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ABSTRACT

Ukrainian literary language is a complex communicative system, synchronous-diachronic section of which is informative regarding the state of development of national consciousness, intellectual level of society, and in a broader sense – concerning inscribing of the language in the history of national and world culture. This article is devoted to tracing the temporal and conceptual dynamics of the stylistic norm in the work of Ukrainian writers of the 20th century. The methodological basis for the study was made by such methods as comparison and analysis of literary works of Ukrainian writers of the XX century. As a result of the study, the authors concluded that the linguistic norm is a cognitive reference point for the scientific parameterization of the style norm of artistic discourse. The authors also emphasize that the dynamism of the stylistic artistic norm lies in the ability of the poetic language to respond to the development of artistic and linguistic consciousness, thinking of both the author and the reader in various manifestations.
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DIÑAMICA DAS NORMAS ESTILISTICAS NO DISCURSO ARTISTICO DO SÉCULO XX

RESUMO

A língua literária ucraniana é um sistema comunicativo complexo, cuja seção sincrônica-diacrônica é informativa sobre o estado de desenvolvimento da consciência nacional, nível intelectual da sociedade e, em um sentido mais amplo – sobre a inscrição da língua na história da cultura nacional e mundial. Este artigo se dedica a traçar a dinâmica temporal e conceitual da norma estilística na obra de escritores ucranianos do século XX. A base metodológica para o estudo foi feita por métodos como comparação e análise de obras literárias de escritores ucranianos do século XX. Como resultado do estudo, os autores concluíram que a norma linguística é um ponto de referência cognitivo para a parametrização científica da norma de estilo do discurso artístico. Os autores destacam ainda que o dinamismo da norma artística estilística reside na capacidade da linguagem poética de responder ao desenvolvimento da consciência artística e linguística, pensando tanto no autor como no leitor em várias manifestações.


DIÑAMICA DE LAS NORMAS ESTILÍSTICAS EN EL DISCURSO ARTÍSTICO DEL SIGLO XX

RESUMEN

La lengua literaria ucraniana es un sistema comunicativo complejo, cuya sección sincrónico-diacrónica es informativa sobre el estado de desarrollo de la conciencia nacional, el nivel intelectual de la sociedad y, en un sentido más amplio, sobre la inscripción de la lengua en la historia de la cultura nacional y mundial. Este artículo está dedicado a rastrear la dinámica temporal y conceptual de la norma estilística en el trabajo de los escritores ucranianos del siglo XX. La base metodológica del estudio se basó en métodos como la comparación y el análisis de obras literarias de escritores ucranianos del siglo XX. Como resultado del estudio, los autores concluyeron que la norma lingüística es un punto de referencia cognitivo para la parametrización científica de la norma de estilo del discurso artístico. Los autores también enfatizan que el dinamismo de la norma artística estilística radica en la capacidad del lenguaje poético para responder al desarrollo de la conciencia artística y lingüística, pensando tanto en el autor como en el lector en diversas manifestaciones.

INTRODUCTION

Understanding the structural and functional features of linguistic units of phenomena in the categories of stylistic and normative cognition has heuristic value for the description of the system of literary language. The category of stylistic norms is methodologically defining among them. Defining the essence of the concept of “stylistic norm”, most researchers specify such differential features as expediency, relevance, approbation by time. This is fully consistent with the understanding of the linguistic nature of the style itself—“a kind of creative language activity, type of language thinking, language behavior in different collectively conscious communication situations, compliance with communication conditions in different areas of culture” (YERMOLENKO, 1999). Each style has its own inherent, stylistic norms, which are specific, logical, justified for this particular style. They are tested by its canons and ensure the historical longevity and conceptual integrity of its development.

The interpretations of the stylistic norm, relevant to the modern theory of linguistic stylistics, postulate its understanding as a regulatory principle that determines the construction of the utterance (text) in certain functional and communicative areas (EDLICHKA, 1987), “regulates the use of language units that have a functional-stylistic colouring or are marked by additional expressive-emotional content in accordance with the stylistic system of literary language” (YERMOLENKO, 2001). Therefore, it is logical to state that the codifying-regulatory principle for artistic style as a historically formed functional variation of literary language is the stylistic artistic norm.

The temporal and conceptual dynamics of the stylistic artistic norm is revealed by a comparative study of the language-making practice of authors of different generations of the XX century. After all, the artistic language of this period is a heterogeneous linguistic and aesthetic continuum, in which several dominant aesthetic platforms and directions should be singled out. They are based on various creative standards and principles of text-making, in the comparison of which it is possible to state the longevity of tradition or the development of new poetic norms. At the same time, they reciprocally overlap in many aspects, creating a single space and witnessing common trends in vocabulary changes, thematic expansion of author’s lexicons, syntactic diversity of texts. These parameters establish the non-discretion of the stylistic artistic norm in a comprehensive representation.

The categorical status of the stylistic artistic norm and its difference from the literary norm was substantiated by R. Budahov: “the literary language becomes richer, more expressive against the background of rich and diverse fiction presented by outstanding writers. In this sense, there is a constant and continuous interaction between literary language and the language of fiction” (BUDAHOV, 1967) Going forwards, this idea has been productively developed in the following terminological concretizations: “poetic norm”, “fictional norm”, “esthetic norm”, etc. Using these concepts, the researchers state the following norms of the development of the poetic dictionary: aesthetic, phono-stylistic, neologial, phraseological, syntactic (YERMOLENKO, 2001; PLYNYSKY & PUSTOVIT 1990, L. STAVYTSKA, SIUTA, 2017). Along with this, they consistently emphasize that the linguistic aesthetic essence of the artistic norm is revealed against the background of the existing canon of the literary norm: “in order to deeply study the linguistic and aesthetic phenomenon, it should be compared with others, considered against the background of the same type of aesthetic formations, correlated with the linguistic norm” (STAVYTSKA, 2000). Thus, the linguistic norm is a cognitive guideline for the scientific parameterization of the style norm of artistic discourse.

The correlation of stylistic artistic and literary norms is also considered taking into account external lingual (specificity of the era, cultural, moral and value priorities of the society) and intralingual (norms of word usage, the state of development of literary language, etc.) factors: “Artistic norm is a historical, changeable category; it is modified depending on literary traditions, trends, directions, art schools and individual styles” (YERMOLENKO, 1999). At the diachronic level, it is implemented as “a lexical-figurative and semantic background that chronologically precedes the aesthetic formation considered within the framework of a certain artistic and fictional norm” (STAVYTSKA, 2000).

The concept of fictional (belletristic) norm, which is important in terms of fixation in literary language and concretizing in relation to the norms of artistic style, acts a kind of link in the interaction of literary and stylistic artistic norms – it is understood as “common to all poetic language (language of fiction) field of neutral norms that closely link the literary language and the language of fiction” (HRYHORIEV, 1979). Determining the type of representation of fiction (belletristic) norms in the work of a particular period and in the idiosyncrasy of a particular author is a significant indicator of the correlation of individual and literary norms, forasmuch as “the work of any contemporary poet is perceived not only against the background of current norms of literary language, but also against the background of the average fictional norms of poetic language of a certain period” (HRYHORIEV, 1979).
A convincing example is the conscious orientation towards creative assimilation, a “new experience” of the texts of previous authors, eras and cultures, characteristic of the aesthetics and stylistics of postmodernism. This guideline was implemented both as an individual and as a fictional norm of the artistic language of the late XX century. Its fundamental separability against the background of the general poetic tradition is determined by the radical expansion of the field of semantic- evaluative transformations of the use of quotations as linguistic manifestations of appeals to the texts of the previous culture.

From the outlined, the historical meaning of the stylistic artistic norm follows, the variability of which is caused by the dynamic nature of the artistic language itself, historically social factors, intercultural contacts, the general cultural level of the society, the influence of literary and colloquial language, etc., art schools and individual styles (YERMOLENKO, 1999). Therefore, the dynamism of the stylistic artistic norm or, conversely, the stability of its manifestation can be determined only in the context of consideration of artistic language as a system that: a) is based on ethnic cultural tradition; b) has a temporal-spatial manifestation; c) establishes the cultural paradigm; d) is modified in individual author systems.

The nature of variability and / or stability of a stylistic artistic norm is closely connected with the concepts of “tradition” and “innovation”, as well as with the substantiation of temporal and spatial parameters of this norm. Thus, the temporal variability of the norm is evidenced by textual actualization of universal images (archetypes, symbols, linguistic and aesthetic signs of ethnoculture, concepts) Ukraine, homeland (motherland), land, time, space, people, etc., axiological oppositions own — alien, good — evil, truth — untruth, etc. Their dynamics demonstrates the variability of lexical-semantic compatibility, means of image creation, ways of verbalization and axiolization of reality in the general context of the development of artistic language and in the projection on a specific time frame, when a text was created.

After all, apriori it can be argued that during the XX century the same images: a) are modeled differently, b) are used to express different semantics, c) are used with different values. This thesis is conclusively illustrated by ideological metaphors-stereotypes (Mother — Motherland, brothers — nations, sisters — republics, party — sun, party — truth / conscience), expression, clichés and quotes (be a wheel and a cog; study, study and study again; we’ll go the other way who was nothing will become everything; a spark will kindle a flame; man to man a friend, comrades and brother). Contexts with such word usages show an obvious attachment to the ideology and time of poetry: Donih bahato v tmi lezhalo / Odna do sotsia proostialas / I sotse rury ti ziednala / Z yakykh nezlamna mits lylas. / Iz iskry polumia povstalaj / Iz “Iskry” “Pravda” zainiala (RYLSKY, 1983). With the change of social-political and social-cultural situation, such units have radically changed the axiological message. From this point of view, “the history of how and why the composition of linguistic means, adopted in traditional usage, has changed, is understood as [...] the history of poetic language” (VINOGRAD, 1974).

The idiosyncratic aspect of understanding the artistic norm is represented by the idiostyle artistic norm, which “finds its direct expression in the system of language means and methods of specific-sensory mastery of reality” (STAVYTSKA, 2000). After all, each author lives in his time, social-cultural space and describes the world through the prism of individual experience and the culture to which he belongs. Therefore, the text units produced by him, the characteristics are projected on the normative categories, which have enriched the language at that time.

In order to outline the dynamics of the artistic norm, a level approach is productive, according to which we differentiate phonostylistic, lexical, grammatical, and other stylistic norms. Their definition and description creates a true picture of the development (intensification, stagnation, obsolescence) of linguistic and poetic phenomena, their actualization / peripheralization at a particular stage of development of artistic style, in projection on the basic requirements of genre, trend, aesthetic platform, etc. This technique was introduced in the work “Course of the history of the Ukrainian literary language. Stylistics”, where the sections of vocabulary, phraseology, syntax, figurative means in the language works of outstanding writers show the natural development of artistic language (BILODID, 1973). The concept of “stylistic artistic norm” is not terminologized in this work, however, the authors describe the norm in detail both in level varieties and in a large-scale projection on the history of the Ukrainian literary language. In modern theory and practice of linguistic stylistics, the principle of level representation (with differentiation of level norms) is decisive, as it provides a relevant description of the dynamics of artistic style in its historical duration and at specific stages.
THE STABLE PHONOSTYLISTIC NORM OF THE UKRAINIAN POETIC LANGUAGE OF THE 20TH CENTURY

One of the first experiences of scientific representation of phenomena that collectively represent the “phonostylistic” panorama of the development of Ukrainian poetic language was proposed by V. Koptilov (BILÖDI, 1973), who chose the phenomena of sound recording and sound repetitions as the main object of analysis (assonance, alliteration, sound imitation, sound repetition). Emphasizing the phonostylistic aspects, the researcher confirmed the relevance of the stylistics of phonetic language resources and developed methodological principles for further acceptance of the concept of phonostylistic norm.

The understanding of sound as a semantic, content-forming formant of artistic (primarily poetic) text was established in the 1970s; it was methodologically conditioned by the general reorientation of the reception of poetic language, when both the author and the reader become more sensitive to sound-word modulation, implicitly embedded in it. As a result, the phonetic component began to be considered at the level of stylistic norms. Later, this research trend was categorized in the concept of paronymic attraction. Its introduction into active scientific circulation codified the stability of attention to the maximum sound and semantic correlation of text-making mechanisms. In this regard, V. Hryhoriiev emphasizes that the linguistic-aesthetic essence of sound repetitions in the poetry of the second half of the XX century differs significantly from the practice of sound recording of previous periods, forasmuch as they are transformed into the principle of semantic organization of the text and become minimally differentiated ("words do not so much coincide as differ by one or two or three sounds, and sometimes one sound") (HRYHORIEV, 1990), semantic and systemic.

The publication “Ukrainian linguistic style of XX—beginning of XXI century: system of concepts and bibliographic sources” contains information on the following numerous studies of phonetic resources of poetic language, on the purposeful study of semantic and formal-structural nature of repetitions and semantic approximations, their typological varieties, semantic and functional load in artistic language (YERMOLENKO, 2007b). Noting the establishment of certain phonetic and structural types of attraction, the repetition of paronymic pairs, the active development of group of words and series with identical quasi-morpheme bases, which are synchronously actualized in different authorial idiom systems, researchers identify the most pronounced trends in paronymization of artistic language. Summarizing this experience, as well as our own observations on the dominant principles of phonetic construction of a poetic text, we emphasize the stylistic normativeness of paronymic approximations in the structures:

- epithets: Pronyzhe, prokljune zhakhka zhravlyna zhurba (OLIYNKY, 1985); Obrii nedobryi staie dubala (STUS, 1986); Krapchasti napasti, rokovani roky (DRACH, 1986); I tam de vtomyleys debeli debily, vona do avtobusa lehko dobiba (KOSTENKO, 1989); Vedy mene shliakhtynymy shliakhamy (KOSTENKO, 1989); perha silv u potravu / nam pohanam pohanienym (KALYNETS, 1997);
- metaphorical: Svi prostir pryVertexArray slenstvosm rozhorod (STUS, 1986); Humor — ne Homer (KOSTENKO, 1989); Khodlyo bile khodlyo (VINHRANOVSKYI, 1990);
- comparative: nas shal, yak shkval, nese (DRACH, 1986); vin tsei vokal pidnosvy, yak bokal (KOSTENKO, 1989); Svitlylysia kiosky, mov kiotky (KOSTENKO, 1989); sira vikhola, yak vikhot (KOSTENKO, 1989); Bila fata, yak bila vata (DRACH, 1986);
- antithetical: dokynyvshy derechne khvaly, a ne khuly (OLIYNKY, 1985); Roby shcho khoch, rydai abo radii (KOSTENKO, 1989); Bozhe, ne liosti — stotosti, / Bozhe, ne lasky a msty (STUS, 1986); Velykyi abo dvolykyi. Seredyny tut nema (KOSTENKO, 1989); Podatys mozhna, a podivys — ni (KOSTENKO, 1989);
- list: Ochynyljysia dveri, a vin ii zhival i zhavav (OLIYNKY, 1985); I svit mikryshyalitsia, plavlytsia, palytysia (DRACH, 1986); Tsvit na kashtanakh pomirno, pokirno pohas (OLIYNKY, 1985); Bozhevillia moie, bozhemylylia, / bohomillia moim silozam (KOSTENKO, 1989); Dodumu ditslenh vechiniosirohoso, vechirniosirohusto lastivkam (VINHRANOVSKYI, 1990); Stokolos natsii, stoholos (DRACH, 1986).

The systematic reproduction of certain phonetic echoes, synchronously observed in different idiolect practices, is evidence to ascertain the establishment of the phonostylistic norm. They confirm that “paronyms, already united in advance in the poet’s individual vocabulary by their material proximity, provoke, suggest, and to certain extent determine the directions [...] of associations, although they do not restrict their freedom” (HRYHORIEV, 1979). The consonant base s // n belongs to the indicative sound complexes on the basis of which the expanded
Dynamics of stylistic norms in the artistic discourse of the XX century

The number of “basic” sound associations included in this nest (son, syn, sOntse) is constantly increasing due to the increase of new attractants (syn – sin, osinni – suni, osinni – ostannii). For instance Chyi son, chyi syn odstrilivavsia, padav? (KOSTENKO, 1989); De son, de syn, de tyschi syniv… (VINHRANOVS’KYY, 1990); Ya chuui u noch osinni / Ya mariu knz osinni shn (SYMONEK, 1973); Osinni den, osinni den, osinni den, osinni (KOSTENKO, 1989); I sunii teren v tumanakh syzykh osinnio terpne (OLIiNYK, 1985); nich, shcho vyruke v osinnii, ostannii pisi (RUBCHAK, 1991).

Stability and at the same time idiosyncratic variability of the phonostylistic norm is evidenced by the artistic actualization of the epithet combination biliy bit. The frequency of repetition (in various morphological and syntactic modifications) in the poetry of the second half of the XX century gives grounds to qualify it as a formulaic, aesthetic and normative sound metaphor. chyi biliy bit mii, a chy poluchb> ne promylnyi son mii (STUS, 1986); lechu nad biliy bolem bezdorzh (KOSTENKO, 1989); neryv oholien stebel / Bolem zobilim bezmovno krychat (OLIiNYK, 1985); ty biliy bolom nyesu u lehenyakh (RUBCHAK, 1991); biliy bolom proziv… (RUBCHAK, 1991); vybiliu bolem usta (BOYCHUK, 1991). The structural renewal of the poetic formula is evidenced by the verb correlation bility / bolyty. Skilky bilityshche / Bilomy tsvitu, / Skilky bolytyshche / Bilomy svitu (DRACH, 1986); C, yak boliov – azh krov bility (OLIiNYK, 1985).

The stereotypes of semantic associations motivated by a sound image are demonstrated by the correlations synchronously actualized in the idiospheres of different authors ruby – roki (Ya za toboi prosplavai / ruky, roky svoi (VINHRANOVS’KYY, 1990), zhyty – zhaty – zhyty – zhytillia Tozh nam vse zhytyu/ buine zhyto zhaty (DRACH, 1986); Nabyteko zhasheh grudem zhaty zhyto (RUBCHAK, 1991); I my sobi kazuly, shcho zhytillia – posiyanzh zernyn dornile zhyto (BOYCHUK, 1991); Moue zhytillia potroschene, mou zhyto (SYMONEK, 1973); Bih po zhytillia, red po zhyto (OLIiNYK, 1985), sonste – sertsie (Bent sOntsa – kladit meni v sertsia (DRACH, 1986); Vytkhokkie soloveiko – / Sonste yomy po sertsie (DRACH, 1986); Dzhyzhat na zhyvyhlytshakh / sOntsa i sertsia dytystva (RUBCHAK, 1991)), sviatly – svity / Prudy, Skovorodo, / osvytly / (OSVITY (DRACH, 1986); Den mii hriushchyi… / Blahoslov. / osvyty / OSVITY (OLIiNYK, 1985); vona ziaziaketsia meni – / svity, / Sviatlytsia (Stus 1986); doloni, shcho v miisichnykh plesah / pro sviatst svitiat (RUBCHAK, 1991)).

In the linguistics of the writers, working in the 1990s, paronymic attraction continues as a phonosemantic norm, it is revealed as a means of intertextualization. Thus, the context pinniu vanini biliu panniu marening spravdystia will come true provided that the recipient has sufficient competence, it appeals to at least two author’s texts (Ya povertaus, panno moia pinna (VINHRANOVS’KYY, 1990); Panna, pinna, khvylia plynna (BOYCHUK, 1991)) and to the precedent of the myth of the birth of Venus from sea foam in all the illustrated contexts. However, such referentiality of the artistic image is implemented only under the condition of “linking vectors that lead to a broad cultural context, which in relation to any text acts as an external semiotic environment” (MOZHEIKO, 2001).

In modern linguistic and poetic practice, the tendency to the intensified exploitation of separate paronymic pairs is also implemented; it is relevant for the creativity of previous periods [for instance, nizny – snizhny and rows [for instance, three-membered semantized sound row sunii – son – sonny]. When comparing the work of poets of different generations, the intersection of associative-sounds plane is revealed, it is a sign of the formation of phonostylistic norm: Po synih snakh prysnytsia sonna syn (N. Fedorak) – / sonni soniashnyky suni sonnykh kis (VINHRANOVS’KYY, 1990); peliustka posmikhetnia nizhno i snizhno (M. Rozumny) – / nizhno, mii snizhny sobor – pereliah (DRACH, 1986). Such phononic correlations testify to the affiliation of the phonostylistic norm in the linguistic styles of Ukrainian poets of the XX century, belonging to different creative generations and aesthetic platforms.

WAYS TO EXPAND THE VOCABULARY OF THE UKRAINIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The individual author’s word formation is an important norm for assessing the poetic discourse of the XX century. Synthesizing formal-derivational and semantic aspects, neolexes testify to the intensity and creativity of individual searches of authors and at the same time confirm the universality of word-forming models. Therefore, researchers G. Vokalchuk (2008), Zh. Koloiz, N. Holikova fairly state that the elucidation of semantic, derivational, functional-pragmatic parameters of occasional lexical item significantly complements the idea of trends and patterns of updating the national poetic dictionary in a broad historical context. Productivity of aesthetically oriented word formation in different genres and styles and space-time segments of the Ukrainian artistic
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language of the XX century is due to the efforts of poets to actualize the expressive potential of the word and achieve a certain expressive and stylistic effect.

Innovations are called new realities, processes, concepts (nominative function), express the author’s attitude to the denoted, give it an assessment (pragmatic and evaluative function), and also overcome the automatism of language expression. Since the tendency to regularity systematically opposes the tendency to expressiveness in the artistic style, the neologization of the dictionary here is more active and according to its own internal laws. These laws are different from other functional styles of the modern Ukrainian language.

“Fitting” in the literary language is important for the author’s neoloxes, compliance or non-compliance with the word-forming, stylistic, aesthetic norms applicable for the period of their creation and for the language system in general. After all, the occasional nomination is “an unusual, expressively colored word formed on the basis of a word or phrase in the language, sometimes in violation of the laws of word formation or language norms” (YERMOLENKO, 2007a). The creative essence of occasionalisms is determined by the authors’ focus on the originality of language expression, on updating the internal form of words, discovering new semantic nuances: ‘in order to say something new, to embody or convey a meaning not yet known, but tangible to the poet, it is necessary to overcome the “eternal way of expression”, so the norms of literary language cannot be violated if the artist wants to say “new word”’ (HRYHORIEV, 1990). Another thing is that the regulator of such deviations from the norm or their deliberate destruction should be the clarity of the text.

Expansion of the vocabulary of the Ukrainian literary language of the twentieth century occurs primarily due to normative, relevant for literary word formation dictionaries and methods of derivation – affixation (suffixation and prefixation), composition. At the same time, the importance of less productive word-formation resources cannot be denied. So, the poetic dictionary of the Sixties is actively enriched by neolaxes with peripheral prefixes for literary derivation па-, су-, по-: voznesena nad padollyam silz (KALYNETS, 1997); Z lozha namplyati v pakholodi tyshi (DRACH, 1988); Bryzne lysam buyno Te pahillya (PAVLYCHKO, 2003); steblo, павив, баринок [KALYNETS, 1997]; nichni i pazyherlyi zvirí (PAVLYCHKO, 2003); Hodayet’sya paviv, a sentsre ne hasne; pravdvyvy padi bez* ýazykhyk silv (STUS, 1986); Tsy Bohom poslana Holhoe/ vede u padli (STUS, 1986); Tut paverkh, пан на, pazhyttaya i paskin (STUS, 1986); sutemna syn* на bronzove cholo (KOSTENKO, 1989); v sutemnaya rihu* kaye meni (KOSTENKO, 1989); Vzhe pohoryu holos snowyhaye (STUS, 1988); pohoryu/ vesely benket bozhev (STUS, 1986); zatkala vikna ponich volokhata (STUS, 1986); spiznili i nadto porann* tiumlyat*sa po nashykh snah (KALYNETS, 1997)

The asymmetry of the common language and literary stylistic norms can be traced in the noun word formation using prefixes of foreign origin mikro-, kvazi-, anty-: Na tykh planetakh – svoye mikrolyudytsvo (DRACH, 1986); Mikro-Sodom, zashorena Homorra (KOSTENKO, 1989); Po toy bik kvaziistency (RUDENKO, 1991); antykov*yu zapalyvyi bezmerytya (KALYNETS, 1997); yakas* nevdoma planeta Antyzemlya (KALYNETS, 1997); v antysvitl* ye antylishky / u narodkh ye antynarody/ stotilftyakh ye antyviky (KOSTENKO, 1989), aby uvity v antysebe (STUS, 1986).

Another aspect of the neological norm is the creation of neutral nouns with ending -ya. Its specificity is determined by the time marking and accentuated idiostyle expression in the works of I. Drach (1988) [bezmi*ya, stokrilya, kaydannya, kharavar*ya, hromov*ya, krutorizhzhya], M. Vinhranovskyi (pereyar*ya, snizhynnnya, perelettya, temnovynnya, namystynnya), D. Pavlychko (1909) [zakordonnya, plytya, krylyla], V. Stus (1986) [svichaddya, bahnettya, kvittya], L. Kostenko (1989) [chornoknyzhzhya, chortnobyry*ya]. The activity of this model is motivated by the implicit expression: zamknut* tyureenni brami*ya (M. Osadchyy); nochey chornoknyzhzhya chytayu po buvakh (Kostenko 1989); prokhopytys* chornokrylyam* gid sotnem bozhevino-bilym (STUS, 1986); bolyache ryakhcko/ za chornovodyarn doli spohad-son (STUS 1986); zakolysuye, zavorozhuce/ chornobryv*ya takykh nochey (Kostenko 1989); u snakh zaliftayme dyako Zirko u kharav*ya (Drach 1986); lelechko krylyla pomakh obmorozvy meni oblychnya (PAVLYCHKO, 2003).

The relative balance of the neological norm is supported by word formation with suffixes of subjective evaluation (duminitive and rude meaning) in poetic language, which in activity correlates with the corresponding processes in literary practice: Zetatyaty pylyuhyt palyv pozhukli sterni (DRACH, 1986); My – pereterchhky chornychuschi (DRACH, 1986); Zdiyemo meni khoch no yakey?/ Litatenyat*ko neshchasne (VINHRANOVSKYI, 1990).

We recognize the productivity of adjective and verb innovations as indicative from the partial linguistic stratification point of view: iriyny klyuchi, ovohnnena mova, kanna svitanna, dolyna chasha (VOVK, 2000), strunysta krov, krovysti budni, hrebinnia pire, vin banduryt, dni zavidi myuyut / (Ruchek 1991); neshchastlivyti potresbi, vyholodynyu holod, vapniyut slova, krayevydy nepotrivniyut, lyudy neznayomiyut / (BOYCHUK, 1991).
dyvholosyt' tat' (STUS, 1986), snihovyet'sya daf'-khytayt'sya (VINHRANOVS'KII, 1990). The normativeness of the illustrated neologisms is confirmed by analogues in the linguistic styles of authors of younger generations (eighties, nineties, etc.) (VOKALCHUK, 2008). A characteristic stylistic feature of the considered poetry is the active use of complex neolexes, different in word-forming types. Their number is associated with the significant productivity of the method of basics and word formation, which allows saturating the newly created lexical units with the necessary semantic and expressive nuances. The correlation of the processes of updating the artistic and literary vocabulary, and the stability of the correlation of neologial and literary norms, is demonstrated by composites with color, numbering, audio and somatic components.

A significant micro-corpus recorded among neologisms-composites in the literary discourse of the twentieth century are units in which the motivating component is the name of color. As the most productive among them we single out innovations with achromatics chornyy, bilyy (black, white): chornostav, chornokrylyya, chornovoddy, bilousto (STUS, 1986), chornizemlya, chornorekreyya, chornovelchye, biloshelesnya (DRACH, 1986), chornokvit, chornoptakh, chornolis, chornshylyakh, chornodolya, bilovody, biolotnynyy, bilostela (KALYNETS, 1997), bilokvit, chornokrylyy (VINHRANOVS'KII, 1990), bilchray (oiliynyy, 1985); choronoruka (PAVLYCHKO, 2009).


The neologality productivity of such colors as zolotyy ta sirnyy (gold and silver) is also indisputable: krapl zolotomorya (KALYNETS, 1997), rybyk sribnoperi (KALYNETS, 1997), Styrboh zolotolykyy (RUDENKO, 1991), zolotovuste sontse (KALYNETS, 1997), divchyna zolototchola (DRACH, 1986), krnytsya sribnokvonna (OLIYNYK, 1985), sribnoryly khoral (STUS, 1986), movleno zolotousto (KALYNETS, 1997), udaryt sribnokvonna (OLIYNYK, 1985).

The stable longevity of the norm is evidenced in the literary practice of the twentieth century by the creation of complex neologisms with numeral prepositional components sto-, tysyacha– (hundred-, thousand-) which in literary language are the expressions of the highest degree of manifestation of a sign or expression: storozherzany (TYCHNYA, 2011), stooryly, stazovkyy, stoslyly, stodzoveny (DRACH, 1986), stohalyly (SYMONENKO, 1973), stavovny (PAVLYCHKO, 2009), stasurnyy (VOV, 2000). At the idio-stylistic level, this norm is clearly manifested in the speech of V. Stus (1986), where the corresponding neolexes act as hyperbolized images – actualizations of the seven ‘sufferings’: Chervonyy bif od nahaya v ochatk rozkhodyvyya stokolom Svit obstupaye stotryk; stoholosinya bilykh vust; Kryk stousty, Molin stolobykh ty ruka; lyuty zoyk zavruny'sya stozhaly.

The value of the illustrated neoplasms prevails over their informativeness, since the main function of the numeral element is the hyperbolization of the meaning embedded in the second creative basis. Presumably a significant segment of normative-poetic word formation is formed by "anthroporiented" units with creative components-somatisms body, face, forehead, eyes, eyebrows, heart, hands, throat hadyuka vohnetllya, hrihky usmikhenolytsi, naymennyya hordolytsy, zdarya vibovnychok, suputykny antenholobyy (PAVLYCHKO, 2009); sobor kraszvolotsy (VOV, 2000); droz bezmzhoonoi (RUCHAK, 1991); nebo vysochole (SYMONENKO, 1973); midyanohorly trybun (DRACH, 1986); midyanohorly surmna (STUS, 1986).

The innovations of the considered thematic group, formed with the help of the above-mentioned and other creative components, normatively exist as names of specific physical features that are perceived visually (divchata bronzvolotsi – I. Drach (1986); zwizdar hostoborody, stvorinnya lastohrudye – L. Kostenko (1989)), characterological features (pyrnts nizhnobyuby, vona kam'stannastna – I. Drach (1986)), as elements of a metaphor (ohnennoyazyky znak – I. Kalynets (1997); nebo vysocholove – M. Rudenko (1991); bilovody slovo – I. Drach (1986)). These associated complicated neolexes confirm that “the writer with the help of language means reflects the world through the prism of his activities, social and individual experience” (YERMOLENNYK, 1999).

The integrity of the neological artistic stylistic norm is supported by word formation with the use of creative elements – the nuclear units of the national poetic dictionary. These poetic include sontse, nebo, kivity, viter.
krylo (the sun, sky, flowers, wind, wing); v sertsi liša – šchedryy santspad (KOSTENKO, 1989); Sontsehin, kapilyar solomy (DRACH, 1986); slovo/ Prokynet’sya yanym santsseholovom (DRACH, 1986); Bīl’ vymrâ/ U hrandoynim santssetantsi (DRACH, 1986); Sontseoblychchya zostanet’ya ti’llk’/ spomnom zryme (RUBCHAK, 1991); Yak boljache ryakhkochya santssepruh (STUS, 1986); Zvorkohobylyysya aystry/ pryosinnim santeleitom (STUS, 1986); na miy zhyvit’/ poday santssevorot (KALYNETS, 1997); U syzo-zbyrenunebopad/ Zdlymy meni […/ Litatenyatońko neshchasne (VINHRANOVS’KY, 1990); sants – ti’llk’ v slovonebi vidshukaty (DRACH, 1986); pryvitaye osin’/ mene/ morozokvitamy (VOVK, 2000); Dyvovitamy maren’/ tysoń/ slova (RUBCHAK, 1991); khoche na vitri vyplest’/ sny krylokkuy ikar (RUBCHAK, 1991); Rab dukhy konokrylykh (RUBCHAK, 1991); syn’okryle movchannya v yoho oachak (RUBCHAK, 1991); Krov’yu vlyvul/ kryloyuby (RUBCHAK, 1991).

Demonstrated neological productivity emphasizes the significance of poetics as linguistic constants of national culture. Non-systemic from the point of view of the modern word-forming norm are individual and personal forms of the highest and highest degrees of comparison of adjectives: Vin vić misyatsya chuzhchyy (RUBCHAK, 1991); sírny ptakh malishyy vid sľozyny (OLINOV, 1985); Taki orly, odyn orlishyy inshoho (KOSTENKO, 1989).

Individual author names of characters are perceived as linguistic manifestations of poetic and word-forming norm. Their creation is based on various features: a) characteristics of the type of occupation, performed specific actions, functions: bzholy u borodi solodarya (KALYNETS, 1991); Vona mene boryt’sya – rubacha (PAVLICHKO, 2009); Svichonosytsya ya bohohkvala (VOVK, 2000); b) features of appearance: chornnyvych chy bilyavych; c) hobbies, interests of a person: shche odyn z kinoviyrvychkh; Dushu vidav orhanu pożity (DRACH, 1986); d) trait of a character, habit: Pokirilvys’t – yak papirets’/ zvidky povine – povinets’ya (KALYNETS, 1997); Nadarenno vse, znenavysa (STUS, 1986); Nikola ya ne umryalo (KALYNETS, 1997); Skifi ky obereznychkh oberezhnykh (DRACH, 1986); Ty – sun’holov. Ty skiri’ napropadymy (KOSTENKO, 1989); vidhorody domy i stayni/ … vid kryvojka vid kryvoysta (KALYNETS, 1997); d) a momentary condition: Buly y soldat-k’ski zharty – voyenrab (STUS, 1986). In general, the study of the neological norm of poetic language of the twentieth century. reveals productive ways of creating author’s neologies, the contextual pragmatics of which are determined by the semantic and expressive or verification necessities of the poetic text.

THE STYLISTICS OF THELEXICAL NORMS OF THE ARTISTIC LANGUAGE

The study of the level of lexical norm involves the analysis of the dictionary of the language in terms of determining the characteristic stylistic verbal and pictorial means, their microcontextual functions and emotionally expressive connotations. At the same time, it is fundamental to consider the fact that the stylistics of lexical means of poetical art is based on determining its place in the system of literary language, the relationship with the literary lexical norm. So, for the relevant characteristics of the formation and dynamics of the stylistic norm, it is necessary to determine the thematic groups of vocabulary that form the basis of the dictionary of the artistic language of the twentieth century. We include here:

1) everyday language, the stylistic pragmatics of which is associated with the reliability of the description of the common picture of the world;
2) old words (archaisms, historicisms), which create the cultural and historical context of the depicted, stylize descriptions, language of the characters;
3) dialectisms, which perform the function of markers of areal culture in the linguistic structure of the work of art;
4) folklore and ethnographically marked vocabulary, which is the main body of linguistic and aesthetic signs of national culture;
5) the names of colors (color vocabulary), sounds (audio vocabulary), smells (odorative vocabulary), which serve as a means of outlining, showing, expressing the sensory picture of the world;
6) names of natural phenomena;
7) temporarily marked vocabulary;
8) names of space;
9) socio-political vocabulary used to describe the temporal, historical and ideological context of the day;
10) military (battle) vocabulary is used as a means of linguistic and temporal stylization, a specific description of battle situations;

11) terminological and professional vocabulary is relevant to artistic texts on production topics;

12) foreign lexis, which creates a national linguistic color.

The list above does not exhaust the whole size of the language dictionary, but represents the main lexical and thematic segments. We can trace the dynamics of the artistic lexical norm by their component content and temporal development. For example, the demonstrative expansion of semantic and aesthetic content can be traced to the nominations that form the lexical and semantic fields "man", "nature", "time", "life". In a broader perspective, they illustrate the variability of the national linguistic picture of the world in accordance with the temporal and spatial dimensions of literary and written practice.

These trends are convincingly illustrated by the stylistic actualization of the nominations of the thematic sphere "nature". According to researchers S. Yermolenko (2001), L. Stavytska, H. Siuta (2017), a prominent place in the relevant segment of the poetic dictionary belongs to the images of the lexical and thematic group "sky": sky, sun, moon, stars, ray, lightning, clouds. Formed in folklore, in ancient Ukrainian literature, in the language of the authors of the nineteenth century (primarily romantic poets), the first third of the twentieth century (modernists, neoclassicists), the tradition of its use is significantly renewed by individual practices of the authors who are called the Sixiers. They modernize the usual structural and semantic types of metaphorization, and, consequently, dynamize the artistic norm: na vydnokrui santsy zairzhalo (PAVLYCHKO, 2009); ludy v santsy khodyly, swyatkye santsy zoloty stovpy, pinrayu hlyboko v santsy (DRACH, 1986); santsy yshlo v movchazonu vyzenomu nebi; Prozora nez hlubymi poynalya... dytnyne santsy (STUS, 1986); khyzhe santsyopoludnye i nebo zhytyne dayut (STUS, 1986); Sants, santsy utikaye, zyzooke i zlozive (STUS, 1986); tmyane dzerkalo svitlyje, mov drihiba santsy vstromlena u nich (STUS, 1986); Ukraedene santsy zyzyt skharapudzhenym okom (STUS, 1986); Sontsem dushu zhadihnu nalyj (SYMONENKO, 1973); Bahyryane santsy sutinnyu lisnoyu/u prosvit khmar pokazuye kino (KOSTENKO, 1989); Sydyt/ prosmolena vorona/v bereti santsya nabakry (KOSTENKO, 1989); Zymove santsy na plechyi, mov hlek (KOSTENKO, 1989); YA pishov dorohamy krutymi/ cherpnuty santsya v chuzhiny (BOYCHUK, 1991).

Sacred vocabulary is a more dynamic segment of the dictionary of modern language from the point of view of formation of a new stylistic norm. Due to the inconsistency with the ideological guidelines of the Soviet era, such units, although recorded in the idiosyncrasies of the authors of the twentieth century before the independence period, but note their slight relevance: U ts’omu sviti sens lyshe odyt: "Pobachyty Tvorzya dukhovnym okom" (Rudenko 1999); Lys ty mene, Hospody-Bozhe, prosyty (STUS, 1986); I Boha Maty plakala s’rozamy/ Ta pomozhit’ nesty yomu toy khrest (KOSTENKO, 1989); Baby svatytye yabluka na Spasa (KOSTENKO, 1989). Their "explosive" actualization is evidenced by the stylistic models of the authors of the late twentieth century (eighties and nineties), where synonyms and sacraely marked concepts and nominations of church objects, buildings, rituals, customs, etc., (angel, archangel, apostle, cherub, abbot; prayer, liturgy, to pray, akathist, offering; icon, iconostasis, ladanka, altar, oil, psalm, psalter, lamen) are used both in the literal sense codified by dictionaries and in the semantically expanded. For example, the names Kayin, Avef, Petro (Cain, Abel, and Peter) which implicitly contain specific religious information, most often exist as established symbols, carriers of linguistic and cultural memory: Cain is a fratricide, Abel is an innocent victim, Judas is a traitor, Moses is a spiritual guide, a leader, Herod is a cruel man, Dessim is a cunning woman, and many others.


The dynamics of the lexical-semantic norm in this segment of the poetic dictionary is obvious. The examples of the stability of the norm of figurative and aesthetic use are the biblical images of Noah’s ark and thirty pieces of silver. At all stages of the development of the Ukrainian poetic language of the twentieth century, we observe their traditional symbolic meanings, codified in dictionaries of literary vocabulary, and new semantic, evaluative and verbal formats: Noah’s Ark – “a safe place; means of rescue; a place of significant concentration of people, animals, etc.”: Nache v Noviy kovcheh, nas upkhalos’ v tsey Chas nepomalu (ZABUZHKO, 2013); V bukneri bulo povno meshkantsiv – ditye, zhinok, staryikh. … – Noviy kovcheh – zavazhyv Khoma (O. Honchar); trydtsya’t sribnyakiv – «tsina zradyh: Ty, zvychayno, ne toy, shcho hotovyy za trydesyat’
sribnykh. – Ale vzhe i ne to, shcho rozprzestšya za lyudy svoya (ZABUZHKO, 2013); pokaysya paskudo/ … / yakoho khrina prodavsya za trydtsyaš hnylykh eskudo (ANDRIUKHOVÝCH, 1995).

The time-marked, formalized in the early 1960s and actively continued in the following periods of development of the national artistic language, is the development of folklore and folk song traditions. At the lexical level, this is evidenced by units of folklore and ethnographic, ethnographic dictionary, which in other terminological qualifications are defined as linguistic and aesthetic signs of ethnic culture (Yermolenko 1999). In the works of L. Kostenko (1989), D. Pavlychko (2009), V. Symonenko (1973), I. Drach (1986), V. Stus (1986), I. Kalynets (1997), M. Vinhranovskyi (1990), M. Rudenko (1991) the nominative-evaluative possibilities of the names of folk clothes are actualized and mastered in a new way (scarf, corset, spare wheel, sheet, casing), everyday realities (makira, jar, mortar, night, spindle, towel), images of national mythology (mermaid, witch, mavka, ghou, forester).

At the same time, their inherent cultural and aesthetic information is often semantically and evaoustic transformed or acquires a universalized aesthetic sound: brynjať rákety veretén' v halakytski kahantsevovy mistyky (KALYNETS, 1997); u sayevo tsilyushchim svichvy/ zitkhnuly hleky; svichnyky (KALYNETS, 1997); radjuť hlechky puzať (VINHRANOVSKYI, 1990); bili moyi rushnky – tse kryla moho narodu (DRACH, 1986); na arfakh predwichynky krosenť tchuť barvisty melodiy kylymv (KALYNETS, 1997). In the future, this normative-poetic tendency consistently continues in the language styles of the authors of the following generations: ya tkal na krosnakh/ svyi prostyť; polotnyany svit (MAIDANSKA, 2007); chervonolystsya/ hladyska, shcho na chastokoli (MOISÍNEKO, 2009). The filling of the poetic dictionary was also influenced by the tendency typical for the second half of the twentieth century to literarize the literary language. Given this extralinguistic factor, the defining feature of the Ukrainian literary language of this period, researchers call the interaction of artistic and journalistic styles (PYLINSKY & PUSTOVIT, 1990).

Its result is the saturation of literary texts with typical journalistically marked syntactic constructions, metaphors, paraphrases. As an individual norm, we state such journalistic trope and expressiveness in relation to the idiosyncrasies of I. Drach (1986), M. Vinhranovskyi (1990), and M. Rudenko (1991). The active components of the language creation of these authors are the socio-political words people, humanity, eternity, existence, the universe, freedom, conscience, brotherhood, truth, epoch, time, and others. Koly narod zaklopotany zhalydaye uv ochi narodovi/ Ruta-my'ata braterstva/ Vyrosto po pleči samopovahy (DRACH, 1986); Shtrormamy zmoreny, hreby/ Tudy, kudy zvytyazho klyche/ Velinnya sovisti y doby (RUDENKO, 1991); Khudozhnyk – tse svitohiyad i talant!/ Yoho dukhoozbroyennya – suchasnist/! i plan dumok, i nerviv yoho plan/ Lyahaye v plan doby i u vsechasnist' (VINHRANOVSKYI, 1990). At the same time, the entry of journalism into literary texts is accompanied by a noticeable expansion of their semantics and obvious expressiveness.

The opposite aspect of poeticization of the literary norm of the development of socio-political units (lexical units and expressions, language formulas) is represented by the tendency to their reduction, negativization in the works of dissident authors. The change of the stylistic register is connected with the subject matter and inventive tone of the works, the essence of the phenomena depicted in them: Moya epokha do pidrobok lasy/ V samiy istoti škovanaya turyma (RUDENKO, 1991); Dovkola sopky i horby, kaminnya, zolota i kosti/ Hey, zemlyaky, zakhodne v hosti, piddantsi spio ni doby (STUS, 1986).

Also in the texts of V. Stus (1986), M. Rudenko (1991) we define lexical synonymous nominative series as markers of idiostyle norm from the point of view of publication of the poetic dictionary. Their components reflect the concepts relevant to the linguistic consciousness of dissidents – captivity, prison, prison, bars, barred wire, fence, fence, walls, towers, guard; iz sebe vyklych leva i shaly; miz zasuwyami, gratomy, zamkamy/ bo zatsvitalye vsesvit shpychakamny, / kolychymy drotnay veremiy (STUS, 1986); Pereletit' mene, pereletit/ cherez droty, parkany i horozi/ na Ukrainnu (STUS, 1986); wymerly dereva y pty yi: / Pozalysyalys' vyshky i droty (RUDENKO, 1991).

So, let’s make a conclusion that the actualization of the artistic stylistic norm depends on the genre and thematic orientation of the work and is logically motivated. The poetic dictionary of the second half of the twentieth century is actively supplemented by the terms and word usage of special areas of scientific and technical communication. This tendency correlates with the general processes of development of artistic style and literary language in general; in the period of active development of science and technology communicative activation of terminological vocabulary, general scientific concepts and specialized nominations becomes a sign of the times. In works of art they are used in both direct nominative and figurative sense, become components of metaphors. We can already trace this tendency at the level of headlines: “Protuberants of the Sun”, “DNA Ballad

Determinologization is another time-marked lexical norm of the second half of the XX century. Integrating into the artistic text, the term acquires the characteristics of a common language unit: it loses its semantic unambiguity, is enriched with emotionally expressive coloring. For example, the poetry of the 1960s actively includes deterministic scientific and technical vocabulary in the field of “space” (space, rocket, rocket launch, space launch, orbit, spacecraft). This is quite understandable because the scientific significance of the space issues in the 60s of the twentieth century: Todi b ty bachyla v meni i mozoli pid praporamy, / kosmos, i nad buryakamy/ Zhinok pokhylenykh, yak v sni (VINHRANOVSKYI, 1990); Nam vichno treba neboem zhyt’, / Po shyy buduchy v planeti (VINHRANOVSKYI, 1990); planeta – bezsyla, navivna, mala – / v noakh u hromyly iz atomnymy kryzyakamy (ZHYLENKO, 2006); strashno hulyaty planety. Malii/ samoi po bezlyudnyi i temnyj orbiti (ZHYLENKO, 2006); Zikhodyt’ dolya tykh no orbitu/ Vysokotochnykh dum i pochuvtti (VINHRANOVSKYI, 1990); Tse ne zakon molekul./ Ne domatychynist’ orbit (PAVLYCHKO, 2009); Rakety u zasyly v khliba y silz (DRACH, 1986); yakor’ kosmichnoyi raketuy vrosly v narod (DRACH, 1986); Iz Baykonura vkoškani raketuy / Spynyluy v už-holov’yi shkol’nyi (OLINYK, 1985).

Particularly noticeable is the wide evaluative and stylistic amplitude of terms in L. Kostenko’s style, which acquire both lyrical, intimate, colloquial, domestic and ironic connotations as a result of determinologization: Tut, za shchytom smaradovyk lifting h uslok/ Moyikh zar-pytys blakytni kosmodrorny. Vechiruini obriy opustuy zavisu, kosmichny tsryk zapalyuye vohni Dvyluyuy, yak prostor hne svoyi pickovky, tuman halaktyk buchau tak lechem; Koly my ykhaly u miro Yahnutyh./ Na nas uapp blakytnyi asteroid.

So, the lexical norm of artistic style of the second half of the twentieth century can be described as a period in which two processes change – thematic expansion, enrichment of author’s lexicon, publicism, various branch terms of science and technology, which reflect current trends in intellectual practice, actualization of language for a society of a theme and a problem, and for development of a science and technics. A significant fragment of the national artistic style is the poetic work of the late XX–early XXI centuries, which is represented by the generation of the eighties (ANDRUKHOVYCH, 1995; BILOTSEKIVETS, GERASIMYUK, ZABUZHKO, 2013, MALIKOVYCH, RYMARUK, PAHLOVSKA, 2012) and nineties (ANDRUSYAK, IRVANETS, 1995; Neborak, Zhadan, Fedorak, Rozumnuy, Romen, 2018). This stage in the development of the national poetic language is of interest both in terms of the longevity of the artistic tradition, and in terms of dynamization, updating the stylistic norm.

Tracing the stylistic features of language creation of the eighties, in particular in terms of the specifics of its textual organization and interaction of traditional-poetic, folklore, colloquial vocabulary against the background of commonly used stylistically neutral vocabulary, researchers determine the parameters of correlation of authorial idiols with literary (primarily in terms of their deaestheticization, colloquialization, stylistic decline), describe the characteristic structures of the syntactic organization of texts. The colloquialization of the dictionary as a time-marked stylistic norm of poetry of the end of the twentieth century is its hypertrophied saturation with stylistically reduced, rough, vulgarized vocabulary. This colloquial, ‘slang explosion’ is a kind of consequence of the linguistic protest against the mass consciousness formed by the totalitarian system, mass ideological culture.

The micro-dictionary of stylistically reduced vocabulary is formed by derogatory and evaluative names of masculine and feminine persons (nedonosok, chmo, alkash, debil, muro, mudak, lyahavvy, vylupok; karha, shkapa, sh’ondra, profura, mochatka), rough names of parts of the human body (rylo, pyka, shnobe, hrabli, te*bukhy), words-estimations of different part-of-speech affiliation (lazha, fufo, kaiy, fihnya, po tsymbalakh, po barabana, v kaiy, kfovo, za buhrom), slang, evaluative adjectives (zashuheny, dovbany, kfovyy), slang evaluative verbs (zamakhay, naykhaty, kryratiy, penzlyuvaty), phraseologized compounds (z prybabakhom, pudruty mizky, poyikhaty mizkamy, shl’ham prykynutys’). This colloquialization of the dictionary most clearly distinguishes the language-making practice of the eighties against the general background of the stylistic artistic norm of the twentieth century.
CONCLUSIONS

Today, the concept of stylistic artistic norm is understood and categorized as a concept of the theory of theoretical and historical stylistics. A full-scale study of the history of artistic style involves the study of the dynamics of stylistic artistic norms as one of the units of its measurement. Determining the temporal, spatial and idio-stylistic parameters of the stylistic artistic norm, describing the typological and historical trends of its formation allows to demonstrate the systemic connections with the literary norm, to outline the general picture of the national artistic style.

The dynamism of the stylistic artistic norm is related to the ability of poetic language to respond to the development of linguistic and artistic consciousness, linguistic thinking of both the author and the reader in different temporal and spatial manifestations. In generalized chronological and level manifestations, it testifies to the most significant trends and phenomena in the development of poetic language, and the panoramic picture of the establishment, chronological-spatial and idiosyncratic variability of the norm reflects the history of national artistic style.
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