MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL

FIELD OF RUSSIAN LANGUAGE LINGUISTIC SECURITY: ON THE PROBLEM OF INTERPRETATION

Lenara Islyamova
Lecturer
Jizzakh State Pedagogical University named after A. Kadiri
Jizzakh, Uzbekistan
E-mail: islyamova@mail.ru

Natalya Sharipova
Lecturer
Jizzakh State Pedagogical University named after A. Kadiri
Jizzakh, Uzbekistan
E-mail: sharipova@mail.ru

ABOUT ARTICLE

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to theoretically substantiate, design and implement a model for the formation of a linguistic safety of the future language teacher - in the system of higher professional education. The author considers various approaches to understanding linguistic security so that and offers his own definition of this concept and its basic principles, which allows concretizing the direction of further research. If linguistic security as a system of special measures covers the techniques for drafting the texts of legislative acts, official documents and information support for document management, then strict security rules in relation to the language of the "printed" media, the language of the "spontaneous Russian internet" and free speech communication do not yet have effect. In recent years, it has become quite obvious that the subject field of linguistic security needs to be expanded.

INTRODUCTION

The communication "boom" that engulfed our society at the turn of the 20th-21st centuries gave rise to many interesting linguistic phenomena and problems that require understanding and analysis from a linguistic point of view. At the same seminar, the topic of linguistic security was also voiced

in the speech of Academician of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, Doctor of Law and Philology E.I. Galyashina, who spoke about the relevance of this problem not only on the scale of the national interests of individual countries, but also of the world community as a whole, about the need to comply with linguistic security when compiling the texts of official documents, about the objectivity of the threat to the information and linguistic security of electronic document management and oral speech communication on the Internet, as well as the fact that in Russia the punishment for violating the "linguistic security" of a person and society has a long history [15].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The functional aspects of the Russian language in different types of discourse and the specifics of the sociolinguistic and general cultural essence of the language are actively studied (Yu.D. Apresyan, L.P. Krysin, T.B. Radbil, L.V. Ratsiburskaya and others) [2; 3; 6; 7; 10]. At the same time, linguists note a threatening decline in the level of Russian speech culture, a change in the boundaries of action and observance of the language norms of the Russian language, the dynamics of speech behavior patterns and the linguistic picture of the world, which are generally characteristic of informal and official communications [5; 6]. Concerns are also associated with the assessment of the conditions for the functioning of the Russian language in the status of the state language, which acquired its specificity precisely during this period in the post-Soviet space [3; 4; 5]. Finally, the interaction of the language and the system of legal regulation in society requires analysis, showing to specialists and society the growth of violations in the sphere of speech actions of citizens [4; 6; 11]. In the aggregate of these conditions, such a state of the language situation is seen, which leads to the concept of linguistic security [1].

A generally accepted definition of the concept of linguistic security has not yet been developed, which is quite understandable by its relative scientific novelty and multidimensionality. Based on existing points of view [1; 5; 8; 10; 11; 12], we will try to generalize the definitions of the concept. Linguistic security is understood as the state of legal protection of the Russian language as a means of interethnic communication and the state language; a stable state of the Russian language, characterized by the preservation of its richness, integrity, normativity, functionality, national and cultural identity, as well as a system of measures to ensure just such a self-development of the Russian language; this is a language policy that excludes harm to the language system under the influence of internal and external influences, as well as the direction of research considering the problems of ensuring linguistic security. The linguistic security of the text is interpreted in a special way: a set of principles for such formation of a Russian-language text, which minimizes the risks of its conflict perception and reproduction.

Research in line with the orthology of the Russian language reveals the dynamics of the norm in language and speech, which erodes the stability of the traditional norm - the model. In this case,

security in linguistics is associated with an assessment of the relevance of an invariant norm, an analysis of the consequences of the introduction of Newspeak and the threats of Westernization of the Russian language, and the scientific development of prescriptive orthological measures.

Let us consider the factors of actualization of the subject field of linguistic security in connection with the development of linguistic conflictology. It is believed that Professor M.V. Gorbanevsky in connection with the analysis of the conflict potential of communication [11]. Indeed, the realities of communication in the modern world highlight such areas where linguistic canons, linguistic requirements, characteristics, signs are so significant that we can talk about areas of increased speech responsibility. For example, the speech actions of a politician, a journalist, a teacher, a judge, a law enforcement officer, an official are clothed with increased speech responsibility, because the statements of people engaged in such professional activities play an important role in the life of society as a whole and individual citizens, can become a verdict that determines the fate of a particular person, are able to influence public opinion. The attention of specialists to the "hate speech" (eng. hate speech) arose in the framework of research on conflict discourse and the means of its expression. In the works of linguists (as well as in interdisciplinary works), "hate speech" is viewed through the prism of manifestations of extremist speech actions, expressions of social protest, intercultural rejection, interpersonal conflict, and political struggle [4]. In communication, hate speech acts as a mechanism for presenting social and political stereotypes, positioning prejudices, as many researchers believe [12]. Hate speech, saturating communication with expression and a destructive idea, can take a wide variety of forms - from harsh explicit calls for violence, discrimination or implicit calls for protest to derogatory and offensive evaluative labels that create a negative image of an ethnic or religious group; from explicit propaganda of violence/discrimination/hostility to covert manipulation by quoting xenophobic statements.

In recent years, the range of problems of linguistic security has objectively expanded: verbal aggression has become such a frequent occurrence that it has become impossible not to notice it. Thus, in the subject field of linguistic security, studies devoted to ethnofolisms stood out, in the Soviet period ignored by linguists for reasons mainly of a political nature. Ethnopholisms (ethnic nicknames, negatively connoted names of representatives of various ethnic groups in jargon-sociolects, penetrating from there due to their expressiveness as a means of stylization into the literary language, derogatory phraseological units with ethnonyms, epithets in the form of adjectives formed from the names of ethnic groups, metaphors based on ethnicity etc.) are considered by researchers as a means of expressing verbal aggression, markers of conflict discourse and signs of changes in the direction of negative connotations of fragments of the picture of the world [8].

For the first time, the phrase "linguistic security" was heard in a scientific meeting from the lips of a well-known modern scientist, president of the Guildia of Linguistic Experts on Documentation

and Information Disputes (GLEDIS), professor, academician of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, Doctor of Philology M.V. Gorbanevsky at the scientific-practical seminar "Theory and practice of linguistic analysis of media texts in forensic examinations and information disputes" in 2002. His favorite phrase is "Be careful when choosing a word!" appealed to the journalistic guild and directed the interpretation of linguistic security towards the responsibility of journalists for their statements written or uttered in the media, not only moral and ethical, but also civil, administrative, and even criminal [17].

Most scientists (Professors Yu.A. Belchikov, N.D. Golev and others) - and this is quite fair - when discussing the concept of linguistic security, turn primarily to the study of those cases, phenomena and their incarnations in language and speech that qualify as as violations: defamatory information, value judgments, opinion and assumption, insult and slander, indecent form of expression, invective and obscene vocabulary, use of irony, incitement of national, racial hatred, insult to national honor and dignity, propaganda of exclusivity, superiority or inferiority of citizens on the basis of their relationship to national, tribal or racial affiliation, etc. [14].

This bias is due to the fact that the issue of linguistic security itself arose from the growing flow of forensic linguistic examinations on controversial documents and media texts and on the results of such practice. Therefore, the interpretation of linguistic security in line with the new direction of linguistics - jurislinguistics - is based on the intersection of two sciences: linguistics and jurisprudence. So, Professor N.D. Golev considers the features of the examination of conflict texts in modern linguistic and legal paradigms, therefore he investigates cases of speech hooliganism, infliction of speech injuries and mutilations through the word, as well as the phenomenon of speech fraud, including speech strategies and tactics of lying, substitution of concepts and manipulation. He writes: "a fairly wide range of violations of the norms of the language are, to one degree or another, in contact with the law and can be discussed in the aspect of qualifying them as offenses" [16]. However, these studies are mainly about orthology and a new approach to understanding the norm in language and speech, in which the prescribed pattern is replaced by an invariant norm that is mandatory for a certain type of text in a certain communicative situation.

The logical continuation of the discussion of the problems of linguistic security is the emergence of the concepts of linguoecology and ecolinguistics, linguistic self-defense - in connection with the topic of linguistic aggression, linguistic violence and criminalization of the language. (Note in brackets that, according to the encyclopedic formulation, ecology is a science that studies the conditions for the existence of living organisms, the relationship between living organisms and their environment. Therefore, the term "linguoecology" turns out to be redundant and, in fact, redundant.)

In recent years, the interpretation of "linguistic security" has expanded. In connection with external influences caused by the processes of globalization, as well as with internal disorder in the

field of education, upbringing, ethnic relations and psychology of the population, researchers link the provision of Russia's national security with the task of ensuring the linguistic security of the Russian language. So, A.A. Bartosh, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Military Sciences, Director of the Information Center for International Security at MSLU, identifies geopolitical, political, social, and personal factors of a constructive and destructive nature [13].

The strategic vector of this interpretation of the linguistic security of Russia was set in 2006 by I.I. Khaleeva, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Rector of the Moscow State Linguistic University. She drew attention to such a source of danger as the unipolar orientation of society towards one of the world languages, which is currently the most important means of communication. As a basic category of linguistic security, mentality is proposed as an individual or mass consciousness, expressed by linguoculturally colored units of knowledge. Thus, linguistic security turned out to be associated with ensuring the full functioning of the Russian language as one of the leading languages of the world. The main problem of linguistic security is to ensure the sustainable development of the national language in interaction with other languages [21].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

However, despite a sufficient number of serious scientific works in the field of factors, criteria and violations of linguistic security, there is no proper definition of this concept, which to some extent blurs the horizons of further research. Thus, before going further, we should try to define what is the subject of our research, namely, what is it - linguistic security?

In the Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language V.V. Dahl gives the following explanations: "safe - not dangerous, not threatening, not able to cause harm or harm; harmless, safe, faithful, reliable. Security is the absence of danger; safety, reliability" [18, 67]. Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language S.I. Ozhegova and N.Yu. Shvedova is more concise: "security is a state in which there is no threat of danger, there is protection from danger" [20, 39]. In such a case, we can think of security as some feature of something that minimizes risk to the maximum extent possible.

In its most concise form, the concept of "security" can be defined as the state of protection of a certain system from harm. Conversely, the state of the system that allows harm is defined by the concept of "danger". Under the system in this case, we mean a complex situation of discourse, the components of which are the Russian language as a system, and the participants in the discourse, and the situation of the formation of an utterance (text).

Therefore, when producing a text (statement), it must be safe, i.e. should not pose a threat or harm the author, the character (we are talking primarily about journalism and journalistic texts, the characters of which are real people) or the audience.

The presence of such threats or potential harm in the text indicates its linguistic conflictogenicity. It is interesting that the text should strive for safety, but cannot become absolutely safe, since its design, formation, reproduction and perception at each of these stages are always conditioned by an infinite number of interpretations and interpretations that depend on many factors studied by hermeneutics, the science of meaning and its interpretation.

The desire of a text (statement) for safety as a permanent property that ensures the stability of its existence and perception cannot have positive results in the absence of rules for safe operation (in our case, the Russian language) set forth in the relevant rules and norms recorded in dictionaries and reference books . The issues of regulation in the Russian language and culture of speech are constantly discussed and lead to the development and modification of these norms, but the very existence of these norms is not in doubt. Today, to the norms of spelling and punctuation, of course, communicative and stylistic norms are added, related to the conditions of the communicative situation.

When forming a text (statement), it is necessary to pay special attention to its ability to effectively resist external threats and protect content from ambiguous interpretation, protect a person from the effects of harmful language units, and, by analogy with environmental safety, it is also necessary to set the values of the maximum permissible concentration (MAC) of harmful units of language that, through daily contact, cannot cause deterioration in moral or mental condition or cause harm or damage today or in a more distant period.

Another criterion of linguistic security should be recognized as the absence of risk in the perception of the text (statement), the confidence that the reproduction of the text, its comprehension will not harm its recipient or author.

The methods of ensuring linguistic security include measures to prevent threats, increase the resistance of the text to destructive influences (development and strengthening of immunity), the creation of a protection system, the creation of a system for eliminating the consequences of destructive influences.

The principle of destruction (destruction) is that the text as a system leading to a dangerous result can be destroyed by excluding one or more elements from it. The principle of risk reduction is to use solutions that improve safety even though they do not achieve the level desired or required by the regulations. The principle of eliminating danger is the elimination of dangerous and harmful factors, which is achieved by changing the technology of text formation, transforming the idea, replacing dangerous language units with safe ones, and using safer speech structures. Thus, linguistic security is such a state of a text (statement) in which its potential conflict potential tends to zero and the risk of harm to its author, character or recipient is minimal. A text becomes linguistically safe if it meets a number of criteria, among which the absence of certain elements occupies a significant

place. However, only the absence of conflictogenic language units (their systematization and description is the need of today) does not guarantee linguistic security. Particularly relevant tasks of tomorrow are the study of the linguistic security of the text in the aspect of linguoculturology, hermeneutics, and textual criticism.

The features noted by us are not an exhaustive description of the factors that actualize the subject field of linguistic security, but may be sufficient to reflect on how the linguistic dimension of sociocultural processes reveals threats, challenges and pain points of our time. It seems that in the future the development of the theory and practice of linguistic security will contribute to the normalization of the language situation and the solution of many problems of the Russian language.

CONCLUSION

The inaccuracy and ambiguity of the formulations always make one doubt the correctness of the direction, especially when it comes to humanitarian knowledge. In this situation, those modern linguists also found themselves who drew attention to the urgent need to understand those linguistic violations, the responsibility for which goes beyond the culture of speech and literacy as a criterion of human culture as a whole.

As guiding principles for ensuring security, fundamental ideas can be put forward that determine the direction of the search for secure solutions. In this case, it is possible to refer to the fundamental principles of safety in general: the principle of consistency, the principle of destruction, the principle of reducing danger and the principle of eliminating danger. The principle of consistency is that any component of the text is considered as an element of the system.

REFERENCES

[1]. Bartosh A. Geopolitical aspects of ensuring the linguistic security of Russia and the CIS // Bulletin of the Academy of Military Sciences. 2010. No. 4. URL: http://www.isc.mslu.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=3 10&Itemid=36

[2]. Getmanskaya M.Yu. Educational programs in local linguistics as a means of forming professional and general cultural competencies in the practice of teaching the Russian language // University readings - 2016. Materials of scientific and methodological readings of PSLU. Pyatigorsk, 2016, pp. 131-135.

[3]. Gikis S.N., Kicheva I.V. General cultural competence in the system of pedagogical concepts // Bulletin of the Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University. 2014. No. 1. P. 137-142.

[4]. Kicheva I.V., Pravikova L.V. Cognitive-semiotic properties of the discourse of verbal extremism // Bulletin of the Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University. 2013. No. 4. P. 123-128.

[5]. Kiyanova O.N. Russian language as the state language of the Russian Federation in modern conditions // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 9: Philology. M.: Publishing House of Moscow State University, 2016. No. 2. S. 106-116.

[6]. Klassovskaya O.A. Features of anthroponyms as units of intercultural communication (on the example of Russian and Chinese languages) // University readings - 2016. Materials of scientific and methodological readings of PSLU. Pyatigorsk, 2016, pp. 124-128.

[7]. Kovaleva T.N. The role of quotations from works of Russian literature in the novel by I.A. Bunin "The Life of Arseniev" // University readings - 2017. Materials of scientific and methodological readings of PSU. Pyatigorsk, 2017. S. 67-78.

[8]. Lyashenko I.V., Fedyunina I.E. Ethnic nicknames of Russians in the Ukrainian and Russian blogospheres // Research result. Questions of theoretical and applied linguistics. T. 3. 2017. No. 1. S. 42-48.

[9]. Ozhegov S.I. Dictionary of the Russian language. M.: Publishing house "Onyx", 2007.

[10]. Radbil T.B., Marinova E.V., Ratsiburskaya L.V., Samylicheva N.A. Russian language of the beginning of the XXI century: vocabulary, word formation, grammar, text: collective monograph. Nizhny Novgorod: Publishing House of the UNN named after. N.I. Lobachevsky, 2014. 325 p.

[11]. Theory and practice of linguistic analysis of media texts in forensic examinations and information disputes: in 2 hours. Moscow: Gallery, 2002-2003. 96 p.

[12]. Bar-Tal D. Delegitimization: The extreme case of stereotyping and prejudice // Stereotyping and prejudice: Changing concepts. N. Y., 1989. P. 169-182.

[13]. Bartosh A.A. Geopolitical aspects of ensuring the linguistic security of Russia and the CIS countries // Bulletin of the Academy of Military Sciences. -2010.-№ 4(33).

[14]. Belchikov Yu.A., Gorbanevsky M.V., Zharkov I.V. Guidelines on linguistic expertise of controversial media texts: Sat. materials. — M.: Informkniga, 2010.

[15]. Galyashina E.I. Linguistics vs extremism: To help judges, investigators, experts / Ed. M.V. Gorbanevsky. - M .: Legal world, 2006.

[16]. Golev N.D. Examination of conflict texts in modern linguistic and legal paradigms // Theory and practice of linguistic analysis of media texts in forensic examinations and information disputes: Sat. materials of the scientific-practical seminar. Moscow, December 7–8, 2002. Part 2 / Ed. M.V. Gorbanevsky. - M.: Galeria, 2003.

[17]. Gorbanevsky M.V. Be careful when choosing a word! // The price of the word: From the practice of linguistic expertise of media texts in lawsuits to protect honor, dignity and business reputation. - 3rd ed., Rev. and additional / Ed. M.V. Gorbanevsky. - M .: Galeria, 2002. - S. 15-36.

[18]. Dal V.V. Explanatory dictionary of the living Great Russian language: In 4 vols. - Vol. 1. - M .: Russian language, 1999.

[19]. Law of the Russian Federation of March 5, 1992 No. 2446-I "On Security". URL: http://svr.gov.ru/svr_today/doc04.htm

[20]. Ozhegov S.I., Shvedova N.Yu. Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language. — M.: Az Ltd., 1992.

[21]. Khaleeva I.I. Linguistic security of Russia // Bulletin of the Russian Academy of Sciences. - 2006. - T. 76. - No. 2. - S. 104-111.