

Linguocognitive Analysis Of Homonyms (Using Uzbek And Turkish Languages As Examples)

 Abdurahmanova M.T.

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Uzbek Linguistics, Faculty of Journalism and Uzbek Philology, National University of Uzbekistan, Uzbekistan

Received: 30 November 2025; **Accepted:** 21 December 2025; **Published:** 26 January 2026

Abstract: World linguistics conducts research aimed at studying linguistic units within the comparative-historical and systemic-structural paradigm. Additionally, special attention is given to the study of the anthropocentric paradigm - specifically, investigating the semantics of linguistic units based on cognitive, psycholinguistic, and pragmatic approaches. Of practical significance are the analysis of speech mechanisms, worldview, processes of reflecting existential information in linguistic consciousness, assimilation of word meanings and retention of concepts in linguistic memory, perception of object and event characteristics, semantic development of lexemes, and lexical clarification of the form-content relationship in understanding meaning through a linguocognitive approach.

This article analyzes the linguocognitive characteristics of homonyms and their usage statistics in the Uzbek and Turkish languages.

Keywords: Lexical homonymy, homoneme, semanteme, interlingual homonymy, polysemy, mental homonymy, cognitive interpretation.

Introduction: Cognitive linguistics is a field that connects language with thinking (consciousness, understanding) and studies the holistic relationship between psychological, biological, and neurophysiological aspects of language formation and social, cultural, and linguistic phenomena. The cognitive approach is based on understanding and studying language as a means of forming and expressing thoughts, storing and organizing knowledge in human consciousness, and exchanging knowledge.

The phenomenon of homonymy and the interpretation of homonyms have been one of the main issues in Turkology. Homonyms in "Divanu lugat-it-turk" were analyzed. A number of studies on homonyms have been conducted in Turkish linguistics. Turkish scholars have analyzed the issues of interlingual homonymy by comparing homonyms (eşsesliler) of two related or unrelated languages. In Turkish linguistics, linguistic units with terms such as interlingual homonymy or

"false equivalents," "false words" were studied. ("false friends of the translator," "pseudo-friends of the translator," "false equivalents"). The issue of borrowing homonyms (interlingual homonyms) was also examined. Turkish homonyms (interlingual homonyms) were studied from a linguocultural perspective in a comparative aspect. In Turkish, homonymy is represented by the terms Eş adlılık; Eşdaşlık, Eş seslilik/sesteş, Eş yazımlılık, Eş gösterenlik, Eş biçimlilik. Of these, Eş yazımlılık reflects the essence of homonyms relatively fully. Hadra Kubra and Erkinay Tamtamish clarified the essence of concepts related to the term homonymy and described the relationship between the terms Eş adlı, Eş sesli, Eş yazımlı. In the Turkish language, the issue of interlingual homonymy has been primarily studied.

The scientific study of homonymy began in the second half of the 15th century. Alisher Navoi deserves recognition as the creator of the theory of homonymy.

In the work "Muhokamat ul-lugatayin," it is stated that homonyms are the basis of thought genres, and that the tuyuq, based on the meaning of homonyms, is a special genre of Turkic poetry.

In linguistics, homonymy is evaluated differently and classified according to several criteria. Specifically, A.A. Shaikovich used the term "homonyms" to refer to words and word forms, and in the semantic structure of homonyms, he considered not only lexical but also grammatical meaning. V.V. Vinogradov identified the phenomenon of homonymy as one of the most relevant and simultaneously intricate problems.

Research has shown that homonyms are acquired more quickly than new words. It has been observed that certain phonological forms facilitate word learning, and that homonyms are initially difficult to acquire when studying words, but are later easily assimilated due to their uniform form. Foreign studies distinguish dominant features in homonyms. It is emphasized that a particular homonym becomes dominant in a specific context. The study of homonyms from a linguocognitive perspective serves to elucidate the conceptual characteristics of linguistic units.

"Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk" is recognized as an important source containing homonyms of Turkic languages. Ramiz Asker noted that the number of words in this source is reported differently in various studies, and he attributed this discrepancy to the varying number of homonyms and polysemantic words in the divan.

I.T. Sheyker noted that homonymy and polysemy are considered as a system, and the terms "homoneme" and "semanteme" are used to separately denote a lexical unit in this system: "Homonymy reflects the lexical microsystem of the language. The unit of this microsystem is the homoneme, which is taken as the lexical unit of the homonymous system. A homoneme is a unit of the lexical homonymous microsystem of a language, representing a combination of two or more different semes united only by the formal similarity of lexemes. The unit of the polysemantic microsystem was called a semanteme. It is noted that over time, a semanteme can transform into a homoneme.

In research conducted in Uzbek linguistics, psycholinguistic and cognitive approaches to homonyms are observed. Sh. Shaabdurahmanov evaluated homonymy as a positive phenomenon. H.

Jamalkhanov noted that homonyms help a person think more deeply. Sh. Rakhmatullayev, expressing his opinion on the types of homonymy and the process of their formation, drew attention to the fact that homonymy is a phenomenon related to the level of perception in the human brain. He was among the first to note that homonymy is resolved through word combinations and context. He pointed out that homonymy in literary texts can be used for positive purposes. In Uzbek linguistic research, homophones and homographs are also distinguished. Essentially, these concepts represent the process of forming homonymous relationships, and it is inappropriate to consider them as phenomena adjacent to homonyms. The concept of homographs does not align with the nature of Turkic languages.

Our research has identified 1,029 homonymous sets in the Uzbek language and 911 in the Turkish language. These homonymous sets contain from two to six homonymous words (homonyms). The number of homonyms in an Uzbek homonymous set ranged from two to eight, while in Turkish, it ranged from two to six. It has been established that homonymous sets with two homonyms are the most numerous in both languages - 862 in Uzbek and 746 in Turkish. The number of homonymous sets with three homonyms is 119 in Uzbek and 127 in Turkish. A higher frequency of homonymous sets with two homonyms is observed in Uzbek, while sets with three homonyms are more common in Turkish.

M. Mirtadjiev explained the emergence of homonyms as a result of the development of polysemous words. The formation of homonyms through semantic means is considered a product of cognitive knowledge and processes. Studies have noted the connection between the figurative meaning of words and the process of abstraction in thinking and perception. The method of semantic development in the formation of homonyms is based on linguocognitive factors. Changes are also observed in the cognitive frameworks of the language speaker's brain.

In the Turkish language, there are several factors contributing to the formation of homonyms: 1. The similarity between commonly used words and toponyms creates homonymous relationships. 2. Homonyms are formed as a result of the Turkification of some foreign words. 3. Formation occurs when

foreign words adapt to the phonetic rules of the Turkish language. 4. Semantic origin. One of the most active manifestations of homonym formation through the semantic method is the transformation of a polysemous word into a homonym.

Lexical homonyms form series based on similarity in form but difference in meaning. These series vary in the number and content of homonyms. Such differences are revealed through cognitive-semantic analysis. Z.D. Popova and I.A. Sternin noted that cognitive-semantic analysis is based on lexicographic and psycholinguistic analysis of the meanings of linguistic units. Psycholinguistic analysis is carried out through experiments.

The belonging of Uzbek and Turkish languages to the same language family is also observed in lexical homonyms. A number of lexical homonyms are used identically in both languages in terms of their formation and meaning: homonymy noun+verb: aç I meaning "one who needs to eat"; "hungry" - aç II is the imperative form of the verb açmak; "open." The same homonymous series in both languages reveal stylistic and semantic differences in some instances: düş I meaning "dream" (sleep) - düş II is the imperative mood of the verb düşmek (to fall). When comparing the

homonym düş II "to fall" in this homonymous series with the verbal lexeme düş II (to disembark from an airplane) in the Uzbek language, it is observed that the frame structure differs for speakers of Uzbek and Turkish.

Homonyms possess the following cognitive properties: 1. Homogeneity of form. 2. Uniformity in pronunciation. 3. Variety of meanings. 4. Formation of two to six related series. 5. Specificity to a particular period of language development. 6. Use in the same form of communication. The difficulty in interpreting homonyms lies in the presence of at least two referential structures.

During the research, experiments were conducted on understanding and memorizing homonyms with the participation of students. The study involved 189 respondents from Uzbekistan and 178 respondents from Turkey in the experiments.

Task: Provide 10 examples of lexical homonyms in the Uzbek language and explain their meanings. The purpose of the experiment: to determine students' level of knowledge about homonyms, their meanings, and the prevalence of homonymous series.

The following results were obtained from 23 students in group A:

Group A	Group B
ot - 15 (65.2%)	tut - 13 (56.4%)
soch - 11 (47.8%)	olma - 12 (52.1%)
olma - 8 (34.8%)	qo'y - 9 (39.1%)
oq 7 - (30.4%)	oq - 8 (34.8%)
kul 7 - (30.4%)	yoz - 7 (30.4%)
ko'k - 6 (26%)	o't - 4 (17.4%)
tut - 5 (21.7%)	soch - 3 (8.6%)

During the analysis of the experimental results, it was noted that students cited homonyms found in textbooks and manuals.

Due to the focus on form similarity, polysemous words were presented as homonyms. The homonymous series provided by the respondents included words characteristic of colloquial speech, dialects, and archaic units. Grammatical forms that are equivalent in form to a word were also considered as homonyms. In the

phenomenon of homonymy, there are also cases that are not limited in terms of historical context and scope of use, and these play an important role in the perception of homonyms.

Mental homonyms are more numerous than lexical ones. In mental homonymous series, dominant homonyms are identified based on cognitive interpretation. Cognitive interpretation is meaning-oriented interpretation. The content and structure of

meaning are based on the description of symbols. The field of cognitive interpretation consists of the core, the immediate periphery, the distant periphery, and the external periphery. For example, in the Uzbek language, the homonym "o't" (grass) is used in connection with the current graphic uniformity. The "o't" homonymous series consists of four homonyms: o't I "burning process; fire"; o't II "green plant, which is the main feed for livestock; grass"; o't III "yellowish-green bitter liquid secreted from the liver, bile" (O'TIL, V, 172); o't IV "movement." The word "o't" seen in writing or heard, first of all, revives the meaning of "plant" in the mind of a native speaker of the Uzbek language. Then the meaning of "movement" comes to mind. The fact that the lexeme o't with the meaning of "plant" is perceived and imagined faster than o't with the meaning of "movement" is explained by its existence in a real state. Movement also has reality, but movement itself cannot be directly observed. When the action verb "o't" is pronounced, a person first thinks about the movement of the legs. At the near periphery of the cognitive field is the word o't, which means "part of the body." And from the outer periphery comes the word "o't," meaning "fire." A word with this meaning is often used in speech due to an illness related to o't (gallbladder). The word o't with the meaning of "fire" is rarely used. The word "fire" has a neutral connotation, and the lexeme "fire" is actively used in colloquial speech. The place of homonyms forming the homonymous series (homoneme) in the cognitive field is determined by the frequency of word usage. The word ut with the meaning of "fire" is rarely used. In the word fire, there is a neutrality, the lexeme fire is actively used in colloquial speech.

In the next experiment, students were presented with sentences containing homonyms. The task was to identify the homonyms in the sentences and explain their meanings.

Based on the results of the experiment, the following conclusions can be drawn about the level of knowledge and understanding of homonyms:

1. In the minds of philology students, the examples provided when explaining theoretical issues related to homonymy in textbooks and manuals are more memorable: ot, olma, qo'y, soch, ko'k, oq, ot, yoz, tut.
2. It was found that students memorized and accepted

as homonyms words that are presented in sources as lexical homonyms, but are not actually lexical homonyms.

3. The use of figurative, archaic, and dialect-specific words as homonyms during the experiment, as well as the separation of forms within a word, demonstrates the difference between linguistic homonymy and mental homonymy. In mental homonymy, it has been established that the most frequently used homonym is located in the core of the cognitive interpretation field, while the remaining members are situated in the central and peripheral parts of the cognitive field.

4. The dominance of a homonymous series is explained by the frequent occurrence of lexical homonyms, their mention in sources, and their frequent use in the activities of native speakers.

Experiments were conducted on understanding and memorizing homonyms in the Turkish language. In an experiment conducted with 3rd-year non-philology students of Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies during Turkish language classes, 14 student participants were asked to explain the meaning of the homonym pul. In Turkish explanatory dictionaries, pul is interpreted as a polysemous word, but we classified this unit as a homonym. Two of the 14 respondents (Sh.D., 21 years old and O.B., 22 years old) provided the meaning "stamp," but listed it second. They placed the meaning "coin" in first place. The responses also included variants of pul as "devalued," "type of food," "ship dock," "used for shopping," and "online wallet."

The experiment revealed that non-philology students consider toponyms to be homonyms. Frequent use of homonyms in speech and their inclusion in texts ensured their high frequency of usage. Older respondents attempted to find a complete set of homonyms. It was established that the understanding and memorization of homonyms is related to a person's region, age, and field of activity. The conceptual sphere of homonyms in the Turkish language encompasses objects, toponyms, and proper nouns. It should be noted that in Uzbek linguistics, toponyms and proper names are not considered linguistic homonyms.

From a neurolinguistic perspective, the study of homonyms focuses on how the brain processes and distinguishes words that have the same sounds or

sound identical but have different meanings. Neurolinguistic research encompasses various methods and approaches that help understand the cognitive and neurophysiological mechanisms involved in processing homonyms. For example, functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) examines brain activity during homonym processing; participants are presented with homonyms within a text or in isolation, while fMRI records changes in the activity of different brain regions. As a result, different meanings of homonyms activate different neural networks depending on the context. The text plays a key role in differentiating the meanings of homonyms. The brain uses context to quickly and effectively determine the correct meaning of a word. This analysis serves as evidence that the phenomenon of homonymy is directly related to brain activity.

As a result of semantic development in the Uzbek and Turkish languages, the formation of lexical homonyms has a linguocognitive factor and manifests itself in several ways. The semantic method manifests itself in the form of semantic relations of polysemous words and category syncretism. The emergence of lexical homonyms through semantic means depends on the refinement of frames and changes in the structure of frames within the conceptual sphere of native speakers.

In a psycholinguistic experiment on the acquisition and understanding of homonyms in Uzbek and Turkish languages, colloquial, historical, and archaic homonyms were also observed in the homonymous series. This finding substantiates the existence of both standardized lexical homonymous series in the language, which are a linguistic phenomenon, and non-standardized mental homonymous series related to the native speaker's environment, cultural views, age, thinking, perception, talent, and professional activity. The inclusion of mental homonymous series in the dictionary of lexical homonyms demonstrates the need for an anthropocentric approach to linguistic phenomena, including lexical homonymy. Mental homonymous series in the Uzbek language include dialectal words, archaic units, and colloquial-specific units, while those in the Turkish language encompass dialectal words, anthroponyms, and toponyms.

Dominance in the cognitive field is determined by the regular recording of homonyms in scientific sources

and educational literature (visual memory), as well as frequent repetition in speech and communication. In both Uzbek and Turkish languages, the dominance of nouns in the noun-verb homonymous series was observed. Frequently used, active lexical homonyms in Uzbek and Turkish are located in the core of an individual's cognitive field. Low-frequency homonyms are positioned in the center and in the near or far periphery of the field.

The cognitive interpretation of homonymy demonstrates that it is not a random coincidence of sound forms, but rather a reflection of cognitive processes involved in categorizing and comprehending reality. Each element in a homonymous series forms its own concept based on both individual and collective experiences of native speakers. In this sense, homonymy functions as a multidimensional conceptual mirror through which one can trace how language structures and differentiates knowledge about the world.

REFERENCES

1. Mirtojdiyev M. Polysemy in the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Fan, 1975. - 31 p.
2. Musabayeva Z. Homonyms in Mahmud Kashgari's "Divan-u Lughat at-Turk" (11th century): Abstract of dissertation for Candidate of Philological Sciences. - Frunze: 1975. - P.11.
3. Rahmatullayev Sh. Dictionary of Uzbek Homonyms. - Tashkent, 1984. - 214 p.
4. Shaker I.T. Lexical non-derived noun homonyms and their representation in dictionaries. Abstract of dissertation for Candidate of Philological Sciences. - Voronezh, 2013. - 25 p.
5. Shaykevich A.Ya. On the principles of homonym classification // Processes of language development. - Moscow, 1959.- P. 127.
6. Asker R. Divanü Lugat-it-Türk Statistics. Proceedings of the 2nd International Turkology Research Symposium: Mahmud al-Kashgari and his era (28-30 May 2008) [e-book] /Ankara: Turkish Language Association, 2022. - P.64-65.
7. Uçar A. Semantic Relatedness: The Distinction Between Polysemy and Homonymy in Turkish Verbs [Anlambilimsel Bağlantılılık: Türkçe Eylemlerde Çokanlamlılık ve Eşadlılık Ayrımı] 2009,

In S. Ay, Ö. Aydın, İ. Ergenç, S. Gökmen, S. İşsever and D. Peçenek (Eds.), *Essays on Turkish Linguistics: Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, 6-8 August 2008, - P.207 - 216.

8. Hadra Kübra, Erkinay Tamtamiş. A Historical Journey from Polysemy to Homonymy [Çok Anlamlılıktan Eş Adlılığa Doğru Tarihsel Bir Yolculuk] folk/ed. Journal, 2022; 28 (1) - P. 109.