PARTONYMS IN THE ASSIMILATED LEXICON OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Safarova Mahfuza Rajabovna

Independent researcher of Bukhara State University Senior English teacher of school No. 17, Bukhara district, Bukhara region

Abstract: *This article explores the structural, semantic, and functional features of partonyms—lexical units expressing part–whole relations—within the assimilated vocabulary of English and Uzbek. Through comparative analysis, the study examines the origins of borrowed partonyms, the mechanisms of assimilation, and the types of partonymic relations common to both languages. The findings indicate that English and Uzbek, despite belonging to different language families, demonstrate universal cognitive patterns in forming partonymic structures while also revealing language-specific morphological and semantic tendencies shaped by their respective borrowing histories.*

Keywords: *partonymy; holonym–partonym relations; lexical assimilation; borrowed vocabulary; English linguistics; Uzbek linguistics; loanwords; morphological adaptation; phonological assimilation; semantic specialization; component–object relations; cross-linguistic comparison; lexical typology; agglutinative morphology; historical borrowing.*

Partonymy is a fundamental lexical-semantic relation that represents the structural dependency between a part and its whole (e.g., wheel–car, finger–hand).

In both English and Uzbek, partonymic vocabulary constitutes an essential component of the lexicon and reflects centuries of linguistic contact, borrowing, and cultural exchange.

The purpose of this article is to analyze assimilated partonyms, i.e., part–whole terms that were borrowed from foreign languages and later integrated into English and Uzbek.

This study highlights how each language assimilates loanwords phonologically, morphologically, and semantically, and how these borrowed partonyms function within the broader lexical system.

English demonstrates a long and complex history of lexical borrowing, resulting from multiple periods of cultural contact, conquest, scientific development, and trade.

Borrowed partonyms in English typically reflect both material culture (e.g., engine, window) and scientific terminology (e.g., digit, corpus).

The major sources of partonymic borrowing include Latin, French, Greek, Old Norse, and Germanic languages. Each source contributed in distinct historical periods and for specific semantic domains.

1. Latin Borrowings

Latin borrowings entered English during two main periods:

(1) Christianization of Britain (7th century)

(2) Scientific Renaissance (15th–17th centuries)

Latin contributed numerous anatomical and scientific partonyms.

Examples:

Latin Source	Modern English	Meaning/Function	Assimilation Features

	Partonym		
digitus	digit	'finger' or numeral symbol	Phonological reduction; regular plural digits
musculus	muscle	body part enabling movement	Simplified spelling; semantic specialization
corpus	corpus	body; body of texts	Academic term with metaphorical extension

Explanation

Latin words often entered English through French intermediaries or through scholarly usage.

They typically underwent:

• Simplified pronunciation (e.g., musculus → muscle)

• Category narrowing (e.g., digit used more technically than 'finger')

• Metaphorical extension (e.g., corpus used in linguistics).

2. French Borrowings

French influence was strongest after the Norman Conquest of 1066, when French became the administrative and aristocratic language of England.

Many partonyms related to technology, household objects, and nature entered English from Anglo-Norman French.

Examples:

French Source	Modern English Partonym	Domain	Assimilation Features
engin	engine	machinery part	Semantic expansion: from 'skill' → mechanical device
branche	branch	part of a tree	Orthographic naturalization; plural branches
detail	detail	component/part	Broadened meaning: 'small part' → 'specific information'

Explanation

French-origin partonyms underwent:

• Phonological domestication (e.g., bran-che → branch)

• Semantic evolution (engine: 'device' → part of a machine)

• Regular English morphology (detail → details)

3. Greek Borrowings

Greek contributed heavily to scientific and technical terminology, often through Latin mediation.

Greek-origin partonyms include components of systems, biological parts, and conceptual subdivisions.

Example:

Greek Source	Modern English Partonym	Domain	Assimilation Features
mikros ('small')	micro-	system component	Used as a bound morpheme in

			compounds: microchip
bios ('life')	bio-	biological systems	Forms system parts: biomass, biosphere
systēma	system	organized whole	Adopted with minimal phonological change

Explanation

Greek borrowings often function as:

• productive prefixes (micro-, bio-)

• scientific partonyms (cell, neuron, organ system)

Their assimilation is mainly semantic and morphological, integrating into English derivational patterns.

4. Old Norse and Germanic Borrowings

From the Viking settlements (8th–11th centuries), English absorbed many everyday partonyms related to household objects and natural elements.

Examples:

Old Norse / Germanic Source	English Partonym	Domain	Assimilation Features
vindauga ('wind-eye')	vindauga ('wind-eye')	vindauga ('wind-eye')	vindauga ('wind-eye')
vængr	vængr	vængr	vængr
Proto-Germanic krutjon	Proto-Germanic krutjon	Proto-Germanic krutjon	Proto-Germanic krutjon

The comparative analysis of assimilated partonyms in English and Uzbek demonstrates that part–whole relations are shaped by universal cognitive principles, yet their linguistic realization is strongly influenced by each language's historical, structural, and typological characteristics.

English, with its long history of contact with Latin, French, Greek, and Norse, tends to integrate borrowed partonyms primarily through phonological simplification, semantic specialization, and limited morphological adaptation. Many English partonyms retain traces of their original forms, reflecting the language's analytic nature and relatively low reliance on inflectional morphology.

In contrast, Uzbek—an agglutinative, suffix-rich Turkic language—shows a much deeper and more systematic assimilation of borrowed partonyms from Arabic, Persian, and Russian. Loanwords are incorporated not only phonologically but also morphologically, participating fully in derivation and word formation.

This leads to high productivity and structural uniformity within the Uzbek lexical system.

Despite these typological differences, both languages exhibit comparable types of partonymic relations (component–object, part–body, member–collection, substance–object, and technical part–system), indicating that partonymy is conceptually universal while its linguistic encoding varies according to each language's internal mechanisms.

Overall, the study shows that assimilated partonyms serve as important indicators of linguistic contact, cultural exchange, and lexical evolution.

Their patterns of adaptation reveal how English and Uzbek reshape foreign lexical material to fit their own phonological, morphological, and semantic systems, thereby enriching their vocabularies and expanding their expressive capabilities.

REFERENCES:

1. Aikhenvald, A. Y., & Dixon, R. M. W. (Eds.). (2002). Word: A Cross-Linguistic Typology. Cambridge University Press.

2. Bussmann, H. (1996). Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. Routledge.

3. Carstairs-McCarthy, A. (2002). An Introduction to English Morphology. Edinburgh University Press.

4. Crystal, D. (2010). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

5. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2018). An Introduction to Language (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.

6. Haspelmath, M., & Tadmor, U. (Eds.). (2009). Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook. De Gruyter Mouton.

7. Jeffries, L. (2006). Discovering Language: The Structure of Modern English. Palgrave Macmillan.

8. Johanson, L., & Csató, É. Á. (Eds.). (1998). The Turkic Languages. Routledge.

9. Trask, R. L. (1994). Language Change. Routledge.

10. Uz-FA (Uzbekistan Fanlar Akademiyasi). (2010). Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti.

11. Safarova M.R. THE LEXICAL-SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION OF WHOLE–PART RELATIONS IN THE UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES. Finlan. d, Helsinki international scientificonline conference"SUSTAINABILITY OF EDUCATION SOCIO-ECONOMIC SCIENCE THEORY", https://interoncof.com/plugins/generic/pdfJsViewer/pdf.js/web/viewer.html?file=https%3A%2F%2Finteroncof.com%2Findex.php%2Ffinland%2Farticle%2Fdownload%2F14848%2F13399%2F26419.

12. Rajabovna, S. M. (2025). THE LEXICAL-SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION OF WHOLE–PART RELATIONS IN THE UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES. SUSTAINABILITY OF EDUCATION, SOCIO-ECONOMIC SCIENCE THEORY, 3(36), 7-10.

13. Rajabovna, S. M. (2025). THE LEXICAL-SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION OF WHOLE–PART RELATIONS IN THE UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES. SUSTAINABILITY OF EDUCATION, SOCIO-ECONOMIC SCIENCE THEORY, 3(36), 7-10.

14.	Radjabovna, S. M. (2022). ASSESSMENT AND ITS ROLE IN TEACHING. INNOVATION IN THE MODERN EDUCATION SYSTEM, 65.

15.	Radjabovna, S. M. (2022). SOME FEATURES OF TEACHER'S NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR. INNOVATION IN THE MODERN EDUCATION SYSTEM, 60.

16.	Radjabovna, S. M. (2022). SOME FEATURES OF TEACHER'S NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR. INNOVATION IN THE MODERN EDUCATION SYSTEM, 60.

17.	Haydarov, K., Abdujabbarov, A., Rayimbaev, J., & Ahmedov, B. (2020). Magnetized particle motion around black holes in conformal gravity: Can magnetic interaction mimic spin of black holes?. Universe, 6(3), 44.