Kulturologie

UDC 1'271

THE NORM IN THE CONTEXT
OF THE LANGUAGE MATERIAL'S SELF-ORGANIZATION

O. V. Chibisova   *Candidate of Arts, assistant professor,*
Komsomolsk-on-Amur State Technical University,
Komsomolsk-on-Amur, Khabarovsk region, Russia

Summary. The quality of communication is a key factor in determining the degree of group's stability and mobility, which directly or indirectly is realized by all its members. The interest in matters of communication manifests itself at all levels of the hierarchical organization of the group. The examples of display of interest can equally be the language policy of a state, and homeschool, gender or group education, and language-related recreational forms of interaction, and then some. Still, today we can say that the norm is actively used only on the periphery of the totality of speech acts produced by people; in those areas of communication, which are rarely turned to by the majority of speakers. So, it is the category of communicative freedom which is equally important for a communicative space

Keywords: literary norm; ideological control; regulatory oversight; communicative freedom.

A literary norm is a set of the rules of verbal behavior mandatory for all native speakers. The linguistic theory fairly perceives a norm as a factor of stabilizing and preserving the various manifestations of linguistic reality, ensuring the unity of language and impeding centrifugal processes which arise in it. But this perception is not directly reflected in the speech practice and communicative behavior of people. The groups of speakers, who are opposite from the standpoint of their language competence level, show the same consistent, though often functionally different, rejection of the norm.

That is why the members of the group subject communication problems to permanent direct and indirect reflection, which has a wide range of manifestations: from daily individual and group speech evaluations to large-scale disputes involving the masses. Reflection is carried out continuously, and it periodically transforms into a discussion, for example, the dispute between archaists and innovators in the XIX century, the debate about the spelling of the XX century. A complex set of issues related to various disputes and preferences in relation to the Russian language is considered by V. M. Zhivov [1], V. G. Kostomarov [2] and other authors.

On a superficial and almost tangible level, such discussions frequently relate to the issues of speech correctness. Correctness is defined in the terms of the ratio to norm: what the evaluator considers to be fitting with norm is correct and what deviates from is wrong. Norm is a standard of speech behavior, the pattern obligatory for producing, somehow fixed to a certain synchronic transition. The norms are different. There are two extreme points of norm's existence: an individual norm, formed in a specific native speaker due to a variety of reasons, and the norm of a linguistic community – a literary norm. Further, we will talk only about the literary norm. It is fixed in the normative dictionaries, reference books and grammars.

You can go on popular linguistics debates about how the norm comes into existence from the depths of popular speech and / or from the treasury of literature, how it is born, what factors determine its formation and development, when it appears, how it accumulates the tradition and so on. But in fact of its actual existence the norm is created not by masses, cultural memory, or mythical creatures, but by concrete linguists. The norm is the result of the theoretical linguistic interference into the concepts of the Prague Linguistic Circle [3].

The rate actually becomes the norm only when it is codified or recorded, that is when certain people, belonging to a spelling commission, to the authors' membership of orthoepic, explanatory, spelling and other dictionaries and reference books, say (fix): one can speak / write this way and one cannot do it that way. The creators of the literary norms of modern Russian language can be listed by name. All of them, by definition, belong to the elite. Let us remember this fact which is not obvious to the average native speaker.

Regardless of the fact of acquaintance with the basic normative sources, any native speaker has an idea of the literary norm. This idea can be very different. The end points are: 1 extremely abstract knowledge, reducible to unclear categories of right / wrong, backed by everyday notion of tradition – it is appropriate / inappropriate to speak so; 2 extremely concrete knowledge, based on the familiarity with the original regulatory sources and their reasoned, conscious reproduction in communicative interaction.

The norm as a communicative, linguistic and social category is the center, pulling together all the diversity of a variety of speech acts carried out by the group to ensure the smooth exchange of information and to create a common space of understanding each other. The facts of steady, persistent non-compliance, rejection, ignoring the norm by language community cannot be explained by its apparent historical volatility. If all cases of deviation from the norm are the evidence of origin of a new norm, the norm is so dynamic that it simply cannot perform its preserving function, that is, the dynamics of its development denies its existence and necessity.

The causes of extreme distancing of the language community from the norm are multiple. Among them, on the surface of the problem, a significant place is occupied by: the increase in number and diversity of information channels, the increase in number and diversity of broadcast information, permanent contacts with other languages, the increase of the community's liberalization degree, the quickening pace of interaction with the information, the transfer of substantial segments of interaction in the virtual sphere, the growing role of mediated communicative interaction and cross-cultural communication. All these reasons arose not at the beginning of the XXI century. All of them with varying degrees of intensity, decay and decline, highlighting one or another factor operated in the XVIII, the XIX, and the XX centuries, that is, those 300 years, in respect of which it is safe to about the existence of the norm. An exception is the recently emerged actualization of the virtual sphere, but here, as observations show, there is nothing fundamentally new in the communicative sense [4]. During its more than three hundred years of interaction with these factors the norm could steadily adapt to them (develop immunity to external stimuli), which may have happened. One way or another, but the long-term coexistence of the norm with the factors that undermine it indicates that the reason for the current state is not in them.

It seems that all these reasons, for the most part, are external (or minor). In the essential terms, the current rejection of the norm by the community is due to the fact that the norm can closely interact with them not during its natural organic broadcasting, but only in an artificial situation – with a rigid external support of the state.

Confirmation of this is the USSR with a lot of powerful institutions of editing, censorship and proofreading, where the norm was extended much larger (wider) and was used more often in the practice of verbal communication of the community. These institutions, which stifled the manifestations of personal and artistic freedom, had two main functions: ideological control and regulatory oversight; at this the regulatory oversight was seen as an integral part of the ideological control which makes sense both practically and theoretically. The desire of teaching all people to talk identically was directly (and not without reason) tied up with a desire of obliging all people to think identically. Thus, objectively the norm acted as one of the ideological weapons of a monocultural state, a powerful tool for universal fictitious equalization.

Since the state cannot exist without the ideological and regulatory diktat, after the destruction of the institutions of censorship and editing in the Russian Federation, these types of control, of course, have not disappeared, they just weakened a little and transformed into other forms. In particular, nowadays with a reasonable degree of efficiency, the regulatory oversight function, at least in the area of spelling, punctuation and grammar, can be performed by automatic text verification programs and reference and information portal «Gramota.ru.» But their obvious difference from earlier forms of regulatory diktat consists precisely in the fact that the average native speaker is free to access the programs and portal or ignore them. And this difference, banal in the formal respect, reveals the presence of freedom of choice, shows us a curious position. If, in spite of a simple possibility to exercise self-control, that is directly contact with the norm, the native speaker removes the use of the norm in the peripheral spheres of communication, it means that there is no general

need in the self-test. Consequently, the community has no desire (necessity) of constantly using the norm, translating it in the practice their verbal behavior, always following its regulations.

The present distancing of the language community from the norm is likely to be regarded as a natural type of interaction which is consistently and fully in line with the self-organization of linguistic material. The norm as an initially external and artificial in relation to the language factor occupies an appropriate external position of an artificial guide.

We think that the example of the interaction of a language community with the norm demonstrates the fundamental changes which are taking place in the communication space. They are not connected with the fact that the norm, as a linguistic category, as an important factor of the language consciousness which regulates behavior and defines the main sample of education or competence, will die out. It will retain its actuality, existing mostly outside the language community than inside it. The discrepancies will deepen, but they will never lead to a complete rupture, which would mark in the functional, but not in a meaningful sense, a return to a situation of bilingualism. That is the norm would take the place of the Church Slavonic language, but with a different field of application, and a living language would take the place of the Old Russian language. This will not happen because of state regulation, though reducing is retained, and the education system, which transmits the norm, though decaying, continues to exist. It is important that the underlined or soft distancing of the language community from the norm reveals the nature of regulation of those speech forms which it selects for its own use. It is subject to a significant communicative factor, which eventually will become increasingly important. It can be called a communicative freedom.

Communicative freedom is a guideline existing in the mind of a language community that it can build its own verbal behavior without agreeing with any external regulatory factors, but relying solely on the idea of the appropriateness of the communicative behavior and its own experience. The nature of this guideline includes a paradoxical duality. On the one hand, it shows the self-organization of linguistic material. On the other hand it reflects the false notion that the language community is able to globally regulate the self-development of linguistic forms. It is a fictitious refraction of real processes in the linguistic consciousness. But its substantial fictitiousness is not an obstacle or barrier to its widespread operations. The modern communicative space accepts as equally important both strict regulatory standards and communicative freedom which promises the ultimate lack of control. They are two counterbalancing landmarks, choosing between which, native speakers can build their behavior with a due measure of specified and unconditioned ratio.

Bibliography

1. Живов В. М. Культурные реформы в системе преобразований Петра I // Из истории русской культуры. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 2000. – Т. 3. – С. 528–583.
2. Костомаров В. Г. Языковой вкус эпохи. – 3-е изд., испр. и доп. – СПб. : Златоуст, 1999 – 280 с.
3. Пражский лингвистический кружок : сборник статей. – М. : Прогресс, 1966. – 558 с.
4. Шунейко А. А. ВИР – вариант мира // Ученые записки Комсомольского-на-Амуре государственного технического университета. 2012. – Т. 2. – № 11. – С. 120–121.

Bibliography

1. Zhivov V. M. Kulturnyie reformyi v sisteme preobrazovaniy Petra I // Iz istorii russkoy kulturyi. – M. : Yazyiki russkoy kulturyi, 2000. – T. 3. – S. 528–583.
2. Kostomarov V. G. Yazyikovoy vkus epohi. – 3-e izd., ispr. i dop. – SPb. : Zlatoust, 1999 – 280 s.
3. Prazhskiy lingvisticheskiy kruzhok : sbornik statey. – M. : Progress, 1966. – 558 s.
4. Shuneyko A. A. VIR – variant mira // Uchenyie zapiski Komsomolskogo-na-Amure gosudarstvennogo tehnicheskogo universiteta. 2012. – T. 2. – № 11. – S. 120–121.