

The Concept, Role and Place of Homonyms in The Modern Karakalpak Language

Ali Kaljanov

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

Received: 25 February 2026 Accepted: 22 March 2026 Published: 11 April 2026

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the concept, role and place of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. The interest in homonymy has been and remains relevant throughout the history of the science of language and is explained by the complex nature of this phenomenon, which requires a comprehensive study in lexic-semantic, grammatical and word-forming aspects. The meaning of a word is determined by the entire lexical and semantic system of the language as a whole and is the result of reflecting a socially conscious, objective reality. Homonymy, as the most problematic phenomenon in language, has become the main object of study in semantics. Homonyms are words that have the same form but are not related in meaning. The phenomenon of coincidence in the form of unrelated words is called homonyms: Alma 'apple' and alma 'do not take'.

Keywords: Homonyms, Karakalpak language, homonymy, concept, role, place of homonyms, kók.

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of homonymy, which is characteristic of all languages, has not yet received a complete and unambiguous interpretation in the scientific literature. There is still no clear definition of the basic concepts of homonymy. In other words, a single definition of homonyms, recognized by all linguists, has not yet been developed. In the process of language communication, the phenomenon of homonymy can cause certain difficulties, which, however, are removed when considering the context of communication. In addition, homonyms can be used in the language as a stylistic tool. The relevance of this article lies in the reflection of the system relations of vocabulary, and some questions of homonymy remain open, there are still disputes about the place and role of homonyms in the language. Main research objectives:

- To study the place of homonymy in the modern Karakalpak language,
- Reflection of the study of homonyms in the Karakalpak

language and foreign researchers.

Some European researchers use the term "homonymy" as a synonym for the concept of "homophony". However, the concept of homophony is much broader than homonymy. In homophony all types of consonance, consonance in constructions, combinations of words, individual segments of speech, and even in adjacent sound combinations are present.

Since scientists have not yet proposed a generally accepted definition of homonymy, we have found a definition that is suitable for any language level: homonyms are language signs that have identical signifiers, but different signifieds.

Homonymy is no less difficult when building automatic text processing systems, as well as in lexicographic work – when determining the boundaries between individual words, when developing ways to represent homonyms in a dictionary, when choosing units of counting the frequency of the dictionary, etc.

The work on the compilation of explanatory dictionaries, on the creation of effective programs for automatic translation of text and on improving the methods of teaching languages – both foreign and native – all this requires an in-depth study of the problems of homonymy, studying its internal laws, determining the place it occupies in the general system of the language.

The study of homonym is also of great interest in connection with the widespread work on the statistical study of vocabulary and in connection with the use of homonyms in experimental psycholinguistic and psychological studies.

However, despite the fact that the study of homonymy has been conducted for a long time, very little has been done in this area for a number of reasons. To date, homonymy has been much less studied. Terminology is not ordered, there is no classification that would adequately reflect the nature of semantic relations between different classes of homonyms, and the qualitative characteristics of homonymic series are not studied.

The question of homonym has long attracted linguists. Sometimes it was noted that the presence of homonymy contradicts the logic of language, the unity of sign and meaning, the basic law of the language sign. Interest in the study of homonyms, their origin and development in individual languages, as well as in families and groups of related languages, in the study of the functions of homonyms, their types and conditions for their preservation and use in a particular language has flared up, then weakened and even faded in different periods of the history of the science of language. The range of issues related to homonymy is very wide: methods of distinguishing and distinguishing homonyms – semantic, morphological, word-forming, syntactic – on the basis of differences in the forms of compatibility, the language's reaction to homonymy, the loss of words due to homonymy, the elimination of homonymy by lexical borrowing, irregular changes in the form of words due to homonymy, transformations of the morphological composition of words to avoid homonymy, new formations in the methods of combining morphemes and words generated by the struggle of homonyms, the delaying effect of phrase logical expressions when homonyms die off, the degree of tolerance of different languages to homonymy, the phenomenon of attraction or contamination in the homonyms, differentiation of meanings in homonyms and homonymic forms, structural differences between

homonymy and polysemy, the limits of the possibility of homonymy in the sign system, and much more.

Over time, this interest in homonymy flared up and then faded, but now we can talk about the second youth of this phenomenon. Such a revival is associated with the creation of intelligent systems, automatic text processing and machine translation. In foreign and Karakalpak linguistics, the process of developing the theory of homonymy has a long tradition and is associated with the names of such scientists as V. V. Vinogradov, V. I. Abaev, D. E. Rosenthal, L. A. Bulakhovskiy, L. V. Malakhovskiy, O. S. Akhmanova, A. A. Reformatorskiy, Bally, R. A. Osmanova, L. Bloomfield, Yu. S. Maslov, I. P. Ivanova, A. Ya. Shaikevich, R. A. Budagov, F. P. Filin, N. A. Baskakov, E. Berdimuratov, M. Dauletov, K. Pakhratdinov, K. Bekbergenov and many others.

The works of foreign linguists contain rich illustrative material related to the identification and accounting of homonyms. However, the disadvantage of such works is that they do not show the relationship of the studied words in the entire system of linguistic phenomena.

According to academician V. V. Vinogradov, in his proposed classification, it says:

“Homonyms... can only be called such lexical units that coincide in their external sound appearance in all their forms” (Vinogradov 71).

In homonymy, words do not have anything similar, or the former connection between the meanings of homonyms from the point of view of the current state is lost.

“It is advisable to consider only words that are different in origin as homonyms” – these words belong to V. I. Abaev (Abaev 71).

D. E. Rosenthal gives the following definition of homonymy – “the sound and grammatical coincidence of language units that are semantically unrelated to each other” (Rosenthal 27).

The need to study homonymy is also caused by the needs of applied linguistics. According to Malakhovskiy L. V.: “Homonymy is a manifestation of that special property of a language sign, thanks to which identical signifiers can correspond to different denotable” (Malakhovskiy 3). Because of this, homonymy is a certain hindrance in the

process of communication. Sometimes the listener is at a loss as to which of the several different meanings expressed by a given language form will be correct for a clear understanding. Difficulties may arise not only in the listener, as noted, for example, O. S. Akhmanova, but also in the speaker who seeks to build a statement so that it can be understood unambiguously (Akhmanova 145). Homonyms also introduce difficulties in the process of learning a foreign language when the student is faced with the fact that the same language form can have completely different meanings. Analyzing them, we come to the understanding that this significantly complicates the perception of a foreign text or message.

In the book "Introduction to Linguistics" Reformatorsky A. A. gives his definition of homonyms: "Homonyms are defined as words that sound the same but have different meanings." Without making such a reservation, the authors E. F. Vorno, M. et al. give the following definition of homonyms:

"Homonyms are words that have the same form, but have nothing in common with each other in sound" (Vorno et al. 24-26).

The category of homonyms usually includes not only words in the aggregate of all their forms, but also individual word forms of different words. Some Western linguists, striving for greater accuracy of definitions, define homonyms without using the term word. For example, Bally gives the following definition of homonyms: "Homonyms are two signs that have identical signifiers and different signifiers" (Bally 24). Under this definition, even cases of the use of a word that differ only in contextual meaning can be summed up.

The broadest and most complete way to define homonyms is to define any segments of speech with the same form but completely different meanings. Under such a definition of homonyms, cases of homonymy of morphemes and cases of homonymy of word combinations would also fit.

This does not mean that such a broad definition of homonyms is completely meaningless. The phenomena covered by this definition can be called not homonyms, but homonymic morphemes, homonymic word combinations, etc.

According to A. Ya, Shaikevich gives definitions of homonyms:

Homonyms are words and word forms of the same sound but with completely different meanings (Shaikevich 127).

As proved by I. P. Ivanova, each homonymic group is a small system in the language. Words-homonyms included in such a system are connected to each other in a certain way. The values of one of these homonyms depend to some extent on changes in the values of the other homonym. As a result of the semantic development of homonyms that are close in meaning, one of them can become part of the meanings of the other, i.e. two homonyms will merge into one word. In other cases, a clash of homonyms' meanings may cause one of these homonyms to disappear from the language. In short, a homonymic group is characterized by multiple connections between the homonyms included in this group (Ivanova 145).

As Yu.S. Maslov notes, it is precisely in the wide spread of homonymy that one of the important differences between any natural language that develops spontaneously over centuries and millennia, and ... artificial semantic systems created at the will of man are (Maslov 202).

R. A. Budagov: "Homonyms are such a widespread phenomenon in the vocabulary that it would be wrong to consider them "sick words" (Budagov 53). And continues: "...homonyms can interfere with each other only in very rare contexts. In practice, however, even in such cases, the inconvenience caused by homonyms is temporary since the language removes homonyms in advance from those areas where they are inconvenient. And, what is especially important, homonyms penetrate deeply into the national language, where, while existing, they do not interfere with anyone" (Budagov 55).

However, statements of the opposite nature are much more common. The authors of many works on homonymy and general linguistics believe that in practice the language usually does not experience any inconvenience from the existence of homonyms and that homonymy usually does not interfere with understanding, since homonyms are distinguished for the listener by the context and the situation.

Thus, the opinion that homonymy, although it violates the law of the sign, does not cause difficulties in the process of communication, has become a common method in linguistics. However, there are facts that make us doubt the validity of this opinion.

Homonyms cannot be considered a defect of language, but is one of its fundamental properties, which should be taken into account in all theoretical concepts of linguistics, as well as in solving various applied problems.

F. P. Filin defines homonyms as "words that coincide in their sound shell, but have unrelated meanings" (Filin 59-60). Thus, F. P. Filin gives an incomplete definition of homonymy, including only homophones and homonyms that coincide in pronunciation and spelling, and leaving out homographs. Taking into account only the oral form of communication is very common when determining homonymy.

L. Bloomfield defines homonyms as follows:

"Different linguistic forms which have the same phonetic form are known as homonyms" (Bloomfield 145). From the definition of L. Bloomfield, it is not clear what exactly is meant by different linguistic forms.

Some linguists, on the contrary, when defining homonyms, indicate only the difference in spelling and do not say anything about the coincidence of words in their sound. In a number of definitions of homonymy, there is no indication at all of the fact that the words that make up the homonymic pair coincide or do not match in sound and spelling.

Despite the recognition of homonymy as a fundamental property of language, the opinions of scientists about the usefulness-harmfulness of homonymy are very ambiguous. According to R. A. Osmanova, it is impossible to convey all the diversity of life and thought with a few dozen sounds, so homonymy is a natural process in language.

Linguists, like E. Berdimuratov, M. Dauletov, among homonyms distinguish homographs – i.e. words that have the same spelling, but the pronunciation does not match, for example, alma (do not take), alma [apple], and homophones, i.e. words with different spellings, but with the same pronunciation, for example, jazaladı (punished), jaza aladı (can write), and others.

T. Begzhanov in his book – On the relation of the Muynak dialect to the Karakalpak literary language – examines the part of the vocabulary of the Muynak dialect that is absent in the literary language. The author gives detailed information about homonyms. For example, homonyms: iynelik "device for weaving a fishing net" - iynelik

"dragonfly"; jon "spine of fish" - jon "mountain crest" "to cut"; etc. (Begzhanov 45).

Dialect data show that there are homonyms in the dialect vocabulary, as well as specific dialect phenomena combined by isoglosses. Therefore, such words are reflected in the dictionary.

T. Begzhanov also said:

"The phenomena of polysemy, homonymy, synonymy and antonymy, although not characteristic of professional terminology, however, can, nevertheless, serve to a certain extent as a means of enriching professional vocabulary. When using polysemantic words, homonyms and synonyms in professional speech, it is important, first, to achieve maximum unambiguity of terms and, secondly, to proceed from the professional content of the context or colloquial speech in which a particular term is introduced». (Begzhanov 39).

Along with these thematic groups, the author considers lexical layers, including dialect homonyms, obsolete vocabulary, idiomatic and phraseological combinations, words of Arab-Iranian origin, borrowings from other Turkic languages, etc.

Urakbai Dospanov in his article, each of the homonyms is given as a registered word, and its meaning is revealed with the help of examples. A dialect word can be phonetically identical to a particular word in a literary language: maydan dialect. "time, epoch", maydan lit. "square, cotton field, battle arena, field prepared for sowing", mat dial. "suffer defeat on the battlefield", mat lit. "checkmate in a chess game", etc. Also, in his book "Dialect vocabulary of the Karakalpak language", he analyzes in detail such phenomena as dialect homonyms. (Dospanov 77-84).

The whole typology of semantics is based on homonymy, and it is important in etymological studies and dictionaries. The tasks of etymological reconstruction are also closely related to the study of homonymy. The nature of homonymy is usually associated with dialects, and it is also necessary to study it in terms of external linguistics, borrowings, ethnolinguistics, cultural history, on a large diachronic scale. According to the speaker, multidialect homonymy and the resulting interdialect homonymy accompanied glottogenesis.

All this allows us to conclude that homonymy is an

inevitable, natural result of the spontaneous development of language and, therefore, represents an absolute linguistic universal.

Looking at the development of the history of the Karakalpak language, it can be seen that this language has undergone a significant change in vocabulary. A significant number of monosyllabic words were formed. Linguists were able to establish that in the language of short words are the main reason for the formation of homonyms because the more short words – the greater the number of homonymous words. When studying the homonyms of the Karakalpak language, one can notice a strong influence of the Arabic language.

Homonyms are grouped into homonymic groups, each of which may consist of two or more homonyms. Thus, in the Karakalpak language, the homonymic group with the forms [kók] has seven homonyms of the following meanings:

Kók-sky

Kók – blue, blue

Kók-green

Kók-leather braid

Kók-a spot on the human body

Kók - unripe, raw

Kók- dollar

So, homonym is a phenomenon in which the same language form has several meanings that, unlike polysemy, do not have any common semantic features, any common elements of meaning, and therefore are not related to each other in any way.

In total, homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language make up no more than 10-12% of the total vocabulary, and the number of homonyms within the same part of speech does not exceed 8-9%. Probably, it is the lack of connections between the meanings of homonyms that makes homonymy an undesirable phenomenon for the language while limiting the scope of its distribution. In addition, it is also important that in speech, homonymy can be an obstacle to understanding and recognizing the exact meaning of an utterance.

There is still a debate among linguists around the world about the role of homonyms in language. Some argue that this phenomenon is natural and does not interfere with the development of the language at all. Others tend to think that homonymy is a random and even harmful phenomenon and will eventually become obsolete. Thus, the question arises about the regularity of preserving the homonyms that have arisen as a result of semantic changes, as well as due to borrowing or word formation and retaining them in the language for a more or less long period of time.

The homonyms that appear are placed at the disposal of native speakers and begin to function in speech along with other words, obeying the same laws. However, homonyms, due to the possibility of a collision, homonymic conflict, are more likely to fall out of the language than words that are not in a relationship of formal identity with other words. But even if we assume that not all of the homonyms that continuously occur in the language are preserved, but only some part of them, then even in this case, the presence of homonyms in the language will be mandatory.

Despite the spelling differences, homonyms are in a constant struggle, in which the more irreplaceable word wins and is fixed in the vocabulary, and others are gradually replaced. When words-homonyms appear in different languages, there is a tendency to somehow shade the homonym in order to avoid double meaning.

The process of collision of homonyms is aggravated and aggravated by the fact that sometimes homonyms denote concepts of the same category or related to the same field of activity.

In this regard, U Dospanov mentions that in one of the dialects of the Karakalpak language, there were identical words (mata) for the concepts of "motorcycle" and "product".

Sometimes homonyms refer to concepts that can be very inconvenient to mix. For example, two homonym words refer to concepts related to a person and a thing: súmelek and súmelek.

It is quite obvious that homonym cannot reduce the effectiveness of language as a means of communication. A hindrance to language is anything that violates its clarity and unambiguity – this is understandable and does not require special evidence. Therefore, homonymy, which

leads to confusion and misunderstandings, is also perceived as a hindrance.

The vocabulary of the Karakalpak language is rich in homonymous pairs. Basically, the forms of words become homonymous as a result of a random coincidence: the main part of homonyms is the same in spelling. In the process of communication, the use of homonyms can cause some difficulties for understanding. The occurrence of homonyms in the language is caused by various reasons.

The very definition of the concept of homonym should show us the ways to go in solving this problem. From the definition of homonyms given in this article, we can distinguish three main signs of homonyms constituting the signs of homonyms:

- commonality of form,
- difference of meaning,
- attribution of homonyms to words or word forms.

Homonyms occupy a special place in the semantics of the Karakalpak language. In languages with more traditional orthography, the Karakalpak language has significantly more homofoms.

Homonyms also appeared as a result of the fact that two or more words borrowed from different languages (often at different times), for certain lexical reasons, appeared in the Karakalpak language. This is the way of origin of the already mentioned homonyms blok - union (from French. bloc-association), blok-machine for lifting weights (from the English block).

The distribution defines both the typical constructions that are characteristic of a word in a sentence, and the lexical subclasses of words that fill in separate places in these constructions. Differences in both respects allow us to assert that verbal units that are superficially similar are not identical to each other, are not equal to each other, and are therefore homonyms.

The concept of homonymy will obviously be greatly expanded in connection with this approach. Such an 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 and ambiguous meanings 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.

Some linguists hold the opinion that homonyms are words that accidentally coincide in sound at a certain stage of language development, which have different etymologies that have nothing in common with each other.

There is a different view of the status of homonymy, which is held by most linguists. According to him, it is believed that, along with homonyms that have different etymologies and coincidentally coincided forms at a particular stage of the development of the language system, there are also historical homonyms.

Such homonyms occurred as a result of the development of the lexeme in history, but the semantics of these words have become so different that in the modern language they are perceived as completely separate words that have nothing in common.

It cannot be said that the problem of homonymy is not sufficiently studied. Other sciences also have their own views on this topic. There are enough points of view in science.

Of course, homonym contributes to the economics of the plan of expression, the compactness of the language. However, some researchers do not consider this phenomenon positive: homonymy, violating the law of the sign, can cause difficulties in the communication process.

Recognizing the fact that the presence of homonyms in some cases can interfere with the process of communication, the emergence of homonyms in languages is one of the manifestations of their communicative necessity associated with the principle of saving sound shells. As a consequence of the lack of signifiers or, otherwise, as a manifestation of the law of least effort, homonymy is characterized by many authors.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that the question of the positive or negative role of homonyms in a language cannot be solved in isolation from the language system as a whole. The homonymy in the modern Karakalpak language, which is highly developed in comparison with other languages and is constantly growing, is related to the historical conditions of its development. If homonyms do not violate the communicative clarity of the utterance, then they can coexist in the language for a long time. If the communicative clarity is disturbed, then the language seeks to restore the balance of its units in internal ways, either through the frequent use of synonyms, which eventually leads to the displacement of the homonym, or through the creation of a difference in form, or by some other means. Which path is chosen in a particular case is determined by the specific system relations in the language.

A huge number of interpretations of this term indicates that this phenomenon is complex. There is a huge debate about the origin of homonyms:

- homonyms are words that accidentally coincide in form at a certain stage of language development, which have different etymologies that have nothing in common with each other;

- homonyms are historically formed words, but the semantics these words have become so different that in the modern language they are perceived as completely separate words that have nothing in common.

In our time, homonymy is widely used and is still used today in literature. Homonymy creates an interesting stylistic effect. Homonymy has already penetrated so much into the culture of the Karakalpak people that this concept can no longer be divided among themselves.

REFERENCES

1. Abaev, V. Speech at the discussion on homonymy. Progress, 1960.
2. Akhmanova O. Lexicology of the English language. Book, 1966.
3. Bally Sh. General linguistics and questions of the French language: Trans. from French. Progress, 1955.
4. Begzhanov T. From questions of dialectology of the Karakalpak language. Karakalpakstan, 1971.
5. Begzhanov T. About professional agricultural terminology in the Karakalpak language. Soviet Turkology, no. 5, 1981.
6. Budagov, R. Introduction to the science of language. Prosveshchenie, 1965.
7. Bloomfield L. Language. New York, 1933.
8. Dospanov U. Dialect vocabulary of the Karakalpak language. Karakalpakstan, Nukus, 1980.
9. Filin F. Questions of ambiguity. Moscow: Nauka, 1960
10. Ivanova I. "On the historical consideration of homonymy". Problems of comparative Philology, no 1, 1981, pp. 204-210.
11. Malakhovsky L. Theory of lexical and grammatical homonymy. Nauka, 1990.
12. Maslov Yu. "Introduction to Linguistics". Nauka, 1975.
13. Osmanova R. On the phenomenon of homonymy in the Lezgian literary language. Scientific Notes of the Azerbaijan State University. Baku: Series of social sciences, 1962.
14. Reformatorsky A. Introduction to linguistics. - Moscow: Nauka, 1967.
15. Rosenthal, D. The Contemporary Russian language. Moscow: iris press, 2003.
16. Shaikevich A. On the principles of classification of homonyms. Processes of development in the language, 1959.
17. Vinogradov V. "About homonymy and related

- phenomena”. Questions of linguistics, no. 5, 1960, pp. 3-17.
18. Vorno E. F., et al. Lexicology of the English language. L, 1955.
19. Kaljanov Ali. (2024). Homonyms as a phenomenon are one of the sources of the word play. *Türkologiya № 2 2024*,
20. Kaljanov Ali. (2023). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. *The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC) 5 (1)*, 26-31
21. Kaljanov Ali (2022). Homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language: general theoretical questions. *Science and Education 3 (1)*, 368-385
22. 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/nspj/article/view/28>
23. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Universal (Mixed) Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. *Science and Education, 1 (5)*, 142-145.
24. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. *Journal on International Social Science, 1 (1)*, 1-6.
25. 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.
26. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Some Questions of Grammatical Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. *International Journal on Orange Technologies, 2 (9)*, 19-21.
27. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The essence of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. *Journal of Foreign Languages and Linguistics. 2 (3)*, 24-26.
28. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The short study of multiple homonyms in Karakalpak language. *International scientific and current research conferences*, 51-53.
29. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Problematic aspects of grammatical homonyms. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11 (6)*, 815-821.
30. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Theoretical basis of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. *International Scientific and Current Research Conferences*, 36-40.
31. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Межъязыковые омонимы в русском и каракалпакском языках. *Современная филология: проблемы и перспективы*, 225-229.
32. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Qaraqalpaq tilindegi omonimler klassifikatsiyasiniñ ayırım máseleleri. *Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан, 265 (4)*, 196-199.
33. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). On the state of the problem of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. *Вестник КГУ им. Бердаха, 52 (3)*, 182-185.
34. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Single homonyms in Karakalpak language. “Қиёсий адабиётшунослик, чоғиштира тилшунослик ва таржимашунослик: муаммо, ечим ва истикболлар” мавзуидаги халқаро конференция, 74-76.
35. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Omonimlardi ajirativda kontekstniñ aҳmiyeti. *Uluslararası Türk bilim Öğrenci Kurultayı Bildiriler Kitabı*, 194-200.
36. 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.
37. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Lexico-grammatical homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. *Science and Education, 2 (11)*, 992-1001.
38. 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.
39. 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.

40. 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.
41. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Linguistic features of the sources of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. *Science and Education in Karakalpakstan*, 17 (2), 123-126.
42. 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.
43. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Некоторые межъязыковые омонимы в русском и каракалпакском языке. «SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS» *Scientific Journal*, 1 (1), 46-51.
44. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The some interlingual homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. *UzAcademia Scientific-methodical journal*, 1 (2), 206-210.
45. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Вопрос омонимии в преподавании языка. *Современная психология и педагогика: проблемы, анализ и результаты*, 4, 511-515.
46. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Qoraqalpoq tilidagi omonimlarga bir nazar. Ta'limga kompetensiyaviy yondashuv: muammo va yechimlar" mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy onlayn konferensiya materiallari, 30-32.
47. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). A few words about homonyms. Republican scientific-practical online conference "Application of modern methods in the development of science. 228-230.
48. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The question of translation homonyms. *Filologiya masalalari" mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy onlayn konferensiya materiallari*, 91-93.
49. 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.