

Theoretische Grundlagen und Forschungsprobleme des Standard- und Unterstandardvokabulars in der Sprachik

Satimova Dilafuz Numonjonovna

PhD der Philologischen Wissenschaften, Abteilungsleiter an der Andizhan State Universität Interfakultäres Institut für Fremdsprachen (für exakte und Naturwissenschaften)

Zusammenfassung: In dem Artikel werden die theoretischen Grundlagen und Forschungsprobleme von Standard und Substandard in der Linguistik beschrieben. Insbesondere werden die Ansichten und theoretischen Schlussfolgerungen von Linguisten, die sich mit diesem Thema beschäftigen, sowie die Analyse von Standards und Substandards in der Erforschung lexikalischer Systeme und deren Kategorisierung im Rahmen der vergleichenden englischen und usbekischen Sprachen akribisch untersucht. Die wichtigsten Ergebnisse, die auf dem Gebiet des Wortschatzes mit begrenztem Umfang erzielt wurden, werden in dem Artikel beschrieben.

Schlüsselwörter: Standard, Substandard, Subnorm, Schicht, Umfang, Umgangssprache, Konsum, lexikalischer Stil, Kontrastive Linguistik.

Theoretical basis and research problems of standard and substandard vocabulary in linguistics

Dilafuz Satimova Numonjonovna

PhD of Philological Sciences, Head of department at Andizhan State University, Interfaculty department of foreign languages (for exact and natural sciences)

Abstract: The theoretical basis and research problems of standard and substandard in linguistics are described in the article. In particular, the views and theoretical conclusions of linguists working on this issue, as well as the analysis of standards and substandards in the study of lexical systems and their categorization within the framework of comparative English and Uzbek languages are studied meticulously. The main results achieved in the field of vocabulary of limited scope are described in the article.

Keywords: standart, substandard, subnorm, layer, scope, colloquialisms, consumption, lexical style, contrastive linguistics.

I. INTRODUCTION.

Development of language and society is not always limited to standard vocabulary, in which the emergence of new units of non-standard vocabulary is also observed. Most of the speech activity performs using substandard vocabulary. Knowledge of these words and phrases is essential for speakers to be able to communicate freely, have a deep understanding of modern literature and media, understand corporate vocabulary, grasp the speech of a socially restricted group, such as the underworld language, and prevent crime.

In linguistics, it is very crucial to comprehensively describe the substandard in terms of speech activity and to study its positive and negative aspects in the vocabulary of speech in contrastive linguistics.

The research of substandard lexical systems should mainly reveal typological features, similarities and differences between comparable sociolects, specific features of their interactions and development trends within comparative languages. Why is it necessary to study substandard vocabulary? It is understood that live communication is not only a demonstration of standards, but also a result of the interaction of society and language over internal and external factors that are not specific to language norms, including various groups in society, the criminal world, youth, the elderly, students, military personnel, regional dialects, speeches of various professions, and even representatives of the upper and lower classes.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Despite the fact that research in various languages on substandard in world linguistics has been conducted; this field is still a controversial and interesting issue. Notable works on the subject of standard and substandard are Dj.K. Hotten (1860), L. Bloomfield (1923), Dj.B. Greenou and Dj.L. Kittridge (1929), E.H. Partridge (1954), R. Bridges (1966), B.A.Ilish (1998), I.R.Galperin (1971), V.I.Arnold (1971), V.A.Xomyakov (1971), T.M.Belyaeva (1985), Sh.Shoabdurahmonov (1980), A.Hojiev (1981), M.E.Umarkhojaev (2010), Sh.Shahobiddinova (2019), M.Asqarova (1989), X.Jamolxonov (2000), M.Mirtojiev (1992) and others.

The progress of time, the reconstruction of social life, new technologies are leading to a certain change in all areas of language. In other words, such a transformation is making a significant shift at the lexical level of the language. In this case, when some words become obsolete, some come to life, other new words appear, and the activation of the lexicon is observed. There are cases when certain groups are limited to their own lexicon, or when those lexicons become more or less common lexicons, gaining popularity, realization, as a result of which the scope of consumption expands and vocabularies become richer.

It is natural to divide the vocabulary of each language into different layers depending on the sphere of consumption. It is obvious that the language owner enters into a free and lively conversation, preferring diversity in communication.

The vocabulary of the Uzbek language can be divided into two main layers according to the scope of consumption:

1. *The scope of application is not limited, general vocabulary.*
2. *Vocabulary with a limited scope of consumption, applied only to a certain extent* [1, P.11].

The above classification belongs to the lexicologist A.Khojiev, and the scientist argues that the vocabulary, which is not limited in scope, includes words that denote things and events, processes, necessary for the relationship of life in everyday life.

Uzbek linguists categorize vocabulary of limited scope into three types:

- 1) dialectal vocabulary

- 2) special (professional-terminological) vocabulary
- 3) jargons [1, P.17].

In the lexical differentiation of language we can comprehend some similarities and differences in the languages being compared. Comparison of languages allows clarifying not only the specific aspects and peculiarities of the studied phenomena in each language, but also their general or individual linguistic aspects.

The lexical structure of the English language is divided into 2 main layers: 1) Standard English (Стандартная лексика); 2) Substandard or Nonstandard English (Субстандарт или нестандартная лексика). The first lexical layer includes literary words, methodologically neutral words, and colloquialisms. There is no consensus in linguistics on the composition of the second layer, and scholars have different approaches to its composition [6, P.52].

III. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

According to V.P. Korovushkin, the lexical substandard includes the national and particular lexical style of speech as a specific object of special contrastive sociology. Thus they are divided into the following pairs:

- ✓ lower colloquialisms, common slang and vulgarisms
- ✓ socio-professional and socio-corporate jargons, esoteric argot / cant [3, P.3].

Pursuant to the scientist, this division can reveal another important typological feature of them, as well as allow further typology of sociolects in English and Russian [3, P.3].

Z. Kester-Thomas studies the layers of socially and culturally limited language and argues that the difficulty of learning such linguistic types is associated with the complexity of concepts. The researcher approaches the lexical layers in the form of three group-triads [2, P.15]. He distinguishes between standard and non-standard language elements with systemic characteristics that appear at all language levels. In particular, the linguist recognizes non-standard, linguistic forms that are not widespread at the lexical-phraseological level and do not embody the system. In this regard, the use of the linguistic terms Standard, Substandard, Subnorm, Nonstandard, Nichtstandart, Sociolect, Slang in European linguistics leads to some confusion.

An explanation of the word *Substandard* in the “Collins Dictionary” is as follows:

1. below an established or required standard
2. another word for nonstandard
3. nonstandard

a usually pejorative designation for forms of a language that differ from the standard dialect, and a term not widely used by linguists

4. noting or pertaining to a dialect or variety of a language or a feature of usage that is often considered by others to mark its user as uneducated; nonstandard [7].

The Substandard is related to the corresponding subculture of society. The dominant pathos of the youth subculture is inspired by the spirit of rebellion and the desire for self-expression, manifested in extraordinary, shocking behavior, including linguistic. That is why youth slang is marked not just by new, previously unprecedented lexical units, often greatly reduced stylistically. It contains words, the internal form of which is not just only unmotivated, but paradoxical, and their number in the youth jargon is especially large.

The Substandard refers to all manifestations of the national language, with the exception of the standardized literary language (that is, a dialect, vernacular, social and corporate jargons, which have dramatically expanded their scope in recent years). Substandard linguistic elements, as markers of subcultural values, potentially always have a chance to move into the standard (literary) plane.

In addition to targeting different types of cultures, Standard and Substandard differ in their relationship to norm and normativity. A huge, almost boundless literature is devoted to the norm. The substandard, being a destabilizing principle, is necessary for the functioning of the language system as homeostasis. It is unthinkable to remove the conservative, protective principle from the language, since this threatens the very existence of the language as a system. At the same time, elements that, at first glance, seem to be extremely destructive, ruinous for the system, in fact, contribute to the establishment of systemic equilibrium. The substandard is, by its very nature, predominantly spoken rather than written; this is modern folklore, addressed mainly to the listener, and not to the reader; this circumstance determines a special attitude towards the norm. [4, P. 20]

A motivated appeal to the substandard in all its manifestations can serve as a vivid example of the enrichment of language and speech.

The ratio of the standard and the substandard is conveyed by iconic coding, according to which the social distance of the communication participants is diagrammatically reflected with the help of a greater length of nominations (*зачетная книжка - зачетка, курсовая работа - курсовик*). [4, P. 26]

Lexical substandard units related to *argot* (the language of asocial elements experiencing a stable need to conceal thoughts, plans and desires, *jargon* (the language of social groups united by the same interests, preferences, occupation, social status, etc., *slang* (a social type of speech that differs from the literary language by the special use of word-formation means and specific, expressively rethought vocabulary and phraseology), as components of a single layer of substandard vocabulary, have certain similarities and differences. The use of substandard lexical units in speech is multifunctional (giving a pejorative coloration, invective, a person's belonging to a certain social class, group, etc.). To a large extent, it contributes to the representation of the image of a person using substandard vocabulary in his speech in the eyes of the participants in the communicative act. [5, P.7]

The accumulation of the sociocultural experience of using the substandard opens up interesting prospects. So, syncretic description of vocabulary in its interaction with both general literary and substandard layers seems to be highly promising, which should reflect the latest communication processes.

IV. CONCLUSION

All above considered, it is noteworthy to state that further research on substandarts will aid to comprehend a real life communication and can reveal the stage of spoken discourse in comparative languages. The two-level Standard-Substandard terms allow for the differentiation of vocabularies both horizontally and vertically in the differentiation of the lexical layer of language, as well as the separation of upper and lower poles. At the same time, through the Substandard, special attention is paid to the issue of all types of ethno-language, such as simple colloquial language, colloquialisms, dialectisms, slang, jargon and argot.

The intensive lexical dynamics of the "standard-substandard" ratio makes it possible to see significant shifts in the modern linguistic picture of the world. The research of the standard and the substandard in the language helps to clarify the nature of the adaptive language system, the elements of which are not so much mutually conditioned as they maintain the parameters of their existence within certain limits, create balance, and ensure the survival of the system.

References

1. Hojiev A., Ahmedov A. Lexicology of the Uzbek language. - T.: Science, 1981. - 312 p.
2. Kester – Toma Z. Standart, substandart, nonstandart [Electronic resource] / Z. Kester-Toma // Rusistika. - Berlin, 1993. - № 2. - p. 15–31. - Access mode: <http://www.philology.ru/linguistics2/koester-93.htm>.
3. Korovushkin V.P. The basis of contrasting sociology. Diss. abs. phil.scien. Pyatigorsk, 2005. - 50 p.
4. Kudinova T.A. Language substandard: sociolinguistic, linguocultural and linguo-pragmatic aspects of interpretation. Diss. abs. scien. deg. Doc. of Phil. – Nalchik, 2011. – 45 c.
5. Metelskaya Y.V. Human image in English and Russian substandard linguocultures. Diss.abs. Cand. of phil. scien. Pyatigorsk, 2012. – 26 c.
6. Satimova D.N. A comparative analysis of English and Uzbek youth slang. Doc.of phil.scien. (PhD)... diss. Andijan, 2020. - 156 p.
7. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/substandard>