



ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ СЕМАНТИКА FUNCTIONAL SEMANTICS

DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2025-16-1-90-100

EDN: DYJKKJ

UDC 81'37'42

Research article / Научная статья

Substandard Language Phenomena in Artistic Discourse

Anzhelika V. Korolkova^{1, 2, 3}  , Tatyana S. Novikova³ 

¹Moscow State Pedagogical University, *Moscow, Russian Federation*

²RUDN University, *Moscow, Russian Federation*

³Smolensk State Agricultural Academy, *Smolensk, Russian Federation*

 lika.korolkova@bk.ru

Abstract. It should be noted that in the fiction of the XX century, lexical units from various types of jargon, argot, youth slang are quite common, but the theme and communicative goal of the author of the text play an important role. The article examines the use of various substandard linguistic phenomena in the artistic discourse of the second half of the XX century — early XXI century. Since artistic discourse is a reality reinterpreted by the creative imagination of the author, then in the second half of the XX century, the use of substandard vocabulary and phraseology became necessary in a number of literary texts. Numerous linguistic studies note a certain feature: the activation of substandard vocabulary and its use in colloquial speech reduce the expressive potential of the vocabulary and phraseology of the standard, which correlates with the literary language. Analyzing substandard vocabulary within the framework of the artistic space of Russian literature of the late XX — early XXI century, it should be noted that this vocabulary has become actively in demand in works of various genres. In this context, we can note its active use in works of the detective genre, in fiction and fiction-publicistic works that comprehend the era of the Great Terror, as well as in works about youth and for youth young people. Modern research in the field of studying the substandard vocabulary of artistic discourse allows us to fully analyze the modern language space. The modern language substandard implements various functions in literary texts, from nominative to cognitive and cumulative, from the expression of emotions to vivid evaluativeness. The substandard is currently becoming a source of replenishment of the stylistically reduced layer of modern colloquial speech.

Keywords: jargon, arg, slang, social language

Authors' contribution: the authors contributed equally to this research and preparation of the article text.

Conflicts of interest: the authors declare no conflict of interest.

Article history: received: 01.09.2024; accepted: 15.09.2024.

© Korolkova A.V., Novikova T.S., 2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

For citation: Korolkova, A.V., & Novikova, T.S. (2025). Substandard Language Phenomena in Artistic Discourse. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 16(1), 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2025-16-1-90-100>


Субстандартные языковые явления в художественном дискурсе

А.В. Королькова^{1, 2, 3}  , Т.С. Новикова³ 

¹Московский педагогический государственный университет, Москва, Российская Федерация

²Российский университет дружбы народов, Москва, Российская Федерация

³Смоленская государственная сельскохозяйственная академия, Смоленск, Российская Федерация

 lika.korolkova@bk.ru

Аннотация. Следует отметить, что в художественной прозе XX века лексические единицы из различного вида жаргонов, арг, молодежного сленга являются частотным явлением, однако важную роль играют тематика и коммуникативная цель автора текста. В статье рассматривается использование различных субстандартных языковых явлений в художественном дискурсе второй половины XX века — начала XXI в. Поскольку художественный дискурс представляет собой переосмысленную творческим воображением автора реальную действительность, то во второй половине XX века в ряде художественных текстов употребление субстандартной лексики и фразеологии стало необходимым. Проведенное исследование показало, что в многочисленных лингвистических исследованиях отмечается определенная особенность: активизация субстандартной лексики и ее использование в разговорной речи снижают выразительный потенциал лексики и фразеологии стандарта, который соотносится с литературным языком. Анализируя субстандартную лексику в рамках художественного пространства российской литературы конца XX — начала XXI в., следует указать, что эта лексика стала активно востребованной в произведениях различных жанров. В данном контексте можно отметить ее активное использование в произведениях детективного жанра, в художественных и художественно-публицистических произведениях, осмысливших эпоху большого террора, а также в произведениях о молодежи и для молодежи. Современные исследования в области изучения субстандартной лексики художественного дискурса, позволяют в полной мере анализировать современное языковое пространство. Современный языковой субстандарт реализует различные функции в художественных текстах, от номинативной до когнитивной и кумулятивной, от выражения эмоций до яркой оценочности. Субстандарт в настоящее время становится источником пополнения стилистически сниженного пласта современной разговорной речи.

Ключевые слова: жаргон, арг, сленг, социальные варианты языка

Вклад авторов: вклад авторов равнозначен на всех этапах исследования и подготовки текста статьи.

Заявление о конфликте интересов: авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи: дата поступления: 01.09.2024; дата приема в печать: 15.09.2024.

Для цитирования: Korolkova A.V., Novikova T.S. Substandard Language Phenomena in Artistic Discourse // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. 2025. Т. 16. № 1. С. 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2025-16-1-90-100>

Introduction

The modern anthropocentric paradigm of philological research actualizes the study of various social variants of language and speech. The study of the substandard and its reflection in literary texts is a rather topical issue, since it allows us to comprehend the socio-cultural foundations of communication. The novelty of this study lies in the postulate that since fiction reflects reality reinterpreted by the creative imagination of the author, the use of substandard vocabulary and phraseology became inevitable in a number of fiction texts in the XX century.

The analysis of social features of language in diachrony began with stylistic studies of the language norm and deviations from it. Voltaire and Diderot wrote about the social determination of language, the reflection of social processes in it, and even earlier ancient Greek philosophers thought about this.

One of the first Russian researchers of social jargon was V.I. Dal, who created the “Russian-Fenya Dictionary” and the “Fenya-Russian Dictionary”, which collected lexical units from the language of the peddlers¹. They deliberately changed words to make them incomprehensible to the uninitiated. These dictionaries by V.I. Dal were published only in the 21st century, thanks to V.D. Bondaletov, who prepared them for publication. “Handwritten Dictionaries” by V.I. Dal were published in electronic form in 2004 (then reissued). Part of the dictionary — the vocabulary of the Mazurik social group — is a short list of vocabulary units from the lexicon of St. Petersburg thieves and vagabonds.

In the XX century, the study of the substandard became systematic. Research primarily concerned individual aspects of the sociolect (social dialect) — jargons, argot, slang. A significant number of dictionaries of jargon and youth slang appeared. The first dictionary of thieves’ jargon was the book by Vasily Trakhtenberg “Blatnaya muzyka ‘Thieves’ jargon””, published in St. Petersburg in 1908². The dictionary contains and explains the most frequent lexical units of thieves’ jargon, describes interesting facts about the life of prisoners, for example, “snipe hunting” (catching lice), etc. The dictionary is the first scientific publication, since the type of dictionary entry was created by I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay; the book makes it possible to evaluate in historical retrospect the dynamics of the development of the vocabulary of thieves’ jargon.

By now, several dozen dictionaries of jargons, youth slang, and even argot have been published. Among the largest in volume are “The Big Dictionary of Russian Jargon” by V.M. Mokienko and T.G. Nikitina [1]; “Dictionary of Criminal Thieves’ Jargon” in 2 volumes by D.S. Baldaev [2]; “Explanatory Dictionary of Youth Slang” by T.G. Nikitina [3]. A unique publication of its kind is the dictionary “Russian Jargon:

¹ Dal, V.I. (2007). Handwritten dictionaries [electronic resource]: (Ofensky, Sherstobitov, Mazuryk) [Rukopisnye slovari [jelektronnyj resurs]: (ofenskie, sherstobitov, mazurikov)]. Moscow: Flinta: Businesssoft. (In Russ).

² Trakhtenberg, V.F. (1908). *Blatant music. Prison jargon*, Baudouin de Courtenay (Ed.). Saint Petersburg: A.G. Rosen. (In Russ).

Historical and Etymological Dictionary” by M.A. Grachev and V.M. Mokienko, which contains a diachronic analysis of lexical units and expressions from Russian argot and provides their interpretation [4].

Active lexicography of jargons, youth slang, even argot testifies to the active analysis of special layers of vocabulary, to the systematic development of research in the field of social subjects of the Russian language.

Materials and Results

At the end of the XX — beginning of the XXI century, a large number of studies appeared in the field of social dialect terminology. Such concepts as jargon, slang, argot were clarified; the terms ‘standard’, ‘substandard’ and ‘nonstandard’ were introduced into active scientific circulation. In 1993, the journal *Rusistics* published an analytical article by Z. Koester-Thoma, “Standard, Substandard, Nonstandard”, where there was an attempt to streamline the terminology of social studies of language.

Z. Koester-Thoma suggests using the term *standard*, due to the fact that the concept of literary language is related, first of all, to the language of fiction: “The introduction of the term *standard* is necessary due to the excessive “correlation” of the term “literary language” to the concept of “language of literature”, which is especially conditional these days, when the standard is created largely by the media, as well as the hierarchical correlativity with its opposite, non-standard, in contrast to the negative relationship of the terms non-literary speech, colloquialism, vulgar speech, etc.” [5. P. 15–31]. The substandard in this case includes vocabulary that “has consistency” at various levels of language, “dialect, the language of folklore” [5. P. 15–31].

The same article justifies the introduction of the term *nonstandard*, since, according to the researcher, nonstandard makes it possible to divide the group of negative vocabulary into groups or “levels” and include in it those elements that cannot be included in the substandard: “The introduction of both terms substandard and nonstandard makes it possible to approach this problem in detail, as well as to include in the three-level model those linguistic elements that cannot be attributed with certainty to any of the above-mentioned spheres. The division of nonstandard into groups and subgroups (e.g., jargon, slang, obscenities, etc.) is determined by a number of extralinguistic parameters” [5. P. 15–31].

However, in other works on linguistics that study negative vocabulary, as well as vocabulary with a pejorative coloring, the term *substandard* is used as a generic designation for all groups of vocabulary with negative characteristics of semantics and/or stylistic coloring.

V.V. Khimik in his monograph “Poetics of the Low, or Common Speech as a Cultural Phenomenon” [6] states that the terms argot, common speech, and jargon have come to be used as related terms; in some scientific works, they are even used interchangeably.

However, V.V. Khimik notes that the term slang is used to characterize a special social form of language and speech. In subsequent works, V.V. Khimik puts forward the idea of the existence of a socialized substandard, which he defines as a functional-stylistic common speech, which includes everything that is outside the linguistic norm; he contrasts the socialized substandard with private substandards, which include “territorial and social-group dialects” [7].

V.B. Bykov in his doctoral dissertation “Lexicological and lexicographic problems of the study of the Russian substandard” notes that “standard — substandard” should be contrasted according to the feature “presence — absence of obligatory codification”. At the same time, the standard and substandard are normalized subsystems of the national Russian language, which differ from each other in the nature of the norm, codified in the standard and non-codified, usual in the substandard [8].

In the doctoral dissertation of V.P. Korovushkin, “Fundamentals of Contrastive Sociolectology,” the language substandard is correlated or identified with popular language where four varieties are distinguished: 1) non-literary, 2) territorial, 3) ethnic, 4) lexical popular language. [9].

M.A. Grachev, studying the history of Russian slang, suggested considering it as a social variant of the language of declassed elements, while three types of slang are distinguished: general criminal slang, prison slang, specialized slang (used by representatives of various “specialists” in their field, for example, pickpockets, burglars, etc.). In a number of scientific works, M.A. Grachev analyzes various types of jargon, correlating them with the social characteristics or professional status of the speakers; youth slang is considered separately [10; 11].

It should be noted that in his latest works, M.A. Grachev asks about the need to limit the use of argot elements in the modern language of the media, since their activation in journalism and colloquial speech reduces “the level of the neutral layer of the language, which means that all speech becomes rougher. In this case, only an emotional impact is achieved, and less information is transmitted. All this happens to the detriment of the expressiveness of the common language” [10].

V.M. Mokienko, the author of a number of jargon dictionaries, uses the term substandard in his works, including in this concept various types of jargon (social and professional), as well as slang and argot. E.N. Kalugina in the article “Conceptual and theoretical aspect of the study of the language substandard” defines “a substandard as a heterogeneous language continuum, characterized by non-normativity, oral form of existence, manifestation of subcultural values, unclear boundaries between its varieties, lexical level of existence” [12. P. 267].

Theoretical disputes about the essence of the substandard have now ceased to be acute, since almost all modern scientists agree that the substandard is a complex linguistic phenomenon representing social variants of language and speech. Thus, in the article by A.V. Ageeva “Substandard as a marker of communicative intention in French-language Internet discourse” demonstrates the general trend of the modern

understanding of the substandard, which “is a complex subsystem that includes various kinds of socially limited forms of language existence, one of which is slang” [13. P. 4101].

We believe that when distinguishing between a standard and a substandard, attention should be paid to the codification/non-codification of the norm. “Thus, standard and substandard represent normalized subsystems of a national language that differ in the nature of the norm: in a standard, codified norms prevail, in a substandard, non-codified, common ones” [14. P.12].

In works of fiction of the XX century, lexical units from various types of jargon, argot, youth slang are significant in quantitative terms, although everything depends on the subject matter and communicative goal of the author of the text. Since fiction reflects reality reinterpreted by the creative imagination of the author, the use of substandard vocabulary and phraseology became inevitable in a number of fiction texts in the XX century.

At the same time, many linguistic studies note that the activation of substandard vocabulary and its penetration into colloquial speech reduces the expressive potential of the vocabulary and phraseology of the standard, which is related to the literary language. L.P. Krysin writes about this: “Slang words and phrases are far from uncommon in literary speech. At first, slang vocabulary seeped mainly into its oral and colloquial variety, then, closer to our days, into the language of the mass media, and then a broad stream poured into journalism, into public speeches of politicians, deputies and even writers” [15. P. 214].

In the second half of the XX century, a large number of literary texts of various levels were created, which comprehend the difficult recent historical past of Soviet Russia. One of the first works about prisoners published in the USSR was A.I. Solzhenitsyn’s story “One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich”, which describes camp life in some detail. The use of socially limited vocabulary units from prison camp jargon turns out to be necessary and justified. In the story by A.I. Solzhenitsyn, elements of prison camp jargon perform not only a nominative and emotional-expressive function, but also form the basis for creating characters and their individualization. The vocabulary of prison camp jargon creates a special stylistic coloring of the text.

A.I. Solzhenitsyn, who himself spent about seven years in the camps, had a large number of jargon and argot in his personal active vocabulary. However, it should be noted that they do not form the basis of his artistic and journalistic texts. Solzhenitsyn uses such vocabulary when necessary and in small quantities. Elements of camp jargon are also used in other works by the author. It should be assumed that in the fiction of A.I. Solzhenitsyn, jargon and argot perform an identification function. The use of these lexical units by the characters of his works allows us to show how the corresponding social connections were formed and maintained.

A.I. Solzhenitsyn often uses jargon vocabulary to implement a cognitive function, since jargon and argot in his works convey the socio-historical experience of the generation that fell under the “wheel of Stalin’s repressions”, preserve the

names of certain concepts and phenomena, allow us to rethink the tragic history of the revolution in Russia, two world wars, devastation, collectivization, post-war reconstruction, etc. It should be noted that according to the classification of M.A. Grachev, units from general criminal argot (or prison camp jargon) predominate in Solzhenitsyn's works.

G.V. Kolshansky in his work "The Communicative Function and Structure of Language" notes that "the cognitive world of language, i.e. social consciousness, in its form objectively reflects the original world and therefore serves as a means of further cognition of it" [16. P. 21]. In the fiction and fiction-publicistic works of A.I. Solzhenitsyn, the cognitive world of language "objectively reflects the original world."

The cognitive function of using slang, argot, and colloquial elements allows the author to create a linguistic model of the non-linguistic surrounding reality. In essence, the cognitive function of language as a whole can be interpreted as epistemological, preserving knowledge about the world and phenomena of the surrounding reality. Solzhenitsyn, using slang and argot in fiction, created and represented a model of the tragic socio-political system of the repressive penitentiary system in Soviet Russia. As an eyewitness and victim of this system, he preserved and conveyed the horror of the ordinariness of the events of those days.

During the period of change in the political system in the USSR, at the beginning of perestroika, a large number of texts appeared in the Russian-language artistic space, which narrated the period of repression in the 1930s in Soviet Russia. For example, "Kolyma Tales" by Varlam Shalamov, or "The Steep Route" by Evgenia Ginzburg³. Evgenia Ginzburg's autobiographical story "The Steep Route" narrates in detail all the trials of a political prisoner and her "comrades in misfortune" in prison and camps, while describing in detail the prison cells, transit cars, camp barracks, the customs of the guards. It should be noted that there is little substandard vocabulary in Ginzburg's story; the main function of slang lexical units is nominative. Lexical units of prison camp jargon name objects of prison life, the realities of prisoners' lives. "Now no one gets up from their bunks. The crack in the door is closed. The bolt is screwed tight. Bread rations are cut almost in half. They don't bring gruel. It's a punishment cell situation" [17].

At the same time, an insignificant amount of such vocabulary creates a certain stylistic effect. The combination of high poetic vocabulary and vocabulary units of prison camp jargon create a phantasmagoric picture of the reality surrounding the characters. Vocabulary units of camp jargon in the story by Evgenia Ginzburg also perform the cumulative function of collecting, storing and transmitting information. As in the story by E. Ginzburg, in the "Kolyma Tales" by V. Shalamov

³ Ginzburg, E.S. (1990). *Steep route: Chronicle of the times of the cult of personality* [Krutoj marshrut: Hronika vremen kul'ta lichnosti]. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel'. (In Russ).

a small amount of camp jargon is used, most often these are lexical units that perform a nominative function. However, even individual lexical units of this kind create a special hypertrophied expression.

The understanding of the tragic historical events of the repressions of the Soviet period of history is also contained in fiction texts, the authors of which avoided the fate of their characters. These are such works as “Moscow Saga” by Vasily Aksenov, “Children of the Arbat” by Anatoly Rybakov, “Life and Fate” by Vasily Grossman.

In these works, the description of places of imprisonment and camp life is not as piercing as in the texts of Solzhenitsyn, Ginzburg, Shalamov. However, prison camp vocabulary and argot vocabulary are also contained in these works, allowing a realistic description of the historical events of the period of repression in the late 1930s in Soviet Russia. The substandard vocabulary in the works of V. Aksenov, A. Rybakov, V. Grossman demonstrates the linguistic expressiveness necessary for the creation of a figurative system of literary text, and also helps to convey the color of the era for a realistic description of a group of society — unjustifiably repressed people of creative professions and the intelligentsia.

Over time, society’s understanding of the events became deeper and more diverse. Much in the history was rethought from a Christian perspective. In the fiction of the early XXI century, the reasons for the tragedy of repression and the death of a large number of people are shown not as the will of one tyrant, but as a systemic error of the entire political leadership of the country. Such a work is the novel “Abode” by Zakhar Prilepin⁴, in which one of the characters is the Solovetsky special-purpose camp.

Substandard vocabulary units (prison camp jargon) are an integral part of the language of the narrative, performing cumulative and cognitive functions, creating emotional coloring and revealing the ideological dominants of the era.

Substandard vocabulary is used not only in detective stories or texts about the difficult years of repression in Soviet Russia, but also in literature about youth and for youth. Such texts use a large number of units from youth slang. Among such works, it is worth mentioning the stories and short stories by M. Kulakov “I am a kid”⁵; E. Matveeva “Goodbye, Ophelia”⁶; T. Krasnova “A boy from a bad family”⁷; E. Murashova “Remedial class”⁸; Z. Prilepin “Sankya”⁹, etc.

⁴Prilepin, Z. (2009). *Sankya: a novel* [San'kja: roman]. Moscow: Ad marginem. (In Russ).

⁵Kulakov, M. (2019). *I am a boy: stories and stories*. [Az esm' pacan: povesti i rasskazy]. Moscow: U Nikitskikh vorot. (In Russ).

⁶Matveeva, E.A. (2003). *Farewell, Ophelia*: [Proshhaj, Ofelija] [Story: For Wednesdays. school age]. Moscow: Globulus. (In Russ).

⁷Krasnova, T.A. (2007). A boy from a bad family: a story [Mal'chik iz plohoj sem'i: povest']. *We, I*, 16–74. (In Russ).

⁸Murashova, E.V. (2007). *Correction class: story*: [Klass korrekcii: povest'] [for middle and high school age]. Moscow: Samokat. (In Russ).

⁹Prilepin, Z. (2009). *Sankya: a novel* [San'kja: roman]. Moscow: Ad marginem. (In Russ).

Conclusions

Considering substandard vocabulary within the artistic space of Russian literature of the late XX — early XXI centuries, it should be noted that this vocabulary has become actively in demand in works of the detective genre, which was rapidly developing in Russia at the turn of the century. In the mass-published works of Daria Dontsova, Tatyana Ustinova, Andrey Kivinov, Alexandra Marinina, Yulia Shilova, a large amount of jargon, argot, colloquial and abusive vocabulary is used to create expression, convey the realities of the lives of characters at odds with the law, to assess the described criminal situations. Many of the works of these authors have been made into films and TV series, in which substandard vocabulary and phraseology are an integral part of the artistic space. Often, a large amount of substandard vocabulary from detective stories and films passes into colloquial speech.

In addition to detective stories, literary texts appear in the Russian discursive space of fiction at the turn of the century, the goal of which is to show the life and everyday life of the criminal environment, to shock the public with an abundance of crude slang and lexemes from the “Russian slang”. Such are, for example, the texts of Elmira Netesova, who specializes in describing the lives of people who have committed serious crimes and been rejected by society. The basis of the language of Netesova’s works is substandard vocabulary, often incomprehensible to the ordinary reader. That is, in works of this kind, slang and jargon are used not with a strict stylistic assignment, but to create real shock content within the framework of the artistic space.

Slang in works of this kind is a necessary condition for the realistic depiction of the morals of the youth environment, the emotional assessment of what is happening. Slang vocabulary units perform both cognitive and cumulative functions, communicative and nominative functions, allowing authors to create a truthful portrait of a young man at the turn of the 21st century.

In general, it should be noted that modern research in the field of substandard vocabulary of fiction texts allows us to fully analyze the modern language space. The modern substandard implements various functions in fiction texts, from nominative to cognitive and cumulative, from the expression of emotions to vivid evaluativity. The substandard is currently becoming a source of replenishment of the stylistically reduced layer of modern colloquial speech.

References

1. Mokienko, V.M., & Nikitina, T.G. (2000). *Large dictionary of Russian jargon: 25,000 words, 7,000 stable combinations*. Saint Petersburg: Norint. (In Russ.).
2. Baldaev, D.S. (1997). *Dictionary of thieves' slang*. Moscow: Campana. (In Russ.).
3. Nikitina, T.G. (2006). *Explanatory dictionary of youth slang: words incomprehensible to adults: about 2000 words*. Moscow: Astrel: AST. (In Russ.).
4. Grachev, M.A., & Mokienko, V.M. (2009). *Russian jargon: Historical and etymological dictionary*. Moscow: AST-PRESS KNIGA. (In Russ.).

5. Koester-Thoma, S. (1993). Standard, substandard, nonstandard. *Russian Studies* (Berlin), (2), 15–31. (In Russ.).
6. Khimik, V.V. (2000). Poetics of the low, or Vernacular as a cultural phenomenon. Saint Petersburg: Faculty of Philology of Saint Petersburg State University. (In Russ.).
7. Khimik, V.V. (2004). Spoken speech as creativity. In: *Proceedings and materials: Russian language: historical destinies and modernity: II International Congress of Russian Language Researchers* (Moscow, M.V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Faculty of Philology, March 18–21, 2004 (pp. 374–375). Moscow: Lomonosov Moscow State University publ. (In Russ.).
8. Bykov, V.B. (2001). *Lexicological and lexicographical problems in the study of the Russian substandard* [PhD thesis]. Moscow. (In Russ.). EDN: QDQZOF
9. Korovushkin, V.P. (2005). *Fundamentals of contrastive sociolectology* [PhD thesis]. Pyatigorsk. (In Russ.). EDN: NOKYMB
10. Grachev, M.A. (2022). Adaptation of argotic units in the popular Russian language in the 21st century *Neophilology*, 8(2), 210–217. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.20310/2587-6953-2022-8-2-210-217> EDN: ZTKQRL
11. Grachev, M.A. (2009). Criminal language intervention. *Nauka i zhizn'*, (4), 128–132. (In Russ.).
12. Kalugina, E.N. (2013). Conceptual and theoretical aspect of the study of linguistic substandard. *Nauchnyi dialog*, 5(17), 261–269. (In Russ.).
13. Ageeva, A.V. (2023). Substandard as a marker of communicative intention in French-language Internet discourse. *Philology. Theory & Practice*, 16(11), 4097–4102. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20230623>. EDN: XEKIYA
14. Novikova, T.S. (2008). Substandard of the XX century and its contrastive artistic interpretation (based on the story by A.I. Solzhenitsyn “One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich”) [PhD thesis]. Belgorod. (In Russ.). EDN: PVSXVD
15. Krysin, L.P. (2002). About the Russian language of our days: The changing linguistic world. In: *Proceedings of Perm University conference, November 12–17, 2001* (pp. 214–216). Perm: Perm State University publ. (In Russ.).
16. Kolshansky, G.V. (2005). *Communicative function and structure of language* [Kommunikativnaja funkcija i struktura jazyka]. Moscow: URSS. (In Russ.).
17. Grachev, M.A. (1992). Third wave [Tret'ja volna]. *Russian speech*, (4), 61–64. (In Russ.).

Список литературы

1. Мокиенко В.М., Никитина Т.Г. Большой словарь русского жаргона. 25 000 слов. 7000 устойчивых сочетаний. СПб. : Норинт, 2000.
2. Балдаев Д.С. Словарь блатного воровского жаргона. М. : Кампана, 1997.
3. Никитина Т.Г. Толковый словарь молодежного сленга. Слова, непонятные взрослым. Около 2000 слов. М. : АСТ, Астрель, 2003.
4. Грачев М.А., Мокиенко В.М. Русский жаргон; Историко-этимологический словарь. М. : АСТ-ПРЕСС КНИГА, 2009.
5. Кёстер-Тома З. Стандарт, субстандарт, нестандарт // Русистика (Берлин). 1993. №2. С. 15–31.
6. Химик В.В. Поэтика низкого, или Просторечие как культурный феномен. СПб. : Филолог, фак-т СПбГУ, 2000.
7. Химик В.В. Разговорная речь как творчество // Русский язык: исторические судьбы и современность: II Междунар. конгресс исследователей рус. яз., 18–21 марта 2004 г., М. : Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 2004. С. 374–375.
8. Быков В.Б. Лексикологические и лексикографические проблемы исследования русского субстандарта : дисс. ... д-ра. филол. наук. М., 2001. EDN: QDQZOF
9. Коровушкин В.П. Основы контрастивной социолектологии: дисс. ... д-ра. филол. наук. Пятигорск, 2005. EDN: NOKYMB

10. Грачев М.А. Адаптация арготических единиц в общенародном русском языке в XXI веке // Неофилология. 2022. Т. 8. № 2. С. 210–217. <https://doi.org/10.20310/2587-6953-2022-8-2-210-217> EDN: ZTKQRL
11. Грачев М.А. Интервенция криминального языка // Наука и жизнь. 2009. № 4. С. 128–132.
12. Калугина Е.Н. Понятийно-теоретический аспект исследования языкового субстандарта // Научный диалог. 2013. Т. 5. № 17. С. 261–269.
13. Агеева А.В. Субстандарт как маркер коммуникативной интенции во франкоязычном Интернет-дискурсе // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. 2023. Т. 16. № 11. С. 4097–4102. <https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20230623>. EDN: ХЕКІУА
14. Новикова Т.С. Субстандарт XX в. и его контрастивно-художественная интерпретация (на материале повести А.И. Солженицына «Один день Ивана Денисовича»): дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Белгород, 2008. EDN: PVSXVD
15. Крысин Л.П. О русском языке наших дней // Изменяющийся языковой мир: материалы конференции, Пермь, 12–17 ноября 2001. Пермь : изд-во Пермского госуд. ун-та, 2002. С. 214–216.
16. Колианский Г.В. Коммуникативная функция и структура языка. М. : URSS, 2005.
17. Грачев М.А. Третья волна // Русская речь. 1992. № 4. С. 61–64.

Information about the authors:

Anzhelika V. Korolkova, Dr.Dc. (Philology), Professor, Moscow State Pedagogical University (house 1, building, Russia, Moscow, Malaya Pirogovskaya str., 1119435), Associate Professor at the Department of Russian Language No. 4, Institute of Russian Language, RUDN University (6, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, Russian Federation, 117198); *Research interests*: phraseology, lexicology, lexicography, aphoristics; *e-mail*: lika.korolkova@bk.ru
ORCID: 0000-0003-3245-7307, SPIN-code: 6560-9720, AuthorID: 352038; Scopus ID: 57222246422.

Tatyana S. Novikova, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Humanities and Mathematical Sciences, Smolensk State Agricultural Academy (10/2, Bolshaya Sovetskaya str., Smolensk, Russian Federation, 214000); *Research interests*: phraseology, lexicology, lexicography, slang; *e-mail*: tatjana_1@inbox.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-9388-2062, SPIN-code: 1191-1159, AuthorID: 808613.

Сведения об авторах:

Королькова Анжелика Викторовна, доктор филологических наук, профессор, профессор кафедры русского языка филологического факультета, Московский педагогический государственный университет (1119435, Российская Федерация, г. Москва, ул. Малая Пироговская, д. 44–46); доцент кафедры русского языка № 4 Института русского языка (Российский университет дружбы народов, Российская Федерация, г. Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, д. 6); *научные интересы*: фразеология, лексикология, лексикография, афористика; *e-mail*: lika.korolkova@bk.ru
ORCID: 0000-0003-3245-7307, SPIN-код: 6560–9720, AuthorID: 352038; Scopus ID: 57222246422.

Новикова Татьяна Сергеевна, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой гуманитарных и математических наук, Смоленская государственная сельскохозяйственная академия (214000, Российская Федерация, г. Смоленск, ул. Большая Советская, д. 10/2); *научные интересы*: фразеология, лексикология, лексикография, сленг; *e-mail*: tatjana_1@inbox.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-9388-2062, SPIN-код: 1191-1159, AuthorID: 808613.