

## WORD-FORMATION NESTS AS A FACTOR OF HOMONYMS CATEGORIZATION

Kurbanov Bakhram Shukrievich

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences, Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10041378>

**Abstract.** *The article discusses questions regarding non-derivative and derivative homonyms by the example of verbs of the Russian and Uzbek languages. In sight are the problems of distinguishing polysemy and homonymy, the criteria for determining their boundaries. The basis of the study is the study of the internal structure of the word. The classification of non-derivative and derivative verbs-homonyms of the Russian and Uzbek languages is presented taking into account the ways of their formation, derivative and non-derivative lexemes depending on the place in the word-building nest. Examples of word-formation types, in particular, affix word-formation methods inherent in the formation of verbal homonyms in the comparable Russian and Uzbek languages are given.*

**Keywords:** *homonymy, non-derivative and derivative homonyms, word-forming nest, root word/morpheme.*

### Introduction.

The relevance of the problem can be identified that currently, a comprehensive study of lexical paradigms in the interlayer aspect remains a perspective area of linguistics. A typological study of problems opens up fundamentally new possibilities in teaching languages. Despite such a deep and multifaceted study, the issue of homonymy regarding their occurrence and differentiation from polysemy remains incomplete. Traditionally, the issues of distinguishing homonyms from polysemy narrow down such reasons as borrowing, expanding or narrowing meanings, semantic derivation, or else - decay of polysemy, difference in the set of grammatical categories, different division, genetic connection of words, homonymy of foundations, homonymy of affixes, etc. Moreover, common reasons can include "leading to the emergence of polysemy in the language: the expansion of the meaning of the word, differentiation of meanings, borrowing, coming into use with the new meaning of the once obsolete word, values (metaphoric and analogical) [1, 71-73].

The research problem is the enrichment of vocabulary through the use of derivational processes in the field of homonymy, as well as the definition of the role of word-building nests in the formation of verbal homonymic paradigms in the Russian and Uzbek languages.

**Materials and methods.** Many scientists study the phenomenon of homonymy in connection with lexicography, morphology and word formation, because the study of linguistic phenomena is impossible without taking into account the interconnection and interrelations of language levels. Therefore, against the background of the systematic, regularity and repeatability of synonymy and antonymy, it should be noted the regular relationship of homonymic paradigms.

It is noteworthy that the opinion and definition of homonymy by L. A. Novikov can be stated: "On the foundation of a polysemy with regularity, repeatability, proportionality (and therefore, to a large extent the predictability of its LSB (family) relations, homonymy as a whole act as a negative category.

With homonymy, semantic relations appear as isolated, singular, exceptional, difficult to predict, which do not fit into the framework of regular relations characteristic of lexical-semantic variants of one word” [2, 209].

On this regard, A. I. Golovnya states: “concerning the homonymy of derived words, the regularity and predictability of reflected homonymy is less high than the regularity and predictability of reflected synonymy, but still quite high, as is the regularity and predictability of derivational formative homonymy. Most linguists currently consider homonymy as a systemic category of a language” [3, 132].

In our viewpoint, homonymy, and word-building homonymy as a whole, as a systemic and regular phenomenon, is quite fully reflected, analyzed, classified in the scientific works of linguistic scientists.

A.N. Tikhonov, studying the problems of homonymy, calls it one of the complex lexicological, word-building and lexicographic problems. He considers the internal structure of a word to be the most important criterion for resolving homonymy problems [4, Vol. 1, 33].

A. S. Pardaev considers it inappropriate to study lexical and word-formation homonyms in isolation from the study of the structure of homonymic nests. In this regard, he offers the following classification of homonyms:

1. Non-derivative homonyms leading homonymy nests.
2. Derived homonyms within the same nest.
3. Non-derivative homonyms opposed to derivatives in different nests.
4. Reflected derivational homonyms in homonymy nests [5, 64-68].

O.S. Akhmanova notes the systemic character of lexical-semantic relations in the formation of homonyms and divides them into the following types:

- I. Words with a pronounced morphological structure.
  1. Homonymy of the roots.
  2. Homonymy of affixes.
  3. Different degrees of separability.
  4. The difference in internal structure.
  5. Mismatch (difference) in belonging to parts of speech.
- II. Originally different words.

### **III. The dispersed polysemy [6, 6-8].**

O. L. Rubleva identifies lexical, word-building and semantic homonyms and notes the following causes of lexical homonyms: a) as a result of borrowing one of the components (*брак I-II* – marriage or defect), b) as a result of parallel borrowing from different languages (*гриф I-III* – signature or a part of musical instrument), as a result of various phonetic changes inside the tongue (*лук I-II* – bow or onion) [7, 87].

A. N. Tikhonov and A. S. Pardaev devote much attention to the system of derivative homonyms, mainly linking the study of the problem with derivational processes. O.S. Akhmanova calls word-building homonyms "with a pronounced morphological structure", considering the morphological structure, etymology and semantic meaning of the word to be an important criterion for the classification of derivatives of homonyms. This means that the criterion of production and non-production is one of the important factors in distinguishing homonymy and polysemy, because a set of derivatives and semantic relations in word-building nests are a material expression of lexical-semantic relations between paradigms. Therefore, “an important means of distinguishing

between polysemy and the homonymy of non-derivative words is a set of derivatives and semantic relations in word-building nests. Lexicologists who distinguish between polysemy and homonymy regardless of word-building nests, although they are guided by the criterion for the closeness of lexical meanings, the presence or absence of a semantic connection between certain units, grammatical features, or try to develop formal criteria for monosemy, polysemy and homonymy, do it “by eye” to a certain extent intuitively. However, derivatives that are part of a particular SG either explicate semantic relations with the source word of the nest, or signal their absence (if the nest is incorrectly composed) [8, 68-72].

Non-derivative homonyms are simple, lexical homonyms. Non-derivative homonyms are the root words of derivational nests. They control over the nests.

### **Results and discussions.**

Let us consider several examples for non-derivative homonyms from the “Dictionary of Russian Language Homonyms” by O.S. Akhmanova [10] and analyze the data of homonyms from A. N. Tikhonov's “Word-formation Dictionary of the Russian Language” [4] regarding their correlation to word-formation nests. In the word-building nest (WN), one-root words are placed, their internal structure and composition of derivatives is reflected, which is one of the important criteria for determining homonymy. In relation to the system of word-building nests of the Russian language, the following main types of non-derivative homonyms-verbs can be distinguished:

1. Non-derivative homonyms leading homonymy nests. The root words of such homonyms are led either by different ones or by one WN depending on the lexical-semantic relations between the paradigms:

a) Homonym verbs leading different derivational nests, for example: болтать I (*set in motion*) and болтать II (*idle talk*); валить I (*cause/force to fall*) and валить II (*move in mass, in multitude*); верстать I (*set the position*) and верстать II (*take on military service; endow with smth.; reward, equalize*); воротить I (*make smb. come back*) and воротить II (*turn to the side, drive*); гореть I (*To succumb to the action of fire, destroyed by fire.*) and гореть II (*be in the game of the burner in the role of catching*); доложить I (*officially inform; to notify*) and доложить II (*add; finish laying or putting*); жать I (*squeeze, press*) – жать II (*cut the stalks of cereals*); зубрить I (*mechanically memorizing*) and зубрить II (*making notches*); влиять влечь I (*pull*) and влечь II (*from лечь*) (*act*) and влиять II (*historical form. вливать*).

Here, the homonymy of verbs is based mainly on the fact that homonyms are the source words of different word-forming nests, which is why it should be concluded that they are of different origins.

b) Homonymous verbs leading the same derivational nest. Such homonyms arise on the basis of polysemantic words, the main criterion for generating such homonyms is semantic derivation: баловать I (*детей*) and баловать II (*от баловаться*); бить I (*молотком*), бить II (*ключом*) and бить III (*тревогу*).

O.S. Akhmanova notes that “the distinction between polysemy and “non-representative” homonymy is greatly facilitated by the different origins of the coincident complexes and, on the contrary, is complicated by the common origin. In addition, at this stage of the development of the language, this or that process may be incomplete, not completed” [6, 153].

2. Non-derivative homonyms opposed to derivatives in different nests. Non-derivative homonym verbs of this type enter into homonymic relations with derivative words that are derivatives of another derivational nest. For example: блудить I (non-derived word) and блудить

II (derived from *блуждать*); бродить I (derived from *бредти*), бродить II (derived from *брод*) and бродить III (non-derived word); бухнуть I (derived from *бух*) and бухнуть II (non-derived word); вешать I (derived from *вес*) and вешать II (non-derived word); влечь I (non-derived word) and влечь II (derived from *лечь*); вспылить I (*проявить гнев*) and вспылить II (derived from *пыль*); выправить I (non-derived word) and выправить II (derived from *править II*); выстегнуть I (non-derived word) and выстегнуть II (derived from *стегать*); выторочить I (non-derived word) and выторочить II (derived from *торока*); детонировать I (non-derived word) and детонировать II (derived from *тон*); добреть I (non-derived word) and добреть II (derived from *добро I*); донести I (non-derived word) and донести II (derived from *нести*); дрогнуть I (non-derived word), дрогнуть II (non-derived word) and дрогнуть III (derived from *дрожать*); душить I (derived from *духи*) and душить II (non-derived word); влопаться I (derived from *влопать*) and влопаться II (non-derived word).

3. Non-derivative homonyms through the parts of speech (*Conversion*). Homonyms of this type lead different word-building nests. A characteristic feature of such homonyms is that in their education “there are sporadically different types of inter-particle homonymy (conversion): verbs and nouns, adverbs and nouns, interjections and nouns, interjections and adverbs [10, 71-73]. However, in the formation of such homonyms mainly the verb and noun participate: *выть I (verb)* and *выть (noun)*; *мочь I (verb)* and *мочь II (noun)*; *пасть I (verb)* and *пасть II (noun)*; *знать I (verb)* and *знать II (noun)*; *печь I (verb)* and *печь (noun)*; *бить (verb)* and *бить (noun)*.

More diverse and versatile is the organization of derivative homonyms of the Russian language. Every derivative word, including derivative homonyms, is the result of derivational processes. Derived homonyms are derivational homonyms or simply articulated words, regardless of their morphemic structure and derivational structure.

An important role in the organization of derivative homonymy is played by word-building nests. As noted by A. N. Tikhonov, “word-building nests are involved in the systematic organization of all units of vocabulary, in the coordination of their relations. They are associated with all the reflected phenomena in vocabulary - “reflected synonymy”, “reflected homonymy”, “reflected antonymy”, “reflected polysemy” (“reflected metaphor”, “reflected metonymy”), etc. [4, 4].

In traditional linguistics, word-formation homonymy is often used along with lexical and morphological homonyms, often they are simply derived and segmented words. It is necessary to distinguish word-formation homonyms from derivatives of homonyms created on the basis of lexical homonyms, as well as homonyms with different division. It is logical that a derivative word consists of two constituent parts - a generating base and a word-forming affix. The internal structure of the word always “suggests” the semantic and morphological proximity of homonymic words. Having matching external parts, word-building homonyms have a different word-building structure. Word-forming homonyms must have matching homonymic components. Otherwise, they cannot be attributed to word-formation homonyms, for example, as A.N. Tikhonov notes, the following paradigms cannot be attributed to word-formation homonyms: *составить (non-affixal)* and *со-ставить (affixal)*, *за-жить (affixal)* and *зажить (non-affixal)*, *вы-глядеть (affixal)* and *выглядеть (non-affixal)*, *пере-бить (affixal)* and *перебить (non-affixal)*, *до-нести – до-носить (affixal)* and *донести - доносить (non-affixal)* [4, 48]. These homonyms do not coincide in structure with either productive foundations or derivational affixes.

O. S. Akhmanova states that “with an innumerable variety of individual cases, the existence of the following four main categories can be considered undeniable, namely: 1) partial homonymy of species forms, prefix homonymy (that is, homonymy resulting from the homonymy of prefixes when the identity of the root morpheme), 3) the homonymy of the root morpheme with the identity of the prefixal, and 4) the homonymy of both morphemes [6, 144].

Therefore, homonyms should be considered word-building if they have the same two parts of the word or one of them is the base or word-forming affix, which contributes to the emergence of root and affix homonymy of derived words. There are several examples for the root and affixal homonymy in Russian: за-брызгать (*pre-*) and за-брызгать (*over-*), вы-жать (*squeeze*) and вы-жать (*sow*), за-топить (*heat*) and за-топить (*fill with water*).

Based on the many peculiarities of the phenomenon of homonymy of verbs in the Russian language, A. N. Tikhonov identifies several types of derivative homonyms: 1) homonyms that arose on the basis of lexical homonyms; 2) homonyms created on the basis of one-root words; 3) homonyms formed on the basis of consonant, but not homonymous and not root words, the foundations of which coincide when they participate in word formation [8, 49].

We generally approve of the classification of word-formation homonyms of the Russian language, developed by A. N. Tikhonov, but with some terminological and factual clarifications. In particular, homonyms created on the basis of consonant, but not homonymous and non-root words, the generating bases of which coincide in the derivation process, are an important link in homonyms in the system of linguistic units of the Russian language.

According to the classification we offer, derivative verbal homonyms are divided into the following types: 1) reflected word-forming homonyms in the structure of homonymic nests; 2) derivative homonyms within the same nest; 3) homonyms formed on the basis of consonant, but not homonymous words.

Homonyms of these groups are mainly formed from the foundations of non-derivative homonyms that lead word-forming nests, as well as from non-derivative homonyms opposed to derivatives in different nests. In addition, all derivatives of the homonyms of these two types reflect the homonymity of their generators, which relate to the same part of speech. It is noteworthy that the study of the reflection phenomenon was first begun by V.V. Vinogradov precisely on the basis of homonymy [12, 74].

Reflected derivational homonyms as part of homonymic nests. This group includes derivatives of verb homonyms, the derivatives of which are the root words of different derivational nests: болтнуть I (derived from *болтать I*) and болтнуть II (derived from *болтать II*).

This also includes homonyms that are produced by non-derivative homonyms opposed to derivatives in different nests: заблудить I (derived from *блудить I*) and заблудить II (*блудить II* derived from *блуждать*), выбродить I (*бродить I* derived from *брести*), выбродить II (*бродить II* derived from *брод*) and выбродить III (*вино*, derived from *бродить III*), вывесить I (and *вес*) and вывесить II (derived from *вешать II*), обвесить I (derived from *вес*) and обвесить II (derived from *вешать II*).

Derivative homonyms within the same nest. This group includes derivative homonyms that produce the same verb, which is the source word of the nest. Homonymy under such paradigms arises due to the homonymy of the foundations, affixes or, at the same time, the roots and affixes. Here are examples of the homonymy of the basics, for example: выдрать I and выдрать II, побудить I and побудить II.

This type is especially productive due to the homonymy of affixes, in particular for verbs with prefixes *за-*, *по-*, *на-*, *с-*, *про-*, *пере-* and etc. For example: *забить I* (*beginning of beating*) and *забить II* (*hammering*), *заболтать I* (*beginning of a talk*) and *заболтать II* (*blend*).

It should be noted that the issues of defining the boundaries of polysemy and homonymy, derivative and non-derivative verbs in relation to word-building nests in the Russian language remain incomplete. Evidence of this is the cases identified during the study of the structure of non-derivative and derivative verbs. For example, homonymic paradigms *драть I* and *драть II* in the dictionary of homonyms O.S. Akhmanova are given as homonyms, respectively, are derived from verbs *выдрать I* and *выдрать II*. In the vocabulary dictionary of A. N. Tikhonov, the verb *драть* is the source word of the nest; it has no homonymous paradigms. The verbs *выдрать I* and *выдрать II* are given as derivatives of tear within one nest. In the explanatory dictionary of S. I. Ozhegov, *выдрать I* and *выдрать II* are given as two meanings of the same word *драть*.

The homonymic paradigms of *верстать I* and *верстать II* in A. N. Tikhonov's word-formation dictionary are listed as non-derivative homonyms as the root words of different nests, and also have several derivative homonyms. The materials on these verbs are not reflected in the dictionary of homonyms by O.S. Akhmanova.

Derivative homonyms formed on the basis of consonant, but not homonymous words. According to the classification of A. N. Tikhonov, this is the only type of word-building homonyms that arise as a result of random coincidence of the division of derivatives of the foundations of relative adjectives: *метельный I* (derived from *метла*) and *метельный II* (derived from *метель*); *душевой I* (derived from *душ*) and *душевой II* (derived from *душа*); *кремнистый I* (derived from *кремень*) and *кремнистый* (derived from *кремний*) [4, 52].

In our opinion, this should include verb derivatives of homonyms that are produced by consonant, but not homonymous verbs in the Russian language, for example: *кусать* and *кушать*, *месить* and *мешать I-II*, *месту* and *метать I-II*. In the word-building nests of these paradigms, many homonymous words are formed. However, they are not related to reflection due to the lack of homonymy of the root words of their nests.

In the Uzbek language, non-derivative verb homonyms are formed mainly from the basics of verbs. It is known that the infinitive in the Uzbek language is expressed using the suffix *-моқ*, which corresponds to the Russian indicator of the infinitive *-ть*. However, in the dictionary of homonyms of the Uzbek language by Sh.Rakhmatullaev, which is the only dictionary of homonyms of a general nature, the verbs are given in the form of an imperative mood, for example *оз* instead of *озмоқ* [13, 92]. The reason for this approach is that the imperative form of the verb is smaller than the infinitive form in its morphemic composition. Consequently, the least significant part of the word is given in the dictionary.

Non-derivative homonyms of the Uzbek language, according to the classification of Sh. Rakhmatullaev, are divided into two main types: 1) homonymy as a result of the coincidence of the expression plan; 2) homonymy as a result of the expansion of lexical meaning. The coincidence of the expression plan provides for the penetration of three different types of homonymy: 1) homonymy between Uzbek lexemes; 2) homonymy between Uzbek and borrowed lexemes; 3) homonymy between borrowed lexemes.

Sh. Rakhmatullaev divides the derivative homonyms of the Uzbek language into two types:

1. Homonyms, consisting of non-derivative and derivative lexemes.
2. Homonyms consisting of derivative lexemes.

Homonyms of the second group are divided into two subspecies:

- 1) Homonyms formed from one lexeme;
- 2) Homonyms formed from different lexemes.

Both last groups of homonyms are therefore divided into subgroups by the participation in their education of the same or different affixes [14, 133].

As for us, one of the main criteria for determining the boundaries of homonymy and polysemy is lexicographic descriptions of word-forming nests. Relations of Uzbek language lexemes in word-forming nests are presented in the “Educational word-formation dictionary of the Uzbek language” by B. Mengliev [15].

Our classification, applicable to verbal homonyms of both Russian and Uzbek languages, provides for the following types of non-derivative and derivative homonyms.

1. Non-derivative homonyms leading homonymy nests. This can include homonymic paradigms leading different or the same word-building nests.

a) Homonymous verbs heading different word-forming nests: бит II (*finish*), бит III (*grow, be born*) and бит IV (*write*), бўл I (*divide*) and бўл II (*become*), ёз II (*write*), ёз III (*spread*), ёз IV (*offend*) and ёз V (*auxiliary verb*), ёк II (*fire*) and ёк III (*like*), сўк II (*tear a fabric*) and сўк III (*scold*), сўр I (*suck*) and сўр II (*ask*), чоп I (*run*) and чоп II (*chop*).

b) Homonymous verbs leading the same derivational nest. The main criterion for generating such homonyms is semantic derivation: бер I (*give*) and бер II (*aux. verb in the meaning of finish*), орт II (*load*) and орт III (*increase*), чак I (*break the stone of fruits*) and чак II (*sting*).

2. Non-derivative homonyms opposed to derivatives in different nests. Non-derivative verbs of this type are homonymous with derivative homonyms, which are derivatives of another derivational nest: яра I (*ёр – chop into two + а – suffix.*) – яра II (*to be good for*); тезла I (*be faster*) and тезла II (*make smth. sharper, or keen*).

3. Inter-speech-part non-derivative homonyms (Conversion).

It should be noted that the author includes in one series homonyms having a different part-line origin, which leads to the emergence of mainly Inter-speech-part homonyms. Interparticle homonyms make up the majority of the paradigms of the dictionary of homonyms of the Uzbek language. They are formed from a noun, a verb, an adjective, an adverb, and other parts of speech: от I (*horse*), от II (*name*) and от III (*throw*); сол I (*beat*), сол II (*put into*) and сол III (*auxiliary word*), ел I (*ветер(ок)*).

Derivative homonymous verbs in the Uzbek language are formed both from the roots of verbs and from the roots of the nominal parts of speech. Derivative verbal homonyms are mainly formed by adding the suffix *-ла, -а* to the root. It should be noted that the phenomenon of reflected homonymy is universal for the Russian and Uzbek languages, because in the Uzbek language, as in Russian, derivative verb homonyms reflect the homonymy of their generators.

Reflected derivational homonyms as part of homonymic nests. This group includes derivative verbal homonyms formed on the basis of lexical homonyms that are produced by the source words of different derivational nests: газла I (*measure*) and газла II (*газировать*), дастала I (*to make a handle*) and дастала II (*to make a bunch*).

Derived homonyms within the same nest. This group includes derivative homonyms that produce the same verb, which is the root word of the nest. Homonymy in such paradigms arises due to the homonymy of the roots, affixes, or at the same time, the roots and affixes: бетла I (*turn*

*the page*) and бетла II (*dare*), бошла I (*start*), бошла II (*special., co-operate*) and бошла III (*to lead, to head*).

Findings. Thus, it should be emphasized that the phenomenon of homonymy in the Russian and Uzbek languages is regular and systemic. Particularly regular relationships and interactions in the formation of derivatives, in particular, reflected homonyms. In this case, an important place is occupied by homonymy, arising due to the homonymy of foundations and affixes. If the derivative of verbal homonyms of the Russian language is characterized by the active participation of prefixes and suffixes, then in the Uzbek language, derivative verbal homonyms are mainly formed using the suffixes *-ла, -а*. Unlike Russian, in the Uzbek language, the formation of derivative homonyms in the prefixal way is unproductive. Homonyms in the Russian and Uzbek languages can be formed both from the roots of verbs, and from the roots of other parts of speech: the noun and adjective, etc. Russian and Uzbek languages, as heterogeneous and unrelated languages, have much in common in the field of homonymy. This is evidenced by the presented analysis of homonyms of the mapped languages, based on criteria common to the two languages.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Xasanov E.R. Factors determining the development of polysemy. Russian language and literature in Uzbekistan – 2016 // Materials of the Republican scientific-practical conference dedicated to the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of M.A. Bulgakov. – Tashkent: National University of Uzbekistan, 2016. – P. 133-134.
2. Novikov L. A. Semantics of the Russian language. – Moscow: Higher School, 1982. – 272 p.
3. Golovnya A. I. Homonymy as a systemic category of language. – Minsk: Belarusian State University, 1974. – 132 p.
4. Tixonov A.N. Word formation dictionary of Russian language. – Moscow.: Russkij yazyk, 1985. – Vol. 1 – 856 p. Vol. II – 887 p.
5. Pardaev A.S., Kurbanov B.Sh. Typology of homonyms and homonymic word-building nests in the Russian language // Actual problems of Russian word-formation. – Samarkand: Samarkand State University, 2015. – P. 64-68.
6. Akhmanova O.S. Essays on General and Russian Lexicology. – Moscow: Publishing house of Uchpedgiz, 1957. – 295 p.
7. Rubleva O.L. Lexicology of the modern Russian language. – Vladivostok: Publishing house of DVGU, 2004. – 247 p.
8. Pardaev A.S., Kodirova Z.A. Word-building nests as a criteria for distinguishing non-derivative homonyms in the Russian language // Actual problems of Russian word-formation. Materials of a traditional republican seminar in the framework of the Uzbek scientific school of Russian word formation. – Tashkent: National University of Uzbekistan, 2016. – P. 68-72.
9. Tixonov A.N., Pardaev A.S. (1989). The role of nests of root words in the systemic organization of Russian vocabulary. Reflected synonymy. Reflected homonymy. Reflected Anthony. – Tashkent: Fan, 1989. Akhmanova, O. S. Dictionary of homonyms of the Russian language. – Moscow: Russkij yazyk, 1974. – 141 p.
10. Mirzaeva Sh.R., Usmanova S.Yu. Homonyms of Russian language in the frequency aspect. Russian language and literature in Uzbekistan - 2016 // Materials of the Republican



- scientific-practical conference dedicated to the 125th anniversary of the birth of M. A. Bulgakov. – Tashkent: National University of Uzbekistan, 2016. – P. 68-71.
11. Vinogradov V. V. Problems of the morphemic structure of the word and the phenomenon of homonymy in Slavic languages // Slavic linguistics. 6<sup>th</sup> international congress of Slavists. – Moscow: Nauka, 1968. – P. 53-119.
  12. Raxmatullaev Sh. Explanatory dictionary of homonyms of the Uzbek language. – Tashkent: Oqituvchi, 1984. – 215 p.
  13. Tursunov U., Muxtorov A., Raxmatullaev Sh. Modern Uzbek literary language. – Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 1992. – 399 p.
  14. Mengliyev B., Bahriddinova B., Xoliyorov O'., Zaripova M., Xushvaqtoy M. Word-formation dictionary of the Uzbek language. – Tashkent: Publ. Yangi asr avlodi, 2008. – 176 p.