

Izvorni naučni rad  
UDK: 811.161.2'276.6:316.774

**Tetiana KOTS (Kyiv)**

Institute of the Ukrainian Language  
of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine  
Tetyana\_kots@ukr.net

**Anhelina GANZHA (Kyiv)**

Institute of the Ukrainian Language  
of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine  
ganzhalina@ukr.net

## **TENDENCIES OF THE LITERARY NORM IN THE TEXTS OF CONTEMPORARY UKRAINIAN MEDIA RESOURCES: A PAN-SLAVIC CONTEXT**

The article examines the evolving tendencies in the literary norm of the modern Ukrainian language in light of both intrinsic national values and pan-Slavic contexts, as well as the challenges arising from the digital mode of information dissemination. Key transformations are attributed to the strengthening of authorial voice across different genres and stylistic domains, and to global trends in the expressivization of language. These phenomena may result in stylistic polymorphism and the adoption of simplified linguistic standards. The study observes, through the interplay of journalistic, academic, and religious styles, a shifting balance between bookish and colloquial elements in traditionally conservative varieties of language, and highlights the role of interactive technologies in shaping intellectual discourse in contemporary society.

*Keywords: literary norm, digital environment, axiological standard, expressivization, simplified linguistic norms.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The first quarter of the 21st century has brought radical changes, searches, and challenges for the Ukrainian literary language, shaped by both internal cultural and sociopolitical factors and the broader forces of globalization in the digital age. The digital environment prioritizes the dissemination

of diverse, multifaceted information from all areas of social life, where value is often determined less by factual accuracy and more by sensational impact and immediacy. The very mode of communication has shifted. As linguists note, the internet — hosting thousands of discussions daily — has emerged as a lever of democracy and equality, having disrupted the asymmetric structure of traditional media where one speaks and the others listen. (Skrabacz, Lewińska-Krzak, 2022: 131). Such tendencies are prompting a restructuring in the choice of linguistic means to meet the emerging communicative needs of society across all spheres of language functioning — including journalistic, literary, academic, official-administrative, and religious domains. All of these spheres are actively integrated into the digital communication landscape. Their key features are maximal openness and intensified interstyle interaction, which no longer solely facilitates the natural evolution of language but increasingly provokes stylistic polymorphism — the blending of heterogeneous styles and genres, resulting in texts that are not governed by any established stylistic norm (Gajda, 2001: 25). These processes are typically accompanied by deviations from the literary norm and the proliferation of language errors, the causes of which range from basic linguistic incompetence to the influence of uncontrolled technical mechanisms — particularly in machine translation, AI-generated texts, and similar outputs. However, the issue also has a broader, more systemic dimension: society's attitude toward the literary norm has fundamentally shifted. It is no longer perceived as a strict imperative but rather as a flexible set of linguistic resources aimed at fulfilling communicative intentions. This shift brings both advantages and risks. Such a reconceptualization of norm-establishing processes alters not only the trajectories of language practice but also signals a deeper transformation in how the foundational criteria of linguistic normativity are understood.

## METHODS

The validity of the obtained results and conclusions was ensured by the use of general linguistic and receptive-stylistic methods: comparative-historical (to identify analogy, axiology, and empiricism of language norm in a synchronological analysis); communicative-functional (to establish the differentiating features of literature norm as a linguistic category; (to identify emotional and rational elements in the structures of scientific texts); system-structural (to identify the units of verbal competence and their textual implementation); semantic-axiological analysis (for understanding the estimated mechanisms of the language norm); semantic-differential analysis (for examining the dynamics, dissimilarity of semantics of language units); lingu-

stic and cultural analysis (to understand the content and evaluation of the language means of scientific texts depending on the sociopolitical, sociocultural conditions of their formation.

## DISCUSSION

Although the literary norm is primarily associated with a set of prescriptions and constraints established by codification sources, its status and internal structure are fundamentally determined by the functional nature of language. This conceptual approach was introduced by E. Coseriu, who contrasted the linguistic norm with the systemic potential of language, defining it as the set of realized and socially accepted possibilities within the language system — as opposed to unrealized potentials or realized but non-normative uses that do not attain general acceptance (Coseriu, 2007: 153). This theoretical framework has been further developed in the works of contemporary Slavic linguists (Gajda, 2001; Habrajska, 2004; Sartori, 2007; Skudrzyk, 2005; Yermolenko, 2013). Linguistic standardization, according to linguists in Montenegro, it is a somewhat artificial process that is carried out with the aim of leveling linguistic differences in one society, in one territory. It is, first of all, a political, economic and commercial tool within the framework of state policies and strategies (Šušanj J., Orlandić S., Čirgić A., 2025).

It is indisputable that the selection of units from among the codified linguistic means recognized as normative must correspond to the communicative intent of the author. Each functional variety of language reflects a specific level of encoding and decoding of information in such a way that these processes remain symmetrical and ensure mutual understanding between individuals. Linguists emphasize that the literary norm must consistently offer a comprehensive inventory of linguistic means capable of guaranteeing that any given message is interpreted in a manner that aligns with the sender's intention — regardless of auxiliary contextual factors. (Habrajska, 2004: 293). In the current context, this issue gains particular significance in view of the implementation of the functional potential of the norm against the backdrop of the increasing openness of all literary language styles to interaction and transformation. These shifts are driven by societal attitudes and the technical affordances of the internet, which has become the primary source of information. The transformations have assumed a systemic nature, reflecting the society's axiological reorientation in defining the normativity of linguistic units. Foundational criteria of the literary norm — outlined not long ago, in the 2013 monograph *Literary Norm and Language Practice* — are gradually losing their relevance. These criteria included linguistic tradition; generally accepted

models measured against the linguistic usage of authoritative writers; and the aesthetic canon, which had been a defining standard since the formation of the literary norm in the late 19th to early 20th century (Yermolenko, 2013: 20). The content of these criteria is also undergoing transformation: the direction of change in the literary norm is no longer determined by the artistic style, but rather by the journalistic one. The concept of tradition is interpreted in divergent ways, often being described as either disrupted or obsolete. In light of these developments, some scholars have even proposed replacing the term *literary norm* with *language standard* (Mozer, 2020).

Linguistic practice demonstrates that, under present-day conditions, the primary driving forces behind the dynamics of the literary norm are shifting sociocultural factors that draw heightened societal attention to specific issues. In response to the demands of the time, the norm selects from the broader strata of linguistic units embedded in the language system those means that align with the prevailing public sentiment and are capable of adequately reflecting its value orientations. Contemporary discourse activates a substantial segment of the Ukrainian lexicon, which, for various historical reasons, had previously been functionally marginalized, while also redefining its stylistic applicability. In this regard, it is the axiological criterion that emerges as a key factor — and it is important to underscore: a factor of change — within the boundaries of the literary norm.

Does this criterion negate the traditional parameters of the literary norm as a whole? Unambiguously, it does not. Rather, those traditional parameters serve as the foundation upon which the symbolic core of the Ukrainian literary norm has been established — a stable corpus that remains an enduring standard of continuity and consistency in the Ukrainian literary language across all historical periods. The dynamics driven by the society's value orientations constitute an inherent aspect of linguistic evolution, yet such dynamics generally affect only a portion of the mutable resources of the language, primarily at the lexical level. Moreover, not all emerging tendencies attain systemic status or become accepted within actual language use.

A degree of subjectivity in the concept of the literary norm was noted by Yu. Sheveliov, who observed: “*The norms of the literary language are all the more valid the more closely they correspond to the developmental tendencies of the given language and the broader the speaker base they rest upon. Nevertheless, they inevitably contain a degree of arbitrariness and subjectivity. From a strictly scientific standpoint, one cannot assert that anything in language is inherently correct or incorrect — for everything that exists in a language has its reasons for emergence and, thus, is justified in its own way*” (Sheveliov, 1951: 9 – 10).

The value system of contemporary Ukrainians, on the one hand, is open to the comprehensive processes of global democratization, which are accompanied by a liberalization in the language community's attitude towards language use. This liberalization manifests as an expansion—often not fully justified from the perspective of traditional literary language principles—of the boundaries of linguistic usage and even an increase in the “pluralism” of approaches to the linguistic norm. Such developments provoke a predominance of emotional over rational considerations (Wolny-Zmorzyński, 2006: 115; Kłosińska, 2009). On the other hand, it is marked by existential challenges related to affirming a distinct identity during wartime. These processes largely resonate with the tendencies observed in the normalization of the Montenegrin language, which is currently undergoing a phase of reviving its fundamental distinctive features and their codification in normative standards. A. Čirgić notes that “the Montenegrin language has been standardized alongside the practices established in official communication and literary language over the past one hundred and fifty years” (Čirgić, 2023: 14). According to him, the external resistance to the establishment of defining features of the Montenegrin language serves as evidence that language, especially the standard language, is one of the most significant forms of identity (Čirgić, 2023: 14, 2023: 17).

The dynamics of the Ukrainian literary norm take place against the backdrop of global trends, namely: 1) the strengthening of the author's position within the text, and 2) functional-stylistic changes across all varieties of literary language, with a marked tendency towards expressiveness.

## RESULTS

### **The Intensification of the Authorial Stance in the Text: Benefits and Threats**

The ability of each author to articulate individual value orientations in their texts raises a broader issue of the heterogeneous intellectual levels of language competence within society. Each speaker draws on only a limited subset of the linguistic system's full repertoire, which constrains the representation of its functional potential and highlights disparities in the command of the literary norm. From the perspective of Slavic linguists, such authorial verbal mediation of information across diverse styles and genres tends to destabilize the integrity of linguistic usage, revealing an increasing disjunction between the literary norm and everyday language practice and confining the implementation of the norm to a narrow cultural elite (Markowski, 2006: 21). An expression of the author's linguistic competence is evident in so-called authorial journalism, the projects of which are carried out by individuals from

various professional backgrounds across diverse multimedia genres—further exacerbating the issue of deviation from codified norms. Nevertheless, the tendency to preserve the author’s language, particularly in bookish styles, also has positive implications for the dynamics of the Ukrainian literary norm, especially in terms of the autochthonization of linguistic resources. The retention of authorial language—especially in scholarly texts within the humanities—facilitates the reintroduction of previously forgotten Ukrainian words into usage, with the potential for these to become part of the general lexical repertoire.

For example, lexical items like *оковид* [eye-shaped] and *рівнорядний* [equal], though no longer attested in current lexicographic sources, have been revitalized in the academic writings of literary scholars, thus contributing to the autochthonous enrichment of the language: *Студії над історичною прозою української еміграції з перспективи національної, колективної, індивідуальної пам’яті варто проводити не тільки в літературознавчому ракурсі, а й, сказати б метафорично, з обріїв культурознавства. Саме з такого оковиду можна побачити її ідеологічні, соціальні, культурологічні, ідейно-естетичні контури як важливого медіума колективної пам’яті, у координатному просторі тетогіа – пам’яті як феномену культурологічного та історичного* (Слово і час [Word and time]. 2022. № 4. С. 47); *Однак літературні тексти не можна трактувати рівнорядно з «іншими медіями культурної пам’яті, з іншими символічними системами (історичні хроніки, історичне письменство, тексти юриспруденції, релігійні твори, мітологічні оповіді)», бо вже з XVIII ст. літературним текстам приписують відмітні риси, які відрізняють їх від історичних / історіографічних наративів* (Слово і час [Word and time]. 2022. № 4. С. 54). These lexemes, once part of the active vocabulary of the early twentieth century, have since fallen into disuse. The noun *оковид*, in particular, demonstrates considerable lexical-semantic potential, as evidenced by historical lexicographic sources that register its synonymous usage with *перспектива* [“prospect”] (Karavanskyi, 2014: 310). The word *рівнорядно* has a terminological tradition of use in Ukrainian linguistic scholarship (Syniavskyi, 1931), yet in contemporary usage it demonstrates the potential of entering the general vocabulary, functioning as a synonym of *рівнозначно* and *тотожно* (“identically”).

In religious texts, authorial language tends to draw on dialectal vocabulary that remains stylistically elevated and compatible with the sacral nature of the genre, as seen in the usage of the verb *досвідити* [talk over]: *Ми боронимо Богом дане право жити як люди на своїй землі. З цієї причини, будучи переконаними у своїй правоті, всупереч усім страшинам випробуванням,*

які *досвідчуємо* щодня, ми все ж таки не втрачаємо надії. Бо живемо не тільки одним днем і дивимося на перспективу кожної людини через призму вічності (Патріярхат [Patriarchate]. 2022. № 5). In contemporary lexicographical works, this term is stylistically constrained by the label "dialectal," yet it was prevalent in linguistic practice at the beginning of the 20th century, a fact corroborated by its recording in dictionaries from that period (Krymskyi, 1924 – 1933; Nikovskyi, 1927).

A characteristic feature of religious texts is the activation of infrequently used and colloquial words, such as.: *користати* [to use], *огульно* [in general], *візія* [vision], *таланний* [talented], for instance: *Важливо у Великому пості приступити до Таїнства Покаяння. Церква заохочує до частоті сповіді, але тих християн, хто не **користає** з неї впродовж року, зобов'язує принаймні раз у рік приступити до цього таїнства, яке веде нас не лише до примирення з Богом* (<https://ugcc.ua/data/pist-tse-chas-na-bozhi-obiymy-vladyka-andriy-himyak-2392>); *Сучасна молодь – це найбільш **таланна** генерація усіх поколінь, оскільки вона вже як мінімум 30 років живе українським життям, чого не мала жодна генерація до цього часу. Це молодь, яка своєю кров'ю показала свою віру в такі великі цінності, як свобода, ідентичність, демократія, вільний світ. Змогла це зробити у симфонії з багатьма країнами світу* (Церква і суспільство [Church and society]. 2023. № 3). These can be viewed as potential constituents of the general neutral lexicon of the literary language.

Currently, such processes haven't achieved a systematic character. While bookish styles reach a far more restricted audience than journalistic ones, they nonetheless attest to the uninterrupted internal linguistic lexical-semantic processes of updating the literary standard.

A significant threat amidst the prevailing diversity of authorial opinions is the unchecked artificial influence on the literary norm. A prime illustration is the feminization of the language, a process initiated by education sector officials that has grown to alarming dimensions. This trend is undermining the morphological, lexical, and stylistic norms of the Ukrainian literary standard, especially concerning the adaptation of foreign loanwords to the rules of the Ukrainian language. (Karpilovska, 2017: 386, Kots, 2023). Linguistic phenomena that contravene the inherent principles of a language have generated a range of artificial variants. These variants provoke opposition in usage, even at the level of linguistic intuition, such as: *вождь* [anarch] – *вождиня / вождиця / вождиха*; *канцлер* [chancellor] – *канцлериня / канцеляриня / канцлеркиня / канцлерка*; *філософ* [philosopher] – *філософеса / філософиня / філософка*. These processes hinder the consolidation of linguistic identity, the intellectualization of language, and the coherence of linguistic usage.

### **Functional changes within stylistic varieties of language as projected onto the literary norm**

A far more powerful force than the author's individual stance within a text is another direction of functional change: **inter-stylistic interaction**. This interaction encompasses all spheres of language, influencing stylistic differentiation, disrupting the communicatively pragmatic principles of text creation, and altering the stylistic balance of linguistic devices across all varieties of the literary language. While all styles are equally crucial for the realization of the literary norm, only one holds a leading role in norm-creation processes. The primary directions of these changes were first pioneered by the **journalistic style**, which S. Gajda metaphorically terms a "stylistic melting pot"(Gajda, 2001: 25).

### **Axiological Guidelines for Norm Formation in the Contemporary Journalistic Text**

The principal direction of transformation within the journalistic style is a marked tendency toward expressivization, which has already become an integral feature of informational genres. In contemporary media, the selection of linguistic means is no longer primarily guided by their informational function—typically associated with neutral or rationally evaluative vocabulary—but rather by their capacity to influence mass consciousness. As a result, among the units available in the linguistic system, the most acceptable and effective are those belonging to the emotional stratum of the lexicon. However, this lexical layer does not fully meet the communicative demands of the media and is therefore continually expanding—particularly in the domain of negative evaluation—through the activation of the language's latent potential.

The key concept underlying strongly negative expressive evaluation is *war*, with its primary embodiment being the *enemy*. Around this image, a significant portion of stylistically low-register vocabulary has been activated—mainly colloquial words marked by strong negative connotative meaning, such as: **Стогони, шмарклі європейців** [the groans, the snorts of Europeans] *про те, що "так з нами не можна", нас також не повинні цікавити. Нас повинні цікавити гроші на закупівлю американської зброї, оскільки у достатній кількості вона є тільки в них. У нас гинуть люди, а не в них. Сморід їхніх підштанників* [the stench of their underpants] *нас не повинен хвилювати* (<https://surl.li/zfdkrp>). The colloquial expression of negative emotion often evolves into a form of bitter metaphorical irony: *Автоматичне набуття Україною членства в НАТО, знаєте, трохи попахує солодким Будапештом, солодким Бухарестом, а потім солодким Парижем дадуть по голові* [smells like sweet Budapest, sweet Bucharest, and then

they'll hit you on the head with sweet Paris] (<https://surl.li/xkegqr>). The frequent use of such lexical units noticeably deprives informational genres of rational evaluativity and the stylistic neutrality traditionally associated with informational discourse. These tendencies may justifiably be interpreted as a mechanism of resistance in the context of the information war. However, this phenomenon affects not only the vocabulary of journalistic texts, but also reflects a broader shift in the criteria of expressivity and colloquiality, as well as in the linguistic-aesthetic canon—significantly expanding the scale of negative evaluation and the range of genres in which it is employed. In contemporary texts, the category of colloquiality has become subordinated to the goal of achieving maximal emotional and expressive intensity, with the corresponding lexical stratum regarded by psycholinguists as one of the most effective means of influencing mass consciousness (Mikołajczuk, 2000; Nowakowska-Kempna, 1986).

Linguists emphasize the potential pitfalls in how society perceives overtly expressive informational content. Analytical genres, recognizable to readers and listeners, function as a kind of guide for the accurate interpretation and reception of information—information that has been verified, interpreted, and analyzed by an editorial team, often with reference to documentary sources. When genre markers are unclear or absent, this creates varying degrees of misinterpretation or even distortion of the intended message (Chudziński, 2007: 124). As an illustrative case, scholars often recall the mass panic among British radio listeners following the broadcast of a radio drama depicting the outbreak of nuclear war, which the audience mistakenly perceived as a live news report (Maślanki, 1976: 90).

In the last century, journalistic style interacted actively primarily with artistic style, and its impulses did not have a large-scale impact on literary norms. Today, they extend even to conservative, bookish varieties of language.

### **Functional Shifts in the Bookish Styles of Language**

The shifting balance among bookishness, colloquiality, and emotionality is particularly noticeable in the scientific style, especially in texts within the humanities, which have traditionally maintained stylistic neutrality to ensure the objective reception of information by the audience. This trend distinguishes the Ukrainian literary language within the broader Slavic context, as most researchers consider deviations from neutrality in academic writing to be technical oversights stemming from authorial inattention (Wytrębawicz, 2009). However, texts published in Ukrainian academic journals increasingly demonstrate the use of lexical items in figurative senses, frequently marked by distinct colloquial connotations (*unemumu* [insult], *прослизати* [to slip thro-

ugh], *приправляти* [flavour], *докотитись* [to arrive], *діставати* [procure], *вичищений* [cleaned]), for example: *У цьому творі, який можна вважати точкою відліку її письменницької кар'єри, авторка порушує питання жіночої долі і щедро **приправляє його прискіпливими фізіологічними подробицями*** (Вісник НАН України. 2022. № 12. С. 45); *У результаті цивілізаційні кордони України ставали все беззахиснішими, через них легко **прослизали** наративи і образи російської пропаганди, зазвичай транскрибовані у вигляді культурних продуктів* (Вісник НАН України [Bulletin of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. 2022. № 12. С. 62). Notably, this process extends to the terminological apparatus of science itself, particularly in the creation of new term-formation units marked by overtly emotional and negative evaluative connotations. Consider, for instance: *Анні Ерно явно вірить у визвольну силу письма. Її роботи безкомпромісні й написані простою, **вичищеною мовою*** (Вісник НАН України [Bulletin of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. 2022. № 12. С. 44). This contradicts not only the nature of the stylistic norm of the scientific style but also the very essence of a term, one of whose distinguishing features is stylistic neutrality.

A negative manifestation within the scientific style is the use of slang terms with pejorative meanings, which intensify metaphorical expressivity in the text and, in effect, shift the stylistics of the scientific text toward a journalistic register, for example: *Нині подібні фільми, зроблені **«за межею фолу»** і здорового глузду, змиті самою історією* (Вісник НАН України [Bulletin of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine]. 2022. № 12. С. 64). The scholarly community must, without a doubt, ensure that such phenomena do not exert a significant influence on the future evolution of the stylistic norm of the scientific style, since the hallmark of the scientific variety of academic discourse is academic rigor in presentation, a distinctive informational focus, and professional addressivity, which leave subjective (often socially conditioned) components to the realm of scholarly creativity.

The overall trend of expressivization in the contemporary lexicon negatively affects the stylistic norm of another bookish variety of the literary language — the religious style — thereby violating the principle of sacrality within the contextual framework of the text, as exemplified by: *Господь перший шукає того, хто вірує, і серед натовпу питає учнів: «Хто торкнувся Мене?». А що всі **відпекувались** [baked], Петро мовив: «Наставнику, то люди коло Тебе юрмляться і тиснуться»* (З проповіді С. Шевчука [From the Shevchuk's sermon], 20.11.2023); *Наприклад, в моєї знайомій на фронті був чоловік, згодом у армію пішов син. Проте в їхньому селі їх не вважають героями. Вони невдахи, які просто не змогли **«відмазатися»** [to excuse oneself]...* (Патріярхат [Patriarchy]. № 5. 2021). It is crucial that

such processes of violating these fundamental principles do not become systemic and do not undermine the stylistic differentiation of the literary language. Notably, the trends toward expressivization—characterized by the predominance of the emotional over the rational—in the literary language are observed against the backdrop of global-scale processes aimed at simplifying the verbal content of texts across all spheres of linguistic communication.

### **The Impact of Simplified Standards of Contemporary Culture on the Literary Norm**

The challenges of systemic understanding of the norm in society are further complicated by the dominance of the visual over the verbal, which facilitates effective influence on mass consciousness but provokes fragmentation in knowledge acquisition and disorganization of thinking. This, in turn, impedes the perception of cause-and-effect relationships (Sartori, 2007) and disrupts the continuity of tradition in preserving and transmitting the literary norm from generation to generation (Skudrzyk, 2005).

Slavist scholars interpret the processes of colloquialization and expressivization in journalistic texts as manifestations of a broader tendency toward the tabloidization of language or the “implementation of simplified standards in language” (Kępa-Figura, 2010). M. Deuze emphasizes that within the media space, the weight of the word—even in bookish styles—noticeably diminishes, whereas the weight of the image, conversely, increases (Deuze, 2004: 140). According to F. Esser, this issue is far more profound, indicating a decline in the value of education within society alongside a growing demand for systemic marketing (Esser, 1999: 293). Some scholars rightly emphasize that this is merely one manifestation of the tabloidization of culture as a whole, which is linked to the simplification of cognitive processes in digital society (Janus, 2010).

The simplification of linguistic standards occurs as a result of the expansion of well-known linguistic mechanisms, primarily the principle of linguistic economy, which underlies univerbation. This is undoubtedly a natural process in language development, especially in the formation of compound words, abbreviations, and the like; however, the scale of its application—extending throughout entire texts—is cause for concern. Text compression at the graphic level is achieved through contemporary visual-graphic technologies and the use of conventional letter-based abbreviations and symbols drawn from various fields of knowledge and spheres of human activity, as well as specific uses of punctuation marks, different font styles, and symbols. Such mechanisms become indispensable in the genre of infographics. The recipient of infographics not only perceives, memorizes, and analyzes the information but also in-

interprets it based on their linguistic competence, associations connected to life experience, knowledge, universal and national values, cultural environment, logic, and so forth. This results not only in ambiguity in understanding brief textual messages but also fosters a simplified type of linguistic cognition.

The consequences of this simplified approach to verbal information transmission include:

1) the reproduction of names of concepts and terms from other languages retaining Latin script through technical copying, without effort to convey their meaning in Ukrainian—even in intellectually sophisticated scientific texts, for example: *При розгляді об'єкта набув поширення принцип **case study**, який передбачає поглиблений аналіз невеликої сукупності провідних (відносно середнього національного рівня) ЗВО на основі їхньої звітної інформації* (Наука і наукознавство [Science and scientific studies]. 2022. № 4).

2) the widespread use of foreign words, primarily Anglicisms. This phenomenon is observed across all functional varieties of the literary language. Their usage cannot be justified even in the scientific style, particularly in cases of mass reproduction of de-terminologized nominations—resulting from frequent use in media language—originating from various leading fields of activity, which have precise Ukrainian equivalents. Consider, for example: *аутсайдер – останній [outsider], стартап – успішний проєкт [startup], гайд – путівник, інструкція [guide], напр.: Тому ігнорування решити ЗВО не є виправданим зі статистичних міркувань та виглядає репресивним у науково-політичному аспекті (як провокація скорочень у групі **аутсайдерів** рейтингу)* (Наука і наукознавство [Science and scientific studies]. 2022. № 4); *Є багато **стартапів**, які мають ідеї вирішення проблеми, до речі, і в Україні також, але виникає питання – хто це має фінансувати, прибирати в космосі?* (Куншт [Kunsht], <https://kunsht.com.ua>). These examples attest to the barbarization of the language, which has nothing in common with bookishness as a category correlated with intellectualization. Such phenomena are also observed in religious texts, whose distinctive feature until recently was a clear orientation toward specifically Ukrainian and Church Slavonic word-formation resources, for example: *Почетверте, Церква, нарешті, може і повинна інвестувати в розвиток своїх майданчиків комунікації, таких як соціальні мережі, для залучення й утримування уваги вірних і ширшого кола громадськості, але в цьому аспекті з важливо робити спільні проєкти з медіа, які досі дбають про своїх **фоловерів** [follower] або читачів* (Патріярхат [Patriarchy]. 2024. № 1); *Пісня, яка стала **саундтреком** [soundtrack] до культового фільму «Цілісно-металева оболонка» Стенлі Кубрика про війну у В'єтнамі, вмить стала нашою реальністю* (Патріярхат [Patriarchy]. 2024. № 2). It

is incorrect to explain these phenomena solely by the principle of linguistic economy, since this principle entails not the adoption of single-word nominations from foreign languages, but rather their creation based on multi-word (analytic) expressions within the general framework of linguistic compression methods and means.

## CONCLUSION

The contemporary literary norm of the Ukrainian language is, more than ever before, open to changes determined both by global trends of democratization and the possibilities of digital technologies, as well as by internal cultural-historical and unstable axiological orientations of society. It is existentially crucial not to lose one's own priorities on this path and to preserve the fundamental criterion for defining the linguistic standard—the conformity of each linguistic exemplar to the intrinsic laws of the language—while maintaining a high level of linguistic competence across all stylistic varieties. Linguistic evaluation of these processes must always remain rational, despite the extensive processes of expressivization in the global communicative space.

## References

- Čirgić, A. (2023). „Crnogorski jezički standard u analizi Milorada Pupovca“. *Lingua Montenegrina*. XVI/1, br. 31. Cetinje, str. 3 – 22. <https://doi.org/10.46584/lm.v31i1.971>
- Chudziński, E. (2007). *Słownik wiedzy o mediach*. Bielsko Biala.
- Coseriu, E. (2007). *Textlinguistik: eine Einführung*. 4. Aufl. Tüb.: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Deuze, M. (2004). What is Multimedia Journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 5(2), pp. 139–152.
- Esser, F. (1999). „Tabloidization of News. A Comparative Analysis of Anglo-American and German Press Journalism“. *European Journal of Communication*, № 14, 3, pp. 291–324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323199014003001>
- Gajda, S. (2001). „Nowe społeczności dyskursywne a edukacja komunikacyjna“, in: *Zmiany w publicznych zwyczajach językowych*. Warszawa: BV, pp. 7–13.
- Habrajska, G. (2004). *Wprowadzenie do gramatyki komunikacyjnej*. Tom 1. Łask.
- Janus, J. (2010). „Tabloidization of television news language“, *“Oblicza Komunikacji”*. *Tabloidization of language and culture*, pp. 161–175.

- Караванський, С. (2014). [Karavanskyi, S.]. *Практичний словник синонімів української мови*. [Practical Dictionary of Synonyms of the Ukrainian Language]. Львів. <https://562.slovaronline.com/>
- Карпіловська, Є., Кислюк, Л., Клименко, Н. та ін. (2017). [Karpilovska, Y., Kysliuk, L., Klymenko, N., etc.]. *Вплив суспільних змін на розвиток української мови*. [The influence of social changes on the development of the Ukrainian language]. Київ: Вид. дім Дмитра Бурого.
- Кєра-Figura, D. (2010). „Linguistic dimensions of tabloidization – a case study“, *“Oblicza Komunikacji”*. *Tabloidization of language and culture*, pp. 127–134.
- Kłosińska, K. (2009). *Formy i normy, czyli poprawna polszczyzna w praktyce*. [Forms and norms, or correct Polish in practice]. Warszawa: BV.
- Коць, Т. (2023). [Kots, T.]. „Словотвір назв осіб жіночого роду в українській літературній мові: між нормою і деструкцією“. [Word formation of feminine names in the Ukrainian literary language: between norm and destruction]. *Культура слова*, Vol. 99, pp. 96 – 111. doi.org/10.37919/0201-419X-2023.99.8
- Кримський, А., Єфремов, С. (1924 – 1933). [Krymskyi, A., Yefremov, S.]. *Російсько-український словник*. [Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary]. Kyiv.
- Markowski, A. (2006). *Kultura języka polskiego. Teoria. Zagadnienia leksykalne*. Warszawa.
- Maślanki, J. (Ed.). (1976). *Encyclopedia of knowledge about the press*. Ossolineum, Wrocław.
- Mikołajczuk, S. (2000). „Problem ocen w analizie wybranych polskich nazw uczuć z klasy semantycznej GNIEWU“. *Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis No2229. Język a kultura, Tom 14*. Wrocław, pp. 117 – 134.
- Mozer, M. (2020). „Is a Ukrainian Standard of the Russian Language on the Agenda? “ *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal*, № 7, pp. 185 – 196. <https://doi.org/10.18523/kmhj219672.2020-7.185-196>
- Ніковський, А. (1927). [Nikovsky, A.]. *Українсько-російський словник*. [Ukrainian-Russian Dictionary]. Київ: Горно.
- Nowakowska-Kempna, I. (1986). *Konstrukcje zdaniowe z leksykalnymi wykiadnikami predykatyw uczuć*. Katowice: Uniwersytet.
- Sartori, G. (2007). *Homo videns. Telewizja i postmyślenie*. Warszawa.
- Шевельов, Ю. (1951). [Sheveliov, Yu.]. *Нарис сучасної української літературної мови*. [An essay on the modern Ukrainian literary language]. Мюнхен: Молоде життя.
- Skrabacz, A., Lewińska-Krzak, M. (2022). „Wpływ rewolucji cyfrowej na rozwój społeczeństwa informacyjnego oraz społeczną wartość informacji“. *Roczniki nauk społecznych*, T. 14 (50), №1, pp. 12 – 21. <https://doi.org/10.18290/rns22501.12>

- Skudrzyk, A. (2005). *Czy zmierzch kultury pisma? O synestezji i analfabetyzmie funkcjonalnym*. Katowice, 2005.
- Šušanj, J., Orlandić, S., Čirgić, A. (2025). „Акцент у Црногорском језику између стандарда, стварности и идеологије“. *Lingua montenegrina*, XVIII/1. 35, Cetinje, str. 4 – 21. <https://linguamontenegrina.me/index.php/lm/article/view/1070/1066>
- Синявський, О. (1931). [Syniavskiy, O.]. *Норми української літературної мови*. Харків – Київ: Література і мистецтво.
- Wytrębawicz, J. (2009). „O poprawności językowej publikacji naukowo-technicznych“. *Zagadnienia naukoznawstwa*, 1(179), pp. 1–10.
- Wolny-Zmorzyński, K.; Kaliszewski, A.; Wysocki, F. (2006). *Journalistic Genres. Theory, Practice, Language*. Warsaw: Academic and Professional Publishing Houses.
- Єрмоленко, С., Бибик, С., Коць, Т. та ін. (2013). [Yermolenko, S., Bybyk, S., Kots, T., etc.] *Літературна норма і мовна практика*. [Literary Norm and Language Practice]. Київ. [https://drive.google.com/file/d/10CZw2XjWuyVB5\\_UkP6Nc-FxsD5u1svEc/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/10CZw2XjWuyVB5_UkP6Nc-FxsD5u1svEc/view)

**Tetiana KOTS & Anhelina GANZHA**

**TENDENCIJE KNJIŽEVNE NORME U TEKSTOVIMA  
SAVREMENIH UKRAJINSKIH MEDIJSKIH RESURSA:  
PANSLOVENSKI KONTEKST**

Članak ispituje evoluirajuće tendencije u književnoj normi modernog ukrajinskog jezika u svjetlu intrinzičnih nacionalnih vrijednosti i panslovenskih konteksta, kao i izazove koji proizilaze iz digitalnog načina širenja informacija. Ključne transformacije pripisuju se jačanju autorskog glasa u različitim žanrovima i stilskim domenima, kao i globalnim trendovima u ekspresivizaciji jezika. Ovi fenomeni mogu dovesti do stilske polimorfizma i usvajanja pojednostavljenih jezičkih standarda. Studija posmatra, kroz međusobno djelovanje novinarskih, akademskih i vjerskih stilova, promjenu ravnoteže između knjiških i kolokvijalnih elemenata u tradicionalno konzervativnim varijantama jezika i ističe ulogu interaktivnih tehnologija u oblikovanju intelektualnog diskursa u savremenom društvu.

Ključne reči: *književna norma, digitalno okruženje, aksiološki standard, ekspresivizacija, pojednostavljene jezičke norme.*