



## LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL FEATURES OF SUBCOLLOQUIAL PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN FRENCH AND UZBEK

Nodirjon Otakulov

[nodirorient@gmail.com](mailto:nodirorient@gmail.com)

National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek,  
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

**Annotation.** This article presents a systematic study of the structural–semantic and cultural–discursive characteristics of subcolloquial phraseological units used in French and Uzbek, based on a modern linguoculturological approach. The research identifies the place of these units within the language system and provides a comprehensive analysis of their communicative–functional roles, semantic–pragmatic interpretation in socio–discursive contexts, and stylistic–functional attributes. The study further explores how subcolloquial phraseologisms convey national–cultural codes, reflect collective cultural cognition, and embody symbolic meanings within the cultural consciousness. The findings offer a theoretical framework for the linguoculturological classification of subcolloquial phraseological units, highlight their culturally and socially marked components, and demonstrate their significance within the context of national linguistic worldviews.

**Key words:** *subcolloquial, linguocultural, phraseological unit, colloquial speech, argot, jargon.*

## ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ СУБКОЛЛОКВИАЛЬНЫХ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ ВО ФРАНЦУЗСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

**Аннотация.** В настоящей статье на основе современного лингвокультурологического подхода проводится системное исследование структурно–семантических и культурно–дискурсивных особенностей субколлоквиальных фразеологических единиц, функционирующих во французском и узбекском языках. В рамках исследования определено место указанных единиц в языковой системе, раскрыты их коммуникативно–функциональные задачи, семантико–прагматическая интерпретация в социально–дискурсивном контексте, а также стилистико–функциональные характеристики. Особое внимание уделено репрезентации национально–культурных кодов посредством субколлоквиальных фразеологизмов, их отражению в духовно–когнитивной сфере носителей языка, а также символично–смысловому потенциалу в культурном сознании. Результаты исследования служат научной основой для лингвокультурологической классификации субколлоквиальных фразеологических единиц, выявления их культурно и социально маркированных компонентов, а также определения их роли в национальном языковом мышлении.



**Ключевые слова:** субколлоквиальный, лингвокультурологический, фразеологическая единица, разговорная речь, арго, жаргон.

**Introduction.** The relevance of the present study is closely connected with the socio–linguistic processes emerging in modern society, particularly the active usage of colloquial and subcolloquial lexical and phraseological units in spoken language and everyday speech practices. These language elements, which are widely represented in the speech of various social strata, have not yet been sufficiently explored within the framework of contemporary linguistics. In this regard, the investigation of their linguoculturological characteristics and their relation to national and cultural codes constitutes one of the pressing directions in current linguistic research.

The linguoculturological description of subcolloquial phraseological units, their cultural interpretation, and the semantic features reflected in the collective consciousness of a people are analyzed on the basis of theoretical sources and empirical observations. Drawing on conceptual approaches developed by prominent linguists, the research clarifies the stylistic classification of these units, their representation in lexicographic sources, selection criteria, and degree of use in communicative contexts. The findings of this study contribute to the elucidation of the linguoculturological content of subcolloquial phraseologisms and serve as a scientific foundation for conceptualizing them as a stylistic layer within the language system. Phraseology is considered a significant component of a language’s lexical structure, possessing high linguocultural potential. It reflects a people’s historical memory, spiritual and moral worldview, social experience, and cultural archetypes, while also functioning as a medium for transmitting these values to future generations. In particular, phraseological units associated with spoken discourse—especially subcolloquial phraseologisms—constitute a stylistically reduced but highly expressive and emotionally charged layer of phraseology. Such units are predominantly used in informal speech domains, including mass media, publicistic and political genres, internet discourse, and everyday interpersonal communication.

Subcolloquial phraseological units function as natural and expressive means of linguistic articulation, facilitating the interpretation of interpersonal relationships and interactions within social life. They serve as effective semantic constructs in conveying subjective attitudes and evaluative judgments. The emergence and evolution of such units are rooted in the complex lexical and stylistic interplay among elements of argot, jargon, and vernacular (informal) speech.

In particular, the linguistic, sociolinguistic, and lexicographic interrelations between argot and colloquial speech demonstrate a structurally continuous and historically shaped connection, which in contemporary usage has acquired dynamic characteristics. These layers are organically interlinked through mutual influence, functional interchangeability, and systemic associations across various stylistic and communicative domains.

**Review of the relevant literature.** The theoretical and methodological foundations of the present study have been developed primarily on the basis of advanced research conducted in both foreign and local linguistics. In particular, scholarly works by prominent linguists such as V.G.Gak [12], A.Rey [9], V.D.Devkin [14], and P.Guiraud [7], who have extensively examined issues related to linguistic and speech norms, the lexical–semantic system, and the formation and use of phraseological units in the French language, have been analyzed. Their fundamental theoretical perspectives form the methodological framework of this research.



In the context of Uzbek linguistics, the scientific contributions of scholars such as A.Mamatov [8] and B.Urinboev [22], who have explored pressing issues in phraseology, functional styles, and speech culture, have provided a solid basis for examining the topic within a localized linguistic and cultural framework.

In recent years, linguistic scholarship worldwide has shown increasing interest in the nature of spontaneous spoken language, the mechanisms underlying the formation of lexical and phraseological units in communicative discourse, and their stylistic and pragmatic properties. Particularly in the context of the French language, the structural and semantic diversity of such units has necessitated their comprehensive and systematic study, which is now considered a pressing scholarly endeavor [18].

**Research methodology.** This study employs a comprehensive methodological framework derived from contemporary phraseological research in order to analyze the role of subcolloquial phraseological units in speech interactions, with particular attention to their functional load and stylistic expressiveness. The methods utilized in the research were selected within an integrated approach that allowed for the systematic and multidimensional analysis of phraseological phenomena.

Firstly, for the identification and analysis of the structural and semantic features of phraseological units, the study adopts A.V.Kunin's methods of phraseological identification and phraseological analysis as primary analytical tools [15]. These methods enabled the differentiation of phraseological units from other types of fixed expressions by identifying their semantic integrity and function as integral lexical entities.

Secondly, contextual analysis was employed to investigate the real-life usage of phraseological units within discourse and to examine the semantic load they carry. This method facilitated the exploration of how phraseological units function across various communicative situations, revealing their semantic variability and adaptability in speech. In conjunction with this, dictionary definition analysis was applied to compare the entries of phraseological units in explanatory dictionaries with their actual usage in spontaneous discourse, highlighting potential discrepancies and shifts in meaning.

Thirdly, the study made use of componential analysis, which focuses on the semantic roles of the lexical components constituting a phraseological unit. This approach allowed for a deeper understanding of the figurative and culturally marked functions of individual elements, as well as their contribution to the overall image and national-cultural connotation of the unit. It served as a key tool in uncovering the internal structure and metaphorical organization of subcolloquial phraseological expressions.

Additionally, semantic analysis, as developed by A.D.Raykhshtein [19], was widely used to determine the frequency of use and stylistic coloration of phraseological units. This method proved especially effective in identifying the expressive potential of subcolloquial units within informal speech.

Through this multifaceted methodological approach, the study systematically explores the communicative-pragmatic functions, stylistic affiliation, and expressive-stylistic features of subcolloquial phraseological units in various speech contexts. The selected methodologies collectively contribute to a fuller and more nuanced understanding of the multidimensional nature of subcolloquial phraseologisms and their role within the language system.

**Analysis and results.** For the first time, this study undertakes a comparative and analytical investigation of the subcolloquial layer of phraseology in both French and Uzbek languages. Subcolloquial phraseological units were systematically analyzed based on stylistic registers,



thematic groupings, and the semantic structure of phraseological meaning. The research contributes new theoretical insights by examining phraseological phenomena through the lenses of normative sociolinguistics and functional stylistics.

The study of phraseological units from a subcolloquial–stylistic perspective is inherently linked to the scholarly analysis of phenomena such as colloquial speech, popular vernacular, jargon, and argot. Within the history of research on the subcolloquial and argotic strata of French and Uzbek, a range of theoretical approaches has emerged.

The investigation of colloquial language from dialectological and sociolinguistic perspectives is reflected in the works of linguists such as V.M.Zhirmunsky, V.V.Straten, L.P.Yakubinsky, D.S.Likhachov, and B.A.Larin. These scholars illuminated the social and historical foundations of colloquial, dialectal, jargon, and argotic elements, including their mechanisms of word formation and their function within speech.

Contemporary linguistics demands that the study of these interrelated layers move beyond purely lexical analysis and be approached through pragmatic, semiotic, cognitive, and linguocultural frameworks as well. From this perspective, the use of argot functions not only as a form of linguistic encryption but also as a symbolic marker of belonging to a particular social group, reinforcing internal group communication and expressing identity. Argot thus operates as a linguistic strategy of social identification, often reflecting marginal positioning or affiliation with alternative subcultures.

In this regard, the examination of subcolloquial phraseologisms and their intersections with argotic usage emerges as a relevant topic not only within the domains of lexicology and phraseology, but also in sociolinguistics, linguoculturology, and lexicography. The semantic, pragmatic, and symbolic dimensions of these units reveal the complex relationship between language, culture, and social identity.

According to V.M.Mokienko, phraseology “covers those segments of reality that hold the most subjective significance” [17]. Therefore, in comprehending the contemporary linguistic landscape, the thematic systematization of subcolloquial phraseological units, along with the study of their pragmatic functions and stylistic potential, enables scholars to uncover society’s conceptual worldview. Identifying the parallel and divergent characteristics of subcolloquial phraseological units in French and Uzbek constitutes the methodological and linguocultural foundation of this research.

It is well established that in analyzing the lexical and stylistic layers of any language, the goal should not be subjective evaluation, but rather the scientific examination of the communicative functions and expressive capacities of the linguistic units under investigation. In this regard, as E.M.Beregovskaya emphasizes, the categorization of jargon and colloquial language as improper represents a subjective attitude that is alien to scholarly linguistic inquiry. The task of the linguist is to reveal the semantic, functional, and communicative characteristics of a linguistic unit based on its socio–stylistic status. Any lexical layer—regardless of its stylistic register—should be analyzed as an integral component of linguistic reality [11]. From this perspective, the scientific investigation of colloquial and subcolloquial phraseologisms remains highly relevant in contemporary linguistic studies.

F. Gadet points out that early studies of lexical–stylistic units associated with colloquial speech were often deemed superficial and unsystematic. He argues that this perception stemmed primarily from a historical lack of adequate scholarly and lexicographic resources in the field [6]. Gadet draws special attention to this issue and proposes a classification of lexicographic sources into two conditional categories: “correcteurs” (prescriptive sources) and “descripteurs”

(descriptive sources). The former aim to establish the normative framework of the language, while the latter strive to reflect its actual usage, including elements of spoken, dialectal, subcolloquial, and jargon-based expressions—real-life linguistic phenomena.

In this context, descriptive sources play a crucial methodological role in modern linguistics, particularly in understanding the diversity of the language's functional styles. They facilitate a more comprehensive and empirically grounded depiction of language as it is used in social practice, offering deeper insights into the fluid interaction between different stylistic registers and sociocultural identities.

The study of *argot* within French linguistics necessitates a dedicated historical excursus. In the dictionary *Le Petit Larousse*, *argot* is defined as “the language of a particular social or professional group” and “the language of the criminal milieu.” This definition reflects the matured evolution of *argot* as a linguistic phenomenon. The earliest recorded instances of *argot* date back to the 13th century. Among the most well-known historical references is the trial held in Dijon in 1445, as well as the *ballade* written in *argot jobelin* by François Villon in 1489.

The etymology of the term *argot* remains a subject of scholarly debate, with various hypotheses linking it to words such as *ergo*, *ergoter*, *Argos*, *Argonauts*, or *arts des Gots*. Historically, the term *argot* denoted “a group of thieves” until the 17th century, after which it began to replace the term *jargon* in the sense of “thieves’ language.” A comprehensive account of the development of these terms is provided in L. Sainean’s seminal work *Les sources de l’argot ancien* [10].

As noted by D. François-Geiger, *argot* did not originate within academic or institutional settings but rather emerged from the informal contexts of the street, cafés, and places of leisure. By the 19th century, the social function of *argot* underwent a transformation: it moved beyond the confines of criminal groups and increasingly merged with the broader colloquial register of public discourse [5]. This linguistic convergence was paralleled by a broader process of social leveling across society.

As V. Gak observes, *argot* gradually lost its original cryptological function and began to align more closely with colloquial speech, simultaneously shedding some of its distinct features [12]. This evolutionary process has been extensively examined by scholars such as H. Bauche, P. Guiraud, M. Cohen, and L. Sainean. According to H. Bauche, *argot* played a critical role in the formation of everyday colloquial language, having originated as the language of marginalized and economically disadvantaged groups.

As emphasized by D. François-Geiger, for many French speakers, the term *argot* is most closely associated with the Parisian *argot* of the late 19th and early 20th centuries [5]. However, the scholar adopts a critical stance toward such a narrow and historically constrained interpretation.

The linguistic, sociolinguistic, and lexicographic relationships between *argot* and general colloquial language are complex, historically embedded, and dynamic. Investigating these interrelations constitutes one of the important objectives of contemporary linguistics, particularly within the framework of functional stylistics and sociolinguistic variation.

The affiliation of certain phraseological units with colloquial or substandard language can be identified through the presence of characteristic lexical elements commonly found in informal speech. These include coarse or vulgar expressions, somatic references (*somatismes*), archaisms, dialectisms, popular proper names, gender- or class-marked terms, and animal names. For example, the following expressions in French illustrate these features: *Jean farine*



– “a naïve person, a simpleton”; *la fin des haricots* – “that’s the end of it,” “it’s all over now”; *crever à la peine* – “to wear oneself out,” “to be injured or broken from effort”; *faire une vadrouille* – “to start a fight or commotion,” “to go on a spree, to party or drink excessively”; *serrer les fesses* – “to be afraid,” “to tense up from fear or anxiety”; *prendre son pied* – “to enjoy oneself,” “to take pleasure,” “to have fun, feel elated”; *se fourrer un courant d’air dans l’œil* – “to make a fool of oneself,” “to be humiliated or discredited”; *tête de cochon* – “as stubborn as a mule,” “pigheaded”; *tirer ses grègues* – “to leave hastily,” “to flee,” “to make a run for it”.

In Uzbek, similar phraseological expressions with subcolloquial or informal coloring also exist. For instance: *bo’ri yeb ketarmidi* – “nothing terrible will happen,” “it’s no big deal” [20]; *burgaga achchiq qilib qo’rpani kuydirmoq* – “to overreact and cause unnecessary harm over something trivial” [20]; *jin urdi / jin tegdimi?* – “to act irrationally,” “to be mentally disturbed or afflicted”; *jinnilik qilmoq* – “to behave foolishly or absurdly”; *maynabozchilik qilmoq* – “to clown around,” “to act in a ridiculous or unserious manner”; *o’zini tentak qilib ko’rsatmoq* – “to feign foolishness,” “to pretend to be dumb or ignorant”.

These examples underscore the extent to which colloquial and substandard phraseological units in both French and Uzbek languages reflect the expressive, emotional, and socially marked layers of language. Their structures are often rich with metaphor, irony, and pragmatic nuance, which are best analyzed not only from a lexicological point of view but also within broader sociocultural and stylistic frameworks.

Subcolloquial phraseological units are distinguished by their vivid and concrete imagery, reflecting a high degree of expressive intensity. These expressions often carry visual, somatic, or situational metaphors that evoke strong emotional and cognitive associations. In French, such idiomatic constructions include: *bille de billard* – “a bald, shiny head,” “chrome dome”; *en confiture* – “mashed,” “crushed”; *jambes en parenthèses (en italiques)* – “bow-legged,” “knock-kneed”; *jouer des mains* – “to cheat,” “to deceive,” “to trick someone”; *jouer de l’orgue* – “to snore loudly”; *épouser la vache et le veau* – “to marry a pregnant woman”; *avoir mangé ses pieds* – “to have bad breath” (lit. “to have eaten one’s feet”); *n’avoir plus de fil sur sa bobine* – “to be bald,” “to have no hair left”; *bouffer des briques à la sauce de cailloux* – “to starve,” “to live in extreme poverty”; *avoir l’estomac dans les talons* – “to be extremely hungry”; *autant vouloir tirer un pet d’un âne mort* – “hopeless case,” “you’re useless,” “there’s no point”; *il pleut comme une vache qui pisse* – “it’s pouring rain” (lit. “it rains like a peeing cow”); *verser le potage à la seringue* – “to eat greedily,” “to be stingy,” “to be miserly or tightfisted”.

The use of *argot* is not merely an act of cryptographic communication but simultaneously a performance of social identity. It serves as a marker of group belonging and solidarity, signifying an individual’s inclusion into a specific sociolect or subculture. In this sense, the employment of *argot* can be understood as an act of possessing the “password” to gain entry into a shared linguistic and cultural space.

This dynamic gives rise to what contemporary researchers refer to as the crypto-ludic function of *argot*. Unlike the traditional cryptographic role, which primarily focuses on concealment, the crypto-ludic function emphasizes the playful, creative, and aesthetic dimensions of language. It involves not only the masking of meaning but also the generation of verbal pleasure through inventive expression.

François-Geiger articulates this dual nature by stating: “Lorsqu’on joue à cache-cache, la fonction cryptique s’accompagne souvent d’une fonction ludique... nous parlons d’une

*fonction crypto-ludique, qui engendre dans un groupe une certaine connivence.*” (“When playing hide-and-seek, the cryptic function is often accompanied by a playful function... we speak of a crypto-ludic function, which fosters a kind of complicity within a group.”) [5]

Scholars have noted the multifunctional roles of argot in modern communication. Gak argues that contemporary French exhibits a “complex system of speech registers with blurred boundaries,” where argot plays a flexible stylistic and social role [13]. H.Bauche categorizes argot into three principal subtypes: (1) criminal argot, (2) professional jargons, and (3) group-based jargons.

P. Guiraud, on the other hand, differentiates between: technical terminology and thieves’ lexicon, and expressive lexis, which includes emotionally charged, metaphorical, or humorous expressions [7].

This framework reveals that subcolloquial phraseology, far from being marginal or degenerate, is a rich and dynamic stratum of language. It serves as a repository of cultural codes, humor, identity, and stylistic creativity, and it plays an increasingly important role in discourse analysis, pragmatics, and sociolinguistic studies.

In his work *Dictionnaire de l’argot et de ses sources*, D. François-Geiger acknowledges that “in the 1990s, it was extremely difficult to precisely define argot” [5]. The phenomenon that L.–J. Calvet referred to as *argot moderne* (“modern argot”) is widely recognized in French linguistics under the term *argot commun* (“common argot”) [1].

These lexical items may not be actively used by every French speaker, yet they are generally familiar and socially accepted across various communicative contexts. In parallel with the French term *argot commun*, analogous concepts exist in other languages, such as *jargonlashtirilgan sodda so‘zlashuv tili* (“colloquial speech influenced by jargon”) in Uzbek. According to V.Salyaev, such intermediate forms serve a “vertical” function, enabling a continuum between argot and colloquial language [21]. This mediating layer facilitates linguistic navigation between highly coded sociolects and mainstream informal registers.

From a global perspective, the phenomenon of argot is not unique to French. As noted by Goudaillier, “*toute langue possède une dimension argotique*” (“every language possesses an argotic dimension”). In Germany, this is known as *Rotwelsch*; in Anglo-Saxon countries – *Slang*; in Spain – *Germanía*. Furthermore, languages are often classified using color metaphors (e.g., *la langue bleue, la langue verte, italien rouge*), a tendency described by D. Likhachov as reflecting the “local color” of speech [16].

When discussing argot, it is important to distinguish it from Saussure’s notion of *langue* (the abstract language system). Rather, argot is a manifestation of *parole* – the spoken, socially contextualized, and lexically marked expression of language. Argot is, first and foremost, a lexical phenomenon. As M.Cohen observes, argot is “a superstructural phenomenon for the subject who self-reproduces and self-identifies through vocabulary” [3].

In this sense, argot is not merely a linguistic deviation but a sociolexical mirror of the speaker’s identity and positioning. This point is underscored by D.François-Geiger, who defines argot as: “*le parler des truands, grands et petits*” – “the language of thugs, great and small” [5].

Here, the term *truands* (“thugs” or “delinquents”) should not be interpreted solely in terms of age or social class but also in terms of their linguistic behavior. The “delinquency” referenced is as much a discursive phenomenon as it is a social one—signifying linguistic rule-breaking, expressive creativity, and subversion of standard norms.

Thus, contemporary research on argot necessitates an interdisciplinary approach, combining historical linguistics, sociolinguistics, and pragmatics. Far from being a relic of criminal

underworlds, argot today functions as a dynamic and culturally embedded register—simultaneously resisting, reshaping, and enriching the language.

In modern linguistics, the stylistic, semantic, functional, and cultural analysis of phraseological units has become an issue of both theoretical significance and practical importance. In particular, subcolloquial phraseological units—expression forms operating within the lower stylistic register of colloquial speech, yet characterized by high expressive intensity—have emerged as one of the most critical objects of contemporary linguistic research.

These units serve as a distinctive verbal mirror of a nation's oral communicative culture, social experience, historical memory, and national mentality. Therefore, their linguocultural and pragmatic analysis is increasingly regarded as a key link in the broader chain of language—and—culture interrelation studies.

Subcolloquial phraseological units occupy a non—standard, extra—normative layer of language, positioned outside formal and codified linguistic usage. Nevertheless, from a communicative perspective, they are highly active and socially embedded. Typically rooted in vernacular speech, these units are emotionally and expressively charged and often convey irony, satire, sarcasm, or evaluative semantics.

They are frequently employed in informal registers of discourse, such as: mass media (e.g., tabloid headlines, talk shows), internet discourse (memes, forums, social media), political rhetoric (populist speeches, public debates), performative speech (stage dialogues, stand—up comedy), everyday conversation.

**Conclusion and recommendations.** The emergence and development of subcolloquial phraseological expressions are largely linked to phenomena such as argot, jargon, regional dialects, diachronic evolution, and broader lexico—stylistic processes. Their pragmatic value lies not only in their lexical meanings but also in the social connotations, communicative functions, and emotional loading they carry.

Subcolloquial phraseologisms represent one of the most dynamic and stylistically downgraded yet semantically rich layers of modern language. Identifying and analyzing their pragmatic and linguocultural features is not only key to understanding the intricate ties between language and culture but also serves as a crucial tool in uncovering the psychological, social, and ethnic patterns of thought that shape a given speech community.

## References

1. Calvet L.–J. L'argot variation diastratique, diatopique et diachronique. – P.: Langue française, 1991. – P.40–48.
2. Calvet L.–J. L'argot. – P.: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999. – 128 p.
3. Cohen M. Histoire d'une langue: Le français. – P.: Editions Sociales, 1947. – P.27.
4. Colin J.–P., Leclère C. Dictionnaire de l'argot français et du français populaire. Paris: 2018.
5. François–Geiger D. L'argot et ses dictionnaires. – P.: Lexicographie historique, 2001. – P.877–880.
6. Gadett Françoise. Le français populaire. – Paris: Armand Colin, 1992. – P.8.
7. Guiraud P. L'argot. – P.: Presses Universitaires de France, 1956. – 126 p.
8. Mamatov A.E. Zamonaviy lingvistika. T.: Noshir. 2019. – B.168.
9. Rey I.G. La phraseologie du français. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2002. – 268 p.
10. Sainean L. Les sources de l'argot ancien. – P.: Champion, 1912. – P.43–44.



11. Береговская Э.М. Молодежный сленг как объект лингвистики. М.: 1996. – С.33.
12. Гак В.Г. Введение во французскую филологию. – М.: Просвещение, 1986. – С.132, 183.
13. Гак В.Г. Сравнительная типология французского и русского языков. М.: 1984.
14. Девкин В.Д. Очерки по лексикографии. – М.: Прометей, 2000. – 395 с.
15. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 1996. – С.5.
16. Лихачев Д.С. Арготические слова профессиональной речи. – Тверь: Тверское областное отделение российского фонда культуры, 1993. – С.115.
17. Мокиенко В.М. Стилистика и фразеология: Очерки. СПб., 1999. – С.83.
18. Отакулов Н.Б. Француз ва ўзбек тилларида субколлоквиал фразеологизмларнинг лисоний хусусиятлари. – Тошкент: “Grandkondorprint”, 2024. – 128 б.
19. Райхштейн А.Д. Национально–культурный аспект интеркоммуникации. // Иностранные языки в школе. 1986. – №5. – С.10–14.
20. Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ўзбек тилининг фразеологик луғати. – Т.: Ўқитувчи, 1992. – Б.58.
21. Саляев В.А. Лексика арготического и жаргонного происхождения в толковых словарях современного русского языка: Автореф.дис. ...канд.филол.наук. Магнитогорск, гос. пед. ун–т. – М.: 1998. – С.7.
22. Ўринбоев Б. Ўзбек сўзлашув нутки. – Т.: Фан, 1982.