

Socially Restricted Lexis in English And Uzbek: A Comparative Theoretical Overview

Raimova Nafosat Olimovna

Uzbek State University of World Languages, independent applicant, Uzbekistan

Received: 31 May 2025; **Accepted:** 29 June 2025; **Published:** 31 July 2025

Abstract: This article studies the concept of socially constrained lexis in Uzbek and English, including sociolects, jargon, and argot. The study talks about how these linguistic patterns manifest in various social groupings and how they represent identity and culture. Both theoretical viewpoints and real-world examples are used to create a comparative study.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics, English, Uzbek, jargon, argot, sociolect, and socially constrained lexicon.

Introduction: Language is a mirror of social reality as well as a means of communication. Depending on their age, occupation, social standing, and geographic location, people in every society use language in different ways. As a result, words and expressions that are only used by members of particular social groupings are created, a phenomenon known in linguistics as socially restricted lexis.

Jargon, sociolects, and argot are examples of socially constrained lexicon. Frequently, formal or standard language does not use these parts. Rather, they reinforce social identification, in-group communication, and even secrecy. For example, professional circles, youth communities, and criminal organizations all have a tendency to develop their own jargon that may be difficult for outsiders to grasp. By contrasting their structures, functions, and sociocultural roles, this research seeks to examine the usage and traits of socially restricted lexicon in Uzbek and English. Bernstein and Halliday's theoretical frameworks, as well as the research of Uzbek linguists like Z. To'rayeva, serve as the foundation for the analysis. Lexical classification, real-world examples, and comparative language analysis are some of the techniques employed.

The three primary categories of socially restricted lexicon are sociolect, jargon, and argot. Certain social groups utilize argot, a coded or informal language, to keep outsiders out. It is frequently linked to

marginalized populations, young subcultures, and criminal organizations. The informal, perhaps secret nature of argot and its frequent linguistic innovation are its defining characteristics. Jargon is the term used to describe the specific vocabulary used by people in a given trade, profession, or academic discipline. It serves to make expert communication more accurate and effective. Although jargon is frequently incomprehensible to outsiders, it is generally more stable than argot. The term "sociolect" describes the range of languages used by a specific social group, which is frequently distinguished by factors such as class, age, geography, or ethnicity.

Several social and communicative purposes are served by the use of socially limited language:

Group Identity and Solidarity: Members of a group can identify one another and feel a sense of belonging when they use specialized jargon.

Exclusion and Privacy: Groups preserve their privacy and control over information by use terminology that is foreign to outsiders.

Effective Communication: Jargon facilitates clear, concise communication in business settings.

Cultural Expression: Argot and sociolects frequently convey group-specific cultural meanings and conventions.

METHODOLOGY

Some scientists has researched different works

about this topic. For example, according to Bernstein's (1971) Code Theory distinguishes between developed and limited codes, with the latter frequently taking the form of socially constrained language employed in close-knit communities.

Labov's Variationist Sociolinguistics: Examines how lexical choices and other aspects of language variation are influenced by social characteristics including class, age, and ethnicity. The study of Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics looks at how language choices serve social purposes, such as determining group membership.

Youth slang, criminal slang, and subcultural vocabulary are where English argot is most prevalent. Among the examples are: Young people frequently use terms like "cool," "lit," "bae," and "ghosting," which are derived from internet or music cultures. Criminal slang: To keep things secret, terms like "snitch" (informer), "stash" (hidden goods), and "cuff" (arrest) are employed. Cockney rhyming slang, online memes, and African American Vernacular English (AAVE) are all incorporated into English argot, which is incredibly inventive. English jargon is used in many different professions, such as: Words like "stat" (immediately), "code blue" (emergency), and "anemia" are examples of medical jargon. Words like "bug," "server," "firewall," and "cache" are examples of computer jargon. Jargon is frequently taught formally in professions and helps with accurate, technical communication.

There are significant regional, socioeconomic, and ethnic differences in English sociolects. Among the examples are: Regional sociolects: "mate" in British English, "y'all" in Southern US English. Chicano English and African American Vernacular English (AAVE) are examples of ethnic sociolects. Sociolects have unique grammatical, phonetic, and vocabulary characteristics.

Young people's speech and casual contexts frequently contain Uzbek jargon. Among the examples are:

"Baliq" is slang for "money."

"Shabada bermoq" is to make fun of or tease someone.

"Potop" means to be punished or caught.

Russian and Persian linguistic influences can also be seen in Uzbek argot.

In domains including technology, education, and medical, Uzbek jargon is becoming more prevalent. For instance:

In medical history, "Anamnez."

Diagnoz means "diagnosis."

"Koding" refers to programming or coding.

Because of historical and international influences, this

jargon is frequently taken from or modified from Russian or English terminology. In Uzbek, sociolects are strongly associated with socioeconomic groups and regional dialects. For instance:

Regional dialects in Samarkand or Bukhara are very different from the Tashkent dialect. Certain slang and loanwords influenced by English and Russian are used by young people and students.

RESULTS

Uzbek and English socially constrained lexicons: mark the identify of the group, keep outsiders from comprehending, change quickly, particularly in terminology used by young people, borrow terms from other languages as a result of cross-cultural interactions.

Here are some differences between two languages. Uzbek argot is more local and regional, whereas English argot is more impacted by the media and world culture. Because of its widespread usage, English jargon is more well-established and codified, whereas Uzbek jargon is evolving and more influenced by borrowings.

Uzbek sociolects are strongly linked to regional dialects and social classes, whereas English sociolects are varied due to their extensive geographic dispersion.

Words from Cockney, African American Vernacular English, and other dialects are frequently borrowed into English to enhance argot. The most common sources of borrowing in Uzbek are English and Russian. In social and professional settings, code-switching between English, Russian, and Uzbek is typical. Social, political, and cultural factors influence language use over time, as seen by the beginnings and development of socially constrained lexis in both English and Uzbek. The study of argot has a long history in English, dating back to the 16th and 17th century thieves' cant, which was used as a covert code by criminal underworlds to avoid being discovered by authorities. According to linguists like (Partridge, E. 1933. A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English. Routledge.) "these early argots were full with coded language, such as "prig" for thief or "cove" for man, which were purposefully hidden from outsiders as a means of social exclusion and defense."

The history of socially restricted vocabulary in Uzbek is closely linked to the region's complicated geopolitical past, which includes centuries of Arabic and Persian influence before a predominately Russian influence during the Soviet era. According to academics like (Abdullaev, I. 2002. Language Contact and Lexical Borrowing in Uzbek. Tashkent: National University Press), "Russian was used as a lingua franca and as a source of specialized language that permeated society

during the Soviet era. Because of this multilingual setting, Russian lexical elements were commonly used in Uzbek jargon and argot, reflecting both the power dynamics present in language contact situations and practical borrowing.” Globalization and the emergence of English as a universal language have brought about a new wave of lexical invention and borrowing since Uzbekistan's independence, particularly among young people and urban professionals.

Power systems and language are inextricably intertwined, and socially constrained lexicon is crucial to upholding or challenging these arrangements. According to (Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.), “language is a type of symbolic capital, and having access to specialist terminology is frequently a sign of authority and social standing. Jargon reinforces social hierarchies by using technical terminology to indicate participation in an elite group of professionals. On the other hand, slang and argot can be used as linguistic resistance tools, allowing underrepresented groups to establish areas of identity and autonomy separate from the prevailing culture.”

In a similar vein, Russian-origin language has mixed connotations in Uzbek society. The promotion of a pure Uzbek language identity is made more difficult by the fact that Russian technical words can be seen as both a reminder of colonial linguistic control and a mark of modernity and expertise. In order to fight cultural imperialism, intellectuals like (Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*.) the significance of reclaiming indigenous languages, which is reflected in this tension and other post-colonial discussions regarding language and identity. In this situation, socially constrained lexis turns into a location of complex intersections between sociopolitical power and linguistic identity.

Another significant factor affecting how socially limited terminology is used and perceived is gender. Men typically use more aggressive or taboo argot to assert dominance or camaraderie, while women may use a wider range of expressive and relational vocabulary, as evidenced by Cameron's (1997) research. Studies have shown that men and women frequently adopt different strategies in their lexical choices. These patterns, which show how social duties and expectations influence language use within social groups, may be seen in a variety of languages, including English and Uzbek.

Robust approaches that integrate qualitative insight and quantitative data analysis are necessary for the study of socially constrained lexis. A vital instrument for monitoring the evolution of slang and jargon over time is corpus linguistics, which is the methodical analysis of

enormous databases of real-world language use. According to McEnery and Hardie (2012), researchers can spot new trends and regional or socioeconomic variances by examining the frequency, collocations, and contexts of lexical words in spoken and written corpora. One way to see how digital communication speeds up lexical innovation is to compare corpora from social media sites with traditional spoken corpora.

By offering a contextual understanding of how socially constrained language functions within certain societies, ethnographic methods serve as a useful supplement to corpus analysis. Researchers can capture the attitudes, values, and social functions associated with particular words through participant observation and interviews, which is something that solely quantitative methods could miss. Studying professional jargon and youth slang in both English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking populations has benefited greatly from this method, which has shown the complex ways that language both reflects and shapes social identity. Lastly, experimental sociolinguistics examines the effects of socially constrained terminology on perception and comprehension through controlled trials. These techniques can bridge the gap between linguistic theory and social psychology by measuring, for example, how exposure to jargon affects speakers' social judgments or how easy outsiders understand certain argot phrases.

The dynamics of socially constrained lexis have been transformed in recent decades by the emergence of digital technology and social media, making it a very dynamic subject of research. Rapid lexical invention and diffusion have been fostered by the internet and platforms like Instagram, TikTok, and Twitter. Local slang has become an international phenomenon as a result of language elements that used to take years to spread across social groups but now can be recognized globally in a matter of days. Words like “ghosting” and “flex,” for instance, sprang from specialized social circles but swiftly made their way into the general English language thanks to social media.

Abbreviations, acronyms, and emotive slang are characteristics of a new register of informal writing that has been cultivated by mobile communication, particularly text messaging. These features frequently translate into spoken language, further obfuscating the distinction between written and oral sociolects. Similar to this, Uzbek youth modify these forms to represent their multilingual circumstances by using English acronyms and producing hybrid terms. The normalization and dissemination of socially limited words are greatly aided by media like music and movies. Rap and hip-hop, which have their origins in

African American culture, have made AAVE and related slang widely known and influenced young people's speech everywhere, even in Uzbekistan. This cross-cultural spread is a prime example of how socially constrained language may serve as a potent tool for globalization and cultural identification.

Because socially restricted lexis is so contextually and culturally established that it defies simple equivalency, it poses serious problems for translation and language instruction. The challenge for translators is to transmit not just the denotative meaning of slang and argot, but also its connotative and social nuances. For instance, in order to maintain their communication impact in the target language, idiomatic idioms or culturally distinctive jargon frequently need to be creatively adapted. In language teaching, socially restricted lexis is often neglected due to its informal status and perceived instability. However, ignoring slang and jargon deprives learners of crucial pragmatic competence and authentic language use. As researchers like Schmitt (2010) argue, integrating awareness of socially restricted vocabulary into curricula better prepares learners to engage in real-world interactions, understand cultural references, and avoid miscommunication. This is particularly important in multilingual settings like Uzbekistan, where learners must navigate complex linguistic landscapes combining Uzbek, Russian, and English influences.

In order to shape and communicate social identity, socially constrained language is essential. Slang, jargon, and argot are examples of linguistic variants that serve as indicators of in-group membership by drawing distinctions between "insiders" and "outsiders," according to Fishman. "This setting of boundaries is both expressive and defensive. Argot helps underprivileged groups create a sense of unity and shared identity in addition to acting as a barrier against outside influence. African American Vernacular English (AAVE) slang is a powerful illustration of how language can strengthen socially disadvantaged populations by promoting cultural pride and cohesiveness, as (Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. University of Pennsylvania Press) highlighted. Slang is unique in that it is flexible and imaginative, frequently capturing the vibrancy of adolescent culture. Adolescent slang, according to Eckert, has two functions: it distinguishes children from adults and gives peer groups a chance to express their independence and creativity. Slang frequently defies standardization due to its quick evolution and ephemeral character, reflecting the fleeting nature of cultural movements.

Looking ahead, multidisciplinary approaches that combine computational linguistics, ethnography, and

psycholinguistics have a lot to offer the study of socially constrained lexis. Slang and jargon may now be automatically identified in large datasets thanks to developments in natural language processing, which makes it easier to track lexical evolution in real time. By highlighting commonalities and distinctive developments, cross-cultural comparative research can help clarify how globalization changes socially limited lexicon in various language communities. In both Uzbek and English, socially constrained lexicon is essential. It represents cultural norms, professional roles, and social identities. Argot, jargon, and sociolect all serve the same purposes even though the sociolinguistic contexts of the two languages are different. To understand how language interacts with society, identity, and culture, one must have a solid understanding of these languages. Through fieldwork and corpus studies, additional study can enhance understanding.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, complex social systems and cultural identities are reflected in the socially constrained lexicon of both Uzbek and English. Slang, jargon, and argot are effective means of negotiating power dynamics, expressing group membership, and upholding social boundaries. The ongoing development of socially constrained vocabulary emphasizes how language is a social phenomenon that is dynamic, particularly in light of globalization and digital media. It takes interdisciplinary approaches that blend quantitative and qualitative methods to comprehend these linguistic variations.

REFERENCES

- Abdullaev, I. (2002). *Language Contact and Lexical Borrowing in Uzbek*. Tashkent: National University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press.
- Cameron, D. (1997). *Performing Gender Identity: Young Men's Talk and the Construction of Heterosexual Masculinity*. In *Language and Masculinity*. Blackwell.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*.
- Partridge, E. (1933). *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. Routledge.

Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching Vocabulary: A Vocabulary Research Manual*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Tagliamonte, S. A. (2016). *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and Its Social Significance*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. William Morrow.