

SCTCMG 2019

International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

“SPREADING” OF TERMS IN NOMINATION OF EVERYDAY LEXICAL UNITS IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Duong Thuy Trinh (a)*, Viktor Shaklein (b)

*Corresponding author

(a) Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, 6, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, 117198, Russia
dukyu.rea@gmail.com, +79645798266

(b) Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, 6, Miklukho-Maklaya str., Moscow, 117198, Russia
shaklein_vm@pfur.ru, +79164990810

Abstract

This article deals with terminological issues related to the clarification of the conceptual field of everyday vocabulary”. The study of everyday vocabulary is important for lexicographic and linguistic and cultural descriptions of the Russian language, necessary for foreign students in classes in language practice. The purpose of the article is to describe, compare the terms used by Russian and Vietnamese researchers in the nomination of household lexical units, identify the relationship between the proposed terms, and also define the concept of “everyday household vocabulary” from the point of view of Vietnamese linguists. The material of the article served as registers of terms for the nomination of everyday lexical units, highlighted in monographs of Russian and Vietnamese scholars, in specialized lexicology publications in Russian and Vietnamese. The main research methods are the descriptive method, the comparative method, the method of semantic interpretation, offering a comprehensive interpretation of various understandings of the term. A comprehensive comparative analysis of all these concepts can lay the foundation for an effective comprehensive study of Russian vocabulary, which is reflected in everyday communication, forming the Russian everyday lexical picture of the world. As a result, the article identifies the key problems facing the researchers of everyday household vocabulary at present, such as “spreading” in the use of terms for the nomination of everyday lexical units, “mixing” of different understandings of the term everyday vocabulary” in Russian, as well as the complexity in explaining them from the point of view of Vietnamese linguists.

© 2019 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Everyday vocabulary, lexical units, term, stylistic plan, linguoculture.



1. Introduction

It is known that language as a human activity is permeated with feelings. This is especially noticeable when implementing the communicative function in everyday life. That is why linguistics develops a special direction in which the problem of studying everyday vocabulary and reflecting patterns of everyday life, denoting the emotional and expressive world of a person, is being actively developed. So far, a lot of research has been done on all the lexical layers of the Russian language, but in the field of Russian everyday vocabulary, in particular, from the point of view of Vietnamese linguistic culture, there are few comprehensive studies on this issue today. In the period from 50-60-ies to the present day, a number of articles of various kinds have been published, most of which are notes on the use of everyday vocabulary, limited by the framework of either Church Slavonic and old Russian languages in Moscow Russia, or the languages of Russian national minorities, for example, "Household vocabulary in the language of Moscow monuments of the 2 half of the XVII century" (Prokhorov, 1953), "Everyday vocabulary in the language of Voronezh letters of the XVII century" (Sokolova, 1956), "On some questions of Russian historical lexicology" (Vinogradov, 1999), "Vocabulary of everyday spoken language of Moscow Russia XVI – XVII centuries" (Mzhelskaya, 2003), "Household vocabulary of even language" (Danilova, 1991), "Household vocabulary of Even language" (Danilova, 2004) etc. In the above-mentioned studies the concept of "everyday vocabulary" is not explained clearly and comprehensively. The problem of using this layer of vocabulary is not covered by researchers, does not take into account the reflection of everyday vocabulary of reality, thanks to which students perceive patterns, peculiarities of life and the national culture of the language being studied. As can be seen in the published works in the field of lexicology in recent years, an infinite number of terms are presented for the nomination of household lexical units. Moreover, from the point of view of the carriers of different socio-cultural and linguistic traditions, the understanding of such terms changes greatly when they are considered to reflect their reality.

2. Problem Statement

The word "everyday vocabulary" is not in the terminological dictionaries. Moreover, his concepts are interpreted differently in scientific research.

3. Research Questions

What is everyday vocabulary? What are the terminological issues related to the refinement of the conceptual domain "everyday vocabulary"?

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this article is to describe, analyze and compare the terms used by Russian and Vietnamese researchers in the nomination of household lexical units, identify the relationship between the proposed terms, and clarify the concept of "everyday vocabulary" from the point of view of Vietnamese linguists.

5. Research Methods

The main research methods are an explanatory description, a comparative method, a method of formalizing linguistic descriptions and a method of semantic interpretation, offering a comprehensive interpretation of various understandings of the term.

6. Findings

1. On the history of the study of everyday vocabulary: the “spreading” of the use of terms in the nomination of household lexical units.

There is no doubt that the study of lexico-semantic layers, in particular everyday vocabulary, has a long tradition in Russian linguistics. One of the main tasks of modern linguistics is the consideration and identification of features of colloquial speech, including the study of one of the constituent parts of the entire lexical stock of the language - thematic groups that reflect the features of everyday speech.

The study of this lexical layer was started in the works of I.O. Stepanyan, A.M. Peshkovsky, L.P. Yakubinsky, S.I. Abakumov at the beginning of the 20th century, then in the 1950s-1980s, continued in the works of V.V. Vinogradov, N.K. Sokolova, V.N. Prokhorova, M.S. Gurycheva, B.A. Serebrennikova, E.M. Galkina-Fedoruk, A.I. Efimova, A.M. Zemsky, S.E. Kryuchkov and others. In the 90s of the XX century and the beginning of the XXI century, there is an increased interest of linguists in this problem.

However, it should be emphasized that at present, among scholars who study everyday vocabulary, there has not yet been a generally accepted opinion about its essence, interpretation, and also about the range of linguistic phenomena included in this concept.

There is still no comprehensive research on the pragmatic, stylistic and aesthetic aspects of functioning, and there is no consensus on the question of a different understanding of the lexical layer denoting the speech peculiarities of everyday life. It should be noted that along with the term “*everyday household vocabulary*” represented in this article, there are a number of terms when nominating household lexical units, such as “*everyday vocabulary*” (Sorokin, 1981; Galkina-Fedoruk, 1954; Danilova, 1991; Zakharevich, 1974), “*everyday conversational vocabulary*” (Mzhelskaya, 2003; Sobyenin, 2004), “*colloquial everyday vocabulary*” (Abakumov, 1942), “*conversational everyday speech*” (Vasilyeva, 2017), “*subjectly - everyday vocabulary*” (Panteleev, 2006), “*everyday speech*” and “*colloquial everyday speech*” (Abakumov, 1942), “*everyday speech*” (Sorokin, 1949), “*specific everyday vocabulary*” (Bulakhovsky, 1949), “*professional everyday terminology*” and “*everyday terminology*” (Sorokin, 1949), “*concrete everyday vocabulary*” and “*everyday terms*” (Efimov, 1954), “*subject vocabulary of the everyday concept sphere*” (Kushko, 2016) and many other similar terms in the works of Russian-speaking researchers. Thus, the presence of a large number of almost equivalent terms causes foreign students, especially among Vietnamese audiences, to be confused and confused when studying these lexical units of life.

In this article we do not seek to set forth in detail the entire history of the study of the lexical layer we are considering; we intend to present in general outline the main points of view on this issue.

The fact is that many researchers believe that the term describing everyday lexical units does not have an exact, uniform definition in linguistics, and consequently, this term has several meanings and becomes multivalued.

In this article we will consider the points of view of some researchers. First of all, we should mention the terms devoted to everyday lexical units in the research of academician Bulakhovsky (1949). As the main feature of the studied units, Bulakhovsky (1949), systematizing and analyzing the composition of Russian vocabulary in a stylistic sense, in his guidebook "The Course of the Russian Literary Language", suggests the term "specific everyday vocabulary" (or "narrow everyday vocabulary"). He singles out a fund of commonly used and commonly understood words that constitute the property of each speaker of a literary language. Bulakhovsky (1949) argues that such lexical units are akin to specific everyday vocabulary (in other words, narrow everyday vocabulary), viewed as a set of ethnographic units of everyday life.

On the other hand, exploring the work of Bulakhovsky (1949), we note that the author simultaneously uses the terms "specific everyday vocabulary" and "everyday vocabulary" in the same meaning. He writes that "as an excellent expert in everyday vocabulary, giving it freely and without any underlined deliberateness, several examples should be cited from the works of M. Gorky (1970): "This is a fisherman radiating fish" / "Charred verses" the gates stood at the fire with black watchmen" (Gorky, 1970, p. 72)". So, according to the above examples, Bulakhovsky (1949) refers to the everyday vocabulary of the word: "gateposts" - the pillars on which the towels of the gate are hung, "beams" - beams sharp. However, these words can also be attributed to the specific-everyday vocabulary, and not to everyday. The concept of "specific everyday vocabulary" is narrower than the concept of "everyday vocabulary", and therefore, such terms do not have the opportunity to stand in one synonymous row due to the fact that they mean different concepts. Based on the foregoing, it can be concluded that Bulakhovsky (1949) does not establish a distinction between the specific everyday vocabulary and everyday vocabulary, and in the textbook "The Course of the Russian Literary Language" there is no clear, unified, strictly delimited concept of everyday vocabulary. This situation, from our point of view, is unclear and incorrect.

Abakumov (1942) in his book "Modern Russian literary language" designated the lexical units he studied with the terms "colloquial everyday speech" and "everyday vocabulary". He believes that the composition of the modern Russian literary language should, above all, highlight the words "everyday content". This term refers to "the names of objects and phenomena with which we deal daily in ordinary living conditions" (Abakumov, 1942, p. 63). Nevertheless, classifying groups of objects and phenomena covered by the term "everyday vocabulary", Abakumov (1942) mixes the understanding of this term in the stylistic layer of speech.

The author suggests the following terms: "everyday vocabulary" and "colloquially everyday speech", which he then calls "everyday speech". To everyday vocabulary as to a certain wide layer of vocabulary, from the point of view of Abakumov (1942), can also be attributed argotism, special peasant vocabulary, as well as vocabulary that characterizes the language of certain professions. Such an understanding of everyday vocabulary, in our opinion, is broad, indefinite and incorrect in defining the language of certain social groups. Considering the term "everyday vocabulary", Abakumov (1942) cites a number of the following synonyms: "everyday speech", "household dictionary", "everyday speech". This confirms the vague concept of everyday vocabulary. Based on the above, we can conclude that Abakumov

(1942) adequately defines the everyday vocabulary we study with lexical units, but further expands the concept of everyday vocabulary, mixes it with vocabulary related to territorial dialects and social jargon, and replaces the term “everyday vocabulary” with the term “colloquial everyday vocabulary”.

The research of Sorokin (1949), presented in the article “Conversational and Popular Speech in the Dictionary of the Russian Academy”, published in the collection “Materials and Studies on the History of the Russian Literary Language”. The author, taking into account the various stylistic speech layers, uses the following terms: "everyday vocabulary", "professional everyday terminology", "everyday terminology" (Sorokin, 1949, p. 121); “everyday speech”, “everyday styles” (ibid, 32); “everyday terminology” (ibid., 144). Sorokin (1949) uses the terms "professional everyday terminology" and "everyday terminology" as the name of the totality of objects and phenomena of everyday life, while such terms as "everyday speech" and "everyday styles" are used to denote the conversational and everyday speech style. However, Sorokin (1949) does not clearly indicate in what meaning and in what situation the term “everyday vocabulary” is used, but in our opinion, the first indicated meaning seems more likely.

Of great interest to learners of the Russian language is a textbook by Galkina-Fedoruk (1954) “Modern Russian. Vocabulary”, in which the term “colloquial everyday vocabulary ” is used as one of the stylistic speech layers. Following Galkina-Fedoruk (1954) colloquial vocabulary is defined as certain lexical units for use in informal communication, outside official relations, and especially between people who have close relationships based on culture and lifestyle. By the way, in this work the term “everyday vocabulary” is found once in the following context: “Everyday household vocabulary is used, at work associated with the work process, professional” (ibid., 15). Obviously, the term “everyday vocabulary” is devoted to lexical units, denoting the names of objects and phenomena of everyday life, as opposed to the term “colloquially common vocabulary”, which serves as the name of a certain speech style, therefore, it is impossible to put them in one row within a single lexical system.

In his book, “The History of the Russian Literary Language”, Efimov (1954) uses the terms "specific everyday vocabulary" and "everyday terms" (p. 130). He emphasizes that both of these terms refer to objects and phenomena of everyday life, whereas the term “colloquially everyday speech” (p. 115) is used to designate a specific speech style. In addition, Efimov (1954), when deciding on the name of the lexical units under consideration, also uses the term “everyday words”, which is determined by the fact that “the lexical composition is characterized by the predominance of everyday words denoting family relationships of people, handicrafts, food, etc.”. It is especially necessary to note that the terms "concrete everyday vocabulary", "everyday terms" and "everyday words", from the point of view of Efimov (1954), used in one single meaning, not mixing with the term "colloquial everyday speech", having a place in the conversational style of speech.

Based on the foregoing, it can be concluded that the majority of researchers, using the term “everyday vocabulary” in the stylistic sense, mix this concept with other stylistic varieties of the language. In other words, the term "everyday vocabulary" is replaced by the term "colloquial and everyday style of speech."

So, despite numerous studies in the field of everyday vocabulary, many Russian linguists define this vocabulary differently because of the heterogeneity of the grounds on which it stands out, as well as because of the complexity of the subject itself. The terms discussed above do not have an accurate linguistic

description to date. However, it should be noted that the majority of researchers consider this special layer of vocabulary as part of the national vocabulary and consider it in stylistic terms (when defining the terms "spoken vocabulary", "colloquial-everyday vocabulary", "colloquial-everyday style of speech", etc.). It should be noted that these lexical units are polysemantic. They obey all the laws characteristic of the vocabulary of the Russian language as a whole. So, this segment of the lexicon are lexical items used in everyday speech and it means, basically, everyday concepts.

In turn, our study is limited to the consideration of this lexical group from the point of view of its reflection in reality as a set of names of objects and phenomena of life. In this article, to refer to it, we use the term "everyday household vocabulary"».

2. To clarify the different understandings of the term "everyday household vocabulary" in Russian studies.

Within this part of the article, it is necessary to clearly clarify our definition of the term "everyday household vocabulary". To date, Russian linguistics has a small number of works devoted to issues of everyday vocabulary. Linguists who study everyday vocabulary often consider it in various aspects. In the variety of works and approaches to the study of these lexical units there are a number of lacunae that have yet to be filled. In particular, everyday vocabulary is studied:

- 1) in terms of its origin (Bulakhovsky, 1949; Mzhelskaya, 2003);
- 2) in terms of its semantic development (Sorokin, 1949);
- 3) in line with historical lexicology (Smolina, 1990; Vinogradov, 1999; Efimov, 1954; Sorokin, 1981);
- 4) stylistically (Vasilyeva, 2017; Abakumov, 1942; Galkina-Fedoruk, 1954)
- 5) in English (Ryzhkov, 2003), as well as in the languages of the peoples of Siberia that are in danger of extinction: in Even, Yukagir, etc. (Danilova, 1991, 2004);
- 6) from the standpoint of the formation of lexical and thematic groups (Sokolova, 1956);
- 7) in the onomasiological aspect (Sudakov, 1986);
- 8) in terms of comparison of the names of objects and phenomena of everyday life in Russian with similar designations in other related and unrelated languages (Zakharevich, 1974; Sobyenin, 2004);
- 9) in terms of use in communication (Panov, 1962; Vasilyeva, 2017; Lukina & Lepekhin, 1965).

Based on the foregoing, it can be concluded that such issues as the history of everyday household vocabulary, its linguoculturological description, the development of Russian names of objects and phenomena of life in conjunction with other languages, in particular, Vietnamese, are not sufficiently studied. Since everyday vocabulary is practically not considered in the linguistic-cultural aspect, the research results in most cases are dispersed in different lexico-semantic groups and do not provide a complete picture of the everyday vocabulary system based on the cultural and historical basis, the traditions of society, and also on the origin its individual members in one language or another. However, it must be admitted that in recent years, the topic of everyday vocabulary has increasingly interested both Russian and Vietnamese linguists. Interest in everyday vocabulary due to the fact that the names of objects and phenomena of life and their symbolic meaning are for any nation a kind of reflection of cultural traditions, religion, past and present. It is known that almost all major changes in the daily life of society and the

communicative elements important for humanity are associated precisely with lexical units with the nomination of life.

Everyday household vocabulary is characterized by mass use, since it is used by people of all ages and all professions. She can be found not only in everyday life, but also in informal personal communication, for example, in such areas as educational, scientific, socio-political, industrial and labor, as well as in artistic works. In written language, everyday household vocabulary is used to express certain artistic and expressive goals in artistic and journalistic styles. In the scientific and official business styles such vocabulary is quite rare.

Speaking about everyday vocabulary, many linguists state that its role and significance in linguistic science were not evaluated, since this lexical layer is most often referred to as colloquial words considered outside the framework of a literary language. Panov (1962) also emphasized that everyday vocabulary “is outside the literary language. In fact, it is a variation of the latter because it does not include any linguistic features” (p. 101). Thereby Panov (1962) without saying it directly, Panov led to the fact that everyday vocabulary is used in such communicative situations as friendly conversation, everyday conversation between people who in other conditions use neutral and book lexical units. Therefore, it seems to us that the use of everyday vocabulary in book speech gives the context a colloquial and everyday connotation, and precisely such everyday words are considered to be elements that are not completely foreign, then at least external.

Everyday household vocabulary, first of all, is actively used in everyday life, generalized here by such a concept as "household sphere". This lexical layer is formed by words that call objects and phenomena of everyday life with established rules, customs, habits.

There is no doubt that everyday vocabulary occupies an exceptional place in the system of the modern Russian language. This is due to the fact that these lexical units are considered native in the national language, and all other lexical units are linguistic phenomena of later and secondary education. It is not by chance that the definition of everyday vocabulary, and then its comparison with other lexical units, is presented as an effective way for learning the language in general and lexicology in particular. Understanding the need to clarify this term, in this article we talk about how the interpretation of everyday vocabulary is formed and on what basis the lexical layer we consider is called everyday household.

It seems to us that the term “everyday household vocabulary” has received several abstract meanings and shades emanating from related words with the basics of “everyday life”, widely used in Russian since the beginning of the 19th century. The researchers of the first quarter of the 19th century, who tried to define the term “everyday vocabulary” in the Russian literary language, were forced to admit that the abstract and generalized meaning of the original words “life” and “everyday life” ousted their specific meanings.

It is necessary to name some Russian linguists who disagreed on this issue, such as V.I. Dahl, A.A. Shakhmatov, S.I. Ozhegov, V.V. Vinogradov, M.R. Vasmer, D.E. Rosenthal, M.A. Telenkova, K.P. Smolina, G.N. Lukina, T.F. Efremova, A.P. Guskova, B.V. Sotin, V.S. Bezrukov, D.V. Dmitriev, T.V. Zhrebilo. Vasmer (1986), Vinogradov (1999), Smolina (1990), Guskova and Sotin (2008) reveal the meaning of the words “life” and “everyday life” as the most ancient words of common Slavic origin, which

entered the Russian literary language from living popular speech, denoting “property” (see the proverb “not expensive water, but expensive life”).

It can be argued that originally the words "life" and "everyday life" had the meanings of property, means of livelihood, the environment, and also the economy. Lukina and Lepekhin (1965) argue that by everyday vocabulary is meant a certain lexical layer reflecting material culture. Speaking about everyday vocabulary as a property designation, Lukina and Lepekhin (1965) identify several subject groups in this vocabulary: names of shoes, clothes, jewelry, food, vessels, etc. In addition, it is emphasized that some other thematic groups with adjacent meanings may be adjacent to this vocabulary.

We also note that the words “life” and “everyday life” are actual words of realism, i.e. reflect real life. In such a definition, the term “everyday vocabulary” can be more accurately and in detail understood as a reflection of the way of life in a given environment or social group, the set of customs and ways of life characteristic of a certain class or profession (Grot, Shakhmatov, Chernyshev, & Shcherba, 1891; Efremova, 2000; Dmitriev, 2016). Based on the foregoing, it can be concluded that the understanding of everyday vocabulary develops and changes under the influence of material production, public relations, cultural level, religious views, as well as geographical conditions that have a great influence on the formation of personality and human life.

In the process of satisfying the spiritual and material needs of people, a complex of receptions, customs, customs, rituals is created, which constitute the internal way of life of a class or social group. Consequently, everyday vocabulary includes not only lexical-semantic groups of property (such as the names of clothes, food, vessels, etc.), but also such subject groups as customs and rituals, including those for which has its influence religion.

Much more meaningful is the explanatory approach of this term by Dmitriev (2016) in his explanatory dictionary of the Russian language. The word “everyday life”, which is understood as the current life in its constant, habitual manifestations or household items, is coming to the fore. Along with this, such expressions are noted as “to quit everyday life” (i.e. stop using) and “enter into everyday life” (i.e., start using). Such an understanding of the word “everyday life” has already been encountered in the works of some linguists, but the meaning of the term “everyday vocabulary” was considered unclear and often mixed and continues to be mixed with the understanding of other lexical units.

Thus, within the framework of this article, based on the above definitions of the words “life” and “everyday life”, the following ideas are proposed:

1) if a lexical unit (i.e., a word) came into use, it means that it has become part of everyday vocabulary, since it is widely used and used in people's daily lives;

2) if any lexical unit came out, disappeared from everyday life, it means that it is no longer included in everyday vocabulary (for example, “perestroika”);

3) a lexical unit can be introduced into everyday vocabulary by a certain person, provided that it aroused interest in many people who also began to use it in their daily life, work, etc. (for example: the concept of “sobornost”, first introduced into the everyday life by the Russian philosopher A.S. Khomyakov, later began to be related to everyday vocabulary);

4) most often in everyday life a phenomenon or substance is called by those who are not an expert in the relevant field (for example: magnesium sulphate is commonly called “bitter salt” in everyday life).

In the “Modern Dictionary of Methodical Terms and Concepts” by Azimov and Schukin (2018) everyday vocabulary is considered as “the most part of colloquial vocabulary”. Also, according to Azimov and Schukin (2018), under the everyday vocabulary refers to lexical units that are used in colloquial speech, in a relaxed everyday conversation. Azimov and Schukin (2018) consider the considered lexical group as one of the digits of the vocabulary of the literary language, along with neutral and book vocabulary. They emphasize that the use of everyday vocabulary, especially in artistic texts and in electronic media texts, is an actual problem in language practice classes.

However, a comprehensive scientific study of everyday vocabulary as colloquial has many difficulties, the sources of which lie in itself. Such lexical units in their most pure and specific forms can be found only in the process of easy everyday communication. Also, some difficulties may be related to the fact that the colloquial vocabulary, in particular everyday, in the role of elemental units in the colloquial-everyday style of speech, is extremely automated, and therefore, the speaker, as well as the investigators themselves often “do not notice it, cannot grab in a natural course” (Vasilyeva, 2017). Difficulties in the statistical description of lexical units in the process of natural easy communication are also related to the fact that in writing it is often impossible to convey all the specifics of everyday household. To define the concept of any subject, it is necessary to clearly list the essential features that distinguish this subject from other similar ones when considered in the same aspect (for example, from literary vernacular). According to Vasilyeva (2017), everyday vocabulary can be defined as colloquial lexical units that serve mainly the everyday communication sphere, refer to a specific way of thinking of native speakers, and to the oral form of the existence of words denoting objects and phenomena of everyday life.

In this article, in the process of defining the concept of everyday household vocabulary, various interpretations are proposed. How Sudakov (1986) notes everyday vocabulary, being “an accessory to the speech of the entire collective, i.e. of every person, and not of a professionally limited group of persons” (p. 103), reflects the subject world that is most relevant to native speakers and is related to meeting the everyday needs of a person.

Rosenthal and Telenkova (2008), in turn, rightly consider everyday vocabulary to be the most important language unit for achieving a communicative goal and stresses that these are mostly common vocabulary (i.e., words that call objects of the environment: “home”, “room”, “table”, etc.), reflecting a person’s way of life, habits, customs and traditions (the words “wedding”, “funeral”, etc.), in part - colloquial everyday vocabulary.

Finally, we follow the definition of everyday vocabulary: colloquial everyday vocabulary constitutes a certain part of everyday vocabulary, and therefore, they are not two equal in their meaning and use of lexical layers. And it is not by chance that colloquial everyday vocabulary (as well as colloquial everyday speech) is often mixed and continues to mix with everyday vocabulary. Many researchers call everyday conversational everyday life due to the fact that it serves for everyday communication with friends or strangers in everyday situations.

As noted in the encyclopedic dictionary of the teacher “Fundamentals of spiritual culture” Bezrukova (2000), everyday vocabulary is understood as “common vocabulary of a spoken character, depending on the area, which has its own specificity” (p. 79), i.e. dialect of people living in a particular locality. It is quite possible to assume that in the process of the development of intercultural communication,

verbal depiction of everyday life will be formed, a typical representative of which will be everyday vocabulary with specific cultural verbal features of each people.

3. On the explanation of the concept of everyday vocabulary from the point of view of Vietnamese linguistic culture speakers.

In the Vietnamese linguistic tradition, the concept of “everyday vocabulary” is not clearly defined, the term “colloquial and everyday style” is more often mentioned. However, some Vietnamese researchers in a number of their works (Zap, 2015; Chu, Ngiu, & Fien, 2006; Lak, 2013; Chau, 1996; Tu, 1976) often say that everyday vocabulary against the background of Vietnamese linguistic culture is understood:

1) common lexical layer in accordance with the scope (in addition to terms, dialects, professional words, jargons);

2) mostly - colloquial vocabulary, partially - neutral vocabulary (along with book vocabulary) on the used stylistic specificity;

3) a positive vocabulary (in addition to a negative vocabulary) depending on the frequency of use.

So, the Vietnamese researchers define everyday vocabulary based on several specific aspects.

On the one hand, in the field of application, everyday vocabulary is considered as part of the general lexical stock, i.e. including words that are used by people everywhere and at any time. It obeys all the patterns characteristic of the vocabulary. This layer of vocabulary has the largest vocabulary and also plays a fundamental role in any language. “This is the basis for combining the lexical units of the national language, while everyday vocabulary is the common property of all members of the nation for use as a common means of communication” (Chu et al., 2006, p. 62). This is due to the fact that everyday vocabulary refers to the most significant objects, phenomena and processes of a person’s daily life.

It should be noted that everyday vocabulary complements such lexical layers as dialects, professional words, terms and jargon. In some cases, few lexical units from the aforementioned lexical layers are assimilated as part of everyday vocabulary. This is nothing but bilateral interaction, an expression of unity in the diversity of everyday vocabulary. For example, the Vietnamese researcher Chu (Chu et al., 2006) when considering this issue, argues that “compared to terminological vocabulary, everyday household lexical units have a wider extension, but their intension is not so deep and, therefore, they are less logical” (p. 71). Obviously, terminological vocabulary should not have emotionally expressive coloring, unlike everyday everyday vocabulary. Chu (Chu et al., 2006) cites as an example the Vietnamese word "Nước" ("water") - "chemical combination of oxygen and hydrogen", which differs from the word "Nước" (water) in words and word combinations, such as "nước mắt" ("tear"), "Nước bọt" (saliva), "nước tiểu" (urine), "nước súp" (broth), "nước sốt" (sauce), "nước mưa" (rainwater), "nước ao" (pond water) etc.

In the stylistic sense, according to Vietnamese linguists, everyday vocabulary can be found as colloquial vernacular, in other words, it is the language used in everyday life, which has, unlike the book, stylistic characteristics (Zap, 2015). Most often, lexical units with emotionally expressive coloring are used to exaggerate any quality of the speaker and to attract the attention of the listener. It is not by chance that Vietnamese researchers inadvertently include colloquial words in everyday vocabulary. It is emphasized that the everyday vocabulary is understood as colloquially-vernacular language without careful processing, carefully selected vocabulary, and, therefore, less associated with language rules and principles.

However, it should be noted that the “vulgarity” of colloquialisms in general and colloquially-vernacular vocabulary in particular cannot be defined as foul language or swear words. The lack of a clear distinction between the above characteristics and the abuse of swear words leads to the opacity of the language, loss of aesthetics of the vocabulary and violation of ethical norms in the process of communication.

In addition, many linguists believe that the lexical layer neutralized in its functional style is a separate part of everyday vocabulary (Tu, 2007; Lak, 2013; Zap, 2015; Chau, 1996; Trask, 1999). With the exception of lexical units with specific designations of colloquial vernacular and book vocabulary, most of the lexical units occupying the main part of the vocabulary are called neutral vocabulary. These lexical units do not have certain signs and can be used in all functional styles. However, the boundary between lexical layers (neutral or colloquially) cannot be unequivocally determined. Based on the above, we can argue about the "flexibility" of everyday vocabulary and its ability to transform between lexical layers.

On the other hand, Vietnamese researchers indirectly assert in their works that everyday vocabulary is regularly used in the communicative process as a positive vocabulary, becoming its basis (for example, "vegetables", "porridge", "son", "daughter" and others). Do not have to doubt that the active role of lexical units in communication is related to the frequency of their use in everyday life (Zap, 2015).

In the early 1960s, many Vietnamese linguists stated that speaking of everyday vocabulary in works on linguistics became a sign of bad taste that people with a low level of education use this vocabulary, and this lexical layer cannot be used in noble literature scientists and intellectuals. Nevertheless, the last few decades have been a period of development of everyday vocabulary. This lexical layer penetrated the linguistic culture and became one of the main parts of the national cultural language.

Everyday lexical units began to be used not only in communicative situations of low style and in everyday life, but also as one of the language means for creating outstanding political and philosophical literary works, such as “Đường cách mệnh” (“Revolutionary Path”), “Bản tuyên ngôn c lập” (“Declaration of Independence of Vietnam”), “Những lời kêu gọi của chủ tịch Hồ Chí Minh” (“Calls of President Ho Chi Minh”), etc. And precisely because of the study of the mass language and the excellent use of everyday vocabulary, Tô Hữu - one of the most famous poets in the history of Vietnamese literature, created the famous poems “Từ ấy” (“Since ...”), “Gió lộng” (“Gusty wind”), “Việt Bắc” (“Viet Bak”). Later, famous writers from Vietnamese literary circles Ngô Tat Tô, Nguyễn Công Hoan reached new milestones in the development of Vietnamese novels and stories.

7. Conclusion

To date, there is no common understanding of the essence of everyday vocabulary. There is an opinion that these lexical units are outside of linguistics, in other words, they do not have an exact, uniform content in the language system. Some researchers are inclined to believe that the existence and wide distribution of this layer of vocabulary have a negative impact on the norms of the literary language. Based on the study of a large number of materials, we believe that the development of everyday vocabulary constitutes a necessary and irreplaceable part of the language process, which widely reflects the patterns and characteristics of popular everyday speech. From the above, it is clear that the everyday vocabulary layer is created in order to implement a social communicative function.

Within the framework of this article it has been established that the stability of everyday vocabulary is beyond doubt. Note also that existence, as a rule, is a process of constant struggle based on the theory of natural selection. And the lexical units used in colloquial speech are no exception. In other words, over time, they preserve and strengthen some of their elements and eliminate inappropriate, contrary to the laws of human life, as well as national and socio-political characteristics. Consequently, the emergence, distribution and replacement of everyday household vocabulary does not go beyond the above rule: some household lexical units that meet the requirements of the modern language environment exist longer, but they can be eliminated and replaced by other lexical units when they become irrelevant. So, the linguists and theorists should have a more flexible, comprehensive and positive understanding of the issues of this everyday lexical layer, which has recently been at risk of being forgotten in scientific research.

In general, neither in Russian nor in Vietnamese linguistics in recent years there has been a marked increase in research in the field of everyday vocabulary. Searches of this kind were conducted mainly by scientists of a more advanced generation, while young researchers for the most part ignore the problem of a deep understanding of the essence of the term “everyday vocabulary”. Unfortunately, the scope of this article does not allow us to speak in more detail about the perception and interpretation of this term in other languages (besides the Russian and Vietnamese language traditions) from different positions on the same scale. We only note that everyday vocabulary has penetrated strongly and continues to penetrate the linguistic culture, and also step by step becomes the main part of the national cultural language. From the above, it is undoubtedly that mastering everyday vocabulary contributes to the assimilation of knowledge in the field of national linguistic and cultural features of the Russian language, especially for foreign students. In further works, we will describe and analyze the statistical data obtained as part of a study on the reality of the use of Russian everyday vocabulary in a Vietnamese audience.

References

- Abakumov, S. I. (1942). *Modern Russian literary language*. Moscow.
- Azimov, E. G., & Schukin, A. N. (2018). *Modern dictionary of methodical terms and concepts: theory and practice of language teaching*. Moscow.
- Bezrukova, V. S. (2000). *Fundamentals of spiritual culture: Encyclopedic dictionary of the teacher*. Yekaterinburg.
- Bulakhovsky, L. A. (1949). *The course of the Russian literary language*. Kiev.
- Chau, D. Kh. (1996). *The lexico-semantics of the Vietnamese language*. Hanoi.
- Chu, M. N., Ngiu, V. D., & Fien, Kh. Ch. (2006). *The basis of linguistics of the Vietnamese language*. Hanoi.
- Danilova, A. A. (1991). *Everyday vocabulary of Even language*. Moscow.
- Danilova, A. A. (2004). *Everyday vocabulary of the Yukagir language*. Moscow.
- Dmitriev, D. V. (2016). *Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language*. Moscow.
- Efimov, A. I. (1954). *The history of the Russian literary language*. Moscow.
- Efremova, T. F. (2000). *New dictionary of the Russian language. Explanatory word-building*. Moscow.
- Galkina-Fedoruk, E. M. (1954). *Modern Russian language. Vocabulary*. Moscow: MSU.
- Gorky, M. (1970). *My Universities*. Moscow: Mysl.
- Grot, Y. K., Shakhmatov, A. A., Chernyshev, V. I., & Shcherba, L. V. (1891). *Dictionary of the Russian language*. St. Petersburg.
- Guskova, A. P., & Sotin, B. V. (2008). *Popular dictionary of the Russian language. Explanatory encyclopedic*. Moscow.
- Kushko, N. V. (2016). *Subject vocabulary of the everyday concept sphere*. ASU, Sochi.

- Lak, D. Ch. (2013). *The stylisticsof the Vietnamese language*. Hanoi.
- Lukina, T. A., & Lepekhin, I. I. (1965). *Great Russian Encyclopedia*. Moscow.
- Mzhelskaya, O. G. (2003). *Vocabulary of everyday spoken language of Muscovy XVI–XVII centuries (according to Foreign for studying. Russian. Lang.)*. St. Petersburg.
- Panov, M. V. (1962). On the development of the Russian language in Soviet society. *Questions of linguistics*, 3.
- Prokhorov, V. N. (1953). *Household vocabulary in the language of Moscow monuments of the 2 half of the XVII century*. Moscow: Mysl.
- Rosenthal, D. E., & Telenkova, M. A. (2008). *Reference book on the Russian language. Dictionary of linguistic terms*. Moscow.
- Ryzhkov, V. D. (2003). *Spoken English in Everyday and Business Situations*. Kalinigrad.
- Smolina, K. P. (1990). *The vocabulary of the property sphere in the Russian language of the XI–XVII centuries*. Moscow: USSR Academy of Sciences, Inst. Rus. Lang.
- Sobyanin, V. A. (2004). *The interaction of terminological and everyday colloquial vocabulary in the German language*. Moscow.
- Sokolova, N. K. (1956). *Everyday vocabulary in the language of Voronezh letters of the XVII century*. VGTU, Voronezh.
- Sorokin, Yu. S. (1949). Colloquial and popular speech in the “Dictionary of the Russian Academy” (1789–1794). *Materials and studies on the history of the Russian literary language*, 1, 121–144.
- Sorokin, Yu. S. (1981). On the principles of the historical description of the Russian language vocabulary of the new time (XVII–XX centuries). *Russian language. Problems of artistic speech*. In *Lexicology and lexicography*, 125–134.
- Sudakov, G. V. (1986). Household vocabulary in onomasiological aspect. *Questions of linguistics*, 6, 105.
- Trask, R. L. (1999). *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Tu, K. D. (2007). *The style and features of the lexicology of the Vietnamese language*. Hanoi.
- Tu, N. V. (1976). *Modern Vietnamese words and vocabulary*. Hanoi.
- Vasilyeva, A. N. (2017). *The course of lectures on the style of the Russian language: General concepts of stylistics. Conversation-everyday style of speech*. Moscow.
- Vasmer, M. R. (1986). *Etymological dictionary of the Russian language*. Moscow.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1999). *History of words*. Moscow.
- Zakharevich, L. I. (1974). *Russian-German parallels in everyday vocabulary (Study guide for foreign students)*. Donetsk.
- Zap, N. T. (2015). *The word and lexicology in Vietnamese*. Hanoi.