



THE FORMATION AND SOURCES OF NEOLOGISMS IN MODERN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LEXICONS

Ruzmuratova Aziza Anvarovna

Master Student of Asian University of Technologies;

Karshi, Kashkadarya; Tel:+998912220305;

e-mail:azizaruzmuratova@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines the nature, formation, and sources of neologisms in modern Uzbek and English lexicons. In the twenty-first century, globalization, technological advancement, and cultural contact have dramatically increased the speed at which new words appear in different languages. English, as a global lingua franca, is highly receptive to lexical innovation, while Uzbek, as a national language undergoing modernization and standardization, demonstrates a unique balance between openness to borrowing and linguistic purism. This paper discusses the theoretical perspectives on neologism, surveys key word-formation processes, and provides comparative examples to illustrate how new words are coined, borrowed, adapted, and integrated in both languages. The study highlights how media, technology, youth culture, and institutional language planning shape the trajectory of neologism formation and adoption.

Keywords: neologism, word formation, borrowing, derivation, compounding, lexical innovation, Uzbek language, English language, linguistic policy.

1. Introduction

The lexicon of a language is a living system that constantly evolves in response to cultural, social, and technological changes. Neologisms — newly coined words or expressions — are a clear sign of a language's vitality and its speakers' creativity. They often arise to name new objects, technologies, phenomena, or



ideas that did not previously exist or were not relevant in the language community.

English, due to its role as a global language, exhibits a particularly high rate of lexical innovation. The influence of the Internet, pop culture, and mass media has accelerated the creation and global dissemination of new terms. Uzbek, while less globally dominant, shows active vocabulary renewal, particularly after independence when national identity and modernization processes intensified efforts to both develop native terminology and regulate borrowings.

This paper aims to explore how neologisms are formed and what sources contribute to them in these two languages. Understanding these processes has practical implications for lexicographers, educators, translators, and policymakers.

2. Theoretical Background

Linguists have long studied the phenomenon of neologism from structural, sociolinguistic, and psycholinguistic perspectives. Bauer (1983) defines word-formation as the process by which new words are made on the basis of existing ones, highlighting derivation, compounding, and conversion as primary methods. Crystal (2003) emphasizes the role of globalization and technological innovation in accelerating lexical change, especially in English.

Salomov (2010) and Yuldasheva (2018) provide insights into neologism in the Uzbek context, underlining the balance between borrowing and the conscious development of native equivalents. Uzbek language policy, especially in the post-Soviet era, encourages the use of indigenous or Turkic roots to maintain cultural authenticity while accommodating modern concepts.

Fromkin et al. (2014) suggest that new words reflect not just linguistic creativity but also social attitudes, prestige, and identity. This perspective is especially relevant in multilingual societies where code-switching and loanwords often coexist with efforts at language purification.

3. Methods of Neologism Formation

Neologisms can enter a language through multiple channels. The main processes include:



3.1 Borrowing

Borrowing involves adopting words from other languages. English has historically borrowed extensively from Latin, French, and other languages. Today, English also acts as a donor language, providing terms to many languages, including Uzbek.

For example, English borrowed robot from Czech, piano from Italian, and sushi from Japanese. In modern times, words like emoji (from Japanese) and k-pop (from Korean pop music) demonstrate ongoing borrowing.

Uzbek borrows mostly from Russian (historically) and now increasingly from English, especially in technology and business. Terms like internet, smartfon, market, like, and onlayn are everyday borrowings. Some borrowed words are adapted phonologically and morphologically to fit Uzbek grammar.

3.2 Derivation

Derivation uses prefixes and suffixes to create new words. English uses a wide array of derivational morphemes, such as un-, re-, -ness, -ify, etc. Examples include unfriend, googleable, and streaming.

Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, heavily relies on suffixation. New words often arise by adding suffixes like -chi (denoting profession or person), -lik (denoting quality or abstraction), or -lash (verbalization). For instance:

Dizaynerlik (design work),

Raqamlashtirish (digitalization),

Kompyuterchi (computer specialist).

3.3 Compounding

Compounding combines two or more words to form a new one. English examples include blackboard, laptop, workshop, crowdfunding, and brainstorm. This method remains productive for coining catchy terms in marketing and media.

In Uzbek, compounding is less common than derivation but exists, especially in technical or bureaucratic contexts, e.g., yong'in xavfsizligi (fire safety), avtomobil yo'li (highway).



3.4 Semantic Shift

Semantic shift occurs when an existing word acquires a new meaning. English has many examples: mouse (from animal to computer device), virus (from biological to digital), and cloud (from weather phenomenon to data storage).

In Uzbek, semantic shift also appears, although less dramatically. Words like tarmoq (originally ‘net, network’ now also means ‘social network’) illustrate how native words adapt to new realities.

3.5 Clipping and Blending

English frequently shortens words (clipping) or blends them. App (from application), flu (from influenza), brunch (breakfast + lunch), smog (smoke + fog) are classic cases.

In Uzbek, clipping is less common but exists in informal speech, such as komp (computer) and insta (Instagram).

4. Influencing Factors

Several social and cultural factors affect neologism formation and adoption:

Technological progress: New devices, platforms, and services require naming. For instance, selfie, streamer, TikTok.

Media and pop culture: Movies, music, and celebrities popularize new words.

Youth slang: Young speakers often innovate with playful or fashionable terms.

Language policy: In Uzbekistan, language planning encourages native alternatives to foreign words; dictionaries and media campaigns promote standardized usage.

For example, while smartfon is widely used, official documents might prefer aqlli telefon (‘smart phone’ with native roots).

5. Comparative Discussion

Comparing Uzbek and English reveals similarities and differences:

Both languages adapt quickly to global trends.

English favors minimal restriction, leading to a flood of new terms.

Uzbek uses derivation and careful adaptation, reflecting a balance between openness and cultural identity.



Media, the Internet, and youth subcultures drive change in both contexts. This dynamic highlights how language reflects broader social attitudes toward globalization, national identity, and cultural continuity.

6. Implications and Challenges

The spread of neologisms presents opportunities and challenges:

Opportunities: Enriches vocabulary, promotes innovation, and reflects cultural dynamism.

Challenges: Excessive borrowing may threaten language purity; rapid change can complicate standardization and education.

Teachers, translators, and lexicographers must track new words, decide when to accept them, and help speakers use them correctly. For policy-makers, balancing modernization with cultural preservation remains a central concern.

7. Conclusion

Neologisms are a vital sign of a language's growth. English and Uzbek both demonstrate active word-formation processes shaped by technology, culture, and policy. While English embraces lexical change with few barriers, Uzbek carefully integrates new words to maintain cultural integrity alongside modernization.

Future research could explore how social media accelerates or localizes neologisms, how speakers' attitudes affect word acceptance, and how dictionaries can better reflect real usage trends.

References:

1. Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Salomov, G'. (2010). *Tilshunoslikka kirish*. Tashkent: Fan.
4. Yuldasheva, Z. (2018). *Zamonaviy o'zbek tilida yangi so'zlar*. Tashkent: Akademnashr.
5. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2014). *An Introduction to Language*. Cengage Learning.
6. Plag, I. (2003). *Word-Formation in English*. Cambridge University Press.
7. McCarthy, A. (2002). *An Introduction to English morphology*. Edinburgh University Press.