

ABUSIVE LEXICON STYLISTICS IN DIALECT CARRIER CHARACTER

^aANASTASIA V. FALKOVSKAYA, ^bOLGA N. GORYACHEVA

Kazan Federal University, 18 Kremlyovskaya street, Kazan 420008, Russia

e-mail : ^aeditor@ores.su, ^binfo@ores.su

Abstract: Dialectic lexicographic material during the analysis is classified with the following stylistic marks, characteristic of obscene vocabulary: swearing, abusive, unflattering. The article analyzes the character of abuse in the dialectal language and in the colloquial form of the modern Russian language, the assessment of its functioning change in retrospect is performed, which allows to see the role of abusive words in the organization of speech. Many linguists at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries turned to the topic of the linguistic consciousness of the dialectician, using obscene vocabulary. Recognizing abuse as a peculiar means of an object description, explaining its emergence by a communicative situation, the authors come to the conclusion that the evaluation vocabulary reflects the picture of the subject's world, determines his values, the language identity. Research materials can be used in the educational process at a higher educational institution.

Key words: anthropocentrism, linguistic consciousness, dialectology, obscene vocabulary, nicknames, dialect carrier, communication study.

1 Introduction

Language as a product and an instrument of a man serves as a tool to mark the surrounding world, all its components, and a person himself. A man from a linguistic point of view is a nomination whose meaning can be formed from psychophysical characteristics. A man is the bearer of the onom, but the name has an independent lexical meaning, has a historical basis and motivation. The anthropic nature of nominations and their emotionally expressive coloring of is manifested most clearly in the dialectal language, especially in nicknames.

The study assumes an analytical understanding of anthropocentrism in the linguistic context, revealing the forms of its manifestation in communicative practice. It seems important to study the frequency of abusive language use. One of the important tasks of the work is the systematic analysis of the lexicographic material with its further stratification based on the semantic feature.

2 Theoretical basis

In the anthropocentric approach to the dialect carrier speech, the person himself and those spheres that shape his life are exposed to nomination. M.E. Ruth explains this phenomenon as a specific way of dialect carrier life, those traditions and foundations that were formed throughout the history of human development in his mind at home. The scholar notes that "at that it is very noteworthy that the orientation takes place not on the house as a structure, but on the home as a way of life, the totality of the realities that accompany the person collected under the house roof" (Ruth, 2008).

The linguists of the XX-XXI centuries turned to the study of the individualized speech of dialect-carriers in scientific works. They sought to analyze comprehensively the language personality, to reconstruct the speech portrait of the epoch, and the micro-model the recipient's consciousness (Gross, 2000; Ivantsova, 2010; Myers-Scotton, 2000; Sorace, 2004).

V. S. Leea, A. B. Tumanovaa, Z. H. Salkhanovaa, отмечают «the anthropocentric approach in focused on the person as a subject of speech activity that implements his communicative intentions in certain speech acts oriented to the world of semantics and mental human activities» (Leea Valentine et al, 2016; Villalobos Antúnez, 2015).

The frequency of abuse manifestation can not be ignored from the linguistic aspect. A characteristic feature of the dialectal language is anthropocentrism. The attempt is made in this work to summarize the answer to the difference in the nature of abuse colloquial form within dialect and modern Russian.

3 Methodology

During the work with dialect lexicographic material, often encountered swearing, abusive, unflattering marks, prompted us to analyze the nature of abuse in dialectal language and in the colloquial form of the modern Russian language. In addition to the observation of obscene vocabulary operation in different forms of national language, it is important to record and evaluate the changes occurring in the speech of dialect carriers. The most productive methods are the following ones: the method of stylistic analysis, which allows to evaluate the choice of lexemes from the stylistic point of view; the method of comparison, consisting in word form comparison used by the dialect carriers from different places of residence; the method of continuous sampling, which was used during the operation with the linguistic material of the explanatory regional dictionary by Vasnetsov, who reflected Vyatka dialects.

Anthropocentrism is the expression of the situation where a person in a nominative process is in terms of communication not at peripheral positions, but at the center of linguistic processes. Of course, it is not entirely true to talk about the applicability of this thought to the modern dialect carrier, as they change the language, the conceptual component of it, and, as a consequence, the language picture of the world, which can be traced back to the method of retrospective analysis.

4 Results and discussion

In the modern world a dialect-carrier becomes closer the urban type of a native speaker, and the main thing for him is material, a work, perhaps. The attitude of the subject to work becomes the source of antonymic pair development, the semantic core of which is in the following terms: laziness - diligence, licentiousness - morality, accuracy - negligence, sanity - stupidity and a number of other qualities that characterize a person more from a negative aspect than from a positive one. This may be due to the fact that a person as the result of the behavior that is disapproved by society becomes not so much in the center of attention as the center for discussion and censure. Why it happened so and, in general, and the situation is currently being developed, one can understand if we turn to the psychological structure of society. Positive psychology, which studies the causes of all sorts of psychological disorders of a person, suggests that a person is naturally negative, a negative and a positive attitude toward the world is evolutionary, which is difficult to prevent. Along with the conditionality by psychology, a negative significance of the nomination can also be explained by the semantics of a nickname as a lexeme, its bright expressive-evaluative function; by the means of a nickname, they express the attitude to the nomination an object, and, as a rule, the most negative becomes the focus of attention (Ruth, 2008; Shekarbaghani, 2017). It is peculiar to provide communicative resonance for a negative.

In the lexicographical material, the indication of a nickname is given extremely rarely, basically a nickname-like nomination is marked as a naming. And relying on the definition of the substantive, we can talk that it can function as a nickname in a communication environment but not with an absolute accuracy.

Given the prevalence of negative motivation, it is not surprising that abusive will be a frequent mark. If we talk about the part of speech affiliation of the marks, then the noun prevails, adjective is little less quantitatively, which is logically aligned with the process of naming as the functional task of nomination as a name. However, in most cases, the verb with the intrinsic value of the action will serve as the base for them, which is also understandable, since the above-mentioned component, the component of everyday life - work, labor - presupposes the semantics of action.

Having studied "Materials for an explanatory regional dictionary of Vyatka dialect" by N.M. Vasnetsov, which is the first

dictionary reflecting Vyatka dialects, 71 words were found, marked as swearing, calling, unflattering, abusive (Vasnetsov, 1908).

The boundary between these marks is unsteady, they become synonymous with each other under certain conditions and contexts. For example, calling and swearing marks become synonyms: *bangs* - the calling of a "stupid" person (as swearing); *выпорток* - the calling of children, swearing; *здохой*, adj. - 1) the calling of a weak, a sick person; 2) an abusive word to address someone who does not meet expectations, so to speak. Thus, swearing and abusive language come close to calling when they are aimed at that quality isolation in the subject that contradicts the value usual norms.

The following examples already have only the swearing mark: *bad stomach* - 1) a child who has not worn pants yet; 2) swearing; *tattooed* - big-eyed, more like cursing; *botalo* - a person who eats soup, does not meet others, and tries to eat more himself. This word is abusive; *mop* - swearing: rubbish, wasteful person!

Swearing can come close to calling, being used irrespective of person: *pens* - 1) scrupulousness, ambition, pride, wilfulness; 2) swearing; scolding, a malevolent wish.

An interesting example of swearing and caressing combination, which is transmitted by the diminutive-affectionate suffix - *incubus* (in the dictionary - *ёнок*) in the word *лешачонок* - a dirty word. (*Лешачонок*, where have you gone?).

The following words are revealed with a single mark "curse": *bashka* - 1) a smart man, an intelligent head; 2) as curse; *bezpelyukha* - a man rather poor, carefree and, perhaps, dull. Often it is used as swearing; *beznoloch* (the voiceless effect is not reflected in the dictionary) - absolutely *безтолковый*. It is often used as swearing; *bitch* - noun, f. - 1) carrion, fall, the corpse of an animal, when it began to decompose; 2) sometimes the following meaning is taken: very skinny; 3) abuse, calling of only the subject, or even the abuse without an address; *шайтан* - swearing. An evil creature according to Cheremis mythology.

On the basis of these examples, we can conclude that swearing and calling can also come together, they can be synonymous with an address. If there is no address, a subject will not be called, because it is focused on a subject, abuse can be general and function independently, approaching abuse, but with a larger negative connotation of meaning: *стерво!* - abuse; *халера* - abuse.

The most numerous group of words with "swearing" mark: *корзювка* - an indefinite, abusive expression; this word is used to name those who behave like grouchy old women; *kosh* - an abusive word, means a merciless man, without pity or compassion; *locus* - a bad person, weak in skills and acts; *mahry* - an indefinite expression; corresponds to some extent to the word "slop"; *обмолызга* - unflattering epithet, an abusive word. It refers to a person mocking others; *падина* - the calling of a skinny, weak, powerless animal, and sometimes a person. In the latter case (with respect to a man) the expression takes on a tinge of swearing; *pokas* - abusive word; *straggle* - dirty, untidy to disgust; Sometimes it is used as an abusive word, corresponding to the expression "submarine"; *треух* - 1) a clumsy hat, 2) a hit given to someone, 3) a swear word, referring to an awkward, unwieldy person; *freebie* - abusive: untidy, slovenly; *jaw* - used as a swear word in the sense of greedy, glutton; *chuh* - 1) shabby (the dictionary does not reflect voiceless phenomenon), sometimes used to play in *chukhi* (*gorodki*), 2) sometimes used as an easily abusive word; and etc.

In these examples the mark "abusive" comes nearer to the mark "calling", but there are not always such nuances of meaning as censure, reproach, condemnation for naming, inherent for an abusive expression. Calling often delineates a certain quality, which will be a subjectively chosen naming element at a particular moment. Calling is not a permanent character, rather, it is sporadic and depends on external conditions, whereas the

appearance of abuse provokes specific external conditions. Abusive expressions are of a general nature, they are known to dialect speakers in the meaning assigned to them, calling is often of an individual character. For example, *vorgan* is a swear word, and sometimes it's just the call of another: the meaning is uncertain; *fizzy* (the phonetic version of the word "shibzdik") - the calling of a small person - a word is unflattering, although not an abusive. But there are not always marks with words. The absence of other lexeme marking does not exclude the fact that they can not be used as abusive during a person description. The reasons for the semantic repulsion are conditioned not only by a communicative situation, but also by the language picture of the world of a dialect carrier.

Having analyzed obscene vocabulary, we can assume that the abuse is less vulgar than in modern Russian, its colloquial form. For example, if you refer to the meaning of the word "abuse" from "The dictionary of Russian language" by S.I. Ozhegov (Ozhegov, 2004) then the definition contains the reference to the synonymous word swearing. Swearing is a word that they abuse, abuse. In the description we do not see a bright negative shade, which would be contained in the word. The "Dictionary of the Russian Language" edited by A.P. Evgenieva already has the indication of word description, called swearing. "Swearing is insulting, rude words, which abuse. As a shade of meaning: gross condemnation, blame, reproaches. Wrangling - offensive, abusive words; abuse / condemnation, censure, reproaches" (Dictionary of Russian language). An interesting fact is the etymological reference of the word swearing. Homonyms "fighting - battle" and "abuse - abuse" have one source of origin. *Брань* in meaning battle is the producing basis of the second one according to the etymological study by Shansky (Shansky, 1971). *battle* is borrowed from the Old Slavonic language. The Old Slavonic abuse dates back to the common Slavonic *bornъ*, formed by the suffix *нь* from **borty* (cf.: to fight, defense, fence). *Wrangle* in the meaning of abuse is actually Russian word, which appeared on the basis of the first lexical-semantic way of word-formation, that is, through the semantic word-formation. Thus, it is possible to single out the common motivator - a struggle. Thus, it is understandable how this value motivates the internal form of the word abuse as swearing.

In linguistics, numerous functions are fixed for the language. Considering this concept from the point of view of communication studies, it can be found that the language also performs the function of an amulet, implementing it through a careful selection of word forms, the fixation of proper names. It is established that obscene vocabulary, originally used as the means of protection, stating the motivation of abusive words. In the future, the protective function is transformed and becomes destructive. Since the development of a common language is accompanied by the formation of functional-style varieties, such vocabulary refers to the lower style and later turns out to be outside the literary language. This lexical layer goes into the category of vernacular, often coarse one. Jargon, dialectisms, professionalisms, argotisms are opposed to literary language. Given that the dialect language is an independent language system, the lexical stratification with a functional-style variety will also have independence, which means that swearing will not go beyond any limits because of the lack of stylistic delimitation inherent in literary language. The only thing that can be noted in the nature of abusive vocabulary is the attitude to everyday and conversational sphere and the bright expressive and emotional coloring. But there no reasons that the abusive vocabulary turns out to be beyond the bounds of language, since the dialect language is not selective with respect to its filling lexemes, they carry the same semantic and functional load, make an integral component of the linguistic consciousness of a dialect carrier. In this case, we can not say that cursing is the function of vagueness, because if it were so, there should have been the norm opposed by common language, and the concept of norm does not apply to dialectal language.

5 Conclusions

Obscene vocabulary often acts as the means of an object characteristic nomination, which is contained in the semantic basis of antonymic pairs. In this case, insulting nicknames and calls are presented to a dialect carrier by a motivated situation, attitude, behavior, external data, a person's character, an insult can be heard even if a person to whom the negative is directed does not possess any of the characteristics invested in lexical unit. Such vocabulary is often classified as obscene language, obscenity rather than abuse. In the XX century obscene vocabulary attracted the attention of philologists, but the study of this lexical layer was not complete and profound due to the current censorship. Recognizing the need for distancing from normative and non-normative vocabulary in speech and language, these strata should be viewed from the research point of view, revealing the nuance of stylistic marks, studying language structures and components. Along with, for example, Balakhonova who considers the dilemma between vernacular and dialectal vocabulary, as well as colloquial and common vocabulary, which has disparate functional-stylistic marks, the correlation in the explanatory dictionaries of Russian language, we can by analogy speak of the fragility of functional-stylistic and expressive marks in abusive vocabulary. Subjective marks are close to the actual linguistic ones. The main function of nicknames, which they perform in the anthroponomical system, is their substitute function, which consists in the fact that a nickname can adopt the functions of a name, a surname, and also a compound naming (Balakhonova, 2018).

6 Summary

Thus, the cursing in dialect speech has a pronounced motivation, unlike its position in modern Russian language, where it tends to common language or turns into a stage of obscenity and is rarely subjected to analysis. However, until now clear, transparent relationship are not developed between the concepts of abuse, cursing, vernacular and obscene vocabulary. Rogers Brubaker stresses that: "Cognitive approaches make it possible to comprehend ethnicity, race and nation in a non-group way, as a view of the world, rather than the essence of the world, and at the same time help to explain the practical vitality of thinking in the categories of groups" (Rogers, 2004). Obscene vocabulary, like any evaluative vocabulary, reflects the picture of the subject's world, determines its values and the linguistic identity. At the same time a dialect-carrier is not always objective in the interpretation of lexemes, and often uses them to express an emotional state and a personal relationship.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

Literature:

1. Ruth M.E. (2008). Imaginative nomination in Russian onomastics. - Moscow: Publishing house LCI.
2. Gross S. (2000). Intentionality and the markedness model in literary codeswitching, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(9), pp. 1283-1303
3. Ivantsova E.V. (2010). Linguistic personology: the foundations of language personality theory: Textbook. Tomsk: Publishing house of Tomsk University, p.160.
4. Myers-Scotton C. (2000). Explaining the role of norms and rationality in codeswitching, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(9), pp. 1259-1271.
5. Sorace A. (2004). Native language attrition and developmental instability at the syntax-discourse interface: Data, interpretations and methods. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, No. 7, 143-145.
6. Leea Valentine S., Tumanovaa Ainakul B., Salkhanovaa Zhanat H. (2016). New Approaches to a Subject of Anthropocentric Linguistics, *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL & SCIENCE EDUCATION*, 11(11), pp. 4716-4728 .
7. Vasnetsov N.M. (1908). Materials for the explanatory regional dictionary of Vyatka dialect - Vyatka, province printing house,
8. Ozhegov S.I. (2004). Dictionary of Russian language , S.I. Ozhegov; Ed. in charge: prof. L.I. Skvortsov. - 24 th ed., Rev. - M.: LLC "Publishing house" ONYX 21 century": LLC "Publishing house "Peace and Education".
9. Dictionary of Russian language: In 4 volumes, RAS, Institute of Linguistic Studies; Ed. by A.P. Evgenieva. (1999). - 4th ed. - Moscow: Rus. lan., Polygraph Resource.
10. Shansky N.M. (1971). Brief etymological dictionary of Russian language N.M. Shansky; Ed. by S.G. Barkhudarov. Moscow: "Enlightenment".
11. Balakhonova L.I. (2018). On the issue of speech and dialect vocabulary status [Electronic resource], L.I. Balakhonov, *Issues of Linguistics*. 3, pp. 104 -110 URL: <http://philology.ru/linguistics2/balakhonova-82.htm>.
12. (2004). *Ethnicity without groups*. Harvard University Press, 296.
13. Villalobos Antúnez J.V. (2015). LAS CIENCIAS SOCIALES Y LAS LUCHAS POR EL DERECHO, *Opcion*, 31(77), pp. 5-15.
14. Shekarbaghani A. (2017). The impact of science museum on education in Iranian schools, *Astra Salvensis, Supplement No. 2*, pp. 255-262.