

**THE STUDY OF NEOLOGISMS IN RUSSIAN LINGUISTICS**

**Khatamov Ildar Urakovich**

Senior lecturer at Karshi state technical university, Uzbekistan

**Abstract**

Russian linguistics has made significant contributions to the theoretical and practical study of neologisms, particularly through the lens of language contact, lexical borrowing, and sociopolitical influences. This article explores the historical development of research on neologisms in Russian scholarship and its impact on Uzbek lexicology across different periods. It analyzes key works by Russian and Uzbek linguists, highlighting mechanisms of lexical innovation, semantic shifts, and adaptation processes. Within the anthropocentric paradigm, the study emphasizes the role of human social needs, political contexts, and technological changes in driving lexical evolution. The findings reveal a transition from predominantly externally imposed borrowings during the Tsarist and Soviet eras to more balanced internal development and selective integration in the post-independence period.

**Keywords:** Russian linguistics, neologisms, lexical borrowing, language contact, sociolinguistics, anthropocentric paradigm, Uzbek language, semantic change, globalization.

**Introduction.** The lexical layer of any language is highly dynamic and directly reflects social, political, technological, and cultural transformations. In Russian linguistics, the study of neologisms has traditionally focused on processes of lexical enrichment, borrowing, and adaptation, especially in multilingual contact situations. This research has profoundly influenced Uzbek lexicology, shaping approaches to new words during the Tsarist, Soviet, and independence periods.

Placing human agency and societal needs at the center, the anthropocentric paradigm views neologisms not merely as linguistic units but as manifestations of human adaptation to changing realities. This article examines the evolution of research on neologisms in Russian linguistics and its application to Uzbek, highlighting key scholars, historical contexts, and contemporary challenges.

**Methods.** The study employs a historical-comparative, sociolinguistic, and analytical approach. It reviews monographs, dissertations, and articles by prominent Russian and Uzbek linguists. Diachronic and synchronic methods are used to trace lexical changes across periods, while anthropocentric and sociolinguistic perspectives emphasize human and social factors in neologism formation and integration.

**Results.** Russian linguistic influence on Uzbek vocabulary was particularly strong during the 19th–20th centuries. Scholars such as J. Hamdamov and R. Doniyorov analyzed Russian and international borrowings (*general-gubernator, zavod, fabrika, oblast, sovet*) that entered Uzbek as neologisms under political and administrative pressure. E. Begmatov provided a comprehensive classification of lexical layers, noting the dominance of Russian-mediated borrowings until the late 20th century.

In the post-independence era, research shifted toward language purification and revival of native terms. T.I. Rahmonov studied semantic transformations in Arabic borrowings, while A.Kh. To‘raxo‘jayeva examined socio-political lexicon development. N. Isakova and E. Davlyatova analyzed foreign borrowings in media and their linguocultural aspects, highlighting direct English influence (*selfi, blog, trend, onlayn*). O. Shukurov’s doctoral work (2022) offered a detailed investigation of modern borrowings, their evolution, and lexicographic challenges in the globalization era.

Russian linguists contributed foundational theories on neologism stages (from individual creation to collective acceptance) and their functional roles in mass media, literature, and digital communication.

**Discussion.** The study of neologisms in Russian linguistics reveals deep interconnections between language, power, society, and human cognition — core elements of the anthropocentric paradigm. During the Tsarist and Soviet periods, lexical innovation was largely driven by external political forces, resulting in massive influxes of Russian and international terms. This process, while enriching vocabulary, often occurred at the expense of native linguistic identity. Scholars like Hamdamov and Doniyorov documented these borrowings not only as linguistic facts but as reflections of colonial and ideological influence on human communicative practices.

In the anthropocentric view, such borrowings illustrate how language users actively (or passively) adapt to new social realities. Post-independence research marks a significant shift: scholars began prioritizing human-centered language planning — reviving native words (*hokim*, *vazir*, *devonxona*) and creating internal neologisms while selectively adopting global terms. This transition demonstrates human agency in reshaping linguistic systems to serve national identity and contemporary needs.

A particularly insightful aspect is the semantic evolution of borrowings. As Rahmonov showed, words like *hokim* expanded or narrowed in meaning to fit new democratic and administrative contexts. Such changes reflect how speakers cognitively and socially renegotiate meanings. Davlyatova's work on direct Western European (especially English) borrowings highlights globalization's impact: terms like *selfi*, *blog*, *trend*, and *onlayn* integrate rapidly through digital media, driven by young users' communicative demands.

O. Shukurov's comprehensive analysis underscores contemporary challenges — chaotic influx of borrowings via the internet, the need for better lexicographic description, and the balance between internationalization and national linguistic sovereignty. In the anthropocentric paradigm, these issues raise important questions: How do individuals and communities exercise control over their linguistic worldview? How do neologisms shape and are shaped by human thought patterns?

Russian linguistics provides valuable methodological tools for addressing these questions, including historical-comparative analysis and attention to functional adaptation. However, modern studies should further integrate cognitive linguistics and corpus methods to explore how neologisms influence human perception and social interaction in digital environments.

The trajectory from externally imposed to internally driven lexical innovation in Uzbek illustrates language's role as both a product and instrument of human social development. Future research in this direction will enhance our understanding of language policy, education, machine translation, and cross-cultural communication in a globalized world.

#### References:

1. Begmatov E. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tilining leksik qatlamlari. – Toshkent: Fan, 1985. – 200 b.
2. Cambridge Dictionary 2022. [www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)
3. Cambridge English Corpus, 2021.
4. Davlyatova E. Mustaqillik davri o'zbek tilidagi g'arbiy yevropa o'zlashmalarining madaniyatlararo tadqiqi: Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) ... diss. avtoref. – Termiz, 2021. – 58 b.
5. Gaylard A.L. Poetic neologism in english from the renaissance to modernism: – Dissertation. – Deakin University, 2019. – 351 p.

6. Hojiyev A. Sovet davrida o'zbek adabiy tilining taraqqiyoti: III jildli. III jild. So'z yasalishi va leksika. – Toshkent: Fan, 1988. – 188 b.
7. Isakova N. Mustaqillik yillarida o'zbek tiliga kirib kelgan xorijiy so'zlarning tarkibiy-mazmuniy tahlili ("Xalq so'zi" gazetasi materiallari asosida): Filol. fan. bo'yicha fals. dokt. (PhD) ... diss. – Samarqand, 2021. – 143 b.
8. Jumaniyozov O. O'zbek tilidagi german tillari o'zlashmalari. Monografiya. – Toshkent: Fan, 1987. – 104 b.
9. Levchenko Y. Neologism In the lexical system of modern English: on the mass media material: Master's dissertation. – Munich: GRIN Verlag, 2010. –132 p.
10. McDonald L. The Meaning of "e-": Neologisms as Markers of Culture and Technology //eTOPIA. Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies. – 2005. vol. 14. – P.82-90.
11. Mengliyev B. Hozirgi o'zbek tili. – Toshkent: Tafakkur bo'stoni, 2018. – B.180. – 200 b.
12. Patrizia A. Lexical Innovation in World Englishes: Cross-fertilization and Evolving Paradigms. – London: Routledge, 2018. – P.59.
13. Qo'ziyev U.Ya. O'zbek tilidagi izohli lug'atlarda o'zlashma so'zlar tadqiqi: Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) ... diss. avtoref. – Farg'ona: 2018. – 44 b.
14. Rahmonov T.I. Hozirgi o'zbek tilidagi arabcha o'zlashma so'zlar semantik tuzilishidagi o'zgarishlar: Filol. fan. nomz. ... diss. – Namangan, 1994. – 120 b.
15. Shukurov O. O'zbek tili zamonaviy o'zlashmalarining evolyutsiyasi, transformatsiyasi va leksikografik talqini masalalari (mustaqillik davri): Filol. fanl. d-ri. (DSc) diss. – Qarshi, 2022. – 255 b.
16. Smyk-Bhattacharjee D. Lexical Innovation on the Internet – neologisms in blogs: Dissertation. Doctor of Philosophy. – Zurich, 2009. – 325 p.
17. To'raxojayeva A.X. Mustaqillik sharoitida o'zbek tili ijtimoiy-siyosiy leksikasining taraqqiyoti: Filol. fan. nom. ... diss. avtoref. – Toshkent: 2012. – S.26.
18. Данияров Р.И. Заимствование русско-интернациональных личных имен узбекским языком: Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Ташкент, 1967. – 21 с.
19. Хамдамов Ж. Из истории русского языка в обогащение лексики узбекского языке (вторая половина XIX века): Автореф. дисс... канд. филол. наук. – Ташкент, 1963. – 24 с.
20. Ху П. Английские неологизмы-заимствования в русском и китайском языках: Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Москва, 2012. –19 с.