

WORD-FORMATION FEATURES OF HYBRID WORDS FORMED ON THE BASIS OF ANGLICISMS IN THE ECONOMIC VOCABULARY OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Abdukakharova Gulnoza Abduvahobovna

Independent Researcher, Termez State University

E-mail: gulnoza.abdukaxarova@mail.ru

Abstract: The article examines Anglicism-based hybrid lexical units emerging in Uzbek economic vocabulary. The study aims to identify the word-formation patterns of these hybrids, describe their structural and semantic features, and clarify their functional potential in economic discourse. The analysis treats affixation and composition as the main mechanisms of hybrid formation. In particular, the productivity of affixational patterns such as X+chi, X+lik, X+lash, and X+li is discussed, along with the terminologization potential of compositional structures including N+N, Adj+N, and N+Adj. The findings show that hybrid units differ from ordinary loanwords because they generate new nominations through the derivational adaptation of a borrowed component within the Uzbek word-formation system. This tendency is associated with communicative economy in the economic domain, rapid naming needs, and the demand for unified normative spelling and usage criteria. The paper also proposes practical criteria for distinguishing hybrid units from barbarisms, calquing, and code-switching in lexicographic and terminological practice.

Key words: anglicism, hybrid unit, economic vocabulary, word formation, affixation, composition, terminologization, derivational pattern, nomination.

Introduction. In recent decades, the lexical composition of the Uzbek language has been undergoing noticeable renewal, especially under the influence of the economic and business spheres. As linguists acknowledge, there is virtually no language in which borrowed vocabulary is not found in practice [9]; [8]. This phenomenon is closely linked to socio-economic development, the expansion of market relations, the intensification of international trade ties, and the strengthening of financial integration. Accordingly, new terms are regularly emerging in Uzbek economic discourse, while some traditional units are shifting into the passive layer.

One of the important sources of lexical enrichment is borrowing. The phenomenon of borrowing is interpreted in two ways: in a broad sense, it is regarded as a factor that expands the vocabulary, whereas in a narrow sense it refers to the entry of a foreign lexeme into another language, its phonetic, graphic, and grammatical adaptation, and, as a result, its stabilization within the new language system [3, 111]. In economic lexis, this process is closely intertwined with global communication and international exchange of experience. However, at the present stage, not only fully assimilated borrowings are observed, but also an increasing number of hybrid derivatives formed on the basis of Anglicism stems through Uzbek word-formation means. This indicates that the influx of Anglicisms in economic discourse is intensifying and that word-formation models are operating more actively.

The purpose of this article is to analyze hybrid words in Uzbek economic vocabulary formed on the basis of Anglicisms, to identify their main word-formation models, and to describe their structural and semantic features.

To achieve the aim of the article, the following objectives were set:

- 1) to identify hybrid words formed on the basis of anglicisms in uzbek economic vocabulary and compile an illustrative corpus;
- 2) to classify the word-formation models of these hybrid units and assess their productivity;
- 3) to describe the structural-semantic and functional features of hybrid words and determine the factors influencing their use in economic discourse.

Literature review. From this perspective, Anglicisms related to economics in the Uzbek language constitute a distinct layer. The term “*anglicism*” is derived from Medieval Latin *anglicus* (“English”) and the suffix *-ism*, which denotes a practice or quality, and thus refers to an “*English-like*” linguistic unit. In the encyclopedic dictionary by F.Brockhaus and I.Efron, an anglicism is interpreted as “a feature of the English language transferred into another language” [2, 25]. The term denotes words, phrases, and constructions borrowed from English into other languages and is generally observed more frequently from the 17th century, when the influence of English intensified.

At the same time, scholarly literature explains the term “*anglicism*” in two ways – **broad** and **narrow**. In the **broad** sense, according to V.M.Aristova, “*anglicism*” is a linguistic notion in which the decisive criterion is not national or ethnic characteristics but the source language [1, 13]; therefore, this group also includes words borrowed from American, Australian, Indian, and other varieties of English. In the **narrow** sense, however, an Anglicism is understood as a word belonging only to the original English lexicon [4, 96].

Thus, the role of economy-related Anglicisms in Uzbek is determined by the need to provide scientific analysis of how they serve to name and classify contemporary economic processes, to develop a terminology base aligned with international economic communication, and to ensure the stability and normative standardization of the terminological system.

Research Methodology. Today, the study of anglicisms on the basis of data from several languages remains one of the actively developing areas in linguistics. Existing research is largely focused on identifying how anglicisms adapt to a particular recipient language, while comparatively less attention is paid to revealing the general patterns that govern the functioning of English borrowings within the language system as a whole. Studies by Yu.Balakina (2011) [6] and J.Scherling (2013) [10] may serve as examples of such work.

In the first study, based on anglicisms used in blogs, the formal and semantic features of the adaptation of borrowings into Russian and German were analyzed (Balakina, 2011, pp.13, 215). The second study aimed to identify the specific features of the graphic, phonological, and morphological assimilation of anglicisms in German and Japanese (Scherling, 2013). From the perspective of language coverage, a relatively broader approach can be observed in the work of G.Bergh and S.Ohlander (2012) [7, 283].

The issue of anglicisms has not been overlooked in Uzbek linguistics either: scholars such as D.S.Kulmamatov, A.E.Xudayqulov, E.M.Davlatova, R.Daniyarov, and A.Turaxodjayeva have examined it from different angles. In particular, A.E.Xudayqulov, drawing on the analysis of new anglicisms, proposes their systematization as follows: new anglicisms are divided into anglicisms as language borrowings and anglicisms as barbarisms, exoticisms, foreign-language insertions, and calques [5, 24].

Analysis and results. A proper analysis of hybrid derivatives first requires a clear delimitation of the concept of a “hybrid word.” In substantiating this concept academically, it is important to show that it is formed at the intersection of language-contact studies and word-formation theory. In classical approaches to language contact, particularly in the works of U. Weinreich and E. Haugen, it is emphasized that borrowings are not limited to entering a language as ready-made lexemes; rather, they can be reprocessed through the recipient language’s internal derivational resources and generate new formations (Weinreich, 1953; Haugen, 1950; 1953). Consequently, if within a single unit the source-language stem combines with derivational markers or components of the recipient language to produce a new derivative, such a phenomenon goes beyond an ordinary “loanword” and is interpreted as hybrid word formation. The defining feature of a hybrid word is reflected in its morphemic structure:

- 1) the stem comes from one language (in your case, most often an English Anglicism stem),
- 2) whereas the derivational marker belongs to the recipient language (an Uzbek affix, and sometimes an Uzbek component).

This reflects derivational integration, meaning that the borrowed stem becomes incorporated into Uzbek word-formation patterns and begins to generate new nominations. For example:

brend + **-lash** → *brendlash*; (*balanslash*, *litsenziyalash*);

aksio+ **-dor** → *aksiodor*;

lizing + **-chi** → *lizingchi*; (*dollarchi*, *bizneschi*, *investorchi*);

broker + **-lik** → *brokerlik*; (*dilerlik*, *dizaynerlik*, *liderlik*);

dollar+ **-furush** → *dollarfurush*.

In these examples, the “english stem” is retained, whereas the grammatical and derivational type of the derived unit is determined by the Uzbek affixal system.

Difference from an “ordinary borrowing”:

In an ordinary borrowing, a unit enters the language as a ready-made lexical item (e.g., *akkaunt*, *diler*, *marketing*, *kredit*, *investor*, *barter*). In a hybrid word, however, the focus is not on a ready-made unit but on the process of word formation itself.

As evidence, the following distinguishing features are presented:

- 1) word-formation motivation: in economic discourse, a need arises to name a new subject, process, or institution, and the language creates a compact derived form: *startup* → *startapchi*; *brend* → *brendlash*;
- 2) patternedness (model-based formation): the derivatives do not remain isolated cases; rather, they become productive patterns: *X+chi*, *X+lik*, *X+lash*, *X+li*;
- 3) derivational nests (word-family clusters): several derivatives accumulate around a single base: *brend* → *brendli*, *brendlash*, and (if necessary) *brendlashuv*. This indicates that the borrowing has been fully integrated into the language system.

Inter-component integration in compound formations:

Hybridization is not limited to affixation. If an English component combines with an Uzbek component to provide an economic nomination, this also constitutes a form of hybrid word formation: *onlayn to'lov*, *startup loyiha*, *marketing bo'limi*, *barter qilmoq*, *biznes reja* and so on.

In these units, the degree of terminologization varies; however, what they share is the systematic combination of components belonging to different languages within a single nominative unit.

Delineation: hybrid words and related phenomena. For scholarly precision, it is necessary to distinguish a “hybrid word” from the following:

- 1) barbarism / foreign-language insertion: a foreign word is used in the text as it is, but it does not produce derivatives with Uzbek word-forming means;
- 2) calquing: not the form but the semantic (conceptual) model is translated;
- 3) code-switching: a language shift occurs in speech, but this does not necessarily imply the immediate creation of a new derivational unit.

In composition-based hybrid formations, English and Uzbek components combine within a single nominative unit and satisfy naming needs in economic discourse. The focus here is not on accepting a ready-made borrowing, but on creating a concise nomination on the basis of material from two languages. Accordingly, hybridity is not limited to affixation; rather, units such as *onlayn to'lov*, *startup loyiha*, *marketing bo'limi*, *biznes reja*, and *barter bitimi* represent a clear manifestation of inter-component integration. In such formations, the structural pattern, model-based character, and degree of terminologization serve as the main criteria, while terminologization is graded between stability and context dependence.

Models	Brief description	Examples (Uzbek forms kept)	Degree of terminologization
N+N	The 2nd component is the head; the 1st component specifies the field/specialization.	<i>startup loyiha</i> , <i>marketing bo'limi</i> , <i>biznes reja</i> , <i>investor portfel</i> , <i>diler tarmoq</i>	Often high; becomes stabilized through repeated use.
Adj+N	The 1st component denotes the method/channel; it is quickly understood.	<i>onlayn to'lov</i> , <i>mobil bank</i> , <i>elektron hisob</i> , <i>virtual hamyon</i> , <i>digital xizmat</i>	Can be very high.
N+Adj	More context-dependent; stabilization depends on normalization/standardization.	<i>brendli mahsulot</i>	Medium or low; may increase if it becomes widespread.
Pattern productivity	Multiplication based on a template indicates integration.	“X bo'limi”: <i>marketing</i> , <i>PR</i> , <i>HR</i> ; “X reja”: <i>biznes</i> , <i>marketing</i> ; “X to'lov”: <i>onlayn</i> , <i>mobil</i>	If the template strengthens, terminologization accelerates.

As the table shows, composition-based hybrid units do not remain isolated examples; rather, they proliferate on the basis of productive patterns, which indicates their gradual assimilation into the language system. For scientific precision, they should be distinguished from closely related phenomena: in barbarisms, a foreign word occurs in its original form and does not yield systematic derivatives; in calquing, it is not the form but the semantic model that is translated; and in code-switching, a shift between languages takes place, but this does not necessarily imply the immediate creation of a new nominative unit.

Conclusion/Recommendations.



This article analyzed hybrid lexical units in Uzbek economic vocabulary that emerge on the basis of English borrowings, with the aim of identifying their leading formation patterns and describing their structural and semantic features. Within the scope of the study, a set of Anglicism based units was compiled, and their word formation mechanisms, domains of use, and functional roles were presented in a systematic manner.

The analysis shows that hybrid units, unlike ordinary loanwords, are not limited to the direct adoption of ready made lexemes. On the contrary, the borrowed component aligns with the internal word formation resources of Uzbek and produces new nominative units. The distinctive feature of a hybrid unit becomes clear in its morphemic structure: the lexical base is taken from a donor language, whereas the derivational marker is shaped through the system of the recipient language.

The productivity of affixational patterns, including forms such as X+chi, X+lik, X+lash, and X+li, and the emergence of derivational families around a single base, confirm the growing derivational adaptation of borrowed components. At the same time, hybridization is not restricted to affixation. The combination of English and Uzbek components within one nominative unit meets the needs of communicative economy and rapid naming in economic discourse.

Among compositional hybrids, patterns such as N+N, Adj+N, and N+Adj stand out. Their degree of terminologization varies depending on stable usage, recognition within the field, and contextual dependence. The widespread use of templates like “X department”, “X plan”, and “X payment” also indicates the need for unified criteria for normative spelling and practical usage of terms.

Practical recommendations:

First, it is necessary to maintain a regularly updated corpus of Anglicism based hybrid units on the basis of economic discourse materials and to label them by formation pattern and domain. Second, it is advisable to develop normative spelling and usage criteria for units with a high degree of terminologization and for productive affixational patterns.

Third, introducing criteria into lexicographic practice that distinguish hybrid units from barbarisms, calquing, and code switching will make the process of term regulation more precise.

Therefore, Anglicism based hybrid units are forming as a systematic process in Uzbek economic vocabulary, and the activity of their affixational and compositional patterns reflects the current dynamics of word formation.

References:

1. Аристова В.М. К истории англо-русских литературных связей и заимствований // Семантические единицы в категории русского языка в диахронии. – Калининград, 1997. – С.12-19.
2. Брокгауз Ф., Ефрон И. Иллюстрированный энциклопедический словарь. – М.: Эксмо, 2006. – 986 с.
3. Лобковская Л.П. Иноязычные слова в лексической системе языка // Вестник Челябинского гос. уни-та. – 2008. – № 37 (138). – С. 109-120.
4. Мельникова А.И. Изучение англицизмов в курсе «Современный русский язык» // Русский язык в школе. – 1991. – № 2. – С.95-101.



5. Худайкулов А.Э. Рус ва ўзбек расмий ҳужжатларида инглизча ўзлашмалар (ўтмиш ва ҳозирги замон ҳолати): Филол. фан. б. фалс. док. (PhD) ... дисс. автореф. – Тошкент, 2020. – 56 б.
6. Balakina J. Anglicisms in Russian and German Blogs: A Comparative Analysis. – Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011. – 264 p.
7. Bergh G., Ohlander S. English direct loans in European football lexis // Anglicization of European Lexis / ed. by C.Furiassi, V.Pulcini, F.Rodríguez González. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012. – P.281-304.
8. Haspelmath M. Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues // Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook. – Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009. – P. 35–54.
9. Hoffer B.L. Language Borrowing and Language Diffusion: an Overview // Intercultural Communication Studies. 2002. – XI-2. – P.1-36.
10. Scherling J. Holistic loanword integration and loanword acceptance: A comparative study of anglicisms in German and Japanese // AAA – Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik. – 2013. – Vol. 38, № 1. – P.37-51.