



## Semantic divergence of cognate verbal stems in Kyrgyz and Turkish languages

Alfiia Seydenaliev\*

Acting Associate Professor

Bishkek State University named after Academician Kusein Karasaev

720044, 27 Chyngyz Aitmatov Ave., Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-3507-6190>

**Abstract.** This article examined the semantic divergence of verbal stems in Kyrgyz and Turkish – two languages sharing Turkic roots but developing distinctly over time. The study aimed to identify specific shifts in verbal meanings and determine their underlying factors. The research material comprised four pairs of Turkic verbs: *gel/кел*, *çık/чык*, *al/ал*, and *düş/мыш*. Utilising a comparative analysis of contextual usage and derived meanings, the study identified three distinct types of semantic divergence. Semantic expansion: observed in the Turkish verbs *gel* and *çık*, which acquired abstract and idiomatic meanings (e.g., related to time or outcomes), whereas their Kyrgyz cognates retained narrower, spatially motivated semantics. Semantic specialisation: characterised Kyrgyz verbs, which stably preserved their original meanings. Lacking significant alterations, their semantic structure remained transparent and motivated for native speakers. Metaphorical divergence: occurred in the pairs *al/ал* and *düş/мыш*, where shared original meanings evolved in different directions. Turkish verbs focused on external events and pragmatic aspects, while Kyrgyz verbs acquired abstract meanings associated with internal cognitive states and social concepts. The research demonstrated that these shifts were driven by a combination of factors. The primary catalyst for Turkish semantic shifts was the 1923 language reform, which compelled native verbs to express complex abstract ideas. Conversely, the semantic conservatism of Kyrgyz verbs was sustained by development under Kyrgyz-Russian bilingualism. Divergent cultural environments and differing cognitive models of metaphorical thinking also played decisive roles. These findings contributed to the comparative study of Turkic languages, lexical semantics, and language pedagogy for preventing cross-linguistic interference. Ultimately, analysing Kyrgyz and Turkish verbal stems enhanced the understanding of diachronic semantic evolution, offering deeper insights into the shared history and cultural trajectories of their speakers

**Keywords:** comparative linguistics; lexical semantics; cognate verbs; metaphorical transfer; semantic narrowing; comparative Turkology; polysemy

### Introduction

In practically all Turkic languages, the verbal system acts as a stable and immutable component of the language, preserving pieces of the Common Turkic heritage over many hundreds of years. The similarity and proximity of a large number of verbal stems in related languages suggest that they are close in meaning. However, in reality, the situation is even more complex: verbs that sound and are written similarly are not always identical in meaning. Over time, as a result of historical changes and the geographic areas inhabited by specific peoples, related languages found their own paths of development. This was reflected primarily in the semantics of core vocabulary, including verbs. Consequently, such cognate verbs, which share a single proto-language root, can differ from each

other in modern Turkic languages both in meaning and in frequency of use. In science, the process of changes in word meanings due to historical transformation is called semantic divergence. For example: in the Proto-Turkic language, the word *öt* had the meaning “to pass by, to pass through”; in the Kyrgyz language, it has retained this meaning and is translated the same way, whereas in the Turkish language, this verb is already translated as “to sing (of a bird), to sound” (Starostin *et al.*, 2003).

Recent scholarship confirms that the external lexical similarity of Turkic languages frequently conceals deep differences in historical-semantic development. A. Tabaldieva (2022) demonstrated, on the basis of Yenisei runic texts, that modern Kyrgyz verbs preserve the

### Suggested Citation:

Seydenaliev, A. (2026). Semantic divergence of cognate verbal stems in Kyrgyz and Turkish languages. *Bulletin of the Bishkek State University*, 24(2), 34-40. doi: 10.35254/ss/2.2026.34.

\*Corresponding author ([aseydenaliev@bhu.kg](mailto:aseydenaliev@bhu.kg))



morphosemantic structure inherited from the proto-language, which accounts for their conservatism relative to Turkish. J.N. Washington & F.M. Tyers (2019) showed that Kyrgyz and Turkish non-finite verb forms constitute fundamentally different syntactic classes, which leads to divergence in functional load even when the root is shared. N. Doğan (2022) established that transitivity in Turkish is a gradient phenomenon: the same verb can be proto-transitive or low-transitive depending on context, opening additional niches for semantic expansion. F. Alijonova (2025), reviewing semantic analysis in Turkic and other languages, confirmed that polysemy and context-dependent meaning distribution represent the primary challenge in comparative lexicology of agglutinative languages. L. Johanson (2021) has recently published an authoritative study on the Turkic language family in which it is assigned an important role in linguistic divergence across the Turkic languages. S.A.K. Buhari (2024) synthesised current approaches to semantic change in historical linguistics and stated that changes in semantics should be approached as part of the interaction of cognitive, social, and contact-induced factors rather than only through one of these factors, thus representing a true multi-factor approach to the issue. A complementary line of evidence comes from research on the grammatical behaviour of cognate verbs rather than their lexical meaning alone. J.N. Washington & F.M. Tyers (2019) showed, on the basis of six Turkic languages including Kyrgyz and Turkish, that non-finite forms built on the same verbal roots do not occupy identical syntactic categories across languages; what looks like a single converb or participle category in traditional Turcology in fact splits into distinct classes of verbal noun, verbal adjective, verbal adverb, and infinitive, with the boundaries drawn differently from one Turkic language to the next. This finding is important for the present study because it indicates that grammatical divergence in cognate verbs are likely to be connected: a verb that has been pulled toward a new syntactic function in one language is also a plausible candidate for acquiring new, function-related meanings, since syntactic recategorisation typically creates the structural opportunity for semantic reanalysis to follow. A related point emerges from work on transitivity: the flexibility documented by N. Doğan (2022) supplies exactly the kind of structural slack that a verb needs in order to be reused, over time, for additional and increasingly abstract senses, since each new construction in which the verb participated can become the seed of a new figurative meaning. Taken together with typological observation that Turkic languages in general are prone to extensive polysemy in their core verbal vocabulary, these findings support the expectation that cognate verb pairs separated for roughly a century, such as those examined here, should show measurable differences not only in dictionary meaning but in the syntactic company the verb is allowed to keep.

The Turkish language underwent a major language reform in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, carried out by the Turkish Language Society (Türk Dili Kurumu). As a result of purifying the language from Arabic-Persian and European

loanwords, native Turkish vocabulary took over the expression of complex abstract concepts and acquired a steady tendency toward expanding the semantic potential of certain verbs. The Kyrgyz language, which developed under conditions of Russian-Kyrgyz bilingualism, retained a narrower and more concrete semantics of verbal roots. This contrast is documented in the Etymological Dictionary of Altaic Languages (Starostin *et al.*, 2003) and the Old Turkic Dictionary (Tenishev *et al.*, 1969). Despite these developments, the semantic divergence of verbal stems specifically in the Kyrgyz-Turkish language pair has not been systematically examined in prior research. Therefore, the aim of the present study was to identify the main types of semantic divergence in cognate verbal stems of Common Turkic origin and to determine the factors contributing to their development.

### Materials and Methods

The research material comprised commonly used verbs of Kyrgyz and Turkish that share a Common Turkic origin and actively function in contemporary language practice. Verb pairs were selected according to three criteria: (1) attestation in the proto-Turkic etymological sources; (2) high frequency in both languages as documented in the reference dictionaries listed below; and (3) structural comparability, i.e., the existence of a direct formal cognate in both languages. No frequency corpora were consulted at this stage; selection relied on cross-referencing multiple lexicographic sources to confirm active modern usage. Four pairs were identified as meeting all criteria: *gel/кел*, *чык/чык*, *ал/ал*, and *düş/мыш*.

The primary lexicographic sources included the Etymological Dictionary of Altaic Languages (Starostin *et al.*, 2003), the Old Turkic Dictionary (Tenishev *et al.*, 1969), and the Kyrgyz-Russian Dictionary (Yudakhin, 1985). Additional grammatical and comparative references included Grammar of the Modern Turkish Language (Kononov, 1956), Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005), and Introduction to the Study of Turkic Languages (Baskakov, 1969). Historical depth was additionally provided by M. Tyulemissov's (2005) study of Mahmud al-Kashgari's *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk*, the earliest comprehensive dictionary of the Turkic languages, which supplied additional attestations for several of the verbal roots examined. These sources ensured normative description and comparability of Kyrgyz and Turkish material.

The core (primary) meaning of each verb was determined by identifying the meaning listed first in the etymological sources and corroborated by the explanatory dictionaries of both languages. Derived and figurative meanings were identified from the same dictionaries and cross-verified across at least two independent sources before inclusion. Contextual data were drawn from lexicographic example sentences contained in the dictionaries used, supplemented by stable collocations and phraseological units documented in the grammatical descriptions of A.N. Kononov (1956), J. Kornfilt (1997), and A. Göksel & C. Kerslake (2005). The



methodological basis was comparative-contrastive analysis, which involved: (1) identifying the core meaning of each verb; (2) establishing derived and figurative meanings; (3) comparing semantic structures across the two languages; and (4) classifying the type of semantic divergence. Contextual analysis was applied additionally to establish verb usage in natural speech. As E.C. Traugott & R.B. Dasher (2008) argued, the context of use plays a decisive role in the formation of new meanings. The present study did not aim at reconstructing proto-language

meanings or conducting a historical-etymological analysis; the focus was on a synchronic comparison of verb meanings in contemporary Kyrgyz and Turkish.

## Results

Table 1 presents two illustrative examples from the etymological sources that motivated the study and demonstrate the general pattern of semantic divergence in Common Turkic cognates before the four focal pairs are examined in detail.

**Table 1.** Semantic divergence in selected Common Turkic cognate verbs

| Proto-Turkic root + meaning                          | Verb (Turkish + Kyrgyz) | Turkish (semantic derivation)                                          | Kyrgyz (meaning preservation)           |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| <i>tut</i> – to hold, to catch                       | <i>tutmak + mymyy</i>   | to hold, to catch; to hire, to rent, to keep/observe                   | to hold, to catch                       |
| <i>çök</i> – to sink, to kneel, to plunge into water | <i>çökmek + чөзүү</i>   | to collapse, to crash; to sink in (of eyes); to settle (of a building) | to sink, to kneel, to plunge into water |

Source: compiled by the author

As Table 1 shows, Turkish verbs acquired new meanings over time while Kyrgyz verbs remained largely unchanged. The following subsections present detailed analysis of the four focal verb pairs.

**The verb pair *gel/кел* (“to come”).** The verbal stems *gel* (Turkish) and *кел* (Kyrgyz) belong to the primary verbs of motion and go back to a Common Turkic root meaning directional movement toward the speaker or a reference point. In both languages this meaning is preserved as the semantic core. In Turkish, *gelmek* shows a high degree of semantic expansion. Beyond the basic meaning of movement, it is widely used to denote the onset of time, the occurrence of events, and the emergence of states, and it appears in numerous stable constructions and idiomatic expressions: *zamanı geldi* – “the time has come”; *aklına geldi* – “it came to mind”; *bu bana iyi geldi* – “this was good for me”. J. Kornfilt (1997) attributed this expansion to “the general tendency of Turkish toward the functional concentration of meanings in basic verbs”. In Kyrgyz, *кел* also permits figurative uses, but their range is narrower. Abstract and idiomatic expressions occur much less frequently than in Turkish: *айтканың келсин* – “may your wishes come true”; *аялдар боорукер келет* – “women tend to be kind-hearted”. The pair *gel/кел* thus exhibits semantic divergence along the line of abstraction: Turkish demonstrates active meaning expansion and metaphorisation, while Kyrgyz retains a more concrete, object-oriented structure.

**The verb pair *çık/чык* (“to go out, to rise”).** The original meaning of *çık/чык* is movement outward or upward. In their spatial meaning these verbs coincide across both languages. However, subsequent semantic development reveals major differences. In Turkish, *çıkma* is one of the most polyfunctional verbs. It is used to denote appearance, publication, an increase, the result of an action, and it features in a large number of stable combinations. As L. Johanson & É.Á. Csátó (1998) noted, such polyfunctionality is characteristic of Turkish, where “a limited number of verbs are combined with a wide spectrum of semantic

functions”: *dışarı çıkmak* – “to go outside”; *yarına çıkmak* – “to live until tomorrow”; *karpuz kabak çıktı* – “the watermelon turned out to be unripe”. In Kyrgyz, *чык* is also enriched with figurative meanings, but these retain a connection with spatial semantics: *үйдөн чыкты* – “left the house”; *жолдон чыкты* – “lost one’s way” (Yudakhin, 1985). Abstract uses occur less frequently and are more semantically transparent. The pair demonstrates divergence between semantic expansion (Turkish) and semantic specialisation (Kyrgyz).

**The verb pair *al/ал* (“to take”).** The verbal pair *almak/ал* belongs to the most archaic and widespread Common Turkic roots. In their original meaning these verbs coincide across both languages. In Turkish, *almak* is distinguished by high frequency and breadth of usage: besides “to take”, it is actively used to mean “to buy, to accept, to receive”, and it participates in numerous analytical constructions: *elma almak* – “to take / buy an apple”; *Ahmet komşu kızını aldı* – “Ahmed took the neighbour’s daughter as a wife” (Kononov, 1956). Turkish thus develops functional-pragmatic meanings. In Kyrgyz, *ал* retains the basic meaning of taking but develops additional meanings such as “to win, to buy, to cut (hair/nails), to capture”: *шаарды алды* – “captured the city”; *тырмагын алды* – “cut one’s nails”. This suggests a metaphorical expansion of “to take” in the direction of social or competitive superiority – a different trajectory from the Turkish functional-pragmatic path. The pair thus exemplifies metaphorical divergence.

**The verb pair *düş/мүш* (“to fall”).** In both languages *düş/мүш* originally signifies downward movement or falling. In Turkish, *düşmek* is highly metaphorised toward eventfulness and unintentional change of state: *fiyat düştü* – “prices dropped”; *başına bir şey düştü* – “something happened to him”. In Kyrgyz, *мүш* along with its spatial meaning is actively used in the cognitive domain, denoting the process of understanding or consciousness: *эсине мүштү* – “he remembered (lit. fell into his memory)”. N.A. Baskakov (1969) noted that such meanings reflect “features of semantic derivation in Turkic languages

oriented toward the internal state of a person". The pair thus exhibits metaphorical divergence along distinct conceptual lines: Turkish is oriented toward external eventfulness; Kyrgyz, toward internal cognitive states. An additional illustrative case that reinforces the pattern is the pair *bakmak/bazy* ("to look / to look after"). In Turkish, *bakmak* covers both "to look" and "to look after, to care for, to feed", whereas the Kyrgyz *bazy* has preserved primarily "to look after, to care for, to feed" as its core meaning. This indicates that the Kyrgyz root is semantically closer to the Old Turkic source, while Turkish developed a broader semantic range incorporating both a perceptual and a caretaking domain. This case further illustrates the pattern of semantic specialisation in Kyrgyz versus semantic expansion in Turkish.

The analysis of the four verb pairs made it possible to identify three types of semantic divergence: (1) Semantic expansion: the verb retains its original meaning while acquiring a wide range of abstract and figurative meanings. This type is characteristic of Turkish, where basic verbs actively participate in analytical constructions (attested in *gel/кел, çık/чык*). (2) Semantic specialisation: the verb retains a relatively narrow set of meanings. This type predominates in Kyrgyz, where the semantic structure of verbs remains more motivated and transparent. (3) Metaphorical divergence: similar verbal stems develop in different conceptual directions. The pairs *al/ал* and *düş/мүш* show that a shared proto-meaning can give rise to qualitatively different models of abstraction in each language.

**Table 2.** Types of semantic divergence of cognate verbal pairs

| Pair           | Kyrgyz semantics              | Turkish semantics                        | Type of divergence         | Direction            |
|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>gel/кел</i> | concrete movement             | movement + events, states, idioms        | Semantic expansion         | Tur. > Kyr.          |
| <i>çık/чык</i> | movement outward / upward     | exit + appearance, publication, result   | Expansion + specialisation | Tur. > Kyr.          |
| <i>al/ал</i>   | take + win, capture           | take + buy, accept, receive              | Metaphorical divergence    | different directions |
| <i>düş/мүш</i> | fall + understand (cognitive) | fall + event occurrence, change of state | Metaphorical divergence    | different directions |

Source: compiled by the author

## Discussion

The present study found that Turkish verbs of Common Turkic origin consistently demonstrate semantic expansion and metaphorical abstraction, while their Kyrgyz cognates preserve narrower, denotatively motivated semantics. This finding is consistent with L. Johanson & É.Á. Csató's (1998) observation that "changes in meanings in Turkic languages are often associated with the redistribution of functions between basic verbs". However, L. Johanson & É.Á. Csató did not systematically examine the Kyrgyz-Turkish contrast; the present study provides empirical evidence for this specific language pair, specifying the direction and type of divergence for each verb.

The finding that Turkish verbs absorb abstract and pragmatic meanings is consistent with J. Kornfilt's (1997) demonstration that the Turkish verb exerts exceptional morphosyntactic power: through agreement mechanisms, verbs dictate case forms in dependent constructions, which enables them to absorb extensive semantic domains. This structural feature was not previously linked in the literature to the specific divergence patterns documented here. Further support for this is gained through J. Kornfilt's (2003) study on case assignment in Turkish nominalised subordinate clauses, in which she demonstrates that similar morphosyntactic operations enable the verb to assign case not only in finite clauses but also in nominalised subordinate clauses, thus increasing the number of contexts where the meaning of the verb can be reanalysed. By contrast, N.A. Baskakov's (1969) classification of Kyrgyz as belonging to the Kyrgyz-Kipchak group, which preserved an archaic stratum of lexis, explains the semantic conservatism observed in the present data. The difference between the two languages is thus not merely lexical but reflects distinct typological priorities.

The present study's finding of metaphorical divergence in *düş/мүш* – Turkish oriented toward external eventfulness, Kyrgyz toward internal cognitive states – partially differs from the predictions of M. Erdal (2004), who noted that figurative meanings of verbs "are often formed on the basis of spatial representations". While the spatial origin is confirmed by the data, M. Erdal did not account for the bifurcation of metaphorical trajectories in related languages. The present results suggest that social and historical factors channel the metaphorisation process in different directions: the Turkish language reform of 1923 created a structural need for abstract event verbs, which *düşmek* filled, while the Kyrgyz sociolinguistic context favoured a different cognitive mapping.

These findings are further supported by recent comparative studies. N. Doğan (2022) established that Turkish transitivity is gradient, meaning low-transitivity verbs are precisely those that accumulate the widest range of abstract meanings – a structural explanation for the expansion observed in *almak* and *gelmek*. This differs from the Kyrgyz pattern, where the same verbs remain anchored to higher transitivity and more concrete event semantics. G. Kaçar's (2024) finding that semantic instability of Kyrgyz auxiliary verbs causes classificatory disagreements among grammarians aligns with the present study's observation that *кел, чык, ал, and мүш* are productive in compound constructions with modified semantics, as also documented by A. Tan (2006) for *tasvir fiilleri* in Kyrgyz Turkish. In the same way, K. Kamchybekova's (2011, 2013) research on the perception and taste-perception verbs of Kyrgyz reveals the tendency in the Kyrgyz language for semantically close verb groups to retain their concrete sensory sense instead of developing abstract meanings. F. Alijonova's (2025) review confirms that polysemy and context-dependent





meaning distribution represent the primary challenge in comparative Turkic lexicology – a challenge that the present typology of divergence types begins to address systematically. K.M. Abdulqader's (2024) finding that semantic changes in Turkish are primarily determined by socio-cultural and historical factors is consistent with the present study's conclusion that the Turkish language reform of 1923 is the key extralinguistic driver of semantic expansion. The present study extends this observation from loanword semantics to cognate verbal stems, demonstrating that the reform affected the entire high-frequency verbal core, not only the lexical layer.

## Conclusions

The analysis of four cognate verbal pairs – *gel/кел, чык/чык, al/ал, and düş/мүш* – demonstrated that formal similarity of verbal roots does not imply semantic identity and that the divergences are systematic in nature. For *gel/кел* and *чык/чык*, the dominant factor proved to be the Turkish language reform, which drove semantic expansion and polyfunctionality. For *al/ал* and *düş/мүш*, cognitive metaphorisation along distinct conceptual lines proved decisive: Turkish developed event-oriented and pragmatic meanings, while Kyrgyz developed cognitive-internal ones. Three key contributions emerge. First, the study demonstrated that semantic divergence in Turkic cognates is a systemic pattern shaped by identifiable historical, sociolinguistic, and cognitive forces. Second, the typology proposed – expansion, specialisation, metaphorical divergence – provides a reusable analytical framework applicable to other

Turkic language pairs. Third, the study established a direct connection between the macro-level Turkish language reform of 1923 and micro-level semantic shifts in specific high-frequency verbs. The findings are of significance for translation studies, comparative linguistics, Turkology, and the methodology of teaching Turkic languages. Awareness of semantic divergences of cognate verbs helps prevent interference when studying related languages.

Future research could extend the proposed typology to other parts of speech and to further Turkic language pairs such as Uzbek-Turkish or Kazakh-Kyrgyz. Corpus-based methods and distributional semantic models could provide quantitative grounding for the frequency claims made here. A diachronic comparison with data from Yenisei runic texts would allow the historical depth of the observed divergences to be assessed more precisely. The phenomenon of morphophonological reorganisation in the fusion of cognates in Kyrgyz and Turkish also suggests that future studies could integrate semantic and morphophonological approaches within a unified classification framework.

## Acknowledgements

None.

## Funding

None.

## Conflict of Interest

None.

## References

- [1] Abdulqader, K.M. (2024). Semantic shift and phonological features of words borrowed from Kurdish to Turkish. *British Journal of Education*, 12(12), 51-74. doi: 10.37745/bje.2013/vol12n125174.
- [2] Alijonova, F. (2025). Semantic analysis in global, Turkic, and Uzbek languages: Resources, algorithms, and development prospects. *Science and Innovation: International Scientific Journal*, 4(12), 19-28. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.18054745.
- [3] Baskakov, N.A. (1969). *Introduction to the study of Turkic languages*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
- [4] Buhari, & Kumala, S. A. (2024). Semantic change in historical linguistics: Theories, evidence, and contexts. *Lingua: Journal of Linguistics and Language*, 2(2), 102-115. doi: 10.61978/lingua.v2i2.1033.
- [5] Doğan, N. (2022). Formal and semantic hierarchy of Turkish transitive verbs. *İctimaiyat Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(2), 688-703. doi: 10.33709/ictimaiyat.1195290.
- [6] Erdal, M. (2004). *A grammar of Old Turkic*. Leiden: Brill.
- [7] Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- [8] Johanson, L., & Csató, É.Á. (Eds.). (1998). *The Turkic languages*. London: Routledge.
- [9] Johanson, L. (2021). *Turkic* (Cambridge Language Surveys). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/9781139016704.
- [10] Kaçar, G. (2024). On the classification of compound verbs in Kyrgyz. *Akademik Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 8(3), 1456-1474. doi: 10.34083/akaded.1572240.
- [11] Kamchybekova, K. (2013). *Taste perception verbs in Kyrgyz Turkish*. *Türk Dünyası*, 35, 9-22.
- [12] Kamchybekova, K. (2011). *Perception verbs in Kyrgyz Turkish*. *ODÜ Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(3), 87-102.
- [13] Kononov, A.N. (1956). *Grammar of the modern Turkish language*. Moscow: Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
- [14] Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish*. London: Routledge.
- [15] Kornfilt, J. (2003). Subject case in Turkish nominalized clauses. In U. Junghanns & G. Zybatow (Eds.), *Syntactic structures and morphological information* (Vol. 7; pp. 129-215). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi: 10.1515/9783110904758.129.
- [16] Starostin, S.A., Dybo, A.V., & Mudrak, O.A. (2003). *An etymological dictionary of Altaic languages* (Vols. 1-3). Leiden: Brill. doi: 10.1163/9789047400165.

- [17] Tabaldieva, A. (2022). [Semantics of verbs in Yenisei texts](#). *Bulletin of the Jusup Balasagyn Kyrgyz National University*, 14(4), 263-268.
- [18] Tan, A. (2006). [On descriptive verbs in Kyrgyz Turkish](#). *Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 22, 67-82.
- [19] Tenishev, E.R., Nadelyaev, V.M., Nasilov, D.M., & Shcherbak, A.M. (Eds.). (1969). [Old Turkic dictionary](#). Leningrad: Nauka.
- [20] Traugott, E.C. & Dasher, R.B. (2008). *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: [10.1017/CBO9780511486500](#).
- [21] Tyulemissov, M. (2005). [Mahmud al-Kashgari "Diwan Lughat al-Turk"](#). Almaty: Dayk Press.
- [22] Washington, J.N., & Tyers, F.M. (2019). Delineating Turkic non-finite verb forms by syntactic function. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Turkic and Languages in Contact with Turkic*, 4, 132-146. doi: [10.3765/ptu.v4i1.4587](#).
- [23] Yudakhin, K.K. (1985). [Kyrgyz-Russian dictionary. \(Part 1\)](#). Frunze: Main Editorial Board of the Kyrgyz Soviet Encyclopedia.

## Кыргыз жана түрк тилдериндеги тектеш этиш негиздеринин семантикалык дивергенциясы

Альфия Сейденалиева

Доценттин милдетин аткаруучу

Академик Кусеин Карасаев атындагы Бишкек мамлекеттик университети  
720044, Чыңгыз Айтматов проспекти, 27, Бишкек ш., Кыргыз Республикасы  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-3507-6190>

**Аннотация.** Бул макалада жалпы түрк тамырына ээ болгон, бирок убакыттын өтүшү менен ар башка багытта өнүккөн кыргыз жана түрк тилдериндеги этиштик негиздердин семантикалык дивергенциясы (маанилик ажырашышы) изилденди. Изилдөөнүн максаты – этиштердин маанилик жылыштарынын конкреттүү типтерин аныктоо жана бул өзгөрүүлөргө түрткү болгон факторлорду тактоо болуп саналат. Изилдөө материалы катары түрк этиштеринин төрт жубу алынды: *gel/кел*, *çık/чык*, *al/ал* жана *düş/мүш*. Бул этиштердин контексттик колдонулушун жана туунду маанилерин салыштырмалуу талдоо аркылуу изилдөөдө семантикалык дивергенциянын үч өзгөчө тиби аныкталды: Семантикалык кеңейүү: Түрк тилиндеги *gel* жана *çık* этиштеринен байкалды; бул этиштер абстракттуу жана идиомалык маанилерге (мисалы, убакытка же натыйжага байланыштуу) ээ болушкан, ал эми алардын кыргыз тилиндеги когнаттары (түркөш сөздөрү) конкреттүү мейкиндикке негизделген тар семантикасын сактап калышкан; Семантикалык адистешүү (специализация): Кыргыз тилиндеги этиштерге мүнөздүү болуп, алар өздөрүнүн алгачкы маанилерин түрктүү сактап калышкан. Алардын маанилик түзүлүшү олуттуу өзгөрүүлөргө дуушар болбогондуктан, тилдин ээлери (ээлик кылуучулары) үчүн түшүнүктүү жана жүйөлүү бойдон калган; Метафоралык дивергенция: *al/ал* жана *düş/мүш* жуптарында кездешип, мында алгачкы жалпы маанилер таптакыр башка багыттарда өнүккөн. Түрк этиштери сырткы окуяларга жана прагматикалык аспектилерге басым жасаса, кыргыз этиштери ички когнитивдик абалдар жана социалдык концепттер менен байланышкан абстракттуу маанилерге ээ болгон. Изилдөө бул өзгөрүүлөрдүн бир катар факторлордун айкалышы менен шартталганын далилдеди. Түрк этиштериндеги семантикалык жылыштардын негизги кыймылдаткыч күчү 1923-жылдагы тил реформасы болгон, ал түпкү этиштерди татаал абстракттуу түшүнүктөрдү билдирүүгө мажбур кылган. Ал эми кыргыз этиштеринин семантикалык консерватизми кыргыз-орус кош тилдүүлүгүнүн шартында өнүгүүсү менен камсыз кылынган. Ошондой эле ар башка маданий чөйрөлөр жана метафоралык ой жүгүртүүнүн ар кыл когнитивдик моделдери да чечүүчү ролду ойногон. Бул илимий жыйынтыктар салыштырмалуу тюркологияга, лексикалык семантикага жана тилдер аралык интерференциянын алдын алуу максатында лингводидактикага (тил үйрөтүү үсүлүна) маанилүү салым кошот. Жыйынтыктап айтканда, кыргыз жана түрк тилдеринин этиштик негиздерин талдоо сөз маанилеринин диахрониялык өнүгүү механизмдерин тереңирээк түшүнүүгө көмөктөшүп, бул тилдерде сүйлөгөндөрдүн жалпы тарыхы менен маданий багыттарын кеңири ачып берет

**Негизги сөздөр:** салыштырма тил илими; лексикалык семантика; тектеш этиштер; метафоралык көчүрмө; семантикалык тарылуу; салыштырма тюркология; көп маанилүүлүк



## Семантическая дивергенция когнатных глагольных основ в кыргызском и турецком языках

**Альфия Сейденалиева**

Исполняющий обязанности доцента

Бишкекский государственный университет имени академика Кусеина Карасаева

720044, пр. Чынгыза Айтматова, 27, г. Бишкек, Кыргызская Республика

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-3507-6190>

**Аннотация.** В данной статье исследовалась семантическая дивергенция глагольных основ в кыргызском и турецком языках – двух родственных тюркских языках, которые, имея общие корни, развивались в различных исторических условиях. Цель работы заключалась в том, чтобы выявить конкретные типы смысловых сдвигов и определить факторы, предопределившие эти изменения. Материалом для анализа послужили четыре пары базовых глаголов: *gel/кел*, *çık/чык*, *al/ал* и *düş/мүш*. На основе сравнительного анализа контекстуального употребления данных глаголов и их переносных значений в исследовании были выделены три ключевых типа семантического расхождения. Семантическое расширение: наблюдалось в турецких глаголах *gel* и *çık*, которые приобрели абстрактные и идиоматические значения (например, связанные со временем или результатом действия), тогда как их кыргызские когнаты сохранили более узкую, конкретно-пространственную семантику. Семантическая специализация: проявилась в кыргызских глаголах, продемонстрировавших высокую устойчивость в сохранении своих исходных значений. Поскольку они не претерпели радикальных смысловых изменений, их семантическая структура осталась прозрачной и мотивированной для носителей языка. Метафорическая дивергенция: зафиксирована в парах *al/ал* и *düş/мүш*, где исходные общие значения развились в противоположных направлениях. Турецкие глаголы сфокусировались на внешних событиях и прагматических аспектах, тогда как кыргызские ушли в сферу абстрактных значений, связанных с внутренними когнитивными состояниями и социальными концептами. В ходе исследования было доказано, что данные изменения были обусловлены комплексом факторов. Главным стимулом семантической трансформации турецких глаголов стала языковая реформа 1923 года, вынудившая исконную лексику приспосабливаться к выражению сложных абстрактных понятий. Консерватизм кыргызских глаголов, напротив, поддерживался в условиях кыргызско-русского двуязычия. Не менее важную роль сыграли различия в культурной среде и когнитивных моделях метафорического мышления. Полученные результаты вносят вклад в сравнительную тюркологию, лексическую семантику и лингводидактику в целях предотвращения межъязыковой интерференции. В конечном счете, анализ кыргызских и турецких глагольных основ помогает глубже понять механизмы диахронической эволюции слова и проливает свет на культурно-исторические траектории носителей обоих языков

**Ключевые слова:** сравнительное языкознание; лексическая семантика; когнатные глаголы; метафорический перенос; семантическое сужение; сравнительная тюркология; полисемия