

Pregledni rad

UDK 81'1

Tetiana KOTS (Kyiv)

Institute of the Ukrainian Language

of National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Tetyana_kots@ukr.net

AXIOLOGICAL AND TEMPORAL DIMENSIONS OF THE LANGUAGE NORM

The article deals with the analysis of the language norm – an important concept of the general theory of a language and the main category of the language culture as a direction of linguistics. The prescriptive norm is differentiated as an ideal, codified norm, which regulates the rules of use of linguistic means, and the descriptive norm as a model of real functioning of multilevel language units. In the historical aspect, attention is drawn to the existence of a symbolic norm, which embodies the connection with folk traditions, national self-awareness and a pragmatic norm, which subordinates the means of language to a certain communicative goal. Attention is drawn to the dynamics of the literary norm in connection with the internal potential of the system and socio-cultural factors.

Key words: linguistic norm, prescriptive norm, descriptive norm, axiology, diachronic aspect, history of the literary language.

INTRODUCTION

Standardisation of the internal structure and functional development of the literary language are historically determined and depend on intralingual and extra lingual factors.

Norm is an important concept of the general language theory and the main category of language culture as a branch of linguistics that determines the optimal choice and functioning of alternative means. Any developed language has a specific historical, socially determined norm. It organizes a complex language structure and consolidates the national space. It is generally accepted to define a language norm as a set of commonly used language assets that correspond to the language system and which have been recognized by

its native speakers as the most appropriate in a particular historical period of society development.

In linguistic research, the terms of language norm and literary norm both function – they are similar in meaning, but not identical. The concept of language norm is broader and covers the characteristic features of the language system, the norm of the nationwide national language, its dialect manifestations, which are absorbed spontaneously by native speakers. The literary norm provides for the conscious use of established, codified model language forms that are fixed in the society mind in the process of education.

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 diachronological 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 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); linguocultural analysis (to understand the content and evaluation of the language means of texts depending on the socio-political, socio-cultural conditions of their formation.

RESULTS

The norm acts as a unifying and strengthening element of literary language at all stages of its development. It has its core – an unchanging vocabulary, clear grammatical mechanisms, orphoepical features that ensure the stability of literary language over time and unites the national space. However, language, like any living organism, is constantly evolving, enriching, improving. Native speakers of the national language in the process of education assimilate the established core of the norm of literary language, but constantly experience the continuous variability of the language, which present them with a choice of a language phenomenon. Changes occur mainly on the periphery and do not drastically affect the differential features of the literary language as a whole.

DISCUSSION

E. Koseriy interprets the concept of language norm, contrasting it with the language capability system. The language norm, in his opinion, is the realized generally accepted possibilities of the language system, in contrast to the unrealized possibilities of the system and the realized but not generally accepted as normative (Koseriy, 1963: 173 – 175). V.G. Kostomarov notes that “if the system is considered as something constant and unchanging, then the norm as its correlate can be qualified as a constant that is subject to fluctuations, variations and changes. If we call the system a set of significant changes, then the norm can be considered a set of minor changes in connection with significant changes, provided the analysis of the transition from one to another” (Kostomarov, Leontiev, 1966: 66 – 69).

The intrastructural and functional development of the literary language is historically determined and depends on intralingual and extra lingual factors. Language dynamism is a process that ensures its compliance with the variable needs of human communicative and cognitive activity. According to C. Y. Ermolenko, “the literary norm, implemented at the synchronous level, always contains elements of linguistic diachronia in its content plan, reveals the most close connection with the literary tradition” (Yermolenko, 2013: 65). Each language state is marked with dynamic equilibrium, relative stability, which ensures the transfer of experience from generation to generation.

A comprehensive study of the language norm involves the establishment of patterns of development of literary language, taking into account the internal potential of the system and in connection with the dynamics of socio-cultural factors. We differentiate the criteria of the literary norm into external and internal. The external ones include: a) cultural-historical criterion (it determines at the beginning of the formation of literary language as a socially prestigious variety of national language); b) the criterion of language tradition; c) prevalence criterion, or statistical criterion; d) the criterion of generally accepted samples, which include the language practice of authoritative writers. An important external criterion of the literary norm is the aesthetic criterion, correlated with the artistic and linguistic practice of writers, and in modern times - motivated by the influence of authoritative media. The internal criterion of a literary norm is its compliance with the laws of the national language system. All criteria of the literary norm interact with each other. At different periods of development of literary language, some of these criteria become more important, others - become secondary.

Accepted norms at certain intervals require revision, reassessment. Retrospective and the most exclusive and objective form of social acceptance

of the language norm is codification. It reflects those phenomena that have been established in the process of language practice. Codification is called the systematization of the language norm in grammars, textbooks, dictionaries, reference books.

The modern literary norm cannot be a measure of the standardization of units during the historical development of the language. Each period had its own features of understanding the literary standard. Until the end of the XIX century, the Ukrainian literary language was structurally an open, heterogeneous system that simultaneously preserved the book tradition (Church Slavonic elements), and into which dialect units infiltrated unrestrictedly. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the variability of the means of language expression, unacceptable for the modern norm, was a natural way of developing the language and finding a literary standard.

Traditionally fixed and unchanged throughout the entire historical development of the language remain the defining features of the Ukrainian language – different from other related Slavic languages. Their own linguistic awareness took place in grammars and dictionaries at the beginning of the twentieth century and was subsequently enshrined in spelling in 1928 – 1929, which became a symbol of the unified Ukrainian language. At different time periods, we can talk about the existence of a symbolic norm (the ideal of a literary norm formed in the speaker's imagination, which embodies the connection with folk traditions, national self-awareness, the choice of such linguistic means that distinguish the Ukrainian language from related languages). The Ukrainian language is characterized by the formation of a literary standard with an emphasis on linguistic identity compared primarily to the Russian language. This is a well-known model for other Slavic languages. According to A. Cirgić, the establishment of a literary model of the Montenegrin language "includes almost all the components of construction of a new ethnolinguistic identity, which will be as far away as possible from other South Slavic peoples and their languages, and first of all from Serbian"(Cirgić, 2023: 9).

In the 40 – 80's of the twentieth century in the conditions of the totalitarian regime in Ukraine, attention to the symbolic norm fades. The tendency to maximize the convergence of the Ukrainian language with Russian affected the morphological level, in particular, the indistinguishable nominative and vocative cases, word-forming processes (the spread of active participles on *-учий, -ючий (діючий, пишучий)*, nouns – names of persons by type of activity with the suffix *-щик (кранівщик)*, which competed with the forms on *-ник (кранівник)*, etc. There were significant changes in the axiological guidelines of society, which was reflected in the semantics of evaluation units, the standardization of thinking. Such subordination of linguistic means to a

certain communicative goal – an unambiguous understanding for the public of the necessary information, which leads to mutual understanding between the subject (power) and the object (people), is a pragmatic norm. Pragmatic language norm is one of the defining features of the style norm primarily of the media. Language units throughout the history of the literary language performed a pragmatic function – they were an instrument of influence on the public consciousness of society. In the 10 – 20 years of the twentieth century, the pragmatic norm complemented the symbolic norm in matters of affirmation of national identity. In the 30 – 80s of the twentieth century, the formed symbolic norm is inferior to the pragmatic norm, which destroys the national, religious, aesthetic ideals traditional for Ukrainian language and promotes the strict framework for the functioning of the Ukrainian literary language.

According to W. Labov, language changes can occur both from above and from below (Labov, 2010). Changes in the language norm from above (importation of norms) may be associated with the recommendations of law-makers, codifiers of the norm. An important role in the formation of the English literary norm was played by King Henry V (1413 - 1422) giving English the status of an official language in the administrative sphere. Formation of the Ukrainian literary language in the late XIX and early XX centuries depended on the choice of vector by authors of grammars and dictionaries (O. Kurylo, O. Sinyavsky, A. Krymsky and others) who, on the basis of the Dnieper Ukrainian dialect, by codification, approved the Ukrainian literary standard. Another factor that acts from above is the external influence of other languages, which is especially important in modern conditions of globalization. Standardization from above involves the following stages: selection, recognition, dissemination, support, codification (Nevalainen, Tiekens-Boon, 2006).

Modifications from below are caused by the development of internal potential capabilities of the language. Such a model causes a variant of the norm, which, due to differentiation, natural selection, subsequently disappears and the only model acceptable to society is affirmed in the language. Standardization from below occurs in three stages: 1) incipience, actualization of new discourse models and grammatical resources 2) their territorial and social distribution, 3) the adoption of variation (Nevalainen, Taavitsainen, 2008: 4).

When studying the language norm in diachrony, the dynamics of the level structure of the language are traditionally taken into account. The history of the literary language reflects the trends in the development of lexical, morphological and syntactic norms. The lexical norm regulates semantic processes and rules of linguistic usage. The lexical system is open, dynamic and primarily determined due to pragmatic factors. The introduction into literary life of new, most often borrowed words, their adaptation to the internal laws of the

language takes place for several years. Written sources record the establishment of their phonetic and grammatical structure, semantic processes, taking into account contextual manifestation. The state of the lexical norm determines the intensity of intra-semantic processes of actualization, reorientation, activation - passivation, neologization, etc.

Compared to other level standards, the grammar norm is the most stable throughout the historical development of the language. The grammatical norm combines a system of morphological and syntactic units, their categories and forms, as well as word-forming units and ways of using words.

Morphological phenomena are represented by paradigms of lexical and grammatical categories: case forms, number forms, gender, degrees of comparison, grammatical aspects, etc. As a result of the openness of the language system, the grammatical forms of individual paradigmatic elements are modified. This raises another problem of the dynamics of the language norm - variability. The chronologically limited variant of the word is a direct consequence of the historical development and evolution of the language. Some variants of the word either disappear over time or dissimilate. Others function in the language throughout historical development. They are often a sign of the developed stylistic system of literary language.

An important factor in the coexistence of variants in any period of development was the recognition or non-recognition by linguists, which was reflected in the codification and introduction into linguistic practice of the relevant prescriptive norms.

Exceptional mobility is inherent in the word-forming norm. The word-forming system is closely related to other levels of the language – phonology, morphology, syntax, and grammar in general. In addition, in word formation it is impossible to define a clear line between its potential and actual implementation, between synchrony and diachrony.

The word-forming norm determines the regularities of the formation of morphological structures of derived words, fixes their samples in the process of derivation and expression of new meanings by them. It covers high-performance and low-performance models, as well as regulates single phenomena that disappear due to non-compliance with established schemes.

The syntactic norm does not change, but improves. The creation of a new syntactic model has been going on for many hundreds of years. Thanks to such long dynamic processes, the grammatical norm in any period of the history of the literary language is perfect and serves to combine the temporal and spatial paradigms of the national language space.

The socio-political conditions throughout the historical development have influenced the actualization of two traditional aspects of the analysis of

the language norm of the Ukrainian literary language in different ways - the language itself (correspondence to the language system) and socio-historical or axiological (the selection and consolidation of implementations in the communication process). The axiological criterion was decisive in the early twentieth century during the formation of the literary standard. Important for the creation of the prescriptive norm of that time was the compromise aesthetic criterion for the selection of the source base. The standard of Ukrainian literary language considered the works of Taras Shevchenko and P. Kulish. In the 40s and 80s of the 20th century, the literary norm was considered primarily as a prohibition, which categorically determines what is right, suitable, and what is wrong and unacceptable. In the late 20th and early 21st century, linguistic accents in the definition of language norm are changing. S. L. Popov notes that in the definitions of the language norm, the credibility of its source gives way to a social criterion: linguists have begun to realize that language rules are spontaneously established not by individuals, but by society as a whole (Popov, 2014: 18).

CONCLUSION

Today, the norm is mostly perceived as a choice. It suggests taking from the language the most suitable for the appropriate functional variety, in the appropriate communicative situation. A norm is the result of selecting language elements (lexical, morphological, syntactic, orthoepic) from the list of existing traditional units in the language, neologisms, returned from the passive stock of past means, in the process of their social assessment. The linguistic norm in any historical period of the development of a literary language is the expression of the values of an age that are changing and becoming the regulator of the linguistic behaviour of society. Values define linguistic behaviour, actualize aesthetic criterion of choice of linguistic units, act as a basis of motivation and function in system of ideological orientations of people. Depending on the cultural and historical and social conditions of the development of society, the various axiological occupancy of linguistic units, which form texts as temporary markers of the historical development of the language, is actualized. New, understandable, socially receptive content, a new understanding of events or phenomena that correspond to the moods of the era, reflect fashion trends, often become the key to the actualization and consolidation in the language practice of periodicals of the corresponding linguistic forms, which can be considered as a potential element of the linguistic system realized in certain conditions. Depending on the cultural and historical, social conditions for the development of society, various axiological content of linguistic units that

form texts as temporary markers of the historical development of the language is being updated. New, understandable, socially acceptable content, new understanding of events or phenomena that correspond to the mood of the era, reflect fashion trends, often become a guarantee of updating and consolidation in language practice of periodicals of appropriate language forms, which can be considered as a potential element of the language system implemented in certain conditions.

References

- A. Ćirgić (2023). Ćirgić A. *Crnogorski jezički standard u analizi milorada pupovca. Lingua montenegrina. XVI/1. Br. 31*, p. 3 – 21.
- Labov, W. (2010). *Principles of Linguistic Change. V 3: cognitive and cultural factors*. Oxford: WileyBlackwell.
- Nevalainen, T., Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (2006). *Standardization. A history of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, p. 271 – 311.
- Nevalainen, T., Taavitsainen, I., Pachta, P., Corhonen, M. (2008). *The dynamic of linguistic variation: Corpus Evidence of English Past and present (Studies in English Variation 2)*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Koseriy, Eduard. (1963). Косериу Э. *Синхрония, диахрония и история. [Synchrony, diachrony and history]. Новое в лингвистике. Вып. 3. Москва*, p. 324 - 345.
- Kostomarov, Vitaliy G. (1999). Костомаров В. *Языковой вкус эпохи: Из наблюдений над речевой практикой мас-медиа. [The linguistic taste of the epoch: From observations on the speech practice of the mass media.]*. Санкт-Петербург: Златоуст, 1999.
- Роров, Sergey L. (2014). Попов Сергей Л. *Русская грамматическая вариантность в когнитивно-эволюционном освещении. [Russian grammatical variability in cognitive-evolutionary coverage]*. Харьков: Міськдрук.
- Stančienė, Dalia Marija. (2018). *Brandžiųjų viduramžių scholastinė filosofija = Scholastic philosophy in the high middle ages. Logos 94*, p. 55–62.
- Yermolenko, Svitlana, Bybyk Svitlana, Kots Tetiana. (2013). Єрмоленко Світлана, Бибик Світлана, Коць Тетяна. *Літературна норма і мовна практика. [Literary norm and language practice]*. Ніжин: Аспект-Поліграф.

Tetiana KOTS

AKSIOLOŠKA I VREMENSKA DIMENZIJA JEZIČNE NORME

Članak se bavi analizom jezične norme – važnog pojma opće teorije jezika i glavne kategorije jezične kulture kao smjera lingvistike. Razlikuje se preskriptivna norma kao idealna, kodificirana norma koja uređuje pravila uporabe jezičnih sredstava i deskriptivna norma kao model stvarnog funkcioniranja višerazinskih jezičnih jedinica. U povijesnom aspektu upozorava se na postojanje simboličke norme, koja utjelovljuje povezanost s narodnom tradicijom, nacionalnom samosviješću i pragmatičke norme, koja jezična sredstva podređuje određenom komunikacijskom cilju. Upozorava se na dinamiku književne norme u vezi s unutarnjim potencijalom sustava i sociokulturnim čimbenicima.

Ključne riječi: *jezična norma, preskriptivna norma, deskriptivna norma, aksiologija, dijakronijski aspekt, povijest književnoga jezika.*