

The Evolution of Language: Neologisms in Russian and Uzbek

R. R. Biksalieva

Navoi Innovations University, Navoiy, Uzbekistan

Keywords: Neologism, Neology, Neography, Borrowing Neologisms, Semantic Neologisms.

Abstract: The examination of neologism-related issues is a focal point in contemporary linguistics. Key concerns revolve around defining and assessing neologisms, as well as delineating all lexical phenomena encompassed by this concept. Emphasis is also placed on the genesis of neologisms, their integration into a language's lexicon, and their practical use. This article delves into the study of neology, scrutinizing the definition and categorization of neologisms in both Russian and Uzbek languages, which vary due to distinct approaches and concepts. By analysing the scholarly discourse of global and Uzbek experts, it is argued that a neologism in any language should ideally be unambiguous, conceptually motivated, concise, and capable of fitting into the word-formation structure, while aligning with phonetic and morphological systems. However, no single criterion can solely ensure effective communication. Notably, neologisms are dissected concerning their formation, revealing three main groups: borrowed neologisms, word-forming, and semantic neologisms.

1 INTRODUCTION

Globalization and scientific progress have catalysed a "neological explosion" across numerous national languages, including Russian. This surge in neologisms reflects the evolving social and cultural landscape influenced by extralinguistic factors. As societies transition, interdisciplinary research becomes imperative to understand language changes comprehensively. Such studies elucidate trends in linguistic evolution, societal transformations' linguistic reflections, influx of foreign borrowings, and the language's ecological state.

The 20th century marked the initiation of active exploration into Russian neologisms, coinciding with the rise of the information society. This period witnessed profound political, economic, scientific, and technological shifts, profoundly shaping the modern Russian lexicon. As a result, the Russian language necessitated specialised scrutiny to grasp its growth and development within this dynamic milieu (Ermakova 2012, et al.).

The emergence of an information-driven society spurred radical changes across various sectors, thereby influencing linguistic evolution in Russian. This necessitated an intensified focus on comprehensively studying the language's vocabulary expansion. Analysing neologisms allows for insights into the language's responsiveness to societal shifts,

its adaptation to technological advancements, and its integration of foreign influences (Krysin 2012, et al.). Such research illuminates crucial aspects of linguistic ecology, aiding in understanding language's role as a mirror of societal change.

2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology adopted here is rooted in an analysis of language transformations across various levels, encompassing phonetic, word-formation, morphological, lexical, and grammatical dimensions. It recognises the interconnectedness and mutual recognition of all elements within the lexical-semantic system, highlighting the internal regular connections prevalent throughout the vocabulary. The terminology of "neologism" is central to this methodology, denoting the most common term in modern linguistic discourse for describing new linguistic phenomena and processes. Additionally, the concept of "innovation" is employed to encompass new word-forming nominative units, reflecting the dynamic nature of language evolution.

This study employs a multidisciplinary approach to understanding neologisms, acknowledging their significance both as linguistic phenomena and as cultural markers. Neologisms are viewed as diverse and heterogeneous linguistic innovations reflecting

societal development and meeting communicative needs. The methodology embraces psycholinguistic perspectives, which link the emergence of new words with the acquisition of new knowledge and highlight the social significance of innovation. Furthermore, it recognises the interchangeable use of terms such as "innovations," "new formations," and "neologisms" to describe novel lexical units, underscoring the dynamic nature of language adaptation and evolution.

3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The concept of "neologism" has roots dating back to F. Toll's notation in the "Desk Dictionary for References in All Branches of Knowledge" (1864), as noted by S.I. Alatorseva. E.V. Senko contextualizes neologisms within the framework of societal development, emphasizing their emergence as a response to evolving linguistic and societal needs. However, despite its historical recognition, a precise scientific definition of neologism remains elusive.

Various scholars offer definitions of neologism, ranging from the creation of new words or phrases for novel concepts to the inclusion of lexico-semantic variants or borrowed terms. T.V. Jerebilo outlines the broad and narrow senses of neologism, encompassing lexical, derivational, phonetic, morphological, and syntactic innovations. Nonetheless, E.V. Rosen criticizes the term's vagueness in modern science, suggesting its inadequacy in encompassing semantic shifts in existing words.

Debate persists among researchers regarding the classification of neologisms, with some advocating for the inclusion of non-verbal units like morphemes and phrases, while others, like L.V. Shalina, argue for their exclusion. Nevertheless, S.I. Alatorseva advocates for a broader understanding, encompassing not just new words but also new meanings and combinations within a given historical period.

N.Z. Kotelova offers criteria to specify neologisms, including temporal existence, linguistic space, type of novelty, and structural features. L.Yu. Kasyanova expands on this, proposing additional criteria such as chronological, local, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, functional, and statistical dimensions, along with consideration of their absence in existing dictionaries. These collective features help distinguish neologisms from other lexical units and highlight their evolving nature within language systems.

Neologisms, coined to denote emerging concepts within a culture, encompass various aspects of life, from politics to medicine. However, the term

"neologism" suffers from semantic complexity due to the inherent variability in defining what is "new" or "old". This linguistic unit's classification is multifaceted, with scholars like T.V. Popova, L.V. Raciburskaya, and D.V. Gugunava proposing categories such as borrowing, semantic, and derivational neologisms. Borrowings, contested by some researchers, are acknowledged as innovations by others, enriching languages with new vocabulary. Semantic neologisms denote new meanings attributed to existing words and phrases, often arising through metaphorization or semantic shifts.

Word-formation neologisms, generated through the mechanisms of the Russian language, predominantly emerge through affixation and compounding. They constitute a significant portion of the modern Russian neological vocabulary.

Classifications by linguists such as S.I. Alatorseva and I.B. Golub provide further insight into the diversity of neologisms, considering factors like form, novelty, method of nomination, and duration of existence. Stylistic neologisms, a subtype identified by Golub, are characterised by their evaluative nature, reflecting the speaker's attitude towards a concept. While initially vivid in expressive colouring, frequent usage can lead to their stylistic neutralisation.

In summary, the study of neologisms reveals the dynamic nature of language evolution, influenced by cultural, social, and linguistic factors. From borrowed words to internally formed innovations, neologisms reflect the constant adaptation and expansion of vocabularies to articulate contemporary realities and concepts.

4 CONCLUSION

The exploration of neologisms demonstrates the intricate interplay between language and societal evolution. While tracing its historical roots to F. Toll's notation in the 19th century, scholars like E.V. Senko and T.V. Jerebilo have emphasised the dynamic nature of neologisms, which respond to shifting linguistic and societal needs. Despite the elusiveness of a precise scientific definition, researchers such as N.Z. Kotelova and L.Yu. Kasyanova offer criteria to distinguish neologisms, shedding light on their temporal, linguistic, and structural features. This collective understanding underscores the multifaceted nature of neologisms, encompassing not only new words but also new meanings and combinations within a given historical context.

Furthermore, the classifications proposed by linguists like I.B. Golub illuminate the diversity of neologisms, considering factors such as form, novelty, and method of nomination. Stylistic neologisms, identified as a subtype, highlight the evaluative nature of language, where expressions reflect the speaker's stance towards particular concepts. Through this lens, neologisms emerge as vital indicators of linguistic dynamism, reflecting the constant adaptation and expansion of vocabularies to articulate contemporary realities and concepts, thus underscoring the dynamic nature of language evolution influenced by cultural, social, and linguistic dynamics.

REFERENCES

- Ermakova, E. N. (2012). Transformative possibilities of the modern Russian language: occasional and potential words and phraseological units. *Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State Pedagogical University*, (3), 289–298.
- Zherebilo, T. V. (2016). *Dictionary of linguistic terms and concepts*. Nazran: LLC "Pilgrim".
- Kadyrova, L. D. (2014). *Hybrid neonominations in the modern mass media discourse: semantic-derivational aspect* (Doctoral dissertation, Simferopol, 10.02.01).
- Kotelova, N. Z. (2015). The first experience of lexicographic description of Russian neologisms. In *Selected Works* (pp. 181–199). St. Petersburg: Nestor-History.
- Krysin, L. P. (2012). Words-foreigners in Russian guise. *Russian speech*, (4), 52-57.
- Marinova, E. V. (2014). "The eternal question" about borrowing. *Russian speech*, (3), 58–61.