

# Sociolexicographic Analysis of Non-Standard Vocabulary Dictionaries of Differently Structured Languages: A Contrastive Analysis Between English and Russian

Tulegenova Medina K.

Department of Foreign Languages, Abylkas Saginov Technical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan

Beiskhanova Saltanat A.

Department of Foreign Languages, Abylkas Saginov Technical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan

Magauina Gulbakhyt M.

Department of Foreign Languages, Abylkas Saginov Technical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan

Prozovskaya Eleonora A.

Department of Foreign Languages, Abylkas Saginov Technical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan

**Abstract**—The present paper explores the contrastive sociolexicographic analysis of non-standard vocabulary dictionaries in differently structured languages, with a primary focus on English and Russian. The study addresses the significance of documenting substandard vocabulary in lexicographic editions, emphasizing its relevance in both theoretical and applied linguistics. The authors assert that the development of modern non-standard vocabulary dictionaries will enhance the empirical foundation for linguistic hypotheses based on live speech data. The paper presents a detailed framework for comparing non-standard dictionaries, using parameters such as the microstructural organisation of dictionary entries. Citing the work of G.V. Ryabichkina, the paper identifies key elements that should be included in dictionary entries. They contain vocabulary representation, orthographic and orthoepic features, grammatical characteristics, and stylistic features. The study emphasises the need for comprehensive linguistic descriptions, including functional, social and ethical stylistic marks, as well as varied definitional approaches such as literary synonyms commonplace synonyms, and extended linguistic interpretations. This paper contributes to the broader understanding of how non-standard vocabulary is represented in dictionaries of English and Russian, providing insights into the nuances of language variation and lexicographic practice.

**Index Terms**—non-standard vocabulary, applied linguistics, dictionary entry, slang, English and Russian dictionaries

## I. INTRODUCTION

The issue of fixation and processing of non-standard language in dictionary editions is a subject of scientific interest, the study of which is necessary due to ‘the relevance of reflecting by lexicographic means those trends that determine the current and historical state of special vocabulary in all its diversity. The intensification of work on the creation of the latest dictionaries of the non-standard will significantly enrich the source base of those branches of theoretical and applied linguistics that need to confirm their hypotheses with the facts of live speech’ (Fel’de, 2012).

For the contrastive analysis of non-standard dictionaries of English and Russian, it is necessary to compare them in order to identify similarities and differences in several parameters. Such an approach facilitates the creation of multifunctional dictionaries (Pedersen et al., 2018), which integrate these features into reference tools. G. V. Ryabichkina, for instance, considers the parameter of microstructural organisation of a dictionary entry to be one of such parameters. According to the scientist, the objective of a dictionary entry should be to reveal the following components: vocabularies represented by a non-standard word, stable word combination or sentence; orthographic features; orthoepic characteristics; grammatical characteristics, indicated by necessary markings and inflection, showing control and valency; stylistic features of a vocabulary, and the designation of these features. They may be categorized as follows: functional-stylistic; social-stylistic; ethical-stylistic. The definition may be made in one of the following ways: literary synonym, commonplace synonym, extended linguistic interpretation, philological-encyclopaedical definition. The following characteristics should also be considered:

- sociolinguistic characteristics of the vocabulary: areal (for English-language material), represented by the labels indicating the main national variants of polyethnic English: British, American, Canadian, Indian, Australian, New Zealand and South African areolas;
- socio-professional characteristics of the vocabulary, indicated by word labels characterizing the societies of the speakers of the corresponding jargons: aviation jargon; military jargon; railway jargon; medical jargon; maritime jargon, etc.;
- socio-corporate characteristics of vocabularies, indicated by word marks characterizing the societies of the respective jargon speakers (by knowledge and interests outside the profession): a) youth jargon; b) student jargon, etc.;
- socio-subcultural characteristics of vocabularies, indicated by word marks characterizing the speakers of the corresponding jargons: homosexual jargon, drug addicts' jargon, prank jargon, etc.,
- socio-ethnic characteristics of vocabularies, indicated by word marks characterizing the societies of the speakers of the respective slangs: African-American slang, Anglo-Indian slang, and slang of other ethnic diasporas.
- historical-temporal characteristics of the vocabulary, indicated by vocabulary labels: centuries/hundreds, parts, decades, and specific years.

The author's citation (for lexemes collected from live speech) and illustrative example (lexemes extracted from a literary work) with its precise and complete passportisation and etymological-derivatological note: disclosure of the historical and etymological development of the lexeme in terms of form and content, word formation and lexicosemantic explanations for unusual innovations, showing the source of internal or external (foreign-language borrowing and peculiarities of its phonetic, graphic, morphological and semantic adaptation in the language receptor;

- linguocultural and linguocountry studies;
- linguo-ecological and juridical-linguistic information for vulgarisms and euphemisms' (Ryabichkina, 2009; Mini, 2013).

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of non-standard vocabulary and its inclusion in lexicographic works represents a vital area of research in both theoretical and applied linguistics. Non-standard language encompasses a variety of substandard forms, including slang, jargon, regionalisms, and colloquialisms, which are imperative for comprehending contemporary language utilisation. A fundamental aspect of this field is the accurate documentation of these forms in dictionaries, which plays a pivotal role in linguistic analysis and the exploration of language variation across different cultures.

The significance of incorporating non-standard vocabulary in lexicographic editions has been underscored by numerous scholars. Fel'de emphasises the necessity of including professional substandard vocabulary in lexicographic works for capturing the essential dynamic nature of language, especially as it evolves within specific social groups of professional communities. The expansion of lexicographic resources, particularly those dedicated to capturing youth slang or regional dialects, has been identified as a significant development in linguistic research, offering empirical data that illuminates the dynamic nature of language use in contemporary society (Fel'de, 2012).

The authors propose a detailed framework for comparing non-standard dictionaries, which is crucial for understanding the microstructural organisation of dictionary entries. This approach is in alignment with the work of Pederson et al. (2018), who explored the integration of various lexical resources, including dictionaries and wordnets. Their findings suggest that a multi-faceted approach to lexicography can address the complexities of language variation.

The importance of documenting non-standard vocabulary has been emphasised in various linguistic studies. For instance, Mini (2013) discusses the necessity of including colloquial and substandard terms in dictionaries to reflect the true linguistic landscape.

The paper addresses a central concern in modern lexicography: how to effectively capture and represent the complexities of non-standard language in dictionary form. The construction of lexicons that accurately reflect substandard language is of paramount importance, as they provide empirical evidence that can support linguistic theories grounded in real-world language usage. This standpoint finds concurrence with the contributions of Dubichinsky (1998), who emphasised the pivotal role of lexicons in both theoretical and practical lexicography, underscoring their function as instruments for both linguistic analysis and practical language learning.

In the context of contrastive analysis of English and Russian non-standard dictionaries, Ryabichkina (2009) provides a detailed framework for examining the structure and components of dictionary entries. She proposes that dictionary entries should comprise not only the word or phrase in question but also various linguistic features, including orthographic details, orthoepic (pronunciation) features, grammatical characteristics, and stylistic markers. The significance of Ryabichkina's work lies in its provision of a comprehensive perspective on the presentation of non-standard vocabulary dictionaries. According to Ryabichkina (2012), a dictionary entry should include functional-stylistic, social-stylistic, and ethical-stylistic markers, which help contextualise the term within its specific social environment. This is crucial for understanding the sociolects that arise within different groups, whether based on age, profession, or geographical location (Ryabichinka, 2012).

The integration of Apresyan's (1994) contribution on the language of definitions and semantic primitives indicates that the paper will also engage with theoretical debates concerning the optimal methods for defining and elucidating the

meaning of non-standard terms. Furthermore, the study of dictionary entries in both English and Russian highlights the differences in the organisation of non-standard vocabulary. Partridge's *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (2002) is regarded as one of the most comprehensive resources for the documentation of English slang. His approach is to catalogue the lexical items based on their usage in different subcultures, emphasising the role of slang in shaping language identity. By contrast, Russian lexicons, including *Bol'shoy Tolkovyy Slovar' Russkogo Zhargona* by Mokienko and Nikitina (2001) or Nikitina's *Tolkovyy Slovar' Molodezhnogo Slenga* (2008), adopt a more regional and culturally specific approach, emphasising the impact of social and political contexts, as well as generational shifts, on the evolution of youth slang.

Khodzhayeva (2013) has further contributed to the sociolexicographic analysis of youth slang by examining *Tolkovyy Slovar' Molodezhnogo Slenga* (Nikitina, 2008). She emphasises the necessity of a sociolinguistic approach to comprehending the evolution of youth slang, reflecting societal transformations and shaping linguistic and cultural units in the interpretation of non-standard vocabulary. She underscores the significance of realizing the cultural implications behind words when developing dictionaries of non-standard language.

The contrastive analysis of these resources reveals discrepancies in the treatment of non-standard vocabulary in English and Russian dictionaries. While English dictionaries frequently prioritise the lexicalisation of terms, defining slang through synonyms and contextual usage, Russian dictionaries tend to place greater emphasis on the historical, social, and political dimensions of non-standard vocabulary.

This phenomenon is indicative of the broader linguistic structure and cultural priorities inherent within each language. Ryabichkina's (2008) research also delves into the systematic categorisation of stylistic markers in substandard vocabulary dictionaries, noting the challenges and benefits of providing comprehensive definitions that reflect the fluidity of language.

The incorporation of Russian language dictionaries and research (Anisimova, 2013; Tsibizova, 2006; Vakhitov, 2001) underscores the cross-linguistic applicability of the proposed framework. Studies on Russian slang, such as Tsibizova's (2006) dissertation on the lexicographic description of contemporary youth jargon and Vakhitov's (2001) dictionary of Ufa slang, provide a crucial counterpoint to English-centric perspectives, thereby enriching the comparative analysis. Similarly, Anisimova (2013) emphasises the importance of lexicographic interpretation of linguocultural units, which are crucial for language learners.

A seminal figure in the field is G.V. Ryabichkina, whose contributions have shaped the framework for analysing entries. Ryabichkina (2011) contends that entries should not merely list words but also comprehensively represent their grammatical, orthographic, and phonological features. These multifaceted representations a more profound comprehension of the word's usage and its position within the socio-cultural milieu of a given language.

In conclusion, this paper makes a significant contribution to the field by providing a much-needed contrastive framework for analysing dictionaries of non-standard vocabulary in different languages. The study builds on existing research, especially the work of Ryabichkina, and by incorporating a cross-linguistic perspective, it advances our understanding of the lexicographic representation of language variation.

### III. METHODOLOGY

The following dictionaries were selected for the purpose of conductive contrastive sociolexicographic analysis: E. Partridge's dictionary "A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English", V.M. Mokienko and T.G. Nikitina's "Bol'shoy Tolkovyy Slovar' Russkogo Zhargona" and S. Vakhitova's "Dictionary of Ufa Slang". The following parameters identify the similarities and differences between the following dictionaries: microstructural organisation of vocabularies in the dictionary entry and observance of alphabetical order in the arrangement of vocabularies in the dictionary.

The contrastive sociolexicographic analysis of the aforementioned dictionaries has demonstrated discrepancies in their adherence to alphabetical order. In E. Partridge's dictionary, the alphabetical order is not observed. The non-observance of the vocabularies' alphabetical order is explained by the fact that the organisation 'something before nothing' proposed by Partridge is more suitable for this type of dictionary (Partridge, 2002).

The alphabetical order is observed in V.M. Mokienko and T.G. Nikitina's "Bol'shoy Tolkovyy Slovar' Russkogo Zhargona". The alphabetical order of vocabularies is also preserved in T.G. Nikitina's dictionary "Tolkovyy Slovar' Molodezhnogo Slenga". The organisation of vocabulary is undertaken in alphabetical order in this dictionary.

Utilising a sociolexicographic analysis of E. Partridge's dictionary, V.G. Ryabichkina asserts that the organisation of vocabularies in E. Partridge's dictionary is structured in alphabetical order (Ryabichkina, 2002). The organisation of dictionary entries is uniform, stereotypical and fixed throughout the whole corpus of the dictionary: vocabulary (headword or word combination), grammatical information, definition, stylistic and sociolinguistic information, and source with a possible illustrative example' (Partridge, 2002).

### IV. DISCUSSION

The following sociolexicographic analysis of the entry in such dictionaries will be conducted, with the example of *bong-tong* vocabula being used to illustrate the points made.

The grammatical information of the vocabulary is given by means of a designation, for example, flogged, adj. (adjective). A subsequent analysis of the microstructural organisation of the dictionary entry reveals that it provides information exclusively on grammatical characteristics. The definition of the word *bong-tong* is conveyed through the use of a synonym. It does not indicate the areal features of the word, provide etymological-derivatological reference, indicate social features of the lexeme, or provide information of historical-temporal character.

In contrast, the “Big explanatory dictionary of Russian jargon” (2000) comprises eight indexes within its dictionary entry, including *the title of the entry, grammatical characteristics, definition and interpretation of the word, illustrative material, indication of the source of the word, attributes, historical and etymological reference, derivations and interpretations of words in this dictionary.*

For instance, the sociolexicographic analysis of the vocabula *basok* can be examined through the vocabulary zones: *grammatical mark*: adverbial, adverbial – predic. (predicate); *functional characteristic*: this word originates from youth slang; *expressive-stylistic mark*: approve. (approving); *interpretation*: excellent; *illustrative material*: *yesterday we had a steam bath – basok*; *passportisation*: a) *lexicographic source*: S.I. Maximov, 1998, No. 4 (Maximov B. Dictionary of youth speech: lame speech from A to Ya // Speed-info, 1998, No. 4 – 10); author’s field collection: Record 1999; *historical and etymological note*: dialect: *basok* – good (Maximov, 1998).

The dictionary entry, in T.G. Nikitina’s “Tolkovyy Slovar’ Molodezhnogo Slenga”, comprises *a headword, a phonetic characteristic, somatization of the headword, a phonetic characteristic, semantisation of the headword, interpretation, and an etymological reference.*

A sociolinguistic analysis of the dictionary entry from the “Tolkovyy Slovar’ Molodezhnogo Slenga” vocabula *allo*;

- 1) grammatical marking: in the significance adj. impersonal – predicate, endorsement – unchangeable word. It is employed in an impersonal – predicative capacity;
- 2) expressive and stylistic characterisation: *approve*;
- 3) interpretation: *excellent, excellent*;
- 4) illustration: *well, I’ll tell you, it was allo*;
- 5) passporting: source: Nikitina T.G. Dictionary of phraseological terminology, 1996. – p. 136;
- 6) combinability: *in general, not allo*. Jokingly ironic (Nikitina, 2008).

The obligatory sociolexicographic analysis is not carried out in the “Bol’shoy Tolkovyy Slovar’ Russkogo Zhargona” by V.M. Mokienko and T.G. Nikitina. From social features, the authors indicate only the functional characteristics of the word, limiting themselves to pointing out the sociocorporate characteristics of the vocabulary. The socio-subcultural and linguocultural characteristics of the vocabulary are not addressed. Conversely, Ryabichkina (2012) emphasises the contemporary significance of a synthesis between philology and culture in lexicography.

Sociolexicographic parameters of the microstructural organisation of the dictionary entry of this vocabula are also not maintained in T.G. Nikitina’s “Tolkovyy Slovar’ Molodezhnogo Slenga”, as only the following parameters are given: *grammatical notes, expressive and stylistic characteristics, passportisation, definition, illustration, and combinability.* However, the sociolexicographic characteristics of the vocabula *allo* are not provided, thus leaving the reader unacquainted with the socio-corporate characteristics of the vocabula, its socio-subcultural characteristics, historical-temporal and linguocultural, and linguocountry studies data (Khodzhayeva, 2013). At the beginning of the 21st century, the question of establishing a new branch of lexicography – *linguoculturography* was raised. The period of its emergence is designated by O.K. Anisimova in the 1990s and the beginning of the 21st century (Anisimova, 2012).

In addition, O.V. Tsibizova has noted that the microstructure of dictionary entries in T.G. Nikitina’s lexicographic edition is traditional in terms of the structure of ‘most dictionary entries: it includes several lexicographic zones: the title word, its grammatical, functional and expressive-stylistic characteristics, interpretation, illustrative material, and passportisation of the source material. It is further noted that some dictionary entries contain historical and etymological references (Tsibizova, 2006).

It should also be noted that in the above dictionary there are problems with the presentation of the grammatical marks of some words, such as *nishtyak, nishtyachek, normalek, and normul* (good, normal); the generic affiliation of the dictionary words *trail-vali* is also not indicated. The attribution of certain words to one or another genus is doubtful, as the author does not present the context of word usage; cf. the dictionary entry: *pivachok, pivi*, not changed. *m., marish*, not changed. *fem. marijuana. Where did you get the marish (marijuana)?*

The sociolexicographic contrastive analysis shows that Vakhitov’s dictionary S. of Ufa slang also fails to maintain all the parameters of the model of microstructural organisation of a dictionary entry on the examples of vocabula *authority*. They include: 1. the headword is presented in the nominative case (orthographic and orthoepic features are not specified); 2. the gender of the given word is indicated in the genitive case; 3. the socio-subcultural characteristics of the vocabula are given, indicating the society of the speakers of this slang, i.e., it is shown that this is the slang of criminals; 4. the entry is semantic (the word is given a definition by means of a detailed linguistic interpretation: experienced criminals, having power; the interpretation of the meaning of the word is also carried out with the help of synonyms: *authority – leader, leader, ‘the kid, everyone in a certain group’*); 5. an illustrative material is given: *an authority at a wake stands up and makes a speech*. Nedelya, 2001, no. 2; 6. the source of the factual material is given (the newspaper “Nedelya”).

The analysis of the dictionary entry reveals that the grammatical marking of vocabularies is not adequately represented in the dictionary. Specifically, the control and valence of the word are not displayed, and the stylistic, historical-temporal and etymological-derivatological aspects are not addressed (Dubichinsky, 1998).

The contrastive analysis of the aforementioned dictionaries has demonstrated that they adopt divergent approaches to the parameter of marking. The Ukrainian scientist V.V. Dubichinsky hypothesises that a word mark is 'a dictionary specification of the stylistic level of usage, functional and professional sphere of use, semantic characteristics of lexical units, etc., given in an abbreviated or conventional (symbolic) record' (Ryabichkina, 2008). In the works of G.V. Ryabichkina, the dictionary entry is understood as 'a lexicographic index, presented and clarifying morphological, ethno-cultural and sociolinguistic (areal-territorial) characteristics of the lexicographic unit, which are not fully disclosed in order components of the dictionary entry – in the definition, derivatological reference, illustrative examples and passportisation of the material used in the dictionary' (Ryabichkina, 2008).

Consider the parametrization of labels in E. Partridge's Dictionary of English Slang. Four main labels are used here: *grammatical, stylistic, sociolinguistic, and derivatological* (Partridge, 2002). The peculiarity of the notes in this dictionary is that each note contains a number of private, specific notes, e.g. grammatical notes include the following: a) indications of parts of speech, e.g., participles (note: ppl = past participle) scuttered Ppl. Captured: military) 1914; b) indexes of lexico-grammatical characteristics of parts of speech, for example, indexes of verb plausibility are given (entry: in passiv, den ju passive. To 1 log, to be whipped: in. C. 16-18, coll.

*The socio-stylistic markers* include as private markers the following:

– *functional-stylistic entries*, which include: a) stratification entries. In this case, elements that have been given the status of a literary standard are indicated, in particular the entries: col. (= colloquial), comp. *backhander. A blow with the back of the hand* coll. by 1870. S.E. b) Functional-historical entries. A new word or an obsolete word is indicated in the dictionary (the entry is a conditional + (= obsolete);

– *ethno-stylistic entries*, e.g., jocular (entry: *jocular*), *baby-maker*, and *hoom the census. To get a woman with child; jocular* coll.: p. 20;

– *sociolinguistic labels* include eight private labels. The local origin or use of a word. A private entry is labelled as accepted in England (adopted Anglicised): *Baby. A girl, sweetheart. USA (c.1010), adopted c. 1930.*

*South African Midlands geo-geographical entries:*

- a) *indexes of territorial regiolects*, e.g., a note (in the regiolect of the South African interior: *buck-doctor covenant veterinary surgeon: coll. of South African Midlands*): pp. 19-20;
- b) *indexes of territorial dialects*, note *Ayrshire* (slang – dialect of the county of Ercaire in Scotland): bucket. A glass of spirits: low Ayrshire: 1870;
- c) *indexes of localised semi-dialects*. The note *seaport* (location of the mundane ports of Great Britain) broom pr. (at the masthead), it carries the. She's a) where: a seaport c.p. of c. 1820-90;
- d) *indexes of localised urban colloquialisms*: note *Dublin* (Dublin localect), lowman. A companion or friend, a 'pak'; also, as a term of address: Dublin lower classes: from c. 1910;
- e) *Indexes of provincialisms*. Mark provincial s. = slang: bagging. Food taken between meals: provincial s. rather than dialect.: pp. 18-49;
- f) *indexes of classes*: mark Burma;
- g) *indexes of world regions*. Note Arabic-speaking countries: shwaiya. A little: Army, hence Air Force, in Arabic-speaking countries: since c. 1925;
- h) *indexes of places of military-patriotic events*. Note *Arras sector: Arras shifter*. Nickname of a big gun used in the Arras sector in 1917: military.

*Temporal marks*: note the sign + *after a date* indicates that the lexeme was in use during the period indicated:

- a) *indications of the period of functioning in terms of one or more centuries* (mark: p. 14. Broker. A peddler of monger; pejorative: late C. 14;
- b) *indications of the period of functioning in terms of decades*, e.g., within C. 16. *backward, ring the bells*. To sound the alarm: c. 1500, 1890; col. S.E.; breeding. Parentage: low coll.: c. 1597, 1620;
- c) *indicators of entry time into common usage in terms of specific dates within centuries*, e.g., bound I dare or will be. I feel certain: certainly. coll.: from c. 1530.
- d) *indicators of time out of use in terms of specific dates within centuries*, e.g., within C. 12: Ropper, marry, Mrs. to enlist in the marines: naval (1864).

*Historical entries:*

- a) *indexes of the periods of service in terms of non-military historical events*. Restoration period (Restoration period: 1660 - 88): bamble. To fornicate: Restoration period;
- b) *marking periods of operation in terms of military historical events*. Irish labour market (civil wars: 1641-52; 1689 - 91).

*Social class markings*. For example, indexes of the upper classes of society: mark society [s] (s=slang) (high society vocabulary): bad form. Vulgar; rude; unacceptable of society: society s.: from ca. 1860:

– *socio-professional notes*. Tagged *aviation s. (s = slang) (aviation vocabulary): conk, v. to fail: aviation s. (1918) 1, by 1921, gen. coll.;*

– *socio-corporate labels*. *Beatniks (lexicon of the beatnik subculture): deb chik. A debutant beatnik: mostly beatnik: since the late 1950s...*;

– *professional-corporate notes*. *Commercial traveller's note: box Harry to the lunch and afternoon. Tea together: business travellers: 1850- 1910;*

– *sociodemographic notes*. *Women's note (women's slang): Birthday, give (something) to clean thoroughly, e.g. a room: London women. C. 20;*

– *derivatological marks (indexes of borrowing sources)*. For example: *boull.*

*A conversation in which anyone may take part: Charterhouse: c. 1860 - 1990, A. H. Tod. For example. Gr. Booh, a council (Partridge, 2002).*

We note that the contrastive sociolexicographic analysis of the parameters of compliance with general labels (pragmatic, stylistic, sociolinguistic, derivatological), which include additional private labels, shows that the explanatory dictionary of V.M. Mokienko and T.G. Nikitina does not sufficiently specify private labels related to the main ones. Thus, the sociolexicographic analysis of the vocabula *majority* (rich) shows that the grammatical mark of this word includes only the indication of the speech part (adjective, because it has the endings -aya, -oye). There is no indication of the lexico-grammatical characteristics of the language. Of the social and stylistic features, only the functional and stylistic ones are given. It is emphasised that the word belongs to the youth slang. Marker: *youth*. Ethical-stylistic notes are not given; compare the fixation of the word *majorist* in the dictionary of V.M. Mokienko and T.G. Nikitina:

– *Majorist -aya, -oye, youth. Disapproving. Peculiar, belonging to a major – a representative of the elite. Such a "majorist" office: soft chairs, the sea, girls in minis. Why do you talk like a major chick? Mitrofanov, Nikitina, 109. + Yuganovs, 126.*

The authors also use an indirect marker of social class. This private marking is the main indicator of the sociolinguistic marking of the dictionary entry. The vocabula is also characterized by historical-temporal properties, as evidenced by citations to the works of other authors who are included in the dictionary.

The contrastive-sociolexicographic analysis between T.G. Nikitina's "Tolkovyy Slovar' Molodezhnogo Slenga" and E. Partridge's Dictionary of Youth Slang in terms of general and private vocabulary labels shows that the former dictionary contains only three of the four main vocabulary labels (grammatical, socio-stylistic, sociolinguistic). Compare: vocabula *super, unchangeable, adverbial, impersonal predicate, approving, something excellent, superlative*. After the last chord, there was a rapturous cry: 'Borja, this is super.' Zhitinsky, 102. I'm reading a slang dictionary here – super! WMN, 90. Gena, show me something with high heels. Oh! Super! (TNT, 'Happy Together, 2007).

1. *The grammatical entry* includes such private notations as: an index of parts of speech: the part of speech – adverb is indicated, for example, it is noted that it is an unchanging part of speech and acts as an impersonal predicative adverb.

2. *Social and stylistic entry*. It is pointed out that such a private marking of this main marking is an ethical-stylistic marking. The dictionary in question states that this word has an approving connotation.

3. *Sociolinguistic entry*. The dictionary does not directly indicate the private sociolinguistic mark, but its inclusion in the "Tolkovyy Slovar' Molodezhnogo Slenga" indicates that the vocabulary belongs to youth slang.

## V. RESULTS

The contrastive sociolexicographic analysis of E. Partridge's dictionaries and S. Vakhitov's "Dictionary of Ufa Slang" shows that the latter does not fully use basic and private labels. Thus, the main grammatical marker vocabula *klushka* indicates the word ending and its gender. The second marker is sociolinguistic; it is indicated as a private socio-corporate marker, as the vocabula *klushka* refers to the slang of hippies. Derivatological note. The way of formation of the word abbreviation (abbreviation of KLH (Club of Hippie Lovers)) is indicated.

The dictionary entry defines the vocabulary and gives an example of its use; cf. the dictionary entry vocabulary. *Klushka* is in the dictionary under review: *klushka, -i, f. – 1. An adult girl. 2. A vulgarly dressed girl. - A hockey stick – 'a person who sympathises with hippies but is not a hippie himself (though often imitates them)'. From the acronym KLH – Club of Hippie Lovers (Rozhansky, 1992).*

The contrastive-lexicographic analysis of E. Partridge's dictionary and other Russian-language non-standard dictionaries shows that in multilingual non-standard dictionaries the vocabulary is semanticised in different ways. According to the lexicographers Y.D. Apresyan, P.N. Denisov and M.V. Moiseev. Lexicographic semanticisation should meet such requirements as relativity or addressee orientation, multiple descriptions of the same range of language and linguistic phenomena, semantic step-by-step description, systematicity, standardisation, simplicity, economy, sufficiency, etc. (Apresyan, 1994).

E. Partridge's dictionary uses such types of definitions as a literary synonym, *a number of literary synonyms, a non-literary synonym, a detailed linguistic interpretation, a philological-encyclopaedic definition, the introduction of intertextual quotations; a combined definition; a reference to another dictionary entry* (Ryabichkina, 2008).

The study of derivation methods in E. Partridge's dictionary shows how a vocabulary is interpreted with the help of: a) a literary synonym, see (vocabula *boob. To blunder. Army and Force: since ca. 1930*); b) by means of several literary synonyms (vocabula-noun: *bouncer, a bully, swaggerer, blusterer: late. pp. 17-19; coll.*); c) vocabula is interpreted by

means of a non-literary synonym (vocabulary: *barrow*. A 'black Maria': *Australian*: p.20; in the corresponding dictionary entry. It interprets the slangism *barrow*' as Black Maria. *A prison cart used to transport prisoners*. From about 1870: orig. c.: by 1902, s.; by 1930, coll.).

The next type of interpretation is to use an extended linguistic interpretation. Vocabulary verb: *belt*, v. *To divert the result from the straight line by deliberately losing a match. Association footballer. Since c. 1950*.

The word in this dictionary is also interpreted by intertext. A vocabulary is interpreted by quoting from other dictionaries, jargon, e.g., vocabulary: *bandstand*. *The circular gun platform in small escort ships* [Granville W.A. Dictionary of Naval Slang, 1945] (Ryabichkina, 2008).

The semantics of a word in E. Partridge's dictionary is also given by means of a combined definition; cf. *bacon-hole* vocabulary. *Mouth: mostly R.A.F.: since ca. 1945*.

The word interpretation, in the "Bol'shoy Tolkovyy Slovar' Russkogo Zhargona" by V.M. Mokienko and T.G. Nikitina, is carried out in the following ways:

- 1) with the help of synonyms, cf. Vocabulary: *bairovat'*, -uyu, -yet, incomp, whom. crimin. BBI, 22; Perm: Miljanenlov, 79; Bayadaev, 1, 25. Vocabulary: *betonno* (concrete), jarg. coll. *Precisely, necessarily*, Elistratov, 40;
- 2) by enumerating synonyms. In this case, a vocabulary is interpreted by listing several of its synonyms listed one after another. The method of interpretation can be characterised as combined when several techniques are combined: enumerative, literary synonym + extended linguistic interpretation, cf.: vocabulary - *gruzchik* (loader) -a, m. youth. Unapproved. *A liar, deceiver* – a person who speaks nonsense. Some words and expressions used in Novorossiysk: *pognat'* – exaggerate, *gruzchik* – liar. AiF, 1992, No. 21;
- 3) descriptive way. cf. vocabulary: *yulonit'*, -nyu, -nit, incomp., crim. *To lie*; FBI, 300; Baldaev, II, 183;
- 4) extended linguistic interpretation. The fourth way of definition in the dictionary of V.M. Mokienko, T.G. Nikitina, is vocabulary: crim. *To throw someone's wallet when committing a theft*. SRVS, III, 80; Miljanenkov, 88 BBI, 35; Baldaev, 1, 47;
- 5) the use of a philological-encyclopaedic definition for the interpretation of a method: vocabulary *andropovka* – i, f. jarg. coll. *Joke. Moskovskaya vodka, the price of which was reduced during Y.V. Andropov's tenure as General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee*. Nikitina, 10; Yuganovs, 24.

As we can see, in the dictionary of V.M. Mokienko and T. G. Nikitina, the following methods of vocabulary definition are used:

- definition by means of the list of literary synonyms;
- interpretation by means of a combined method: list of literary synonyms + extended interpretation;
- descriptive method of word semantics;
- clarification of the word meaning by means of the extended linguistic interpretation;
- interpretation of the word meaning by means of the method of philological-encyclopaedic definition.

In the "Tolkovyy Slovar' Molodezhnogo Slenga" by T.G. Nikitina, the following types of definitions are given:

- the use of a literary synonym, see: '*razdolbajstvo*, -a. Incompetence, irresponsibility. AIF, 2005, No. 45;
- the method of interpretation is enumerative: vocabulary *Yely-paly*, Mitki expression (in Mitki). Denotes offence, regret, joy, apology, fear and anger. From 'Manifesto of the Mitki' (Nenashev, Pilatov, 74) '*Yely-paly*' – *this is not us*, 1991, No. 3, 175. *Yely-paly, rock'n'roll is so close*. MK, 03.04.98;
- philological-encyclopaedic interpretation: vocabulary *Atas*, inter. Warning of danger: *Atas! Chira is dragging*. *Mitrofanov, Nikitina 11, Atas! Parents! Yuganovs, 25. Atas! Cops! Elistratov, 26*. Criminals! BSRJ jargon, 40. This method of interpretation gives a more detailed interpretation about the meaning of the word by giving examples as well as etymological reference; the mode of interpretation is descriptive. Vocabulary: (from evoking approval, admiration). '*Well, full flight!*' Rekshak, 20.

In the "Dictionary of Ufa Slang", vocabularies are defined in the following ways:

- interpretation by introducing a literary synonym, cf.: vocabulary *galima* (галима) f. – nonsense, absurdity. Shortened from *galimatya*. Sterin has a variant of *haluma* (галюма) (Sterin 20);
- by using the method of interpretation: vocabulary: *buhoi* (бухой) – drunk, -aya, -oe. At eleven o'clock in the evening he came into some office and said to me, 'Don't go anywhere!' *Vechernaya Ufa*, 2001, No. 16. Originally meaning 'drunk, saturated with moisture, swollen, soft' (Tolstoy, 1995, pp. 416-417). In the Ofen language *bukhan* means 'glass', '*bukhalka* means 'shot glass', *bukharik* means 'glass', *buhlyanka* means 'bottle' (Bondaletov, 1974, p. 86);
- the word 'show off', – I am showing off, – you are showing off again in this layer. First you show off by breaking your finger, and then, when you really want to leave, you wave your arms and jump. *Bazar*, 2001, no. 19. *Trubachev* derives from the regional *vypetivat'*, where it was then inflected, '-n' and '-tr.' passed into -dr. under conditions of expressive use (Trubachev, 1965, p. 131).

Combined way of interpreting, cf. Vocabulary: *to pick brains* – to annoy, to talk nonsense, to deceive. *Don't pick brains*. *Mikhelson's klepat* – 'to gossip about someone, to talk nonsense, to slander'- *and he has klepalo* 'tongue in a bell' (Mikhelson; 431). *Klepat*, 'to deceive', from *klepat*, 'to ring', agrees with the model 'to make a ringing sound' – to deceive, associatively connected with *kovat*, 'to bind'. Compare: *kovy* deceitful intentions, intrigues. According to *Michelson*, the words *kovy* and *rivet* are related to each other and to the myth of *Vulcan*, the god of fire, the blacksmith

who ‘riveted Venus when she was in the arms of Mars’ (Michelon I: 436). The results of the contrastive sociolexicographic analysis of the substandard lexicons according to three parameters: 1) on the microstructural organisation of the dictionary entry (compliance with the model of structural organisation of the dictionary entry); 2) on the use of basic and private entries in the dictionary and their systematisation; 3) on the use of vocabulary definitions paths in multilingual substandard dictionaries, are presented in the table below.

TABLE 1  
SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN MICROSTRUCTURAL ORGANIZATION OF ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN SUBSTANDARD DICTIONARIES

Parameters of microstructural organisation (dictionary entry, notes, modes of interpretation)	Non-standard vocabulary dictionaries of Russian and English languages			
	V.M. Mokienko, T.G. Nikitina “Bol’shoy Tolkovyy Slovar’ Russkogo Zhargona”. - SPB: Norint, 200 E. 1984.	T.G. Nikitina. “Tolkovyy Slovar’ Molodezhnogo Slenga”. M.: AST, 2008.	S. Vakhitov. “Dictionary of Ufa Slang” – Ufa: GPU Publishing House, 2001.	E. Partridge “A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English” / ed. by Paul Beale, 8 <sup>th</sup> ed., N.Y.: Macmillan publishing Co.
Adherence to the model of vocabulary microstructural organisation	The dictionary contains 8 indexes: entry title, grammatical, functional, expressive-stylistic, word interpretation, illustration, sociolinguistic, historical and etymological passports.	The dictionary contains seven labels: vocabularies, grammatical, expressive-stylistic, interpretation, illustration, passportisation, and systemacity.	It gives the vocabulary its grammatical, social and cultural characteristics, the interpretation of the word, the definition, the demonstration of the use of the word and the source.	In the process of microstructural organisation of the dictionary, not all 10 parameters are used, but only grammatical and stylistic (sociolinguistic, derivatological and definitional) notes.
Methods of interpretation	There are 5 types of definitions in the dictionary.	The dictionary uses 4 methods of interpretation.	There are 4 types of vocabulary interpretation used in the dictionary.	The dictionary uses 8 methods of vocabulary interpretation:
Systematisation of excrements	In the dictionary, grammatical marking contains 1 index; social stylistic marking - 1) not all private markings are respected.	In this dictionary only grammatical and social -stylistic marks are given, they contain one private marker each.	The main parameters of the dictionary entry are not fully used, not all private markers are given in S. Vakhitov’s dictionary.	It uses not only the notes of the basic vocabulary, but also notes: grammatical mark includes two private indexes; socio-stylistic includes 3 types of private marks; sociolinguistic includes 9 private marks.

## VI. CONCLUSION

The contrastive sociolexicographic analysis of non-standard vocabulary dictionaries for English and Russian demonstrates the importance of documenting non-standard language in a way that takes into account both linguistic structure and social context. By comparing the microstructural components of dictionary entries and examining the role of stylistic, social, and ethical markers, this research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how non-standard vocabulary is represented and interpreted in lexicographic works. Integrating these findings into lexicographic practice will enhance both theoretical linguistics and applied sociolinguistics, ensuring that non-standard vocabulary is accurately and comprehensively represented.

Thus, when considering the macro- and microstructure of English and Russian non-standard dictionaries, the analysis revealed the following similarities and differences of the dictionaries of non-standard vocabulary considered: 1. *similarities*. When creating English and Russian substandard vocabulary dictionaries, lexicographers adhere to the generally accepted methodology of lexicography of sociolects, which are arranged in alphabetical order inherent in all types of dictionaries; there is a vocabulary (dictionary word, lemma), definition (definition, interpretation, semanticisation), grammatical, word-formative, illustrative parts, syntactic notes, references and spellings; 2. *differences in dictionaries*:

- the main parameters of the dictionary entry are preserved, but private notes are not sufficiently used; eight ways of vocabula interpretation are used in the dictionary of V.M. Mokienko, T.G. Nikitina, “Bol’shoy Tolkovyy Slovar’ Russkogo Zhargona” (2000);
- the main labels are present, private labels are few, the structure of the dictionary entry is not preserved, and not all types of vocabulary definitions are used. English non-standard vocabulary dictionaries are divided into two groups in the dictionary of S. Vakhitov, “Dictionary of Ufa Slang” (2001);
- the parameters of the microstructure of the dictionary entry are more fully observed: a) the use of a large number of general and private labels; different types of definitions, labelling systems in the dictionary of E. Partridge “A Dictionary of Slang” (2001). Partridge, “A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English” (1984).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Anisimova, O.K. (2013). Leksikograficheskaya interpretatsiya lingvokul'turnykh yedinit: model'nyy slovar' lingvokul'turnoy gramotnosti: dlya izuchayushchikh russkiy yazyk kak nerodnoy/inostranny [Lexicographic interpretation of linguacultural units: a model of the dictionary of linguacultural literacy: for those studying Russian as a non-native/foreign language]. *Dissertatsiya kandidata filologicheskikh nauk*: 10.02.01. Novosibirsk, 249.
- [2] Apresyan, Yu. D. (1994). O yazyke tolkovaniy i semanticheskikh primitivakh [On the language of interpretations and semantic primitives]. *Izvestiya Rossiyskoy akademii nauk. Seriya literatury i yazyka*. T. 53, № 4, 27 – 40.
- [3] Dubichinsky, V.V. (1998). *Teoreticheskaya i prakticheskaya leksikografiya*. [Theoretical and practical lexicography]. Vienna; Kharkov, p. 160.
- [4] Felde, O.V. (2012). Leksika professional'nogo substandarta v leksikograficheskom osveshchenii. [Vocabulary of professional substandard in lexicographic coverage]. *Bulletin of NSU. Series: History, Philology*. V. 11, No. 9, 41 – 45.
- [5] Gazeta *Nedelya*. (2001). [The newspaper *Nedelya*]. No. 2. 6.
- [6] Khodjaeva, N.Kh. (2013). Sotsioleksikograficheskiy analiz «Tolkovogo slovarya molodezhnogo slenga» T.G. Nikitinoy [Sociolexicographical analysis of the “Explanatory Dictionary of Youth Slang” by T.G. Nikitina]. *Bulletin of the Leningrad State University named after A.S. Pushkin*. No. 1, 75 – 80.
- [7] Maksimov, B. (1998). Slovarik molodozhnoy rechi: khromaya rech' ot A do YA [Dictionary of youth speech: lame speech from A to Z]. *Speed-info*, No. 4–10: author's field collection.: Recording 1999.
- [8] Mini, B. (2013). Lexicographical Problems in isiXhosa. *Lexikos*, 5, 40-56. <https://doi.org/10.5788/5-1-1055>.
- [9] Mokienko, V.M., Nikitina T.G. (2001). *Bol'shoy tolkovyy slovar' russkogo zhargona: 25 000 slov. 7000 ustoychivyykh sochetaniy* [Large explanatory dictionary of Russian jargon: 25,000 words. 7000 stable combinations].
- [10] Nikitina, T.G. (2008). *Tolkovyy slovar' molodezhnogo slenga*. [Explanatory dictionary of youth slang]. M.: ACT, 256 c. Moscow: AST, p. 256.
- [11] Partridge, E.A. (2002). *Dictionary of slang and Unconventional English*. – Ed. 8th. – N.Y.: Macmillan Publishing Co., 2002. – p. 1432.
- [12] Pedersen, B., Nimb, S., Olsen, S., & Sorensen, N. (2018). *Combining Dictionaries, Wordnets and other Lexical Resources Advantages and Challenges*.
- [13] Ryabichkina, G.V. (2009). Problemy substandartnoy leksikografii angliyskogo i russkogo yazykov: teoreticheskiy i prikladnoy aspekty [Problems of substandard lexicography of English and Russian languages: theoretical and applied aspects] *monograph*. Pyatigorsk, p. 878.
- [14] Ryabichkina, G.V. (2012). Sravnitel'nyy analiz prezentatsiy substandartnykh leksem v angliyskikh substandartnykh i prostorechnykh slovaryakh. [Comparative analysis of the presentation of substandard lexemes in English substandard and Russian colloquial dictionaries]. *Almanac of modern science and education*. No. 9(64), 185 – 187.
- [15] Ryabichkina, G.V. (2008). Sistematizatsiya pomet v substandartnykh slovaryakh (sotsioleksikograficheskiy analiz) [Systematization of labels in substandard dictionaries (sociolexicographic analysis)]. *Philological sciences. Theoretical and practical issues*. No. 1(1), part 2, 116 – 118.].
- [16] Ryabichkina, G.V. (2008). Semantizatsiya slovarya v slovare E. Partridzha «Slovar' slenga i netraditsionnogo angliyskogo yazyka (sotsioleksikograficheskiy analiz) [Semantization of vocables in the dictionary of E. Partridge “A dictionary of slang and unconventional English (sociolexicogeographical analysis)”] *Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University*. № 21, 137 – 147.
- [17] Ryabichkina, G.V. (2008). Teoreticheskiye aspekty razrabotki sotsioleksikograficheskogo instrumentariya. [Theoretical aspects of the development of sociolexicographic tools. *Almanac of modern science and education*]. No. 8(15), part 2, 167 – 169.
- [18] Tsibizova, O.V. (2006). Sovremennyy molodezhnyy zhargon: problemy leksikograficheskogo opisaniya. [Modern youth jargon: problems of lexicographic description] *dissertation of candidate of philological sciences*: 10.02.01. Severodvinsk, 183.
- [19] Vakhitov, S. (2001). *Slovar' ufimskogo slenga*. [Dictionary of Ufa slang]. Ufa: Publishing house of BSPU, p. 262.

**Tulegenova Medina Kazhimkanovna**, PhD at Department of Foreign languages, Abylkas Saginov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan. Her research interests include applied linguistics, lexicography. [mail.rumadina@mail.ru](mailto:mail.rumadina@mail.ru)

**Beiskhanova Saltanat Altayevna**, PhD candidate at Department of Foreign languages, Abylkas Saginov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan. Her research interests include cross-cultural linguistics. [saltanat\\_b@internetl.ru](mailto:saltanat_b@internetl.ru)

**Magauina Gulbakyt Muratovna**, MA at Department of Foreign languages, Abylkas Saginov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan. Her research interests include applied linguistics. [Gulba\\_85@mail.ru](mailto:Gulba_85@mail.ru)

**Prozovskaya Eleonora Andreyevna**, MA at Department of Foreign languages, Abylkas Saginov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan. Her research interests include applied linguistics, intercultural communication. [Miss\\_elle\\_19@mail.ru](mailto:Miss_elle_19@mail.ru)