

TRACING ENGLISH LOANWORDS IN UZBEK AND KOREAN: ETYMOLOGY, DONOR LANGUAGE, AND ROUTES OF LEXICAL BORROWING

S.M.Rakhmanova¹

1. Lecturer at Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Beruni

Mas'ul muallif: Rakhmanova Sanobar Madaminovna, Lecturer at Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Beruni.

e-mail:
s.raxmanova82@gmail.com

Received: 27 Sentabr 2026

Accepted: 02 Oktabr 2026

Published: 07 Oktabr 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author(s). Licensee Buxoro xalqaro universiteti ilmiy axborotnomasi.

Iqtibos uchun: Rakhmanova, S. M. TRACING ENGLISH LOANWORDS IN UZBEK AND KOREAN: ETYMOLOGY, DONOR LANGUAGE, AND ROUTES OF LEXICAL BORROWING / S. M. Rakhmanova // Buxoro xalqaro universiteti ilmiy axborotnomasi. — 2026. — T. 10, № 1. — B. 136–138.

Abstract. This article examines the historical identification of English loanwords in Uzbek and Korean with particular attention to etymological source, donor language, mediating language, and borrowing route. The study argues that the ultimate origin of a lexical item should not automatically be equated with the language through which it entered the recipient language. A comparative historical-linguistic approach is applied to distinguish direct English borrowing from mediated transmission. Particular attention is given to the role of Russian in the history of English-derived vocabulary in Uzbek and Japanese and Chinese in earlier Korean borrowing. The analysis demonstrates that the classification of English loanwords requires documentary and cross-linguistic evidence rather than formal similarity alone.

Keywords: english loanwords, Uzbek, Korean, donor language, etymology, mediating language, lexical borrowing, language contact, direct borrowing, indirect borrowing.

O'ZBEK VA KOREYS TILLARIDAGI INGLIZCHA O'ZLASHMA SO'ZLARNI ANIQLASH: ETIMOLOGIYA, DONOR TIL VA LEKSIK O'ZLASHUV YO'LLARI

Annotatsiya. Mazkur maqolada o'zbek va koreys tillaridagi inglizcha o'zlashma so'zlarning tarixiy jihatdan aniqlanishi etimologik manba, donor til, vositachi til hamda leksik o'zlashuv yo'llariga alohida e'tibor qaratilgan holda tadqiq etiladi. Unda leksik birlikning dastlabki kelib chiqish manbasini ushbu birlik qabul qiluvchi tilga kirib kelgan til bilan avtomatik ravishda tenglashtirish mumkin emasligi asoslab beriladi. Tadqiqotda ingliz tilidan bevosita o'zlashgan birliklarni vositachi tillar orqali kirib kelgan o'zlashmalardan farqlash maqsadida qiyosiy-tarixiy va lingvistik yondashuvdan foydalaniladi. O'zbek tilidagi inglizcha kelib chiqishga ega leksikaning shakllanish tarixida rus tilining, koreys tilidagi dastlabki o'zlashuv jarayonlarida esa yapon va xitoy tillarining vositachilik roli alohida tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot natijalari inglizcha o'zlashma so'zlarni tasniflashda faqat shakli o'xshashlikka tayanish yetarli emasligini, balki hujjatli manbalar va tillararo dalillarga asoslanish zarurligini ko'rsatadi.

Kalit so'zlar: inglizcha o'zlashmalar, o'zbek tili, koreys tili, donor til, etimologiya, vositachi til, leksik o'zlashuv, til kontakti, bevosita o'zlashuv, bilvosita o'zlashuv.

АНАЛИЗ АНГЛИЙСКИХ ЗАИМСТВОВАНИЙ В УЗБЕКСКОМ И КОРЕЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ: ЭТИМОЛОГИЯ, ЯЗЫК-ДОНОР И ПУТИ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОГО ЗАИМСТВОВАНИЯ

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается историческая идентификация английских заимствований в узбекском и корейском языках с особым вниманием к этимологическому источнику, языку-донору, языку-посреднику и путям лексического заимствования. Обосновывается положение о том, что исходное происхождение лексической единицы не следует автоматически отождествлять с языком, посредством которого она вошла в язык-реципиент. В исследовании применяется сравнительно-исторический и лингвистический подход, позволяющий разграничить прямые заимствования из английского языка и заимствования, поступившие через посреднические языки. Особое внимание уделяется роли русского языка в истории английской лексики в узбекском языке, а также японского и китайского языков в более ранних процессах заимствования в корейском языке. Анализ показывает, что классификация английских заимствований требует документальных и межъязыковых доказательств, а не может основываться исключительно на формальном сходстве.

Ключевые слова: английские заимствования, узбекский язык, корейский язык, язык-донор, этимология, язык-посредник, лексическое заимствование, языковой контакт, прямое заимствование, косвенное заимствование.

Introduction. Lexical borrowing is a natural consequence of sustained contact between linguistic communities. Languages acquire lexical material when speakers encounter new cultural objects, institutions, technologies, social practices, or concepts for which existing vocabulary may be insufficient or less convenient. Borrowed words may

subsequently undergo phonological, morphological, orthographic, and semantic adaptation in the recipient language; therefore, their modern forms do not always reveal the complete history of transmission. One of the central issues in identifying English loanwords is the distinction between etymological source and immediate donor language. A lexical item may ultimately originate in Latin, Greek, French, or another language but enter Uzbek or Korean through English, while an English-origin word may reach the recipient language through an additional intermediary. Thus, formal similarity with an English word alone cannot establish direct borrowing.

Haugen's influential study of linguistic borrowing emphasized the systematic analysis of transferred linguistic material and the relationship between bilingualism and borrowing (Haugen, 1950), while Matras (2009) examined lexical borrowing within the broader framework of language contact. These approaches provide a theoretical basis for analysing English lexical influence in Uzbek and Korean. The comparison is particularly relevant because the two languages have experienced English influence under different historical conditions: Uzbek developed significant contact with Russian during the Russian imperial and Soviet periods, whereas Korean experienced extensive contact with Chinese and Japanese before developing strong direct contact with English. Therefore, identifying English loanwords requires attention not only to their form and etymology but also to the immediate donor language, possible mediating language, and historical route of transmission.

Materials and Methods. The study employs a comparative historical-linguistic and lexicographic approach that distinguishes four related but non-identical categories: etymological source, the language to which the historical origin of a lexical item can ultimately be traced; donor language, the language that directly supplied the item to the recipient language; mediating language, an additional language through which the item passed before reaching the recipient language; and borrowing route, the historically reconstructed pathway connecting these languages. The analytical model is therefore expressed as etymological source → mediating language → donor language → recipient language, although not all stages are necessarily present: direct borrowing may involve English and the recipient language alone, whereas indirect borrowing may include one or more intermediary languages. For Uzbek, recent research documents both mediated borrowing and increasing direct English influence, including the historical role of Russian as an intermediary and the growing importance of direct English contact in the post-Soviet period (Kuchkarov, 2025).

For Korean, the study draws on historical and phonological evidence to distinguish different routes of English lexical transmission. Kim (2008) identifies both indirect borrowing through Chinese or Japanese and direct adoption from English during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Kang, Kenstowicz, and Ito (2008) further demonstrate that some English loanwords transmitted through Japanese retain phonological characteristics associated with that route, providing evidence for distinguishing historically mediated forms from later direct English borrowings. Contemporary Uzbek and Korean lexicographic resources are also used to establish the current lexical status and usage of the analysed units.

Results and Discussion. The comparative analysis demonstrates that etymological origin and donor language are not identical concepts. A lexical item may have an ancient etymological history while entering Uzbek or Korean as a relatively recent English-mediated form. This distinction is particularly important for international vocabulary, since lexical similarity across several languages indicates diffusion but does not by itself establish the immediate donor language. Therefore, a reliable analysis should separately determine (1) the ultimate etymological source, (2) the language that supplied the form to Uzbek or Korean, (3) any mediating language, and (4) the historical evidence confirming the transmission route. This approach prevents internationally widespread vocabulary from being automatically classified as direct English borrowing. In Uzbek, English lexical influence has developed through different historical periods and contact channels. During the Soviet period, Russian functioned as an important mediating language for international terminology, whereas after independence direct contact with English expanded through higher education, international business, information technology, sport, media, and other fields. The distinction can be illustrated by futbol, historically related to English football: although its ultimate source is English, the Russian form футбол and the Soviet historical context indicate that Russian mediation should be considered before classifying it as a direct English → Uzbek borrowing. By contrast, more recent forms such as marketing and menejer show a transparent relationship with English, and contemporary contact conditions make direct English influence plausible. Nevertheless, documentary evidence is required to distinguish established direct borrowings from internationally circulating vocabulary. English-derived bases may also combine with Uzbek grammatical and word-formational elements, demonstrating their integration into the recipient language. The Korean data provide particularly clear evidence of the importance of mediating languages and historical transmission routes. Kim (2008) shows that English vocabulary entering Korean in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries followed both direct and indirect routes, including transmission through Chinese and Japanese. Kang, Kenstowicz, and Ito (2008), based on more than 500 Japanese-influenced English loan forms, further demonstrate that Japanese-mediated English vocabulary may preserve phonological features associated with Japanese pronunciation. Their examples, including meter, muffler, fantasy, catalogue, vinyl, and concrete, illustrate how phonological evidence can contribute to identifying borrowing routes. The Korean forms of meter, in particular, reveal direct, Japanese-mediated, and hybrid pathways, showing why comparison of English spelling and Korean form alone is insufficient for reconstructing borrowing history.

The case of coffee, also discussed by Kang et al. (2008), provides further evidence that Korean loanword pronunciation may preserve traces of different historical contacts, particularly in the treatment of English /f/. Older Japanese-mediated forms and later direct English borrowings may therefore display different phonological patterns. The Korean evidence suggests that borrowing can involve several successive stages of adaptation rather than a simple one-

directional transfer. An earlier Japanese-mediated form may subsequently be influenced by direct contact with English, resulting in variation or partial restructuring. Thus, identifying English loanwords in Uzbek and Korean requires not only etymological comparison but also attention to the donor language, mediating language, historical period, and phonological or documentary evidence supporting the proposed route of transmission. Comparative routes of borrowing. The Uzbek and Korean situations can be summarized through the following analytical model:

Language	Possible route	Historical significance
Uzbek	English → Uzbek	Increasingly important in contemporary international communication
Uzbek	English → Russian → Uzbek	Relevant to some earlier international and technical vocabulary
Korean	English → Korean	Especially important with modern direct contact with English
Korean	English → Japanese → Korean	Historically significant, particularly during the period of Japanese influence
Korean	English → Chinese → Korean	Documented for some lexical material in the modernizing period

These routes should not be applied mechanically to every lexical item. A word must be investigated individually using historical dictionaries, early texts, comparative evidence, and contemporary lexicographic resources.

The Korean evidence demonstrates particularly well why phonological form can be historically informative. If two Korean forms corresponding to the same English lexical item show systematic differences associated with Japanese-mediated and direct English adaptation, the variation can provide evidence concerning their borrowing histories (Kang, Kenstowicz, & Ito, 2008).

For Uzbek, the distinction between Russian-mediated and contemporary direct English influence is similarly important. The existence of an English equivalent does not automatically establish the route by which the Uzbek form entered the language. Historical period and documentary evidence must therefore accompany lexical comparison. A criterion for identifying English loanwords. The findings support a more precise procedure for constructing a corpus of English loanwords in Uzbek and Korean. A lexical unit should not be included solely because it resembles an English word or because English is listed somewhere in its etymological history.

A stronger classification procedure is:

Lexical unit → earliest documented evidence → etymological source → donor language → mediating language → borrowing route → recipient-language form → current meaning and usage.

Under this model, a word may be classified as an English loanword when English can be demonstrated as the immediate donor. If English is only the ultimate source but another language directly transmitted the word to Uzbek or Korean, the item should be described as an English-origin or English-derived mediated borrowing rather than an uncomplicated direct English loan. This distinction is especially useful for comparative and contrastive linguistics because it separates lexical origin from actual language contact.

Conclusion. Tracing English loanwords in Uzbek and Korean requires a historical approach that distinguishes etymological source, donor language, mediating language, and borrowing route rather than relying on formal similarity alone. Uzbek has experienced both mediated and increasingly direct English influence, with Russian serving as an important intermediary in earlier periods, while Korean demonstrates both direct English borrowing and indirect transmission through Chinese and Japanese; phonological variation may also preserve evidence of earlier borrowing routes. The comparative analysis shows that each lexical item should be examined individually and its historical pathway established before inclusion in a corpus of English loanwords, particularly because international lexical similarity does not necessarily prove direct borrowing from English. Therefore, the key analytical question is not simply whether a word exists in English, but which language supplied the lexical item to Uzbek or Korean and what historical evidence demonstrates that route, providing a more transparent and historically defensible basis for comparative research on English lexical influence.

References

- [1] Haugen E. The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing // Language. – 1950. – Vol. 26, № 2. – P. 210–231.
- [2] Kang Y., Kenstowicz M., Ito C. Hybrid loans: A study of English loanwords transmitted to Korean via Japanese // Journal of East Asian Linguistics. – 2008. – Vol. 17, № 4. – P. 299–316.
- [3] Kim H.-Y. A semantic approach to the translation of English loanwords into Korean in the period of the late 19th and early 20th centuries // Language Research. – 2008. – Vol. 33, № 3. – P. 457–480.
- [4] Matras Y. Language Contact. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [5] Sohn H.-M. The Korean Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [6] National Institute of Korean Language. Korean-English Learners' Dictionary. – Seoul: National Institute of Korean Language.
- [7] Kuchkarov I. The entry of words from English into Uzbek and their adaptation // O'zMU xabarlar. – 2025. – Vol. 1, № 12.1.