A LOOK AT THE PROBLEM OF «SYNONYMY» WITH EXAMPLES FROM TURKISH AND KAZAKH: ARE THERE SYNONYMS IN A LANGUAGE OR NOT?

KARABULUT F. ⓘD

Karabulut Ferhat - PhD, docent, Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey
E-mail: ferhatkarabulut@yahoo.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5039-9580

Abstract. The concept of synonymy – the existence of different words with the same meaning-has been widely debated in linguistic theory. While traditional definitions suggest that synonyms are interchangeable without any change in meaning, deeper linguistic analysis challenges this notion. This article explores the different dimensions of synonymy, including absolute and near-synonymy, contextual meaning variations, and the impact of sociolinguistic and cognitive factors on word choice. We deal with the reality of synonyms in languages in general, and examine Turkish and Kazakh regarding synonyms as a concept in particular. Using a comparative analysis, we try to find out whether true synonyms can exist, or whether semantic, stylistic or pragmatic differences distinguish between synonymic words. Turkish and Kazakh examples illustrate how cultural context, usage frequency and speaker intent influence synonym usage. The article questions the validity of the term «synonym» as a strict linguistic category and suggests that what are often labeled as synonyms may, in fact, reveal deeper layers of meaning and linguistic variation.
Key words: Synonym, meaning, Turkish, Kazakh, absolute synonymy

Introduction. Synonymy is often assumed to be a fundamental characteristic of language. However, linguistic research has shown that true, absolute synonymy is rare, if not nonexistent. Even words considered synonymous exhibit subtle differences in meaning, usage, or connotation. This study examines whether true synonymy exists in natural languages or if all words possess distinct semantic, pragmatic, or phonetic properties. This study is relevant because the concept of synonymy plays a central role in semantics, lexicography, and language pedagogy, yet remains underexplored in the context of Turkic languages such as Turkish and Kazakh. The purpose of this article is to investigate the existence and nature of synonymy, with a particular focus on determining whether absolute synonyms truly exist. The specific objectives are: (1) to examine linguistic and philosophical theories on synonymy; (2) to analyze examples from Turkish and Kazakh languages; and (3) to evaluate the extent to which cultural, contextual, and pragmatic factors influence synonym usage.

Types of Synonymy:

Linguists generally speak of two types of synonymy: absolute synonymy and near synonymy.

1. Absolute Synonymy

Absolute synonyms are words that can be used interchangeably in all contexts without altering meaning. Many linguists argue that such cases are exceedingly rare, as language tends to develop distinctions for efficiency and precision.

2. Near-Synonymy

Most so-called synonyms fall into the category of near-synonyms, where words have overlapping but not identical meanings. Differences may arise in:

Connotation: «Slim» vs. «Skinny» (positive vs. negative perception)

Register: «Commence» vs. «Start» (formal vs. informal)

Collocational Restrictions: «Strong tea" vs. «Powerful tea»

Dialectal Variation: «Apartment» (American English) vs. «Flat» (British English)

The question of whether true synonymy exists in language has been a longstanding debate in linguistic theory. While many scholars accept the idea of near-synonymy, absolute synonymy remains highly contested. Some perspectives that support the existence of synonymy include Jerrold J. Katz [1], Eleanor Rosch (Prototype Theory) [2, 111-144], D. A. Cruse [3], and Traditional Lexicography.

Katz (1972) argued that synonymy can exist at an abstract semantic level, particularly in formal logic and philosophical linguistics, where meaning is defined systematically and unambiguously.

In cognitive linguistics, Rosch's prototype theory (1973) suggests that words exist within graded semantic categories. Some words may function as synonyms depending on how closely they align with a central prototype concept.

Cruse (1986) acknowledges that synonymy exists but argues that true synonymy is rare. Most so-called synonyms exhibit subtle differences in meaning, connotation, and collocation, making them near-synonyms rather than absolute equivalents.

Many dictionaries (Traditional Lexicography) list words as synonyms based on overlapping meanings, recognizing at least functional synonymy in everyday language.

Despite these perspectives, many linguists, such as Quine [4], Goodman [5] and Lyons [9] argue against absolute synonymy, suggesting that differences in usage, register, and social context prevent perfect interchangeability between words. The discussion of synonymy remains central to semantics, cognitive linguistics, and lexicography. Biber, D., Conrad, et.al (2006) highlight corpus methodology in analyzing semantic fields and near-synonym patterns across registers [6, 123].

Materials and methods of research

The subject of study is synonyms in the Turkish and Kazakh languages. The comparative method is used to compare synonyms in two languages, and the descriptive method is used to give the definitions to the examples, and to find their peculiarities. This study adopts a comparative and descriptive linguistic approach to examine synonymy in Turkish and Kazakh. The methodology includes the following components:

1. Data Sources: Synonym pairs were identified through a triangulated method involving: *Monolingual and bilingual dictionaries* of Turkish and Kazakh, including authoritative sources such as *Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlüğü* and *Kazak tilinin Tusindirme Sozdigi*; Existing synonym dictionaries and linguistic thesauri in both languages; Selected online corpora for frequency and contextual usage validation, such as the *TUD Corpus* (for Turkish) and *KazCorpus* (for Kazakh), where available.

2. Sample Size and Selection Criteria: A total of 28 synonym pairs were chosen—14 from each language—based on the following criteria: The words must belong to the same part of speech**;** They must appear as synonyms in at least two independent lexical resources**;** Their usage should be documented in actual language use (e.g., newspapers, literature, spoken discourse); Semantic overlap must be sufficient to allow interchangeability in core contexts**,** pending pragmatic considerations.

3. Analytical Procedures: Each synonym pair was evaluated using *semantic**, **pragmatic**, *and *stylistic* analysis: *Semantic analysis* focused on denotation, connotation, and collocational behavior. *Pragmatic analysis* examined register, dialectal use, and speaker intention. *Stylistic dimensions* were assessed based on discourse function and emotional or poetic nuance. Comparative techniques were used to identify cross-linguistic equivalences and to distinguish between absolute and near-synonymy based on criteria established by Cruse (1986), Lyons (1995), and Rosch (1973).

4. Justification: The methodological design aligns with comparative linguistic practices and cognitive semantics, particularly drawing from the works of Katz (1972) on semantic representation, Rosch's (1973) prototype theory, and Cruse's (1986) lexical semantics framework. This ensures the validity and cross-linguistic applicability of the findings.

Results and discussions

Etymologically the word synonym comes from Ancient Greek («*syn*») «with» and («*onoma*») «name». Latin form of synonym is *synonymum* from syn + onymum (name). Synonyms are widespread in all languages, perhaps because variety in expression is appreciated as part of a good writing style by the speakers. It is also used to make expression easier in speech, daily conversations, prose and poetry. For instance, synonyms are widely used in poetry in order to have rhythm, in novel to express the ideas efficiently, in politics to show the power of the politician and his/her speech.

As a concept, synonymy is a lexical item that shows the relation taking place between the words and meaning. Therefore, in the usages, synonym words in a same or different conversations has sometimes *similar meaning*, but sometimes *near identical connotations.* In our opinion, every natural language has more or less synonym words, and these words have powerfull expression in writings and conversations. Thus, the claim that frequency, distribution and connotation of the word never coincide is not the case for us. In fact, the three characteristics of the word is important, but not so crucial. In our opinion, if two different words are used in the same meaning even in a single place, they should be considered as synonyms. The dialects of Turkic languages, Turkish and Kazakh, have many synonyms that can interchangeably be used in their own and in between them. For example, the sentences in Turkish *öğrenci okula gitti = talebe okula gitti* (the child went to school) are the same in meaning, although the different words *öğrenci* and *talebe* used interchangeably. The same is true of Kazakh, too. *Alla adam balasın jarattı = Quday adam balasın jarattı* (God created human being) have the same meaning. The same is aslo true of between these dialects. For example, *bu adam kalp hastalığından öldü = osı adam jürek awruwınan öldi* (this man died because of heart attack). These two sentences have the same meaning, too.

Let's look at the following examples we chose from Turkish and Kazakh.

Turkish	Kazakh
Göndermek and *yollamak* (to send)	*Jedel*, *jıldam* and *tez* (fast)
kara and *siyah* (black)	*bıltır* and *ötken jıl* (last year)
armağan and *hediye (*gift*)*	*oqıwşı* and *talebe* (student)
yıl and sene (year)	*oqutıwşı* and *muğalim* (teacher)
edebiyat and *yazın (*literature*)*	*suluw* and *körkem* (beautiful)
okul and *mektep (*school*)*	*qate* and *jañılıs* (mistake)
ırmak and *nehir (*river*)*	*üyretüw* and *oqıtuw* (teach)
ünlü harf and *sesli harf* (vowel)	*davıs* and *dıbıs* (vowel)
önsöz and *sözbaşı* (foreword)	*kerek* and *qajet* (necessary)

Table 1. Turkish and Kazakh examples of synonyms

Traditionally, synonymy can only hold between words and more precisely, between words belonging to the same part of speech. They can be nouns, adverbs, adjectives, verbs or postnominals as long as both members of the pair are of the same part of speech. For example: Turkish «harika» = «muhteşem» (wondeful); «seyretmek» = «izlemek» (to watch), Kazakh «tamaşa» = «keremet» (wonderful); «tamaşalaw» = «körüw» (to watch) consequently. This is the classic form of synonymy, covered by, for instance, synonym dictionaries.

Given the complexity of meaning, a person searching for an alternative word must be sure that the synonym chosen is accurate and precise. In its strict sense, a *synonym* is a word with a meaning identical or very similar to that of another word. In fact, it is often said that there is no such thing as an absolute synonym for any word, that is, a form that is identical in every aspect of meaning so that the two can be applied interchangeably. According to these researchers, absolute synonymy, if it exists at all, is quite rare. Absolute synonyms would be able to be substituted one for the other in any context in which their common sense is denoted with no change to truth value, communicative effect, or 'meaning'. At the beginning, this idea came from not linguists but philosophers and lexicographers beginning from the fifties of 20th century. Especially after the fifties, the non existency of the synonymy in the natural languages affected to other social sciences such as linguistics. In this period, philosophers like Quine (1951) and Goodman (1952) argue that true synonymy is impossible, because it is impossible to define, and so, perhaps unintentionally, dismiss all other forms of synonymy.

Willard Van Orman Quine (1951) was highly skeptical of the concept of synonymy, arguing that defining synonymy in an objective, non-circular way is inherently problematic. In Two Dogmas of Empiricism, he challenged the distinction between analytic and synthetic statements, which relies on the notion of synonymy. Quine also introduced the concept of the indeterminacy of translation in Word and Object (1960), arguing that there are no fixed meanings between words in different languages, making synonymy relative and context-dependent. He ultimately rejected the idea of absolute synonymy, suggesting that meaning is determined by an entire web of interrelated beliefs rather than by individual words, reinforcing the fluid and dynamic nature of language.

Nelson Goodman (1952) approached synonymy from a nominalist perspective, questioning the existence of inherent meanings in words. In The Structure of Appearance, he argued that meaning is not fixed but shaped by symbolic structures and contexts. Goodman viewed linguistic and non-linguistic symbols as part of broader systems where meaning is determined by function rather than inherent properties. Thus, synonymy is not an absolute feature of words but a contingent property based on the rules of a given symbol system. Additionally, he emphasized that what counts as synonymous depends on how symbols are used in specific discourses, reinforcing the idea that meaning is constructed rather than pre-existing.

According to Goodman, if we assume, as a condition on synonymy, that any two synonmous expressions are interchangeable in all non-intentional context, then it is possible to show that no two expressions in any language can be synonyms [6, 67-74] Even if absolute synonymy were possible, pragmatic and emprical argument show that it would be very rare. In other words, two expressions are synonyms if and only if they have the same primary and the same secondary extentions. Cruse [7, 270] says that natural languages abhor absolute synonyms just as nature abhors a vacuum,' because the meanings of words are constantly changing. More formally, Clark [8] employs her principle of contrast that 'every two forms contrast in meaning,' to show that language works to eliminate absolute synonyms. Either an absolute synonym would fall into disuse or it would take on a new nuance of meaning. For a moment if this could be true, at best, absolute synonymy is limited mostly to dialectical variation and technical terms such as *önsöz* (foreword) in Turkish, *algı söz* (foreword) in Kazakh. Eventhough these two words are different, the meaning is absolutaley the same.

After these philosophers, linguist John Lyons [9] argued that there must be a complete similarity between the words which have so called the same meaning. According to him, two or more words should be used interchangeable in all cases. If it is not possible, so there cannot be synonymy between or among the words. According to philosopher aforementioned and Loyns and his collegues, words that are close in meaning are near-synonyms or almost synonyms, but not quite, very similar, but not identical in meaning, not fully of denotations, connotations, imlicature, emphasis, or register [10].

John Lyons (1995) argues that absolute synonymy, where two words are entirely interchangeable in all contexts without any difference in meaning, is extremely rare or nonexistent. He distinguishes between *completely synonymous* and *absolutely synonymous (*near-synonymy), emphasizing that language avoids redundancy. Most so-called synonyms exhibit subtle differences in connotation, register, collocation, or dialectal variation. Lyons also highlights that words exist within lexical fields, meaning their definitions are shaped by their relationships with other words. Thus, complete synonymy contradicts the functional economy of language; reinforcing the idea that near-synonymy is the dominant phenomenon. He defines them as follows: «Lexemes can be said to be *completely synonymous* (in a certain range of contexts) if and only if they have the same descriptive, expressive and social meaning (in the range of contexts in questions). They may be described as *absolutely synonymous* if and only if they have the same distribution and are completely synonymous in all their meanings and in all their contexts of occurrence» [11,148]. He says that *complete synonymy* is rare, and absolute synonymy hardly exists. If *absolute synonymy* exists at all, it is merely in very special contexts such as scientific terms (e.g. *almonds* and *tonsils*). But what happens when we have two absolute synonyms is that specialists or

speakers in general tend to use one of the two synonymous words and agree that the chosen word should be always used to refer to the concept they are describing.

Saussure's structuralist approach in *Lectures in General Linguistics* [12] suggests that language functions as a system of differences, implying that true synonymy would be inefficient and redundant in communication.

Cognitive approaches argue that words carry conceptual frames that influence their meaning, making perfect synonymy improbable. Words may activate different cognitive associations based on past experiences.

According to Sociolinguistics, synonymy is influenced by social factors such as politeness, power dynamics, and cultural preferences. For example, euphemisms emerge as a means to express the same idea in a socially acceptable manner (e.g., «passed away» vs. «died»).

Indeed, absolute synonyms are pervasive in language, examples are easily to find. Turkish *hakikat, gerçek, realite* and Kazakh *boskın, qaşkın, azgın*, for example, are synonyms of one another. Although they slightly differ from one another in using in different contexts, they have the same meanings in the dictionary of Turkish and Kazakh. In other words, all denote a statement that does conferm to the *reality* and *fugitive* consequently, and they don't really differ from one another in three aspects of their denotation.

Some Turkish scholars also claim that there is no synonymy in Turkish. Kazakh scholars don't pay much attention to the debate on existency of synonyms in Kazakh. They almost accept the reality of synonmy in Kazakh. Bekturov, for example, gives the definition of synonyms and represents some examples from Kazakh. According to him, synonyms consist of two or more words. Bekturov gives some detailed information about synonyms in Kazakh with regard to their shape, form, source and types. According to him, there are all kinds of synonyms in Kazakh: noun, verb, adjective, adverb; simple word, conjugated word, agglutinated word etc. [13, 26-27]. In Turkey, some scholars such as Vecihe Hatipoğlu [14, 9-10], Doğan [15, 72-72;102-105], Doğan Aksan [16], Doğan Aksan [17], Talat Tekin **[18,** 73-76**]** don't accept the existence of synonms in Turkish, or even in other languages. Aksan [19, 323], for example, claims that using two or more words for one object is indeed not possible. For him, the principle of nonexistency of two identical words is acceptable. He argues that every word has a different meaning from one another. The word *kalp* (heart) for example is different from *yürek* (heart), because *kalp* and *yürek* are not used in the same contexts in all sentences. In the same way, Talat Tekin [20, 73] also claims that people can have *kalp krizi* (heart attack) but not *yürek krizi* (means heart attack). According to him, *ak* and *beyaz* do not carry the same quality with respect to synonymy. He says that we can use the phrase of *beyaz peynir* (white cheese), but not *ak peynir* (white cheese). The same might be true of Kazakh *dawıs* and *dıbıs* that can be used in different contexts in different sentences. We think that what those linguists were trying to establish is that there is no absolute synonymy.

According to this extreme view, the only true synonyms are terms having precisely the *same denotation, connotation, and range of applicability*. As it turns out, these so-called true synonyms are frequently technical terms and almost always concrete words coming from linguistically disparate sources. Good examples of such pairs are *mektep* (from Arabic) and *okul* (from Latin) in Turkish; *mektep* (from Arabic), *uçilitse* (from Russian) in Kazakh and *öğrenci* (Turkish), *talebe* (from Arabic) in Turkish; *okuşı* (Kazakh) and *student* (from English) in Kazakh. These meet the criteria for true synonymy: They have precisely the same denotations, connotations, and range of applicability, and they are used in identical contexts. The difference might only come from the context where speaker of the language has different aims and reasons. In the dictionary of Turkish and Kazakh, for example, the meanings of words such as *önsöz*, *söz başı* and *algı söz* are always the same and mean *foreword*. When one Turkish speaker uses the word *hediye* (gift) in a sentence like *Annem için bir hediye aldım* (I bought a gift for my mom) and the word *armağan* (gift) in a sentence like *Annem için bir armağan aldım* (I bought a gift for my mom), the hearer or listener understands these sentences in the same meaning. The same is true of Kazak

sentences such as *men bir ädemi qız kördim* (I saw a beatiful girl) and *men bir äsem qız kördim* (I saw a beautiful girl).

It should be noted that the crucial point is the primary and essential meaning of the words. If we look at the secondary extention or embedded meanings of the different words, we can not see the similarities between these two ones. Connotations and secondary meanings are the topic of the Semantics and need to be handled from this perspective. The concept of *synonymy* is the topic of the syntax, but not the Logic or Psychology. Therefore when we use, for example, the words *kara* (black in Turkish) and *siyah (*black from Arabic*)* in Turkish sentences like *kara boya aldım* and *siyah boya aldım*, no one can understand that *I bought the green color.* If we use the same words in a sentence like *bana bir kilo siyah zeytin ver* (give me one kilo black olive), the listener will fully understand the sentence and give *one kilo black olive,* but not *butter* or *green olive*. On the other hand, if we use the sentence like *bana bir kilo kara zeytin ver* (give me one kilo black olive), the listener might look at us in a while and later will give one kilo black olive, too. Tekin Claims [21] that everybody in Turkey use *kara zeytin* in Turkish instead of *kara zeytin*. This is not completely correct. In the western part of Turkey, the olive producers, farmers and villagers use the pahrse of *kara zeytin* (black olive) instead of *siyah zeytin*. The same can be seen in between Turkish and Kazakh, too. In Turkish, people use the phrase of *beyaz peynir*, on the contraray in Kazakh people use *ak peynir* (white chees). The pair of *kara-siyah* and beyaz-ak have absolutaley the same meaning. In this condition, for example, the seller would not give us one kilo *green* olive, but *black* oliv. The same is true of Kazakh words, too. When one use the sentence like *osı qızdı süyemin* (I love this girl) and the sentence like *osı qızdı jaksı köremin* (I love this girl). In these sentences, the meanings of the words *süyemin* and *jaqsı köremin* are identical and reflect almost the same meaning. From these sentences, one can not understand that the speaker *does not love* the girl. That is, a speaker of Kazakh can be use these sentences in the same context, because in the dictionaries of the Kazakh the meaning of these words is the same, and *they* mean *to love*.

Conclusion

This study set out to examine whether absolute synonymy truly exists in natural languages by analyzing Turkish and Kazakh lexical data. The objectives were to explore theoretical frameworks of synonymy, compare synonym pairs across two Turkic languages, and assess the extent to which cultural, contextual, and pragmatic factors shape synonym usage. These objectives have been successfully achieved through a combination of dictionary analysis, comparative semantic interpretation, and contextual usage examples.

Key findings reveal that while absolute synonymy is rare and context-bound, there are specific instances—particularly involving borrowed or technical terms—where words in Turkish and Kazakh can function interchangeably with no noticeable difference in meaning, denotation, or register. The evidence suggests that although synonymy is often gradable and shaped by discourse, cultural variation, and linguistic economy, it is nonetheless a *real phenomenon* with practical and theoretical implications.

This study confirms that synonymy—both absolute and near—is a valid and observable linguistic category in Turkish and Kazakh, despite traditional skepticism in linguistic theory. This supports a more nuanced view of lexical semantics, emphasizing contextual flexibility rather than rigid structural opposition.

There are many factors that brought synonymy. As a result of the study, the following conclusions were reached:

There are different dialects of Turkic language, so the same object or concept has different names, and when those dialects came to touch with each other and the new standard Turkish and Kazakh came into existence, it preserved such names and words.

1.The concept or the object has only one name originally, then and through time people described it using different adjectives which in turn became established terms or words for that object, and people used them as synonyms.

2. Borrowing from foreign languages such as Arabic, Persian, Russian, English etc.

Although some group of linguists refuses to recognize the existence of synonymy in Turkish and also in Kazakh, we said that synonymy does exist in many contexts. We for now don't examine different types of synonymy in Turkic languages, but recognize only absolute synonymy and near-synonymy which is used in al languages, too.

We recognize some benefits of synonymy:

1. The multiplicity of words and methods in order to enable us to express ourselves. That is, in case we forgot a certain word, or it was difficult to pronounce a sound in the word we need, we tend to use its synonym. For example, let's assume that a man is not able to pronounce the /r/ sound, so he uses other words as synonyms all his life.

2. Synonyms help in eloquence, rhythm …. .

3. There are certain words in Turkish and Kazakh that have many synonyms in a way that one can not deny the existence of synonymy.

As a result, we can explain some of the differences in the meaning of synonyms according to the context in which the words are used, but we do not have all explanations, the matter that tells us that synonymy is a natural linguistic phenomenon.

References

1. Katz Jerrold J. Semantic Theory. New York, Harper & Row, 1972.
2. Rosch E. «Prototype Theory». Cognitive development and the acquisition 1973
3. Cruse D. A. Lexical Semantics, Cambridge University Press, Manchester, 1986 - 310 p.
4. Quine V.O «Two Dogmas of Empiricism», Philosophical Review, V. 60, 1951, pp. 20-43
5. Goodman Nelson «On Likeness of Meaning», in Linsky ed. Semantics and Pholosophy of Language, 1952, pp. 67-74.
6. Goodman Nelson «On Likeness of Meaning», in Linsky ed. Semantics and Pholosophy of Language, 1952, pp. 67-74.
7. Cruse D. A. Lexical Semantics, Cambridge University Press, Manchester, 1986, - 310 p.
8. Clark E.V. V. «Conventionality and contrast: Pragmatic principles with lexical consequences», in A.Lehrer and E. Fedder Kittay, ed. Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992, pp. 171-188.
9. Lyons J. Language and Linguistics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
10. DiMacro C., Hirst, G. and Stede, M. «The semantic and stylistic differentiation of synonyms and near-synonyms», In *AAAI* Spring Symposium on Building Lexicons for Machine Translation, Stanford, CA, March, 1993, pp. 114-121,
11. Lyons J. Language and Linguistics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
12. Saussure Ferdinand de Cours De Linguistique Générale, (ed. Charles Bally & Albert 1916),
13. Bekturov Ş.K. (2003), Kazakh Tilinin Koldanbalı Grammatikası, Foliant, Astana, b. 26-27
14. Hatipoğlu Vecihe «Eşanlamlı Sözcükler Var mıdır?», Türk Dili, S. 229. 1970, pp. 9-10.
15. Aksan Doğan, Anlambilimi ve Türk Anlambilimi, Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi, Ankara, 1971, pp. 72-73, 102-105
16. Aksan Doğan «Eşanlamlılık Sorunu ve Yazı Dilinin Eskiliğinin Saptanmasında Eşanlamlılıktan Yararlanma», Türkoloji Dergisi, VI, I, 1974, pp. 1-14
17. Aksan Doğan (1994), «Lengüistik Verilerine Göre Türk Yazı Dilinin Yaşı Konusunda Değerlendirmeler» TDA Belleten (1989), p. 323
18. Tekin Talat, «Eşanlamlılık Ve Kullanış», Türkoloji Eleştirileri, Simurg Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997, pp. 74-76
19. Aksan Doğan Anlambilim ve Türk Anlmbilimi, Engin Yayınevi, Ankara, 1998
20. Tekin Talat «Eşanlamlılık Ve Kullanış», Türkoloji Eleştirileri, Simurg Yayınları, İstanbul,

1997, p.73

21. Tekin Talat «Eşanlamlılık Ve Kullanış», Türkoloji Eleştirileri, Simurg Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997, p.21-24.

Әдебиеттер тізімі

1. Katz Jerrold J. Semantic Theory. New York, Harper & Row, 1972.

2. Rosch E. «Prototype Theory». Cognitive development and the acquisition 1973

3. Cruse D. A. Lexical Semantics, Cambridge University Press, Manchester, 1986 - 310 p.

4. Quine V.O «Two Dogmas of Empiricism», Philosophical Review, V. 60, 1951, pp. 20-43

5. Goodman Nelson «On Likeness of Meaning», in Linsky ed. Semantics and Pholosophy of Language, 1952, pp. 67-74.

6. Goodman Nelson «On Likeness of Meaning», in Linsky ed. Semantics and Pholosophy of Language, 1952, pp. 67-74.

7. Cruse D. A. Lexical Semantics, Cambridge University Press, Manchester, 1986, - 310 p.

8. Clark E.V. V. «Conventionality and contrast: Pragmatic principles with lexical consequences», in A.Lehrer and E. Fedder Kittay, ed. Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization, Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992, pp. 171-188.

9. Lyons J. Language and Linguistics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

10. DiMacro C., Hirst, G. and Stede, M. «The semantic and stylistic differentiation of synonyms and near-synonyms», In *AAAI* Spring Symposium on Building Lexicons for Machine Translation, Stanford, CA, March, 1993, pp. 114-121,

11. Lyons J. Language and Linguistics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

12. Saussure Ferdinand de Cours De Linguistique Générale, (ed. Charles Bally & Albert 1916),

13. Бектуров Ш.К. Қазақ тілінің қолданбалы грамматикасы, Фолиант, Астана, (2003), 26-27 б.

14. Hatipoğlu Vecihe «Eşanlamlı Sözcükler Var mıdır?», Türk Dili, S. 229. 1970, pp. 9-10.

15. Aksan Doğan, Anlambilimi ve Türk Anlambilimi, Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi, Ankara, 1971, pp. 72-73, 102-105

16. Aksan Doğan «Eşanlamlılık Sorunu ve Yazı Dilinin Eskiliğinin Saptanmasında Eşanlamlılıktan Yararlanma», Türkoloji Dergisi, VI, I, 1974, pp. 1-14

17. Aksan Doğan (1994), «Lengüistik Verilerine Göre Türk Yazı Dilinin Yaşı Konusunda Değerlendirmeler» TDA Belleten (1989), p. 323

18. Tekin Talat, «Eşanlamlılık Ve Kullanış», Türkoloji Eleştirileri, Simurg Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997, pp. 74-76

19. Aksan Doğan Anlambilim ve Türk Anlmbilimi, Engin Yayınevi, Ankara, 1998

20. Tekin Talat «Eşanlamlılık Ve Kullanış», Türkoloji Eleştirileri, Simurg Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997, p.73

21. Tekin Talat «Eşanlamlılık Ve Kullanış», Türkoloji Eleştirileri, Simurg Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997, p.21-24.

«СИНОНИМИЯ» МӘСЕЛЕСІН ТҮРІК ЖӘНЕ ҚАЗАҚ ТІЛІНЕН МЫСАЛДАР АРҚЫЛЫ ҚАРАУ: ТІЛДЕ СИНОНИМДЕР БАР МА, ЖОҚ ПА?

КАРАБУЛУТ Ф. 🔴

Карабулут Ферхат – Ph.D, доцент, Джелал Баяр Университеті, Маниса қ., Түркия
E-mail: ferhatkarabulut@yahoo.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5039-9580

Аңдатпа. Синонимия ұғымы – бір мағыналы әр түрлі сөздердің болуы – лингвистикалық теорияда кеңінен

талқыланды. Дәстүрлі анықтамалар синонимдер мағынасында ешқандай өзгеріссіз бір-бірін алмастыруға болатынын көрсетсе де, тереңірек лингвистикалық талдау бұл түсінікке күмән келтіреді. Бұл мақала синонимияның әртүрлі өлшемдерін, соның ішінде абсолютті және жақын синонимді, контекстік мағынаның вариацияларын және әлеуметтік лингвистикалық және когнитивтік факторлардың сөз таңдауына әсерін зерттейді. Біз жалпы тілдердегі синонимдердің ақиқаттығын қарастырамыз, ал синонимдерді концепт ретінде қарастырамыз. Түрік және қазақ тілдерінен алынған мысалдар мәдени контекст, қолдану жиілігі мен сөйлеушінің мақсаты синонимдердің қолданылуына қалай әсер ететінін көрсетеді. Синонимдердің қолданылуы тілдің нақты жағдайы мен ситуациясына байланысты өзгеріп отырады, бұл олардың мағыналық тереңдігі мен көпқырлылығын көрсетеді. Мақала «синоним» терминінің лингвистикалық категория ретінде зерттейді, сонымен қатар, синонимдер арасындағы тілдік ерекшеліктер, стильдік айырмашылықтар, тіпті эмоциялық реңктердің де маңыздылығын қарастырады. Синонимдер деп аталатын сөздер шын мәнінде терең мағыналық қабаттарды, мәдени мәндерді және тілдік өзгерістерді көрсете алатындығы дәлелденеді. Осылайша, синонимия ұғымының күрделілігі мен көпқырлылығы жан-жақты талданып, тілдің дамуындағы рөлі анықталады.

Түйін сөздер: Синоним, мағына, түрік, қазақ, толық синонимдер

ВЗГЛЯД НА ПРОБЛЕМУ «СИНОНИМИИ» НА ПРИМЕРАХ ТУРЕЦКОГО И КАЗАХСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ: ЕСТЬ ЛИ В ЯЗЫКЕ СИНОНИМЫ ИЛИ НЕТ?

КАРАБУЛУТ Ф.

Карабулут Ферхат – Ph.D, доцент**,** Университет Джелал Баяр, г. Маниса, Турция
E-mail: ferhatkarabulut@yahoo.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5039-9580

Аннотация. Концепция синонимии — существование разных слов с одинаковым значением — широко обсуждалась в лингвистической теории. В то время как традиционные определения предполагают, что синонимы взаимозаменяемы без изменения значения, более глубокий лингвистический анализ ставит под сомнение это понятие. В этой статье рассматриваются различные измерения синонимии, включая абсолютную и близкую к ней синонимию, контекстуальные вариации значений и влияние социолингвистических и когнитивных факторов на выбор слов. Мы имеем дело с реальностью синонимов в языках в целом и рассматриваем турецкий и казахский языки в отношении синонимов как концепции, в частности. Примеры из турецкого и казахского языков показывают, как культурный контекст, частота употребления и намерения говорящего влияют на использование синонимов. Использование синонимов изменяется в зависимости от конкретной ситуации и контекста, что подчеркивает их смысловую глубину и многогранность. В статье рассматривается термин «синоним» как лингвистическая категория, а также важность лексических особенностей, стилистических различий и эмоциональных оттенков, присущих синонимам. Примеры синонимов демонстрируют, что эти слова могут раскрывать более глубокие смысловые слои, культурные значения и языковые изменения. Таким образом, сложность и многозначность понятия синонимии подробно анализируются, и определяется его роль в развитии языка.

Ключевые слова: синоним, значение, турецкий, казахский, абсолютные синонимы