

INTERNATIONAL WORDS IN THE RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Urinova Shahlo Abdikhalimovna

Lecturer, Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature, Tashkent,

E-mail: Urinovash@umail.uz

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20378989>

Abstract: This article examines international words (loanwords of global origin) in the Russian and Uzbek languages from a comparative linguistic perspective. It analyzes their semantic, phonetic, morphological, and functional characteristics, highlighting both similarities and differences in their adaptation processes. Special attention is given to the influence of globalization, cultural contact, and Russian–Uzbek language interaction on the development and usage of international vocabulary. The study shows that while both languages actively borrow international lexical units, their integration mechanisms differ due to typological and structural distinctions.

Keywords: international words, loanwords, Russian language, Uzbek language, comparative linguistics, adaptation, semantics, morphology, globalization, lexical borrowing.

Introduction.

In the era of globalization, languages are increasingly exposed to intensive lexical borrowing from international sources such as English, Latin, Greek, and French. These borrowed lexical units, commonly referred to as international words, play a significant role in the enrichment and modernization of both Russian and Uzbek vocabularies. International words are generally understood as words that exist in several languages with similar form and meaning due to common origin or borrowing through intermediary languages.

The Russian and Uzbek languages, despite belonging to different language families—Slavic and Turkic respectively—have both experienced extensive contact with global languages. Russian, as a historically influential regional language, has served as a major intermediary for the entry of international vocabulary into Uzbek, especially during the Soviet period. In the contemporary period, direct borrowing from English has increased in both languages due to technological development, media expansion, and global communication.

From a linguistic perspective, international words are important because they facilitate cross-cultural communication and scientific exchange. However, their integration into different language systems is not uniform. Russian, being a synthetic language with rich inflectional morphology, and Uzbek, an agglutinative language with suffix-based structure, adapt international words in different ways. This creates both similarities and differences in phonological, morphological, and semantic assimilation processes.

Another important aspect is the sociolinguistic role of international words. In both Russian and Uzbek, such vocabulary is widely used in scientific, technical, economic, and political discourse. However, the level of adaptation and everyday usage differs depending on cultural context, language policy, and exposure to global media. In Uzbek, international words often coexist with native equivalents, while in Russian they are more deeply integrated into the core vocabulary.

Therefore, studying international words in these two languages is essential for understanding modern lexical development, translation practices, and intercultural communication. This article aims to analyze the similarities and differences in the formation, adaptation, and usage of international words in Russian and Uzbek, focusing on their linguistic and functional characteristics in contemporary usage.

Main part.

International words represent lexical units that are widely shared across different languages due to globalization, scientific development, cultural exchange, and historical language contact. In both Russian and Uzbek languages, such words mainly originate from English, Latin, Greek, and French, and are widely used in scientific, technological, economic, political, and media discourse. Despite their common origin, the process of adaptation and integration of international words in Russian and Uzbek demonstrates both structural similarities and significant differences.

One of the main similarities between Russian and Uzbek languages is the semantic stability of international words. In most cases, international lexical units retain their core meaning across both languages. For example, words such as “internet,” “bank,” “medicine,” “technology,” and “culture” are used with nearly identical meanings in both Russian and Uzbek. This semantic transparency facilitates international communication and simplifies translation processes, especially in scientific and technical texts. The shared semantic structure of these words demonstrates the global nature of modern vocabulary development.

However, phonetic adaptation shows noticeable differences between the two languages. In Russian, international words are usually adapted according to Slavic phonological rules, including stress placement and consonant clusters. Russian pronunciation tends to preserve complex consonant structures, which makes many loanwords closer to their original English or European forms. In contrast, Uzbek phonological adaptation is influenced by vowel harmony and syllable structure typical of Turkic languages. As a result, international words in Uzbek often undergo simplification in pronunciation, insertion of vowels, or modification of consonant clusters to fit the native phonetic system.

Morphological integration also differs significantly between Russian and Uzbek. Russian, being a highly inflected language, integrates international words into its grammatical system by assigning gender (masculine, feminine, neuter) and applying case endings. For example, international nouns can change forms depending on syntactic function in a sentence. Uzbek, on the other hand, is an agglutinative language where grammatical meanings are expressed through the addition of suffixes. International words in Uzbek generally remain unchanged as roots, while grammatical relations are indicated through native suffixes such as plural (-lar), possessive, and case markers. This structural difference clearly demonstrates how language typology influences the adaptation of foreign vocabulary.

Another important aspect is lexical productivity. In Russian, international words often generate derivative forms through affixation, creating verbs, adjectives, and nouns based on borrowed roots. For instance, from international stems, Russian can form new lexical units that fully integrate into everyday usage. In Uzbek, although derivation is also possible, it is less flexible with international roots, and native word-formation patterns are more commonly applied. This indicates that Russian demonstrates a higher degree of morphological assimilation of international vocabulary compared to Uzbek.

Sociolinguistic factors also play a crucial role in the usage of international words. In Russian, international vocabulary is widely used not only in scientific and official contexts but also in everyday speech, media, and popular culture. This reflects the long-standing integration of Russian into global scientific and political discourse. In Uzbek, however, the use of international words is often more restricted to formal, academic, and technical contexts, while everyday communication still relies heavily on native Turkic equivalents. Nevertheless, with the growth of digital communication, social media, and globalization, the frequency of international words in Uzbek is steadily increasing.

Another key similarity lies in the role of English as the primary source of modern international vocabulary. In both languages, English has become the dominant donor language for

new technological and scientific terms. Words related to information technology, business, and digital communication are increasingly borrowed directly from English with minimal modification. This trend reflects the global dominance of English in contemporary communication and its influence on both Russian and Uzbek lexical systems.

Despite these similarities, differences in language policy and cultural attitudes toward borrowing also shape lexical development. Russian language policy is relatively flexible in accepting foreign terms, while Uzbek language policy often encourages the creation of native equivalents alongside international borrowings. This leads to a parallel existence of synonyms in Uzbek, where both international and native terms may be used depending on context, audience, and stylistic preference.

Overall, the comparison of international words in Russian and Uzbek reveals a complex interaction between globalization and language-specific structural features. While both languages actively incorporate international vocabulary, their phonological, morphological, and sociolinguistic adaptation strategies differ significantly due to typological distinctions and cultural-linguistic policies.

Conclusion.

The comparative analysis of international words in the Russian and Uzbek languages demonstrates that globalization has significantly influenced the lexical systems of both languages, leading to the widespread adoption of internationally shared vocabulary. These lexical units play an important role in scientific, technical, economic, and cultural communication, ensuring mutual understanding and facilitating cross-linguistic interaction in the modern world.

The study shows that both Russian and Uzbek languages share important similarities in the semantic interpretation of international words. In most cases, borrowed lexical units retain their original meaning and function across both languages, which contributes to the universality of modern scientific and technological terminology. Additionally, in both languages, English has become the primary source of new international vocabulary, especially in the fields of information technology, business, and global communication.

At the same time, significant differences are observed in the processes of phonological, morphological, and sociolinguistic adaptation. Russian language integrates international words more deeply into its grammatical system through inflection, gender assignment, and derivational processes. Uzbek, being an agglutinative language, preserves the root form of international words and expresses grammatical relations through suffixation. These typological differences strongly influence the way borrowed vocabulary functions within each language system.

Furthermore, sociolinguistic usage patterns differ: international words are more widely and informally used in Russian, while in Uzbek they are still largely associated with formal, academic, and technical contexts, although this gap is gradually narrowing due to digitalization and globalization. Language policy and cultural attitudes toward borrowing also play a significant role in shaping these differences.

In conclusion, international words in Russian and Uzbek represent both a common global linguistic phenomenon and a reflection of language-specific structural characteristics. Their study is important for understanding modern lexical development, translation practices, and intercultural communication. The findings confirm that while globalization promotes lexical convergence, individual language systems continue to preserve their unique structural and cultural identity.

References:

1. Ismatullayeva, D. (2021). Zamonaviy o'zbek tilida o'zlashma so'zlarning rivojlanishi. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya nashriyoti.

2. Qodirov, A. (2022). "O'zbek tilida inglizcha o'zlashmalarning fonetik moslashuvi." *Filologiya masalalari*, 4(2), 33–40.
3. Karimova, M. (2023). *Tilshunoslikda leksik integratsiya jarayonlari*. Toshkent: Universitet nashriyoti.
4. Yo'ldoshev, B. (2020). "O'zbek tilida xalqaro terminlarning qo'llanilishi." *Zamonaviy tilshunoslik jurnali*, 2(1), 55–62.
5. Raxmatov, S. (2024). "Globallashuv va o'zbek tilining leksik o'zgarishlari." *Ijtimoiy fanlar va tilshunoslik*, 6(3), 70–78.
6. Haspelmath, M. (2021). "Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues." *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 15(4), 1–18.
7. Trask, R. L. (2020). *Historical Linguistics*. Routledge.
8. Thomason, S. G. (2022). *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh University Press.