



The Literary Norm In The Grip Of Dogma And Dialectics

Madoyan V.V.

University of International Relations, Armenakyan 125, Yerevan, Armenia

KEYWORDS**ABSTRACT**

In modern linguistic literature, the need to combine statics and dynamics in the literary norm is beyond doubt, on the basis of which the idea (so far only the idea) of creating principles for the regulation of innovations is put forward. The article examines the issue in historical terms on the material of the Armenian and Russian languages, taking into account the fact that the literary language is a national language that has certain rules of use. Its formation, according to the author's approach, goes through four stages: the folklore stage, the written language, the literary version and the canonized version. Its development can begin on the basis of its own dialects or by crossing languages, on the basis of the spoken language of not only the political, but also the cultural center, proceed permanently or abruptly. In any case, the normative layer of the literary language is formed on the basis of oral speech and finds expression in the language of outstanding writers who make their own adjustments related to the strengthening of expressiveness. Changes in the language are divided by the author into formal and substantive. At different periods of language development, some tendencies intensify, others fade. At the present stage, formal changes (phonetic, grammatical) are passive, since the dialect base of both Armenian and Russian languages has not changed over the past two centuries, and substantive changes have intensified due to the development of figurative thinking. Both in the first and in the second case, the changes are due to colloquial speech, therefore, according to the author, before developing the principles of standardization of the literary language, it is necessary to determine the directions of development of colloquial speech. The dependence of language development on the development of society excludes the development of accurate methods for determining the literary (normativity) of language transformations and makes the boundaries of the literary language quite transparent, which is why there is no convincing theory of its development. Excessive freedom leads to the blurring of the boundaries of the norm, and excessive conservatism leads to crises, as was the case with the ancient Armenian literary language (Grabar), which is why the construction of a new literary language begins.

INTRODUCTION

The literary norm is always dominated by dogmas and dialectics. Currently, the desire for state regulation of language norms is increasing, and the purpose of this article is to establish whether it (state regulation) can have significant consequences in the history of the literary language and whether the canonization of norms can stop their violations. These questions can only be answered by the history of the literary language, in this case – Russian, which is given in a comparative description with the history of the Armenian literary language, since the conditions of

formation of the latter are directly opposite to the conditions of development of the first, and if the construction of the language depends on the official rules, this can be reflected in the history of at least one of these languages.

In modern linguistics, a literary language is understood as a language recognized as common to the entire ethnic group - the language in which all national literature (including administrative documentation) is created, having clear rules of use, designed to serve several dozen generations. In view of this, following the modern literary norm, established

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: v.madoyan@rambler.ru

Received date: November 02, 2025; Revised manuscript received date: November 15, 2025; Accepted date: November , 2025; Online publication date: November 30, 2025.

Copyright © 2025 the author. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

rigidly and definitely, mandatory at the highest state level, is a necessary condition for the creation of national texts (speeches in the media, scientific papers, textbooks and educational materials; fiction, mainly, etc.), which corresponds to their purpose and functions. This is well known, and there is no point in quoting any "luminaries" in this area. At the same time, the literary language (and, accordingly, the literary norm) functions in time and space. The requirement to strictly observe literary norms, their stability, is a dogma, in another interpretation, dogma means "to stop time", which contradicts the very essence of dialectics. "... In the norm of language, the historically educated common usage of language means is noted, as well as the rules for their selection and use, recognized by society as the most suitable in a particular historical period" [30, pp.18-19]. The issue of "conservation" of norms is quite clear: "The written tradition constrains the process of linguistic changes" [13, p.80], "the measure of the constancy of language is the circumstances that change the chances of stimuli for the emergence of some statements and the disappearance of others" [13, p.81]. At the same time, the dialectical process of development constantly updates the means of the literary norm: "it would be wrong to think that the literary norm is stationary: it develops and changes over time" [9, p. 13; etc.], but how to establish approaches to the assessment and formation of these changes? What can and cannot be changed? A dead end situation arises: the requirement to strictly observe literary norms, since the literary language must serve the entire ethnic group in several of its generations, comes into conflict with its dialectical development. This is the first thing. Secondly, there are certain normative rules, but there are no rules for their normalization, recognition of a phenomenon in the sphere of the norm or outside it. It would seem natural that "it is the duty of scientists not to passively state what is happening, but to determine the focus of what is needed and what is "not necessary" for the language, make forecasts and recommendations, instead of geological and topographic maps of the linguistic district, invent a reliable linguistic compass" [14, p.10], but according to what principles it should be is it formulated and how should it be? It seems logical that, "asserting their right and ability to influence the language, even the obligation to regulate it in the name of national-state unity of society, for the sake of education, discipline and order in it, people are obliged to know the boundaries of what is permissible" [14, p.13], but how to

outline them?

Materials and Methods

The formation of literary languages goes through several stages. Initially, the language that functions as speech for a small mass of listeners was the language of folklore. This is the first semblance of a mass media outlet. The study of samples of ancient Armenian and Russian folklore seems to indicate the development of a special style of songs and legends in them. We emphasize "as if", because folklore works have been collected and published at best since the middle of the nineteenth century and, naturally, during the period of "oral existence" they were constantly processed. Since dialects do not develop outside of contact with other dialects (grammar and phonetics do not change much) [16], the functioning of the "mass" style with the dialect speech became the beginning (albeit qualitatively and quantitatively insignificant) of the formation of a national language.

Writing in the Armenian and Russian areas appeared with the adoption of Christianity, the first and most powerful factor of conscious national unity. A spiritual text can really be called the beginning of understanding (perception) of some forms and expressions as exemplary (from a political point of view – consolidating).

The first Russian texts, as is known, were created in ancient Bulgarian, since Christianity in Russia spread from Byzantium. It was different from colloquial, actually Old Russian. This is an example of an external source of the written language. There was no rigid unity in the rules of writing, although the desire to adhere to the language of sacred texts was obvious. In our opinion, the style of the spiritual work is perceived as high. The opposition of two types of speech begins. Oral speech turns out to be beyond limitations, while written speech is characterized by obvious conservatism (it was necessary to follow the patterns clearly).

This situation is very similar to the one that is currently developing in connection with the canonization of literary norms, moreover, the spiritual text was sacred, which for the scribe meant blind adherence to tradition, but the samples were still violated.

If we compare the monuments of the period of the Vladimir Principality, on the one hand, and ancient Novgorod and Pskov, on the other, it is difficult to deny that their language is oriented towards the language of spiritual texts (Old

Slavic, Old Bulgarian). This has been proven in more than one scientific work from the beginning of the last century and the century before last (and maybe even earlier). At the same time, the linguistic features of these monuments are explained by the influence of the living spoken Russian language of the territory, i.e. the corresponding urban koine, in the area of distribution of which they were created, therefore, their language often varies from text to text. At the same time, this language is beginning to acquire one of the signs of a literary one – nationwidity.

In the Armenian written tradition, Western Armenian became the language of spiritual texts, since the center of cultural life at the beginning of the 5th century (when the Armenian alphabet was created, the Bible was translated) was located in Western Armenia. This fact clearly contradicts the well-established theory that the basis of a literary language can only be the language of the political center (and the political center was located in Vagharshapat, in Eastern Armenia).

Science does not have any facts that would allow us to call the language of the beginning of the Armenian writing in any way processed. We assume that he was no longer based on the language of a separate dialect or separate dialects (the Ayrarat and Taron regions of the central part of historical Armenia, as is customary in Armenian science), but on the folklore tradition of these territories. This is justified by the fact that it does not completely coincide with any of the Western Armenian dialects, it absorbs elements of several dialect groups. The process of actively integrating the Armenian language into scientific and political circulation has begun. The appearance of historical and philosophical writings was the second step towards generalizing the rules of writing letters and words, even in several variations. Libraries were created at the princely estates, universities, where education, of course, focused on spiritual literature. The Armenian language, divided into 44 small dialects from the Caspian Sea to the Aegean, in close contact with other languages of Asia Minor, preserved its national identity. This is an example of the internal development of a language becoming nationwide.

This period of the formation of literary languages we can call the language of writing, since writing is functionally and geographically limited and does not have all the features that allow the language to be called literary. It can also be called the period of the language of spiritual literature, historical chronicles, the beginning of accounting, the first examples

of artistic creativity, etc., but not the literary language.

In Russia, the development of the national language was constantly going on through permanent changes in written speech under the influence of the spoken element [34, p.208] or by "editing" the spoken text under the influence of spiritual (exemplary) writing [38, p.183-184], which in any case should be considered as a crossing of two language systems: Old Bulgarian and Old Russian. Russian was developed in both directions in principle: the first way became the basis for the formation of scientific, and the second – business Russian speech [16]. It is surprising that the process of forming a literary language is considered very mechanistically: "Literary norms are formed over the long history of the language: the most commonly used ones are selected from national linguistic means, which in the minds of speakers are evaluated as correct and obligatory for all" [9, p.13]. This statement is a fiction, because it is difficult to understand how the consciousness of the speakers (which ones? The intelligentsia? Peasants? nobles?) selects "the most commonly used ones from the national linguistic means", according to which principle, not to mention the fact that it is impossible to accurately outline the boundaries of "what is allowed and what is not allowed" during this period.

If we keep in mind that literary language is a generalization of oral and written speech, processed by writers and focused on the language of a certain (exemplary) author(s), then written language goes its way to the literary version through hundreds of works of fiction. The Russian intelligentsia recognized the language of A.S. Pushkin as an exemplary one (without selecting only expressions "correct and obligatory for all"), which was created before him by the efforts of M.V. Lomonosov, N.M. Karamzin, V.A. Zhukovsky, etc. It is quite natural that Pushkin, like all other authors, chose expressions not "the most common", "correct and obligatory for everyone", but the most expressive from his point of view, which turned out to be really expressive. In other words, the formation of the Russian literary language proceeded by crossing the written and oral languages of that period (in different "shares") due to the educational activities of individual outstanding writers (not scientists!), naturally, step by step moving towards a variant that became nationwide, generalized. The language of A.S. Pushkin was recognized as such spontaneously, due to its quality.

From the second half of the XVIII century, grammars began to appear (M.V. Lomonosov, before A.S. Pushkin, then N.

Grech, etc.), which the creators of fiction and historical literature, as well as official texts, focused on, but they were not mandatory (official!), differed in their rules, although the written language began to acquire its second main feature is systematization, orderliness in the rules. Compare, declension of nouns and pronouns in V.V. Lomonosov's "Russian Grammar" (1755) [15] and N.I. Grech's "Extensive Russian Grammar" (1827) [11], between which there are only 70-odd years. N. Grech identifies 6 types of verbs, which he calls pledges [11, p. 243], Lomonosov has three voices: real, passive, and average, and the differences of the latter two are not due to the forms of the verb [15, p. 35]. Lomonosov distinguishes the indicative, indicative and indefinite moods [15, p. 34], while Grech indicates the indicative, imperative and subjunctive, however, without distinguishing the latter into a separate type: "In the Russian language, these forms (of the subjunctive mood. – V.M.) of verbs are expressed by the past tenses of the indicative with the addition of conjunctions бы, чтобы, дабы, да (to, in order, yes) etc." [11, p.249]. In these grammars, the literary norm becomes, as it were, a "harmonization" of the rules of oral and written speech, although from the point of view of modern linguistics none of the classifications consistently corresponds to the currently applied principles of distinguishing grammatical categories: neither unity of content and form, nor oppositionality. By presenting the grammar of a language, it seems to us that we reflect what is real. In fact, we "put" on the tongue the "shirt" that seems more appropriate to us. But is it such a thing?

M.V.Lomonosov's grammar does not contain those syntactic constructions (cripples) that N.Karamzin and then Pushkin introduced into the Russian language in order to create more expressive means (out of French) [38, pp.49-53]. Only the work of N. Karamzin and A. Pushkin can be spoken of as the "selection and use" of some linguistic means, but these are "recognized as the most suitable" not by society, but by creative personalities, and means very limited in scope, but, we repeat, necessarily exclusively expressive. Pushkin in Russia is considered the founder of the literary language, not because he introduced new morphological forms into use, but because he spoke in a more expressive language. In the "Grammar" of Lomonosov, in the creation of many numbers, only endings are recommended, which are considered normative and in the infusion currently, although in the same work "The letter G is pronounced in different ways" («Буква Г произносится разными образы») (our italics – V.M.) [15,

p.48]. Here, the specified form is not stylistically highlighted. Pushkin, on the other hand, uses the ending –ы of ablative Pl. as an expression of the "cloth" style, i.e. as a means of enhancing the expressiveness of the text. Compare. in "Dubrovsky" in the court's ruling: «сennыми покосы, рыбными ловли» (hay mowing, fishing). After Pushkin, the Russian literary language was processed by M.Y. Lermontov, N.V. Gogol, and others. Thus, it can be summarized that the formation of the literary language in Russia took place consistently.

A different situation developed in Armenia due to its loss of independence in the tenth century and its division between neighboring powers - Byzantium (then, from the XV century. - Ottoman Turkey) and Persia (subsequently, from the beginning of the XIX century. – the Russian Empire). The need to preserve national unity in the absence of their state authority required strict adherence to exemplary spiritual texts (Grabar), especially since in the current situation the church played a mobilizing role not only in spiritual terms, but also in law (Armenians did not sue in state sofas, but by the leaders of their religious community). Up to the beginning of the XIX century all Armenian literature (spiritual, historical, artistic, educational, scientific) was created only in the ancient Armenian language at church schools and in church libraries (since the middle of the fifth century, by order of the tsar Pope, monasteries in Armenia were liquidated). And, despite the rich literature in Middle Armenian, only the Grabar texts were recognized as exemplary. The changes concerned only vocabulary, while phonetics, morphology and syntax mostly strictly adhered to the standards of spiritual writing.

The entire XIX century for the Russian literary language, it is the age of its processing and perfection by self-regulation, naturally, on the basis of the conversational element. Each author offered his own individual style of presentation, based on the principle of expressiveness. Compare, for example, the styles of I. Turgenev and N. Leskov, Feta and N. Nekrasov.

With the establishment of Soviet power, the Russian language acquires the status of a literary language, which is why the trends of its ordering are increasing. Official institutions (commissions) define clear grammar rules, and those that do not meet the requirements of the time are removed from the old rules. These are not only transformations in the alphabet, but also in spelling (they took place all the time). The latter are considered to be the



"Rules of Russian Spelling and Punctuation 1956") [1], which are mandatory for school education and official speech throughout Russia. Several academic grammars of the Russian language have been published. However, it is enough to compare two school textbooks of the Russian language, as the differences in the interpretation of not only literary norms, but also spelling norms turn out to be obvious. This process is the process of defining literary standards based on spontaneously established traditions, rather than developing them (!).

Transformations in the Russian literary language during the twentieth century are scientifically substantiated in the works of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The authors emphasize not only the movement towards the systematization of linguistic facts, but also the influence of external components, such as the development of society, the impact of world languages, the spread of literacy (orthography) on phonetic transformations, etc. [26, pp.104, 112, 121; 27, p.10, 13].

It is difficult to state strict observance of the norms of the literary language when in Soviet society the Russian language not only changed "internally", but also acquired new types of word formation (for example, abbreviation, semantic contraction), new types of names (for example, compound names) [28, p.10]. Some of the processes observed at the end of the XIX century continue (the complication of consonantism, etc.) [27, p.10]. It is also necessary to add an extension of the usage speaking a literary language, in connection with which elements of other dialects penetrate into the latter, i.e. The entire Russian ethnic group is being involved in the work and processing of the literary language of the nation.

Only the stability of the morphological system is emphasized [29, p.9, etc.]. However, if we use the data from «Ведомости» ("Vedomosti") for 2020 [36], the use of variable forms such as лошадьми (by horses) is sharply reduced (only forms that do not have "correct" analogues are consistently used – людьми, детьми - by people, children). There is a further consistent development of the literary language, due to the presence of the Russian ethnic group of its independent statehood.

To the outstanding Armenian educator Kh. Abovyan had to take the liberty and abruptly switch from Grabar (spiritual Armenian script) to Ashkharabar (spoken Armenian) due to the fact that the lack of permanent development led to a sufficient separation of the national literary language from

the living, spoken one. Abovyan began with his own dialect, not thinking at all about the norms. The connection of traditions was broken. Attempts have begun (and successful ones!) creation of a new national literary language. Some writers began to process Grabar under spoken language (Muratcan) or spoken language through Grabar (Raffi). After establishing the rules of grammar (morphology), consistent work on expressiveness began (H. Tumanyan, V. Teryan).

This development should be called revolutionary. The history of society has made itself felt again in the history of language. In Eastern Armenia, which is part of the Russian Empire, the Eastern Armenian literary language began to form (classical works by Raffi, Shirvanzade, Muratsan, etc.). It turned out to be common in cultural centers that worked in the same legal and territorial plane (Yerevan, Tiflis, Baku, Shushi). Being processed at the end of the XIX – in the first half of the XX century by D. Demirchyan, H. Tumanyan, and finally by V. Teryan, with the establishment of Soviet power, it was ordered in its rules and recognized as nationwide and official, i.e. literary. In the cities of Arzrum, Van, and finally in Constantinople, the Western Armenian literary language was formed. After the Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire in 1915, it now functions in all Armenian diasporas and still does not have unified rules of use. The difference in the lexical composition of the Western and Eastern Armenian variants of the Armenian language is insignificant, but the grammar is based on different dialect groups (the so-called k-dialects and um-dialects).

In the history of the new Armenian literary language (in its variants), the same patterns are observed as in the development of the Russian literary language: words and word forms that have fallen out of use are gradually replaced by spoken ones (compare, the language of Muratsan, on the one hand, and Raffi, Shirvanzade, Nar-dos, on the other), the rules of use are unified but, unlike the Russian counterpart, not only on the basis of the koine of the political center, but taking into account the expressiveness of similar forms functioning in different dialects (compare the languages of H. Tumanyan, E. Charents and V. Teryan).

The legality of creating two variants of the Armenian literary language instead of a single Grabar is still considered controversial, since they split the people to a certain extent. If we take into account that before the revolution of 1917, Armenians received primary education in their parish schools, and then only transferred to gymnasiums, with the adoption of new versions of the national language, school

programs in the Armenian language began to differ: the dogma had obvious positive sides. At the same time, remaining in the grip of dogma meant for the majority of the population to remain outside of live oral and written literary speech. Dialectics had to be taken into account: the literary language, since it was national, had to be understandable to the whole people.

During the Soviet period, work began on the normalization of the Armenian language (after all, before that period the process was spontaneous!) – and quite successfully. Moreover, the question concerned not only the speech of the peoples who had a written language (Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians, Armenians, Georgians), but also the speech of non-written peoples (Volga and Azerbaijan Tatars, Kirghizs, Kazakhs, Turkmens, etc.), for whom alphabets had been based on the Russian alphabet, literary norms had been focused on the spoken language of the political center. These norms have been fixed both in political documents and in educational and scientific literature [40]. The formation of these literary languages can also be considered a revolutionary (by leap), but it was carried out by generalization of linguistic facts by linguistic scientists, and not by official decrees.

From this period, we can talk about literary languages proper, since they acquired all the above-mentioned signs of literariness.

In the post-Soviet period, Armenian and Russian literary languages received the status of state languages, which required the final consolidation of the norms of use, for violation of which by officials, the Russian government established, as indicated above, the appropriate punishment [5]. The Armenian government has formed a special committee to monitor the correct use of the Armenian literary language (including in the speeches of officials). The transition from a standardized literary language to a codified one means a ban on violations of established norms in a natural way, officially generalized by scientists. The concept of speech culture has finally been formed. Along with this, the richest Armenian and Russian linguistic literature of the twentieth century, as well as the literature of other nations, recognizing the need to follow legalized rules, recorded violations of them [4; 26]. Moreover, grammar was considered and is considered to be normative first of all. Borrowing, the appearance of new meanings in words are issues that previously did not cause any special objections, although the use of a word or phrase, syntactic construction

outside the literary norm is also a violation of the culture of speech. These processes, as noted, are permanent and are associated with both the development of society and the development of intercultural and interethnic ties [18, pp.7-14; 19, pp.57-68].

Does codification mean the status quo in the development of the language, or does it still have the right to change? Which ones? So - if we state the development. It is clear that [д'в'ёр'] during the twentieth century and now passes into [дв'ёр'], but what is considered correct, literary? How is it "legal" to pronounce [дэка́н] or [д'икан] so as not to violate the "state" etiquette of speech culture and not be officially fined? If we proceed from the well-established opinion that certain forms or words, the meanings of words are initially considered violations of norms and are recognized as literary only with a high frequency of use, it is necessary to recognize the admissibility of such (which?) errors. "I don't like Russian speech without a grammatical error," the great Pushkin joked. This is at the grammar level.

In the last years of Soviet rule, there were constant disputes in Armenian linguistics about the recognition of a particular word as literary or non-literary. In particular, an example of the word թռն [thor] (meaning "seine") was given. In reality, neither side had a solid basis for evidence. The only criterion is the frequency of use in normative speech, which is the official press, as has long been accepted in our linguistics. And what should the official press be guided by?

It would seem that the development of literary Armenian and Russian languages shows that the codification of norms leads to a slowdown in the pace of phonetic and morphological changes, while – regardless of state regulation - lexical and semantic transformations continue, which is associated with the development of society, public relations, and the development of abstract thinking [17, pp.62-73]. The language is moving towards increasing expressiveness, to combining semantics and stylistics ("two or three in one"). Figurative words and expressions appear in the unofficial press that are completely unrelated to street, obscene language: давить подушку (to crush a pillow = "sleep"), колбасить (to be sausage = "clumsily, drunkenly dance"), etc.; words acquire new meanings, without violating the general rules of semantics development at all: бригадир (brigadier = "leader of a criminal group") and others. In the middle of the last century, linguists did not allow too abstract transfer of meanings. "... "Wooden table" and "table of wooden" are possible, but "wooden smile" and

"smile of wooden" are impossible," wrote Z.S. Harries [12, p.554]. In modern English, wooden smile is quite possible, although it may be more occasional or in a stylistically colored text.

The reasons for the slowdown in phonetic and morphological transformations of the languages under consideration are explained rather not by the codification of norms, but by the stability of their dialect base over the past two centuries. There are no significant changes in the spoken language, so there are none in the literary one. In the specified grammars of Lomonosov and Grech, with the exception of some verbal formations: participles of the type *двигань* (moved) [15, p.133] adverbs of the type *двигаючись, парючи* (to be moving, to be soaring) [15, p.138], forms of the past tense [15, p.129-132, etc.], paradigms of declension of words *сопок, девяносто, сто* (forty, ninety, one hundred) [15, p.102-103] and some others, which are hardly rigidly connected with live use, the morphological system of the Russian language still functions in an almost static form.

A special topic in modern official documents is the use of borrowings. G.O. Vinokur believed that "word-making" (in this case, purism) is meaningless when there is a possibility of borrowing [39, pp. 163-173]. "But pantaloons, tailcoat, waistcoat – All these words are not in Russian. Shishkov, I'm sorry, I don't know how to translate," Pushkin confessed. F.P. Filin, on the contrary, demanded the use of the internal capabilities of the Russian language [8, p.15-61].

These questions are theoretical problems that modern linguists should solve in order to answer the practical questions of time. To paraphrase K. Marx, we note that modern linguistics is working on ways to describe a language, while it must also work on how to improve it and protect it from tabloidism, how to permanently normalize it so as not to tear the literary language from the living. For centuries, the words *жопа, говно* (ass, shit), which were considered non-literary, obscene, suddenly turned out to be equal members of the Russian lexical "society" [21], along with *задница, испражнения* movements, although it is quite clear that they mean the same thing and we are talking only about the tradition of use, and, strictly speaking, it does not matter at all how these objects are to name. But what about "Dictionaries of Russian words outside of Russian Dictionaries"? [25]. These have been published from time to time abroad, fixing Russian tabloid jargon. What is the value of them? When is it possible to break tradition, cross

the "red line" in vocabulary? There are no standards for this at all, although there are many attempts to create standards [3, pp.91-101].

If the development of a literary language is determined by a spoken one, then it should be recognized that at present the norms are established by scientists by the inductive method, by general conclusion. If we admit that the literary language is processed by the intellectual efforts of individual writers (and it is), we state that the literary language is artificial in terms of rationing, although neither Pushkin, as already indicated, in Russian, nor H.Tumanyan or V.Teryan in Armenian were introduced into the language, for example, new forms and paradigms of declension. When we establish certain rules of use at the level of codification, which today we call the culture of speech, it means that we recognize that these rules are artificially systematized based on the natural development of language. In this case, the issue of rationing, the establishment of a norm, is a matter of ascertaining natural progress. If it were possible to identify ways to establish certain norms, generalizations could be made. So, there was a *музыка* (from Polish. *muzyka*, in Polish, the stress is always on the penultimate syllable), which was replaced by a *музыка*. Similar transformations have been experienced by *физика, лирика, мимика, пантика, техника* (from Polish. *fizyka, liryka, mimika, panika, technika*), etc. This happened under the influence of transformations in the speech of society. Why and based on what the norm was transformed? Today's linguistic "toolkit" does not allow us to draw any convincing conclusion, which is no longer needed as a historical fact, but as a method for orientation in the development of language in the future, since the level of language development is the level of linguistic thinking, and the latter is the basis of national security.

Russian scientists noted the growth of agglutinativity in the semantics of a derived word, the increase in the number of suffix morphemes with a single content etc. by the middle of the last century. In terms of word formation, the process of Russification of non-Russian suffixes is quite active in modern Russian, i.e. the inclusion of non-Russian suffixes in the word-formation processes of the Russian language. Compare, along with *большевизм, меньшевизм* (bolshevism, menshevism), also *chiefdom, отзовизм, украинизм, пушкинизм, милитаризация, славянизация, бумаженция* etc. (otzovism, ukrainism, pushkinism, militarization, slavianization, paperwork) [41]. Morphologically, the number of non-declinable nouns is increasing, and - mainly of the middle gender, nouns of the

so-called general genus (two-gendered): бойфренд, бизнес-вуман (boyfriend, businesswoman) etc. Last examples indicate a weakening of the gender category in the literary language, which, according to S.P. Obnorsky, is very actively reflected in dialects already at the beginning of the last century [20, p.217]. Some borrowings have only one form – Nominative (boyfriend, businesswoman). The "Russification" of borrowings is very active, especially in colloquial speech, their inclusion in the Russian inflectional paradigm (primaries, restyling, biopic, etc.). This is a tendency towards uniformity of expression. "If the free combination of linguistic elements produced by an individual did not coincide with the vast majority of cases with the traditional form, then the development of language would be difficult" [5, p.14]. Russian Grammar is only ten years old between the "Grammar of the modern Russian literary language" [10] and the "Russian Grammar" [23; 24], but in the latter, for example, there are syntactic constructions of the type Видно следы (Traces are visible), about which there is no information in the first grammar.

These changes occur in spite of themselves of linguistic scientists, who can only arrange them to derive general rules.

Borrowing is a natural result of the mutual influence of languages, but in connection with political, scientific, and economic revolutions, their influx should be restrained (how?). There are many borrowings in modern Russian and Armenian languages related to the spread of new technology. They enter the literary language in borrowed (in Russian) or calcified form (in Armenian), regardless of the requirements of the literary norm (which one?). F. de Saussure within the specified (but only!) is right: "Language activity is not regulated by any human norms; the human mind cannot constantly correct and direct it and does not do so" [32, p.97]. When we assert that language policy is "a system of measures of conscious regulatory influence on the functional side of language, and through it, to a certain extent, also on its structure" [2, pp.28-29], we can only mean language construction as a state phenomenon, the principles of language use in some society – at the level of sociolinguistics. So far, there are no strict selection criteria, differentiation of linguistic facts (except for those already traditionally accepted as literary) into literary and non-literary ones, although the latter enter our reality, which we cannot ignore. There is no point in introducing any prohibitions on the use of vocabulary, except for non-literary,

colloquial abuse, since life is developing in all directions, new phenomena appear, new names of old phenomena are probably more successful if they replace the old ones. Moreover, as we have repeatedly noted, we do not have a specific standard by which new words and grammatical facts could be chosen, therefore, before demanding compliance with the culture of speech, it is necessary to outline the normalizing standards that no deputies have the right to violate, as stated in the above-mentioned law of the Russian Federation [6], nor tabloid newspapers, since it is about the purity of the language.

According to the history of the languages under consideration over the last two centuries, it can be concluded that there are changes as such that do not have access to the content of communication, and there is actually a development that affects the informative essence of the language. The former occur spontaneously, the latter (especially at the present stage) due to the efforts of creative personalities. If there is a hardening of the consonant before the soft consonant, this is a change. If the change is accompanied by a semantic factor, then it is a development (even, for example, the spread of abbreviations and complex names). Otherwise, the general phrase about language development (even if it is "consistent and dialectical") becomes incorrect and meaningless. Visually meaningful development can be demonstrated by comparing languages, for example, Sumarokov and Pushkin. Our conclusion comes into direct contradiction with the generally accepted interpretation of language development, formulated at the time by F. de Saussure: "... It is clear what should be understood by the hypothesis of progress in language. Absolute progress is obviously out of the question ... There are various states that replace each other and in each of which certain laws prevail, which are the result of the balance of forces acting in them" [31, pp.457-458]. Otherwise, this idea can be interpreted as "stomping on the tongue", which does not correspond to reality in any way. Formal indicators exist as long as they are such. As soon as they lose their role, they disappear. In Russian, the sound denoted Ъ was kept until the end of the 18th century ("Ъ – thin, е – thick", Lomonosov pointed out [15, p. 16], i.e. Ъ = je). But, having stopped distinguishing the sound shells of words, he disappeared. The same is true with the genus in Armenian, with variable endings in the Russian literary language, etc. Formal changes lead to phonetic, word-formation and formative uniformity. At Lomonosov's:

ни видя в лице, р.13; скрып, соловьеву свисту, Азиатские народы, all - р. 14; у Китайцевъ, на другом месте, all - р. 23; клену (instead of кляну), прохожей (-ий), all - р. 25; частьми, р.26; лебядъ, р.27; второй степень, р.28; у Турковъ, р.33 [15], which is no longer in the language of the middle of the XIX century.

The actual development takes place, as noted, as a result of the mixing of dialects, and sometimes literary languages (in a number of Armenian diasporas in the USA and France), which is reflected in the texts of classical writers, whose language becomes a model for imitation. At the present stage, this can only be the result of the intellectual efforts of outstanding masters of the word. Thus, in Armenian, attempts are being made to combine two functioning versions of the literary language in one.

Language is not a mathematical (artificially created) or physical object. At the present stage, new formations are included in the spoken language of the political center, in which different variants of this language are crossed outside the logical rules. The variants, as is known, can be colloquial, stylistic, professionally conditioned, etc. So, if in the Russian language, along with the добы́ча, the word до́быча is used, it is necessary to state the professional version of the norm (professionalism): national use is the norm, another is an option (for this, of course, the author should not be legally punished!). If a variant ceases to be perceived as a stylistically colored phenomenon, it becomes a doublet.

The history of the Russian literary language shows that the stylistically more refined version is often activated, while swear words do not become literary, even if they are actively used by the classics (at S.Esenin, V.Mayakovsky, E.Yevtushenko, etc.). There is another approach: "The more actively the word is used the more words it combines with, the more actively the number of its meanings grows. So, the word тусовка, which was a long term relatively recently, is now increasingly used in print media" [5, p.91]. But тусовка is not swearing.

However, lexical variants, even if they combine semantics and style, are not necessarily fixed in the literary language. Stylistic variations of political vocabulary, which are its non-normative analogues, have gained a large place in the modern press: прихватизация, расстройка, быдлан, ЕБН (Ельцин Б.Н.) etc., but they are unlikely to become normative. Why? If we apply the oppositional method of analysis, they differ from the established lexemes in the language in two ways: they are conditioned by the political situation, which is changing quite quickly, and their stylistic

meaning is not accepted by all members of society.

Summarizing, we can say that the formation of the literary languages under consideration goes through four stages of development: folklore, written, literary, codified. And at all stages, permanent changes spontaneously occur due to various historical reasons. The formation of a literary language can occur both consistently and revolutionarily (by leaps and bounds). It can be based on the conversational element of not only a political, but also a cultural center, which has formed into an independent communicative system in the language of a creative personality. Depending on the cultural and historical conditions, the written language is formed either on an internal basis or by crossing languages.

The quality of a language is determined by its expressiveness. If the changes do not lead to qualitative results, this is a formal transformation taking place due to the action of internal phonetic laws or the mixing of dialects, types of literary languages. Transformations that lead to qualitative changes determine the actual development. The former proceed spontaneously, the latter can be introduced consciously by the masters of the artistic word by implementing them in their creative texts.

The literary language, as history shows, cannot remain "pure" and "untouched" even in one temporal plane, since it functions over a large area in the mouths of representatives of different dialects, different educational levels, and different professions. This indicates that today other requirements must be imposed on the culture of speech related to the development of stylistic coloring, with a mixture of styles to achieve artistic effects, etc. In addition, modernity makes its own adjustments. Thus, "the introduction of these means (mass media – V.M.) accelerates the processes of convergence of written, book and spoken forms of speech" [33, p.4].

The literary norm at the present stage, despite codification and all limitations, continues to develop at all levels: the progress of society requires more and more advanced means of expressing thought ("two in one", figurative use, etc.). At the same time, there is no movement towards greater systematization of language and speech, which was observed in the last century: there is a movement towards greater and non-standard expressiveness, for which both lexical and grammatical means are used, and which indicates that there are no clear boundaries between norm and usage and cannot be today, since usage, being the basis of normative grammar,



constantly influences the correction of norms, improving them. We do not determine whether a word (word form) is literary. It becomes such by itself, regardless of our desire. In fact, the new form or lexical unit follows the same path that the literary language has followed. Neologism (let's conditionally call it not only a new word, but also a new form) originates in living speech (= folklore), then begins to penetrate into written speech, from where it can claim to be literary. The frequency of use forces linguists to include it in dictionaries (and word forms in grammars), which provides the basis for its codification. But frequency in itself cannot serve as an absolute factor in including the phenomenon in the norm (the principle of rationing), because the most frequent words are expletives.

Foreign language lexical units are included in the literary language without "tradition and rationing" if they are the only names of the relevant subjects. This is logical, but the law "On the State Language of the Russian Federation" [7] poses an unsolvable problem: «Ведомости» ("Vedomosti") for 2023 recorded more than a hundred words that are not yet in any dictionary: they appear in dictionaries after distribution in written speech. And how to designate the relevant realities before their names will be included in dictionaries? If we keep in mind that phonetic changes do not affect the content side of the language, morphological changes are associated with the activation of some forms and a reduction in the frequency of others, syntactic – with increased expressiveness, lexical - with the development of society. Then the transformation of literary the norms between dogma and dialectics are not violations of the norms of use, but an alternation of topicalities caused by the actualization of certain aspects of the linguistic sign in the spoken language. Since the development of the literary language throughout the national space turns out to be dependent on the spoken element, before looking for the principles of normalization of linguistic phenomena, it is necessary to establish the principles of the development of spoken language in different periods of existence. To determine the reasons for the changes in the latter means to understand how the new version differs from the old one. Similarly to the variants of music in modern Russian, *девичий* and *деви'чий* function (compare, the latter variant in the language of A.Blok and S.Yesenin). They differ only in frequency in the spoken language, and which option is the perspective?

The development of the literary language is a self-regulating process, which society or the state can influence not by laws,

but by the quality of speech of masters of the artistic word, therefore, the new law [7] to the Law of the Russian Federation "On the State Language of the Russian Federation" [6], as noted, will really have no meaning. Significant changes in the language norm take place only if there is a more meaningful implementation of the language. "Revolutionary" attempts such as futuristic experiments in Russian and Armenian literature at the beginning of the last century cannot have obvious consequences.

Regardless of our desire, codifiers always strive to avoid deviations from recognized norms, and the further society develops, the more this trend increases. In theory, the normativity and culture of speech should be improved within the framework of logic, rigidly maintaining consistency, continuity and traditions. The literary language has never been in the grip of dogma: it has always obeyed dialectics, and any dialectical development of the language should in no case be assessed as a corruption of its literary version (processed over the centuries), although the canonical rules of use are partially violated. Moreover, the development of a literary language is necessary, despite the legislative consolidation of rules and norms, because otherwise, as Grabar's story shows, such a crisis may occur that will force the construction of a new literary language to begin. Today, when defining linguistic norms, we rely on traditions. The development of principles for the normalization of new linguistic phenomena in this regard could become the basis for the permanent, consistent development of the language system, however, the history of language is the history of society, the development of which does not obey any state and materialistic laws.

REFERENCES

1. Abramenko F.H. New Russian spelling. Part 2. Moscow, USSR, 1918. – 95 p.
2. Avrorin V.A. Problems of studying the functional side of language (on the subject of sociolinguistics). Leningrad (St. Petersburg), "Nauka", USSR, 1975. – Pp.28-30.
3. Chirkova E.K. On the criteria for distinguishing occasional words from new words of the literary language. Russian Lexicography.- Leningrad (St. Petersburg): "Nauka", USSR, 1975. - Pp.91-101.
4. Espersen O. Philosophy of grammar. Moscow, "Inostr. liter., USSR, 1958. - Pp.12-44.
5. Evstyugina A.A. Russian language and culture of speech: a

course of lectures. Yekaterinburg, RSPU. The Russian Federation. 2019. – 269 p.

6. The Federal Law of the Russian Federation "On the State Language of the Russian Federation" No. 53-FL. Adopted by the State Duma on May 20, 2005 – Collection of Codes and Laws of the Russian Federation. Moscow: Yurist, Russian Federation, 2011. – Pp.456-458.
7. The Federal Law of the Russian Federation "On Amendments to the Federal Law "On the State Language of the Russian Federation". Adopted by the State Duma on February 16, 2023, approved by the Federation Council on February 22, 2023 – An online resource. Date of application: 04/22/2023.
8. Filin F.P. Essays on the theory of linguistics. Moscow, "Nauka", USSR, 1982. – 336 p.
9. Golub I.B. Russian language and culture of speech: Textbook. – Moscow, "Logos", Russian Federation, 2002. - 432 p.
10. Grammar of the modern Russian literary language. Moscow, "Nauka", USSR, 1970. – 800 p.
11. Grech N.I. Voluminous Russian grammar. St. Petersburg, 1827. Publisher's typograph. The Russian Empire. – 396 p.
12. Harris Z.S. Joint occurrence and transformation in the linguistic structure // New in linguistics, v.2. Moscow, "In. lit.", USSR, 1962. – Pp. 528-636.
13. Hoenigswald G. Are there universals of language changes? – New in Linguistics, issue 5. Moscow, Progress, USSR, 1970. - Pp.77-105.
14. Kostomarov V.G. Concerning the normative regulation of language. - fil nauki-51. An online resource. Accessed 11.06.2023.
15. Lomonosov M.V. Russian grammar. St. Petersburg, Imperial Printing House, The Russian Empire, 1755. – 213 p.
16. Madoyan V.V. The formation of a literary norm as a result of mixing variations of oral and written speech. – SRoFHS Philological sciences. No.2, Russian Federation, 2022. – Pp.10-17.
17. Madoyan V.V., Sheiranian S.Z. Stylistic development of speech in ideological conflicts of the late 20th – early 21st century (based on the material of the Russian and Armenian languages). Moscow, Coincidence, Russian Federation, 2020. – 114 p.
18. New words and meanings. Dictionary-reference book. Moscow, "Nauka", USSR, 1970. – Pp. 5-14.
19. Norman B.Y. Grammatical innovations in the Russian language related to social processes. – "Rusistics", 1998, No.1-2. Moscow, Russian Federation. - Pp.57-68.
20. Obnorsky S.P. Nominal declension in modern Russian. Noun,

Issue 1. Sing., Leningrad (St. Petersburg), "Uchpedgiz", 1927;

Issue 2. Pl., Leningrad, 1931. USSR. – Pp.126-145.

21. Ozhegov S.I., Shvedova N.Yu. Dictionary of the Russian language. Moscow, RL, Russian Federation, 1995. – 938 p.
22. Rushkin A.S. Complete collected works (in three volumes). V. 2. Moscow, "Khud. liter.", USSR, 1985. – Pp. 354-425.
23. Russian grammar, v.1. Moscow, "Nauka", USSR, 1980. – 709 p.
24. Russian Grammar, v. 2. Moscow, "Nauka", USSR, 1980. – 783 p.
25. Russian vocabulary outside of Russian dictionaries. London, UK, 1976. – 856 p.
26. The Russian language and Soviet society. Russian vocabulary of the modern literary language. Moscow, "Nauka", USSR, 1968. - 185 p.
27. The Russian language and Soviet society. Phonetics of the modern Russian literary language. Moscow, "Nauka", USSR, 1968. - 214 p.
28. The Russian language and Soviet society. Word formation of the modern Russian literary language. Moscow, "Nauka", 1968. – 210 p.
29. The Russian language and Soviet society. Morphology and syntax of the modern Russian literary language. Moscow, "Nauka", USSR, 1968. – 366 p.
30. Skvortsov L.I. Fundamentals of speech culture. – Moscow, "Higher School", USSR, 1984. - 320 p.
31. Saussure F. de. Notes on general linguistics. Moscow, Progress, Russian Federation, 2000. – 97 p.
32. Saussure F. de. General Linguistics course. – Works on linguistics. Moscow, USSR. 1977. - Pp.31-269.
33. Schweitzer A.D., Nikolsky L.B. Introduction to sociolinguistics. Moscow, "Higher School", USSR, 1978. - 216 p.
34. Shakhmatov A.A. An essay on the most ancient period of the history of the Russian language. Petrograd (St. Petersburg), The Russian Empire, 1915. – Pp.105-212..
35. Sumarokov A. P. Complete collection. V. 3. Moscow, University printing House. The Russian Empire, 1781. – Pp. 40-54.
36. "Vedomosti" («Ведомости»), the official agency of the Government of the Russian Federation, issues for 2023 (Moscow, Russian Federation).
37. Vinogradov V.V. Russian language. Grammatical teaching about the word. Moscow, "Higher School". USSR, 1972 – 674 p.