

THE ROLE OF GLOBALIZATION, LANGUAGE CONTACTS AND INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION IN THE FORMATION OF BORROWED NEOLOGISMS

Jovlijeva Laylo Farkhod qizi – Independent researcher, Department of German Language and Literature, Karshi State University

Abstract. This article examines the role of globalization, language contacts and international communication in the formation of borrowed neologisms in German and Uzbek. The study shows that new lexical units emerge under the influence of technological development, business, education, migration, digital media and mass culture. Special attention is paid to English as a major donor language and to the different ways in which borrowings are adapted in German and Uzbek. The article also discusses nominative need, discourse activity, frequency of use and normative adaptation as key factors in the stabilization of borrowed neologisms.

Keywords: globalization, language contacts, international communication, borrowed neologisms, donor language, English borrowings, lexical adaptation, normative integration.

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается роль глобализации, языковых контактов и международной коммуникации в формировании заимствованных неологизмов в немецком и узбекском языках. Показано, что новые лексические единицы возникают под влиянием технологического развития, бизнеса, образования, миграции, цифровых медиа и массовой культуры. Особое внимание уделяется английскому языку как ведущему донору и различным способам адаптации заимствований в сопоставляемых языках. Также анализируются номинативная потребность, дискурсивная активность, частотность употребления и нормативное освоение как важные факторы закрепления заимствованных неологизмов в языковой системе. Сопоставительный подход позволяет выявить общие тенденции и национально-специфические особенности их функционирования в современном медиадискурсе и профессиональном общении.

Ключевые слова: глобализация, языковые контакты, международная коммуникация, заимствованные неологизмы, язык-донор, английские заимствования, лексическая адаптация, нормативное освоение.

Introduction. Globalization is a process that connects the economic, political, technological and cultural spheres of modern social development. It also has a direct influence on the language system. Globalization does not only mean the growth of international trade or information exchange. It also refers to the rapprochement of different peoples, cultures and communicative spaces. As a result, a new concept, term or name that appears in one language may pass into other languages, meet the nominative needs of the recipient language and become active in a certain speech environment. In this respect, globalization is one of the main socio-linguistic factors that determines the emergence, spread and normalization of borrowed neologisms.

Literature Review and Methodology. A. Giddens interprets globalization as “the intensification of worldwide social relations that connect distant localities in such a way that

local events are shaped by events occurring many miles away.”¹ This definition is also important for linguistics, because in the modern period new lexical units often arise not only from local needs, but also under the influence of global information flows and international relations. New names that appear in technology, business, education, the Internet, migration and mass culture enter different languages within a short period of time. Therefore, globalization accelerates lexical renewal, reactivates existing naming resources and strengthens the adaptation of foreign units to the recipient language.

The influence of globalization on the formation of borrowed neologisms is seen through the unity of linguistic and extralinguistic factors. Extralinguistic factors include international economic integration, labour migration, transnational education, scientific and technological progress, digital platforms, mass culture and the activity of international organizations. Linguistic factors are connected with nominative need, the tendency toward short and concise expression, terminological accuracy, professional standardization, language contact and repeated use in speech. When a new concept does not have a clear equivalent in the recipient language, or when the existing equivalent does not meet the requirements of international communication, the unit from the donor language may be borrowed. However, after entering the language, such a unit does not immediately become a normative lexical item. Its further development depends on frequency of use, social acceptance, semantic clarity and morphological adaptation.

Language contact plays a decisive role in the formation of borrowed neologisms. U. Weinreich defines language contact as a situation in which “two or more languages are used alternately by the same person.”² According to this view, languages come into contact not as abstract systems, but through the activity of bilingual or multilingual speakers. In the context of globalization, the circle of such mediators has expanded. Translators, journalists, specialists, students, migrants, Internet users and representatives of international companies introduce new units into the recipient language. A unit that is first used in a narrow professional or group environment may later spread to a wider speech community through electronic media, social networks, scientific texts, official documents and dictionaries.

Borrowing that results from language contact is not a simple process of transferring a word. E. Haugen defines borrowing as “the attempt to reproduce in one language patterns previously found in another language.”³ This idea shows that a borrowed neologism is reprocessed within the system of the recipient language. When a foreign unit enters a new language, it may adapt graphically, phonetically, morphologically and semantically; it may also be calqued, shortened or transformed into a hybrid form. For this reason, a borrowed neologism is not a mechanically transferred form from the donor language, but a unit reinterpreted according to the internal laws and communicative needs of the recipient language.

International communication is the most active field of language contact in the present period. In earlier periods, borrowings usually entered languages through territorial proximity, trade, political domination or religious and educational influence. Today, however, the Internet, electronic media, international scientific databases, online education, digital services, transnational companies, advertising and mass culture have become the main channels. Under such conditions, the formation of a borrowed neologism takes place in three stages: first, the

¹ Giddens A. The Consequences of Modernity. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990. – P. 64.

² Giddens A. The Consequences of Modernity. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990. – P. 64.

³ Haugen E. The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing // Language. – 1950. – Vol. 26, № 2. – P. 212.

need to name a new concept arises; then the unit from the donor language enters the recipient language through communicative channels; finally, through repeated use, adaptation and normalization, it becomes fixed in the lexical system.

In the present period of globalization, English has a special status as the main donor language. As D. Crystal notes, “a language achieves a truly global status when it develops a special role that is recognized in every country.”⁴ English performs such a role in science, technology, business, diplomacy, the Internet, sport, tourism, higher education, advertising and mass culture. For this reason, English lexical units are actively borrowed into German and Uzbek, especially in the fields of digital technologies, economics, marketing, management, media and youth speech. However, this process is not the same in both languages. In German, English units usually enter through direct contact, whereas in Uzbek they are borrowed both directly and through Russian, international terminology or translation practice.

The donor status of English is determined not only by its linguistic influence, but also by its social prestige and communicative convenience. Units from the donor language are often accepted as signs of international standard, professional prestige, modernity or terminological precision. In such cases, a borrowed neologism does not merely satisfy a naming need; it also indicates the speaker’s belonging to a certain socio-cultural sphere. In Internet and professional discourse, the brevity, transnational comprehensibility and terminological stability of English units contribute to their rapid spread. At the same time, not every unit coming from a donor language should be considered necessary for the recipient language. When a national equivalent already exists, unnecessary borrowing may negatively affect the naturalness of speech.

In German, the influence of globalization and the donor role of English are clearly seen in the activation of Anglicisms. German is a highly developed national literary language and a language of science and culture with strong internal resources. Nevertheless, the influence of English is strong in global scientific, technological, business and media communication. A. Onysko⁵ studies Anglicisms in German in connection with the influence of English on German press language, written code-switching and word formation. P. Eisenberg⁶ examines foreign words in relation to German phonology, orthography, inflection and word formation, and explains the adaptation of foreign units to the grammar of the recipient language. Thus, in German, a borrowed neologism is not only regarded as a foreign form, but also as a unit that actively participates in gender assignment, plural formation, compounding and affixal adaptation.

In Uzbek, the influence of globalization appears in specific historical and social conditions. The vocabulary of Uzbek has been enriched for centuries through contact with Arabic, Persian-Tajik, Russian and other languages. Sh. Rahmatullayev writes that “borrowed lexemes occupy a significant place in the vocabulary of the modern Uzbek literary language.”⁷ His idea that “in recent times borrowing has become more dominant than word formation in the process of

⁴ Crystal D. English as a Global Language. 2nd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – P. 3.

⁵ Onysko A. Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, Lexical Productivity, and Written Codeswitching. – Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007. – P.6.

⁶ Eisenberg P. Die grammatische Integration von Fremdwörtern // Neues und Fremdes im deutschen Wortschatz: Aktueller lexikalischer Wandel. – Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2001. – S. 183.

⁷ Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги адабий ўзбек тили. – Тошкент: Университет, 2006. – Б. 105.

vocabulary enrichment”⁸ is also important for explaining lexical renewal in the age of globalization. At the present stage, English, the Internet environment, international education, digital technologies, economic reforms and mass culture are becoming active sources of new borrowings in Uzbek. At the same time, the creation of national equivalents, calquing, terminologization and orthographic standardization are becoming increasingly important.

Discussion. An important feature of the Uzbek language process is that new borrowings enter the language through several channels at the same time. In official documents and the terminological system, they are mainly connected with the need for standardization. In the media, they are related to the speed of information transmission. In social networks, they become active because of expressiveness, brevity and group identity. Therefore, in evaluating English borrowed neologisms in Uzbek, it is necessary to consider not only their source language, but also their channel of entry, spelling variants, phonetic adaptation, ability to take affixes, stylistic status and relationship with national equivalents. These criteria make it possible to distinguish direct Anglicism models in German from direct and indirect borrowing processes in Uzbek.

Another important feature of donor-language influence under globalization is the speed and multi-source nature of lexical innovation. In earlier periods, the entry of a new unit into the literary language usually occurred slowly through printed texts, official translations and dictionaries. Today, however, a new unit may first appear in a social network, advertisement, blog, professional forum or electronic publication, and only later move into traditional texts. For this reason, when evaluating a borrowed neologism, its first recorded use, channel of distribution, the social group that actively uses it and its level of transition into official speech are also important. These criteria allow the influence of globalization on language to be studied not as a general theoretical phenomenon, but as a concrete communicative process. As a result, the researcher does not limit the analysis to the question “From which language was this unit borrowed?” but also seeks answers to the questions “Why was this particular unit chosen?”, “Which discourse popularized it?” and “How did the recipient language reprocess it?” This increases the accuracy and consistency of contrastive analysis.

When the donor influence of English is compared in German and Uzbek, both common and distinctive features become visible. The common feature is that in both languages English units become active in fields open to international communication, such as technology, the Internet, business, marketing, sport, media, advertising, science and mass culture. The difference is observed in the channels of borrowing and methods of adaptation. In German, Anglicisms often enter directly and adapt to German grammatical gender, plural formation and compounding. In Uzbek, English units are borrowed directly, but they may also enter through Russian, international terminological systems, translation and calquing. They adapt to Uzbek orthography, pronunciation, case and possessive suffixes, as well as to national terminological norms.

Results. The discursive nature of international communication is also important in the formation of borrowed neologisms. The popularization of a lexical unit is determined not only by the prestige of the donor language, but also by the type of text in which it is used, the audience to which it is addressed and the purpose for which it is used. In scientific and technical discourse, a borrowed unit may provide accuracy and conformity with international standards. In economic and corporate discourse, it may function as a sign of professional competence. In

⁸ The cited work. – P. 105-106.

media and advertising texts, it may strengthen novelty, speed and persuasive force. Therefore, when a borrowed neologism is studied as a product of globalization, not only its etymological source but also its discursive function should be taken into account. This aspect is especially important in comparing borrowings in German and Uzbek, because the same donor-language unit may acquire different stylistic meanings, different normative status and different communicative value in the two languages. As a result, a borrowed neologism may simultaneously perform the functions of naming, evaluation, expression of group identity and connection with the international information space.

The donor role of English is not an absolute or one-sided process. Each recipient language selects foreign units according to its internal resources, normative requirements and communicative needs. Some units quickly enter the active layer of vocabulary, some remain narrow professional terms, and others become passive as a result of the formation of national equivalents or the disappearance of communicative need. Therefore, in evaluating borrowed neologisms, it is necessary to consider not only their source, but also their function in the recipient language, their relationship with existing national units, their activity in speech and their normative adaptation. A borrowing may enrich the language, but when used without need it may also create communicative ambiguity. Scientific evaluation should distinguish between these two cases. In this process, the acceptance of donor-language units is determined primarily by their communicative necessity, professional accuracy, repeated use in public discourse and the degree to which they do not conflict with national norms.

Conclusion. Thus, globalization determines the general socio-linguistic environment of borrowed neologisms, language contacts define the mechanism of their entry, and international communication shapes their field of distribution. At the present stage, English is one of the main donor languages for both German and Uzbek. In German, this process is connected with the direct entry and grammatical integration of Anglicisms. In Uzbek, it is connected with the direct and indirect borrowing of English units, translation, calquing, phonetic and orthographic adaptation, and normalization. Therefore, borrowed neologisms are not simple units transferred from a donor language into a recipient language. They should be evaluated as the result of the interaction of globalization, language contacts, international communication, social need and the national language system.

List of References:

1. Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
2. Eisenberg, P. (2001). Die grammatische Integration von Fremdwörtern. In G. Stickel (Ed.), *Neues und Fremdes im deutschen Wortschatz: Aktueller lexikalischer Wandel* (pp. 183–209). De Gruyter.
3. Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford University Press.
4. Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.
5. Onysko, A. (2007). *Anglicisms in German: Borrowing, lexical productivity, and written codeswitching*. De Gruyter.
6. Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. Linguistic Circle of New York.
7. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). *Hozirgi adabiy o'zbek tili*. Universitet.