



Scan me!



## Issues of interlanguage homonymy (proximates) in the Turkic languages: on the example of the Tatar and Kazakh languages

Alfiya Yusupova  [orcid:0000-0003-4156-5705](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4156-5705)  
e-mail: [alyusupova@yandex.ru](mailto:alyusupova@yandex.ru)

Professor, Doctor of Philology (Philology), Kazan Federal University,  
Kremlevskaya str, 18 , Kazan, 420008, Russia

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15174911>

**Abstract:** The article touches upon the topic of interlanguage lexical correspondences of a homonymic nature based on the material of the Kazakh and Tatar languages, which represent lexical problems in the compilation of bilingual dictionaries and in translation practice. The relevance of the presented work is due to the need for a comprehensive study of the processes of interaction and mutual influence of lexical systems of related languages and the need to study and analyze interlanguage lexical deceptive correspondences between the Kazakh and Tatar languages. This is an important topic for linguists and researchers, as understanding such correspondences will help expand our knowledge of the relationships and similarities between these two Turkic languages. This article examines the interlanguage lexical correspondences of a homonymic nature based on the material of the Kazakh and Tatar languages, analyzes the theoretical aspects and practical applications of correspondences, as well as their significance for lexicographers, linguists and translators. The goals and objectives of the study are to conduct an in-depth analysis of the lexical correspondences between the Kazakh and Tatar languages, with an emphasis on deceptive correspondences. The research objectives include: analysis of lexical structures and similarities between the Kazakh and Tatar languages, identification of words that may be perceived as deceptive correspondences due to similarity of sound or spelling, but have different meanings or origins; study of historical context and cultural factors that may influence the appearance of deceptive correspondences between languages; assessment of the influence of interlanguage contacts on the formation of lexical deceptive correspondences and their modern use in both languages; presentation of practical examples and studies demonstrating the prevalence and importance of interlanguage lexical deceptive correspondences for native speakers of the Kazakh and Tatar languages. The obtained results contribute to the study of interlanguage correspondences and contribute to a deeper understanding of the specifics of the interaction of related language systems.

**Keywords:** Turkology, Kazakh language, Tatar language, interlanguage homonymy, "Ancient Turkic dictionary", proximates, false friends of the translator

### 1 Introduction

Interlanguage lexical similarities between related languages is one of the most interesting phenomena in linguistics. They are words that have a common origin and form in different languages due to a common ancestor. These similarities can be especially noticeable in related languages such as Slavic languages (e.g. Russian, Polish, Belarusian) or Turkic languages (e.g. Tatar, Kazakh, Yakut). The Turkic languages, which include Kazakh and Tatar, have common roots dating back to the ancient Turkic language. Despite the proximity of these languages, various phonetic, morphological and semantic changes in the native vocabulary took place during their historical development. The study of the causes and nature of these changes is an important task of comparative historical Turkology.

### 2 Technology for obtaining materials and research method

Comparative analysis, descriptive method and component analysis method were used as a method for the study of proximates. Comparative analysis involves the comparison of lexical units of the Kazakh and Tatar languages, the definition of cases of interlanguage homonymy. The use of the descriptive method makes it possible to comprehensively describe the identified proximates, their semantic, structural and functional characteristics. The use of component analysis makes it possible to identify semantic components in the meaning of proximates, to determine their similarities and differences. The research used materials from bilingual and etymological dictionaries of the Tatar and Kazakh languages, research on other languages and the "Ancient Turkic Dictionary".

### 3 Experimental results and their discussion

When comparing related and especially closely related languages, attention has long been paid to similar words with different meanings, which may be a consequence of the uneven development of the common origin of the meaning of the word. As a result of such changes in the Turkic languages, there were changes in the meanings of words of the same form, and some of them acquired antonymic meanings. This type of lexical correspondence is common, and is a problem when compiling dictionaries, translating and studying closely related languages. To identify such inconsistencies, it is necessary to study the root and etymology of the proximates in both languages. Kazakh and Tatar languages belonging to the Turkic language family have a number of common features at various language levels, including in the field of vocabulary. The etymology of the interlanguage lexical correspondences of the Kazakh and Tatar languages is an important aspect of the study of these languages, as it can provide an opportunity for a better understanding of their relationship and evolution over the centuries.

For historical comparison of lexical units of two languages, data from etymological dictionaries and reference books on etymology, ancient dictionaries of the original version of lexical units are used. For Turkic languages, such a dictionary is the "Ancient Turkic Dictionary".

The "Ancient Turkic Dictionary" was created on the basis of a collection of material for several decades extracted from ancient Turkic monuments of the VII-XIII centuries. Hundreds of bilingual dictionaries have been created over the previous centuries. They use various systems of construction and interpretation of the material. The "Ancient Turkic Dictionary" is the first attempt to provide complete information about the vocabulary of ancient Turkic languages and dialects preserved in these written monuments.

Many words in modern Turkic languages have been preserved to this day exactly unchanged, apart from minor phonetic differences in the languages. Basically, these are verbs: Jürü – 1) to walk, to move 2) in the meanings of the service verb [5, p. 305], numerals: Jüz – 2) hundred [5, p. 306], pronouns: Men/min – personal pronoun of the 1st l. unit. I [5, p. 362], words denoting kinship: Kelin is a daughter-in-law, a bride [5, p. 315]. In comparison with the Slavic languages, the Turkic languages have retained a large number of correspondences in verbs and numerals. For example, E.V. Fedorchuk in his dissertation, using the example of Russian and Ukrainian languages, considers interlanguage homonymy in close connection with interlanguage paronymy, paying attention to the fact that this phenomenon is expressed by such parts of speech as a noun, adjective, numeral, verb [13, p. 256]. There are many classifications of proximates proposed by linguists. In our article, we will rely on the classification proposed by the French lexicographers M. Kessler, J. Derocquigny, who divide them into partially false interlanguage homonyms and completely false interlanguage homonyms. It was they who first introduced the term "faux amis du traducteur", which is known as "false friends of the translator", which has become common in modern linguistics [6, p. 112]. Partially false proximates include lexemes with similar spelling and common semantics – expressed in words similar in spelling and meaning, but can be used in context in a different, little-known meaning. And complete false proximates can be attributed to those with similar spelling and divergent semantics – words that can be confused due to consonance. Partially false interlanguage homonyms have similar spelling and, as a rule, common semantics - they are expressed in words similar in spelling and meaning, but can be used in context in a different, little-known meaning. Here are some examples in the context, in Kazakh kantar 1) the name of the month "January", 2) the figurative meaning "difficulty", 3) the verb "an action that is performed when tethering a horse so that it cannot eat hay". An example of sentences in Kazakh: Uninde kantarda katkan muzdai bir myzgyms zil zhatyr! (I. Yesenberlin) [7, p.251]. There is a strength in his voice comparable to the frost in January. Salima ak boz atta etekke kantaryp tastap, ozi tastyn basyna shykty (Z. Akyshev, Dostar) [7, p.251]. Salima tied the white horse and climbed onto the stone. And in Tatar, kantar has the meaning of "lump", "lump". Example in sentences: Shartlau bik kochle bula, katy balchyk kantarlary alle ni erak atylmas da, vak kisaklar shybyr-shybyr booth tubalaren koela, alle kailarga ocha ide... (R.Karami) [11, p.103]. The explosion was very strong, and although the heavy clay pieces were not thrown far away, small pieces fell on the roofs of the booth and flew far, far away... Homonyms can also be classified according to various criteria. For example, homographs can be distinguished: words that are the same in spelling, but different in pronunciation, they differ in stress [12, p. 11]. But, the stress in all Turkic languages falls on the last syllable, this is a feature of all Turkic languages. Therefore, this classification is not suitable for our chosen languages. The problem of interlanguage lexical correspondences of a homonymic nature is of interest from the point of view of the current state of the lexical systems of the Kazakh and Tatar languages, as well as from the point of view of their etymology. And the emergence of lexical synchrony and diachrony is inevitable in the evolution of language. Ancient Turkic words are preserved in the language, but their modern usage may be ambiguous due to changes in grammar, vocabulary and phonology. Let's consider the main factors influencing the formation of proximates. One of the main reasons for the emergence of interlanguage lexical differences is the historical events and migrations of peoples that took place on the territory of the ancient

Turkic states. Also, language contacts in the neighborhood with other states and cultures contributed to the formation of different lexical layers. Kazakh and Tatar languages were influenced by languages such as Persian, Arabic, Russian and Mongolian. The problem of multilingualism also has its own characteristics in two languages. The majority of residents of Kazakhstan and Tatarstan are bilinguals who, due to circumstances, are forced to speak any one language, at a subconscious level pronounce their utterance in their native language [9, p. 247]. Thus, the native language remains open for "code switching" [3, p. 514], and some borrowed words can adapt to the native language and contribute to the appearance of proximates. Arabic and Persian loanwords entered the Turkic lexicon during the spread of Islam. Writing, science and state-important correspondence were conducted in Arabic script. Arabisms and Persiisms are still used in Turkic languages without changes in meanings, for example, Tatar *adep* – decency, politeness, Kazakh *adep* – decency, politeness, "Ancient Turkic dictionary" *ädäb* – courtesy, politeness, good manners. It is still unknown how many interlanguage similarities there are in the Kazakh and Tatar languages. Since this problem remains open in Turkology, although questions about interlanguage lexical correspondences in modern Turkic languages have been asked by Turkic scientists and are among the important problems of comparative analysis of Turkic languages. It is worth noting that there is no detailed study of interlanguage homonyms for the vast majority of languages, and bilingual comparative dictionaries with "false translator's friends" exist mainly only in popular world languages such as English, French, Chinese. Also in Russian, bilingual comparative dictionaries have been released relatively recently. Russian Russian, Slovak and Russian languages, in which the term "proximate" is given for interlanguage homonyms, which will later be used in the article to denote interlanguage lexical inconsistencies, can be noted in the scientific works of E. A. Pravda on the lexical parallels of Serbian and Russian, Slovak and Russian languages. A proximate is a fact of a foreign language (word, phrase, morpheme, etc.) that bears an external resemblance to some fact of the native language, but differs from it in semantic, grammatical, stylistic or other properties and therefore is capable of causing an error when used in speech in a given foreign language [10, p. 128]. Also, the dissertation of E. V. Fedorchuk paronyms and homonyms based on the material of the Russian and Ukrainian languages. In Turkology, one can distinguish the works of A. With a detailed analysis of lexical parallels in Uzbek, Turkish and Kazakh languages, the scientist notes that interlanguage parallels differ not only in meaning, but also in positive and negative shades, as well as stylistic aspect [8, p. 52]. Philologists and researchers of the Uzbek language have also made good progress. Scientific works of the Uzbek linguist E. Odilova is devoted to the phenomenon of interlanguage lexical formality in Uzbek and Kazakh languages, examples of more than 50 lexical units are given.

The analysis of the collected material showed that the changes in ancient Turkic words in the Kazakh and Tatar languages may be due to the following main reasons:

1. Phonetic changes. These changes are associated with regular phonetic processes, such as nasalization of vowels, assimilation and palatalization of consonants. Differences in the alphabet contributed to this. For example, the lexeme "it", which can be attributed to comic proximates, means meat in Tatar, and dog in Kazakh. According to the "Ancient Turkic dictionary", the word *et* is meat [5, p. 199]. Another interesting variant of this correspondence is the words with the meanings "louse" and "face". According to the "Ancient Turkic dictionary", the bit token has two meanings: 1) face, physiognomy; 2) louse. In Tatar *bet* is a louse, *bit* is a face, in Kazakh *bet* is a face, *bit* is a louse. Thus, correspondences in two languages have an antonymic meaning. We have added such similarities to a number of phonetic changes, even if one of the languages has a similar analogue with some changes, lexemes with a different meaning may occur in the second language, as in the above example, but the affiliation of such correspondences to interlanguage homonyms is controversial. For example, the controversial lexemes include the ancient Turkic pronoun *bu* – this (used to indicate the object closest in spatial or temporal relations compared to others) [5, p. 127], in Tatar *bu* – this, although in Kazakh there is an analogue of the pronoun "this" – *bul*. The main meaning of this lexeme in Kazakh is *par*, and in Tatar, it is more often used as a pronoun, but also has a second meaning "par". The meaning of the "pairs" of the *bu* lexeme is also ancient Turkic. The "Ancient Turkic Dictionary" gives three meanings for this lexeme.

2. Semantic changes. The ancient Turkic word "Qısyān" means to be greedy, to be stingy [5, p. 498]. In modern Tatar, it means *kızganych* – pity, in Kazakh, *kızganysh* – jealousy. The Kazakh language has retained the closest meaning. These semantic shifts may be due to the influence of other languages, as well as the development of figurative meanings. Some ancient Turkic words were displaced or changed under the influence of borrowings from Arabic, Persian and Russian.

Thus, the changes in the ancient Turkic vocabulary in the Kazakh and Tatar languages are explained by a complex of phonetic, morphological, semantic and contact factors that operated during the historical development of these languages.

## 4 Conclusion

In the proposed article, we tried to lay the first foundation for compiling a bilingual dictionary of the "false friends of the translator" of the Kazakh and Tatar languages. The study of interlanguage proximities in closely related languages is an interesting and relevant topic for linguistics. Despite the genetic kinship of languages, the geographical proximity of countries and similarities in culture and mentality, there are a significant number of differences in related languages. It is important to understand why semantic divergence occurs in historically related languages and why there is a diachrony in words. In the process of studying interlanguage Tatar-Kazakh homonyms, it turned out that this problem is poorly understood. Russian Russian and Kazakh-Russian bilingual dictionaries were collected, and explanatory and etymological dictionaries of both languages were also used. However, for a competent translation from Tatar into Kazakh or from Kazakh into Tatar, it is necessary to create dictionaries of "false friends of the translator". In theoretical and practical terms, dictionaries of "false friends of the translator" are considered more useful, giving a description of all the meanings inherent in each word and reflecting its stylistic, emotionally expressive, grammatical characteristics, cultural significance and lexical compatibility. As a result of a comparative analysis of the lexical systems of the Kazakh and Tatar languages, a number of interlanguage homonyms characterized by both formal and semantic similarities have been identified. The description of the identified proximities showed that they can differ in terms of speech, sphere of use, stylistic coloring and other characteristics. Thus, the conducted research contributes to the study of interlanguage lexical correspondences, contributes to a deeper understanding of the specifics of interaction and mutual influence of lexical systems of related languages.

## Reference

1. Akhmanova O. S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. – M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1966. – 607 p.
2. Akulenko V. V. About "false friends of the translator" // Russian-English and REnglish-Russian dictionary of "false friends of the translator". – M., 1969. – pp. 371-372.
3. Angermeyer, Philipp S. Spelling bilingualism: Script choice in Russian American classified ads and signage // *Language in Society*. 2005. No 34 (4). P. 493 – 531.
4. Vinogradov V. S. Translation: General and lexical questions: A textbook. – 2nd ed., reprint. – M.: KDU, 2004. – 240 p.
5. Old Türkic Dictionary. Ed. D. M. Nasilova, I. V. Kormushina and Dr. A. A. Borovkova, L. V. Dmitrieva, A. A. Zyrin, I. V. Kormushin and Dr. 2 – Astana: Publishing House "Science", 2016 – 760 P.
6. Koessler M., Derocquigny J. Les faux amis ou les trahisons du vocabulaire an-glais. Conseils aux traducteurs. — Paris, 1928..
7. Dictionary of the Kazakh literary language. Fifteen volumes. Volume 9. / Comp. A. Abraham, A. Dzhnanabekova, K. Rysbergenova and others – Almaty, 2011. - 744 P.
8. Mamedova Farah Alikhan gyzy Bilingual lexical variation as a linguistic phenomenon. *Philological Sciences Bulletin*. 2024. 4 (1). P. 246 – 251.
9. Mamedova Farah Alikhan gyzy Bilingual lexical variation as a linguistic phenomenon. *Philological Sciences Bulletin*. 2024. 4 (1). P. 246 – 251
10. Pravda E. A. Interlanguage proximities in the parallels of Serbian and Russian, Slovak and Russian languages: types of proximities // *Bulletin of the VSU*. Issue 1. – Voronezh: VVSU, 2010. – pp. 128-129.
11. Explanatory dictionary of the Tatar language: volume III. – K. – Kazan: 2017. – 744 p.
12. Fan' Yuan'yuan' Homonymy in linguistics: mechanisms of education and semantic features. *Philological Sciences Bulletin*. 2023. 3 (11). P. 11 – 14.
13. Fedorchuk E.V. Interlanguage homonymy and paronymy in closely related (based on the material of Russian and Ukrainian languages) Abstract. on the job. learned. step. K.philol.N. Spec. 10.02.01. – Moscow, 2001. – 256 p.