

## ORIGIN OF NEOLOGISMS

Ugiloy Khoshimova

*ESL teacher at school №1 Altyarik region***Abstract**

*Every living language renews its vocabulary. New technologies, social practices, and cultural contacts create concepts that existing words cannot name, and speakers respond by producing new lexical units. Such units are called neologisms. The study of their origin is important for lexicology and for terminology, because it shows how a language adapts to change and which resources it uses to do so. This article reviews the main sources of neologisms, the stages through which a new word becomes part of the lexicon, and the social and communicative factors that decide whether a coinage survives.*

**Keywords:** *neologism, word formation, borrowing, lexicon*

**1. Introduction**

A neologism is a word, a word combination, or a new meaning of an existing word that has recently entered a language and is still perceived as new by its speakers. Definitions differ in how they treat novelty. Some scholars stress the time of first use, while others stress the speakers' awareness that the item is unfamiliar. Algeo (1991) approached new words as a continuous process of lexical renewal and described the different ways in which they arise. Fischer (1998) added that creative neologisms are shaped by the motivation of the speaker, by their gradual institutionalization, and by their productivity. Novelty is therefore relative: a word may be new for one community of speakers and ordinary for another.

Neologisms can be classified in several ways. By meaning, researchers separate completely new words from new senses of existing words. By scope of use, they distinguish general neologisms, which spread across the whole speech community, from terminological neologisms, which circulate within a profession, and from nonce words, which are tied to a single text or speaker. The difference between nonce words and established words is discussed by Lipka (2002) as part of the broader problem of how new formations become part of the lexicon. This typology matters because each type behaves differently. A term in a specialized field is usually coined deliberately to fill a gap in a conceptual system, whereas a general-language coinage often appears spontaneously in speech, humor, or the media.

**2. Literature review**

Linguists usually distinguish several mechanisms through which neologisms appear. The first is word-formation, the creation of new items from existing morphemes and words.

Marchand (1969) described the categories and types of English word-formation in detail, and Plag (2003) showed how the productivity of affixes and patterns explains why some formations are readily accepted while others are not. The most common processes are affixation (derivation), compounding, conversion, blending, clipping, back-formation, and the creation of acronyms (Yule, 2020).

Blending is especially active in contemporary vocabulary. In tourism discourse, for example, glamping combines glamorous and camping, and bleisure combines business and leisure. Both words name new travel practices and are transparent enough for speakers to interpret immediately. Compounds such as eco-tourism or city break work in a similar way, joining two familiar elements to name a new concept.

2.1 The second major source is borrowing. When a community meets a new object, practice, or idea through contact with another culture, it often takes over the foreign name together with the concept. Yule (2020) regards borrowing as one of the most common sources of new words in English, which itself contains many items of French, Latin, and Scandinavian origin. Languages with less global influence often borrow from English, either directly or through an intermediary language, and then adapt the borrowed word to their own phonology and morphology. This is a typical path for modern terminology in many languages, including those of Central Asia.

The third source is semantic change, in which an existing word acquires a new meaning without any change in form. Widening, narrowing, amelioration, pejoration, and metaphorical extension are the processes most often described. Metaphorical extension is particularly productive in specialized fields, where familiar words are re-used for new technical concepts. Finally, some neologisms are true coinages created from nothing, usually as brand names or trade names, which may later become common nouns.

### **Stages in the Life of a Neologism**

Creating a word is not the same as establishing it in the language. Bauer (1983) proposed a three-stage model in which a new formation begins as a nonce-formation, a word coined for a single occasion. If other speakers adopt it and it becomes known in the community, it is institutionalized. At the final stage it may be lexicalized, meaning that it acquires features, such as an idiosyncratic meaning or form, that cannot be predicted from the rules by which it was produced. Lipka (2002) similarly distinguishes these processes and notes that institutionalization and lexicalization are gradual rather than sudden. Most nonce-formations never leave the first stage, and this explains why dictionaries record only a small proportion of the words that speakers actually coin.

The survival of a neologism depends on several conditions. Metcalf (2002) summarized them as five factors: the frequency and spread of the word, its unobtrusiveness, the diversity

of its users and situations of use, its capacity to generate other forms and meanings, and the endurance of the concept it names. A word that is useful, easy to form, and attached to a lasting concept has a much better chance of being accepted than one that merely attracts attention for a short time.

**2.2** Neologisms are not only linguistic events but also social ones. New words arise because speakers need to name something new, but also because they want to be expressive, humorous, or economical, or to signal membership in a group. Fischer (1998) stresses that the motivation of the speaker is an essential part of the explanation of why a particular word is created at a particular moment. Technology, globalization, and the media are the main external forces behind the present growth of new vocabulary. Global English acts as a major source language, and the internet and social platforms have accelerated diffusion: a coinage can now reach a very large audience within days, while in earlier periods the same process could take decades.

**2.3** Speakers' attitudes also shape the fate of new words. In many speech communities, borrowed and newly coined items meet both enthusiasm and purist resistance. Language institutions, dictionaries, terminology committees, and educational policy can encourage some forms and discourage others, and their decisions influence whether a competing foreign term, calque, or native coinage prevails. For this reason, a description of origin that ignores attitudes and policy gives only a partial picture of how a lexicon changes.

The origin of a neologism becomes especially important in translation, because the translator must decide how to render an item that may not yet be recorded in any dictionary. Newmark (1988) lists several types of neologisms, among them old words with new senses, new coinages, derived words, abbreviations, collocations, eponyms, phrasal words, transferred words, acronyms, and pseudo-neologisms, and he describes procedures such as transference, naturalization, through-translation (calque), descriptive equivalent, and functional equivalent for dealing with them.

In the Uzbek–English pair these procedures correspond to real choices. A new English item can be transferred into Uzbek in a form adapted to Uzbek spelling and pronunciation, rendered part by part as a calque, explained by a descriptive phrase, or replaced by a native word created for the purpose. The choice depends on the text type, the audience, and whether the concept is already established. A scientific article may accept a transferred term with an explanation, while a popular text may prefer a descriptive phrase. Without a consistent policy, the same concept may appear under several names, which weakens communication in specialized fields.

### **Neologisms in Specialized Terminology**

In special languages the origin of neologisms is closely tied to the development of knowledge and practice in a field. Cabré (1999) emphasizes that new terms appear when specialists need to designate new concepts, and that term creation is usually more deliberate and more regulated than the spontaneous growth of general vocabulary. Terminologists therefore pay attention not only to how a term is formed but also to how it is standardized, translated, and adopted by professional communities.

Tourism is a useful example. The industry changes quickly under the influence of technology, new patterns of travel, and international exchange, and its vocabulary changes with it. Many new tourism terms originate in English, spread through professional communication and the media, and are then reproduced or adapted in other languages. In a comparative perspective, such as Uzbek and English, the same concept may be introduced as a direct borrowing, a calque, a descriptive phrase, or a native coinage. Comparing these solutions shows which origins are most productive in each language and how far national terminology follows or resists international models.

The Uzbek lexicon itself has been shaped by successive layers of contact. Arabic and Persian words entered over many centuries through religion, literature, and administration. In the twentieth century, Russian and, through it, international vocabulary became a major source of scientific and social terms. In recent decades, English has become one of the main suppliers of new items. Borrowed roots are usually integrated through Uzbek suffixes and light-verb constructions, which shows that borrowing is not simply the import of words but their adaptation to the receiving system.

Sager (1990) distinguishes primary term formation, in which a new concept and its designation appear together, from secondary term formation, in which a new term is created for a concept that already exists elsewhere, for instance in translation or when a native term replaces a borrowed one. This distinction is useful for comparative research. English tourism terms often illustrate primary formation, whereas their Uzbek counterparts frequently illustrate secondary formation, and comparing the two shows how a concept travels between languages and how each language chooses to name it.

### **Directions for Future Research**

Several lines of research would extend the present discussion. Corpus-based studies can measure the frequency and stability of new terms over time and show which sources of neologisms are most productive in each language. Diachronic tracking of individual items, from first attestation to dictionary entry, can test the stages of nonce-formation, institutionalization, and lexicalization on concrete material. Surveys of speaker attitudes can show how acceptance of borrowed and native forms differs between professional groups and

age groups. Finally, terminological databases that record competing variants and recommend preferred forms would give translators, teachers, and specialists a practical basis for consistent usage.

### Conclusion

Neologisms originate in a limited set of mechanisms: word-formation, borrowing, semantic change, and, more rarely, pure coinage. What distinguishes a lasting term from a passing coinage is not its origin alone but its progress through the stages of nonce-formation, institutionalization, and lexicalization, and the social conditions that support its use. In specialized fields such as tourism, these processes are intensified by the pressure of rapid change and international contact. A systematic study of the origin of neologisms therefore helps explain both the internal structure of the lexicon and the ways in which languages respond to a changing world. Further research based on corpus data would make it possible to measure the productivity of each source and to compare how different languages adapt new concepts. Such work is valuable not only for linguistic theory but also for translation, lexicography, and language teaching, where the ability to recognize and explain new words is increasingly necessary.

### References

1. Algeo, J. (Ed.). (1991). Fifty years among the new words: A dictionary of neologisms, 1941–1991. Cambridge University Press.
2. Bauer, L. (1983). English word-formation. Cambridge University Press.
3. Cabré, M. T. (1999). Terminology: Theory, methods and applications. John Benjamins.
4. Fischer, R. (1998). Lexical change in present-day English: A corpus-based study of the motivation, institutionalization, and productivity of creative neologisms. Gunter Narr.
5. Lipka, L. (2002). English lexicology: Lexical structure, word semantics and word-formation. Gunter Narr.
6. Marchand, H. (1969). The categories and types of present-day English word-formation: A synchronic-diachronic approach (2nd ed.). C. H. Beck.
7. Metcalf, A. (2002). Predicting new words: The secrets of their success. Houghton Mifflin.
8. Newmark, P. (1988). A textbook of translation. Prentice Hall.
9. Plag, I. (2003). Word-formation in English. Cambridge University Press.
10. Sager, J. C. (1990). A practical course in terminology processing. John Benjamins.
11. Yule, G. (2020). The study of language (7th ed.). Cambridge University Press.