

The Process of Borrowing English Loanwords into Uzbek and Korean: Historical Stages and Extralinguistic Factors (19th-21st Centuries)

RAKHMANOVA SANOBAR MADAMINOVNA
Urganch State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

English has become an important source of lexical enrichment in many languages as a result of expanding international communication. This study examines the historical development of English loanwords in Uzbek and Korean from the nineteenth to the twenty-first century, with particular attention to borrowing routes and extralinguistic factors. A comparative historical-linguistic approach is used to analyze documented English-derived lexical items and relevant linguistic studies. The results show that English lexical influence developed gradually but became more visible with modernization, education, technological development, international communication, and globalization. Korean demonstrates both direct and indirect borrowing, particularly in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, whereas Uzbek experienced an important intermediary role of Russian during the Soviet period and a stronger increase in direct English borrowing after independence. Selected lexical examples further demonstrate that borrowed forms are adjusted to the phonological and orthographic systems of the recipient languages. The comparison indicates that English borrowing in Uzbek and Korean has common functional domains but different historical pathways. The study concludes that the development of English loanwords should be interpreted through the interaction of linguistic adaptation and the historical, social, technological, and cultural conditions in which language contact occurs.

Keywords: English loanwords, lexical borrowing, language contact, Uzbek, Korean, historical linguistics, extralinguistic factors, linguistic adaptation

1. INTRODUCTION

Lexical borrowing is one of the most common outcomes of sustained contact between languages and speech communities. It occurs when speakers incorporate elements from another language into their own linguistic system, particularly when social, cultural, economic, or communicative conditions encourage such contact. The study of borrowing therefore requires attention not only to linguistic structure but also to the social circumstances in which language contact takes place (Haugen 1950; Weinreich 1953).

English has become an important source of lexical influence in both Uzbek and Korean, although the historical pathways of this influence have differed. In Korean, English-derived vocabulary entered the language through both direct contact and indirect transmission through Chinese and Japanese, especially during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Kim 2008). In Uzbek, Russian played an important intermediary role in the transmission of some English-derived terminology during the Soviet period, while direct English influence increased after independence (Kuchkarov 2025).

Despite these similarities and differences, the historical development of English loanwords in Uzbek and Korean requires further comparative consideration. In particular, the relationship between borrowing routes, extralinguistic factors, and recipient-language adaptation deserves closer examination. Drawing on established approaches to language contact and borrowing (Thomason & Kaufman 1988; Matras 2009), this study examines the development of English loanwords in Uzbek and Korean from the nineteenth to the twenty-first century. It focuses on three aspects: historical stages of borrowing, extralinguistic factors contributing to lexical expansion, and the adaptation of selected English loanwords in the two recipient languages.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study uses a comparative historical-linguistic approach. The research material consists of documented English-derived lexical items in Uzbek and Korean, together with findings reported in linguistic studies and dictionary resources. The material is organized according to historical period, borrowing route, and semantic domain. Particular attention is given to vocabulary associated with technology, communication, business, education, sport, and other areas in which international terminology has become established.

The analysis combines qualitative comparison with historical interpretation. Loanwords are examined according to their source forms, recipient-language forms, and observable phonological or orthographic adjustments. The study also considers extralinguistic factors, including modernization, education, technological development, international communication, economic interaction, and cultural contact. The historical interpretation follows established approaches to borrowing and language contact (Haugen 1950; Weinreich 1953; Thomason & Kaufman 1988).

To ensure consistency in the analysis, the selected lexical items are compared using the same set of criteria in both languages. These criteria include the relationship between the English source form and the borrowed form, the degree of phonological and orthographic adjustment, the borrowing route, and the semantic field in which the item is used. Only lexical items for which sufficient linguistic or dictionary evidence is available are considered in the comparative analysis. This procedure makes it possible to identify both common patterns and language-specific features of English loanword adaptation in Uzbek and Korean.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. *Historical stages of English loanword borrowing*

The evidence indicates that English lexical influence on Uzbek and Korean developed progressively rather than appearing as a

single historical process. In Korean, English-derived vocabulary became increasingly visible during the period of modernization. Kim (2008) identifies both direct and indirect routes of English borrowing in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In indirect borrowing, lexical material could reach Korean through Chinese or Japanese, while direct borrowing involved the transcription of English forms into Korean.

The historical development of English vocabulary in Uzbek followed a different route. During the Soviet period, Russian played an important intermediary role in the transmission of some English-derived terminology. According to Kuchkarov (2025), direct English borrowing increased considerably after 1991, reflecting changes in Uzbekistan's international, educational, technological, and economic environment.

The later twentieth and early twenty-first centuries brought a wider range of English-derived vocabulary into both languages. Technology, business, mass communication, international education, sport, and popular culture created new contexts for English lexical influence. The expansion of these domains contributed to the increased visibility of English-derived words in everyday and professional communication.

3.2. *Extralinguistic factors in borrowing*

The findings show that lexical borrowing is closely connected with social and historical interaction. International communication, educational exchange, technological development, economic relations, and mass media create circumstances in which foreign lexical items can become necessary or widely recognizable. Such factors are consistent with the broader understanding of borrowing as a consequence of language contact (Weinreich 1953; Matras 2009).

In Uzbek, the increasing use of English in education, information technology, business, and international communication has supported the introduction of new English-derived vocabulary. The process is especially visible in terminology associated with contemporary technological and economic developments (Kuchkarov 2025). Korean has also experienced extensive English lexical influence in modern

communication, with English-based forms appearing in a variety of contemporary domains.

The historical evidence therefore suggests that extralinguistic conditions influence not only the quantity of borrowing but also the areas in which borrowed vocabulary becomes established. A new lexical item is more likely to spread when the social environment provides repeated opportunities for its use.

3.3. *Comparative and contrastive features of selected English loanwords*

The comparative material demonstrates that English loanwords may preserve their basic meanings while undergoing phonological and orthographic adaptation in the recipient language. The following examples illustrate this tendency.

Table 1. *Comparative forms of selected English loanwords in Uzbek and Korean*

English source	Uzbek	Korean	Main observation
computer	kompyuter	컴퓨터 (keompyuteo)	Adaptation to the phonological and writing systems of the recipient languages
internet	Internet	인터넷 (inteonet)	Similar lexical meaning with different phonological representation
Sport	Sport	스포츠 (seupocheu)	Recipient-language phonological adjustment
marketing	Marketing	마케팅 (maketing)	Adaptation of the English form to Korean phonotactics; Uzbek retains a close written form
Taxi	Taksi	택시 (taeksi)	Different phonological representation of the same international term

The Uzbek dictionary evidence confirms the established use of *kompyuter*, “internet,” “marketing,” “sport,” and *taksi* in Uzbek. For example, *kompyuter* is defined as an electronic calculating device and is identified as originating from English; “marketing” is explicitly marked as derived from English; and “internet” and “sport” are established lexical items in Uzbek usage. The Korean

National Institute of Korean Language's *Korean-English Learners' Dictionary* records 컴퓨터 as corresponding to *computer* and identifies English as the source language for related forms such as 노트북컴퓨터/“notebook computer.”

The examples show that the two languages adapt borrowed vocabulary according to their own phonological and orthographic systems. Korean forms are represented in Hangul and therefore require systematic phonological representation of the source form. The Uzbek forms, by contrast, are represented through the Uzbek Latin orthographic system. This difference supports the observation that borrowing involves not only the transfer of lexical material but also its adjustment within the recipient language. Kim (2008) similarly identifies phonological differences between English and Korean as an important factor in the representation of English loanwords.

4. COMPARISON OF BORROWING ROUTES

One important difference between the two languages concerns the routes through which English vocabulary entered them. Korean historical evidence demonstrates both direct and indirect borrowing during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Kim 2008). The indirect route was associated with lexical material transmitted through Chinese or Japanese, whereas direct borrowing involved transcription from English.

The Uzbek situation was strongly influenced by Russian during the Soviet period. After independence, however, direct contact with English became increasingly significant, particularly in education, technology, business, and international communication (Kuchkarov 2025). Thus, the two languages share the general tendency toward increasing English influence but differ in the historical mechanisms through which that influence developed.

These differences are important for comparative linguistics because identical source-language influence does not necessarily produce identical borrowing patterns. The recipient language's historical contacts, writing system, sociopolitical environment,

and communicative needs all contribute to the final form and distribution of loanwords.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The study demonstrates that English lexical borrowing in Uzbek and Korean developed through several historical stages and was strongly affected by changing extralinguistic conditions. Both languages show increased English influence in areas such as technology, communication, education, business, and international interaction, but their borrowing routes differ. Korean historical evidence points to both direct and indirect borrowing, while Uzbek experienced a significant intermediary role of Russian before direct English borrowing became more prominent after independence. The comparative examples further show that English-derived words are adjusted to the phonological and orthographic systems of the recipient languages. Consequently, English loanword development in Uzbek and Korean can be understood most accurately as the result of interaction between language contact, recipient-language structure, and historical and sociocultural conditions.

REFERENCES

1. Haugen, E. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26/2, 210-231. <https://doi.org/10.2307/410058>.
2. Kim, H. 2008. A semantic approach to the translation of English loanwords into Korean in the period of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, 33/3, 457-480. <https://doi.org/10.18855/lisoko.2008.33.3.005>.
3. Kuchkarov, I. 2025. The entry of words from English into Uzbek and their adaptation. *O'zMUXabarlari*, 1/1.12.1. <https://doi.org/10.69617/nuuz.v1i1.12.1.10431>.
4. Matras, Y. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Sohn, H.-M. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

6. Thomason, S. G. & Kaufman, T. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
7. Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

RAKHMANOVA SANOBAR MADAMINOVNA

LECTURER,

URGANCH STATE UNIVERSITY, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <S.RAXMANOVA82@GMAIL.COM>