

LINGUISTICS

DOI <https://doi.org/10.36059/978-966-397-196-4/1-21>

LINGUISTIC INNOVATIONS PAVING THE WAY FOR LANGUAGE DEMOCRATIZATION

Klymenko O. L.

INTRODUCTION

The dialectical contradiction of linguistic tradition and innovation is manifested in their interconnection and interdependence. They are difficult to differentiate, since innovations often modernize the tradition, and no tradition is a tradition from the very beginning – it has arisen in a novel, more democratic way some time ago.

With modern innovation, as a rule, the question of the boundaries of the permissible measure of innovation is rather overlooked: how long can it be possible to "innovate" the language as the mirror of social environment, where the boundaries of possible changes? The paradox of innovation from the point of view of the socio-linguistic and linguo-cultural approaches is that the innovation itself, even if it is rational from the point of view of social, political or information technology and is supported by individuals – subjects and participants of the given process, can actually destabilize the situation with the standard language and cause the deviation or dynamics of language norms. However, observing the boundaries for the "sufficient measure of novelty" can protect language from innovative chaos. We emphasize that these boundaries are determined primarily by stable elements of the standard language, including rules and regulations which are modernized under the influence of liberalization, restructuring and democratization processes in contemporary globalized world.

To this point we must admit that nowadays the Internet, as a global phenomenon, is transforming the relationship between standard and non-standard language forms. The spread of English as the lingua franca of the information age is considered to be a linguistic consequence of the process of globalization. The complete dominance of English online is

regularly viewed as the linguistic counterpart to the process of globalization, which ultimately demonstrates how pervasive the process of global Englishization is. The term is coined by merging words (English + Globalization) to describe this exact phenomenon¹. Thus, the global nature of English, and the sheer number of people who can comprehend it all over the world, is helping the information spread faster online, with its quick spread itself supporting further popularization of English as its vehicle, continuing a kind of self-perpetuating cycle².

We can see quite a lot of discussion about these concepts in academia. Current debates concentrate on the complementary issues of global Englishization and multilingual freedom, “the dynamics of language change, the patterns of language use, and linguistic standardization”³. Daniel Dor claims that “on the Internet we already witness the global emergence of novel patterns of linguistic usage, standardization, maintenance, and variability”. Internationalization of online communication, or, rather, its complete disregard for physical borders that are often impossible to grasp, causes restandardization and destandardization of English as a global language. Global English paved the way “from village to global village”⁴, became an efficient lingua franca for the multilingual Internet community and has made democratization of innovative discourse an inevitable process. Internet linguistics attracted scholars to lexical dynamics and enrichment of standard language with non-standard forms⁵.

We, therefore, argue that some portion of "chaotization" is necessary for a successful innovation process, as a wide range of individuals cannot be engaged in the creative innovative activity when constrained by any sort of rigid structure. Bottom-up innovation is chaotic almost by

¹ Crystal, David. 1997. *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

² Crystal, David. 2001. *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

³ Daniel Dor From Englishization to Imposed Multilingualism: Globalization, the Internet, and the Political Economy of the Linguistic Code // *Public Culture* 16 (1): 97-118. December 2004

⁴ Romaine S. English: from village to global village. *World Englishes: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*. Vol. 1. Bolton K., Kachru B. B. (Eds.). London, New York : Routledge. Taylor & Francis, 2006. P. 46–54.

⁵ GRETCHEN MCCULLOCH Because Internet: Understanding the New Rules of Language. NY: RIVERHEAD BOOKS, AUGUST 10, 2019. – 336 p.

definition. The most stable elements of the standard language, the border that protects it from chaos-disintegration, is language norm.

As language evolves, its study requires some tools for measuring dynamics of language norms deviations. Vitality of lingual traditions and speed of acceptance and adaptation to innovations can therefore be used as such indicators. From this point of view, innovative potential and speed of adoption of a new word by language community predict the linguistic consequences of innovation⁶. Viability and speed of diffusion of linguistic innovation are predetermined by linguistic and extralinguistic factors⁷. Otherwise, if initial innovation is perceived as uncertain and even risky, the preservation of traditional strict rules and regulations, traditionalism as a mechanism for overcoming everything unknown, unusual, unacceptable, turns out to be a powerful anti-innovation factor, often making degradation inevitable. The diffusion of linguistic innovation shows how online interactions between Internet users affect development and evolution of language in its cultural aspect, thus shaping the dynamics of the interactions themselves, delivering expansion of linguistic expressions and allowing scientists' attempts at the prediction of their future flows⁸.

It can be argued that the use of the Internet accelerated the spread of democratic concepts and ideas as rapidly as steam engine pushed the Industrial Revolution into being, or penicillin affected medicine. Moreover, the Internet is changing the very nature of innovation dynamics by decreasing the importance of physical distance between people⁹. It has truly and deeply transformed the way human beings communicate and adopt new ideas¹⁰.

⁶ Metcalf A. Predicting New Words. *The Secrets of Their Success*. Boston, New York : Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002.

⁷ MICHAŁ B. PARADOWSKI, ŁUKASZ JONAK DIFFUSION OF LINGUISTIC INNOVATION AS SOCIAL COORDINATION. *Psychology of Language and Communication* 2012, Vol. 16, No. 2

⁸ Paradowski, M.B. & Jonak, Ł. (2012). Understanding the social cascading of geekspeak and the upshots for social cognitive systems. In A. Galton & Z. Wood (Eds.), *Understanding and modelling collective phenomena* (pp. 27-32). AISB/IACAP World Congress, 2-6 July 2012, Birmingham, UK.

⁹ Paradowski, M.B., Jonak, Ł., & Kuscsik, Z. (2010). Tracking the diffusion of lexical innovation in online social networks. Workshop on Data-Driven Dynamical Networks, l'École de Physique des Houches.

¹⁰ Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press, 5th edition

This study refers to the notions of globalization, internationalisation, democratization, restandardization and destandardization of English as global language (Global English) through the analysis of conditions, mechanisms and consequences of English language democratization process in the globalized world.

1. Democratization process and Linguistic consequences

Nowadays the term "democratization" is rather ambiguous. Thus, it is vitally important for the success of this study to clarify the difference between democratization and liberalization, destandardization and restructuring, as well as identify differentiated features encoded in the given concepts.

The concept of democratization is increasingly expanding. It is acceptable to both formal and everyday use, and includes variation in contrast to the strict rules and regulations clearly defined as norms and standards. It's important to note, that even though democracy was originally mostly reserved for uses in the political contexts, nowadays it is very often used in all spheres of human life where the notions of a social group and central authority are presented. Democratization is, thus, all about giving more members of a given group influence over the matters of this group's issues. In linguistic context, for example, it may refer to how the language is coined, which terms are considered acceptable or standard, and how different linguistics forms may or may not be used in various contexts.

In contemporary linguistic studies democratization is seen as the restandardization and includes the idea of democratization of language norms and standards, which should be based on "the actual use of linguistic elements in most cases"¹¹.

Development of democratic ideas proclaimed that equality, dignity and globalization, as well as values of social, gender and ethnic identity, freedom and openness are to be maintained and celebrated in the modern age information society. The global democratization of the English language (Global English) concerns more and more the appropriateness of the language standard and norms. It includes restandardization and destandardization processes, which together can be named by the term "democratization" and is determined in this study as lexical

¹¹ Joseph, J.E. (1981). The standard language: Theory, dogma and sociocultural reality. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Michigan: University of Michigan, 174.

transformation and semantic modernization of standard form of language by means of adaptation of language norms to more democratic society standards and linguistic tools affordable and accessible in communication.

As the result of a number of sociopolitical and sociocultural changes society has become more tolerant to differences, such as extreme behavior and self-representation, or forms of self-expression that may be considered offensive by some of its members. More people have become freer from condemnation of their “otherness” and all forms of discrimination; however these freedoms must be taken with a grain of salt. As more and more people urbanize and live in less and less space, they are forced to interact with each other more often. This raises the inevitable, and also the most contentious question: where exactly does the liberty to self-expression of one individual start infringing on the liberty of another? Is my right to speak the language I want more important than the right of someone else not to hear the language he or she doesn't want to hear? Answering such questions is never easy, but that is the price the modern world has chosen to pay for the benefits that democratization brought with it: dynamically increasing access to endless opportunities and decision-making beyond set rules and regulations, which proves the democratic principles of the society. The language norms dynamics is refocusing from strict rules and regulations to informal communication skills openness to creativity and tolerance to variation, development and change.

Destandardization is viewed as “decreasing acceptance of old standards and causes regression of highly standardized systems up to the situation of plurality”¹². Restandardization is considered to be “solely motivated by personal needs and common goals”¹³. Thus, scientists agree that there is “only restandardization as a sociopolitical process”¹⁴, which is a “response to social problems or social change in a particular social

¹² Joseph, J.E. (1987). *Eloquence and power: The rise of language standards and standard languages*. Oxford: Blackwell, 179.

¹³ Cooper, R. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 56.

¹⁴ Johl, C. (2002). Restandardisation, harmonisation and Afrikaans. A few cautionary notes. *Speaking in unison: The harmonisation and standardisation of Southern African languages*. Cape Town: CASAS, 161-176.

group”¹⁵. Modernization as an expression of restandardization aims to expand access to information necessary to ensure the formal and informal communication among all members of the society. Restandardization is a regulatory approach to language policy, aimed at weakening or, where possible, completely eliminating the ideological standard of language. Informal communication becomes the uniting tool for the community members, serving the interests of all participants especially those marginalized or suppressed in their democratic rights or access to information.

It is clear that the democratization of language standards also requires some rules and regulations. Webb notes that standardization is “always a process that goes from top to bottom with the assistance of institutions such as government and education, but it is rarely a successful process as it faces resistance from the community and restandardization is impossible without support from the “bottom”¹⁶.

Modernization of language is a constant terminological, orthographic, grammatical and stylistic development of language norms. Any standard language is constantly undergoing this democratic process in order to keep relevant to the communicative needs of its users in the modern world¹⁷.

Webb considers that language has to become an important resourceful tool in the process of democratization. In this way it can form an opposition to discrimination of non-standard language variants, and all of its negative outcomes for language speakers, including, but not limited to the linguistic uncertainty and negative self-imposing models¹⁸.

Webb argues that situation, in which language is used to express certain views, beliefs and behaviors, and becomes a reason for

¹⁵ Wade, R.D. (1996) An investigation of the putative restandardisation of South African English in the direction of a „new. English, Black South African English. Unpublished MA thesis. Durban: University of Natal, 62.

¹⁶ Webb, V. N. 2007. “English in higher education in South Africa: exclusion or inclusion”. In *Multilingualism and Exclusion. Policy, Practice and Prospects*, Edited by: Cuvelier, P., du Plessis, T., Meeuwis, M. and Teck, L. 287–300. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

¹⁷ Deumert, A. & Vandenbussche, W. (2003). Standard languages. Taxonomies and histories. Germanic standardizations: Past to present. Amsterdam.Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1-14.

¹⁸ Webb, V.N. 2002. Language in South Africa: the role of language in national transformation, reconstruction and development. (Impact, studies in language and society no. 14). Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

discrimination and exploitation, is unacceptable. Developing his idea, he states that using language to pamper the interests of a dominant social group or class in order to control, dominate and deprive the rights of any social group or class is just inappropriate. From these grounds he concludes that most standard languages can be viewed as tools of ideologies.

Approaching this point from a different angle, however, Webb notes that language policy development, implementation and assessment are to be founded on the principles of justice, liberty and democracy. He argues that language in society should be used to express the linguistic diversity of all groups, and therefore should be an instrument of minorities fighting against injustices and discrimination, for liberalization, democracy and for the creation of just social order¹⁹.

Restandardization, therefore, presents an approach to language policy, in which linguistic processes are guided to weaken the ideological influence of the standard language. The language, thus, becomes a tool for the linguistic unification, serving the interests of all the speakers, especially those, who have been marginalized or otherwise deprived of their democratic right to use any form of native language²⁰.

Language democratization is the emancipation of language aimed at changing the hierarchical structure of society. It aims to establish a new democratic structure for the purposes of eradicating the domination of one sociolinguistic group over the other or others, and establishing non-discrimination and equality of linguistic rights and freedoms for all.

Language democratization exhibits itself in the expansion of the linguistic environment, that is apprehended by its speakers as being appropriate for everyday use, and which includes significant variation, as opposed to the strictly defined rules and regulations of the standard language. Another sign of language liberalization is the spread of diverse non-standard linguistic forms in official sources, notably when the latter are doing so in order to increase their profile as valuable media resources of a modern democratic society²¹.

¹⁹ Webb, V.N. 2002. Language in South Africa: the role of language in national transformation, reconstruction and development. (Impact, studies in language and society no. 14). Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

²⁰ Odendaal, G. (2013). Restandardisation defined as democratising language planning. Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus, Vol. 42, 183-203

²¹ Huss, L. and A.-R. Lindgren. (2011). Defining language emancipation. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 209, 1-15.

It may be concluded, therefore, that language democratization can be manifested as the expansion of language standards, including oral and written innovative variants not only into the regular speech use at different language levels, but in official sources as well. The limits of what is (or is not) considered acceptable, or deemed to be standard, vastly expand, starting to encompass dialectal, sociolectal, borrowed and newly created elements, as well as new elements of rather narrow usage.

Democratization of language standard, which is, in essence, a goal of any restandardization, includes the idea of democratization of language norms. Linguistic norms must be based on the most up-to-date usage of linguistic elements in the majority of possible contexts. These norms must be described empirically, forming language standard as an example of linguistic behaviors of members of a given language community²².

It is thus self-evident, that language democratization maintains that entire language community is expected to participate in the formation and development of language policy.

Webb underlines that language standardization is an invariably top-down process that encompasses various governmental, educational and other institutions²³. The overall success for such endeavors, is not too high, for the necessary element of grassroots support for restandardisation is as needed, as it is lacking²⁴.

Every speaker in a democratic society participates in formal and informal communication. Thus a wider range of variations provides a sustainable and successful development and expansion of standard and non-standard language variants which include dialects of different national, regional and local communities.

The democratization factor to be considered in all spheres of social life within national parameters include the absence of censorship and limitation, freedom, academic progress intensified by the development of

²² Joseph, J.E. (1981). The standard language: Theory, dogma and sociocultural reality. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Michigan: University of Michigan, 174.

²³ Webb, V. 2005. The role of language standardisation in the effective development of communities in public life in SA. In V. Webb, A. Deumert and B. Lepota (eds.) The standardisation of African languages in South Africa. Pretoria: PanSALB. pp. 35-42.

²⁴ Webb, V. N. 2007. "English in higher education in South Africa: exclusion or inclusion". In *Multilingualism and Exclusion. Policy, Practice and Prospects*, Edited by: Cuvelier, P., du Plessis, T., Meeuwis, M. and Teck, L. 287–300. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

the latest information technologies being involved into formal and informal communication. A special focus is put to the idea of democratization as a causal manifestation of different concepts and the creation of new form of language without borders – Global English. Democratization as an access to online resources from anywhere in the world, as an access to the cultural heritage of civilization and the possibility of spreading information by mass media worldwide, provoke changes of cultural and linguistic tastes and transform language standards and communication norms. Much of the control over languages will fall “in the hands of the software, media, and advertising industries. Most probably, it will result in a state of market-based, imposed multilingualism.”²⁵

The growing importance of English is gradually changing the traditional linguistic environment, speech behavior rules and attitudes to the language standards.

2. Linguistic innovations and Language norms

Due to the rapid development of the society in the new millennium hundreds of new words inevitably appear every year to nominate new concepts and ideas emerging as a result of this process in innovative discourse. Nowadays globalization and technological progress have become a powerful force which caused the activation of innovative processes based on the existing lexical wordstock and influence language variation, development and changes. Traditionally, linguistic innovation is a new language phenomenon, which emerges under the influence or caused by various factors (linguistic and extralinguistic).

Linguistic innovation as a verbalized sign of the language knowledge is characterized by its dynamic development which is conditioned by the language knowledge evolution and the dynamics of language changes. The study of various stages of linguistic innovation development and its types result in the differentiation of these types as they transfer new knowledge about the surrounding reality²⁶.

A term “linguistic innovation” is considered in this study as a linguistic sign denoting a new notion about the world around us and

²⁵ Daniel Dor From Englishization to Imposed Multilingualism: Globalization, the Internet, and the PoliticalEconomy of the Linguistic Code // Public Culture 16 (1): 97-118. December 2004

²⁶ Bialyk, V.. (2019). SOME CRITERIA OF A LEXICAL QUANTOR TYPOLOGY. 10.36059/978-966-397-131-5/37-53.

certain human activity or feeling within us and transferring the new knowledge about language reality (added-on or modified) meeting a number of requirements, such as novelty, creativity, nominativity, motivation, stylistic coloring, etc.²⁷.

The very nature of a linguistic innovation as a linguistic sign will be revealed in this study taking into consideration the ways of their formation, and functioning in the language system. The creation of any linguistic innovation is much stipulated by various language factors, a language norm dynamics being among the most important.

V. Bialyk considers that new linguistic formation should meet three criteria of language normativity at the same time:

- relevance of a given phenomenon to the productive word-formation, morphological, syntactical patterns;
- relevance to the pattern, usage, and necessity;
- relevance to the pattern and its deviation, stability and variability, necessity and creativity²⁸.

Let's consider how linguistic innovations can cause deviation or dynamics of a language norm. In neutral literary speech the use of new norms is regulated by the rules fixed in language. "But the new paves its way despite the existing rules."²⁹ The controversy between tradition and innovation exists in any language. The standard language strives to fix the norms as compulsory rules and regulations but in speech practice there is a new more democratic tendency which regulates language development.

Language is a system of signs and symbols registering categorization of the world and human creation. It is also an effective and powerful tool used to alter reality³⁰. Linguistic creativity is manifested in linguistic innovative discourse of language communities and cultures³¹.

²⁷ Bialyk, V. (2019). LEXICAL QUANTOR GENESIS VS LANGUAGE NORM DYNAMICS. 10.36059/978-966-397-124-7/39-56.

²⁸ Bialyk, V. (2019). LEXICAL QUANTOR GENESIS VS LANGUAGE NORM DYNAMICS. 10.36059/978-966-397-124-7/39-56.

²⁹ Bialyk, V. (2019). SOME CRITERIA OF A LEXICAL QUANTOR TYPOLOGY. 10.36059/978-966-397-131-5/37-53.

³⁰ Castells, M. (2007). Communication, power and counter-power in the network society. *International Journal of Communication*, 1 (1), 238-266.

³¹ Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

The aim of lexical innovations is to transfer new knowledge, to name something new which is not reflected and does not have any equivalent in the language, or to surprise and influence the interlocutor's feelings and emotions. The individual characteristics of a personality involved in the process of the new word formation are also important for the future acceptance or rejection of innovative creation.

What makes some of yesterday's isolated innovations globally accepted, essential parts of tomorrow's mainstream vocabulary? Why does another, initially widespread, become soon forgotten? A good example of such global acceptance by a language community may be the most spread in multilingual world abbreviation *OK (all correct)* which completely ignores the literary standard norm but has become a fully-fledged element of the system of the English and other languages in contrast to *O.W. (all right)* described by A. Metcalf in his well-known book "*Predicting New Words*"³².

Applying the sociolinguistic approach to the study of innovative discourse as a new linguistic environment, we distinguished some stages of its formation:

- 1) awareness of the need for innovative activity;
- 2) cognition as a stage in the process of renewal activity;
- 3) creativity as a driving force of linguistic innovations;
- 4) adoption by language community;
- 5) assimilation process and fixation as language fact;
- 6) productivity potential and practical activities;
- 7) evaluation of performance by language standards³³.

When we conceptualize, re-evaluate and explain traditionally perceived common phenomena in a new dynamic framework these basic reconstructions make it possible to determine the forms and the perspective of renewal of language standards.

The first condition of language normativity is the relevance of a given phenomenon to the productive word-formation, morphological, syntactical patterns. The following criteria are considered to be important in linguistics: relevance to the pattern, usage, and necessity. Of course, these criteria may be viewed as relative because various controversies underline the language development, including the relevance to the

³² Metcalf A. *Predicting New Words. The Secrets of Their Success*. Boston, New York : Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002.

³³ Coupland N. "Sociolinguistics and Globalisation", *Journal of Sociolinguistics* – 2003. – 7 (4); – P. 465–473.

pattern and its deviation, stability and variability, necessity and creativity. Any new normative linguistic formation should, however, meet all three criteria at the same time³⁴.

Innovation corresponds to the demands and meets the requirements of language normativity under the following conditions:

- absolute novelty,
- frequency of usage, acceptance by language community,
- popularity in both formal and informal communication,
- absence of standard words denoting a new phenomenon,
- more expressive substitution of existing lexical unit,
- context independence,
- word-formation reproductivity,
- dictionary fixation.

Some basic conditions can be identified under which innovation may change the traditional language standard:

1) to determine the new language knowledge and to name new phenomena, facts, events, concepts or ideas that have a decisive influence on the society, to designate something lacking a fixed naming in language (*bimbo, boomer, buster, crack, glitch, glitterati, mugging, yuppy*)³⁵;

2) to render the notions already existing in the language by different linguistic means or designate the notion with one word instead of its description with a word combination (*wannabe – want to be; gimme – give me, gofer (gopher) – go for, con-trickster – con a trick, can-do – can do; twofer – two for one*)³⁶;

3) to express in a new way already existing facts: such formations are conditioned by stylistic needs – to rename by new more expressive, creative and attractive synonyms the existing language facts (*cool, awesome, bad-mouth, crack-down, fat-cat, dweeb, dude, geek, nerd, hype, clout*).

Innovations used in informal communication recurrently by different speakers in different contexts may not be fixed by a word usage tradition but due to the democratization process in language development the most

³⁴ Bialyk, V.. (2019). LEXICAL QUANTOR GENESIS VS LANGUAGE NORM DYNAMICS. 10.36059/978-966-397-124-7/39-56.

³⁵ Green J. New Words. A Dictionary of Neologisms since 1960. London: Bloomsbury, 1992. 340 p.

³⁶ Ayto J., Simpson J. (1996) The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang / J. Ayto, J. Simpson. – Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. – 300 p.

popular of them have a potential and probability to render certain information without specific contextual conditions, to be used recurrently and become a language fact. Such a situation occurs when non-standard innovation is a socially actualized phenomenon (*acid, crack, hippie, hip-hop, punk, rap, yuppie*). It is quickly adopted, spread, and accepted by the community as a full-fledged lexical unit. Such originally non-standard words and elements acquire the new status and enrich literary wordstock if they are understood beyond the context, may be created by any speaker, or by different speakers independently in accordance with existing language patterns and models or become an example for new word-formation patterns and models and for new creations by analogy.

Due to the democratization process of contemporary English language development a linguistic innovation may become a language fact if possesses a number of linguistic consequences:

– word-formation productivity: *yuppie* “*young urban professional*”³⁷ → *anti-yuppie, superyuppie, technoypuppie, yuppidom, yuppieism, yuppiness, yuppette yuppish, yuppiefied, yuppification, to yuppify, Yuppiegate, yupperware, yuffer, yuppie gismo, yuppie line, yuppie flu, yuppie leather, yuppie party, yuppie husband, yuppie wife, yuppie child, yuppie puppie, yuppie boy, yuppie girl, yuppie friends, yuppie slum, dot-com yuppie, buppie (black+yuppie), chuppie (chinese+yuppie), Euroypuppie (European+yuppie), juppie (japanese+yuppie), yummie (yuppie+muslim), yupsky (yuppie+russky), guppie (gay+yuppie) or (green+yuppie), duppie (depressed urban professional), scuppie (socially conscious+yuppie); yup (abbreviation of yuppie) → Yuppese, Yupspeak, yupskie, yuppette, yupmobile; couch-potato → couch-potatoism, couch-potatodom, couch-potatoing; fast track → to fast-track, fast-tracker, fast-tracknik, fast-tracking, rap → rap sheet, to beat the rap, to get the rap, to take the rap³⁸; crack → crack-baby, crack-binging, crack-crime, crack-house, crack-squad, crackberry (crack+Blackberry); spin → to spin, spin-doctor, spin-doctoring, spin crew, spin journalism, spinnable/unspinnable, Spinnish (spin+English), spin row, spinspeech (spintalk); hype → to hype, megahype, hype-fest, hypeorama, long-hyped, much-hyped;*

³⁷ Green J. *New Words. A Dictionary of Neologisms since 1960*. London: Bloomsbury, 1992. 340 p.

³⁸ Ayto J., Simpson J. (1996) *The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang / J. Ayto, J. Simpson*. – Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. – 300 p.

– transformations of syntactic constructions: *gloom and doom* → *gloom-and-doomster*; *over the top* → *over-the-topper*; *bunny behind the booth* → *booth bunny*; *toy-boy* → *boy toyer*;

– functional transformations: affixalisation of lexical units (*savvy*, *hip*, *core*, *junkie*, *city*, *ville*, *happy*, *crazy*), affixalisation of morphological elements (*gram*, *zine*, *fest*, *cred*), lexicalization of affixes (*gram*, *zine*, *fest*, *mega*, *super*, *hyper*);

– modification of meaning: *ball-park*, *hardball*, *homeboy*, *crown jewel*, *to launder*, *posse*, *glitch*, *slush fund*, *pork barrel*³⁹;

– language economy: *come out of the closet* → *come out*; *Mr.Clean hands* → *Mr.Clean*; *be on the back burner* → *back burner*;

– analogy: *couch potato* → *mouse potato*, *rat pack* → *brat pack*, *rat race* → *mouse race*, *red flight* → *white flight*; *hard money* → *soft money*, *fat cat* → *thin cat*, *glass ceiling* → *silicon ceiling* → *grass ceiling* → *silver ceiling*; *bag lady* → *bag person* → *bag people*; *flavour of the month* → *flavour of the week*, *flavour of the year*;

– substitutions of phraseological components: *be on the back burner* → *be on the front burner* → *put on the back burner* → *stay on the front burner*; *put noodles on smb's ears* → *handle noodles on smb's ears* → *handle spaghetti on smb's ears*;

– modification or enlargement of phraseological unit: *be on the back burner* → *be on the media back burner*; *climb/jump on the bandwagon* → *jump on the eco-bandwagon*, *make/earn a quick/fast buck* → *make megabucks/ earn megabucks*; *make/earn a big buck* → *make/earn the biggest bucks*, *talk talk and walk walk* → *talk the talk but, walk the walk*; *bang for the buck* → *bang for your buck* → *bang for one's buck* → *more bang for the buck* → *bigger bang for the buck* → *get a bang for a buck*.

It is not clear at the initial stage of innovation formation whether it will become a language fact. Characteristic feature of contemporary innovative discourse is its multimodality which is revealed in active visualization of innovations through the use of symbols and modes of various kinds (figures, pictures, emoticons etc.)⁴⁰. Media language does

³⁹ Dickson P. *Slang. Topic-by-Topic Dictionary of Contemporary American Lingoes*. New York: Penguin Books, 1990. 223 p.

⁴⁰ Sali Tagliamonte. *Teen Talk: The Language of Adolescents* By Sali A. Tagliamonte Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. xiv + 298.

reflect what is going on in language and may even pave the way for innovation⁴¹.

This confirms the idea that dominant influence of visual culture and image as the main mode of communication leads to restructuring of the linguo-cultural environment and the democratic transformations of socio-cultural rules and regulations which force labiality and fluctuation of language standards. Thus, the rationality and the creative potential of innovation activity is largely determined by the system of socio-cultural constants and concepts which they determine, on the one hand, and the existing language models and standards, on the other.

Successful innovation in the linguo-cultural environment presupposes a harmonious combination of various types of rationality (economic, professional, religious, ethno-cultural, etc.) and creativity accepted by different groups of language community (age, ethnic, professional, religious etc.)⁴².

Innovative dynamics, when carried out spontaneously or in an incentive way, are limited by the fact that all innovations are selected in terms of their consistency or inconsistency with mental attitudes and traditional values and are accepted or rejected depending on their innovative potential and attractiveness for the language community.

The relationship between tradition and innovation as two basic mechanisms of socio-cultural and language development in the modern globalized society of "rapid changes" is largely transformed. The modernization processes clearly indicate that tradition is not only a limiting, stabilizing element of culture and language dynamics, but also a basis that "catalyzes" the democratization processes in the society and influences language development and change. Ethno-cultural traditions acquire special significance.

The problem is that in different cultures there are different ways of updating and counteracting innovations, their diffusion, routinization, etc. The effectiveness of this process largely depends on the historically developed marginal measures of innovations, which may differ according to linguo-cultural environment, and acts as the limit beyond

⁴¹ Sali Tagliamonte. (2005) So weird; so cool; so innovative: The use of intensifiers in the television series Friends // American Speech 80(3):280-300 · September 2005 *with* 2,578 Reads.

⁴² Kirvalidze, Nino. (2017). LINGUO-CULTURAL AND PRAGMATIC PECULIARITIES OF THE PHENOMENON OF ANGLICISATION IN GEORGIA. Journal of Teaching and Education. 06. 269-280.

which the innovations begin affecting the standard language, sometimes leading to unpredictable consequences⁴³.

The Internet as the basic tool in the processes of democratization, unification, globalization and modernization of language, on the one hand, helps to preserve traditional values in the course of interethnic interaction, on the other. It should be emphasized that the processes of marginalization in the course of inadequate introduction of innovations into the socio-cultural environment arise when some groups of population (age, gender, racial, ethnic) may find themselves in transitive integrity, characterized primarily by the contradiction between established traditions and their new lifestyle. Moreover, this kind of integrity can be formed during the introduction and diffusion of socially significant or technological innovations, the destruction of the old-fashioned foundations of life. As a result, traditional values, rules and regulations are changing, new behavioral codes and language norms deviations are disseminated. All this contradicts traditional standards, but the positive values of modernization are accepted. Thus, it turns out that non-regulatory word-creation mechanisms and „external” and „internal” non-standard elements have become productive word-formation tools in standard language, such as -(a)holic (*bookaholic, chocoholic, phonaholic, shopaholic, spendaholic, sweetaholic, tobaccholic, wordaholic*), -athon (*bikeathon, danceathon, dineathon, disasterthon, phonathon, readathon, sellathon, swimathon, telethon*), -city (*edge-city, fat-city*), -red (*force-cred, mosque-cred*), -rati (*culturati, cyberati, digerati, glamorati, journarati, numerati*), -head (*bithead, chip-head, crackhead, cyberhead, digithead, nethead, skinhead, techhead, Webhead, wirehead*), -hip (*computer-hip, techno-hip*), -house (*acidhouse, crackhouse, rockhouse*), -in (*chain-in, die-in, drive-in, read-in, sleep-in, teach-in, work-in*), -itis (*ballotitis, deadlineitis, featureitis, predecessoritis, scandalitis, electionitis*), -jack (*car-jack, sea-jack, ship-jack, sky-jack*), -junkie (*data-junkie, film-junkie, java-junkie, news-junkie, opportunity-junkie, power-junkie, society-junkie, sports-junkie, tax-junkie*), -nap (*babynap, filonap, horsenap, petnap, spacenap*), -(o)rama (*circurama, cyclorama, hypeorama, musicrama, telorama*), -savvy (*tech-savvy, media-savvy, market-savvy, marketing-savvy, net-savvy, computer-savvy, tele-savvy, techno-savvy*), -ville (*bribesville,*

⁴³ Metcalf A. Predicting New Words. *The Secrets of Their Success*. Boston, New York : Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002.

crazyville, cubesville, dullsville, glitzville, gonesville, grimsville, endsville, splitzville).

For the successful implementation of innovations on a mass scale, it is necessary to release personal creativity. Modern technocratic oriented innovation inevitably leads to a binary opposition: either traditional norms, or renewal and modernization.

Can the tradition become an initial basis, the most important factor that mobilizes people's innovative activity?

The data under consideration demonstrates the special role of informal online communication in democratization of innovative discourse, for it is the sensory perception of the world that is the starting point for changing the paradigms of creative activity. Thus, the study of the innovation processes allows us to draw a number of conclusions that bear a common character for linguistic studies.

The mechanisms of the renewal of the traditional norms can be considered using the example of speech and language norm dynamics in different English-speaking countries. It is especially interesting to consider interregional relations, intercivilizational relations, thanks to which it is possible to determine the channels of innovative discourse popularization. Discourse immersed in the social context, determines thoughts, and knowledge, and actions, and certain model of reality. Journalistic innovative discourse to a certain extent is able not only to form the personal or group identity, but also to set the direction of interethnic attitudes towards tolerance or intolerance, to different forms and norms of behavior.

Any change in the sociocultural environment is always associated with a qualitative transformation of everyday language practices, the replacement or abolition of traditional patterns and old-fashioned language forms that regulate communicative behavior, which provokes the inevitable clash of the old and the new. The latter generates innovation process, which, on the one hand, is defined as a clash of dominant culture with different subcultures, and, on the other hand, as a clash of standard and substandard languages, but that always accompanies the language norm dynamics caused by the disruption of everyday life. True, it should be noted that without some chaos, the development of society and language would be impossible. In Western philosophy a stable opinion was created that structural violations make a fruitful field for creativity, which is the essence of the individual self-realization process.

CONCLUSIONS

Predominantly socio-cultural renewal in linguo-culture calls into question the established scheme of the language innovation process. The phenomenon of modernization of language norms under the influence of technological transformation of social and language reality, when the real results and consequences of innovations on the basis of language constants appear to be very far from the original design, proves a very peculiar type of rationality. From our point of view, technically oriented innovation proceeds from the classical for the new culture concept of a person as the participant of global intercultural communication. In innovation, emerging from human creativity, applied research proves to be the motivating tool for language development by means of a limited number of word-formation tools.

The immanent quality of language at any stage of its development is creativity, and besides the person entering into intercultural contact, the results of acculturation (acceptance, syncretism, rejection reaction) cannot arise. The acceptance or rejection of innovation proved to be connected with the historically formed unity in the diversity of different language communities that have a single paradigm of cultural development, identity and differentiation. If the first circumstance facilitates the adoption of innovations, the second is the variable richness of their possible choice. So, if we proceed from a person-oriented approach, then art – in its various forms – turns out to be the most adequate channel for updating cultural and existential meanings, for the artistic image is always symbolic, carries information implicit, unreflected, multivalued, polysemantic and gives a wide possibility of individual interpretation and reinterpretation. Hence follows the importance of forming criterion for assessing the acceptance or non-acceptance of modern innovations.

SUMMARY

The article dwells on the problem of linguistic innovation as a driving force of language development in Internet-dependent globalized world. Linguistic innovation is viewed as a linguistic sign denoting new information about the rapidly-changing surrounding reality. This study refers to the notions of democratization, restandardization and destandardization of English as a global language (Global English) through the analysis of conditions, mechanisms and consequences of English language democratization in new communication space. The extra-linguistic factors and effective linguistic tools of contemporary

English vocabulary modernization, functional transformation and language norms dynamics have been determined. As a result of the research it has been proved that a successful linguistic innovation may become a language fact if it presupposes a harmonious combination of language normativity and creativity accepted by language community.

REFERENCES

1. Ayto J., Simpson J. (1996) *The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang* / J.Ayto, J.Simpson. – Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. – 300 p.
2. Bialyk, V. (2019). Lexical quantor genesis vs language norm dynamics. 10.36059/978-966-397-124-7/39-56.
3. Bialyk, V. (2019). Some criteria of a lexical quantor typology. 10.36059/978-966-397-131-5/37-53.
4. Castells, M. (2007). Communication, power and counter-power in the network society. *International Journal of Communication*, 1 (1), 238-266.
5. Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Cooper, R. (1989) *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 56.
7. Coupland N. (2003) “Sociolinguistics and Globalisation”, *Journal of Sociolinguistics* – 2003. – 7 (4): – P. 465–473.
8. Crystal, David. (1997) *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Crystal, David. (2001). *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Daniel Dor *From Englishization to Imposed Multilingualism: Globalization, the Internet, and the Political Economy of the Linguistic Code // Public Culture* 16 (1): 97-118. December 2004
11. Deumert, A. & Vandebussche, W. (2003). *Standard languages. Taxonomies and histories. Germanic standardizations: Past to present*. Amsterdam. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1-14.
12. Dickson P. *Slang* (1990). *Topic-by-Topic Dictionary of Contemporary American Lingoes*. New York: Penguin Books, 1990. 223 p.
13. Green J. (1960) *New Words. A Dictionary of Neologisms since 1960*. London: Bloomsbury, 1992. 340 p.

14. Gretchen McCulloch (2019) *Because Internet: Understanding the New Rules of Language*. NY: RIVERHEAD BOOKS, AUGUST 10, 2019. – 336 p.

15. Huss, L. and A.-R. Lindgren. (2011). Defining language emancipation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 209, 1-15.

16. Johl, C. (2002). Restandardisation, harmonisation and Afrikaans. A few cautionary notes. *Speaking in unison: The harmonisation and standardisation of Southern African languages*. Cape Town: CASAS, 161-176.

17. Joseph, J.E. (1981). *The standard language: Theory, dogma and sociocultural reality*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Michigan: University of Michigan, 174.

18. Joseph, J.E. (1987). *Eloquence and power: The rise of language standards and standard languages*. Oxford: Blackwell, 179.

19. Kirvalidze, Nino. (2017). Linguo-cultural and pragmatic peculiarities of the phenomenon of anglicisation in Georgia. *Journal of Teaching and Education*. 06. 269-280.

20. Metcalf A. (2002) *Predicting New Words. The Secrets of Their Success*. Boston, New York : Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002.

21. Michał B. Paradowski, Łukasz Jonak (2012). Diffusion of linguistic innovation as social coordination. *Psychology of Language and Communication* 2012, Vol. 16, No. 2

22. Odendaal, G. (2013). Restandardisation defined as democratising language planning. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, Vol. 42, 183-203

23. Paradowski, M.B. & Jonak, Ł. (2012). Understanding the social cascading of geekspeak and the upshots for social cognitive systems. In A. Galton & Z. Wood (Eds.), *Understanding and modelling collective phenomena* (pp. 27-32). AISB/ IACAP World Congress, 2-6 July 2012, Birmingham, UK.

24. Paradowski, M.B., Jonak, Ł., & Kuscsik, Z. (2010). Tracking the diffusion of lexical innovation in online social networks. *Workshop on Data-Driven Dynamical Networks*, l'École de Physique des Houches.

25. Rogers, E.M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press, 5th edition

26. Romaine S. *English: from village to global village*. *World Englishes: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*. Vol. 1. Bolton K., Kachru B. B. (Eds.). London, New York : Routledge. Taylor & Francis, 2006. P. 46–54.

27. Sali Tagliamonte. (2005) So weird; so cool; so innovative: The use of intensifiers in the television series Friends // American Speech 80(3), 280-300.

28. Sali Tagliamonte. (2016). Teen Talk: The Language of Adolescents By Sali A. Tagliamonte Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. xiv + 298.

29. Wade, R.D. (1996) An investigation of the putative restandardisation of South African English in the direction of a „new”. English, Black South African English. Unpublished MA thesis. Durban: University of Natal, 62.

30. Webb, V. (2002) Language in South Africa: the role of language in national transformation, reconstruction and development. (Impact, studies in language and society no. 14). Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

31. Webb, V. (2005) The role of language standardisation in the effective development of communities in public life in SA. In V. Webb, A. Deumert and B. Lepota (eds.) The standardisation of African languages in South Africa. Pretoria: PanSALB. pp. 35-42.

32. Webb, V. (2007) “English in higher education in South Africa: exclusion or inclusion”. In Multilingualism and Exclusion. Policy, Practice and Prospects, Edited by: Cuvelier, P., du Plessis, T., Meeuwis, M. and Teck, L. 287–300. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Information about the author:

Klymenko O. L.,

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Full Professor,
Professor at the English Translation Department,
Zaporizhzhia National University
66, Zukovsky str., Zaporizhzhia, 69600, Ukraine