

THE SEMANTIC RESOURCES OF THE CONTEXT WHEN DEFINING HOMONYMS IN THE MODERN KARAKALPAK LANGUAGE

<https://doi.org/10.70728/phil.v05.i04.101>

Ali Kaljanov

aliyxankaljanov@mail.ru

Karakalpak Scientific-Research Institute of Humanitarian Sciences

Abstract: The question of the influence of context on the identification of the meaning of homonyms was not, as such, a research phenomenon. In linguistics, one can find only some general remarks that the context eliminates homonymy, that homonymy is not so dangerous since words live in a coherent speech, in a sentence. From the context, it is usually clear what exactly the meaning of a particular homonym is; cases that really threatened the correct understanding are relatively rare in speech practice. This article is a continuation of the article that presented the first results of research on linguistic resources of homonyms in the Karakalpak language based on the method of contextual rules. Further, development of the research contributed to a clearer identification of the main problems associated, first of all, with the description of the phenomenon of homonymy in existing lexicographic sources; the identification of syntactically complex cases of homonymy resolution.

Keywords: Homonyms, Karakalpak language, context, semantic resources

In the course of its historical development, the sound structure and grammatical structure of the Karakalpak language have undergone significant changes, which have led to the monosyllabic nature of many words, most of which are simultaneously root words. It is important to keep in mind that their role in the language is extremely large due to their great use. This feature of the language is clearly reflected in the composition of homonyms. It should be borne in mind that in the process of communication, the number of possible homonymic variations can be much greater. In this regard, it is noteworthy that the homonymy of the Karakalpak language is dominated by groups of pairs. Usually, the members of a homonymic pair are quite rare in the same context.

In this article we want to answer all such questions:

- Does the meaning of the homonym depend on the context?
- If it depends, to what extent and how?
- If it does not depend, what is the role of the context in relation to the homonym in this case?

- How, in connection with homonyms in the language, is the problem of differentiation of homonyms in the context environment solved?

The meaning of the homonym, which exists as a potential in the language system, is actualized in speech, that is, in the context. It would be wrong to say that the context or situation of speech does not matter for the correct understanding of the lexical complex. Everyone who has translated from a foreign language or who has had to interpret isolated words knows that it is impossible to talk about the independence of the word-homonym from the context. Without context, it is impossible to set the meaning of a homonym. This is recognized by many researchers. The dependence of the homonym on the context can be proved experimentally. When you are offered an isolated word, such as *kún*, you do not know what is meant - "day" or "sun". But if you give a couple of words: *birinshi kún*, *ekinshi kún*, the first word restricts the associations caused by another word to a certain sphere.

As shown by S. Ullman, the meaning of a homonym in comparison with the figurative meaning of a word and a polysemantic word depends on as much as possible on the context. If you draw a scale of dependence of the word on the context, then homonyms will stand at the top of this scale (Ullman, 1951).

Some scientists argue that in the case of polysemy and homonymy, the elements of the context clarify and determine the meaning of the element under study. The active element of the context is called a choice sign or a determinator of the value of the element under study. This definition of the role of context, in our opinion, refers more to homonymy. Regarding homonymy, it would be more correct to agree with the opinion of L. Antala, who wrote: "The context does not determine, does not establish the meaning of the homonymous form, since it already had its meaning before the active environment appeared. The verbal environment only shows what sign we can accept. For the listener, the verbal environment indicates the desired meaning, based on the previously well-known values that preceded the context. The environment only gives the necessary orientation and does not create a value. Thus, the element of context that helps to learn and identify the meaning of a homonym, we call a semantic indicator or indicator of the meaning of a homonym.

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. In this regard, Bulakhovsky's remark that "homonymy is not as dangerous as one might think, based on general considerations alone: it is usually clear from the context exactly what meaning a particular homonymous word has, and cases that seriously threaten understanding in the practice of language occur relatively rarely" is particularly characteristic.

Homonyms in the context of terminology are very different from a similar phenomenon in a general literary language: First, terminology uses only one kind of homonymy, namely, that which is the result of the semantic development of the word, its polysemy. Secondly, homonymy in relation to terminology can only be characterized as an intersystem phenomenon: either these terms of different terminologic systems, or these terms of the lexical and semantic way of formation, which have become homonyms in relation to the words of the general literary language that gave rise to them.

R. A. Budagov, on the contrary, does not agree: "... 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, 1965).

Let's move on to the question of the verbal environment of homonyms in the text. Here are some examples:

"Men ushın sol yanvar ayı, ásirese ay tolğan kún úlken quwanışqa sebep bolğan edi. "(Homonyms: ay-month and ay-moon).

"Ruxsatımsız heshqashan alma alma, sebebi ruxsatsız alınğan zat urlıq esaplanadı" (Homonyms: alma-apple and alma-don't take).

Homonyms occur in the same sentence. For example: "Balam qara, qara ġargalar ushıp baratır". And without involving previous or subsequent sentences, it is clear that in the first case we are talking about a person, and in the second one about color.

Based on these examples, we can determine the frequency of the use of homonyms in the Karakalpak language by the example of the lexical context.

Given that the point of view we criticize is reflected not only in the scientific literature, but also in the educational literature, we consider it necessary to give a list of homonyms that are included in the first thousand words of the modern Karakalpak language in terms of frequency of use.

The implementation of the meaning of a homonym does not depend on the context, while the meaning of a polysemical word is determined by the context. This is the difference between homonymy and polysemy in the contextual aspect. Communication disorders do not occur because homonyms differ in a number of factors, primarily lexical and semantic, grammatical, graphic, and, finally, in very many cases, their combinations.

One of the distinctive features of the Karakalpak language is its great ambiguity. The word in the modern Karakalpak language has very little autonomy, and therefore, its understanding in many cases is possible only in the context, the size of which can vary from a combination of several words to two, three or more paragraphs.

The role of context in the disclosure of a particular lexical meaning of a word is recognized by all. But at the same time, a fundamental discrepancy was revealed among the authors. Some scholars believe that the word takes on meaning only in the context - outside the sentence, there are no words outside the context. Of course, a word taken separately, isolated from others, often has a vague, vague meaning since there is no connection with the specific surrounding reality. It is also true that both the lexical meaning of a word and its grammatical meaning are fully revealed only in a coherent speech. But to conclude from this that the word torn out of the connection is dead, we consider it illegal. Scientists, who, from different positions, deny the reality of the meanings of individual, isolated words, thereby deny the relative independence inherent in the word.

It is necessary to emphasize the indisputable fact that if words did not have meaning, the creation of dictionaries - explanatory, bilingual, special, etc. - would be impossible and meaningless; the process of communication, the transfer of experience, the exchange of thoughts could not be successfully carried out. It follows that overestimating the context is completely unjustified.

After all, if we recognize that in order to remove the ambiguity caused by homonymy, the listener needs to refer to the context, then this already means that homonymy delays the communication process, since the very reference to the context must obviously require some effort from the listener and, consequently, some time.

Despite the complexity of the phenomenon under consideration, we believe that the most accurate results can be obtained within the framework of the proposed contextual method, or on the basis of the method of calculating semantic contexts, but the effort expended is justified in those linguistic applications where the accuracy of linguistic resources is essential.

Further, research has led to a complication of the structure of the homonymy resolution method, and a number of new steps have been added to the main stages listed above, which allow us to recognize and take into account more complex syntactic constructions when resolving homonyms. Homonyms are not allowed in the entire corpus, and the specifics of the newspaper corpus sometimes make it difficult to determine the entire range of possible contexts.

References

1. Kaljanov Ali. (2024). Homonyms as a phenomenon are one of the sources of the word play. *Türkologiya* № 2
2. Kaljanov Ali. (2023). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. *The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC)* 5 (1), 26-31
3. Kaljanov Ali (2022). Homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language: general theoretical questions. *Science and Education* 3 (1), 368-385

4. 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>
5. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Universal (Mixed) Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. Science and Education, 1 (5), 142-145.
6. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. Journal on International Social Science, 1 (1), 1-6.
7. 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.
8. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Some Questions of Grammatical Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. International Journal on Orange Technologies, 2 (9), 19-21.
9. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The essence of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. Journal of Foreign Languages and Linguistics. 2 (3), 24-26.
10. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The short study of multiple homonyms in Karakalpak language. International scientific and current research conferences, 51-53.
11. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Problematic aspects of grammatical homonyms. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11 (6), 815-821.
12. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Theoretical basis of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. International Scientific and Current Research Conferences, 36-40.
13. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Межъязыковые омонимы в русском и каракалпакском языках. Современная филология: проблемы и перспективы, 225-229.
14. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Qaraqalpaq tilindegi omonimler klassifikatsiyasınıń ayırım máseleleri. Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан, 265 (4), 196-199.
15. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). On the state of the problem of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Вестник КГУ им. Бердаха, 52 (3), 182-185.
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). 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.
18. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Lexico-grammatical homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education, 2 (11), 992-1001.
19. 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.

20. 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.

21. 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.

22. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Linguistic features of the sources of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education in Karakalpakstan, 17 (2), 123-126.

23. 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.

24. Budagov, R. A. Introduction to the science of language [Text] / R. A. Budagov. - M.: Prosveshchenie, 1965 - - 5 p.

25. Ullmann S. Words and their use.- N.Y. Philosophical Library, 1951 p 62-63.