Registered in Germany Europa Revue Journal
ISSN: 1862-6564 Vol. 6 No. 10 (2026) Published October 31, 2026

MAIN TYPES OF REDUPLICATIVE WORDS IN THE KARAKALPAK LANGUAGE

Bekbergenov Q.A.

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Senior Researcher at the Karakalpakstan Humanitarian Research Institute, Karakalpakstan Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Nukus, Uzbekistan.

Abstract

In the Karakalpak language, reduplicative words can be divided into two main groups according to their word-formation features: reduplicative words with identical components and reduplicative words with non-identical components. The latter group comprises several types and subtypes: reduplicative words in which one component has a specific morphological form; reduplicative words in which both components bear different morphological markers; rhyming reduplicative words; and reduplicative words expressing an intensive meaning. This article examines the structural, morphological, phonetic, and semantic characteristics of these types of reduplicative words and identifies their distinctive features through examples from the Karakalpak language.

Keywords

Karakalpak language, compound words, coordinate compound words, reduplicative words, reduplicative words with identical components, reduplicative words with non-identical components.

1. INTRODUCTION

The structures and meanings of reduplicative words in Turkic languages are diverse. Various researchers have proposed different classifications of these linguistic units based on their structural, morphological, semantic, and word-formation characteristics.

A.T. Kaydarov distinguishes three types of reduplicative words in the Uyghur language: (1) identical reduplications; (2) rhyming, deformed, and truncated reduplications; and (3) affixed reduplications [1; 57]. T.M. Garipov points out that reduplicative words in the Bashkir language do not acquire entirely new meanings but rather form new variants of the original words. He divides them into transformed and

truncated forms, including intensive forms of adjectives [2; 162–165]. B. Oruzbayeva examines only rhyming types of reduplicative words in the Kyrgyz language [3; 258–260]. S.N. Muratov divides reduplicative words in Turkic languages into identical and non-identical types while treating intensive forms separately [4; 105]. M. Khabichev classifies reduplicative words in the Karachay-Balkar language into words expressing plurality, such as *jol-jol, qat-qat*, and *tóbe-tóbe*, and words with pejorative meanings, such as *tay-may, suw-muw*, and *qoy-moy* [5; 271].

A. Nazhimov classifies reduplicative words into two main types according to their structural completeness: full reduplications and partial reduplications [6; 79].

Although reduplicative words have been studied in various Turkic languages, their classification and structural-semantic characteristics require further examination in the Karakalpak language. In particular, the morphological features of their components, the principles underlying their formation, and the semantic functions of different types need to be considered systematically.

The purpose of this article is to classify reduplicative words in the Karakalpak language according to their word-formation characteristics and to examine their structural, morphological, phonetic, and semantic properties.

2. MAIN PART

2.1. Reduplicative Words with Identical Components

In the Karakalpak language, reduplicative words can be divided into the following types according to their word-formation characteristics.

The first group consists of reduplicative words with identical components. These words are formed by repeating the same root or stem and possess various word-forming and semantic properties, including plurality, intensification, continuity, and duration.

According to their structural characteristics, such reduplicative words may consist of:

a) Simple roots:

Teńizdiń ortasi taw-taw úyilgen balıq (K. Sultanov).

Qorjın-qorjın olja, qap-qap dán nawaday quyıp tur (Sh. Seitov).

b) Stems:

Qus tútkendey tilkim-tilkim etleri (Kunkhoja).

Onıń oyına qıylı-qıylı qıyallar keldi (O. Khojaniyazov).

c) Words in identical grammatical forms:

Waqtı-waqtı qańǵalap ketedi (Sh. Seitov).

Bekmurat aǵa jollamalardı birim-birim iyelerine tapsırdı (I. Qurbanbayev).

Reduplicative words with identical components can be further divided into nominal, verbal, and imitative types, including interjections [4; 105]. Examples include *qap-qap dán* (bags and bags of grain), *túrli-túrli adamlar* (various people), *sóylep-sóylep* (speaking repeatedly), *kóre-kóre* (seeing repeatedly), *gúrs-gúrs,* and *jalt-jalt*.

These reduplicative words generally retain their original morphological structure and do not undergo phonetic deformation in usage [1; 57].

2.2. Reduplicative Words with Non-Identical Components

The second group consists of reduplicative words with non-identical components. These words are also formed through the repetition or pairing of a single lexical unit; however, their components differ in morphological form or phonetic structure. In the modern Karakalpak language, this group includes several types.

2.2.1. Reduplicative Words in Which One Component Has a Specific Morphological Form

This type includes reduplicative words in which one of the components bears a particular morphological marker, while the other component has a different form.

a) The first component is in the ablative case, while the second component has no suffix.

The components of such reduplicative words demonstrate a certain degree of structural stability.

For example:

Bala-shaǵam óler boldı ashtan-ash (Omar).

Kóp sorawdı ashıqtan-ashıq bere almaytuǵan bala kem-kem batırlandı (T. Kayypbergenov).

In some cases, the second component of this type may also occur in the dative case, as in *bostan bosqa, biyqardan biyqarǵa*, and others.

However, in our view, combinations formed by repeating the same word, in which the first component is in the ablative case and the second is in the dative case, such as *qolnan-qolǵa* and *kúnnen-kúnge*, should not be regarded as single words or reduplicative words. This is because a syntactic subordinate relationship can be observed between their components, preventing them from functioning as a single lexical unit.

For example:

Bazı keshelerde óz janına ózi egew salıp qıyalnan qıyalǵa ótedi, oydan oyǵa shúmip gúbirlenedi (T. Kayypbergenov).

The repeated words in these examples can be separated by inserting additional words, as in *bir qıyalnan ekinshi qıyalǵa* and *jaman oydan jaqsı oyǵa*. Therefore, they should be considered word combinations formed through the repetition of the same word rather than reduplicative words.

For this reason, the combinations identified by A.T. Kaydarov as reduplicative words, such as *kún-kúnge, jıldan-jılǵa, cextan-cexqa,* and *qol-qolǵa* [1; 74], should not, in our opinion, be classified as reduplicative words.

Similarly, examples cited by the same author, such as *tisine (timeydi)* and *awzı-awzılarına (juqpaydı)* [1; 75], should also be regarded as stable expressions.

For this reason, we consider the hyphenated spelling of combinations such as *kúnnen kúnge* and *jıldan jılǵa* in the modern Karakalpak language to be incorrect. In many texts, adjacent forms of the same word are written with a hyphen. For example:

Gúlsimniń awırıwı kúnnen-kúnge ózine bata berdi (S. Aryslanov).

Dúnyada ómir súriw jıldan-jılǵa awır bolıp baratır (S. Aryslanov).

Qońsı-qońsını tanımaydı (T. Kayypbergenov).

In these examples, the adjacent forms of the same word should be written separately.

b) The second component is in the dative case.

Examples:

Ol jeme-jemege kelgende tırnaq aldı ozıp jürer (Ó. Khojaniyazov).

Júregim ústi-ústine soǵadı (T. Khalmuratov).

c) The second component is in the ablative case.

Examples:

Halsiz salqın samallar kem-kemnen kúsheyip qamıs-lardıń buwınlarınıń ızıldattı (I. Qurbanbayev).

Kún-kúnnen baratır isi ońalıp (A. Muusayev).

d) The second component is formed from the first component by adding the suffix -la/-le.

Examples include *mıń-mıńlap, tez-tezlep*, and *wáh-wáhlap*. Reduplicative words of this type are most productively formed from imitative words, interjections, and numerals.

e) The first component takes the elements -ba/-be, -ma/-me, -pa/-pe, or -a/-e, while the second component occurs in its root or stem form.

Examples:

Kúnbe-kún uyısıp silesi qatıp (A. Muusayev).

Sońǵı aylarda jumısı balalap, awılma-awıl tórelikte júrgen Maman biy búgin úyinde (T. Kayypbergenov).

Usılay júrip bir saparı betpe-bet ushırasıp qaldıq (T. Khalmuratov).

Sáliymanıń belin alıp, ústi-ústine dúrse-dúrs topıraq attı (Ó. Khojaniyazov).

Aydanalar ǵajja-ǵaj iske kirisip ketti (Ó. Khojaniyazov).

2.2.2. Reduplicative Words Whose Components Have Different Morphological Markers

This type comprises reduplicative words in which both components bear different morphological markers.

a) The first component takes the suffix -lı/-li, while the second takes -sız/-siz.

Examples include *jónli-jónsiz* and *orınlı-orınsız*.

For example:

Men onıń gápine bólmesten, orınlı-orınsız sawal da bermesten uyıp tıńladım (G. Izimbetov).

b) Reduplicative words formed by pairing affirmative and negative participial forms.

Examples include *bolar-bolmas* and *biliner-bilinbes*.

For example:

Bolar-bolmas biygúman (A. Muusayev).

Such reduplicative words indicate that an action is approaching completion or that its intensity is decreasing [7; 55–56].

2.2.3. Rhyming Reduplicative Words

In rhyming reduplicative words, the first component is a meaningful lexical unit, whereas the second is an artificially formed element that rhymes phonetically with the first [1; 62; 3; 258]. Some researchers also refer to these as transformed reduplicative words [8; 95–96; 9; 34–38].

The rhyming structure of these words is formed in the following ways:

a) If the first component begins with a consonant, the second component usually begins with one of the labial sounds *m*, *p*, or *b*, and sometimes *s*. Examples include *birew-mirew*, *nan-pan,* and *batpaq-satpaq*.

b) If the first component begins with a vowel, one of the sounds *m*, *p*, *b*, or *s* is added to the beginning of the second component. Examples include *adam-padam, at-mat,* and *eplep-seplep*.

S. Kenesbayev explains the frequent use of the sounds *m, p,* and *b* in the second component by noting that these sounds are relatively easy to articulate and perceive acoustically compared with other sounds [9; 37].

Examples:

Onıń ústine áynekke salatuǵın shólmek-pólmek, mıyıq-pıyıq, boyaw-soyaw, topsa-popsa usaq nárseler (Sh. Seitov).

Traktor jerdegi batpaq-satpaqtı tıńlamay alǵa jıljıyıdı (Ó. Khojaniyazov).

Sırımbet ádep awqat-pawqat shólkemlestirejaq bolıp edi (A. Aliyev).

Sometimes the sound *sh* may also appear at the beginning of the second component:

Ol jerde qıyır-shıyır adam izleri jatır (I. Qurbanbayev).

If the first component begins with the sounds *b, v,* or *f,* which are articulatorily close to the voiceless labial consonant *p*, the second component does not normally begin with *p*. Examples include *balıq-malıq* (not *balıq-palıq*) and *fokus-mokus* (not *fokus-pokus*).

Likewise, if the first component begins with the sounds *j, sh, ch,* or *ts*, which are articulatorily close to *s*, the second component does not begin with *s* [1; 65]. Examples include *jalın-palın* (not *jalın-salın*) and *shiyishe-piyase* (not *shiyishe-siyishe*).

Thus, in the formation of rhyming reduplicative words, sounds that are articulatorily close to the initial sound of the first component are generally avoided.

Rhyming reduplicative words are not formed from every lexical item in the literary language. For example, they are generally not formed from scientific and political terms, numerals, interjections, or words denoting abstract concepts [1; 65]. In colloquial speech, however, the possibilities for forming this type of word are considerably broader. Such forms may even be created from words borrowed from other languages.

Examples:

Ǵarrı qaydan bilsin rod-prodtı (M. Nyzanov).

Men onanday zákún-pákúndi esitpedim (Sh. Seitov).

Nevertheless, the productivity of rhyming reduplicative words is limited. S. Kenesbayev explains this limitation through two main factors. First, words, particularly nouns, frequently occur in other types of paired expressions, such as *bala-shaǵa, qız-kelinshek,* and *shıbın-shirkey*. These expressions already perform the stylistic functions of transformed reduplicative words, making the formation of additional variants such as *bala-mala* or *bala-sala* unnecessary. Second, transformed reduplicative words perform expressive and stylistic functions in the language and are formed mainly from meaningful words that can acquire metaphorical meanings and various stylistic functions. Their relatively low frequency of formation from verbal stems and terms in the literary language is also related to this factor [9; 38].

These explanations are generally plausible and can also be observed in the Karakalpak language. However, in our opinion, they are insufficient to account for all the factors limiting the formation of rhyming reduplicative words.

For example, alongside *bala-shaǵa* and *qız-kelinshek*, forms with different semantic and stylistic nuances, such as *bala-sala* and *qız-pız*, are also used. Moreover, rhyming reduplicative words can be formed from terms for various stylistic purposes. In

general, such forms can be created from a wide range of meaningful lexical items, particularly nouns.

Rhyming reduplicative words may express the following additional meanings:

a) Generalization and collectivity.

For example:

Azǵantay chay-pay iship dem al (A. Aliyev).

In this example, *chay-pay* refers not only to tea itself but also to other similar refreshments.

b) Depreciation and contempt.

Examples include *birew-mirew*, *adam-padam*, and *baslıq-maslıq*.

Certain paired words should not be classified as rhyming reduplicative words merely because their components rhyme. This is because the second component, despite its phonetic similarity to the first, may be an independent lexical unit that participates in the formation of a paired word.

For example:

Hayal anda-sanda artına burılıp qaraydı (N. Dawqarayev).

At first glance, *anda-sanda* appears to be a rhyming reduplicative word. Its first component is a phonetically modified form of the adverb *onda*, while the second component rhymes with it. However, *sanda* is not an artificially created element used solely for rhyming purposes. This word is also used in the Kyrgyz language and in the dialects of Kazakh speakers living along the Aral and Caspian coasts, where it means "rarely" or "from time to time" [1; 69, 112].

Therefore, *anda-sanda* should be classified as a paired word rather than a rhyming reduplicative word. Expressions such as *aspay-saspay, almali-salmali,* and *aspay-taspay* in the modern language also belong to this category.

2.2.4. Intensive Reduplicative Words

Intensive forms constitute a special type of reduplicative words. They are primarily used to express the superlative or intensified degree of adjectives and adverbs.

Intensive forms in the Karakalpak language generally occur in two main structural patterns.

1. Intensive forms expressing the heightened degree of adjectives and adverbs

In this type, the second component is the complete form of an adjective or adverb, whereas the first component is a truncated form of the same root. The truncated component serves to intensify and emphasize the meaning of the original word.

Examples include *úp-úlken*, *jap-jas, qıp-qızıl,* and *jap-jaqın*. For this reason, such forms are also referred to as truncated reduplicative words [1; 70].

The formation of these intensive forms follows certain phonetic patterns.

a) If the first syllable of the original word ends in a consonant, that consonant is replaced by the sound *p*. The resulting form becomes the first, intensifying component, while the complete word serves as the second component.

Examples include *jap-jaqsı, ap-ashshı,* and *qıp-qısqa*.

For example:

Säpiwranıń anasınıń shırayı sup-sur bolıp ketti (K. Sultanov).

Dóp-dóńgelek álemge kem-kemnen keshtıń gúńgirt sáwlesi túse basladı (Ó. Khojaniyazov).

b) If the first syllable consists of a vowel or ends in a vowel, the sound *p* is added after it to form the first component, while the complete form of the word serves as the second component.

Examples include *jep-jeńil, ap-awır,* and *tap-taza*.

For example:

Men qısılǵanımnan qıp-qızıl bolıp kettim (K. Sultanov).

Aǵaydıń úyine kelipti, — dedim óp-ótirik (A. Aliyev).

Irkilmey tup-tuwrı barıp úyine (A. Muusayev).

In the modern Karakalpak language, only a few intensive forms use a consonant other than *p* in this position.

For example:

Bolmasa nám-náhán adam qawındı urlar ma? (T. Kayypbergenov).

c) If the first syllable of the original word ends in two consonants, both consonants are omitted and replaced by the sound *p*. For example: *shalt* – *shap-shalt*. This type of formation is not particularly productive in the modern language.

Intensive forms derived from the colour adjectives *aq* (white) and *kók* (blue) are formed in a special way:

aq – appaq (ap-aq);

kók – kók-kómbek.

For example:

Onıń ushqın atqan kózleri aldında kók-kómbek aydın suw sórindi (Ó. Khojaniyazov).

Intensive forms can also be derived from certain relative adjectives that have acquired qualitative meanings. One example is *map-mazalı*.

For example:

Qanday da bir burılıs jılıńız baslanǵanı bep-belgili edi (Ó. Khojaniyazov).

Most Turkic scholars maintain that this type of intensive form originated from adjectives repeated in their identical forms [10; 85; 11; 34; 12; 61]. For example:

qara-qara – qap-qara;

sarı-sarı – sap-sarı.

A. Kaydarov acknowledges the genetic relationship between these two forms but argues that the shortened form, such as *qıp-qızıl*, cannot be considered to have developed directly from the complete reduplicated form *qızıl-qızıl*. In his view, the complete form does not express the same intensive meaning as the shortened form; rather, it conveys a collective nuance [1; 72].

A. Hojiyev also disagrees with the view that intensive forms originate from fully reduplicated adjectives. According to him, reduplicated adjectives primarily express plurality, whereas intensive forms do not convey plurality but instead emphasize and intensify a particular quality. If intensive forms originated from reduplicated adjectives, they would necessarily retain the semantic characteristics of those forms [7; 99].

Furthermore, intensive forms cannot be derived from every reduplicated adjective. A. Hojiyev also questions the assumption that intensive forms are created simply by repeating the first syllable of an adjective. He points out that intensive forms are derived not only from multisyllabic adjectives but also from monosyllabic ones [7; 99].

In several linguistic studies, the first component of intensive forms has been interpreted as a particle (*janapay*). For example, S.N. Muratov, referring to N.I. Ashmarin's opinion that certain adjectives form their superlative degree through special elements placed before them rather than through ordinary reduplication, considers the first component of intensive forms to be a prepositive particle [4; 110]. Ashmarin's statement is cited in *Materials for the Study of the Chuvash Language* (Kazan, 1898, p. 163).

In the grammars of several Turkic languages, this element is also classified as a particle [13; 346; 14; 576–579]. Drawing on these grammatical descriptions, E. Dauenov likewise classifies the first component of intensive forms in the Karakalpak language as a particle that conveys expressive meaning [15; 405].

In our view, however, the first component of an intensive form should not be regarded as an independent particle. There are several important differences between particles and the first component of intensive forms:

1. The first component of an intensive form is not an independent word but a constituent part of a word. When N.I. Ashmarin refers to "special particles", he understands them as specific elements within a word. This component is used exclusively together with the second component and does not function as an independent part of speech.

2. The first component of an intensive form is created from the initial syllable of the particular word and is therefore structurally and phonetically dependent on that word. Particles, by contrast, are not formed from the words to which they add additional or expressive meanings, although they may undergo certain phonetic changes.

3. The primary function of the first component of an intensive form is to strengthen and intensify a particular quality. Particles, on the other hand, convey various additional grammatical, semantic, or expressive meanings.

Therefore, the first component of an intensive form should not be classified as a particle. As N.I. Ashmarin's explanation suggests, it is a special constituent of the word that serves to form the superlative or intensified degree of adjectives and adverbs.

2. The second structural type of intensive forms

The second type of intensive forms is created by adding the sounds *a*, *á*, or *e* to the first component, thereby further strengthening the meaning of the word.

For example:

kúpá-kúndiz.

In some cases, the sound *p* in the first component is geminated.

Examples include:

teppe-teń;

tuppa-tuwrı;

appaq (ap-aq).

For example:

Jumıstan soń tuppa-tuwrı úyge qayttım (T. Khalmuratov).

3. CONCLUSION

The analysis of reduplicative words in the Karakalpak language demonstrates that they constitute a structurally and semantically diverse group of lexical units. According to their word-formation characteristics, they can be divided into two main categories: reduplicative words with identical components and reduplicative words with non-identical components.

Reduplicative words with identical components are formed through the repetition of the same root, stem, or grammatically identical word form. Depending on their lexical and grammatical characteristics, they may express plurality, continuity, duration, and other meanings.

Reduplicative words with non-identical components have more complex structural and morphological characteristics. They include words in which one component has a specific morphological form, words whose components bear different morphological markers, rhyming reduplicative words, and intensive forms.

The analysis also reveals that not every combination of repeated or phonetically similar words should be classified as a reduplicative word. In particular, combinations in which the components retain a syntactic subordinate relationship should be distinguished from single lexical units. Similarly, rhyming paired words whose

components are independent lexical items should not automatically be classified as rhyming reduplicative words.

Rhyming reduplicative words are characterized by specific phonetic patterns and perform important semantic and stylistic functions. In addition to their basic lexical meanings, they can express generalization, collectivity, depreciation, and contempt. Their formation is particularly productive in colloquial speech.

Intensive forms, in turn, constitute a distinctive structural and semantic type. Their principal function is to strengthen the meaning of adjectives and adverbs. The first component of such forms should be regarded as a specific constituent of the word rather than an independent particle, since it is structurally dependent on the second component and is directly involved in forming an intensified meaning.

Thus, the classification of reduplicative words in the Karakalpak language requires consideration of their morphological structure, phonetic composition, semantic characteristics, and syntactic relationships. The proposed classification provides a basis for a more systematic description of these lexical units and may contribute to the further development of Karakalpak lexicology and word-formation studies.

REFERENCES

1. Aganin, R. A. (1954). Povtory i ustoychivye odnorodnye parnye sochetaniya v sovremennom turetskom yazyke [Repetitions and stable homogeneous paired combinations in modern Turkish] [Abstract of Candidate of Sciences dissertation]. Moscow.

2. Batmanov, I. A. (1939). Grammatika kirgizskogo yazyka (Issue 1). Frunze.

3. Dmitriev, N. K. (1948). Grammatika bashkirskogo yazyka. Moscow–Leningrad.

4. Garipov, T. M. (1959). Bashkirskoe imennoe slovoobrazovanie. Ufa.

5. Habichev, M. (1971). Karachaevo-balkarskoe imennoe slovoobrazovanie. Cherkessk.

6. Hojiev, A. (1963). O‘zbek tilida qo‘shma, juft va takroriy so‘zlar. Toshkent.

7. Kaljanov, A. (2020a). Mezhyazykovye omonimy v russkom i karakalpakskom yazykakh. In Sovremennaya filologiya: problemy i perspektivy (pp. 225–229).

8. Kaljanov, A. (2020b). The universal (mixed) homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education, 1(5), 142–145.

9. Kaljanov, A. (2020c). Problems of training homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. International Journal of Discourse on Innovation, Integration and Education, 1(2), 10–13.

10. Kaljanov, A. (2020d). The some questions of grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. International Journal on Orange Technologies, 2(9), 19–21.

11. Kaljanov, A. (2021a). The essence of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. Journal of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, 2(3), 24–26.

12. Kaljanov, A. (2021b). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. Journal on International Social Science, 1(1), 1–6.

13. Kaljanov, A. (2021c). Problematic aspects of grammatical homonyms. Academicia: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 11(6), 815–821.

14. Kaljanov, A. (2021d). The short study of multiple homonyms in Karakalpak language. International Scientific and Current Research Conferences (pp. 51–53).

15. Kaljanov, A. (2021e). Theoretical basis of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. International Scientific and Current Research Conferences (pp. 36–40).

16. Kaljanov, A. (2021f). Qaraqalpaq tilindegi omonimler klassifikaciyasınıń ayırım máseleleri. Vestnik Karakalpakskogo otdeleniya Akademii nauk Respubliki Uzbekistan, 265(4), 196–199.

17. Kaljanov, A. (2021g). On the state of the problem of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Vestnik KGU im. Berdakha, 52(3), 182–185.

18. Kaljanov, A. (2021h). Single homonyms in Karakalpak language. In Qiyosiy adabiyotshunoslik, chog‘ishtirma tilshunoslik va tarjimashunoslik: muammo, yechim va istiqbollar (pp. 74–76).

19. Kaljanov, A. (2021i). Omonimlerdi ajıratıwda konteksttíń áhmiyeti. In Uluslararası Türkbilim Öğrenci Kurultayı Bildiriler Kitabı (pp. 194–200).

20. Kaljanov, A. (2021j). 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.

21. Kaljanov, A. (2021k). Lexico-grammatical homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education, 2(11), 992–1001.

22. Kaljanov, A. (2021l). 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.

23. Kaljanov, A. (2021m). The short analysis of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. In Noi tendințe în predarea limbajelor de specialitate în contextul racordării învățământului la cerințele pieței muncii (Vol. 4, pp. 251–255).

24. Kaljanov, A. (2021n). 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.

25. Kaljanov, A. (2021o). Linguistic features of the sources of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education in Karakalpakstan, 17(2), 123–126.

26. Kaljanov, A. (2021p). The role of interlingual homonyms in language teaching (on the example of Russian and Karakalpak languages). In Advanced methods of teaching foreign languages and their implementation issues in the system of training security personnel (pp. 276–278).

27. Kaljanov, A. (2022a). Homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language: General theoretical questions. Science and Education, 3(1), 368–385.

28. Kaljanov, A. (2022b). The influence of homonyms on the process of transterminologization in modern Karakalpak language. JournalNX, 8(11), 61–69. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/7KN9R

29. Kaljanov, A. (2022c). Features of the study of the degree of homonyms in Karakalpak language. Neo Scientific Peer Reviewed Journal, 4, 23–34. https://www.neojournals.com/index.php/nspj/article/view/28

30. Kaljanov, A. (2023). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. The International Journal of Language and Cultural (TIJOLAC), 5(1), 26–31.

31. Kaljanov, A. (2024). Homonyms as a phenomenon are one of the sources of the word play. Türkologiya, (2).

32. Kaljanov, A. (n.d.). The semantic resources of the context when defining homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. World of Philology, 5(4), 598–603.

33. Kaljanov, A. (2026a). The concept, role and place of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Current Research Journal of Philological Sciences, 6(4), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.37547/philological-crjps-07-04-03

34. Kaljanov, A. (2026b). The difficulty of distinguishing homonyms and polysemies as actual problems in the modern Karakalpak language. American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Research, 6(4), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.37547/ajsshr/volume06issue04-10

35. Kaydarov, A. (1958). Parnye slova v sovremennom uygurskom yazyke. Alma-Ata.

36. Kenesbaev, S. (1965). O transformirovannom povtore v kazakhskom yazyke. In Voprosy tyurkologii (pp. 34–38). Fan.

37. Muratov, S. N. (1961). Ustoychivye slovosochetaniya v tyurkskikh yazykakh. Izdatelstvo inostrannoy literatury.

38. Najimov, A. (1979). Qaraqalpaq tilinde jup hám tákirar sózler. Nókis.

39. Nasilov, V. M. (1940). Grammatika uygurskogo yazyka. Moscow.

40. Oruzbaeva, B. (1964). Slovoobrazovanie v kirgizskom yazyke. Ilim.

41. Современный татарский литературный язык: Лексика, фонетика, морфология. (1969). Moscow.

42. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси: I. Морфология. (1975). Toshkent.

43. Ҳәзирги қарақалпақ әдебий тилиниң грамматикасы: Сөз жасалыў ҳәм морфология. (1994). Билим.