



INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMICS

JUNE 24-25, 2019

PROBLEMS OF NORMATIVITY / NONNORMATIVITY OF LANGUAGE UNITS OF A COTTON.

Abstract

This article contains a number of points about the existence of a language and its problems of normative and non-normative meaning.

The concept of the norm should be altered primarily in relation to the inventory of language units at different levels of the language system in a certain period of its development. Recognizing the dynamic nature of the language system as a property immanent to this system and opposite to the property of stability, sustainability, it is necessary to recognize similar characteristics with respect to the norm. In the light of the above, the definition of the concept of a norm, its criteria and variability acquire an especially important meaning.

keywords: *normative/non-normative, language units, language system, uzus, stability*

**SAIDAKHON
SHUKURZHONOVNA
MAMATKULOVA**

Doctoral student (PhD)

*Uzbek State University of World
Languages*

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

mamatkulova88@bk.ru

Introduction

Many different definitions of language and its functions can be attributed to the fact that language is a structurally organized sign system of a special kind that is in a state of continuous development and serves as the main means of human communication, an instrument of expression of thoughts and feelings. The study of language, like any natural object, can be done in at least three ways (Kubryakova, 1972,24):

- a) as a certain set of elements;
- b) as a definite set of relations between these elements;
- c) as a connected whole, i.e. as a certain coherent set of elements and relationships.

In other words, language learning can be carried out on the basis of three approaches:

elementary, structural, and systemic. In the language, as a sound matter, from the set and its components can be isolated fragments as something autonomous and qualitatively separate, for example, phonemes. "The unity of heterogeneous elements within the whole" represents the structure (Reformatsky, 1967,25). A language is a complex structure in which several levels are distinguished - phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, etc. Each level is characterized by its system, i.e. "The system is the unity of homogeneous interdependent elements" (Reformatsky, 1967,25). The elements of the structure and systems of the language are interrelated and interdependent. Qualitative or quantitative changes of elements entail a restructuring of the structure and system of the language. Within the system of each level of the language structure there are subsystems or private systems. So, in the syntactic system of a language, one can distinguish such subsystems as: phrase, sentence, sentence members, syntactic links, etc. adaptations to the changing needs of communication. The language continuously loses the elements that have become unnecessary in one way or another and constantly introduces new elements into the same system "(Peretrukhin, 1973.31). In other words, the system is not only what really exists in the language, but everything that can be changed and created in it.

The concept of a norm is closely connected with the concept of a language system. The norm predetermines and regulates the choice of language elements existing in a particular system, since language values at any level (grammatical, lexical, etc.) can be expressed in one or several variants. The choice of a variant depends on many reasons: the prevalence and compulsory conformity of the normative, familiarity (usus) and authority of the source. "Where there is no choice, there is no problem of the norm" (Feelin, 1966, 17).

Thus, the concept of a norm should be defined primarily in relation to the inventory of language units at different levels of the language system at a certain period of its development. Recognizing the dynamic nature of the language system as a property immanent to this system in the opposite property of stability, sustainability, it is necessary to recognize similar characteristics in relation to the norm. In other words, the norm should also be determined by simultaneously acting, but oppositely directed signs, creating its stability and, in this sense, rigor and certainty, on the one hand, and lability, variability and,

accordingly, uncertainty, on the other. In addition, it can be assumed that there is an inverse relationship between the language system and the norm. When changes in the norm can stimulate changes in the language system. Indicative in this respect, in our opinion, is the tendency noted in modern English to suppress the subjunctive II forms of the past tense in indicative II, which some grammatists have already rushed to raise to the rank of fait accompli with respect to the language system (Barkhudarov, 1975.130-131) .

In the light of the above, the definition of the concept of a norm, its criteria and variability acquire an especially important meaning.

Language norm

Norm is a complex and dialectically contradictory phenomenon. The difficulties of defining this concept are due to the presence in the language of mutually exclusive features, and above all, dynamism and static character. Many linguists have a different approach to the definition of the norm.

So, E. Koseriu considers the concept of the norm in opposition to the concept of a system. "In the structures constituting the language, one can distinguish between what is normal, or universal (norm), and what is functional and is given in opposition to (system)." (Koseriu, 1963,173).

The concept of the norm E. Koseriu considers through the system, in connection and in comparison with it. In a sense, the norm is wider than the system, since the norm contains a larger number of signs. On the other hand, the norm is already a system, since the norm is limited within the limits of the implementation possibilities allowed by the system. The concept of the system E. Koseriu reveals through functional meaningful oppositions, the concept of the norm is considered through options that do not carry a sense-differentiating load. For example, in Russian you can find such cases as workshops and workshops, he was cheerful and he was cheerful. The differences between these pairs of words are functionally not significant. While from home - to home, writing - they write represent functionally significant, i.e. systemic oppositions.

VG Kostomarov and A.A. Leontiev adhere to the same point of view on the norm and system. They view the language system as something given and unchanging, and the norm as a

constant, accepted phenomenon, but subject to fluctuations, variation and change. If the system is defined as a set of irrelevant variables in their connection with significant variables with the obligatory analysis of the rules of transition of one to another (Kostomarov, Leontyev, 1966: 9).

A completely different approach to the theory of the norm distinguishes researchers of the Prague School of Linguistics. In the works of such linguists as B. Gavranek (Gavranek, 1963), A. Edlichka (Edlichka, 1963) an attempt is made to clearly distinguish the concept of norm from the concept of codification. Under the norm is understood generally accepted, enshrined in the language of use. Under the codification is understood the use recommended by grammar, dictionary, reference book, use, supported by the authority of a famous writer. The first definition refers the norm to the objective reality of the language, the second one brings the norm beyond the language boundaries. The norm is not contained in the language itself, but is entered into the language by grammars and reference dictionaries. V. A. Itskovich differentiates these concepts: "From the objectively existing norm of a language, its codification should be distinguished, i.e. establishing rules for the use of words, rules of word formation, inflection, rules for constructing phrases and sentences ... the norm exists in any team. The codification, the conscious and fixed norm, is a phenomenon peculiar only to the literary language "(Itskovich, 1967,7-8;).

In our opinion, such an understanding of a kind of two norms has both features of similarity and difference features. On the one hand, grammars and reference dictionaries must correctly reflect the patterns that exist in the language. They fix what is already there, appeared and stuck in the language. On the other hand, if the codified norms are retrospective, the norms of speech activity, on the contrary, are addressed to present and future language changes, for all changes and innovations pass through speech, but not all changes and innovations become the property of the language, its codified norms.

REFERENCES

- Kubryakova E.S. On the concepts of language system and language structure. - In the book: General Linguistics. Ed. V.A.Serebrennikova. -M. : Science, 1972, pp. 8-115
 Reformatsky A.A. Introduction to linguistics. - M., 1967. - about 42 p.

- Filin F.P. A few words about the language norm and culture of speech. - In book: Questions of culture of speech. UD, M., 1966, p.15-22
- Barkhudarov L.S. Essays on the morphology of modern English. - Moscow: Higher School, 1975. - 156 p.
- Koseriu E. Synchrony, diachrony and history. - 8 kN .: New in linguistics, issue.Sh. M., 1963, p .143-343.
- Kostomarov VG, Leontievk A. Some theoretical questions of the culture of speech. - Questions of linguistics, 1966, No. 5, p. 3-15.
- Ravranek B. Tasks of the literary language and its culture. - In the book: Prague linguistic circle. - M .: Progress, 1967, p. 338-377.
- Edlichka A. On the Prague theory of literary language. - In the book: Prague linguistic circle. - M .: Progress, 1967.
- Itskovich V.A. Language norm. - M .: Education, 1967. – PAGE 92.

