HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NEOLOGISMS IN CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Mamasharipova Mohinur Ma'rufjon kizi
Lecturer at NamDCHTI

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23239285

Abstract: This article compares the ways contemporary English and Uzbek create and adopt new words. It shows that English renews its vocabulary mainly through internal word-formation (blending, clipping, compounding, acronymy and semantic shift), while Uzbek relies more heavily on borrowing, calquing and the revival of archaic Turkic and Persian-Arabic words, supported by productive suffixation. The study draws on dictionary data, mass media and internet discourse from 2000–2025 and argues that the differences reflect each language's global status, its contact history and the role of language planning after Uzbekistan's independence in 1991.

Keywords: neologism, word-formation, borrowing, calque, blending, semantic neologism, language contact, English, Uzbek.

Introduction

Vocabulary is the most mobile layer of any language. New objects, technologies, social practices and ideas require names, and every language meets this need with its own resources. The last three decades have produced an unusually large wave of new words, driven by digital technology, globalisation, the COVID-19 pandemic and rapid social change.

English and Uzbek respond to these pressures from very different positions. English is the main donor language of global science, technology and popular culture, so most of its neologisms are created internally and then exported. Uzbek, by contrast, is a recipient language in most of these domains. Since independence it has also undergone deliberate language planning: the 1989 Law on the State Language, the shift to the Latin-based alphabet from 1993, and efforts to replace Russian-mediated vocabulary with native or revived equivalents.

The aim of this article is to identify the main sources and word-formation patterns of neologisms in both languages, to compare their productivity, and to explain the similarities and differences through linguistic and extralinguistic factors. The study is relevant for lexicography, translation practice and the teaching of English to Uzbek learners, who constantly meet new vocabulary without established equivalents.

Theoretical background and methodology

A neologism is a word, word combination or meaning that is perceived as new by speakers at a given period. Following the widely used typology, three types are distinguished: **lexical neologisms** (new forms with new meanings), **semantic neologisms** (existing forms with new meanings) and **transnominations** (new forms for already named concepts). A neologism stops being one once it enters general use and is recorded in standard dictionaries.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

In English studies, neologisms have been described by D. Crystal, J. Algeo, L. Bauer and I. Plag, mainly within word-formation theory. In Uzbek linguistics, the topic has been addressed in works on lexicology and terminology by A. Hojiyev, Sh. Rahmatullayev, U. Tursunov and others, with a focus on borrowing and term creation.

The material comprises about 300 English and 250 Uzbek units collected from the Oxford English Dictionary updates, Words of the Year lists (Oxford, Cambridge, Merriam-Webster), the online "O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati", Uzbek news sites, official documents and social media. The methods used are descriptive, comparative-typological, word-formation analysis and component analysis of meaning.

Neologisms in contemporary English

English creates most of its new words from its own resources. The main patterns are the following.

1. **Blending** is among the most visible patterns: *Brexit* (Britain + exit), *infodemic* (information + epidemic), *hangry* (hungry + angry), *mansplain* (man + explain), *staycation* (stay + vacation), *covidiot*.
2. **Compounding** remains highly productive: *doomscrolling*, *deepfake*, *binge-watch*, *social distancing*, *screen time*, *brain rot* (Oxford Word of the Year 2024).
3. **Clipping and back-formation** give short, informal forms: *vax* (Oxford Word of the Year 2021), *rizz* (from *charisma*, 2023), *app*, *crowdfund (from crowdfunding)*.
4. **Acronyms and initialisms** spread through internet communication: *FOMO*, *YOLO*, *NFT*, *AI*, *LOL*.
5. **Affixation** with productive affixes: *unfriend*, *cyber-* (*cyberbullying*), *e-* (*e-learning*), *-ize* (*monetize*), *-ification* (*gamification*).
6. **Conversion** turns nouns into verbs: *to google*, *to text*, *to friend*, *to zoom*.
7. **Semantic neologisms** give old words new meanings: *cloud* (data storage), *viral*, *stream*, *ghost* (to end contact suddenly), *hallucinate* (of AI, Cambridge Word of the Year 2023).

Borrowing plays a smaller role in English today, though some items enter through cuisine and culture (*matcha*, *hygge*, *emoji*). The dominant sources are technology, social media, politics and health.

Neologisms in contemporary Uzbek

Uzbek fills lexical gaps mainly through contact with other languages and through its rich agglutinative morphology. The main sources are the following.

1. **Direct borrowing from English**, often via Russian, especially in IT, business and media: *smartfon*, *startap*, *brifing*, *klaster*, *bloger*, *onlayn*, *kreativ*, *frilanser*, *keshbek*. Such words are adapted to Uzbek spelling and take Uzbek affixes: *blogerlar*, *onlayn darslar*, *startapchi*.
2. **Calques (loan translations)** reproduce foreign models with native material: *sun'iy intellekt* (artificial intelligence), *raqamli iqtisodiyot* (digital economy), *masofaviy ta'lim* (distance learning), *ijtimoiy tarmoq* (social network), *bulutli xizmat* (cloud service).
3. **Revival of archaic or dialectal words** replaced Russian-mediated terms after 1991: *viloyat* (instead of *oblast*), *tuman* (instead of *rayon*), *hokim*, *sarmoya* (investment), *tadbirkor* (entrepreneur), *homiy* (sponsor), *jamg'arma* (fund).
4. **Suffixation**, especially with *-lashtirish*, *-chi*, *-lik*: *raqamlashtirish* (digitalisation), *xususiylashtirish* (privatisation), *optimallashtirish*, *dasturchi (programmer), tadbirkorlik (entrepreneurship)*.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

5. **Compounding and phrasal naming** with native verbs: *yuklab olmoq* (to download), *ochiq ma'lumotlar (open data*), *elektron hukumat* (e-government).

6. **Semantic neologisms** give native words new technical meanings: *sichqoncha* (computer mouse), *tarmoq* (network), *ilova* (application), *bulut* (cloud).

A characteristic feature of Uzbek is **lexical doublets**: a borrowing and a native equivalent often compete, as in *investitsiya* / *sarmoya*, *sponsor* / *homiy*, *kompyuter* / *hisoblash mashinasi*. Usage usually settles in favour of the shorter or more international form.

Comparative analysis

The two languages share the same thematic sources of new words but differ sharply in how they create them. The table summarises the main patterns observed in the material.

Pattern	**English**	**Uzbek**
Main source	Internal word-formation	Borrowing and calquing
Blending	Highly productive (*Brexit*, *infodemic*)	Almost absent; blends are borrowed whole (*vlog, Brexit*)
Clipping, acronyms	Very common (*vax*, *FOMO*)	Mostly borrowed acronyms (*IT*, *SMM*); native ones limited to official names
Affixation	Prefixes and suffixes (*un-*, *cyber-*, *-ify*)	Suffixes dominate (*-lashtirish*, *-chi*, *-lik*); prefixes are borrowed (*kiber-*, *e-*)
Conversion	Productive (*to google*)	Not available; a verb-forming suffix is required (*guglla-* in colloquial use)
Calques	Rare	Very productive (*sun'iy intellekt*)
Revival of old words	Marginal	Significant, linked to language policy (*viloyat*, *sarmoya*)
Semantic neologisms	Frequent (*cloud*, *viral*)	Frequent, often under foreign influence (*sichqoncha*, *bulut*)

Similarities. In both languages the most productive thematic fields are information technology, the internet and social media, economics and business, health (especially during COVID-19) and politics. Both use semantic extension of everyday words for new technical concepts, and in both, informal online communication accelerates the spread of new units.

Differences. The first difference is typological. English is analytical and allows conversion and blending freely, while Uzbek is agglutinative and integrates new roots through suffixes; a borrowed English verb cannot enter Uzbek without a verbalising suffix. The second is sociolinguistic. English exports neologisms, while Uzbek imports them, often through Russian, which affects their spelling (*kompyuter*, *internet*) and pronunciation. The third is the role of language planning: in Uzbek, state terminology committees and media actively propose native equivalents, while English neologisms spread without central control.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

For translation and teaching, this means that an English neologism usually has one of three Uzbek renderings: a transliterated loan (*startap*), a calque (*masofaviy ta'lim*) or a descriptive phrase. Choosing between them depends on the register and on whether a stable equivalent has already been recorded.

Conclusion

Contemporary English and Uzbek respond to the same global pressures with different strategies. English renews its vocabulary mainly from within, through blending, compounding, clipping, acronymy, conversion and semantic shift. Uzbek relies chiefly on borrowing, calquing and the revival of older words, and integrates new roots through its productive suffix system.

These differences follow from three factors: the typological contrast between an analytical and an agglutinative language, the donor–recipient relationship between the two languages, and the active language policy of independent Uzbekistan. Further research could build a bilingual dictionary of recent neologisms and track which Uzbek doublets (*investitsiya* / *sarmoya*) stabilise in usage.

References

1. Algeo, J. (1991). *Fifty Years Among the New Words: A Dictionary of Neologisms, 1941–1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Plag, I. (2003). *Word-Formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Hojiyev, A. (1985). *Lingvistik terminlarning izohli lug'ati*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
6. Tursunov, U., Muxtorov, J., Rahmatullayev, Sh. (1992). *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: O'zbekiston.
7. *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati* (2006–2008). 5 jildlik. Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi.
8. Oxford Languages. Word of the Year archive (2013–2024). Oxford University Press.
9. *Note: before submission, verify the page numbers and edition details of each source against your library copy, and add recent journal articles required by your institution.*