

VARIOUS LANGUAGE-PHILOSOPHY APPROACHES TO THE CATEGORIZATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL OIL LANGUAGE IN ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN

Abstract

Out of relatively isolated current discourses served by particular and professional languages, the paper considers features of the uncodified unit components of the oil business language. The material of the study is the uncodified vocabulary and phraseology of Russian and American English, indicating persons, objects, and actions of the oil business: 317 and 360 units correspondingly. The study of the mentioned units' structure -their core and periphery - is most effectively executed by applying component analysis. The aim is to consider different types of classification of professional oil non-codified units, analyze their semantic derivation, establish the nature of paradigmatic subsystem relations, and explain the mechanism of generating jargonisms and euphemisation. Communicative and pragmatic characteristics of a professional unit prescribe their adequate choice and restrictions on their use in certain areas and situations of communication. It is concluded that the national specificity and originality of thesaurus units' semantics of professional oil sublanguage are the result of the linguistic factor itself.

Keywords: professional language, oil business language, jargonism, quasi-jargonism, dejargonism, interjargonism.

Introduction

If previously, language was studied as a monument of the epoch, direction or artistic creation of individuals, i. e. as something external to a person, in modern linguistics, it has become an integral part of a human being. Language penetrates all components of human life and can reflect people's emotional and physical state, the degree of their education and experience, and their interrelations and functions in society.

Due to globalization and internationalization, which contribute to the overall development of international multicultural professional contacts in the XXI century, the study of various aspects

of intercultural professional communication is becoming increasingly relevant. One of the most critical aspects of the study of intercultural professional communication is the study of the dependence of its effectiveness on the degree of subjects' mastery of communicative competence, which is successful, provided the communicators have sufficient language competence. Professional speech is often studied from the viewpoint of the professionally marked vocabulary defined as sub-languages of a particular knowledge area. Professional speech in a communicative aspect is a particular perspective discourse, which is distinct from the institutional discourse model (e.g. pedagogical, medical, diplomatic, etc.) and from

the business discourse model (Samigullina & Samigullina, 2018b)

The thesaurus of the professional oil sublanguage (POS) is part of the lexical system of the language and is distinguished by the clarity of the internal structure and certainty of the boundaries connected with the semantic features of its lexical units. The choice of this particular sublanguage makes it possible to reveal the specificity of the manifestation of extralinguistic and linguistic factors proper in the process of thesaurus formation. Moreover, the presence of similar thematic fields and groups in the Russian and English languages provides a basis for their comparison and identification of the specifics of the Russian and English language pictures of the world. The research subject presupposes a comparison of thematic and semantic characteristics of the units of the considered thesauruses of the Russian and English variants of the POS.

Terminology as Part of the Professional Language and the Lexical System of the Language

In modern society, there are relatively isolated discourses served by particular and professional languages (Surnina, 2002; Gorokhova, 2019). In special languages, they use terms officially accepted and fixed by the corresponding dictionaries; professional languages represent words and expressions accepted in the given professional environment and often borrowed from the national language and given a new meaning. An example of a professional language is the oil business language (Yunusova, 2015; Kukasova, 2018; Doroshenko, 2004).

Although scientific research has primarily focused on medical and technical professional languages (Jabbour-Lagocki, 1992; González Pueyo & Val, 1996; Dahm, 2011; Gallo, 2016; Coxhead & Demecheleer, 2018), the units used in the oil and gas industry have also acted as the research material for several scholars. The subject matter of current studies is mainly connected with terminology: terminology as the set of con-

cepts and terms in a specific subject field (Schmitz, 2006), types of electronic terminology resources (Rogers, 2006), and theories of terminology (Castellví, 2003). The problem of terminology for specific problem areas and issues, specifically the case of oil terminology in Norwegian, is comprehensively addressed by Ø. Andersen and J. Myking (2018). Using a novel technique of topic modelling S. Jaworska and A. Nanda (2018) examine thematic patterns and their changes over time in a large corpus of corporate social responsibility reports produced in the oil sector. F. Nooralahzadeh, L. Øvrelid and J. T. Lønning (2018) aim to evaluate domain-specific embedding models induced from textual resources in the Oil and Gas domain.

To distinguish two areas within the core of the professional-communicative system – the area of codified units (terms) and the area of non-codified units (jargonisms/industry words/professional words) – it is proposed to use the following names: “terminological system” – to denote the area of codified units (terms and nomens) and “uncodified variant of professional sublanguage” – to designate the field of non-codified units represented by slang words and jargon.

Professional Oil Sublanguage as Part of the Lexical System of the Language

The definition of “professional speech”, with seeming simplicity has numerous interpretations. N. K. Garbovsky (1988) refers to it as any communication between specialists on professional topics, regardless of whether it proceeds in written or oral form, in a formal or informal setting. In some studies, professional speech is withdrawn from the framework of a literary language and interpreted as one of the varieties of linguistic functioning of relatively weakly expressed variable connotations.

It is noteworthy that, in the Russian language, the units used in professional speech are commonly known as “professionalisms”. They come into being in the everyday discourse of people engaged in this or that profession and form a

specific language system. There are professional naming units for some objects and notions, whereas there are none for others. Professionalism is a word typical of a certain professional group or the vocabulary characteristic of speaking people pertaining to one and the same profession. Jargon is a slang word or expression common for separate social groups. It is artificially created with the purpose of linguistic isolation. Jargon words often have a decreased stylistic nuance and contradict generally accepted canons of the literary language. Professionalisms and jargon words, unlike terms, can be emotionally coloured, and it is possible to substitute them with some terms to make them more convenient and transparent in use (Dvorak, 2018).

The oil business is related to human fields that unite several professions; consequently, we can speak about the “macro-professional field” of the oil sublanguage and the “mini-language” of a focused specialist, for example, the drill runner (terms of V. S. Yelistratov (2002)).

The thesaurus of the POS is part of the lexical system of the language and is distinguished by the clarity of the internal structure and certainty of the boundaries connected with the semantic features of its lexical units. The choice of this particular sublanguage aims to reveal the specifics of the manifestation of extralinguistic and linguistic factors proper in the process of thesaurus formation within the professional Oil Sublanguage.

Materials and Methods

The research material is uncodified vocabulary and phraseology of the Russian language and American English, denoting persons, objects, and actions of the oil business – 677 units in total: 317 in Russian and 360 in English. The collection of the material used by professionals in an informal setting was carried out using lexical (14 dictionaries and vocabularies) and journalistic sources (Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language, 2001; Buckley, n.d.; Bulatov, 2004; Khartukov, 2004; Skrynnik,

2004; Belousov, 2005; Drill Site Terminology and Jargon, 2005; Oil Field Glossary, 2005; Wilkinson, 2006; Bahadori, Nwaoha, & Clark, 2014; Jargon Buster, 2019; The Oilfield Glossary: Where the Oil Field Meets the Dictionary, n.d., etc.). Another source – works of fiction – includes more than 200 titles. Questionnaires of informants – oil specialists, served as the most valuable practical data collected at oil fields in Western Siberia and Urals-Povolzhye (wells in Aznakaevo, Asrakhan’, Bugulma, Elabuga, Leninogorsk, Noyabr’sk, Surgut, etc.). The total amount of illustrative material is 17.5 printer’s sheets.

The theoretical significance of this paper is to describe the theoretical foundations of a manifold comparative study of uncodified units of thesauruses of Russian and English variants of one professional sublanguage, based on which other layers of the vocabulary of non-closely related languages can be compared. Comparison of selected fragments of the linguistic picture of the world on the material of Russian and English vocabulary helps not only to concretize ideas about the national and cultural specifics of professional language and speech but also helps to identify common semantic patterns of the studied units and the concepts they express in the compared languages.

To achieve this goal, it was decided to solve the following tasks:

1. to establish the composition and structure of the thesauruses of the Russian and English variants of the POS;
2. to identify the specifics of the methods of professional nomination in the considered subsystems of the Russian and English languages;
3. to identify the representation and boundaries of the thematic groups in the composition of the considered variants of professional sublanguage;
4. to determine the universal and idioethnic in the structure of thesauruses in Russian and English variants of the sublanguage, in its fields, micro-fields and individual units;

5. to establish possible reasons for the similarities and differences in the composition and structure of the thesauruses of both variants of the POS;
6. to provide principles for the lexicographic fixation and description of units within the Russian and English variants of the POS.

To determine the componential content of the units considered in work, we applied component analysis, the theory of which is based on field theory and the lexico-semantic language system. Lexico-semantic fields, being a complex paradigmatic structure, are the central structural units of the language. In the structure of any linguistic field, the core and the periphery are distinguished. The core members most fully designate the generic concept, while the peripheral members represent more particular, specific concepts. The more semantic features are contained in the meaning of a word, the farther away they are from the core. The core concentrates the primary information about the field as a whole. The total value of the field is expressed by the dominant, which is the carrier of the semantic feature that forms the entire field. The meanings of all the other elements containing differentiating semantic features are revealed through the dominant.

Results

The inventory of a professional petroleum sublanguage can be described as a field in terms of the core and periphery. The basis of the division is the functional-semantic attribute: the core of the professional oil language consists of units that have a thematic correlation with production processes, the main objects in the borehole, and also function in all oil communities regardless of their location and are understood by all carriers of the POS. As a rule, these are units built according to patterns of a nationwide language.

The periphery of the lexical terminology inventory of a POS is made up of units that are functionally related: a) to one or several separate companies; b) to a specific region, base or drilling site; c) obsolete and occasional units. The-

matically, in some cases, the units of the periphery of the POS may remain correlated with objects of the oil industry and, in others – lose this connection. For instance, *kerosinka Academy of Oil and Gas after Gubkin in Moscow* • “Strictly and particularly speaking, in the world-famous “Kerosinka” it seems there is a specialized “oil and gas translation” subbranch or department”; *kirechin (kerosene) fuel that is obtained by the distillation of petroleum or the cracking of heavy petroleum products*; *ambar/priyamok a pit in the ground for storing drilling mud and flushing fluid*; *balok/bendzhka a drilling cabin of a rig master and shift workers*; *floorman (hand)/roughneck worker on the rig*; *to flow to produce oil (about the well)*; *to flow by heads, to gush to spout, to flow*.

Thematic Classification of Non-Codified Units

The Russian variety of the oil uncoded sublanguage nominates the real world's objects, properties, and processes. The groups “Artifacts, used in professional activities” and “Human activity” are at the centre of the nomination. The most relevant for professional oil workers are the nominations of “artefacts used in professional activities” – 39.8%, “human activity” – units, which is 30.8% of the total number of considered units in the Russian variant of the POS.

A quantitative analysis of units of the English variant of the oil uncoded sublanguage showed that objects, properties, and processes of the real world underwent language objectification. In the centre of the nomination are the following groups: “Activity” and “Status of a person”. The most relevant for American professionals in the oil industry is “human activity” nominations – 76 units (63.5%). High productivity demonstrates the thematic group “Status of a person” (35.6%).

Table 1 presents a comparative analysis of functional and stylistic parameters in the structure of the meaning of the units of a thematic macrogroup “Activity”. Interestingly, in most cases (22 of 32), Russian jargonisms used in a

low communication register are translated into English using terms. Given the quantitative correspondence of the considered subsystems in both sublanguages, it can be concluded that the symmetry of the field composition, as well as

interlanguage quantitative symmetry of groups and subgroups, coexists with asymmetry in the structure of the meaning of the similar language units and groups and subgroups of the languages.

Table 1.

Comparative Thematic Classification of Non-Codified Units of Russian and English
Variants of a Professional oil Non-Codified Sublanguage

Man				Artefact	
Russian		English		Russian	English
50.2%		88.6%		39.8%	11.4%
Status of a person (19.4%)	Activity (30.8%)	Status of a person (35.6%)	Activity (53.0%)	Artefacts used in profes- sional activity	Artefacts used in profes- sional activity

Semantic Derivation in a Professional Oil Sublanguage

Professional names of the oil sublanguage carry the features of concrete and imaginative thinking based on the external similarity of objects.

Human thinking is anthropocentric. The most effective is the comparison with an insight visualized object. Thus, the main component of the figurative nomination model is the choice of the sphere of object identification, determined by the social experience of the nominee.

At the basis of the overwhelming majority of the considered units is a specific image. For example, *podsvetchnik* (lit. candlestick) – a device for fixing pipes when descending into a well; *svecha* (lit. candle) – tube; *kust* (lit. bush) is a combination (existence) in one place of more than 2 production wells from which oil is extracted • “*Svodochku pishem? Na 5 kustu perevypadeniye kozla*” – “*Chto znachit perevypadeniye?*” In English: bleeder – a valve to reduce the pressure of a liquid or gas; lazy board wooden stand (when lowering pipes into a well or installing pipelines); monkey (-) board upper platform of the derrick where the derrick man works; children (sarc.), LA, Tx the nickname of unskilled workers (in the oilfield).

Metaphorical transference of the name from one object to another based on associative simi-

larity (shape, colour, place, behaviour or sound) is very productive.

The most typical direction of metaphorical transfer from a non-person to a person is realized in two main ways:

1. “subject” → “man”: *bashmak* (jest.) (lit. shoe) tractor driver; *pomazok* (lit. shaving brush) assistant driller of the 3rd rank; *nochnik* (lit. night-light) operator working on the night shift; “subject” → “somatics of a person” *truba* (lit. pipe) neck;
2. “animal” → “man”: wild cat (fig.) exploratory well (on a scantily explored area); hogs-head fig. drilling fluids engineer; stud duck prof. the most reputable watchman, usually the drill master; cleaning pig prof. a tool for cleaning the wellbore; utility pig prof. junk catcher-fishing tool, bailing tube, pistons for pumping out wells; smart pig prof. self-folding support; rock hound/stone squirrel prof. geologist.

In all cases, there is a decrease in the status of the person. When naming a person as a certain animal (cat, hog, duck, pig, squirrel) or object (*bashmak*, *pomazok*) together with a decrease in status and creating a bright visual image, as a rule, there is a shift in the brightest semes in the donor’s meaning to the nuclear position in the structure of metaphors: mobility, thinness, large size, etc.

The model of transfer from “person” to “non-

person”, “animate” to “inanimate object” (personification) retains its productivity in both variants of the sublanguage in:

1. verbal word formation: *glotat’ to accept, to absorb, to absorb water, cement, mortar. The well is swallowing, i.e. absorbs drilling mud; to blind to close the pipeline at the rig to prevent flow; to eat into the rock face to start drilling; to bite into the bottom hole, key seat;*
2. substantive word formation: “person – non-person”: *koldun (lit. sorcerer) 1. chart recording; 2. forklift; konduktor (lit. conductor) prof. pipe guide column, which serves to preserve the wellbore when a rock falls, to preserve layers containing fresh water; papka (lit. father) prof. pin-pipe end; mamka (lit. mother) prof. coupling end; odinotchka (lit. loner) prof. drill pipe, length from 8 to 12m; uspokoitel’ (lit. damper), the element of the winch of the drilling rig for calming the pulley rope during winding and unwinding on the drum of the lifting shaft; dresser (lit. valet); prof. 1. a worker for refilling bits; 2. a device for refuelling drills; a refuelling machine; jobber (n) lit. person working by the piece; prof. a company independently carrying out transportation of a product; “human somatics – non-human”: palets (lit. finger) protection pipe, behind which there is a comb with a drill pipe installed on it; face (n) 1. bottom hole; 2. chamfer; butt; face surface.*

When using the model “person” → “person”, a derogatory effect arises due to the accumulation in the structure of the meaning of senses that are not characteristic of the object of nomination: *kosari (jest.) idlers; dresser valet; 1. worker refuelling chisels; 2. drill sharpener; 3. rig builder, rigger; pebble pimp lit. labourer on the rocks; prof. (iron.) geologist; head knocker the chief show off; prof. (jest.) the most reputable watchman, usually the drill master; mud man fig. driller; roustabout American worker (on the pier, steamboat, ranch) fig. unskilled worker (in the oilfield). • “After floorman or roughneck, the next job would be a mud man. He follows the orders of the mud engineer in preparing the*

drilling mud – that’s a fluid mixture which is used to equalize the pressure when you’re drilling a well so that it doesn’t collapse” (Sandmel, n.d.). • “On the bottom of the ladder, you have what you call a roustabout, who runs around ‘and does everything that nobody else wants to do. He’s a ‘grunt’. He unloads and stacks pipe pipe, mops, cleans, paints, that kind of thing”. • “Crawford Vincent of Lake Charles, a former guitarist with the Cajun Swing band, the Hackberry Ramblers, worked as a roustabout in the 1940-s, and describes it succinctly as “you do what you’re told, and plus!” (Sandmel, n.d.)

The “object” → “object” model is objectified in the following variants:

1. “primitive artifact” → “complex artifact”: *bukhanka UAZ 452, a vehicle for transporting people, cargo; bashmak 1. a device used for running the casing; 2. part of the controlled, or passive, (spring) clamping device of the downhole tool; grebenka (lit. brush) device on the beds of the derrick man for the installation of drill pipes; kvadrat (lit. square) lead pipe; karman (lit. pocket) 1. sump; 2. open interval; 3. well section drilled with a bit of smaller diameter to accumulate sediment, drill cuttings; kozyrek (lit. visor) a device designed to move drill and casing pipes, pipe drills and other devices; polati (lit. plank-bed) the place where the derrick man works; rubashka (lit. shirt) 1. casing filled with oil in which the electric drill motor is placed; 2. mud pump liner; skrebok (lit. scraper) casing mountings designed to destroy and remove the mudcake from the borehole wall to ensure a more intimate contact of the cement stone with various rocks; designed to remove paraffin from the production column. In English: oil patch prof. 1. territory of oil production; 2. oil industry; farm prof. a platform where several oil cisterns connected to a common pipeline and interconnected are installed.*
2. “artifact” → “artifact”: *boylor (lit. boiler) 1. heating apparatus for water; 2. water tank truck; girlyanda (lit. garland) several interconnected adapters, centralizers, calibrators;*

koromyslo (*lit. shoulder-yoke*) *rocker part of the lever mechanism on the winch*; chaynik (*lit. kettle*) *helmet for drilling*; ambar (*lit. barn*) *deepening in the ground for storing drilling mud and flushing fluid*; doghouse *prof. a cabin for the drilling master and shift workers*;

3. “complex artifact” → “primitive artifact”: torpeda (*lit. torpedo*) *emergency geophysical instrument*;
4. “animal” → “artifact”; “animal somatics” → “artifact”: pauk (*lit. spider*) 1. *a tool for gripping, clamping objects on the bottom (cutters and other metal objects)*; 2. *a type of emergency tool*; 3. *a type of safety device for the transportation of goods*; gusak (*lit. gander*) *connection between the swivel and mud hose*; lapa (*lit. paw*) *part of the drilling bit*; buryonka (*lit. milk cow*) *oil well*. In English: crow *prof. pipeline clamp*; mud hog *prof. plastic clay disintegrator*; sand hog *prof. 1. sand trap (in casing or tubing string)*; 2. *sand pump*; dog leg 1. *curvature (well bore, trench)*; 2. *sharp bend (of the pipe)*; 3. *double sharp bend (of sheet)*; fish 1. *an item left in the well; part of the tool left in the well; drilling tool that fell into the well*; 2. *marine geophysical sensor*; wild(-)cat *prof. probe well; exploration well (on underexplored areas)*.
 • “Clearly an increasing number of wildcats indicates that oil is getting harder to find, especially if you’re coming up dry” (Wolfdrop);
5. “plant” → “artifact”: kust (*lit. bush*) *a set (presence) in one place of more than two production wells, from which oil is extracted*; Christmas tree (*lit. fir tree*) *wellhead*.

Metonymic transfer is less common. The ma-

terial of both languages enabled us to reveal several models, but their activity is small.

“Part” – “whole”:

“part of the document” – “document”: poteri (*lit. losses*) *a document prepared by geologists of the workshop and approved in the development department of the Territorial Oil Production Project; contains information about the decrease in well productivity*; zapuski-ostanovki (*lit. starts-stops*) *daily summary formed at the Oil and Gas Production Department and sent to the District Engineering and Technical Service, containing information on the movement of the stock of wells: start-ups, stops, conclusions on the mode, shifts, causes of downtime*.

“somatics” → “person”: roughneck *LA unskilled worker (in the oilfield)*; hand (*in oil industry*) *worker*.

Complex types of word formation can combine double motivation and use semantic and morphological methods. The word vyshkar’ meaning *rig builder* is formed using two methods: metaphorical and suffixal_manner of derivation. Complex ways are also revealed in units: khrapok (*lit. snoring*) (*jest.*), *a pipe provided with a tip with small openings through which the pump sucks liquid* < snoring (metaphorisation) + suffixation; general *general’nyy direktor (general manager, CEO)* < apocope + homonymy; konservy (*lit. canned food*) *is a conservation fund of wells, in which there are flooded and non-flushed wells, but, as a rule, many wells awaiting repair (well production maintenance or major workover)* < apocope + homonymy; FORM, an acronym for Fault Occurrence and Repair Model < apocope.

Table 2.

Semantic Derivation in Russian and English Versions of the Professional Oil Non-Codified Sublanguage

Model	Model Version	Russian Language	English Language
A. metaphoric models	object → person	productive ¹	productive
non-person → person	animal → person	productive	productive

¹ The average level of productivity was set at the rank indicator II (from 20 to 50 applications); low level of productivity was established at the rank indicator I (from 1 to 19 applications); a high level of productivity was established at the rank indicator III (more than 50 applications).

	plant → person	underproductive	underproductive
person → non-person	person → artefact	highly productive	productive
	human somatics → object	underproductive	not identified
	person of a particular profession → oilman	underproductive	underproductive
	communication → professional action	underproductive	underproductive
non-person → non-person	primitive device/object → complex device/object	highly productive	highly productive
	complex device/large-sized object → primitive device/small-sized object	productive	productive
	object → object (without identified hierarchical relations)	underproductive	underproductive
	animal → artefact	highly productive	highly productive
	animal somatics → artefact	not identified	underproductive
B. metonymic model	whole → part	productive	productive
	material → place	not identified	underproductive
	material → object	underproductive	not identified
	place of work/accommodation → staff	productive	productive
	accessories/clothing/document → person	productive	productive

The thematic classification of the units of the considered variants of the professional sublanguage makes it possible to systematically reflect the naturally existing connections of the sublanguage units, which have become a fact of Russian and English, to establish the features and nature of paradigmatic relations within the sub-system.

Discussions

One of the most critical aspects of the study of intercultural professional communication is the study of the structural and semantic characteristics of its language component. Scientists agree that “intercultural professional communication is effective if its subjects possess three components of communicative competence: cognitive, linguistic, and interactive or discursive” (Petrenko, 2002, p. 21), i.e. both (1) professional language and (2) the picture of the world belonging to a different nation are significant. At the same time, the latter acquires special significance since the architectonics of professional concepts may have national differences; therefore, “that part of the picture of the world that is associated with the national and cultural characteristics and linguocultural experience of other

people remains inaccessible for the subject of professional communication” (Petrenko, 2002, p. 23).

The spectrum of typical situations and communicative roles in the considered field of activity is broad. Therefore the inventory of units serving this area is extensive. Among the professional variants of the language spoken by one of the existing micro-communities, we can distinguish the professional sublanguage of the oil and gas industry. It is a language with three properties: firstly, it is understandable to all members of the oil and gas industry; secondly, it can verbalize subtle semantic nuances; thirdly, it can maintain the professional and social differentiation of the language, which ensures orderliness and organization of communication (Samigullina & Samigullina, 2018a).

In general, “we can talk about both the dialectal varieties of the professional language and the professional varieties of the dialect” (Yelistratov, 2002, p. 473). The oil business is related to human fields that unite several professions, so we can talk about the “macro-professional field” of the oil sublanguage and the “mini-language” of a narrow professional, for example, the master of drilling (the terms of V. S. Yelistratov (2002)). It is obvious that the units of “mini-languages” in-

side the “macro-professional field” are interconnected, and the same unit, belonging to several languages at the same time, is either an interterm (if this unit is codified) or interjargonism (if the unit is not codified).

Types of Professional Language Units

Thus, all units of a professional language, depending on their relationship to codification, can be divided into (1) codified (terms and nomens) and (2) non-codified (slang words and jargonisms). In this case, codification is understood as “comprehension and detection of the norm” (Yartseva, 1990, p. 391). The concept of a language norm is a complex and multifaceted category; it has its specifics at different levels of the language system. Nevertheless, characterizing one or another aspect of the language norm, all linguists note that the norm results from the selection of language means by members of a given group of native speakers in the course of speech activity. The definition of the language norm, proposed by B. N. Golovin (1988), reflects the structural and functional aspects of this language category: “A norm is a historically accepted (preferred) choice in a given language community of one of the functional paradigmatic and syntagmatic variants of a linguistic sign” (p. 15). As we can see, this definition considers that the choice of a language sign when expanding speech is carried out along two axes: the choice of a member of a particular paradigm (paradigmatic variant) and also considering the contextual environment (syntagmatic variant). B. N. Golovin points out another important aspect of the norm: it is created thanks to the constant need for a better mutual understanding. “It is this need that motivates people to prefer certain options and discard others” (Golovin, 1988, p. 21). Thus, the norm is understood as a property of a functioning language system created by a group of people using a given language to achieve a better mutual understanding.

An analysis of the thesauruses of the Russian

and English variants of the POS based on a single metalanguage in non-closely related languages allows us to establish the general and idioethnic in the world language picture. The practical novelty of the research lies in the lexicographic description of the thesauruses of the Russian and English variants of the professional oil sublanguage.

The oil industry as an “industry engaged in the extraction of oil and associated gas” (Prokhorov, 1981, p. 894) has as its denotata the activities of the oil complex (geological exploration, well drilling, production, transportation, oil refining). The community of experts of the oil complex unites a large number of social groups (the management of the oil complex and the management of individual companies, engineers and workers) and professional teams (geologists, laboratory workers, workers in boreholes and pipelines, etc.). In everyday speech communication in the oil industry, the real differentiation of micro-groups and all sorts of social micro-groups is reflected.

When discussing production problems in an unofficial or loosely formal setting, professional words occupy a significant part of the vocabulary of modern oil industry workers. One of the definitions of jargonism was given by N. K. Garbovsky (1988), who believes that there are two classes of professionally-marked units of the lexical and phraseological level, namely, special professional terminology and non-codified units of language that arise and function mainly in the colloquial speech of specialists on professional topics in informal communication. These latter units are called jargonisms.

Uspenskiy L. V. (1936) refers to jargonisms all that for this special language is vernacular, that less stable and more lively part of its vocabulary, which exists exclusively in the conditions of oral speech of professionals.

Norms of a Professional Oil Sublanguage

The norm of the first level of POS, Russian and English oil terminology is hierarchically

(based on genus-species relations) and thematically (based on correlation with professionally significant objects of reality) an organized system of language signs.

The system of norms of the second level, the uncoded part of the Russian variant of POS, contains nominative and communicative units, classified as 1) jargon or slang (if the classification is based on the criterion of the level of stylistic substandard); 2) jargonisms, quasi-jargonisms and dejargonisms (when classified according to the denotative component); 3) jargonisms and interjargonisms (when classified according to the functional feature).

Jargonisms are units of the second level of the professional sublanguage, functioning in a low register of institutional discourse as a substitution of terms, for example, *beremennaya truba* (lit. *pregnant pipe*) *injection valve*; *yolka* (lit. *fir-tree*) *wellhead fittings on the well*; *rozhdstvenskaya yolka* (lit. *Christmas tree*) *an elaborate arrangement of pipes, valves, etc., as for controlling the flow of oil or gas*; *to blind* *to close the pipeline to the rig to prevent flow*.

Dejargonisms are lexical units of the second level of professional sublanguage, the meaning of which does not have parallels in the term sphere of the relevant type of activity: *kosari* (lit. *haymakers*) (jest.) *idlers*; *turbobur* (lit. *turbodrill*) (jest.) *male sexual organ*; *reserve salute* (lit. *reserve fireworks*), (fig.) *shrugging one's shoulders*; *bubba* *the strongest driller in the brigade*. As a rule, dejargonisms are used only in an appropriate professional environment and do not go beyond the informal communication of people in a given profession.

The continuity of the professional language continuum is ensured by a group of units, quasi-jargonisms, occupying an intermediate position between jargonisms and dejargonisms. These are units that have no parallels in the term system, but their denotative meaning is correlated with professional actions and objects. For example, "Closeology" *Tx refers to the art of drilling as close as legally possible to another company's well, in hopes of pumping from the same pool of*

oil. If a pipe connection loosens just a bit, ensuring that it can be eventually taken off, someone may comment, "if they wink, they'll screw" (Sandmel, n.d.).

A large group of interjargonisms, units used in several professional languages, has also been revealed. Interjargonisms are: *slesarka* *storage room for spare parts and items*; *kosa* (lit. *braid*) 1. *cable*. 2. *part of wireline above geophysical instruments*; *lipa* (lit. *a false story*) (jest.) *work failure report*; *tyul'ku vparit'* (jest.) *to prepare a work failure report*; *children* (derisive) *LA, Tx* *the nickname of unskilled workers (in the oil-field)*; *Daddy* *immediate superior*; *out of commission* *out of order*; *unusable*.

Thus, in the professional oil uncoded sublanguage composition, we distinguish the following groups of units: *jargonisms*, *interjargonisms*, *quasi-jargonisms* and *dejargonisms*.

Functions of a Professional Oil Sublanguage

The discourse of a professional community functions as a normalizer of professional and social values, thus impacting the community and society as a whole (Mihailova & Solnyshkina, 2017). POS performs functions that can be compared in scale with "the functions of several sublanguages and jargons at the same time" (Rebrina & Generalova, 2019). The sublanguage in question is a professional-communicative system, a set of lower-level sublanguages used in the professional language community and concerning functional complementarity. Each of the sublanguages has its functions without intersecting the functions of other sublanguages. POS serves communication during the implementation of mining, exploration and repair work while providing a link *drilling↔drilling and drilling↔drilling* base. The high level of modern means of communication ensures the continuity of communication of shift teams with the base and other teams. However, the oil sublanguage functions both in a temporarily closed community (during periods of long shifts in remote areas)

and in a relatively open community (working in the immediate vicinity of the base, training, etc.). It reflected both the forced isolation of its carriers during long watches and the needs of the carriers not only to facilitate communication inside and outside the micro-community but also to complicate the penetration of the “uninitiated” from the outside.

As already noted, depending on their attitude to codification, all units of a professional language can be divided into 1) codified (terms and nomens); 2) uncoded (jargon and slang). The former includes, for example, drilling (*term.*) *the process of constructing a mine opening (a shot-hole, a borehole, less often a hole, a shaft), preferably of a circular cross-section in the earth's crust to study the geological structure, prospecting works, exploration, mining, engineering – geological surveys, etc.*; drilling assessment *drilling assessment wells*; beam (*term.*) *movable steel bar of the pump*; cap (*term.*) *stratum of alluvial unbound rocks*. The second group is represented by substitutions of terms used in a low register of communication: *glotat' (lit. to swallow), to ingest, to absorb, to absorb water, cement, mortar*; *gorizontalka (smth horizontal) horizontal well, barrel length with angles greater than 70*; *to bleed 1. to release liquid or gas slowly; 2. to reduce pressure*; *hole well; borehole; to junk a hole to eliminate the well*.

The derivational base of the units in question is represented, first of all, by units of the national language: *baraban (lit. drum) winch shaft; bashmak (lit. shoe) device used for lowering the casing; golovka (lit. head) equipment for cementing casing; joint (prof.) single pipe, tube, single stand; junk (prof. metal debris (at the bottom of a well)); hole prof. well, borehole; brine (prof.) water containing a high concentration of salt, etc.*

The units of the oil sublanguage are usually used in oral communication between communicants: 1) on the same level of the hierarchy; 2) connected through informal relationships. For example, “bubba” (*n*) *the strongest driller in the brigade* • “There’s always a ‘bubba’ on a rig.

We couldn’t get a plug off a pipe once, so we walked over to driller and asked for his “bubba”. The driller knew right away that we needed one of the strongest and hard workers on his crew. He called a guy to come up, and this ‘bubba’ had the plug off in about three minutes.” Sandmel B. Oilfield Lore.

There are numerous terms on board a drilling rig that allude to animals: dog’s house *driller’s shed cabin*, a monkey board *the derrick man’s platform located on the derrick and mounted over the aperture in the hull of a drillship known as the moonpool*, a mousehole *an opening in the drill floor where a joint of pipe is temporarily stored until added to the drillstring*, muleshoe *orienting sleeve*, spider *a cross*, rabbit – *a pipe cleaner*, ram *a part of the blowout preventer*, ringworm *in ringworm corrosion*.

Features of a Professional Oil Vocabulary

Professional oil vocabulary of uncoded vocabulary, created based on thematic, etymological and functional principles, aims at fixing one-word and verbose units of the uncoded component of the POS for their subsequent multidimensional linguistic analysis. When a unit is included in the Dictionary, three parameters are prioritized – “oil” etymology, the nomination of an object belonging to the petroleum industry or landscape, and functioning in a POS.

The macrostructure of the Dictionary includes the following elements:

1. lemma, marked with accent marks/signs;
2. etymological information;
3. grammatical characteristics;
4. functional and stylistic parameters;
5. interpretation of meaning;
6. set expressions;
7. illustration of functioning;
8. certification of the material (Morozova, Yakhina & Pestova, 2020).

The study is a development of a professional non-codified sublanguage, the typology of which is carried out on the basis of language units of the

second level norm of a professional substandard. The basis of a professional oil-producing society is a practical activity carried out with the help of certain tools based on legislatively approved acts. The professional team has a relationship with the authorities, served by the normative, literary component of the relevant professional sublanguage (the first level norm); therefore, the characteristic of the form of existence of the language includes the parameters of the language norm of the first and second levels (Solnyshkina & Gafiyatova, 2014).

A specific kind of language, which we define as an oil sublanguage, corresponds to the oil business as a specific area of human activity. The oil sublanguage, one of the options for implementing a common language used by a limited group of speakers in terms of both official and unofficial communication, provides communication for people working in the oil industry.

Conclusion

The research of the problem showed asymmetry of categorization of objects and subjects of the oil business in the compared languages: the Russian variant of the professional oil non-codified sublanguage demonstrates a higher grading of categorizations when nominating artefacts. In contrast, the English version of the considered sublanguage has a higher density of nomination of production processes. The symmetry of the inventory of nuclear concepts implemented in the Russian and English variants of the professional oil uncoded sublanguage is determined by the uniformity of activities, the environment, the cyclical nature of employment, the presence of danger and dependence on natural phenomena.

The national specificity and originality of the semantics of the thesaurus units of the POS's Russian and English versions result from an extralinguistic and linguistic factor. The extralinguistic factor largely contributed to the appearance of differences, while the linguistic factor itself acted towards creating similarities in the

composition, structure and semantics of the subsystems under consideration.

The symmetry and asymmetry of the compared lexical units can best be represented in a comprehensive comparative professional dictionary containing a comprehensive interpretation of the lexical-semantic variants of the headword, grammatical, functional and stylistic information and illustrations of the functioning of the unit in professional speech.

The permeability of the lexical subsystems of the language predetermines the migration of professional vocabulary, responsive to pragmatic variation, from a social-group dialect to a social-group dialect, from a professional language to a national one. Jargonisms act as markers of the tone of the speech act, informal, spontaneous relations between communicants. Professional oil language stands out among the professional variants of the language spoken by one of the existing micro-communities. It is a language with three properties: firstly, it is understandable to all representatives of the oil industry; secondly, it can verbalize subtle semantic nuances; thirdly, it can maintain the professional and social differentiation of the language, which ensures orderliness and organization of communication.

Acknowledgments

This paper has been supported by the Kazan Federal University Strategic Academic Leadership Program (Priority-2030).

References

- Andersen, Ø., & Myking, J. (2018). Terminology work for specific problem areas and issues: The case of oil terminology: An international handbook. In J. Humbley, G. Budin, & C. Laurén (Eds.), *Languages for special purposes* (pp. 535-547). Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Bahadori, A., Nwaoha, Ch., & Clark, M. W.

- (2014). *Dictionary of oil, gas, and petrochemical processing*. CRC Press. Retrieved from <https://www.engineering-bookspdf.com/dictionary-of-oil-gas-and-petrochemical-processing-by-alireza-bahadori-chikezie-nwaoha-and-malcolm-william-clark/>
- Belousov, V. S. (2005). English-Russian and Russian-English phrase-book for oil and gas industry specialists. Moscow: Techniput.
- Buckley, M. (n.d.). *Laughs and nightmares in oilfield translation*. <https://www.translationdirectory.com/article1050.htm>
- Bulatov, A. I. (2004). *Anglo-russkiy, russko-angliyskiy neftegazopromyslovyy slovar (English-Russian and Russian-English oil and gas dictionary, in Russian)*. Moscow: Nedra.
- Castellvi, M. T. C. (2003). Theories of Terminology: Their description, prescription and explanation. *Terminology*, 9(2), 163-199. <https://doi.org/10.1075/term.-9.2.03cab>
- Coxhead, A., & Demecheleer, M. (2018). Investigating the technical vocabulary of plumbing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 51, 84-97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2018.03.006>
- Dahm, M. R. (2011). Exploring perception and use of everyday language and medical terminology among international medical graduates in a medical ESP course in Australia. *English for Specific Purposes*, 30(3), 186-197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.02.004>
- Doroshenko, S. M. (2004). *Formirovaniye i razvitiye ukrainskoy terminologii neftegazovoy promyshlennosti (Form and development of Ukrainian terminology for the oil and gas industry, in Russian)*. Retrieved from <http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/6094/1/Doroshenko.pdf>
- Drill site terminology and jargon*. (2005). In *English-Russian dictionary of general vocabulary (Universal Russian-English dictionary): 100 thousand entries*. AB-BYY Software Ltd.
- Dvorak, E. (2018). On study of professional sociolect as language universalia. *Current Issues of Linguistics and Didactics: The Interdisciplinary Approach in Humanities and Social Sciences (CILDIAH-2018)*, 50. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shs-conf/20185001047>
- Gallo, K. Z. (2016). Understanding professional jargons literature review. *Psychologia Wychowawcza*, 10, 157-163. doi: 10.5-604/00332860.1234518
- Garbovsky, N. K. (1988). *Sopostavitel'naya stilistika professional'noy rechi (Comparative style of professional speech, in Russian)*. Moscow: MGU.
- Golovin, B. N. (1988). *Osnovy kultury rechi (The basics of speech culture, in Russian)*. Moscow: High school.
- González Pueyo, I., & Val, S. (1996). The construction of technicality in the field of plastics: A functional approach towards teaching technical terminology. *English for Specific Purposes*, 15(4), 251-278. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(9-6\)00011-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(9-6)00011-7)
- Gorokhova, N. V. (2019). Peculiarities of English oil and gas terminology. In Anikina Z. (Ed.), *Going global through social sciences and humanities: A systems and ICT perspective. GGSSH 2019. Advances in intelligent systems and computing*. (Vol. 907). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-114-73-2_38
- Jabbour-Lagocki, J. (1992). Medical terminology: A phonological analysis for teaching English pronunciation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 11(1), 71-79. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(92\)-90007-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(92)-90007-W)
- Jargon Buster*. (2019). Oil sector. Retrieved from <http://www.energyweb.net/oil/jargon/>

- Jaworska, S., & Nanda, A. (2018). Doing well by talking good: A topic modelling-assisted discourse study of corporate social responsibility. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(3), 373-399. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw014>
- Khartukov, Ye. M. (2004). *Anglo-russkiy slovar' po neftyanomu biznesu* (English-Russian dictionary of the oil business, in Russian). Moscow: Olimp-Biznes.
- Kukasova, D. G. (2018). *Terminologicheskaya antonimiya v leksike russkogo i angliyskogo yazykov (na primere terminosistemy neftegazopromyslovoy geologii)* (Terminological antonymy in the vocabulary of the Russian and English languages (On the example of the terminology of oil and gas field geology), in Russian). *Filologicheskiye nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki* (Philological Sciences. Questions of Theory and Practice, in Russian), 10(88), 309-312. <http://doi.org/10.30853/filnauki.2018-10-2.19>
- Mihailova, M., & Solnyshkina, M. (2017). Photographers' nomenclature units: A structural and quantitative analysis. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 6(5), 166-172. <http://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v6i5.1266>
- Morozova, O. A., Yakhina, A. M., & Pestova, M. S. (2020). On the problem of creating a professional dictionary of uncoded vocabulary. In *Utopia y Praxis Latinoamericana* (Vol. 25, pp. 195-206). <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4009661>
- Nooralahzadeh, F., Øvrelid, L., & Lønning, J. T. (2018). Evaluation of domain-specific word embeddings using knowledge resources. In N. Calzolari, K. Choukri, C. Cieri, T. Declerck, S. Goggi, R. Hasida, ... T. Tokunaga (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*, Oslo (pp. 1438-1445). Retrieved from <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/L18-1228.pdf>
- Oil Field Glossary. (2005). In *English-Russian Dictionary of General Vocabulary (Universal Russian-English Dictionary): 100 thousand entries*. ABBYY Software Ltd.
- Petrenko, E. G. (2002). *Navyki mezhkul'turnoy professional'noy kommunikatsii v strukture professional'noy kompetentnosti ekonomista* (Skills of intercultural professional communication in the structure of professional competence of an economist, in Russian). In *Mayetrialy XXII nauchno-tekhnicheskoy konferentsii po rezul'tatam raboty professor-sko-prepodavatel'skogo sostava, aspirantov i studentov SevKavGTU za 2002* (Materials of the XXII Scientific and Technical Conference on the Results of the Work of the Faculty, Graduate Students and Students of SevKavGTU for 2002, in Russian) (pp. 21-23). Stavropol: SevKavGTU.
- Prokhorov, A. M. (Ed.). (1981). *Sovetskaya entsiklopediya* (Soviet encyclopedic dictionary, in Russian). Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia.
- Rebrina, L. N., & Generalova L. M. (2019). Professional Jargon units in workplace communication (By the example of professional languages of miners, oilmen, railway workers and ambulance doctors). *IOP Conf. Series: Materials Science and Engineering*. <http://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/483/1/012089>
- Rogers, M. (2006). Terminology, term banks and termbases for translation. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics* (pp. 588-591). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00477-6>
- Samigullina, L., & Samigullina, E. (2018a). Linguistic and normative aspects of oil and gas business terminology. *SHS Web Conf. Current Issues of Linguistics and Didactics: The Interdisciplinary Approach in Humanities and Social Sci-*

- ences (CILDIAH-2018), 50. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185001220>
- Samigullina, L., & Samigullina, E. (2018b). Oil and gas business specialists' professional discourse structure and functions study. *SHS Web Conf. Current Issues of Linguistics and Didactics: The Interdisciplinary Approach in Humanities and Social Sciences (CILDIAH-2018)*, 50. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185001221>
- Sandmel, B. (n.d.). *Oilfield lore*. Retrieved from http://www.louisianafolklife.org/LT/Articles_Essays/creole_art_oilfield_lore.html
- Schmitz, K. D. (2006). Terminology and terminological databases. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics* (pp. 578-587). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00453-3>
- Skrynnik, Yu. N. (2004). *Terminological dictionary. Oil. Gas. Equipment*. Moscow: Nedra-Business Center.
- Solnyshkina, M., & Gafiyatova, E. (2014). Modern forestry English: Macro- and micro-structure of low register dictionary. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(4), 220-224.
- Surnina, A. F. (2002). Oil and gas industry terminology. In A. F. Surnina, & M. Kuderova (Eds.), *Scientific creativity of youth: Problems and development prospects* (52-53). Ust'-Kamenogorsk: VKGU.
- The oilfield glossary: Where the oil field meets the dictionary*. (n.d.). <http://www.glossary.oilfield.slb.com/>
- Uspenskiy, L. V. (1936). Materials on the language of Russian pilots. *Language and Thinking*, 6-7, 161-217.
- Webster's Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language*. (2001). New York: Random House Inc.
- Wilkinson, R. (2006). *Speaking Oil & Gas* (3rd ed.). Canberra: APPEA.
- Yartseva, V. N. (Ed.). (1990). *Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar* (Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary, in Russian). Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia.
- Yelistratov, V. S. (2002). *K proleme izucheniya professional'nykh yazykov* (To the problem of learning professional languages, in Russian). In N. A. Kalanov (Ed.), *Slovar' morskogo zhargona* (Dictionary of Sea Lingo, in Russian) (pp. 469-475). Moscow: Azbukovnik.
- Yunusova, I. R. (2015). *Formirovaniye angliyskoy terminologii v neftegazovoy promyshlennosti* (Formation of English oil and gas field terminology, in Russian). *Gumanitarnyye, sotsial'no-ekonomicheskiye i obshchestvennyye nauki* (Humanities, Social-Economic and Social Sciences, in Russian), 3, 258-261. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/formirovanie-angliyskoy-terminologii-v-neftegazovoy-promyshlennosti/viewer>