The communicative and pragmatic potential of sub-standard vocabulary

Karylgash Kinzhagaliyeva – Saule Nurkenova – Zhanna Ospanova – Zhanar Tusselbayeva – Almagul Maimakova

Abstract
The article is devoted to the study of the sub-standard vocabulary of the English language using examples of American slang, which makes up its main part. The development of language and society entails the constant emergence of new units of both standard and non-standard vocabulary. Knowledge of this layer of vocabulary is necessary for a better understanding of native English speakers, modern literature and mass media.
The definitions and stylistic characteristics of the layers of non-standard vocabulary are indicated, combining them into a lexico-semantic paradigm based on the principle of socio-cultural and stylistic determinism of their functioning.
The communicative structure of a literary text as a linguocultural space is determined to identify the stylistic characteristics of non-standard lexical units. The features of the conceptualization of the world through non-standard vocabulary are revealed.
In addition, the article describes the communicative and pragmatic techniques of non-standard vocabulary at the lexical and semantic levels.
At the word-formation level, non-standard compatibility manifests itself, as a rule, through a language game created with the help of word-formation means, as a rule, it is affixation, contamination, abbreviation, truncation.
Key words: English, communication, non-standard vocabulary, functional styles, colloquialisms, American slang, jargon, argot, vulgarisms, word formation

Introduction

Any language is social by nature, and that is why it cannot exist and develop outside of society. Language, first of all, is a means of communication between people who actively influence the formation of its vocabulary. At the same time, we must not forget that language is a sign system with its own internal laws of functioning.
Language is social in nature and, in all its manifestations, cannot exist and develop outside the environment of functioning. The purpose of language as a means of communication between people has a pronounced social character. Its social functions actively affect its vocabulary, largely determining the direction of its development. The problems of interaction between language and society, language and culture, while remaining relevant in modern linguistics, cannot be successfully resolved without studying the specifics of the use of language in various layers of society, social and professional groups, without a thorough study of its socio-dialectal stratification and functional and stylistic variation. At the same time, it is important to distinguish between the main and peripheral areas of language dynamics in connection with the development of society and the peculiarities of the impact of various social factors on language (O'Grady, 2001).
If the language system does not have direct and rigid links with the social structure of society, then the functioning of the language bears a vivid imprint of the impact of social division (Stengers, 2015).
Currently, the study of the speech of various social groups is continuing in order to clarify the living mechanism of language variation and change, which aims for researchers to develop a global anthropological theory integrating the achievements of sociology, psychology, ethnography, philology and other sciences. This will eventually make it possible to comprehensively study the speech of an individual as a

representative of a certain social group to identify the parameters of the variability of speech behavior depending on the changing social role.

The social stratification of modern vocabulary leaves its imprint not only on oral speech but also on its written embodiment, in particular, on the language of fiction. Unfortunately, neither in foreign nor in domestic linguistics, there is still a sufficiently distinct terminological definition and an unambiguous essential characteristic of colloquial speech, consisting of a number of varieties and layers of different social and stylistic functioning and purpose.

With regard to the English language, it can only be stated that there are significant differences both in the general terminological characteristics of the various forms of existence of English colloquial speech and in the fundamental assessment of their communicative status.

Over time, many of the sub-standard lexical units are fixed by dictionaries and acquire the status of standard ones. This fact determines, in our opinion, the constant attention of specialists to the corpus of non-standard vocabulary as a special, rather universal and dynamic phenomenon, especially at the present time, when information culture is saturated with diverse elements, including non-literary ones (Brown, and et all 2020).

The concept of the norm is usually associated with the idea of correct, literately literate speech, and the literary speech itself is one of the sides of a person's general culture. The norm, as a socio-historical and deeply national phenomenon, characterizes, first of all, the literary language - recognized as an exemplary form of the national language. Therefore, the terms "linguistic norm" and "literary norm" are often combined, especially when applied to the modern Russian language, although historically, they are not the same.

The language norm is formed in the real practice of speech communication, is worked out and fixed in public use as a usage (Latin usus - use, usage, habit); the literary norm is undoubtedly based on usage, but it is also especially taken care of, codified, i.e., legalized by special regulations (dictionaries, rulebooks, textbooks).

The concepts of literary language and the language of literature are not equivalent. In the first case, the term standard or standard language is sometimes used. In the English linguistic tradition, this term is used - standard language.

The language norm is quite rigid, based on the choice of options, and can be codified in the form of a set of rules and a dictionary.

In modern speech conditions, the question of normativity is increasingly leaving the field of codification: the concept of correctness/incorrectness is replaced by the concept of appropriateness /inappropriateness. And this is not set by normative dictionaries with various kinds of marks. In this regard, in modern lexicography, an increasing preference is given to "elastic codification" and "recommendation codification" when, instead of simple restrictions (prohibitions), an expanded presentation of neutral units is used with an indication of their stylistic or communicative value.

Non-standard vocabulary as a complex lexical system occupies a certain place in the socio-stylistic hierarchy of the components of the national language. Within this system, there is an increased variability of the vocabulary of various subsystems, which we consider as a set of stylistic means of literary language, professional and social spheres of speech, as a lexico-semantic "set" of non-standard vocabulary, opposed to standard vocabulary and vocabulary of territorial dialects.

In the 80-the 90s of the XX century, the English language, especially in its oral and colloquial form, is strongly influenced by the slang and vernacular language environment. This influence is expressed, according to the observations of scientists, in the flow of sub-standard vocabulary that has flooded onto the pages of fiction, journalism, etc., and in the freer use of obscene vocabulary than before, including on the pages of print, on television and radio, and in the expansion of morphological and

syntactic models that are not characteristic or of little character for the traditional system of literary language. At the same time, it can be stated that many of the professional translators, teachers and specialists in other fields interested in foreign languages were not ready for a full-fledged perception of modern variants of non-standard vocabulary (Struys, 2015).

The study of such a complex structured phenomenon as non-standard vocabulary requires terminological clarity in determining its stratification. In order to derive a working definition of the corpus of vocabulary under consideration, it seems appropriate to analyze definitions and concepts that are significant for our study, developed in domestic and foreign linguistics (Giménez-Moreno, 2012).

In their works, scientists call the non-standard vocabulary of the English language the English lexical vernacular, which "... means a complex lexical and semantic category - a certain fragment of the vocabulary of the national language, i.e., in a well-known way, an ordered and structured hierarchical whole representing a set of socially determined lexical systems (jargon, argot) and stylistically reduced lexical layers ("low" colloquialisms, slang, vulgarisms), which are characterized by significant differences and discrepancies in basic functions and in social, lexicological, pragmatic, functional-semantic and stylistic aspects" (Kenyon, 1948).

In the issue of structuring sub-standard vocabulary in modern English, V.A. Khomyakov adheres to the existing classical approach, taking as a basis that linguists isolate the so-called non-literary vocabulary and phraseology (dialectisms, slangisms, jargonisms, vulgarisms, etc.). Each such layer is attributed to certain stylistic functions, which are fixed in lexicographic manuals in the form of functional and stylistic litter.

Within the framework of this approach, all non-standard English vocabulary is divided into "low" colloquialisms, general slangisms, special slangisms (jargonisms, kentism) and vulgarisms.

In addition to the lexical layers mentioned above, there are also forms of existence of non-standard vocabulary that have the status of linguistic microsystems included in macrosystems, such as social dialects, argot (Kent), professional and corporate (group) jargon, urban semi-dialects such as "Cockney" and "scouse", "extra-literary vernacular", which is understood phonetically, grammatically and lexically "incorrect" from the point of view of the literary standard, the speech of uneducated or poorly educated people. Territorial dialects stand apart, which have nothing to do with slang. There is also an opinion that English non-standard vocabulary as a complex, hierarchically organized macro-system of the national language includes certain lexical layers of expressive non-standard vocabulary and language microsystems of socio-professional non-standard vocabulary.

Results

The pragmatic potential is manifested in need to create non-standard vocabulary, which is realized, as a rule, through regular or semantic word formation.

Non-standard vocabulary appeared for a number of social, psychological and stylistic reasons. It is a complex socio–stylistic, lexico-phraseological category, a historically stable system, and performs certain functions: (a) in speech, strive to satisfy various emotional needs of individuals; and (b) in texts where standard vocabulary serves as a background on which elements of non-standard vocabulary acquire expressive significance.

The works of scientists who have conducted research in the field of non-standard vocabulary do not in all aspects reflect its linguistic and functional-linguistic role as a special socio-cultural phenomenon and a marker of a character's speech behavior in a literary work. In particular, the issues of determining the functions performed by non-standard lexical units in live speech, and the problems of studying the lightness of members of one society, which are reflected in artistic speech, have not been fully

reflected in the works of modern linguists. We also note the importance of studying the phenomenon of modern fiction both from the point of view of literary criticism and linguistics, which, in turn, meets the need to expand the object of philological research with new textual material (Hannerts, 2015).

Another example of analyses
Thus, the reasons we have listed, namely, the lack of unity of opinion in defining the vocabulary that forms a non-standard continuum, the ambiguity of the existing definitions of this layer and its stratification in different languages, the diversity in defining the functions of non-standard lexical units in speech, and, in particular, the lack of elaboration of the specifics of their functioning in terms of explication of the speech behavior of characters in the fragmentary nature of research in the field of the textual representation of non-standard vocabulary as an important marker of socio-cultural polyglossia, they give us the right to talk about the relevance of our work.

In work, non-standard vocabulary is defined as a complex lexico-semantic category - a certain fragment of the vocabulary of the language, representing a set of socially and culturally determined, often expressive lexical systems (jargons, argot), stylistically reduced lexical layers with the expression of ease and often pejorativeness, commonly used and well-known in the spheres of everyday speech communication (colloquialisms, "low" colloquialisms, slangisms, vulgarisms), as well as socially unmarked and commonly used occasionalisms, which are characterized by significant differences and discrepancies in the main functions and in sociolexicological, pragmatic, functional, semantic and stylistic aspects.

Distinctive language indicators, which genetically had a purely social nature, in the future receive a certain stylistic load. This is, to a large extent, characteristic of a non-standard lexical continuum when used in a literary text. The literary norm is stylistically neutral and is used in fiction in various combinations with various functional styles, and the artistic effect often depends precisely on the "clash of styles" and the demarcation of stylistic norms. An integral part of the artistic style, which combines elements of almost all existing styles (depending on the author's intention), is the everyday style, which allows reflecting (mainly in dialogues) the characteristic features of the colloquial speech of the characters of the works (Jurko, Primož, 2021).

Depending on the status-marked and socio-emotive conditionality of the communicative situation, the dialogic and monological speech of the characters often includes non-standard vocabulary, socially and chronologically marked. The dominance of the aesthetic function, unlimited possibilities of using linguistic means on the principle of individual imagery, and the special significance of the subject of speech distinguish artistic works from all non-artistic ones but do not translate them into a fundamentally different plane.

Different linguistic means of a work of art are organized into a single structural-semantic and content-conceptual whole from the point of view of a certain goal setting, as in other styles, subjectivity finds its specific expression in any text. In general, "the structure of the text is determined by the speech actions of a particular linguistic personality (individual or collective). The actions themselves are not completely arbitrary but are regulated in their construction by certain norms and rules (Yarts, 2019).

Fiction, as one of the kinds of literature, only seems to be independent of such rules. "Having considered the currently existing approaches to the classification of literary genres, we, in accordance with the objectives of our research, directed our attention to fiction, focusing on its socio-cultural nature. Fiction that actively responds to the "malice of the day", embodying the trends of the "small time", is significant in the composition of current literature (Partridge, 2018).

Considering non-standard vocabulary, let's first focus on the problem of style. It is based on the statement about the existence of two main styles: functional and expressive. A functional style, first proposed by linguists, can be defined as "a set of linguistic means used in a certain communication environment and for a specific purpose. At the same time, these are certain patterns of selection and grouping of linguistic means potentially assigned to any sphere of human activity (business style, conversational style, scientific style, etc.)." The division of "functional styles in modern Russian linguistics is extremely diverse and diverse. As a rule, most classifications of this kind are based, on the one hand, on the spheres of application of styles (i.e., on a socio-social feature), and on the other - on the dichotomous division "spoken" - "written". Linguists still cannot decide on a unified classification of functional styles, trying to provide a complete list of all specialized means of expressing various types of information. Thus, the styles are distinguished: scientific, everyday, journalistic, artistic and fictional, conversational, correspondence style, newspaper style, poetic, professional and technical, official and business (Algeo, 1977).

Discussion

"Style is a socially conscious and functionally conditioned, internally united set of techniques for the use, selection and combination of means of speech communication in the sphere of a national, national language, correlated with other similar ways of expression that serve for other purposes, perform other functions in the social speech practice of this people.

Expressive style is distinguished on the basis of certain emotionally situational criteria and is defined as a traditional set of linguistic means for an expressive level of communication – neutral style, reduced style. Other terms are also used. Thus, in the concept of R.G. Piotrovsky we find high styles, covering solemnly poetic and scientific everyday life; medium styles, including literary-narrative and literary-colloquial styles; low styles - colloquial. J. Kenyon points to two levels - standard and sub-standard and two functional varieties - formal and informal. Yu. Hannerts speaks of high and low or formal and informal styles. V Yarts writes that "style issues are closely related to the dismemberment of book-written and oral-spoken types of speech."

In this paper, we are talking about non-standard vocabulary, which is traditionally divided into "low" colloquialisms (colloquial vocabulary), general slang, special slang (jargon and argot), as well as vulgarisms. But it should be noted that there are still no clear criteria for the distribution of words into a particular group (Schwarz, 2000).

Colloquialisms are located on the border between standard and non-standard vocabulary. Some linguists refer to them more as a non-standard vocabulary. For example, E. Partridge, in his work "The World of Words" characterizes colloquialisms lower than standard vocabulary but higher than slang. And the authors of the new Webster dictionary consider colloquialisms to be a characteristic of colloquial speech and non-business correspondence and do not consider them as non-standard or non-literary vocabulary. We will stick to the opinion of E. According to Partridge, colloquialisms are part of the standard vocabulary, and "low" colloquialisms are included in the circle of the problem of non-standard vocabulary we are considering (Schweitzer, 2013).

The main part of non-standard vocabulary is slang, that is, words that can be used in everyday speech but are not included in the standard vocabulary. Although, V.A. Khomyakov believes that general slang is included in the vocabulary of the literary language as a generally accepted means of stylistically reduced speech, bearing an emotional and evaluative load. A.D. Schweitzer, on the contrary, considers general slang to be one of the components of the national vernacular, located outside the literary language (Mallory, J. P. & Adams, D. Q. , 1997).

Jargon is the language of some professional groups, which is accessible only to them. Argot refers to words that are delimited by the use of any social or age group, especially in criminal circles. Scientists still cannot come to a consensus on whether to attribute jargon and argot to special slang or consider it a separate group of non-standard vocabulary. Because of their rude and obscene nature, vulgarisms are unequivocally attributed to non-standard vocabulary. They carry a meaning that is defined as taboo from the point of view of standard English (O'Grady, 2001).

Being a part of the national language and reflecting its norms, non-standard vocabulary is formed according to its trends and laws of development. Sometimes these words are borrowed from other languages. A significant number of such words arise as a result of various kinds of hyphenations, metaphorical and, less often, metonymic (Coleman, 2012).

The main method of replenishing the vocabulary of a language with non-standard vocabulary is the semantic derivation, as a result of which the semantic volume of a word of a literary standard is expanded due to the appearance of colloquial lexico-semantic variants in it. And it should be noted that this pattern is not random. Non-standard vocabulary is formed mainly on the basis of root words of Germanic origin. Accordingly, the source of the occurrence of ethically reduced words, which are secondary units of the nomination, is mostly the same vocabulary of the literary standard, the use of which in figurative, reduced meanings characterizes non-standard vocabulary as a whole (Christopher, 2016).

Non-standard lexical units, verbalizing the periphery of cultural concepts and having a high communicative and pragmatic potential, explicate the value dominants of individual author/ character behavior when transferring them to another language, compliance with socio-cultural norms of translation as an act of intercultural communication is mandatory. The pragmatic meanings of emotionally colored units of the original and translated texts often do not coincide, which requires the use of certain translation techniques aimed at preserving the pragmatics of this unit and the text as a whole (Schlamberger Brezar, 2021).

Such techniques include lexico-semantic: functional replacement, neutralization, emphatization; morphological: omission, addition, as well as compensation, and descriptive translation. In many cases, there is a clear softening of the expressive-negative connotation of sub-standard lexical units in the translation texts, which is explained by the existing socio-cultural differences between Western and domestic linguistic cultures.

Briefly considering the processes of word formation in a non-standard lexical system, in this paper, we will give examples from American slang (Eneko, 2020).

Affixation is one of the most productive ways of word formation in modern English, where there are a large number of affixes, both native and borrowed. Affixes include prefixes, suffixes, and infixes.

Determination of pragmatic potential and study of general parameters of scientific and technical text as a means of intercultural communication. Analysis of the features of the scientific style of the English languages. Description of the requirements of pragmatic adaptation of the text (Escoda, 2020).

In the formation of sub-standard vocabulary, including slangs, the same affixes are used as in neutral vocabulary, but in slang they acquire a wider range of meanings. The most common suffix that conveys cultural information and expresses the meaning of an active person is -er. For example, greener is a novice or inexperienced worker (green - green, immature); juicer is an alcoholic (juice -juice, booze); jumper is a thief who enters the house through the window (jump - jump); penciller is a journalist (pencil - pencil). There are hundreds of such words in American slang.

For the formation of nouns, the suffix -ie is widely used, conveying in slang a shade of familiarity, sometimes contempt or neglect: drunkie - a drunkard, an alcoholic; baddie - a villain, a bad uncle; goodie - a good person (Eric, 2020).

In units of American slang, the negative prefix no- is used, which conveys an obvious lack, a lack of what is at the heart of the word. Such units, as a rule, are written with a hyphen: no-hoper - a loser, a useless person (hope - to hope); no-name - an insignificant person (name - name); no-show - not appearing (show - to show).

Another word-forming element is -aholic, isolated from alcoholic and then became widespread in general American slang. For example: workaholic - workaholic (work - to work); New Yorkaholic (New York - New York city); coffeholic - very fond of coffee (coffee - coffee); foodoolic - glutton (food - food).

In English, there is such a thing as semi-suffixes, which are also used to form slang units, for example: proof, -man, -land, -like, -hood, -head and others. These are affixes that contain the features of the suffix, on the one hand, and can be a separate word, on the other. For example: freshman -a novice addict (fresh - fresh); jellyhead - a fool, a fool (jelly - jelly); hayhead -a person smoking marijuana (hay - hay); homeland - a black quarter (home - house); knifeman - a surgeon (knife - knife);

The word composition, as well as affixation, according to its structural and morphological characteristics, is based on the norms of the literary standard. Most often this happens by adding two substantive bases, for example nutball - idiot (nut - nut, ball - ball); nutbox - psychiatric clinic (box - box, box); pigpen - police station (pig - pig, pen - cattle pen) (Mavrommatidou, Stavroula & Gavriilidou, Zoe & Markos, Angelos, 2019).

Reduplication is one of the oldest ways of word formation, in which new words are formed by doubling the base of the word, which at the same time can remain in its original form (bye-bye), or change. For example: jaw-jaw -conversation, chatter (jaw - jaw). Most often, words formed by reduplication are found in slang. Such units can then pass into a literary standard, for example, English tip-top (excellent, first-class) or hocus-pocus (hocus-pocus, fraud). Such words can be stored in the language for centuries (Hnilicová, 2021).

Thus, we see that when translating non-standard vocabulary, we have to adhere mainly to two directions - either to look for a similar slang with approximately the same expressiveness or to follow the path of interpretation and clarification of meaning, that is, to use a descriptive translation technique.

At the same time, "background knowledge" about slang is of great importance, that is, information about the situation of using the corresponding slang. Unfortunately, such information is still very poorly reflected in modern bilingual dictionaries. All this, to some extent, complicates the work of professional translators (Fraser, 2000).

Conclusion

Based on the above, it can be concluded that the communicative-pragmatic status and the linguistic essence of the corpus of non-standard vocabulary are of great interest in theoretical and practical terms as one of the significant aspects of the problem of "language and society", which is quite relevant in many modern societies. This problem includes aspects of the interaction of literary speech with a non-literary, socio-professional variation of vocabulary, its component, functional and stylistic differentiation of vocabulary in different communicative spheres, and interdependence between speech features caused by non-linguistic and linguistic causes. This means, according to an authoritative scientist in this field, a broader approach to the development of the problem of social differentiation of language in the context of the general problem of varying the means of language, taking into account the real linguistic behavior of a person, due not only to his linguistic competence, but also knowledge of socially-conditioned connotations available in language signs.

The culture of speech communication is understood as a highly developed ability to communicate according to the norms historically established in this language group, taking into account the psychological mechanisms of influence on the addressee, as well as using linguistic means and methods of implementing such communication, in order to achieve the greatest planned pragmatic result. The totality of linguistic/linguistic competence, communicative and rhetorical competence acts as a prerequisite for the culture of speech communication (Gorobets E.A., 2017).

Throughout the history of mankind, various cultures have created a huge number of very diverse norms of behavior and communication. Different norms had different degrees of influence and significance in people's behavior, and those that gained the most influence became generally accepted (Gorobets, 2017).

Lexical means of ethical and stylistic reduction usually have evaluative and pejorative use and general negative expression, however qualitatively different from abusive and obscene: words are not perceived as vulgar dysphemisms, but give the speech a flavor of familiarity, although, of course, there are borderline cases when much depends on the scope of use of a particular word, complicated by social meanings, emotional and stylistic coloring, context, the genre of the work and many extralinguistic factors. When translating non-standard vocabulary, one has to adhere mainly to two directions - either to look for a similar Russian slangism with approximately the same expressiveness, or to follow the path of interpretation and clarification of meaning, that is, to use a descriptive translation technique. At the same time, "background knowledge" about slang is of great importance, that is, information about the situation of using the corresponding slangism. Unfortunately, such information is still very poorly reflected in modern bilingual dictionaries. All this, to some extent, complicates the work of professional translators (Silva, 2018).

Based on the above, we can conclude that studying only the standard vocabulary of any language will not give us a complete picture of the language itself and the spirit of the people who speak it. Knowledge of non-standard vocabulary, and especially American slang, is necessary for a successful understanding of modern fiction, radio and television broadcasting, as well as for translation activities and simple communication with people who speak this language.

Bibliographic references

Algeo, J. (1977). Blends, a structural and systemic view. American Speech 52(1-2), 47-64. https://doi.org/doi: 10.2307/454719

Brown, Z. C., Anichich, E. M. & Galinsky, A. D. (2020). Non standard vocabulary in modern lexicology. Organizational behavior and human decision-making processes 161, 274-290. doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2020.07.001

Coleman J. (2012). The Life of Slang, 2012. Oxford, OUP Oxford. 354 p. ISBN 0199571996, 9780199571994

Eneko, A., & Dunyabeitiya, J., A. (2020). Better to Be Alone than in Bad Company: Cognate Synonyms Impair Word Learning by Eneko Antón and Jon Andoni Duñabeitia Behavioral Sciences 10(8), 123; https://doi.org/10.3390/bs10080123

Escoda, X. B. (2020). New dictionary Lithuanian-French | Nouveau dictionnaire lituanien-français. Verbum(Lithuania), 11.

Fraser B., & Rintell E. (2000). Approach to conducting research on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. In the analysis of discourse. Second language. D. Larsen Freeman (ed.). Newbury House, publishers Incorporated, Rowley Massachusetts

Giménez-Moreno, R. (2012) The Interdependence of Repetition and Relevance in University Lectures. Journal of Pragmatics 44 (6-7): 744-755. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2012.02.013

Gorobets E.A. (2017). The core of the professional language in the terminographic representation (based on the special vocabulary of the medical field). Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 7(10), 31-36.

Hannerts U. (2015). Language. Variations and social relations. Studia Linguistica. 24(2).

Hnilicová, K. (2021). The Language Between the Written and the Spoken: The Example of the Radio Chronicle "Pop & Co". Journal for Foreign Languages, 13(1), 17-33. https://doi.org/10.4312/vestnik.13.17-33

Kenyon, J.S. (1948). Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English. *College English, 10*, 31-36. Ney York press

Mallory, J. P. & Adams, D. Q. (eds.), Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture, Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, London – Chicago 1997, 829 pages, ISBN 1-884964-98-2.

Mavrommatidou, S., Gavriilidou, Z. & Markos, A. (2019). Development and validation of the strategy inventory for electronic dictionary use. International Journal of Lexicography: Oxford University Press, 32(4), 393-410, https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecz015.

Primož, J. (2021). Semantic Prosody in Translation: Slovene and English ADV-V combinations. ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries. 18. 187-209. 10.4312/elope.18.1.187-209.

O'Grady W., Archibald J. (ed.). (2001). Contemporary Linguistics: 4th edition. Boston: New York: Bedford /St. Martin's. 788 p. ISBN 0-312-24738-9.

Partridge, E. (2015). The World of Words. 1st ed. Taylor and Francis. Retrieved from https://www.perlego.com/book/1642540/the-world-of-words-an-introduction-to-language-in-general-and-to-english-and-american-in-particular-pdf

Schlamberger Brezar, M. (2021). Productivity of Loan Prefixes in Compound Nouns and Adjectives in Slovenian. Journal for Foreign Languages, 13(1), 67-90. https://doi.org/10.4312/vestnik.13.67-90

Schwarz, V. (2018). Non-standard vocabulary in the structure of the English language of the national period: abstract of the dissertation of the Doctor of Philology. L., 2000.

Schweitzer, A.D. (2013). Social differentiation of the English language in the USA. Part of the Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science book series, 43.

Stengers, H., & Boers, F. (2015). Book. «Exercises on collocations: a comparison of trial-and-error and exemplar-guided procedures». 301 p.

Struys, E. (2015). Results of the discussion of stylistic issues. Questions of linguistics, 10(1), 34-46.

Yarts V.N. (2019). Development of the national literary English language. Reedited. Sage publication. The History of the English Language.

Yes, S. N., & Krishman R. (2018). The role of frames in the organization of online dictionaries. Calidoscopio, 16(3), 450-459.

Words: 5104
Characters: 34 710 (19,3 standard pages)

Karylgash Kinzhagaliyeva
L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,
Satpayev str.2
Z01A3D7 Astana
Kazakhstan

prof. Saule Nurkenova
Candidate of Philology
L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,
Satpayev str.2,

Z01A3D7 Astana
Kazakhstan

assoc. prof. Zhanna Ospanova, PhD.
A.K. Kussayinov Eurasian Humanities Institute,
M.Zhumabayev prospect 4,
010009 Astana
Kazakhstan

assoc. prof. Zhanar Tusselbayeva
Astana IT University
Mangilik El, 55/11
010000 Astana
Kazakhstan

assoc. prof. Almagul Maimakova
Candidate of Philological Science
Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University
Dostyk avenue, 13
050010 Almaty
Kazakhstan