CHRONOLOGY OF SCHOLARLY RESEARCH ON GERMAN BORROWINGS IN RUSSIAN AND UZBEK

Ergasheva Fotima Baxrom qizi
fotima@tersu.uz
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24159322

Abstract. *When translators and lexicographers encounter German-origin vocabulary in Russian and Uzbek, they face different explanatory traditions for the same intercultural lexical material. This study reconstructs how that scholarship emerged, changed its questions, and organized evidence across time. Historical-comparative analysis was combined with source criticism, hermeneutic reading, and examination of archival bibliographic records. The comparison distinguishes three research stages: early grammatical description, Soviet-era systematization, and post-Soviet interdisciplinary interpretation. Russian-language studies generally prioritized grammatical adaptation, semantic integration, and literary usage, whereas Uzbek-language scholarship more often connected borrowed units with language contact, mediation through Russian, and terminological development. The chronological model shows that the two traditions overlap in subject matter but diverge in periodization and explanatory emphasis. Its scholarly contribution is a comparative framework that links research stages to changing concepts of borrowing, allowing German-origin vocabulary to be studied as both a lexical layer and a record of intercultural transmission.*
Keywords: *archival source criticism, German-origin vocabulary, historical-comparative analysis, lexical transfer, Slavic linguistic tradition, Turkic linguistic tradition*

Annotatsiya. *Tarjimonlar va lug‘at tuzuvchilar rus hamda o‘zbek tillaridagi nemischa kelib chiqishli birliklarni izohlar ekan, bir xil madaniyatlararo leksik materialga nisbatan turli ilmiy an’analarga duch keladi. Mazkur ish bu yo‘nalishdagi tadqiqotlarning shakllanishi, savollari o‘zgarishi va dalillarni vaqt davomida tizimlashtirishini tiklaydi. Tarixiy-qiyosiy tahlil manbashunoslik, germenevtik o‘qish va arxiv bibliografik qaydlarini ko‘rib chiqish bilan uyg‘unlashtirildi. Qiyoslash uch bosqichni ajratadi: dastlabki grammatik tavsif, sovet davridagi tizimlashtirish va postsovet davridagi fanlararo talqin. Rus tilidagi izlanishlarda grammatik moslashuv, semantik integratsiya va badiiy qo‘llanish ustun bo‘lgan; o‘zbek tilidagi ishlarda esa aloqa, rus tili orqali vositachilik va terminologik taraqqiyot ko‘proq yoritilgan. Xronologik model ikki an’ananing mavzu jihatidan yaqin, davrlashtirish va izohlash mezonlari jihatidan farqli ekanini ko‘rsatadi. Ilmiy hissa o‘zlashuv haqidagi tushunchalar bilan tadqiqot bosqichlarini bog‘lovchi qiyosiy mezon yaratishdan iborat.*
Kalit so‘zlar: *arxiv manbashunosligi, nemischa kelib chiqishli leksika, tarixiy-qiyosiy tahlil, leksik transfer, slavyan tilshunoslik an’anasi, turkiy tilshunoslik an’anasi*

Аннотация. *Переводчики и лексикографы, работающие с лексикой немецкого происхождения в русском и узбекском языках, сталкиваются с разными научными традициями объяснения одного и того же межкультурного материала. Работа восстанавливает формирование этого направления, изменение его вопросов и способы упорядочения свидетельств во времени. Историко-сравнительный анализ объединён с источниковедческой критикой, герменевтическим чтением и изучением архивных библиографических записей. Сопоставление выделяет три этапа: раннее грамматическое описание, систематизацию советского периода и междисциплинарную интерпретацию постсоветского времени. Русскоязычные исследования преимущественно рассматривали грамматическую адаптацию, семантическую интеграцию и литературное употребление, тогда как узбекоязычные работы чаще связывали заимствования с языковым контактом, посредничеством русского языка и развитием терминологии. Хронологическая модель показывает тематическое сходство двух*

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

традиций при различии их периодизации и объяснительных акцентов. Научный вклад состоит в создании сравнительной схемы, связывающей этапы изучения с изменением представлений о заимствовании.

Ключевые слова: *архивное источниковедение, лексика немецкого происхождения, историко-сравнительный анализ, лексический перенос, славянская лингвистическая традиция, тюркская лингвистическая традиция*

INTRODUCTION

German borrowings expose unequal research trajectories in the Russian language and Uzbek language, while their chronology remains insufficiently reconstructed through comparable source criticism [1]. Haugen's borrowing model and Weinreich's contact framework establish analytical foundations [2]. Weinreich's study provides a general framework for examining language contact and the processes of linguistic borrowing [2], whereas Uzbek scholarship emphasizes lexical integration and literary norm formation. The semantic and grammatical characteristics of borrowed units in the Uzbek language have been examined as part of this scholarly direction [3], and the normalization of borrowed words in the Uzbek literary language has likewise constituted a distinct research concern [4]. This study aims to reconstruct the chronology of scholarly research on German borrowings across both languages. It examines a two-language documentary corpus through content analysis, historical-comparative analysis, source criticism, hermeneutics, and archival work. The object is the development of scholarly research; the subject is its chronological stages, lexical units, methods, and interpretive emphases. Tasks are: 1) identify sources; 2) classify stages; 3) compare analytical priorities; 4) interpret methodological shifts. Vinogradov's grammatical approach [5] and Abduazizov's account of Uzbek borrowings [6] guide the subsequent comparative reconstruction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The bibliographic-source matrix extends the earlier source-critical framework by separating research stages according to object, method, and interpretive emphasis. Documentary evidence places Russian-language scholarship first within a grammatical and lexical description of foreign elements, whereas Uzbek-language scholarship reaches German borrowings through broader accounts of lexical stratification and language contact [7]. This divergence confirms the hypothesis that both trajectories are interconnected yet institutionally and methodologically unequal.

Table 1 *— Chronological comparison of research stages*

Language	Chronological indicator	Object of study	Dominant method	Interpretive emphasis
Russian language	Early grammatical-lexical stage	Foreign lexical units	Grammatical description	Adaptation and norm
Russian language	Contact-oriented stage	Borrowing mechanisms	Contrastive analysis	Interference and integration
Uzbek language	General lexical stage	Borrowed vocabulary	Source criticism	Historical stratification
Uzbek language	Comparative stage	German-related lexical units	Historical-comparative analysis	Cultural mediation

Source: Author's classification based on documentary and archival analysis [8]

The sequence in Table 1 demonstrates that Russian-language research progressively narrowed its object from foreign vocabulary to borrowing mechanisms, while Uzbek-language research initially

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

embedded German borrowings within general lexical studies. Krysin connected foreign words with contemporary Russian speech and thereby shifted attention toward functional distribution and usage conditions [1]. In Uzbek scholarship, Mahmudov's methodological argument favors a multidimensional analysis in which lexical history, semantic development, and language-system interaction are examined together [9].

Source criticism also reveals a difference in evidentiary hierarchy. Russian studies rely more visibly on grammatical description, lexicographic observation, and contact linguistics, while Uzbek studies combine textbook synthesis, lexical classification, and historical interpretation; Haugen's model clarifies why such materials must be read as evidence of adaptation rather than simple transfer [10]. The distinction affects taxonomy: German borrowings may be classified by source route, semantic field, structural adaptation, and degree of integration[1].

Comparative lexical analysis identifies convergence at the level of object, since both traditions examine the leksik birlik as a carrier of cultural contact. Contrast appears in interpretation: Russian-language scholarship foregrounds norm and usage, whereas Uzbek-language scholarship emphasizes historical mediation and interculturality[2]. These findings support the hypothesis and prepare a conclusion centered on chronology, three analytical dimensions, and source-based comparative linguistics[3].

CONCLUSION

The chronological reconstruction demonstrates that scholarly research on German borrowings developed through distinct yet interconnected trajectories in the Russian language and Uzbek language. Their comparative value emerges from the coordinated examination of research object, methodological procedure, and interpretive emphasis, which clarifies how source traditions shaped lexical description and historical explanation. This synthesis establishes a new field-specific framework for source-based comparative linguistics, with practical use in lexicography, discourse analysis, and translation studies. Subsequent research should integrate multilingual archival corpora, intertextual analysis, and translation strategies to trace intercultural equivalence more precisely.

REFERENCES

1. Krysin L.P. Inoyazychnye slova v sovremennom russkom yazyke. — Moskva: Nauka, 1968. — 208 s.
2. Weinreich U. Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. — The Hague: Mouton, 1953. — 148 p.
3. Mengliyev B.R. O‘zbek tilida o‘zlashma birliklarning semantik va grammatik xususiyatlari // O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. — 2018. — № 4. — B. 12–20.
4. Jamolxonov H.A. O‘zbek adabiy tilida o‘zlashma so‘zlarning me’yorlashuvi // Filologiya masalalari. — 2005. — № 3. — B. 25–32.
5. Vinogradov V.V. Russkiy yazyk: grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove. — Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, 1972. — 616 s.
6. Abduazizov A.A. O‘zbek tilida o‘zlashma so‘zlar masalasi // O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. — 2010. — № 4. — B. 3–10.

[1]Integration concerns the borrowing's conformity to phonological, grammatical, and lexical norms.

[2]Interculturality denotes the cultural meanings activated when a borrowed unit enters a new linguistic environment.

[3]The three dimensions are object of study, methods, and interpretive emphasis.

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

7. Крысин Л.П. Иноязычные слова в современной русской речи // Русский язык в научном освещении. — 2002. — № 2. — С. 5–20.
8. Земская Е.А. Активные процессы современного русского словообразования // Русский язык конца XX столетия: 1985–1995. — Москва: Языки русской культуры, 2000. — С. 90–141.
9. Mahmudov N. Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo‘llarini izlab // O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. — 2012. — № 5. — B. 3–12.
10. Haugen E. The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing // Language. — 1950. — Vol. 26, № 2. — P. 210–231. — DOI: 10.2307/410058.

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.