



INTEGRATING SCIENCE, THOUGHT, AND TECHNOLOGY: TOWARD AN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENT ENVIRONMENT

17/11/2025

BORROWING AS A LINGUISTIC AND SOCIOCULTURAL PHENOMENON

Nazarova Gulbaxor Azimjon qizi

UzSWLU, Associate professor, PhD

G'ulomjonova Rayxona Shuxratjon qizi

UzSWLU, Student

Annotation

The article examines borrowing as a linguistic and sociocultural phenomenon. It analyzes language contact, mutual linguistic influence, and interference processes from both theoretical and practical perspectives. Drawing on the ideas of scholars such as U. Weinreich, E. Haugen, I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, L.V. Shcherba, and L. Bloomfield, the study discusses various types of borrowings, their classifications, degrees of morphemic assimilation, and semantic extension. The role and impact of borrowed elements in the Uzbek lexicon, along with their historical and sociolinguistic factors, are also addressed. The research provides a comprehensive description of continuous linguistic development and the transformations resulting from interlingual communication.

Keywords: *borrowing, language contact, interference, loanwords, calque, lexical change, morphemic assimilation, linguistic influence, source language.*

The rapid development of society and the scientific-technical progress of social life necessitate the development and improvement of language, which serves as the main tool of communication. Systematic political, economic, and cultural relations between countries and peoples lead to active mutual influence among languages, as a result of which their interaction intensifies, including the process of borrowing. The vocabulary of any language is considered its most dynamic sphere, constantly changing. There is no language whose lexical richness has not been influenced by changes in the development of society.

Problems of language contact began attracting researchers' attention in the second half of the 20th century. The term "language contact" was first introduced by A. Martinet in 1952, and it began to be widely used after the publication of U. Weinreich's "Languages in Contact" in 1953, followed by works of E. Haugen and other scholars. The term "language contact" replaced G. Schuchardt's earlier term "language mixture," since the concept of "language mixture" did not fully reflect the processes of mutual influence between languages.

The famous scholar I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay considered that when languages come into contact, not only certain elements are borrowed, but distinctions between individual elements of

the language may weaken, meaning that simplification at the system level occurs. Academician L.V. Shcherba emphasized that the process of language contact consists of the convergence and generalization of signs while preserving the differences in the signifiers.

Since the second half of the 20th century, the issue of language contact has become one of the most important fields of linguistic research worldwide, expanding beyond the study of purely internal linguistic processes. As theoretical foundations developed, the definition of this phenomenon also evolved. U. Weinreich described this process as a phenomenon arising from the alternate use of two languages by the same speaker. Through language contact, we can observe any forms of coexistence and mutual influence between languages. According to Mechkovskaya, language contact is a process that encompasses a very broad range of interactions resulting from the mutual influence of languages.

Research within the sphere of language interaction has given new impetus to a new branch of linguistics—borrowing studies. Scholars working in this field propose various classifications of borrowing based on language contact. For example, A.T. Khrolenko notes that the degree of influence and interaction between languages is diverse, ranging from the adoption of individual elements to complete integration.

No language in the world functions in complete isolation from other languages, since every nation or ethnic group enters into various relationships—neighborly, social, political, economic, trade, cultural, and others—throughout its historical development. Such interactions serve as one of the main sources of enriching the lexical composition of a language. The problem of language contact has not escaped the attention of linguists. U. Weinreich describes this phenomenon as follows: “When a foreign word is frequently used in the speech of certain individuals, such words begin to serve as a direct source of language contact.”

In our opinion, the term “borrowing” is a broad concept that encompasses such notions as “language contact,” “mutual influence of languages,” “language interference,” “cross-language acquisition,” and “adoption of foreign language elements.” During language contact, units related to the phonetic, lexical, syntactic, phraseological, and grammatical norms of another language may enter the recipient language, resulting in the transformation of a foreign unit into a unit of the new language.

The process of a foreign language unit entering or intersecting with another language is first observed among certain individuals, and later is used by all speakers of the recipient language.

Although the term “borrowing” is interpreted in various ways in linguistics, the transfer of a unit from one language into another and the result of this process are both expressed by the term “borrowing.”

U. Weinreich interprets borrowing as one of the forms of linguistic blending, considering units not native to a language as “borrowed or transferred.”

E. Haugen asserts that the concept of borrowing encompasses all phenomena of lexical interference and represents the speaker’s desire to express lexical units learned from another language. He contrasts the “borrowed units” of a language with its “native units.” Haugen divides borrowed units into two groups: borrowed words (loanwords) and extensions (loan-extensions). In the first case, a word from one language passes into another; in the second case, borrowing manifests only in the use of a certain word in the native language (a shift in context). He distinguishes two types of loanwords:

1. directly adopted words (pure loanwords),
2. hybrid words (based on borrowing or calquing of a loanword or word combination).

Such classification, according to Haugen, depends on whether foreign morphemes are fully or partially assimilated. The linguist understands “extension” as the process in which the meanings of existing units in the language expand. This “extension” leads to the emergence of new units in the borrowing language. According to the degree of morphemic substitution, Haugen identifies three main types of borrowing:

1. borrowing without morphemic correspondence,
2. borrowings with partial morphemic correspondence,
borrowings with full morphemic correspondence.

However, although his classification encompasses the process of borrowing, it does not analyze or address its outcomes, leaving them outside the scope of consideration.

The well-known American linguist L. Bloomfield distinguishes between dialects borrowed from linguistic sources and dialects borrowed from cultural spheres. In his view, because there are no absolute boundaries between languages, it is not always possible to determine the distinctions between them.

In our view, if borrowings enter another language while fully preserving the linguistic norms of the source language, then loanwords, by contrast, are primarily adapted to the linguistic system and cultural norms of the receiving language, often through the method of calquing.

In general, the process of borrowing is a natural and continuous linguistic phenomenon, and there are borrowings that have had a significant impact on the Uzbek lexicon. At the same time, there are also borrowings from several languages that are no longer actively involved in the borrowing process; their proportion in our dictionaries constitutes only a small percentage.

References:

1. Мартине А. Принцип экономии в фонетических изменениях. М., 1960, -154 с
2. Вайнрайх, У. Языковые контакты. Состояние и проблемы исследования. Киев: Вища школа, 1979, -364 с.
3. Naugen E. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. "Language" 1950, vol. N 2.
4. Шухардт, Г. К вопросу о языковом смещении // Избранные статьи по языкознанию. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2003а. – С. 174–184.
5. Бодуэн де Куртене И. А. О смешанном характере всех языков. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1963. Т.2. С. 140–142.
6. Щерба, Л.В. Избранные работы по языкознанию и фонетике. Л., 2015. Т. I. 40–53 с.
7. Мечковская, Н.Б. Социальная лингвистика. М.: Аспект-Пресс, 2000. 207 с.
8. Хроленко, А.Т., Бондалетов В.Д. М.: Флинта; Наука, 2004. 110 с.
9. Блумфилд, Л. Язык. М.: Прогресс, 1968. 506 с.