

ТЮРКСЬКІ МОВИ

UDC 811.512.161+811.512.162

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2025.3.1/30>**Karimova A. Kh.**

Baku Slavic University

THE VARIETY OF SOURCES OF EQUIVALENT BORROWINGS IN AZERBAIJANI AND TURKISH LANGUAGES

The article examines the varieties of borrowed equivalents in the Turkic languages, and provides a comparative analysis between Azerbaijani and Turkish languages. It is noted that the lexical level is more variable than the grammatical one. The demands of the time, the historical course of peoples' development and socio-political influence lead to the fact that the vocabulary of languages becomes different over time. The Azerbaijani and Turkish languages have been using borrowed words of Arabic-Persian origin for many centuries in parallel. For this reason, the vast majority of words that are completely equivalent in both languages are borrowed from Arabic and Persian. The introduction of Russian and European loanwords into Turkish since the 16th century and into Azerbaijani since the 19th century led to significant changes in the language in terms of quantity and source. The reason for the acquisition, the method of acquisition, the period it covers, the type, the possibilities of use, the form and unification create different characteristics in equivalent acquisitions. It is more expedient to study equivalent borrowings by dividing them into five groups, taking into account their phonetic structure, semantic meaning and variety of sources: complete, relative, semantic, pseudo-equivalent and equivalent borrowings replaced by national words. As a result of the research conducted on the materials of both languages by groups and subgroups, it was found that equivalent borrowings are a) identical; b) which differs only in its source; c) words having the same spelling, orthoepy and source, but completely different meanings, i.e. creating a false equivalence; d) expresses parallel meanings as a result extensions and abbreviations of the meaning; e) it is concluded that there are cases when borrowed words that have already become archaic in the language are replaced by neologisms that arise due to the internal capabilities of the language. The results were obtained by making comparisons at the etymological level based on examples taken from dictionaries and fiction.

Key words: borrowings, source language, semantics, pseudo-equivalence, national words, substitution.

Statement of the problem. The globalization of the modern world and the rapid development of technology represent a new stage in the integration of peoples, cultures and languages. Intercultural contacts have not only shaped the cultural characteristics of peoples, but also influenced the sociolinguistic process. It is for this reason that the lexical layer of the language is developing, and the vocabulary is being quantitatively enriched. As a result, the process of neologism in the language is accelerated. The main factors influencing the enrichment of vocabulary include both new lexical units created due to the internal capabilities of the language, and borrowings.

The phenomenon of mutual borrowing between the languages of the world also has an impact on the history of peoples and languages. The lexical and

semantic properties of words borrowed from related or diverse languages, and the issues of their unification in the language in which they are found, have always been of interest to linguists, especially Turkologists.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Azerbaijani linguists who have conducted extensive research on this topic include A. Demirchizade, S. Jafarov, H.A. Hasanov, M. Adilov, N. Khudiyev, R. Rustamov, N. Mammadli, A. Akhundzade, S. Valibeyov, A. Rasulov, A. Garayev, B. Abbasova, and among Turkish linguists it should be noted – E. Hasan, A. Ahmet, G. Karaagach, S. Altayli, D. Aksan, D. Gunay, E. Ozdemir, Z. Korkmaz, L. Karahan, S. Eker, M. Ergin, M. Hangermen.

Task statement. The main task of the article is to analyze the varieties of borrowed equivalents in the

Azerbaijani and Turkish languages in a comparative aspect.

Outline of the main material of the study. This term, called “ekvivalent” in Azerbaijani and “eş değər” in Turkish, is mainly an object of research in technical sciences. At the same time, “equivalence is a special category of the semantic system of linguistics in the sense of typological equality” [11, p. 6]. “Equivalence” is synonymous with the terms “adequacy” and “compatibility”. Naturally, the question of whether there is basic compatibility between two or more languages is most evident in the field of translation. That is why “equivalence” has become a subject of translation activity and was created to maintain the functionality of the language. Fundamental research on the application and types of equivalence in linguistics belongs to the American linguist Eugene Nida. The author applies the topic of equivalence to all levels of the language and identifies its types. At the same time, many Russian and foreign linguists are interested in this topic. Valuable research on this topic has been conducted by D. Kenny, M. Baker, R. Jacobson, M. Yazichi, A. Gokturk, B. Sadi, Z. Kaya, G. Akin, R. Huseynov, A. Efendiyev, A. Kubatov, J. Asimova, G. Bayramova, A. Rasulov and others. The question of “equivalence” has been classified differently in different periods of history. “Until 1980, the problem of “equivalence” was investigated on linguistic and text-oriented grounds, but after the 1980s it began to have a functional and communicative character” [3, p. 131]. That is, the topic was considered from both a sociological and a philosophical point of view.

In linguistics, the attitude to the form of expression of lexical and syntactic units that create “equivalence” was not unambiguous. So, “E. Nida noted that there are formal and dynamic types of equivalents, R. Jacobson – linguistic and semantic, M. Baker – lexical, phraseological, grammatical, textual and pragmatic” [9, p. 126]. In this separation, the researchers did not deny each other, they simply approached the problem from different perspectives. In general, it is concluded that formal equivalence implies the translation of text from the source language into the target language with maximum preservation of grammatical and lexical structure. Since this is a literal translation, a complete match remains. Full equivalence is expected. Dynamic equivalence means using possible means to transfer the information load of a word in the source language to the target language in its current form. What is meant here is the functionality and meaning of a word in context, not its form. Semantic equivalence is also understood as rather a free translation. It doesn’t matter in which language

unit the equivalent is expressed, the main thing is to preserve the meaning. Pragmatic equivalence takes into account the context and use of the source text. At the same time, synonymy and doubletism are considered the main ones. Cultural equivalence is most often found in texts written in religious and scientific styles, as well as in the language of literary works. In this case, the translator must rely on the history of both languages and the culture of the people. From this, we can conclude that when searching for a suitable equivalent, the above types should be taken into account. Or each of the words and phrases that make up the equivalence must belong to some type. At the same time, M. Yazichi notes that equivalence in a language is created through several stages: “identity, similarity, equivalence at different levels, hierarchical, sequential placement of equivalence, and the stage at which a decision on equivalence is made” [9, p. 137]. All stages are designed to ensure an accurate translation of the text from the source language to the target language. In his book “Theory and Practice of Translation”, A. Rasulov, discussing the problems that arise in translation, draws attention to such issues as “the inability to find an adequate lexico-semantic equivalent” [12, p. 70], mismatch of meaning, naming different concepts or expressing several meanings, expansion and contraction. As a result, all translations divide equivalents into four groups, taking into account the differences that arise when searching for a suitable equivalent of a word in another language; “1. Unambiguous lexical units. 2. Polysemous lexical units. 3. Lexical units without equivalents. 4. False equivalents” [12, p. 71].

There are enough equivalent loanwords in Azerbaijani and Turkish, and they mostly consist of common words. The reason for the acquisition, the method of acquisition, the period it covers, the type, the possibilities of use, the form and unification create different characteristics in equivalent acquisitions. Taking into account both the latest literature written on the topic of “equivalence” and the materials obtained as a result of comparing words equivalent to each other in both languages, equivalent borrowings can be grouped as follows:

1. Full equivalence
2. Relative equivalence
3. Semantic equivalence
4. False equivalence

5. Equivalent borrowings have been replaced by national words

Full equivalence. The intensity of the speech event should not allow the separation of related languages from each other. In addition to national words, most

of the loanwords have equivalents in Azerbaijani and Turkish. In addition to phonetic, semantic, and stylistic possibilities, there should also be similarities in terms of the etymological language and the source language. Thus, when establishing full equivalence, the initial external feature, lexical meaning, morphological structure and source of words should be taken as a basis. The equivalent of each borrowed word that meets the conditions is considered its exact equivalent.

A. Rasulov, discussing the differences between the original and translated texts, writes about the term semantic equivalents: "Semantic equivalents are numerous in the language, can relate to different parts of speech, and also include other levels of language – free phrases, phraseological combinations, idioms, phrases, proverbs and sayings" [12, p. 71]. One-word equivalents have the same characteristics as full equivalence, and there are hundreds of such examples in the language. For example, *cani* (ar.) / *cani* (ar.), *çirkab* (pers.) / *çirkef* (pers.), *etajer* (fr.) / *etajer* (fr.), *forint* (mac.) / *forint* (mac.), *idealist* (fr.) / *idealist* (fr.), *kontrol* (fr.) / *kontrol* (fr.), *lotos* (gr.) / *lotos* (gr.) və s. Bəzi sözlərdə cüzi fonetik fərqlər olsa da, sözlər ekvivalentliyini məna və mənbəyinə görə saxlayır; *fəqir* (ar.) / *fakir* (ar.), *qallon* (eng.) / *galon* (eng.), *quaş* (fr.) / *guaj* (fr.), *ovsun* (pers.) / *efsun* (pers.), *partnyor* (fr.) / *partner* (fr.), *skumbriya* (gr.) / *uskumru* (gr.).

Relative equivalence. The vocabulary of both languages was compared in order to comprehensively study equivalent loan words. Because dictionaries are more extensive and cover the language as a whole. It can be concluded that in both languages there are dozens of loanwords with the same phonetic structure and lexico-semantic meaning, but different sources. These differences are directly related to the environment and the period from which the word originated. Equivalent acquisitions of this kind can be conditionally called "relative equivalence". For the number of examples and an accurate description of the topic, these words can be grouped into three groups;

Group I: The Azerbaijani language has a different European origin, while Turkish has relatively equivalent words only in French. The equivalent loan words included in this group make up the majority of the language. The vast majority of loan words in the Turkish language, the source of which is French, are terms. As is known from world history, if we consider that many fields of science originated in Greece and Rome, then we can determine that the origin of words that differ in their source belongs to the Greek and Latin languages. For example, *arena* (lat.) – *arena* (fr.), *barbar* (gr.) – *barbar* (fr.), *boks* (eng.) – *boks* (fr.), *duet* (it.) –

düet (fr.), *dedektiv* (eng.) – *dedektif* (fr.), *film* (ing.) – *film* (fr.), *illüstrasiya* (lat.) – *illüstrasyon* (fr.), *radio* (lat.) – *radio* (fr.), *yod* (gr.) – *iyot* (fr.), etc.

Group II: Arabic-Persian loanwords of different origin in Azerbaijani and Turkish languages. There are dozens of words in the Azerbaijani language that have Arabic or Persian equivalents in various European languages in Turkish. For example, *almanax* (ar.) – *almanak* (fr.), *alkoqol* (ar.) – *alkol* (fr.), *feminizm* (ar.) – *feminizm* (fr.), *mağaza* (ar.) – *mağaza* (fr.), *atlas* (ar.) – *atlas2* (fr.), *falanqa* (gr.) – *falaka* (ar.), *fanus* (gr.) – *fanus* (ar.), *okean* (gr.) – *okeanus* (ar.), *coğrafiya* (gr.) – *coğrafi* (ar.), *lağ* (pers.) – *laga* (bulg.), *tərsənə* (ar.) – *tersane* (it.). In the Azerbaijani language, the word *əlifba* "is an Arabic word formed from a combination of the first two letters" [5, p. 100], in Turkish, the *alfabe* "is a word created from a combination of the letters alpha-beta in the ancient Egyptian language, which passed into the language through French after the 9th century" [4, p. 12]. *Qurush* is "originally a penny and has a Latin origin" [5, p. 175]. Although it means a penny, in the language this word is used as a complex noun formed by combining similar words in the form of *qəpik-quruş*. It was translated into Azerbaijani through Italian. In the Turkish language, *Kurush* "switched from Latin to German, and then to Turkish" [4, p. 211].

The Turkic peoples adopted a certain part of religious and scientific terms through the Persian language. Historically, the occupation of Turkish lands by the Arabs and their rule for many centuries created conditions for the passage of Arabism directly. However, the restoration of the independence of the States interrupted direct contacts with the Arabs, which led to their strife. The presence of our borders with the Persians and constant good-neighborly relations made it inevitable to buy them from or through Persia. The socio-political consequences of this period led to the fact that languages received words from different sources. Even today, the differences are obvious in the vocabulary of the Azerbaijani language and the Turkish Turkish language. For example, the source of such words is attributed to different languages: *ahıl* (fars) – *ahi* (ar.), *bamiyə* (pers.) – *bamiya* (ar.), *cilvə* (ar.) – *cilve* (pers.), *nəzakət* (ar.) – *nezaket* (pers.), *ruzi* (pers.) – *rızık* (ar.), *mat* (pers.) – *mat* (ar.), *narıncı* (pers.) – *narınc* (ar.), *şivə* (pers.) – *şive* (ar.).

There are different opinions about whether the word *xəncər* is of Arabic or Persian origin. However, Bashir Ahmadov notes that "the word *xəncər* is of Persian origin, since there is a word *xənc* in the Persian language and it means a wound. The dagger is also a tool for inflicting severe wounds" [5, p. 125]. In Turkish, *hançer* "is taken from Arabic and means a sharp

knife, a large knife. There is even an Arabic word *hançere*, which means larynx, throat” [4, p. 156]. The word *müşk* came to the Azerbaijani language from Persian. “In Turkish, the word “yıpar” is used instead (Akhmadov B., 213). In the Turkish language, *misk* comes from Arabic and means “a pleasantly smelling liquid extracted from the umbilical skin of a gazelle” [4, p. 229].

Group III: This group includes loan words of mixed type by source. All the words included in the group are of European origin. In the context of such rapid development and integration of States, it is quite natural to observe such differences. The reason for this is that words can enter a language in different ways. For example, *çətə* (alb.) – *çete* (bulg.), *benzin* (khor.) – *benzin* (fr.), *fakültə* (ger.) – *fakülte* (fr.), *fen* (eng.) – *fön* (ger.), *litre* (fr.) – *litre* (gr.), *mebel* (fr.) – *mobilya* (it.), *media* (lat.) – *medya* (eng.), *müzike* (eng.) – *muzika* (it.), *robot* (che) – *robot* (fr.), *siqaret* (fr.) – *sigara* (sp.), etc.

Semantic equivalence. The words in this group change their meaning over time. The use of a word in various communicative situations leads to an expansion or narrowing of the semantic structure, semantic layer. This process develops the lexical level of the language not only in quantity, but also in content. Based on the evolutionary processes in the public consciousness and the metaphorical features of the language, the word becomes metaphorical and acquires new semantic shades, as a result, the meaning expands. The narrowing of meaning occurs as a result of the reduction, forgetting and specialization of the meaning expressed by the word in a certain period of time.

Semantic changes occurring in both national and borrowed words of the Turkish language are reflected in the form of “expansion of meaning, narrowing of meaning, improvement of meaning, deterioration of meaning”. The first two meanings, as the name suggests, express the meaning that words gain or lose over time. An “improvement in meaning” occurs when any word that is considered slang expresses new positive content. For example, if at first *cerbeze* was used in the meaning of “multiple cunning”, today it means “having a beautiful speech, sociable, skillful”. “Deterioration of meaning”, in turn, is the opposite of what was said above and currently has a negative content. For example, *ukala* is the plural form of the Arabic word for intelligence, in modern linguistics it means “the one who considers himself the smartest of all”. Or *kepaze* means “vile, shameless, funny”, and not “soft summer” from the Persian language.

Let us use some examples to explain the expansion of meaning that occurs with equivalent borrowings in

the Azerbaijani language and Turkish: *pəncərə* is a page that opens on a computer; *masa* is a place where ideas are discussed; *ailə* is a place where similar ideas gather, a collective; *sinif* is a social class; *sərhəd* is the limit in a relationship; *pərdə* is distance, mystery; *şöbə* – a specialized field of education, science; *şans* is the way to victory; *kürə* – objects of round shape; *təbəqə* – an aggregate, an aggregate, an organizing group, etc.

Mehmet Hangerman also attributes “generalizations” to the expansion of the meaning of words. That is, this is due to the fact that proper names become common names over time and acquire additional meaning. “Sandwich is the name of the English king. Since the gambling king did not even have the opportunity to eat, he ate food between the loaves. The form of food he created is now understood as a type of food” [7, p. 381].

Mehmet Hangerman also includes “generalizations” in the expansion of the meaning of words. That is, this is due to the fact that proper names become more common over time and acquire additional meanings. “*Sandwich* is the name of the English king. The gambling king didn’t even have a chance to eat, so he ate between slices of bread. The form of food he created is now understood as a type of food” [7, p. 381]. Words like *jilet*, *giyotin*, *şampanya*, *selpak* are also common words that have passed from proper names into many languages. In the Azerbaijani language, loan words such as *sirab*, *rentgen*, *pampers*, *kalaşnikov*, *jeep*, *adidas*, *termos*, *velosiped*, *diktafon*, *kamaz*, *tefal* initially referred to specific and specific objects, but over time they became universal in the language. They have become common names for various objects.

Let us look at examples of equivalent borrowings that have led to semantic shortening in Azerbaijani and Turkish; while in Azerbaijani the word *telefon* is used only as a means of communication, in Turkish it also refers to the process of making a call. *Avtomat* means not only weapons, but also a vending machine for snacks. In addition to similar meanings, the word *xarakter* also means “a letter in the printing process”. Or, although this word is used to mean a place where information, resources and natural materials are concentrated, in Turkish it refers only to a center or building where financial issues are being resolved. Although in modern linguistics the word *tütün* is understood only as a substance containing nicotine, in the ancient Turkic language it also meant *duman*. At the same time, this type includes words such as *ahbap*, *amele*, *evlat*, *mesaj*, *kibar*, *fukara*, *həkim*, *molla*, *dərman*, *hakim*, *məktəb*, *qəsd* and others.

False equivalence. Azerbaijani and Turkish also have a group of equivalent loan words that are spelled and pronounced the same way, but have different meanings. The words included in this group are called false, fake or deceptive equivalents in linguistics. “False equivalents are considered pseudoequivalent homonyms” [12, p. 78]. False equivalents can create serious problems when translating and “transferring” materials from related languages. That’s why using this group of words in the right place, understanding it in context, and choosing the appropriate option help preserve the essence of the text. The main feature that distinguishes false equivalents from equivalent words is that their meaning is understood in context.

A. Rasulov identifies three reasons for the occurrence of false equivalents: 1) The division of the Turkic languages into various branches and subgroups in the course of their long historical development; 2) the adoption of various forms of borrowings from both languages into the literary language; 3) Some borrowed words remain in colloquial speech without reaching the level of the literary language, which leads to a distortion of meaning [14, p. 87]. The changes in meaning occurring in the first group are observed in all Turkic languages. It mainly consists of words of national origin.

Among the loanwords, the word *kireç* can be cited as an example. “The word *kireç* comes from the Latin word. It does not come from the root “creta”. The words *gerç*, *kerç gereç* in Persian have the same root. Although in early times it meant chalk powder, this word spread to the East as the name of a substance extracted on the island of Crete [4, p. 202]. In this sense, the word “lime” borrowed from Persian is equivalent in the Azerbaijani language. However, as a synonym for the word *kireç*, it means “lime is a white or yellow calcareous mineral substance used in construction, sculpture, surgery, etc.” [1, p. 709], but the source is not specified. An example of the second group is the word *məktəb*, borrowed from the Arabic language. Thus, this word has become figurative in the Azerbaijani language and has many meanings, while in the Turkish language only its original form has been preserved. It has now become archaic: “After the period of the Republic, the word *ecol* from the French language began to be used” [15]. To explain the content of the third group, let us take the word *məqam-makam* as an example. Comparing the etymology of both languages and their interpretations in modern dictionaries, it can be seen that fewer meanings have been learned at the level of the literary language than the other. They have six meanings in Azerbaijani and three in Turkish, and they are equivalent. However, the meaning

of “position, rank, position, status” [2, p. 330] in the Azerbaijani language is more functional in Turkish, in live colloquial speech. Indeed, in addition to the ideas of a scientist, this word can have several other meanings. Differences between languages arise because each language accepts and retains the necessary meaning of borrowed words.

In Huseyn Rahmi Gürpınar’s work “We found refuge in the Truth” [6, p. 42], the word “*musavat*” in the phrase “*Hürriyet, müsavat diye herkesin ağzına bir parmak ball çaldılar*” [6, p. 42] is used in Turkish to mean “unity, justice, honesty”. The exact equivalent of this word does not match its meaning in the Azerbaijani language. Because in the Azerbaijani language, “*Musavat*” is more associated with the name of the party than with the meaning of equality. As in Bakhtiyar Vahabzade’s poem “*Musavat*”. “*Zülmətlə savaşlarda zəfər çaldığı gündən, Qəlblərdə azadlıq odu yandırdı Müsavat. Ulduz*” [13, p. 238]. The existing differences create confusion in translation, especially when they are not replaced by the correct, appropriate word in poetry. Thus, a false equivalence arises in speech.

False equivalents of loanwords include *nazik* (narrow/polite), *dəhşət* (terrible/unusual), *balon* (spherical object, balloon/lie, balloon), *bank* (center/bench where monetary transactions take place), *adi* (simple/modest, banal), *faraş* (prematurely sown/untidy), *kesafət* (dirty/crowded), etc. “*Bikar* consists of the Persian words *bi* (-sız-⁴) and *kar* (work), which means “unemployed”” [5, p. 47]. Apart from the fact that this word has a different meaning in Turkish, its origin is also different. The word comes from the Arabic root *bikr* (untouched, young girl) and is used to refer to a single person who has never been married [15].

Equivalent borrowings have been replaced with national words. Neologisms created due to the internal capabilities of the language have increased in quantity and quality in both languages since the last century. In this regard, the influence of the Turkish language on the Azerbaijani language is strong. If in the Middle Ages borrowings from Arabic-Persian prevailed, and in the XVIII–XIX centuries – borrowings from Russian-European languages, now the trend has changed. Either the language creates new words through morphological, syntactic, and derivative methods, or it borrows words of European origin or through Turkish. There are also many words among the borrowings that were once part of the active base of the Azerbaijani language, but are now considered dialectal or archaisms.

National words that arise as a result of the process of “assimilation” either completely displace some Ara-

bic-Persian borrowings, which are already becoming archaic, or are used in the language in parallel. There are dozens of similar words in the Azerbaijani language that have been granted the right to “citizenship”. There are many more such words in colloquial speech. For example, *vəziyyət-durum*, *cəmiyyət-toplum*, *topluluk*, *savadlı-bilgili*, *rastlaşmaq-uğramaq*, *sual-soru*, *iclas-toplantı*, *beynəlxalq-uluslararası*, *məna-anlam*, *arzu-dilək*, *məşhur-ünlü*, *dətal-ayrıntı*, *səbəb-dolayı*, *məhdud-qısıtlı*, *iştirak-qatılmaq*, *əks etdirmək-yansıtmaq*, *təklif-önəri*, *tarazlıq-dəngə*, *vacib-önəmli*, *reklam-tanıtım*, *təzyiq-baskı*, *egoist-bəncil*, *qabiliyyət*, *talant-yetənək*, *təcrübə-dənək*, *təcrübəvi-dənəysəl*, *təbiət-doğa*, etc.

The replacement of borrowed words with words of Turkic origin can be carried out using morphological and syntactic methods. An example can be given by using suffixes that change a word: *mənzərə – görünüşü*, *elan – bildiriş*, *məlumat – bilgi*, *ərazi – bölgə*, *gərçi (pers.) – baxmayaraq*, *qarət – soyğun*, *period – dönəm*, *bəziçə (pers.) – oyuncaq / aqerist (fr.) – dolandırıcı*, *agresif (fr.) – saldırgan*, *ampirik (fr.) – deneysel*, *tabaka (ar.) – katman*, etc. Examples of words formed in syntactic ways can be given: *bəşəşət (ar.) / güləruz*, *yubiley – ildönümü*, *familiya – soyad*, *kinayə – üstüörtülü*, *keysu – uzunsaç*, *kontrabanda – qaçaqmalçılıq*, *aeroport – hava limanı*, *stansiya – dəmir yolu*, *terapevt – can həkimi / astronom (fr.) – gökbilimci*, *mikroskop (fr.) – büyütec*, *prejüje (fr.) – onyargı*, *üterus (fr.) – dölyatağı*, *vakur (ar.) – ağırbaşlı*.

One of the tasks set by the Association of the Turkish Language in Modern Turkish is to cleanse the language of unnecessary borrowings and replace repetitions with words of national origin. Along with language laws and reforms, citizens' proposals in daily newspapers and on websites are being accepted and evaluated in order to find solutions for borrowing equivalents at the state level. The examples below can be used as examples of loan words common in Turkish in this sense, as their national equivalents in the Azerbaijani language. For example, *akne (fr.) – sızanaq*, *abadi*

(pers.+ar.) – bolluq, *ambalaj (fr.) – qablaşdırma*, *pıhtı (pers.) – laxta*, *anahtar (gr.) – açar*, *baraka (it.) daxma*, *basen (fr.) – omba*, *beskül (fr.) – qapan*, *bizzat (ər.) – birbaşa*. *Buton (fr.) – düymə*, *çabuk (pers.) – tez*, *çaçaron (it.) – lağlağı*, *çarşı (pers.) – bazar*, *eleğimsağma (ar.+ar.) – göyqurşağı*, *eleman (fr.) – işçi*, *fobi (fr.) – qorxu*, *hakaret (ar.) – söyüş*, *kepçe (pers.) – çömçə*, *kloroz (fr.) – aşındırma*, *kukuleta (it.) – qorxuluq*, etc.

Conclusions. The abundance of loan words in a language is not a consequence of the lack of vocabulary in that language. Every borrowed word in the language that names necessary and new objects and phenomena is a sign that this nation or state has not remained aloof from civilization and is part of the development of the epoch. The materials obtained as a result of studying the topic of borrowings at all levels will become a visual aid for the common Turkic language in the future. It should also be noted that along with the cleanest language, the most understandable and most relevant language may be the common language. In this sense, the spontaneous exclusion of Arabic-Persian words from the language, which are generally accepted units of understanding of the Turkic languages, is unacceptable. The materials obtained as a result of comparing examples are important both for translation work (choosing the most optimal, adequate option that reflects the semantic load in translation, i.e. the correct implementation of lexical transformation), and for the re-introduction of certain words into the language that have undergone a narrowing of meaning, and for characterizing the generality of words. The expansion of meaning and metaphor increase the expressive possibilities of speech. The influence of the Turkish language on the Azerbaijani language since the beginning of the 20th and 21st centuries has mainly been directed towards nationalization. In all cases, this process returns languages to their past, to their origins. As a result of the assimilation process, both Azerbaijani and Turkish languages are being cleansed of unnecessary borrowings that burden the language.

Bibliography:

1. Azərbaycan dilinin izahlı lüğəti. AMEA-nın nəşri. II cild. Bakı, Şərq-Qərb, 2006, 791 s.
2. Azərbaycan dilinin izahlı lüğəti. AMEA-nın nəşri. III cild. Bakı, Şərq-Qərb, 2006, 631 s.
3. Berk Ö. Kurumlar ışığında çeviribilim terimcesi, Multilinguae, Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt: 6, Sayı: 12, Temmuz 2016, s. 125-144.
4. Eyüpoğlu İ.Z., Türk dilinin etimoloji sözlüğü. Sosyal Yayınlar, İstanbul, 1988, 407 s.
5. Əhmədov B. Etimologiya lüğəti, Altun kitab, 2015, 288 s.
6. Gürpınar H. R. Hakka sığındık, TDK, 2021, 167 s.
7. Hangerman M. Türkçe temel dilbilgisi. İstanbul, 2002, 427 s.
8. Karaağaç G. Türkçenin alıntı sözlüğü. Akçağ, 2015, 855 s.
9. Karavin H. Trakya Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt: 6, Sayı: 12, Temmuz 2016, s. 125-143.
10. Qarayev A. Müasir Azərbaycan dilində Avropa mənşəli leksik alınmalar. Bakı, ADU, 1989, 93 s.

11. Məmmədli. F Azərbaycan dilində linqvistik ekvivalentlər. Bakı, 2012, 44 s.
12. Rəsulov Ə. Tərcümə nəzəriyyəsi müstəvisində Türkiyə türkcəsi və Azərbaycan dili. Bakı, Elm-Təhsil, 2015, 159 s.
13. Vahabzadə B. Seçilmiş əsərləri. I cild. Bakı, "Öndər nəşriyyat", 2004, 327 s.
14. Feyza T. Azərbaycan türkcəsi və Türkiyə türkcəsi arasındakı yalancı eş dəyərlərin XVI. Yüzyılda Azərbaycan sahasında türkcəyə çevrilmiş bir metindəki örneklər. Uluslararası türk lehçe araştırmaları dergisi, I cild, 2. sayı, 2017, s. 85-99.
15. Etimoloji sözlük. URL: www.aksozluk.org

Карімова А. Х. РІЗНОМАНІТНІСТЬ ДЖЕРЕЛ ЕКВІВАЛЕНТНИХ ЗАПОЗИЧЕНЬ В АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСЬКІЙ ТА ТУРЕЦЬКІЙ МОВАХ

У статті розглядаються різновиди запозичених еквівалентів у тюркських мовах, проводиться порівняльний аналіз азербайджанської та турецької мов. Відзначається, що лексичний рівень є більш варіативним, ніж граматичний. Вимоги часу, історичний хід розвитку народів і суспільно-політичний вплив призводять до того, що словниковий склад мов з часом стає різним. В азербайджанській і турецькій мовах протягом багатьох століть паралельно використовуються запозичені слова арабо-перського походження. З цієї причини переважна більшість слів, які є повністю еквівалентними в обох мовах, запозичені з арабської та перської мов. Введення російських і європейських запозичень в турецьку з 16 століття і в азербайджанську з 19 століття призвело до значних кількісних і джерельних змін мови. Причина придбання, спосіб придбання, період, який воно охоплює, тип, можливості використання, форма та уніфікація створюють різні характеристики в еквівалентних придбаннях. Еквівалентні запозичення доцільніше вивчати, поділивши їх на п'ять груп, враховуючи їх фонетичну структуру, семантичне значення та різноманітність джерел: повні, релятивні, семантичні, псевдоеквівалентні та еквівалентні запозичення, замінені загальнонародними словами. У результаті дослідження, проведеного на матеріалах обох мов за групами та підгрупами, встановлено, що еквівалентні запозичення а) тотожні; б) який відрізняється лише своїм джерелом; в) слова, що мають однакове написання, орфоенію та джерело, але зовсім різні значення, тобто створюють хибну еквівалентність; г) виражає паралельні значення як результат розширення та скорочення значення; д) зроблено висновок про випадки, коли запозичені слова, які вже архаїзувалися в мові, замінюються неологізмами, які виникають завдяки внутрішнім можливостям мови. Результати отримано шляхом проведення порівнянь на етимологічному рівні на основі прикладів зі словників та художньої літератури.

Ключові слова: запозичення, мова оригіналу, семантика, псевдоеквівалентність, національні слова, заміна.