

**Reminska Yu.Yu.**  
*Practicing Philologist*  
*Kyiv, Ukraine*

## **ARGOT, JARGON AND SLANG: THE QUESTION OF DELIMITATION (LINGUISTIC ASPECT)**

In XX century the sociolinguistic studies have become particularly important. Obviously, the main object of this study was the social differentiation of language. That's why the greater part of scholars has drawn their attention to the demarcation of such concepts as «argot», «jargon» and «slang» from each other. Therefore, the analysis of linguistic nature and specific characteristics of this language phenomena, defining their place in lexical system of Ukrainian language is especially important in our time.

Originally, the term «jargon» had negative meaning because of political, economic and social reforms in the Soviet Union territory. In the 1920 linguists were worried about «wide-scale penetration of criminals' catchwords to the speech of the younger generation» [2, p. 6]. Already in 1931 scientists had emphasized on harmful influence of the «thieves' speech», «spoiling the language» and therefore in the XX<sup>th</sup> century the term «jargon» was specifically associated with criminal environment [6, p. 161–162].

In the XIX century a special study process, containing accumulation and investigation of Ukrainian language phenomenon, had been started. Scholars have turned their attention to the language features of beggars, criminals, soldiers, craftsmen, workers and of course youngsters. However, these works were almost rare and usually made in a short notes and explorations, which were carried out in historical meaning. Studies of the youth speak became topical in the 1960. The works, devoted to the social differentiation of jargons had been appeared. Particularly, it was works, related to Ukrainian speech of thieves (K. Estreyher, P. Petrov), beggars (F. Nykolaychyk, V. Hnatyuk) and youth (K. Shyrots'kyi, V. Shchepot'yev). Active observation of age speech peculiarities has started in the second half of XX<sup>th</sup> century and acquired a significant development in the next few years by Y. Dzendzelivs'kyi and O. Gorbach [10, p. 4–5].

It must be emphasized, there are many controversial issues in the studying of youth speak. One of them is the terminological definition of this concept. Also it's important to identify specific characteristics and peculiarities, which distinguish it from the linguistic phenomena such as, for example, slang, dialect, sociolect. Nevertheless, the most common terms for this linguistic concept are «youth speak», «youth slang» and «language of the youth subculture». At the same time, such notions as «jargon» and «slang» in relation to the language of young people, are considered to be synonymous. But unfortunately there is no common opinion in national linguistic science about correlations between such concepts as «slang», «jargon» and «argot» at the present day. Very often argot and slang are identified with the jargon, jargon with argot, and slang with jargon and so on.

As well as the terms «jargon» (from the French «incomprehensible language», «nonsense», «gaggle») and «argot» (from the French «language of thieves») came from French language into Ukrainian linguistics, and word «slang» (means «low, vulgar language») – from the English. The main problem in relation between terms «argot», «jargon» and «slang» is the demarcation of these concepts on the one hand, and on the other – using them as the synonyms.

In some dictionaries «argot» is defined as closed linguistic substance, which is used to describe the secret language of some social group. Unlike argot, jargon is a half-open lexical and phraseological subsystem, used by one or another social group with the purpose of separation from the other linguistic community. Verbal communication of many people, which differs from a certain language standards, received the name «slang» [7, p. 40].

According to the O. Selivanova, slang is a colloquial additional lexical system, which is representing expressive-evaluative, often stylistically understated synonymy of well-known concepts and symbols, which are belonging to a certain social subculture; paradigm of sociolinguistics – socially marked vocabulary of a social group (professional, military, youth etc.) within the national language. In some cases, slang can have such attributes as «youthful», «student», which greatly reduces its meaning. Slang is not a form of existence of language, because it has its own specifics phonetic and grammatical levels and based on the patterns of the national language. Sometimes slang is identified with argot. In contrast to argot slang is understandable to ordinary speakers, is a property of open (public) social and professional groups, characterized by stylistic understatement, pejorative and don't accomplish such functions as convention and delimitation [9, p. 560].

Some linguists completely avoid using the term «slang» and prefer such concepts as «argot», «jargon», «colloquialism», «speaking», at the same time providing them with additional definitions like «open argot» [3, p. 221-226], «general jargon» [5, p. 4–8], «jargon vocabulary» [8, p. 3–6].

Ukrainian scientist V. Balabin suggested a difference between terminology and non-terminology approaches to the determination of argot, jargon and slang, namely «wide» and «narrow» understanding of those phenomena. According to the terminological approach, these concepts are synonyms. In a general sense argot, jargon, slang are mostly spoken languages of social groups. The main idea of non-terminological approach is that those terms are the lexical and phraseological units, serving as an independent types of speech [1, p. 23].

On the basis of exploring the special information which deals with the serious linguistic problems I. Schur offered his own understanding of the terms «argot» «slang» and «slang». The first term scholar understands as conditional language specifically created by a certain social group for secret communication and separation of themselves from other social groups. Furthermore, the notion «jargon» is an absolute synonym for the English term «slang» [10, p. 6].

T. M. Mykolenko, examining the concept of «jargon» and «slang», figured out some common and specific features for both linguistic phenomena. Common features are: 1) the usage of slang and jargon to describe speech, which is not

limited by literary standards; 2) the transition of jargon lexemes into slang, which indicates the presence of common units in both systems; 3) slang and jargon vocabulary indicate emotional and expressive attitude of a certain speaker to the subject matter or even to the addressee; 4) slang and jargon units are often include the evaluated characteristics, so, the evaluation function is appropriate for them; 5) slang and jargon are indirectly referred to a certain object or phenomenon, therefore, accomplishing an euphemistic function. Also there are some features, which distinguish slang with jargon and vice versa: 1) slang as a linguistic phenomenon is formed and functioning on the basis of jargon units of a certain language groups, that indicates its main characteristics as general and open linguistic phenomena; 2) slang units are not so functionally limited in comparison with jargon, which is prevalent within a particular group or group formation. In such case the concept of «jargon» is identical to the concept of «slang» on the assumption to «leakiness» of a certain social community. In other words, we are talking about usage of some specific linguistic forms outside of the group. The concept of «jargon» is not identical to the concept of «slang» if it historically indicates the limitations of its speakers as well as to narrowness of the semantic field [4, p. 9].

By way of conclusion it is of utmost importance to emphasize following. All from the researched categories – argot, jargon and slang – are the special types of social dialect. The specificity of each of these linguistic formations can be determined by the professional isolation of certain groups or by their social isolation from the rest of society. Conducted analysis of relevant scientific literature has shown, the terms «jargon» and «slang» will be used as synonyms because they are both denoting a same type of speech, characterized (in contrast to the popular language) by specific vocabulary and a set of phraseological units as well as a special using of world-building funds. The term «slang» is more characteristic for the western linguistic tradition. Inherently, «slang» is close to what is meant by the term «jargon». At the same time, it is useful to make distinction between the concepts of «argot» and «jargon». It is believed, argot, in contrast to the jargon, is a «secret language» to some extent and created specifically to make the speech of a given social group incomprehensible to outsiders.

### References:

1. Балабін В. В. Сучасний американський військовий сленг як проблема перекладу / В. В. Балабін. – К.: Логос, 2002. – 315 с.
2. Грачев М. А. От Ваньки Каина до мафии / М. А. Грачев – СПб.: Азбука-Классика: Авалон, 2005. – 386 с.
3. Ермакова О. П. Слова, с которыми мы все встречались. Толковый словарь общего жаргона / О. П. Ермакова, Е. А. Земская, Р. И. Розина / [под общ. ред. Р. И. Розиной]. – М.: Азбуковник, 1999. – 320 с.
4. Миколенко Т. М. Український міський сленг (на матеріалі усного мовлення тернопільців): Автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.01 / Т. М. Миколенко; Ін-т укр. мови НАН України. – К., 2006. – 24 с.
5. Мокиєнко В. М. Большой словарь жаргона / В. М. Мокиєнко, Т. Г. Никитина. – СПб.: Норинт, 2000. – 716 с.

6. Поливанов Е. Д. О блатном языке учащихся и о «славянской» революции / Е. Д. Поливанов // За марксистское языкознание. – М.: Федерация, 1931. – С. 161-172.
7. Словарь блатного жаргона в СССР [В. В. Махов]. – Харьков: Фирма «Божена», 1991. – 151 с.
8. Степанов Ю. С. Основы общего языкознания: [учебное пособие] / Ю. С. Степанов. – М.: Просвещение, 1975. – 271 с.
9. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія / [О. Селіванова]. – Полтава: Довкілля – К., 2006. – 716 с.
10. Щур І. І. Українськомовний комп'ютерний сленг: формування і функціонування: Автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.01 / І. І. Щур; Київ. нац. ун-т ім. Т. Шевченка, Ін-т філол. – К., 2006. – 20 с.