ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF JARGON IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Urinov Rustambek Ravshanovich
English Teacher, Department of Language Teaching
Fergana Regional Centre for Pedagogical Excellence
urinov_rustambek@mail.ru
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23215316

Abstract. This article examines the structural and semantic features of jargon in English and Uzbek through a qualitative comparison of published linguistic research, dictionary entries, and selected illustrative forms. It distinguishes group-specific vocabulary from slang, established technical terminology, and general colloquial expressions. The analysis considers clipping, affixation, letter-based abbreviation, semantic transfer, and the integration of borrowed lexical material into Uzbek verbal constructions. Dictionary evidence and published Uzbek examples indicate that similar formal mechanisms can produce expressions with different social and stylistic statuses. The article proposes that structural formation, lexical meaning, and social use be treated as distinct but interacting dimensions. Its findings concern the selected examples and do not establish usage frequencies or the distribution of jargon across English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking populations.

Keywords: jargon, slang, word formation, semantic transfer, borrowing, register, social meaning.

Introduction

The comparison of English and Uzbek jargon requires a clear account of what qualifies as jargon. A shortened word, an expressive adjective, or a recent borrowing does not acquire group-specific status solely because of its form. The linguistic problem is therefore twofold: how an expression is constructed and how its meaning becomes associated with a particular activity or community. Treating these questions separately makes it possible to compare lexical mechanisms without assigning the same social function to every informal expression.

In English lexicography, jargon is associated with vocabulary used by particular groups, especially in professional activity, which may be difficult for outsiders to understand. The Uzbek entry jargon similarly associates the term with words and expressions characteristic of a social or professional group and different from literary usage (Cambridge University Press, n.d.; Madvaliyev, 2006, Vol. 2, p. 71). These definitions overlap, but their emphases are not identical. The English definition gives considerable weight to specialised activity, while the Uzbek definition also explicitly foregrounds departure from the literary norm.

General descriptions of English provide a background for examining lexical structure and social variation (Crystal, 2018; Yule, 2020). Within Uzbek linguistics, Rahmatullayev (2006, pp. 3–5) distinguishes the language system from its realisation in speech and explains lexical innovation and borrowing through speech activity. This distinction is relevant here: the availability of a word in the language does not determine the social meaning of every instance of its use.

The aim of this article is to compare the formal construction and semantic interpretation of selected English and Uzbek expressions discussed under the heading of jargon. The research question is: how can shared formation mechanisms be distinguished from differences in register and social meaning? The analysis argues that an adequate comparison must identify structural process, lexical sense, and evidence of group-related use for each expression.

Materials and Methods

The study uses qualitative comparative analysis rather than an experimental design or a population-based survey. Its materials comprise linguistic reference works, research on social meaning and identity, English and Uzbek dictionary entries, and examples reported in an Uzbek publication. The sources were selected for their relevance to lexical formation, the distinction between jargon and neighbouring categories, or the interpretation of social meaning. This is a focused literature-based study, not a systematic review.

English lexical evidence was checked against Cambridge Dictionary entries for jargon, lab, LOL, mouse, and sick. Uzbek lexicographic evidence was checked against scans of the published O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati, edited by A. Madvaliyev (2006, Vol. 2): jargon (p. 71) and zo‘r (pp. 166–167). The discussion of positive evaluation draws specifically on sense 5 of zo‘r (p. 167). Pardaeva (2024) supplies published examples of Uzbek slang, including jirafa, saqich, and strelka belgiladi. The digital constructions like bosmoq(qilmoq), post tashlamoq, and chatlashmoq are retained from the supplied manuscript as illustrations for structural analysis. They are not presented as independently collected conversational tokens or as proof of established jargon status.

Each example is examined for its formal composition, relevant lexical sense, and proposed register classification. Clipping is distinguished from letter-based abbreviation; affixation is distinguished from a construction containing a separate verb; and semantic transfer is distinguished from the creation of a new word form. Plag (2003) provides the morphological background for this separation. The resulting classifications are analytical interpretations of the selected material.

Dictionary meanings, examples reported by another author, and morphological illustrations carry different evidential weight. A dictionary entry establishes a recorded sense; a published slang example establishes that the form has been reported in that source. Neither automatically establishes national prevalence, age distribution, or present-day frequency. No numerical comparisons, participant responses, or claims about rates of lexical change are made.

Results

Clipping reduces the phonological or orthographic extent of an existing expression. English lab, recorded as a shortened form of laboratory, illustrates this process (Cambridge University Press, n.d.). Its shortened structure does not by itself show exclusion from general vocabulary. The Uzbek form komp, retained as an illustration from the manuscript, can likewise be analysed in relation to kompyuter. A comparison of these forms identifies a shared mechanism of reduction, while a classification of either as jargon would require evidence about its users and communicative setting.

Affixation introduces a different structural relationship. English blogger contains the base blog and the agent-forming suffix -er. The parallel Uzbek example yozuvchi is a conventional agent noun and cannot serve as evidence that derivation is specifically a jargon-forming process. These examples are useful controls: they demonstrate that ordinary morphological resources remain available in specialised or informal vocabulary. The relevant question is whether a derived form has acquired a distinctive sense or group association, rather than whether it contains an affix.

LOL represents letter-based abbreviation of a multiword expression. Cambridge Dictionary records its association with social media and text messages and its expansion as laughing out loud (Cambridge University Press, n.d.). It should therefore be distinguished from lab-type clipping. By contrast, the manuscript’s rax, associated there with rahmat (thank), does not consist of the initial letters of several words. Without an attested interaction or information about pronunciation, it is safer to treat it as a proposed informal written reduction rather than an acronym. Grouping both forms under one structural heading would conceal the difference between their construction processes.

Borrowing and integration into Uzbek constructions

The expression like qilmoq(bosmoq) combines English-derived lexical material with an Uzbek verb. Its structure can be represented as like + qil- + -moq, with -moq attached to the Uzbek verbal stem. The construction is therefore not adequately described as the English word like receiving the suffix -moq directly. Qilmoq supplies the verbal component, while like identifies the platform-related action. This analysis concerns the composition of the illustration and does not establish how widely the expression is used.

Chatlashmoq offers a different pattern. On the analysis adopted here, chat provides the borrowed base and -lash- forms the Uzbek verbal stem, followed by the infinitive ending -moq. The sequence is thus chat + -lash- + -moq. The contrast with like qilmoq is structural: one form involves an affixed verbal stem, whereas the other contains a separate Uzbek verb. Both illustrate ways of accommodating foreign lexical material, but the grammatical mechanisms should not be collapsed into an undifferentiated category of borrowing.

Post tashlamoq provides a further distinction between lexical material and constructional meaning. The English-derived noun post occurs with Uzbek tashlamoq. In the digital reading intended by the manuscript, the expression refers to publishing or placing a post online. Describing this reading as a construction avoids attributing the entire meaning to post alone. Its classification as jargon would depend on evidence that a relevant community associates the expression with a particular style or specialised practice.

Semantic transfer and evaluative meaning

English sick illustrates coexistence between an illness-related sense and an approving slang sense recorded in Cambridge Dictionary. The selected sense expresses a positive assessment rather than a medical condition (Cambridge University Press, n.d.). The contrast involves lexical interpretation without a change in word form. It also shows why a word must be analysed at the level of a particular sense: labelling sick as slang in every use would incorrectly include ordinary descriptions of illness.

Uzbek zo‘r offers a useful comparison in evaluative function. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati records strength-related senses of zo‘r, a positive assessment of quality or interest. This evaluative sense carries no slang label in the entry (Madvaliyev, 2006, Vol. 2, pp. 166–167). Zo‘r may provide a contextually appropriate translation of approving sick, but the two expressions do not thereby share the same register label. Functional similarity in praising an object or performance must be distinguished from evidence that both belong to group-restricted vocabulary.

Pardaeva (2024, p. 258) reports jirafa for a person who understands something slowly and saqich for a person who persistently bothers others. These examples permit an interpretation in terms of figurative characterisation: an existing noun is applied to a person through a selected association. Her example strelka belgiladi is glossed as arranging a meeting. The present study treats these as examples documented in that publication, without adopting its broader claims about their prevalence. Their meanings show how an apparently familiar form can acquire a socially situated interpretation.

Semantic transfer also operates in established terminology. English mouse has a recorded computer-device sense (Cambridge University Press, n.d.). This sense is useful for illustrating lexical extension, but it cannot establish that mouse remains slang or opaque group vocabulary in every contemporary setting. An analysis that places mouse and approving sick in the same category simply because both depart from another familiar sense would confuse the mechanism of semantic extension with the resulting expression’s register.

The selected forms illustrate different relationships between linguistic structure, meaning, and register. English lab, a clipped form of laboratory, demonstrates lexical shortening, although its structure alone does not establish jargon status. LOL is a letter-based abbreviation associated with digital communication. The approving sense of sick is labelled as slang in Cambridge Dictionary,

whereas the positive evaluative meaning of Uzbek zo‘r is recorded in general lexicography (Cambridge University Press, n.d.; Madvaliyev, 2006, Vol. 2, p. 167). Their similarity in expressing approval therefore does not imply an identical register classification.

The Uzbek forms jirafa and saqich are reported by Pardaeva (2024) as figurative slang expressions characterising people. The digital forms like qilmoq and chatlashmoq illustrate different structural patterns: like qilmoq combines a borrowed lexical element with a separate Uzbek verb, while chatlashmoq incorporates a borrowed base into an affixed verbal stem. These constructions are examined as morphological illustrations; their classification as group-specific jargon requires contextual evidence.

Discussion

The comparison identifies a methodological difficulty in treating jargon as a single lexical layer. Structural processes explain the relationship between forms, while register classification concerns their use. Clipping can produce an ordinary shortened word, and semantic extension can produce either a specialised term or an expressive slang sense. An account of jargon therefore needs social evidence in addition to a morphological or semantic description. This distinction prevents ordinary derivation and familiar technical vocabulary from being counted as jargon by default.

Social meaning also depends on interaction. Eckert (2008) describes linguistic variation in terms of a field of potential social meanings activated in situated use. Applied here as a theoretical perspective, this suggests that an expression’s association with familiarity, expertise, or a social group cannot always be reduced to a fixed dictionary label. The same form may have different stylistic effects across encounters. This application is an interpretation of the framework, not an empirical finding about the selected Uzbek expressions.

Bucholtz and Hall (2005) likewise locate identity in linguistic interaction and show how labels, stances, and styles can contribute to social positioning. Their approach supports examining how participants respond to a marked expression, rather than inferring membership in a group from the expression alone. For a future study of English and Uzbek jargon, evidence of correction, shared understanding, imitation, or rejection would help establish whether speakers themselves treat a form as socially distinctive.

Expressiveness should also be separated from taboo. Allan and Burridge (2006) examine taboo and the social regulation of language, a topic relevant to some marked vocabulary. The selected examples here do not justify a general claim that jargon is offensive, secret, or linguistically undesirable. Professional expressions may serve precise reference, while evaluative slang may convey an attitude. These functions require individual analysis, and neither secrecy nor emotional intensity should be treated as a necessary property of all jargon.

The data also provide no basis for a simple opposition between an English vocabulary shaped by technology and an Uzbek vocabulary shaped only by oral communication. The Uzbek digital illustrations themselves concern platform activities. What the comparison establishes is the possibility of different grammatical packaging of similar communicative actions. It does not establish which language borrows more, which process is more productive, or how rapidly an expression moves between communities.

Several limitations follow from the material. Dictionary entries offer recorded meanings but limited interactional context. The Uzbek slang examples come from one publication, and their social distribution has not been independently examined. The manuscript’s digital forms are useful for structural analysis but require attested contexts before firmer sociolinguistic conclusions can be drawn. A subsequent corpus study should record the source, date, communicative setting, and complete context of each token, with comparable sampling criteria for both languages.

Conclusion

The structural and semantic comparison of English and Uzbek jargon is most defensible when form, sense, and social use are analysed separately. The selected material illustrates clipping, affixation, letter-based abbreviation, figurative interpretation, and the combination of borrowed elements with Uzbek grammatical resources. These mechanisms do not independently establish jargon status. The contrast between approving sick and zo‘r demonstrates that equivalent evaluative functions may coexist with different lexicographic classifications.

The Uzbek constructions like qilmoq and chatlashmoq further illustrate distinct patterns of grammatical integration. Their analysis clarifies how borrowed material can participate in a construction containing a separate verb or in an affixed verbal stem. The principal contribution of the study is a framework for classifying such examples without equating informality, novelty, and borrowing with jargon. Further conclusions about community membership, prevalence, and change require contextualised evidence from comparable English and Uzbek speech or written interaction.

References

1. Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring of language. Cambridge University Press. https://research.monash.edu/en/publications/forbidden-words-taboo-and-the-censoring-of-language/
2. Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. Discourse Studies, 7(4–5), 585–614. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407
3. Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Entries for jargon, lab, LOL, mouse, and sick. In Cambridge Dictionary. Retrieved October 7, 2026, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/jargon ; https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/lab ; https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/lol ; https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/mouse ; https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/sick
4. Crystal, D. (2018). The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108528931
5. Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 12(4), 453–476. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00374.x
6. Madvaliyev, A. (Ed.). (2006). O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati [Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language] (Vol. 2, E–M). O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi. https://ziyouz.uz/durdona-toplamlar/uzbek-tilining-izohli-lugati/
7. Pardaeva, B. A. (2024). O‘zbek tilidagi slenglar va ularning kelib chiqish sabablari [Slangs in the Uzbek language and the reasons for their origin]. Modern Science and Research, 3(3), 256–260. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10806231
8. Plag, I. (2003). Word-formation in English. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511841323
9. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). Hozirgi adabiy o‘zbek tili [Modern literary Uzbek]. Universitet. https://cspu.uz/en/books/3769/download/19214
10. Yule, G. (2020). The study of language (7th ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108582889