At the lexical level, punning is at a premium. As the example, we have punning in an ad for Dexter shoes, we have a picture of a Dexter shoe worn by a foot and leg in jeans on one side and the same Dexter shoe worn by a foot and leg in dress pants on the other. The word below says it all: "AmbiDEXTERS." The fortuitous similarity of the company's name is capitalized upon to achieve a manipulation over the word "ambidextrous." Although at first blush this seems only a lexical manipulation, this is virtually impossible: the pronunciation of the word hinges, on the breaking and reforming of sound rules as well [6].

So, lexical manipulations are often puns over well-known, bound idioms. We have examples such as the Brooks ad for its running shoes ("Roads Scholar."), the Levi-Strauss advertisement for its painted denims ("Painted Denims. Strokes of Levi's Jeanius."), the Holland-America Trans-Canal ad for its less-expensive voyage across the Isthmus ("Connect the docks and save $600."), the Nissan "Feel your Pulsar quicken." ad, or the Martini & Rossi vermouth quip: "Martini & Rossi. In a glass by itself." These all constitute manipulations at the levels of sound and spelling, "roads/Rhodes," "genius/jeanius," "docks/dots," "pulse/Pulsar," "glass/class" which lead immediately to manipulations at the level of bound idiom: a Rhodes scholar, a stroke of genius, connect the dots, feel your pulse quicken, in a class by itself.

Sometimes, a lexical manipulation may be achieved by capitalizing on the meaning of a foreign word which happens to be part of the advertisement. A particularly poignant example is Goodyear's depiction of its tires on a Pontiac Fiero: "Fiero means 'proud," performance means Eagles." Here, a pseudo-definition is concocted out of the fortuitous pairing of the foreign-named car with the advertised Goodyear tires. Out of this, the reader/viewer gets the notions of "proud performance = Eagles," a rather neat, albeit somewhat bogus, formulation [6].

The grammatical structure of the English language makes this kind of advertising especially lucrative, because of people's tendency to only register those parts of the advertisement that they want to be true. The relationship between words in a sentence is intricate, and we must be aware of the way a subtle shift in the structure of a sentence can change the entire sentence's meaning before we can claim to be immune to the linguistic gimmicks of advertising.

REFERENCE

1. Collins English Dictionary / 8th Edition, HarperCollins Publishers, 2006.
2. Different types of advertising [Electronic resource] / Uttara Manohar. – Mode of access: http://www.buzzle.com/articles/different-types-of-advertising.html. – Date of access: 20.01.2014.
3. Schrank, J. The Language of Advertising Claims / Jeffrey Schrank // Teaching About Doublespeak. – ed. Daniel Dieterich. Illinois: NCTE, 1976.
4. Different types of advertising methods [Electronic resource] / Paul Suggett. – Mode of acess: http://advertising.about.com/od/advertisingprojects/a/Different-Types-Of-Advertising-Methods.htm. – Date of access: 20.01.2014.
5. Beauchamp, T. Manipulative Advertising / Tom Beauchamp // Business and Professional Ethics Journal. – 1983.
6. Alan, C. Semiolinguistic manipulation in print advertising / C. Alan, Ph.D. Harris. – 1989.

UDC 821.111.03

AMERICAN SLANG AS THE REFLECTION
OF NATIONAL AND CULTURAL PECULIARITIES

MARIA SHURUPOVA, KRISTINA MILMAN
Moscow State Regional Institute of Humanities, Russia

The article deals with the notion of American slang, which is an indispensible part of the English language and one of the means of national and cultural peculiarities reflection.

Nowadays, with the rapid development of computer science and means of communication, the role of literature translator as a link in intercultural communication increases. The translator has the responsibility for adequate (appropriate) transference of a literary text. The art of "conveyance the work to the reader" is not only

in the ability to render the text without breaking the usual norms of a given language, but also in the maximum reflection of cultural features of the original language.

One of the "problematic" layers of any language vocabulary was and remains the non-standard vocabulary which is the closest to the live (real) communication, the most clearly expressing the mentality of the native speakers and often idiomatic. According to V.D. Devkin, it is impossible to learn a foreign language without knowing the stylistically colored colloquial vocabulary. Familiarity with the colloquial vocabulary is necessary to understand everyday speech, to master an important part of linguistic and cultural studies and to be able to decode an implication, facetiae and associative side of statements [1, p. 5]. Not a single translator can do without it trying to tie the reader with the author. The non-standard vocabulary is rather diverse, it is represented by jargons, slang, dialects, vulgar and taboo vocabulary and also insignificantly lowered lexical units (close to neutral) which are typical of non-expressive and weakly expressive oral communication.

We consider slang to be the most interesting and at the same time difficult from the point of view of translation. The difficulty of slang units translation is determined by frequent contradiction in its stylistic assessment. This contradiction is expressed in the fact that some authors believe that slang spoils the literary standard, and it should be fought with. Others, on the contrary, see in it some element, giving to the language vivacity and figurativeness and promoting enrichment and language improvement. M.M. Makovsky tells that slang, existing in the language, can be included in its system in case of necessity, thus forming more or less system microstructures. Oral English national standard is inconceivable without slang elements as well as the latter does not exist without the elements of oral standard. In some cases minor language layers can influence on the oral national standard to a greater or lesser extent interacting with it. In this respect John Galsworthy expresses his point of view: "It is quite probable that the majority of vital words of our language used to belong to slang, gradually getting the status of national standard contrary to the protests of the clergy and other circles". Thus, nowadays the English national standard includes such slang words as bluff, billet, minx, flummox, ripping (e.g., place, pictures, ride), blackguard, humbug, flog, soccer, yarn, shabby, sham, pluck ("courage"), whitewash, baggage ("girl"), bet, bore, chap, donkey, hoax, kidnap, mob, odd, trip, character ("man"), bother, fishy ("suspicious") and others [2, p. 25-26]. On the other hand, slang is in constant contact with jargon, professional language, etc., which in its part has an impact on the standard language. Thereupon a well-known American linguist M. Pei says: "It is not possible to neglect the words, which currently can be heard only in slums or within some profession. Tomorrow the same words can be accepted by all the speakers of a given language and enter the everyday vocabulary of Shakespeare of the XXI century" [3, p. 153].

Slang is particularly difficult to translate, because a new slangism or new meanings of an existing slangism have recently appeared in the language; they are generally unknown to the translator and are not registered in the dictionary. The cause of the latter is the fact that dictionaries usually lag behind the continuous development of the vocabulary and lexicographers are careful of including new slangisms in the dictionary, since the existence of slang words is often short and they disappear as quickly as they come into use. Thus, the main difficulty in slang translation into Russian is the new word meaning clarification or rethinking of the word usual meaning in a particular context. In the following example we can observe the contextual use of the word having opposite connotations in American slang and common vocabulary: You look wow! Like training rebels up in the mountains [4] (the term "wow" is used in slang for sarcasm or if you do not like someone or something that someone says [5]. – Ну и видок! Будто вы на марше. Мятежники на полигоне в горах [6]. Потрясно выглядишь. Никак в поход собрался? [7].

Dealing with translation, the translator should be familiar not only with the biography of the author and the definite epoch, but also with the conditions which accompanied his work. The translation of a literary work is the cultural and different ethnic and language groups rapprochement [8, p. 147]. Thus, we note that no less important significance in the process of slang translation belongs to "background knowledge" about this language stratum, i.e. information about the situation where a corresponding slangism is to be used. Thus, in the work "Introduction to translation techniques" by L.L. Nelyubin we find that "background knowledge" is a corpus of information of historical and cultural nature, which are included in the language unit meanings and evoke in the minds of speakers some certain associations typical of the given linguistic-cultural community and are alien to the culture of other nations. "Background knowledge", i.e. knowledge of general conditions, settings, surroundings, the situations of interlanguage communication is obtained by the translator in the course of daily professional activities. "Background knowledge" is also the socio-cultural basis of the text [9, p. 81].

Here are two examples of American slang illustrating the importance of "background knowledge". **Brody** [5] – самоубийство, высотный прыжок [6], свести счёты с жизнью [7] (taking a header or fall (possibly a

suicide attempt) from a bridge span or other elevated structure; coined for the name of the first guy that jumped off the Brooklyn Bridge [4]; **cracker** [5] – белый нищий [6], голодранец из южных штатов [7] (originally the white slave driver because he would "crack" the whip, hence the noun cracker; racist term for a white person; noun slang word used to refer to those of European ancestry; the word is thought to have either derived from the sound of a whip being cracked by slave owners or because crackers are generally white in colour [4], another term for "poor white" [10], a poor usually Southern white [11], «молотильщик», «трещотка» (бедный житель Юга США) [12]).

Professor L.L. Nelyubin also mentions that the translator should press towards improving and enriching his cultural level, mastering nationally specific features of population life and existence in a given country, government, history and culture, language contacts of native speakers from the point of view of the reflection in a language, especially lexical units denoting household items, concepts and situations of communication, and other phenomena of life, not existing in the practical experience of Russian native speakers, constant reading the original and translated literature, publicist and press items, using the Internet and informative media. To master the area knowledge to which the corpus of translated texts belongs, the translator should also know the metalanguage of the subject area in which he works. As a rule, when the translator masters the metalanguage the effective confrontation of translated lexical and terminological equivalents should be achieved practically without using dictionaries (bilingual and monolingual), especially in translation. It is out of the question that "background knowledge" and metalanguage knowledge are interrelated to some extent, since they enrich the long-term translator memory, bring his speech activity to that one of English speakers, and it helps the translator to feel free in any situation and sphere of communication [9, p. 80 – 82].

In conclusion, it is appropriate to quote Professor L.L. Nelyubin's words, offering the translator to adhere to the following rule in translation a literary work from English into Russian: it is necessary to convey the sense of a translated literary work, that cannot be just done as to transfer it into Russian, as if the author himself was Russian [9, p. 121].

REFERENCES

1. Девкин, В.Д. Специфика словаря разговорной лексики / В.Д. Девкин // Немецко-русский словарь разговорной лексики. – М.: Русский язык, 1994. – 320 с.
2. Маковский, М.М. Современный английский сленг: Онтология, структура, этимология / М.М. Маковский. – 2-е изд. – М.: ЛКИ, 2007. – 168 с.
3. Pei M. The History of English Language. – N.Y.: New American Library, 1994. – 488 p.
4. Urban Dictionary [Electronic resourse]. – Mode of access: http:// www.urbandictionary.com. – Date of access: 15.10.2010.
5. Pynchon, T. The Crying of Lot 49. – New York: Harper and Row, 1966. – 183 p. [Electronic resourse]. – Mode of access: http://people.brandeis.edu/~mikek/books/pub/Thomas%20Pynchon%20THE%20 CRYING%20OF%20LOT%2049.rtf. – Date of access: 25.08.2009.
6. Пинчон, Т. Выкрикивается лот 49 / Т. Пинчон. – пер. с англ. Г. Григорьева [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: http://lib.rus.ec/b/144496/read. – Дата доступа: 23.01.2009.
7. Пинчон, Т. Выкрикивается лот 49 / Т. Пинчон. – пер. с англ. Н.В. Махлаюка, С.Л. Слободянюка [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: http://fictionbook.ru/ author/pinchon_tomas_ragglz/viykriki- vaetsya_lot_49/read_online.html. – Дата доступа: 20.04.2009.
8. Писарихина, А.С. Проблема переводческой эквивалентности и безэквивалентности лексических единиц в переводах поэмы Н.В. Гоголя «Мертвые души» на немецкий язык: дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.20 / А.С. Писарихина. – М., 2012. – 169 с.
9. Нелюбин, Л.Л. Введение в технику перевода (когнитивный теоретико-прагматический аспект). Учебник. Английский язык / Л.Л. Нелюбин. – 2-е изд., испр. и доп. – М.: МГОУ, 2007. – 188 с.
10. Oxford Dictionaries [Electronic resourse]. – Mode of access: http://oxford dictionaries.com. – Date of access: 11.05.2009.
11. DTMWO – Dictionary and Thesaurus – Merriam-Webster Online [Electronic resourse]. – Mode of access: http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary. – Date of access: 20.09.2010.
12. ABBYY Lingvo [Electronic resourse]. – Mode of access: http://lingvo.yandex.ru. – Date of access: 10.05.2009.