

Theoretical Basis of the Phenomenon of Borrowing Words in Linguistics

Valijon Vositov¹

¹ Andizhan state institute of foreign languages, Uzbekistan

Abstract:

The article analyzes the study of the process of borrowing words, the question of the study and classification of words borrowed in linguistics, word borrowing's serving as a factor in the development of linguistic communication, formal, functional and lexical-semantic types of loan words as a result of language communication, word borrowing as a factor creating language contact and extralinguistic and intralinguistic reasons in word borrowing.

Keywords: Turkic words, borrowed words, communication, socio-political, diplomatic relations, trade and military campaigns, assimilation, noun category, language contact, permanent, temporal, occasional, extralinguistic and intralinguistic factors.

Introduction. Language serves a particular society as the best, convenient and unique means of communication. It is constantly developing and perfecting in order to regularly and fully realize the communicative-pragmatic intention of the speakers of the language. In such processes, the importance and role of the internal units, symbols, elements and possibilities of the language are incomparable, and the basis for communication in the language is created at one or another level according to the need. At the same time, in some cases, due to the need for communication, the language is forced to learn the missing units, signs and elements from another language, and only in this way, it tries to satisfy the need in communication.

Literature review. In linguistics a lot of research on language contacts, their types, the reasons for the emergence of Turkic lexical units in English, intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors, the influence of language units on borrowed words, phonetic, lexical, lexical-semantic and grammatical assimilation and comparative study has been done by world and our country's linguists and put forward important scientific and theoretical views. For instance, European and American linguists such as W.D. Whitney (1881), O. Jespersen (1930), G. H. Mc. Knight (1923), A.A. Daryush (1934),

U.Weinreich (1953), E.Haugen (1958), by Russian scientists V.A.Bogoroditsky (1894), B.V.Gornung (1952), V.I.Abaev (1956), A.M.Roth (1969), N.V.Labunets (2007), E.E.Uzhinin (2008), N.N.Mukhina (2019), by Uzbek linguists G.M.Khashimov (2017), A.Jumaniyozov (1987), O.T.Khujanova (2020), N.A.Isakova (2021) have done research in the field of word borrowing, the problem hasn't been studied monographically.

Methodology & empirical analysis. In the coverage of the research topic, methods of component, classification, structural, cultural, statistical, comparative analysis, as well as linguistic description were used.

As we know language contacts can be natural and superficial (artificial). Natural language contact occurs as a result of temporary communication of two language owners with their territory of residence close to them on the basis of regular communication, and superficial language contact takes place for certain purposes in communication temporally. We proposed to give the natural contact with the terms "permanent" or "constant" and the surface with the terms "temporal" or "casual", "occasional".

The problem of the term borrowing is considered one of those issues that have not yet sufficiently found its solution in every possible way, although a significant amount of work carried out on it in Uzbek, Russian and foreign linguistics. Based on this, the fact that until that time there has no uniform interpretation of the term "borrowing" in linguistic literature it prompts to clarify this issue.

For example, G.Paul considers borrowing as the result of language interference of a broad and narrow sense of words, and two non-related languages do not place a limit on the middle of word borrowing through the connections of two dialects of the same language or two individuals. He thinks that the impetus for the emergence of the influence of one language on another comes mainly from individuals, at least to a limited extent, from individuals who know both languages. This external influence can increasingly also affect the internal structure of the language. From this point G.Paul concludes that the borrowed word gradually penetrates into general consumption in the language it has borrowed and there are different levels of its use [6, 411].

The principle of borrowed, foreign and strange words of another language has been taken as a basis by many researchers. Such a classification was also followed by some Russian linguists. For Example, I.I.Ogiyenko divides all words related to another language into 1) borrowed words that were appeared much earlier and became as their own, completely assimilated in the Russian language; 2) the original foreign, but incredibly used words in the Russian language, thanks to which they remained the usual word and also placed on the folk language; 3) words that are purely foreign, but little used in the Russian language [4, 14-14]. These are so-called "barbarisms", which are easy to choose the corresponding Russian equivalent, and they are used only among the intelligent people. Such words are unfamiliar to people.

However, such a classification has serious drawbacks and faces some criticism. The main drawback of the division of words related to other languages into foreign and borrowed is that they, as a rule, are separated from the single basis. On the basis of such a division, first of all, a functional criterion (the nature of the application of the word) is taken into amount. And researchers using the term "foreign words" and "borrowed words" did researches based on the degree of phonetic and grammatical assimilation of the word and formal criteria.

Y.V.Opelbaum's German language dictionary contains a classification of lexical units in the East Slavic languages based on three, namely formal, functional, and semantic characters devoted to the research of lexical elements in the East Slavic languages [5, 636].

According to this classification Y.V.Opelbaum divides the lexical units of in the East Slavic languages into 1) internationalisms; 2) original words related to another language; 3) exotisms.

This classification, in our opinion, done by Y.V.Opelbaum is not clearly understood due to the uncertainty of the boundaries between the groups. However, it is very important that Y.V.Opelbaum divided the exotic lexicon into a separate group of independent words.

Here it should be said that we cannot fully agree with Y.V.Opelbaum's classification. Because internationalisms are different from borrowed words. International words occur synchronously in at least three languages, while borrowings are diachronic phenomena that are characteristic of each language. At the same time internationalisms can be an international phenomenon, and borrowings can be a phenomenon within a specific language.

Taking into account all the classifications of appropriations mentioned above and based on the research of Turkish lexical elements in English fiction, we tried to give a classification of Turkish words that have been borrowed into English. It should be noted that most of the Turkish words that we are thinking about have their origins in Arabic, Persian, and Latin languages, entered the Turkish language before the XIV-XVI centuries, and started to borrow from Turkish language into English, mainly from the XVI century, and from the Uzbek language from the XXI century. Accordingly, we have classified them as follows:

1) borrowed into the Turkish language from Latin, Albanian, Tatar and transferred into English from the Turkish language in the XVI-XX centuries: *sherbet, arnaut, chan, shagreen, caravanserai* and others.

2) words borrowed into Turkish from the countries of Central Asia, the Caucasus, the Caspian countries and through it into English. These words are used a lot in English communication and have become common words for English people: *shashlik, kebab*, etc.

But the word "kebab" in the Web. Dictionary is explained that it was borrowed into English from the Armenian language, but according to the ABBYY Lingvo dictionary, it was borrowed from Arabic, partially Urdu, Persian and Turkish languages in the XVII century. It can be observed that it is used as "kabob" in the dictionaries of "Collins English Dictionary", "Cambridge Dictionary" as in Uzbek.

3) words borrowed from the Uzbek language through the sports sphere in the XXI century: *kurash, chala, yonbosh, halol, g'irrom*:

Kurash is a traditional form of combat of the Turkic people. [10]

In the modern conditions of normalizing the worldview of society, the problem of ethnic identity is becoming relevant. Ethno-linguistic identification processes depend on the choice of principles of communication and social behavior and the types of interethnic intervention.

The modern theory of the interaction of languages has long been in the attention of linguists, and now this issue continues to develop in the system of various lingvo-contactological directions. When understanding the nature of language contact, they should be analyzed from a historical and typological point of view.

The historical aspect of language contact considers the verbal communication of two or more ethnic communities that lived nearby or border areas, and this contact occurred rapidly due to economic, domestic-like needs. When ethnic groups interact with language contact occurs in the form of speech (ethno-speech), dialect (ethno-dialect) under the influence of a number of linguistic and non-linguistic factors. In the process of language contact, speech is synchronous, speech occurs synchronously, and language diachronically.

The typological aspect of language contact is carried out from the point of view of indicating its main parameters: the method of establishing contact, the duration and stability of contact, the nature

of the state of contact, the degree of members' participation of communication in it, the territorial location of the people, genetic and structural closeness, the result of language contact [3, 16].

G.M.Khoshimov recommends applying more than 20 of the most effective and tested principles of comparative typological analysis on linguistic research of any language of comparison or contact [1, 6]. Among the proposed principles, the author emphasizes the principle of accounting the borrowings (substratum/ superstratum/adstratum) in the compared languages.

In the English lexicon a layer of words characteristic of Turkic languages is encountered. This resulted from the written and oral communication of peoples with each other, trade, diplomatic relations, socio-political proximity, as well as the campaigns of the Hunn tribes to European countries as a result of historical progress.

It is known that the degree of influence of another language in different languages is not the same. Some languages freely accept lexical material in another language, while others strongly resist accepting the lexical layer.

This can be caused, of course, by both intralinguistic factors (degree of similarity, degree of closeness of the languages with which you are getting in touch) and extralinguistic factors (presence of more or less language contacts).

Results. As to the above points, it can be said language contact occurs as a result of direct and indirect language contact of two language owners who are getting in touch in 1) bilingualism (bilingualism), a) natural, b) artificial bilingualism; 2) political, trade, diplomatic relations.

Conclusions. Based on the facts of the interaction of English and Turkic languages, as well as cultural and historical information, we consider the direct relations of English-Turkic languages as foreign relations, since the two language owners, belonging to different socio-political structures and not territorial in terms of location, have established economic, cultural, trade and other relations among themselves for a certain purpose.

References:

1. Khoshimov G.M. Lectures on Comparative Typology (Third edition, revised). – Andizhan, 2017. – 100 p.
2. Vositov V.A. Study of the historical process of Turkic borrowed words. Проблемы и перспективы современной гуманитаристики: педагогика, методика преподавания, филология: сборник материалов международной научно-практической конференции. Андижан – Санкт-Петербург, 2024. – С. 181-184.
3. Лабунец Н.В. Русская географическая терминология в ситуации языкового контакта: Автореф. дисс...д-ра филол.наук. – Екатеринбург: 2007. – 46 с.
4. Огиенко И.И. Иноземные элементы в русском языке. – Киев: тип. В.П.Бондаренко и П.Ф.Гнездовского, 1915. – 136 с.
5. Опельбаум Е.В. Восточнославянские лексические элементы в немецком языке. – Киев: 1968. – 867 с.
6. Пауль Г. Принципы истории языка. – М.: 1960. – 500 с.
7. Ужинин Е.Е. Турецкие заимствования в языках восточно-средиземноморского ареала (языковые контакты на территории Османской империи): Автореф. дисс...канд.филол.наук. – Москва: 2008. – 26 с.
8. Улуков Н. “Мехробдан чаён” романида қўлланган арабий, форсий киритмаларнинг вазифаси ва услубий хусусиятлари. Qo‘qon DPI. Ilmiy xabarlar. 2-2021 Iyun. – Б. 184-185.

9. Ўзбек тили лексикологияси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1981. – 315 б.
10. <https://www.youtube.com>