



**Meligaliyev Jaloliddin Najmiddin o'g'li**  
**Termiz Iqtisodiyot va Servis Universiteti**  
**Xorijiy til va adabiyoti KXT1.23-gurux talabasi**  
[jaloliddinmeligaliyev@gmail.com](mailto:jaloliddinmeligaliyev@gmail.com)

**Allayev Zafar Mengboyevich**  
[Zafarallayev598@gmail.com](mailto:Zafarallayev598@gmail.com)  
**Termiz Iqtisodiyot va Servis Universiteti**  
**Xorijiy til va adabiyoti kafedrasasi o'qituvchisi**

**ABSTRACT.** The study explains how lexical choice reflects social identity, profession, age, education, regional belonging, cultural norms, politeness, and digital communication. The vocabulary of any language is not homogeneous: it includes standard words, colloquial units, slang, jargon, professional terminology, dialectal words, euphemisms, borrowings, and digital lexical forms. English and Uzbek both demonstrate a strong connection between vocabulary and society, but the sources and functions of these layers differ. English social lexis is strongly influenced by globalization, youth culture, professional specialization, and internet discourse. Uzbek social lexis is also changing under global influence, but it remains closely connected with national etiquette, kinship terms, respect forms, regional dialects, occupational vocabulary, and Russian-English borrowings. The article uses a qualitative-comparative method. The results show that socially marked vocabulary functions as a marker of group membership, prestige, informality, solidarity, social distance, and cultural identity.

**Keywords:** social lexis, sociolinguistics, English, Uzbek, slang, jargon, dialect, sociolect, lexical stratification.

## INTRODUCTION

Language is not only a grammatical system; it is also a social phenomenon. Every word chosen by a speaker may show not only the meaning of an object or action, but also the speaker's social background, profession, age, education, cultural environment, and attitude toward the listener. For this reason, lexis is one of the most socially sensitive levels of language. New words, borrowings, slang expressions, and professional terms usually react to social change faster than grammar.

The study of the social layer of lexis belongs to sociolinguistics, because it investigates the connection between vocabulary and society. The lexicon of a language is never completely uniform. It consists of neutral literary vocabulary, colloquial vocabulary, slang, jargon, professional terminology, dialect words, taboo expressions, euphemisms, borrowings, and group-specific lexical units. These units are not randomly used. They are selected according to communicative situation, social role, degree of formality, cultural norm, and the relationship between speakers.

This issue is important for the comparative study of English and Uzbek. English is a global language with wide regional, professional, and digital variation. Its vocabulary includes British and American variants, occupational terminology, youth slang, internet vocabulary, and words borrowed from many languages. Uzbek is a Turkic language with rich oral traditions, regional dialect diversity, and a vocabulary shaped by Arabic, Persian, Russian, and English influences. In Uzbek, social lexis is strongly connected with politeness, age hierarchy, kinship relations, local identity, and cultural etiquette.

The relevance of the topic is determined by globalization and digital communication. English words such as online, blogger, marketing, startup, deadline, kontent, post, and platforma are



now common in Uzbek speech, especially among young people and professionals. Social networks, messengers, memes, gaming, and online education accelerate lexical change. Therefore, socially marked vocabulary must be studied not only as a linguistic phenomenon but also as a cultural and communicative resource.

The aim of this article is to analyze the main social layers of lexis in English and Uzbek and to identify their similarities and differences. The object of the research is the lexical system of English and Uzbek. The subject is socially marked lexical units and their functional-pragmatic features. The main hypothesis is that English social lexis is more strongly influenced by global youth culture and digital discourse, while Uzbek social lexis preserves stronger links with etiquette, regional identity, kinship terminology, and bilingual contact.

### **METHODS**

This research uses a qualitative-comparative method. The material consists of representative examples from English and Uzbek slang, colloquial vocabulary, professional terminology, jargon, dialectal words, euphemisms, honorific address terms, borrowings, and digital vocabulary. The purpose is not to calculate frequency, but to describe semantic, stylistic, social, and pragmatic features of these lexical layers.

The analysis was carried out in four stages. First, the main social lexical categories were identified. Second, examples were selected according to sphere of use and social function. Third, each group was analyzed in terms of formality, social marking, and communicative purpose. Fourth, English and Uzbek examples were compared to reveal common tendencies and language-specific features. The methodological basis of the research relies on sociolinguistics, lexical semantics, functional stylistics, and comparative linguistics.

### **RESULTS**

The results show that the social layer of lexis in both English and Uzbek can be divided into several major categories. The first category is standard or literary vocabulary. In English, words such as education, society, communication, development, profession, and research are used in official, academic, and formal contexts. In Uzbek, similar neutral words include ta'lim, jamiyat, muloqot, rivojlanish, kasb, and tadqiqot. This layer is associated with education, literacy, institutional communication, and social prestige.

The second category is colloquial vocabulary. Colloquial words are used in everyday informal communication. In English, kid, guy, bucks, phone, and mom/mum are typical examples. In Uzbek, zo'r, unaqa, bunaqa, gaplashmoq, ishlar qalay, pul-mul, and bola-chaqa belong to everyday spoken speech. These units are not necessarily incorrect; they create naturalness, closeness, and solidarity between speakers.

The third category is slang. English slang includes cool, lit, chill, cringe, vibe, ghosting, bro, flex, and hype. Such words often mark youth identity, internet culture, humor, informality, or belonging to a peer group. Uzbek youth slang includes zo'r, bomba, gap yo'q, krutoy, brat, tema, klass, like bosmoq, post tashlamoq, and story qo'yimoq. Many Uzbek slang forms are hybrid: they combine English or Russian lexical material with Uzbek grammar. For example, like bosmoq and post tashlamoq show that borrowed words are adapted to Uzbek verbal patterns.

The fourth category is jargon and professional vocabulary. Jargon is used by specific occupational or social groups. In English, medical vocabulary includes diagnosis, hypertension, lesion, and cardiac arrest; legal vocabulary includes plaintiff, defendant, liability, and jurisdiction; academic vocabulary includes methodology, empirical data, and theoretical framework. In Uzbek, tashxis, muolaja, da'vogar, yurisdiksiya, audit, metodika, baholash mezoni, hisobot, grant, and



loyiha are used in professional communication. This layer makes specialist communication precise, but it may also create distance between experts and non-experts.

The fifth category is dialectal and regional vocabulary. English has regional lexical differences such as lorry/truck, flat/apartment, biscuit/cookie, and queue/line. Uzbek also has strong dialect diversity. Regional speech in Tashkent, Fergana Valley, Bukhara, Khorezm, Kashkadarya, Surkhandarya, and other areas may differ in pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. Dialectal lexis is important because it marks local identity, family background, and cultural belonging.

The sixth category is taboo vocabulary and euphemisms. English often uses passed away instead of died, senior citizen instead of old person, economically disadvantaged instead of poor, and let someone go instead of fire someone. Uzbek also uses euphemisms actively: vafot etdi is more polite than o'ldi, and yoshi ulug' is softer than direct reference to old age. In Uzbek, euphemism is especially connected with respect, modesty, religious-cultural norms, and avoidance of direct offense.

The seventh category is honorific, borrowing, and digital vocabulary. Uzbek words such as aka, opa, ustoz, domla, xola, and amaki express respect, age, social distance, and cultural closeness. English has sir, madam, Mr., Ms., Professor, and Doctor, but it relies less on kinship-based address. Uzbek borrowings from Arabic and Persian often carry cultural or religious associations, Russian borrowings are linked with administration and education, and English borrowings are linked with business, technology, and internet speech. Modern Uzbek contains marketing, startup, kontent, platforma, post qo'yimoq, like bosmoq, skrinshot qilmoq, and chatlashmoq.

**Table 1. Main social lexical layers in English and Uzbek**

| Lexical layer | English examples     | Uzbek examples     | Social function   |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Standard      | education, society   | ta'lim, jamiyat    | Formal norm       |
| Colloquial    | kid, bucks           | zo'r, unaqa        | Informality       |
| Slang         | cool, cringe         | gap yo'q, bomba    | Youth identity    |
| Professional  | diagnosis, liability | tashxis, audit     | Specialist speech |
| Dialectal     | lorry/truck          | regional words     | Local identity    |
| Euphemism     | passed away          | vafot etdi         | Politeness        |
| Digital       | post, hashtag        | like bosmoq        | Online speech     |
| Borrowing     | algebra, café        | marketing, startup | Cultural contact  |

## DISCUSSION

The analysis confirms that vocabulary is socially layered. The same meaning can be expressed by different lexical units depending on formality, social distance, profession, region, age, and cultural context. Standard vocabulary gives speech an official and educated character, while colloquial words and slang create informality and group solidarity. Professional terminology shows competence, but it may also separate specialists from ordinary speakers.

English and Uzbek are similar because both languages have standard, colloquial, slang, professional, dialectal, euphemistic, borrowed, and digital vocabulary. In both languages, non-standard vocabulary should not be considered linguistically inferior. Slang and dialect words are appropriate in certain communicative situations and inappropriate in others. The real issue is



functional suitability: a word that is natural in friendly conversation may be unsuitable in academic writing or official speech.

At the same time, the two languages differ in cultural emphasis. English social lexis is strongly shaped by global media, youth subcultures, migration, professional specialization, and digital platforms. Uzbek social lexis is also modernizing, but it remains more strongly connected with etiquette, age relations, regional belonging, and kinship-based address. Borrowings also show different social meanings: Arabic and Persian units often carry cultural associations, Russian borrowings are connected with administration and education, and English borrowings are linked with modern business and internet speech.

Translation of social lexis is difficult because dictionary equivalents are not enough. The English word *bro* may be translated into Uzbek as *aka*, *uka*, *brat*, *og‘ayni*, or omitted depending on context. The Uzbek word *domla* may be translated as *teacher*, *professor*, *sir*, or *mentor*, but none fully reflects its cultural meaning. Therefore, translators and teachers must consider meaning, register, politeness, and pragmatic effect.

### CONCLUSION

The social stratification of lexis in English and Uzbek proves that vocabulary is closely connected with society. Both languages contain standard, colloquial, slang, professional, dialectal, euphemistic, borrowed, and digital layers. These layers reflect changes in education, technology, culture, social relations, and communication.

The main conclusion is that socially marked vocabulary performs several functions: it identifies group membership, shows social distance or closeness, expresses respect or informality, marks professional competence, indicates regional origin, and reflects cultural identity. English social lexis is strongly influenced by globalization and digital culture, while Uzbek social lexis combines modernization with traditional politeness, kinship terminology, and regional identity.

The practical value of the research is connected with translation, language teaching, lexicography, and intercultural communication. Learners should know not only what a word means, but also where, when, and with whom it can be used. Future research may focus on Uzbek youth slang under English influence, professional jargon in bilingual communication, or the role of social media in changing Uzbek lexical norms.

### REFERENCES

1. Begmatov, E., Boboyeva, A., & Asomiddinova, M. (1983). *Adabiy norma va nutq madaniyati*. Toshkent: Fan.
2. Hojiyev, A. (2002). *Tilshunoslik terminlarining izohli lug‘ati*. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi.
3. Muhiddinova, X., & Xudoyberganova, D. (2006). *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: Ilm ziyo.
4. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: Universitet.
5. Sayfullayeva, R., Mengliyev, B., Boqiyeva, G., Qurbonova, M., Yunusova, Z., & Abuzalova, M. (2009). *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya.
6. Shoabdurahmonov, Sh., Asqarova, M., Hojiyev, A., Rasulov, I., & Doniyorov, X. (1980). *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: O‘qituvchi.
7. Tursunov, U., Muxtorov, J., & Rahmatullayev, Sh. (1992). *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston.
8. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati. 5 jildli. (2006-2008). Toshkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi.



9. Trudgill, P. (2000). Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society. London: Penguin Books.
10. Wardhaugh, R. (2010). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
11. Yule, G. (2020). The Study of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.