

THE CLASSIFICATION OF LOANWORDS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: DIRECT, INDIRECT, HYBRID, AND SEMANTIC TYPES.

Ikramova Hilola Jaloliddinovna

Student of Linguistics (English) at the Faculty of Philology,
Alfraganus University

ABSTRACT

This article examines the classification of loanwords in English and Uzbek languages, focusing on direct, indirect, hybrid, and semantic types of lexical borrowing. The study highlights the linguistic and cultural contact that shaped the vocabulary of both languages, analyzing how loanwords adapt phonologically, morphologically, and semantically. Using descriptive and comparative methods, examples from both English and Uzbek are provided to demonstrate how loanwords undergo structural and semantic changes. The research also discusses the influence of social and historical factors on borrowing processes. The findings contribute to understanding the dynamics of lexical enrichment and language contact phenomena.

Keywords: loanwords, borrowing, English, Uzbek, hybrid words, semantic change, linguistic contact.

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi o'zlashma so'zlarning tasnifi tahlil qilinadi. Asosiy e'tibor to'g'ridan-to'g'ri, bilvosita, gibrid va semantik o'zlashmalar turiga qaratilgan. Tadqiqot davomida o'zlashma so'zlarning fonetik, morfologik va semantik jihatdan moslashish jarayonlari, shuningdek, ijtimoiy-madaniy omillar ta'siri yoritilgan. Deskriptiv va qiyosiy tahlil usullaridan foydalanilgan holda har ikki til misolida o'zlashma so'zlarning shakl va ma'no jihatidan o'zgarish holatlari ko'rsatilgan. Natijalar tillarning boyish jarayonida leksik o'zaro ta'sirning ahamiyatini ochib beradi.

Kalit so'zlar: o'zlashma so'zlar, qarz so'zlar, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, gibrid so'zlar, semantik o'zgarish, til aloqalari.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В данной статье рассматривается классификация заимствованных слов в английском и узбекском языках, с особым вниманием к прямым, косвенным, гибридным и семантическим типам заимствований. Анализируется влияние культурных и исторических контактов, а также особенности фонетической, морфологической и семантической адаптации заимствованных слов. Исследование, основанное на описательном и сравнительном методах,

выявляет лексико-семантические изменения и их роль в процессе обогащения словарного состава языков.

Ключевые слова: *заимствованные слова, лингвистический контакт, английский язык, узбекский язык, гибридные слова, семантические изменения*

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of lexical borrowing has long been one of the most significant processes in the development of languages. As languages come into contact through trade, migration, colonization, cultural exchange, and globalization, they inevitably borrow words to fill lexical gaps or to express new concepts. English and Uzbek, despite their different linguistic families, have both undergone extensive lexical enrichment through borrowing.

English has historically borrowed words from Latin, French, Greek, and other languages, resulting in a highly diverse and international vocabulary. Similarly, Uzbek has adopted numerous words from Arabic, Persian, Russian, and, more recently, English, reflecting various cultural and political influences. The interaction of these borrowings reveals interesting patterns of adaptation and integration.

The present study aims to classify and compare loanwords in English and Uzbek languages, focusing on **four major types**: direct borrowings, indirect borrowings, hybrid forms, and semantic borrowings. The study employs descriptive and comparative linguistic methods to analyze how loanwords are integrated into each language's lexical and grammatical system.

Understanding the mechanisms of lexical borrowing not only sheds light on language evolution but also highlights the socio-cultural dynamics that shape linguistic identity. By exploring English and Uzbek examples side by side, this paper seeks to contribute to the broader understanding of how languages develop through contact and exchange.

Theoretical Background

Lexical borrowing has been a central topic in comparative and contact linguistics for many decades. Scholars such as Einar Haugen (1950)¹ and Uriel Weinreich (1953)² defined borrowing as a process through which one language adopts linguistic elements—mostly words—from another language due to contact and communication. Later, **Thomason and Kaufman (1988)**³ emphasized that borrowing is not merely a linguistic process but also a social phenomenon reflecting the intensity and nature of contact between speech communities.

¹ Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.

² Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.

³ Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. University of California Press.

According to Haugen's classification, loanwords can be grouped based on the level of adaptation and integration into the recipient language:

1. **Direct borrowings** — words borrowed without significant phonological or morphological change (e.g., *computer*, *internet* in Uzbek).

2. **Indirect borrowings** — words borrowed through a mediating language, often showing structural or semantic modifications (e.g., Uzbek *falsafa* < Arabic *falsafa* via Persian).

3. **Hybrid borrowings** — words that combine foreign roots or morphemes with native ones, forming mixed lexical units (e.g., *kompyuterchi*, *televideniyechi*).

4. **Semantic borrowings** — words that already exist in the recipient language but acquire new meanings under the influence of the donor language (e.g., *dizayner* or *lider* in Uzbek gaining new semantic shades from English).

In the case of **English**, borrowing has been constant since the Old English period. French contributed legal and social terms (*court*, *judge*, *government*), Latin added scientific vocabulary (*radius*, *formula*), and Greek influenced academic and technical fields (*philosophy*, *biology*).

Similarly, **Uzbek** has gone through multiple borrowing stages:

- **Arabic and Persian period** (religious and cultural terms: *kitob*, *ilm*, *adab*),

- **Russian and Soviet era** (administrative, technical, and everyday terms: *zavod*, *stantsiya*, *direktor*),

- **Modern English influence** (global terms: *marketing*, *blogger*, *menedjer*).

Thus, both languages illustrate the universality of borrowing as a mechanism of lexical expansion and adaptation to cultural change.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative comparative-descriptive design, which is commonly used in linguistic research to analyze lexical phenomena (Creswell, 2014)⁴. The aim of this design is to describe, compare, and classify loanwords in English and Uzbek based on structural and semantic characteristics.

Since loanwords represent the result of social and linguistic interaction, the research does not involve experimental testing but rather focuses on textual and corpus-based observation. The analysis combines theoretical insights with empirical examples from dictionaries, corpora, and media usage to determine how borrowed words are integrated into each language system.

⁴ Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.

Data Collection Sources

The data for this research were collected from **multiple linguistic and lexicographic sources** to ensure accuracy and reliability:

1. Lexicographic sources:

- *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* and *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary* for English examples;
- *O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati* (Tashkent, 2020) and *Inglizcha–o‘zbekcha lug‘at* (2019) for Uzbek examples.

2. Academic publications and theoretical works:

- Haugen (1950), Weinreich (1953), Thomason & Kaufman (1988), Haspelmath (2009), Treffers-Daller (2010).
- Modern Uzbek studies on borrowings (Rahmatullaev, 2000; Ergashev, 2018; Hasanov, 2022).

3. Contemporary sources:

- Uzbek online news portals (*Gazeta.uz*, *Daryo.uz*) and English digital media (*BBC News*, *The Guardian*) for identifying current hybrid and semantic borrowings.

4. Digital corpora:

- *British National Corpus (BNC)* and *Sketch Engine (Uzbek corpus)* for quantitative examples of usage frequency where available.

Data Sampling and Selection Criteria

Approximately **200 lexical items** were selected for analysis — 100 from English and 100 from Uzbek. The selection focused on frequently used borrowed words representing **four types of borrowing**:

- Direct (loanwords without significant change),
- Indirect (mediated borrowings),
- Hybrid (mixed forms),
- Semantic (meaning borrowings).

Each selected word was verified for origin, etymology, and usage frequency. Only commonly used or dictionary-recognized items were included to ensure linguistic validity.

Analytical Framework

The analysis follows a **four-stage model** developed on the basis of Haugen’s (1950) and Haspelmath’s (2009)⁵ frameworks:

1. **Identification:** locating loanwords in authentic sources (texts, corpora, dictionaries).

⁵ Haspelmath, M. (2009). Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues. In Haspelmath & Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the World’s Languages*, pp. 35–54.

2. **Classification:** assigning each loanword to one of the four categories (direct, indirect, hybrid, semantic).

3. **Adaptation analysis:** describing phonological, morphological, and semantic adaptation.

4. **Comparative interpretation:** comparing parallel examples from English and Uzbek to find cross-linguistic similarities and differences.

For example, English *robot* (from Czech) and Uzbek *kompyuterchi* (hybrid form from English root + Uzbek suffix) illustrate structural adaptation and productivity patterns.

Methodological Approach to Classification

The classification of borrowings is based on both **linguistic structure** and **semantic transformation**⁶:

Type of Borrowing	Definition	Example (English)	Example (Uzbek)	Adaptation Type
Direct	Borrowed with minimal change	café (Fr.)	market (Eng.)	Phonetic
Indirect	Borrowed through an intermediary	sugar (Fr. via Lat.)	falsafa (Ar. via Per.)	Morphological
Hybrid	Mix of native and foreign elements	speedometer	kompyuterchi	Derivational
Semantic	Only meaning borrowed	virus (medical computer)	→ lider (semantic extension)	Semantic

This table summarizes the operational framework used for classifying loanwords in both languages.

Reliability and Validity

To ensure **reliability**, all examples were cross-checked across at least two independent sources. **Validity** was established by consulting recognized dictionaries and peer-reviewed publications. Moreover, the classification was reviewed according to well-established linguistic theories by Haugen (1950), Poplack (1984), and Thomason & Kaufman (1988)⁷.

Limitations of the Study

Although the study provides a comprehensive qualitative analysis, it is limited by the availability of Uzbek corpora and the lack of quantitative frequency data⁸ for

⁶ Gómez Capuz, J. (1997). Towards a typological classification of linguistic borrowing. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 10, 81–94.

⁷ Poplack, S., & Sankoff, D. (1984). Borrowing: The synchrony of integration. *Linguistics*, 22(1), 99–135.

⁸ Treffers-Daller, J. (2010). Borrowing. In M. Fried, J. O. Östman, & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Variation and Change: Pragmatic Perspectives*, pp. 17–35. John Benjamins.

certain borrowings. Future research may include computational corpus analysis or sociolinguistic surveys to explore speakers' attitudes toward borrowed words.

Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Direct Borrowings

Direct borrowings are those adopted without significant alteration. In English, such examples include *café* (from French), *piano* (from Italian), *robot* (from Czech). In Uzbek, *internet*, *market*, *manager* are direct borrowings from English. They maintain their original pronunciation and meaning, showing minimal adaptation.

4.2 Indirect Borrowings

Indirect borrowings occur when a word enters a language through an intermediary. For example, the Uzbek word *falsafa* (philosophy) came from Arabic through Persian, while the English word *sugar* reached English through Old French and Medieval Latin. These layers of transmission often result in slight phonetic or semantic shifts.

Examples:

Language Borrowed Word Origin Path			Meaning
English	<i>sugar</i>	Sanskrit → Arabic → Old French → English	Sweet substance
Uzbek	<i>falsafa</i>	Greek (<i>philosophia</i>) → Arabic → Uzbek	Philosophy

Indirect borrowings highlight how intermediary languages shape both form and meaning. For instance, Arabic served as a major conduit for classical terminology entering Uzbek, while French influenced English heavily during the Norman period (Weinreich, 1953)⁹.

4.3 Hybrid Borrowings

Hybrid words combine a borrowed element with a native one. In Uzbek, examples include *kompyuterchi* (computer + suffix -chi, denoting a person) and *internetlashtirish* (internet + lash + tirish). In English, hybridization is less common but appears in compounds like *speedometer* (English + Greek) or *television* (Greek + Latin). Such forms demonstrate creative integration.

4.4 Semantic Borrowings

Semantic borrowing involves the adoption of meaning rather than form. For instance, Uzbek *lider* previously existed as a borrowed word but acquired an additional sense meaning “political or business leader” under English influence. Similarly, English *virus* extended from a medical term to mean “computer virus,” illustrating metaphorical semantic borrowing.

4.5 Sociolinguistic Aspects

⁹ Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. Mouton.

Borrowing often reflects cultural prestige, technological influence, or social change. English dominates modern global communication, which explains the influx of Anglicisms into Uzbek. Conversely, Uzbek borrowings reflect its historical ties with Arabic, Persian, and Russian cultures.

Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Direct Borrowings

Direct borrowings are those adopted without significant alteration. In English, such examples include *café* (from French), *piano* (from Italian), *robot* (from Czech). In Uzbek, *internet*, *market*, *manager* are direct borrowings from English. They maintain their original pronunciation and meaning, showing minimal adaptation.

Examples:

Language	Source	Borrowed Word	Origin	Adaptation	Meaning
English	French	<i>restaurant</i> , <i>ballet</i>	<i>garage</i> , Fr.	Slight phonetic	Culinary, lifestyle terms
Uzbek	English	<i>kompyuter</i> , <i>bank</i>	<i>internet</i> , Eng.	Orthographic adjustment	Modern tech, finance

In Uzbek, such borrowings often undergo orthographic adaptation (*kompyuter*, *internet*), aligning with Uzbek phonological patterns (Ergashev, 2018). English direct loans, in contrast, maintain near-original spelling due to the orthographic flexibility of English (Durkin, 2014)¹⁰.

4.2 Indirect Borrowings

Indirect borrowings occur when a word enters a language through an intermediary. For example, the Uzbek word *falsafa* (philosophy) came from Arabic through Persian, while the English word *sugar* reached English through Old French and Medieval Latin. These layers of transmission often result in slight phonetic or semantic shifts.

4.3 Hybrid Borrowings

Hybrid words combine a borrowed element with a native one. In Uzbek, examples include *kompyuterchi* (computer + suffix *-chi*, denoting a person) and *internetlashtirish* (internet + *lash* + *tirish*). In English, hybridization is less common but appears in compounds like *speedometer* (English + Greek) or *television* (Greek + Latin). Such forms demonstrate creative integration.

Examples:

Language	Hybrid Form	Structure	Source	Function
Uzbek	<i>kompyuterchi</i>	Eng. root + Uzbek suffix <i>-chi</i>	English	Denoting a person's occupation
Uzbek	<i>marketlar</i>	Eng. root + Uzbek plural <i>-lar</i>	English	Pluralization

¹⁰ Durkin, P. (2014). *Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords in English*. Oxford University Press.

Language Hybrid Form Structure

English *speedometer* English + Greek root

Source Function

Greek Compound formation

This hybridization demonstrates linguistic creativity and adaptability. It also illustrates how loanwords integrate semantically while remaining morphologically dynamic (Haugen, 1950; Gómez Capuz, 1997)¹¹.

4.4 Semantic Borrowings

Semantic borrowing involves the adoption of meaning rather than form. For instance, Uzbek *lider* previously existed as a borrowed word but acquired an additional sense meaning “political or business leader” under English influence. Similarly, English *virus* extended from a medical term to mean “computer virus,” illustrating metaphorical semantic borrowing.

4.5 Sociolinguistic Aspects

Borrowing often reflects cultural prestige, technological influence, or social change. English dominates modern global communication, which explains the influx of Anglicisms into Uzbek. Conversely, Uzbek borrowings reflect its historical ties with Arabic, Persian, and Russian cultures.

Conclusion

The comparative study of English and Uzbek loanwords has revealed that lexical borrowing is a multifaceted linguistic process reflecting both historical contacts and modern globalization. Despite belonging to different language families, English (a Germanic language) and Uzbek (a Turkic language) demonstrate similar mechanisms of word assimilation, adaptation, and semantic development.

The analysis showed that loanwords can be classified into four major types — direct, indirect, hybrid, and semantic borrowings — each illustrating a specific pattern of linguistic interaction:

1. **Direct borrowings** preserve the original structure of foreign words, indicating prestige or the cultural dominance of the donor language (e.g., *restaurant*, *kompyuter*).
2. **Indirect borrowings** undergo modification through intermediary languages, which adds layers of historical depth (*falsafa*, *sugar*).
3. **Hybrid borrowings** reflect the creative capacity of languages to combine native and foreign elements, showing how Uzbek integrates English roots through suffixation (*kompyuterchi*, *marketlar*).
4. **Semantic borrowings** demonstrate conceptual transfer, particularly in fields such as technology and media (*virus*, *oyna* in computing contexts).

¹¹ Haugen, E. (1950). The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.

Gómez Capuz, J. (1997). Towards a Typological Classification of Linguistic Borrowing. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 10, 81–94.

From a linguistic perspective, both English and Uzbek exhibit phonological adaptation, morphological assimilation, and semantic extension, which together form the foundation for successful lexical integration. However, the degree of adaptation differs — Uzbek tends to naturalize loanwords more visibly, while English maintains closer ties to the original form due to its flexible orthography and historical borrowing tradition.

The findings confirm earlier theoretical models proposed by **Haugen (1950)**, **Weinreich (1953)**, and **Haspelmath (2009)**, yet also highlight new patterns specific to modern Uzbek influenced by digital communication and globalization. The appearance of hybrid and semantic borrowings such as *onlayn*, *bloggerlik*, and *fayllash* illustrates how English continues to shape contemporary Uzbek vocabulary.

From a practical point of view, the classification of loanwords can be used in:

- **Lexicographic studies**, for improving bilingual dictionaries;
- **Language teaching**, especially in English and Uzbek linguistic courses;
- **Translation studies**, to ensure accurate rendering of borrowed and hybrid terms.

Finally, the study emphasizes that loanwords should not be viewed merely as “foreign intrusions,” but as linguistic evidence of cultural dialogue. They expand the expressive potential of both languages and serve as bridges connecting different civilizations and knowledge systems.

REFERENCES

1. Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.
2. Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.
3. Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. University of California Press.
4. Haspelmath, M. (2009). Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, 35–54.
5. Durkin, P. (2014). *Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords in English*. Oxford University Press.
6. Crystal, D. (2019). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Ergashev, A. (2018). O‘zbek tilidagi o‘zlashma so‘zlarning tasnifi. *Filologiya masalalari*, 2(1), 45–52.
8. Rahmatullaev, Sh. (2000). *O‘zbek tili leksikologiyasi*. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti.

9. Poplack, S., & Sankoff, D. (1984). Borrowing: The synchrony of integration. *Linguistics*, 22(1), 99–135.
10. Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. University of Illinois Press.
11. Hasanov, B. (2022). English lexical borrowings in modern Uzbek media. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 3(4), 56–64.