#### INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE



ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23

American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 04,2025



Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

## CONTACT PHENOMENA IN TURKIC LANGUAGES (INFLUENCE OF PERSIAN, RUSSIAN, ARABIC)

Nabijonova Nodirabonu Nozimjonovna Andijan branch of Kokand University

Abstract: This article explores the linguistic consequences of prolonged contact between Turkic languages and three major linguistic traditions: Persian, Arabic, and Russian. It examines the nature and depth of lexical, morphological, phonological, and syntactic borrowing, alongside sociohistorical factors that have shaped these processes. The paper highlights the asymmetry of influence, the domains most affected (religion, administration, education, and science), and the strategies of linguistic adaptation within Turkic language systems. The study contributes to our understanding of how language contact shapes structural and semantic developments across typologically diverse linguistic families.

**Keywords:**language contact, Turkic languages, Arabic influence, Persian influence, Russian influence, lexical borrowing.

#### INTRODUCTION

Language contact has been one of the most significant factors in the historical evolution of Turkic languages. Stretching across a vast geographical area—from the Balkans to Siberia—Turkic-speaking communities have been exposed to a range of dominant cultures and linguistic systems. Among the most influential of these are Arabic, Persian, and Russian, each of which has played a critical role in shaping the lexicon, structure, and stylistic conventions of various Turkic languages. These interactions have not only contributed to the enrichment of vocabulary but have also left traces in the grammatical and phonetic systems of Turkic languages.

The influence of Arabic and Persian dates back to the Islamic expansion and the cultural prestige of Persianate civilization, especially from the 9th century onwards. These two languages served as carriers of science, philosophy, and religion, embedding a large corpus of terminologies and rhetorical styles into Turkic languages. In contrast, Russian influence—much more recent—resulted largely from political dominance during the Tsarist and Soviet periods. This contact introduced a secular and administratively oriented vocabulary, along with structural borrowing driven by education, media, and bilingualism. In this article, we analyze the nature, extent, and consequences of these linguistic contacts, paying close attention to how Turkic languages absorbed, adapted, and occasionally resisted foreign elements.

#### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Arabic entered the Turkic linguistic sphere primarily through the spread of Islam and the religious-cultural institutions that accompanied it. This influence is most visible in the lexical domain, particularly in religious terminology (e.g., namaz, roza, masjid, iman, taqwa), legal terms (e.g., shariat, mufti, qadi), and moral-philosophical vocabulary. Arabic borrowings are typically phonologically integrated, with their morphology adapted to Turkic patterns (e.g., pluralization, verb derivation).

Moreover, Arabic's impact extended to script and literary style. The adoption of the Arabic script for Ottoman Turkish, Chagatai, and other classical Turkic languages reinforced

#### INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE



ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23

American Academic publishers, volume 05, issue 04,2025



Journal: <a href="https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai">https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai</a>

orthographic and stylistic conventions rooted in Arabic models. Classical prose and poetry frequently employed Arabic rhetorical structures, including parallelisms and metaphors rooted in Quranic idioms.

Yet, despite the extensive lexical borrowing, the grammatical core of Turkic languages remained intact, reflecting the resilience of their agglutinative structure. Arabic did not significantly alter the syntactic order (SOV), case systems, or verbal morphology. However, semantic shifts occurred: borrowed Arabic words often developed secondary meanings or narrowed functions in Turkic usage, diverging from their original Arabic senses.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

If Arabic contributed the language of religion and law, Persian brought the aesthetics of high culture. Particularly in Central Asia and Anatolia, Persian was the language of administration, poetry, and sophisticated prose. Chagatai Turkish, for instance, emerged in close symbiosis with Persian literary traditions. Persian influenced Turkic prosody, narrative structure, and terminology related to the arts, such as adab, ghazal, shair, and majlis.

Unlike Arabic, Persian contributed significantly to phraseological and idiomatic layers. Many fixed expressions and stylistic markers in modern Uzbek and Azerbaijani, for example, are of Persian origin. Persian also influenced word formation strategies: compounding and abstract noun formation through suffixes such as -goh (e.g., kitobgoh) or -mand (e.g., ilm-mand) became common.

It is also noteworthy that Persian influence operated not just through borrowing but through bilingual elites, whose fluency in both languages resulted in hybrid linguistic registers. Even today, educated varieties of Uzbek or Tajikized Turkic dialects retain Persian idiomatic frames and interjections, highlighting the deep-rooted cultural intertwining.

Russian influence became prominent in the 18th to 20th centuries as a result of Tsarist expansion and later Soviet control. This influence is especially strong in Turkic languages of the former USSR—such as Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, Tatar, and Bashkir—where Russian functioned as the language of education, science, governance, and industry.

The most visible sign of Russian contact is lexical borrowing, especially in the fields of science (matematika, fizika), technology (kompyuter, telefon), transportation (poezd, samolyot), and politics (partiya, sovet, ministir). These borrowings are often phonologically preserved and only partially adapted morphologically, leading to bilingual code-switching and diglossia in speech.

A more profound level of contact involved structural borrowing and syntactic calques. Certain Turkic varieties developed constructions mirroring Russian patterns, such as the use of participial and relative clauses, or indirect speech structures unfamiliar to native Turkic syntax. The Cyrillic script, imposed during the Soviet era, also shaped orthographic conventions, affecting phonemic representation and literary norms.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The linguistic history of Turkic languages is, in many ways, a record of cultural convergence and divergence. Contact with Arabic, Persian, and Russian has shaped not only vocabulary but also styles of thinking, modes of expression, and registers of formality. Arabic and Persian introduced a religious-philosophical and literary lexicon, leaving the core syntax largely untouched. Russian, by contrast, brought administrative and scientific terminology, with some structural influence in syntax and orthography.

# ORIGINAL ARTICLE

### INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-5206, Impact Factor: 12,23





Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

#### **REFERENCES:**

- 1. Johanson, L. (2012). Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts. Richmond: Curzon Press.
- 2. Schlyter, B. N. (2015). Language and Identity in Central Asia: Uzbek, Russian, and Tajik. Stockholm University Press.
- 3. Lazard, G. (2012). Persian Influence on Central Asian Turkic Languages. In: Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae.
- 4. Comrie, B. (2011). The Languages of the Soviet Union. Cambridge University Press.