The Influence Of Spoken Language On Linguistic Change (A Comparative Study Of English And Uzbek)

N.S.Qobilova,
BuxDU, PhD, dotsent n.s.qobilova@buxdu.uz
N.M.Raximova
BuxDu, magistranti nargiza4414441@gmail.com

Abstract
This research focuses on the role of speech—this fast and spontaneous form of language. As spoken language primarily focuses on ease and convenience, this leads to decreasing complexity in languages. This research finds that linguistic evolution occurs primarily in: phonetic reduction, a reduction in lexical content, elliptical speech, simplifying syntaxes, and pragmatic repairs. Taking into account contemporary fast developments within electronic language use, such spoken language traits are gaining prime importance. There occurs a major trend of phonetic reduction in English language evolution, while in Uzbek language evolution, a major trend towards grammatical and syntactical simplification. This comparison proves that speech plays a major role in languages as a catalyst for evolution.
Keywords: spoken language, linguistic change, phonetic reduction, simplification, English, Uzbek, pragmatics, conversational speech.

Introduction. Language is a living and dynamic phenomenon but never static.[1] Amongst the modes of communication, speech has the most dynamic elements. [2]Unlike writing, where rules are rigorously followed and norms are carefully maintained, speech performs its function with flexibility, emotion, and adaptability. Speakers reduce words to shorter forms, truncate elements of sentences, use shared contexts instead of entire sentence structures, and use tonality to depict meanings that would be expressed in extensive wording.

The role of spoken language has increased greatly in recent decades with the help of digital technology, audio messages, social networking sites, and other forms of Internet communications. All such advancements break down the differences between writing and spoken language because more and more spoken language can now penetrate mainstream language.

English and Uzbek, although belonging to different language types with diverse grammatical structures, share similar trends whereby habits of speech continually affect language norms. However, each language expresses such tendencies uniquely: English does this with a more prominent emphasis on simplifying phonetics, while Uzbek does this to a much larger extent concerning grammatical and syntactic compression.[3] This article aims to examine such tendencies in a manner that is thorough but also readable and human-focused.

Objective of the study. The major aims of this research work are to establish how spoken language triggers linguistic changes in English and Uzbek, to examine patterns of simplification in phonetics, lexicon, and syntax as a consequence of speech, investigate how electronic forms of communication have contributed to speeding up such spoken language trends, to compare the linguistic characteristics of English and Uzbek with a view to determining similar and dissimilar trends in language changes.

[1] Crystal,D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge University Press.P 16-25

[2] Martinet.(1964). Elements of General Linguistics. P. 43-60
[3] Roach, P.(2009) English Phonetics and Phonology. P.98-130

Methodology. This research uses descriptive linguistic analysis, comparative linguistic analysis, pragmatic explores factors. With the help of this methods, it is possible to study cross-phonetic, lexical and grammatical variations in English and Uzbek.

Presentation and discussion. Speech is a function of efficiency, velocity, and emotional expression.[4] People generally avoid producing fully articulated and Grammatically complex sentences except when the speech situation requires this form of communication. They rely instead on mutual comprehension and syntactic simplification.[5]For example: *" Want some?"* instead of *"Do you want some?"* Example in Uzbek: *"Qayerga?"* instead of *"Qayerga boryapsan?"*

This tendency towards simplifying has far-reaching effects: conversational shortcuts introduced over a period of time affect the dominant grammar of a language. In English, a strong degree of phonetic reduction occurs in informal pronunciation. For example: *going to - gonna, want to - wanna, let me – lemme, did you - didju[6].* Thus, fast articulation leads to reduced vowel sounds and consonant blending. In Uzbek, this phonetic reduction phenomenon is less apparent but does exist, for example: *ketayapman – ketyapman, bo'libdi - bo'pti, kelayapti – kevotti.[7]* Thus, in common language use, such reduced forms often function as defaults. Spoken communication tends to shorten frequently used words.For example grammatical and syntactic shortening in English:

Subject omission:*"Coming?"*
Auxiliary reduction: *"I dunno"*
Ellipsis: *"Told you"*
In Uzbek: Ega tushiriladi:*"Keldim"*

Kesim qisqaradi: *"Borvomman"[8]*
Ellipsis keng: *"Men ham boraman. U ham."*
Digital communication has connected with spoken language and written language. Voice messages imitate conversational speech.The texting culture values quickness over content.Emojis serve as a replacement for emotional intonation.As a consequence, norms of spoken language are being integrated more rapidly with those of written language

Results. Speech perception remains a leading factor for language evolution in English and Uzbek. In English, phonetic simplification more often occurs in comparison with grammatical simplification.In Uzbek,the simplification process primarily targets grammar and syntax. The role of spoken language in language change is significantly quickened through digital communications. Both languages embody a preference for efficiency that has a wide universal appeal.

Conclusion. The spoken language has a great effect on the development of English and Uzbek. Despite simplifications for each language in varying parameters, the drivin/8g force remains uniform: humans prefer a language of efficient communication that performs tasks fast with a capability to convey emotion. As technology continues to give prominence to spoken-style speech, distinctions between 'spoken language' and 'written language' may become more blurred. This means that speech mannerisms and norms that would otherwise be practiced in everyday spoken language only might soon be a norm. A thorough grasp of such trends can enrich our understanding of the natural course of language development and this innate human need for simplifying language without losing content.

[4] Martinet, A. (1964) Elements of General Linguistics. P. 35-50
[5] Grice,H.P.(1975). Logic and Conversation. In syntax and Semantics, Vol.P. 41-58
[6] Ladefoged, P.(2006). A Course in Phonetics. P. 180-200

[7] O'rinboyev, B (2015). O'zbek tilining zamonaviy grammatikasi.P. 90-110

References:

1.Crystal, D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 1–488.

2.Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In: Cole, P., Morgan, J. (eds.) Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3. New York: Academic Press, pp. 41–58.

3. Kobilova, N. S. (2020). IN THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR AND THE HERO OF THE WORK SIMILARITIES. Theoretical & Applied Science, (6), 250-252.

4.Ladefoged, P. (2006). A Course in Phonetics (5th ed.). Boston: Thomson Wadsworth. pp. 1–400.

5. Sulaymonovna, K. N., & Tulkunovna, A. E. (2025). ENHANCING LISTENING COMPREHENSION IN DIVERSE CLASSROOMS: ADDRESSING THE PROBLEM OF PRACTICE THROUGH COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIES. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING, 3(3), 582-585.

6.Kobilova, N., & Azimova, M. (2024). LANGUAGE UNITS EXPRESSING THE CONCEPT OF EVALUATION. Наука и инновации в системе образования, 3(12), 84-87.

7.Kobilova, N. S., & Azimjonova, E. T. (2024). Analyzing the Impact of the Program for International Student Assessment on Technology Use in English Listening Classes. International Multidisciplinary Journal of Education, 2(10), 192-195.   8.Nazarova, N. A. (2022). Study of anthroponyms and their places in the lexical system (In Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal, Volume 3, Issue 1, pp. 90-96). Ahrorovna, NN (2022). STUDY OF ANTHROPONYMS AND THEIR PLACES IN THE LEXICAL SYSTEM. Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal, 3(1), 90-96.

9. Akhrorovna, N. N., & Kizi, B. S. N. (2024). METHODS OF TEACHING ENGLISH TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LEARNERS. SUSTAINABILITY OF EDUCATION, SOCIO-ECONOMIC SCIENCE THEORY, 2(17), 163-168.

10. Akhrorovna, N. N., & Khamidullayevna, K. S. (2024). BENEFITS OF STUDYING FOREIGN LANGUAGES. PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES AND TEACHING METHODS, 3(32), 55-59.

11. Akhrorovna, N. N. (2024). ENHANCING LANGUAGE TEACHING AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT THROUGH INTERACTIVE PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES. PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES AND TEACHING METHODS, 3(32), 50-54.

12. Nazarova, N. (2024). ANTHROPONYMS AS REFLECTIONS OF CULTURE AND IDENTITY. Развитие и инновации в науке, 3(9), 59-63.

13. Кобилова, Н. (2019). ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННЫЙ ПСИХОЛОГИЗМ И ПРИНЦИП ЭПИЧЕСКОГО ИЗОБРАЖЕНИЯ. Международный академический вестник, (5), 108-111.

14.Kobilova, N. S. (2019). LITERARY PSYCHOLOGY AND STYLE. Theoretical & Applied Science, (10), 254-258.