

Structural and Phonetic Transformation of Iranian loanwords in the Turkic Languages of Central Asia

By

Sonaiym K. Karataeva

Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor, Head of Department (Kyrgyz State University named after I. Arabaev, Bishkek, Kyrgyz Republic)

Kenan Semiz

Candidate of Philology, teacher (International Kazakh-Turkish University named after H.A. Yasavi, Turkestan, Republic of Kazakhstan)

Annotation

This article deals with the issues concerning structural-phonetic transformations of diphthongs and separate sound complexes within words of Iranian origin in such Turkic languages of Central Asia as Kyrgyz, Kazakh, Uzbek and Uighur. The languages of the ethnic groups that inhabited the territories of contemporary Central Asia have since ancient times developed in close connection with Iranian languages, namely the Perso-Tajik literary language. It should be noted that in the process of borrowing the words of Iranian origin have been subjected to certain phonetic regularities, which in turn served as a mechanism for their adaptation in Turkic languages, which is explained by the diversity of the Turkic and Iranian languages in their structural-typological features. However, the phonetic transformation of the phonetic complexes in the Iranian lexical borrowings in the Kyrgyz, Kazakh, Uzbek, Uighur languages, as well as in their dialects occurred differently, despite the genetic relationship of the above mentioned languages.

Keywords: Iranian languages; Turkic languages; long vowels; phoneme; borrowed vocabulary; phonetic structure; borrowing process; phonetic transformation; phonetic doublet; sound change.

Introduction

The study of issues of language contacts and related phenomena, in particular the process of borrowing, has a great tradition in domestic and foreign linguistics. This problem is currently particularly relevant and attracts the attention of many researchers, since the end of the XX and the beginning of the XXI century are characterized by a significant expansion of international relations and the strengthening of language contacts, which are carried out both directly between native speakers of different languages and with the help of mass media.

In a situation of intensive interaction of languages, changes occur in the system of one or both languages, or the appearance of common language features, i.e. interference, or partial or complete displacement of one of the contacting languages. The most significant consequence of language contact is the appearance of various types of borrowing in interacting languages [Atakulova,2017, p.728].

The study of the phenomenon of "borrowing" is a study of a complex of linguistic and extralinguistic problems, which include issues related to the interpretation of this term, types of borrowings, causes and conditions of borrowing, changes occurring with borrowings in the recipient language, etc. The term "borrowing" in linguistics is ambiguous. Thus, many

scientists distinguish between the concepts of "borrowing" and "borrowed word", proposing to define the term "borrowing" as "mutual influence of languages", other authors identify these concepts, arguing that words are most often borrowed [Bondarets, 2008, p.142].

Some linguists mean by borrowing a process, others - the result of the process. Many foreign linguists describe borrowing as "a process that results in the transition of a linguistic unit from one language to another." In turn, others believe that borrowing is "elements transferred to another language, i.e. consequences of the interaction of languages that may exist in this language after the interaction has ceased."

The closest to the tasks of our research is the definition of borrowing, belonging to I. G. Dobrodomov: "Borrowing is an element of a foreign language (word, morpheme, syntactic construction, etc.) transferred from one language to another as a result of language contacts, as well as the process of transition of elements from one language to another."

By borrowing, we mean foreign language elements, primarily words, since borrowing occurs most often at the lexical level. In addition, borrowing is the movement of lexical units from one language to another with the subsequent adaptation of borrowed lexemes in the system of the recipient language. The process of lexical borrowing is undoubtedly broader than grammatical, word-formation or phonetic borrowing [Clyne,2004, p.58].

Being the result of a long historical interaction and mixing of languages, borrowings occupy a significant place in the vocabulary of many languages. The channels of borrowing can be both oral and book, written. With oral borrowing, the word undergoes more changes in its appearance than with written. If a word enters the language of another people while simultaneously borrowing a new subject or concept, then the meaning of this borrowing does not change, but if a new word enters as a synonym for already existing words, there is a differentiation of meanings between them and shifts in the original semantics are observed. A morphologically complex borrowed word, when passing into the recipient language, is usually subjected to questioning and is perceived in this language as simple and non-derivative [Comrie,2000, p.73–86].

Thus, borrowing in the broad sense is the process of moving various elements from one language to another and their adaptation in the borrowing language, and in the narrow sense - language elements moved from one language to another and functioning in it. We can talk about borrowing a word (the most frequent and typical case of borrowing), borrowing a phoneme (the most rare and special case depending on the degree of contact between two languages), borrowing a morpheme (usually as part of a word), borrowing syntactically (the construction of phrases in a language is influenced by foreign syntactic constructions) and, finally, about semantic borrowing (the appearance in the word of the meaning "under pressure" of a foreign sample is semantic calculus).

The most active process of borrowing occurs at the level of vocabulary, this is due to the need to nominate new realities, concepts and phenomena in the recipient language.

It is believed that the process of borrowing, unlike other phenomena accompanying language contacts, in particular mixing and switching codes, does not imply a deep knowledge of the language from which the elements are borrowed, and direct contact between the speakers of the two cultures, since only lexical material directly touches and functions. The ability to borrow is influenced by a large number of factors, such as the genetic proximity of languages,

socio-political conditions, the way languages are distributed, their similarity, the nature of contact, the attitude of language communities to these languages, etc.

In both domestic and foreign linguistics, there are a number of classifications of borrowings based on various criteria. For example, there are oral and book borrowings, direct and indirect, lexical and morphemic, linguistic and cultural-historical, material borrowings and tracing paper [Dybo,2015, p.3-20].

Following E. Haugen, we distinguish the following types of borrowings:

- Borrowing itself, while both the material form and the semantics of the source language are borrowed, however, phonomorphological and semantic changes are possible under the influence of the recipient language;
- Semantic tracing paper, i.e. borrowing semantics without a material form or with partial morphemic substitution;
- Hybrid formations, i.e. words partially consisting of foreign language elements [Esenbayeva,2008, p.227].

Material, Methods, Review

The importance of the problem of borrowing is determined both by linguistic parameters, which are aimed at revealing the mechanisms of adaptation, and by social parameters, which make it possible to reveal the depth of cultural and historical contacts. The linguistic mechanism of the entry of borrowed units from various source languages into the recipient language is basically the same, and borrowings can be investigated from the point of view of the interference mechanism that led to them and from the point of view of phonological, grammatical and semantic adaptation in the borrowing language.

Understanding borrowing as the transfer of words from one language to another implies their adaptation in the structure of the recipient language and gradual adaptation to its linguistic norms. Hence, according to L. A. Ilyina, the priority of formal development of borrowings as a criterion of their inclusion in the perceiving language, their division according to this criterion into "assimilated" and "unassimilated", the allocation of common but unassimilated foreign words in the language [Haspelmath,2008, p.43-62].

Modern contact linguistics is dominated by three main approaches (or theories) to the problem of lexical borrowing, which, in particular, Y. points out. Aydukovich. These include:

- 1) the theory of the transfer of borrowings, according to which borrowing is considered as "the transition, transfer, penetration of elements of one language into another language";
- 2) the theory of structural modeling of borrowings by analogy with foreign-language samples, according to which borrowing is explained as "the creation of their own language elements by means of creative imitation, approximate copying of foreign-language samples; 3) a compromise theory according to which "when copying the plan of expression", "transference, transition of foreign language meanings" is allowed.

Thus, the widespread traditional understanding of borrowing as a transition, transfer, penetration of elements of one language into another is opposed by its explanation as the creation of its own elements by means of creative imitation, approximate copying or structural modeling by analogy with foreign-language samples.

On the basis of the theory of "transfer", the theory of activation or adaptation of elements of the source language in the recipient language is also postulated, according to which, in the speech of monolinguals, a word transferred from one language to another is adapted at all language levels and the results of linguistic influence can be represented by a scale - from complete integration to complete mismatch of language elements.

Most scientists distinguish three main stages of adaptation of borrowings in the recipient language: penetration into speech, partial assimilation (borrowing), rooting in the language.

1. Penetration meets the following criteria:

- Direct connection with the source language, manifested in the external formalization of the word, for example, the appearance of foreign language inclusions in texts, the appearance of formal doublets, fluctuations at the grammatical and word-formation levels;
- Semantic unambiguity as a consequence of the fact that in most cases a lexical unit at the stage of penetration denotes someone else's reality or conveys someone else's concept;
- Use in certain contexts;
- Absence of derivative formations.

2. Borrowing is characterized by:

- Internal connection of the word with the source language;
- Stabilization of the word form at the grammatical and word-formation levels;
- The beginning of the regular use of the word;
- The beginning of word-formation activity.

3. Rooting is characterized by:

- Separation of words from the source language;
- Full semantic independence of the word and the formation of the lexico-semantic microsystem of the word (phraseological units, figurative uses, etc.);
- Interaction with elements of the borrowing language, leading to the differentiation of meanings in the original words;
- Wide use of the word;
- Wide word-formation activity, often leading to the formation of new lexemes [Kudaibergenov,1980, p.538].

It can be difficult to determine at what stage of adaptation a particular borrowing is. The process of adaptation of borrowings at different language levels proceeds unevenly; a relatively small number of borrowings is characterized by the same degree of mastery at all levels of the language system.

Linguists are developing more specific classifications of the degrees of adaptation of borrowings. Following the traditionally distinguished criteria for the adaptation of borrowings, developed by Sh. Seshan, S. A. Belyaeva, V. M. Aristova, G. V. Pavlenko, the following order of the degree of adaptation is proposed: phonetic and graphic adaptation, grammatical, lexico-semantic adaptation, semantic independence of the word, its word-formation activity, the emergence of new meanings in the recipient language, wide use in speech, expansion of the semantic range of the word.

At the first stage, foreign language inclusions, or exotisms, are distinguished, which are occasional lexical units that penetrate into the language, preserve the letter (spelling) combinations of the source language. In texts with graphical implementation, they are displayed in quotation marks or italics. There are only small changes in the sound shell of borrowing. They are at the initial stage of adaptation, but in the process of frequent use in speech, they can adapt in the recipient language and move to the stage of rooting in the language.

At the second stage of mastering, borrowings become more and more adapted to the system of the recipient language, which is associated with the desire to make them more understandable. Partially mastered borrowings are subjected to phonetic-graphic, morphological and semantic adaptation. In order to transmit a foreign-language word through the sounds of the borrowing language, it is simplified by reducing sounds, omitting unstressed vowels and eliminating the dependence of the meaning of the word on the length of the vowel sound.

In grammatical adaptation, borrowings are correlated with certain lexical and grammatical categories of words. The borrowed word gradually loses the grammatical categories of the source language and is included in the morphological system of the borrowing language, acquiring the corresponding grammatical categories of the recipient language.

At the rooting stage, the borrowed word begins to possess signs of semantic independence and enters into a system of semantic connections with other words of the recipient language. Not many words retain their previous semantic characteristics, most often they are influenced by the borrowing language, which leads to the development of new meanings in them. At the stage of rooting, the foreign language vocabulary in the borrowing language shows active word-formation activity, forms single-root words, acquires new shades of meanings, etc.

B. N. Zabavnikov notes that borrowings begin to show "a deviation in semantic development on new ground. This may be a change in the volume of the meaning of a borrowed word compared to its prototype, most often a narrowing."

It should be noted that the semantic adaptation of the word primarily indicates that the word was really assimilated in the recipient language. In this case, the borrowed word is included in the system of semantic connections in the vocabulary of the recipient language, undergoes new grammatical transformations, undergoes semantic changes along with the original words and can get a completely different meaning [Levitskaya,2014, p.320].

Borrowing can take place at all levels of the language structure. In some situations, in particular with indirect language contact, only lexical borrowing occurs, while the consequences for the receiving language may be insignificant; in others, in particular with direct language contact, various types of code switching may take place. With intensive contact between two or more language collectives, both lexical and structural borrowing can occur, which can lead to changes and restructuring of the language or recipient languages; language contact can also contribute to language change. In some cases, the recipient language may undergo only minor changes in different language tiers, in others - significant restructuring, as a result of which its variants or varieties may be formed, an example of which are territorial variants of the Spanish language and Spanish-Creole languages common on the American continent.

As for the mechanism of interaction of contacting languages, it depends both on the nature of interethnic contacts and on the infrastructural properties of these languages and, above all, on their structural similarity (differences) and mutual understanding (non-mutual understanding).

The basis of the generally accepted classification of borrowed lexical units is the classification according to the degree of mastering the word. Along with etymological classifications (according to the source of borrowing), "this kind of classifications involves not only solving the question of the source of borrowing a word (or a group of words), but also raising the question of typological similarity and the limit of permeability of two systems (giving and receiving), on which one or another form and degree of formal and semantic adaptation depends" [List, 2014, p.141-150].

L. P. Krysin identifies the conditions necessary for the adaptation of the borrowed word in the system of the borrowing language, which at the structural level include its transmission by phonetic and graphic means of the borrowing language, correlation with grammatical classes and categories, phonetic and grammatical mastering, word-formation activity. At the level of semantic adaptation, the definiteness of meaning is formed, there is a differentiation of meanings and their shades between the borrowed word and the native vocabulary existing in the language. Finally, one of the main signs of the adaptability of a word is its regular use in speech.

The classifications also reflect the aspect of the borrowing process concerning the definition of the extreme points of this process, namely the time of penetration and the time of mastering the borrowed unit in the system of the borrowing language. Foreign-language material that does not fit into the parameters of the language system is subjected to mandatory processing in it. So, in relation to the second extreme point (state), as shown above, a whole set of signs-indicators of complete assimilation of the word- has been put forward.

The degree of mastery of a foreign word is indicated by the presence of differential signs: the more of them, the higher the mastery of borrowing in the recipient language. All borrowings are subdivided on the basis of compliance / non-compliance with established language norms, as a result of which the following types of adaptation of borrowed vocabulary are distinguished: graphic, phonetic, morphological, syntactic and semantic [Matras, 2007, p.46].

Since the structural difference of languages in contact is an objective cause of interlanguage interference, for its study, as a rule, their systems are compared in synchronous and/or diachronic terms. It is believed that the structural factors affecting interference are of a total nature and cover all levels of the language system (phonological, grammatical and lexical). In order to more fully and reliably describe the changes in the languages in contact, the above levels are investigated in paradigmatic, syntagmatic and transformational plans with the study of complete and partial discrepancies in language structures.

The degree of adaptation of borrowing depends on the level of genetic affinity of the donor language and the recipient language, typological similarity of the contacting languages, the scope, frequency and duration of its use, the intensity of the adapting effect of the recipient language, as well as the correspondence/inconsistency of phonetic, spelling and grammatical characteristics of words of foreign origin to productive types of design of the original words of the borrowing language. A foreign-language word is considered fully adapted if it has been mastered not only at the formal level, but has also acquired its own independent lexical

meaning, i.e. it has begun to express subject-conceptual relations, and has also developed the ability to combine with other words [Mitrofanova, 2015, p 67].

Results and Discussion

The Turkic languages of Central Asia have had contacts with Iranian languages since ancient times, which, according to the genealogical classification of languages, belong to the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European language family. Based on the classification mentioned above, as well as taking into account phonetic and grammatical features, the Iranian languages are divided into two large groups – Western and Eastern. The languages of the Western group include: Old Persian, Middle Persian and modern Persian, Tajik, Dari, Tat, Kurdish and a number of other languages. The eastern Iranian languages include: Sogdian, Tokharian, Khorezm, modern Pashto (Afghan), Ossetian and Yagnob, as mentioned above, have had contacts with the Turkic languages of Central Asia since ancient times. Such contacts had a direct impact on the lexical fund, phonetic and grammatical structure of the languages that were part of direct or indirect contacts. In particular, it should be noted that under the influence of Iranian languages, namely, in the process of borrowing words of Iranian origin, in a number of Turkic languages and their dialects, certain combinations of vowels and consonants were transformed into long vowel sounds. Thus, due to combinatorial changes in sounds in the Turkic languages, special layers of words were formed, with long vowels in the composition, which in some Turkic languages had a phonemic property, and in some vowel length is not a phonemic feature [Musaev, 1975, p.84].

This process was indirectly influenced by a number of the following linguistic and extralinguistic factors: 1) the nature of linguistic contacts between Iranian and Turkic languages (direct or indirect); 2) the ways of lexeme borrowing (written or oral); 3) the features of the phonetic structure of a particular Turkic language or its dialects; 4) anthropophonic processes. Thus, diphthongs, a combination of long (stable), short (unstable) and guttural consonants in words of Iranian origin in the Kyrgyz literary language are transformed into long vowels, and as for the Kazakh, Uzbek and Uighur languages (except for some dialects of Uzbek and Uighur languages), these combinations have completely or half retained their original sound compositions. And in the process of transition of certain combinations of sounds into long monophthongs the general phonetic regularities are preserved, according to which the so-called derivative (secondary) longitude of vowels is explained. It follows from the above that the emergence of long vowels is mainly due to the process of transition of vowels combining with guttural consonants into long vowels, namely the reduction of a guttural consonant between two vowels, which resulted in the fusion of two vowels into one long vowel [Rastorgueva, 1982, p 287].

In the course of the study, the descriptive method, the method of systematization, as well as the method of structural analysis, synthesis and modeling were applied.

Discussion of the issue. According to historians, the territory of Central Asia has been inhabited since ancient times by tribes and nationalities speaking Sogdian, Tokharian, Khorezm, and Parthian languages. In the VI-VII centuries AD, the eastern Iranian languages (Sogdian, Tocharian, etc.) in Central Asia had a strong influence on the languages of neighboring tribes. Over time, the languages mentioned above give way to Western Iranian languages, namely the Persian-Tajik language, as well as the Turkic languages.

The ethnic composition of the peoples inhabiting the territories of modern Central Asia was directly influenced by the Turkic tribes, who at that time began to move to the territories

of the Amu Darya and Syr Darya river basins. In this regard, the following opinion of V.V. Bartold should be cited: “The new conquerors, the Turks, who came out of the Altai, in a short time subjugated all the peoples from the Great Ocean to the Black Sea. in the era of the greatest power of the Turks, around 630, their state, like the former state of the Ephthalites, stretched to the Indus. The border between the Turkish nomadic Empire and the Iranian state of the Sassanid dynasty was considered to be the Amu Darya River: the area beyond the Amu Darya became Turkestan for the Iranians, Turkestan proper, i.e. the “country of the Turks” [Rastorgueva, 1990, p.253].

Thus, the above historical facts indicate that in the V-VI centuries of our era, the Turkic-speaking tribes had close ethnic ties with the Iranian-speaking tribes. However, it should be noted that the Turkic languages spoken in Central Asia had different levels of relationship with the Iranian languages. According to academician B.M. Yunusaliev, the influence of Iranian languages on the Kyrgyz language increases around the XI century: “...This does not mean at all that some Kyrgyz clans or tribes before the collapse of Kyrgyz statehood in the XI century did not have economic and cultural ties with the Iranian-speaking population or with another people (tribe) that already had a lot of words of Iranian origin in their vocabulary”. Further, the author wrote that at the end of the X century, part of the Kyrgyz tribes had close ethnic contacts with the Tokhars, and in the XVI century, Kyrgyz tribes inhabited the territories of the Fergana, Pamir, Gisar valleys, when words of Iranian origin began to appear in the Kyrgyz language.

It follows from the above that the words of Iranian origin in the Turkic languages are the result of centuries-old ethnic contact between Iranian-speaking and Turkic-speaking tribes and nationalities, which include the Turkic-speaking peoples who inhabited the territory of Central Asia as Uzbeks, Uighurs, Kyrgyz and Kazakhs. It should be noted that the process of borrowing between the Turkic and Iranian languages was of a two-way nature, i.e., in the Iranian languages, Turkic lexical borrowings make up a large layer, after Arabic lexical elements.

The vocal systems of the Iranian and Turkic languages do not coincide. As for the modern Persian language, its vocal system has undergone significant qualitative changes. By longitude, vowel sounds are divided into: 1) long (steady) – [ā], [ȳ], [ṅ]; 2) brief (unstable) – [ə], [e], [o]. Long vowels do not lose their longitude, even if there is no stress on them in the speech stream, since their pronunciation is accompanied by stronger muscular strains of the speech organs. That is why in the Iranian language long vowels are called stable, and short vowel sounds are unstable. According to their acoustic-articulatory characteristics, vowel sounds in the Tajik language resemble vowel sounds in the Persian literary language. There are only 6 vowel sounds in the Tajik language, of which the sounds [a], [ɪ], [y] – unstable, and sounds [ê], [ô], [ÿ] – stable. The number of long vowels in the languages mentioned above is also different. In particular, the Kyrgyz language has 6, and in the vocal system of the Persian-Tajik languages there are 3 long (stable) vowels. At that time, there are no long vowels in other Turkic literary languages of Central Asia, namely Kazakh, Uzbek and Uighur. That is why borrowed words from Iranian languages have been mastered and adapted in different ways [Rastorgueva, 1990, p.253].

1. In the Persian literary language, diphthongs [ɛɪ], [oÿ] they are innovative, which in the flow of speech are overwhelmingly not used before vowels, but if they take a position before vowels, then the second element of the diphthong acquires the properties of a consonant sound and as a result, the characteristic features of the diphthong are lost: [ɛɪ]→[ɛɪ̯], [oÿ]→[oβ̯]. Diphthong [oÿ] not used at the beginning of a word, when used in the middle or at the end of a word, it is pronounced as [oβ̯]. Thus, words were borrowed into the Turkic

languages, which in their composition have an ascending diphthong [oʏ]. As the linguistic facts show, the phonetic transformation of this diphthong in the Turkic languages has its own peculiarities.

For example, in the modern Kyrgyz literary language, the above-mentioned diphthong is absent, since at a certain historical stage of the development of long vowels, it turned into long vowels [oo] and [øø], while the southwestern dialect of the Kyrgyz language retains a diphthongoid pronunciation. This diphthong in the Kazakh language has the form [ay], uzbek [av], and in the Uyghur language, the diphthong has undergone a transformation and as a result, a short vowel is used instead of it [o] [Saaya, 2005, p.22].

a) In the middle of a word: п. سودا[соуда] “trading”; **comp.** taj. savdo; kyrgyz. соода; **comp.** kaz. sauda, uzb. savdo, uig. سودا[сода]; سوغات [соугат] “a gift brought from a trip”; kyrg. соогат // has a phonetic doublet “соога”, this word has undergone a semantic shift in the Kyrgyz language and means “a gift from military or hunting prey”; **comp.** kaz. sauga, uzb. sovga, uig. سوڭغات[совгат]; п. نوچه[ноуче] 1) “letters”. a new person; a person who has just started work”, 2) “a guy; a young man”; in the Kyrgyz language, this word has a variant of “нооча” and means the following: (about a person) “tall; slender; usually about a tall young man; **comp.** kaz. науша, uzb. новча, uig. نوچا[ноча]; п. جوذر[жоудэр] “a weed growing among wheat”; kyrg. жоодар “the name of a herbaceous plant”. Regarding the long vowels mentioned above, K. K. Yudakhin noted the following: ...In Arab-Persian borrowings, a long [oo], as a rule, there is no influence on the neighboring syllable соода, but not соодо, оопа, but not оопо. A weak influence of the long vowel [o o] on the neighboring syllable is observed in words belonging to the southern dialect of the Kyrgyz language: жоодо/жоода, тоодо/тоода etc.

b) At the end of the word: п. علو [элоу] “fire, flame”; **comp.** taj. алов; kyrg. literary language. алоо “fire, flame”, in the southern dialect of kirg. language. the variant is used “алов”. As a result of semantic derivation of this word in the Kyrgyz language, such verbs as алооло (blaze), алоолон (flaming), алоолот (понуд. пылал); п. پلو[полоу] “палоо”; **comp.** taj. пилаф; kyrg. балоо // палоо (phonetic doublets), kaz. палау, uzb. палов, uig. پىلاف [пилаф]; п. بدو [бадоу] “скакун”; kyrg. бедөө “скакун”; **comp.** kaz. бедеу.

c) After vowels: From a diphthong combination [oʏ] and a vowel [ā] long vowels formed [oo], [øø]: п. ناول[нāv] 1) “warship”, 2) “water channel”; 3) “aryk”; **comp.** taj. нова; kyrg. ноо “gutter, trough”; **comp.** kaz. наау, uzb. нов, uig. نو[но]; п. گوميش [гāv-миш] «буйвол» گاو[gāv] “cow; bull, ox” + ميش[миш] “овца”; **comp.** кл. п. гāv, taj. говмеш; southern dialect. kyrg.lang.көөмүш же көөмүш уй “multi-layered cow”; **comp.** uzb. гавмуш “букв. dairy that is, multi-layered” (about the cow); п. چاولى [чāvли] “решето”; kyrg. чөөлү “skimmer, nonsense”, in the southern dialect a variant of the Kyrgyz language is used “чавли”; п. گورکاو [гүр-кāv] 1) “the gravedigger”, kyrg. көркоо (jackal) 1) “a predator digging graves”, 2) portable. oppressor, oppressor; **comp.** uzb. гүрков “the gravedigger”, uig. گورکاو[гөркав] [Sydykov, 1984,p.57].

According to many researchers, by merging the diphthong [oʏ] and a vowel [й] a long vowel sound was formed in the Kyrgyz language [øø]: п. ديو[дйв] 1) “gin”, 2) “diva, giant”; **comp.** кл. п. дѣв, taj. дев; kyrg. дөө 1) “a man of gigantic physique”, 2) “a man of high stature, powerful” [КТТС, 161]; **comp.** kaz. дәу, uzb. дев “gin”; п. ديودار [дйв-дар] “big tree”; kyrg. дөөдүр “talker, talkative”; **comp.** uzb. довдир “stupid”.

In the Kyrgyz language, etymological long vowels in the composition of words borrowed from Iranian languages were subjected to reduction, the quantitative nature of which

was studied by G. Yarring on the example of the Uighur language: *padiṣāh* > *pad'ṣā*//*paṣa*, *Karīm* > *Kerim*, *hākīm* « leader » > *hakim*, *nādān* « глупый » > *na'dan*.

2. In words related to the borrowed vocabulary of the Kyrgyz language, there is a movement of long vowels from one syllable to another syllable: п. *كوسه*[*kūse*] “beardless; a man with a thin mustache and beard”; *kyrg.* *kөсөө*”; **comp.** *kaz.* *көсе*, *uzb.* *кўса*; п. *پناه*[*pānāh*]

a) “cover, shelter, protection”;

b) “a place where you can hide, find shelter”; **comp.** *taj.* *панахгоҳ*; *kyrg.* *маана* // *паана* // *паанек* (phonetic doublets); **comp.** *kaz.* *пана*, *uzb.* *пана*, *uig.* *پانا*[*пана*]; п. *دچار*[*доҷар*] “to be exposed to survive”; **comp.** *taj.* *дочар кардан* “to survive; to meet”; *kyrg.* *дучар* // *дуучар* // *дуушар* and the auxiliary verb *bol-* form a compound verb “*дуушар бол*” – (met) ; **comp.** *kaz.* *душар болу*, *uzb.* *дучор бўлмок*, *uig.* *دۇچار*[*дучар болмак*] [Trofimov, 1991, p.173].

Conclusion

As the linguistic facts show, not all words of Iranian origin have undergone the same phonetic changes. Moreover, some words have retained their original sound compositions, but many words are borrowed and adapted according to the phonetic laws of the Kyrgyz language [Winfred, 1962, p.57].

1. The combination of certain sounds in the composition of borrowed words of Iranian origin, in the process of borrowing, were subordinated to certain phonetic patterns, which, in turn, served as a mechanism for the adaptation of sounds or sound complexes in the Kyrgyz language [Wohlgemuth, 2009, p.67].

2. The long vowel sound [ī] in modern Persian passes into the vowels [и] or [е], and in some cases, according to the law of synharmonism, in the Kyrgyz language it is pronounced as a vowel sound [ү], but it does not pass into the category of long vowels: п. *فارسی*[*fārsī*] «фарси» - *kyrg.* «перс//фарси»; п. *امير*[*эмйр*] « emir, ruler » - *kyrg.* « emir »; п. *زيرك*[*зйрек*] “smart, insightful” - *kyrg.* «зирек», п. *تیشه*[*тйшэ*] « ахе » - *kyrg.* *теше*, п. *اميد*[*умид*] « hope » - *kyrg.* *үмүт* etc.

From all that has been said, it follows that the phonetic transformation of long vowel sounds and sound complexes in Iranian lexical borrowings occurred according to the internal phonetic laws of the Kyrgyz language.

Literature

- Atakulova M.A., Zulpukarov K.Z., Kalmurzayeva A.A., Ayylchieva D.T., Dzhusupova A.A. Invariance in the pronominal and proverbial paradigms of language. Bishkek, 2017. 728 p.
- Bondarets O.E. 2008. Foreign borrowings in speech and in language: the linguo-sociological aspect. - Taganrog: Publishing House of Taganrog. State Pedagogical Institute, p. 142
- Clyne Michael. 2004. Dynamics of language contact. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 58
- Comrie Bernard. 2000. Language contact, lexical borrowing, and semantic fields. In Gilbers, Dicky & Nerbonne, John & Schaecken, Jos (eds.), Languages in Contact (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 28), 73–86. Amsterdam: Rodopi

- Dybo A.V. About "primary" longitudes in the Turkic languages // Bulletin of the NSU. Series: Linguistics and Intercultural Communication. 2015. Volume 13, vol.1. –p. 3-20.
- Esenbayeva G. A. The vocalism of the Kyrgyz language in comparison with the Turkic languages of Southern Siberia. Cand. diss. -Novosibirsk, 2008. -227 p.
- Haspelmath Martin. 2008. Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrow ability. In Stolz, Thomas & Bakker, Dik & Salas Palomo, Rosa (eds.), Aspects of language contact: New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romancisation processes, 43–62p. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kudaibergenov S., Tursunov A., Sydykov Zh.. Grammar of the literary Kyrgyz language.: Ilim, 1980. -538 p.
- Levitskaya L. S. Historical phonetics of the Chuvash language. –Cheboksary, 2014. -320 p.
- List Johann-Mattis. “Networks of Lexical Borrowing and Lateral Gene Transfer in Language and Genome Evolution.” Bio Essays 36.2 (2014): p.141-150. Print.
- Matras Yaron, Sakel Jeanette. 2007. Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective.p.146 Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Mitrofanova I. Language and «Communicative personality». Monograph. B&M Publishing San Francisco. California. USA .2015
- Musaev K. M. The vocabulary of the Turkic languages in comparative coverage. Moscow: Nauka, 1975.-84p.
- Rastorgueva V. S. Comparative-historical grammar of Western Iranian languages: Phonology. –M., 1990. -253 p.
- Rastorgueva V. S., Efimov V. I., Sharova E. N. Persian, Tajik, dari /// Fundamentals of Iranian linguistics. New Iranian languages: Western group, Caspian languages. -M.: Nauka, 1982. -pp.5-287.
- Saaya O. M. Long vowels of the Tuvan language (in comparison with the Turkic languages of Southern Siberia and Mongolian). Author's thesis. cand. diss. -Novosibirsk, 2005. -22 p.
- Sydykov S. S. A real similarities and differences in the vocabulary of the Turkic languages of Central Asia and Southern Siberia. Frunze, 1984. -57 p.
- Trofimov M. I. Problems of Turkic accent and Uighur vocalism. –B., 1991. -173 p.
- Winfred P. 1962. Historical linguistics: -57 pAn introduction. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Wohlgemuth Jan. 2009. A typology of verbal borrowings. -67 p. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter