

Alexandra Golikova

IN SEARCH OF “RUSSIAN URDU”: A POSSIBLE LINGUISTIC PHENOMENON IN THE MAKING

It would seem that the question of how language and thought relate to each other is quite old and apparently more difficult to answer than some people might believe. Wilhelm von Humboldt (within the German philological and linguistic tradition) and Edward Sapir with Benjamin Lee Whorf (within the respective tradition in the English-speaking world) are commonly believed to be the originators of this debate; in both cases, the scholars in question ultimately believed that language does, in fact, influence thought – an idea that is now known as a theory of linguistic relativity. (It’s quite another thing to remember that at least one of those parties – that is, Humboldt – spent a significant part of his seminal work trying to prove that thought – or “spirit” – influences language just as much, but, as with every debate, nuance is often not welcomed among the fighters.) Nowadays, the main ideas of these scholars are often simplified, misunderstood and/or outright used for the purposes of propaganda, especially in case of revanchist, unhappy nations; for further details, I would like to refer the readers to a rather interesting and informative Russian-language publication *From Linguistics to Myth* [From Linguistics to Myth, 2013], or to an English-language essay *How to Catch a Unicorn?* By the editor of the previous publication [Pavlova, Bezrodnyj, 2010], which does a good job of describing and criticizing the position of so-called Neohumboldtianism in the Russian-speaking world.

However, those wishing to forego the Neohumboldtsians and see what Humboldt himself had to say about language (or certain languages in particular) would probably find his actual work to be quite difficult to use for propaganda purposes: it is often obscure and self-contradictory, which is acknowledged even by the editor notes in the Russian edition. Beside the classical German philosophy (an obvious enough influence), his closest genetic relatives seem to be the alchemists and natural philosophers, Eastern and Western alike. According to a Lebanese scholar Nader El-Bizri, “the practitioners of [occult sciences] viewed their inquiries as being continuous with natural and exact sciences in potentially disclosing what remains veiled of the arcana and mysteries of reality, or that point to what is concealed behind what is made manifest through the natural and exact sciences... This ultimately means that what is conceived as being supra-natural was veiled behind the apparent face of nature, and was not instead posited outside an enlarged picturing of what nature on the whole would have been.” [El-Bizri, Orthmann, 2018] If we take this definition of occultism to be true, then Humboldt was certainly an occultist – his aspiration was to discover the mysteries behind the rise and fall of civilizations; he believed that the “spirit” of a nation, its creative and history-making powers, is made manifest in its language, and vice versa: that a language influenced the thinking of its respective people. Humboldt tried to map the exact patterns of these different national spirits, their bursts of activity and their stagnation; in doing so, he had more or less created the field of comparative linguistics (which is less than could be said for the Neohumboldtsians). His contribution to the typology of languages is truly invaluable; it could be said, if one wished, that he achieved a scientific goal through means and purposes we would now consider unscientific – not unlike the alchemists and natural philosophers of old.

The aforementioned critics of Neohumboldtianism/linguistic relativity disprove the idea that language influences thought, or, at any rate, the “strong” version of this idea: that the influence of language on thought is immanent, all-powerful and inescapable. Their arguments are strong and valid, yet certain parts of Humboldt’s work itself present, if not an alternative point of view, then at least a certain degree of nuance. Humboldt’s seminal (unfinished) work is a study of the Kawi/Old Javanese language; its introduction is usually published as a separate piece entitled *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and Its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind* (German: *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*) and considered his *magnum opus*, particularly in terms of his philosophical views on language. The reason why he chose to relay his most cherished ideas in an introduction to a study of the Kawi language, and none other, isn’t accidental, of course: Java, that is, Indonesia, is a place of crossroads for three great civilizations – Hindu-Buddhist, Chinese and Muslim – and their respective languages: Sanskrit, Chinese and Arabic. (The greatness of those civilizations and their languages is something that Humboldt himself acknowledges, not without a number of caveats; however, he favored Sanskrit far above the other two.) In spite of that, he argues, the native Javanese language and culture, despite being subjected to all these strong and diverse influences, didn’t become any of them; in turn, it became a completely new thing

of its own. To be more precise: “It is without doubt,” Humboldt writes, “that Java had received from India a (considerably, too) higher level of civilization and culture; yet the native language hadn’t changed its less perfect form, hardly capable of satisfying the necessities of thought. On the contrary, it stripped the endlessly superior and nobler Sanskrit of its form to impose another of its own.” [Humboldt, 2000] This is an idea that he goes on to repeat, rephrased differently, a number of times across the introduction and other works collected in the Russian edition.

It should by now be quite obvious that Humboldt had a ranking system of sorts pertaining to languages (and cultures), considering some of them superior to others – an idea that wouldn’t find much understanding with the public today, not to mention that the statement of one language being better or worse than the other is essentially meaningless from the linguistic point of view. However, if we take this away, what remains is a concept not dissimilar to inertia or gravity, except of linguistic kind – a language that, while succumbing to the outside influences, creates a synthesis of itself and those influences. While the idea of linguistic relativity, on its surface or in its most extreme, simplified forms, may seem like a superstition for the modern age, in fact, the whole modern linguistic philosophy, from the “linguistic turn” to the most recent amateur debates on political correctness in language, has been nothing but this – an attempt to find out the relationship between language, thought and reality, a task that is apparently more difficult than it seems. It does seem a little incongruous to reject linguistic relativity wholesale (like some critics of Neohumboldtians do) and then spend a significant part of modern philosophical discussion in musings on how language may influence our perception of ourselves and others, after all. I would argue that, regardless of whether language influences thought, or vice versa, language does possess a certain inertia and that it is particularly apparent in case of world religions in general and Islam in particular.

Islam is a culture and a religion that is, for lack of a better word, obsessively in love with a single language, that is, Arabic; yet it is also a religion which possesses a distinctly international character. Thus, languages of the Islamic cultures, while gravitating towards the Arabic language, have each developed into something which was neither Arabic nor the same language as it had used to be, but a third, completely different thing. Such, I would argue, is the fate of every cultural empire in general (if we were to use the notion of “cultural imperialism” as it appears in post-structuralism) – the very act of trying to unify its “subjects” causes it to fall apart, giving birth to multiple new entities. This article, as well as the larger dissertation of which it is a part, seeks to describe some of the ways in which the influence of Islam, Arabic language and Arabic literary tradition shows in Indo-European and (collaterally and to a far lesser extent) Turkic languages, with the particular focus on Indo-Iranian and Slavic languages; the reason for such preference will be made more clear later in this text. It would, without doubt, be very interesting, edifying and potentially useful to focus on, for example, Dravidian, Austronesian or Niger-Congo languages in that particular aspect, but, unfortunately, this isn’t a priority at the moment.

It would seem that many, if not most, languages of Islamic cultures had not developed under the direct influence of the Arabic language; it was Persian that served as the mediator. And, as for Persian, it had to undergo quite a bit of change and reform under the influence of Arabic. This becomes apparent if one merely looks at such a text as, for example, *A Compendium of the Standards of Persian Poetry* (Arabic: *Al-Mu’jam fi ma’ayir ash’ar al-‘ajam*) by Shams-i Qays ibn Muhammad ar-Razi from XIII century A. D. Natalya Chalisova, who supplied the Russian translation and commentary of this treatise, points out in her introduction that this text has yet to find its due appreciation on part of linguists and historians of linguistics specifically, despite the author possessing a rather astonishing insight into the typological differences between a Semitic and an Indo-European language [Shams-i Qays, 1997]. Indeed, the texts of Shams-i Qays and Humboldt appear to echo each other without the two even being aware of each other’s existence. Here are merely some of the transformations that the Arabic poetic tradition had to undertake in being absorbed by the Persian one: the simplest and most obvious is, of course, the invention of *radif*, a refrain which ends every couplet, following the rhyming word proper. This invention, which would go on to become a part of Ottoman, Azerbaijani, Urdu etc. poetry, is made possible by the fact that Persian is a subject-object-verb language where the verb / the predicate usually goes at the end of a sentence (unlike Arabic, and particularly literary Arabic, which is a verb-subject-object language). Also, in Persian, same verb can be used to describe completely different things (like the verb *kardan*, *to do*, in this example, where Shams-i Qays quotes Anwari):

<p>طرایف سخن من همی Does your joyful acceptance عنان مدت من چرخ بر So long as my feet are in the stirrups of your service, کی هر کرا بود از مردمانش If I possess any mastery, it’s due to the two particularities</p>	<p>کجا بماند کی اقبال تو بدست قبول <i>not make</i> my speech into a miracle? جو پای من بود اندر رکاب خدمت تو heaven <i>won’t make</i> itself a master of my life’s reins. مرا اگر هنری هست این دو خاصیت است that, by following any man, <i>make</i> him their own.</p>
---	--

[Shams-i Qays, 1997]

(English translation based on the Russian translation by Natalya Chalisova.)

All of this makes Persian verbs particularly easy to use as a *radif*.

Another thing was foregoing the wordplay and alliteration of Arabic poetry and compensating for it with different devices, such as parallelism. The reason for that is the difference in morphology: in Arabic, it is possible to derive almost any form from any given root, whereas the Persian morphology is a little less flexible, or at any rate, differently flexible. Morphology also led Shams-i Qays (and probably his predecessors and posterity) to reconsider the notion of rhyme as a whole: while in Arabic new words are often formed either by prefixes or by “building” a morpheme in between the root consonants, Persian is more dependent on suffixes/postfixes. And, since even the Arabic loanwords behave differently in Persian, one could see how this would be a problem [Shams-i Qays, 1997].

Interestingly enough, although Shams-i Qays warns the poets against using too much undue, or “alien” Arabic loanwords and advices to only use such Arabic words which have been “well-absorbed” into the Persian language, he doesn’t list his explicit criteria of “alien” and “well-absorbed”, although he does offer an example of a poem that he finds bad in this respect (by Manuchehri):

<p>که مهجور کردی مرا از O raven, cry no more جنین خانگی گشت وجونین Oh, woe is me, for this love دلی داشتم نا صبور و Because of the night when my beloved went away,</p>	<p>غرابا مزن بیشتر زین of how I've been estranged from my lover... ایا لهف نفسی کی این عشق با من have made its home in me and grown deep roots... بدان شب کی معشوق من مرتحل شد my heart is impatient and full of worry.</p>
---	---

[Shams-i Qays, 1997]

The Persian literary and linguistic tradition, formed and established in this way, would then go on to influence other languages, such as the Ottoman Turkish; however, it is the Urdu language that I would like to dwell upon longer. Urdu (also known as Hindustani, Lashkari, Rekhta etc.) had formed as a result of Persian influence on one (or probably some of) Indo-Aryan languages of North India that had descended from one of the Prakrit languages. Interestingly enough, in his volume *Ab-e hayat* (the English translation of which serves as the main point of reference for this unfortunately short and inconclusive article), Muhammad Husain Azad, a noted theoretician, historian and practitioner of Urdu and Persian poetry from XIX century A. D., insists that the Indo-Aryan language which served as the basis for Urdu was Braj Bhasha, while Frances Pritchett spends a significant part of his introduction explaining why this probably isn’t the case [Azad, 2005]. At any rate, Azad, too, describes various transformations that the Indic base and the Persian substratum had to undergo in the process of giving birth to a third, new entity. Among such changes is the *izafat* (a construction already borrowed by Persian from Arabic), “both possessive and adjectival... sometimes as subject and sometimes as predicate” [Azad, 2005]. Azam notably cites brevity as one of the *izafat*’s advantages: ‘We ought to be grateful to our ancestors for this verbal device: that while in the Hindi language words are conjoined by the possessives *ka*, *ke* and *ki*, the use of the Persian *izafat* construction made for more compression.’ When one looks, for instance, at the examples of Ottoman Turkish *izafats* next to their Modern Turkish counterparts (as they are compared in *History of the Ottoman Civilization*, for example [Üce, 2006]), one cannot help but notice a similarity: the Ottoman *zulf-e yar* against the modern *sevğilinin saçı* (both meaning “tresses of the beloved”), or the Ottoman *sheb-i hijran* against the modern *ayrılık gecesi* (“night of the separation”) make the “native” Turkic suffixes used to form the genitive seem overly long.

Azad also lists a number of similes, metaphors, idioms, terms and other “inventive changes” made by Persian to Urdu. displaying, therefore, that the changes were structural and not merely limited to loanwords; not to mention that the loanwords themselves underwent a lot of transformation: “Arabic and Persian words were sometimes taken with their meanings changes; sometimes the meanings were taken and the words changed... a number of words were taken in such a way that along with the meaning, the form changed as well... in declension, [Hindi] took nothing from Persian. What it did was attach its own Hindi plural [object] marker *-on* to Arabic and Persian words...” [Azad, 2005] He also describes “changes first Bhasha, then Urdu, made in Sanskrit words”; the English version is abridged and doesn’t contain the lists of these transformed words which are nonetheless present in the Urdu original.

What is of particular interest to this article, is that the Urdu language which first appeared as a result of Islamic influence went on to become nothing else than a symbol of secularism: Urdu, to a certain extent, transcended religion. Even Azad’s own text, finished in XIX century A. D., reflects that. Here are just some of the excerpts:

“In the seventeenth century after Christ, there was Baba Tulsi Das, a Brahman, who came from Bandah district; he was a pandit, and a poet too, and a faqir too. He translated the Rama’ in into Bhasha in such a way

that that peerless book became popular among great and small. In his dohras there are many – and in the above-mentioned book some – Persian and Arabic words...

In the same age, Surdas-ji made his poetry universally popular through his descriptions of Sri Krishnan-ji. In his works there is scarcely a single verse without a Persian or Arabic word.... Think about it: when these venerable religious elders used Persian words in their dohras, wouldn't the ordinary Hindus have used even more in their conversation?" [Azad, 2005]

And here is a conversation between a king and an Urdu poet/nobleman in the Muslim court, where they casually refer to a characters from the Hindu *Ramayana*:

"...the Raja Sahib said, 'Navab Sahib! How did Ahmad Shah Durrani carry off [Muhammad Shah's wife] Malikah Zamani?' These words displeased Fughan; sadly he replied, 'Maharaj, her carried her off the way Ravana carried off Sita-ji.'" [Azad, 2005]

Or an excerpt about a different Urdu poet and a Sufi teacher:

"In that period, the influence of Sufism lay spread like a cloud over India. Thus, leaving aside accomplishment in poetry, thousands of Muslims – and even Hindus – were his [Mirza Jan-e-Jahan Mazhar's] disciples, and revered him from the heart." [Azad, 2005]

In the other introduction to the English edition, Shamsur Rahman Faruqi lists even more Hindu (non-Muslim) poets who wrote in Urdu, but whom Azad doesn't mention [Azad, 2005]; and in modern India, the Urdu language is also seen as a symbol of religious syncretism and secularism, as testified by article such as *The Secular Nationalism of Urdu* (to take just one example among many others like it). [Rahman, 2013]

In light of everything said above, this article and the upcoming PhD dissertation by this author is an attempt to construct, to imagine, how a Russian-based language, or rather, register, analogous to Urdu could look. This language could potentially become a language of inter-religious and inter-ethnic communication, free of any stigma, without replacing any of the existing languages in Russia and its environs. This "Russian Urdu" would, then, be based on the literary traditions of Farsi/Tajik and Turkic languages, such as Tartar (languages that, again, have experienced a strong influence of Persian, anyway), as well as other Slavic languages with their traditions of Islamic discourse: the *kitab*s in Belarusian, Ukrainian and Polish, the Bosnian language/register and the Bulgarian as spoken by the Pomak community, as well as the preconditions that already exist in Russian language. Therefore, the Arabic loanwords in "Russian Urdu" would have to be in the altered form which Turkic or Iranic languages have already given them. I would like now to present a small sample of a text in this invented Russian Urdu; I chose a legal text for this example to show that this "Urdu" can be of practical use, despite the fact that both Shams-i Qays and Azad had written almost exclusively about poetry. In fact, Azad even explicitly says that Urdu was born as a language of poetry first and foremost, and only later transferred into legislative, educational etc. spheres [Azad, 2005].

Here is an excerpt from a Russian template form for a legal opinion, a perfectly normal, actually existing template specifically designed for everyday usage (source: [Legal Encyclopedia, 2017]), and my approximation of how its "Russian Urdu" version might look like:

Russian

В соответствии с законодательством РФ, получение травмы на работе расценивается как несчастный случай, обстоятельства которого подлежат расследованию.

Расследованию и учету в соответствии с Трудовым кодексом РФ подлежат несчастные случаи, происшедшие с работниками и другими лицами, участвующими в производственной деятельности работодателя, при исполнении ими трудовых обязанностей или выполнении какой-либо работы по поручению работодателя, а также при осуществлении иных правомерных действий, обусловленных трудовыми отношениями с работодателем либо совершаемых в его интересах.

"Russian Urdu"

По российскому канону рабочий джурх является кадой и требует тахкыка.

Тахкыка и хисаба по российскому канун-е шугль требуют кады, когда они происходят с людьми работы и другими шахсами, которые заняты мудиром в его трудовой деятельности, его поручениях, задачах и прочими канонных действиях, следующих из низама работы, либо исполненных именем мудира.

Несчастный случай подлежит расследованию, если он повлек за собой необходимость перевода пострадавшего на другую работу, временную или стойкую утрату трудоспособности, смерть пострадавших.

Для расследования несчастного случая создается комиссия не менее чем из 3 человек.

Любая проверка государственных органов по охране труда начинается с детального изучения Положения по охране труда, правил по оказанию первой медицинской помощи, правил пожарной безопасности и организации эвакуации, должностных инструкций, и т.п., наличие которых необходимо.

Данные документы позволяют работодателю максимально снять с себя ответственность за наступление несчастных случаев.

(Transliteration and translation:)

Russian

V sootvietstviyi s zakonodatielstvom RF, polucheniye travmy na rabote rastsenivayetsia kak nieschastnyi sluchay, obstoyatel'stva kotorovo podliezhat rassliedovaniyu.

Rassliedovaniyu i uchiotu v sootvietstviyi s Trudovym kodeksom RF podliezhat nieschastny'ye sluchayi, proysshedshie s rabotnikami i drugimi litsami, uchastvuyushimi v proizvodstvennoy dieyatelnosti rabotodatielia, pri ispolnieniyi imi trydovych obiazannostey ili vypolnieniyi kakoy-libo raboty po porucheniyu rabotodatielia, a takzhe pri osuchestvleniyi inykh pravomiernykh dieystviy, obuslovliennykh trudovymi otnosheniyami s rabotodatieliem libo soviershayemykh v yego interesakh.

Nieschastny'y sluchay podliezhit rassliedovaniyu, yesli on povliok za soboy nieobkhodimost' pierievoda postradavshevo na druguyu rabotu, vriemiennuyu ili stoykuyu utratu trudospobnosti, smert' postradavshikh.

Dlya rassliedovaniya nieschastnovo sluchaya sozdayotsia komissiya nie mienie chem iz triokh cheloviek.

“Russian Urdu”

Po rossiyskomu qanonu rabochiy jurh yavliayetsia kadhoy i triebuyet tahqiqa.

Tahqiqa I hisaba po rossiyskomu qanon-e-shughl triebuyut kadhi, kogda oni proiskhodiat s liud'mi raboty I drugimi shakh-sami, kotorye zaniaty mudirov v yego trudovoy dieyatelnosti, yego porucheniyakh, zadachakh i prochikh qanonnykh dieystviyakh, sleduyushikh iz nizama raboty, libo ispolnieniykh imieniem mudira.

Kadha triebuyet tahqiqa, kogra vliechiot za soboy naql majruha/majruhi v druguyu rabotu, ili potieriu qudrata vaqtiiy/abadiyu, ili maut majruha/majruhi.

Dlia tahqiqa triebuyetsia lajna, v kotoroy tri insane, ya aksar.

Када требует тахкыка, когда влечёт за собой наклъ маджруха(и) в другую работу, или потерю кудрата вактийю-абადийю, или маут маджруха(и).

Для тахкыка требуется ляджна, в которой три инсана, я аксар.

Начало каждого тахкыка со стороны государственного трудового низама – тафсильное изучение дастур-е-химаийат-е-шугль, дастура врачебного, пожарного, спасательного и должностного, а также прочих лазимных эвраков.

Эти эвраки помогают мудиру освободиться от мусулийи до наибольшего худута при кадах.

English

Under the law of Russian Federation, work-related injuries are considered industrial accidents, and their circumstances subject to investigation.

Under the Labour Code of Russian Federation, the industrial accidents that shall be investigated and accounted for are those that happen to workers or other persons involved in the employer's industrial activities while fulfilling their work responsibilities or the employer's assignments; or during other lawful acts resulting from their work relations with the employer or carried out on his behalf.

An accident is subject to investigation when it results in an allocation, temporary or permanent incapacity for work, or death.

For purposes of the investigation, a committee of 3 or more persons is formed.

Liubaya provierka gosudarstvien-nykh organov po okhranie truda nachinayetsia s dietal'no izucheniya Polozheniya po okhranie truda, pravil po okazaniyu piervoy mieditsinskoy pomoshi, pravil pozharnoy bezopasnosti i organizatsiyi evakuatsii, dolzhostnykh instruksiy b tomu podobno-vo, nalichiye kotorykh nieobkhodimo.

Dannye dokumenty pozvoliayut rabotodatielyu maksimal'no sniat' s siebia otvietstviennost' za nastuplieniye nieschastnykh sluchayev.

Nachalo kazhdovo tahqiqa so storony gosudarstviennogo trudovovo nizama – tafsil'noye izucheniye dastur-e-himayat-e-shughl, dastura vrachebno-vo, pozharnovo, spasatiel'no-vo I dolzhostno-vo, a takzhe prochikh lazimnykh evrakov.

Eti evraki pomogayut mudiru osvobodit'ia ot musuliyyi do nayibol'shevo huduta pri kad-hakh.

An audit on part of the government authorities on workplace safety shall always start from a close examination of the Workplace Safety Regulations, first aid protocol, fire safety and evacuation protocol, job descriptions, etc. These documents are essential.

The existence of these documents allows for maximum exemption of responsibility on part of the employer in case of an industrial accident.

This attempt is only a demonstration; it is small and inconclusive and would require a lot more research, explanation and effort (e. g. developing an Arabic-based script for “Russian Urdu”); yet it does offer some kind of a model for an Indo-European / Slavic language influenced by an Islamic culture. Among other things, it can also be used as a model of another kind – one that introduces Russian speakers to how Urdu / Turkish / Bosnian etc. are perceived by natives speakers of related languages or registers.

In becoming a language of an Islamic culture, languages still retained their uniqueness; apparently, what impelled Anton Antonovich to study the Belarusian *kitab*s in the first place was “the many archaic elements of Old-Belarussian, hidden beneath the Arabic writing” [Zverko, 2017]. It is possible that “Russian Urdu” may one day become Russian’s one chance of surviving – either literally, or in the sense of retaining a positive image of itself.

Bibliography:

Azad, Muhammad Husain. (2005). *Ab-e Hayat: Shaping the Canon of Urdu Poetry*, translated and edited by: Frances W. Pritchett, in association with Shamsur Rahman Faruqi, Digital South Asia Library, Chicago. Accessed: March 20, 2020. URL: <https://dsal.uchicago.edu/books/PK2155.H8413/index.html#top>

El-Bizri, Nader and Orthmann, Eva, “Introduction.” In: *The Occult Sciences in Pre-Modern Islamic Cultures*, edited by: El-Bizri, Nader and Orthmann, Eva, 7-12. Beirut, 2018.

From Linguistics to Myth: Ethnolinguistics in Search of the “Ethnic Mentality”, compiled by Pavlova A., Anthology Publishing Group, Saint Petersburg, 2013.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. (2000). *Selected Writings on the Study of Languages*, translated into Russian by: S. Starostin, V. Bibikhin and others, Progress Publishing Group, Moscow.

Pavlova A., Bezrodnyj B. (2010). *How to Catch a Unicorn? The Image of the Russian Language from Lomonosov to Wierzbicka*, Toronto Slavic Quarterly, no. 32 (Spring 2010): 71-95. Accessed: March 20, 2020. URL: http://sites.utoronto.ca/tsq/32/tsq_32_pavlova_bezrodnyj_how_to_catch_a_unicorn.pdf

Rahman, A. Faizur. “The Secular Nationalism of Urdu.” *The Hindu*, September 03, 2013. Updated: June 02, 2016. Accessed: March 15, 2020. URL: <https://www.thehindu.com/books/books-reviews/the-secular-nationalism-of-urdu/article5186833.ece>

Shams-i Qays ar-Razi. (1997). *A Compendium of the Standards of Persian Poetry, Part II: On the Theory of Rhyme and the Criticism of Poetry*, translated into Russian, annotated and prefaced by: Natalya Chalisova, Eastern Literature Publishing House, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow.

Template Form for a Legal Opinion (Russian). Law Encyclopedia, 2015-2017. Accessed: 15.03.2020. URL: <https://uristhome.ru/document/83/yuridicheskoe-zaklyuchenie-obrazets-blank>

Üce Nuri, “The Turkish Ottoman Language.” In: *History of the Ottoman State, Society and Civilization, Part II: History of the Ottoman State*, edited by: Ihsanoğlu E., translated into Russian by Feonova V., 3-19. Eastern Literature Publishing House, Moscow, 2006.

Zverko Nataliya. “Kitabs and Kitab Studies: Who is the Belarussian Man That Revealed the Secrets of the Tartar Script?” *Delfi.ru*, October 11, 2017. Accessed: March 19, 2020. URL: <https://www.delfi.lt/multimedija/100-let-slitvoi-kitab-i-kitabistika-kto-etot-belorus-raskryvshij-zagadki-tatarskoj-pismennosti-v-litve.d?id=75943373>

Alexandra Golikova

In Search of “Russian Urdu”: A Linguistic Phenomenon in the Possible Making

This article begins with examination of Wilhelm von Humboldt’s concept of language and human “national spirit”, and how one influences the other; it then suggests a concept of language inertia based on Humboldt’s research of the Indonesian Kawi language. At the heart of this concept is an idea that, when a major culture influences a minor culture, it imposes its own language(s) on said culture and its language(s); however, the outcome of this process is a birth of an entirely different, entity that is neither of the two original elements. Such is the dialectic of linguistic imperialism. This thesis is then briefly illustrated within the paradigm of a Semitic language (Arabic) influencing Indo-European languages, using the examples from Persian and Urdu linguistic and literary theory, mostly from the works of Shams-i Qays (Persian) and Muhammad Husain Azad (Urdu). Finally, the author proposes a concept of “Russian Urdu”, that is to say, a Russian-based language/register created with the influence of Islamic tradition and Arabic, Persian and Turkic languages, but a language that would be one of secular, syncretic, interreligious communication, as well as a significant linguistic and aesthetic phenomenon, existing parallel to other existing languages without replacing any of them, much like Urdu was/is in India. A brief sample of such language is presented and further possibilities for research are mentioned.

Олександра Голікова

У пошуках «Російського Урду»: Лінгвістичний феномен у можливих варіаціях

Стаття починається з вивчення концепції Вільгельма фон Гумбольдта про мову та людський «національний дух», і як один впливає на іншого. Надалі він пропонує концепцію інерції мови, засновану на своїх дослідженнях індонезійської мови каві. В основі цієї концепції лежить ідея, що, коли центральна культура впливає на периферійну, вона нав’язує свою власну мову (мови) в межах зазначеної культури та її мовам; проте результат цього процесу є народженням чогось зовсім іншого, цілого, що не є жодним із двох оригінальних елементів. Така діалектика мовного імперіалізму. Потім ця теза коротко проілюстрована в парадигмі семітської мови (арабської), яка впливає на індоєвропейські мови, використовуючи приклади з мовної та літературної теорії перської та урду, переважно з праць Шамс-І-Кея (перської) та Мухаммеда Хусайна Азада (Урду). Нарешті, автор пропонує концепцію «російської урду», тобто російської мови/реєстру, створеної під впливом ісламської традиції та арабської, перської та тюркської мов, але мови, яка була б однією із світських, що утворює синкретичне, міжрелігійне спілкування, а також естетичне явище, що існує паралельно від іншим існуючих мов без заміни жодної з них, подібно до того, як урду була чи є в Індії. Представлений короткий зразок такої мови та подані подальші можливості для дослідження.

Alexandra Golikova, PhD student, Tver State University, Department of Foreign Languages and International Communication, Tver, Russia.