

Seyidzada L. E.

Azerbaijan University of Languages

DIFFERENCES OF SLANG FROM DIALECTS, VULGARISMS AND COLLOQUIAL LANGUAGE

Slang is a very interesting concept that generally exists in any language. In particular, this layer of the lexical system of the language is very actively expanding in modern times, we would say that it is becoming more widespread among young people and new ones are being formed. This is especially due to the fact that many of the restrictions that have existed so far in public and private life have been removed, and therefore it manifests itself in language, people are able to express their views. In some cases, it seems that the use of slang is due to illiteracy, but in fact this is not the case. Slangs, as a rule, differ significantly from the norm of literary language. Of course, this is not always the case. It is the first to react to every event and change in society and is able to assimilate them, and therefore slangs are more popular among young people. Slang is distinguished from dialects and dialects by its vocabulary. The words in its lexical system are mainly divided into three groups: a) words taken from another language; b) specially installed words; c) words with changed meaning, etc. Words in slang are unusual. This feature enhances the listener's sense of expressiveness and expressiveness. As a result, there is an opportunity to spread. Elements of slang are rapidly spreading and used in the art world, albeit by a small number of people. Slang is not the same in all nations. Thus, in many nations it is weak, and in some nations it is strong. For example, slang related to hunting and trade was widespread in Russian until the beginning of the 20th century. The origin, formation and development of slangs, as well as tracking their transformation into literary language over time, researching their cognitive relationship, summarizing these ideas, classifying slang, studying their origin and use from a social and functional point of view can be considered a scientific innovation of our research.

Key words: *slang, vulgarism, social dialects, colloquial language, communication, meaning, hide.*

Introduction. As part of the national language, it includes colloquial language, dialect, and slang. They differ significantly in scope, nature, character and quality. For example, while dialectal speech units can be found in all areas of the national language, dialect elements can be found only in the dialect to which it belongs, and so on [19, p. 147].

A.M. Babayev [2] describes slang as following: "Slang is a means of artificial communication used to hide an idea based on one or more language materials from others. It is developed by a certain group and is also understood by them. Slang or the use of it can have several purposes:

- 1) to hide his ugly fears from others (in society);
- 2) to explain each other with covered jargons – to explain something (in prisons);
- 3) to artificially separate from others (to demonstrate aristocracy) [7, p. 346].

He (A.M. Babayev) formulated I.R. Galpern's opinions on slangs as following: "There are a group of words in the non-literary dictionary of the English language called slangisms. It is the recognition of a group of words in each language that one group uses to keep them secret from another social group.

They are usually caused by the use of old words in new meanings. The traditional meaning of these words is abstract, but the new meaning used is important [7, p. 110].

Other researchers have said the same thing about slang. It is necessary to mention that no matter how close they are different too. Slang, as noted, occurs in the speech of different social and professional groups of people, and in linguistic literature it is sometimes called slang.

The actuality of the subject. It is clear from the linguistic literature that W.F. von Humboldt once emphasized that "language always develops with people, and a person understands himself/herself not in any other way, but in another word. When it comes to the social nature of language, it is understood as a national nature". W.F. von Humboldt also noted that although language is associated with the activities of the people and their thinking, it also has its specificity and independence, its stability. The process of speech and language are interrelated, but not the same. The form of language is constant, but its formation is different. Language is a form and nothing more than a form [8, p. 27].

Research methods. The research cover the following methods: descriptive method to reveal the legitimacy of the metaphorical nomination to perform a certain function through the analysis and synthesis of factual material, generalization, comparison and observation; Cognitive modeling, as well as semantic-syntactic analysis of slang used metaphorically, as well as contextual analysis methods.

Discussion. I.V. Arnold divides slangs into two groups according to the field of application: *general slang* and *special slang*. General slang is that do not belong to any social or professional group, and special slang is slang words in the speech of teenagers, university students, schoolchildren. This group also includes slang words used by the Air Force, footballers, sailors and others. Continuing his views, I.V. Arnold emphasizes that Schweitzer believes that both slangs belong to this group of words.

He thinks that it makes more sense to distinguish slang from slang. The difference is that while slang has an expressive function, slang also has secrecy. There is a regular motivation in slang words. For example, *cradle-snather* – *an old man who marries or courts a much younger woman* – “qoca kişinin cavan qadınla evlənməsi və yaxud ona pərəstiş etməsi”; *belly-robber* – *the head of a military canteen* – “hərbi yeməxananın başçısı”, *window-shopping-feasting* *one’s eyes on the goods displayed in the shops, without buying anything* – “vitrinə qoyulmuş şeylərə baxmaq tamaşa etmə (maraq xatirinə, almaq üçün yox)”.

On the contrary, slang words have no motivation. *Rap-kill*, *shiv-knife*, *book-alifence*, etc. [1, p. 230].

Speaking about slang, N.Ch. Valiyeva emphasizes that slang words appear in informal conversations of professional or social groups and they are divided into two groups.

The first of them is the professional naming of objects and processes, for example, picture show – it has nothing to do with cinema, but according to the military concept, its official name means battle. Another group is the naming of non-professional objects, events, phenomena and processes. For example, *big gun-important person* is used as an important person. Each professional group creates its own slang. We can distinguish the slang of students, musicians, lawyers, soldiers and others [13, p. 59].

Based on the ideas of Bethany K. Dumas and J. Lighter, N.Ch. Valiyeva claims that if two of the following conditions are met, then it is a «real slang». In order not to violate these conditions, we consider it important to keep the idea as it is in the original:

1) *it lowers if temporarily, “the dignity of formal or serious speech or writing”, in other words, it is likely to be considered in those contexts a “glaring misuse of register”;*

2) *its use implies that the user is familiar with whatever is referred to, or with a group of people who are familiar with it and use the term;*

3) *it’s taboo term in ordinary discourse with people of a higher social status or greater responsibility;*

4) *it replaces “a well-known conventional synonym”, this is done primarily to avoid discomfort caused by the conventional synonym or discomfort or annoyance caused by having to elaborate further [13, s. 61].*

Here we have talked about the definition and use of some aspects of slang and slang by different linguists. In addition, there are vulgar words or vulgarisms, dialects, colloquialisms, about which linguists and researchers have expressed valuable opinions at different times. After digging into those ideas, we will try to visualize how these word groups are used in fiction. *Vulgar* – *not having or showing good taste, not polite, elegant or well behaved* [12, s. 1450] – not having good taste or showing no pleasure, not being polite, elegant or well-behaved.

Vulgar – *indecent, a vulgar joke/offensive to one’s finer feelings, a vulgar display of riches/of or characteristic of the common people, a vulgar superstition// normally accepted, most common, take the word in its vulgar connotation/(of speech) vernacular.*

We have seen what vulgar words mean in two explanatory dictionaries. The researchers’ conclusions are almost identical, and we can summarize them in general terms. Vulgar words are not naturally widely used in literary language. They include obscene language, in some cases swearing, obscene language, cursing, and so on. Vulgar words and expressions form the lowest level of any language.

Talking about vulgar words, N.Ch. Valiyeva divides them into two groups: *lexical vulgarisms* and *stylistic vulgarisms*. Lexical vulgarisms include words that are not used in civil society. N.Ch. Valiyeva’s stylistic vulgarisms are a kind of humiliating, insulting use of words or phrases. As an example, N.Ch. Valiyeva shows the following expressions: *“old bean”* – *an old man* – qoca adam (qoca paxla); *smeller-nose* – burun; *“pay dirt”* – *money and the like* – uğurlu nəticə [13, p. 67].

Speaking of substitutions, L. Bloomfield writes that the English slang word *“beat it”* – qaç get, ehtiyatlı ol, *“he hot footed it home”* – o evə qaçdı, *“let her go”* – qoy getsin. Biz *they* əvəzliyindən iş-hərəkətin icraçalarına işarə edərəkən istifadə edirik:

"*They say Smith is doing well*" – deyirlər ki, Smit yaxşı iş görür. The most common feature of such forms is that the pseudo-imperson form is used as an informal executor of a certain pronoun [4, p. 247].

Analyses. Whether substitute or standard English in general, L. Bloomfield notes that standard forms of English are used in schools, churches, and all official public discourses, courts, and legislatures. Both standard and non-standard English speakers agree that Standard English is «good» or «correct» English, while non-standard English is «bad» or «incorrect», «vulgar» and even «non-English». Those who speak Standard English do not find it difficult to learn a non-standard language, but many non-standard English speakers try to use standard forms [4, p. 54].

Continuing his thoughts, L. Bloomfield emphasizes that there are small differences within the standard English language itself. In this case, different forms are still considered high and low. For example, in words such as *laugh* – gülmək, *half* – yarısı, *bath* – vanna, *dance* – rəqs, *can't* – bilmirəm, a person who pronounces «ah» (as in the word father) instead of the usual «a» (as in the word man). Chicago is said to speak in a «more aristocratic» form of English. However, people's attitudes differ on such issues [4, p. 55].

As can be seen, non-standard English is studied not only at the lexical level, but also at the phonetic level, and we believe that L. Bloomfield's services in this matter are great. Earlier, when we talked about substitution, we also touched on that issue.

The simplest way to describe the phonetic structure of a language is to show non-syllable phonemes or groups of non-syllable phonemes, each phoneme appearing in three possible positions, in front of the first syllable phoneme of other sentences and at the end after the phoneme of the last syllable and in the middle of the phonemes of the middle syllable [4, p. 120].

In addition to mentioning other aspects, what is needed for our research is that in the next stream of his thoughts, L. Bloomfield shows that, for example, *minx* – həyasız (slenq forması jinxed [jɪŋkst] – bədbinlik gətirmək, where /it/ is finally added: other postfinal [p] second final dimension [m]. For example, *glimpse* – ötəri nəzəri salmaq *tempt* – tovlamaq [4, p. 124].

In linguistic literature as a whole, it is somewhat accepted that vulgarism is considered an ethically and aesthetically inferior word. We believe that this is due to the fact that vulgarisms originated in the deepest layers of language, at a time when society was just being formed, and it is no coincidence that

at a certain stage of society's development, some of them were valued as taboo words and expressions.

It is quite right that in the linguistic literature, researchers do not equate vulgarism with kent, slang or dialect, they consider it an ancient component of the vocabulary of the language (in our version, English).

In addition to vulgar words, there are various professionalisms and colloquialisms in English (they are also called colloquialism).

What makes us think is how these words express themselves in fiction. There are not many of them in explanatory dictionaries, as well as in special dictionaries. In view of all this, we dedicate the next part of this subsection to the study of slang, slang, professional words, as well as colloquialisms within the text on the basis of factual materials. We think this would be more accurate and important. The following examples may illustrate our point of view:

"*How long's this coop been a dinge joint?*" *the big man demanded gruffly. Says which?*

The big man made a first into which his whisky sour glass melted almost out of sight [6, s. 14].

"*Nə vaxtdan bu toyuq hininə bənzər belədir?*" *böyük adam qaba, xıriltılı səslə tələb etdi. Nə dedin?*

Böyük adamın yumruğu içində viski stəkanı sanki əriyib ətrafa yayıldı.

In this context, "*says which?*" designed as slang, it is an expression that does not conform to any linguistic norm, because it has no question sentence structure or command sentence, but with the help of cognition and motivation it is possible to understand that if a person demands something arrogantly, angrily and rudely, the other party is natural. «What did you say?» It is not difficult to understand exactly what happens in communication when that rude, big man naturally gets angry and in this context gives the glass of whiskey in his hand as «melted almost out of sight». Examples:

He grinned back then a flat white grin without meaning "whisky sour", he told the barmam. "Shake them fleas out a your pants. Service" [6, p. 15].

O cavab olaraq gülümsədi, dişlərini mənasız yerə ağartdı. Kokteyl barmenə dedi. Hərəkət elə, xidmət.

The "*shake them fleas out a your pants*" movement used in this context is how it becomes our language. In fact, the meanings of the words used in this slang are completely different, but when the word «shake» has the concept of stirring something, and the previous expression «cocktail» order, there is a general notion that the service worker must work quickly, and if ordered, the service In the previous sentence, a meaningless smile is

mentioned, and logically, the ordering person used «your pants» in the expression due to the slow movement of the bartender, which means that the bartender working in this field should not smile in vain and perform the service.

Other examples:

“There aint nothing left of the joint” he complained. They was a little stage and band and cure little rooms where a que could have fun. Velna did some warbling. A redhead she was. Cute as face pants. We was to of been married. When they hung the frame on me [6, p. 15]. (“İçkixanada heç bir əlamət qalmayıb”, o şikayətləndi. Orada balaca səhnə, cazibəli balaca otaqlar vardı, cavan oğlan (gülməli geyinən) məzhəkə düzəldərdi. Velna cəh-cəh vurardı, o qırmızıbaş bir adam idi. Haşiyələnmiş cazibəli tuman. Biz belə olmalıydıq. Onlar mənim boynuma yıxdılar (evlənən zaman).

In this passage, «we were to have been» actually means «we were to have been» and we have translated it as we should be, and this expression refers directly to the spoken language. The authors note that it is possible to divide the systematic semantic connection into two groups with codified words when talking about words, expressions and studying their analogues. The first group (related and free) is analogous, the second group is universal (related and free), and the analogous group of word units is synonymous with the literary language standard. In explanatory dictionaries, their meaning is given by stylistically marked (marked) synonyms (for example, *cabbage-money* in English, *капустаденьги* in Russian, *kələm-pul* in Azerbaijani). Dialectal words belonging to the *Univerb* group are not synonymous in literary language standards. Accordingly, in explanatory dictionaries they are interpreted by description or have an encyclopedic character (in English *lifer = a prisoner serving a life sentence*, in Azerbaijani – *günü uzadılmış – məktəbdə günü uzadılmış qrup şagirdləri*) [3, p. 84].

As we have seen, the expression dialectal words in the example we quote from fiction has a synonym in standard literary language, as we have emphasized: *We was to of been – we were to have been*. In that passage, the expression they hang the frame on me is slang. The word «married» came before the expression, in fact, it would be easier to understand if the phrase «when married» was followed by slang, but here the issue becomes a bit more complicated after the change of words, and «hung frame» on the other hand. Through cognition, as well as a result of motivation, the meaning of that slang is understood as if they put it on my neck.

When we pay attention to the next continuation of that piece of text, we see the use of slang again. Let us look at the examples:

I took my second whisky sour. I was beginning to have enough of the adventure. “What frame?” I asked.

“Where your figure I been them eight years I said about?”

Catching butterflies.

He proved his chest with forefinger like a banana. “In the caboose”. Mallow is the name. They call me Moose Malloy, on the account of I’m large. The Great Bend bank job. Forty grand. Solo job [6, p. 15].

It is clear from the general spirit of the text that this is what we are talking about. In the center, they put a «frame» around my neck, and in the previous piece, «catching butterflies» – catching a butterfly, and «forefinger like a banana» – the index finger like a banana, followed by «In the caboose» – in prison. It ensures that the slang is understood as a logical result. For example:

No, darling, this is on me. And Mr. Dwight, of course. (Xeyir, əzizim, bu mənlilikir və Mr. Dvayt, əlbəttə).

This is on me – I’ll pay the bill – Hesabı mən ödəyəcəm – it’s colloquialism as it’s easy to understand.

Each layer in the language has a certain stylistic function, which is recorded in the lexicographic materials as a functional-stylistic feature. In addition to the above, there are dialect words that have the status of a microsystem, and this microsystem includes social dialects, slang, corporate and professional jargon, semi-dialects of urban dwellers «skauz», non-literary words and their division. Phonetically, grammatically, lexically it is «correctly used in the language of literary illiterate or illiterate people.

“Spare me a minute”, he asked. “I’ve been bird dogging” all over the place, trying to track you down. Pearce had to leave early and I want you to write the last Elixircol commercial”.

The phrase «bird dogging» underlined in this passage is in fact a slang used instead of «hunting for», and the author used such a stylistic tool to make sure that not everyone understood something, depending on the context, and that the slang performed a certain function.

The small economy size (business with the bottle) costs seventy five dollars and the giant family bottle comes at two hundred and twenty. It’s a lot of scratch, God knows, but these are inflationary times and who in put a price on youth? (John Cheeve). (Küçük iqtisadiyyatın (butulka biznesi) dəyəri

75 dollar təşkil etdiyi halda böyük (nəhəng) butulka ailəsində bu rəqəm iki yüz iyirmi ilə hesablanır. Bu böyük (çoşlu) puldur. Allah bilir ki, belə şişirtmə vaxtda kim gəncliyə qiymət qoya bilər?)

It was clear from the translation of the context that It's a lot of scratch – the rest (lots) of money, because the fact that the small business is seventy-five dollars and the big business is two hundred and twenty dollars (in the bottle business) made sense in the translation. For example:

“What a pity” said the dragon. “So that was the secret. It doesn't seem quite sporting to me, all this magic stuff, you know. Not cricket, as we used to say when I was a little dragon: but after all, that's a matter of opinion”. (“Təəssüf” əjdaha dedi. “Beləliklə o məxfi idi. Siz bilirsiniz ki, bütün bu sehirlə təzyiqlər mənə təsir etmir. Haqsızlıq (doğru olmayan), balaca əjdaha olanda işlədiyim ifadə kimi: bütün bunlardan sonra bu fikrin münasibətin məsələsidir”).

«Not cricket» used in context is colloquialism, and it means that injustice, as we translate, is not true, because the sentence that followed was to some extent one of the expressions used by that person in his childhood, because he compares himself to a dragon. We believe that from a linguistic point of view, this colloquialism has both motivation and cognition due to the situation, so that the transmitted information is completely understood by the recipient of the information, so that colloquialism was able to perform a certain stylistic function.

In another passage, we think it would be appropriate to consider the development of both slang and colloquialism. For example:

“That's a nice idea”, said the hunter. “But how many of us have that much sense? Most of us don't have brains enough to leave a party when the gin runs out. We hang around”.

“We hang around” I said, and “what a shame”.

We ordered some more beer.

The hunter drank half the glass and wiped his mouth.

“So what can you do about wrong graves?” he said.

“Treat them as if they didn't exist”, I said. “And maybe they'd go away, like a bad dream”.

The hunter laughed once, a kind of cry. “God, you're crazy. But I like listening to crazy people Blow some more” [5, p. 161]. (“Bu gözəl ideyadır”, ovçu

dedi: Ancaq bizim hansı birimizin kifayət qədər ağı vardır? Çoxumuzun kifayət qədər dərrakəmiz çatmır ki, araq qurtaranda məclisi (partini) tərək edək. Heç bir şey etmədən dayanıb qalırıq.

“Dayanıb qalırıq” mən dedim, Eyib nədir ki, Biz bir qədər də pivə sifariş verdik.

Ovçu pivə bakalının yarısını içdi və ağzını sildi.

Beləliklə, biz səhv qəbirlərlə nə edə bilərik o dedi.

“Onlarla elə rəftar edin ki, sanki onlar mövcud olmayıblar” mən dedim.

“Ola bilsin ki, onlar pis yuxu kimi özləri çıxıb getsinlər (yox olsunlar).

Ovçu qışqırığa bənzər bir dəfə güldü: “Aman allah, sən dəlisən, ağılsızsan. Lakin mən dəli, ağılsız adamları dinləməyi xoşlayıram. Bir qədər də danış”).

The passage we have given as an example contains both colloquialism and slang. First of all, «that much sense» means that there is not enough sense, because in the next conversation it is foolish not to leave the party, even after drinking vodka (gin – English vodka). There is a second point where one of them says that there is nothing wrong with it or those “what is embarrassing” shows once again that the previous idea is logical for them. Again, ordering beer and emphasizing people they don't like as their own graves (like a dead person) during their next conversation, and another saying, /»Think they don't exist,» and maybe they'll disappear like a dream?/ again, the hunter's screaming laughter shows where the problem lies.

Conclusion. Summarizing this article, we would like to note that in all cases many colloquialisms, words, expressions belong to the living informal communication, and they are common to all languages, have come a long way in the development of literary language.

Slang, on the other hand, is called words and expressions that are associated with giving contextual meaning to any stylistic means.

We have studied these qualities by observing them in the text we have selected as examples from the literature, and in all cases we have seen space, time, and situation in the foreground, and we have tried to show in context that those who use these expressions do not have a clear meaning, and we have tried to interpret the differences of colloquialism from this point of view, and we think we have succeeded it.

References:

1. Arnold, I.V. The English word / I.V. Arnold. Moscow : Vyssh.Shola, 1973. 302 p.
2. Babayev, A.M. Introduction to Linguistics / A. Babayev. Bakı : Mutarjim, 2017. 560 p. (in Azerbaijani)
3. Bally, Sh. French style / Bally, Sh. Moscow : Linguistic Heritage of the 20th Century, 2009. 392 p. (in Russian)
4. Blumfeld, L. Dil (ingilis dilindən tərcümə) / L. Blumfeld. Bakı : Prestij çap evi, 2014. 519 s. (in Azerbaijani).

5. Cheeve, J. (L.S. Golovchinskaya). Speak good English / Moscow : Voenizdat, 1980. 271 p. (in Russian)
6. Chandler, R. Farewell, my lovely (Farewell My Lovely and Stories) / Chandler Raymond. Moscow : Raduga Publishers, 1983. 367 p. (in Russian)
7. Galperin, I.R. Stylistics / I.R. Galperin. Moscow : Vyshya Shkola, 1977. 334 p. (in Russian)
8. Humboldt, W.F. von Selected works on linguistics / Humboldt, W.F. von. Moscow : Progress, 1984. 397 p. (in Russian)
9. Hemingway, E.M. Fiesta The sun also rises / E.Hemingway. Moscow : International Relation, 1981. 245 p. (in Russian)
10. Lyons, J. Linguistic semantics: introduction / Lyons, J. Baku : Prestige printing house, 2014. 389 p.
11. New Webster's Dictionary and thesaurus of the English language / USA : Lexicon Publications, 1993. 1149 p.
12. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary / Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2005. 1780 p.
13. Valiyeva, N.Ch. Theoretical issues of stylistic lexicology / N.Ch.Valiyeva. Baku : Azerbaijan State Publishing, 2014. 185 p. (in Azerbaijani)

Сеїдзада Л. Е. ВІДМІННІСТЬ СЛЕНГУ ВІД ДІАЛЕКТІВ, ВУЛЬГАРИЗМІВ І РОЗМОВНОЇ МОВИ

Сленг – цікаве явище, яке існує у будь-якій мові. Сьогодні цей прошарок лексичної системи мови в сучасний період активно розширюється. Можна сказати, що він набуває все більшого поширення серед молоді, причому формуються нові слова та категорії. В основному це пов'язано з тим, що багато обмежень, що існували досі в суспільному та приватному житті, були зняті, і тому це проявляється у мові, у можливості людей висловлювати свої погляди. У деяких випадках здається, що вживання сленгу пов'язане з неграмотністю мов, але насправді це не так. Сленги, зазвичай, істотно відрізняються від норм літературної мови, хоча це завжди так. Сленг першим реагує на кожен подій та зміну в суспільстві та здатний їх засвоювати, у зв'язку з чим сленг популярніший серед молоді. Сленг відрізняється від діалектів та говірок своєю лексикою. Слова у його лексичній системі переважно поділяються на три групи: а) слова, взяті з іншої мови; б) спеціально створені слова; в) слова зі зміненим значенням, і т. д. Слова у сленгу незвичайні за своєю структурою та функцією. Ця функція посилює у слухача відчуття виразності та експресивності. В результаті є можливість поширюватись серед носіїв мови. Елементи сленгу швидко розповсюджуються і використовуються у світі мистецтва, хоча й у невеликій кількості носіїв. Сленг не однаковий у всіх народів. Так, у ряду народів він розвинений слабо, а в деяких народів – ширше. Наприклад, сленг, пов'язаний із полюванням та торгівлею, був широко поширений у російській мові до початку ХХ століття. Походження, формування та розвиток сленгов, а також відстеження їх перетворення з часом на літературну мову, дослідження їх пізнавального зв'язку, узагальнення цих уявлень, класифікація сленгу, вивчення походження та вживання слів із соціальної та функціональної точок зору можна розглядати як наукову новизну нашого дослідження.

Ключові слова: сленг, вульгаризм, соціальні діалекти, розмовна мова, спілкування, значення, закритість.