

*Normurotova Maftuna**Faculty of Foreign Philology**Department of Foreign Language and Literature Trainee-teacher***LINGUISTIC COMPARATIVE INTERPRETATION OF POLYGRAPHIC UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES**

Annotation: This article presents a comparative linguistic analysis of polygraphic units in English and Uzbek languages. It explores the structural and semantic characteristics of polygraphic elements, examining their similarities and differences in both languages. The study highlights how these polygraphic units, including abbreviations, acronyms, and initialisms, function within their respective linguistic systems. The research provides insights into the historical and cultural factors influencing the development and use of these units. By comparing English and Uzbek polygraphic units, this work contributes to the understanding of how polygraphy evolves across different language systems and enriches modern lexicology.

Key Words: Polygraphic units, Comparative analysis, Abbreviations, Acronym, Linguistic structures, Cultural influence

Introduction:

In the modern era of communication, polygraphic units, such as abbreviations, acronyms, and initialisms, play a vital role in simplifying language use across various fields, including science, technology, business, and culture. Both English and Uzbek languages have witnessed the growing prevalence of these units, which reflect broader linguistic trends in lexical economy and globalization. Despite their similar roles in communication, the structural formation, usage, and evolution of polygraphic units differ significantly between these two languages due to their unique linguistic systems, cultural contexts, and historical backgrounds.

This article aims to provide a comparative linguistic interpretation of polygraphic units in English and Uzbek languages. By analyzing the phonological, morphological, and syntactical features of these units, we can better understand their influence on language development. This comparative study will also shed light on the cross-linguistic patterns and cultural underpinnings that shape the usage of polygraphic units in both languages.

MAIN PART

Definition of Polygraphic Units. Polygraphic units refer to symbols, letters, or combinations of letters that have specific phonological, semantic, or syntactic roles in a language. These can include alphabetic symbols, punctuation marks, and special typographic characters. In both English and Uzbek, these units serve distinct linguistic functions influenced by each language's phonetic and orthographic systems.

2. Historical Context and Development

- English: The English writing system has evolved from Latin and has adopted a relatively stable alphabet with 26 letters. However, English orthography often does not align directly with its phonology due to the language's rich borrowing from Latin, French, and other languages.

- Uzbek: Historically, Uzbek has used multiple scripts, including Arabic, Cyrillic, and now Latin, which influences how polygraphic units are interpreted. The current Latin-based script was

adopted in the early 1990s, replacing Cyrillic, and this transition creates an interesting comparative field.

3. Alphabet and Orthographic Differences

- English: The use of digraphs (e.g., "th," "sh") and silent letters is common in English. These are often polygraphic units that require interpretation based on context.

- Uzbek: In contrast, Uzbek employs fewer polygraphic units related to digraphs but has its unique phonetic symbols in the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets. For example, the letters "sh" and "ch" are used as single units in both the Cyrillic and Latin scripts of Uzbek, but they are more directly aligned with their phonetic sounds than in English.

4. Phonological Representation

Polygraphic units are often linked to how sounds are represented in written form.

- English: The English language's inconsistency between phonology and orthography can make interpreting polygraphic units more challenging. For example, the combination "ough" in English can represent multiple sounds, depending on the word (e.g., "though," "through," "rough").

- Uzbek: Uzbek has a more phonetic-based orthography, meaning that most letters correspond directly to their sounds, with fewer ambiguities.

5. Punctuation and Special Characters

In both languages, punctuation plays a significant role in polygraphy. Understanding the use of commas, periods, question marks, and quotation marks helps in interpreting written text.

- English: Has extensive rules for punctuation usage, with some characters (e.g., the apostrophe) having multiple functions (possessive and contractions).

- Uzbek: The punctuation marks are similar but are often influenced by Russian orthographic rules, especially in older texts using the Cyrillic script.

6. Challenges in Translation and Interpretation

When translating polygraphic units from English to Uzbek (or vice versa), some symbols may not have direct equivalents. For example, English contractions (e.g., "don't," "I'm") have no exact parallel in Uzbek, where more explicit structures are often used.

7. Influence of Sociolinguistic and Cultural Factors

Cultural codes reflected in how each language uses polygraphic units are also important. English, being used globally, has adopted many international symbols, while Uzbek maintains specific uses tied to its national and cultural context.

Conclusion:

The comparative analysis of polygraphic units in English and Uzbek languages reveals both shared linguistic tendencies and unique structural differences. While both languages utilize abbreviations, acronyms, and initialisms to enhance communicative efficiency, the linguistic strategies and cultural influences underlying these units vary. English, with its global prominence, has shaped the formation of polygraphic units in many languages, including Uzbek. However, the Uzbek language has preserved its distinct linguistic identity by adapting these units to its phonological and grammatical system. This study highlights the dynamic nature of polygraphic units and their role in the ongoing development of both languages. Understanding these units' comparative structure offers valuable insights into the broader processes of linguistic innovation, cultural exchange, and language modernization in the global era.

References:

1. Brinton, L., & Brinton, D. (2010). *The Linguistic Structure of Modern English*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
2. Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Internet Source: The Usage of Acronyms in Modern Linguistics (Accessed from <https://www.languagejournal.com>).
4. Muminov, M. (2015). "Language Policy and the Development of the Uzbek Language." *Central Asian Studies*, 22(3), 45-67.
5. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
6. Saidova, Z. (2020). "The Role of Abbreviations in the Uzbek Language: A Historical Perspective." *Journal of Uzbek Linguistics*, 18(1), 32-51.