

The usage of English Borrowings in Uzbek Language

(M. A. Nomozova)

Annotation: This article studies the principles of lexical, morphological and syntactic borrowings and their specific linguistic aspects in the Uzbek language. In the clarification of these issues, we relied on the experience of scholars who have conducted research on the lexicon of the Uzbek language.

Key words: lexical borrowings, morphological borrowings, syntactical borrowings.

A borrowed word, a loan word or borrowing is a word taken over from another language and modified in phonemic shape, spelling, paradigm or meaning according to the standards of the language.

Uzbek language developed under the influence of Persian, Arabic and later Russian languages. In the study of the borrowed element in English the main emphasis is as a rule placed on the middle English period and in Uzbek it is middle Turkic language. When we speak about the role of native and borrowed words in the language we must not take into consideration only the number of them but their semantic, stylistic character, their word building ability, frequency value, collocability (valency) and the productivity of their word-building patterns.

If we approach to the study of the role of native and borrowed words from this point of view we see, though the native words are not numerous they play an important role in the English and Uzbek languages. They have value, great word forming power, wide collocability high frequency, many meanings and they are stylistically neutral. Almost all words of native origin belong to very important semantic groups. The number and character of the borrowed words tell us of the relations between the peoples, the level of their culture, etc. It is for this reason that borrowings have often been called the milestones of history.

Several Uzbek linguists have expressed their ideas on the issue of borrowings in different linguistic layers of the Uzbek language in their works. One of the most significant work of them is "Lexical layers of the modern Uzbek literary language" by E. Begmatov. Moreover, most of our scholars who have studied the lexicon of the modern Uzbek language have learned certain ideas about borrowings in the language. In particular, in scientific publications such as "Lexicology of the Uzbek language" (1981), published under the edition of A. Khojiev and A. Akhmedov, "Modern Uzbek literary language" by H. Jamalkhanov (2005), "Modern literary Uzbek language by Sh. Rakhmatullayev (2006), and "Lexicon of the Old Turkic Literary Language" (2015) by B. Abdushukurov, some scientific observations have been made on this issue. Furthermore, most of the dissertations defended in the field of lexicon in recent years have to some extent drawn conclusions and generalizations on the borrowed units to a certain extent. Nevertheless, in most of the above-mentioned studies, borrowings are examined at the lexical level, mainly lexical borrowings are discussed.

Every language, which is a means of human communication, develops on the basis of two different materials. These are internal sources and external sources. If we look at the development of a particular language, it does so primarily through its own internal resources - lexical richness and grammatical tools. In addition to internal sources, external sources also play an important role in the enrichment and improvement of the Uzbek language vocabulary. External sources usually refer to the enrichment of vocabulary through the borrowing of words from other languages. Due to the connection of the Uzbek language with other non-related languages, a certain number of words have been borrowed from other languages into Uzbek. There is no language in the world that has not passed words into other languages or borrowed words from other languages.

¹Independent Researcher, Department of Linguistics, Karshi State University, Karshi, Uzbekistan.

The Uzbek language does not bypass these laws. Numerous published sources confirm our abovementioned opinion. Taking into the consideration that our motherland has also risen to high levels of development in certain periods of history, and that it has spread to the whole world as a hotbed of science, these views are not very unbiased. As N.A. Baskakov wrote, a number of lexical units from Turkic languages were transferred to Russian and through it to Western European languages in the XVI - XVII centuries. However, by the XX century, the inverse of the above phenomenon began to take effect, it is known from researches that through Russian, European-specific units were transferred to Turkic languages, in particular, the Uzbek language began to borrow linguistic units. There are also scientific sources about the adoption of Turkish linguistic units in Persian and Arabic, which proves once again that this process is not one-sided. Researches have shown that the presence of certain linguistic units in a language does not indicate that it is a unit of a language. For example, a number of factors need to be taken into account when determining from which language a linguistic unit, which is equally used in Uzbek, Persian, Arabic, or Russian-European languages, has been borrowed. This is not a simple phenomenon. It is true that in most scientific publications published so far, our language has always been in the background. Nevertheless, in many studies today, a new approach, a new trend, has begun to emerge, that is, the tendency to prioritize the Uzbek language. This means that when we encounter a word or other linguistic element in another language, we believe that it is not as if that unit of language is really borrowed from that language, but rather from the point of view that it is borrowed from our language into that language.

As a result of economic, cultural, and political relations between peoples, the units inherent in the construction of a language (mainly lexical units, partly phonetic and grammatical units) are transferred to another language, absorbed into this language and become its wealth. In our opinion, it is expedient to develop a typology of units of borrowings in the Uzbek language, to study their functional-semantic development on the basis of modern scientific achievements, dividing borrowings. Surprisingly, the research so far on the borrowings' layer has mostly covered only lexical units. In addition, the acquisition of such units was assessed only in terms of one-sidedness, that is, the borrowings of the Uzbek language

It has been mentioned that when borrowed words were identical in meaning with those already in English the adopted word very often displaced the native word. In most cases, however, the borrowed words and synonymous native words (or words borrowed earlier) remained in the language, becoming more or less differentiated in meaning and use. As a result the number of synonymic groups in English greatly increased. The synonymic groups became voluminous and acquired many words rarely used. This brought about a rise in the percentage of stylistic synonyms.

As a result of the differentiation in meaning between synonymous words many native words or words borrowed earlier narrowed their meaning or sphere of application.

Abundant borrowing intensified the difference between the word stock of the literary national language and dialects as well as between British English and American English. On the one hand a number of words were borrowed into the literary national language which are not to be found in the dialects. In a number of cases the dialects have preserved some Anglo-Saxon words which were replaced by borrowings in the literary language. On the other hand, a number of words were borrowed into dialects are not used throughout the country.

In spite of the numerous outside linguistic influences and the etymological heterogeneity of its vocabulary the English language is still, in essential characteristics a Germanic language. It has retained a ground work of Germanic words and grammar. A comparative study of the nature and role of native and borrowed words show that borrowing has never been the chief means of replenishing the English vocabulary. Word-formation and semantic development were throughout the entire history of the English language much more productive than borrowing. Besides most native words are marked by a higher frequency value. The great number of borrowings bringing with them new phonon-morphological types, new phonetic morphological and semantic features left its imprint upon the English language. On the other hand under the influence of the borrowed element words already existing in the English changed to some extent their semantic structure, collectability,

frequency and word forming ability. Borrowing also considerably enlarged the English vocabulary and brought about some changes in English synonymic groups, in the distribution of the English vocabulary through sphere of application and in the lexical divergence between the two variants of the literary national language and its dialects.

Uzbek language is also under constant influence of borrowings. We are living in the age of progress and technology. New discoveries new inventions, bring about new notions which are accepted by languages, and Uzbek language is also among them. The words connected with development of technology, sport terms, everyday words have been penetrating into Uzbek language from other languages, especially from English, Russian and through Russian or English from many European languages. Uzbek language is full of barbarisms which are mainly used by the youth: конечно certainly(Russian), okay (English) and etc.

The incompleteness of assimilation results in some specific features which permit us to judge of the origin of words. They may serve as formal indications of loan words of Greek, Latin, French or other origin. Another factor determining the process of assimilation is the way in which the borrowing was adopted into the language. Words borrowed orally are assimilated more readily, they undergo greater changes, whereas with words adopted through writing the process of assimilation is longer and more laborious. Whenever the need filling motive plays a part, the borrower is being confronted with some new object or practice for which he needs words. Under these conditions three rather distinct things may happen, giving rise respectively to «loanwords», «loanshifts», and 'loanblends'. The borrower may adopt the donor's word along with the object or practice; the new form in the borrower's speech is then a loanword.

When confronted with a new object or practice for which words are needed, the borrower may somehow adopt material in his own language. A new idiom arises and since it arises under the impact of another linguistic system, it is a «loanshift».

A loanblend is a new idiom developed in the borrowing situation in which both the loanword and the loan shift mechanisms are involved: the borrower imports part of the model and replaces part of it by something already in his own language.

The type of the word borrowed by personal contact would undoubtedly at first be names of objects unfamiliar to the borrowers, or products, and commodities exchanged by way of trade. If the contacts were maintained over a long period then ideas concerned with government, law, religion and customs might be absorbed and perhaps the names of these would be adopted. Only in the case of nations in relatively advanced stages of civilization would there be much influence exerted through the written word; concrete objects would come first, then abstract ideas learnt from what might actually be seen from their effects in everyday life and abstract ideas through the indirect contact achieved by books would come much later.

The international word-stock is also growing due to the influx of exotic borrowed words like anaconda, bungalow, kraal, orang-outang, sari etc. These come from many different sources.

International words should not to be mixed with words of the common Indo-European stock that also comprise a sort of common fund of the European languages.

We should also include here Uzbek language which was under influence of Russian language for a long period of time but didn't lose its properties and its own word-stock and now being.

As the process of borrowing is mostly connected with the appearance of new notions which the loan words serve to express, it is natural that the borrowing is seldom limited to one language. Words of identical origin that occur in several languages as a result of simultaneous or successive borrowings from one ultimate source are called international words.

Expanding global contacts result in the considerable growth of international vocabulary. All languages depend for their changes upon the cultural and social matrix in which they operate and various contacts between nations are part of this matrix reflected in vocabulary.

International words play an especially prominent part in various terminological systems including the vocabulary of science, industry and art. The etymological sources of this vocabulary reflect the history of world culture. Thus, for example, the mankind's cultural debt to Italy is reflected in the great number of Italian words connected with architecture, painting and especially music that are borrowed into most European languages: *allegro*, *andante*, *aria*, *arioso*, *barcarole*, *baritone*, *concert*, *duet*, *opera*, *piano* and many more.

The rate of change in technology, political, social and artistic life has been greatly accelerated in the 20th century and so has the rate of growth of international word-stock. A few examples of comparatively new words due to the progress of science will suffice to illustrate the importance of international vocabulary: *algorithms*, *antenna*, *antibiotic*, *automation*, *bionics*, *cybernetics*, *entropy*, *gene*, *genetic*, *code*, *graph*, *microelectronics* etc. All these show sufficient likeness in English, French, Russian, Uzbek and several other languages.

To adapt means to make or undergo modifications in function and structure so as to be fit for a new use, a new environment or a new situation. Being adaptive system the vocabulary is constantly adjusting itself to the changing requirements and conditions of human communications and cultural and other needs. This process of self-regulation of the lexical system is a result of overcoming contradictions between the state of the system and the demands it has to meet. The speaker chooses from the existing stock of words such words that in his opinion can adequately express his thought and feeling. It is important to stress that the development is not confined to coining new words on the existing patterns but in adapting the very structure of the system to its changing functions.

According to F. de Saussure synchronic linguistics deals with systems and diachronic linguistic – with single elements, and the two methods must be kept strictly apart. A language system then should be studied as something fixed and unchanging, whereas we observe the opposite: it is constantly changed and readjusted as the need arises. The concept of adaptive systems overcomes this contradiction and permits us to study language as a constantly developing but systematic whole. The adaptive system approach gives a more adequate account of the systematic phenomena of a vocabulary by explaining more facts about the functioning of words and providing more relevant generalizations, because we can take into account the influence of extra – linguistic reality. The study of the vocabulary as an adaptive system reveals the pragmatic essence of the communication process, i. e. the way language is used to influence the addressee. There is a considerable difference of opinion as to the type of system involved, although the majority of linguists nowadays agree that the vocabulary should be studied as a system. Our present state of knowledge is, however, insufficient to present the whole of the vocabulary as one articulated system, so we deal with it as if it were a set of interrelated systems.

To sum up this brief treatment of loan words it is necessary to stress that in studying borrowed words a linguist cannot be content with establishing the source, the date of penetration, the semantic sphere to which the word belonged and the circumstances of the process of borrowing. All these are very important, but one should also be concerned with the changes the new language system into which the loan word penetrates causes in the word itself, and on the other hand, look for the changes occasioned by the newcomer in the English vocabulary, when in finding its way into the new language it pushed some of its lexical neighbors aside. In the discussion above we have tried to show the importance of the problem of conformity with the patterns typical of the receiving language and its semantic needs. However, the second trend in modern Uzbek linguistics, that is, the transfer of many words from Uzbek (Turkish) to other languages in the world, is proving to be a real linguistic phenomenon. With this in mind, in this small study, in addition to the research on the layers of language in Uzbek

linguistic s, we also aim to reflect on not only borrowed words (lexical units), but also the affixal, syntactic, and phraseological acquisitions that are in use in the Uzbek language qisman (partially), ruhan (spiritually), majburan (compulsorily)). In the current period, the works on word formation in Uzbek claim that if the units, in particular, the affixes, used in another language, are borrowed together with the words in that language, these affixes are not considered belonging to Uzbek. Although some of the above affixes are used in the content of borrowings of those languages (this is mainly the case with affixes in Arabic), the vast majority of them are used with the units of pure Uzbek language. At the same time, it is not in line with our modern linguistic principles to consider words with suffixes that are used only in the lexemes of other languages as "root words". Therefore, we believe that such affixes can be considered as affixed morphemes. In many studies conducted since the second half of the last century, majority of affixal assimilations, borrowed from the Russian language have been referred as a morphological borrowings in the Uzbek language. However, in the post-independence period, with the development of the Uzbek language, many of these affixes have almost become obsolete or inactive.

Controversy over whether we call them affixes of the Uzbek language. However, such units are used in certain texts in the Uzbek language, and according to international linguistic principles, we cannot call them anything other than affixes.

References

1. Hojiev A. Uzbek word formation system. –Tashkent: Teacher, 2007. –P.62-80;
2. G.Abdurahmanov.Uzbek grammar. –Tashkent: Fan, 1975. –P.248 -252.