

4. Кордон Ю.В. Удосконалення ефективності перевірки знань студентів за допомогою тестового контролю / Ю.В. Кордон, О.І. Жорняк, С.А. Колодій // Проблеми та перспективи вищої медичної школи у розробці та реалізації національної стратегії побудови нової системи охорони здоров'я в Україні на період 2015-2025 рр.: тези доповідей навчально-методичної конференції, м. Вінниця, 25 березня 2015 року. – С.101-102.

COLLOQUIAL WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS IN PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Athu C., Mihaila R., Botezat O.

Dimitrie Cantemir Christian University, Bucharest, Romania

Language generally represents a means of communications in society, a complex reality that may be conceptualized in various ways as it is differently approached. Due to the current explosive development of science and technology to satisfy the multi-folded demands and desires of people worldwide as well as the increase of inter-cultural changes, many words belonging to the "terminological bank" have passed into the common literary or even colloquial vocabulary. When we speak about professionalisms we refer to the lexical units used in a definite trade, profession or calling by people connected by common interests both at work and at home.

Keywords: colloquial language, expressions, professional environment.

Language is a very complex phenomenon that continuously develops and its various instances are due the internal evolution of the socio-economic system as well as of the influences of other languages along the years. The changes do not take place suddenly and entirely since the new forms of linguistic expression coexist with the old ones for a while, hence the communication between generations is possible.

As for the special languages, regardless the professional field, they develop from the colloquial language using its structure mainly through terminologies especially created (denotative and mono-semantic ones) to properly denote the concepts.

The interference area of the colloquial language and the special ones is currently extending through bidirectional lexical transfer.

A. Professionalisms.

Professionalisms are the words used in a definite trade, profession or calling by people connected by common interests both at work and at home.

Professionalisms are correlated to terms. Terms, as has already been indicated, are coined to nominate new concepts that appear in the process of, and as a result of, technical progress and the development of science. In distinction from *slang*, *professionalisms* cover a narrow semantic field, for example connected with the technical side of some profession.

Professional words, denoting already-existing concepts, are well-organised lexical units, usually mono-referential and mono-semantic, and therefore independent of context. These distinctive features make them different from the colloquial words with various meanings according to the specific context. Professionalisms, with their technicality, belong to the non-literary layer of the English language and therefore they are barely used in casual conversation.

B. Dialectal words

When we refer to the dialectal words there should be considered the process of integration of the English national language and its on-going change beyond the literary style. They are normative lexical units used in a particular area devoid of stylistic references in regional dialects. However their distinctive flavor (of the region they belong to) narrows the area of their usage to certain people or to specific communicative circumstances.

C. Colloquial coinages – words and meanings

Colloquial coinages – *nonce words*, apart from being dependent on the context, are more emotionally colored than the words in the literary style, they are spontaneous and elusive. Some of the colloquial nonce words are neither recorded in dictionaries nor may they occur in the written works with the view to their temporary usage in a language and to the fact that they most likely disappear thus being soon obliterated. As for the means of enriching the vocabulary, colloquial coinages do not undergo any morphemic changes (prefixation or affixation), yet there might be certain semantic changes according to a specific context or to certain communicative reasons.

D. Colloquial Words Expressions

Colloquial words, used in everyday communication instances, are semantically flexible, preferential polysemic lexical units, adding more figurative meanings and entailing the occurrence of semantically ambiguous situations. At the same time, the connotative meanings of the colloquial words may strengthen their "everlastingness" in language, enabling their movement towards different functional styles. Samuel Johnson thought colloquial words inconsistent with good usage and, thinking it his duty to reform the English language, he advised "to clear it from colloquial barbarisms."¹

It was noted that by the end of the 19th century, the colloquial language was in depth studied as it particularly referred to the vocabulary actually used in casual communication with no connection to a special activity field. The current term *colloquial* is mistaken for *'slangy'* or *'vulgar'*, as the latter two represent only subsets of colloquial speech for particular groups of people.

Considering the term *literary colloquial*, we notice that it is used for written or oral communication purposes by educated people, such as well-known authors like: E.M. Forster, J. Galsworthy, J.B. Priestley, and others.

For a modern reader it represents the speech of the elder generations. The younger generation of writers adheres to familiar colloquial. Thus it seems in a way to be a differentiation of generations.

¹ *Apud David Crystal, Johnson's Dictionary: Myths and Realities* <https://www.bl.uk/restoration-18th-century-literature/articles/johnsons-dictionary-myths-and-realities#>

Familiar colloquial is more emotional and much freer and more careless than literary colloquial. It is also characterized by a great number of jocular expressions or ironical expressions and nonce-words.

The term *low colloquial* regards the category of illiterate people's speech. There cannot be found a clear cut between the low colloquial and dialectal speech as they are both used in ordinary communication intercourse. Taking into account fiction it is even harder to make a proper speech characterization, so the social aspects are to clearly distinguish the low colloquial speech from the two other types of colloquial.

The main peculiarities of low colloquial grammar and pronunciation are obvious, as to the vocabulary, it goes beyond the colloquial resorting to more vulgar words, and frequently to dialectal elements. A worth-mentioning example is G.B. Shaw's *Pygmalion* where the problem of speech as a mark of one's social position and of social inequalities is one of the main issues.

Besides the low colloquial, we may also mention the so-called slang and argot as other language subsegments, situated below the level of standard educated speech.

The term *argot* differs from slang since it denotes a particular vocabulary and idiom, its usage is confined to the speech of a specific group of people, of a restricted age, to the underworld gangs and criminals. It is a special code of communication among people (with an evident purpose to be unintelligible for the others) who break the law and resort to illegitimate actions.

If we realize that *gesture, tone and voice and situation* are almost as important in an informal act of communication as words are, we shall be able to understand why a *careful choice of words* in everyday conversation plays a minor part as compared with public speech or literature, and consequently the vocabulary is much less variegated.

The same pronouns, prop-words, auxiliaries, post positives and the same most frequent and generic terms are used again and again, each conveying a great number of different meanings. Only a small fraction of English vocabulary is put to use, so that some words are definitely overworked. Words like: *thing, business, do, get, go, fix, nice, really, well* and other words characterized by a very high rank of frequency are used in all types of informal intercourse conveying a great variety of *denotative meanings* and *emotional meanings* and fulfilling no end of different functions. The utterances abound in imaginative phraseology, *ready-made formulas of politeness and tags, standard expressions of assent, dissent, surprise, pleasure, gratitude, apology, etc.*

Every type of colloquial style displays a lot of figures of speech:

"If you're seriously proposing to print rumors without even a scrap of evidence, the paper isn't going to last very long, is it?"

"Why in God's name not?"

"What's going to stop a crop of libel actions?"

"The trouble with you lawyers," said Seymour, jauntily once more, "is that you never know when a fact is a fact, and you never see an inch beyond your noses. I am prepared to bet any of you, or all three, if you like, an even hundred pounds that no one, no one brings an action against us over this business."²

Carefully observing the means of emphasis used in the passage above, one will notice that the words *a scrap, an inch, even* are used here only as intensifiers lending emphasis to what is being said; they are definitely colloquial. But they have these properties due to the context, and the reader will have no difficulty in finding examples where these words are neither *emphatic* nor *stylistically colored*.

The conclusion is that some words acquire these characteristics only under certain very definite conditions, and may be contrasted with words and expressions that are always emotional and always colloquial in all their meanings, whatever the context.

On earth or in God's name, for instance, are colloquial and emotional only after some interrogative word:

Why in God's name ...,

Why on earth ...,

Where in God's name ...,

Where on earth ...,

What in God's name...,

What on earth..., etc.

On the other hand, there exist *oaths, swear words* and their euphemistic variations that function as emotional colloquialisms independent of the context.

The examples are:

- ✓ *by God*
- ✓ *Goodness gracious*
- ✓ *for Goodness sake*
- ✓ *good Lord*

and many others. They occur very often and are highly differentiated socially. Not only is there a difference in expressions used by schoolboys and elderly ladies, sailors and farmers but even those chosen by students of different universities may show some local color.

E. *Lexical Expressions of Modality*

Usually referred to as colloquialisms, they have a specific scope of usage, thus occurring only in informal everyday intercourse. In case of affirmative and negative answers they may reveal a wide range of modality shades.

F. *Slang*

This term encompasses many semantic realizations and is far from being thoroughly known. It concerns every linguistic aspect that lies below the standard of the current English language.

We may define *slang* as an odd language to a specific group of people as:

² Snow, C.P., *The Conscience of the Rich*, Pan Macmillan, 2018

- i. the special and often secret vocabulary used by a class, as thieves, beggars, and usually felt to be vulgar or inferior: argot;
- ii. the jargon used by or associated with a particular trade, profession, or field of activity;
- iii. a non-standard vocabulary composed of words and senses characterized primarily by connotations of extreme informality and usually a currency not limited to a particular region and composed typically of coinages or arbitrarily changed words, clipped or shortened forms, extravagant, forced or facetious figures of speech, or verbal novelties usu. experiencing quick popularity and relatively rapid decline into disuse.
- iv. words or expressions that are very informal and are not considered suitable for more formal situations. Some slang is used only by a particular group of people (Macmillan).

Slang words, used by most speakers in very informal communication, are highly emotive and expressive and as such, lose their originality rather fast and are replaced by newer formations. This tendency to synonymic expansion results in long chains of synonyms of various degrees of expressiveness, denoting one and the same concept. So, the idea of a "pretty girl" is worded by more than one hundred ways in slang.

In only one novel by S. Lewis there are close to a dozen synonyms used by Babbitt, the central character, in reference to a girl: "cookie", "tomato", "Jane", "sugar", "bird", "cutie", etc.

So broad is the term 'Slang' that, according to Eric Partridge, there are many kinds of Slang, for example, cockney, public-house, commercial, society, and military, theatrical, parliamentary and others. This leads the author to believe that there is also a Standard Slang, the Slang that is common to all those who, though employing received standard in their writing and speech, also use an informal language which, in fact, is no language but merely a way of speaking, using special words and phrases in some special sense. The most confusing definition of the nature of slang is the following one given by Partridge:

"...personality and one's surroundings (social or occupational) are the two coefficients, the two chief factors, the determining causes of the nature of slang, as they are of language in general and of style."³

The term 'Slang', which is widely used in English linguistic science, should be clearly specified if it is to be used as a term, i. e. it should refer to some definite notion and should be definable in explicit, simple terms. It is suggested here that the term 'Slang' should be used for those forms of the English vocabulary which are either mispronounced or distorted in some way phonetically, morphologically or lexically.

Conclusions. The stylistic function of the different strata of the English vocabulary depends not so much on the inner qualities of each of the groups, as on their interaction when they are opposed to one another. However, the qualities themselves are not unaffected by the function of the words, in as much as these qualities have been acquired in certain environments.

The standard English includes the common colloquial vocabulary as it is considered neither neutral nor particular, both literary and common colloquial words being heterogeneous. Many layers of the English language develop various stylistic aspects when they interact, opposing to one another.

References

1. Beglar D., Murray N. *Contemporary Topics*. New York: Longman. 2002.
2. Crystal D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. 2003.
3. Dumas B. Lighter J. "Is slang a word for linguists?" *American Speech*, 53, 1978. pp. 5-17.
4. Kucharenko, V.A. *A Book of Practice in Stylistics*, M.: Высшая школа, 1986, pp. 25-28, questions, ex. 1, 2, 4
5. Lighter J.E. *Historical Dictionary of American Slang*. J.E. Lighter (ed.). Vol.1. A-G. – New York: Random House, LVIII, 1994, p. 1007.
6. Partridge E. *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. 8th edition. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. XXIX, 1982, p. 140.
7. Rampton B. *Crossing. Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. Harlow and New York: Longman. 1995.
8. *The Routledge Dictionary of Modern American Slang and Unconventional English*. Tom Dalzell (ed.). NY & London: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, X, 2009, p. 105.
9. Snow, C.P., *The Conscience of the Rich*, Pan Macmillan, 2018
10. Thorne T. *Dictionary of Contemporary Slang*. London: A&C Black Publishers Ltd., 2007, p. 513.

³Partridge E. *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. 8th edition. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. XXIX, 1982, p. 140.