ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫНЫҢ БІЛІМ ЖӘНЕ ҒЫЛЫМ МИНИСТРЛІГІ

ҚОЖА АХМЕТ ЯСАУИ АТЫНДАҒЫ ХАЛЫҚАРАЛЫҚ ҚАЗАҚ-ТҮРІК УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ

ӘОЖ 811.111

Уразбаева Айгуль Қуанышбековна

NONSTANDARD LEXICON OF MODERN ENGLISH

6M021000 – Шетел филологиясы (ағылшын тілі)

Магистрлік диссертацияның авторефераты

Қазақстан Республикасы

Түркістан – 2017

Диссертация Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті Филология факультеті «Ағылшын филологиясы» кафедрасында орындалған.

Ғылыми жетекшісі: әлеуметтік ғылымдарының
                                                           кандидаты, доцент м.а.
                                                           Тұрлыбеков Б.Д.

Ресми оппоненті: Оңтүстік Қазақстан
                                    мемлекеттік педагогикалық институтының
                                    «Шетел тілдері» кафедрасының меңгерушісі,
                                    педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты
                                                           Сманова Ғ.С.

INTRODUCTION

Interest in problems of communication has caused emergence in linguistics of a significant amount of the works devoted to studying of structural and semantic features of the dialogical speech. Since latest decades of the 20th century a large number of works on linguistic pragmatics appears.

Among numerous researches of the dialogical speech there is an analysis of the factors and conditions connected with mental, intellectual and physical activity of subjects of the speech. The speech cognitive activity is carried out within a certain society that allows both domestic and foreign linguists to come to a conclusion that speech activity, as well as any other kind of activity, is regulated by certain rules.

As these rules have general character, it is reasonable to distinguish from them the most important and significant from the point of view of a dialogue institutionalization: what novelty of our research consists in. Knowledge communicants of these rules which we believe to call quite appropriate the principles of a communicative and pragmatic institutionalization of dialogue, ability to operate in case of communicative need and to manipulate them in various situations of communication. There designed to promote the organization of frictionless communication and successful implementation of the communicative intentions speaking. Besides, the essence of this work is determined that dialogue of one individual with another is considered as means and a necessary condition for disclosure of personality characteristics of both participants of communication.

The aim of the research is to show the nature, origin and usage of nonstandard lexicon in the speech of natural speakers.

The tasks of the investigation are the following:
- to study the notion and types of nonstandard lexicon of Modern English;
- to show the peculiarities of nonstandard lexicon usage;
- to characterize the notion of taboo in modern society;
- to mark out features of the essence of nonliterary lexicon.

The scientific novelty of the research is to expose the essential similarities and differences of nonstandard lexicon of non-related languages, the nature of their origin, frequency of their usage and place in general vocabulary.

The theoretical importance of a research consists in submission of the dialogical speech as type of the speech activity having a communicative and functional and pragmatic focus. It has allowed proving that, as well as any other activity, speech activity is regulated by certain rules.

The practical value of the work is determined that its results can be used in courses of lectures and on seminar classes in theoretical grammar, pragma-linguistics, the theory and practice of cross-cultural communication, English stylistics, by preparation of special courses and special seminars on linguistics and cross-cultural communication, in the courses of improvement of qualification of teachers, and also at the preparation of training computer programs.

The structure of the work. The dissertation consists of Introduction, two research chapters, Conclusion, List of Used Sources and Appendices.

1 THEORETICAL BASIS OF NONSTANDARD LEXICON OF MODERN ENGLISH

The populations of the British Isles have a varied and often strained relationship with the language with which they have to engage every day in print and in the spoken media. This is the language through which they are (almost) all educated, and which, many of them are persuaded, is both correct and, in an absolute sense, good. Some are at ease with this language, others struggle to master it. A few turn their backs on it. This bald characterization of the multiple relationships between language users and Standard English is intended to highlight, not only the diversity of the sociolinguistic set-ups throughout the islands, but also the wide range of beliefs, opinions and responses relating to the notion of 'Standard English' on the part of educators, policy makers and professional linguists, as well as, of course, those millions who do not belong to any of these groups.

First, how 'Standard English' and 'Received Pronunciation' (RP) have been conceptualized by those who have an academic, professional or policy-maker's interests in them. Second, the chapter will deal with the nature of the 'variety space' which is said to be bounded by Standard English and RP on one side and by 'non-standard', 'vernacular' speech on the other. As we shall see later, the standard–non-standard dimension is closely related to the distinction between written and spoken language. But let us begin with an illustration of how norms involving standard/written English interact with norms of spoken or non-standard usage.

To lexical level there corresponds the lexical stylistics. It studies stylistic functions of lexicon and considers interaction of direct and figurative senses. The lexical stylistics, both literary, and linguistic, study different components of contextual word meanings, and in particular their expressional, emotional and evaluation potential and their irrelativeness to different functional and stylistic layers. Dialectal words, terms, words of a slang, speech words and expressions, neologisms, archaisms, foreign words are, etc. studied from the point of view of their interaction with different conditions of a context. In stylistics finds application not only a descriptive synchronous lexicology, but also a historical lexicology, especially because some authors revive old word meanings and then etymological data can promote completer disclosure of expressivity of the text. The lexical stylistics can also study the expressional potential of some word-formation models, some types of abbreviations, composition models, etc. Each section of a lexicology can supply with the information, very useful to stylistics.

Stylistics problems draw to themselves attention of more and more wide range of linguists and literary critics every year, and the stylistics more and more are differentiated and breaks up to separate specialized disciplines. But at the same time, just as in any other science, there is also opposite directed process, namely integration, i.e. strengthening of mutual influence of the different branches of knowledge and emergence of the new synthetic sections uniting, generalizing these

disciplines, which before were considered as far here. Both tendencies are equally important for scientific research.

It is impossible to reach exhaustive, only the correct interpretation of this or that work of art, but it is necessary to prevent the wrong, distorted or primitive understanding of the read discourse. It is important to use methods of the stylistic analysis, to learn to see in the text more and more specific items. The procedure of the analysis, optimum and valid for any text, doesn't exist and can't exist; however acquaintance to different possible receptions and ability to combine them help to obtain big information when reading.

The deep understanding of the text requires its consideration as whole that means comparison and the accounting of interaction of all means of the art image in the text. In a further statement of stylistics of perception this principle will be one of the main.

The insufficient and incomplete understanding which can be corrected by systematic work on the stylistic analysis is caused by the following reasons:

1. The isolated perception of separate elements, inability to consider influence of a context, including grammatical features of creation of the text.

2. Lexical difficulties. An attention to stylistic, emotional, estimated, and expressional connotations. An attention to unusual word compatibility, and misunderstanding, the words used in rare, outdated or special values.

3. Superficiality of the understanding read inability to notice the author's relation to represented, his irony or sarcasm, tolerance to implication, inability to independently add untold.

4. Prejudiced opinion. The reader quite often expects that the solution of this or that problem imagined by him coincides with the decision of the author. It is difficult for such reader to perceive new, unexpected for himself. He simplifies in advance and hardens the text, can't react to thoughts, new to himself and feelings, simply doesn't notice them. Needless to say what in this case reading can't enrich.

Problems of interaction of language and society, language and culture, remaining urgent and in modern linguistics, can't be successfully resolved without studying of specifics of use of language in various sectors of society, social and professional groups, without careful research its social dialectal stratification and a functional and stylistic variation.

Intensively conducted developments in the field of socially fixed discourses for identification of real mechanisms of language evolution and its variability staticize development of the global anthropological theory integrating achievements of sociology, psychology, ethnography, philology and other sciences. It gives to researches in the field of an individual speech producing the complex finishing character as "immersion" of the speech in a social context allows to reveal a paradigm of speech creative potential of the personality depending on the changing social and situational status of the person. Social stratification of a modern vocabulary leaves the mark not only on oral speech, but also on her written embodiment, in particular on fiction language.

In the 80-90th years of the 20th century the literary language, especially in the colloquial form, comes under the strongest influence of the slangy and

colloquial language environment which is expressed, on observations of scientists, as in a flow of the non-standard lexicon which has rushed on pages of fiction, journalism, etc. and in more free, than earlier, use of obscene lexicon, including on pages of the press, in TV and radio; this process has accepted as well a form of expansion of the morphological and syntactic models not characteristic or low-characteristic of traditional system of the literary language. At the same time it is possible to note that many of professional translators, teachers and experts in other areas which are professionally connected with foreign languages weren't ready to adequate perception of modern versions of non-standard lexicon.

Relevance of studying of the communicative and pragmatical status and language essence of the case of non-standard lexicon is caused by the theoretical and practical importance of development of a problem "language and society" in borders of a modern paradigm of linguistic knowledge. This perspective includes aspects of interaction of the literary speech with nonliterary, a social and professional variation of lexicon constituting it of functional and stylistic differentiation of dictionary structure in different communicative spheres, interdependence of linguistic and extralinguistic determinants of the language options. This are meant by more liberal approach to development of a problem of social differentiation of language in the context of a general perspective of a variation of means of language taking into account real language behavior of the person caused not only his language competence, but also knowledge of the social caused connotations which are available for language signs.

1.1 Notion, aspects and components of nonstandard and informal lexicon in Modern English

The term 'Standard English' described a form of the English language was universal or common in the nineteenth century. By the 1930s, however, it had become associated with social class and was seen by many as the language of the educated. Rural dialects had become revalorized as 'class dialects' and one of the main symbols of class became pronunciation.

With regard to this, not much has changed since then. Standard English is still referred to and spoken by British people who have a very high, perhaps even the highest, social status and therefore are the most influential, educated, prestigious and wealthiest people in the United Kingdom. Hence, Standard English is held in high esteem within society. However, they are the minority of the British population. Only a small percentage of UK residents have upper or upper-middle class backgrounds. Therefore, no more than 9%-12% of the British population speaks Standard English with a regional accent and only 3-5% speaks it without any regional accent.

It is unsurprising, then, that RP has become stigmatized, because only the 'pure' form of it is spoken and represented by the highest social classes.

On the contrary, nonstandard dialects have a distinct grammar, lexis and pronunciation and vary greatly throughout the United Kingdom; for instance, a nonstandard dialect speaker might use the forms '*I ain't done it*', '*them sandshoes over there*' or '*she sings nice*'. The dialects of rural areas often contain more distinctive lexis and grammar than those of urban areas, because speakers of these varieties are not often exposed to being in contact with speakers of other dialects.

Occasionally, nonstandard dialects are more accurate than Standard English. For instance, the Newcastle dialect distinguishes between the second person pronouns in number: the singular is represented as the usual '*you*', but the plural with '*yous*'.

Speakers from lower classes tend to use nonstandard dialect features more excessively, because they are more likely to have left education earlier, have non-professional jobs and therefore have no need to associate themselves with specific lexis or a 'prestige' way of speaking. Hence, the use of nonstandard dialect words, grammar and pronunciation decreases the longer an individual spends in education as they have to be more 'aware' of the context as speakers from other social classes.

However, it needs to be emphasized here that nonstandard dialects are often wrongly perceived as being 'incorrect', but linguists persistently stress that Standard English is in no form superior to any spoken dialect and that, linguistically, no dialect has a lower status than Standard English. Trudgill (1990:13) states in *The Dialects of England* that 'it [Standard English] is not even legitimate to claim that it is more "acceptable" than other dialects, unless we specify *who* it is acceptable to'.

To put matters in a different perspective, the linguist Paul Kerswill argues in *RP, Standard English and the standard/non-standard relationship* that social

mobility leads to dialect leveling, i.e. the reduction of differences between local accents and dialects and the development of new features that are adopted by speakers over a wide area.

This is extremely common in urban areas, such as London and Tyneside. New linguistic features diffuse in these areas and due to the high degrees of contact and mobility of the speakers, linguistic homogenization might be an outcome in the future.

Estuary English is one example – it is the only regional leveling process that has received a name. The British linguist David Rosewarne coined the term 'Estuary English' (EE) in 1984. He describes the variation as a 'variety of modified regional speech (…) a mixture of non-regional and local south-eastern English pronunciation and intonation'.

John Wells defines EE as 'standard English spoken with an accent that includes features localizable in the southeast of England' and David Crystal refers to it as a 'continuum of pronunciation possibilities', because the elements of this dialect share Cockney and Received Pronunciation (henceforward RP) features.

EE has some distinctive lexical features. Coggle (*Do You Speak Estuary?*) and Rosewarne (*Estuary English – tomorrow's RP?*) mentioned that there is a frequent use of the word 'cheers' in preference to 'Thank you', the word 'mate' is used frequently and the original meaning of the word 'basically' is extended and used as a gap filler.

Additionally, both linguists state that speakers of EE are not averse of using American terms, for instance 'There you go' as an alternative to the British equivalent 'Here you are', 'Excuse me' instead of 'Sorry' and 'No way' as a substitute of 'By no means'.

Morphological speaking, there is a frequent use of the word 'innit' as opposed to tag questions, as in '*She is nice, innit?*' in contrast with '*She is nice, isn't she?*'. The word '*ain't*' is used occasionally instead of the negative form of the present tense of the verb 'be', for instance '*I ain't coming*' as a substitute for '*I am not coming*' and as a replacement for the negative present tense of the auxiliary verb 'have', forming the present perfect tense, for example '*I ain't done it*' rather than '*I have not done it*'.

Furthermore, similar to the Cockney accent, there is a generalization of the past tense plural 'was', such as '*You was there*' instead of '*You were there*'. Sometimes there is an omission of the adverbial suffix '-ly', as in '*You are going too slow*' as opposed to '*You are going too slowly*'.

Kerswill states that this variety is a "result of greatly heightened mobility since the period just after the Second World War, coupled with a change in ideology allowing non-RP users to occupy a range of occupations, especially in broadcasting, from which they were formerly effectively barred".

David Britain, however, argues in *Language in the British Isles* that the loss of the local dialects in the east of England is a result from "greater short- and long-term mobility, the replacement of primary and secondary by tertiary industries, labour market flexibility and family ties over greater geographical distances".

The concept of 'non-standard' remains somewhat fuzzy during the Early Modern English period. Language change and especially ongoing standardization can make it difficult to pin down an individual feature at any given time as clearly non-standard. Contemporary views of 'good' language, which we also discuss here, need to be taken into account and may lead to a more socially restricted idea of standard and thus a wider area of non-standard. Regionally restricted uses, both with regard to the lexicon and pronunciation, are investigated with the help of (comparing) sources like Ray's dialect dictionary (1674) and the Corpus of English Dialogues, and shown to be relatively rare in writing. Socio-stylistic variation or evidence for non-standard forms, including lower-class, uneducated, and emotive uses (often called 'vulgar' or 'low' by contemporaries), is investigated with the help of metacomments, pauper letters and the treatment of taboo usage. Two case-studies on demonstrative them and non-standard third-person subject-verb concord show the features to be very rare in the Corpus of English Dialogues and to occur predominantly in authentic spoken contexts and with lower-ranking speakers. We argue that rarity is an indicator for non-standard status, but also that the status of these features is different from that of modern sociolinguistic markers.

With the appeal of linguistics to "a human factor", to the native speaker – the person, the speaking, clever person, the stage of researches which were under construction on formal criteria of the analysis of language has ended. Efforts of linguists even more often began to go to a research of speech messages taking into account speech influence as most important means of human communication. As a result to the forefront there is a pragmatics which subject Yu. S. Stepanov defines as "the choice of language means from the cash repertoire for the best expression of the thought or the feeling, expression of the most exact or beautiful, or the most corresponding to circumstances, or for the most successful lie; for the best influence on listening or reading – with the purpose to convince it, either to excite and touch, or to make laugh, or to mislead" (Stepanov, 1981). Thus, pragmatical function of language materializes in conscious intention of the sender of the message to make the corresponding impact on the recipient (Nayer, 1985). At the same time from the point of view of cognitive approach of the pragmatist it is understood "as area of opinions, estimates, presumptions and installations speaking" (Arutyunova, 1990).

Emotional, expressional, estimated and stylistic components of a lexical meaning quite often accompany each other in the speech therefore they are often mixed, and these terms use as synonyms. But coincidence of components isn't obligatory; presence of one of components doesn't involve obligatory presence of all others, and they can meet in different combinations.

Let's review at first an example where at connotations of a number of words really there are at the same time all four components. In the following example many words have vulgar and colloquial coloring, are emotional, expressivna also don't leave any doubt concerning character of feelings of Tim Kendal to the wife:

Then Tim Kendall lost control of himself. *"For God's sake, you damned bitch» he said, «shut up, can't you? D'you want to get me hanged? Shut up I tell you. Shut that big ugly mouth of yours"*.

(A. Christie. *A Caribbean Mystery*).

Especially typically in this plan of shut up — the word the rough, colloquial, expressing strong degree irritations, and at the same time figurative. The component of assessment is present, but it is displaced as the negative relation is directed not to the fact that the person will become silent, and on what he tells.

Coincidence of components can be shown also on separate words. B. Charlston1 quotes following a row with the usual, not depending on a context emotionality: *cad, coward, sneak, snob, prig, tale-bearer, boor, lout, stooge, busybody, spiv, double-crosser, whipper-snapper, trash, tripe,* ets. of a number of accusatory epithets it would be possible to continue. All these words have various denotational meaning, but an identical emotional component and identical negative assessment as express indignation of these or those shortcomings or defects. Figurativeness inherent in these words does them expressional, and the habitual association with familiar and colloquial style, or a slang, allows to establish also existence of the fourth component.

All four components of connotations are obligatory also for words of a slang. The slang belongs to number of the most studied, or, in any case, most in detail described, and at the same time most disputable layers of lexicon. A slang are called the rough or comic especially colloquial words and expressions applying for novelty and originality.

The principle of differentiation of types of connotations offered above helps to find also to these words the place in the general lexical system of language. Really, at words of a slang surely there are all types of connotations: emotional component in most cases ironical, contemptuous and respectively estimated. Stylistically slengizm are accurately opposed to literary norm, and in it partly the sense of novelty of their use. They always have synonyms in literary lexicon and, thus, are as if the second, more expressional, than usual, names of the objects for some reason or other summoning the emotional relation. Their expressivity relies on figurativeness, wit, surprise, sometimes amusing distortion.

The slang, thus, is the lexical layer consisting of words and expressions with full and besides a specific set of the usual connotations different from the neutral synonyms these connotations.

It is necessary to make a reservation that habitual expression of "the word of a slang" not absolutely precisely as along with separate words can be units of a slang and very often there are lexico-semantic versions of words which semantic structure includes also other, not so slang options.

However for not slang words full set the connotational of components isn't obligatory at all, words only with three, two, one component or at all without connotations are possible.

Pronounced emotional, estimated and expressional character has the special, genetically very non-uniform layer of lexicon and phraseology called by a slang, occurring in informal conversation and which is outside literary norm. The most important properties of slengizm are their rough and cynical or rough expressivity, scornful and playful figurativeness. The slang isn't allocated as special style or substyle as his features are limited only to one level — lexical. About a slang there

is extensive literature. The question of criteria of reference of words to a slang as slang borders as the general, and the special, i.e. limited to the professional or social sphere use, are very indistinct remains a difficult question. Words and expressions of a slang have, as a rule, synonyms in neutral literary or special lexicon, and specificity them can be revealed on comparison to this neutral lexicon.

In numerous modern novels from life of teenagers the slang of teenagers plays an important stylistic role. For a long time it is noticed that the phenomenon of synonymic attraction is especially peculiar to a slang, i.e. big bunches of synonyms for the concepts for some reason or other causing strong emotional reaction (the girl, money, intoxication, alcohol, drugs, theft have especially big groups of slang synonyms).

1.2 Structural characteristics of nonstandard lexicon in English

Linguistic research puts special emphasis on – but is not restricted to – the in-depth and computer-based analysis of large collections of authentic spoken and written texts, i.e. corpora. Corpus-based methodology is applied to various levels of linguistic description, e.g. phonetics/phonology, morphology, lexicology (in English for academic purposes), syntax (with regard to verb complementation), synchronic and historical sociolinguistics and varieties of English (e.g. Indian English). In the area of non-standard varieties, the history, sociolinguistics and structure of English-lexicon pidgins and creoles form an important area of research, as do dialects of English. Research into the evolution of spoken and written norms and standards in postcolonial varieties of English considers both the structural and the social aspects of standardization processes. Language and pedagogical implications and applications of linguistic analyses are another important field of linguistic research into the English language in Giessen. For example, the English linguistics section has been actively involved in the compilation and analysis of various corpora of Kazakh learners' use of English as a foreign language.

Another focus of linguistic research are process-oriented investigations of text comprehension, text production and translation using methods such as keystroke logging, think aloud, screen recording and eye-tracking. Other fields of applied-linguistic research include linguistic stylistics and pragmatics. The history of the English language is an integral part of the research activities in the English linguistics section as well.

As V. N. Gridin notes, expressivity "as one of properties of language unit is closely connected with category of emotional assessment and in general with expression of emotions at the person". Moreover, in his opinion, in works of a number of linguists of category of expressivity and emotionality are identified (Gridin, 1998). It is thought, however, that expressivity should be understood as set of semantic-stylistic signs of language unit rather, i.e. expressional not always emotionally, but emotional, according to a number of linguists, always in expressive way as expressivity is those means of the speech which do it both expressive, and influencing, impressing (Galkina-Fedoruk, 1958; Arnold, 1970; Cherepova, 1984, etc.). At the same time semantic-stylistic expressivity is always pragmatically put in intentions of speaking.

Any language is social by the nature and for this reason it can't exist and develop out of society. Language, first of all, is the means of communication between people who actively influence forming of its lexicon. At the same time it is impossible to forget that language represents sign system with the internal laws of functioning.

In any developed language the same thought can be expressed differently depending on a situation. There are words neutral which are a language kernel also the words which are used in certain situations stylistically painted are used irrespective of the sphere of communication, and. Such words are noted in dictionaries as nonliterary which we also call non-standard lexicon.

Considering non-standard lexicon, at first, we will start on a style problem. The regulations on existence of two main styles are assumed as a basis: functional and expressional. The functional style for the first time offered by linguists of the Prague school can be determined as "set of the language means used in a certain communication environment and with a particular purpose. At the same time, certain regularities of selection and group of the language means are potentially assigned to any sphere of human activities (official style, colloquial style, scientific style, etc.)". Division of functional styles in modern domestic linguistics is extremely motley and diverse. As a rule, the majority of classifications that is based, on the one hand, on scopes of styles (i.e. on a public social feature), and on the other – on dichotomizing division "colloquial" - "written". Linguists can't be determined with single classification of functional styles yet, trying to provide more complete list of all specialized means of expression of various types of information. Thus it should be marked out styles as: scientific, everyday and household, publicist, art and fictional, colloquial, style of correspondence, journalese, poetic, professional, official.

V. V. Vinogradov has given the generalized understanding of functional style. "Style is the public and conscious and functional caused, internally integrated set of methods of the use, selection and combination of means of speech communication in the sphere of this or that public, national language, correlative with other same ways of expression which serve for other purposes, perform other functions in speech public practice of these people.

Expressional style is distinguished on the basis of certain emotional and situational criteria and is defined as traditional set of language means for the expressional level of communication – neutral style, the reduced style. Also other terms are used. So, we find the elevated styles covering solemnly poetic and scientific use in R. G. Piotrovsky's concept; the average styles including literary narrative and literary and colloquial styles; low styles – colloquial. J. Kenyon points to two levels – standard and substandard and to two functional versions – formal and informal. Yu. Hannerts speaks about high and low or formal and informal styles. V. N. Yartseva writes that "style questions are closely connected with a partition of book and written and colloquial types of the speech".

So, certain stylistic functions which are fixed in lexicographic benefits in the form of functional and stylistic dung are attributed to each layer of lexicon. In this work it is about non-standard lexicon which is traditionally subdivided into "low" colloquialisms (colloquial lexicon), a general slang, a special slang (a slang and a slang), and also vulgarisms. But it is necessary to notice that else there are no accurate criteria of distribution of words in this or that group.

Colloquialisms are on border between standard and non-standard lexicon. Some linguists carry them more to a non-standard vocabulary. For example, E. Partridge in the work "World of Words" characterizes colloquialisms below, than standard lexicon, but above, than a slang. And authors of the new dictionary of Webster consider colloquialisms the characteristic of informal conversation and non-business correspondence and don't consider them as non-standard or nonliterary lexicon. We will hold E. Partridge's opinion that colloquialisms are a

part of a standard vocabulary, and "low" colloquialisms enter a circle of the problem of non-standard lexicon considered by us.

The main part of non-standard lexicon is made by a slang that is words which can be used in the daily speech, but don't enter standard lexicon. Though, V. A. Homyakov considers that the general slang is included into lexicon of the literary language as the standard means stylistically of the lowered speech bearing emotional and estimated loading. A. D. Schweitzer, on the contrary, considers the general slang one of components of the public popular speech which is outside the literary language.

Language of some professional groups which is available to understanding only to them is considered slang. The words delimited by the use by any social or age group, especially in criminal circles belong to slang. Scientists can't still come to a consensus whether carry slang to a special slang or to consider it separate group of non-standard lexicon. Because of the rough and obscene character vulgarisms unambiguously carry to non-standard lexicon. They bear in themselves value which is defined as a taboo from the point of view of Standard English.

Being a part of national language and reflecting its regulations, non-standard lexicon is created on its tendencies and laws of development. Sometimes these words are borrowed from other languages. A significant amount of such words results from different transfers, metaphorical and, rarer, the metonymical.

The main reception of replenishment of dictionary structure of language non-standard lexicon is the semantic derivation which expansion of semantic volume of the word of the literary standard due to emergence in him results from colloquial lexical and semantic options. Also it is necessary to notice that this regularity has no casual character. Non-standard lexicon is formed mainly on the basis of root words of the German origin. Respectively, as an emergence source ethically of the lowered words which are secondary units of the nomination serves in the majority the same lexicon of the literary standard which use in the figurative, reduced values, characterizes non-standard lexicon in general.

Briefly considering processes of word formation in non-standard lexical system, in this work we will give examples from the American slang.

Affixation – one of the most productive methods of word formation in modern English where a large number of affixes both primordial, and borrowed meets. Affixes include prefixes, suffixes and infixes.

At formation of non-standard lexicon including slengizm, the same affixes, as in neutral lexicon are used, but in slang they gain wider range of values. The most widespread suffix which transfers cultural information and expresses value actively of a character, is – *er*. For example, *greener* – the beginner or the inexperienced worker (green – green, unripe); *juicer* – the alcoholic (juice – juice, binge); *jumper* – the thief who gets into the house through a window (jump – to jump); *penciller* – the journalist (pencil – a pencil). Such words in the American slang are hundreds.

For formation of nouns the suffix – ie transferring in a slang a familiarity shade, sometimes contempt or neglect is rather widely used: drunkie – the drunkard, the drunk; baddie – the villain, the bad uncle; goodie – the good person.

In the American slang the negative prefix *no-* transfers obvious shortage, a lack of about that word basis is used in speech. Such units are, as a rule, written through a hyphen: *no-hoper* – the loser, the useless person (hope – to hope); *no-name* – the insignificant person (name – a name); *no-show* – not been (show – to show).

One more word-formation element is – *aholic* allocated from alcoholic and then gained distribution in the general American slang. For example: *workaholic* – the workaholic (work – to work); *New Yorkaholic* (New York – the city of New York); *coffeholic* – very loving coffee (coffee – coffee); *foodoholic* – the glutton (food – food).

In English there is such concept as semi-affixes which are also used for formation of slang units, for example: *-proof, – man, – land, – like, – hood, – head* and other. These are such affixes which comprise lines of a suffix, on the one hand, and can be the separate word, with another. For example: *freshman* – the beginning addict (fresh – fresh); *jellyhead* – the fool, the fool (jelly – jelly); *hayhead* – the person smoking marijuana (hay – hay); *homeland* – black quarter (home – the house); *knifeman* – the surgeon (knife – a knife);

The composition as well as affixation, according to the structural morphological characteristics is under construction based on regulations of the literary standard. Most often it occurs by addition of two substantive bases, for example: *nutball* – the idiot (nut – nut, ball – a ball); *nutbox* – psychiatric clinic (box – a box, a box); *pigpen* – policy station (pig – a pig, pen – the shelter for the cattle).

Abbreviation (reducings) is very characteristic acceptance for formation of slengizm: *mon* (money – money), *biz* (business – business, business), *fess* (professor – professor), *tec* (detective – the detective). T. M Belyaeva and V. A. Homyakov allocate four methods of truncations when the beginning, the end, the middle or the beginning and the end of the word can be truncated.

Reduplication is one of the most ancient ways of word formation at which new words are formed by doubling of a basis of the word which at the same time can remain in the original form (bye-bye), or change. For example: *jaw-jaw* – a conversation, chatter (jaw – a jaw). Most often the words formed by reduplication meet in slang. Such units can pass then into the literary standard, for example, *tip-top* (excellent, first-class) or *hocus-pocus* (a focus-pokus, fraud). Such words can be stored in language for centuries.

Proceeding from the aforesaid, it is possible to draw a conclusion that studying only of standard lexicon of any language won't give us complete idea of the language and of spirit of the people on it speaking. Knowledge of non-standard lexicon, and in particular the American slang, is necessary for successful understanding of modern fiction, broadcasting of radio and television, also for translation activities and simple communication with the people speaking this language.

In the following tables, a number of commonly occurring non-standard features of varieties of English are listed. These are divided according to language level, i.e. phonology, morphology and syntax. The features occur in different

varieties to different extents and the precise combination is unique in each case. Many of the features are retentions of archaic or dialectal traits, found in English at the time of early settlement of overseas locations. The status of features may change at a new location: a recessive feature may come to the fore and become an indicator of a new overseas variety, as may well have been the case with double modals in Appalachian English vis à vis forms of Scottish and Ulster English which provided the historical input to this variety.

The tables below do not contain information about specific structures which can clearly be traced to background languages at overseas locations, this is a matter for a discussion of the individual varieties in question. Furthermore, the tables do not contain lexical data. The reason for this is that vocabulary is an open class and tends to intergrate new items easily, for instance for the flora and fauna at an overseas location, so that a table of lexical items would be inordinately large compared to those for the other levels of language. In variety studies, lexical survivals can be used to establish historical connections between older and newer varieties or between varieties and background languages see the discussion of such items in Holm (1994) with reference to the Caribbean.

Phonology

Consonants

1	Presence of syllable-final /r/		*card* [kɑ:ɪd]
2	Realization of /Ө, ð/		
		a) TH-fronting	*brother* ['bɪʌvɚ]
		b) TG-fortition	*other* ['ʌdɚ]
3	L-vocalisation		*milk* [mɪʊk]
4	Lak of initial /h-/		*head* [ɛd]
5	Lenition of alveolars		
		a) Glottalisation of /t/	*bottle* [bɒʔl]
		b) Tapping of /t/	*water* ['wɑ:ɾɚ]
		c) Fricative /t/	*but* [bʌt]
6	Presence of /hw/ [ʍ]		*which* [ʍɪtʃ]
7	Alveolarisation of /ŋ/		*walking* [wɔ:kŋ]
8	Yod deletion in /ju:/		*news* [nu:z], *tune* [tu:n]
9	Yod insertion after velars		*cap* [kjæp], *gap* [gjæp]

Vowels

1	No lowering of /ʊ/	*but* [bʊt]
2	Short /a/ before /f, s, θ/	*staff* [staf], *grass*[gras], *bath* [baθ]
3	No lexical distribution of / æ/ and / ɑ:/	*grand* [gra(:)nd], *pass* [pa(:)s]
4	Short vowel distinction before /r/	*fern* [fɛ:n] # *burn* [bʌ:n]
5	Unshifted long /u:/	*town* [tu:n]
6	Diphthong shift	*bait* [bæɪt], *five* [fæɪv], etc.
7	Short vowel raising	*bat* [bət] [bɛt], *bet* [bɪt], *bit*
8	Lack of vowel length contrasts	*fool, full* [fʊl]
9	*cot/caught* merger	*cot/caught* [ka(:)t]
10	*horse/hoarse* merger	*horse/hoarse* [ho:rs]
11	*pen/pin* merger	*pen/pin* [pɪn]
12	HAPPY-tensing	*happy* [hæpi]
13	Unstressed vowels	*trusted* ['trʌstəd]
14	Epenthesis in sonorant clusters	*film* ['fɪləm]
15	Metathesis	
	a) Short vowel and /r/	*modern* [mɒdɪən]
	b) /ks/ cluter	*ask* [æsk]
16	Word stress patterns	*compensate* [kɒmpɛn'seit]
17	Syllable-versus stress-timing	*education* ['ɛd'jʊ'ke'ʃən]
18	Sandhi phenomena	*going to* ['gɒnə], *want to* ['wɒnə]

Morphology

1	Use of /i:/ for /ai/ with possessive pronoun *my*
2	Use of demonstrative pronouns for possessive pronouns: *them boys*
3	Distinctive form for the second person plural: *ye*, *yez*, *youse*
4	Use of objective forms for subject, e.g. *us* for *we*
5	Analogical levelling with reflexive pronouns: *hisself, theirselves*
6	Differences between weak and strong verbs
7	Reduced number of verb parts, e.g. *seen* and *done* as preterites
8	Contraction of *am + not*: *amn't* or *aren't* and of *is + not*: *isn't* or *ain't*
9	Epistemic negative *must*: *He mustn't be Scottish.*
10	*Be* as auxiliary and in the negative: *He is gone now.*
11	Unmarked adverbs (deletion of final /i/): *He's awful busy these days*
12	Unmarked plurals after numerals: *It cost five pound.*
13	Zero marking for plurals, often with numerals: *He's been here five year now*
14	Residues of grammatical gender

Syntax

1	Non-standard verbal concord: *The boys wants to go home.*
2	Narrative present with generalised -*s*: *I hops out of the car and finds him lying on the ground.*
3	Additional aspectual distinctions such as the habitual: *He does be working all night.*
4	Resultative perfective with participle after object: *He has the book read.*
5	*A*-prefixing for the continuous: *They were afixing the car.*
6	Negative concord: *They don't do nothing for nobody.*
7	Range of the continuous form: *She's knowing lots of people from abroad.*
8	Greater range of present tense: *I know him since ten years at least.*
9	Double modals: *He might could come this evening.*
10	Use of *for* with infinitives of purpose: *He went out for to get some milk.*
11	Deletion of copula and/or auxiliary: *She a farmer's daughter, He gone home now.*
12	Tag concord: *They live in London now, aren't they?*
13	Zero subject in relative clauses: *There's a man wants to see you.*
14	Preference for *that* with animate antecedent: *There's a man wants to see you.*
15	Double marking with comparative and superlative: *It's the most worst pub in town.*
16	Resumptive pronouns: *The house where you are in it now.*
17	*Never* as past tense negative: *I never done the work* (= *I didn't do...*)
18	Lack of negative attraction: *Anyone wasn't interested in linguistics.*
19	Clefting for topicalisation: *It's too expensive the house was.*
20	Clause structure (parataxis for hypotaxis). *He stayed, he was tired.*
21	Inversion with embedded questions: *She asked him did he want more.*
22	Passive with *get*: *His car got stolen last week.*
23	Positive *anymore*: *He might want to come here anymore.*
24	Different use of prepositions, e.g. *on* to express relevance: *They broke the glass on me.*
25	Overuse of the definite article: *He asked the both of them, She likes the life in Dublin.*

	Singular	Plural
English	*thou* (N), *thee* (W,SW)	*you, ye*
Irish English	*you*	*ye, youse, yez*
Scottish English	*you*	*Yous, yous yins*
Newfoundland English	*you*	*ye*
Southern American English	*you*	*y'all, y'uns*
African American English	*you*	*you, y'all*
Caribbean English	*you*	*unu, wuna, yina*, etc.
South African English	*you*	*youse, y'all*
Australian English	*you*	*youse*
New Zealand English	*you*	*youse*
Pacific Creole English	*yu*	*yupela*

Second person pronouns in varieties of English

In Scotland, a standard variety of English (Scottish Standard English) exists alongside a minority language, Scots. Both Scots and English have similar roots (as Germanic languages), which distinguishes them from Gaelic (a Celtic language). Scots shows some significant differences from Standard English in terms of vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar. Some examples of grammatical differences (taken from the SCOTS corpus, www.scottishcorpus.ac.uk) are presented below:

Scots	English
I'm silly, amn't I?	I'm silly, aren't I?
You'll can enjoy your holiday now	You'll be able to enjoy your holiday now
Fit wey was that?	Why was that?
How do you nae put that ain in your pocket?	Why don't you put that one in your pocket?
I nae ken how to put the cord in	I don't know how to put the cord in

Like the differences between Standard and non-standard varieties of English, the differences between Scots and English tend to cluster around particular aspects of grammar, such as negation, question formation, and the use of auxiliary verbs.

The spread of English around the world, and contact between speakers of English and other typologically distinct languages, has resulted in the development of a wide variety of 'new Englishes'. Some of these new Englishes have developed standard and vernacular varieties of their own. For instance, in Indian English, there are some significant differences between standard and non-standard wh-question formation and embedded question formation.

Contact with other languages may also mean that structural characteristics and lexical items of one language may be transferred into the English spoken in a given area. For instance, it has been suggested that the high degree of contact between English and Chinese in Singapore may be one reason for the prevalence of null-subject sentences in Singapore English, even in fairly formal circumstances. The following example (from Deterding 2007: 58) comes from an interview with a Chinese trainee teacher; the asterisks mark places where UK SE would require an overt subject:

*so in the end ...
* didn't didn't try out the rides, so initially
* want to to take the ferris wheel ... but then ... the queue is very long and too expensive, so
* didn't, didn't take any ...
* spent about two hours there looking at the things

Indeed, a fascinating aspect of English in such contact situations concerns the emergence of standard forms which don't correspond to the standard forms of other Englishes: what constitutes the standard is often negotiated at a fairly local level, so there is a range of standard Englishes across the world.

SE is often defined socially, rather than linguistically as a 'language of wider communication', i.e. a variety which is widely understood and used. This definition suggests a neutral medium that facilitates communication between people from different regional and social backgrounds. However, there is no evidence that it is in fact more widely understood than non-standard varieties, and indeed it is likely that accent is more of a barrier to understanding than dialect.

Moreover, SE tends to be spoken at home by members of higher social classes (estimates put the number at not more than 15% of the population in Britain). The association of SE with social class and level of education is inconsistent with ideas of social neutrality and SE is sometimes seen more critically as a class dialect that serves to exclude rather than include other speakers. SE will have a range of associations for speakers – as neutral, educated, a language of social advancement, posh, exclusive, snobby. Such social meanings will affect how SE forms are taken up and used by speakers – something that needs to be taken into account in any attempt to teach SE.

Most economically advanced nations have one or more official or national standardized languages which at least some children learn at school and which are used in public and formal situations. In many countries, however, non-standard

dialects have much higher social status than in Britain; for instance, in German-speaking Switzerland and in most parts of the Arabic-speaking world everyone uses the local non-standard variety at home so the link to social class is absent. Such evidence shows that standard and non-standard dialects can co-exist in a complementary relation, without being seen as in competition. This 'bi-dialectism' is comparable with the bilingualism of many speakers of community languages in Britain. This seems a satisfactory and sustainable outcome, and, in spite of the proscriptive attitudes of previous generations, there is no reason to assume that SE has to replace non-standard varieties.

1.3 Some ways of nonstandard lexicon forming in Modern English

Communication can be considered at various levels. Everything depends on what is taken as a basis. For this reason there is a number of classifications of levels of communication. So, some researchers allocate the following levels of communication:
• macrolevel (the person communicates with other people according to traditions, customs, the public relations that have developed);
• mezalevel (communication happens within a substantial subject);
• microlevel (it is the act of contact: question-answer).

Each of the listed levels can be shown in various situations and in different spheres: business, interpersonal, role etc. In particular, one business when partners act as equal participants of communication, and absolutely another if one of them feels certain dependence, and especially if not equal rights in a form of pressure, aggressions, intimidations, etc. begin to be shown.

American psychotherapist and theorist of the psychoanalytic direction E. Bern allocates the following levels of communication, or ways of structuring time: rituals (norm of communication), pastime (entertainments), games, proximity and activity. Each of these levels has the means of communication.

Identity of the person in the relations with other people determines his style of communication as which it is accepted to understand system of the principles, regulations, and methods, acceptances of interaction and behavior of the individual. Most brightly style of communication is shown in the business and professional sphere, in the relations between business partners or between the head and the subordinate. For this reason the problem of style is better researched in the sphere of leadership - managements.

Classification of K. Levin who marked out three styles of leadership (management) is known:
• authoritative (tough methods of management, determination of all strategy of group, the termination of an initiative and discussion of the made decisions, individual decision making, etc.);
• democratic (collective nature, encouragement of an initiative);
• liberal (refusal of management, elimination of a management).

According to the specified styles of leadership - managements are described also styles of communication.

According to authoritative style the leader makes all decisions solely, gives orders, and does instructions. It always precisely determines "limits of competence" everyone, that is strictly determines a rank of partners and subordinates. In case of authoritative style of communication, the decisions made on upper floors of hierarchy arrive in the form of directives down (for this reason this style often call directive). At the same time the leader (head) doesn't love that directives were subject to discussion: those, in his opinion, belong it is indisputable to carry out.

For the leader there is also as a prerogative a control and an efficiency evaluation of activities. At heads (leaders) with such style of communication high

self-esteem, self-confidence, aggression, tendency to stereotypes in communication, black-and-white perception of subordinates and their actions is, as a rule, observed. People with authoritative style of interaction have dogmatic thinking in case of which only one correct answer (generally it is opinion of the head), and all others wrong. So, to discuss with such person, to discuss the decisions made by it is a waste of time, the initiative of others isn't encouraged with such person.

As for democratic style of communication, for it joint decision making, promotion of activity of participants of communicative process, wide knowledge of all who participate in a discussion about the solved problem, about accomplishment of the planned tasks and the purposes are peculiar.

All this promotes that each of participants of communication voluntarily takes the responsibility for task performance and realizes its importance in achievement of a common goal. At the same time participants of discussion of a problem, in the conditions of democratic style of interaction, are not only contractors of someone else's decisions, and people who have the values and interests show own initiative. For this reason the called style promotes growth of initiative of interlocutors, the number of creative non-standard decisions, to improvement of moral and psychological climate in group.

Thus, if for authoritative style of communication allocation of the "I" is peculiar, then the democrat leader considers in interaction with others their individual and psychological properties, studies their requirements, interests, the reasons of recession or growth of activity at work, determines levers, etc., i.e. staticizes "We" in establishing social and business contacts.

In case of liberal style of communication characteristic feature is insignificant activity of the head who can not be a leader. Such person of a problem discusses formally, is exposed to various influences, doesn't show an initiative in joint activities, and often and doesn't wish or is incapable to make any decisions.

The head with liberal style of communication is characterized in interaction with others by restacking of production functions on their shoulders, inability in the course of business interaction to influence her result, tries to avoid any innovations. The liberal it is possible to tell about the person that he in communication "goes down stream" often persuades the interlocutor. Eventually, in case of liberal style of interaction typical is a situation when the active and creatively oriented employees begin to use a workplace and time for the activities which aren't connected with common cause.

For the description of the specified styles also other names are used:

• directive (command and administrative, authoritative at which the person in interaction with others is a supporter of one-man management, submission of their own will, to the orders, rules, instructions);

• joint (democratic for whom the person considers in communication independence, initiative, activity of others trusts them);

• liberal (at which the person practically doesn't operate a communication situation, doesn't show communicative abilities, indulges other, if discusses a problem, then it is formal)

As we see, each person has certain stereotypes of interaction with others which determine its style of communication.

It is known a number of researches in which it is specified a certain communication between style of communication, to type of behavior of the person, his relation to activities and sociocultural features of interaction:

• style reflects the settled methods of activities of a certain type of the person, it is closely connected with psychological features of his thinking, decision making, manifestation of communicative properties, etc.;

• style of communication isn't inherited quality, and is created in the course of interaction and changes therefore it can be adjusted and developed;

• the description and classification of styles of communication to some extent reproduce contents of the characteristic of the business sphere: specifics of objectives, relations, etc.;

• social and economic, political, social and psychological and other external factors influence nature of forming of style of communication;

• style of communication is caused by cultural values of the next environment, its traditions, to the settled standards of behavior, etc.

Concerning the last feature, here it is about communication of style of communication with national culture. Practice of interpersonal interaction shows that styles of communication which are effective in one culture can not work in another. Especially it concerns the business sphere. Therefore in case of establishment of business contacts it is necessary to consider the fact that the business people who are brought up in different national traditions and conditions adhere also to different opinions concerning behavior and establishing social contacts.

Style of communication has both an objective, and subjective basis. On the one hand, it depends on moral standards, sociocultural, social and economic and political factors, the developed system of the relations, and with another, - on personal features of the person.

Several approaches to the analysis of leadership styles, and from here - and the styles of communication connected with a certain ratio of business contacts, subjective and objective in the course of establishment; work in the management sphere for today.

Concerning the first approach, he relies mainly on structure of personal and business qualities of the head. That is each head represents identity in the sense that has a unique combination of manifestation of separate structural components of personal and business qualities.

According to this approach two classifications are created: on the basis of the first allocate structures "the head - the political leader", "specialist", "organizer", "mentor", "companion" who in an ideal management system are harmoniously combined, and on the basis of the second - in management process are applied authoritative, joint and liberal leadership styles.

The necessary effect can be reached if the head is able to apply the style adequate to a situation. As for the second approach, he relies on objective factors in management in this connection differentiate business, sociable and room styles.

Methods of communication and behavior of business people are under construction so that to show the confidence in a conversation, to be an example for subordinates, to inspire them on achievement of effective objectives. In general style of communication there usually remains to constants in case of certain situations, but if circumstances change, then adaptation, transition to other style or a combination of styles is possible.

Most of people have the dominating style, and also one or several spare which are shown when it is impossible to apply the main. At the same time any of the styles of communication called here isn't universal.

For the characteristic of features of communication in psycholinguistics use also the concept "communication type".

And described in scientific literature the following types are known:

• mentor type of communication which is based on the principle of strict submission of one interlocutor to another, focused on lecture, instructing. Presently updating and democratization of public life, a humanization of the relations for participants of interaction especially unacceptable is such type of communication, it suppresses activity of one of interlocutors, becomes the reason of negative attitude to each other, leads to deterioration in moral and psychological character of the relations;

• the "informative" type of communication directed to transfer of a certain information. The "informative" type of communication in modern communicative process isn't rather effective, simple relaying of information results in passivity of his perception, doesn't create conditions for exchange of opinions, independent search of solutions of problems on the basis of scientific methodology;

• the "inspired" communication is considered this indicator of high culture of contacts. This type of communication characteristic of democratic style of interaction differs in active participation of each of participants of communicative process, ability of partners to show insistence at the same time with justice, ability to keep up the conversation, to listen to the opponent, etc. For this reason the principles of this kind of communication are, interchangeability, mutual assistance, a cooperation and dialogue;

• "confrontational" type of communication which becomes didactically now necessary as disposes to a discussion, is a dialogue with opponents. At the same time only the person is capable to express and fix by words and gestures the maintenance of the feelings and thoughts, to call by them various phenomena and objects. Thanks to it he creates certain communicative space in which unite, his inner, inner world and the world external, objective coexist.

Usually distinguish verbal and nonverbal means of communication. The main, universal verbal remedy of human communication is language (oral and written).

Language is a basis of culture of the people, the boundless inexhaustible ocean of universal experience. Emphasizing value of language in human life,

popular wisdom puts it near other unconditional values, such as freedom, good, etc.

Language is the phenomenon not only linguistic, but also psychological, esthetic and public. For this reason people long since noticed various qualities of language and tried to explain them, using such words as "correct", "beautiful", "available", etc. For example, Cicero considered that the speaker only then will cause admiration of listeners when his speech is net, clear and beautiful. During communication language develops and enhanced. Thus, a form of its existence is broadcasting, i.e. the act of use by the individual of language for communication.

More accurately to realize communicative qualities of the speech and thinking, it is necessary to find out to what it corresponds and as this ratio can be used for the description of all scale of those meanings of communication which in it are hidden.

First of all, the speech is correlated to the person therefore it shall be available as for this purpose who speaks, and for the receiver of information. The most important is the language ratio fact with the sign mechanism of communication. However this evidence doesn't mean yet that we see and we understand all components of this ratio. It is that the speech is constructed of set and system of sign units of communication, submits to laws of this system, but it isn't equal to it. In language sign units of communication receive the choice, repeating, placement of a combination and transformation.

That is the one who speaks or writes is compelled by the problems and opportunities of communication to carry out the choice, repetitions, placements, combinations and transformation from a large number of words and other units of that from them which correspond to a speech situation.

Within a natural language the important means of communication are so-called artificial languages: Morse alphabet, language of deafs, different codes, etc. Often artificial language is used in science, for example, various special terms and concepts, mathematical and chemical formulas, conditional geographical designations, etc. For this reason language acquisition of this or that science is the necessary admission to her temple. Also computer languages thanks to which there is a communication of the person with the computer and in virtual space of Internet network relate to artificial languages.

The term of slang is very hard to define. It contains very informal words and expressions that are more common in spoken language and are not suitable for formal situations. Slang is sometimes restricted to one particular group of people, for instance soldiers, children, teenagers. One can speak of "army slang", "prison slang", "teenage" or "theatre slang".

Certain dictionaries describe it as "one of those things that everybody can recognize but nobody can define. However some attempts to define slang were successful ranging from "illegitimate colloquial speech" or "a familiar language defying conventions" (Carl Sandburg), to slang as a "language on trial" or "the plain man's poetry".

Slang is in fact a language style or register, a way of speaking that consists of word and phrases – restricted in their use to a particular social group – that may

replace the terms used in formal, standard language by other terms with a strong emotional impact. It's a way of expressing an attitude of defiance with respect to conventions or the moral authority of the community and it depends upon the speaker's belonging to a certain group, be it social, racial or professional. Slang covers a wide range of domains of life and activity such as:

a) the underground world of crime, prostitution, sexuality or drugs addiction;

b) the students' world, the computer's;

c) the sports' universe;

d) the army;

e) mass-media, cinema etc.

It is generally short-lived and it's an expression of the group's intimacy and the solidarity of its members. That's why it is not usually understood by people outside that particular group. Slang is characterized by imagination, wit and picturesque having an obvious intimate, familiar character. As a strongly subjective, metaphorical language slang varies from biting irony or witty remarks to curses or oaths, obscenities or even gross, vulgar terms completely incompatible with standard language. Lots of slang terms were derived from standard, formal language but they acquired new metaphorical meaning due to its imaginative, flexible character.

The sources of its vocabulary include:

- comparison with other words;

- changing the order of syllables or sounds within a word;

- abbreviations, play upon words (also called pun) based on allusions comparison or polysemy

- the ironical interpretation of certain words.

British slang is famous for its "Rhyming Slang", a Cockney creation, in which a word is replaced by a pair of words, the second rhyming with the one replaced. For example the term "my wife" is replaced by "my trouble and strife" or "my fork and knife".

The new pair is often shortened so that an expression like "Use your loaf and bread" becomes simply "Use your loaf" both meaning "Use your head".

The expression "Let's get down to brass tacks" (meaning "Let's get down to business" is a rhyming slang in its origin: "*brass tacks*" was used instead of "the facts").

Similarly they say: "*Farmer Giles*" instead of "piles" "*apples and pears*" instead of "stairs", "*five and two*" to refer to a "Jew", "*Jimmy Brits*" instead of "shits", "*Jimmy Riddle*" instead of "piddle".

"*Bees and honey*" is used to mean 'money", "*Cain and Abel*" replaced "table" and "*Daisy-roots*" is used instead of "boots".

This linguistic phenomenon is not limited to the lower classes in London but it became a means of enriching slang vocabulary both in Australian English and in the variety used in Jamaica or South Africa. Rhyming slang is also known in American English here it developed particularly, by the contribution of Black people.

Slang and dialect meet and mingle in London Cockney, that racy, spontaneous, picturesque, witty and friendly English…spoken by millions of Londoners living within a forty-mile radius of the "mother of the cities", as Simon Potter puts in his work Our Language. In his opinion Cockney is both regional and social. There are some more examples:

"*Charley's dead*" is an exclamation meant to draw attention when somebody's trousers are unzipped.

"*She has a dumpling on*" refers to a woman expecting a child: A woman's "*grapes*" or "*grapefruit*" are her "breasts".

A "*chum*" is a buddy, a pal, a very close friend

"*He has a load on*" means that he is drunk.

"*To have ants in one's pants*" is to be anxious; restless.

Another kind of slang is the so called "Backslang" or "Pig Latin". It consists in changing the order of sounds, letters or syllables within the same word. For instance "*rennig*" means "nigger"; "*ump-chay*" means "chump" (a foolish person);

A.C.A.B. – abbreviated from All Coppers ARE Bastards.

The two varieties, standard and non-standard English differ mainly in pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. The lexical variables include slang and cant words. But while slang may also be a defining feature of standard colloquial varieties of English, a mark of the informal style (is casual and intimate), cant, which is the slang used by the underworld, is typical mainly of substandard dialects.

Examples:
- to two finger (to pick pocket)
- snow (cocaine)
- confidence man (swindler)
- ex-con (ex-convict).

Other cant terms have made their way from underground to overground and are understood by everybody. However, most them are still considered slang.

Examples:
- payola (blackmail, extorsion)
- grand ($1 000)
- C – cocaine
- C –bill note (a hundred dollars bill)
- to hung paper (to write false checks)
- buck = 1$
- sawbuck = $10 (ten dollars)
- fiver = $5 (five dollars)
- nickle = 45 (five cents)
- dime = 410 (ten cents)
- quarter = 425 (25 cents)

The terms "hippy", "pot" (marihuana) are looked upon as slang by some people and not slang by others ("phone", "hot-dog", "zoo" were slang words but now they aren't anymore). Eventually they gained entrance into the respectable circle of formal usage.

Slang words spread to so many people that they use no longer considered slang but part of the everyday language. One should make clear cut distinction between cant, argot, jargon and slang. Cant and argot are nearly synonymous. One speaks for example, of "thieves' cant" or "thieves' argot". But the term argot may also be applied to the specialized terminology of a profession or trade.

Linguistic argot consists of terms such as phoneme, morpheme, case, competence, style, rule, lexicon, affixation, deep structure, surface structure, etc.

The argot of the computer enthusiast includes words such as: files, sites, folders, and internet.

Jargon: in one of its meanings it has the non-cant definition of argot, it is technical language, has specialized vocabulary and style of discourse linked to a particular trade or occupation.

Argot: - cant - jargon

For example the:
- banking jargon;
- computer jargon;
- legal jargon;
- business jargon

Practically, every conceivable profession, trade and occupation has its own jargon. Like any aspect of language, jargon changes. Many jargon terms pass into the standard language. Jargon spreads from a narrow group until it is used and understood by a larger group of people, similar to slang. Eventually, it may lose its special status as either jargon or slang and enter the formal usage.

Jargon is a word like "administrivia" refers to all the trivial used for specialized communicative goals. In American Business activities and reports requires by administrators; Career Limiting Move (CLM) is an action which will adversely affect your future; elephant hunt means trying to find a major corporation to move into you community stimulating economic development;   hush money = bribe = payment to keep someone quiet.

The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language (1987) mentions some terms characteristic of the truck drivers jargon:
- bears = police;
- doughnuts = tires;
- eyeballs = headlights;
- grandma lane = slow lane;
- smokey = policeman;
- 10 – 1 = poor reception;
- 10 – 2 = good reception;
- 10 – 3 = end transmission;
- 10 – 4 = message understood.

Like slang, jargon may be adopted by people outside the original group. In fact, it seems that there is no clear difference between slang and jargon. The former is used to talk about the in-group language of youth subcultures while the latter is used to talk about the in-group language of particular occupations. Both of them

tend to be colourful and creative, but occupational jargon also contains colourful technical terms.

An interesting aspect of slang is the use of taboo language, i.e. forbidden language (dealing with sex or death) it is considered impolite or offensive because of the nature of the topic or because of the nature of the attitude expressed.

Taboo language is associated with criminals, labourers, tough kids (members of a gang); it is also used by members of the middle class in order to shock the audience or for humour purposes;

Uses:
- fuck – literally "have sexual intercourse"
- vulgar word for " intercourse"
- solidarity (tough guys): " You guys are fucking amazing!"
- humour (sarcasm): "I would like to express my sincerest fucking attitude."
- emotional response, insult, curse: " Oh, fuck! I smashed my finger!"
- verbal attack, vulgar way of expressing something "Fuck off and die!"
- for swearing, without having their literal meanings at all.

Some words referring to a taboo topic are considered obscene, while others are considered only mildly offensive or oven not offensive at all because they are technical or clinical:
- "shit"(mildly offensive) – can be used either for swearing or of excrement (human or animal)
- "crap" (mildly offensive) – "The horse left crap (ship) all ever the road"; Shit! I forgot my keys"; "Crap!" I forgot my keys.
- "dung" – animal excrement – not normally used for swearing
- "feces" – clinical word for human excrement – not normally.

Euphemisms: used for swearing indirect way of expressing obscene language by replacing unpleasant or rude words with a more pleasant or less offensive one. They can be phonologically related to a taboo expression or they can be semantically related: e.g. "shoot" instead of "shit", darn (damn), goshdarn (goddamn), f –ing (fucking) Geez (Jesus).

Euphemisms for urination [piss = taboo expression; urinate = technical expression):
- take a leak (slang);
- do number 1 (baby talk) – a kind of code word);
- relieve one (slang) etc.

If a person decides they want to identify themselves with another group, then they may start to imitate the language of that group. This often happens when people belong to a stigmatized group, but they want to become a part of the educated middle-class. Or, the other way round: educated middle-class people may try to identify themselves with tough urban culture by imitating their slang and non-standard dialect.

British English, American English and Australian English developed their own slang; Jack-and-Jill is a drug pill, Jack-sauce refers to a fool, or insolent person. In American English "Acapulco Gold" is a refined drug, "Ace boon/ ace

buddy" is a very good friend, best friend; "Apple" is a synonym for man, fellow. So is "article man" or guy (always preceded by an adjective) e.g. He's a real slick apple. Another use is for "big town" (especially for the jazz musicians of the 30's) or for "Indian red skin".

Speakers of Australian English use " apples" instead of "all right", (for example "she'll be apples"), "bastard" is a term of endearment, if something is "cactus" it means it is dead, not functioning and if one is thirsty one should have a "coldie" (a beer), but if one " is off his face" it means that he is drunk.

2 STRUCTURAL VARIABILITY AND FUNCTIONAL PECULIARITIES OF NONSTANDARD LEXICON OF MODERN ENGLISH

Studying of any foreign language and ownership as means of the international communication is impossible for them without profound and versatile knowledge of culture of speakers of the language, their mentality, national nature, a way of life, the worldview, customs, traditions, etc. today. Only the combination of these two types of knowledge – language and culture – provides effective and fruitful communication.

Cross-cultural communication (CCK) represents a special form of communication of two or more representatives of various cultures during which there is an exchange of information and cultural values of the interacting cultures. Process of cross-cultural communication is a specific form of activities which isn't limited only to knowledge of foreign languages, and requires also knowledge of material and spiritual culture of other people, religion, values, moral installations, world outlook representations etc. in total of the determining behavior models of partners in communication.

The American linguist Edward Hall came to a conclusion about necessity of training in culture of communication in the same community. By his opinion, a main goal of studying of a problem of CCK is studying of practical needs of representatives of various cultures for successful communication with each other.

A variety of types of social interaction, social contexts and intentions of participants of communication finds the reflection in a variety of speech genres – from daily chatter before emotional recognitions, from business meetings and negotiations prior to a performance in mass media. At the same time speech communication in images, motives, installations, emotions determines social and interpersonal relations, the speech creates them.

By special researches of foreign scientists it is established that character, the form and style of communication in many respects depend on the first minutes or seconds of communication. There is a set of very simple receptions allowing facilitating practically in any situation the initial stage of communication that defines all further course of this process. The smile, the address to the interlocutor by name, a compliment to him etc. are among such receptions.

Depending on a combination of various ways, receptions and styles of communication in the theory of communication it is accepted to allocate three main types of cross-cultural communication – verbal, nonverbal and paraverbal.

As experts consider, communicative interaction of people on three quarters consists of speech (verbal) communication. So, in linguistic science various forms of language communication have received the name of verbal means of communication.

Use of language as the main means of verbal communication assumes that it to each word or a sound is given special, only to him peculiar value. For carriers of this language this value is standard and helps them to understand each other. However in the modern world there are several thousands of languages, in each of

which the language picture of the world [3] assuming specific perception of the world by carriers of this language is created. Therefore at communication of carriers of various languages there are situations of language discrepancy which are shown in lack of an exact equivalent for expression of this or that concept or even in lack of the concept. As a rule, objects and the concepts characteristic only of this culture reflecting them and which are absent in other cultures and also different cultural ideas of them form a basis for such discrepancy.

In the West the old tradition of oratory (rhetoric) assumes exclusive importance of verbal messages. This tradition fully reflects the western type of logical, rational and analytical thinking. In cultures of the western people the speech is perceived irrespective of a conversation context therefore it can be considered separately and out of a sociocultural context. Here in the course of communication speaking and listening are considered as two independent subjects whose relations become clear of oral statements, in contrast to Asians, for example, whom the emotional party of interaction in general, than values of certain words and expressions interests more.

In comparison with verbal means of expression of thoughts in Asian and Orient cultures residents of the European countries and the USA speak more directly, clearly and precisely, trying to avoid silence during communication. Representatives of the European cultures say that think, and think the fact that they say as for them the sociocultural context of communication doesn't matter. These cultures extremely approvingly concern to those who simply and directly express the thoughts and feelings.

Verbal communication can mainly take place in a form of dialogue or a monologue.

Perception of information on representatives of other cultures depends not only on knowledge of language, but also on understanding, so-called language of nonverbal communication. Here it is important to know that if partners aren't able to perceive the content of a conversation, then they watch how it is told.

Nonverbal communication in science is understood as set of the not language means, symbols and signs used for information transfer and messages in the course of communication. The mimicry, gestures, gestures, speed and a timbre of the speech, clothes, a hairstyle, surrounding objects, hand habitual actions – all of them represent a certain type of messages.

Paraverbal means – set of the sound signals accompanying oral speech, introducing in her additional values. Purpose of paraverbal communication is in causing at the partner the corresponding emotions, feelings, experiences which are necessary for achievement of definite purposes and intentions. Such results are usually achieved by means of paraverbal means of communication which treat:

- a prosody – tempo of speech, a timbre, height and loudness of a voice;
- an extralinguistics – pauses, cough, sighs, laughter and crying (i.e. sounds which we reproduce by means of a voice).

Thus, paraverbal communications is based on voice-frequency and timbre features of language and their use in culture. On this basis it is possible to mark out silent and loud cultures.

For example, in Europe Americans are condemned for their manner to speak too loudly. This their line is given rise by that circumstance that very often for sociable Americans doesn't matter whether listen to their speech or not. For them it is much more important to show the competence.

As it is paradoxical, the very important role in communication is played by silence. In different cultures idea of that how many silence is necessary for adequate communication, has the national specifics. Also in cross-cultural communication intonation of speech communication which often defines sense and contents of the transmitted data matters.

Culture specific features of paraverbal communication find the expression and in speech speed. For example, Finns speak rather slowly and with long pauses. This language feature has created him image of people who long think and slowly work. Carriers of Romance language which practically don't do a pause between speech pieces belong to the fast-speaking cultures. On this indicator Germans hold average position, but the speed of the speech is more in Berlin more slowly in the north of Germany.

As it was already noted, the main distinctive feature of process of communication is obligatory mutual understanding of partners. Without the correct perception, assessment and mutual understanding all process of communication loses a meaning. Certain knowledge, skills and capabilities which create adequate and right mutual understanding of partners in communication are necessary for effective and successful communication with representatives of other cultures.

Researches of domestic and foreign scientists on a problem of cross-cultural mutual understanding allow drawing a conclusion that there are many reasons for misunderstanding and emergence of the cross-cultural conflicts. These reasons are directly or indirectly connected with the psychological mechanism of perception and formation of cross-cultural competence.

Process of perception assumes reflection in consciousness of the person of separate feelings about objects, situations and events of the outside world as a result of which sensory data are selected and organized so that we could understand both the obvious and hidden characteristics of the world around. At the same time perception of the world and the subsequent judgment of him isn't free from emotions, motivations or representations. So, we are inclined to perceive people, similar to us, more positively, than unlike, such relation extends to the people reminding those familiar with whom we once had experience of positive communication.

As a rule, interpretation and structuring the arriving information happens based on the previous experience. This approach provides successful overcoming difficulties and proves the practical efficiency. Obtaining information from the world around, the person systematizes and orders it in a form, convenient for him. In psychology this process received the name "categorization".

So, perception of reality by the person is caused by the cultural, social and personal reasons. From huge number of factors such scientists allocate four main which generally define perception by the person of reality in the course of

communication: factor of the first impression, factor of "superiority", factor of appeal and factor of the attitude towards us.

Indispensable condition of communication is not only knowledge of common language, but also existence of the certain knowledge accumulated to it. It is necessary for communication that its participants had a certain community of social history which finds the reflection in knowledge of the world around. This knowledge which is present at consciousness of participants of the communicative act has also received the name of background. By O. S. Akhmanova's definition, background knowledge is "mutual knowledge of realities speaking and listening, being a basis of language communication".

Need of the account in the course of communication of background knowledge is conventional today. Background knowledge which members of a certain ethnic and linguistic community have is the main object of linguistic and area studies.

Background knowledge plays a special role at understanding of the foreign-language (foreign culture) text. The text in this case is a true joint of linguistics and cultural linguistics as he belongs to language and is his highest tier, at the same time the text is a form of existence of culture. The cultural linguistics – the scientific discipline investigating the material culture and mentality embodied in living national language and which are shown in language processes in their effective continuity with language and culture of ethnos deals with this problem. The important place in cultural linguistics is allocated to studying of case names and key concepts of culture. As for comparative cultural linguistics – an independent interdisciplinary branch of science of the synthesizing type, studying in a comparative foreshortening on material of two and more languages interaction of language and culture as complete structures by means of system methods and with orientation to modern priorities and cultural establishments, studies interaction of languages and cultures in their functioning.

The most popular source of stereotypic ideas of national characters are so-called international jokes, that is the jokes constructed on a sample plot: representatives of the different nations, having got into the same situation, react to it differently, according to those lines of their national character which attribute to them in the homeland of a joke.

The European stereotypes are well visible in the following joke:

"Paradise is where cooks are French, mechanics are German, policemen are British, lovers are Italian, and it is all organized by the Swiss. Hell is where cooks are British, policemen are German, lovers are the Swiss, mechanics are French, and it is all organized by Italians."

So, one source where with clauses and big care it is possible to look for national natures, are the international jokes and jokes of different types: those which are told about themselves by representatives of this or that culture, and those which are created by other cultures.

Other source can be considered national classical fiction. The word classical in this context isn't casual because the literature having this rank has stood the test of time: her works have deserved recognition, have affected minds and feelings of representatives of these people, this culture.

2.1 Types and features of spoken lexicon in modern English

Today the questions concerning semantics of language draw attention of many linguists. The nomination is one of the most serious problems of linguistics. Process of the nomination as creations of significant language units at first sight can seem quite simple. Actually this most difficult language phenomenon. As the modern linguistics claims, the nomination is no other than language fixing of the conceptual signs displaying properties of objects which is complicated by a polysemy and transfer of values. V. G. Gak understands "process and result of the name at which language elements correspond to the objects designated by them" as the nomination.

The nomination happens primary and secondary. Primary nomination – the initial nomination realized in the modern language as an antiderivative: earth, water, sky. Secondary – the derivative nomination which was created due to reconsideration of the ready language units acting in function, secondary for them. In other words it is motivated names. The phraseology also belongs to methods of the secondary nomination.

The phraseology of any language is the most valuable linguistic heritage, in which vision of the world and national culture is reflected. V. N. Thalia determines phraseology as the section of linguistics which operates with knowledge of language units as the sign system capable to provide messages on the world. According to A. V. Kunin, the phraseological units (PU) are steady combinations of lexemes with fully or partially the rethought value. The most general signs of FE call "language stability, semantic integrity and separately completeness".

By scientists it isn't developed the uniform principle of classification of FE. We adhere to classification of A. V. Kunin selecting three sections as a part of phraseology: idiomatics, idio-phraseomatics, and phraseomatics itself. The section of idiomatics includes actually FE, or idioms, that are set combinations of lexemes with partially or completely rethought value. For example, "kill one's dog" (to be drunk).

The section of a phraseomatics joins phraseomatysm, or phraseological units of non-idiomatic character, but with the complicated value, for example, of "launch a boat" (a pestilence "to float the boat"). The verb "launch" has narrow value that is the reason of its limited compatibility and reduces the choice of partners in the phrase (to launch a boat, liner, ship, vessel or the name of any ship of new type).

The section of idio-phraseomatics enters idio-phraseomatycal units, or idio-phraseomatism, that is set phrases where at the first the phraseomatycal of options components have the literal, but complicated values, and at the second, idiomatic options, – completely rethought. For example, "You are the doctor"" (I will make what you will tell), literal value – "you are a doctor".

Phraseological reconsideration is the cornerstone of process of the phraseological nomination. Reconsideration is one of methods of knowledge of the reality of consciousness of the person and is connected to reproduction of real or imaginary features of the reflected objects on the basis of establishment of communications in between. The technique of reconsideration is that the old form

is used for the secondary or tertiary name by transfer of names and semantic information from denotation of prototypes of FE or phraseological options respectively on denotation of FE or the phrase-semantycal options.

The phraseology of national language (standard and non-standard) is reflection of life of these people, his life, culture, traditions, beliefs, myths, etc. For example, = I'm skeptical by nature (I am a skeptic by the nature) lets us know "I'm from Missouri" that in this state there are a lot of mistrustful inhabitants. This state is called still "by Show – Me State" (the state mistrustful: you show me, then I will believe you). But It should be noted the fact that not in all units obviously expressed national and cultural specifics since similarity of the phenomena reflected in languages is inherent in many people. For this reason many units aren't carriers of all volume of national peculiar features.

Any phraseological unit transfers this or that national and cultural information; it bears in itself information on a pattern and society. By means of phraseological units we can know better history, culture and mentality of these or those people. It is necessary to mark that in the analysis of structural composition of the American non-standard FE their likeness to structural composition of literary phraseological units comes to light. Difference is that in non-standard FE emotional evaluation and expressional loading is more brightly expressed, at the same time culturally significant information transferred by them is embodied in a cultural-national connotation of FE. Determination last not always is simple business as as material serve FE which is on the periphery of language system. It is difficult to deal, for example, with a cultural connotation of expressions like *to go cold turkey* (=to stop), *to break a leg* (=to die), *to talk turkey* (=to talk business) and many others.

The phraseology of the American slang draws attention of researchers, lexicographers both in the USA, and in Russia. It is enough to call a number of large English-language dictionaries which authors include units of this many-sided and interesting phenomenon, treasures of a living language in the case of lexicographic editions: Berrey L.V. and Melvin Van den Bark (1962), Chapman R.L. (1986), Farmer J.S. and W.E. Henley (1996), Flexner S.B. (1976, 1982), Lighter J.E. (1994, 1997), Green J. (2000), Partridge E. (1968), Spears R.A. (1991), Wentworth H. and S.B. Flexner (1975), etc.

Existence in itself, evolution, dynamics, functioning of FE of the American slang represents great theoretical and practical interest as all this took and takes place already irrespective of the British English from which the American English has historically separated more than 300 years ago. And today linguists even more often speak about existence of the American language, so it differs from the British English and has huge influence on all other options of English in the world.

It is necessary to tell that almost all American phraseology has developed on the American soil taking into account geographical, historical, social, cultural, political, and other reasons and factors of actually American mythology originating from ancient one.

Lexical and phraseological units of the general American slang appear on the periphery of lexico-semantic system of language in the beginning. And if they

express concepts, vital for this linguo-cultural community, then can pass from the periphery into center. Cf. the following note: "New lexical units settle down on the periphery of language system, namely, on its boundary; if they designate a reality, important for a certain society, then they can penetrate into center of language system in spite of the fact that they were seldom used earlier".

Democratization of the American option of English leads to the growing interaction of the literary standard and non-standard phraseology, their close interaction, active use of the American non-standard phraseology in mass media, in fiction, not to mention daily informal conversation. Relevance of a problem is explained as well by replenishment of dictionary structure of language at the expense of FE from the general American slang that is absolutely natural process. New FE reflects the changing situation, new cultural and historical conditions and realities of linguo-cultural community better. As the proof to it serves the periodical press, lexicographic sources, check on informants. Therefore, FE of the general American slang is an integrated part of phraseological system of language. Constant replenishment of dictionary structure of language and phraseological fund promotes performance the main – communicative – functions of language.

Let's give some examples the colloquially of the American FE: *a sweater girl* – the girl with a magnificent bust; *run one's face* – "to leave" on pleasant appearance, the affable address; *ants in one's pants* – a nervous state; *old flame* – the ex-boyfriend or the girl; *throw a fit* – to fly into a rage or a rabies, to go into a hysterics.

Often phraseological units of the American slang are used in a political discourse: "fair weather friend and sunshine politician" - "the friend politician on good weather" (the unreliable politician on whom it is possible to rely only under favorable circumstances).

In all developed natural languages there are units transferring a condition of the person, his behavior in critical situations when he feels pain or is in a strip of larger troubles, but only this idea is transferred in the American general slang by means of FE: bite (on) the bullet – to grit teeth, to fasten, suffer from pain, a grief; to accept troubles and to try to live with them, etc. The parentage of this FE is bound to carrying out morbid operations on wounded in field conditions during military operations which due to the lack of anesthesia had – to bite bite the bullet a bullet. Now this expression became standard and is widely used in tongue.

The phraseology is a result of collective experience of the people. Non-standard, as well as other FE, arise in the thick of the people having sharpness, irony, humour, lively, sharp wit which help him to cope with life burdens. FE is a result of creative cognitive activity of people – occupy the niche in language in the course of a dynamic categorization and conceptualization of surrounding reality as a result of continuous process of cognitive activity of the person. "Phraseological units arise and find the status of the reproduced units in the national environment for which popular wisdom "is closer and clearer than the legend of old times deep".

Language is dynamic, and at any given time hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of words and expressions are in the process of changing from one level

to another, of becoming more acceptable or less acceptable, of becoming more popular or less popular.

Slang is very informal use of words and phrases for more colorful or peculiar style of expression that is shared by the people in the same social subgroup, for example, computer slang, sports slang, military slang, musicians' slang, students' slang, underworld slang, etc. Slang is not used by the majority of native speakers and many people consider it vulgar, though quite a few slang phrases have already come into standard usage. Slang contains many obscene and offensive words and phrases. It also has many expressions that are acceptable in informal communication. Slang is highly idiomatic. It is flippant, irreverent, and indecorous; it may be indecent or obscene. Its colorful metaphors are generally directed at respectability, and it is this succinct, sometimes witty, frequently impertinent social criticism that gives slang its characteristic flavor. Slang, then, includes not just words but words used in a special way in a certain social context.

Language is the property of a community of speakers. People rarely speak, or write, with only themselves as the audience. It should not be surprising then that some components and forms of language are socially motivated. So slang is one kind of vocabulary that serves the social nature of language.

Slang comes to be a very numerous part of the English language. It is considered to be one of the main representatives of the nation itself. The birth of new words results from the order of the modern society. Slang arises due to our propensity for replacing old denominations by expressive ones. And yet the growing popularity of ever new creation prevents it from remaining fresh and impressive. What was felt as strikingly witty yesterday becomes dull and stale today, since everybody knows it and uses it.

Slang expressions often embody attitudes and values of group members. They may thus contribute to a sense of group identity and may convey to the listener information about the speaker's background. Before an apt expression becomes slang, however, it must be widely adopted by members of the subculture. At this point slang and jargon overlap greatly. If the subculture has enough contact with the mainstream culture, its figures of speech become slang expressions known to the whole society.

It is convenient to group slang words according to their place in the vocabulary system and more precisely in the semantic system of the vocabulary. If they denote a new and necessary notion they may prove an enrichment of the vocabulary and be accepted into Standard English. If on the other hand they make just another addition to a cluster of synonyms and have nothing but novelty to back them, they die out very quickly, constituting the most changeable part of the vocabulary.

Another type of classification suggests subdivision according to the sphere of usage, into general slang and special slang. General slang includes words that are not specific for any social or professional group, whereas special slang is peculiar for some such group: teenager slang, university slang, public school slang, Air Force slang, football slang, sea slang and so on.

General slang is language that speakers deliberately use to break with the standard language and to change the level of discourse in the direction of formality. It signals the speakers` intention to refuse conventions[1] and their need to be fresh and startling in their expression, to ease social exchanges and induce friendliness, to reduce excessive seriousness and avoid clichés, in brief, to enrich language. General slang words have a wide circulation as they are neither group – nor subject – restricted.

Special slang is language that speakers use to show their belonging to a group and establish solidarity or intimacy with the other group members. It is often used by speakers to create their own identity, including aspects such as social status and geographical belonging, or even age, education, occupation, lifestyle, and special interests. It is largely used by people of a common age and experience to strengthen the bonds within their own peer group, keeping the older generation at a distance. It is also used by people sharing the same occupation to increase efficiency in communication; or by those sharing the same living conditions to hide secret information from people in authority. It is finally used by people sharing an attitude or a life style to reinforce their group cohesiveness, keeping insiders together and outsiders out.

Special slang tends to originate in subcultures within a society. Occupational groups (for example, loggers, police, medical professionals, and computer specialists) are prominent originators of both jargon and slang; other groups creating slang include the armed forces, teenagers, racial minorities, citizens-band radiobroadcasters, sports groups, drug addicts, criminals, and even religious denominations. Slang expressions often embody attitudes and values of group members. They may thus contribute to a sense of group identity and may convey to the listener information about the speaker's background.

Cockney Rhyming Slang originated in the East End of London.

Rhyming slang is a form of slang in which a word is replaced by a rhyming word, typically the second word of a two-word phrase (so stairs becomes "apples and pears"). The second word is then often dropped entirely ("I'm going up the apples"), meaning that the association of the original word to the rhyming phrase is not obvious to the uninitiated.

Rhyming Slang phrases are derived from taking an expression which rhymes with a word and then using that expression instead of the word. For example the word "look" rhymes with "butcher's hook". In many cases the rhyming word is omitted - so you won't find too many Londoners having a "bucher's hook", but you might find a few having a "butcher's".

The rhyming word is not always omitted so Cockney expressions can vary in their construction, and it is simply a matter of convention which version is used.

In this list of example Cockney slang for parts of the body, you'll notice that some expressions omit the rhyming word but others do not.

English	Rhymes with	Cockney

Feet	Plates of meat	Plates
Teeth	Hampstead Heath	Hampsteads
Legs	Scotch eggs	Scotches
Eyes	Mince pies	Minces
Arms	Chalk Farms	Chalk Farms
Hair	Barnet Fair	Barnet
Head	Loaf of bread	Loaf
Face	Boat race	Boat race
Mouth	North and south	North and south

The proliferation of rhyming slang allowed many of its traditional expressions to pass into common usage. Some substitutions have become relatively widespread in Britain, for example "scarper", meaning to run away is derived from "Scapa Flow" meaning "to go". "To have a butcher's" means to have a look, from "butcher's hook. For example "use your loaf" is an everyday phrase for the British, but not too many people realize it is Cockney Rhyming Slang ("loaf of bread: head"). There are many more examples of this unwitting use of Cockney Rhyming Slang.

2.2 Stylistic differentiation and synonymic variability of nonstandard lexicon of English

English has an alphabetic writing system based on the Roman alphabet that was brought to Anglo-Saxon England by Christian missionaries and church officials in the 600s. An earlier Germanic writing system called runes, also alphabetic and originating ultimately from the same source as the Roman alphabet, was used for more limited purposes (largely incantations, curses, and a few poems) when the tribes were still on the continent and also after their migration to Britain, up until Christianization.

Alphabetic writing systems are based on the principle of representing spoken sound segments, specifically those at the level of consonants and vowels, by written characters, ideally one for each sound segment. Crucial elements of the sound stream of a message are thus 'captured' by a linear sequence of marks that can be "sounded out" to recapture the message by means of its sounds. The entire sound stream is not captured, but enough of it is to provide a prompt for lexical recognition. (Other kinds of writing systems are based on written representation of other linguistic units such as syllables, words, or some mix of these.)

The Roman alphabet that being designed for a language with a very different phonological system was never perfectly adapted for writing English even when first used to represent Anglo-Saxon. The first monks wrote English using Roman letters soon added new characters to handle the extra sounds. For example, the front low vowel /æ/ of Anglo-Saxon was represented by a ligature of *a* and *e*, forming a single written character called *ash*. They also added few runic characters to the alphabet to represent consonant sounds not found in Latin or its Romance descendents, such as the fricatives thorn *þ, eth ð*, and yogh *ʒ* (a voiced palatal or velar fricative, represented by a character that looks somewhat like a *3*). Later on in the medieval period these runic characters were replaced with digraphs, two-letter symbols such *as th, sh*, and *gh*. The letters in these digraphs do not have their usual values, but are used as a complex to indicate single sounds.

Norms for writing words consistently with an alphabetic character set are collectively called orthography. Consistency in writing was never absolute in Anglo-Saxon because the whole system was new and norms for writing words in a consistent way took time to develop. It is not easy for writers to remember a single orthographic representation, called a spelling, for a word; yet this is what is required for standardization, unless there is a perfect one-to-one correspondence between phonemes and graphemes, which is an ideal rarely reached with alphabetic systems. Writers seem to prefer to produce written forms they have seen before for specific words, even if there is not a good match between written characters and sounds.

From the reader's perspective, we might think that simply pronouncing a word based on the prompts provided by the graphemes would be enough to allow a reader to produce a spoken message matching the written form. Yet it turns out that producing the sound of an utterance by reading it off from the graphemes is no simple cognitive task. Getting a pronunciation out of alphabetic writing requires

people to analyze the sound string down to the level of component sounds. Yet this type of phonemic analysis is apparently not an obvious or natural one for humans; it needs to be taught intensively before it can be done fairly automatically and that is one reason why acquisition of literacy at an early age is stressed in cultures with alphabetic writing. It takes a lot of practice to reliably decode messages from alphabetic writing. Some of those who try to learn to read alphabetic writing never master it because they can't separate the speech string into individual segments, which are clusters of vocal gestures in consonants and vowels, in this way. Syllables apparently are a more natural unit for humans to perceive and hence code (write) and decode (read) by means of marks on a page.

Reading is also apparently swifter the more familiar form of the written words are. A word in a spelling the reader has seen before is easier and quicker to recognize than one not seen before. Also reading is apparently quicker the less variation there is in the forms of words. (But there is much individual variation on this last point.)

The manuscripts were apparently normally read aloud, rather than internally as most reading is now done. That means the process of reading was slow enough that variation in the visual forms did not seriously detract from production of the sounds as prompted by the written characters. With reading 'to oneself', the process is potentially swifter once the reader has mastered the system; but variation can then slow it down.

If there was ever consistency at the start of the use of the Roman alphabet for representing Anglo-Saxon, it began to lessen immediately. The novelty of the alphabetic system as a technology, the lack of fixed norms for written representations, and the changes over time of the language were all forces that led to greater divergence of the written forms from the spoken string. Add to that dialect variation: Some of the scribes came from outside Wessex, and even when they tried to write so as to approximate Wessex sounds, their own local pronunciations often affected the characters they wrote. Scholars observe the dialect features of individual manuscripts to gain clues about where the manuscript was composed and/or copied.

There was at that time no strong countervailing force leading toward standardization, i.e reduction of variation, such as would come later. Spellings are so variable that to lessen the difficulties modern readers may have, Old English texts are generally "normalized", or printed in accordance with what scholars think is a good representative form for each word.

Manuscripts were produced in fairly large numbers by monks copying originals using quill pens, ink, and, as the writing surface, prepared sheepskins (parchment) or the much more expensive and high quality calfskins (vellum). The physical technology of this system hardly changed for 800 years. During that time some norms arose for spelling (incipient standardized spellings, although still by our standards highly variable), but the sounds of the language were changing faster. As usual with written languages, norms for writing lagged behind those for pronunciation, thus providing another source of divergence of the written form from the spoken.

Although the royal court was in Winchester, other regional centers of government and/or learning arose or continued developing, such as York, Peterborough, Jarrow - and at the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, just before the conquest, London. The first three of these centers tended to have their own orthographic norms based on Northern pronunciations. Thus there was no single center for the development of orthographic norms, although the royal court in the south exerted a powerful force for normalization.

The Norman Conquest and its aftermath changed the entire social and governmental structure. It also affected spelling greatly, for various reasons. The most obvious is that the use of English in written documents was greatly reduced. English was no longer the dominant language for law and government, so the tendency toward standardization for Anglo-Saxon writing was essentially stopped in its tracks. Some English was still written, but far less than before. With no schools and monasteries teaching ways of writing Old English, any incipient norms were swept away and people hardly literate in the language just tried to spell as the words sounded, with predictably irregular results.

Second, after the conquest many scribes were French or French-trained. Their norms for representing sounds were different in many respects. The letter c, for example, was used in French to spell an /s/ sound in many loanwords of Latin origin; the letter c in the Roman writing system represented a /k/, but a sound change in Latin turned /k/ into /s/ before front non-low vowels. (Thus Latin *civitas* /kiwitas/ evolved into French *cité*, from where we get our word *city*.) From many instances like this one, the use of a single letter c to represent the radically different sounds /k/ and /s/ came into the English spelling system (and persists to this day). The /s/ variant developed by assimilation and weaking of the original /k/ in particular contents. A similar sound change when Latin was changing into the Romance languages gave rise to the use of the letter g for both a /g/ sound and a /dʒ/ sound, as in *goat* vs. *gesture*. Like the split of the early /k/ sound into /k/ and /s/, this split of Latin /g/ was induced by assimilation of the /g/ before front non-low vowels, in which the sound took on the frontends of the following vowel. And like the split of /k/, the orthographic mismatch of the letter /g/ and the sounds it stood for was imported into English via the introduction during Middle English of large numbers of French loanwords with the new /dʒ/ sound in them.

Third, the conquest brought about a change in the dialect taken as the standard. The seat of the royal court and government moved to London after the conquest. (Edward the Confessor built his beloved Westminster Abbey in Westminster, then just down the river to the west of the Roman and Saxon settlements of London, and used buildings around the abbey as a seasonal court. The Conqueror built a whole court complex around the abbey, which thus became the center of government.) As a result the new pronunciation norms were derived from London English and not from ancestral Wessex which was in the West Country. Many manuscripts were re-copied into the newly important London dialect of the ruling classes. Older spelling norms were abandoned for new ones based on London pronunciations.

Writing had been used for governmental purposes from the beginning of the Anglo-Saxon era, but for a long time its chief use remained in the church. After the conquest it was used more and more for governmental purposes, centered in the royal court and law courts. The Court of Chancery in London became the seat of official record-keeping, and by the 1300s spelling norms were developing noticeably, in a written variety called Chancery English.

The rise of two important centers of learning outside London, Oxford and Cambridge, by the 1300s affected written norms as well. These towns had somewhat different dialects, but they were still relatively close to each other and to the court, and many of the spelling norms developed there could also be applied to writing the London dialect. The triangle of London-Oxford-Cambridge, with its revolving scholarly and clerical workforce, became a large and important center of developing orthographic norms.

The advent of printing in the late 1400s drastically changed the speed at which manuscripts could be produced and therefore disseminated, and the adoption of paper also helped to make written documents cheaper and more widespread. These factors encouraged the growth of record-keeping and bureaucracy and the continued growth in importance of the Court of Chancery and Chancery English. Property records, tax-collecting and other financial records, laws, and records of crime and punishment all burgeoned in the 1500s.

The rise of schools, designed to train not only religious workers but also secular clerical workers for government, made it possible to train larger numbers of people in literacy and thereby also further spread the developing norms for orthography. The growth of London and its role in public institutions ensured its importance as the center of a linguistic standard for the developing nation. Standard written norms based on London English developed and were used even where local pronunciations were hardly affected by the sounds of spoken London English. Documents moved around in far greater numbers than people and thus could influence the norms of the region more easily than the spoken dialect features of travellers.

The growth of a professionalized class of printers outside of the direct control of church and government led to the role of printers in setting norms of writing and spelling. Printers had a strong interest in standardization to reduce variation and hence make the printing process easier. The printing profession evolved into the profession of publishing, and publishers have been important ever since in the setting of written standards.

During the 1500s, a major upheaval in the pronunciation of English vowels, the Great English Vowel shift, spread through the speech community and tore the conservative written forms of the long vowels away from their changing pronunciations, leaving English with a set of letter-to-written vowel correspondences different from everywhere else in Europe, as well as internal variation that bedevils readers in pairs like *divine*, *divinity*.

At about the same time, many inflectional endings were reduced and finally eliminated, notably many final unstressed e's. These "silent e's" were continued in the spelling system but repurposed as a tool to signal the value of the long vowels

changed in the Great Vowel Shift (e.g. in *mate*, *name*, *while* etc.). Other sounds were reduced then eliminated, such as the k's and g's in the old clusters kn and gn (as in *knight* and *gnat*) and some of the remnants of Old English yogh, the old velar fricative (as in *neighbor* and *bough*). The result is the numerous set of "silent letters" that learners find so maddening.

By the late 1500s, under the impetus of printing the tremendous variety of spellings in written English had shaken down into a far smaller set of variants, and a great part of the outlines of the modern orthography was in place. Changes in orthographic norms slowed considerably, and Modern English was left with a spelling system from an earlier period of its history: essentially it is a normalized Middle English system. The result is a set of letter-to-sound mismatches greater than those of elsewhere in Europe, even in some respects greater than those of French, whose spelling was codified a little later.

In the late 1500s England became a Protestant country. As part of the new doctrine and its administration, new documents were needed such as liturgies for the recently-established Church of England, the Book of Common Prayer, and above all, English translations and copies of the Bible.

The push for an accessible version of Scripture, which meant an English Bible, began a few centuries earlier but was thwarted until the church and government adopted the basic tenets of the Reformation. A number of versions of the scripture in English were produced in the late 1500s, but the culmination of this trend was the King James Bible of 1611. This was the most influential and most widespread religious document of the age, and the norms adopted by the translators and printers of this Bible had an immense influence on writers.

With the growing use of written language, the need was felt for materials that presented aspects the language in a way that could be looked up by all who desired information about the language: first, non-native speakers and later also native speakers of the language who wanted to know about newly developed parts of the language that were not part of every native speakers' knowledge. The first dictionaries were essentially lists of "hard words", particularly the large number of new loanwords from the Classical languages and also from the new colonies overseas. By the 18th century dictionary-writing was becoming a recognized activity and scholars and other learned men were being commissioned by publishers to write such materials.

Elsewhere in Europe language academies were established to codify and normalize all aspects of language. This trend did not catch on in English-speaking lands and there has never been an officially recognized academy for standardization either in Britain or the U.S. There was however an English version of the trend towards "language purification" that swept European countries through the Renaissance and Enlightenment. (This trend never fully died out in the English speaking world, and we see its echoes in prescriptivism movements that seek to minimize foreign influences, which are viewed as threats, probably for nationalistic and ethnic-based reasons. Since languages do not degenerate but only change with the needs of their speakers, it is difficult to see how one language could actually be threatened as long as it has speakers--especially one such as

English with such a numerous body of speakers. A language can be threatened or endangered only if it ceases to be used at all.) Jonathan Swift was a vocal proponent of English language purification, but as is usual with purifiers, his knowledge of the history of the language was faulty and his beliefs about the reasons for particular norms and why they had to be upheld were irrational.

The publication of Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary of the English Language* was a milestone in the development of dictionary and reference materials. It adopted a more-or-less descriptivist stance which is very modern, and at odds with the prescriptive views of earlier producers of dictionaries. Johnson's recognition of change as a normal process and his refusal to see it as degeneration was novel and important.

By the time of Johnson's dictionary, the spelling system in place was recognizably that of current Modern English, with only a few orthographic peculiarities such as the spelling of *show* as *shew* and the use of the "long S" character (easily confused with the f of that time). Probably the typefaces in use at the time give more appearance of difference with modern texts than any of the remaining spelling differences between 18th century English and contemporary British English.

The political independence of the United States in the 1770s led to a push towards identifying distinguishing cultural factors. Language was an obvious way of distinguishing Americans from Britons, since a recognizable set of American pronunciation features had already developed. However, instead of using pronunciation differences to try to develop a separate written standard, Noah Webster wrote a dictionary containing some regional, American-dialect based definitions to set it apart, and also introduced into his dictionary and other writings a set of spellings that put a distinctive stamp on American orthography without changing it too much for mutual intelligibility. In other words, most of the spelling conventions that had solidified in the British standard written form by the early 19th century were maintained by Webster, but he added a few systematic differences: Using *-ize* instead of *–ise* for verbs derived from Greek verbs in *-izein*; eliminating *u* in the suffix *-our* (thus moving it away from the French-derived spelling of Middle English to a spelling somewhat more in line with pronunciation on both sides of the Atlantic), the replacement of *-re* in French loans by *-er* (*centre/center, theatre/theater*) and a few other simplications.

Movements advocating more drastic spelling reform of English emerged in the 18th century, and there are periodic resurgences of this trend, which represents an attempt to introduce efficiency and save time for new learners.

Benjamin Franklin devised an alphabetic system largely keeping English orthography the same but introducing single symbols for the current digraphs, and additional symbols for vowel distinctions not systematically represented in the writing system. (See link under this essay.)

George Bernard Shaw was a passionate advocate of total spelling reform and left his entire estate to be devoted to this project.

Systems for extreme changes of spelling, however rational, do not seem to gain much ground in the English speaking world, probably because updating the

spelling to match pronunciation would make older documents unintelligible for those learning only the new system, as well as giving trouble as to how to take account of variations in pronunciation. Another objection is that historically-oriented people (admittedly, a minority) would not like to see the history of words containing fossil traces of earlier forms (i.e. antiquated spellings) erased by updating to modern rational spellings.

The existing system has now gone on so long that it is difficult to turn the clock back too much at once, but only by doing so can the proponents gain their objective of an entirely rational correspondence between letters and sounds.

Some other European nations make small orthographic adjustments every generation or so, and thus keep their spelling gradually evolving along with (or actually a little bit behind) the pronunciation. The Scandinavian languages are well-known for this strategy. There was a spelling reform in Germany in 1989 or so, but it was not a drastic one, although portrayed as dire by some. Recently major national newspapers have declared their intention to go back to the old system, leaving language users in confusion about which standard to adopt.

Current orthography represents two major centers of standardization: British and American English. The British standard held sway throughout the world until very recently, when some other countries began to first accept and then to teach American orthography and lexical choices. (Grammatical features have been adopted with more reluctance it seems.) Pronunciation variants had been spread over the community rather than via writing, but the same changeover from British to American norms appears to be occurring.

In the English-speaking world beyond Britain and the U.S., the norms are coming into flux in some places. The spelling usages of former colonies Canada and Australia are undergoing change as the influence of the U.S. is felt more and more. These countries were tied to the mother country, Britain, longer, and have maintained largely British orthography, but proximity (in the case of Canada) and cultural influence are exerting pressure on the norms speakers choose. The use of U.S. spelling variants seems to be on the rise in the populace in these countries, despite resistance of schools and government. In other former colonies such changes are less obvious, but the same trend may be active.

The spread of electronic communication in the form of computers and phone texting have provided a large number of abbreviator conventions. The enforcers of spelling norms, schools and publishers, have so far maintained the current orthographic standards in printed documents. But because spelling norms are hard to acquire given all the spelling-pronunciation mismatches, and writing has become so democratized through these technologies, the use of non-standard spellings (not just abbreviations) is increasingly widespread. Such changes in usage patterns are bound to have some effect on the written language ultimately, just as speaker's usage of words eventually affects what are considered conventional norms. It is still too early to tell how these effects on the written language will play out. Publishing it as an industry feels endangered by the vital wave of un-edited electronic publication on the internet. What happens to publishing as an industry will probably affect how quickly new orthographic norms

are adopted, since publishing is one of the major conservative forces of orthographic standardization in the modern world. The others, schools, government, and church, seem less powerful in determining the form of the documents that are actually produced on paper.

Benjamin Franklin developed a keen interest in spelling reform and this is his system for a more rational spelling system for English. He even took the trouble to commission a type foundry to make the new letters needed for typesetting in his proposed system. (He was a printer/publisher after all.) He wrote an article about it in 1768 when he was living in London. But then he seems to have lost interest in the project, possibly because he could not interest anyone else in it.

In addition to links on writing and spelling reforms in a wide variety of languages, this site also includes some nice links to sites about writing systems, the relation of language to writing systems, spelling games and other curiosities, and issues related to spelling reform and literacy.

There is also a short list of campaigns for spelling reform in English. Overviews of reasons for reform, but arguments against reform are not given in depth. The overall point of view in this article, unlike in the one above, is pro-reform. There also have short descriptions of reform efforts for a number of languages.

2.3 Borrowings of nonstandard lexicon in modern English

Why are words borrowed? Sometimes it is done to fill a gap in vocabulary. When the Saxons borrowed Latin words for "butter", "plum", "beet", they did it because their own vocabularies lacked words for these new objects. For the same reason the words "potato" and "tomato" were borrowed by English from Spanish when these vegetables were first brought to England by the Spaniards.

There may be a word (or even several words) which expresses some particular concept, so that there is no gap in the vocabulary and there does not seem to be any need for borrowing. However a word is borrowed because it supplies a new shade of meaning or a different emotional coloring though it represents the same concept. This type of borrowing enlarges groups of synonyms and provides to enrich the expressive resources of the vocabulary. That is how the Latin "cordial" was added to the native "friendly", the French "desire" to "wish", the Latin "admire" and the French "adore" «liking and loving".

The historical circumstances stimulate the borrowing process. Each time two nations come into close contact. The nature of the contact may be different. It may be wars, invasions or conquests when foreign words are imposed upon the conquered nation. There are also periods of peace when the process of borrowing is due to trade and international cultural relations.

Do borrowed words change or do they remain the same? When words migrate from one language into another they adjust themselves to their new environment and get adapted to the norms of the recipient language. They undergo certain changes which gradually erase their foreign features, and, finally, they are assimilated. Sometimes the process of assimilation develops to the point when the foreign origin of a word is quite unrecognizable. It is difficult to believe now that such words as "dinner", "cat", "take", and "cup" are not English by origin. Others, though well assimilated, still bear traces of their foreign background. "Distance" and "development", for instance, are identified as borrowings by their French suffixes, "skin" and "sky" by the Scandinavian initial, "police" and "regime" by the French stress on the last syllable.

Borrowed words are adjusted in the three main areas of the new language system: the phonetic, the grammatical and the semantic.

The lasting nature of phonetic adaptation is best shown by comparing Norman French borrowings to later (Parisian) ones. The Norman borrowings have for a long time been fully adapted to the phonetic system of the English language: such words as "table", "plate", "courage", and "chivalry" bear no phonetic traces of their French origin. Some of the later (Parisian) borrowings, even the ones borrowed as early as the 15th century, still sound surprisingly French: "regime", "valise", "matinee", "cafe", and "ballet". In these cases phonetic adaptation is not completed.

Grammatical adaptation consists in a complete change of the former paradigm of the borrowed word. If it is a noun, it is certain to adopt, sooner or later, a new system of declension; if it is a verb, it will be conjugated according to the rules of the recipient language. Yet, this is also a lasting process. The Russian

noun "pal'to" was borrowed from French early in the 19th century and has not yet acquired the Russian system of declension. The same can be said about such English Renaissance borrowings as "datum" (pl. data), "phenomenon" (pl. phenomena), "criterion" (pl. criteria) whereas earlier Latin borrowings such as "cup", "plum", "street", "wall" were fully adapted to the grammatical system of the language long ago.

By semantic adaptation is meant adjustment to the system of meanings of the vocabulary. Sometimes a word may be borrowed "blindly" for no obvious reason: they are not wanted because there is no gap in the vocabulary or in the group of synonyms which it could fill. Quite a number of such "accidental" borrowings are very soon rejected by the vocabulary and forgotten. But some "blindly" borrowed words managed to establish itself due to the process of semantic adaptation. The adjective "large", for instance, was borrowed from French in the meaning of "wide". It was not actually wanted, because it fully coincided with the English adjective "wide" without adding any new shades or aspects to its meaning. This could have led to its rejection. Yet, "large" managed to establish itself very firmly in the English vocabulary by semantic adjustment. It entered another synonymic group with .the general meaning of "big in size". Still bearing some features of its former meaning it is successfully competing with "big" having approached it very closely, both in frequency and meaning.

Role of adoptions in any language is unequal and depends on definite historical events of a language development. In different languages adoptions have different influence on enrichment the word stock of any vocabulary. In some languages adoptions did not play such a great role that could have an essential affect on the stock word of the vocabulary. In other languages adoptions in different historical events have a strong impact on the word stock of the vocabulary, that event auxiliary words, as an example, prepositions adopted from other languages have ejected aboriginal words. Language is a living and moving thing.

In the English language the percent of adopted words is much higher than in any other languages as during various historical events it was very permeable. It is computed that quantity of aboriginal words in the English language make up only 30%.

Any influences of one language to another are explained by historical events: wars, conquests, trades, travailing, which give rise to more or less intimate communication of different language.

Adopted word usually assumes one or more meanings semantically close to its meaning words which were exist in the language earlier. Interaction of adoptions and word stock of any vocabulary is seen through the history of the language which denotes the meaning "rabotat' (to work), troodit'sya (to labour)" which are synonymous to "to work". After adoptions in middle-English period of verbs "*labouren* – troodit'sya, prilagat' bol'shiye usiliya " (from Old-French "*labourer*, Latin "*laborate*") and "*travaillen*- tyazhelo troodit'sya " (from Old-French "*travailler*", Latin "*trepaliare*"- "moochit'"). The very first verb is synonymous to aboriginal word "*swincan*" replacing this last from public language

to some territorial dialects. The second verb "*travailler*" did not withstand competition with the verb "*werken*" and that is why its meaning is "to travel" In this meaning it ejects aboriginal verb "*lithenan*- to travell" which was less used by the time the verb "*to travailer*" appeared.

The process of assimilation can be so deep that appearance of foreign words is not become aware of English spoken people and is possible to recognize only with the help of etymological analysis. In contrast to completely assimilated words partially assimilated units preserve marks of its foreign origin.

Adoption of vocabulary serves as consequence of intimacy of people on the ground of economic, political, scientific and cultural relations. In most cases adopted words come into language as a source of indication new things and expressions which were unknown earlier.

In the development of the word stock of the English vocabulary the great role played words adopted from Latin and French languages.

For example:

The English word "sport" is adopted during Middle- English period from Old-French language where it was "disport" and descended from Late-Latin "disportus".

Vocabulary adoptions are being descending in oral and written forms of the language. Words adopting by dint of oral means are quicker assimilate to the language. And words adopting by dint of written means are longer preserve their phonetic and orthographic peculiarities.

In the vocabulary of the English language there is a considerable layer of words called "barbarisms". These are words of foreign origin which have not entirely been assimilated into the English language. They are bear the appearance of a borrowing and are left as something alien to the native tongue. The role of foreign borrowings played in the development of the English language is well known, and the great majority of these borrowed words now form part of the rank and file of the English vocabulary.

It is the science of linguistics, in particular its branch Etymology, that reveals the foreign nature of this or that word. But most of what were formerly foreign borrowings are now not regarded as foreign. But still there are some words which retain their foreign appearance to a greater or lesser degree. These words, which are called barbarisms, are also considered to be on the outskirts of the literary language.

Most of them have corresponding English synonyms:
"Chic"= "stylish"- "элегантность, шик"
"Bon mot"= "a clever witty saying"-"остроумное выражение, острота"
"En passant= "in passing"-"мимоходом, случайно"
"Ad infinitum"= "to infinity"-"на неопределенно-долгое время"

"Foreignisms" do not belong to the English vocabulary. They are not registered by English dictionaries, except in a kind of addenda which gives the

meanings of the foreign words most frequently used in literary English. There are foreign words in the English vocabulary which fulfill a terminological function. Such Russian words are "*ukase*", "*udarnik*", "*soviet*", "*kolkhoz*" and the like denoted certain concepts which reflect an objective reality not familiar to English speaking communities.

Both foreign words and barbarisms are widely used in various styles of language with various aims, aims which predetermine their typical functions. One of these functions is to supply local colour. In order to depict local conditions of life, concrete facts and events, customs and habits, special care is taken to introduce into the passage such language elements as well reflect the environment.

A subfield of linguistics developed in the late 1870s, pragmatics studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation which is usually a conversation. It distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act of verbal communication. One is the informative intent or the sentence meaning, and the other the communicative intent or speaker. The ability to comprehend and produce a communicative act is referred to as pragmatic competence which often includes one's knowledge about the social distance, social status between the speakers involved, the cultural knowledge such as politeness, and the linguistic knowledge explicit and implicit.

There are not many loan words from Russian language. It is explained that relations between Russian language and English began not long time ago. During XVII- XVIII centuries the following Russian words penetrated to the English language:

"Astrakhan"
"Kopeck"
"Ukase"
"Samovar"

Most of adopted words got into English language after the October Revolution. Among them such words as:

"Soviet"
"Bolshevik"
"Komsomol"
"Kolkhoz"
"Sovkhoz"
"Socialist competition"
"Five-year plan"

During XX century more and more words appear in the English language which prove that English people is interested in the political occurrences in Russia.

Many adopted words are connected with the World War II. There are words denoting notions and realias appeared in the time of Hitlerite's regime. Here are several of them:

"Black Shirt"-"schwarhemd"
"Brown Shirt"-"braunhemd"
"Stormtroopers"- "stumabteilung"
"Nazi"-"natsist, fashist"

And some other loan words that came into the English language:

"Masterpiece" from German "meisterstuck"
"Wonder child" from German "wunderkind"

In England, as well as in other countries of Western Europe, the Latin language has an original location. During many centuries, after Christianity's appearance, this language was use to officiate to God. Public culture's evolution entailed the emergence of new notions. New words appeared from Latin language denoted notions out of the sphere of culture and life.

For example:

"Anchor"- from Latin "ancora"
"Box"-from Latin "buxus"
"Cappe (cap)"- form Latin "cappa"
"Pund (pound)"- from Latin "pondo"
"Assa (ass)"- from Latin "cesinus"
"Palm"-from Latin "palma"
"Engel (angel)"- from Latin "angelus"
"Kitchen"- from Latin "coquina"
"Piper"-from Latin "piper"

Altogether, by the calculation of the English linguist Bo, till the end of the Old-English period counted approximately four hundred and fifty Latin adoptions, exclusive of derivatives and proper names.

Distinguishing characteristic of the Latin adopted words in XVI-XVII centuries is that there are many verbs, adjectives, and not much nouns, whereas loan words? in the Old-English period are mostly consist of nouns.

Among adjective adopted words two main groups may be marked out:

- Adjectives, traced to the Latin adjectives.
- Adjectives, traced to the Latin participles.
- The term "loan-word" is equivalent to "borrowing".

Among the first group we may consider adjectives which end on "-al", "-ar", "-id", "-ous".

For example:

Adjectives ending on "-al":

"Annual"- from Latin "annualis"

"Cordial"- from Latin "cordialis"
"Dental"- from Latin "dentalis"
"Legal"-from Latin "legalis"

Adjectives ending on "-ar":

"Lunar"- from Latin "lunaris"
"Solar"- from Latin "solaris"
"Stellar"- from Latin "stellaris"
"Triangular"- from Latin "tringularis"

Adjectives ending on "-id":

"Gelid"- from Latin "gelidus"- "ice"
"Frigid"- from Latin "frigidus"-"cold"
"Livid"- from Latin "lividus"-"dead"

Adjectives ending on "-ous":

"Atrocious"- from Latin "atrox"-"cruel"
"Continuous"- from Latin "continuus"
"Obvious"- from Latin "obvius"

Among adopted adjectives in the Latin language there is one group represented as comparative adjectives of the Latin language.
For example:

"Exterior"-from Latin "exterior", comparative form -"exterus"- "external"
"Inferior"-from Latin "inferior", comparative form- "inferus"-"lower"
"Minor"-from Latin "minor", comparative form- "minus"-"small"

The second group is divided into two subgroups. The first subgroup consists of adjectives constituted from Latin participles of present tense. They have that sort of suffixes which correspond with Latin suffixes of participles of the present tense, such as "-ant", "-ent".
For example:

"Absent"-from Latin verb "abesse"
"Deficient"- from Latin verb "deficere"
"Indignant"- from Latin verb "indignari"
"Fragrant"-from Latin verb "fragnare"

The second subgroup is composed of adjectives produced from Latin participle of the past tense. Such adjectives have the following suffixes "-ate", "-

ete", "-t" which correspond with Latin participle of the past tense; the remnant suffix? "-ct", the prefix "dis-".

For example:

"Correct"- from Latin verb "corrigete"
"Desolate"- from Latin verb "desolare"
"Desperate"- from Latin verb "desperare"

By remnant suffixes are meant the ones that are only partially preserved in the structure of the word: Lat. (-ctus) >Lat. (-ct)

"Separate"- from Latin verb "separare"
"Disagree"- from Latin verb "disagree"

Verbs borrowed from Latin language to Modern English can be divided into two groups. The first group consists of verbs produced from Latin participle of the past tense of the verb. Such verbs have the following suffixes: "-ate", "-ute", "-t", which corresponds with suffixes of participle of the past tense of the Latin verb.

For example:

"Accumulate"- from Latin verb "accumulare"
"Decorate"- from Latin verb "decorare"
"Contribute"- from Latin verb "contribuere"
"Distribute"-from Latin verb "distribuere"
"Connect"- from Latin verb "connectere"
"Select"- from Latin verb "seligere"
"Collapse"- from Latin verb "collabi"
"Dismiss"- from Latin verb "dismittere"

The verbs of the second group produced from the stem of the present tense Latin verbs, which have such endings: "-el", "-de", "-end", "-mit", "-duce".

For example:

"Expel"- from Latin verb "expellere"
"Repel"- from Latin verb "repellere"
"Collide"- from Latin verb "collidere"
"Divide"- from Latin verb "dividere"
"Contend"- from Latin verb "contendere"
"Comprehend"- from Latin verb "comprehendere"
"Commit"- from Latin verb "commitere"
"Omit"- from Latin verb "omitter"
"Induce"- from Latin verb "inducere"
"Produce"- from Latin verb "priducere"

As well as Italian loan words Spanish adopted words first appeared in the English language in XVI century.

The development of foreign commerce in England in XVI century inevitably leads to collision of economic interests with Spain, which was accompanied by both on land and at sea. These factors made a great influence on learning some Spanish words. First of all, these words are connected with the commerce. It should be mentioned that these words essentially concern trade concepts, words denoting objects of commerce.

For example:

"Cargo"-"груз", form Spanish "cargo"
"Contraband" from Spanish "contrabando"
"Embargo" from Spanish "embargar"
"Banana" from Spanish "banana"
"Cacao" from Spanish "cocao"
"Cigar" from Spanish "cigarro"
"Potato" from Spanish "patata"
"Tobacco" from Spanish "tabaco"
"Tomato" from Spanish "tomate"

It is necessary to notice that several groups of words, which denoted particular natural phenomenon, plants and animals with which come across colonizers in their property, also penetrated to the English language.

For example:

"Canyon", from Spanish "canon"
"Savannah", from Spanish "sabana"
"Armadillo", from Spanish "armadillo"
"Coyote", from Spanish "coyote"
"Mosquito", from Spanish "mosquito"
"Hurricane", from Spanish "huracan"

In connection with Spanish- English wars there are many adopted words of military notions.

For example:

"Armada" from Spanish "armada"
"Galleon" from Spanish "galleon"
"Guerrilla" from Spanish "guerrilla"

The last word ("guerrilla") emerged in the English language at the beginning of XIX century during the war between Italian people against Napoleon. Besides these words there are some other words which do not constitute any group of words.

For example:

"Canoe", from Spanish "canoa"
"Corral", from Spanish "corral"
"Matador", from Spanish "matador"
"Mulatto", from Spanish "mulatto"
"Ranch", from Spanish "rancho"

The English noun "pica ninny" - "a Negro boy" appeared in the result of learning the Spanish word-combination "pequeno nino"-"a small boy, kitty".

Portuguese loan words almost entirely connected with the relations aroused from geographical discoveries. Mainly it were adopted words denoting new notions concerning with way of life and dispositions settlement of aboriginal population, with vegetative and animal's world, as well as words designating new objects of commerce. For instance, "negro"-"black"- this word gets into the English language in slave-holding time in Brazil, when Portuguese people imported there slaves from Africa.

Here are more examples:

"Albino", from Portuguese "alvo"-"white"
"Cobra", from Portuguese "cobra de campuz"
"Caste", from Portuguese "casta"
"Tank", from Portuguese "tanque"
"Marmalade", from Portuguese "marmelada"
"Buccaneer", from Portuguese "bucaneiro"

The word "albino" - a name of a bird or an animal came from an old word "alvo" - white. One Portuguese merchant called Negro- half-breeds. Now it is the name of all living things that do not have coloring including animals.

The next word is "cobra" – a name of a snake. There is a word "snake" in the English language to be replaced, but "cobra" is a definite type of snakes. When Portuguese people first saw it they have called it "cobra de cabelo" ("cobra de capuz") - a snake with hears.

The next is "caste". It was originated from the meaning "clean, untouched". It was the name of some groups of people, who honored their customs and traditions, signs and religion.

When the word "tank" (tanque) appeared in the English language it had only the meaning of "reservoir, stock". But during the World War I this word acquired its present-day meaning.

The word "marmalade" (from Portuguese "marmelada") descended from "Portuguese sweet dessert", which is cooked by dint of quince (Portuguese version is "marmelo"). The English people borrowed this meaning and gave the name to "jam, Confiteor ".

The word "buccaneer" - "pirate, sea bandit" (from Portuguese "bucaneiro") first denoted a wild sea-robber. And later all pirates were named as "buccaneer".

The loan words from Arabic language reflect cultural and commercial relations between Europe and East.

It should be noted that as well as Latin language was the language of scientists in the Medieval Europe so the Arabic language was the language of science in the ancient East. Several Arabic words were adopted by the Medieval Latin language and from it these words got to the English language.

Arabic loan words constitute many words of eastern origin into English language. Considerable quantity of Arabic words conveys the notions which are typical for the life in the East.

For example:

"Emir"- from Arabic "emir"
"Bedouin", from Arabic "Bedouin"
"Fakir", from Arabic "facur" - a poor man
"Lute", from Arabic "lute"
"Myrrh", from Arabic "myrrh"
"Sheikh", from Arabic "shaikn" – head of a tribe

The largest amount of Arabic words was adopted in XIV-XVI centuries. Mainly they were presented as scientific terms or they denoted the means of trade, especially eastern goods.

"Camphor", form Arabic "kafur"
"Alkali", from Arabic "al quali"
"Amber", from Arabic "anbar"
"Tara", from Arabic "tarhan taraha" - to through out
"Jar", from Arabic "jarrah"
"Mameluke" – slaves in Egypt in medieval times
"Caliph" originated from Arabic

There are more than 400 words and word combinations which came from the Scandinavian languages to the English language.

The very first words which penetrated from Scandinavian language to the English language were verbs.

"Call"- from Scandinavian "kalla"
"Take"- from Scandinavian "taka"

To the adopted words from Scandinavian languages belong also:

"Husband"- from Scandinavian "husbondi?"
"Window"- from Scandinavian "vindauga?"
"Anger" -from Scandinavian "angr"
"Ill"- from Scandinavian "illr"
"Weak"- from Scandinavian "veikr"

"Wrong"- from Scandinavian "vrangr"

That or those adopted words from Scandinavian languages to the English one penetrated not only because of they were connected with some new notions to the English people. It was mostly because in the process of communication between Scandinavian people and English people such words appeared to be more useful for adequate expressing thoughts.

Sc. "hus+bondi" means "inhabitant of the house".
Sc. "vindauga" means "the eye of the wind".

In overwhelming majority of cases there was an interaction between Scandinavian and English dialects and on the grounds of regular authentication as a dialect of that particular language. As a consequence of that a very new variant of the languages was emerging which include something in common of the two languages.

2.4 Analysis of peculiarities of nonstandard lexicon

This study addresses the distribution of nonstandard syntactic and lexical features in Indian English (IE) across a homogeneous group of highly educated IE speakers. It is found that nonstandard syntactic features of article use, number agreement and assignment of verb argument structure do not display uniform intragroup distribution. Instead, a relationship is found between nonstandard syntactic features and the sociolinguistic variables of lower levels of exposure to and use of English found within the group. While nonstandard syntactic features show unequal distribution, nonstandard lexical features of semantic reassignment, and mass nouns treated as count nouns display a more uniform intragroup distribution.

This pilot study is designed to stimulate further research in the quantitative analysis of oral IE by providing an analysis of the nonstandard syntactic and lexical features of fifteen IE speakers' oral narrative response to the Pear Story film (Chafe 1980, Erbaugh 2001). These IE speakers' narratives have been compared against a standard variety of English found in the Pear Story narratives of fifteen highly educated American English (AmE) speakers, students at the University of California at Berkeley (Erbaugh 2001). Syntactic and lexical features found in the IE narratives and not attested to in the AmE narratives are considered "nonstandard." The use of the term "nonstandard" is not intended to carry the meaning of "incorrect." For the purposes of this study, the term "nonstandard" is simply a more efficient way of describing syntactic and lexical features that are not found in the oral narrative of standard AmE speakers. The definition of the term "standard" can be found in Bhatia (1978: 226) and issues regarding highly educated speakers providing standard speech for analysis are discussed in the next section of the thesis, Context of the Research. In this study the nonstandard syntactic features found in the IE corpus are categorized according to type and discussed in relation to the research done on similar features found in other corpuses of IE. Nonstandard syntactic features are found in the categories of: a. Agreement b. Verbal argument structure c. Subordinate clauses 2 d. Modifier placement e. Article use Nonstandard lexical features are found in the categories of: a. Semantically based reassignment of words b. Noun compounding c. Use of Latinate terms d. Mass nouns e. 'Mitigators' f. Deictic adverb phrases g. Proverbs A possible relationship is found between these nonstandard features and the IE participants' exposure to and use of English. A relationship is found between lower levels of English use and exposure in the group and the presence of nonstandard syntactic features. Lexical features not found in the AmE narrative are distributed more evenly throughout the group of IE speakers. However, greater percentages of use and higher numbers of speakers exhibiting features are still found in the lower levels of English exposure and use. This finding points to the need to address sociolinguistic variables in the study of linguistic features of IE. Context of the Research This purpose of this section is to situate the present study within the body of research done in IE. It also explains the underpinnings of the structure of the study. Previously, a desire to define a standard IE has led many researchers to

study the speech of highly educated IE. The sample of highly 3 educated IE speakers found in this study was chosen in hopes of complementing previous research done in this area. Some of investigators lay the foundation for the choice of this sample of highly educated IE speakers. He begins by outlining two schools of thought towards IE - one, that there can be no "standard IE" because of the unsystematic nature of presence or absence of nonstandard features across different speakers' language, and a reaction to that line of thought, namely that those who state IE is unsystematic have not chosen a homogeneous sample of speakers whose speech would reflect a standard, nor have they been sensitive to language variation in different socio-cultural contexts. They discuss the use of an abstracted standard of Educated Indian English (EIE), around which the different varieties of IE would vary according to the level of proficiency of the speaker, the situation and socio-cultural context in which the English was being spoken, and the varying functions for which the English was being used. While various written forms of IE have been widely studied, oral data remains less attested to in the field. Research has been done on 'written, edited and printed' data, on the IE found in newspapers, on the written essays of college students, on the language found in guidebooks and in novels. Written questionnaires have been administered by Dixon (1991) and Sahgal & Agnihotri (1985) in regards to IE speakers' acceptability of attested IE features, and in an analysis of the request speech act. Researchers working with oral data include Sharma with research on syntactic features and article systems, and Baldridge who investigates linguistic and social features of IE. In many ways the study presented here is structured after Sharma's work in 2005. In Sharma (2005a,b) participants' nonstandard feature usage is correlated with the extent of the 4 participants' English use in formal and informal contexts. English use in formal situations (education) and informal (daily use) is found to be an indicator of proficiency. The correlation is done in order to discern the difference between "second language acquisition (SLA) features and emergent dialect features." SLA features are found to correlate with lower levels of formal and informal use of English. Emergent dialect features are seen in speakers with both higher levels of formal and informal English use and lower levels. In Sharma (2005a) an implicational analysis shows that nonstandard article use is perhaps more stable than variables such as nonstandard copula use and lack of agreement. However, a multivariate analysis shows that articles are also guided by proficiency. Sharma (2005b) continues working with the data obtained from these interviews to discern whether the article use of these speakers is systematically divergent from standard article systems. Sharma's findings on articles in IE do not agree with the article use displayed by participants in the present study, though Sharma does reference Tarone and Parrish (1988), saying that article use may be more standard in narrative genres "due to the greater communicative burden of precise and efficient reference" (2005b: 562). Sharma's basic method of exploring the relationship between sociolinguistic variables and feature use in IE is used in this study to further investigate the potential effect of sociolinguistic variables on feature use.

Standard English and education are closely entwined, since education is the main channel for transmitting SE to speakers of other varieties and of teaching

formal and written registers to all; and SE is the medium of most lessons and of the formal discourse of education. At one time there was a debate about whether schools should teach SE at all, and in particular about the need to teach spoken SE, but this debate has now been replaced by general agreement that schools should teach both written and spoken SE. (In practice, given the overlaps between varieties mentioned above, this would involve teaching, or drawing attention to, features that distinguish standard and non-standard forms.) CLIE sees no reason to disagree with this view.

A similar consensus exists about responses to non-standard forms. These are no longer described in educational circles as 'wrong' or as 'mistakes', but are recognized as linguistically equivalent to their standard alternatives: official publications contain few negative references to non-standard varieties. Indeed, it would be fair to say that official publications hardly mention non-standard varieties at all (and equally rarely try to define SE).

This benign neglect is not enough to give non-standard varieties the status they should have as the varieties used by most school-children. The principle of 'starting where the child is' demands more serious attention, both in policy documents and in the classroom, to the varieties of English that most children know already. The arguments are familiar from the literature on community languages and English as an Additional Language; but they are rarely applied to non-standard varieties.

CLIE therefore believes that local non-standard forms should be much more 'visible' in the curriculum. As the normal speech of most pupils, they should be the starting point both for learning about SE and for exploring general principles of language – 'Knowledge About Language'. We urge educationalists to devote more research to the question of how best to realize this principle.

Paradoxically, therefore, we end a statement about the teaching of SE by focussing on the importance of teaching about non-standard varieties.

Problems of interaction of language and society, language and culture, remaining urgent in modern linguistics, it can't be successfully resolved without studying of specifics of use of language in various sectors of society, social and professional groups, without careful research its social dialectal stratification and a functional and stylistic variation.

In the last decades of the 20th century the literary language, especially in the colloquial form, comes under the strongest influence of the slangy and colloquial language environment which is expressed, on observations of scientists, as in a flow of the non-standard lexicon which has rushed on pages of fiction, journalism, etc. and in more free, than earlier, use of obscene lexicon, including the mass media; this process has accepted as well a form of expansion of the morphological and syntactic models not characteristic or low-characteristic of traditional system of the literary language. At the same time it is possible to note that many of professional translators, teachers and experts in other areas which are professionally connected with foreign languages weren't ready to adequate perception of modern versions of non-standard lexicon.

The term 'Standard English' described a form of the English language that was universal or common in the nineteenth century. By the beginning of the last century, however, it had become associated with social class and was seen by many as the language of the educated. Rural dialects had become revalorized as 'class dialects' and one of the main symbols of class became pronunciation.

Standard English is still referred to and spoken by British people who have a very high, perhaps even the highest, social status and therefore are the most influential, educated, prestigious and wealthiest people in the United Kingdom.

However, they are the minority of the British population. Only a small percentage of UK residents have upper or upper-middle class backgrounds.

Therefore, no more than 9%-12% of the British population speaks Standard English with a regional accent and only 3-5% speaks it without any regional accent.

On the contrary, nonstandard dialects have a distinct grammar, lexis and pronunciation and vary greatly throughout the United Kingdom; for instance, a nonstandard dialect speaker might use the forms 'I ain't done it', 'them sandshoes over there' or 'she sings nice'. The dialects of rural areas often contain more distinctive lexis and grammar than those of urban areas, because speakers of these varieties are not often exposed to being in contact with speakers of other dialects.

Speakers from lower classes tend to use nonstandard dialect features more excessively, because they are more likely to have left education earlier, have non-professional jobs and therefore have no need to associate themselves with specific lexis or a 'prestige' way of speaking. Hence, the use of nonstandard dialect words, grammar and pronunciation decreases the longer an individual spends in education as they have to be more 'aware' of the context as speakers from other social classes [1].

Relevance of studying of the communicative and pragmatic status and language essence of the case of non-standard lexicon is caused by the theoretical and practical importance of development of a problem "language and society" in borders of a modern paradigm of linguistic knowledge. This perspective includes aspects of interaction of the literary speech with nonliterary, a social and professional variation of lexicon constituting it of functional and stylistic differentiation of dictionary structure in different communicative spheres, interdependence of linguistic and extra-linguistic determinants of the language options. This are meant by more liberal approach to development of a problem of social differentiation of language in the context of a general perspective of a variation of means of language taking into account real language behavior of the person caused not only his language competence, but also knowledge of the social caused connotations which are available for language signs.

To put matters in a different perspective, the linguist Paul Kerswill argues in *RP, Standard English and the standard/non-standard relationship* that social mobility leads to dialect leveling, i.e. the reduction of differences between local accents and dialects and the development of new features that are adopted by speakers over a wide area.

This is extremely common in urban areas, such as London and Tyneside. New linguistic features diffuse in these areas and due to the high degrees of contact and mobility of the speakers, linguistic homogenization might be an outcome in the future [2].

Estuary English (EE) is one example – it is the only regional levelling process that has received a name. The British linguist David Rosewarne coined the term 'Estuary English' in 1984. He describes the variation as a 'variety of modified regional speech (…) a mixture of non-regional and local south-eastern English pronunciation and intonation' [3].

John Wells defines EE as 'standard English spoken with an accent that includes features localizable in the southeast of England' and David Crystal refers to it as a 'continuum of pronunciation possibilities', because the elements of this dialect share Cockney and Received Pronunciation (henceforward RP) features.

EE has some distinctive lexical features. Coggle (*Do You Speak Estuary?*) and Rosewarne (*Estuary English – tomorrow's RP?*) mentioned that there is a frequent use of the word 'cheers' in preference to 'Thank you', the word 'mate' is used frequently and the original meaning of the word 'basically' is extended and used as a gap filler [4].

Additionally, both linguists state that speakers of EE are not averse of using American terms, for instance 'There you go' as an alternative to the British equivalent 'Here you are', 'Excuse me' instead of 'Sorry' and 'No way' as a substitute of 'By no means'.

Morphological speaking, there is a frequent use of the word 'innit' as opposed to tag questions, as in 'She is nice, innit?' in contrast with 'She is nice, isn't she?'. The word 'ain't' is used occasionally instead of the negative form of the present tense of the verb 'be', for instance 'I ain't coming' as a substitute for 'I am not coming' and as a replacement for the negative present tense of the auxiliary verb 'have', forming the present perfect tense, for example 'I ain't done it' rather than 'I have not done it'.

Furthermore, similar to the Cockney accent, there is a generalization of the past tense plural 'was', such as 'You was there' instead of 'You were there'. Sometimes there is an omission of the adverbial suffix '-ly', as in 'You are going too slow' as opposed to 'You are going too slowly'.

Socio-stylistic variation or evidence for non-standard forms, including lower-class, uneducated, and emotive uses (often called 'vulgar' or 'low' by contemporaries), is investigated with the help of metacomments, pauper letters and the treatment of taboo usage. Two case-studies on demonstrative them and non-standard third-person subject-verb concord show the features to be very rare in the Corpus of English Dialogues and to occur predominantly in authentic spoken contexts and with lower-ranking speakers. We argue that rarity is an indicator for non-standard status, but also that the status of these features is different from that of modern sociolinguistic markers [5].

With the appeal of linguistics to "a human factor", to the native speaker – the person, the speaking, clever person, the stage of researches which were under construction on formal criteria of the analysis of language has ended. Efforts of

linguists even more often began to go to a research of speech messages taking into account speech influence as most important means of human communication. As a result to the forefront there is a pragmatics which subject Yu. S. Stepanov defines as "the choice of language means from the cash repertoire for the best expression of the thought or the feeling, expression of the most exact or beautiful, or the most corresponding to circumstances, or for the most successful lie; for the best influence on listening or reading – with the purpose to convince it, either to excite and touch, or to make laugh, or to mislead" (Stepanov, 1981). Thus, pragmatical function of language materializes in conscious intention of the sender of the message to make the corresponding impact on the recipient. At the same time from the point of view of cognitive approach of the pragmatist it is understood as area of opinions, estimates, presumptions and installations speaking [6].

Emotional, expressional, estimated and stylistic components of a lexical meaning quite often accompany each other in the speech therefore they are often mixed, and these terms use as synonyms. But coincidence of components isn't obligatory; presence of one of components doesn't involve obligatory presence of all others, and they can meet in different combinations.

Let's review at first an example where at connotations of a number of words really there are at the same time all four components. In the following example many words have vulgar and colloquial coloring, are emotional, expressivna also don't leave any doubt concerning character of feelings of Tim Kendal to the wife:

Then Tim Kendall lost control of himself. «For God's sake, you damned bitch,» he said, «shut up, can't you? D'you want to get . me hanged? Shut up I tell you. Shut that big ugly mouth of yours». (A. Christie. *A Caribbean Mystery).*

Especially typically in this plan of shut up — the word the rough, colloquial, expressing strong degree irritations, and at the same time figurative. The component of assessment is present, but it is displaced as the negative relation is directed not to the fact that the person will become silent, and on what he tells.

Coincidence of components can be shown also on separate words. B. Charlston1 quotes following a row with the usual, not depending on a context emotionality: cad, coward, sneak, snob, prig, tale-bearer, boor, lout, stooge, busy-body, spiv, double-crosser, whipper-snapper, trash, tripe.etot a number of accusatory epithets it would be possible to continue. All these words have various denotational meaning, but an identical emotional component and identical negative assessment as express indignation of these or those shortcomings or defects. Figurativeness inherent in these words does them expressional, and the habitual association with familiar and colloquial style, or a slang, allows to establish also existence of the fourth component.

All four components of connotations are obligatory also for words of a slang. The slang belongs to number of the most studied, or, in any case, most in detail described, and at the same time most disputable layers of lexicon. A slang are called the rough or comic especially colloquial words and expressions applying for novelty and originality.

The principle of differentiation of types of connotations offered above helps to find also to these words the place in the general lexical system of language.

Really, at words of a slang surely there are all types of connotations: emotional component in most cases ironical, contemptuous and respectively estimated. Stylistically slengizm are accurately opposed to literary norm, and in it partly the sense of novelty of their use. They always have synonyms in literary lexicon and, thus, are as if the second, more expressional, than usual, names of the objects for some reason or other summoning the emotional relation. Their expressivity relies on figurativeness, wit, surprise, sometimes amusing distortion.

The slang, thus, is the lexical layer consisting of words and expressions with full and besides a specific set of the usual connotations different from the neutral synonyms these connotations.

It is necessary to make a reservation that habitual expression of "the word of a slang" not absolutely precisely as along with separate words can be units of a slang and very often there are lexico-semantic versions of words which semantic structure includes also other, not so slang options.

Language of some professional groups which is available to understanding only to them is considered slang. The words delimited by the use by any social or age group, especially in criminal circles belong to slang. Scientists can't still come to a consensus whether carry slang and slang to a special slang or to consider it separate group of non-standard lexicon. Because of the rough and obscene character vulgarisms unambiguously carry to non-standard lexicon. They bear in themselves value which is defined as a taboo from the point of view of Standard English.

Being a part of national language and reflecting its regulations, non-standard lexicon is created on its tendencies and laws of development. Sometimes these words are borrowed from other languages. A significant amount of such words results from different transfers, metaphorical and, rarer, the metonymical.

Any language is social by the nature and for this reason it can't exist and develop out of society. Language, first of all, is the means of communication between people who actively influence forming of its lexicon. At the same time it is impossible to forget that language represents sign system with the internal laws of functioning.

In any developed language the same thought can be expressed differently depending on a situation. There are words neutral which are a language kernel also the words which are used in certain situations stylistically painted are used irrespective of the sphere of communication, and such words are noted in dictionaries as nonliterary which we also call them as non-standard lexicon.

CONCLUSION

At present, non-standard language varieties appear both in literature and film or television series quite often. Such a tradition can be traced especially in the field of fiction—G. B. Shaw's *Pygmalion* published in 1912, Zora Neale Hurston's *Their Eyes Were Watching God* written in the 1930's, or Harper Lee's To Kill a Mockingbird published in 1960 can be named as a few examples; from a wide range of more recently published novels, *Trainspotting* by Irvine Welsh, or Peter Carey's *True History of the Kelly Gang* can be listed.

At present, Standard English is seen as a variety or a dialect; it includes grammar, vocabulary and orthography, and excludes phonetic features, because its speakers may use various accents. It is not a local variety, because one cannot tell from where the addresser comes. Since most people speak admixtures of local regional dialects and Standard English, it is considered a minority variety, although it carries the most prestige and is widely understood.

Even though some scholars argue today that the need for standardized language is connected to a certain ideology about - speaking properly, a great deal of attention is still paid to language codification and standardization. Many native speakers and learners of various languages believe that there should be an institution, authority or at least a publication prescribing the correct way of speaking and writing.

Pragmatic information is also already incorporated in some works in the form of "usage notes" and "language notes". The importance of collocations is fully acknowledged in many recent reference books. The productive patterns of word-formation also find special attention in the latest editions of some works. These are "steps in the right direction". What goes for lexicography also holds to a large extent for language learning and language teaching. It is the duty of the lexicographer and the teacher alike to draw on the insights of linguistics into the internal and external lexical structure, without neglecting at the same time the limits of the discovered generalizations and the influence of extralinguistic factors. Above all, the function of words in context and the creative forces of lexical rules and semantic processes must be seen as the fundamental tools which help learners to come to grips with the universe around them.

LIST OF USED SOURCES

1. Агапова С.Г. Прагмалингвистический аспект английской диалогической речи: Автореф. дис. докт. филол. наук. - Ростов-на-Дону, 2003. - 41с.

2. Аракин В.Д . Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков.- Л.: Просвещение, 1979. - 260 с.

3. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. М.: Наука, 1998. - 896 с.

4. Ахманова О.С. Дихотомия «язык-диалект» в свете проблем современного билингвизма // Проблемы двуязычия и многоязычия. М.: Наука, 1972. - сс. 98-102.

5. Баранникова JI.И. Просторечие и литературная разговорная речь // Язык и общество: Межвуз. науч. сб. Вып. 4 / Отв. ред. Л.И. Баранникова. Саратов: Изд-во Сарат. ун-та, 1977, сс. 59-77.

6. Баранникова Л.И. Просторечие как особый социальный компонент языка // Язык и общество: Сборник статей. Вып. 3. Саратов: Изд-во Сарат. унта, 1974, сс. 3-22.

7. Беликов В.И., Крысин Л.П. Социолингвистика. - М.: Институт «Открытое общество», 2001. - 436 с.

8. Беляева Т.М., Хомяков В.А. Нестандартная лексика английского языка. - Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1985. - 316 с.

9. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. - М.: Прогресс, 2002. - 373 с.

10. Бенедиктова Т.Д., Раренко М.Б «Образ речи» в романе. К проблеме моделирования национально-специфического дискурса. - М.: Наука, 2002. - 113 с.

11. Береговская Э.М. Молодежный сленг: формирование и функционирование // Вопросы языкознания, 1996, №3, сс. 32-41

12. Беркнер С.С., Ильинская С.В. Язык молодых американцев в художественной прозе США конца XX века // Коммуникативные и прагматические компоненты в лингвистическом исследовании. - М.: Наука, 2000, сс. 3-7.

13. Беркнер С.С. Проблемы развития разговорного английского языка в XVI-XX веках. - Воронеж: Изд-во Воронеж, ун-та, 1978.

14. Берман И.М. К вопросу о вставочном словообразовании (англ. яз) // - ИЯв шк., 1960. №4, сс. 106-112.

15. Берн Э.Л. Игры, в которые играют люди. Психология человеческих взаимоотношений / пер. с англ. А. А. Грузберга; терминологическая правка В. Данченка. - Киев: PSYLIB, 2004. – 242 с.

16. Блумфилд Л. Язык. - М.: УРСС, 2002. - 607 с.

17. Бондалетов В.Д. Социальная лингвистика. - М.: Просвещение, 1987. - 160 с.

18. Бондаренко М.В. Типы метонимического переноса и проблемы их системного описания (на материале английского языка): Автореф. дис. . канд. филол. наук. – Л., 1980. - 16 с.

19. Борисова Л.М. Исторические корни современной неформальной лексики американского варианта английского языка: Дисс. канд. филол. наук. - М., 2001. - 310 с.

20. Вердиева З.Н. Семантические поля в современном английском языке. - М.: Высш. шк., 1986. - 120 с.

21. Вилюман В.Г. Английская синонимика (введение в теорию синонимии и методику изучения синонимов). - М.: Высш. шк., 1980. - 128 с.

22. Виноградов В.А. Идиолект // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. - М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1990.

23. Винокур Т.Г. Говорящий и слушающий: Варианты речевого поведения. - М.: Высшая школа, 1993. - 371 с.

24. Винокуров А.М. Субстандартная суффиксация в английском языке США: Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Калинин, 1981. - 16 с.

25. Гальперин И.Р. О термине «сленг» // Вопросы языкознания, 1956, №6, сс. 107-114.

26. Говердовский В.И. История понятия коннотации // Филол. науки, 1979. №2, с. 135.

27. Грачев М.А. Русское арго. - Н. Новгород: Изд-во Нижегор. ун-та им. Н.А. Добролюбова, 1997. - 246 с.

28. Гусева Т.А. Просторечная суффиксальная номинация (на материале производных имен существительныхамер. просторечия): Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Л., 1983. - 16 с.

29. Девкин В.Д. О видах нелитературности речи // Городское просторечие. Проблемы изучения / Отв. ред. Е.А.Земская, Д.Н. Шмелев. - М.: Наука, 1984, сс. 12-21.

30. Дубровина К.Н. Студенческий жаргон // Филологические науки, 1980, №1, сс. 78-82.

31. Елистратов В.С. Сленг как пассиолалия // Вестник МГУ. Сер. 19. Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. - М.: Изд-во МГУ, 2000, №4, сс. 42-48.

32. Ермакова О.П. Номинация в просторечии // Городское просторечие. Проблемы изучения /Отв. ред.: Е.А.Земская, Д.Н. Шмелев. - М.: Наука, 1984, сс. 130-140.

33. Жельвис В.И Поле брани: Сквернословие как социальная проблема в языках и культурах мира. Издание второе, переработанное и дополненное. - М.: Ладомир, 2001. - 349 с.

34. Жура В.В. Эмоциональный дейксис в вербальном поведении английской языковой личности: Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Волгоград, 2000. - 23 с.

35. Заботкина В.И. Новая лексика английского языка. - М., 1991.

36. Казаева Н.Н. Английская субколлоквиальная лексика: Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Одесса, 1983. - 19 с.

37. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. - Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. - 477 с.

38. Конецкая В.П. Введение в сопоставительную лексикологию германских языков. - М.: Высш., шк, 1993. - 201 с.

39. Коровушкин В.П. К проблеме классификации вокабуляра просторечия как компонента социально-коммуникативной системы национального английского языка // Бюллетень передового опыта. Вып. пятый /Отв. за вып. В.В. Савчик. - Череповец: ЧВВИУРЭ, 1985, сс. 58-64.

40. Лихачёв Д.С. Картёжные игры уголовников // Словарь тюремно-лагерно-блатного жаргона: Речевой и графический портрет советской тюрьмы / Авторы-составители Д.С. Балдаев, В.К. Белко, И.М. Исупов. М.: Края Москвы, 1992. - сс. 398-405.

41. Маковский М.М. Английские социальные диалекты (онтология, структура, этимология). - М.: Высш. шк., 1982. - 135 с.

42. Максимов Б.Б. Фильтруй базар: Словарь молодежного жаргона города Магнитогорска. - Магнитогорск: МаГУ, 2002. - 506 с.

43. Массина С.А. Профессионализация терминов в подъязыках разных типов: (К проблеме функциональной стратификации языка): Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Саратов, 1991. - 14 с.

44. Матвеева Т.В. Лексическая экспрессивность в языке. - Свердловск: УрГУ, 1986.-92 с.

45. Мешков О.Д. Семантические аспекты словосложения английского языка. - М.: Наука, 1986. - 209 с.

46. Миллер А.А. Стилистически сниженная лексика и ее отражение в двуязычных словарях: Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Алма-Ата, 1972. - 38 с.

47. Нурова Л.Р. Синонимические ряды в сниженной лексике (на материале лексических единиц, объединенных значением «интеллектуально несостоятельный человек»): Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Нижний Новгород, 2002.- 18 с.

48. Нырко А.И. Рифмованная субституция в английском просторечии (социолингвистический аспект). Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Пятигорск, 1999.- 16 с.

49. Орлов Г.А. Современная английская речь. - М.: Высш. шк., 1991. - 238 с.

50. Палий С.П. Структурно-маркированные образования в американском просторечии: Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Пятигорск, 1999. - 16 с.

51. Портянникова В.Н. Стилистические особенности молодежных жаргонизмов // Теория и практика лингвистического описания разговорной речи. Вып. 6. - Горький, 1975.- С. 133-143.

52. Рябова К.М. Коллоквиальная лексика современного английского языка: Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Одесса, 1980. - 18 с.

53. Садохин А.П. Введение в теорию межкультурной коммуникации. - М.: Высш. шк., 2005. - 310 с.

54. Сафонова Л.В. О лингвистической сущности пейоративности в лексике // Теория и методы лексикологических исследований: Сб. науч. тр. - Л.: Изд-во ЛГПИ им. А.И.Герцена, 1985. - С. 52-58.

55. Скворцов Л.И. Литературный язык, просторечие и жаргоны в их взаимосвязи // Литературная норма и просторечие: Сб. статей. - М., 1977. - сс. 29-57.

56. Скворцов Л.И. Профессиональные языки, жаргоны и культура речи // Русская речь. - М., 1972.-№ 1, сс. 48-59.

57. Скворцов Л.И. Теоретические основы культуры речи. - М.: Наука, 1980. - 350 с.

58. Скворцов Л.И. Об оценках языка молодежи (жаргон и языковая политика) // Вопросы культуры речи / Отв. ред. С.И. Ожегов. - М.: Наука, 1964, Вып. 5. - сс. 45-70.

59. Скребнев Ю.М. Ведение в коллоквиалистику. - Саратов: Изд-во Сарат. ун-та, 1985. - 210 с.

60. Смирнова О.В История становления англоязычной просторечной лексикографии /XVI-XX вв./. - Л.: Лениздат, 1966. - 453 с.

61. Соболева В.Ю. Функционально маркированная специальная лексика в словаре и тексте: Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - Самара, 2000. - 22 с.

62. Турлыбеков Б.Д., Уразбаева А.К. О разновидностях межкультурной коммуникации // Вестник-Хабаршы МКТУ им. Х.А.Ясави, №1, Туркестан, 2016, сс.

63. Турлыбеков Б.Д., Уразбаева А.К. Об уровнях, стилях и типах обращения в профессиональной сфере //Материалы IV традиционной Международной научно-практической конференции «Актуальные проблемы профессионального обучения в условиях новой формации», III том, Туркестан, 2016, СС. 385-389.

64. Турлыбеков Б.Д., Уразбаева А.К. О соотносимости стандартной и нестандартной лексики современного английского языка //Казахская академия образования, №1, 2017, сс.

65. Уразбаева А.К. Номинативный аспект лексики студенческой молодёжи // Акад. Е.А.Букетов атындағы Қарағанды мемлекеттік университетінің 40-жылдығына арналған студенттер мен магистранттар арасындағы халықаралық ғылыми еңбектер байқауының материалдары. – Қарағанды, 2012, 130-132 бб.

66. Хомяков В.А. Введение в изучение сленга основного компонента английского просторечия. - Вологда, 1971. - 104 с.

67. Хомяков В.А., Коровушкин В.П. Просторечие как внутренний ресурс пополнения словарного состава литературного английского языка. // Проблемы пополнения словарного состава романо-германских языков. - Л., 1983. сс. 48-53.

68. Хомяков В.А., Коровушкин В.П. О классификации нестандартных редупликатов и аллитератов (на материале американского военного жаргона) // Словосочетания и сложные слова в терминосистемах и литературной норме. - Владивосток: ДВНЦ АН СССР, 1984. сс. 24-31.

69. Хомяков В.Н. Рифмованный слэнг и вторичная номинация // Вторичная номинация в современном английском языке: Межвуз. сб. научн. трудов / Отв. ред. Б.В. Пупченко. - Пятигорск: ПГПИИЯ, 1987. - сс. 12-16.

70. Хомяков В.А. Нестандартная лексика в структуре английского языка национального периода: автореф. дис. … д-ра филол. наук. - Л., 1980. -39 с.

71. Царев П.В. Продуктивное именное словообразование в современном английском языке. - М., 1984. - 225 с.

72. Швейцер А.Д. Социальная дифференциация английского языка в США. - М., 1983. - 216 с.

73. Шилина М.В. Лингвистические средства создания экспрессивности в английском художественном тексте (на основе использования стилистически маркированной / немаркированной лексики): Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. - М., 2000. - 16 с.

74. Щукин В.Г. Лингвистические аспекты проблемы идиолекта: Автореф. дис. .канд. филол. наук. - Л., 1978. – 21 с.

75. Щукин В.Г. О лингвистическом содержании понятия «идиолект» // Лингвистика и модели речевого поведения: Межвузовский сборник научных трудов. - Л.: ЛГУ, 1984. - сс. 21-26.

76. Ярцева В.Н. Соотносительность региональных и социальных вариантов языка в плане стиля и нормы // Социальная и функциональная дифференциация литературных языков. М.: Наука, 1977. - сс. 12-26.

77. Adams, M. Slang: The People's Poetry. – Oxford; N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2012. – 256 p.

78. Adams Y. An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation. - London: Longman, 1973. - VIII, 230 p.

79. Austin J. L. How to do things with words. - Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. - 453 p.

80. Bierwisch M. Social differentiation of language structure // Language in focus: foundations, methods and systems. - Dordrecht; Boston, 1976. - 613 p.

81. Bridgman, Richard. The colloquial style in America. - New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1966. - 254 p.

82. Coleman S.I. Dialect, Jargon and Slang. - London: Folklore Academy, 1962. - 12 p.

83. Coupland N. Dialect in use: Sociolinguistic variation in Cardiff English. - Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1988. - XIV, 175 p.

84. Draskau J. Toward a clarification of the concept jargon // Fachsprache. - Wien, 1983. JG. 5. № 1. S. 11-24.

85. Flexner S.B. American Slang // The American Language in the 1970s. A Collection of Articles. - San Francisco (Calif.), 1974. - P. 70-86.

86. Foster B. The Changing English Language. - New York, 1968. - 243 p.

87. Grimshaw A.D. Language as social resource. - Stanford (Cal.): Stanford University Press, 1981. - XIV, 373 p.

88. Haugen E. From Idiolect to Language //Haugen S. Studies by Einar Haugen Presented on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday April 19, 1971. - The Hague-Paris, 1972. - P. 415-421.

89. Hotten J.C. A short History of slang, or the vulgar language of fast life // Hotten J.C. The slang dictionary. - East Ardsley: EP publishing Ltd., 1972. P. 34-70.

90.   Hudson K. The Jargon of the Professions. - London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1979. - 146 p.

91.   Hudson R. A. Sociolinguistics. - Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1980. - XII, 250 p.

92.   Hymes D. Foundations in sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic approach. - London: Tavistock, 1977. - X, 248 p.

93.   Irving L.A. The City in Slang: New York Life and Popular Speech. - New York: Oxford University Press, 1993. - VIII, 307 p.

94.   Jacobson R. Verbal communication / Scientific American. 1972. - Vol. 227, № 3. P. 73 - 80.

95.   Labov, W. The study of Non-standard English. Champaign (111): Center for applied linguistics, Illinois, 1970. - 73 p.

96.   Labov W. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Center for Applied Linguistics. - Washington, 1966. - 647 p.

97.   Lehnert M. Substandard English (Vulgärenglisch). - Berlin: AkademieVerl., 1981. - 104 S.

98.   Lewin E, Lewin A.E. The thesaurus of slang: 150,000 uncensored contemporary slang terms, common idioms, and colloquialisms arranged for quick and easy reference / Esther Lewin and Albert E. Lewin. - New York; Oxford: Facts On File cop. 1988. - XI, 435 p.

99.   Mattiello, E. An Introduction to English Slang. A Description of Its Morphology, Semantics and Sociology. – Milano: Polimetrica Publisher, 2008. – 320 p.

100. Mattiello, Elisa. The Pervasiveness of Slang in Standard and Non-Standard English. - Mots Palabras Words-*6/2005. – 41 p. www.ask.com/ questions-about/British-slang*

101. Mencken H.L. The American Language: An inquiry into the development of English in the United States. - New York: Knopf, 1980. - XI, 769, XXIX p.

102. Partridge E. The World of Words. - London, 1938.

103. Partridge E. Usage and Abusage. A Guide to Good English. - Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1978. - 380 p.

104. Partridge, Eric. Slang to-day and yesterday: With a short hits, sketch; and vocabularies of English, American, and Australian slang. - London etc.: Routlege & Kegan Paul, 1979. - IX, 476 p.

105. Puxley, R. Complete Cockney Rabbit: The Ultimate Dick 'n' Arry of Rhyming Slang. – London: JR Books, 2008. – 496 p.

106. Sagarin, Edward. The anatomy of dirty words. With an introduction by Prof. Allen Walker Read. - New York: Stuart, 1962. - 220 p.

107. Soudek L. Structure of substandard words in British and American English. - Bratislava: SAV, 1967. - 228 p.

108. Wilson K.G. The Columbia guide to Standard American English. - New York: Columbia University Press, 1993. - XV, 482 p.

109. Wyld H.C. A history of Modern Colloquial English. - Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956. - XVIII, 433 p.

Dictionaries

1. Англо-русский словарь американского сленга. М.: Инфосерв, 1994. - 544 с.

2. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. Изд. 2-е - М.: УРСС, 2004. - 576 с.

3. Глазунов С.А. Новый англо-русский словарь современной разговорной лексики. - М.: Русский язык, 2000. - 776 с.

4. Квеселевич Д.И. Толковый словарь ненормативной лексики русского языка. - М.: ООО «Издательство Астрель», 2003. – 1021 с.

5. Левикова С.И. Большой словарь молодежного сленга. - М.: ФАИР-ПРЕСС, 2003. - 928 с.

6. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / Гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. - М.: Сов.энциклопедия, 1990. - 685 с.

7. Нефедова Е.А. Экспрессивный словарь диалектной личности. -М.: Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 2001. 144 с.

8. Советский энциклопедический словарь / Гл. ред. Прохоров А.М. -М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1987. - 1599 с.

9. Collins Gem Thesaurus: A dictionary of Synonyms. - Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992. - 498 p.

10. Richard A. Spears. Dictionary of American Slang. - National Textbook Company. Lincoln Wood. Illinois, USA, 1991. - 527 p.

11. Clarence Major. Dictionary of Afro-American Slang. - New York: International Publishers Co., 1975. - 625 p.

12. Farmer, J.S, Henley W.E. Dictionary of slang and colloquial English. -N.Y.: Dutton & Co, 1929. - VIII, 533 p.

13. Flower H.W. A dictionary of modern English usage. - Oxford, 1977. - 378 p.

14. Franklyn J. A Dictionary of Rhyming Slang. - London, 1969. - 367 p.

15. Freeman W. A concise dictionary of English slang. - London: English Universities Press Ltd, 1955. - XII, 268 p.

16. Green J. Cassel's Dictionary o Slang. 2nd Edition. - L., 2005. - 1565 p

17. New Webster's Dictionary of the English Language. - NY, 1980. - 1580 p.

18. NTC's American Idioms Dictionary by R.A. Spears. - Chicago: NTC Publishing Group, 2000. - 641 p.

19. Richard A. Spears. NTC's Dictionary of American Slang. - M.: Русский язык, 1991. - 528 с.

20. Partridge E. A dictionary of slang and unconventional English / Edited by Paul Beale. 8th ed. - New York: Macmillan Publishing Co, 1984. - XXIX, 1400 p.

21. Spears R.A. Slang and Euphemism. A dictionary of oaths, curses, insults, sexual slang and metaphor, racial slurs, drug talk, homosexual lingo, and related matters. - New York: Jonathan David Publishers, Inc. 1981. - XXVIII, 448 p.

22. The Oxford dictionary of abbreviations. - Oxford, 1996. - 397 p.

23. The Shorter Oxford English dictionary on historical principles. Third edition. - Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973. - Vol. I, XXX, 1280 p. - Vol. II. XII, 1281 p.

24. Thorne T. Dictionary of contemporary slang. - London: Clays Ltd, 1994. - VII, 583 p.

25. Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language. Unabridged. - Springfield, 1999. - 2662 p.

26. Webster's New World Dictionary of American English. - New York, 1989. - 882 p.

27. Weingarten J. An American dictionary of slang and colloquial speech. -New York, 1954. - VIII, 390 p.

28. Wentworth H., Flexner B.S. Dictionary of American Slang. Second Supplemented Edition. - New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Publishers, 1975. - 766 p.

29. Wierzbicka A. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. 2nd ed. - Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. – XXXVII, 502 p.

30. Wilkes G.A. A dictionary of Australian colloquialisms. - London; Henley: Routledge & ICegan Paul, 1978. - XII, 370 p.

31. Wood F.Th. Dictionary of English colloquial idioms / Frederick T. Wood; Rev. by Robert J. Hill. - London; Basingstoke, 1979. - V, 354 p.

32. Lighter J.E. Random house historical dictionary of American slang, vol.1, A-G. - N.Y., 1997. - 513 p.

33. Chapman R.L. Thesaurus of American slang. New York: Harper Perennial, 1991.489 p.

Lexicons of Early Modern English

Lexicons of Early Modern English (*LEME*) is a historical database of monolingual, bilingual, and polyglot dictionaries, lexical encyclopedias, hard-word glossaries, spelling lists, and lexically-valuable treatises surviving in print or manuscript from the Tudor, Stuart, Caroline, Commonwealth, and Restoration periods. Texts of word-entries whose headword (source) or explanation (target) language is English tell us what speakers of English thought about their tongue in the period served by the Short-title, Wing, and ESTC catalogues, from the advent of printing to 1755. Their lexical insights, which may at times seem misguided to us, shaped the history of our living tongue. Any contemporary's testimony about the meaning of his own words has an undeniable authority. For this reason, *LEME* is not a period dictionary like *The Middle English Dictionary* or the yet unrealized Early Modern English period dictionary. The scholar who proposed the latter, Charles C. Fries, would have recognized *LEME* to be a source of "contemporary comments" that illustrate word usage. What Fries could not have imagined eighty years ago was a technology that would store all these quotations as distinct word-entries and have the potential to list them, alphabetically by lemmatized headword, and then chronologically by lexicon date. *LEME* incorporates some of what he hoped to create.

Lexical information takes many forms in this period because the dictionary was an emerging genre. The notion of an English-only, monolingual lexicon was late in coming. Only in 1623, with Henry Cockeram's hard-word lexicon, did the term "dictionary" (first employed in English by Sir Thomas Elyot in 1538 for a bilingual lexicon) acquire a sense like that we take for granted today. Historical lexicons also take many different forms. Most *LEME* lexical texts have word-entries that open with a headword and close with an explanation of that headword, but explanations of words also appear inside informative treatises and literary editions with marginal glosses or notes that explain terminology. Encyclopedic or topical works, such as herbals and books of reference in medicine or law, sometimes offer logical definitions of things in subject-complement ("is-a") form.

Why compile a database of old dictionaries when English has the great *Oxford English Dictionary*? Oxford lexicographers give a scientific account of the history and meaning of all English words, based on corpus-linguistic principles. That is, quotations support every definition. Now in its second edition, available online, and proceeding to a monumental third edition, the *OED* grows with the English language. Even a monumental work that covers 1500 years, however, necessarily selects lexical evidence. Jürgen Schäfer observed that Early Modern English quotations in the first edition of the OED predominantly come from major authors and overlook information in monolingual glossaries. Clarendon Press published Schäfer's *Early Modern English Lexicography* in 1989. It surveys 133 printed glossaries to 1640 and provides new evidence for 5,000 *OED* entries. The OED has expanded its coverage of authors, thanks to Schäfer's achievement. Yet he does not provide the electronic data on which his extracts are based; and any English lexical expression in the explanations of huge bilingual dictionaries by the likes of Cotgrave, Florio, Minsheu, and Thomas Thomas, is hard to find and thus easily overlooked.

Shakespeare's Nonstandard Lexicon

All dictionaries have boundaries, whether they are chronological being restricted to a particular period or to an author such as a Dictionary of Old English, or thematic being restricted to a particular topic such as A Dictionary of Computer Language, or a mixture of both being restricted to certain types of word used by a particular author or in a specified period such as this dictionary. Boundaries cause difficulty for the compiler because of their inherent fuzziness, but the boundaries of thematic dictionaries are more problematic than chronological ones because of the difficulty in defining the topic covered with sufficient rigour. In this dictionary the fuzziness arises from both the difficulty in distinguishing what constitutes Shakespeare's œuvre and how to define non-standard English.

So many of Shakespeare's plays were published in quarto format before (or occasionally after) their appearance in the First Folio and these are divided into 'bad' and 'good' quartos. The former may be earlier versions or adaptations of individual plays for a company smaller than the main London one or memorial reconstructions of the plays by one or more actors who were paid for this work by publishers intent on pirating them. It is difficult to decide with the so-called bad quartos how much of what is there constitutes Shakespeare's own work. But these memorial reconstructions, if they are such, are often invaluable sources of information for the type of non-standard language which people attributed to Shakespeare, even if not actually representing his own words. The good quartos may differ lexically from the versions in the First Folio, and to what extent these variations are attributable to Shakespeare or to another dramatist employed by the acting company are uncertain. One can have adopted the policy that all early versions of a play forming part of the Shakespeare canon, other than the quarto ***The Taming of a Shrew*** (whose status is still a matter of debate), are possible sources for the data forming his informal English, though one accept that it is unlikely that all words recorded in this dictionary were introduced by Shakespeare into the plays.

Wherever possible the quotations from Shakespeare's work used as illustrative examples have been quoted in the original spelling. In a volume in which spelling and variant forms are significant, it has been important to reproduce the spellings found in the original texts.

The subject matter of this problem is more difficult to define. At no period in the English language is there a clear division between non-standard and standard English. One reason for this is that many innovations in English vocabulary occur within the non-standard variety and, gradually, some of the words developed at this level are accepted into more formal language. Today this can be seen in the language of drugs and drug users, for words like crack, which were formerly restricted to certain speakers, are now more widely used. But it is very difficult to determine when this 'acceptance' into the standard occurs, and for some speakers this acceptance may never be recognized. This situation applies just as much to earlier periods of English, though, as the standard language was not fully established then, the question of whether a word was part of that language or not is more difficult to determine. Words borrowed from Latin or other languages could be taken over for nonstandard use and they are found in the mouths of lower-class people, as the forms accommodate and occupy in this dictionary reveal. Just as sociolinguistics has revealed to us that there is a continuum in the use of language between the various classes in the country, so also there was in Shakespeare's time no sharp division between the unlettered and the educated as far as language use was concerned.

Slang as Nonstandard Lexicon

Examples of Rhyming Slang

Cockney	**British English**
Adam And Eve	Believe
Almond Rods	Socks
Apple and Pears	Staks
Artful Dodger	Lodger
Ball of Chalk	Walk
Band of Hope	Soap
Bird & Lime	Time
Boat Race	Face
Brixton Riot	Diet
Brown Bread	Dead
Bubble and Squeak	Greek
Cock & ft n	Ten
Cream Crackered	Knackered
Currant Bun	Sun
Daisy Roots	Boots
Dancing Fleas	Ke>s
Dig the Grave	Shave
Dog and Bone	Phone
Drum and Fife	Knife
Duchess of Fife	Wife
Elephants Trurk	Drunk
Fork and Knife	Wife
Forsyte Sag^	Lagpr
Gingpr Beer	Queer
God Forbid	Kid
Twist and Twirl	Girl
Weeping Willow	Pillow
Gold Watch	Scotch
Kane and Able	Table
Lemon and Lime	Crime
Ocean Pearl	Girl
One Time Looker	Hooker
Ones & Twos	Shoes
Oxford Scholar	Dollar
Paraffin Lamp	Tramp
Pat and Mick	Sick
Porky Pies	Lies
Rhythm and Blues	Shoes
Schindler's List	Pissed
Skin And Blister	Sister
Strang^'if Weird	Beard
Trouble and Strife	Wife
Tumble down the sink	Drink
Whistle and Flute	Suit