



SOCIAL DIALECTS – A STRUCTURAL PART OF THE NATIONAL LANGUAGE

Musayev Abduvali Sulaymonovich

Associate Professor at Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article discusses how members of a social community are often distinguished into categories such as collective groups, professional groups, age-related groups, as well as through the use of jargon and argot. It is also stated that the sociolect includes other linguistic units with a limited scope of use, while some sociolects expand their scope and find a place within the lexical layer of the language.

KEYWORDS

Social dialect, jargon, dialect, functional style, expressive style, vulgarism, term.

INTRODUCTION

In the process of globalization, the development of international relations and the growth of new technologies and information exchange have led to significant changes in all areas of language. Language is studied not only as a means of communication, but also as a social phenomenon that expresses international and intercultural interaction within society. This process allows language to generalize concepts about reality and adapt to societal changes through categorization and grouping. Although linguistic analysis of the relationship between language and society has been conducted for many years, it was only in the 1920s that European and Russian linguists began to take a serious interest in the issue. In particular, the classification of speech from the perspective of sociolinguistics, distinctions between urban and rural speech, and the unique speech features of artisans, workers, and criminal groups began to emerge as topics of study.

Linguists have conducted in-depth research on the proportionality between society and language, the connection between the speaker and the language, and the issues between literary language and colloquial speech. In addition to studying the internal structural rules of language, they began to acknowledge that speakers use language differently depending on the context, and that language varies not only regionally, but also socially.

Members of society are often classified into the following groups: collective groups, professional groups, age-related groups, communities of friends and neighbors, production units, and others.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

According to Russian linguistic literature, beginning in the first half of the 18th century, a social lexical layer consisting of slang, argot, and jargon started to separate out. The main reason for this was the weakening of the norms of literary language [1], which led to the proliferation of social dialects and the infiltration of criminal lexicon into the literary language [2]. For instance, the renowned linguist V.M. Zhirmunsky emphasized that in addition to the division of language



into regional dialects, there should also be social dialects. He wrote: "In any language where regional dialectology exists, there should also be social dialectology... The social dialect includes regional dialect (peasant speech), semi-dialect ('urban petty bourgeois speech'), and literary language (spoken and written forms), and reflects class differentiation in society, i.e., the 'social level of language'" [3].

According to O.A. Morozova, the classification of social dialects is based on functional parameters:

1. Professional "languages" (the lexical systems of professions such as fishermen, oil workers, sailors, cobblers);
2. Collective (corporate) jargons of student youth, athletes, military personnel, and others;
3. Social groups such as artisans, hunters, merchants-entrepreneurs;
4. Classless jargon (argot).

Based on these parameters, social dialects are divided into two groups: professional dialects; and jargons (argot – secret conventional language, slang – corporate dialect, aristocratic language – class jargons) [4].

According to internet sources, social dialects are classified as follows:

1. Professional language (lexical system): the language of fishermen, hunters, tanners, cobblers, potters, and others engaged in various trades;
2. Group or corporate language, jargons: the language of schoolchildren, students, athletes, soldiers, and other youth groups;
3. Conditional language (argot): the language of merchants, artisans, and others;
4. Jargon (argot) – a language detached from social classes [5].

E. Begmatov noted that the general vocabulary of the Uzbek language is composed of the following groups:

1. Words in wide usage (general vocabulary);
2. Occupational words (professional or trade vocabulary);
3. Dialectal words;
4. Obsolete words (archaisms, historicisms);
5. Scientific terminology;
6. Jargons;
7. Literary and dialectal phraseology;
8. Proper nouns [6].

A ninth group that could also be added is new words (neologisms) [7].

V.D. Bondaletov emphasized that all forms of language belonging to the category of social dialects are tied to specific social boundaries and function as a means of communication among particular social strata, professions, or age-based communities. He classified them into the following groups:

1. The "private" language of professions (more precisely, the lexical systems of professions such as hunters, potters, carpenters, weavers, shepherds, traders, and other occupations and activities);
2. The language of groups or corporate communities with a specific scope (e.g., jargons used among students, athletes, soldiers, and other youth groups);
3. The structured languages of social groups such as artisans, merchants, and others (argot);

4. The jargon (argot) of socially marginalized and classless individuals [8]. Some scholars refer to the speech of local farmers as a “conditional language.” This term encompasses everything from the existing forms of language (including the literary, bookish form) to linguistically marked, socially coded expressions like conspiratorial slang (conditional language) and even the mechanically encrypted language used by young children.

RESULTS

Thus, our scholars emphasize that in such classifications, association jargon, conditional (slang) language, jargon, argot, and various other language phenomena are all considered to fall under the umbrella of social dialects, each having its own functional domain. All socially marked derivative forms of language are classified as part of social dialects, and they can acquire different meanings depending on the context of their use.

Social dialects refer to the set of language forms used by a particular social group or community. Social dialects exist on a broad spectrum, and within each social group, we may find occupational vocabulary, domain-specific terminology, or professionalisms. Such linguistic tools should be viewed not merely as elements of a language system but as components of a speech system. In other words, when occupational vocabulary, terminology, or professionalisms are considered in isolation, they function as terms. However, when integrated into the actual speech of a specific social group, they transform the speech into a sociolect. In this sense, terminology serves as a core element that indicates which field the sociolect belongs to. Naturally, the speech of a farmer differs from that of a chemist or a shepherd, each reflecting distinctions tied to their respective fields. These differences also account for characteristics of the national language.

Our object of study is often interpreted in many sources under the term social dialects. However, within the framework of social dialects, there are varying opinions regarding professional “language” and group (association) jargons:

1. Professional “language” and group jargons are sometimes seen as the same phenomenon. Professional language is based on practical activity and has a normative-legal basis established by state institutions. The concept of “social commonality” preceded the concept of “professional” within professional language.
2. Descriptions of jargon always highlight its difference from contemporary literary language. Social groups (e.g., youth, religious and military associations, interest-based groups) emerge spontaneously within society. They usually do not establish formal relationships with government institutions, nor are they officially recognized in legal terms.
3. Scholars argue that jargon (youth, student, military) emerges based on the national language. However, jargon cannot entirely abandon the system of professional terms and standards of the literary language—it arises within and relies on that very system. For example, a soldier might speak using standard literary speech but then switch to non-standard, colloquial expressions, always feeling the tension of the “standard” vs. “substandard” dichotomy. In such situations, speakers intentionally shift away from literary norms, opting for more convenient, brief, and non-standard linguistic elements.

The social diversification of language is a phenomenon aligned with historical and linguistic laws. Each social stratum, depending on its lifestyle, communication style, and level of social involvement, uses language and its features to serve its own needs. Furthermore, the sociolect

includes other units with limited spheres of use. Some sociolects may expand in use and eventually find their place in the lexical layer of the standard language. In this case, socially or regionally marked words can enrich explanatory dictionaries. For instance, the word limon (lemon) entered the language through Russian and, over time, became part of the social dialectal layer:

limon (from Greek limoni)

1. Botany: An evergreen subtropical plant that grows mainly in southern countries, and its yellow, oval, aromatic sour fruit. Lemon tree. Tea with lemon.
2. Jargon, social term: One million soums (this meaning is based on the similarity in pronunciation between limon and million; initially used to refer to rubles) (O'TIL-2, p. 497).

DISCUSSION

Thus, words borrowed through Russian and used within certain social dialects undergo semantic changes. As a result, these words shift from literary usage into socially limited language layers. For a word to become part of the literary standard, it must transition from isolated, partial use to widespread, collective use—from individual norm to public norm. In this process, words are absorbed from the periphery into the core, becoming established elements of that layer.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the development of society and lifestyle—particularly the contrast between urban and rural environments—gives rise to distinctive forms of social dialects. The nature of village life and the fast-paced lifestyle of the city result in unique communicative behaviors among their respective inhabitants.

REFERENCES

1. Бондалетов В.Д. Социальная лингвистика. – Москва, 1987.
2. Казачкова Е.М. Формирование и функционирование молодежного сленга в лингвокультурной среде (на примере Астраханской области): Автореф. дисс... канд.филол.наук. – Москва, 2006.
3. Вопросы социальной лингвистики. – Л: Наука, 1969.
4. Морозова О.А. Классификация и систематика социальных диалектов // Современная наука: актуальные проблемы теории и практики. №2. 2016. – С. 162-163.
5. <http://www.vseznaikin.ru/articles/69/1006978/1006978a1.htm#1006978-L-102>
6. Begmatov E. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tilining leksik qatamlari. – Toshkent: Fan, 1985.
7. Mahmudov N. Til tilsimi tadqiqi. – Toshkent: "Mumtoz so'z" nashryoti, 2017.
8. Бондалетов В.Д. Социальная лингвистика. – Москва, 1987.