FALSE FRIENDS IN TRANSLATION: WHY SIMILAR WORDS MISLEAD TRANSLATORS

Damir Shermatov

Bachelor Student, Faculty of English Philology and Translation

Studies (Ingliz Filologiyasi va Tarjimashunoslik Fakulteti)
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand 140100, Uzbekistan

Abstract:

False friends—words that look or sound similar across languages but differ in meaning—are a frequent source of translation errors because they trigger automatic (and often wrong) associations. The term is commonly traced to Kœssler and Derocquigny's 1928 work on faux amis, highlighting how deceptive similarity can "betray" translators during comprehension and production. This article explains why false friends occur, how they operate as lexical interference, and why they are especially dangerous in professional translation where speed and familiarity encourage shortcut decisions. Drawing on translation pedagogy that treats meaning as context-dependent and warns against dictionary-first substitution, the paper proposes practical control steps: verify sense through co-text and domain cues, test collocation and register, and keep a personal "risk list" of high-frequency deceptive pairs. Short examples illustrate typical error patterns (semantic mismatch, pragmatic drift, and domain confusion) and show how careful contextual analysis prevents mistranslation. The article concludes that false-friend awareness is a core competence for translator training and quality assurance.

Keywords:

false friends; deceptive cognates; lexical interference; translation errors; context; collocation; register; semantic mismatch; pragmatic meaning; translator training

Introduction

In translation practice, similarity is usually helpful: cognates and shared international terms can speed up comprehension. Yet similarity can also be deceptive. "False friends" are lexical items that appear similar in two languages but diverge significantly in meaning, leading translators to choose an incorrect equivalent. The problem is not only theoretical; it is practical and costly. A single false-friend error can distort facts in technical translation, damage credibility in legal or business texts, and create unintended humor or offense in public communication. For this reason, false friends are often discussed as a classic "error trap" in translator training and editing workflows. False friends matter because translators are human: we use pattern recognition and speed. When a word looks familiar, the brain offers an immediate meaning candidate, and under time pressure this candidate becomes the translation. False friends exploit exactly this cognitive shortcut. They are also structurally common: languages borrow from shared sources (Latin, French, English), but meanings shift over time, creating "near twins" that no longer match. This article explains why false friends arise, what kinds of translation mistakes they produce, and how translators can reduce risk through context-driven checking and disciplined lexical decision-making.

Why false friends exist and why they persist

A widely cited origin of the term points to Kœssler and Derocquigny's 1928 discussion of faux amis—deceptive pairs that betray translators precisely because they look trustworthy. Historically, false friends emerge through shared etymology followed by semantic drift: two languages inherit or borrow a similar form, but one meaning expands, narrows, or shifts while the other does not. Another pathway is borrowing with restricted usage: a loanword may enter one language but develop a specialized meaning, leaving translators to assume a broader (or different) sense based on the source language.

False friends persist because they are reinforced by surface evidence. Orthographic and phonological similarity produces a strong "feels right" effect, which is why even advanced translators make these errors—especially when the text is dense, time is limited, or the domain is unfamiliar. Recent work discussing false friends as lexical interference shows that the problem is not merely "wrong vocabulary," but a systematic interference mechanism that pushes translators toward inaccurate choices. In other words, false friends are not rare accidents; they are predictable risk points in bilingual processing.

False friends as a translation error mechanism

False friends typically trigger three kinds of errors: semantic substitution (wrong denotation), pragmatic distortion (wrong connotation/register), and domain misclassification (wrong field-specific meaning). A key insight from translation pedagogy is that meaning is realized in context; therefore, translators must verify what a word means here, not what it "usually means." When translators skip contextual verification, false friends become automatic substitutions.

Consider a classic English–European example widely used in teaching: English **embarrassed** vs Spanish **embarazada** ("pregnant"). If a translator trusts form similarity, the result is not a minor nuance error but a categorical meaning failure. The supportive point is that false friends often produce "high-impact errors" because they replace one semantic frame with another, changing what is being talked about (emotion vs pregnancy). This is why professional workflows treat them as quality-critical: a single false-friend substitution can invalidate an entire sentence.

Types of false friends and what they do to meaning

False friends are not all identical. Some are "complete" false friends (meanings are unrelated), while others are "partial" false friends (meanings overlap in one sense but diverge in another). Academic discussions often note that partial false friends are more dangerous because they appear correct in some contexts and fail in others.

Example (partial false friend pattern): English **actual** often means "real," but in several European languages the similar-looking form means "current" or "up-to-date." If a translator ignores context, "actual problems" may be mistranslated as "real problems" instead of "current problems." The supportive point is that partial false friends demand contextual disambiguation, not memorization alone: the translator must check which sense is activated by co-text such as time markers ("today," "currently") or evaluative contrasts ("real vs imagined").

Why context is the best defense

Translation training resources stress that false friends must be handled through contextual reading rather than visual similarity. Context operates in two layers: linguistic context (collocates, syntax, discourse topic) and situational context (domain, real-world knowledge, communicative purpose). A strong practical habit is to treat any "suspiciously easy" familiar-looking word as a hypothesis, not as a decision.

Example (domain cueing): the English **instrument** can mean a device/tool, but in some languages its look-alike may mean a musical instrument only. If the text mentions "laboratory," "measurement," or "surgical," the "device/tool" sense is activated; if it mentions "orchestra," "play," or "concert," the musical sense is activated. The supportive point is that domain words act as meaning filters. Translators reduce false-friend risk by scanning 5–10 words around the item for domain triggers before selecting an equivalent. This is faster and more reliable than relying on intuition.

Practical micro-examples and how to avoid the trap

False friends are best learned through "error scenarios," where context shows why the obvious-looking translation is wrong.

Example 1 (English–French): **demand** vs French **demander** ("to ask"). If an English sentence says "They demanded an apology," translating with the French look-alike as if it meant "demand" would weaken force. The correct interpretation is that English "demand" signals strong insistence; a translator must choose a force-equivalent verb in the target language. The supportive point is that false friends often distort pragmatic strength (request vs demand), so translators must preserve speech-act force, not only dictionary meaning.

Example 2 (English–German): English **gift** vs German **Gift** ("poison"). In a safety or medical text, this pair can create severe misunderstandings. The supportive point is that in technical settings, false-friend errors can be high-stakes; they are not stylistic issues but safety and compliance risks. This is why professional QA often includes terminology checks and bilingual glossaries that explicitly flag deceptive pairs.

Example 3 (translation training warning): false friends are especially likely with loanwords and international-looking vocabulary. Baker explicitly discusses false friends (faux amis) as a pitfall for translators, highlighting that similarity in form across languages can mislead even experienced practitioners. The supportive idea is that "international appearance" does not guarantee international meaning. Translators should treat familiar-looking Latinate words as high-risk until confirmed by context.

Preventing false-friend errors in real translation workflow

There are several practical controls that do not require extra tools, only disciplined habits. First, build a personal "false-friend watchlist" from your own mistakes and from high-frequency pairs in your working languages. Evidence from translator-oriented discussions emphasizes that awareness and repeated review reduce error frequency over time. Second, apply a quick triage rule: if a word looks like a direct copy of the target language, pause and verify with context (topic, domain, collocation). Third, test the proposed equivalent inside the full target sentence and ask: does it collocate naturally, and does it match register? A word can be semantically correct but stylistically wrong, which is another hidden outcome of false-friend interference.

Finally, in professional settings, integrate false-friend risk into revision: add a checklist item for "deceptive cognates/loanwords," especially in domains where errors are costly (medicine, law,

finance). Lexicographic work on false-friend dictionaries underscores that systematic lists exist precisely because the problem is recurrent and predictable. The supportive point is that false-friend prevention is not only an individual skill; it is a quality system practice.

Conclusion

False friends mislead translators because they exploit surface similarity and encourage automatic meaning selection. Their impact is disproportionately large: a single deceptive pair can produce categorical semantic errors, shift pragmatic force, or distort domain meaning. The most reliable defense is context competence—treating meaning as activated by co-text and situation, testing candidate equivalents for collocation and register, and using structured revision checks. Translation studies and translator training sources consistently emphasize that successful translation depends on resisting "looks the same, means the same" thinking and replacing it with evidence-based decisions grounded in context. In practice, translators who maintain a watchlist, verify domain cues, and review for deceptive forms significantly reduce false-friend errors and produce translations that are not only accurate but professionally trustworthy.

References:

Baker, M. (2018). In other words: A coursebook on translation (3rd ed.). Routledge.
Koessler, M., & Derocquigny, J. (1928). Les faux amis: Ou, les trahisons du vocabulaire anglais. (Term origin discussed in overview sources.)
Moore, M. (2019). On false friends and other hazards of translations (PDF).
Veisbergs, A. (1996). False friends dictionaries: A tool for translators or learners or both? (Euralex Proceedings, PDF).
Lewis, K. (2020). False friends in terminology (PDF).
Al-Athwary, A. A. H. (2021). False friends and lexical borrowing (PDF).
Razhina, V. A. (2014). To the problem of translator's false friends. CyberLeninka (article page).
Translation Excellence. (2023). Understanding false friends in translation (overview).
JOLCC. (2025). False friends in translation as a source of lexical interference (article page).
UZSWLU Conference Proceedings. (2024). False friends in the translation process (PDF).