

## RUSSIAN AS THE STATE LANGUAGE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION: LANGUAGE NORM AND VALUE CRITERIA

**V.V. Khimik,  
Professor,  
Doctor  
of Philology**

The Russian language is the state language of the Russian Federation<sup>1</sup>. The term *state* means that it is official, approved by authorities, mandatory for use, regulating social linguistic relations by law<sup>2</sup>. Presumably, it does not mean the Russian language in all its historical, regional, social, functional and other variants; it means, first and foremost, the standard language, or, in the domestic tradition, *modern literary Russian language*<sup>3</sup>. The nature of the literary Russian language, like any other standard language, is identified by its norm<sup>4</sup>, which presupposes its special status in the case of the state language, including not only linguistic but also aesthetic, axiological, legal and political aspects.

### LANGUAGE NORM

*Norm* is a system of stable and socially approved linguistic units and rules of pronouncing, spelling, word-building, word-changing and phrasing; it is also a complex of stable traditional realizations of the language system selected and

---

<sup>1</sup> *Federalny zakon... 2005*: Federalny zakon Rossiyskoy Federatsii 1 iunya 2005 g. № 53-FZ O gosudarstvennom yazyke Rossiyskoy Federatsii. Rossiyskaya gazeta. 2005. 7 June 2005.

<sup>2</sup> *Bolshoy tolkovy slovar russkogo yazyka*. Ed. S. A. Kuznetsov. SPb., 1998. P. 223.

<sup>3</sup> *Russky yazyk*. Entsiklopedia. Ed. Y.N. Karaulov. — 2 edition. M., 1998. P. 221–225.

<sup>4</sup> *Lingvistichesky entsiklopedichesky slovar*. Ed. V.N. Yartseva. M., 1998. P. 337–338.

fixed in the course of social communication. Language norm may be considered in two ways: wide, objective approach (norms of oral/informal speech, norms or traditions of urban colloquial speech, regional linguistic norms, norms of social dialects, etc.) or narrow approach (norms established by special regularities, codified norms of the literary language)<sup>5</sup>. In respect to Russian as the state language of the Russian Federation, the strict narrow approach is appropriate: here we mean codified norms of the literary language.

*Normalization* is a basic feature of the literary language and speech and can be identified as their special feature in coordination with "literary-linguistic ideal"<sup>6</sup>. Literary-linguistic ideal driven by systemic potentialities of the language has been formed by Russian literature, common word usage, authority of influential individuals, and, recently, by extensive impact of mass media.

Linguistics recognizes the following basic characteristics of language norm.

A. *Permanence*, that is, stability and, in a way, conservatism. The language norm is a social-historical category; speech normalization, in many respects, is formed by tradition, custom and usage gradually

shaping and preserving the social idea of what is "correct" or "incorrect" in pronouncing, spelling, interpreting and using words. It significantly conditions the very existence of the language norm which connects generations and ensures the continuity of cultural and lingual traditions<sup>7</sup>. This factor determines the linguistic (stability of the language as a system), aesthetic (maintenance of the literary language ideal) and social (connection of generations) status of the Russian language as the official state language. Actually, stability of the language norm shows itself, for instance, in the fact that the greater amount of the nineteenth century literary texts, from Pushkin to Chekhov, appear to the twenty-first century Russian readers an embodiment of the literary language ideal, an aesthetic paragon of language functioning, comprehensible and congenial to all educated Russian speakers.

B. *General usage*. General usage of the modern Russian literary language, prevalence of its basic elements for the majority of speakers, that is, typical pronouncing habits, use of common vocabulary and basic grammar, make another significant feature of the norm determining the status of Russian as the official state language. Indeed, a language may function as a state language if and only if it is known

<sup>5</sup> *Itskovich V.A.* Yazykovaya norma. M., 1967. P. 7–8.

<sup>6</sup> *Peshkovsky A.M.* Obyektivnaya i normativnaya tochka zreniya na yazyk // *Izbrannyye trudy*. M., 1959. P. 54.

<sup>7</sup> *Gorbachevich K.S.* Izmeneniye norm russkogo literaturnogo yazyka. L., 1971. P. 8–9.

and comprehensible to all speakers, citizens of the state, through all its territory. Taking into consideration a great number of regional, social, professional and other variants of the Russian language, it is its normative literary variant that matters socially and politically; only the widespread literary norm can fulfill the unifying communicative function through the vast territory of the Russian state.

**B. *Obligation***, or compulsory observance of the language norm is the matter of principle not only for the literary language but also for the state language. Without compulsory observance of strict directions and normative objectives to language usage — from pronunciation and spelling to structuring texts — speech communication becomes difficult. It is especially significant for bookish style in business and science, the nature of which requires exactness and lucidity of expressing and transferring thought and information. Business documents of all types must be equally readable in any regional and social conditions, accessible and comprehensible to every literate Russian speaker. Observance of language norm is a must for scientific speech irrespective of the field or particular science: astronomy, biology, mathematics, history, jurisprudence, etc. Journalistic style is more sophisticated, from the normative point of view. On the one hand, journalistic speech, both written and oral, is supposed to be literary and codified, especially in its informative

function; on the other hand, journalist texts fulfill a very important expressive, affecting function, which leads them beyond the bounds of the strict literary norm and into using non-codified linguistic means. Such cases involve other socially recognized norms, i.e. ethic, aesthetic, juridical, etc.

**Г. *Systemacy***, or conformity with the language system is a fundamental feature of the language norm, which sets the bounds of the language functions and variants for keeping and spreading its particular elements. Language system as a system of potentials determines ways and directions of socially approved language development. “System envelops *ideal forms* of realizing a particular language, that is, techniques and etalons for corresponding speech activity”<sup>8</sup>. It means that any changes in the language, new forms and words, usage of linguistic units take place or, at least, must take place in accordance with structural resources of the language, which, in its turn, shows the expected ways of language development and ensures distinguishing between promising neologisms and occasional nonce words, and speech incorrectness<sup>9</sup>. For example, foreign words, when used in Russian, undergo phonetic interfer-

<sup>8</sup> Koseriu E. Sinhroniya, diahroniya i istoriya. Trans. from Spanish. In: Novoye v lingvistike. Issue III. M., 1963. P. 175.

<sup>9</sup> Gorbachevich K.S. Izmeneniye norm russkogo literaturnogo yazyka. L., 1971. P. 16

ence and sound in accordance with Russian phonetic norms (devocalization of final consonants, reduction of unstressed vowels, etc.): *акциз* → *акци[s]*, *демпинг* → *демпин[k]*, *бренд* → *брен[t]*, *консалтинг* → *к[a]нсалтин[k]*, *компьютер* → *к[a]мпыют[ы<sup>с</sup>]р* etc. Another example: in mass media we can come across forms like *Кыргызстан* or *кыргызский*, which break the regularities of Russian phonetics and spelling because the Russian phonetic system does not allow combining velar consonants with the middle upper vowel [ы]. Consequently, such combinations are unpromising as artificial, “politically correct” nonce words that run counter to the language system.

We must remember, though, that the above-mentioned and many other typological features of language norm are not absolute. Normative stability, general usage, obligatory observance and systemacy exist in complicated and, sometimes, contradictory relationship.

Thus, the indisputable criterion of stability of the norm is somewhat limited by another distinctive feature of language evolution. An obvious example is Russian spelling that changed and specified during the eighteenth-nineteenth centuries according to the changes in the language (cf.: *ѡзыкъ* → *языкъ* → *язык*). Yet more dynamic is lexical norm. In the nineteenth century the word *кушать* was neutral and commonly used while the word *есть* in the

same meaning was low colloquial; a century later the situation changed radically: *есть* became neutral and normative while *кушать* appeared functionally restricted and colloquial. Natural dynamic processes of the language development ensure codification of a considerable number of new words and meanings representing topical social, economical, technical and cultural realia: *аппарат* (‘body of authorities; the staff of such a body’), *аудит* (‘independent expertise of financial account ... independent inspection of some activities ...’), *вливания* (‘financial funding...’), *дисплей* (‘hardware for viewing information...’), *Интернет* (‘international information network ...’); we can also mention such words as *пикетирование*, *совместимый*, *триколор*, *файл*, *эксклав* etc.<sup>10</sup>.

Common use as a seemingly crucial criterion of the language norm is not absolute either: “The language norm is not statistical, for, as we well know, a mistake can be widely spread and commonly used”<sup>11</sup>. Statistical factor is opposed by the fac-

<sup>10</sup> *Комментарий к Федеральному закону «О государственном языке Российской Федерации». Part 1.: Normy sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka kak gosudarstvennogo (Kompleksny normativny slovar sovremennogo russkogo yazyka)*. Ed. G.N. Sklyarevskaya, E.Y. Vaulina. — SPb., 2007.

<sup>11</sup> *Ozhegov S.I. Ocheredniye voprosy kul'tury rechi*. In: *Voprosy kul'tury rechi*. Issue I. M., 1955. P. 14.

tor of social appraisal<sup>12</sup> [Graudina 1980: 70]. For example, the highly productive pattern of coining (*оборонка, нефтянка, социалка, незавершенка* etc.), irrespective of its high frequency and popularity in the public speech, stands little chance for codification being lexically fuzzy and, as derivatives of attributive phrases, actually keeping expressive and somewhat substandard judgement, which is redundant from the normative point of view. In many cases, this causes deviation from the normative ideal.

Finally, we should not regard as absolute relations between norm and inner system (structure) of the language. Potentiality that regulates codification of normative units demonstrate different features on different levels of the language: it regularly interferes with aberrations from the norms of orthoepy; more or less strictly regulates normalization of word-building morphological models (cf.: *глобальный* → *глобализм, глобализация, глобалист, глобалистский, глобализатор*...); however, it allows variations in lexical subsystems (new synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms), where expedience of normalization of neologisms is determined by needs of specifying of meaning and forming of new concepts, (cf.: *избиратели* ~ *электорат, убийца* ~ *киллер, образ* ~ *имидж*,

*дело* ~ *бизнес, представитель* ~ *дистрибьютор, представление* ~ *шоу* etc.) A topical story with some political bias is the usage of the non-normative preposition in the phrase *на Украину*, which, unlike the normative paradigm (cf.: *в Германию, в Венгрию, во Францию* и т.п.), is etymologically stable in colloquial Russian due to the long-lasting tradition and resists all naïve though politically correct attempts<sup>13</sup>.

**Obligation** seems to be the only feature of the literary norm which can be classified as absolute. Prescription, rule, regulation make the core of language codification of spelling, pronouncing, forming and phrasing, which is respectively actualized in spelling, pronouncing and normative explanatory dictionaries as well as in academic and training grammar manuals. Obligation as a feature of codified language norm is also pivotal for Russian as the official state language:

*“Art. 1.2. Status of the Russian language as the state language of the Russian Federation provides for compulsory use of Russian in the spheres specified by this Federal law ...*

*Art. 1.6. Use of Russian as the state language of the Russian Federa-*

<sup>13</sup> In linguistic studies, there have been made similar attempts of undue codification of some toponyms for political reasons in spite of language regularity. See, for example, *Golev N.D. Yuridichesky aspekt yazyka v lingvisticheskom osvещenii*. In: *Yurislingvistika: problemy i perspektivy*. Ed. N.D. Golev. Barnaul, 1999. P. 26.

<sup>12</sup> *Graudina L.K. Voprosy normalizatsii russkogo yazyka: Grammatika i normy*. M., 1980. P. 70

tion *does not allow* using words and phrases that do not correspond to the norms of the modern literary Russian language ...”

However, we may observe certain conditionality in respect to obligation as a feature of norm. As is known, discrepant relations between social, historical, statistical and systemic factors of language norms cause a special condition that impedes codification, namely, *variance* of norms in the literary language, i.e., in some cases, possibility, acceptability of a few variants of pronunciation, spelling, forming, word usage or ways of combination of language units, (for example, cf.: до[шт'] ~ до[щц], моло[чн]ый ~ моло[шн]ый; взялись ~ взялись, собрались ~ собрались, родился ~ родилсь, отдал ~ отдал, залил ~ залил; на лето ~ на лето, под вечер ~ под вечер, редакторы ~ редакторы, инженеры ~ инженеря; кич ~ кич; Интернет ~ интернет; зимой ~ зимою, рукой ~ рукою; говорить о кино ~ говорить про кино, положить сахара ~ положить сахару, много народа ~ много народу).

The key indication of obligation about language norm in such cases is complicated with practical necessity, limitation of choice among simultaneous linguistic means; sometimes it specifies semantic, pragmatic or stylistic variants, which is the question of language usage and functioning, speech culture or culture of speech that ensures optimal choice between two or more

parallel linguistic means according to the goal of speech communication. Thus, it is not enough to know literary norms, phonetic, orthoepic and grammar rules, that is, to distinguish between norm and anti-norm. Efficient Russian speech presupposes the skill of conscious and reasonable choice among a variety of linguistic units, having in sight the goal of communication and situation; in other words, one must have *stylistic skills*. These circumstances complicate the process of normative evaluating actual speech, especially, public speech<sup>14</sup>. On the one hand, public communication presupposes strict compliance with rules of literary language norms; on the other hand, speaker/writer in Russian often finds himself before the choice of a normative variant, as a rule, pragmatic, semantic or stylistic. More than that, modern public speech, if it is not written

<sup>14</sup> Public speech communication is notable for prevailing of literary (codified) norm and priority of written speech forms. As to the colloquial everyday speech, with the priority of oral forms, it is subject to a different, wider interpretation of the tradition and norm, that is, has its own usual rules and regularities. See: *Russkaya razgovornaya rech* / Ed. E.A. Zemskaya. M., 1973; *Sirotnina O.B. Sovremennaya russkaya razgovornaya rech I eyo osobennosti*. Saratov, 1974; *Lapteva O.A. Russky razgovorny syntaxis*. M., 1976; *Gasparov B.M. Ustnaya rech kak semiotichesky ob'ect // Semiotiki nominatsii i semiotika ustnoi rechi. Lingvističeskaya semantika i semiotika*. 1., Issue 442. Tartu, 1978. — P. 63–112.

speech of official documents, of official communication of senior executives or formal scientific text, allows certain aberrations from literary norm to appear more colloquial and stylistically expressive. Consequently, value cues public functioning of the Russian language exceed the bounds of exclusively codified language norm and need extra criteria.

### CRITERIA OF EVALUATION FOR THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE IN VIEW OF LANGUAGE NORM

Status of the state language of the Russian Federation provides certain legal and political advantages to the Russian language, which is mainly expressed in the legally provided obligatory observance of this language all over the vast territory of poly-ethnic and multi-confessional Russia. Yet the advantages and preferences of the official status impose certain responsibilities on the Russian language. State language must be prestigious and authoritative, qualitative and effective in all its functions, in other words, the Russian language must demonstrate high axiological and aesthetic condition. Some practical solution for evaluating quality and value of the Russian language has been worked out within the academic course “*Russian language and culture*” whose postulates are formed on the basis of studying and practical mastering of the liter-

ary language norms<sup>15</sup>. *Good speech*<sup>16</sup> is a central universal concept of the Russian speech culture, though its axiological point is not as evident as it may seem. Undoubtedly, good Russian speech is literary normative speech. However, the Russian language, as it has been already mentioned, does not consist only of codified language units fixed by normative dictionaries and academic grammars, but also includes numerous usual, colloquial, dialectal, social, professional and other manifestations of the living language. Yet prestige of the Russian language at large, at least, on the territory of its functioning in Russia as a state, for its speakers, is ensured exclusively by the literary speech or the speech close to this norm: literary colloquial, everyday and public, oral and written, common and professional speech.

So, what do we mean by “good Russian speech” and its criteria? The matter is complicated because the high quality of Russian speech, whether oral or written, is not fully ensured by absolute compliance of the speech act with literary norm,

<sup>15</sup> These problems are discussed in an amount of books: *Golovin B.N. Osnovy kul'tury rechi*. M., 1988; *Kultura russkoi rechi*. Ed. L.K. Graudina, E.N. Shiryayeva. M., 1999; *Russky yazyk i kultura rechi*. Goldin V. E., Sirotinina O.B., Yagubova M.A. Ed. O.B. Sirotinina. M., 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2002.

<sup>16</sup> *Khoroshaya rech*. Collection of articles. Ed. M.A. Kormilitsina, O.B. Skoblikova. M., 2001.

i.e., with the criteria of orthoepic, orthographic, lexical-semantic, syntactic or any other regularities: “the real speech culture does not mean only observance of the language norms. It also means the skills of finding a *correct* linguistic form for our thought, and more, most *effective* (i.e., most expressive) and *appropriate* (stylistically fitting the situation)”<sup>17</sup> [Ozhegov 1974: 286]. Indeed, absolutely correct speech may sound monotonous, expressionless and tedious, which positions it far from the aesthetic ideal of its speakers. On the other hand, fluent, vivid and seemingly effective oral or written speech, attractive for a naïve person, may be emotionally expressive, though vulgar, shocking and irritating. Being publicly used in mass media, such a form may turn out to be harmful or even dangerous to public taste, language usage and, eventually, to the status of Russian as the national and state language. The theory of speech culture regards value criteria of the Russian language, *language in action*, as successive distinction and consideration of three basic components of speech communication: linguistic, communicative and ethical. Linguistic component implies compliance of the speech action with the codified norm, that is, to criteria of correctness. Communicative component

implies consideration of conditions and situation of speech communication, and, consequently, comprehensibility as the ultimate goal. Ethical component is the factor of compliance of content and form with the status of the addressee, his or her language habits and expectations. This approach allows distinguishing six basic criteria, or six principles of good Russian speech: correctness, appropriateness, exactness, logicality, clearness, and expressiveness<sup>18</sup>.

1. **Correctness.** Obviously, good Russian speech is marked by elementary correctness, or normativity (graphical, orthoepic, lexical, grammatical, stylistic), compliance with language norms, i.e., absence of bad mistakes like the following common aberrations: \**ложи*, \**совре́мный*, \**звóнит*, \**на́чать*, \**навроде*, \**языко́вый*, \**трое девушек* etc. Let us also mention functional-stylistic mistakes like *вытрусить* instead of *вытряхнуть*; *заботаться* instead of *испугаться*; *кушать* instead of *есть*; *маленько* instead of the normative *немного*; *обратно телефон звонил* instead of *снова/опять звонил телефон*. Such aberrations from the norm spoil any text in public or, especially, official speech and

<sup>17</sup> Ozhegov S.I. Leksikologiya. Leksikografiya. Kultura rechi. M., 1974. P. 286.

<sup>18</sup> B.N. Golovin gave a more detailed description of these criteria and offered nine *communicative features* that qualify good speech: correctness, diversity (richness), clearness, exactness, logicality, expressivity, comprehensibility, affectivity. (Golovin B.N. Osnovy kultury rechi. M., 1988).



should be principally avoided. There is no good Russian speech with bad mistakes. Yet correctness is neither enough nor absolute as the normative criterion.

2. *Appropriateness* is the most significant axiological criterion of good speech as it deals with linguistic action and speech function rather than with linguistic signs. Appropriateness makes a serious problem in speech communication where inappropriateness is a source of misunderstandings, communicative failures and conflicts. Inappropriate speech means words out of place, text out of topic, utterance or speech flow out of communicative situation, without considering the partner or audience. Inappropriate speech demonstrates lack of respect towards the addressee, in particular, misuse of rude expressions, vulgar vocabulary and slangisms in mass media. On the other hand, it may show itself in the unreasonably high style, inadequate professional terms in communication with non-specialists; for example, when during TV interview an economist uses terms like *монетаризм*, *дивергентный*, *версифицированный* etc.. Lately, more often than not, in business speech, we can hear or read public utterances with the mixture of specifically bookish and low colloquial phrases, for example, in the following parody:

*П-ов озвучил проблему, выразив озабоченности по части пробуксовки вопроса с незавершенкой, и обещал одномоментно продавить в коми-*

*тете состыковку проекта, а потом прописать его в годовом бюджете...*

3. *Exactness* is the third compulsory criterion of good speech. Exactness means reasonable choice of linguistic means of expression, which ensures lucidity of concepts and general sense of the utterance. Lack of exactness may often result in obscurity and ambiguity of sense, for instance, careless usage of such polysemic words as: *нормальный* (*нормальный поступок* — ‘обыкновенный’ or ‘правильный?’), *достаточно* (*достаточно неприятная новость* — ‘очень неприятная’ or ‘удовлетворяющая какому-то условию?’). Today the word *презентовать* is widely used in the meaning of ‘официально представлять что-л. новое’ (derived from *презентация*), which causes misunderstanding because it contradicts its traditional jocular meaning ‘преподнести, подарить’, and phrases like *презентовать товар* (*идею, песню* etc.) sound dubious and obscure. More often than not, paronyms, seemingly similar but different in meaning, are confused, which interferes with semantic correctness: *обычный* and *обыкновенный*, *особый* and *особенный*, *патриотический* and *патриотичный*, *органический* and *органичный*, *туристский* and *туристический*, *представить* and *предоставить*, *экономный* and *экономичный*.

4. *Logicality*, or distinctive sequence in expressing thoughts, co-

herence of meaning and composition of the message, is a must in any text, oral or written. Good speech means well-arranged composition with inherent, consistent and completed meaning, summary, resume, and conclusion. This criterion may be well illustrated by texts and oral speeches of famous Russian scholars D.S. Likhachev or A.M. Panchenko. Consistent logicity and compositional unity are also distinctive features of TV shows of E.S. Radzinsky.

5. **Clearness** is an extremely significant criterion of good speech. Clearness of speech, especially, oral speech, means avoidance of unnecessary words, phonetic (*mmm... э-э-э...*) and lexical lumber (like *короче, ну, вот, так сказать, как бы, на самом деле* etc.), which is commonly used to fill in pauses when the speaker is puzzled or embarrassed.

Yet more important, clearness of speech shows itself in the speaker's/writer's skills to select and use literary and literary-colloquial words and phrases without populist usage of low colloquialisms, vulgar and slang words, which, as some speakers think, ensures quick and easy effect with the audience; it is especially negative in public speech, and absolutely intolerable in official speech. (The following examples may illustrate the idea: *мочить в сортирах, ковырять в носу, жевать сопли, хватит скулить, слушай сюда, схватить за одно место, кошмарить бизнес*

etc.). Clearness of speech does not only testify to good speech but also to general and speech culture as well as to good language taste and respect to the audience.

6. **Expressiveness** is a special aesthetic criterion evaluating quality of real speech. It includes thoughtful and appropriate use of expressive linguistic means; motivated emotionality, skilful use of imagery; speech diversity, resourceful use of synonyms without redundant repetitions; motivated selection among various functional and stylistic registers of the literary language; styles and forms of the Russian language at large; even everyday colloquial flow — all these skills form the highly appreciated quality of the speaker's good style and rhetoric.

Certainly, the mentioned principles do not exhaust the concept of good Russian speech; these are its basic, essential criteria. To take into consideration oral forms of good speech, we may add to these criteria such features as diction, timbre, tempo of speech, mimics, gestures, etc. Yet the main, crucial criteria of good Russian speech, linguistic correctness, topic and communication appropriateness, exactness of expression, logicity of structuring text and utterance, and, last but not least, expressiveness, are formed on the basis of codified norm of the literary language. Without full-fledged language norm and standards of good speech the Russian language

would not reach the standard of the official state language.

### **NORMATIVE FOUNDATIONS FOR LINGUISTIC CONSULTING AND EXPERTISE. COMMUNICATIVE NORM OF SPEECH**

The official status of the Russian language, codified language norm and standard of good Russian speech do not exclude various problems of its functioning; they, probably, even stimulate such problems in the course of its use. Problems of language functioning reflect natural development of Russian which is constantly appraised by the society and linguists. To solve current problems of speech communication, to expertise speech facts and acts, to regulate urgent needs of the Russian language functioning, there is a unique institution of *linguistic consulting*<sup>19</sup> [Баранов 2007: 10–11], an applied branch of linguistics dealing with a variety of public and official roles of the Russian language.

The public consulting activity has been formed on the basis of many years of public consulting for people asking about linguistic correctness and speech functioning of the Russian language, mainly, in traditional radio and TV programmes, such as: “From Russian into Russian, or

How to say” (“Radio Rossia”), “Let us speak Russian” and “How to say correctly” (“Ekho Moskvu”), “Competent speaker”, (until late, “Radio Mayak”), “The Russian word” (“Govorit Moskva”), “We know Russian” (“Mir”). There are pages and columns in some newspapers and magazines where readers can ask questions and get answers about the Russian language. Nowadays, there are also language portals in the Internet: Gramota.ru, Gramma.ru, Ruthenia.ru, Verba2007.ru where propaganda of language norms and good Russian speech is exercised.

However, apart from public and initiative activities, linguistic consulting on Russian as the language of social communication needs have some official status as special services or committees under state bodies of power. Meanwhile, linguists are rarely invited for consulting by official services unless local authorities themselves organize such consulting on their own initiative (for example, in Barnaul, Kaliningrad, Ivanovo and some other cities). Federal laws, official governmental documents, regional resolutions and orders, technical manuals and acts, advertisements are written and published with typical mistakes against normative and functional rules, evidently, without consulting linguist experts. Supposedly, consulting experts in phonetics, grammar, terminology, and naming, they would not have issued such hard-to-pronounce acronyms as *ГИБДД* (“State traf-

<sup>19</sup> Baranov A.N. Lingvisticheskaya ekspertiza teksta: teoriya i praktika. M., 2007. P. 10–11.

fic inspection”), or its new version ДООБДД (“Department of preventing traffic accidents”). There would not have appeared bureaucratized nomenclatural tautological designations: “*Federal state educational institution of higher professional education ‘St. Petersburg State University’*” or “*Federal state institution of culture ‘State Hermitage’*”, created by bureaucracy on the formal basis and without due considering principles of naming and syntax. Russian as the official state language, undoubtedly, presupposes state liability for the official speech actions, written or oral, in this language, and for the official linguistic product, manufactured by state services and power bodies. Such speech actions and such linguistic products must be created only with the appropriate consulting and control on the part of professional linguists as well as with consistent codified language norm focus.

Another kind of linguistic consulting is the so-called *juridical linguistics* studying legal aspects of the language<sup>20</sup>, or theory and practice of *linguistic expertise* that lately has formed a new branch of the applied linguistics<sup>21</sup>. This interdisciplinary approach on the junction of linguistic and juridical studies, legal and linguistic conscience is based

on the concept of *social norm* in its wide sense: “universally recognized rule, standard of behavior or action ... Usually, social norms make elements of normative systems; the most significant systems of normative regulation are morals and law”<sup>22</sup>. Let us dwell upon the idea: another normative system is language system which ensures interpreting morals and law by language means. To observe morals and law in their language forms is the target of linguistic expertise, which in communicative practice is interpreted as the objective of solving controversies and conflicts of all kinds based on the usage and abuse of the Russian language. Of course, the main support for linguist expertise analyzing the usage of linguistic means at legal controversies is literary norm codified in prescriptive dictionaries (orthographic, orthoepic, explanatory) and in academic grammars. Dictionaries (notably, normative explanatory dictionary) are major tools of the linguist expert. Yet to expertise the quality of speech, one may need more than the language norm fixed in dictionaries and grammars. All kinds of insult, slander, dissemination of defaming information, disrespect of court, fomentation of interethnic and confessional discord, incitement

<sup>20</sup> Golev N.D. Yuridichesky aspekt yazyka v lingvisticheskom osveschenii. P. 11–16.

<sup>21</sup> \*\* Baranov A.N. Lingvisticheskaya ekspertiza teksta: teoriya i praktika. M., 2007. P. 10–11.

<sup>22</sup> Filozofsky entsiklopedichesky slovar. M., 1983. P. 441.

to violence, speech manipulation and other legal offences<sup>23</sup> may take place and often happen using exclusively normative linguistic means (e.g., valuation vocabulary like: *вор, преступник, убийца, враг, лгать, врать, красть, убивать* etc.); on the other hand, use of non-normative vocabulary may not fall under force of the RF Criminal Code, or at worst is limited to the insult clause. The meaning of a word or phrase fixed in the normative dictionary, forms of linguistic units regulated by normative grammar serve as starting points to linguistic expertise. In fact, linguistic analysis usually deals not with words and phrases but with *speech acts*, i.e., semantic and pragmatic peculiarities of using normative, non-normative or boundary linguistic means which express or can express various appraisals or assertions perceived by the addressee or third parties in

some situations as insulting, harassing, insinuating, discrediting, aggressive and so on<sup>24</sup>. In other words, the linguist expert follows codified norms of the literary language yet he must also take into consideration situational conditionality of the speech act. Thus, expertise of the phrase «*N ведет себя, как проститутка, как ему выгодно, так и преподносит информацию*» cannot be confined to the statement and assessment of the normative word *проститутка* in its colloquial, figurative and expressive meaning. To objectively evaluate semantic and pragmatic meaning of the utterance, which can give lawyers grounds for further legal conclusions, the linguist must consider the complex of situational conditions for this speech act: social role of the speaker; relations between communicants from the point of view of their equality or inequality; speech behavior of the addressee; presence and participation of the third parties; topic, place, subject and object of communication; intentions of the speaker; and so on.

Of course, such linguistic expertise need be regulated as the system of linguistic norms itself. Usually,

<sup>23</sup> These issues are thoroughly discussed in the following publications: "Yurislilingvistika" issues 1–9, prepared in the Laboratory of Jurislinguistics and Development of Speech of Altai State University and Laboratory of Jurislinguistics and Scientific Discipline of Documentation of Kemerovo State University ([www.lexis-asu.narod.ru/index.htm](http://www.lexis-asu.narod.ru/index.htm)) and in the materials of the Guild of Linguist-Experts in Documentation and Information Disputes (GLEDIS), published in the book: *Tseno slova : Iz praktiki lingvisticheskikh ekspertiz tekstov SMI v sudebnykh protsessakh po zaschite chesti, dostoinstva i delovoy reputatsii*. Ed. prof. M.V. Golovanevsky. — 3d ed. M., 2002.

<sup>24</sup> Examples of such and some other expert examinations can be found in the publications mentioned in the previous footnote. Types of linguistic expert examinations of various systems grounds are described in the work of *Baranov A.N. Lingvisticheskaya ekspertiza teksta: teoriya i praktika*. P. 13–16]

the results of expertise (as a rule, it is semantic and pragmatic analysis of the text) give the linguist and the lawyer some grounds for judgement about observance or non-observance by the speaker of social and behavioural norms in their lingual expression. Czech linguist A. Edlichka regards the necessity of the social and linguistic regulation as formulation of the *communicative speech norm* alongside with linguistic and stylistic norms. The crucial factor of the communicative speech norm is situational conditionality, elements of non-verbal behaviour, while it is actualized by means of distribution of language norms in particular communicative conditions<sup>25</sup>. However, such “distribution of language norms” in communication needs studies and formalization of types. Thus, Russian studies face a seri-

ous task of state significance, both theoretical and applied: to work out, describe and codify communicative speech norms, of course, based on linguistic and stylistic norms. Theoretical grounds for formalization and regulation of communicative speech norms, or norms of speech behaviour in everyday, public and official situations, can be achieved through studies and special knowledge in the theory of speech acts, culture of speech, cognitive linguistics, and functional stylistics as well as through studies of the diversity of published linguistic expertise. Formulation and, perhaps, codification of communicative norms of the Russian speech will give serious urge to developing a system of linguistic consulting in our country, raise the status of the linguistic knowledge and, consequently, will elevate the status of Russian as the official state language of the Russian Federation.

*Translated by T. Kazakova*

---

<sup>25</sup> *Edlichka A.* Tipy norm yazakovoi kommunikatsii. Tr. from Czech. // *Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike.* Issue XX. M., 1988. P. 141–147.