

COLLOQUIAL UNIVERBATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

*Sotvoldieva Istorakhon Lutfullo kizi**Andijan state institute of foreign languages*

Annotation: This article presents a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek colloquialisms, focusing on their semantic categories and structural patterns. It identifies recurring thematic clusters and investigates how colloquialisms in both languages reflect cultural values and societal norms. The study also explores the relationship between English colloquial univerbs and their corresponding expressions in Uzbek, highlighting instances where a single English word corresponds to a multi-word phrase, idiomatic expression, or descriptive paraphrase in Uzbek. This comparative approach offers insights into the unique characteristics of colloquial language in each linguistic and cultural context.

Keywords: colloquialisms, verbs, adjectives, semantic analysis, english, uzbek, comparative linguistics, lexical semantics, translation equivalents, univerbs, idioms, phrases.

The study of colloquialisms provides valuable insights into the dynamic nature of language and the socio-cultural factors that shape its evolution. Colloquial language, characterized by its informality and everyday usage, often differs significantly from the standard or literary forms of a language. This article aims to explore the formation processes of colloquialisms in two distinct linguistic contexts: English and Uzbek. By comparing and contrasting the mechanisms through which words acquire colloquial meanings in these languages, we can gain a deeper understanding of the universal principles governing lexical semantic change and the specific cultural influences that contribute to the unique character of each language.

The research also analyzes colloquial verbs and adjectives in English and Uzbek, classifying them into semantic classes and groups. It can be observed that colloquialisms in English and Uzbek are mainly associated with everyday life themes. However, it is not correct to accept this as an unchanging general rule. Because, colloquial lexical units can also be used in the process of relationships outside the scope of everyday themes. In the semantic research process, it is necessary to take into account various factors that reflect the volume and specificity of the language vocabulary. As a result, there is a need to identify such areas or branches of extra-linguistic reality that have universal significance and value. It should be noted that this need is further increased, especially when studying colloquial lexical units that reflect human life and everyday life. Analyzing different word groups, we have witnessed that certain differences may emerge in the composition of these groups in the compared languages.

Different areas and semantic classes can be distinguished that unite colloquial lexical units. For example, J.Green emphasizes that sub-colloquialisms are more often used by people in the following topics:

- 1) body and its parts;
- 2) money;
- 3) food;
- 4) animals;

- 5) buildings and their parts;
- 6) day and night;
- 7) people hierarchy [1].

The semantic space of each area is divided into sema-classes, the total number of which reaches thirty-two. R.Gonzales and A.Stentsrom, in turn, single out the following most active topics:

- 1) school;
- 2) drugs, drinking and smoking;
- 3) music;
- 4) entertainment;
- 5) type of intimate activity;
- 6) fashion;
- 7) leisure activities [2].

When studying sub-colloquial lexical units, B.Sotvoldiev singles out 13 of their lexical-semantic groups:

- 1) anthroponyms;
- 2) eponyms;
- 3) characteronyms;
- 4) toponyms;
- 5) zoonyms;
- 6) phytonyms;
- 7) somatisms;
- 8) ethnonyms;
- 9) product names;
- 10) profession names;
- 11) numbers;
- 12) colors;
- 13) onomatopoeia [3].

G.Rahimov proposes to divide literary language and sub-colloquial lexical units into meanings of words are often derived, and metaphors are crucial in the formation of these new senses. This process involves applying qualities or characteristics associated with one concept or entity to another, resulting in a novel and often figurative meaning [4].

The influence of cultural context on metaphorical transfer should also be considered. For example, a cultural understanding of animal behavior or common usage of an object might contribute to its metaphorical use in colloquial language. The following lexical-semantic variants serve as examples of this phenomenon:

1. Animal – (similar to it) a person or object:

ENGLISH: 1. chick (literary) – a young domestic fowl;

2. chick (colloquial) – a young woman;

UZBEK: 1. eshak (literary) – a mammal with long ears related to the equids, smaller working animal than a horse;

2. eshak (colloquial) – someone who does someone else's work selflessly;

2. Object – Person:

ENGLISH: 1. crook (literary) – a bend, curve, hook;

2. crook (colloquial) – a swindler;

UZBEK: 1. Cho'p (literary) – a piece of twig, branch, thin, long splinter, piece of wood.

2. Cho‘p (colloquial) – a very thin, delicate person.

These examples demonstrate that metaphorical shifts occur based on diverse differential characteristics inherent in objects, events, or phenomena. The thinness of a “cho‘p” compared to the delicateness of a person or a crooks bent shape and the bent ways of a swindler. It is important to note that not all referents of such words originate through this process.

Semantic analysis of colloquial verbs and adjectives:

dirt cheap – extremely cheap or cheaply;

arzon-garov – much less than its real value, for a trifling amount of money, almost free).

In the comparative process, cross-language colloquial matching was found to be manifested in the following semantic relationships:

1) Fully equivalent relationships, that is, complete correspondence in form, denotation and referent:

English: dog – used as a general form of friendly address.

Uzbek: itvoy – expresses a certain degree of affectionate (friendly) attitude towards a young person.

2) Partially equivalent relationships:

English: red – having red or ginger hair.

Uzbek: qizilbosh – a person with reddish hair.

3) Non-equivalent relationships, in which a colloquialism in one language is expressed (translated) by more than one lexeme in the compared language:

English: hog – an angry or unpleasant woman.

Uzbek: yugurish – trying to accomplish or implement something, rushing, taking action).

When studying interlingual synonymy, it was found that English colloquialisms correspond to different stylistic elements in Uzbek:

1. English colloquialisms may have mutual matches in both the neutral and colloquial layers of the Uzbek language:

dipso – an alcoholic – aroqxo‘r (neutral), piyionista (colloquial);

broke – having little or no money – pulsiz (neutral), hemiri yo‘q / singan (colloquial);

snotty – snobbish, impudent – surbet/bezbet (neutral), bez (colloquial);

kid (a child or young person) – bola / go‘dak (neutral), mishiqi (colloquial).

Words of one language that do not have a one-word match in the compared language are classified as non-equivalent vocabulary. Such words are translated into another language with the help of compliance, and are not related to some words in it. M.Tezekbayev calls such one-lexeme units that do not have an equivalent in the form of a lexeme in another language “univerb” [5].

The different opinions presented by researchers confirm the existence of certain difficulties in this matter. It is not always possible to clearly and strictly classify colloquial lexical units by semantic classes and subgroups. Colloquial units belonging to a semantic class through one of its features may also be part of opposite semantic classes based on its other relevant features.

It is interesting to look at what happens when translating collocations cross-linguistically. In many cases, English colloquialisms are represented by a collection of several lexemes expressing Uzbek concepts, and there is no single-lexeme name to express it.

In this case, the Uzbek paraphrase demonstrates a descriptive explanation of the English univverb.

1. The English colloquial univverb corresponds to a phraseological combination in Uzbek:

to riff 3 (to complain) – bayt-g‘azal o‘qimoq, shikoyat qilmoq, dard-hasrat qilmoq – to read bayts and gazals to complain, to lament;

didge (price or cost, esp. very high) – o‘tning kallasiday (juda baland narxda) yoki fazoviy narx (juda baland narx) – at a very high price or space price a very high price;

nix (to reject or deny) – tupurgan tupugini qaytarib olmoq (so‘zidan tonmoq, avval aytgan gapini rad etmoq) – to take back the spit that was spat (to deny one’s words, to deny what was said before).

Such phraseological correspondences can be found in Uzbek in both colloquial and neutral ways. The phraseological combinations given in the examples above are being demonstrated in Uzbek as an additional means of naming for existing stylistic neutral one-lexeme names. These English colloquialisms are univverbs specifically in relation to the Uzbek colloquial substyle. These colloquial phraseologisms mean that such concepts and topics are not so important in the Uzbek language and they do not have an independent univverbal form.

2. The English colloquial univverb corresponds to an idiom in Uzbek:

diddy squat (nothing at all) – zambarakning o‘qi (hech vaqo, hech narsa – cannonball nothing, nothing);

kick off (to sleep off the effects of an illegal drug) – o‘chib qolmoq (spirtli ichimlik, nasha yoki dori ta’siridan qattiq uyquga ketmoq – to fall into a deep sleep from the effects of alcohol, hashish or drugs);

bootleg (to manufacture or provide something illegally) – soyada ishlamoq (noqonuniy faoliyat yuritmoq – to carry out illegal activities).

This comparative analysis of English and Uzbek colloquialisms has highlighted both shared characteristics and language-specific patterns. While both languages exhibit a prevalence of nouns in their colloquial lexicon and share core semantic categories related to everyday life, they also demonstrate unique cultural and linguistic expressions.

The examination of semantic classes and categories reveals underlying values and priorities within each society, such as the emphasis on evaluation and social commentary in English, and on intimate familial relations in Uzbek. Furthermore, the exploration of lexical correspondences demonstrates the different ways in which concepts are lexicalized in each language, with English often employing single-word terms where Uzbek relies on more elaborate phrases or idioms.

References:

1. Green J. The vulgar tongue: Green’s history of slang. – N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2015. – 419 pp.
2. González R. and Stenström A. Expressive devices in the language of English and Spanish-speaking youth. // Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 24, 2011. –PP. 235–256.
3. Sotvoldiev B. Ingliz tilida slengning paradigmatic-sintagmatik xususiyatlari: Filol. fan. b-cha fals. d-ri (PhD) diss. – Namangan, 2021. – 142 b.



4. Rahimov G'. Britaniya va Amerika slengining sotsiolingvistik xususiyatlari: Filol. fan. nomz. diss. – Samarqand, 2006. – 139 b.
5. Тезекбаев М. Лексико-семантическая интерференция казахского языка в русской речи билингвов. – Павлодар, Кереку, 2015. – 112 с.