

Features of the Study of the Degree of Homonyms in Karakalpak Language

Ali Kaljanov

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

aliyxankaljanov@mail.ru

Abstract:

In the modern Karakalpak language, the phenomenon of homonymy is widely developed. This phenomenon attracts many linguists to study its problems and try to classify homonyms in the Karakalpak language. But, despite the fact that the study of homonymy has been conducted for a long time, there is still no generally accepted definition of homonyms, no established terminology in this area. The most general definition of homonymy suitable for any language level considers homonyms language signs that have identical signifiers but different signifiers. In the linguistic literature, there is no unity of views on the phenomenon called homonymy. At the same time, we are talking not only about the different use of the term homonym, which in itself would not be such a big trouble, but rather about the different definition of the word, about the different approach to what are the possible differences between individual specific cases of the use of the same word, i.e. what differences between such cases are compatible and which, on the contrary, are incompatible with the identity of the word. In this paper, we plan to make an outline of the problem at hand. Also, in this article, an attempt will be made to bring the points of view of different researchers and to draw a conclusion about the significance of homonyms in the Karakalpak language.

Keywords:

homonyms; Karakalpak language; homonymy and polysemy; kók; context

INTRODUCTION

In modern linguistics, the problem of homonymy is given very great importance by researchers who adhere to a wide variety of points of view. The range of issues related to homonymy is very wide: methods of distinguishing and distinguishing homonyms, the question of classification and the sources of origin of homonyms, the reaction of language to homonymy, structural differences between polysemy and homonymy, the question of semantic word formation, and much more.

Homonym, a concept that plays an important role in logic, logical semantics and semiotics and is the only generalization of the corresponding linguistic concept. Homonym is a graphic or phonetic coincidence of words, and in general, signs, sign combinations and phrases that have different meanings and meanings.

In the linguistic dictionary of Darigul Seidullaeva, it is written that a homonym is a word that is identical with another in form but different from it in meaning (Seidullaeva, 2018, p. 76).

The first works devoted to this phenomenon appeared in the 20th century, which belong to such scientists as N. A. Baskakov, B. Yesemuratov and A. Bekbergenov.

Members of homonymic pairs belonging to different parts of speech cannot enter a struggle with each other, if only because, according to the laws of syntactic relations, there can be no confusion between them. It is appropriate to recall that N. Baskakov excluded the

=====

possibility of a collision of such homonyms. The same opinion is shared by the largest Soviet researcher L. A. Bulakhovsky.

The study of Esemurat Berdimuratov is undoubtedly the most serious and conscientious work devoted to the issue under consideration. However, in his conclusions, he managed to cite a number of convincing examples from the history of the Karakalpak language. However, in her conclusions, she notes that not one factor is responsible for the disappearance of words, but a number of factors: social reasons, loss of affixes, difficult pronunciation, the influence of euphemism, etc., and of all these factors, homonymy, in her opinion, is the least important since it occurs least often (Berdimuratov, 1994).

Esemurat Berdimuratov in his book "Modern Karakalpak language. Lexicology" is given ten pages about homonyms. The following classification of homonyms in the Karakalpak language is noteworthy: I. Homonyms: a) lexical homonyms; b) lexical-grammatical homonyms; c) grammatical homonyms. II. Homophones. III. Homographs. The book deals with lexical and lexical-grammatical homonyms. (Berdimuratov, 1994, pp. 33-43) Lexical homonyms in the Karakalpak language are always complete, i.e., their components coincide with each other in all their grammatical forms. Lexico-grammatical homonyms, on the contrary, are always incomplete, i.e., the components of such homonyms belong to different grammatical classes and coincide only in some of the grammatical forms (for example, et-meat, et-do).

The problem of homonymy in connection with the compilation of homonymic dictionaries and the development of theoretical problems in lexicology has long attracted the attention of linguists. Until, the question of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language was not the subject of special research. Therefore, the dictionary of homonyms of Kidirbay Bekbergenov to a certain extent filled this annoying gap. In the introduction to the dictionary, the author gives a linguistic definition of homonyms as words or their parts that coincide in sound and spelling but differ in meaning. The dictionary has about 200 pairs of words that are very similar in their semantic structure (Bekbergenov, 2015).

For the first time, homonyms of the Karakalpak language are widely presented in the textbook "Homonyms of the Karakalpak language". The author identifies the following types of homonyms, providing them with digital pointers: lexical, lexical-grammatical, mixed homonyms and homonyms formed as a result of breaking the semantic connections of polysemantic words (Khojanov, Karamatdinova, 2018).

The relevance of the study is to determine the different approaches to the classification of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Therefore, we will try as much as possible to find a more perfect classification of homonyms in the Karakalpak language.

In every language there are points of syntactic uncertainty-sentences whose structure suggests the possibility of double understanding. This ambiguity may be resolved by the lexical content of the construction, the context environment, or the background knowledge of the communicants, but may remain unsolvable. From the point of view of the production and perception of the text, syntactic ambiguity may not interfere with understanding, hinder it, and serve for the conscious "guidance" of the author of the text of false meanings. This

=====
situation sometimes occurs between homonyms and polysemous ones. Thus, in the Karakalpak language, this question is waiting for its research.

A variety of linguistic and extralinguistic factors conspire to alleviate potential homonymy or polysemy, including inflection, word order and orthography and pronunciation. While homonymy can be defined of the language, it may arise not only from the phonological convergence of two distinct lexical items but from polysemy, i.e., the complete semantic divergence of different senses of a given item. In some cases, as already noted, the sense is distinguished orthographically, reinforcing the impression that homonymy rather than polsemy is involved (Laurence, 2002).

Among the relevant and still unresolved issues that have recently focused the study of homonymy is the question of the relationship and interaction of polysemy and homonymy, the question of the criteria for distinguishing homonyms from the semantic structure of polysemantic words.

Basically, there are two views on homonymy and polysemy. According to the first, homonyms are recognized only as such equally sounding words that were originally different in form and only in the process of historical development coincided with each other in a single sound due to various phonetic, and generally accidental, reasons. All other cases, when the same material, the sound shell, reflects different content, are recognized as the phenomenon of polysemy, polysemy of the word.

According to the second view, homonyms include both words that are historically different, but for historical reasons coincided, in form, and those cases when the different meanings of a polysemantic word diverge so much that the material shell that connected them, as it were, breaks, giving life to two new words. With this approach, both kún-ay and ay-ay will fall into the category of homonyms in the Karakalpak language.

The fact is that words that combine into homonymous pairs have completely different syntactic and lexical valence. The word "ań" (hunting) will undoubtedly enter other lexical combinations and will participate in other syntactic constructions than "ań" (consciousness).

METHOD

Homonyms are words that have the same sound, external identity, but do not have any semantic connection. Homonyms and multi-valued words have a mutual affinity. From this it is sometimes difficult to distinguish them from each other. But the difficulty of distinguishing homonyms from multi-valued words is not the same for all homonyms. One of the distinctive forms of homonyms is the relationship of homophones and homographs with spelling and orthoepy in phrases. Homophones are words that are pronounced evenly and written differently. Homographs are words that are written evenly and pronounced differently depending on the accent. Homographs are distinguished by accent in pronunciation. The emphasis falls on the last syllable of the nouns of these words and on the main syllable of the verb. Homonyms are one of the branches of vocabulary. A person who has just started learning a foreign language, especially when he or she hears homonyms, is very bored. So that there are no negative situations and misunderstandings, it is better to get used to memorizing new words and phrases. It is best to memorize words

in pairs. Full homonyms are words that are identical in terms of spelling and spelling. It is not surprising that they are from different classes of words.

In this paper, we use both general research methods (the method of problem formulation, the method of explanation, etc.) and specific methods (comparative analysis, etc.). The results of this study can be used in the theory of lexicology and in the practice of teaching foreign languages and translation.

In this study, as a semantic criterion for determining homonyms, the method of lexical explanatory transformations was used, the use of which allowed us to determine the conditions for the preservation and disintegration of the semantic identity of the word and to solve the question of the homonymy of the compared units of the language, considered in some dictionaries as polysemantic words, in others as homonyms. The use of this method also allowed us to show the nature of the relationship between the lexical-semantic variant of a polysemantic word and the specifics of the allocation of homonyms.

We have considered, if we admit that homonyms—the fruit of random coincidence and homonyms—the fruit of historical development—are completely different things, not even comparable to each other. They differ in the modern language.

Thus, we come to the conclusion that the selection of homonyms of the Karakalpak language, with which we began our consideration, despite the apparent clarity and simplicity, hides the contradictions of the language.

When analyzing the means and ways of expressing homonymy, we used structural-semantic and descriptive methods. The main method of research is the method of component analysis of dictionary meanings and analysis of non-trivial features. Along with it, the method of linguistic observation and description, linguistic experiment and survey of informants, as well as introspection are used as auxiliary methods.

Now proceed to consider another point of view on homonyms, according to which such words are considered not only initially different and coinciding 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 determining and distinguishing a group of homonyms from a large family of polysemous words, in other words, in the distribution of words in the categories of polysemy "and" homonymy, is the uncertainty of the criterion itself, the far-diverged meanings, the break in semantic ties. The concept of breaking semantic ties is primarily subjective and, moreover, absolutely not linguistic. Not for nothing in the terminology of the scientists defending this position. For example, however, there is no doubt that "kisi" and "kisi" ('persona' and 'man') are perceived as closely related to each other.

In general, the second concept of the problem of homonymy and polysemy can be evaluated as follows: from our point of view, it correctly includes in the number of homonyms pairs of words that have become isolated as a result of a strong divergence of individual meanings of a polysemous word. Such newly formed pairs do not differ in any way at any given stage of language development from those that arose due to the accidental convergence of their phonetic appearance. Both are characterized by the fact that they sound the same but mean

=====

different things that graphically and morphologically they do not consistently differ, but they always behave differently in a sentence and have different lexical compatibility.

It follows from the above that it is necessary to find a way to define and evaluate semantic homonyms that would follow from a direct consideration of the specific facts of the language.

Without sharing in general the theory that language necessarily tends to get rid of homonyms, which are supposedly sick words. We should note that the history of the Karakalpak language knows more or less reliable cases of collision of homonyms.

The relationship between the meanings of words that coincide in meaning sometimes takes on a greater role. This refers to those extremely rare cases when the use of a homonym is burdened with unpleasant associations.

In order to answer this question, it is necessary to turn to the homonymy of the Karakalpak language, to study its composition in terms of application, the use of homonyms in speech. On closer inspection of the list of homonyms, it turns out that in many cases homonyms occupy a different place in the dictionary.

It is hardly possible to spread all the homonyms in different layers of the vocabulary of the language. We only give some examples: of course, they could be given much more:

Kók-sky

Kók – blue, blue

Kók-green

Kók-leather braid

Kók-a spot on the human body

Kók - unripe, raw

Kók- dollar

However, there are many homonymic pairs whose members can be attributed to the central, essential part of the vocabulary used in everyday speech of everyday and business communication.

It often happens that one component of a homonymic pair expresses an action usually directed at a person, while its correspondent conveys an action directed at an object.

Most homonyms words with the same sound composition but different meanings – from among the root words represent different degrees or stages of development of the semantics of this single root, the differences between the meanings of which are so great that they cannot be logically explained based on modern ideas about these words and concepts. This group of homonyms includes, for example, uy "house" and uy "gather in a pile", oy "pit" and oy "hollow out", art "back side" and art "snuggle", toy "feast, wedding" and toy "saturate".

This group of homonyms also includes some grammatical homonyms, that is, grammatical formants that have the same sound composition and different meanings, historically arising from the composition of the same grammatical forms, that is, previously had a common semantics, for example: - lar/ - ler-plural affix: at + lar "horses", is + ler "affairs" and so on the one hand and -lar/ - ler - a combination of the modern affix of the verb formation from

=====

the name: - la/ - le and the affix of the future participle, for example, at + la + r "stepping, jumping", is + le + r "working, doing" and others (Baskakov, 1996, p. 89).

As formants, historically representing homonyms, but differentiated in modern language, for example: - maq-shı/ - mek-shi-affix of the form of intention: kelmekshi "intending to come"; almaqshı "intending to take" and maw-shı/mew-shi (maqshı/mekshi) - affix of the participle of the negative form: kelmewshi "not coming"; almawshı "not taking" and others. However, the coincidence of the sound composition of homonyms may not necessarily be explained by the common root. This coincidence may refer to a later time and occur due to secondary alternation, matching sounds, for example, homonyms such as: qıs "winter" qıs "squeeze", bas "head" and bas "give", and so on.

Finally, a certain number of homonyms arose due to borrowing words from other languages, the sound composition of which coincided with the sound composition of some indigenous words, for example, jan "bok" and jan "soul"; qal "stay" and qal position", qan "blood" and qan (qağan) "khan"; sir "paint" and sir "mystery" and others (Baskakov, 1996, p. 90).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The true nature of homonyms has been misunderstood by many writers. To some, homonyms include cases where words have identical spelling (i.e., homographs) and/or where the words have identical sounds (homophones). This view is, however, wrong because doing so will only amount to subsuming what should ordinarily be treated as real homonyms within polysemy. A better approach would have been to distinguish homonyms from polysemy. This is particularly important given the fact that polysemous words mostly result from a metaphorical extension of meaning. (Ndimele, 2007).

Let us now turn to modern applied linguistics and see how the question of polysemy and homonymy is solved in the works of this direction. It should be noted that in the literature of this nature there is no trace of that passionate and stormy polemic on the topic: what should be considered homonyms, and what is a polysemantic word, of the interest in the theoretical side of the question of the identity of the word, which we meet in the works of a more traditional direction.

The concept of homonymy will obviously be greatly expanded in connection with this approach. Such expanded understanding of it is a continuation of the movement that began at the time when the semantic concept of homonyms opposed the etymological one. This movement was quite natural: under the previous understanding of homonymy, a huge number of words with sharp ambiguity had to be interpreted as a single whole. It was impossible to really interpret the word from the modern point of view, and the interpretation turned into a simple enumeration of incompatible meanings.

However, we will not be talking about a simple extension of the concept of homonymy, but about a deeper change. First of all, it is clear that the principle of common etymological origin will not play any role in this approach: it will not be about the sameness or difference in the origin of a word, but about the sameness or difference in its relationship to a sentence and a phrase at a certain, and, moreover, synchronous, stage. On the other hand, the

=====

=====

criterion of semantic proximity or remoteness so difficult to measure by any objective scale will not play the same role for us. Therefore, the difference in values, which seemed to researchers insufficient to recognize the perfect break of one token into two, may be sufficient for us with a different distribution criterion.

Of course, homonyms are words that belong to different parts of speech, although they originally developed from the same lexeme and are often closely related to each other in lexical meaning. For example: jamaw 'mending' and jamaw 'patching', the adjective jezdey 'like bronze' and the noun jezdey 'husband or sister'.

We consider equally sounding words that belong to the same part of speech, have different morphological characteristics, different paradigmatic schemes, as unconditional homonyms. For example: *sin* human appearance, *sin* criticism.

Sometimes the solution to the question is relatively simple, as, for example, in the case of transitive and intransitive variants of the verb.

There is another distinctive feature of homonymy: word-forming connections of words. So, the word *biz* is undoubtedly derived from *bigiz*. The presence of different word-forming nests is a sign that there are two different words in front of us.

It seems most appropriate to assume that the method of splitting values is quite active although its productivity is not the same for different structural types of homonyms. This is evidenced by the examples given above.

Homonym can be the result of the coincidence of the sound, spelling, and full or partial coincidence of the form of the original word and the borrowed one. For example, bor, ataman, ton, bas, kiy. But there are relatively few such examples in the language.

The distinction between different homonyms and one word with many meanings, as already noted, causes a lot of difficulties and cannot always be carried out unambiguously.

The difficulty of distinguishing these phenomena and the complexity of their clear, consistent definition is also indicated by modern lexicographic practice. Thus, many words that are given as polysemantic in one dictionary are treated as different words that are homonymous with each other in another.

We tried to determine the necessary condition for the loss of the semantic unity of the word by the position of a common semantic component in the structure of each meaning and found that the semantic independence of homonyms is ensured by the absence of a common element of meaning and the inability to identify it, for example: saylandı I "elected" and saylandı II "team", etc.

In the Karakalpak language, the number of words of homonyms ranged from 2 to 7. Homonyms don't have to share the same spelling. The homonymous words are marked with a Roman numeral and their meaning is explained.

Despite the complexity of the task of distinguishing polysemy and homonymy, its solution seems quite feasible on the basis of a semantic criterion, namely, the method of lexical explanatory transformations. The results obtained give us reason to believe that this method is a fairly reliable and reliable way to establish the boundary between polysemy and homonymy and is suitable for working with any material, regardless of whether the words being tested for semantic identity are etymologically related or not. The method of

=====

distinguishing homonyms developed by us and the list of semantic homonyms compiled on its basis can contribute to solving the complex problem of distinguishing polysemy and homonymy, primarily in lexicography.

We extend the classification of homonyms of Sh. Xojanov and N.Karamatdinova. The results of our research we classify homonyms as follows: lexical, lexical – grammatical, grammatical and universal (mixed) homonyms. Now let's look at examples of each.

Lexical homonyms: abzal, azıw, ay, ayqulaq, akt, aq, aqırzaman, qarıw, taqatı, ólmesek, qarağanda, saz, qayın, nashar, ashıqlıq, jaña, altınshı, birew, birden, atıw, sınaw, kelisiw, astırıw, taraw, ólimtik, túp, arqa, qáde, múyız, dım, jas, bel, qayshı, qas, qan, ot, qabaq, ana, tasıw, erkelew, quyın, sum, jasaw, asıw, asaw, qıdırıw,

Lexical – grammatical homonyms: aǵarǵan, kórmedik, biyiklew, qaralaw, oylas, kewilles, túyin, ilme, postın, ter, kúnde, payda, atlas, sırlas, teńles, kómekles, orınlı, qısqı, basında, basqa, jasırın, onday, sonda, gúllen, gúlli, shıǵar, birge, birden, úy, toy, sal, taslaw, duzlaw, maylaw, aqlaw, kóklew, jamanlaw, jaqınlaw, maydalaw, tazalaw, qoyma, qoyıwlaw, arıqlaw, salqınlaw, baspa, qıspa, kóshirme, dóretpe, aralaspa, qıdırıspa, atıspa, tıǵılıspa, qısılıspa, otırıspa, kórgızbe, terletpe, tapsırma, kórsetpe, tolıqtırma, kesispe, dizbe, búkleme, tartpa, sızba, toqıma, eritpe, túyme, iyme, tókpe, qatlama, quyma, jazba, iyilme, jasalma, jasama, ushpa, jarılma, qaldıq, asırandı, taslandı, shıǵındı, qırındı, jıyındı, juwındı, toqıldı, saylandı, bóget, shıǵın, aǵın, sawın, tanıs, qorǵan, ele, shekem, sayın, ushın, aralas, qanshelli, kúl, kózler, kespe, qarın, qıyın, ót, almas, oylaw, er, til, júzim, alma, qorǵasın, qısqqa, ǵarǵa, jaw, qıs, qus, qaray, qarağanda, arqalı, qayırılı, jaysha, qıssa, meyliń, qısım, qoyshı, jat, aqsham, alıs, shıq, qaras, yarım, basım, sheksiz, qalıń, shayı, maydan, zulım, aǵım, qalın, qaramay, jır, sawsaq, terim, shaǵım, qırǵısh, tap,

Grammatical homonyms: jazdır, tisler, qıslar, jaqsılar, duzlar, isler, qısta, birewden, qırıldı, qızba, almańız, jazbańız, kespeńiz, almasın, jazbasın, onnan, tınıqsız, sıyın, toplar, talaptı, taradı, jasawshı, barlıǵın, ótkende, biziń, úydi, bezedi, pitedi, tayın, ishti,

Universal (mixed) homonyms: aylanba, ayırma, aqlaw, qurama, jaqtı, eger, oy, sır, at, ash, otın, sırǵa, qası,

Based on the examples given and the resulting classification, it is possible to determine the frequency of the use of homonyms in the Karakalpak language by the example of the lexical context.

About 5.8% of homonyms in the Karakalpak language were formed by the conversion method. The origin of 6.8% of homonyms is based on semantic changes, since this group of homonyms arose as a result of the collapse of polysemy in different periods of language development.

As a result of borrowing, 30.7% of homonyms appeared in the Karakalpak language. This is probably due to the heterogeneous etymological composition of the Karakalpak homonymy, which is represented by words of Arabic origin (40.3%), Persian (30.2%) origin and others.

We believe that at the syntactic level of the language there is only a homonymy of models, that is, there are homomodels of phrases and sentences, and not their lexical content. With adequate lexical content and a single structural scheme of syntactic units, polysemy is

=====

manifested, which is completely conditioned by the context, that is, the concept of syntactic homonymy is completely excluded. In this case, we can only talk about syntactic polysemy. We find that most of the homonyms in Karakalpak language result from conversion and borrowing. Most importantly, it is a purely semantic measure, and so even if it fails to capture the appropriate frequency effects, a positive result must still reflect semantic resolution. Checking for homonyms basically means verifying if the same tag has been used in different contexts.

An important issue that needs to be discussed is the generalizability of the results from written to spoken language. Although we cannot offer definitive arguments on this point, we can cite some reasons why the results might underestimate the difference between some and different class homonyms in speech. First, the disambiguating information provided by orthography would be absent. Second, homonyms from different grammatical classes would tend to have acoustic differences that could aid in disambiguation. In particular, because of the basic clause structure of Karakalpak language, nouns are more likely than verbs to appear at the ends of phrases and clauses and so should tend to be longer because of durational lengthening concomitant with those boundaries.

The main sources of homonymy in the Karakalpak language were identified:

- 1) borrowings;
- 2) phonetic processes;
- 3) conversion rate;
- 4) word-forming processes;
- 5) split polysemy.

We are systematically overestimating the hazards to comprehension posted by homonymy more generally. This stems in turn from a tendency to ignore such factors as:

The difference between a spoken language and its written representation

The role of semantic shift, broadening, narrowing

The role of coincidence and chance resemblance

The communicative advantages of polysemy

The presence of sarcasm or language games

The range of meaning differentiation and neutralization

The role of context in resolving sense.

All of the above allows us to conclude that homonymy is an inevitable, useful and natural result of the spontaneous development of the language. Therefore, homonymy cannot be considered a hindrance or a defect of language, but is an integral part of a living language.

CONCLUSIONS

The homonyms are in Karakalpak language of impressing with their variety, Karakalpak language is a very rich language. You should also have a good vocabulary in the course of interviews and exchange of views with a foreign citizen in order to avoid negative situations. There are so many homonyms in the Karakalpak language that a person learning the language may have some difficulties. In principle, such words put a person in a dead end because the translation of each word does not reveal the full meaning of the sentence.

=====

In the process of learning a foreign language, special attention is paid to homonyms that make up the usual vocabulary, which helps every student to feel free in the language environment.

The conducted research has shown that homonyms that have arisen as a result of breaking the semantic ties of a once single polysemantic word are as natural in the language as polysemantic words, and are the property of the language, the result of the life of the language as a system.

It is extremely difficult to establish the boundary between polysemy and homonymy. Modern lexicographic practice clearly and vividly reflects the lack of uniform principles for the allocation of homonyms. This is evidenced by the results of the analysis of explanatory, bilingual and special dictionaries of homonyms of the modern Karakalpak language, which showed that in similar cases, the same words are interpreted differently in each dictionary: either they are placed in one dictionary entry, or they are served under two, three or more heading words. In foreign lexicography, semantic homonyms are mostly ignored.

It should be emphasized that the compilation of lexicographic reference books and the reflection of the problem of homonymy in them are entirely determined by the solution of the theoretical question of the relationship between polysemy and homonymy and are impossible without a clear boundary between them. When establishing this boundary, it is necessary to proceed from the fact of the presence or absence of a semantic connection between lexical units, therefore, the main way to establish the fact of polysemy or homonymy can only be a semantic criterion.

Having considered in this article the question of the clash of homonyms in the language, we have presented the view of many scientists on this problem, compared the points of view of linguists from different countries. In the next study, we will consider the problem of homonyms in the context environment and attempt to quantify the use of homonyms in speech.

In the future, it is necessary to develop separate homonyms, types of contexts that allow or do not allow the use of homonyms in texts, to determine the number of coordination tests sufficient to establish homonymy. In this study, only elements of the comparative method are used, namely: the relationship of homogeneity as a semantic-syntactic means for determining the degree of semantic proximity between the analyzed words. In this paper, the boundary of establishing homonymy in the course of coordination substitution is conditional and is determined by the presence of at least two contexts in which the permutation of homogeneous terms is possible or impossible, confirming the phenomenon of polysemy or homonymy when correlated with the results of semantic analysis. Therefore, the results obtained during the coordination permutation are probabilistic, but it can be argued that the general characteristics of the semantic relations between homonyms and polysemy in the Karakalpak language completely coincide, differences are observed only in the semantics of individual lexical units and their use in texts.

REFERENCES

1. Baskakov, N. (1996). Karakalpak language. Volume IV. Lexicon. Nukus: Bilim.
2. Berdimuratov, E. (1994). Modern Karakalpak language: Lexicology. Nukus: Bilim.
3. Horn, Laurence. (2002). Uncovering the un-word: a study in lexical pragmatics. *Sophia Linguistica* 49: 1-64.
4. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Universal (Mixed) Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. *Science and Education*, 1 (5), 142-145.
5. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. *Journal on International Social Science*, 1 (1), 1-6.
6. 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.
7. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Some Questions of Grammatical Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. *International Journal on Orange Technologies*, 2 (9), 19-21.
8. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The essence of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. *Journal of Foreign Languages and Linguistics*. 2 (3), 24-26.
9. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The short study of multiple homonyms in Karakalpak language. *International scientific and current research conferences*, 51-53.
10. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Problematic aspects of grammatical homonyms. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11 (6), 815-821.
11. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Theoretical basis of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. *International Scientific and Current Research Conferences*, 36-40.
12. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Межъязыковые омонимы в русском и каракалпакском языках. *Современная филология: проблемы и перспективы*, 225-229.
13. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Qaraqalpaq tilindegi omonimler klassifikatsiyasınıń ayırım máseleleri. *Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан*, 265 (4), 196-199.
14. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). On the state of the problem of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. *Вестник КГУ им. Бердаха*, 52 (3), 182-185.
15. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Til oqıtıwda omonimlerdiń ayırım ózgeshelikleri. «Түркий филологияның әҳмийетли мәселелери». Илимий мақалалар топламы, 190-193.
16. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Single homonyms in Karakalpak language. «Қиёсий адабиётшунослик, чоғиштирма тилшунослик ва таржимашунослик: муаммо, ечим ва истиқболлар» мавзуидаги халқаро конференция, 74-76.
17. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Omonimlerde ajratıwda konteksttiń áhmiyeti. *Uluslararası Türk Bilim Öğrenci Kurultayı Bildiriler Kitabı*, 194-200.
18. 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.
19. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Lexico-grammatical homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. *Science and Education*, 2 (11), 992-1001.

- =====
20. 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.
 21. 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.
 22. 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.
 23. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Linguistic features of the sources of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education in Karakalpakstan, 17 (2), 123-126.
 24. 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.
 25. Kaljanov Ali. (2022). Homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language: general theoretical questions. Science and Education, 3 (1), 368-385.
 26. Khojanov, SH, Karamatdinova N. (2018). Homonyms in Karakalpak language., Nukus: Qaraqalpaqstan.
 27. Ndimele, O.M. (2007). Semantics and the frontiers of communication. Port Harcourt. Uniport Press Ltd.
 28. Pakhratdinov, K, Bekbergenov, K. (2015). Dictionary of homonyms of the Karakalpak language. Nukus: Qaraqalpaqstan.
 29. Seidullayeva, D. (2018). Explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms. Nukus: Bilim.