

M.K. Tulegenova<sup>\*1</sup>, Zh.N. Zhunussova<sup>2</sup>, N.K. Khan<sup>3</sup>, B.K. Ayazbayeva<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan;*

<sup>2</sup>*L.N. Gumilev Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan;*

<sup>3</sup>*E.A. Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan*

(E-mail:<sup>1</sup>[mail.rumadina@mail.ru](mailto:mail.rumadina@mail.ru), [zhanyl\\_08@mail.ru](mailto:zhanyl_08@mail.ru); [hnadeida@yandex.ru](mailto:hnadeida@yandex.ru), [bahit0108@gmail.com](mailto:bahit0108@gmail.com);) )

## Lexicographic tools for describing substandard lexical systems of the contrasted languages

The study explores challenges in describing non-standard lexical items within the lexicographic frameworks of different languages. The relevance of the study stems from the absence of a unified methodology for the description of non-standard vocabulary in modern lexicography. It is shown that the traditional lexicographic approaches often fail to reflect the full semantic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic specificity of substandard lexemes. The paper justifies the need for a dedicated lexicographic instrument tailored to substandard vocabulary. An overview of current lexicographic strategies in both English and Russian traditions is presented using the examples of E. Partridge's dictionary and S. Vakhitov's Dictionary of Ufa Slang. Special focus is placed on microstructural elements of dictionary entries, including various types of grammatical, stylistic, and sociolinguistic annotations and the concept of the Lexicographic Method (LGM) as a basis for the semantic-pragmatic analysis of substandard vocabulary. Drawing on the research findings, the authors advocate for a sociolexicographic approach aimed at developing a lexicographic portrait of a word. The resulting portrait integrates multiple linguistic dimensions such as phonetics, grammar, semantics, derivation, etymology, and contextual usage. The integration of these parameters makes it possible to adequately capture the linguistic and extralinguistic characteristics of substandard units. It is demonstrated that only an integral and systematized approach to lexicographic description allows for the accurate and context-sensitive representation of substandard vocabulary. The article proves that substandard lexicon, due to its dynamic, expressive, and socially marked nature, requires a distinct and more flexible lexicographic methodology. Thus, the article contributes to the development of contrastive and sociolexicographic theory by formulating a set of principles for dictionary compilation that meet the demands of both academic research and practical lexicography. The proposed approach offers a foundation for future lexicographic projects aimed at the comprehensively and culturally aware representation of non-standard language elements in bilingual and monolingual dictionaries. The results of the study can be applied in the design of specialized dictionaries and in broader linguistic research involving substandard varieties.

*Keywords:* substandard vocabulary, lexicographic method, microstructure, sociolexicography, semantisation.

### Introduction

The problem of identifying and describing the lexicographic tools necessary for the sociolexicographic description of substandard lexemes in dictionaries has not yet been solved. This is due to the fact that so far “the obvious developments in the lexicographic description of such non-standard linguistic units, as well as in the tools used their lexicography have not been generalised” [1; 168].

The analysis of the lexicographic tools used in the description of explanatory dictionaries of the literary language and in the lexicographic tools of the dictionaries of the standard and substandard do not coincide, because the stylistically reduced lexicon differs “in its connotation and stylistic marking from the literary vocabulary, socio-ethnocultural factors play a significant role in the substandard varieties of a given language.” In other words, a simple lexeme may carry a range of linguistic and sociolinguistic features that are largely absent from standard literary language, and therefore require a specialized lexicographic approach for this accurate representation in dictionaries [2].

According to M.E. Gavar, the lexicographic method, understood as a set techniques and procedures that allow systematizing and fixing language material, belongs to the lexical tools to fix such words in the dictionary. The lexicographic method uses such techniques of fixing vocabulary units as mapping, fixing the system of notes. The lexicographic method (hereinafter — LGM) was considered in the works of O.I. Blinova [3], I.V. Serebrennikov [4], V.I. Kodukhov [5], I.V. Arnold [6], B.N. Golovin [7],

\* Corresponding author's e-mail: [mail.rumadina@mail.ru](mailto:mail.rumadina@mail.ru)

Z.K. Tarlanov [8] and other researchers. Let us summarise the features of the lexicographic method indicated in the studies of scientists.

M.E. Gavar outlines the following defining features of lexicographic method: a) it is founded on a specific linguistic level, which serves as the basis for analysis; b) the method is characterized by its universality and broad applicability; c) its primary object of study is the word and its meaning; d) it employs multiple approach to the analysis of language; e) it allows for the detailed delineation of various aspects of the linguistic phenomena under investigation; f) LGM uses such techniques of collecting and cataloguing material as the technique of interpretation, techniques of component, contextual analysis, the technique of introspection, etc. Special techniques of LGM “include: mapping, lexicography (compilation of dictionary entries), definition, modelling, techniques of lexicographic parametrization of units”; to the presence of original research methodology [9; 11-17].

The general methodology of lexicography, according to V.V. Dubichinskiy. Dubichinskiy proposes a structured approach to the process of dictionary compilation, identifying the following key stages: 1) the development of a dictionary project, which includes determining the dictionary’s type, genre, and target audience; 2) the formation of an authorial team; 3) the creation of a card index or digital database; 4) the selection and systematization of lexical material in accordance with the dictionary’s goals and objectives; 5) the development of the conceptual framework for the structure of dictionary entries; 6) the lexicographic analysis and interpretation of lexical units; 7) the final preparation of the dictionary manuscript for publication; [10; 24-30].

To the lexicographic toolkit he refers lexical parameter, considered as “a way of lexicographic interpretation of this or that structural element” [11].

The researcher considers the microstructure of the dictionary as the main parameter of lexicographic description and refers to “the problems of dictionary article construction. This includes the issues of format, volume, composition of the dictionary article, presentation of various kinds of information about the linguistic unit described in the dictionary (etymological, encyclopaedic, semantic, grammatical, word-formation, stylistic, illustrative, etc. information)” [11, p. 34].

#### *Materials and methods*

The present study employs a qualitative theoretical approach based on the analysis of lexicographic and sociolexicographic frameworks applied to the description of substandard vocabulary in contrasted languages, particularly English and Russian. The primary materials for the research include existing monolingual and explanatory dictionaries of substandard and non-standard lexical units, such as E. Partridge’s Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English and S. Vakhitov’s Dictionary of Ufa Slang, as well as theoretical works by leading scholars in the fields of lexicography and linguistics semantics (e.g., M.E. Gavar, G.V. Ryabichkina, V.V. Dubichinskiy, Y.D. Apresyan).

The methodological framework of the study is grounded in:

- lexicographic analysis — including examination of dictionary microstructures, macrostructures, and semantic labeling systems used to classify substandard lexemes;
- comparative method — contrasting English and Russian lexicographic practices in relation to non-standard lexical systems;
- descriptive and structural methods — focusing on the representation of substandard lexical units in dictionary entries, including their phonetic, grammatical, semantic, etymological, and stylistic characteristics;
- componental and contextual analysis — used to identify key features of the meaning use, and function of substandard lexemes in real communicative contexts;
- sociolexicographic method — addressing the social, demographic, and territorial markers associated with substandard vocabulary and its lexicographic representation;
- modeling and parametrization techniques — employed to define lexicographic portraits and types of substandard lexical units.

In line with the integral lexicographic approach advocated by Gavar, Ryabichkina, and Dubichinskiy, the research also involves the development of a lexicographic toolkit that includes grammatical, stylistic, sociolinguistic, and derivational labels, aimed at providing a comprehensive, semantically nuanced dictionary entry for each substandard unit.

This multidimensional methodology ensures that substandard vocabulary is not only accurately recorded but also systematically analyzed in terms of its linguistic, cultural, and social specificity.

### *Results and discussion*

In the microstructure of the dictionary the main place is occupied by the dictionary entry, which is understood as “the main structural unit of the dictionary, consisting of the heading unit and its description”, includes: the heading units; its phonetic characteristics; its grammatical characteristic; semantisation of the heading unit (interpretation, definition, translation equivalent, etc.); combination characteristic of the heading unit; word-formation possibilities of the heading unit; etymological references; illustrative parameters; lexicographic notes; references; semantisation of the heading unit (interpretation, definition, translation equivalent, etc.); combination characteristic of the heading unit; word-formation possibilities of the heading unit; etymological references; illustrative parameters; lexicographic notes; references, notes [12].

Comp. the vocabulary entry of the vocabulary *vokabula мнительный* (shrewd) -aya, -oe, -len, lin, lno. One who sees danger, trouble in everything; distrustful, morbidly suspicious. This was an extremely resentful, imaginative doctor, to whom it always seemed that he was not believed, that he was not recognized and not sufficiently respected. Chekhov. Three years [13].

According to G.V. Ryabichkina, the peculiarities of lexicographic portraits of literary language dictionaries and dictionaries of substandard lexicon should be taken into account. Such substandard dictionaries should “take into account all specific, as well as general linguistic characteristics of substandard lexical units” [12, p. 147].

To the lexicographic tools used in the registration of substandard units, the scientist refers to wordmarks. The term “vocabulary marks” as a lexicographic toolkit has been recently introduced into lexicographic practice. “At the same time, the developing labeling systems essential for socio-lexicography of substandard vocabulary — including dictionary labels, content specification, and their representation within dictionary entries of a major national language — is one of the key objectives in the theory of social lexicography.”

O.S. Akhmanova’s dictionary characteristics the term marking as “a lexicographic method based on the use of a standardized system of abbreviations, which enables the expansion of the scope and diversity of information about the included lexical units without substantially increasing the overall volume of the dictionary” [14].

The “linguistic Encyclopaedic Dictionary” (1990) provides a more precise idea understanding of the function of lexicographic labels, noting that they indicate the stylistic level of a word (e.g., informal, colloquial, poetic, literary), its expressive connotation (e.g., humorous, vulgar), frequency of usage (e.g., rare, common), domain or professional field of application (e.g., technical, medical, military), as well as certain semantic features (e.g., figurative use.), relation to the core of the modern language (e.g., oral, neol.) [15].

It should be emphasized that this article follows G.V. Ryabichkina’s understanding of a dictionary entry as “a lexicographic index, primarily conveyed through abbreviated verbal or symbolic forms. This index serves to supplement and elucidate the morphological, syntactic, ethno-cultural and sociolinguistic (including areal-territorial, socio-demographic, and professional-corporate) dimensions of the lexical unit — features that are not fully revealed by other components of the dictionary entry, such as the definition, derivational references, illustrative examples, or the documentation of the material within the dictionary” [12].

The famous dictionary of E. Partridge uses the largest number of lexicographic tools of dictionary labels as: 1) grammatical; 2) stylistic; 3) sociolinguistic; 4) derivatological.

But some of the listed labels have additional private labels, such as sociolinguistic labels, which include such sociolinguistic private markers:

1) Areal markers (British range index, index of adaptation into British range from another range-markers: accepted in England, adopted anglicized); American range index (markers: orig. U.S.), Canadian range index (marker: Canadian); Indian range index (marker: Anglo-Indian); Australian range (marker: Australian); Tasmanian range index (marker: Tasmanian). S), Canadian range index (note: Canadian); Indian range index (note: Anglo-Indian); Australian range (note: Australian); Tasmanian range (note: Tasmanian); New Zealand range (note: New Zealand); South African range (note: South African); Scottish range (note: Scottish); Irish range (note: Anglo-Irish);

2) Geo-electro-geographical labels: indexes of territorial regiolects (e.g. the Cape Colony label, marking usage specific to the Cape Colony regiolect); indexes of territorial dialects (e.g., the Air shine label, denoting a slang or dialectal expression originating from Ayshire in Scotland);

3) Temporal notes: indicators of the period of functioning in terms of one or several centuries (notes: C. 14, 15, C. 16, 17, C. 18, 19, C. 20, where C. — century; indications of the period of operation in terms of parts of one or more centuries (notations: C. 14 et seq.; notation C. 16 et seq.);

4) Historical markers: indicators of the period during which a lexical unit in use, based on non-military historical contexts (e.g., the Restoration period marker, referring to the years 1660-1688; as well as markers referencing specific historical events (e.g., the Irish Wars marker, denoting the periods 1641-52 and 1689-91);

5) Socio-class markers: pointers of social stratification reflected in language use. These include markers denoting the speech of the upper classes, such as Society [s] (where s indicates slang specific to upper classes usage); pointers representing the language of the middle class, such as middle-class (referring to lexical items characteristic of middle-class speech); and pointers identifying vocabulary associated with the lower social classes;

6) Socio-professional labels: indexes of civilian socio-professional lexicons, e.g.: label aviation s. (s.=slang) (aviation lexicon or GVF lexicon=civilian air fleet);

7) Socio-corporate labels: indexes of civil socio-corporate lexicons, e.g.: label, beatniks (lexicon of beatnik subcultures);

8) Professional-corporate labels: indexes of civilian professional-corporate lexicons, e.g.: commercial travelling label;

9) Socio-demographic markers: gender markers, for example: marker women's (women's slang); marker feminine (feminine slang); age markers, for example: marker children's (children's slang); markers juvenile, teenagers' (teenage slang).

As we can see, E. Partridge's dictionary regularly uses a system of basic and complementary sociolinguistic labels, which allows systematizing all linguistic and sociolinguistic information. The main labels are linguistic (grammatical, stylistic, derivatological).

In English substandard dictionaries, stylistic marks are also differentiated. In English substandard explanatory dictionaries 35 stylistic private functional-stylistic notes are distinguished:

1) *functional-stylistic labels*: a) stratified socio-stylistic labels: (1) "coll. [colloquial] [standard English]"; (2) "coll. Verging on S.E. [standard English]"; (3) "coll. [colloquial]", (4) "low, (5) low. S. coll. [colloquial]", (6) "(low) coll. Vergina on s. [slang]", (7) "s. [slang]", (8) "low. S. [slang]", (9) "verging on j. [jargon]", (10) "j.[jargon]", (11) "low coll./s.los-s. verging". On c. [cant]", (12) "c. [cant]", (13) "vulgarism"; б) historian-stylistic notes: (14) "very slightly ob. [obsolescent]", (15) "very ob. Obsolescent]", (16) "rather ob. [obsolescent]", (17) "ob. [obsolescent]", (18) very ob. [obsolescent]", (19) extremely ob. [obsolescent]", (20) "obsolete", (21) "virtually [obsolete], (22) historical, (23) archaism;

2) *ethico-stylistic labels*: (24) joc. [jocular], (25) jocularly, (26) jocularly, (27) semi-joc, (28) ironic, (29) familiar, (30) familiarity, (31) derisively, (32) derog. [derogatory], (33) abusive [2, 33].

Russian substandard dictionaries use 11 stylistic labels. Functional-stylistic marks and their private stratification varieties: 1) jrr. [jargonized colloquial speech]; 2) ethical-stylistic labels: (2) diminutive. [diminutive], (3) respect. [respectful], (4) approve. [approving], (5) jokingly-approving. [jokingly-approving], (6) profane-joking. [profanity-joking], (7) contempt. [contemptuous], (8) rude. [rude], (9) uncensored. [profane].

Vocabulary definition in dictionaries of substandard lexicon also belongs to the most important tools of lexicography. For a complete and adequate description of the semantics of lexical units it is necessary to develop "the issues of classification, the order of defining meanings in a dictionary entry, the establishment of semantic of vocabulary and the identification of the dynamics of the development of the language vocabulary, as well as the issues of lexicographic interpretation of polysemous words, including the "identification" of an ambiguous word, discretization and classification of the identified meanings and connotations, the dictionary design of the content of a polysemous word" [15]. Semantic label "definition" implies, first of all, observance of the following requirements to the semantisation of a word: the first requirement is "the principle of non-autologousness, which stipulates that the interpreted meaning must be defined using simpler meanings, ultimately reducible to a limited set of elementary, indefinable semantic units — referred to as "words of the semantic metalanguage" [16]; the second requirement concerns necessity and sufficiency: all lexical meanings associated with a given linguistic unit must be described comprehensively and exhaustively; the third requirement is that of stepwiseness, whereby the interpreted unit must be represented through progressively larger semantic blocks, reflecting a structured and hierarchical approach to semantic analysis.

Therefore, an acceptable toolkit for lexicographic analysis of a word is a systematic integral approach to word analysis. Integral description of a word implies a cumulative semantic-pragmatic description of the word, the main technique of such a description is analytical interpretation, which is carried out by means of a special meta-language, as well as by using such tools as lexicographic type and lexicographic portrait. A lexicographic type is “understood as a group of lexemes that share at least one common feature — whether semantic, pragmatic, communicative, combinatory, morphological, prosodic, or otherwise — and are therefore subject to the same principles of linguistic description [17; 267-284]. In his work, Y.D. Apresyan characterizes a lexicographic type “as a class of lexemes possessing identical linguistic properties, which, as a result, necessitates a consistent and unified approach to their dictionary treatment. Both the description of a lexicographic type and that of an individual lexeme rely on the same categories of lexicographic information. When moving from a lexeme to a lexicographic type,” writes the researcher, “it is not so much the set of features that changes as the set of description” [18; 33-75].

Lexicographic portraiture of a word implies its integral description, i.e. focusing on the full semantic-pragmatic representation of the word: on the characterization of communicative-prosodic, combinative, syntactic, morphological and stylistic properties of the linguistic unit with other meanings in the dictionary (synonyms, antonyms, conversations and some types of derivatives).

For the sociolinguistic portrait of a substandard unit, it seems necessary to apply the following tools, namely: 1) sociolexicographic method, within the framework of which work is carried out to identify the type of dictionary (explanatory dictionary of substandard units); 2) development of the draft article; 3) determination of the parameters of the dictionary article (microstructure or macrostructure); 4) determination of the components of the microstructure, which includes: a) the heading unit; b) the descriptive part. This part gives phonetic, grammatical, semantic, combinatory, word-formation characteristics of the heading unit, etymological references and illustrations.

According to G.V. Ryabichkina, the microstructure of a dictionary entry is not characterized by parameters, but by the following tools — word marks. The number of word marks can vary depending on the type of dictionary and the nature of its linguistic representation, for example, E. Partridge’s dictionary uses four main ones (grammatical, stylistic, sociolinguistic, derivatological marks).

Among them, sociolinguistic labels include private labels (areal, geolect-geographical, temporal, historical, socio-corporate, socio-demographic). Stylistic labels also include private labels (35 labels).

This dictionary does not focus on such a vocabulary marking as semantic marking, but in E. Partridge’s dictionary headwords — vocabularies — are nevertheless semanticised, through the use of three “main aspects of revealing the meanings of headwords or collocations, namely: 1) filiation — the membership of the vocabulary into discrete meanings; 2) the determination of these meanings through definitions; 3) additional semanticisation: clarification of the established meanings in their usage plans through (a) certain pointers and markers and (b) illustrative examples; showing the modes of formation in aspects of structure and sources of borrowing through a derivatological reference.

In many explanatory substandard dictionaries of the Russian language the semantic note is not highlighted either, although the headword is semanticised thanks to the definition of the word, selection of synonyms and illustrations. In these dictionaries, the lexicographic portrait of a word as its integral description is not compiled. In the dictionary of S. Vakhitov’s Dictionary of Ufa Slang does not give a full integral description of a substandard unit, for example: FUFLYZHNIK, -a, m. — the same as fuflo. In response, Zorkin swore and shouted: “Get out! You’re sticking up for a fuflyzhnik? Are you like that yourself?” Versiya, 2000, No. 9. A derivative of fuflyga. Dahl’s fuflyga, fuflyzhka, pimple, fursak, dutik — an unsightly, small-sized person” (Dahl IV: 540). Mikhelson has fuflyga — a blowing moth (Mikhelson 1: 625) [19].

Thus, for a complete integral description of a substandard unit, it is necessary to consider all its main and additional private labels, as well as to focus on lexicographic portraiture and lexicographic type of a substandard linguistic unit, using as large a set of tools of sociolexicographic analysis as possible.

### *Conclusion*

The study demonstrates that the lexicographic description of substandard vocabulary in contrasted languages requires a specialized and comprehensive methodological approach. Unlike standard lexemes, substandard units possess a complex set of linguistic, stylistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic features that demand an expanded lexicographic toolkit. Based on the analyses of existing English and Russian substandard dictionaries — particularly the works of E. Partridge [20] and S. Vakhitov— the article highlights the importance of integrating grammatical, stylistic, sociolinguistic, and derivational labels, as well as utilizing

methods of lexicographic portraiture and lexicographic typology. The development of dictionary entries for substandard lexemes must include detailed microstructural components such as phonetic, grammatical, semantic, combinatorial, and etymological information, alongside illustrative examples. The findings affirm that only a systematic, sociolexicographic, and integral approach can ensure the accurate representation and semantic-pragmatic interpretation of substandard lexical units in modern lexicographic practice.

### References

- 1 Рябичкина Г.В. Теоретические аспекты разработки социолексикографического инструментария / Г.В. Рябичкина // Альманах современной науки и образования. — Тамбов: Грамота, 2008. — № 8(15). — Ч. 2. — С. 167–169.
- 2 Караулов Ю.Н. Лингвистическое конструирование и тезаурус литературного языка / Ю.Н. Караулов. — Москва: Наука, 1981. — 366 с.
- 3 Блинова О.И. Сленг как объект лингвистического исследования / О.И. Блинова. — Москва: Флинта, 2002. — 192 с.
- 4 Серебренников И.В. Роль человеческого фактора в языке / И.В. Серебренников. — Москва: Наука, 1978. — 352 с.
- 5 Кодухов В.И. Теория языка и основы лингвокультурологии / В.И. Кодухов. — Москва: Высшая школа, 2002. — 287 с.
- 6 Арнольд И.В. Стилистика современного английского языка / И.В. Арнольд. — Москва: Высшая школа, 2004. — 384 с.
- 7 Головин Б.Н. Социолингвистика / Б.Н. Головин. — Москва: Гардарики, 1998. — 312 с.
- 8 Тарланов З.К. Очерки по лексикографии русского языка / З.К. Тарланов. — Казань: КазГУ, 1991. — 144 с.
- 9 Гавар М.Е. Лексикографический метод и его применение в исследовании диалектной синонимии / М.Е. Гавар // Вестник Томского государственного университета. — 2014. — № 384. — С. 11–17.
- 10 Дубичинский В.В. Основные понятия лексикографии / В.В. Дубичинский // Глагол и имя в русской лексикографии: вопросы теории и практики. — Екатеринбург: УрГУ, 1996. — С. 24–30.
- 11 Дубичинский В.В. Теоретическая и практическая лексикография / В.В. Дубичинский. — Вена; Харьков: ХГПУ, 1998. — 160 с.
- 12 Рябичкина Г.В. Социолингвистические пометы в словарных статьях монолингвальных толковых словарей лексического субстандарта [Электронный ресурс] / Г.В. Рябичкина. — 2009. — Режим доступа: [https://www.rusnauka.com/8\\_DNI\\_2009/Philologia/43375.doc.htm](https://www.rusnauka.com/8_DNI_2009/Philologia/43375.doc.htm).
- 13 Словарь русского языка: [в 4 т.] / под ред. А.П. Евгеньевой. — Москва: Русский язык, 1986. — Т. 27. — 36 с.
- 14 Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов / О.С. Ахманова. — Москва: УРСС; Едиториал УРСС, 2004. — 571 с.
- 15 Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / под ред. В.Н. Ярцевой. — 2-е изд. — Москва: Большая Российская энциклопедия, 2002. — 709 с.
- 16 Апресян Ю.Д. Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка / Ю.Д. Апресян. — Москва: Наука, 1974. — 367 с.
- 17 Апресян Ю.Д. Избранные труды: монография: [в 2 т.] / Ю.Д. Апресян. — Москва: Языки русской культуры, 1995. — Т. 2. — 767 с.
- 18 Апресян Ю.Д. Два принципа и два понятия системной лексикографии / Ю.Д. Апресян // Язык. Личность. Текст: сборник статей к 70-летию Г. М. Николаевой. — Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2005. — С. 267–284.
- 19 Vakhitov S.A. Dictionary of Ufa Slang / S.A. Vakhitov. — Ufa: Bashkortostan State University Press, 2000. — 150 p.
- 20 Partridge E.A. Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English / E.A. Partridge; ed. by P. Beale. — 8th ed. — London: Routledge, 2006. — 1400 p.

М.К. Тулегенова, Ж.Н. Жүнісова, Н.К. Хан, Б.К. Аязбаева

### Қарама-қарсы тілдердегі бейәдеп лексикалық жүйелерді сипаттауға арналған лексикографиялық құралдар

Зерттеуде әртүрлі тілдердегі лексикографиялық дәстүрлер аясында бейстандартты лексиканы сипаттаудың қиындықтары қарастырылады. Зерттеудің өзектілігі қазіргі лексикографияда бейстандартты лексиканы сипаттауға арналған бірыңғай әдістемелік тәсілдің болмауымен түсіндіріледі. Дәстүрлі лексикографиялық әдістер субстандартты лексемалардың семантикалық, прагматикалық және социолингвистикалық ерекшеліктерін толық көлемде бейнелей алмайтыны көрсетілген. Сондықтан бейстандартты лексиканы сипаттауға бейімделген арнайы лексикографиялық құралдың қажеттігі дәлелденді. Ағылшын және орыс тілдік дәстүрлеріндегі қазіргі лексикографиялық стратегияларға шолу жасалды. Мысал ретінде Э. Партридждің сөздігі мен С. Вахитовтың «Уфа

сленгінің сөздігі» алынған. Ерекше назар сөздік мақаланың микроструктуралық элементтеріне аударылады, соның ішінде грамматикалық, стилистикалық және социолингвистикалық белгілердің әртүрлі түрлері, сондай-ақ субстандартты лексиканы семантикалық-прагматикалық тұрғыда талдауға негіз болатын лексикографиялық әдіс (ЛӨ) ұғымы қарастырылған. Алынған нәтижелер негізінде авторлар сөздің лексикографиялық портретін жасауға бағытталған социолексикографиялық тәсілдің қажеттігін негіздейді. Мұндай портрет лингвистикалық параметрлердің (фонетика, грамматика, семантика, сөзжасам, этимология және контекстік қолданылу) кең аясын біріктіреді. Бұл параметрлердің интеграциясы субстандартты бірліктердің тілдік және экстралингвистикалық сипаттарын толық әрі дәл бейнелеуге мүмкіндік береді. Зерттеу барысында лексикографиялық сипаттауға тұтас және жүйелі көзқарас қана бейстандартты лексиканы нақты әрі контекске сай көрсетуге мүмкіндік беретіні анықталды. Мақалада субстандартты лексиконның динамикалық, экспрессивті және әлеуметтік жағынан белгіленген табиғатына байланысты икемді әрі арнайы лексикографиялық әдістеменің қажет екені дәлелденді. Осылайша мақала контрастивті және социолексикографиялық теорияны дамытуға үлес қосып, сөздік құрастырудың ғылыми және қолданбалы лексикография талаптарына сай келетін қағидаларын ұсынады. Ұсынылып отырған тәсіл бейстандартты тілдік элементтерді екітілді және біртілді сөздіктерде жан-жақты әрі мәдени тұрғыда саналы түрде бейнелеуге бағытталған болашақ лексикографиялық жобалар үшін негіз бола алады. Зерттеу нәтижелерін арнайы сөздіктерді әзірлеуде, сондай-ақ субстандартты тілдік формаларды зерттейтін кең ауқымды лингвистикалық зерттеулерде қолдануға болады.

*Кілт сөздер:* стандарттан тыс лексика, лексикографиялық әдіс, микроқұрылым, социолексикография, семантизация.

М.К. Тулегенова, Ж.Н. Жунусова, Н.К. Хан, Б.К. Аязбаева

## Лексикографические средства для описания субстандартных лексических систем сопоставляемых языков

В исследовании рассматриваются трудности описания нестандартной лексики в рамках лексикографических традиций различных языков. Актуальность работы обусловлена отсутствием единой методологии описания нестандартной лексики в современной лексикографии. Показано, что традиционные лексикографические подходы зачастую не отражают в полной мере семантическую, прагматическую и социолингвистическую специфику субстандартных единиц. Обосновывается необходимость создания специализированного лексикографического инструментария, адаптированного для описания субстандартной лексики. Представлен обзор современных лексикографических стратегий в английской и русской традициях на примере словаря Э. Партриджа и «Словаря уфимского сленга» С. Вахитова. Особое внимание уделяется микроструктурным элементам словарной статьи, включая различные типы грамматических, стилистических и социолингвистических помет, а также концепции лексикографического метода (ЛГМ) как основы для семантико-прагматического анализа субстандартной лексики. На основе полученных результатов авторы обосновывают необходимость социолексикографического подхода, ориентированного на создание лексикографического портрета слова. Такой портрет интегрирует множество лингвистических параметров, включая фонетику, грамматику, семантику, словообразование, этимологию и контекстуальное употребление. Интеграция этих параметров позволяет адекватно отразить как лингвистические, так и экстралингвистические характеристики субстандартных единиц. Показано, что только целостный и системный подход к лексикографическому описанию обеспечивает точное и контекстуально релевантное представление нестандартной лексики. В статье доказывается, что субстандартный лексикон, обладающий динамичной, экспрессивной и социально маркированной природой, требует особой, более гибкой лексикографической методологии. Таким образом, статья вносит вклад в развитие контрастивной и социолексикографической теории, формулируя комплекс принципов словарной фиксации, соответствующих задачам как академических исследований, так и прикладной лексикографии. Предлагаемый подход может стать основой для будущих лексикографических проектов, направленных на всестороннее и культурно осознанное представление нестандартных языковых элементов в билингвальных и монолингвальных словарях. Результаты исследования могут быть применены при создании специализированных словарей, а также в более широких лингвистических исследованиях, затрагивающих субстандартные языковые разновидности.

*Ключевые слова:* субстандартная лексика, лексикографический метод, микроструктура, социолексикография, семантизация.

## References

- 1 Ryabichkina, G.V. (2008). Teoreticheskie aspekty razrabotki sotsioleksikograficheskogo instrumentariia [Theoretical Aspects of Developing Sociolinguistic Lexicographic Tools]. *Almanakh sovremennoi nauki i obrazovaniia* — *Almanac of Modern Science and Education*, (8)15, 2, 167–169 [in Russian].
- 2 Karaulov, Yu.N. (1981). *Lingvisticheskoe konstruirovaniie i tezaurus literaturnogo yazyka* [Linguistic Construction and the Thesaurus of the Literary Language]. Moscow [in Russian].

- 3 Blinova, O.I. (2002). *Sleng kak obekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniia* [Slang as an Object of Linguistic Research]. Moscow: Flinta [in Russian].
- 4 Serebrennikov, I.V. (1978). *Rol chelovecheskogo faktora v yazyke* [The Role of the Human Factor in Language]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 5 Kodukhov, V.I. (1982). *Teoriia yazyka i osnovy lingvokulturologii* [Theory of Language and the Foundations of Linguoculturology]. Moscow: Vysshaia shkola [in Russian].
- 6 Arnold, I.V. (2004). *Stilistika sovremennogo angliiskogo yazyka* [Stylistics of the Modern English Language]. Moscow: Vysshaia shkola [in Russian].
- 7 Golovin, B.N. (1998). *Sotsiolingvistika* [Sociolinguistics]. Moscow: Gardariki [in Russian].
- 8 Tarlanov, Z.K. (1991). *Ocherki po leksikografii russkogo yazyka* [Essays on Russian Lexicography]. Kazan: Kazanskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet [in Russian].
- 9 Gavar, M.E. (2014). Leksikograficheskii metod i ego primenenie v issledovanii dialektnoi sinonimii [The Lexicographic Method and Its Application in the Study of Dialectal Synonymy]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta — Tomsk State University Journal*, 384, 11–17. Tomsk: Tomskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet [in Russian].
- 10 Dubichinskiy, V.V. (1996). Osnovnye poniatia leksikografii [Basic Concepts of Lexicography]. In *Glagol i imia v russkoi leksikografii: voprosy teorii i praktiki — Verb and Noun in Russian Lexicography: Issues of Theory and Practice* (pp. 24–30). Ekaterinburg: Uralskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet [in Russian].
- 11 Dubichinskiy, V.V. (1998). *Teoreticheskaiia i prakticheskaiia leksikografiia* [Theoretical and Practical Lexicography]. Vena; Kharkov: Kharkovskii Gosudarstvennyi Pedagogicheskii Universitet [in Russian].
- 12 Ryabichkina, G.V. (2009). Sotsiolingvisticheskie pomety v slovarnykh statiiakh monolingvalnykh tolkovykh slovari leksicheskogo substandarta [Sociolinguistic Labels in Dictionary Entries of Monolingual Explanatory Dictionaries of the Lexical Substandard]. *rusnauka.com*. Retrieved from [https://www.rusnauka.com/8\\_DNL\\_2009/Philologia/43375.doc.htm](https://www.rusnauka.com/8_DNL_2009/Philologia/43375.doc.htm) [in Russian].
- 13 Evgenev, A.P. (Ed.). (1986). *Slovar russkogo yazyka* [Dictionary of the Russian Language]. (Vol. 27). Moscow: Russkii yazyk [in Russian].
- 14 Akhmanova, O.S. (2004). *Slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov* [Dictionary of Linguistic Terms]. Moscow: URSS: Editorial URSS [in Russian].
- 15 Yartsev, V.N. (Ed.). (2002). *Lingvisticheskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar* [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary] (2nd ed., expanded). Moscow: Bolshaia Rossiiskaia entsiklopediia [in Russian].
- 16 Apresyan, Yu.D. (1974). *Leksicheskaiia semantika. Sinonimicheskie sredstva yazyka* [Lexical Semantics. Synonymic Means of Language]. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 17 Apresyan, Yu.D. (1995). *Izbrannye trudy* [Selected Works]. (Vol. 2). Moscow: Yazyki russkoi kultury [in Russian].
- 18 Apresyan, Yu.D. (2005). Dva printsipa i dva poniatia sistemnoi leksikografii [Two Principles and Two Concepts of Systemic Lexicography]. *Yazyk. Lichnost. Tekst: Sbornik statei k 70-letiiu T.M. Nikolaevoi — Language. Personality. Text: Collection of Papers for the 70th Anniversary of T.M. Nikolaeva*. (pp. 267–284). Moscow: Yazyki slavianskoi kultury [in Russian].
- 19 Vakhitov, S.A. (2000). *Dictionary of Ufa Slang*. Ufa: Izdatelstvo Bachkirkoskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [in Russian].
- 20 Partridge, E. (2006). *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. London: Routledge.

#### Information about the authors

**Tulegenova, Medina Kazhimkanovna** (corresponding author) — PhD, sr. teacher, Department of foreign languages, Abylkas Saginov Karaganda Technical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan. E-mail: [mail.rumadina@mail.ru](mailto:mail.rumadina@mail.ru); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4097-3551>

**Zhunussova, Zhanyl Nygyzbayevna** — Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, Eurasian National University named after Gumilev, Astana, Kazakhstan. E-mail: [zhanyl\\_08@mail.ru](mailto:zhanyl_08@mail.ru); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0694-470X>

**Khan, Nadezhda Konstantinovna** — Candidate of Philological Sciences, Professor of the Department of Russian Language and Literature named after G.A. Meiramov, Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan. E-mail: [hnadeida@yandex.ru](mailto:hnadeida@yandex.ru); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3986-6269>

**Ayazbayeva, Bakhyt Kusainovna** — Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Russian Language and Literature named after G.A. Meiramov, Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan. E-mail: [bahit0108@gmail.com](mailto:bahit0108@gmail.com); ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2004-3369>