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Abstract

This paper investigates major points of the role of the language norm in the definition of stylist status. On this case, research was conducted both methodologically and practically. Literature review of the different scholars who studied this topic was also covered by the author. The way of conclusion is linked with vivid suggestions of the research directing to further investigations as the whole.
Introduction

In English linguistics, a stylistic study of lexical strata located on the border of the literary language is currently active. This should be judged by the first acquaintance with literature on stylistics: neither neutral nor literary vocabulary and phraseology currently attracts such close attention of researchers as colloquially-colloquial at all [1][2].

In this direction, stylists make attempts to solve such significant problems as determining the very essence of stylistic decline, searching for reliable criteria for distinguishing stylistic decline from related phenomena (colloquiality, for example), identifying units that manifest this attribute, determining the role of stylistically reduced units in the general system of stylistic means, development of the most effective research methods, etc.

However, it cannot be recognized that these problems have received satisfactory resolution. In linguistics there is no consensus on what should be understood as stylistic depreciation, what are the lexical spheres covered by this phenomenon. Accurate, consistent, and adequate research methods are not well developed. In this sense, a long-standing and unremitting discussion about the status of the vernacular unit in Russian studies and the slang unit in English is indicative [3][4][5].

Literature review

The lack of significant progress in this direction should be attributed to the insufficient development of some basic categories of stylistics in general. We mean issues such as the nature of stylistic meaning (or connotative meaning, in the interpretation of individual modern linguists), the structure and inside the structural organization of the elements that make up the stylistic meaning, its interaction with other types of meanings (denotative and grammatical). The situation is further aggravated by the fact that some scholars deny the status of an independent linguistic category to the stylistic meaning [6][7].

In turn, the problem of stylistic differentiation of phraseology is extremely urgent, because The stylistic aspect of studying the phraseological composition, as it seems to us, is very closely connected with the concept of the linguistic status of phraseological units as such.

The language norm is the object of attention not only of linguists who are engaged in literary language and speech culture. Quite often, the concept of a language norm is introduced to illuminate the essence of the functional aspect of the language, the language system in general. This means that the language can be studied both in the aspect of its internal organization (as a system), and in terms of the implementation, functioning of this system, i.e. as the norm. The language norm is considered in various relationships and relationships with such fundamental concepts of language as system or structure. Such an approach to the norm reveals the most general, universal signs of it, on which the signs of more particular, specific norms (norms of the literary language, norms of colloquial speech, norms stylistically differentiated and undifferentiated, etc.) are based.

The views on the linguistic norm in Soviet linguistics are grouped mainly around two concepts. One belief system is based on language norms put forward by Prague linguists. Other researchers proceed from the concept of norm proposed by E. Coseriu.

According to E. Coseriu, the linguistic norm is “a system of compulsory implementations accepted in this society and this culture: the norm does not correspond to what can be said, but to what has already been said and what is traditionally said in the society in question”. As follows from this definition, the norm embodies the second language plan, given that the first language plan is represented by the system itself. Moreover, it (norm) is already a system, because is only part of the language system, its implemented part. Therefore, in Russian linguistics, the views of E. Coseriu on the norm are quite popular. Critically evaluating the concept of E. Coseriu, Soviet linguists, however, make the most of the distinction between the system and its implementation. Given this separation, some linguists have attempted to clarify, concretize, and to a large extent modify the inconsistencies of the original theory. In particular, L.I. Skvortsov, solving the question of how to combine on the one hand stability, the stability of the norm, and on the other hand the need for changes, the natural development of the language, i.e. how to combine statics and dynamics, which are mandatory for the language, proposed a theory of dynamic interpretation of the norm. The norm acts in two boards: 1) Norm implemented. 2) Norm implemented.

The first consists of two parts: a) actualized part (modern, actively acting, realized and practically codified); b) non-actualized parts (archaisms, rare variants, doublets, etc. ). The norm implemented also has two areas:

a) becoming the norm of neologisms and neoplasms at different levels of the language and

b) fundamentally non-codified area of speech activity (occasionalisms, etc.).

It follows from this that the concept of a norm is not limited to the realized part, it necessarily includes a potential
The second point of view on the language norm, which we adhere to, is expressed in the works of Prague linguists. According to this concept, the norm is identified with the language system, taken from the point of view of its bindingness. In addition, the norm is the beginning regulating the relationship between language and speech, otherwise, the norm is a system of mandatory manifestations of the language in speech.

We quote B. Gavranka on this subject: "I understand the language norm as a system of language, taken in terms of its commitment in the field of language, with the task of achieving the target in the field of the functioning of the language".

**Result and Discussion**

Many Soviet linguists are guided by this provision on the norm, however, topic is not fully investigated from different points. This work is the first attempt in this direction.

However, our task does not include a description of the changes that the colloquial-familiar style has undergone as one of the functional subsystems of the language over the past decades. We are primarily interested in the essence of the change in stylistic decline, in individual phraseological units, if we consider their stylistic meanings in the diachronic section.

With regard to foreign English studies, it is necessary to indicate in this connection that the theoretical development of problems associated with the characterization of stylistically reduced language means, the scope of this work and its results are in clear discrepancy with the results of lexicographic practice. English and American lexicography is represented by a large number of dictionaries, reference books, which scrupulously record almost the entire colloquial element: colloquialisms, slang, jargon, vulgarisms, argo, solecisms, fashionable words and expressions, colloquial cliches, etc. In Soviet lexicography, unfortunately, there is not a single dictionary of this type. However, the theoretical understanding of this rich material in many cases is shallow, comes down to trivial descriptions, although there are some interesting observations. Perhaps the most noteworthy, in our opinion, is the work, as well as some comments on the slang of researchers such as Fr. Zechrist (Fr. Sehrist, 255), G. Krapp (G. Krapp, 229), E. Partridge (E. Partridge, 241; 242; 243), S. Flexner (S. Flexner, 213), W. Matthews (W. Matthews, 235), H. Mencken (238).

Thus, in the linguistic area outlined by us, there are still many unresolved issues, which, of course, stimulate further searches in this direction. Therefore, in this work, the question of the linguistic essence of stylistic decline is posed. The object of the study was the phraseology of the English language, which in this aspect is a completely unexplored area. So, the main objectives of this study can be formulated as follows:

I. A stylistic analysis of the phraseology of modern English with the aim of elucidating the essence of the stylistic decline characteristic of certain groups of phraseology.

II. Elaboration of criteria for stylistic decline.

III. Determining the trends, causes and conditions of the stylistic movement in the field of reduced phraseological units.

In connection with these objectives of the dissertation, we focused on solving the following issues Figure 1.
These tasks are closely related to each other: it is impossible to ascertain the fact of a stylistic change in phraseological units, unless its stylistic status is clearly defined during various periods of the existence of a given phraseological unit in the language.

On the other hand, not taking into account evolutionary, dynamic factors, it is possible to admit an incorrect definition of the stylistic meaning of a unit. In our opinion, a relatively intensive study of the colloquially-colloquial layer of the national language is caused by the following reasons:

1. First of all, the importance of this vocabulary (and phraseology) in the linguistic communication of people, which serves the vast scope of linguistic activity in an informal setting, is unquestionable.

2. Many researchers emphasize that the non-literary sphere serves as a rich reserve for replenishing and enriching the literary language with new units. This is precisely the area in which the spontaneous tendencies of the development of the language are concentrated: here processes are ripening that can have a certain influence on the literary language.

3. The study of irregularities, violations and deviations from the literary norm can contribute to a clearer definition of the concept of a literary language.

4. Attention to stylistically reduced areas on the part of linguists also meets the requirement of logical sufficiency, namely: a comprehensive and objective description of the language necessitates the study of all its aspects, subsystems and elements, their components, without exception. Consequently, the study of colloquially colloquial vocabulary and phraseology is as necessary as the study of other stylistic layers of the language.

In solving the above tasks, we proceed from the following theoretical premises:
1. We consider the stylistic qualities of a linguistic unit as its stylistic meaning, which has the status of an independent linguistic category.

2. The stylistic meaning is the totality and interaction of the functional-stylistic and expressive-stylistic components viewed through the prism of normativity (cf. the point of view of E.G. Riesel 249).

3. The special role of the normative factor in determining the stylistic decline is emphasized, because its essence is manifested only in a special relation to the literary norm.

4. The primacy of the functional-stylistic component in the general structure of stylistic significance is recognized.

The research material was English and American dramaturgy, journalism, and prose, mainly over the past 30 years. In addition, the analysis involved material from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. A continuous sample consisted of 30 thousand pages of text of the indicated genres, 120 issues of the Daily Worker, Morning Star, Daily World newspapers. Our file cabinet consists of 6000 phraseological units, of which 3.5 tons are stylistically reduced units. The number of all uses is about 8.5 thousand.

When selecting phraseological material, we did not find any theoretical grounds in order to limit ourselves to the analysis of phraseological units of any one structure. It was practically advisable to study the whole variety of structural types of phraseological units, for stylistically reduced units do not close in any one or several strictly limited structural groups. Using the classification of A.V. Kunin, one can find among the stylistically reduced phraseological units and nominative ones: kick the bucket - die; box of dominoes- piano; eat like a hog - eat like a pig and others, and nominative - communicative phraseological units: give the cold shoulder - give a cold welcome, button up one's lips - keep silence; and interjections: FE: damn your eyes - be damned! put a sock in it - shut up! draw it mild! - lie, know the measure; and communicative phraseological units: that man wants burning - not at all! That’s what she wrote - that’s it.

In addition, the features of the manifestation of stylistic decline, due to precisely this or that structural type, were not found by us.

In the selection of phraseological material for stylistic analysis, we relied on the phraseological concept developed by A.V. Kunin, and adhered to its definition of phraseological units: “A phraseological unit is a stable combination of words with a fully or partially rethought meaning.” To limit phraseological units from variable combinations of words, compound words or formations of an intermediate nature, the following operations were performed, proposed by A.V. Kunin.

a) sustainability;

b) the stability of a fully or partially rethought value;

c) structural and semantic stability, based on the stability of the lexical composition of phraseological units and on its structural and semantic modeling;

d) lexical stability, i.e. the stability of the lexical composition of phraseological units;

e) syntactic stability.

The indicators of minimal stability in their entirety form a coefficient of minimal stability at the phraseological level, which is unusual for the word, including complex, which is a unit of the lexical level. “Sustainable combinations of words whose stability coefficient is below the minimum are not phraseological units.”

2. The separate formality of this verbal group was established in accordance with the advanced indicators of separate formality:

1. morphological separation of phraseological units;
2. morphological-syntactic separation;
3. syntactic separation;
4. structural and semantic separation.

3. In some cases, it was necessary to establish the “phrases” of the components of this education. This is important when analyzing stable combinations such as “take in”, “give up”.

4. The last stage involves the classification of the analyzed education in one category or another as a result of the data.

The above tasks determined the specificity of the methodological approach in the study. It was carried out both in synchronous and diachronic sections. The following is meant here: synchrony and diachrony are considered as concepts related to the research method. They are delimited from the static-dynamics dichotomy, which are
integral attributes of the language objects themselves, i.e. are in the plane of the language object itself. Therefore, speaking of the close relationship between the two research tasks mentioned above, we mean the natural interaction of the statics and dynamics found in the objects themselves, and not the interpenetration of synchrony and diachrony. The method that we used when describing phraseology in a synchronous plan can be defined as a complex method for identifying stylistic depreciation of phraseological units. It is based on the identification of various features of the functional-expressive order of phraseological units considered through the prism of normativity, taking into account some dynamic factors.

In the framework of this complex method, the following particular methods and techniques were used to solve various research problems: 1) a comparative method; 2) contextual method; 3) the method of stylistic distribution; 4) component analysis; 5) receiving applications; 6) reception of the opposition; 7) receiving quantitative calculations.

The study of stylistically reduced strata is of interest in both theoretical and practical terms. Consideration of this issue, in our opinion, can help to further clarify the essence of the stylistic meaning of phraseological units in general and stylistic decline, in particular, which makes it possible to more clearly and consistently distinguish related stylistic phenomena / colloquialism, on the one hand, and actually reduction, on the other. /, for a more adequate definition of the literary norm itself. The study of the dynamics of the development of stylistically reduced phraseology can, in turn, clarify the question of what role colloquial phraseology plays in the direction of the nature of the changes that the literary and literary phraseology of the English language undergoes in the course of its development [8].

The practical significance of the topic being developed lies in the possibility of using some research results in lexicographic practice, as well as in the practice of teaching foreign languages at school and university.

The concept of norms among Prague linguists is connected with the study of literary norms. However, the description of the specificity of the literary norm became possible only if the most general, universal features of the language norm in general were determined. Unlike the concept of E. Coseriu, the norm, in the understanding of Prague linguists, does not stand out in a special language plan, but as if superimposed on the system, being a necessary prerequisite for the existence of the language system itself.

By a system of language we mean "a holistic object consisting of these elements in mutual relations". Theoretically, you can build an infinite number of statements due to the fact that there is an infinite number of possible relationships between elements. They constitute the potential capabilities of the system, which, in the opinion of L. A. Bulakhovsky, never, in any era, were speaking and could not be used until the end. On the other hand, practically existing rules establish possible combinations, the limit of the possible realization of one or another potency in any particular era. Due to this, there are always combinations of elements that are permissible and inadmissible in any language.

The second, very important characteristic of the norm is that it is the beginning regulating the relationship between language and speech [9][10][11].

Conclusion

Language is represented by such a system from which an infinite number of diverse speech works are created. In speech there cannot be that which is not or cannot be in the system of language. Speech is a language in action. It can be considered as the implementation of the system, and thus the role of the norm is to regulate this process in the language-speech pattern. The very fact of the implementation of the system is simultaneously the fact of the manifestation of the activity of the norm. Being an implementation of the system, speech is presented as traditional (familiar) implementations; non-traditional (occasionalisms), and the role of the norm is to establish this distinction in turn, contrasting within any one sphere, for example, in the field of traditional realizations, will be in the competence of more particular, specific norms: norms establishing the distinction between literary and non-literary, etc. thus, the typology of norms arises.
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