

Sotvoldiyeva Istorakhon Lutfullo qizi

Andijan state institute of foreign languages

PhD student

E-mail: i.sotvoldiyeva@mail.ru

Annotation: *The lexical-semantic structure of English and Uzbek colloquialisms is unique.*

The lexical-semantic structure of colloquialisms is considered to be complex, and it is possible to find their various forms in different languages. Therefore, this article talks about the lexical-semantic variation of English and Uzbek colloquial units.

Key words: *colloquialism, lexical-semantic relationship, lexical-semantic variant, colloquial variant, semantic productivity.*

A word with a colloquial meaning is considered only one of the lexical-semantic variants of a polysemantic word, and these variants can belong to both the neutral style and other styles different from the colloquial style. In addition, their stylistic features belong only to the colloquial lexical-semantic variant. The study of colloquial lexicon divided into two structural-semantic types requires a separate analysis. Because these lexical units have differences in both semantic and new word-making procedures, this situation indicates that they should be studied separately [1; 46].

A word with a colloquial meaning has a semantic relationship with its certain lexical-semantic variants [2;59]. This situation can be justified by the presence of a similar semantic marker in the structures of the words that form the colloquial meaning and the new meanings.

In the languages being compared, there is a case of dropping intermediate meanings in the semantic chain of a polysemous word, in which the synchronous connection between the meanings of words close to each other, one of which is considered colloquial, is broken. The lack of semantic connection between these meanings allows to evaluate this lexical-semantic option as a separate word. For example, the English lexical units brick - a good fellow and buck - an American dollar with their main meanings "a rectangular block of molded and baked, or dried, clay" and "the male of various animals" loses mutual connection, and to restore this connection, it is necessary to refer to etymological information.

In the case of the Uzbek language, the word "client" has the colloquial meaning of "permanent customer or customer". notary, etc. The semantic relationship between the "person who handed over to" is broken. On the other hand, the colloquial variant of this word shows a close semantic connection with the word "client", which is the basis for this colloquialism. A colloquial variant of the English word "sager" is "a basketball player", not "a machine used in mining to transfer cars on or off a cage", which is considered the main variant, but "the basket" has an association with the horse "cage". Therefore, the lexical-semantic variant of "sager" can be evaluated as a colloquial word.

The relations between the constructive and constructive meanings of polysemous words can be semantically justified in different ways. That is, the occurrence of the process of secondary nomination can be observed here, and its essence can be justified in terms of its use as a form of artificial meaning that reflects a new subject of reality with some signs of the constructed meaning. Thus, a relation of semantic productivity within one polysemantic word is established between these two meanings.

While researching the colloquial features of the polysemantic word, it was found that there is a large weight of referents that appeared through the transfer of metaphoric meaning. Colloquial meanings of words are usually artificial, and metaphors play an important role in the creation of these meanings. As a proof of our opinion, the following lexical-semantic options can be given as an example:

1. "animal" – "(like) human yoki object":

bug *n* – 1. one of an order of insects that suck vital fluids;

2. colloq. a small microphone for secretly recording conversations [3;217];

butterfly *n* – 1. an insect with broad, brilliantly colored wings;

2. colloq. a gay, fickle woman;

chick *n* – 1. a young domestic fowl;

2. colloq. a young woman;

2. "object" – "human":

crook *n* – 1. a bend, curve, hook;

2. colloq. a swindler;

drag *n* – 1. the act of dragging;

2. colloq. a dull person, situation, etc.;

snippet *n* – 1. a small piece snipped off;

2. colloq. a small or insignificant person.

From the above examples, it can be said that metaphorical migration occurs on the basis of various differential signs characteristic of an object, event or events. However, not all referents of such words can be said to have appeared on the basis of this phenomenon.

REFERENCES:

1. Canning P. Functional stylistics: in the Routledge Handbook of Stylistics by Burke M. – N.Y.: Routledge, 2014. – 540 pp.
2. Doniyorov X. va Yo'ldoshev B. Adabi til va badiiy stil. T., Fan, 1988. – 207 b.
3. Lighter J. The Random House Historical Dictionary of American Slang: A–G. – N.Y.: Random House, 1994. – 1080 pp.