

Contrastive analysis of cross-language colloquial correspondence in English and Uzbek Languages

Sotvoldieva Istorakhon Lutfullo Kizi

Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article deals with the problem of the classification colloquial units into semantic categories in English, and define their equivalents in Uzbek language, as well as determine common or specific features of the contrasted languages, and explain the discrepancies in translation between two languages.

Keywords: a colloquial word, a colloquial correspondence, fully equivalent, partially equivalent, non-equivalent relations, emotional-expressive imagery, a one-lexeme colloquial equivalent.

INTRODUCTION

The problems of typological analysis of lexical systems of different languages are becoming the object of serious attention of linguists in recent years. In particular, the determination of interlinguistic relations between different lexical groups in the compared languages is the basis of these works. In these works, their equivalent relations in the compared languages are considered.

The task of identifying lexical equivalents in the cross-linguistic aspect, revealing the similarities and differences of colloquial lexis is set in the process of contrastive analysis. Despite the fact that the languages being compared have different structures, in the process of analysis, the common aspects of one concept in the expression plan of both languages are determined. So, the correspondences between the lexical units of both languages are determined in this article.

Material And Methods

In world linguistics, a lot of research has been carried out on the English spoken language. Looking at its evolutionary development, one of the early works devoted to the lexical aspect of the spoken language was carried out by E.Partridge (1953), the lexicographic aspects of the American spoken language have been studied by S.Flexner (1974). In addition, W.Ball's (1954) views on the problems of English colloquial language are of great interest among scholars. Sociolinguistic approach in the study of spoken language is reflected in W.Labov's (1973) works, while its stylistic features are studied by I.Arnold (1986). Lexical-phraseological uniqueness of English spoken language is revealed in works of L.Soudek (1967), the Czech linguist.

In the 21st century, research on this problem has been carried out by J.Green (2006), R.Spears (2000), T.Dalzell and T.Victor (2007), M.Márquez and B.Speck (2008), P.Collins and X.Yao (2013).

In Uzbek linguistics, the dissertation devoted to the lexical-stylistic and syntactical problems of Uzbek colloquial speech by B.Urinbaev (1974) can be possibly considered as one of the preliminary works on this sphere. Moreover, the research by M.Tursunpolatov (1982) on the lexical features of the Uzbek colloquial language is also of great interest.

In modern Uzbek linguistics, the research in the realm of the low colloquial units conducted by G.Rahimov (2006), D.Satimova (2020), or B.Sotvoldiev (2021), the areal, stylistic, lexical and onomastic features of them are revealed.

To determine the semantic properties of colloquialisms, the component analysis method, and problems of correspondence in compared languages, the translation method are utilized in this article.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

For this work, English was chosen as the base language, and the study of colloquial correspondences is carried out in accordance with this language. Common synonymous lines for both languages, as well as the existence of cross-language equivalents for expressing certain concepts, are generally explained by the common characteristics of logical-psychological processes in human cognition.

Cross-language synonymy is observed in the compared languages, according to which both languages have fully or partially equivalent colloquialisms within the same field:

- dirt cheap – extremely cheap or cheaply;
- arzon-garov – extremely cheap or cheaply;
- boot – a bootleg product;
- batinka – a boot;
- spin – to make up a story;
- aylantirmoq – to make up a story.

In the process of comparison, it was found that interlanguage colloquial compatibility is manifested in the following semantic relations:

1) equivalent relations, i.e. complete correspondence of denotation and connotation according to the form:

- auto – an automobile,
- avto – an automobile;
- dog – used as a general form of friendly address,
- itvoy – used as a general form of friendly address;
- moustache – a man with a moustache,
- mo'ylov – a man with a moustache.

Also, archisemes in words and phrases such as “to die – to collapse with laughter” – “to die/to collapse with laughter” and “to desire keenly”, it was observed that the components representing the qualifying and denotative sign are fully compatible in both languages;

2) partially equivalent relations:

- blue – \$5.000.,
- ko'k – a dollar bill;
- parsley – marijuana,
- ko'kat – a type of marijuana.

The colloquialisms illustrated above are close in denotation and connotation, but not completely equivalent. In the pair “parsley – ko'kat”, the archiseme, subjective and objective evaluation components match, but certain differences are observed in terms of denotation. On the contrary, in the pair “Blue – ko'k” there is a similarity in denotation, and a slight difference in referent.

3) non-equivalent relations, in which a colloquialism in one language is represented (translated) by more than one lexeme in the compared language:

- chair – the electric chair used for the execution of criminals;
- hog – an angry or unpleasant woman;
- to load – to plant with illicit drugs or stolen goods;
- mixlamoq – to surprise someone with words;
- ichak – rubber or tarpaulin tube, hose;
- yugurish – to try, to run, to have a go at doing something.

None of the colloquial words given as examples has a single-lexeme colloquial correspondence in the language being compared. To express them, it is necessary to use other stylistic means or paraphrase.

While researching cross-language synonymy, it was found that different stylistic elements in Uzbek correspond to colloquialisms in English:

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

dipso – an alcoholic – aroqxo‘r (neutral),

piyonista (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),

mishiqli (colloquial).

This compatibility between English and Uzbek colloquialisms can be evaluated as a result of the contrast between their stylistic features and emotional-expressive imagery. This group consists of colloquialisms that are important for speakers and have their own definitions in the colloquial and neutral layer of the spoken language.

2. The number of English colloquialisms with compatibility in the neutral layer of the Uzbek vocabulary is quite rare:

eel (an informer) – chaqimchi,

drawings (information) – axborot,

hock (the foot) – oyoq,

hospital (jail) – qamoqxona.

3. The number of nouns in English colloquial lexical units that do not correspond in Uzbek is the majority:

accessory – a boyfriend or girlfriend,

accelerator – an amphetamine tablet,

deuce – a two-year prison sentence,

freeze – a small amount of cocaine placed on the tongue,

hitch – a period of duty or service.

According to the results of the analysis, it can be said that the first and third groups, i.e. colloquialisms with equivalents in the neutral and colloquial layers of the Uzbek language, and colloquialisms without one-lexeme colloquial equivalents in the Uzbek language, are quantitatively different from others.

Lexical units belonging to literary, scientific, and official work styles are distinguished by their high interlinguistic equivalence. The level of equivalence in lexical units used in colloquial style is much lower compared to them. However, the degree of equivalence between these lexicons can change according to the time and condition. For example, compared to the colloquial lexicon, which is rich in lexical analogs, sub-colloquial phraseology is reconstructed with more phraseological analogs.

The simpler the denotative meaning of colloquial lexical units is, the more its cross-linguistic equivalents (synonyms) are expressed through various stylistic means:

lippy (talkative) – sergap (neutral),

mahmadona (neutral),

gapdon (neutral),

javraqi (colloquial),

jiqildoq (colloquial),

valdirvoqi (colloquial),
valdirbasar (colloquial),
bijildoq (colloquial).

laqqi (laqma) – naïve (neutral),
gullible (neutral),
pepper (colloquial),
monkey (colloquial),
mug (colloquial),
mullet (colloquial).

From these examples, it can be seen that the process of colloquial nomination caused the formation of colloquialisms with a simple and clearly expressed denotative content. These units are widely used, widespread and understandable to everyone. Also, their important social importance in the society and the presence of interlinguistic synonyms indicate the similarity in the speech nominations of both languages.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the length of cross-language synonymous lines can be attributed to the complexity of the colloquialism's meaning. The simpler the structure of a word in one language is and the more elements it contains, the more synonyms it has in the language being compared.

Firstly, several types of interlanguage colloquial compatibility of the languages being compared, have been identified. According to the analyses, colloquialisms that have any stylistic marker in the English language may correspond to other stylistic elements in the Uzbek language. One colloquialism in English can simultaneously have its neutral and colloquial equivalent in Uzbek. Secondly, in many cases, a colloquialism in English has a colloquial equivalent and a neutral analogue in Uzbek, or a word combination is used as its equivalent without having a lexeme correspondence at all.

Lastly, this article provides new insights into the comparative analysis of two or more languages and suggests new directions for further research through its in-depth analysis of many semantic and translating characteristics of English and Uzbek colloquial nouns.

REFERENCES

- Al-Alami S. Using colloquial language in prose fiction texts: An exploratory study.
// Research Journal in Advanced Humanities, Volume 5, Issue 1. – Nairobi, 2024. – pp.1-15.
- Arnold I.V. Modern English Lexicology. – Moscow, 1986. – 269 pp.
- Ball W.J. Conversational English. – London. – N.Y.: Longmans, Green and Company, 1954. – 284 pp.
- Collins P. and X.Yao. Colloquial features in Word Englishes // International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, Volume 18, Issue 4., John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2013. – pp. 479 – 505.
- Dalzell T. and Victor T. – “The Concise New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English”. – New York: 2007.
- Flexner S.B. American slang. – In: The American language in the 1970-s. – Sacramento: Boyd & Frazer, 1974.
- Green J. Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics (Second Edition). – Elsevier Science, 2006. – 9000 pp.
- Labov W. The logic of nonstandard English. – In: Varieties of Present-day English. – N.Y.: Macmillan, 1973.
- Márquez M. and Speck B. The spoken core of British English: A diachronic analysis based on the BNC // Miscelánea: A journal of English and American studies, V.37. – Valencia, 2008. – pp. 53-74.
- Partridge E. Slang today and yesterday. – London: Routledge, 1953.
- Rahimov G. Sociolinguistic features of British and American slang: PhD diss. – Samarkand, 2006. – 147 pp.
- Satimova D. Comparative analysis of English and Uzbek youth slang. PhD diss. – Andijan, 2020. – 152 pp.

-
- Soudek L. Structure of substandard words in British and American English. – Bratislava, 1967. – 228 pp.
Sotvoldiev B. Paradigmatic-syntagmatic analysis of slang in English. PhD diss. – Namangan, 2021. – 148 pp.
Spears R. – NTC's dictionary of American slang and Colloquial Expressions. – The US, 2000.
Tursunpolatov M. Vocabulary of Uzbek conversation: PhD diss. – Tashkent, 1982. – 179 pp.
Urinbaev B. Questions of syntax of Uzbek colloquial speech. PhD diss. – Tashkent, 1974. – 162 pp.

SOTVOLDIEVA ISTORAKHON LUTFULLO KIZI
PHD STUDENT,
ANDIJAN STATE INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES,
ANDIJAN, UZBEKISTAN
E-MAIL: <B.SOTVOLDIYEV91@GMAIL.COM >