

Reflection Of Arab And Turkic Peoples' Socio-Cultural Relations In Linguistics

Boborajabov Muhammadiqbol
Lecturer at Oriental University, Uzbekistan

Received: 18 March 2026; **Accepted:** 23 April 2026; **Published:** 20 May 2026

Abstract: This article explores the reflection of socio-cultural relations between Arab and Turkish peoples in linguistics through the study of Arabic borrowings in the Uzbek language. The research examines the historical development of Arab–Turkish linguistic contacts and analyzes the phonetic, morphological, semantic, and stylistic adaptation of Arabic lexical units in Uzbek. The study shows that Arabic borrowings influenced not only religious vocabulary but also scientific, literary, legal, and everyday language. Particular attention is given to phonetic changes such as the loss of ‘ayn and hamza, the disappearance of vowel length, and the simplification of emphatic consonants. The findings demonstrate that Arabic borrowings represent an important linguocultural layer reflecting centuries of cultural, religious, and intellectual interaction between Arab and Turkic peoples.

Keywords: Arab–Turkish relations, socio-cultural interaction, linguistics, Arabic borrowings, Uzbek language, phonetic adaptation, morphological adaptation, semantic change, linguoculturology, lexical layer.

Introduction: Socio-cultural relations between Arab and Turkic peoples constitute a complex civilizational process that evolved over many centuries within the historical space of the Middle East and Central Asia. These relations were continuously deepened through religion, state administration, science, trade, military-political interactions, and migration flows. The most stable and consistent traces of these processes are reflected in the language system — primarily in the lexical layer, as well as in semantic, phraseological, phonetic, and morphological adaptation mechanisms. In this regard, the study of Arab–Turkish relations from a linguistic perspective not only enriches historical-linguistic knowledge, but also provides important theoretical and practical conclusions for the fields of social history, religious studies, cultural studies, textual studies, and terminology.

Explaining the reflection of socio-cultural relations between Arab and Turkic peoples in linguistics requires a multi-layered theoretical approach. This is because the linguistic phenomena that emerged as a result of these interactions borrowings, semantic shifts, stylistic stratification, phonetic and morphological adaptation, as well as intertextual stabilization are determined

simultaneously by historical processes, communicative needs, and the internal laws of the language system. Therefore, this chapter substantiates the theoretical foundation of the dissertation, the principal concepts, source materials, analytical criteria, and the set of methods as an integrated methodological framework.

Relations between Arab and Turkic peoples entered a new stage beginning in the 7th–8th centuries with the adoption of Islam and gradually expanded under the influence of political, religious, and cultural factors. As a result of these long-term contacts, numerous borrowings emerged, leaving a profound impact on the lexical, phraseological, and partly grammatical systems of Turkic languages, including Uzbek. Researchers note that the proportion of Arabic borrowings in the lexical structure of the Uzbek literary language ranges approximately between 13 and 20 percent, which is directly related to the status of Arabic as the language of religious and scholarly civilization. The Arabic layer in Uzbek is not limited solely to religious terminology; it also extensively covers the spheres of science, law, ethics, enlightenment, politics, philosophy, art, and abstract concepts. Therefore, this layer should be studied not merely as a collection of loanwords, but as

a linguocultural bridge connecting the Uzbek people with the Islamic and Eastern cultural world.

The linguistic and cultural relations between Arab and Turkic peoples may conventionally be divided into several historical stages: episodic pre-Islamic contacts, the period of the adoption of Islam, the era of the flourishing of medieval science and literature, and the later imperial and modern periods. The Arabic layer in Uzbek is primarily associated with the spread of Islam into Transoxiana, where, beginning from the 8th–10th centuries, Arabic acquired a dominant position as the language of religion and administration. During this period, terminology related to the Qur'an, Hadith, fiqh, and kalām, as well as numerous units expressing worship, morality, and legal relations, entered Turkic dialects and later the Uzbek language (such as Allah, namaz/prayer, ro'za/fasting, zakat, taqwa/piety, sabr/patience, justice, and zulm/oppression).

At the subsequent stage, particularly during the 9th–12th centuries, when Transoxiana and Khorasan became major centers of science and literature, Arabic turned into the principal medium of scholarly discourse. In this process, terminology related to natural sciences, philosophy, logic, medicine, and mathematics was also extensively borrowed (such as ilm/science, falsafa/philosophy, mantiq/logic, kimyo/chemistry, handasa/geometry, tibb/medicine, xulq/ethics, aql/intellect, etc.). Arabic written sources, as well as Arabic–Turkic dictionaries and translations, played a significant role in the formation of the Uzbek scholarly and literary tradition. This, in turn, led to the adaptation of Arabic lexemes to Turkic phonetic and morphological patterns and to their semantic redistribution.

Although Russian and Western languages became the principal donor languages in the modern and contemporary periods, the position of the Arabic lexical layer within religious, educational, and ethical discourse has remained preserved. Moreover, in the post-independence period, many Arabic-derived units have regained active usage as a result of nationalization processes in language policy.

In evaluating the scope of Arab–Turkic relations, the factor of script and orthography holds particular methodological significance. One of the clearest indicators of the extensive linguistic and cultural interaction between Arab and Turkic peoples is the adoption by Turkic peoples of an alphabet based on the Arabic script. This process was accomplished through the creation of special graphic symbols within the Arabic writing system to represent sounds that did not exist in Arabic but were specific to Turkic languages, taking into account the phonetic structure and written

traditions of Turkic speech. This innovation also greatly contributed to the Turkicization of Arabic lexical units.

Arabic borrowings that entered Turkic languages underwent phonetic adaptation based on a tendency toward “simplification” under the pressure of pronunciation and orthography. One of the most frequent phenomena in the phonetic adaptation of Arabic loanwords is the incomplete realization in the Uzbek pronunciation system of certain phonemes specific to Arabic (for example, - ع ‘ayn and - ء hamza), which consequently “disappeared” or were simplified without leaving a trace. In the corpus material, this phenomenon is marked by the notation “- ع ‘ayn absent,” and the number of such units reaches 17, demonstrating that this is a typical and stable tendency (Appendix B). For example, the Arabic “علم” (‘ilm) was adapted into Uzbek as “ilm” (within the science-and-education group, bookish register); “عدل” (‘adl) → “adolat” (religious-legal); “عقل” (‘aql) → “aql” (science and education); “عرف” (‘urf) → “urf” (everyday culture); “عذاب” (‘adhāb) → “azob” (religious-legal); “عمر” (‘umr) → “umr” (everyday usage); “عيد” (‘īd) → “iyd” (religious); “عجيب” (‘ajīb) → “ajib, ajoyib” (artistic-rhetorical); “عبرة” (‘ibra) → “ibrat” (science and education); “عمل” (‘amal) → “amal” (state administration, religious); “عالم” (‘ālim) → “olim” (science and education); “عقيدة” (‘aqīda) → “aqida” (religious); “عاجز” (‘ājiz) → “ojiz” (everyday usage); “عذر” (‘udhr) → “uzr” (everyday usage); “عنصر” (‘unṣur) → “unsur” (science and education); and “عقاب” (‘iqāb) → “iqob” (religious-legal). These examples demonstrate the predominance of phonetic simplification in the religious and educational-scientific groups, since borrowings in these domains entered primarily through the written tradition.

Furthermore, it is observed that the long vowels occurring in Arabic words (such as ā, ī, ū) are often not preserved as phonemic length in Uzbek pronunciation. In the corpus, the “ā-o” type was recorded in 13 cases, while the “ī/ū – absence of vowel length” type was also identified in 13 cases (Appendix B). Examples include: “قانون” (qānūn) – “qonun” (state administration); “جامع” (jāmi‘) – “jomi‘” (religious); “طالب” (ṭālib) – “tolib” (science and education); “حاكم” (ḥākīm) – “hokim” (state administration); “مادة” (mādda) – “modda” (science and education); “قاضي” (qāḍī) – “qozi” (religious-legal); “ناموس” (nāmūs) – “nomus” (everyday usage); “قاعدة” (qā‘ida) – “qo‘ida” (science and education); “شاعر” (shā‘ir) – “sho‘ir” (artistic-rhetorical); “حاجة” (ḥāja) – “hoja” (trade-economic); “راحة” (rāḥa) – “rohat” (everyday usage); “ساعة” (sā‘a) – “soat” (everyday usage); and “مال” (māl) – “mol” (trade-economic). This process is associated with the fact that vowel length in the Uzbek vocalic system is positional

rather than phonemic.

Adaptation is also consistently observed in the consonantal system: the Arabic consonants “خ/ح” (kh/h) are often rendered in Uzbek pronunciation through approximation to “x/h.” In the corpus, this “kh/h → x/h” feature was recorded in 10 cases (Appendix B). Examples include: “خدمة” (khidma) – “xizmat” (state administration); “حق” (haqq) – “haq” (religious-legal); “حكم” (hukm) – “hukm” (state administration); “خطر” (khaṭar) – “xatar” (everyday usage); “حرام” (ḥarām) – “harom” (religious); “خلق” (khalq) – “xalq” (everyday usage); “حساب” (ḥisāb) – “hisob” (trade-economic); “خط” (khaṭṭ) – “xat” (science and education); “حلال” (ḥalāl) – “halol” (religious); and “خير” (khayr) – “xayr” (everyday usage). These adaptations can be explained by the characteristics of the fricative system typical of Turkic languages.

Similarly, emphatic consonants (such as ص – š and ض – ḍ) in Uzbek pronunciation tend to undergo “simplification” and appear in the forms s/z. This “š/ḍ → s/z” feature was identified in 9 cases within the corpus (Appendix B). Examples include: “صحة” (ṣiḥḥa) – “sihat” (everyday usage); “ضرر” (ḍarar) – “zarar” (trade-economic); “صبر” (ṣabr) – “sabr” (everyday usage); “ضمان” (ḍamān) – “zamon” (trade-economic); “صدق” (ṣidq) – “sidq” (religious); “ضعف” (ḍu‘f) – “zai‘f” (everyday usage); “صادق” (ṣādiq) – “sodiq” (everyday usage); “ضابط” (ḍābiṭ) – “zobit” (military); and “صحيفة” (ṣaḥīfa) – “sahifa” (science and education). This simplification is related to the fact that Uzbek phonotactics — the system of rules governing permissible sound combinations and sequencing in a language — does not contain emphatic consonants.

Phonetic adaptation generally brings the “sound shape” of a borrowing closer to the norms of the recipient language, whereas morphological integration and derivation increase the borrowing’s “mobility within the system.” In other words, as a borrowed unit begins to accept Turkic affixes, it generates new derived forms and becomes more freely used across different registers (Appendix A). In this sense, derivational productivity may serve as one of the criteria indicating the degree to which a borrowing has been integrated into the general language system.

On the other hand, certain manifestations of phonetic adaptation (for example, the omission of ع/ء ‘ayn/hamza or the loss of vowel length) transform borrowings into forms that are easier to incorporate into everyday speech and more susceptible to phonetic reduction. However, in historical texts and manuscripts written in Arabic script, these features may complicate etymological analysis. Therefore, in etymological verification, the parallel use of explanatory and

etymological dictionaries is methodologically necessary.

Arabic borrowings in Uzbek also display stylistic stratification and demonstrate varying degrees of activity across different speech styles. Religious vocabulary (such as taqvo, sabr, tavba) is mainly used in religious-educational discourse, sermons, and ethical texts, typically within a high stylistic register. In scientific and official styles, neutral units (ilm, nazariya, tahlil, mazmun) occur regularly and are widespread in modern academic articles and official documents. In literary works (including those of Alisher Navoiy, Zahiriddin Muhammad Bobur, and Cho‘lpon), the Arabic lexical layer is employed to create elevated style, pathos, and philosophical context. Functionally, these borrowings may be divided into active units (ilm, adabiyot, siyosat, natija) and archaic or historical units (riyozat, sarvar, muzaffar). The former remain widely used in the contemporary literary language, whereas the latter are restricted mainly to historical-literary contexts and have often been replaced by Russian or international equivalents.

References

1. Умарова, Н., Фаттохов Х. Арабча ўзлашмалар ва уларнинг Навоий асарларида қўлланиши. Илмий ахборот. No. 6 (2020): Scientific journal of the Fergana State University.
2. Sulaymonova N., Abzalova M. O‘zbek tilidagi arabiy so‘zlar imlosi. Toshkent. Fan va texnologiya, 2008. – 132 b.
3. Eckmann J. R. An Introduction to Chaghatay: A Graded Textbook for Reading Central Asian Sources. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1966/2018.
4. Johanson L., Csató É. Á. (eds.). Turkic Languages in Contact. Berlin; New York. Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
5. Ermers R. Turkic Forms in Arabic Structures. Katholieke Universitet Nijmegen, 1995.
6. Thomason S. G. Language Contact: An Introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001.