VERNACULARS IN ENGLISH AND THEIR CLASSIFICATION

Rakhmatilloeva Umida

Master student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. The article examines varieties of the English language related to the literary language and vernacular and dialect vocabulary, and also presents a stratified division of vernaculars into subgroups.

Key words: literary vernacular, lexical vernacular, dialect vocabulary, jargon, slangisms

INTRODUCTION

Literary vernacular is a very productive, actively developing category of stylistically marked means, constantly replenished from various sources. Vernaculars are words, expressions, forms of word formation and inflection, features of pronunciation that deviate from the literary norm and have a tinge of stylistic decline.

Main part. The conventionality of the border between vernacular and dialect vocabulary is often explained by reasons of a genetic order, historical connections of vernacular with folk dialects, which are sometimes not entirely rightfully considered as the main source of the formation of this reduced layer of the national language. The path of dialectism into general use does not always pass through vernacular speech, since it is not an obligatory transitional medium in the two-way connection between folk dialects and the literary language [1]. In addition, most of the dialectisms that have entered the national language, including the vernacular, do not reveal their origin either in semantics or in structure; it can only be established as a result of a special study.

The problem of distinguishing the dialect from the national language at the lexical level concerns not only vernacular speech, but also other functional and stylistic categories of the national language. More difficult in many cases is the distinction between national and dialectal in the semantic-syntactic structures of national words.

The patterns of processes of interpenetration of vernacular and dialect vocabulary have not yet been sufficiently studied, but it is still possible to say with confidence that the complexity of their differentiation does not apply to all lexical-semantic categories of vernacular speech. "The delimitation of many colloquial words from dialect ones," writes F. P. Filin, "does not cause any difficulties" [2, 26].

English lexical vernacular is understood as a complex lexical-semantic category - a certain fragment of the national composition of the language, i.e. a hierarchical whole that is well-ordered and has a general structure, representing a set of socially determined lexical systems (jargons, argots) and stylistically reduced lexical layers ("low" colloquialisms, slangisms, vulgarisms), which are characterized by significant differences and discrepancies in the basic functions and sociolexicological, pragmatic, functional-semantic and stylistic aspects.

With the stratified division of language, stylistically marked vernacular formations, like other non-standard words, can be attributed to a certain expressive level of communication - reduced style.

With the traditional approach to the consideration of linguistic forms outside the literary standard, all English non-standard vocabulary is divided into "low" colloquialisms, general slangisms, special slangisms (jargonisms, kentisms) and vulgarisms.

On the other hand, in addition to the above lexical layers, forms of existence of vernacular speech are distinguished, which have the status of linguistic microsystems included in macrosystems, for example, social dialects, argot (Kent), professional and corporate jargons, urban semi-dialects such as "Cockney" and "Snooz" , "extraliterary vernacular," which is understood as the phonetically, grammatically and lexically "incorrect" speech of uneducated or poorly educated people from the point of view of the literary standard.

To the stylistically marked formations in the literary language we include that fragment of vocabulary that in traditional Anglo-American terminology is defined as slangisms ("whistle stop" - a provincial town, dough - money) of general slang and "low" colloquialism (to kick him out - kick him out, nit picking - petty nagging, rough neck - hooligan, skedaddle - running away), - two lexical layers recorded in dictionaries with a blurred boundary between them.

Both layers differ from the neutral vocabulary of the literary standard by an ethical and stylistic decline of varying quality: from the humorous and ironic casual expression of everyday communication to the derogatory expression and harshness of a negative emotional assessment of purely familiar communication. What brings them closer to the vocabulary of the literary standard is, first of all, the fact that they are also generally accepted and generally understandable within a certain time period, within the boundaries of a certain communicative community. They oppose the literary standard as special means of reduced speech, characteristic of the colloquial style of the literary language and other everyday colloquial forms of the national language. The words included in this group are qualitatively different from swear words or obscene words and are not perceived as vulgar formations, but give the speech a flavor of familiarity, although there are borderline cases.

The vocabulary of expressive English vernacular emphasizes the features of functional and stylistic variability within the boundaries of the literary language. This variability is qualitatively different from the social-functional variability of argotisms and jargons, since the main features of expressive vocabulary are common usage and ethical-stylistic decline. According to its communicative status, linguistic nature and specific social situations of communication, the vocabulary of expressive vernacular usually functions in everyday colloquial and familiar colloquial varieties of speech.

In the spheres of extraliterary speech and literary language, vulgarisms stand apart (bleddy premises - dump, daft fucker - son of a bitch) - a lexical layer with obscene expression. Vulgarisms can be considered, like elements of expressive vernacular, from the angle of their ethical-stylistic decline, although this decline is qualitatively different from other non-standard words. Among vulgarisms, obscene and obscene forms are distinguished. Thus, we can make the following clarification of our understanding of the essence of vulgarisms: we classify all offensive, swear words and gross curses as indecent forms: obscene forms include obscene words and expressions.

Vulgarisms-taboo usually receive synonyms-euphemisms in speech. Well-known everyday euphemisms (blind - unseeing; fat - overweight mad - mentally sick) as substitutes for taboo vulgarisms gradually acquire a vulgar connotation, i.e. degrades.

According to the semantic structure, everyday euphemisms and pseudo-euphemistic expressions represent the use of words and expressions in a figurative sense based on similarity, analogy, as a result of association in locality and are intended to cover up immodest thoughts, intentions and phenomena of life. Vulgarisms-taboo function only in common speech and are not associated with a literary standard due to the lack of stylistically neutral synonyms-euphymisms.

Many blasphemies and curses have obscene connotations (Come off it, you bloody liar - Stop chattering, you lousy liar, the loony bastard - a lousy idiot!) [3, 200, 214] with the mention of religious terms. Blasphemous curses are functionally close to interjections and act as a kind of stylistically reduced intensifying forms for expressing certain emotions, most often negative, under the influence of some stimulating stimuli. Some blasphemies sometimes deviate from the original phonetic pattern, becoming structurally marked formations.

Lexico-semantically and etymologically, argotisms and jargons are closely related to elements of expressive vernacular. Let us note that in the national language there are argotisms and jargonisms that to some extent reflect the social variation of vocabulary, as well as "low" colloquialisms (mate, 'un, kid - friend, fellow, small, paste - give a beating, bogger - scarecrow, bastard, pinching - to pull), slangisms and vulgarisms, are contrasted with elements of the literary standard. Stylistically reduced vocabulary is opposed to socially determined. However, their boundaries are blurred, and at the junction a colloquial interjargon is formed - the main source and warehouse of various slang and argot elements. In English material, with a stratified classification of a socially differentiated language, one can distinguish: 1) professional jargons, 2) corporate jargons, 3) Kent (argot).

Corporate jargons include so-called conventional languages, since corporate jargons trace their origins to the jargons of beggars, itinerant traders and criminals, which were already characterized by diglossia. Professional jargon is a special linguistic environment, limited by the framework of a certain profession and located between terminological vocabulary and common literary vernacular (army jargon the jump-up card – deserter, "net"). Based on this position, professional vernacular is opposed, on the one hand, to terminological speech, and on the other, to general literary vernacular. There is no objection to the definition of the social relevance of professional jargon as words and expressions of an evaluative nature, conveying the attitude of a given team to the subject of work and everyday life, acting as stylistically reduced doublets of terms, professionalisms and words of the literary language. Knowledge of terms and their jargon synonyms should be considered as professional diglossia.

Professional jargon (den - den of thieves, coppers - pharaohs), like Kentisms, can make speech incomprehensible to an outside observer. Although, unlike Kentisms, there is no special coding or classified vocabulary and phraseology. If jargon is so frequent that it makes it difficult to perceive speech in general - this is pure jargon, but if the uninitiated understand this speech and perceive jargon as something emotionally expressive, subject-logical meaning, which is easily guessed, then here are individual inclusions of jargon in the fabric of literary correctness speech, which can be defined as jargonized, familiar speech.

What professional jargon has in common with corporate jargon is that both are the result of a kind of social fun, a language game, subject to the principles of emotional expressiveness. If the existence of professional jargon depends, first of all, on the social significance of the profession, its isolation, which varies depending on many reasons, starting with secrecy/public availability and ending with the peculiarities of the psychological mindset of people engaged in a given profession, then the existence of corporate jargon is usually short-lived and depends entirely on contemporary reality. Corporate jargons are primarily youth jargons; they serve as the main basis for the general interjargon layer of vocabulary. Speakers of professional jargons have a professional diglossia that is different from the diglossia of argot.

The entire history of special languages (Argot, Kent) is inextricably linked with the history of antisocial groups opposed to legal society. The main function of such a "language" is the function of secret communication. The original reason for the creation of argot was the need for a conventional "language" understandable only to a certain isolated group. Kent borrows all grammatical tools and functions according to the laws of the grammar of the common language. Kentisms - nouns, verbs and

adjectives usually acted as inclusions in the general background of familiar colloquial speech (numskull - club, to be rotten - to be rude, sowd (sold) - to drive).

Conclusion. The emergence and spread of the English Kent was due to certain social reasons, which created, to some extent, various social groups isolated from legal society, subject to persecution, and having a subculture hostile to the dominant culture. It is obvious that these antisocial groups had a number of incentives that contributed to the creation and development of kent: 1) social protection - the desire to unite and oppose themselves to "legal" society, 2) the need to hide something from outsiders, 3) the incentive of the least verbal effort – the desire for brevity of expressions and simplification of the lexical and phraseological system of the language, 4) the desire to give speech an emotional coloring.

REFERENCES:

1. L.I. Balakhonova – On the question of the status of vernacular and dialect vocabulary // Questions of linguistics. – M., 1982. – No. 3. – P. 104-110
2. F. P. Filin – Project "Dictionary of Folk Dialects". M.-L., 1961. – P. 26.
3. Allan Sillitoe Key to the door – Progress Publishers Moscow, 1969 – 470 p.
4. Nasrullaeva, N. Z. (2015). The concept" kindred relations" as a problem of gender linguistics (on the material of English phraseology). In *The Fifth European Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics* (pp. 8-13).
5. Nasrullaeva, N. Z. (2018). The formation of gender concepts in the English and Uzbek phraseological world vision. *Abstract of doctoral dissertation. Tashkent*.
6. Шамурадова, Н. М. (2023). KAUZALLIKNING INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA IFODALANISHI. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, *6*(4).
7. Shamuradova, N. (2021). USAGE OF PARTS OF BODY IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH IDIOMS. *Мир исследований*, *2*(2).
8. Muxtarovna, S. N. (2022). Historical Origin and Usage of Clause of Reason in English. *The Peerian Journal*, *5*, 183-187.