

## SOCIAL WORDS AND THEIR USAGE IN THE UZBEK LITERARY LANGUAGE

**Raxmatova Diyora Uktam kizi**

2nd year student of the Department of Philology and Language Teaching (English) at the  
Uzbek State University of World Languages

E-mail: [rakhmatovadiyora14@gmail.com](mailto:rakhmatovadiyora14@gmail.com)

Tel: +998883251020

### Annotation

This article provides information on social words used in the Uzbek language, as well as the positive and negative connotations of lexicon with limited spheres of usage, and their application in literary works.

### Keywords

literary language, written form, oral form, morphological norm, archaic and dialectal forms, slang, lexis, functional.

First of all, the Uzbek literary language is understood as a refined and standardized form of the national language, developed and polished to serve the diverse cultural needs of the people. The literary language has two forms:

1. the written form,
2. the spoken form.

In scientific and educational literature, the term social dialect is frequently encountered. Social dialects are generally considered to be a variety of language that does not conform to the norms of the literary language. However, many sources also view social dialects as means that reveal and complement certain aspects of the literary language.

All written works, including novels, short stories, poetic works, articles, and similar texts, are composed in accordance with the morphological and syntactic norms of the Uzbek literary language. Morphological norms refer to the rules that regulate the use of word forms in compliance with the laws of the modern literary language. For example, from the perspective of the contemporary literary language, the use of forms such as “oladi” (takes), “o‘rganadi” (learns), and “ishlaydigan” (working) is considered normative, whereas the use of forms like “olgusi”, “o‘rgangusi”, “o‘rganajak”, and “ishlayajak” constitutes a violation of the norm, as these are archaic and dialectal forms.

In particular, the well-known Uzbek poet To‘ra Sulaymon stated: “Language is the mirror of a nation,” as it is often said. To continually cleanse this mirror of dust and impurities is the filial and civic duty of each of us. Language is the primary symbol of our roots, our identity, and our self-awareness. It is also said that “Language is the soul of a nation. If the language disappears, the nation will also cease to exist. If the language lives, the nation lives as well”.

The lexical stock of the Uzbek language contains a large number of words that express emotionality and expressiveness. For example: qizaloq (little girl), jonginam (my dear), sadag‘angga ketay (an expression of deep affection), xumpar (surly), tajang (irritable), badbashara (ugly), nomard (coward), and yaramas (worthless). Such words are widely encountered in various spheres of society.

The term expressive is derived from the Latin word *expressio*, meaning “meaningful” or “emotionally impactful.” Emotion is also of Latin origin and is used to denote a person’s feelings, experiences, and emotional states. Based on this, words are classified into two groups depending on whether, in addition to denoting events or concepts, they convey emotional and expressive meanings such as respect, affection, uplift, contempt, mockery, or irony:

1. words with a positive connotative meaning;
2. words with a negative connotative meaning.

Words with a positive connotative meaning include those that express affection, endearment, and politeness (such as *shirinim* — my dear, *bo‘taloq* — dear child, *bolajon* — beloved child, *ko‘p yashang* — a polite blessing), as well as solemn rhetorical and poetic words, for example *alp* (hero, strong warrior), *lofchi* (braggart, liar), and *oyday to‘lishgan* (beautiful, radiant).

Words with a negative connotative meaning include those that express disgust and contempt, such as *zumrasha*, *so‘tak*, *juvonmarg*, and *gazanda*.

The words discussed in this study belong to one type of negatively connoted vocabulary, namely **vulgarisms**.

Vulgarisms are lexical layers of the language characterized by coarse, rude expressions used in everyday speech and marked by strong stylistic coloring. In literary works, authors employ vulgar words to reveal the inner world of characters, to openly depict their behavior, and to expose the attitudes of others toward them. At the same time, a writer or poet may express their own attitude toward the era or the character they have created through such harsh and coarse vocabulary. For example: “Make no mistake—if your brother were not a scoundrel and dishonest, would he ever make an innocent child shed tears?” (T. Malik, *Shaytanat*, p. 141).

Slang, on the other hand, is speech that does not conform to the norms of the literary language and is characteristic of socially or professionally distinct groups. Slang is often regarded as the street language of adolescents. The concept of slang has increasingly attracted the attention of modern philology and is primarily used to facilitate informal communication. The term slang was first recorded in written form in England in the sixteenth century, where it initially carried the meaning of “insult.” From 1850 onward, it began to be widely used as a designation for “nonstandard” or “illicit” vocabulary. Slang consists of words specific to certain professions or social groups and is observed in both spoken and written discourse. For example, “*olmaxon*” refers to a flirtatious or coquettish person.

In general, by the twenty-first century, definitions of slang in English-language dictionaries began to reflect a predominantly positive attitude toward the phenomenon. For instance, V. V. Mayakovsky highly praised slang and defined it as follows: “Slang is a historically developed linguistic phenomenon which, to a certain extent, functions as a linguosocial norm for representatives of all social strata and differs both genetically and functionally from jargon and functional language elements, primarily within the sphere of oral speech”.

In Turkic linguistics, the terms *argo*, *jargon*, and *slang* are often collectively expressed under the general term *argo*. In Uzbek and Russian linguistics, however, these terms are treated as distinct concepts, although at times the differences between them become nearly indistinguishable.

For example, according to some sources, the word “chau” meaning “goodbye” (used in the speech of style-oriented youth) is classified as jargon. However, in sociolinguistics, youth speech is considered slang. The main difference between youth slang and youth jargon lies in the fact that youth slang corresponds to the general characteristics of slang: it has a wide social scope, a clearly expressed emotional and expressive quality, a humorous nature, and is characteristic of young people from various social spheres. Youth jargon, by contrast, is understood only within a limited and narrow circle and primarily functions as a secretive form of communication. Unlike jargon, slang has no professional boundaries; its usage reflects the speaker’s cultural status rather than professional affiliation.

We have become convinced that the Uzbek language is rich in every respect, and that each word should be used appropriately and at the right time. Words belonging to categories such as argot and jargon are mainly used in the speech of adolescents and members of specific groups, and these words are often difficult for outsiders to understand. Some foreign words have become entrenched in youth speech and are frequently used; however, it would be more appropriate to use native Uzbek equivalents instead of borrowed words such as “chau,” “hello,” and “bratan.” Certainly, knowledge of foreign languages is important not only for young people but also for adults; nevertheless, each language should be used in its proper context. If this situation continues, there is a risk that our language may gradually decline. As we know, every independent state has its own independent language, and if we lose it, we also lose our identity. To prevent this, I recommend that everyone read more literary works written in their native language.

#### References:

1. Azim Hojiyev, “Tilshunoslik terminlarining izohli lug’ati”.
2. Abduqahhorova X.A, “O’zbek tili leksikasida ijtimoiy dialektlar va ularda ekspressiv ma’no xususiyatlari”.
3. Tursunov Mirzohid Ikromjon o’g’li. “O’zbek tilida sotsiolekt”.
4. Tursunov U. va boshqalar. “Hozirgi o’zbek adabiy tili”.
5. Isroilova, X. (2023). O ‘zbek folklorshunosligining rivojlanishida folklorshunos olimlarning qo ‘shgan hissalar. *Oriental Art and Culture*, 4(3), 800-811.
6. Mo‘minova, L. R. (2023). Results of focusing on art and culture in the new Uzbekistan. *Экономика и социум*, (10 (113)-2), 244-247.
7. Xusanov, H. (2021). Historical stages of Uzbek national singing art. *Интернаука*, (22-4), 59-60.
8. Isroilova, X. (2023). Marosim va udumlarning nazariy xususiyatlari xususida. *Oriental Art and Culture*, 4(1), 622-625.
9. Rajabova, S. (2025). Ergash Masofayev rejissurasining o ‘ziga xosligi. *Mahalliy va xalqaro konferensiyalar platformasi*, (2), 578-583.
10. Sodiqov, I. (2025). The social and political role and educational significance of public holidays in Uzbekistan. *Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 3(03), 99-102.
11. Shavkatova, G. (2024). Stage expression of fairy tales in the school program in theaters of young audiences. *European Journal of Arts*, (3), 87-91.
12. Джапилова, С. (2024). Лингвистические основы фразеологии испанского языка. *Зарубежная лингвистика и лингводидактика*, 2(1), 96-103.
13. Mekhrojevna, D. S., & Aragón, M. D. M. M. (2025). The green zone: lexical, phraseological, and cultural perspectives. *EduVision: Journal of Innovations in Pedagogy and Educational Advancements*, 1(5), 193-196.

14. Sadykova, B. (2016). Emotional words and tropes in the roman of italian author N. Ammaniti" I don't fear". In science and practice: a new level of integration in the modern world (pp. 123-125).
15. Nabiullina, L. M., & Akbarova, M. S. Q. (2024). Innovative Technologies as a Tool for Managing Preschool Educational Organizations. American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies, 1(9), 232-236.