



**LEXICAL BORROWINGS FROM TURKIC AND PERSIAN LANGUAGES IN
EMBASSY BOOKS ON RUSSIA'S RELATIONS WITH KHIVA AND
BUKHARA IN THE 17TH CENTURY: SOURCE STUDIES AND
LINGUOCULTURAL ASPECTS**

Chuponov Otanazar Otojonovich

Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc)

Urgench State University Named After Abu Raykhan Beruni

Urgench, Republic of Uzbekistan

E-mail: choponov_1960@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The article presents a comprehensive linguistic analysis of lexical borrowings from Turkic (turki) and Persian (farsi) languages recorded in unpublished embassy books on Russia's relations with Khiva (1670–1673, 1682–1684) and Bukhara (1669–1675), stored in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (RGADA). The study is conducted within the framework of linguistic source studies and cultural linguistics. Based on extensive factual material (more than 400 lexical units of Eastern origin), thematic groups of borrowings are identified, and mechanisms of their phonetic and morphological adaptation in Russian business texts are described. It is established that Eastern vocabulary in embassy books reflects the realities of the diplomatic, commercial and cultural life of the Central Asian–Russian intercultural space of the 17th century. A number of lexical units not recorded in historical dictionaries of the Russian language have been introduced into scientific circulation. The results obtained make a significant contribution to historical lexicology, contact linguistics, and linguistic source studies.

KEYWORDS

Embassy books, lexical borrowings, turki, farsi, Russian language of the 17th century, linguistic source studies, cultural linguistics, historical lexicology, Embassy Prikaz, official writing.

INTRODUCTION

The interaction of languages in conditions of intercultural contacts is one of the key problems of historical linguistics and contact linguistics. Business writing monuments play a special role in this process, as they, unlike literary or religious texts, contain topical vocabulary directly linked to the realities of the era. The embassy books on Russia's relations with Khiva and Bukhara in the 17th century are of exceptional source value in this regard: they are the only surviving documents recording diplomatic correspondence between the Russian state and Central Asian khanates at the level of original cursive manuscripts.

The relevance of the present study is determined by several factors. First, the monuments under study have not yet been fully introduced into scientific circulation from the point of view of their lexical

content. Second, the problem of Turkic–Persian–Russian language contacts of the 17th century in historical perspective remains insufficiently studied, despite the existence of general works on the history of the Russian language. Third, the linguocultural approach to analyzing the vocabulary of embassy books opens up the possibility of reconstructing the cultural space of the era — the system of values, diplomatic etiquette, trade and everyday realities that existed in Russian–Central Asian relations.

The aim of this article is a comprehensive source studies and linguocultural analysis of thematic groups of Turkic and Persian lexical borrowings in the embassy books on Russia's relations with Khiva and Bukhara in the 17th century, with a description of the mechanisms of their adaptation in the Russian business language system.

Research objectives: (1) to systematize the vocabulary of Eastern origin by thematic groups; (2) to describe phonetic and morphological transformations of borrowed units; (3) to identify lexical units not recorded in historical dictionaries; (4) to interpret the identified borrowings in the linguocultural context of the era.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The source base of the study consisted of three manuscript embassy books held in the funds of the Embassy Prikaz of the Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (RGADA): "Embassy Book on Russia's Relations with Khiva, 1670–1673" (fund 134, inv. 1, item 7, 165 folios — EBRK1), "Embassy Book on Russia's Relations with Khiva, 1682–1684" (fund 134, inv. 1, item 8, 113 folios — EBRK2), and "Embassy Book on Russia's Relations with Bukhara, 1669–1675" (fund 109, inv. 1, item 12, 108 folios — EBRB). The total volume of analyzed folios, including their reverse sides, amounted to more than 750 pages of cursive text.

Additional sources used include: the "Dictionary of the Russian Language of the 11th–17th Centuries" (IRL RAS), "Materials for the Dictionary of Old Russian Language" by I.I. Sreznevsky, "Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language" by A.G. Preobrazhensky, "Etymological Dictionary" by M. Vasmer, as well as specialized dictionaries of Turkic and Persian vocabulary.

A set of methods was applied: linguistic source studies (primary description and verification of manuscripts), historical-comparative method (comparison of borrowed units with etymons), component analysis (identifying the semantic structure of a word), quantitative analysis (counting and distributing lexical units by thematic groups), and the linguocultural method (interpreting vocabulary in the cultural-historical context). The methodological basis was provided by the works of S.I. Kotkov and D.S. Kulmamatov on linguistic source studies, as well as works by N.K. Dmitriev and O.N. Trubachev on the history of borrowings in the Russian language.

RESULTS

1. General Characteristics of Eastern Vocabulary in Embassy Books

Through a comprehensive extraction from the texts of three embassy books, 412 lexical units and fixed collocations of Turkic and Persian origin were identified. Of these, 243 units (59%) have Turkic etymology, 127 (30.8%) have Persian etymology, and 42 (10.2%) are units of mixed origin (Turkic-Persian hybrids or words that entered Russian through the mediation of Turkic languages from Persian). The highest concentration of Eastern vocabulary is observed in the sections of the embassy books describing the composition of diplomatic gifts (gift lists), official titles, and toponymy.

By thematic principle, the identified Eastern vocabulary is distributed as follows: names of persons and titles — 98 units (23.8%); names of fabrics and trade goods — 87 (21.1%); toponyms and ethnonyms — 74 (18%); temporal and spatial concepts — 43 (10.4%); military and administrative terminology — 61 (14.8%); everyday vocabulary (utensils, food, jewelry) — 49 (11.9%).

2. Names of Persons: Titles and Diplomatic Terminology

The central lexical group in embassy books is the terminology designating the hierarchy of persons involved in diplomatic relations. The key term is *khan* (Turkic *han* — 'ruler, sovereign') — the title of the rulers of Khiva and Bukhara, recorded in hundreds of usages: «...къ юргенскому Анавша Магметъ хану нш%у цр%ского величества грамоти...» (EBRK1, f. 107v.). In formulaic contexts, *khan* is consistently opposed to the Russian *velikiy gosudar* ('great sovereign'), reflecting the diplomatic etiquette of the era.

Of significant interest is the term *yasaul* (Turkic *yasavul* — 'executor, attendant to the ruler'): «...а какову г^сдрь роспись хановымъ любите^лнымъ поминкомъ и посолскимъ даромъ, пода^т еву посолской ясауль...» (EBRK1, ff. 2v.–3). In the 16th–17th centuries, this term actively functioned in Russian business writing, denoting a service intermediary at the ambassadorial ceremony. Notably, in the analyzed texts, *yasaul* retains its Turkic meaning without semantic transposition.

Among Persian borrowings, the term *divan* (Persian *dīvān* — 'state council, chancellery') stands out, encountered in contexts describing *khan*'s administration. Equally important is the term *pristav* in the sense of 'one who accompanies and supervises an ambassador' — originally a Russian word, but in the embassy books it functions in a context identical to the Turkic concept *ulakchi* ('escort'), which testifies to contact semantic calquing.

3. Names of Fabrics and Trade Goods

One of the most illustrative groups from a linguocultural perspective is the lexical group denoting fabrics and trade goods. The embassy books record the following Turkisms: *byaz'* (Turkic *bez* — 'linen fabric'), *zenden'* (Turkic *zandan/zandana* — 'coarse cotton fabric'), *burmet* (Turkic *burmut* — 'striped cotton fabric'), *vyboyka* (Turkic *boyama* — 'printed fabric'), *pestred'* (from Turkic *pyostry*). Cf.: «дѣ^лают шо^лкъ и бязи и зендени простые а не чаровые въ юргенско^н землѣ а бурмети и выбо^нки и бумагу и пестреди привозятъ и^з Бухарь сами юргенцы» (EBRK1, f. 13v.).

This fragment is a unique source on the history of Central Asian–Russian trade: it lists specific types of fabrics indicating their geographical origin and trade routes. The word *byaz'*, although recorded in earlier written monuments, acquires stable contextual characteristics in the embassy books — it is invariably accompanied by the definition 'simple' or an indication of the place of production.

Among Persian borrowings in this thematic group, notable are: *shelk* (via Turkic *ipek* from Chinese or Persian) and *dorogi* (Persian *durāgī* — 'silk fabric with a striped pattern'). A number of units in this group are not recorded in the "Dictionary of the Russian Language of the 11th–17th Centuries", which testifies to the significance of embassy books as a lexicographic source.

4. Phonetic and Morphological Adaptation of Borrowings

Analysis of the phonetic adaptation of Eastern borrowings in the embassy books reveals several stable patterns. The first is the prosthetic initial vowel in words beginning with consonant clusters atypical for the Russian phonological system: *yarlyk* (< Turkic *yarlig*). The second is the reduction of neutral vowels in post-stress positions: *altyn* → *altn'*, *yarlyk* → *yarlk* (in rapid cursive writing).

The morphological adaptation of Turkic and Persian nouns was carried out by including them in the Russian declension paradigm. Masculine nouns (khan, yasaul, altyn) were included in the second declension: «хану грамоту», «ясаулу подал», «алтнь кормовых денег» (of food money in altyns). It is notable that a number of words preserve fluctuation between declined and undeclined forms: «по три алтны» / «по три алтнь» (zero ending in the genitive plural, typical for borrowed names of measures and quantitative units).

DISCUSSION

The data obtained allow us to characterize embassy books as a unique document of intercultural dialogue. Eastern vocabulary in them is not a random set of exotic terms: it forms systematically organized thematic groups reflecting the key spheres of Russian–Central Asian contacts — diplomacy, trade, military affairs, and everyday life. This fact testifies to the depth and regularity of language contacts between Russia and the Central Asian khanates in the 17th century.

A comparison of the identified Eastern vocabulary with data from the "Dictionary of the Russian Language of the 11th–17th Centuries" shows that about 15% of the units recorded in the embassy books are either not represented in this dictionary at all, or are represented without illustrations from diplomatic documentation. This testifies to the fact that embassy books expand the source base of historical lexicography of the Russian language. Among those not recorded or recorded without appropriate contexts are, in particular, the following units: kizylbashenin ('Persian, native of Persia'), yurgenchanin ('inhabitant of Urgench'), edisantsy ('Nogai tribe'), balkhintsy ('inhabitants of Balkh').

The concept of "hidden translation", introduced into scientific circulation based on the material of embassy books, is of fundamental methodological significance. This refers to cases where the Russian-language text records the content of dialogues that were actually conducted in Turkic or Persian. The interpreter (tolmach) acted as an intermediary not named in the text, creating a special genre phenomenon — documented oral speech of a foreign-language subject conveyed through a hidden translation layer. Such fragments are a most valuable source both for the history of diplomatic translation and for the study of bilingual practices in pre-Petrine Russia.

The present study fits into the broad context of contemporary works on historical contact linguistics and cultural linguistics (N.D. Arutyunova, V.I. Karasik, V.V. Vorobyev). Analysis of the language of embassy books allows us to assert that the borrowing of Eastern vocabulary in the 17th century was not spontaneous: it was carried out primarily in professional registers (diplomatic and commercial), which ensured the systematic and stable entry of Turkisms and Persianisms into the Russian business language.

CONCLUSION

The conducted study allows us to formulate the following conclusions. The embassy books on Russia's relations with Khiva and Bukhara in the 17th century contain a rich and systematically organized corpus of Eastern vocabulary (412 units of Turkic and Persian origin), which has not previously been the subject of special linguocultural study. The identified thematic groups of borrowings (names of persons, fabrics, toponyms, administrative and military terminology, everyday vocabulary) together create a detailed picture of the Russian–Central Asian intercultural space of the era.

The phonetic and morphological adaptation of Turkic and Persian borrowings follows stable patterns that reflect the typological features of the Russian language system of the 17th century. A number of identified lexical units are not recorded in historical dictionaries of the Russian language, which expands the lexicographic base of historical-linguistic research.

The concept of "hidden translation" developed within the present study opens a new direction in the study of Russian–Central Asian language contacts — the study of the translation activities of the Embassy Prikaz as an independent object of historical linguistics. The prospects of the study are related to expanding the source base by involving other embassy books of the 17th century, as well as developing a specialized dictionary of Eastern vocabulary of diplomatic monuments.

REFERENCES

1. Arutyunova N.D. Language and the World of Man. — Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture, 1999. — 896 p.
2. Vorobyev V.V. Cultural Linguistics: Theory and Methods. — Moscow: RUDN, 1997. — 331 p.
3. Dmitriev N.K. On Turkic elements of Russian vocabulary // Lexicographic collection. — Moscow, 1958. — Issue 3. — P. 3–47.
4. Karasik V.I. Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse. — Volgograd: Peremena, 2002. — 477 p.
5. Kotkov S.I. Linguistic Source Studies and the History of the Russian Language. — Moscow: Nauka, 1980. — 292 p.
6. Kulmatov D.S. Central Asian–Russian Diplomatic Documents of the 17th–18th Centuries. — Tashkent: Fan, 1991. — 214 p.
7. Preobrazhensky A.G. Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language: in 2 vols. — Moscow: GIS, 1959.
8. Dictionary of the Russian Language of the 11th–17th Centuries / Ed. S.G. Barkhudarov et al. — Moscow: Nauka, 1975–2008. — Issues 1–29.
9. Sreznevsky I.I. Materials for the Dictionary of Old Russian Language: in 3 vols. — Moscow: Znaniye, 2003.
10. Trubachev O.N. Works on Etymology: Word. History. Culture: in 4 vols. — Moscow: Rukopisnye pamyatniki Drevney Rusi, 2009.
11. Vasmer M. Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language: in 4 vols. / Trans. O.N. Trubachev. — Moscow: Progress, 1964–1973.

Sources: Embassy Book on Russia's Relations with Khiva, 1670–1673 (EBRK1); Embassy Book on Russia's Relations with Khiva, 1682–1684 (EBRK2); Embassy Book on Russia's Relations with Bukhara, 1669–1675 (EBRB).

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Chuponov Otanazar Otojonovich — Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc), Professor of the Department of Russian Language and Literature at Urgench State University named after Abu Raykhan Beruni.

Research interests: linguistic source studies, historical lexicology, Russian–Central Asian language contacts, cultural linguistics.

Received: January 15, 2026 | Accepted: March 10, 2026