

УДК 81'42:811.111

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/54-2-22>**Anastasiia MOSKALENKO,***orcid.org/0000-0003-2481-1927**Lecturer at the Department of Romance Philology  
and Comparative-Typological Linguistics**Boris Grinchenko Kyiv University**(Kyiv, Ukraine) Ao.moskalenko@kubg.edu.ua*

## LANGUAGE NORM AND NEOSTANDARD LANGUAGE NORM AS OBJECTS OF A LINGUISTIC RESEARCH

*The article considers the linguistic phenomena of the language norm and neostandard language norm of modern European languages, the influence on the boundary's expansion of the conventional norm, as well as the dynamics of their renewal. More freedom of rights in the language is examined due to social globalization, tourism and education without borders, that lead to a greater democratization of society and language. Shaking the boundaries of canonized language includes the entry into the common vocabulary of non-standard elements as slang, dialectisms, pidgins, jargon, neologisms and loans that liberalizes the linguistic behavior of society, changing the normalized state.*

*The purpose is to consider the features of the conventional norm and neostandard language norm in the paradigm of linguistic changes. The methods of our work are descriptive that is used to provide the meanings of such terms as language norm, neostandard language, conventional norm; analytical method that is to analyze varieties of neostandard language forms; qualitative method that is to explore the language democratization field. The results may be used in teaching foreign languages at school, university or master-classes to claim that the updated versions of European languages which are also called neostandard languages tend to be constantly evolving as a modern and live language. In this study, neostandard lexis is considered the most accumulated part of common and used expressions, which is expanding among different classes of speakers and represents the active phenomenon of language changes and standardization of marked vocabulary in European languages.*

*As a conclusion, democratized language is explored as the one that tends to simplify, facilitating communication in the community at all the language levels, but most of all at the lexical level, because it keeps updating and tends to the social context. Vocabulary of various genres has the right to exist in oral and written speech of the national language, blurring language boundaries and giving freedom and new opportunities to communicators without stylistic restrictions. Language becomes accessible and liberalized, regardless of the cultural or regional affiliation of citizens, and democratization gives access to what is out of the norm.*

**Key words:** *conventional norm, national language, neostandard European languages, language democratization, modern European languages.*

**Анастасія МОСКАЛЕНКО,***orcid.org/0000-0003-2481-1927**викладач кафедри романської філології та порівняльно-типологічного мовознавства**Київського університету імені Бориса Грінченка**(Київ, Україна) Ao.moskalenko@kubg.edu.ua*

## МОВНА НОРМА ТА НЕОСТАНДАРТНА МОВНА НОРМА ЯК ОБ'ЄКТИ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНОГО ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

*У статті розглядаються лінгвістичні феномени мовної норми та неостандартної мовної норми сучасних європейських мов, вплив на розширення меж конвенційної норми, а також динаміку їх оновлення. Визначається більша свобода прав на мову завдяки соціальній глобалізації, туризму та освіті без кордонів, що призводить до більшої демократизації суспільства та мови. Розхитування кордонів канонізованої мови включає входження до загальної лексики нестандартних елементів, таких як сленг, діалектизми, піджини, жаргонізми, неологізми та запозичення, що лібералізує мовну поведінку суспільства, змінюючи нормалізований стан.*

*Метою є розгляд особливостей загальноприйнятої норми та неостандартної мовної норми в парадигмі лінгвістичних змін. Методи нашої роботи є описовими, що використовується для надання значень таких термінів, як мовна норма, неостандартна мова, загальноприйнята норма; аналітичний метод, який полягає в аналізі різновидів неостандартних мовних форм; метод якісного аналізу, який полягає у дослідженні поля демократизації мови. Результати можуть бути використані при викладанні іноземних мов у школі, університеті чи на майстер-класах, щоб стверджувати, що оновлені версії європейських мов, які також називаються неостандартними мовами, постійно розвиваються як сучасні та живі мови. У цьому дослідженні неостандартна лексика вважається найбільш наповненою загальноживаними виразами, яка поширюється серед різних класів мовців та активно демонструє явище мовних змін та стандартизації маркованої лексики у європейських мовах.*

*Як висновок, демократизована мова досліджується як та, що має тенденцію до спрощення, полегшуючи спілкування у громаді на всіх мовних рівнях, але найбільше на лексичному, оскільки вона постійно оновлюється та тягнє до соціального контексту. Словниковий запас різних жанрів має право на існування в усному та письмовому мовленні національної мови, стираючи мовні межі та даючи свободу та нові можливості комунікаторам без стилістичних обмежень. Мова стає доступною та лібералізованою, незалежно від культурної чи регіональної приналежності громадян, а демократизація дає доступ до того, що не відповідає нормам.*

**Ключові слова:** загальноприйнята норма, національна мова, неостандартні європейські мови, демократизація мови, сучасні європейські мови.

**Introduction.** Among modern European languages, the tendency to changes is becoming more and more significant, which is connected to many factors of development of modern society and the world as a whole. Social globalization, tourism and education without borders lead to a greater democratization and renewal of society and language. Thus, more freedom of rights appears in the language and new lexical units of the lower register, which gradually enter the language norm, become generally accepted and do not cause negative emotions anymore. Distinguishing democratized languages as extension of the boundaries of the language standard, the terms "language norm" and "literary language" should be examined.

**The object** of our work is the process of dynamics of modern European languages conventional norm. **The tasks** of this study is to examine the impact of neostandard language norm on the expansion of language norm in the European language environment. This paper was provided by **linguistic surveys** based on differences between conventional and neostandard norm. It was supposed to achieve a great acceptance of new-formed units among the speakers and of extended language standards.

**Generally accepted language norm.** Literary language is exemplary, understandable, obligatory and generally accepted, which functions in the vast majority of areas of public life and has both forms of expression: oral and written. The concept of the linguistic standard, according to the *Encyclopedia Treccani*, "defines the diversity of language, which is subject to normative coding (linguistic norm), and serves as a basic model for the proper use of language and teaching in schools" (here in after our translation) (7). Thus, literary language is a language that covers almost all the areas of human activity, such as education and science, the field of socio-political and business relationships, covering scientific, journalistic and official business styles respectively.

Literary language norm or conventional norm has clearly defined features, among which the main place belongs to its normative orientation and orderliness. According to Gryshchenko L., "literary language is characterized by specific features, their interaction, however, depends on particular language patterns: superdialectal national form of existence,

multifunctional use, the presence of established and codified norms (grammatical, lexical, orthoepic, spelling, etc.)" (Grishchenko, 2002: 4). So, we can conclude that the literary language has a national character, i.e. it is used without social and regional speakers' restrictions, and is exemplary and generally accepted in all the communicative spheres of a particular society. Taking into consideration the large number of Italian dialects and the wide range of their usage mainly in oral speech, it should be noted that literary Italian is the only language norm common throughout the peninsula and Italian-speaking countries, which is implemented orally and in a written form.

The written form of literary language functions in the field of state, political, scientific and cultural activities, while the oral form serves the direct communication of people. In the opinion of Gryshchenko L., literary language, performing "a particularly important integrative function in relation to the national community, in contrast to territorial dialects, within which there are smaller dialects with their own individual linguistic specificity, is used as a mean of written and oral communication without any spatial restrictions and unites all the speakers regardless of their dialectal affiliation" (Grishchenko, 2002: 5). This statement once again confirms the superdialectal peculiarity of the conventional norm, which is based on the language codification and its possible usage in all the spheres of communication.

According to another definition of Berruto G., the first characteristic of the concept of standard language is equivalent to "neutrality", unmarked by variations of possible genres; the second characteristic is the normative orientation, codified in textbooks and scholastic traditions, accepted as a correct and "good language" (Berruto, 1993: 37). Thus, all the stylistically marked elements are not included into the conventional language norm. In addition, the standardized language is a polished language recorded in dictionaries, as well as it is considered the official language of literature and teaching in educational institutions.

The normativity of language is unchanged for a certain period of time, but from a historical point of view, over time the norms undergo some certain changes. Normalized language with established norms is also called codified, language norms are

fixed at all the language levels (lexical, grammatical, stylistic, punctuation, spelling, orthoepic), for example, words should be used in the context of their common meanings and also there should be used grammatical rules for sentence construction. It is the norm that is binding for any literary language that makes it understandable, stable, and exemplary.

Language forms that do not meet the norm are considered non-standard and opposed to it. This includes, for example, substandard vocabulary that has a narrower range of speakers (jargon, dialectics, slang) or uncodified communicative form, such as colloquial speech. The usage of normalized or non-standardized language may depend on the communicative situation, as well as on the language behavior of its speakers.

A literary linguistic norm is also called canonized, emphasizing the strict predictability of its various stylistic norms, according to which it functions. According to Shtaltovna Y. “the natural consequence of the departing from the canonized artistic language was the movement and mixing of linguistical-stylistic layers, intensification of colloquial style elements, surzhik, vernacular (pidgin), dialectal language, stylistically reduced, vulgar, jargon vocabulary and, of course, stylistic and genre syncretism and intertextuality (Shtaltovna, 2015: 171). So, shaking the boundaries of canonized language includes the entry into the common vocabulary of non-standard elements that liberalizes the linguistic behavior of society, changing the normalized state.

On the other hand, the language standard, which continues to be used in professional areas, is gradually being replaced by democratized language. Under the standard language, according to Thompson, we define an idealized language as an object constructed by a certain set of socio-historical conditions under which a certain language has acquired the status of a single legitimate language or language of a certain language community (Shtaltovna, 2015: 22). The standard language excludes the affiliation of non-standard elements to the language norm, ensuring correctness, formality and infallibility. At the present stage of language development there is a reverse process of its restandardization, i.e. the inclusion of new lexical units in the adopted standard norm, expanding its lexical composition in accordance to the level of the social development and needs. In the opinion of Shtaltovna Y., “restandardization is a normative approach to language policy, when language processes are aimed at weakening and eradicating the ideology of the standard language, and language becomes an instrument of unification of the language community, serving the interests of all speakers, especially those who were marginalized or infringed on their democratic right

to use their native language” (Shtaltovna, 2015: 25). Thus, restandardization can be perceived as loosening the boundaries of the language standard at different levels of language due to substandard or newly formed lexis, which becomes acceptable in society.

The language norm does not include colloquial deviation, colloquial standard and low register language. The colloquial standard is the colloquial “norm” used by speakers in informal communicative situations. This is a simplified version of the standard language, which is more practical for everyday usage.

In addition to simplifications, there are intentional deviations from the language norm. Linguistic deviation, according to the glossary of intercultural communication, is “a type of communicative failure or malfunction in communication, which reason is insufficient linguistic competence of participants” (Batsevich). Thus, these are errors in language that are made during oral or written communication. In such a case, we can conclude that the colloquial deviation is a lexical or grammatical error in the speech of speakers or a deviation from the conventional norm. Considering the deviation as a purposeful rejection, we can say that this is a deliberate denial of the norm, which is used to give greater expressiveness of phrases.

In addition, there is also low register lexis or stylistically marked lexis that deviates from the language standard, which includes colloquial speech, slang and pidgins, as well as loans and dialectisms. According to Shtaltovna Y. “what significantly belonged to the low register becomes familiar, familiar becomes conversational, and conversational itself becomes a neutral unmarked vocabulary layer” (Shtaltovna, 2015: 21). Activation of low register substandard vocabulary in colloquial language, as well as in the language of the media is used to emphasize casual and informal communication with the listener/ reader and to attract his/ her attention. Such a lexis is distinctive in a journalistic context, so the reader will notice that article, even if the topic does not interest him/ her. This is the main purpose of the newspaper language, because the message should be concise and economical in terms of language, but informative.

#### **Neostandard language as an updated innovation**

The modern language standard, including colloquial language, is marked by extended lexical boundaries and is open to the adoption of new language units of the informal register, lexical innovations and corresponds to the current life of European society. Gradually, some elements of colloquial language are becoming common language units, widely used among the population and the media discourse, which expand the conventional norm. The updated version of the standard Italian language gained extraordinary

popularity in the second half of the last century under the name “neostandard Italian language”. Sabatini F. in 1985 distinguishes it as “italiano dell’uso medio”, i.e. “Italian language of average use”, and Berruto G. in 1987 gives another definition of “italiano neostandard” – neostandard language (Berruto, 1993: 37), which we will follow in our paper. These names were given because Italian tends to be constantly evolving as a modern and live language and is a reflection of its society. Neostandard can also be called other European languages, including modern English and Ukrainian. A neostandard language is an extended version of a standard language, i.e. a language norm that is less formal but commonly used. In this way, both researchers emphasize the expansion of the boundaries of normativity, increasing the linguistic function of expressiveness and the adoption of neostandard language by the language group. According to Rebeggiani L., the name “neostandard language” comes from “nuovo tipo di standard” (a new type of standard), which is simpler and closer to the colloquial variant” (Rebeggiani, 2003: 3). According to Makhachashvili R., a corresponding phenomenon in English is related to the area of phenomenological neo-English (Makhachashvili, 2014: 10).

Neostandard language is the most accumulated part of common and used expressions, which is expanding among different classes of speakers. Before the advent of mass media, such language was realized much more in oral than in spoken language, but with the popularization of Internet communications its field of usage has increased significantly and continues its evolution. According to Makhachashvili R., “electronic media act not only as a mean of transmitting information or interaction, but also reveal their own world-creating, meaning-making, and, as a consequence, language-creating potential” (Makhachashvili, 2013: 1). Thus, having a wide sphere of influence, the language of the media influences certain trends in speech activity, the language taste of its speakers and the spread of specific language tools, mainly in everyday speech. The lexical composition of neostandard language includes elements from lower language registers, such as jargons, dialectisms, slang, neologisms, loans associated with colloquial language forms, which have extended and become lexical components of the national language. This phenomenon indicates the development of language, the implementation of the practical task of language and the expansion of the boundaries of language standards and traditional forms. Under the lexis of lower registers we consider jargon (*secchione, sballo, crackare, loggarsi, zippare, vaitra, tranqua*), dialectisms (*mondina, in soldoni, nel contempo*),

slang (*capiscione, a sbafò, forte*), loans (*freelance, low cost, self training, trend*), dialectisms (*gondola, pesto, rubinetto, abbuffarsi*) and neologisms (*bisteccheria, chiavetta, apericena*).

Democratized language tends to simplify, facilitating communication in the community. Simplification in the conventional norm can be seen at all the language levels, but most of all at the lexical level, because it keeps updating and tends to the social context. According to Berruto G., recently those constructions are being established or have already been established as standards in neostandard language, which were not previously included into the canonized language of grammars and textbooks and tried to be avoided in written and spoken language (Berruto, 1993: 38). It is the active phenomenon of language changes and standardization of marked vocabulary that is called neostandard language, which object is modern European languages.

New words and expressions appear quickly and sometimes disappear just as quickly when, for example, the phenomenon they characterize becomes obsolete. Others remain in colloquial language and later move to the basic, replenishing the composition of liberalized lexis. In addition, the changes also cover phonetic, morphological and syntactic language levels. Some of them have been considered the language norm for a long time, while others are just gaining their acceptability and usability. According to Rebeggiani L., to the generally accepted changes of the Italian language at different language levels we can include:

- Phonetic level: the tendency of disappearing the letter *d*, which is added to conjunctions, for example, *e* and *o* instead of *ed* and *od*;
- Morphological level: replacement of *egli, ella, essi, esse* by *lui, lei, loro*;
- Giving preference to *questo / quello* instead of *cioè: tutto questo è vero*;
- Exclusion of the *codesto* form;
- The advantage of the abbreviated form ‘*sto, sta*’ (*questo, questa*);
- Polyvalent *che*, which expresses the causal and temporal relationship, or replaces *il quale, i quali, di cui, del quale, dei quali*, etc. : *aspetta che te lo spiego; mangia che ti fa bene; quel mio amico che gli hanno rubato la macchina; la casa che ci sei stato ieri* (Rebeggiani, 2003: 6).

New elements are not always used to simplify or expand the language norm. Existing language units can acquire new meanings, which is mostly noticeable at the lexical level, or there is an increase in the usage and acceptance of the already existing phenomenon to the norm. Such a case can be monitored at the syntactic level, according to Berruto G. and Sabatini

F., who note *dislocazione a sinistra* (“left shift”) as a linguistic phenomenon that has existed throughout the history of the Italian language, but has become more widely used today (Rebeggiani, 2003: 4). This is an example of the standardization of a linguistic phenomenon, which was previously only a part of the spoken version of the language, but today is widely used in both oral and written language. In general, *dislocazione a sinistra* implies a different, unusual for the linguistic norm word order in the sentence. Instead of an acceptable and common SVO, the sentence is preceded by a central theme, followed by the usual word order with a repetition of the theme (for example, replaced by a pronoun), thus duplicating the object of action to draw more attention to it: *La valigia l'hai comprata? A Marco gliel'avete regalato quel libro?* In addition, there is also a *shift to the right* (*dislocazione a destra*), which is used for the same reasons, duplicating the object of action at the end of the sentence: *L'ho già incontrato, Gianni.*

As another example of the language norm simplification can be considered verbal simplifications. Thus, it is more convenient to reduce the usage of temporal forms, for example, it is common to use the present instead of the future to denote a planned action (*La Repubblica*: “*Domani vado a costituirmi*”). Other grammatical tense, the most common in use, is the past (Passato Prossimo) or remote past tense (Passato Remoto), depending on the territorial affiliation of communicants, i.e. geographical factor (in the Northern Italy speakers tend to use the past tense *Passato Prossimo*, while in the South they prefer *Passato Remoto* even to indicate relatively recent events). In some cases, it is noticeable the use of the actual method of the Italian language instead of the conjunctive (conditional method).

However, the lexical structure of the language remains the most flexible and dynamic, as the language must be updated and nominate new concepts that appear in society. The lexical structure also tends to recover itself when the old units come back into usage, mostly with a new changed meaning. Some-

times the linguistic norm includes such lexical units, which recently were considered generally unacceptable or used only in certain narrow areas.

The main task of democratization of European languages as a driving force for the expansion of the language norm is to provide the right to use everything that is not or was not previously included in the standard, without causing reproach or surprise to other participants in the communicative process. According to Shtaltovna Y. “global democratization from the linguistic point of view challenges the relevance of ideological standard languages, including restandardization and destandardization processes, that together can be described as language democratization, and the process of standard language transformation in order to make it a democratic (accessible, reachable) tool of communication, which will serve the whole society, represented by speakers with different language invariants” (Shtaltovna, 2015: 22). Thus, vocabulary of various genres has the right to exist in oral and written speech of the national language, blurring language boundaries and giving freedom and new opportunities to communicators without stylistic restrictions. Language becomes accessible and liberalized, regardless of the cultural or regional affiliation of citizens, and democratization gives access to what is out of the norm.

**Conclusions.** Thus, the restandardization of the language norm can be monitored in the expansion of various stylistic boundaries in the language environment and increase of the possibility of using lexical units. Blurring the boundaries of canonized language with new democratic elements includes the entry into the common vocabulary of non-standard elements that liberalize the linguistic behavior of society, changing the normalized state. The renewed form of standard European languages gained extraordinary popularity in the second half of the last century under the name “neostandard language”, which is a reflection of its society.

From the perspective of further papers, we consider the structural and semantic parameters of the conventional norm dynamic of modern European languages.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Il gergo e le varietà giovanili. Italiano per la comunicazione, 2011. Retrieved from: <http://www.slideshare.net/B.Samu/gergo-e-variet-giovanili>
2. Грищенко А.П. Сучасна українська літературна мова: Підручник. Київ: Вища школа, 2002. 439 с.
3. Berruto G. Varieta diamesiche, diastratiche, diafasiche, in *Introduzione all'italiano contemporaneo*. Roma-Bari, Laterza: 1993. 92 p.
4. Шталтовна Ю.А. Лінгвокогнітивні, структурно-семантичні та функціональні параметри демократизації сучасної англійської мови (на матеріалі англійських інновацій кінця ХХ – початку ХХІ століття) : дисертація / Запорізький національний університет. Запоріжжя, 2015. 227 с.
5. Бацевич Ф.С. Словник термінів міжкультурної комунікації. Львів. нац. ун-т ім. І. Франка. Київ: Довіра, 2007. 205 с. Режим доступу: <http://terminy-mizhkult-komunikacii.wikidot.com/d>
6. Rebeggiani L. L'italiano neostandard. Romanisches Seminar. Leibniz Universitat, Hannover, 2002/2003. 14 p.

7. Махачашвілі Р.К. Динаміка англомовної інноваційної логосфери комп'ютерного буття : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Одеський нац. ун-т ім. І.І. Мечникова. Одеса, 2013. 44 с.

8. Махачашвілі Р.К. Феноменологічна неанглїстика: теоретико-методологічні засади : монографія. Запорізький національний університет. Запоріжжя, 2014. 344 с.

#### REFERENCES

1. Il gergo e le varietà giovanili. Italiano per la comunicazione. (2011). [Jargon and juvenile varieties. Italian for communication]. Retrieved from: <http://www.slideshare.net/B.Samu/gergo-e-variet-giovanili> [in Italian].

2. Hryshchenko A.P. (2002) Suchasna ukrainska literaturna mova. [Modern Ukrainian literary language]. Kyiv: Publishing and printing centre "Vyshcha shkola", 439 p. [in Ukrainian].

3. Berruto G. (1993) Varieta diamesiche, diastratiche, diafasiche, in Introduzione all'italiano contemporaneo. [Variety of diametric, diastric, diaphysical, in Introduction to contemporary Italian]. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 92 p. [in Italian].

4. Shtaltovna Y.A. (2015) Lihvokohnytyvni, strukturno-semantychni ta funktsionalni parametry demokratyzatsii suchasnoi anhliiskoi movy (na materialy anhlovnykh innovatsii kintsia XX – pochatku XXI stolittia). [Linguocognitive, structural-semantic and functional parameters of democratization of modern English language. on the material of English-language innovations of the late XX - early XXI century]. Dissertation. Zaporizhzhia National University. Zaporizhzhia. 227 p. [in Ukrainian].

5. Batsevych F.S. Slovyk terminiv mizhkulturnoi komunikatsii. [Dictionary of intercultural communication terminology]. Retrieved from: <http://terminy-mizhkult-komunikacii.wikidot.com/d> [in Ukrainian].

6. Rebggiani L. (2002/2003) L'italiano neostandard. [Neostandard Italian]. Romanisches Seminar. Leibniz Universitat Hannover. Hannover. 14 p. [in Italian].

7. Makhachashvili R.K. (2013) Dynamika anhlovnoyi innovatsiinoi lohosphery kompiuternoho buttia. [Dynamics of the English language innovation logosphere of computer being]. Dissertation. Odesa. 44 p. [in Ukrainian].

8. Makhachashvili R.K. (2014) Fenomenologichna neoanhlistyka: teoretiko-metodologichni zasady. [Phenomenological neo-English: theoretical and methodological principles]. Monograph. Zaporizhzhia National University. Zaporizhzhia. 344 p. [in Ukrainian].