

REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN

On the rights of the manuscript

ABSTRACT

of the dissertation
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**HOMONYMY OF SYNTACTIC UNITS
IN THE MODERN AZERBAIJANI LANGUAGE**

Speciality: 5706.01 – Azerbaijani language

Field of science: Philology

Applicant: **Gunel Surkhay Aliyeva**

Sumgait – 2022

The work was performed at Department of Azerbaijani linguistics of Baku State University.

Scientific supervisor: Doctor of Science in Philology, professor
Tofiq Muzaffar Hajiyev

Official opponents: Doctor of Science in Philology, professor
Ikram Ziyad Gasimov

Doctor of Science in Philology, professor
Ismayil Babash Kazimov

Doctor of Science in Philology, professor
Hajar Emin Huseynova

Dissertation Council - FD 2.24 of Supreme Attestation Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at Sumgait State University

Chairman of the
Dissertation Council: Doctor of Science in Philology, professor
Ramazan Salam Mammadov

Scientific Secretary of
the Dissertation
Council: Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, assoc.prof
Boyukkhanim Ibrahim Eminli

Chairman of the
scientific seminar: Doctor of Science in Philology, professor
Astan Ahmadkhan Bayramov

INTRODUCTION

Research issue rationale and development rate. Linguistic research is conducted in 2 directions:

1. Studying issues in depth and incorporating them into a scientific research framework that is entirely new to linguistic science;
2. Clarifying and obscuring aspects of some traditional linguistic problems that have long been known to linguistics and have been the subject of numerous studies.

Homonymy is one of the linguistic phenomenon that is constantly studied and retains its relevance throughout history, as homonymy is a semantic phenomenon that encompasses all meaningful language units. The semantic side of language units is always in the center of attention, since the semantic side of language units must be included in the same research as the form of bilateral language units to complete the research.

Homonymy has long been explored using lexical terms. Later, research of the homonymy included morphological and phraseological units. Homonymy of syntactic units, which give semantic certainty to the stated language units, hasn't been researched in a while. Developments in ICT, computer and text linguistics, and machine translation have led to automatic text processing. Certain disparities between the semantic-syntactic analysis of particular text syntactic units and computer analysis have drawn attention to the homonymy of syntactic units. It raises a number of key concerns, such as the process of homonymy at the syntactic level, the causes that led to its emergence, and its separation from random syntactic differences. The study of homonymy at the syntactic level paved the way for reconsidering the role of syntactic units in language communication and information transfer. Involvement of homonymy in new research has prompted the need for creating terminology on this subject, or a number of terms that can completely describe this language phenomenon.

The abundance of data collected on the basis of Azerbaijani language materials regarding the phenomenon of homonymy at the syntactic level of language and the paucity of theoretical sources devoted to the study of this linguistic phenomenon in our linguistics indicate that the study of this linguistic fact is of great scientific significance. It is essential to investigate and clarify some of the perspectives expressed in the limited theoretical literature on this topic in order to achieve tangible outcomes. In this regard, the dissertation's topic is significant.

The earliest investigations on the linguistic phenomena of homonymy, which occurs at the syntactic level, date back to the 1960s. In the 62 years since these initial studies, the field of linguistics has been expanded by considerable scientific study, including a number of key concerns pertaining to the homonymy of syntactic units. First, it should be mentioned that this linguistic phenomenon has its own terminology in world linguistics. The majority of studies have done a communicative evaluation of the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy, notwithstanding differences of opinion. First, it should be mentioned that this linguistic phenomenon has its own terminology in world linguistics. The majority of studies have done a communicative evaluation of the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy, notwithstanding differences of opinion. N.Chomsky, Fr.Danesh, F.A.Dreyzin, A.N.Gvozdev, Y.P.Kalechits, I.F.Vardul, V.M.Solntsev, L.D.Chesnokova, G.F.Gavrilova, D.A.Salkova, A.V.Gladky, Y.Q.Sokolova, N.P.Kolesnikov, K.Fushs, A.T.Lipatov, M.-A.Pavo, C.-E.Sarfati, O.V.Dragoy, O.A.Lapteva, Y.V.Shkurko and others have attempted to determine the true nature of the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy, the factors that led to the emergence of this linguistic phenomenon, the characteristics of homonymous syntactic units, and the phenomenon of homonymy in their scientific research. In addition, they have revealed very important issues, such as the impact of language units on the information mass.

Research on the homonymy of syntactic units in the Turkological literature is very limited. As in Azerbaijani linguistics,

the topic of syntactic homonymy in Turkology has not been studied in isolation, but rather in the context of lexicology and syntax concerns. As in Azerbaijani linguistics, the topic of syntactic homonymy in Turkology has not been studied in isolation, but rather in the context of lexicology and syntax concerns. Brief information about the essence of the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy is given in M.S.Sergaliyev's doctoral dissertation which named "Synonymy of syntactic constructions in the modern Kazakh literary language".¹ In M.Ravshanov's "Homonyms in the explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language", Z.Y.Kaskarakova's "Homonyms in the Khakass language", and Y.V.Semyonova's "Homonyms in the modern Yakut language" research works, syntactic homonyms are noted while conducting typological classification of homonyms, but the authors satisfied with one-page brief explanations.² According to V.N.Mushayev and S.N.Abdullayev's work titled "On the study of syntactic homonyms" the phenomena of syntactic homonymy is not widely and fully examined in both Mongol studies and Turkology; thus, there is a tremendous need for in-depth research.³

¹ Сергалиев, М.С. Синонимия синтаксических конструкций в современном казахском литературном языке: / Дис. ... докт. филол. наук. / [Elektron resurs] / – Алма-Ата, 1987. – 365 с. URL: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/sinonimiya-sintaksicheskikh-konstruktsii-v-sovremennom-kazakhskom-literaturnom-yazyke>

² Равшанов, М. Омонимы в толковом словаре узбекского языка: / Автореферат дис. ... канд. филол. наук. / [Elektron resurs] / – Ташкент, 1991. – 21 с. URL: <https://cheloveknauka.com/omonimy-v-tolkovom-slova-re-uzbekskogo-yazyka> ; Каскаракова, З.Е. Омонимы в хакасском языке: / Автореферат дис. ... канд. филол. наук. / [Elektron resurs] / – Абакан, 2005. – 28 с. URL: <https://cheloveknauka.com/omonimy-v-hakasskom-yazyke> ; Семенова, Е.В. Омонимы в современном якутском языке: / Автореферат дис. ... канд. филол. наук. / [Elektron resurs] / – Якутск, 2013. – 25 с. URL: <https://cheloveknauka.com/omonimy-v-sovremennom-yakutskom-yazyke>

³ Мушаев, В.Н., Абдуллаев, С.Н. Об изучении синтаксических омонимов (на материале монгольских и тюркских языков): [Elektron resurs] / Вестник Калмыцкого университета, – 2016. №4 (32), – с. 109-114. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ob-izuchenii-sintaksicheskikh-omonimov-na-materiale-mongolskih-i-tyurkskih-yazykov/viewer>

The study of this linguistic phenomenon on the basis of Azerbaijani language materials has begun since 1980. The first theoretical source is the doctoral dissertation "Homonymy in the Azerbaijani language" defended by H.A.Hasanov in 1980. In the sixth portion of the dissertation titled "Syntactic and Phraseological Homonyms," the homonymy of syntactic units is addressed, and the term "Syntactic Homonym" is introduced.⁴ The dictionary of "Explanatory linguistic terms" by M.I.Adilov, Z.N.Verdiyeva and F.M.Agayeva is a remarkable source in terms of correctly defining the essence of this linguistic phenomenon. The dictionary explains the terms "syntactic homonymy", as well as the terms "amphibole" and "syntactic ambiguity" associated with it in one way or another.⁵ In general, in our linguistics we have not come across a monographic research work devoted exclusively to the homonymy of syntactic units. As a result of our observations and analysis of the syntactic level of our language, it became evident that our researchers only encountered syntactic homonymy when studying a particular syntactic issue. All the following authors also implicitly addressed the topic of syntactic unit homonymy: Study of active and passive position of compound subject in the content of complex clause by K.M.Abdullayev, the distinctive role of the intellectual-grammatical functions of intonation in the asyndetic complex sentences by F.A.Calilov, syntax of complex sentences in the Turkish languages by M.M.Musayev, semantical and grammatical in the mixed type of complex sentences by T.Muzaffaroglu, the method of transformation by A.Rajably, problem of eliminating ambiguity in the machine translation system by Z.Guliyeva, and using opportunity of objective subordinate clause in the English and Azerbaijani language and its

⁴ Гасанов, А.А. Омонимия в азербайджанском языке: / Автореферат дис. ... докт. филол. наук. / – Баку, 1980. – с.32-38

⁵ Adilov, M.İ. İzahlı dilçilik terminləri (soru lüğəti). Azərbaycan dilində / M.İ.Adilov, Z.N.Verdiyeva, F.M.Ağayeva – Bakı: Maarif, – 1989. – s.16; s.243

stylistic features by M.N.Asadova.⁶ All of this suggests that the phenomena of syntactic homonymy is not a new area for researches, but it has been thoroughly addressed and researched.

Object and subject of research. The object of research is the syntactic level of contemporary Azerbaijani. The research focuses on homonymous syntactic units collected from sources associated with artistic, partially scientific, and journalistic styles of the Azerbaijani language.

Aims and objectives of the research. To correctly establish the essence of the phenomena of homonymy, all of its linguistic manifestations must be taken into account. From this perspective, the study of the homonymy of syntactic units can reveal a number of fascinating aspects about the phenomena of homonymy and provide conditions for their involvement in the research. The primary objective of this research is to determine the mechanism of formation and development of homonymy at the syntactic level of the Azerbaijani language, as well as to identify its characteristics. The following tasks have been proposed for this purpose:

1. Analyse current theoretical perspectives on the study of homonymy of syntactic units in Azerbaijani and international linguistic literature;
2. Clarify the causes why homonymy of syntactic units was absent from the researches for a long period of time;

⁶ Абдуллаев, К.М. О составе членов предложения в азербайджанском языке // – Bakı: Azərbaycan SSR EA-nın Xəbərləri, Ədəbiyyat, dil və incəsənət seriyası, – 1982. №3, – c. 57-58; Cəlilov, F.A. Mürəkkəb cümlə sintaksisi. Müəllim üçün vəsait. Azərbaycan dilində / F.A.Cəlilov. – Bakı: Maarif, – 1983. – s.40; Musayev, M.M. Türk dillərində tabeli mürəkkəb cümlə: / filologiya üzrə elmlər doktoru dis. / – Bakı, 1994. – s.43-62; Müzəffəroğlu, T. Müasir Azərbaycan dilində mürəkkəb cümlənin struktur semantikasi / T.Müzəffəroğlu. – Bakı: Azər nəşr, – 2002. – s.179-212; Rəcəbli, Ə.Ə. Dilçilik metodları / Ə.Ə.Rəcəbli. – Bakı: Nurlan, – 2003. – s.422; Кулиева, З. Проблема разрешения смысловой неоднозначности в системе машинного перевода // – Bakı: AMEA-nın Xəbərləri, Humanitar elmlər seriyası, – 2005. №4, – c.126; Əsədova, M.N. İngilis və Azərbaycan dillərində tamamlıq budaq cümlələri / M.N.Əsədova. – Bakı: Nurlan, – 2007. – s.86-93

3. Clarify the terminology associated with homonymous syntactic units;
4. Investigate the homonymy of free phrases;
5. Examine the homonymy of sentences;
6. Identify the factors that lead to the emergence of homonymy of syntactic units and dehomonymizers that create conditions for its elimination;
7. Investigate the influence of homonymy on the syntactic level of language on the information transmission process.

Research methods. The research included descriptive, comparative, and transformational approaches.

Basic theses for defence. The following provisions are included in the defence:

- The term "syntactic homonymy" is the most effective and appropriate of the numerous phrases used to name the phenomena of homonymy that manifests at the syntactic level of language;
- Modern Azerbaijani literary language is extremely interesting and replete with scientifically significant data for examining the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy;
- The most significant aspect of the phenomenon of homonymy, which manifests at the syntactic level of language, is the national identity of its formation mechanism, which is free of foreign language influence;
- Homonymy is more prevalent in type III definitive phrases than in other phrases;
- The homonymy of simple sentences is more prevalent in contemporary Azerbaijani. This can be explained by the existence of an inverse relationship between the structural complexity of syntactic units and the process of syntactic homonymy occurrence.

Scientific novelty of the research. In the dissertation, the homonymy of both free phrases and sentences is studied systematically and extensively on the basis of Azerbaijani language materials for the first time. Additionally, the mechanism of occurrence of the phenomenon of homonymy and its distinguishing characteristics from other cases of random meaning diversity are

identified. The reasons why the phenomenon was not studied are explained, as well as the terminology pertaining to homonymy of syntactic units is clarified.

Theoretical and practical significance of the research. The research can be used as a theoretical resource for a comprehensive description of homonymy in Azerbaijani linguistics research, high school and university textbooks. This research is applicable to the study of homonymy, the informative load of syntactic units, their position in the communication process, text and computer linguistics, and machine translation in particular.

The dissertation has the following practical significance for linguistics:

1. Preparation of lectures and special courses on syntax of modern Azerbaijani language in philological faculties of universities;
2. Preparation of textbooks and teaching aids for language classes for secondary and higher schools;
3. Development of solution algorithms for computer programs that perform automatic processing of texts.

Approbation and implementation. The dissertation's key findings are reflected in seven scientific journal articles, three local, and two international conference reports.

The name of the organization where the dissertation was conducted. The dissertation was completed at Baku State University's Department of Azerbaijani Linguistics.

The volume of the dissertation's structural sections separately and the general volume. The dissertation containing 175 pages consists of an introduction (7 pages), three chapters (Chapter I (51 pages), Chapter II (39 pages), and Chapter III (49 pages)), the results of which summarise the principal findings of the research (4 pages), and a bibliography (23 pages). The total volume of the dissertation, excluding the bibliography, is 287174 symbols.

BASIC CONTENT OF THE DISSERTATION

The "Introduction" section of the dissertation describes the research rationale and initial investigation, the aims and objectives of the research, the research methods, the basic theses for defence, the scientific novelty of the research, the theoretical and practical significance of the research, and the name of the organization where the dissertation was conducted. The name and volume of the dissertation's structural units are indicated separately, and the dissertation's total volume is indicated with a symbol count.

The first chapter of the dissertation is composed of three paragraphs and is titled "**The problem of syntactic units' homonymy in linguistics**". The first paragraph, titled "**Homonymy at the lexical and phraseological levels**", investigates the nature and characteristics of scientific research on the phenomenon of homonymy in the lexicology, semiotics, phraseology, and morphology sections of linguistics.

The phenomenon of homonymy has been studied extensively, comprehensively and exhaustively on the basis of words. This is because homonymy is expressed more actively at the lexical level of the language. Numerous studies on the phenomenon of homonymy have demonstrated that all linguistic units (with the exception of phonetic units) can be homonymous, but the phenomenon does not manifest uniformly at all levels of language. This does not, however, diminish the significance of its study in the context of units of varying levels.

Although the existence of the phenomenon of ambiguity in linguistics is frequently linked to the principle of economy, the process of the emergence of the phenomenon of homonymy is occasionally also explained by this principle. In Azerbaijani and global linguistics, linguists take two positions on this issue: 1) those who argue that there is no connection between the phenomenon of homonymy and the effort-saving tendency of the language (these researchers use two or more language signs speaking about homonymous words); and 2) those who accept the phenomenon of

homonymy as a result of the effort-saving tendency of the language (researchers who stand in this position explain the members of the homonymous line as a lexical unit). The phenomenon of homonymy should not be interpreted as an effort-saving tendency in language. The fact that the vast majority of homonymous words, with few exceptions, are formed in different contexts and at different times does not give them any reason to be used interchangeably.

To provide a more accurate perspective on the study of homonymy as a linguistic phenomenon or a random case governed by the internal laws of language, reference must be made to Ferdinand de Saussure's view on the freedom and immutability of language signs.⁷ Although these two aspects appear to be contradictory, they raise an important issue. Language operates according to a set of regularities. Any seemingly random aspect of the situation is subject to these patterns. This fact applies to the phenomenon of homonymy as well. According to L.V.Malakhovsky, *"homonymy is a linguistic phenomenon that closely combines casualty with regularity, it is not relative, it is an absolute linguistic event. The existence of homonyms in a language is absolute and regular, and it is a natural consequence of the evolution of language."*⁸

Classification is one of the most complex issues associated with the phenomenon of homonymy. For a systematic and comprehensive study of the phenomenon of homonymy, a well-organized, comprehensive classification covering all the subtleties of this linguistic phenomenon is necessary and important. After reviewing linguists' classifications of the homonymy phenomenon, we concluded that H.Hasanov's classification is the most exhaustive.⁹

⁷ Sössür, F. Ümumi dilçilik kursu / Ferdinand de Sössür, tərc. ed. N.Q.Cəfərov. – Bakı: BDU, – 2003. – s.146; s.151

⁸ Малаховский, Л.В. Теория лексической и грамматической омонимии / Л.В.Малаховский. – Ленинград: «Наука» Ленинградское отделение, – 1990. – с.9; с.15

⁹ Azərbaycan dilinin omonimlər lüğəti / tərt. ed. H.Ə.Həsənov. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – 2012. – s.24-33

Homonymy manifests itself at the phraseological level of language as well. Figurative meaning determines phraseological combinations. In contrast to the lexical homonymy formed from real meanings, it is necessary to discuss the homonymy of figurative meanings in this context.

The relationship between ambiguity and homonymy and context is one of the most crucial issues in linguistics. The first of these two linguistic phenomena are more context-dependent, as all shades of meaning in a polysemous word are derived from the word's various connections to other words. Because homonymy is more context-dependent than other linguistic phenomena, it is sometimes perceived as an uncontrollable phenomenon that hinders communication. We believe that homonymy should be evaluated as a linguistic phenomenon that does not contradict the laws of language development and does not impede the communication process.

The second paragraph, entitled "**Homonymy at the syntactic level**", examines the available scientific and theoretical sources on homonymy of syntactic units. On the basis of an examination of the perspectives of H.A.Hasanov, M.I.Adilov, Z.N.Verdiyeva, F.M.Agayeva, K.M.Abdullayev, M.M.Musayev, T.Muzaffaroglu, A.A.Rajabli, Z.Guliyeva and M.N.Asadova on syntactic homonymy, the level of research of this field in Azerbaijani linguistics is determined, and attention is given to issues that are crucial to address but have not yet been investigated in depth.

Noting that internal regularities in the form and content relationship of language units are more conservative for syntactic units and that the quantitative composition of language units plays a significant role in this regard, T.Muzaffaroglu writes about the fact of homonymy in syntactic units and need for studying this field: "*In relation to proportionality, the factor of homonymy of language units reduces its activity at the syntactic level. This is because syntactic units tend to be more specific and have a more complex structure.*

However, the syntactic layer has the same ambiguity and homonymy as the other layer”¹⁰.

The fact that a phrase is always used within sentences that play a contextual role for it, and that the sentence is used within context interacting with other sentences, prevents the realization of a second meaning that could potentially exist in them, or this meaning remains outside focus, only to be discovered through machine translation research. The fact that syntactic units serve as linguistic units that eliminate ambiguity and homonymy in words is the second reason why syntactic homonymy is excluded from research. As a third reason, the syntactic units in linguistics have their concrete meaning, involuntary relationship between their content and forms, absence of polysemy and homonymy, strong motivation in their content, and formation based on syntagmatic relations that clarify meaning. The implementation of the communicative function of language on the basis of syntactic level units is the fourth reason for the omission of the homonymy of syntactic units from research. Specificity and uniqueness in the semantics of syntactic units limit the emergence of homonymy-related facts, thereby creating favourable conditions for the language to realise its full communicative function.

The features that distinguish the homonymy of syntactic units can be grouped as follows: 1) It is national, appears in each language in its own way;¹¹ 2) It's relatively limited compared to lexical homonyms, difficult to form, often hidden, does not attract attention; 3) Existence of syntactic homonyms in the language is arbitrary and instantaneous.

In linguistics, syntactic units (especially sentences) are studied as both language and speech units. This is the reason why syntactic homonymy is sometimes presented as a language fact and sometimes

¹⁰ Müzəffəroğlu, T. Müasir Azərbaycan dilində mürəkkəb cümlənin struktur semantikasi / T.Müzəffəroğlu. – Bakı: Azər nəşr, – 2002. – s.179

¹¹ Əliyeva, G.S. Yer, zaman məzmunlu söz və söz birləşmələri cümlədə omonimlik yaradan vasitə kimi (Müasir Azərbaycan dilinin materialları əsasında) // – Bakı: Bakı Universitetinin Xəbərləri, Humanitar elmlər seriyası, – 2012. №1, – s.13

as a speech fact. We believe it would be more accurate to present syntactic homonymy as a linguistic fact, as homonymy is an event related to the semantic aspect of language units. The fact of language is meaning, not speech. Meaning is the fact related to the language, not speech.

Researchers such as F.A.Dreyzin, V.Y.Pines, M.-A.Pavo, C.-E.Sarfati, A.A.Zaliznyak, M.M.Filippova, M.V.Yudina, O.V.Dragoy consider the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy to be the most important problem in the field of machine translation, which maintains its relevance for all times. It is considered the greatest challenge in automatic processing due to the inaccessibility of machine systems to the ability of a human to easily solve a problem through a broad context in the communication process based on common sense, detailed knowledge of reality, and language.

In linguistics, greater emphasis has been placed on the investigation of syntactic homonymy's impact on the human communication process. In terms of their approach to the issue, researchers are divided into two distinct groups:

1) Those who observe that the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy does not hinder the communication process. (Z.Guliyeva, D.A.Salkova, A.V.Gladky, M.V.Yudina, N.V.Novoselova, K.Fushs) - We concur with the researchers that comprise this group;

2) Those who observed that syntactic homonymy is a significant barrier to the communication process (A.N.Gvozdev, N.P.Kolesnikov, G.V.Kolshansky, A.A.Zaliznyak, O.V.Dragoy, Y.V.Shkurko, O.A.Lapteva).

The first group of researchers observes that homonymous sentences are quantitatively quite common; however, the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy does not impede the communication process, particularly because the context (situation) aids in selecting the correct homonymous meaning for the given situation and successfully eliminating other meanings.

In the third paragraph, titled "**Terminological approach to the homonymy of syntactic units,**" it is noted that Azerbaijani linguistics lacks a rich terminology for this linguistic phenomenon,

as the phenomenon of homonymy at the syntactic level is not studied separately. This linguistic phenomenon is referred to as "syntactic homonymy" in our field of linguistics. The term "syntactic homonymy" is a phrase derived from the Russian language using the kalka method (based on the term "syntactic homonymy"). This is the most effective and appropriate term to use because it captures the essence of homonymy at the syntactic level of language.

"Homonymy of word combinations" is the title of the second chapter of the dissertation, which consists of **"General notes"** and two paragraphs. In the section titled **"General Notes,"** homonymy of phrases is defined as homonymy of free phrases that are syntactic level units. *Qara kağız, şam bazarı, müdirin sağ əli, professorun kamerası* (*black paper, candle market, manager's right hand, professor's camera*) type compounds containing homonymous or ambiguous words cannot be explained as homonymous phrases because homonymous free phrases are compounds formed from the same lexical composition. Because homonyms are distinct lexical units, compounds containing homonyms cannot be considered to have the same lexical composition. In phrases containing polysemous words, only literal and figurative meanings based on polysemous words can be discussed, whereas syntactic homonymy is not applicable. Free phrases having homonymous meaning based solely on accidental form compatibility (*Ata məhəbbəti* (*love to father* OR *love by father*), accidental ambiguity of phrases containing words that can be understood as both lexical and onomastic units (*Qoca kişi* (*Qoja as a first name, OR and as adjective "old"*), and accidental structural identity of type II definitive phrases with type III phrases (*şair qardaşı* (*brother, who is a poet* OR *poet's brother*) cannot be interpreted as syntactic homonymy.

The first clause of the first paragraph, titled **"Homonymy of noun combinations,"** and the second clause of the first paragraph, titled **"Homonymy of the First Type Defining Word Combinations,"** analyse the occurrence of the phenomenon of homonymy in type I phrases. Here, the importance of adjoining connection in this process is emphasized. The approach relation is

active when the homonymous phrase contains more than two words. In this instance, the first part is more active. Words that function as the first part are connected to the main part either directly or via adjacent words that function as the first part. This phenomenon manifests itself in language very limitedly because "the first part of a defining word combination formed by an approach relation can sometimes consist of multiple words; however, all of these words together still depend on the other party and used to identify it."¹²

Homonymous the first type defining word combinations can be grouped as follows:

1. *Balaca hasarlı həyətlər, iri güllü süfrə, böyük kəfkirli saat* – (Small fenced yards, a tablecloth with large flowers, a clock with a big spoon) – homonymy in the first type defining word combinations containing simple, complex or compound adjective, complex adjective formed with –li⁴ suffix, or noun;

2. *Yeddi imzalı hökm, yüz yaşlı kişi* (seven-signature sentence, one-hundred-year-old man) – homonymy in the first type defining word combinations containing complex adjective formed with –li⁴ suffix, or noun. We believe that the occurrence of homonymy in these combinations can be explained not only by the suffix –li⁴, but also by the weak approach relation of number to the main side.

3. The first part of some phrases is often expressed by adjectives that gather a large number of words around them. These participles play a crucial role in the development of homonyms, for instance: *Beləliklə, bir zaman qılıncından öpdüyü vəliəhdin ibadət otağında – müqəddəs mehrab qabağında tutduğu bədnam iş şeyxi teymurilərdən döndərmək əvəzinə, onun Əmir Teymura etiqadının daha da möhkəmlənməsinə səbəb olmuşdu.*¹³ (Thus, the notorious case he held in the prayer room of the crown prince, in front of the holy mihrab, rather than discouraging the Sheikh from joining the

¹² Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Sintaksis / Red. M.Ş.Şirəliyev. – Bakı: ADU, – 1959. – s.72

¹³ Hüseynov, İ.M. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [3 cildə] / İ.M.Hüseynov. – Bakı: Azərənəşr, – c. 1. – 1988. – s.113

Teymurids, strengthened his faith in Amir Teymur OR Thus, the notorious case the crown prince held in his prayer room, in front of the holy mihrab, rather than discouraging the Sheikh from joining the Teymurids, strengthened his faith in Amir Teymur).

The second paragraph, entitled "**Homonymy of the Second Type Defining Word Combinations,**" demonstrates that the main part of these combinations is more active for the homonymy in type II phrases. In some cases, under the influence of the semantics of the words that are used as the second part of the type II phrases, the first part of the phrase becomes active as a subject, and sometimes gains certainty as an object acting in a passive position. In our language, it is possible to come across the fact of homonymy in noun combinations, the main part of which is expressed by nouns such as *məhəbbət, sevgi, söhbət, dərd, kədər, qəm, pay, pul, rəsm, şəkil, təsvir, dava, iş, adam* (love, conversation, pain, sorrow, grief, share, money, painting, picture, description, fight, work, person) for example: *Oğul məhəbbəti – Son's love*: a) The first part is active, showing loving side: – *Sənə nə olub, ay ana? – dedi. Oğul məhəbbəti və ailə istiliyi ilə deyilən bu sözə Sona qəti cavab verdi*¹⁴ (– What happened to you, mother? – he asked. Sona responded decisively to this word, spoken with the love and warmth of a son); b) The first side is not active and shows the side where love is nurtured: *Onu ağlamağa məcbur eləyən oğul məhəbbəti hissi dəyişdi, onun ürəyi yenə də daşa döndü. Oğlu Süleyman da bir azdan onun taxtına göz dikəcək, atasının ölümünü arzulayacaq*¹⁵ (The son's love, which made him cry, changed, and his heart turned to stone again. His son Solomon will soon look at his throne and wish for his father's death).

The third paragraph, titled "**Homonymy of the Third Type Defining Word Combinations**" indicates that homonymy is more prevalent in these combinations. This fact is closely related to the

¹⁴ Mir Cəlal. Bir gəncin manifesti. Roman / Mir Cəlal, red. M.Zeynalova. – Bakı: Gənclik, – 1980. – s.225

¹⁵ Kərimzadə, F.İ. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [5 cildə] / F.İ.Kərimzadə. – Bakı: Ağrıdağ, – c. 2: Çaldıran döyüşü (roman). – 2003. – s.278

elastic structure of these compounds and the frequency of use in the language. The homonymy of type III phrases also occurs in the context of the transformation of the first part into an active or passive participant in the process as a result of the influence of the second part.

Homonymy in these compounds can be grouped as follows:

1) Phrases containing nouns carrying the meaning of both nominative and possessive case, for example: *Mahmudun dərdi* – *Mahmud's pain* – a) The first part means the sufferer: *yox, Mahmudun dərdi təkə Məryəm dərdi deyildi*¹⁶ (*no, Mahmud's pain was not only related to Maryam*); b) The first part expresses grief: *Gəncənin qız-gəlini belə bir söz danışır ki, guya bir saray kənizi Mahmudun dərindən özünü asmışdı*¹⁷ (*There in Ganja young girls and women talked as if a palace maid had hanged herself because she fell in love with Mahmud*);

2) Phrases containing nouns carrying the meaning of both nominative and possessive case, as well as postposition “about”, for example: *mənim söhbətim* (*my conversation*) – a) the first person is active and means the speaker: *Siyasi icmalçı. ... Mənim Sizinlə bütün bu əhvalatlar barədə xüsusi söhbətim olacaq*¹⁸ (*Political commentator. I will have a special conversation with you about all these stories!..*) b) The first person is inactive and denotes the person who is spoken about: – *Könül, bu günlərdə evinizdə mənim söhbətim olmayıb?*¹⁹ (– *Konul, is it true that I've been discussed in your home recently?*);

3) Phrases containing nouns carrying the meaning of both nominative and dative case, for example: *mənim qiymətim* – *my value* – a) The first part is active and means the evaluator: *Mən dedim:* –

¹⁶ Elçin. Seçilmiş əsərləri / Elçin. – Bakı: AVRASIYA PRESS, – 2005. – s.357

¹⁷ Again there. – s.332

¹⁸ Elçin. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [10 cildə] / Elçin. – Bakı: ÇİNAR-ÇAP, – c. 3. – 2005. – s.349

¹⁹ Qədirzadə, S.D. 46 bənövşə. Povestlər, mənsur poema və hekayələr / S.D.Qədirzadə. – Bakı: Gənclik, – 1970. – s.36

Güllü pis qızıdır. / – Nə üçün? – deyə o, görünür, mənim qiymətimə o qədər də əhəmiyyət verməyərək soruşdu²⁰ (I said: – Gullu was a bad girl. / – Why? – He asked, apparently not paying much attention to my evaluation); b) The first part is inactive and means valued: *Məhəbbət dərsindən kəsildim yaman, / Oldu bu körpə də “qiymətim” mənim²¹* (I failed the lesson of love, / This baby is my "score");

4) Phrases containing nouns carrying the meaning of both nominative and accusative case, for example: *mənim dəvətim* – my invitation – a) The first part is active, means the inviter: *Fazilxan. Sözlünüz, şeiriniz gəlib İrana, / gəlin özünüz də ... bu, dəvətimdir. / Burda görməyimsə Sizi, inanın, / mənim görüşüm yox, ziyarətimdir²²* (Fazilxan. Your word, your poem came to Iran, / you should also visit us... this is my invitation. / Our meeting here, believe me, / it's not just meeting, it's my visit); b) The first side is not active, it indicates who is invited: – *Mənim saat 13-ə dəvətim var...* / – *Kim dəvət edib?.. – dedi. / – Frau Zibek²³* (I have an invitation for 1:00 pm... / – Who invited?.. – he asked. / – Frau Zibek);

5) Phrases containing nouns carrying the meaning of both nominative and locative case, for example: a) The first part indicated the person who impressed the other: *Məsud oxuduğu, qulaq asdığı, gördüyü ədəbi, rəssamlıq və musiqi əsərlərinin uzun zaman təsiri altına düşür, onların təəssüratı ilə yaşayırdı²⁴* (Masud was under the influence of the literary, artistic and musical works he read, listened to and saw for a long time, and lived under their impression); b) The first part express who made the impression: *Nilufər də onun*

²⁰ Əfəndiyev, İ.M. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [3 cilddə] / İ.M.Əfəndiyev. – Bakı: AVRASIYA PRESS, – c. 3. – 2005. – s.258

²¹ Vahabzadə, B.M. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [2 cilddə] / B.M.Vahabzadə. – Bakı: Öndər nəşriyyat, – c. 2: Poemalar. – 2004. – s.213

²² Həsənzadə, N.Ə. Mənim nikahımı pozdu təbiət. Şeirlər və poemalar / N.Ə.Həsənzadə. – Bakı: Yazıçı, – 1989. – s.244

²³ Məsud, A. Yazı (Roman, esse, hekayə) / A.Məsud. – Bakı: Qanun, – 2005. – s.133

²⁴ Abbaszadə, H.A. Nurdan yoğrulmuşlar / H.A.Abbaszadə. – Bakı: AVRASIYA PRESS, – 2008. – s.493

*təəssüratı barədə heç bir şey soruşmadı*²⁵ (*Nilufar didn't ask anything about his impression*).

In the second paragraph titled "**Homonymy of Verbal Combinations**," it is stated that the difference in the content of homonymous verbal combinations is due to the fact that the words that comprise these compounds can be related to one another in a variety of ways. Homonymous verbal combinations can be grouped as follows:

1) Verbal combinations with the main part expressed by a participle I: This includes verbal phrases containing the main part with $-an^2$, $-diq^4$ + suffixes indicating possession or $-mish^4$ suffixes forming participle, for example: *Heç ərlük-boyluq qızı olan, sənin kimi oğul böyüdən kişi də belə iş tutarmı?*²⁶ (*Can a man like you who has a marriageable daughter and raised a son do such a job?* OR *Can a man who has a daughter and raised a son like you do such a job?*);

2) Verbal combinations with the main part expressed by a verb conjugation: This includes verbal phrases expressed by the main part with $-ib^4$, $-araq^2$, $-arkan^2$, $-anda^2$, $-diqda^4$, $-(ma)mış^4$ suffixes, for example: *1) Xəlil açıq qapıdan artırmaya düşən işıq zolağına baxıb fikirləşdi*²⁷ (*Khalil looked at the strip of light falling through the open door and thought* OR *Khalil looked through the open door at the strip of light and thought*);

3) It is extremely difficult to find an example of the homonymy of verbal combinations whose major component is an infinitive. Such phrases can provide interesting facts about homonymy, especially when the name is used as the first part of the phrase, for example: *Şah Abbasın ağıllı vəzirinə və ya sərkərdəsinə sahib çıxmaq həvəsi*

²⁵ Hasilova, X.M. Heç kim yad deyildi. Pövestlər və hekayələr / X.M.Hasilova. – Bakı: Yazıçı, – 1993. – s.293

²⁶ Şıxlı, İ.Q. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [2 cildə] / İ.Q.Şıxlı. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – c. 2. – 2005. – s.10

²⁷ Məlikzadə, İ.A. Seçilmiş əsərləri / İ.A.Məlikzadə. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – 2005. – s.59

*kitabdan-kitaba addımlayı*²⁸ (Shah Abbas's desire to have a wise minister or commander goes from book to book OR The desire to have a wise minister or commander as Shah Abbas goes from book to book).

The fact that verbal phrases are more dependent on sentences than noun phrases enables them to easily eliminate the homonymy that sometimes appears in a sentence, so the homonymy of verbal phrases does not impede communication.

The third chapter of the dissertation, entitled "**Homonymy of Sentences**" consists of two paragraphs. In the first paragraph, titled "**Homonymy of Simple Sentences**," it is stated that *"the meanings that emerge as a result of the phenomenon of syntactic homonymy must exist in both objective and linguistic reality."*²⁹

O.A.Lapteva provided the most accurate explanation of the syntactic homonymy mechanism: *"The mechanism of syntagmatic homonymy begins to operate when adjacent language units activate all their communication capabilities."*³⁰

It's also possible that one word or phrase in a sentence is more active during the activation of such connections and the formation of different grammatical combinations, resulting in the simultaneous appearance of two (and sometimes more) pieces of information in a sentence, as demonstrated by the examples of simple sentence homonymy.

The following instances can be attributed to the homonymy of a simple sentence in the language:

1) When some sentences are considered in isolation from the text, some words in these sentences creates the impression that these

²⁸ Rüstəmханлы, S.X. *Ömür kitabı* / S.X.Rüstəmханлы. – Bakı: Gənclik, – 1989. – s.65

²⁹ Шкурко, Е.В. Синтаксическая неоднозначность и ее разновидности: [Elektron resurs] / Розділ II. Актуальні проблеми граматики. URL: <https://docplayer.com/51468400-Sintaksicheskaya-neodnoznachnost-i-ee-raznovidnosti.html>

³⁰ Лаптева, О.А. Речевые возможности текстовой омонимии. Изд. 3-е. / О.А.Лаптева. – Москва: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», – 2009. – с.12

sentences are without a subject (arvad-wife, kisi-male words, surnames, occupation, title, military and scientific degree, relativeness). It's because nouns are located in a position that creates favorable conditions for the formation of various syntactic connections. This is a situational meaning variation, for example: *Əhməd kişinin dərđini dađıtmaq üçün söhbətini bir az da şirinləşdirməyi qərara aldı*³¹ (*Ahmed decided to sweeten the conversation a little to dispel the man's pain OR He decided to sweeten the conversation a little to dispel the old Ahmad's pain*;

2) The case category of Noun (particularly possessive, dative and accusative cases) also plays an important role for the homonymy in the sentence, for example: *Qaragözə təcili çay hazırlatdı*³² (*He made Garagoz prepare a cup of tea OR He made someone prepare a cup of tea for Garagoz*).

3) Just as verbal adverbs are developed independently and are directly related to the predicate of a sentence, they can also act as an internal member of the composition formed by the participles that follow, which leads to sentence homonymy, for example: *Mən qayığın kənarına söykənib papiros çəkən gözüqıyıqdan zarafatyana soruşdum*³³ (*I jokily asked squint-eyed man smoking while leaning against the side of the boat OR I leaned against the side of the boat and asked squint-eyed man*);

4) Simultaneous connection of postposition “kimi” (as) with different words in a sentence also creates homonymy. These combinations are connected with any part of the sentence expressed by names, as well as with the predicate, for example: *Hacıqulu. ... Mustafa ođlu kimi yoxsulları yoldan çıxarır*³⁴ (*Hajiqulu misleads the*

³¹ Şıxlı, İ.Q. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [2 cilddə] / İ.Q.Şıxlı. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – c. 2. – 2005. – s.262

³² İbrahimov, M.Ə. Əsərləri: [10 cilddə] / M.Ə.İbrahimov. – Bakı: Yazıçı, – c. 4: “Böyük dayaq” romanı. – 1979. – s.318

³³ Əfəndiyev, İ.M. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [3 cilddə] / İ.M.Əfəndiyev. – Bakı: AVRASIYA PRESS, – c. 3. – 2005. – s.381

³⁴ Əfəndiyev, İ.M. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [3 cilddə] / İ.M.Əfəndiyev. – Bakı: AVRASIYA PRESS, – c. 2. – 2005. – s.263

poor like Mustafa oglu OR Like Mustafa oglu, Hajiqulu also misleads the poor;

5) Homonymy occurs when any word or phrase in a sentence becomes both an internal member of a phrases formed by indefinite forms of the verb (especially participles) and is understood as an independent member of the sentence. In this case predicative members of the sentence are more active, for example: *Hətta Ərmağanla baş verə bilən hər hansı ixtilafın da üstünü örtüb malalasınlar*³⁵ (*They should also conceal any potential conflict with Armagan.*) 1.Conflict with Armagan (main); 2.Conceal with Armagan;

6) The homonymization of sentences occurs, for instance, when certain words or phrases are perceived as potentially homogeneous or when they lose their homogeneity, for example: *Əslində onlar vaxtilə «Həqq məkanından qovulmuş» rəis Yusifin hökmü ilə Hacı Bayram Vəlinin qullarına çevrilmiş bədbəxt adamlardır*³⁶ (*In fact, they are unfortunate people who became slaves of Haji Bayram Veli by the order of Chief Yusif, who was "expelled from the realm of truth*) 1.Yusif was expelled from the realm of truth; 2.they were expelled from the realm of truth.

It should be noted that the dissertation provides a wide range of interpretations for homonymy related to sentence members.

Occasionally, it is observed that homonymous sentences lack informative value. It should be remembered that any sentence separated from the context loses its ability to convey information, so it would be incorrect to apply this rule only to homonymous sentences.

³⁵ Rəhimov, S.H. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [2 cilddə] / S.H.Rəhimov. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – c. 1. – 2005. – s.35

³⁶ Hüseynov, İ.M. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [3 cilddə] / İ.M.Hüseynov. – Bakı: Azərnəşr, – c. 1. – 1988. – s.275

The second paragraph of the third chapter is composed of two clauses and is titled "**Homonymy in Complex Sentences.**" The first clause, titled "**Homonymy in Compound Sentences**" states that syntactic homonymy occurs less frequently as sentences become more complex. This is due to the completeness and specificity of the information created by the structural complexity of complex sentences. Therefore, compound sentences provide neither rich material nor interesting facts for the study of syntactic homonymy. Compound sentences appear to function as microtext (context) for simple sentences, carry a dehomonymizing function, and rather than fostering syntactic homonymy, they eliminate its causes.

We considered it necessary to note the following opinion on semantic relations in Azerbaijani linguistics: "*Generally speaking, if a compound sentence is composed of two sentences, there can be only one semantic connection between its components.*"³⁷

This does not preclude us from discussing homonyms based on purely semantic relationships in our language. The existence of such cases in our language does not invalidate the preceding idea; that is, it does not imply that two semantic connections exist between the components of a homonymous compound sentence at the same time. It's just two compound sentences with different meanings that are made up of components with the same lexical and grammatical structure. One of these sentences is the result of another, and the other is the result of yet another text, so each sentence has only one semantic link. There can be time, sequence, or comparison (including, but not limited to) relations between the components of potentially homonymous sentences. When we remove these sentences from their context and place them in a new environment, their semantic connections are replaced by cause-and-effect relationships, for example: *Çıraqlar yandı, bibim içəri girmədi*³⁸

³⁷ Müasir Azərbaycan dili: [3 cilddə] / Red. Z.İ.Budaqova. – Bakı: Elm, – c. 3: Sintaksis. – 1981. – s.369

³⁸ Əylisli, Ə.N. Seçilmiş əsərləri / Ə.N.Əylisli. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – 2004. – s.24

(The lights are on, but my aunt did not enter the room OR The lights are on, so my aunt did not enter the room).

The diversity of meanings that manifests itself in a subordinate clause can be explained as syntactic homonymy, according to the second clause, "**Homonymy in Subordinate Complex Sentences.**" It's because of the dependent position of the subordinate clause in the complex sentence. It's extended member of the main clause. As a result, when such sentences are simplified, the homonymy is preserved and can cover the entire sentence, for example: *Yalnız burada başa düşdüm ki, Tapdıqgilə üz vermiş qəziyyədən tək cə mən xəbər tutmamışam*³⁹ (Only here I did realize that I was not the only one who was unaware of the tragedy that befell Tapdigs'): *1. Everyone knew, except me; 2. Everyone heard along with me.*

Sometimes the homonymy of a subordinate complex sentence is caused by the interrelationships and relations between its components, for example: *Yazığı az sıxışdırın, ay canım! Xəbəri yoxdur ki, belə bərk durub*⁴⁰ (*Don't be so hard over him! He has no idea that he stands so firmly: OR Don't be so hard over him! He has no idea about situation, so he stands so firmly*).

In this paragraph, cases of random semantic differences observed at the level of subordinate clauses that appear to be syntactic homonyms are analysed and grouped separately.

The main scientific-theoretical provisions of the research are summarised in the dissertation's "**Conclusion**" section:

1. Just as the syntactic level of each language is distinguished by its national characteristics, the phenomenon of homonymy manifested at this level is characterized by the specificity of the mechanism of formation. As the syntactic level is closed and conservative against the influence of other languages, homonymy is this level occurs under the control of language's own internal laws. It

³⁹ Hüseynov, İ.M. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [3 cilddə] / İ.M.Hüseynov. – Bakı: Azərnəşr, – c. 1. – 1988. – s.301

⁴⁰ İbrahimov, M.Ə. Əsərləri: [10 cilddə] / M.Ə.İbrahimov. – Bakı: Yazıçı, – c. 4: "Böyük dayaq" romanı. – 1979. – s.513

is impossible to discuss the impact of any foreign language in this context.

2. Homonymy at the syntactic level of language differs from homonymy at the lexical level by the complexity of its mechanism of formation, limited manifestation, difficulty in detection and observation, and, as a result, is frequently hidden and unnoticed. Because syntactic units do not exist in the language, they are created for the purpose of communication and are usually used only once, the existence of homonymous syntactic units is more random. Homonymy at the syntactic level should be considered as a different semantic manifestation at the level of similarity of structural models of syntactic units because only their structural models are permanently present in the language.

3. Homonymous free phrases are homonymous syntactic units with different meanings that are formed on the basis of the same lexical structure and order and have the same grammatical features.

4. Homonymy in type I definitive phrases draws less attention because the approach relations between the components of these phrases allows them to be placed anywhere they want. The main part is more active for homonymy in type II and III definitive phrases, which can be explained by the semantics of the words expressed by that part, as the first part of the combination is sometimes the subject and sometimes the object, standing in the active and passive positions, respectively. The quantitative plurality of homonymous type III phrases in modern Azerbaijani can be linked to the structure of these combinations, the presence of concord for all three persons, and the frequency with which they develop in the language.

5. We can also encounter homonymy of at least four-word verbal phrases in the Azerbaijani language. Verb conjugation frequently expresses the main part of these phrases. The fact that verbal phrases are more dependent on the sentence precludes isolating these phrases and observing homonymy independently.

6. The following issues concerning sentence homonymy must be considered: 1) similarity of lexical components of sentences; 2) similarity of writing and pronunciation conditions of sentences; 3)

grammatical structure of sentences; 4) meaning (information) aspects of sentences; and 5) the position of syntactic means in the formation of sentence homonymy.

7. Homonymous sentences are more closely related to the context. This is related not just to the relative exhaustion of the idea in those sentences, but also to the requirement to authenticate the legitimacy of the information revealed through homonymy. The meanings communicated by homonymous syntactic units must be reflected not just in linguistic reality, but also in objective reality; more specifically, objective reality must establish the conditions for it to be real. From this point of view, semantic differences resulting from a failed word sequence or improper word connections between words cannot be deemed syntactic homonyms in texts referring to major scientific and historical events.

8. When a word (or phrase) in a simple sentence can be associated with two or more members of the same sentence at the same time, this is referred to as syntactic homonymy. These words and phrases, acting as subordinate clauses, often appear at the beginning of a sentence (sometimes only after the subject) and are associated with the members that come after them, particularly with other parts of speech. This process is influenced by four factors: 1) meaning and syntactic relations, 2) word order, 3) sentence division into syntagms, and 4) intonation.

9. Homonymous syntactic units are frequently hidden because they are used with dehomonymizers in both oral and written speech to eliminate ambiguity in meaning, do not slow down the communication process, and do not prevent communication participants from understanding each other; thus, syntactic homonymy cannot be perceived as a negative communicative phenomenon. An analysis of theoretical sources on syntactic homonymy reveals that this language phenomenon is more of a barrier for the machine (automatic) translation, because machines, unlike humans, rely on information about language and objective reality and don't possess ability to eliminate homonymy.

10. According to research on Azerbaijani language materials, there is an inverse relationship between the structural complexity of syntactic units and the process of syntactic homonymy, which means that as sentences become more complex, their semantics become more specific and unambiguous, resulting in less syntactic homonymy.

11. There are few examples of homonymous compound sentences in the Azerbaijani language. It is possible to find cases of homonymy in compound sentences based on semantic relationships between the parts. The semantic relationship between the components of one homonymous compound sentence with the same structure is usually a cause-and-effect relationship. There can also be time, sequence, or comparison (including, but not limited to) relations between these components.

12. The homonymy of complex sentences in the Azerbaijani language is also limited, there are very few interesting facts. The phenomenon of homonymy should cover complex sentences, not limited to one or another component of the sentence. However, the diversity of meanings that manifests itself in the subordinate clauses of some complex sentences can be explained as syntactic homonymy. This can be explained by the dependent position of the subordinate clause in the complex sentence. It's extended member of the main clause. As a result, when such sentences are simplified, the homonymy is preserved and can cover the entire sentence. If the homonymy of a complex sentence is formed on the basis of interactions and relationships between the components, it can cover all of the sentence's components.

The dissertation's main points were published in scientific publications and conference materials as *scientific article and theses*.

1. Sintaktik vahidlərin omonimliyi (məsələnin qoyuluşuna dair) // – Bakı: Filologiya məsələləri, – 2010. №5, – s. 61-72.

2. Dilçilikdə sintaktik omonimlik // Doktorantların və gənc tədqiqatçıların XIV Respublika elmi konfransının materialları, – Bakı: ADU NƏŞRİYYATI, – 4-5 dekabr, – 2010, – s. 127-128.

3. Dilin sintaktik səviyyəsində təzahür edən terminoloji omonimlik hadisəsinin müəyyənlişməsi // – Bakı: Terminologiya məsələləri, – 2011. №1, – s. 116-124.

4. Müasir Azərbaycan dilində ismi birləşmələrin omonimliyi haqqında // – Bakı: Türkologiya (Beynəlxalq Elmi Jurnal), – 2011. №2, – s. 49-61.

5. Sintaktik omonimlik hadisəsinin sadə cümlənin informasiya ötürücülüyyəsinə təsiri // Doktorantların və gənc tədqiqatçıların XV Respublika elmi konfransının materialları, – Bakı: “Bakı Universiteti” nəşriyyatı, – 2011, – s. 151-153.

6. Текст (контекст) как средство устранения явления омонимии, проявляющейся на уровне предложения (на основании материалов современного азербайджанского языка) // Актуальные вопросы теории и практики филологических исследований: материалы международной научно-практической конференции, – Пенза-Москва-Решт: Научно-издательский центр «Социосфера», – 25-26 марта, – 2011, – с. 103-109.

7. Müasir Azərbaycan dilində sadə cümlə səviyyəsində sintaktik omonimlik hadisəsinin yaranması prosesi // Azərbaycanşünaslığın aktual problemləri. Ümummillə lider Heydər Əliyevin anadan olmasının 88-ci ildönümünə həsr olunmuş II Beynəlxalq elmi konfransın materialları, – Bakı-Gəncə: Mütərcim, – 4-7 may, – 2011, – s. 327-333.

8. Yer, zaman məzmunlu söz və söz birləşmələri cümlədə omonimlik yaradan vasitə kimi (Müasir Azərbaycan dilinin materialları əsasında) // – Bakı: Bakı Universitetinin Xəbərləri, Humanitar elmlər seriyası, – 2012. №1, – s. 12-21.

9. Dil, təfəkkür və gerçəklik arasındakı münasibətin cümlədəki sintaktik omonimlik hadisəsinin sərhədlərinin müəyyənlişməsinə təsiri // Doktorantların və gənc tədqiqatçıların XVI Respublika elmi konfransının materialları, – Bakı: “Müəllim” nəşriyyatı, – 2012, – s. 94-97.

10. Feili birləşmələrdə sintaktik omonimlik hadisəsinin təzahür imkanları (Müasir Azərbaycan dilinin materialları əsasında) // – Bakı: Azərbaycan Dillər Universiteti. Elmi xəbərlər, – 2016. №1, – s. 56-63.

11. Оценивание омонимичных предложений с коммуникативной точки зрения (на материале современного азербайджанского языка) // – Київ: МОВА І КУЛЬТУРА (Науковий журнал), – 2016. Т.V (182), Вип. 22, – с. 86-94.

12. Sadə cümlələrin omonimləşməsində “həmcins üzv” faktoru (Müasir Azərbaycan dilinin materialları əsasında) // – Bakı: DİL və ƏDƏBİYYAT. Beynəlxalq elmi-nəzəri jurnal, – 2018. №3 (107), – s. 131-135.



The defense of the dissertation will be held on _____
_____ at _____ at the meeting of the Dissertation
Council - FD 2.24 of Supreme Attestation Commission under the
President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at Sumgait State
University

Address: AZ5008, Azerbaijan, Sumgait city, 43rd block,
Sumgait State University

The dissertation is accessible at the Scientific Library of
Sumgait State University.

Electronic versions of the dissertation and abstract are
available on the official website of Sumgait State University
(www.sdu.edu.az).

The abstract was sent to the required addresses on _____
_____.

Signed for print:23.09.2022

Paper format: 60*84^{1/16}

Volume: 41680

Number of hard copies:50