

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY AND TRANSLATION

Department of Theory and Practice of Translation from the English Language

## **TERM PAPER**

IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

### **Peculiarities of translating youth agrotisms in the northwestern region of the United States (based on the material of contemporary media discourse)**

FESHCHENKO ILONA

GROUP PA 01-19

Educational Programme:

**English and a Second**

**Foreign Language:**

**Oral and Written Translation**

Majoring 035 Philology

Research supervisor:

**O.B. Halych**

Kyiv – 2023

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ

Київський національний лінгвістичний  
університет Факультет германської філології і  
перекладу  
Кафедра теорії і практики перекладу  
з англійської мови

Представлено на кафедрі

\_\_\_\_\_ (дата, підпис секретаря кафедри)

Рецензування \_\_\_\_\_

(кількість балів, «до захисту» («на доопрацювання»),  
дата, підпис керівника курсової роботи)

Захист \_\_\_\_\_

(кількість балів, дата, підпис викладача)

Підсумкова оцінка \_\_\_\_\_

(кількість балів, оцінка за 4-х  
бальною системою, дата, підпис викладача)

## **КУРСОВА РОБОТА**

З ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

### **ЛЕКСИКО-СТИЛІСТИЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ АРГОТИЗМІВ У МОЛОДІЖНОМУ МОВЛЕННІ НАСЕЛЕННЯ ПІВНІЧНО-ЗАХІДНОГО РЕГІОНУ США**

Фещенко Ілона

студентка групи Па01-19

Керівник курсової роботи \_\_\_\_\_

(підпис)

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

Галич Оксана Борисівна

Київ – 2023

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет  
Кафедра англійської філології і перекладу

Затверджую:

Завідувач кафедри \_\_\_\_\_

(підпис)

д.ф.н., проф. Ніконова В.Г.

“22” вересня 2022р.

### ЗАВДАННЯ

на курсову роботу для студентів IV курсу

Студент \_\_\_\_\_ курсу \_\_\_\_\_ групи, факультету перекладачів КНЛУ

(ПІБ студента)

Напрям підготовки \_\_\_\_\_ 6.020303 Філологія (Переклад (англійська))

Тема роботи \_\_\_\_\_

Науковий керівник \_\_\_\_\_

Дата видачі завдання \_\_\_\_\_ “20” вересня 2022р.

### Графік виконання курсової роботи

№ п/п	Найменування частин та план курсової роботи	Терміни звіту про виконання	Відмітка про виконання
1.	Аналіз наукових першоджерел і написання теоретичної частини курсової роботи (розділ 1)	23–30 жовтня 2022р.	
2.	Написання практичної частини курсової роботи (розділ 2), а саме: - аналіз дискурсу, який досліджується, на матеріалі фрагмента тексту і написання першого параграфу розділу 2; - проведення перекладацького аналізу матеріалу дослідження і написання другого параграфу розділу 2	27–30 листопада 2022р.	
3.	Написання вступу і висновків дослідження, оформлення курсової роботи і подача завершеної курсової роботи науковому керівнику для попереднього перегляду	04–08 грудня 2022р.	
4.	Оцінювання курсових робіт науковими керівниками, підготовка студентами презентацій до захисту курсової роботи	11–13 грудня 2022р.	
5.	Захист курсових робіт	14 грудня 2022р.	

Науковий керівник \_\_\_\_\_ (підпис)

Студент \_\_\_\_\_ (підпис)

**РЕЦЕНЗІЯ НА КУРСОВУ РОБОТУ  
З ПЕРЕКЛАДУ З АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ**

студента(ки) \_\_\_\_\_ курсу групи \_\_\_\_\_ факультету германської філології і перекладу КНЛУ спеціальності **035 Філологія**, спеціалізації **035.041 Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно)**, перша – англійська, освітньо-професійної програми **Англійська мова і друга іноземна мова: усний і письмовий переклад**

(ПІБ студента)

за темою

	<b>Критерії</b>	<b>Оцінка в балах</b>
1.	Наявність основних компонентів структури роботи – <b>загалом 5 балів</b> (усі компоненти присутні – <b>5</b> , один або декілька компонентів відсутні – <b>0</b> )	
2.	Відповідність оформлення роботи, посилань і списку використаних джерел нормативним вимогам до курсової роботи – <b>загалом 10 балів</b> (повна відповідність – <b>10</b> , незначні помилки в оформленні – <b>8</b> , значні помилки в оформленні – <b>4</b> , оформлення переважно невірне – <b>0</b> )	
3.	Відповідність побудови вступу нормативним вимогам – <b>загалом 10 балів</b> (повна відповідність – <b>10</b> , відповідність неповна – <b>8</b> , відповідність часткова – <b>4</b> , не відповідає вимогам – <b>0</b> )	
4.	Відповідність огляду наукової літератури нормативним вимогам – <b>загалом 15 балів</b> (повна відповідність – <b>15</b> , відповідність неповна – <b>10</b> , відповідність часткова – <b>5</b> , не відповідає вимогам – <b>0</b> )	
5.	Відповідність практичної частини дослідження нормативним вимогам – <b>загалом 20 балів</b> (повна відповідність – <b>20</b> , відповідність неповна – <b>15</b> , відповідність часткова – <b>10</b> , не відповідає вимогам – <b>0</b> )	
6.	Відповідність висновків результатам теоретичної та практичної складових дослідження – <b>загалом 10 балів</b> (повна відповідність – <b>10</b> , відповідність неповна – <b>8</b> , відповідність часткова – <b>4</b> , не відповідає вимогам – <b>0</b> )	

**Усього набрано балів:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Оцінка:**

“До захисту” \_\_\_\_\_  
(42-70 балів)

\_\_\_\_\_ (підпис керівника)

“На доопрацювання” \_\_\_\_\_  
(0-41 балів)

\_\_\_\_\_ (підпис керівника)

“\_\_\_\_\_” грудня 2023р.

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1	
THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF STUDYING ARGOTISMS AND YOUTH SLANG.....	3
1.1. Normative language and dialect: linguocultural and sociolinguistic aspects...3	
1.2 Argo as an object of research in sociolinguistics.....	8
1.3 Youth slang in the system of social dialects.....	10
CHAPTER 2	
PECULIARITIES OF TRANSLATING YOUTH ARGOTISMS IN THE NORTHWESTERN REGION OF THE UNITED STATES (BASED ON THE MATERIAL FROM “DIGGIN’ MAGAZINE (PACIFIC NORTHWEST) ENGLISH BOOKLET”).....	11
2.1. Difficulties in translating dialect and slang units.....	12
2.2. Translation of argotisms in the youth speech of the population of the northwestern region of the United States.....	21
2.2.1. Lexical transformations.....	21
2.2.2. Grammatical transformations.....	23
CONCLUSIONS.....	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	29
LIST OF REFERENCE SOURCES.....	32
LIST OF DATA SOURCES.....	33
ANNEX.....	34
PE3IOME.....	36

## INTRODUCTION

The paper deals with the analysis of the peculiarities of translating youth argotisms in the English and Ukrainian language system. The relevance of this research lies in the fact that the features of social dialects are used as a means of communication between people connected by a close social or professional community. It is the language of a particular social group.

The term paper is focused on the features of the translating of argotisms in the English and Ukrainian language system on the material of contemporary media discourse. Socially coloured vocabulary is the prerogative of spoken language. The functional purpose of argot, jargon, slang is to be a means of casual, informal communication between people.

The theoretical background research of social dialects emerged in the nineteenth century. Scholars from different countries have been studying the problems of social dialectology in the nineteenth century and early twenty-first century. These are: Ukrainian linguists V. Borzhkovskiy, O. Horbach, P. Hrabovyi, J. Dzendzelivskiy, I. Matviyas, Y. Mosenkis, L. Stavytska, etc.; Germans G. Bauman, B. David, G. Ehmann, F. Kluge, H. Küper, I. Meyer, etc.; Englishmen A. Barer and C. G. Leland, D. Grettan, Duke Anglicus, R. I. McDavid, E. Partridge, J. S. Farmer, etc.; American linguists L. Bloomfield, J. Gumpertz, J. B. Greenough and J. L. Kittridge and many others.

Considerable attention is paid to the theoretical study of argot, jargon and slang in American sociolinguistics of the nineteenth century – the beginning of the twenty-first century. During this period, linguists in the United States and Europe paid considerable attention to social dialects, highlighted the problem of their origin and functioning

Presentation of the topicality for the study. The topicality of the study is due to the fact that sociolinguistics is a relatively new and relatively little-studied branch of modern linguistics. The existence of argonology as a science is an indicator of the freedom of humanitarian thought and, at the same time, the spiritual culture of a

**society tolerant of the existence of literary argon diglossia and alternative social, group, or personal linguistic expression. The study of social dialects, which is extremely important for the development of linguistics, can be successful only if the problems of social dialectology are studied consistently and comprehensively from the linguistic and historiographical point of view. However, there are no special comprehensive works of this type.**

**The aim of the paper is to study the lexical and semantic features of young people's argotisms in the Northwestern United States.**

**To achieve this aim, the following objectives must be completed:**

- 1. to identify linguistic, cultural and sociolinguistic aspects of the normative language and dialect;**
- 2. to characterise the features of the dialect of the population of the Northwest region of the USA;**
- 3. to consider argot as an object of research in sociolinguistics;**
- 4. to study youth slang in the system of social dialects;**
- 5. to identify the difficulties of translating dialect and slang units;**
- 6. to analyse the translation of argotisms in the youth speech of the population of the Northwest region of the United States.**

**The subject of the research is social dialectology at different stages of development of sociolinguistics.**

**The object of the research is the argotisms of young people in the northwestern regions of the United States. The data source of the study is "Diggin' Magazine" and various online resources.**

**Research methods. In the process of writing the paper, the descriptive and comparative methods of linguistic research, as well as the methods of contextual and component analysis were used.**

**The structure of the paper is determined by its purpose and objectives. The paper consists of an introduction, two chapters, conclusions, a list of references, appendices and a summary.**

## **THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF STUDYING ARGOTISMS**

### **AND YOUTH SLANG**

#### **1.1 Normative language and dialect: linguocultural and sociolinguistic aspects**

The notion of norm is known to be one of the central concepts of the science of language, but it still remains very controversial. The legitimacy of this thesis is confirmed not only by the fact that both domestic and foreign linguistics continue to coexist with two opposing views on the phenomenon of language normativity [8: 11], but also by the differences in the interpretation of the analyzed concept in the reference scientific literature, textbooks, scientific works on linguistics and speech culture. Therefore, despite the fact that most modern linguists quite rightly do not deny the existence of the language norm as a phenomenon necessary for the progressive development of society, education, consolidation of cultural traditions and interaction between individuals belonging to different national communities, the statement made many years ago by F.M. Berezin and B.N. Golovin that “the essence of the norm still defies a clear description” [8: 11] remains true.

The most legitimate approach to the definition of the concept of “literary norm” in our time is a comprehensive approach that takes into account both essential aspects of the analyzed phenomenon:

1) systemic and linguistic, associated with the characterization of the norm as an intralinguistic category, which is determined by the presence in the language of potential possibilities for denoting the same phenomenon provided by the language system;

2) evaluative-functional, which implies that native speakers recognize certain means of linguistic expression as exemplary for use in the form of certain rules [8].



In the light of the achievements of modern linguistics, it is obvious that literary norms objectively exist in the language as a set of “most suitable” and “desirable” linguistic means used in certain spheres and situations of communication, and are reflected in the minds of speakers in the form of knowledge and ideas about the possibilities of the language system and the rules for using vocabulary, taking into account the likely limitations in the implementation of the language system in a certain historical period. Historically, literary norms are maintained consciously and purposefully by codifying them in dictionaries, reference books, and grammars. The codification of a norm is its reflection, fixation and description in special scientific and reference publications, as well as the conscious selection of what is proposed to be used as correct.

Some linguists speak of violations of the literary norm, but there are those who do not consider colloquialisms, jargons, and dialects to be such violations. [6: 12].

One cannot but agree that dialect, colloquialism, and jargon “obey their own norms”; on the other hand, certain norms can be found in broken speech and in the speech of a foreigner. But if we proceed from the notion of the norms of the literary language, the term “deviation from the literary norm” is best suited, as it unites all cases of distortions of the literary language and speech. O. V. Aleksandrova writes about the distinction between “peripheral layers of language” and “intentional and unintentional distortion of spoken language” and suggests two types of deviation, which linguists conventionally divide into collective and individual deviations:

1) collective deviations: colloquialisms, dialects, jargons, argo, slang, professional language;

2) individual deviations: fluency in oral speech, children's speech, broken speech, speech defects (checkered, whispery, mumbling, slurring, stuttering, etc.) [1].

The very concept of “dialect” is described in different ways. Thus, I. Bilodid's work provides a brief definition: “a local variety of a language” [20 : 294]. In a modern philologist's dictionary, we find a more detailed explanation: “a local variety of the national language spoken by a part of the nation, connected by a territorial community. Local dialects

have their own grammatical structure, close to the national language, basic vocabulary, as well as some phonetic features” [5: 30].

The Merriam-Webster English Dictionary provides five interpretations of the term “dialect”:

1) a regional variety of a language that differs in vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation from other regional varieties and constitutes a single language with them;

2) one of two or more related languages;

3) a variety of languages used by members of a group;

4) a variety of language whose identity is fixed by a factor other than geography (for example, social class);

5) a version of a computer programming language [24].

Studies of dialects in the field of linguistic geography (or dialectography) have shown that the very concept of “dialect” lacks sufficient justification and can be understood differently depending on the research objectives.

An attempt to critically revise the concept of “dialect” is the study of German dialectography on “linguistic landscapes”. In the works of T. Frings and his school, there is a tendency to socio-historical substantiation of the understanding of the linguistic landscape (the connection of linguistic boundaries with the boundaries of medieval political territories, with the paths of economic and cultural relations, with the movement of colonization flows, etc [11]).

In the structure of the functional paradigm of language, which is expressed by the model of the real functioning of subsystems (forms of language existence) correlated with each other within a certain historical language [6], a dialect can be contrasted with other forms of language as follows:

1. dialect – other unprocessed forms of language;
2. dialect – other spoken forms of the language;

3. dialect – written forms of language;
4. dialect – supra-dialectal forms of the language;
5. dialect – processed forms of language;
6. dialect – literary language [8: 15].

Three historical types of dialect can be schematically distinguished:

- 1) a dialect in the conditions of the tribal system;
- 2) dialect in the era of ancient and medieval states;
- 3) territorial dialect in the period of formation and development of national unity, when the dialect becomes a form of oral communication of certain segments of society [3].

All assumptions about the status of a tribal dialect in the early stages of the tribal system are mostly based on hypotheses and reconstructions. It can only be roughly stated that a distinctive feature of the dialect in the early stages of historical development was the absence of comparison of the dialect as a regionally limited language with another generalized form of language existence [3].

The following characteristics are recognized as typologically significant features of dialects as components of the functional paradigm of a language:

- dialect is one of the territorial varieties of the lowest level of the functional paradigm of a language;
- dialect has no written tradition, and therefore dialect material is particularly difficult to study;
- dialect is a functionally and socially limited form of language existence, which, with the development of a supra-dialectal form, is pushed into the sphere of oral communication [6: 14].

When studying a dialect in the linguistic and cultural aspect, the subject of research is all linguistic signs that can perform the function of the “language” of culture and reflect the cultural and national mentality of its speakers (paremic fund of the dialect, phraseological fund, standards, stereotypes, symbols, metaphors and images, mythologized

linguistic units, speech behavior of dialect speakers). The linguistic and cultural analysis of units of this type is carried out on the basis of the integrative principle, allowing not only to identify elements of cultural connotation in the semantics of a dialect sign, but also to carry out a cultural and historical interpretation of a certain fragment of the linguistic picture of the world of dialect speakers [2: 89-99].

By studying the system of territorial dialect as a way of encoding the culture of its speakers, one can reveal such basic concepts of linguocultural studies as cultural background, concepts, cultural inheritance and traditions, cultural space, linguocultural paradigm, mentality, mentality, cultural connotation, etc.

Native speakers of a literary language and speakers of a dialect not only use the language in different ways, but also realize their perception of the world in language in different ways [5: 53].

The national and cultural semantics of a dialect expresses the content that goes back to the peculiarities of the economy, geography, social system, folklore, literature, all kinds of art, science, and the details of everyday life and customs of the native speaker.

The rich informative potential of a dialect makes its study from a linguistic and cultural point of view natural and necessary. That is, within the anthropocentric paradigm, a dialect can be studied based on specific methods and techniques of linguistic and cultural studies [1]. Within certain areas (synchronic, diachronic, comparative, and contrastive linguocultural studies), it is possible to solve the tasks and issues posed by this science.

In the aspect of linguistic and cultural analysis of linguistic data, phraseological and parametric material is the most revealing and culturally rich. The figurative bases of dialectal paraphrases and phrases are distinguished by their brightness, directness, uncomplicatedness, sometimes even unpredictability, and surprise. The study of a dialect in the linguistic and cultural aspect provides invaluable and inexhaustible material to understand the laws of language development, because the linguistic features of any local dialect are not due to the negligence of its speakers, but to strict historical patterns [4].

In addition to linguistic and cultural studies, dialects are also studied in the field of sociolinguistics. Modern sociolinguistics is understood as a science that studies the relationship between language and society, and considers the peculiarities of the language of different social and age groups, as well as the situation of a speaker's choice of a particular language variant [1].

## **1.2 Argo as an object of research in sociolinguistics**

The researcher F. Toll gives the first definition of argo in his dictionary (“argo, called in France the language of thieves, also the gypsy language; argotism, an expression or feature of thieves' language” [16]) in the sense of “thieves' language”.

Linguist S. Balli gave his own characterization of argo: “Argo is colloquial speech in its most extreme form. Argo traditionally symbolizes the way of life of the lowest and least respected strata of society” [16].

One of the first characteristics of cant was given by J.C. Hotten: “cant is universal and occurs all over the world in the languages of both civilized and uncivilized nations among groups of people who have no permanent residence and are engaged in vagrancy, begging, and thievery. These people use kent to conceal their intentions and loot” [28].

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the characteristics of argo (cant) by various contemporary authors of the period differ considerably: from an extremely negative assessment to a completely tolerant one [16].

V.M. Zhyrmunsky sees argo as the so-called “thieves' language” and distinguishes a professional function in it; he considers argo a secret language, a conspiratorial, classified language [16].

Ukrainian researcher L. Stavytska considers argo to be a conventional language used as a means of concealing the subject of communication, mutual recognition or separation of its speakers; it denotes the way of communication of declamatory elements, as well as the language of people of itinerant professions, beggars, etc.; the meaning of the term argo is associated with the sealing of verbal communication [17: 23].

In the work of M. Rudenko we find a statement that “argot was formed from the conventional languages of various social groups, in particular from the conventional language of the offenders. The author uses the term argot to refer to the vocabulary of the declassed, and believes that argot is an inevitable companion of the criminal profession” [15].

L. Spitzer, relying on the statements of French writers, opposes the opinion that argues that argot is a natural language. He sees argot as an “affective language” (German “Ziersprache”), an artificial formation created with certain intentions, pursuing certain goals [15].

M. Kuttner [29 : 346] and W. von Wartburg [42 : 376] were of the opinion that argot was a natural language. G. P. Krapp and H. P. Bradley [45] were distrustful of the secret nature of argot.

In the early twentieth century, many researchers did not recognize the secrecy of the argot, even in the underworld itself. L. Seneyan notes: “...today there is no secret language among criminals. They speak the same vulgar vernacular as other classes of petty people – honest and dishonest” [37 : 483].

Thus, the question of the secret, conditional nature of the argot and its natural origin remains open and requires additional research.

Initially, the argot performed a cryptic function. Over time, argot began to perform not only a secretive but also a representative (or identifying) function. Gradually, these functions fade into the background, and the human (play) function comes to the fore [16].

L.O. Stavitska notes that argot also has a communicative and pragmatic function [17: 75].

It should be noted that already in the nineteenth century, secret professional arguers were in the process of dying out and degeneration, the argot was losing its former secrecy and secret professional character [16].

Argo is not stable, it is constantly being reformed. But, at the same time, argo has a kind of “basic vocabulary” that remains relatively stable, acquiring only new synonyms.

J.O. Dzendzelivskiy believes that the question of stability or instability of the lexical and phraseological composition of argo should be considered differentially. For example, the update of the thief's argo is mobile. The argo of lyre players, small craftsmen, etc. is another matter. These argos are quite stable in terms of their lexical and phraseological composition [6: 172].

The languages of traders, craftsmen, and the poor were constantly renewed by borrowing from the language with which this language borders (e.g., Lithuanian, Mari, etc.). At the same time, the main part of the vocabulary is very stable [16].

Confirmation of the fact that a certain part of the argo vocabulary has a special vitality is the work of O. Cherot “Jargon de l'argot réformé” [23]. In the 1849 edition of the work, the researchers recorded that some of the argotisms presented in the study were mentioned in the protocols of the trial of the Coquillard gang in 1445 [18: 20].

Argo, the language of thieves, is characterized by ambiguity and synonymy. Often, the same object in argo has a number of synonyms, or rather, a number of designations that replace each other. Old designations are replaced by new ones as they cease to be secret. Argo is also characterized by brevity (laconic conciseness) and unusual imagery [18: 208].

“Not less than 95 percent of the lexical fund of each argo is made up of designations of ordinary, “everyday” objects, signs, actions, etc. that are not directly related to the profession of the argotist. In the same lyre argo, we come across only a few professionalisms directly related to the occupation of lyre players” [18: 208].

Argo does not stand still, it is constantly evolving. For example, the vocabulary of French argo is constantly growing. Emile Chautard counted 120 argo words in literary monuments in 1457, 232 – in 1628, 500 – in 1725, 1600 – in 1830, and at least 4000 in numerous publications on modern argo. The new records are more complete and detailed than the old ones [16].

Linguist V. V. Straten identifies the following sources of the argo vocabulary of traders, craftsmen, and the poor:

- 1) borrowings from dialects;
- 2) borrowings from other argo;
- 3) borrowings of non-argotic words from a foreign language (Greek, German, Swedish, Tatar, etc. );
- 4) a significant number of words are formed by the transfer of meaning (they are metaphors, metonymies and synecdoches);
- 5) words of unclear origin or invented words of the argo dictionary, 6) words that are mechanically formed from ordinary, non-argotic words [16].

In France, England, America, etc., in the late nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth century, elements of thieves' jargon began to seep into the colloquial (and literary) language [10: 176].

Argo is used not only in spoken language but also in other areas, including fiction. Writers use argotisms with a certain stylistic intent, usually to create the flavour of a particular social environment.

### **1.3 Youth slang in the system of social dialects**

According to English linguists, “slang” occupies a special place among English social dialects. E. Partridge and his successors define slang as fragile, unstable and irregular combinations of words that reflect the social consciousness of persons belonging to a particular social or professional environment [17]. “Slang” is a linguistic tool, the source of which is the literary language, which has a number of stylistic goals:

- A. creating the effect of uniqueness;
- B. creating the effect of novelty;
- C. creating the effect of difference;
- D. conveying the mood of the communicator;



- E. concretization;
- F. liveliness;
- G. expressiveness;
- H. accuracy;
- I. avoidance of clichés and clichés [8].

It should be noted that even in the twenty-first century, the term “slang” still lacks a single unified definition among scholars. According to the English linguist E. Partridge, the term “slang” is wrongly identified with other substandards, such as Kent, jargon and argo [25].

Another scholar, R. Spears, suggests that the term “slang” was not only used to describe the phenomenon of British criminal jargon, but was even equated with “cant” [25].

Over time, dictionaries have expanded the boundaries of the term “slang” to include dialectisms, vulgarisms, jargon, etc. Attempts have been made and continue to be made to distinguish between these terms. As noted by I.R. Halperin, the term “cant” is used to denote the conventional language of certain professional and social groups. Some lexicologists propose to retain the term “jargon” to denote specific professional and technical concepts. It is very difficult to draw a clear line between these layers of vocabulary, since, as I.R. Halperin points out, the differences between all these concepts are transparent and difficult to track [8]. Today, they are distinguished as follows: cant (British term) or argo (American term) – the language of bandits, robbers, homeless people; jargon – the language of people united by a certain profession, these are technical and special terms.

Within the English-speaking linguistic tradition, slang is defined as:

- 1) the language game of young people;
- 2) the language of representatives of science, art, social class, sect, profession, characterized by the presence of special terms [22: 315-316];

3) a separate layer of words and expressions that is often used or known to a wide range of speakers, but is not recognized as an acceptable means of official communication [22: 6].

In Ukrainian linguistics, the term “slang” has also been interpreted differently. Some scholars call slang only the language of young people. Others believe that slang is “a practically open subsystem of non-normative lexico-phraseological units of colloquial speech, its stylistic variety, or a special register intended to express an intensified expression of a special evaluative coloration (usually negative)” [7], and recognize the status of slang as an intermediate formation between the jargon-argot environment and the general vernacular [8].

The observed terminological contradictions are due to the heterogeneity of the subprime market, as there are at least two main layers in its element:

- I. non-literary expressive, stylistically reduced words and expressions that are in common use;
- II. non-literary words and expressions accepted in a certain social group of society [8].

In this regard, it is quite natural for some linguists to include non-literary, stylistically reduced common vocabulary in the expressive, functional and stylistic vernacular, and socially limited substandard vocabulary in the socio-professional, socially determined, social vernacular [8].

The “low colloquialisms”, vulgarisms and general slang identified in the English expressive vernacular on the basis of the nature of expression (general, vulgar, paean) and function (communicative, expressive) are fully consistent with traditional colloquial expressions, taboo expressions of an invective nature, colloquial units of slang origin in the vernacular.

The socio-professional vernacular includes professional and corporate jargon, the argo of criminal society. Interestingly, the concept of “colloquialism” is widespread in the field of national linguistics and serves primarily to denote the language of the uneducated or semi-educated urban population that does not know literary norms [23].

Stylistically reduced and socially determined vocabulary are closely related, and the line separating them is fuzzy. In support of this, we can cite the characterization of slang presented by the authors of the “Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang”, D. Aytó and D. Simpson, describing the stages of formation of English slang, conclude that modern slang includes: the vocabulary of the criminal environment, going back to Kent; special words and expressions used by people of a certain profession, type of activity (slang of printers, street vendors, doctors, lawyers); colloquial version of the language, below the level of the language of an educated person and consisting of new words or common words in new meanings [25: 5].

# PECULIARITIES OF TRANSLATING YOUTH ARGOTISMS IN THE NORTHWESTERN REGION OF THE UNITED STATES (BASED ON THE MATERIAL FROM “DIGGIN' MAGAZINE (PACIFIC NORTHWEST) ENGLISH BOOKLET”)

## 2.1 Difficulties in translating dialect and slang units

Contemporary translation studies attach great importance to the relationship between language and the social roles of communication participants, as well as the influence of the speaker's status and social position on language. Indeed, social class, ethnicity, gender, age, regional background and professional status all contribute to the language people use.

*“The importance we attach to our mother tongue poses significant challenges for the translator; translation is one element in the struggle to develop and protect languages that are on the verge of extinction” [12].*

Sociolinguistics is able to either provide us with a general theory of translation or arm us with linguistic theories that cover specific aspects of translation. Today, the amount of literature devoted to the study of translation of sociolects is steadily increasing. For example, L. Venuti's works describing the peculiarities of translation are understandable to a Western English-speaking reader [41].

Such a translation is designed to suppress or naturalise all the features of the original text. Of course, it is possible to work in the opposite direction. For example, long before L. Venuti, the nineteenth-century German philosopher F. Schleiermacher proclaimed the value of translation with elements of “fornication”. In his opinion, readers should feel that they are in a foreign environment: a language should have special linguistic areas for translation and in these areas the translator is allowed to change the language in a way that is not allowed in the language as a whole [13].

For translators aiming at cultural dominance, there is a problem of expressing linguistic variants other than the dominant “correct” language through translation. We are talking, first of all, about the translation of sociolects and dialects. Despite the fact that both terms contain the common component “-lect”, they denote different concepts, while a dialect

is a special language characteristic of a certain territory, a sociolect is a special language characteristic of a certain social group of people (status, profession).

I. Levii notes: “*Certain languages have much more opportunities than other languages to depict social differences of individuals, since their spoken language has a much wider stylistic scale*” [13].

Difficulties arise in the absence of bilingual and sometimes even monolingual dictionaries of substandards (slang dictionary, dialect dictionary, jargon dictionary, dictionary of professionalisms, etc.) [12: 46].

Some authors outline the further evolution of stable **dialectisms** and **slangisms**, “the transformation of non-literary linguistic means into literary ones with the help of stylistic devices” in fiction and general political literature [12: 47].

With regard to dialectisms, there is an axiom in literary translation studies that expresses the impossibility of transmitting a dialectism from the source language by another dialectism in the target language: “*it is not possible to translate South French dialectisms into South Ukrainian dialectisms*” [3: 38].

The only way to distinguish dialectisms in the target language is to use colloquialisms, as evidenced by a number of works by translation theorists, who add that this should be done with caution and economy. The exception is when the author specifies the dialect speech of the protagonist. In such cases, what the author has said is enough, so it is better to translate the line itself into literary language, without looking for any analogues.

Unfortunately, according to our observations, there is no literature on translation studies that clearly provides instructions for translating dialectisms, especially when the source language is English and the target language is Ukrainian.

***Translation transformations*** are the transformations that are used to make the transition from the original language units to the translation units. Experts in translation theory talk about inevitable inconsistencies in the translation of texts from one language into

another, which may arise, firstly, due to the mismatch of the author's and translator's thesauri, and secondly, due to the existence of “endemic” linguistic means [2: 22].

Two main approaches can be used in translation: **transformational** and **denotational** [2: 22].

According to the theory of the transformational approach, translation is the transformation of objects and structures of one language into objects and structures of another language using certain rules. This means that words and combinations of words in the source language are replaced by their analogues in the target language according to certain rules and certain lists of correspondences recorded in dictionaries and grammars. This approach is most appropriate when working with scientific and technical texts in which unambiguous correspondences prevail.

According to the denotative approach, translation is seen as a process consisting of three stages:

1. the stage of perception of the message in the source language;
2. the stage of forming a cognitive image of this message;
3. the stage of interpretation of this image by means of the target language.

Based on the work of prominent scholars A. M. Fiterman and T. R. Levitskaya, three types of translation transformations can be distinguished [8]:

- Grammatical transformations. These include such techniques as rearrangements, omissions and additions, rearrangements and substitutions of sentences.
- Stylistic transformations. This category includes such techniques as synonymous substitutions and descriptive translation, compensation and other types of substitutions.
- Lexical transformations. These include substitution, addition, specification and generalisation of sentences, as well as omission.

The following classification of types of translation transformations can be found in the works of L. K. Latyshev [8]:

- Lexical transformations (replacement of lexemes with synonyms depending on the context).
- Stylistic transformations (transformation of the stylistic colouring of the word to be translated).
- Morphological transformations (transforming one part of speech into another or replacing it with several parts of speech).
- Syntactic transformations (transformation of syntactic structures (words, phrases and clauses), change of the type of subordinate clauses, change of the type of syntactic relation, transformation of sentences into phrases and rearrangement of adjuncts in complex subordinate and complex sentences).
- Semantic transformations (substitution of feature parts).

Scholar A. Parshin identifies the following main types of transformations used in the translation process [8]:

- A. Lexical transformations: transcription and transliteration; calquing and lexical and semantic substitutions (specification, generalisation, modulation).
- B. Grammatical transformations: syntactic equivalence (literal translation); sentence splitting; sentence combining; grammatical substitutions (forms of a word, part of speech or sentence member).
- C. Lexico-grammatical transformations: antonymic translation; explication (descriptive translation); compensation.

Currently, there is no single classification of types of translation transformations in modern linguistic science. It should also be noted that the creation of a unified classification is complicated by the fact that different linguists distinguish a different number of translation transformations. It is important to note that this division is largely approximate and conditional.

Philologist L. S. Barkhudarov notes that in a number of cases, a particular transformation can be equally well interpreted as one or the other type of transformation. As a rule, translation transformations are also combined in practice, creating complex, complex transformations.

## **2.2. Translation of argotisms in the youth speech of the population of the northwestern region of the United States**

### **2.2.1. Lexical transformations**

During the analysis of the translation of argotisms, we paid attention to the following lexical transformations:

#### a. Generalisation method

*He must be a **high muckamuck** to take the entire plate of biscuits before anyone else got any. – Він, мабуть, **великий негідник**, якщо з'їв усю тарілку печива до того, як хтось інший отримав його.*

*Let's go for a **gumboot!** – Ходімо на **природу!***

The phrase high muckamuck is used to describe an overbearing person. Taken from the Chinook Jargon *hayo makamak*, which means “plenty to eat” and boastful, a high muckamuck is someone who believes themselves to be more important than they actually are. In the translation, we come across the word “негідник”, which, in our opinion, gives a more successful characterisation.

In the second sentence, gumboot means a rain boot. It can also be used to describe an outdoor activity that involves a lot of mud or water. The term “gumboot” is also used to describe Oregonian hikers that wear rain boots while they hike. It's a common way Oregonians describe the type of shoes they wear for outdoor activity. When translating a word, a more generalised meaning is given to the situation in which the word is most often used.

#### b. Acceptance of concreteness



*I took a few **joj**os on my tour. – У подорож я взяв небагато їжі.*

Jojo is literally potato wedges, but not ordinary ones, but breaded, pressure-fried and seasoned with spices, which is a very common dish in Oregon. Thanks to the concreteness, it is easier for readers to perceive the information from the text, but the cultural phenomenon of the state's lexicon is lost, because the traditional fast food dish has acquired a general meaning.

c. Modulation. Modulation is not a very common transformation that we observed during the study, because in our opinion, the logical substitution of a word can negatively affect the cultural expressiveness of argotism.

*That was some real **gobbledygook** he was talking about. – Він говорив про якусь справжню нісенітницю.*

In Oregon, this phrase is usually used to describe words and phrases which are overly complicated or don't make sense. The term can also be used to describe more complex situations where it's hard to make sense of what's going on. It's also a great way to poke fun at someone else's confusing words.

### **2.2.2. Grammatical transformations**

Among the uses of grammatical transformations in the translation of argotisms, we distinguish the following:

#### 1) Sentence splitting

*My friend might be described as a **real kicker**, because if he speaks his mind and not afraid to stand up for what he believes in. – Мого друга можна назвати справжнім танком. Він висловлює свою думку і не боїться відстоювати те, у що вірить.*

The word «kicker» has two different meanings. First, it can refer to a type of Oregon fish found in rivers and streams throughout the state. For example, the Oregon red band trout is a type of **kicker fish**. It can also mean a person with an **opinion** or **attitude** that stands out from the rest of their **group** or **tribe**.

*Hey, I think a **coupla-three** of us are going to the movies tonight – do you want to come along? – Слухай, ми з **парою-трійкою** збираємося сьогодні в кіно. Хочеш піти з нами?*

This Oregon phrase is used to describe an unspecified or unknown number – anything between two and three. For example, it could be used when someone doesn't know how many people are coming to a gathering. The term is derived from Oregon's woods and forests, which are full of tall trees.

## 2) Grammatical replacements

*We had a **hee-haw** when my friend dropped his phone in the river. – Ми так **сміялися**, коли мій друг впустив свій телефон у річку.*

Oregonians use this phrase to describe when something goes **wrong** or there is a **mess up**. The phrase can also be used jokingly to refer to someone who has done something **silly**. The term is also used to refer to Oregon's **rural areas**, as saying someone is from a “hee-haw town” implies that they live in an area with **limited development** or **resources**. During the translation, the noun “a hee-haw” took on the form of a verb, because in our opinion, a successful translation with this grammatical form is impossible.

## 3) Reception of omission

Do you like **grunge music**? – Ти любиш **гранж**?

The word “music” was omitted from the translation, as the context makes it clear to the reader that it refers to a musical style. Grunge is a rock music that originated in Washington, DC, in the late 1980s. It is characterised by distorted electric guitar rhythms and singing using words and phrases of Washington slang. Bands such as Pearl Jam, Alice in Chains and Nirvana are known for popularising grunge music, which is largely inspired by punk and metal bands. Its “sludgy” sound came from slowing down metal riffs to give them a slower tempo, creating a unique heavy sound. Grunge music has been praised for finding its own distinctive style in the alternative music scene, which continues to be heard today.

## 4) Literal translation

*Hey, don't be such a **fraidy cat** – it's just a hike in the woods; you'll be fine! – Гей, не будь таким **боязким котом** – це ж просто прогулянка в лісі, все буде добре!*

This Oregon phrase is used to describe someone who is afraid or nervous about something. The phrase alludes to Oregon's wildlife, which can include some very large cats.

*He's a real **logger** when it comes to working out. – Він справжній **лісоруб**, коли справа доходить до роботи.*

This Oregon slang term is used to refer to someone who works in the logging industry. Although it's most commonly used for jobs related to Oregon's forests, it can also be used to describe other types of hard-working people as well. The term can also be used as an adjective to describe something intensely difficult or physically demanding.

*That guy is such a **corky**. – Цей хлопець такий **дивак**.*

Oregonians use this Oregon slang to describe someone who is a bit eccentric or unusual. It can also be used for someone who's spacey or disconnected from reality. Oregonians might say “that guy is such a corky” when referring to someone who acts strange. However, the term is often used in a light-hearted way.

*They were livin' on **government cheese**. – Вони жили на державному сирі.*

This Oregon slang phrase is used to describe the processed cheese that is given out to those who qualify for food assistance. Oregonians don't necessarily mean it negatively but rather as an expression of acceptance for those who need help. This slang term is also used to refer to a state of poverty. It's mainly used in rural areas where people struggle financially and rely on government assistance for food.

## CONCLUSIONS

The most legitimate approach to the definition of the concept of “literary norm” in our time is a comprehensive approach that takes into account both essential aspects of the analysed phenomenon: systemic and linguistic, associated with the characterisation of the norm as an intralinguistic category, which is determined by the presence in the language of potential possibilities for denoting the same phenomenon provided by the language system; evaluative and functional, which implies that native speakers are aware of certain means of linguistic expression as exemplary for use in the form of certain rules.

Studies of dialects in the field of linguistic geography (or dialectography) have shown that the very concept of “dialect” is not sufficiently substantiated and can be understood differently depending on the research objectives.

Pacific Northwest English (PNWE), the variety spoken in Washington, Oregon and some other neighbouring states, is relatively unexplored, especially compared to other dialect regions in the United States. When considering which geographical regions speak Pacific Northwest English, researchers are faced with a divergence of opinions, claiming that it all depends on where the person is from. There is a general consensus that Washington and Oregon belong to this dialect region, although other places such as Idaho, Montana, Northern California, and, to a lesser extent, Wyoming and Nevada, are also included. Much of the heterogeneity of Western English can be attributed to the many dialects spoken by these groups, as well as the subsequent waves of immigrants that followed them, combined with the relatively recent settlement of the area.

Argo is a term used to refer to a set of linguistic tools (mainly special words and idiomatic expressions) developed by members of certain social groups for the purposes of intra-group, often secret communication.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, most Indo-European languages and many languages of other families have various argots: wandering artisans and traders, beggars, lyre players, labourers, criminals, various declassified elements, students, schoolchildren, front-line soldiers, etc. By the end of the nineteenth century, argotisms were widely used in the spoken language of all layers of Western European society.

According to English linguists, “slang” occupies a special place among English social dialects. Researchers define slang as fragile, unstable and irregular combinations of words that reflect the social consciousness of people belonging to a particular social or professional environment.

For translators aiming for cultural dominance, there is the problem of expressing linguistic variants other than the dominant “correct” language through translation. Sociolects and dialects contain a common component “-lect”, they denote different concepts, while a dialect is a special language characteristic of a certain territory, a sociolect is a special language characteristic of a certain social group of people (status, profession). Difficulties arise in the absence of bilingual and sometimes even monolingual dictionaries of substandards (slang dictionaries, dialect dictionaries, jargon dictionaries, professionalism dictionaries, etc.).

Two main approaches can be applied to their translation: transformational and denotational.

According to the theory of the transformational approach, translation is the transformation of objects and structures of one language into objects and structures of another language using certain rules. This means that words and combinations of words in the source language are replaced by their analogues in the target language according to certain rules and certain lists of correspondences recorded in dictionaries and grammars. This approach is most appropriate when working with scientific and technical texts in which unambiguous correspondences prevail.

There are three types of translation transformations: grammatical, lexical and lexico-grammatical. In our study, we have examined various methods of translating the argot of American youth in the Northwest. It can be argued that the most common is literal translation, because the expressiveness of the American flavour of the regions under study may be lost in the likelihood of the translator's replacement of argotism.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. Александрова О.В. Варіативність соціолекту молоді (на матеріалі української та англійської мов). Diss. Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет імені КД Ушинського, 2015.
2. Байдик Г.С. Особливості відтворення англійських медичних термінів українською мовою (на матеріалі англійських текстів медичного спрямування). Київ, 2021. С. 48.
3. Гаврикова О. М. Проблема співвідношення «мова-діалект» в сучасній англійській мові. Дніпропетровськ : Міжнародні відносини, 2018. 59 с.
4. Глуховцева К. Аспекти лінгвокультурологічного дослідження діалектного мовлення. Українська мова. 2018. №. 1. С. 89–99.
5. Демків Ю. М. Англійська літературна мова та її територіальні діалекти: компаративний аналіз. Young Scientist. 2017. Т. 44. №. 4.3. С. 73–76.
6. Дзензелівський Й. Дослідження К. В. Широцьким жаргону учнів Кам'янець-Подільської духовної семінарії. Збірник Харківського історикофілологічного товариства. Нова серія. Харків, 1998. Т. 6. 167–174 с.
7. Ермакова О. П., Земская Е. А., Розина Р. И. Слова, с которыми мы все встречались : толковый словарь русского общего жаргона. Москва : Азбуковник, 1999. 320 с.
8. Кияк Т.Р., Огуй О.Д., Науменко А.М. Теорія та практика перекладу. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2006. 592 с.
9. Кузло Н. М., Луньова А. В. Особливості розвитку та застосування сленгу в англійській мові. Вісник Національного університету водного господарства та природокористування. 2010. №. 3 (51). С. 70–74.
10. Лебедева А. Роль запозичень з англійської мови у формуванні сучасного російського сленгу (на матеріалі лексикографічних джерел). Південний архів. Серія : Філологічні науки : зб. наук. праць. Херсон, 2009. 111–115 с.
11. Лужаниця О. І., Скороходова А. Г. Англійська діалектна писемність та традиція нелітературного написання. Нова філологія. 2012. №. 54. С. 52–55.
12. Могильницький В.В. Врахування регіональних особливостей при перекладі британських діалектів та сленгу (на матеріалі кінодискурсу), 2020.

13. Молчко О.О. Художнє порівняння як категорія перекладознавства (на матеріалі української та англійської мов), 2015.
14. Палажченко П. Р. Мой несистематический словарь (Из записной книжки переводчика). Москва : Р. Валент, 2003. 304 с.
15. Руденко М. Ю. З історії дослідження арго в європейському мовознавстві ХІХ ст.–початку ХХ ст. Перспективні напрямки сучасної науки та освіти : матеріали Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції викладачів і студентів ДДПУ, учителів та учнів загальноосвітніх закладів (м. Слов'янськ, 22–24 травня 2018 р.) / відп. ред. Н. М. Маторіна. Слов'янськ : Донбаський дер. пед. ун-т, 2018. Вип. 10, ч. 2. 112–116 с.
16. Руденко М.Ю. Арго, жаргон і сленг у європейському й американському мовознавстві: історія і сучасний стан дослідження. Diss. Слов'янськ, 2019.
17. Ставицька Л. О. Арго, жаргон, сленг: Соціальна диференціація української мови. Київ : Критика, 2005. 464 с.
18. Сучасна українська літературна мова. Лексика і фразеологія / заг. ред. І. К. Білодіда. Київ : Наукова думка, 1973. 439 с.
19. Adams R.F. Western words: a dictionary of the range, cow camp and trail. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1944.
20. Becker K., Aden A., Best K., Dimes R., Flores J., Jacobson H. Keep Portland weird: Vowels in Oregon English. Paper presented at the New Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAV) 42. Pittsburgh, 2013.
21. Becker K., Aden A., Best K., Dimes R., Flores J., Jacobson H. Keep Portland weird: Vowels in Oregon English. Paper presented at the New Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAV) 42. Pittsburgh, 2013.
22. Billington R.A., Ridge M. Westward Expansion: A history of the American frontier, 6th edn. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2001.
23. Calvet L.-J. L'argot. Paris : Presse Universitaire de France, 1999. 127 p.
24. Frings Th. Die Stellung der Niederlande im Aufbau des Germanischen. Halle, 1944. 87 s.
25. Gilbert E. W. The exploration of Western America 1800–1850: An historical geography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1933.

26. Grieve J., Speelman D., Geeraerts D. A multivariate spatial analysis of vowel formants in American English. *Journal of Linguistic Geography* 1(01), 2013. P. 31–51.
27. Hartley L.C. A view from the West: Perceptions of U.S. dialects by Oregon residents. In Dennis Preston (ed.), *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology*, vol. 1, 315–332. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999.
28. Hotten J. C. *The history of cant, or the secret language of vagabonds. The slang dictionary.* East Ardsley; Wakefield; Yorkshire; England : Republished by EP Publishing, Ltd., 1972. 26 p.
29. Kuttner M. Von der Geltung des Argot. *Philologisch-philosophische Studien. Festschrift für Eduard Wechsler zum 19. Oktober 1929.* Jena; Leipzig, 1929. S. 346.
30. Labov W., Ash S., Boberg C. *The Atlas of North American English: Phonetics, phonology and sound change.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006.
31. Lance D.M. Regional variation in subjective dialect divisions in the United States. In Dennis Preston (ed.), *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology*, vol. 1, 283–314. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999.
32. Lee F.B. Jerseyisms. *Dialect Notes* 1(4), 1892. P. 327–337.
33. Mullen K. Westernisms. *American Speech* 1(3), 1925. P. 149–153.
34. Partridge E. *Slang To-Day and Yesterday.* London and New York : Routledge Revivals, 2015. 470 p.
35. Reed C.E. The pronunciation of English in the state of Washington. *American Speech* 27(3), 1952. P. 186–189.
36. Riebold J.M. The social distribution of a regional change: /æg, ɛg, eg/ in Washington State. Seattle: University of Washington Ph.D. dissertation, 2015.
37. Sainéan L. *Le langage parisien au XIXe siècle.* Paris : E. de Boccard Editeur, 1920. XII, 590 p.
38. Schleiermacher F. Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens. *Das Problem des Übersetzens.* Darmstadt : Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963. S. 38–70.
39. Sheldon E.S. The first tear of the American Dialect Society. *Dialect Notes* 1(1), 1892. P. 1–12.



40. Stanley J.A. Pacific Northwest English: Historical overview and current directions, 2016.
41. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. London and New York : Routledge, 1995. 365 p.
42. Wartburg W. v. Vom Ursprung und Wesen des Argot. GRM. 1930. № 18. P. 376.

### **LIST OF REFERENCE SOURCES**

1. Білодід І. Тлумачення українських слів: в 11 томах. Т 2. Київ : Наукова думка, 1971. С. 550.
2. Ayto J., Simpson J. Oxford dictionary of modern slang. Oxford University Press, 2010. 299 p.
3. Encyclopaedia Britannica / chief editors J. L. Garvin, F. H. Hooper. London; New York, 1929–1933. № 20. 1936 p.
4. Flower H. W. A Dictionary of Modern English Usage. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1980. 725 p.
5. Merriam Webster. URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionar>
6. Spears R. A. NTC's dictionary of American slang and colloquial expressions. NTC Pub. Group, 2000. 560 p.

### **LIST OF DATA SOURCES**

1. DIGGIN' MAGAZINE [PACIFIC NORTHWEST] ENGLISH BOOKLET. URL: <https://issuu.com/digginmagazine/docs/diggin-mag17i-english-09/1>
2. Learn 14 Most Common Washington Slang Words And Phrases! URL: <https://higherlanguage.com/washington-slang-words-and-phrases/>
3. Washington Slang Words To Sound Like A Local. URL: <https://www.enjoytravel.com/us/travel-news/guides/washington-slang>
4. "You guys," all about the Pacific Northwest accent – Lingoda. URL: <https://blog.lingoda.com/en/pacific-northwest-accent/>

## ANNEX

<b>That organic wine is way too spendy, just get the other stuff.</b>	<b>Це органічне вино занадто дороге, просто візьми щось інше.</b>
<b>A sunbreak is a rare-but-happy moment between clouds when the sun shines down.</b>	<b>Сонячний момент – це рідкісний, але щасливий момент між хмарами, коли світить сонце.</b>
<b>He lives out in the sticks.</b>	<b>Він живе в сільській місцевості.</b>
<b>The mountain is out.</b>	<b>Сонячний день.</b>
<b>I took a few jojos on my tour.</b>	<b>У подорож я взяв небагато їжі.</b>
<b>Sorry I'm late guys, the bridge is up.</b>	<b>Вибачте, народ, я запізнився, бо міст піднявся.</b>
<b>He must be a high muckamuck to take the entire plate of biscuits before anyone else got any.</b>	<b>Він, мабуть, великий негідник, якщо з'їв усю тарілку печива до того, як хтось інший отримав його.</b>
<b>It was hella cool.</b>	<b>Це було дуже круто.</b>
<b>They were livin' on government cheese.</b>	<b>Вони жили на державних хлібах.</b>
<b>Why don't you come out with us tonight? You don't want to be a fernet all the time!</b>	<b>Чому б тобі не піти з нами сьогодні ввечері? Ти ж не хочеш весь час бути аутсайдером!</b>
<b>My friend Alex related to the cougar bait group.</b>	<b>Мій друг Алекс належав до університетської групи Орегону.</b>
<b>We're going to take the highway green</b>	<b>Сьогодні ми поїдемо зеленим шосе,</b>

<b>today; it will be much faster.</b>	<b>так буде набагато швидше</b>
<b>C'mon, c'mon! Stop rubbernecking already!</b>	<b>Давай, давай! Припини вже тягнути час!</b>
<b>She was a glowbuck.</b>	<b>Вона була світилом.</b>
<b>On skis he was like dich witch.</b>	<b>На лижах він був схожий на відьму в кюветі.</b>
<b>Let's go for a gumboot!</b>	<b>Ходімо на природу!</b>
<b>After his last competition, how legs were like crickets.</b>	<b>Після останніх змагань ноги були наче зламані.</b>
<b>You know, I'm not a wringer.</b>	<b>Ти знаєш, я не бовтанка.</b>
<b>He's a real logger when it comes to working out.</b>	<b>Він справжній лісоруб, коли справа доходить до роботи.</b>
<b>That guy is such a corky.</b>	<b>Цей хлопець такий дивак.</b>
<b>Hey, don't be such a fraidy cat – it's just a hike in the woods; you'll be fine!</b>	<b>Гей, не будь таким боязким котом – це ж просто прогулянка в лісі, все буде добре!</b>
<b>We had a hee-haw when my friend dropped his phone in the river.</b>	<b>Ми так сміялися, коли мій друг впустив свій телефон у річку.</b>
<b>My friend is a Tillamooker.</b>	<b>Мій друг – тілламукер.</b>
<b>We're going puddle jumping this weekend!</b>	<b>Ми їдемо стрибати через океани на цих вихідних!</b>
<b>We had such a good green dag.</b>	<b>У нас була така гарна поїздка.</b>

Such good chinook.	Такі файні теплі вітри.
I think he pilfered a few beers from the fridge.	Здається, він поцупив кілька пляшок пива з холодильника.
I think I'll duck and cover until this whole thing blows over.	Думаю, я пригнуся і сховаюся, поки все це не вщухне.
My friend might be described as a real kicker, because if he speaks his mind and not afraid to stand up for what he believes in.	Мого друга можна назвати справжнім танком. Він висловлює свою думку і не боїться відстоювати те, у що вірить.
That was some real gobbledygook he was talking about.	Він говорив про якусь справжню нісенітницю.
Hey, I think a coupla-three of us are going to the movies tonight – do you want to come along?	Слухай, ми з парою-трійкою збираємося сьогодні в кіно. Хочеш піти з нами?
All the way, guys, all the way!	До кінця, хлопці, до кінця!
Do you like grunge music?	Ти любиш гранж?
Do you like it? It looks like poodle skirt.	Тобі подобається? Схоже на спідницю пуделя.
Yo, your hair is nifty!	Йоу, у тебе класна зачіска!
Don't rush, sis.	Не поспішай, сестро.
He was my dawg.	Він був моїм братаном.
Bout it, bout it.	Я в темі, я з вами.
He put on a real Seattle Tuxedo.	Він одягнув справжній сіетлський

	<b>смокінг.</b>
<b>He told me: “You gonna trust me”.</b>	<b>Він сказав мені: «Тобі слід мені довіряти».</b>
<b>Mice is a microserf.</b>	<b>Майк – працівник компанії Майкрософт.</b>
<b>I’m so sleepy, fill me up with leaded!</b>	<b>Я так хочу спати, налейте мені каву!</b>
<b>I found it on the jumble sale.</b>	<b>Я знайшов його на дворовому розпродажі.</b>
<b>I-5 runs North through Seattle.</b>	<b>I-5 проходить на північ через Сіетл.</b>
<b>Man, these fries are absolutely filthy!</b>	<b>Боже, ця картопля дуже смачна!</b>
<b>It is a banana belt.</b>	<b>Цей регіон тепліший.</b>
<b>I enjoyed our jaunt.</b>	<b>Мені сподобалася наша прогулянка.</b>

## РЕЗЮМЕ

Курсову роботу присвячено дослідженню особливостей арготизмів у молодіжному мовленні населення північно-західного регіону США. У ході роботи висвітлено основні проблеми перекладу арготизмів, історія їхнього розвитку та особливостей в американських регіонах. Після проведеного аналізу ми можемо зробити висновок, що найбільш вживаним прийомом – є прийом дослівного перекладу. В роботі ми зазначили свою думку стосовно цього, вважаючи, що будь-яка контекстуальна заміна, модуляція тощо можуть змінити або погіршити експресивність американського колориту.

**Ключові слова:** арго, діалект, молодіжний сленг, Pacific Northwest English (PNWE), перекладацькі трансформації.