



ISSN 1989 – 9572

DOI: 10.47750/jett.2022.13.06.057

Interlingual Homonymy In Uzbek And Turkish

Mukaddas T. Abdurakhmanova¹

Azizakhon A. Rakhmanova²

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 13 (6)

<https://jett.labosfor.com/>

Date of reception: 10 Oct 2022

Date of revision: 16 Nov 2022

Date of acceptance: 07 Dec 2022

Mukaddas T. Abdurakhmanova, Azizakhon A. Rakhmanova (2022). Interlingual Homonymy In Uzbek And Turkish *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 13(6). 552-558.

¹Associate Professor, Candidate of Philological Sciences, National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

²Associate Professor, PhD, Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Tashkent Pharmaceutical Institute Tashkent, Uzbekistan



Interlingual Homonymy In Uzbek And Turkish

Mukaddas T. Abdurakhmanova¹, Azizakhon A. Rakhmanova²

¹Associate Professor, Candidate of Philological Sciences, National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

²Associate Professor, PhD, Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Tashkent Pharmaceutical Institute Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Email: azizahonraa@gmail.com²

ABSTRACT

The problem of interlingual homonymy arises in close connection with the “globalization” of communication. On this basis, elements of different language systems, often completely independent of each other, enter into a kind of systemic relationship with each other. Therefore, it is quite natural that modern linguistics is beginning to pay more and more attention to the comparative (comparative) analysis of languages, which originated in the 19th century and is becoming increasingly popular. This direction of linguistic research is stimulated by links with other important theoretical problems of linguistics, including issues of bilingualism, multilingualism and language contacts.

Keywords: Interlingual homonyms, multilingualism and language contacts, interlingual correspondences, analysis of lexical homonyms, phonetic, graphic and morphological discrepancies.

INTRODUCTION

The relevance of the topic is determined by the fact that at the beginning of the 21st century the education of bilingualism was designated as one of the leading directions of the educational policy of all countries (Bloomfield 1968; Weinreich 1979; Barannikova 1972 and others). Therefore, the relevance of the study of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature and, in particular, interlingual homonyms, is dictated by the insufficient study of this problem in closely related languages, including as a mechanism that triggers word formation and a change in the semantics of words, as well as the need to develop methods to prevent lexical interference caused by interlingual correspondences. homonymous character in everyday communication, mass media, translations of scientific and literary texts.

The relevance of the study is also determined by the need to consider interlingual homonymy and related phenomena in parallel on the material of several languages. As a rule, interlingual homonyms are distinguished on the material of two languages. This approach is due to the practice of translation, since in the process of working on a specific text, the translator usually encounters lexical units of exactly two languages. As a result, for each considered pair of languages with different phonetic, graphic and morphological differences, different formal criteria of correspondence in terms of expression are taken. And, probably, that is why there is still no universal definition of interlingual homonyms, and the many existing terms proposed by researchers to name interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature indicate the ambiguity of the interpretation of this category of words.

The purpose of the study

interlingual homonymy in the Uzbek and Turkish languages.

The research aims to:

- streamlining terminology;
- definition of the category of interlingual homonyms and their classification by types of word correlations in terms of content, in terms of expression and by origin;
- establishment of boundaries between interlingual homonyms;
- study of the mechanisms of lexical interference caused by interlingual homonymy, leading to semantic changes and borrowing of new words.
- To achieve this goal, the following tasks were defined:
- collection and analysis of all existing terms used to name the words of two or more languages, similar in terms of expression and different in terms of content, with their subsequent systematization and ordering;
- classification of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature according to three main criteria (by correspondence in terms of expression, in terms of content and by origin);

- based on the results of the classification of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature, the definition and delimitation of interlingual homonymy from adjacent interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature;
- study of the mechanisms and results of lexical interference caused by interlingual homonymy and related phenomena;
- consideration of the application of the theoretical results of the study in practice.

The object of the study

is lexical Uzbek and Turkish interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature, coinciding in terms of expression in one or more word forms corresponding to each other and referring to the same significant part of speech.

The subject of the research

is the phenomenon of interlingual homonymy in the Uzbek and Turkish languages.

The material of the study

was interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature from 2 Turkic languages (Uzbek and Turkish), selected by us from bilingual dictionaries of Turkic languages, and also recorded in differential dictionaries of “false friends”. To study the properties and types of lexical interference and its results, the materials of scientific articles, as well as Internet sites, were used.

The goals and objectives set in the work required consideration of the object of study in the close relationship of linguistic and extralinguistic factors and determined the need to use an integrated methodology. The following methods were used during the work:

- to collect linguistic facts, a continuous sampling technique was used from bilingual dictionaries of Turkic languages and from differential dictionaries of “false friends”;
- quantitative, descriptive and comparative methods were used to interpret, classify and systematize the selected material;
- to determine the type of semantic transformation of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature, the method of structural-semantic analysis was used.

The scientific novelty of the study

is due to the problem itself and the purpose of the study, and lies in the fact that:

- the not yet sufficiently studied category of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature is analyzed for the first time in parallel on the material selected from 2 Turkic languages;
- the terminological base used to name different types of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature is systematized and ordered;
- on the basis of classifications of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature according to their correlations in terms of expression, content and origin, the general properties of the categories of interlingual homonymy are described and the boundaries between them are determined;
- an analysis of the linguistic and extralinguistic prerequisites for the emergence of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature is given and a distinction is made between regular and random correspondences (cognates and pseudocognates), and a relationship is established between the types of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature and their origin;
- interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature are considered as the cause of interlingual lexical interference;
- interlingual lexical interference, caused by the tendency to equalize the asymmetry between the plane of expression and the plane of the content of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature, is considered as the driving force of semantic changes in the contacting languages;
- the results of interlingual lexical interference caused by interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature are considered from two positions: as negative (representing the subject of language ecology) and as positive (leading to the borrowing of new words and meanings, and thereby contributing to the enrichment of the vocabulary of the Turkic languages).

The theoretical significance of the study

lies in the fact that it deepens and expands knowledge of the Turkic interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature and outlines ways for further comparative study of such phenomena, including on the material of unrelated languages.

The practical significance of the study

lies in the fact that the results of the study can be used:

- for further research on the vast issue of interlingual equivalence;
- in translation activities;
- in the educational process: in the practice of teaching Uzbek and related languages, in teaching the theory and practice of translation, including the training of professional translators in various fields of activity, in lecture courses on comparative (comparative) linguistics and lexicology, in compiling teaching aids;
- in practical lexicography;
- to solve some problems of ecolinguistics related to the spread of bilingualism.

The process of developing the theory of intralinguistic homonymy has a long tradition. In modern language science, it is generally recognized that homonymy is an absolute universal. The presence of homonyms in a language is mandatory and natural, and is due both physiologically (by the effect of the principle of economy in the system of sound shells of words) and by the very nature of the language as a system, in particular, the existence of the categories of symmetry and asymmetry in the language. The variability of the word both in terms of expression and in terms of content is a manifestation of the asymmetric dualism of the linguistic sign, formulated by S.O. Kartsevsky (Kartsevsky 1965: 85–90).

Most of the homonyms in natural language are the result of the development of polysemy. Changes in the meaning of words are determined by many different reasons, both linguistic and extralinguistic (extralinguistic) in nature. But, of course, homonymization is a process that requires considerable time.

Of course, homonymy contributes to the economy of the plan of expression, the “compactness” of the language, but, nevertheless, violating the “law of the sign”, it erases the formal differences between signs with different content and reduces the effectiveness of the language as a means of communication. However, it should be noted that, in general, the approach to homonyms as a “language defect” does not reveal the essence of the phenomenon itself, this becomes obvious when taking into account the fact that in the vast majority of cases the problem of homonymy is nevertheless “removed” by consituation/context.

Recognizing the fact that the presence of homonyms in some cases can interfere with the process of communication, we believe that the emergence of homonyms in languages as a result of the development of homonymy from polysemy is one of the manifestations of a communicative necessity associated with the principle of saving sound shells or, in other words, a manifestation of the law of “least efforts”. The language system does not exclude the possibility of preserving the original form of the linguistic sign when changing the meaning and preserving the original meaning when changing the form.

The approach to homonymy as a “peculiar language defect” is appropriate only in relation to homonyms that have arisen as a result of recent borrowing, referring to the same part of speech and to the same sphere (semantic field) of the language. Words that meet these conditions can lead to a conflict of homonyms (interference). The conflict of homonyms, in turn, can cause such linguistic processes as the disappearance / loss of one of the words from the language system, the expansion or narrowing of the meaning, the change in the form of homonyms.

Speaking about the fact that in the linguistic literature there is no unity of views on homonymy, we mean not only different understanding of the term “homonym”, but also theoretical disputes concerning the distinction between homonymy and polysemy. They are closely related to the problem of “word identity”, that is, to which differences between individual specific cases of the use of the same word are compatible, and which, on the contrary, are incompatible.

Words of different languages that have a similar external (sound and / or graphic) appearance, but different meanings, have long attracted the attention of linguists. Back in 1788 in Salzburg a lexicographic essay by A. Portitor was published, concerning interlingual French-German lexical correspondences of a homonymous nature. But a truly systematic and broad study of such interlingual correspondences began in 1928 with the work of M. Kessler and J. Derkonyi on the material of French-English and Anglo-French parallels. They also introduced the term “faux amis du traducteur” (“false friends of the translator”) and distinguished two types of “false friends of the translator”: 1) “completely false” with similar spelling and divergent semantics, and 2) “partially false” with similar spelling and mostly with general semantics (Koessler ... 1928).

In scientific works, the complete or partial formal similarity of words from different languages with their semantic difference is singled out as a system category, for the name of which various terms are used, for example: “false friends of the translator” (Galperin 1970: 129–136; Budagov 1974: 141–146); deceptive cross-language similarities (Grosbart 1962: 452–453); interlingual homonyms (Zaslavskaya 1992: 23–25); interlingual paronyms (Balalykina 1991; Belchikov 1990: 368); interlingual synonyms (Wheeler 1977: 52–53); interlingual polysemes (Borisenko 1991); false or incomplete lexical parallels (Dubichinsky 1992: 25–29); false equivalents (Fedorov 1968: 167–169); heteronyms (Konetskaya 1961: 25; Selivanov 1976: 118); false cognates (Lado 1989); pseudo-internationalisms (Kolomiets 1976: 10); approximants (Simeonova 1981) and others.

As for the term “interlingual lexical homonymy”, comparative linguistics has long been using this concept, but its use often leads to serious misunderstandings. Some scholars attribute the above term to similarly sounding or spelling linguistic signs coexisting in parallel in different language systems and differing in their meanings (Akulenko ... 1969; Budagov 1974; Vlchek 1963; Gottlieb 1972; Grosbart 1962; Kochergan 1997 and others).

Others refer the term “interlingual homonymy” to the connection between the sets of homonyms of the analyzed languages (Dubichinsky 1993; Dubichinsky 2002; Voyan 2002). V.V. Dubichinskiy believes that interlingual lexical homonymy should be spoken of when homonymic sets constitute at least a four-element structure in synchronously compared language systems (Dubichinskiy 1993; Dubichinskiy 2002). In turn, D. Butler, comparing equivalent Polish and Russian pairs of homonyms, calls this phenomenon “homonymy of homonyms” (Butler 1989: 89).

By analogy with intralinguistic homonymy, phonetic-graphic, phonetic and graphic homonyms are distinguished among interlingual homonyms. Morphological homonyms (homomorphs) in accordance with the objectives of the work were not the subject of our analysis.

Phonetic-graphic interlingual homonyms in EP (expression plan) are characterized by the identity of the graphic and phonetic form with a corresponding difference in CP (content plan). This means that such homonyms can rightly be singled out for all reasons only in languages with similar graphics, for example, Turkish and Uzbek languages:

‘Ala’ - good, great; ‘Ola’ - spotted;
‘Bağ’ - lace, connection; ‘Bog’ - garden;
‘Bol’ - free, a lot; ‘Bol’ - honey;
‘Boy’ - height, clan, size, length; ‘Boy’ - rich;
‘Burun’ - cape, nose; ‘Burun’ - before, nose;
‘Çapak’ - pus, burr; ‘Chapak’ - clap your hands;
‘Çöp’ - garbage; ‘Cho’p’ - a sliver;
‘Çözmek’ - untie, unfasten, solve; ‘Cho’zmoq’ - pull;
‘Daha’ - more; ‘Daha’ - territory, district;
‘Dam’ - roof, partner; ‘Dam’ - rest;
‘Damla’ - drops, apoplexy, stroke; ‘Damla’ - brew;
‘Dilim’ - chunk, slice, piece, belt, sector, zone; ‘Dilim’ - my soul;
‘Don’ - frost, cold, cold, frost; ‘Don’ - grain;
‘Düdük’ - whistle, beep; ‘Duduq’ - stutterer;
‘Ekmek’ - bread; ‘Ekmoq’ - plant, sow;
‘El’ - hand, alien, outsider; ‘El’ - people;
‘Ermek’ - to reach, to get; ‘Ermak’ - have fun;
‘Fiil’ - act, action; ‘Fil’ - elephant;
‘Gür’ - lush, thick, loud; ‘Go’r’ - grave;
‘Has’ - clean; the highest grade, peculiar, inherent; ‘Xas’ - shoved branches;
‘Hayır’ - no, good, good; ‘Hayr’ - goodbye;
‘Kafile’ - group, party; ‘Kafil’ - guarantor;
‘Kaldırmak’ - raise, remove, cancel; ‘Qoldirmoq’ - leave;
‘Karşılık’ - answer, equivalent, correspondence; ‘Qarshilik’ - resistance;
‘Kesim’ - district, zone, cutting, cutting off; ‘Kesim’ - predicate;
‘Keskin’ - sharp, to shout in a harsh voice; ‘Keskin’ - sharply;
‘Kır’ - field, steppe; ‘Kir’ - dirt, linen;
‘Kırmak’ - to break, smash, crush; ‘Kirmoq’ - enter, enter;
‘Koca’ - huge, huge; ‘Kosa’ - a saucer;
‘Kök’ - root, exterminate, eradicate; ‘Ko’k’ - blue;
‘Küçük’ - small, younger; ‘Kuchuk’ - dog;
‘Küp’ - cube, amphora; ‘Ko’p’ - a lot;
‘Pul’ - brand, scales, sequins; ‘Pul’ - money;
‘Saf’ - pure, stupid; ‘Saf’ - row;
‘Satır’ - billhook; ‘Satır’ - string;
‘Şiş’ - skewer; ‘Shish’ - tumor;
‘Tuş’ - key; ‘Tush’ - sleep, lunch time;
‘Toz’ - dust, particle; ‘Toz’ - a basin;
‘Tüp’ - tube, test tube, tube, balloon; ‘To’p’ - ball, pile;
‘Top’ - ball, core, roll; ‘Top’ - find;
‘Ulaşmak’ - to reach, reach, reach; ‘Ulashmoq’ - share;
‘Uymak’ - fit, fit, adapt; ‘Uymoq’ - collect, collect;
‘Yaş’ - age, wet; ‘Yosh’ - young, tear, age.
‘Yüz’ - swim, fresh, one hundred, face; ‘Yuz’ - face, one hundred.
‘Zar’ - skin, shell, dice; ‘Zar’ - shine.

Lexical interlingual homonymy is defined in the work as the words of two or more languages in the same period of their existence, corresponding to each other in at least one of the components of the expression plan

(phonetically and / or graphically) in all or some grammatical forms, and at the same time differing in terms of content.

We include only words with a “profound difference in meanings” as interlingual homonyms (Khodova 1960: 45). With this approach, the words of compared related languages that have at least one common semantic component should be excluded from the number of interlingual homonyms. N.I. Tolstoy, analyzing the problem of “the difference in semantic volume”, notes that “a significant semantic volume of a word, defined as “polysemantic”, is often given out, when approaching it with the measure of another language, for homonymy, which is in principle wrong, since as homonymy means exclusively complete incompatibility of the features of different sememes expressed by one lexeme” (Tolstoy 1997: 21).

The study revealed the following pattern - nouns are characterized by the preservation of the identity of the form to a much greater extent than for other parts of speech, it is nouns that represent the majority of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature. While the most numerous group of interlingual homonyms with regular morphological divergences are words from the lexico-grammatical class of verbs, which is explained by the difference in verbal formative affixes in the Turkic languages.

The paper draws theoretical conclusions about the essence of interlingual homonymy and related phenomena and outlines the prospects for this area of research. The study of the relationship between language and culture is currently one of the main areas of modern linguistics. The study of this category of words can provide materials for understanding the mechanisms of the semantic evolution of words of general vocabulary and the role of interlingual homonyms and other interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature in language and culture.

CONCLUSION

Further development of the problem of interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature involves the analysis of these categories in the lexical systems of the Turkic languages, not only in the synchronous section, but also in connection with a more detailed diachrony. This will reveal the causes, conditions for the emergence and patterns of development of Turkic interlingual correspondences of a homonymous nature. Of particular interest is additional study, mainly of those interlingual homonyms that go back to the same root (etymon).

It is recommended to compile lists of regular interlingual divergences (phonetic, graphic, morphological) for each pair of Turkic languages based on comparative grammars of Turkic languages in order to distinguish between interlingual homonyms and quasi-synonyms from interlingual paronyms.

REFERENCES

1. Bloomfield 1968: Bloomfield L. Language. Moscow: Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1968.
2. Barannikova 1972: Barannikova L.V. The essence of interference and the specifics of its manifestation. Problems of bilingualist and multilingualist. Moscow, 1972.
3. Weinreich 1979: Weinreich U. Language contacts. Kyiv, 1979.
4. Kartsevskiy 1965: Kartsevskiy S.O. On the asymmetric dualism of the linguistic sign. Zvegintsev V.A. History of linguistics XIX-XX in essays and extracts. Moscow, 1965.
5. Kœssler ... 1928: Kœssler M., Derocquigny J. False Friends or The Pitfalls of English Vocabulary, Paris, 1928.
6. Galperin I.R. Informativeness of language units. Moscow, 1970.
7. Budagov 1974: Budagov R.A. Man and his language. Moscow, 1974.
8. Grosbart 1962: Grosbart Z. About Russian and Polish words, similar in sound, different in meaning. Materials of the third international methodological seminar for teachers of the Russian language in the countries of socialism. Moscow, 1962.
9. Zaslavskaya 1992: Zaslavskaya N.V. On the problem of creating a dictionary of interlingual homonyms (on the material of Russian and Ukrainian languages). Modern problems of lexicography. Kharkov, 1992.
10. Balalykina 1991: Balalykina E.A. The role of interlingual paronymy in the comparative study of the Russian language. Russian language abroad. 1991, № 3, p.54-58.
11. Belchikov ... 1990: Belchikov Yu.A. Paronymy. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. Moscow, 1990.
12. Uiler 1977: Uiler M, Linguistics and vocabulary. Russian language abroad. Part 2. Moscow 1977, p. 52-53.
13. Borisenko 1990: Borisenko N.A. Lexico-semantic interference in Russian speech in Ukraine (linguistic and sociolinguistic aspect). Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philology. Kyiv, 1990.
14. Dubichinskiy 1992: Dubichinskiy V.V. Lexical Parallels in Lexicographic Practice. Modern problems of lexicographers. Kharkov, 1992.

15. Konetskaya 1961: Konetskaya V.P. Characteristics of lexical homonyms - words that are genetically related, and the ways of their formation in the English language. *Studies in English Lexicology*. Moscow, 1961, p. 84-110.
16. Lado 1989: Lado R. Linguistics over the borders of cultures. *New in foreign linguistics XXV*, 1989, p. 32-62.
17. Kolomiets 1976: Kolomiets O.V. French-Ukrainian lexical parallels. Abstract for the degree of candidate of philological sciences. Kyiv, 1976.
18. Selivanov 1976: Selivanov G.A. Language contacts and the problem of interlingual homonymy (heteronymy). *Questions of Russian and Slavic linguistics*. Ivanovo, 1976.
19. Akulenko ... 1969: Akulenko V.V., Komissarchik S.Yu., Pogorelova R.V., Yukht V.L. English-Russian and Russian-English dictionary of "false friends of the translator". Moscow, 1969.
20. Dubichinskiy 2002: Dubichinskiy V.V. The concept of the dictionary of lexical parallels of the Polish and Russian languages. Gdańsk, 2002.
21. Tolstoy 1997: Tolstoy N.I. Slavic lexicology and semasiology. *Selected works*. T.1. Moscow, 1997, p. 560.
22. ÖZCAN, Aynur. , On Common Words in Turkey Turkish and New Uyghur Turkish`. *Language and Literature Studies Symposium Mustafa Canpolat Gift, Pub. Aysu Ata and Mehmet Ölmez*, Ankara: 2003. P. 161-169.
23. YAMAN, Ertuğrul. *Syntax Comparison of Turkey Turkish and Uzbek Turkish*. Ankara: 2000.