



# International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies

E-ISSN: 2706-8927

P-ISSN: 2706-8919

[www.allstudyjournal.com](http://www.allstudyjournal.com)

IJAAS 2022; 4(4): 39-42

Received: 15-08-2022

Accepted: 21-09-2022

**Dr. Azima Majeed**

Professor, Department of  
Persian Dari National  
Language and Literature  
Faculty, Kabul University,  
Kabul, Afghanistan

## The distinction between standard language and convergence

**Dr. Azima Majeed**

### Abstract

Convergence is a linguistic issue that is closely tied to numerous other concerns, including nationalism, literary history, sociology, psychology, etc. The concept of convergence has existed throughout the history of all nations; so, it is not a new occurrence. However, at some point in the history of the world, particularly in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, this phenomenon has become more apparent. Standard language is a type of writing or speech that is used by highly educated people in the society, and it is accepted as the dominant language model in the society. In the media, the press (audio and video), lectures and school texts, as well as in formal dialogues and interviews, criteria are utilized. Due to the high social prestige of the standard species, other social groupings attempt to emulate and conform to it.

**Keywords:** Standard language, alien words, standardization

### Introduction

Convergence, or if we express it in the Persian version of Sere or Parsi Sere, because our native language is Persian, is the sort of Persian language that is devoid of or contains few foreign terms. The contemporary Persian language is a vestige of an ancient language from which many words have been assimilated or derived over its history; hence, a significant portion of its grammar and vocabulary has its origins in the Pahlavi and Avesta languages. Due to the spread of Ariana from the West, the Persian language has developed intimate ties with various peoples, which has resulted in numerous alterations. As far as India and Asia Minor, the Tazians and Mongols dominate Ariana; this caused a great deal of damage to it, and if not for the efforts of individuals such as Ibn Sina Balkhi and Al-Bruin Frowsy, the fear of the extinction of the Aryan culture and the dilution of its language and origin would have been a reality. It is fundamentally and ordinarily constructed and derived from numerous dialects. When a language type is adopted to distinguish insiders from outsiders, it can be perpetuated by official grammar and dictionaries and taught through national education. It is important to notice that the language typically, the standard is the written form of the language, which is maintained through a print culture that serves various ideological, economic, and political goals.

### The significance of the research

In essence, standard language and colloquialism are fundamentally distinct; nonetheless, there are some commonalities and features between the two. As a result, some individuals have reservations that standard language is colloquialism, which is acceptable to all speakers. Allow me to describe the similarities and differences between these two entities.

### Research questions

What is the relationship between convergence language and standard language?

What is the difference between convergence language and standard language?

### What is standard language?

Criteria is not a simple notion and has multiple applications. In general, however, one application can be distinguished from the other in terms of its significance: the criteria as a descriptive fact and the criterion as a prescriptive norm.

Descriptive fact: Standard language, according to Rai, is the type of language employed by portions of society that are worthy of imitation. Standard language, according to Garvin and Mathieu, is a structured and established form of language that the majority of the linguistic community accepts and use as a model.

**Corresponding Author:**

**Dr. Azima Majeed**

Professor, Department of  
Persian Dari National  
Language and Literature  
Faculty, Kabul University,  
Kabul, Afghanistan

Redfield, who distinguished between local and urban culture, using standard terminology as opposed to (local speech). In other words, they view standard language as the primary language of urban culture and attach to standard language characteristics that local speech lacks.

Fiesole views standard language to be standard, codified, and governed by generally accepted rules. Language is defined in the encyclopaedia of language and linguistics as a standard utilized by educated individuals and those who are socially, economically, and politically superior. According to the definition of Kamari, the standard language is one of the common dialects in one part of the world, which is generalized as a means of communication between the ethnic groups that share a common life, and in matters that are common to all of these ethnic groups, it functions as the language of choice (Sarli, 1378:38) <sup>[6]</sup>.

Standard language, according to the dictionary of linguistic terminology, is a sort of language that is accepted by society, is based on the language of pupils, and is used in political and cultural centres. This type is popular among speakers of different dialects as an official, auxiliary, and written language, and it is also taught as a foreign language in other countries.

Standard language, as defined by Kho row Farshidvard, is the common cultural and literary language used and written in by students, priests, politicians, scientists, journalists, and authors of technical and specialized textbooks. And they achieve their objective (Farshid Ward, 1380: 564) <sup>[8]</sup>.

Madrasa recognizes the standard language as a viable version of a language used mostly by educated people who reside in the cultural and political capitals of a country. This variety goes beyond regional and social types and is frequently employed as an official language in education, the media, and other places where it is acceptable.

Ali Ashraf Sadeghi considers the standard language to be a language that transcends the common local and social dialects in a country and serves as a method of social, scientific, and literary communication for individuals who may otherwise speak their own local or social dialects. This language is frequently identical to the written language and is typically the language of the students. This is the language used in radio, television, and newspapers, as well as in the instruction of foreign languages. A standard language is a fixed language with rules and guidelines that theologians must adhere to (Sadeghi, 29:1375) <sup>[7]</sup>.

Garvin and Mathieu have addressed two fundamental elements of standard language (composition and acceptance) in addition to its use and users, whereas the previously-mentioned definitions tended to focus on the language's social usage or its users rather than its nature and inherent characteristics. Because of this, Madrasa finds their definition to be clearer and more thorough.

In addition to failing to meet the standards intrinsic to the language, the definition of vote lacks clarity regarding which segments of the population deserve to be emulated by others: educated people, rulers, scientists, priests, politicians, and reporters. Writers, upper-class individuals, textbook authors, or other groups. This flaw is apparently caused by the fact that reference groups vary from society to society. In one society, clergy are viewed as role models in all aspects, whereas in another one, university graduates are more likely to be imitated. It causes others to mimic their words. The description by Garvin and Mathieu is quite exhaustive, however it does not specify when the language

community employs the standard language variety. Today, as a result of the theoretical studies of individuals such as Hagen, we are familiar with the various and unique features of turning a dialect or linguistic variety into a standard language, and we can utilize them to create a more exhaustive definition.

Additionally, Fiesole ignored standard language users and included only two characteristics of standard language in his brief definition. It is not clear in his definition which group and how many individuals should embrace standard language norms. At the same time, the concept itself (acceptance) is surrounded by an atmosphere of ambiguity: is theoretical acceptance of standard language rules sufficient, or does acceptance entail application?

The definition of encyclopaedia of language and linguistics is general and only applies to users of standard language. In this formulation, the intrinsic linguistic characteristics of the speech criterion are not mentioned. Moreover, it is unclear who they are (those who are socially, economically, and politically superior).

Dr. Khandesi's definition does not refer specifically to the inherent characteristics of standard language, but he does mention the contexts in which standard language is used - albeit in a vague manner. According to this definition, standard language is used in matters that are shared by those ethnic groups; ethnic groups that live together.

In the definition of the dictionary of linguistic terms, various uses of standard language have been considered, however the definition appears to be excessively lengthy. In Dr. Fars hid Ward's definition, in order to prevent the error and defect that we contributed to the definition of vote, all users of the standard language are named; nonetheless, it should be highlighted that in some civilizations, for instance, the language spoken by clerics must be regarded a standard. Can't In this definition, the intrinsic qualities of the criterion are not considered.

In Dr. Madrasa's definition, the uses of standard language are emphasized, and in the continuation of his presentation and definition of standard language, he mentions Garvin and Mathieu's definition.

If we pay close attention to the definitions mentioned and omit the repetitious content, we will discover a few points that will pave the way for a new definition of standard

### Language

1. Initially, the standard language was one of the prevalent linguistic types in the culture.
2. There have been modifications to the creation of this sort of language (editing and fixing).
3. The majority of the language community has adopted it as a model (acceptance).
4. The majority of the language community uses it in certain situations and contexts.

The research of Hagen and those who have expressed his perspective on the transformation of a language type into a standard language have shed light on the extension of the standard language's role and function as well as its varied applications. Standard language is typically employed in official writing and scheduled speeches, and efforts are made to broaden its communication function to other contexts.

Keeping in mind the mobility of the benchmark language notion and based on the above definitions and additional research, benchmark language can be described as follows:

The benchmark language is one of the most prevalent language kinds in the linguistic community, with variations in form and structure. It is acknowledged as a valid language model by the majority of the language community and is utilized in official works and speeches.

The prescriptive point of view is characterized by minimal variation in form and maximal variation in role and function. In other words, the standard language should be able to facilitate the greatest amount of communication with the fewest linguistic resources and linguistic units, and if possible, it should be utilized in place of other language varieties. Prescriptivism results from a prescriptive frame of view that is excessive. Prescriptivists place a premium on writing and view it as the (original) form of language. According to this perspective, standard language patterns are similar to prescriptive standards that identify acceptable and justifiable linguistic conduct and reject other patterns. Numerous language usage critics and language guardians hold this viewpoint.

Therefore, the standard language is a collection of terms that are used only in their literal sense - not figuratively - and typically contain the following characteristics:

A: It is utilized for formal education from kindergarten through the end of high school and even into college.

B: It has a uniting function, in that speakers of diverse local dialects utilize it while writing letters, studying Farsi, and listening to news and official announcements on radio and television.

P: It measures right and wrong in writing, thus right and wrong in language is an issue of credibility, and its standard varies roughly every 40 to 50 years.

A: Dari Farsi, the common and official language and script of the people of Afghanistan. Papers, official texts, and textbooks must be written in this language and script. In accordance with the Constitution of official documents, official texts must be produced in the official language (standard) and not in the language of the Samanid or Ghaznavid periods. It is, in fact, the same language that linguists (standard language) refer to, and it is the language that transcends the local dialects of a country and serves as the means of social communication for individuals who speak the local dialects. In speaking, it is the language of official radio and television news broadcasts. In writing, it is typically the language of students and daily correspondence, as well as textbooks in the fields of psychology, linguistics, history, geography, sociology, physics, and chemistry.

### Definition of agreement

Thomas, a German scientist, does not consider serendipity a term due to the lack of consensus over its meaning. William Barnes, an English linguist, believes that a language is more pure and straightforward if the majority of its terms are derived from the roots of the same language. Barnes only addressed the vocabulary level in his definition. It is subjective. Some view syncretism as an effort to remove foreign (or potentially foreign) aspects from a language and replace them with indigenous and national traits. This definition, which encompasses all levels of language, views convergence as a two-sided action, including deletion and replacement, which may or may not be effective. This description, however, does not specify a criterion for recognizing foreign materials.

Kipper viewed foreign language to be the initial level of opposition to foreign words and their function because other

studies have enlarged the topic of foreign language to include different varieties of foreign language, dialect, and even slang terms. Introduces these elements' ejection. Some social species inside the area of the target language may also be subject to systematic attention, as these species may not fall under the lexical, syntactic, morphological, and production standards of standard language. The basis of convergence, according to descriptionists, is that a dialectal, social, or other variety of language is purer and consequently superior to other varieties. In addition to being prescriptive, this definition does not pay great attention to vocabulary; its ideal is a linguistic system with dignity and prestige. Nevertheless, this definition is relatively exclusive. In modern linguistics dictionaries, convergence is also defined as a method for dealing with new words, the introduction of loan words and international words, etc. In addition, it has been viewed as a language attitude that opposes breaking certain grammatical norms, embracing new terms, and borrowing from foreign languages. They refer to conserving or liberating the language from extraneous influences. One of the benefits of this definition is that it places convergence within the realm of language planning and focuses solely on external elements. Assimilation can be defined as the desire of a linguistic community or a portion of it to retain the language or to purge it of foreign or undesirable characteristics. Colloquialism emerges at all linguistic levels. However, its primary occurrence is in vocabulary. Perhaps convergence is also visible in the codification, nurturing, and planning of standard language on a broader scale (Ardakani, 1387:17) [2].

### What is the relationship between standard language and convergence?

Since differentiation, creation of unity, and validity are considered to be among the most important characteristics and objectives of standardization, and convergence is also implemented in the majority of cases with these objectives, there are a kind of shared objectives and, consequently, shared methods in these two methods. It is observable. It should be noted that the creation of unity can be pursued with a variety of expressions and attitudes, such as opposition to the use of dialects and language styles or maintaining a relationship with the past speakers of the language. Of course, each of these approaches to the creation of unity has advantages and disadvantages. It results in the emergence of distinct and sometimes contradictory varieties of collectivism. For instance, one of the purposes of popular convergence is to establish unity among all people, whereas elitist convergence, whilst aiming to create linguistic distinctiveness for a given social class, may want to build harmony between this class and the prior speakers of the language. Upon deeper inspection, we see that the ultimate purpose of the two common features of convergence and standardization, i.e., divergence and generating unity, is to establish credibility, therefore it may not be accurate to consider these three to be similar. In addition, the outcome of standardizing a language with linguistic standards is flexibility, stability, and multifunctionality. In other words, while a standard language should be adaptable and accept some special adjustments, it should also be stable against other changes and capable of playing a variety of roles. The presence of these features in a language endows it with dignity and

prestige. With a broad perspective, we might say that syncretism emerges in particular language contexts. In actuality, this assertion pertains to this this indicates that convergence is a consequence of language interactions. Since linguistic interactions result in the formation of linguistic variation, convergence also interacts with this diversity. Standardization, on the other hand, is a process that develops as a result of linguistic exchanges and the need to distinguish a language code; it is strongly tied to convergence.

### Conclusion

Borrowing words is one of the objectionable sorts of linguistic change, and convergence is the sole method to digest or reject these terms (Robert, 1379: 280). Unless the predominant language is another, a regular occurrence in contemporary global communities is the designation of one of a language's dialects as the right or pure standard form of that language. From a linguistic perspective, no dialect is more proper or legitimate than another dialect: all dialects are equally correct and legitimate. They are equally effective kinds of language because every thought or wish can be articulated in each dialect (Andrin, 1375:337) <sup>[1]</sup>. Additionally, language is an indicator of our national identity Standard of language is language or, to put it another way, the acceptable accent is based on common sense and promotes the fact that some of the common aims described above, such as nationality and standard language, are the same in speech and writing.

### References

1. Andrin Akmajin and others. Linguistics, translator, Gholam Alizadeh, Khosrow, Kermanshah: Taq Bostan; c1375.
2. Ardakani, Negar Davari. Linguistic orientation, Tehran: Hermes; c1387.
3. Al Barzi, Parviz. Sentence Linguistics, Tehran: Paizeh; c2008.
4. Zolnoor, Rahim. Historical language behaviorism, Tehran: Tahori; 2010.
5. Robert Lawrence Trask. Fundamentals of Language, translated by Ali Famiyan, Tehran: Center; c1379.
6. Sarli, Nasser Qoli. Standard Persian language, Tehran: Hermes; c1378.
7. Sadeghi, Ali Ashraf. About the Persian language, Tehran: University Publishing Center; c1375.
8. Farshid Ward, Khosrow. Vocabulary and translation of scientific and technical terms, Tehran: Henry; c1380.
9. Kazemi, Mohammad Kazem. Colingualism and languagelessness, Tehran: FIPA; c1346.
10. Klarkamesh. Language and culture, translated by Fariba Ghazanfar and others, Tehran: Amir Kabir; c2013.
11. Modaresi, Yahya. An introduction to the sociology of language, Tehran: Research Institute of Human Sciences; c2012.