polysemy is based on the presence of a continuous derivational connection that consistently covers all the elements of the semantic structure of a polysemous word. As soon as this continuity is broken at least in one place, the semantic unity of the word is broken, and polysemy disintegrates, turning the

polysemantic word into two unrelated homonyms (Shmelev, 1973, p. 344).

Among homonymy researchers, there is no consensus on the proportion of homonyms formed as a result of the collapse of polysemy. Thus, V. I. Abaev, in the article "On the submission of homonyms in the dictionary," suggested that new homonyms are mainly produced through polysemy. E. M. Galkina-Fedoruk, in the article "On the question of homonyms in the Russian language," considered the separation of meanings to be one of the ways of forming homonyms. Despite the divergence of opinions, it is necessary to pay attention to the great difficulties associated with the search for objective criteria for assessing the completion of the homonymization process.

The process of splitting a polysemantic word and turning its meanings into independent homonyms is very long, and the appearance of intermediate, transitional cases is inevitable when it is difficult to give an unambiguous semantic characteristic of the word.

In polysemy, each meaning of a word is necessarily in a derivational relationship with at least one of its other meanings. In homonymy, formally identical words relate to each other in terms of content, meaning that none of the meanings is connected by a derivational relationship with any of the meanings of the other. The solution to the question of the presence or absence of a derivational relationship between meanings can be carried out in each specific case using methods such as component analysis, comparison of dictionary interpretations, and explanatory transformations (Malakhovsky, 1990, p. 49).

In order to distinguish homonymy from polysemy, L. A. Bulakhovsky points out that homonyms should have completely different meanings. However, this is true only if meaning is understood not only lexically but also grammatically.

### **Polysemy as a Source of Homonymy**

More significant are the difficulties associated with the internal inconsistency of polysemy, which is characterized both by a plurality of semantics and by an indubitable semantic unity. When resolving this contradiction, some researchers refuse to recognize polysemy altogether, reducing the different meanings of a polysemantic word to one common meaning or splitting the word into a number of monosemantic homonyms. A polysemantic word does have many different meanings, but these meanings are only different manifestations of a single semantic whole or different lexico-semantic variants of the word. These variants differ from each other in distribution and in participation in synonymic or word-formation series, but they are interconnected and form a single system

that acts as a signified verbal language sign. The fundamental difference between homonymy and polysemy is that in homonymy we are dealing with different signifiers, whereas in polysemy the signified is the same.

In the practice of teaching foreign languages, it is also very often difficult to assess the degree of connectedness of word meanings — i.e., to find out where the limit of polysemy is and how to draw a clear line between polysemy and homonymy.

### **METHOD**

The question of the distinction between homonymy and polysemy is not of interest to applied linguistics; the problem of polysemy itself is at the center of its interests. Almost everyone notes both the extraordinary complexity and the paramount importance of this problem. Naturally, the difficulties that arise for mechanical translation in connection with the polysemy of words and constructions push the theory to search for means to eliminate polysemy. What seemed at first an insurmountable complexity begins to become clear under the persistent influence of scientific thought.

Traditional linguistics bases the semantic unity of a word on the existence of a connection between its individual meanings. The identification of the types of semantic connection that are natural to a given language is considered a way to distinguish between homonymy and polysemy: typicality and repeatability between two meanings indicate polysemy, whereas uniqueness and exclusivity of the connection indicate homonymy. It usually goes unnoticed that this approach satisfactorily explains the simplest case of polysemy — binomial polysemy, in which the meanings of a word are directly related. The question of semantic unity in the case of polynomial polysemy, where a word contains meanings that are not directly related to each other, remains open. With the development of component analysis, the presence of common semantic components or the preservation of the semantic attribute of the original meaning in the derived meaning is put forward as a necessary condition for the connection between meanings. This approach also does not answer the question of the basis of the semantic unity of a polysemantic word.

The study of the problem of distinguishing polysemy and homonymy is limited to the consideration of linguistic connections specific to the vocabulary of the modern Karakalpak language and is carried out in a synchronic plan.

However, when selecting research material, we checked the etymology of the lexical units selected for analysis and limited ourselves to words of a single

origin, thus introducing an element of diachrony into this work. In order to test the effectiveness of our proposed research methodology and the possibility of its application in working with any material, we in some cases involve groups of indisputable homonyms — words of different etymologies.

Let us now turn to the consideration of the point of view according to which homonyms are not only words that are different from time immemorial and coincide in their external form, but also a large group of polysemantic words in which individual meanings have diverged so far that they gave birth to new words. The main difficulty in distinguishing a group of homonyms from a large family of polysemous words — in other words, in distributing words into the categories of "polysemy" and "homonymy" — is the uncertainty of the criteria of "far-diverged meanings" and "broken semantic ties." The concept of breaking semantic ties is primarily subjective and, moreover, absolutely non-linguistic. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that *kisi* and *kisi* ('man' and 'man') are perceived as closely related to each other.

The following examples, taken from the practice of conducting seminars on Karakalpak lexicology, show the difficulty of distinguishing polysemy and homonymy. Difficulties were also caused by the analysis of the relations between words such as *kabinet* "glass cabinet" and *kabinet* "government."

The method of component analysis is associated with another approach to solving the problem, based on identifying in the semantic structure of the word what is common in all its lexico-semantic variants — i.e., the search for a lexico-semantic invariant. This invariant may mean either a set of semantic components common to all lexico-semantic variants of the word, or a common part in the interpretation of meanings, or a nuclear seme (the main motivating meaning), or the central meaning or semantic core of the word, or the direct nominative meaning of the word. The concept of the lexico-semantic invariant is essentially connected with the theory of the general meaning of a word, and both do not stand up to testing on specific language material. It is not always possible to sum up all the meanings of a polysemantic word under one common meaning, nor is it always possible to find a part common to all. The general part is obligatory only for those meanings that are in relations of direct semantic derivation; meanings that are not directly related to each other may not have a common part. Thus, the main meaning of the word *shıǵıs* "east" has common semantic components with the derived meaning "Asia," as well as with another derived meaning — "basis" — but these two derived meanings do not have common components. That is, the absence of common

semantic components can occur not only in the case of chain polysemy, as is often considered, but also in the case of radial polysemy, as well as mixed polysemy — i.e., in any polysemantic system with more than two elements.

The concept of the lexico-semantic invariant cannot answer the question about the nature of the semantic unity of a word in polynomial polysemy. If we consider not an elementary semantic connection but the whole system of word meanings as a whole, we can see that this is a certain way of organizing a set of such elementary connections, and its unity is ensured by the continuity of derivational relations between individual elements of the system. This continuity creates the integrity of the signified — the integrity of the content side of the verbal language sign.

It should be recognized that for cases that are transitional between polysemy and homonymy, no method provides an indisputable, unambiguous solution. Semantic nominative derivation is not the only but an important factor underlying the development of both polysemy and homonymy. The result of semantic-derivational processes, which have a fundamentally unified mechanism based on analogy, is the emergence of new nominations of two varieties: lexical-semantic variants of the word or new words homonymous with the generating ones. In the second case, it is advisable to speak of semantic word formation, and the task is to delineate its boundaries.

Using this method, it is possible to identify the degree of connectedness and divergence of meanings, which is established by means of native speakers' assessments of the naturalness of the sentences presented to them. This criterion can be one of the objective means of distinguishing homonyms from the semantic structure of a polysemantic word.

It is possible to solve the problem of distinguishing polysemy and homonymy by differentiating the following types of paradigms:

1. paradigms of inflection (morphological paradigm);
2. the word-formation paradigm;
3. the syntactic paradigm;
4. the semantic paradigm.

The first three types cannot be considered absolute criteria when establishing homonymy. They only confirm the facts discovered by semantic analysis.

As semantic criteria for distinguishing polysemy and homonymy, the following methods can be used: the intermediate link method, the criterion of general invariant meaning, the lexical field method, the method of identifying the components of word



semantics, component analysis, and the coordination method.

We use one variant of component analysis based on dictionary definitions with the use of lexical transformations when interpreting words in a monolingual dictionary. The coincidence of the components of the definitions suggests the presence of a lexico-semantic connection between the lexico-semantic variants of the word, and then this is a case of polysemy; otherwise, we have different homonyms.

## RESULTS

The question of the distinction between homonymy and polysemy in linguistics has been raised for a long time. However, a clear distinction between homonyms and polysemantic words has not yet been found by researchers — this question is still relevant, but there are many ways to distinguish them. In science, various methods and criteria for separating homonymy and polysemy are considered. Let us look at a few of them.

**Word-formation criterion.** The tendency to isolate one of the meanings of a given polysemantic nest and, consequently, to form a homonym is accompanied by changes in word formation: the isolated meaning, being formed as a word, acquires its own word-forming possibilities, different from those inherent in the polysemantic nest — i.e., homonyms find grammatical expression: the separation of one meaning from another leads to different word-forming possibilities for words with these meanings. In cases where one of the meanings has an extremely narrow special sphere of use, a new derivative series for this meaning may not be formed.

**Synonymous criterion.** This criterion involves substituting synonyms for words that sound the same. If the selected synonyms are not in a synonymous relation with each other, then we have homonymic series.

**Intermediate link method.** This method unites the meanings of the word due to the similarity of phenomena in form. However, when the transitional value or link is lost — which is not typical of modern usage — polysemy disintegrates and homonyms are formed.

**Component analysis.** This method is based on identifying in the semantic structure of the word what is common in all its lexico-semantic variants — i.e., searching for a lexico-semantic invariant. In essence, the concept of the lexico-semantic invariant fits in with the theory of the general meaning of a word. However, it does not stand up to testing on specific language material.

**Systemic nature.** The systematic nature of word

analysis is understood as taking into account all the connections of a word in the language system. The word belongs to the lexical, grammatical, word-forming, and syntactic levels of the language. Thus, when deciding whether we are dealing with a polysemantic word or a homonym, it is necessary to take into account the entire complex of features inherent in each specific word.

**Psycholinguistic experiment.** Psycholinguistic experiments to determine the degree of distance between individual meanings, and accordingly to determine the threshold between polysemy and homonymy, are usually conducted not with ordinary native speakers but only with those who have linguistic training. The conducted experiment confirmed that at present there is no method for clearly distinguishing homonymy and polysemy.

Thus, there are quite many ways to distinguish between homonymy and polysemy, but the explanation of the same linguistic phenomena in different dictionaries suggests that the proposed ways are not universal in themselves; they are valid in relation to some linguistic facts and invalid in relation to others.

## DISCUSSION

Despite the interrelation and mutual transitivity of polysemy and homonymy, these are qualitatively different phenomena: the first implies related meanings of one word, the second — unrelated meanings forming different, separate words. However, it is impossible not to recognize that these concepts have a common feature — the difference in meanings when the form is identical. This allows us to combine them into a broader concept of ambiguity. The problem is further complicated by the fact that the distinction between the meanings of a polysemous word is based on the same mechanisms that control the distinction — the identification of concepts and the very entities of the world reflected by consciousness — while unclear intermediate cases are not excluded, when it is difficult to determine whether we are dealing with the same or different meanings. In the actual linguistic sense, the difference in meanings is manifested in the peculiarities of compatibility, in different sets of transformations, synonym substitutions, antonym words, translated equivalents, and so on. Each meaning has its own meaning, and this serves as a subsidiary means of linguistic objectification of hypotheses about the differentiation of polysemy.

The dependence of the remaining meanings on the first meaning can be determined not by the repetition in the secondary meanings of any elements essential to the first meanings, but by the reflection in them of

associative or representative features — i.e., features that somehow reflect the representations associated with the objects and phenomena denoted by these words. The problem of the disintegration of the semantic identity of a word poses a number of questions to researchers, and first of all, the question of objective criteria for distinguishing polysemy and homonyms: when can we say that we are not looking at the meanings of the same word, but two different words with the same outer shell?

For this study, we took 10 verbs from the "Dictionary of Homonyms of the Karakalpak Language" by Kuralbay Pakhratdinov and Kidirbay Bekbergenov. In this dictionary, for the first time, words that are in the process of disintegration of identity are marked with a special mark.

The peculiarity of verbs is that the same word is used to refer to different processes, often belonging to different spheres of human activity, without violating the identity of the word. Therefore, in some cases different procedures are specified, but the Karakalpak language selects certain aspects or attributes of them so that they can be specified with the same word. Thus, distinguishing between homonyms and polysemies in the verb system is the most difficult.

The meanings interpreted in dictionaries as lexical-semantic variants of a polysemantic word, and the formal-semantic approach represented by semantic-grammatical, semantic-word-forming, substitution, and distributive criteria, also belong to different groups. Semantic grammatical standards are not based on the essence of semantic differences but on grammatical features. Specific ways of distinguishing homonyms from polysemies have not yet been sufficiently developed.

There are many ways to distinguish between homonyms and polysemies, but the contradictory explanation of the same linguistic phenomena in different dictionaries indicates that each of the proposed ways is not universal in itself; it works in relation to some linguistic facts and does not work in relation to others.

In our opinion, it is the systematic organization of language that will allow us to approach the solution of this most complex problem.

Completely different words are formed based on different meanings of one word. Their former semantic connections are lost, and only etymological analysis allows us to establish a once common semantic feature that testifies to their common historical root. For example, as a result of the disintegration of a polysemantic word, homonyms appeared: jamaw1 — 'repair' and jamaw2 — 'patch'; qamaw1 — 'siege' and

qamaw2 — 'arrest'; kún1 — 'sun' and kún2 — 'day', etc. However, the divergence of meanings of a polysemantic word occurs very slowly, and therefore the appearance of homonyms is not always recognized as a completed process. There may be transitional cases that can be interpreted in different ways.

Modern science has developed criteria for distinguishing homonymy and polysemy, which help to separate the meanings of the same word and homonyms that arose as a result of a complete break in polysemy.

When conducting semantic analysis, the initial method of research was the method of lexical explanatory transformations, which is a kind of component analysis based on dictionary definitions.

In the course of coordination analysis — an auxiliary device of the study — the role of syntactic relations of uniformity in establishing homonymy is revealed at the syntagmatic level. The impossibility of rearranging homogeneous terms adjacent to the words under study confirms the lack of semantic proximity between them. The contexts of the use of homonyms obtained during coordination substitution turn out to be semantically distant and incompatible. The reliability of the results of coordination analysis is determined by their evaluation by native speakers in the course of a psycholinguistic experiment.

Based on the fact that only the totality of all the methods used can provide a solution to the problem of interest to us, as well as based on the above principles of determining word boundaries, we accept in this paper the following definition of homonyms: homonyms are words of the same sound, not connected at this historical stage by any semantic relations, which is expressed in the absence of a common semantic component and in the impossibility of explaining one word through another, as well as in the semantic incompatibility of their contexts of use.

The most productive method for distinguishing between homonymy and polysemy is component analysis — a method for studying the content plan of significant language units, the purpose of which is to decompose meaning into minimal semantic components. This method is based on the hypothesis that the meaning of any language unit consists of semantic components and that the vocabulary of a language can be described using a limited number of semantic features. Also, an effective method is coordination analysis, which allows us to identify the degree of connectedness and divergence of meanings, established by means of native speakers' assessments of the naturalness of the sentences presented to them, obtained when replacing homogeneous terms during

the coordination test. This criterion can be one of the objective means of distinguishing homonyms from the semantic structure of a polysemantic word.

## CONCLUSION

Distinguishing homonyms can be significant for translation, as illustrated in this article. Currently, the problem of homonyms is very important in various areas of linguistic research. The range of issues related to homonyms is very wide. In this paper, we were interested in the ways of distinguishing homonyms — semantic, morphological, word-forming, syntactic — based on differences in the forms of compatibility and structural differences between homonyms and polysemies.

It is clear that the difficulties in defining the boundaries between polysemies and homonyms are due to the very structure of language. In reality, we are not dealing with clearly delineated phenomena but with gradual transitions — i.e., with a graduated scale at one end of which there are classical homonyms such as *alma1* and *alma2*, and at the other — closely related meanings, the general part of whose semantics has a greater specific weight than the relevant semantic differences.

A serious and principled statement of the question of the distinction between polysemies and homonyms is a merit of Karakalpak linguistics. The achievements of theoretical linguistics in this field should influence dictionary work in the sense that an increasing number of lexicographers would try to distinguish between polysemies and homonyms and lexicographically separate these two categories, thus streamlining the presentation of word interpretations. However, this problem is far from being fully resolved, and the methodology for distinguishing and describing homonyms still cannot be considered sufficiently developed.

In linguistic literature, there are many ways to distinguish between homonyms and polysemies, but the contradictions that exist in lexicographic practice indicate that the proposed methods are not universal.

In this article, we used a systemic criterion, which means taking into account all the connections of a word in the language system. To do this, it is necessary to study the word at the lexical, grammatical, word-forming, and syntactic levels of the language. When deciding whether we have a polysemous word or a homonym, we took into account the entire set of features.

The problem of homonyms should be recognized as one of the most urgent and at the same time confusing issues, still very far from being solved in our theory of lexicography and general semasiology.

Summing up the results of the work done, we can conclude that in the linguistic literature there is no unity of views on the phenomenon called homonyms, nor on its delimitation from what is called polysemy.

## REFERENCES

1. Abaev, V. I. (1957). On the submission of homonyms in the dictionary. Questions of linguistics. No. 3.
2. Bondarko A.V. (2008) On the structure of grammatical categories (Relations of opposition and non-positive difference). Moscow.
3. Bulakhovsky L. A. (1953). Introduction to linguistics, part 2, 1953, p. 43  
Russian Russian language in the school
4. Dospanov. U. (1980). Dialect vocabulary of the Karakalpak language. "Karakalpakstan", Nukus.
5. Galkina-Fedoruk E. M. (1954). On the question of homonymy in the Russian language // Russian language in school. No. 3.
6. Kaljanov Ali. (2024). Homonyms as a phenomenon are one of the sources of the word play. *Türkologiya* № 2 2024,
7. Kaljanov Ali. (2023). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC) 5 (1), 26-31
8. Kaljanov Ali (2022). Homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language: general theoretical questions. *Science and Education* 3 (1), 368-385
9. Kaljanov, Ali. "The Influence of Homonyms on the Process of Transterminologization in Modern Karakalpak Language." *JournalNX*, vol. 8, no. 11, 11 Nov. 2022, pp. 61-69, doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/7KN9R.
10. Kaljanov Ali. (2022). Features of the Study of the Degree of Homonyms in Karakalpak Language. *Neo Scientific Peer Reviewed Journal*, 4, 23–34. Retrieved from <https://www.neojournals.com/index.php/nspi/article/view/28>
11. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Universal (Mixed) Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. *Science and Education*, 1 (5), 142-145.
12. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. *Journal on International Social Science*, 1 (1), 1-6.
13. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Problems of training homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. *International journal of discourse on innovation, integration and education*, 1(2), 10-13.
14. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Some Questions of

- Grammatical Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. International Journal on Orange Technologies, 2 (9), 19-21.
15. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The essence of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. Journal of Foreign Languages and Linguistics. 2 (3), 24-26.
  16. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The short study of multiple homonyms in Karakalpak language. International scientific and current research conferences, 51-53.
  17. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Problematic aspects of grammatical homonyms. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11 (6), 815-821.
  18. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Theoretical basis of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. International Scientific and Current Research Conferences, 36-40.
  19. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Межъязыковые омонимы в русском и каракалпакском языках. Современная филология: проблемы и перспективы, 225-229.
  20. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Qaraqalpaq tilindegi omonimler klassifikatsiyasınıń ayırım máseleleri. Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан, 265 (4), 196-199.
  21. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). On the state of the problem of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Вестник КГУ им. Бердаха, 52 (3), 182-185.
  22. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Single homonyms in Karakalpak language. "Қийёсий адабиётшунослик, чоғиштира тилшунослик ва таржимашунослик: муаммо, ечим ва истиқболлар" мавзuidaги халқаро конференция, 74-76.
  23. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Omonimlerde ajratıwda konteksttiń áhmiyeti. Uluslararası Türk bilim Öğrenci Kurultayı Bildiriler Kitabı, 194-200.
  24. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). From the point of view of the phenomenon of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. Yangi O'zbekistonda ilm-fan va ta'lim, 1 (1), 182-184.
  25. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Lexico-grammatical homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education, 2 (11), 992-1001.
  26. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The homonymous resources of the word play in the modern Karakalpak language (based on materials of Karakalpak folklore). International journal of word art, 4 (3), 212-218.
  27. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The short analysis of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. "Noi tendințe în predarea limbajelor de specialitate în contextul racordării învățământului la cerințele pieței muncii", conferință internațională online. 4, 251-255.
  28. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). A short step towards the classification of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Electronic journal of actual problems of modern science, education and training, 12, 41-45.
  29. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Linguistic features of the sources of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education in Karakalpakstan, 17 (2), 123-126.
  30. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Роль межъязыковых омонимов в преподавании языка (на примере русского и каракалпакского языков). Advanced methods of teaching foreign languages and their implementation issues in the system of training security personnel, 276-278.
  31. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Некоторые межъязыковые омонимы в русском и каракалпакском языке. «SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS» Scientific Journal, 1 (1), 46-51.
  32. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The some interlingual homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. UzAcademia Scientific-methodical journal, 1 (2), 206-210.
  33. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Вопрос омонимии в преподавании языка. Современная психология и педагогика: проблемы, анализ и результаты, 4, 511-515.
  34. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Qoraqalpoq tilidagi omonimlarga bir nazar. Ta'limga kompetensiyaviy yondashuv: muammo va yechimlar" mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy onlayn konferensiya materiallari, 30-32.
  35. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). A few words about homonyms. Republican scientific-practical online conference "Application of modern methods in the development of science. 228-230.
  36. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The question of translation homonyms. Filologiya masalalari" mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy onlayn konferensiya materiallari, 91-93.
  37. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The features of grammatical homonyms in Karakalpak language. Digital technologies in modern education, current trends and development factors in philology and pedagogy, 191-193
  38. Malakhovsky Ya. (1990). V. Teoriya lexicheskoy i grammaticheskoy omonimii [Theory of lexical and grammatical homonymy] / L. V. Malakhovsky; Ed. by R. G. Piotrovsky; AN USSR, Institute of Linguistics. Leningr. otd-nie



- 39.** Paul G. (1960). Principles of the history of language.  
– M.
- 40.** Smirnitsky A. (1998). I. Lexicology of the modern English language / A. I. Smirnitsky. - M.: MSU Publishing House.
- 41.** Shmelev D. N. (1973). Problems of semantic analysis of vocabulary. – M.
- 42.** Seidullayeva.D. (2018). Explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms. Nukus, Bilim.