Authentic cultivation of Standard language

Juraj Dolník, Comenius University

A look at language planning and language management indicates how much strengthened in linguistics has become the position of discourse by which the culture of conscious regulation of linguistic life is being reproduced and which suppresses the attitude characterized by "leave your language alone". The above also revives the opposition between the "natural" and the "artificial" cultivation of language, i.e. between the conviction that natural language corresponds to natural cultivation, and the attitude which from the point of view of a "naturalist" is "artificial" that also this language is in conformity with the external cultivating regulation. This paper enters into such opposition and provides argumentation in favour of the attitude that adequate cultivation of the standard language requires taking into consideration its character. It defends the thesis about authentic cultivation of the standard language, i.e. about the "genuine" linguistic and metalinguistic activities causing adaptation changes in the language, or acting against changes. It reacts to the fact that when viewing the life of a language from the position of linguistic planning and linguistic management, the concentration of attention upon the social aspects of the functioning of language shifts to the background the impact of the character of language upon the linguistic activities of the individuals. If, within explaining the activities of the language user, we sufficiently take this fact into consideration, we again come across the question of the naturalness and authenticity of language.

Key words: *standard language, authentic language cultivation, character of language, ideal linguistic activity, behavioural linguistic competence, action-based linguistic competence.*

1. Introduction

Language cultivation is understood here as a sum of adaptation-related linguistic and metalinguistic activities initiating qualitative and quantitative changes in the structure of the language and changes in the structure and usage of linguistic means, but also as a complex of activities functioning against the changes. The term activity expresses a superordinate notion including behaviour and activity, hence the notion linguistic activity embraces linguistic behaviour and linguistic activity, i.e. both unconscious and conscious usage of linguistic means. The above also concerns metalinguistic activity: metalinguistic activity entails our own automatic corrections of the expressions uttered, our subconscious reactions to "slips of the tongue", while metalinguistic actions mean conscious interferences into linguistic phenomena. The effect of these activities lies in the adaptation of linguistic means to the psychic and social needs of language users, as well as to their imagination and conviction about what in their language is good and acceptable. Conflicting attitudes and reactions are evoked by metalinguistic action. An extreme attitude is represented by refusing to interfere into the language under the well-known slogan "Leave Your Language Alone" (Hall, 1950), while the opposite attitude is manifested by the challenge "Do Not Leave Your Language Alone" (Fishman, 2006). However, in reality, language is being interfered into.

Support to goal-oriented interventions into the standard language has been provided by the theory of linguistic planning. Haugen, its prominent representative, understood this planning within the need of producing grammars, dictionaries and manuals of orthography "for the guidance of writers and speakers in a non-homogeneous speech community", but also as

"an attempt to guide the development of a language in a direction desired by the planners. This means not only predicting the future on the basis of available knowledge concerning the past, but a deliberate effort to influence it" (Haugen 1959: 8). The strengthening of the conviction about the usefulness and the need of external language regulation was supported by a broadened understanding of linguistic planning according to which planning concerns decisions on the linguistic problems of the society, hence its scope exceeds the framework of linguistics. In this context we can read the following: "We do not define planning as an idealistic and exclusively linguistic activity, but as a political and administrative activity for solving language problems in the society. Public planning, that is, orderly decision-making about language on a national level, is motivated by public effects of some language problems and by the social context" (Jernudd – Gupta 1971: 211). Gradually reinforced was the claim that linguistic problems form part of social problems that require rational solutions.

One of the questions activating the theory of linguistic planning was: Who is and who should be the linguistic planner? The conviction about the indispensability of the involvement of each of the relevant parties started to be promoted (e.g. Rubin 1986), which has led to the fact that the theory of language management puts to the foreground the role of the microsocial level, and stresses the importance of the perspective of the participants in linguistic communication. "U teorie jazykového managementu je zdůrazněno, že původ všech jazykových problémů je v mikrojevech na úrovni promluvy"[1] (Neustupný 2002: 435). The point is that it is necessary to "odpoutat se od situace, kdy lingvisté či jiný personál určovali na základě velmi omezené zkušenosti z jazykové praxe, co je, či není problém"[2] (ibid.). One of the goals of this theory is to clarify the relationships between "simple" and "organized" management, i.e. the relationships of micro- and macroplanning (Nekvapil 2010: 66). Viewing linguistic planning from the perspective of the democratization of society within the framework of postmodernist thought has led to the fact that there was designed a model of metalinguistic activities from the standpoint of the reactions of the participants in communication within the particular communicative events. Let us remind ourselves that this model represents a scheme of the sequentiality of activities: the participant will note some deviation from the standard (noting), evaluate it positively or negatively (evaluation), and select a plan of action (adjustment design), which is then carried out (implementation).

This cursory look at language planning and language management indicates how much strengthened in linguistics has become the position of discourse by which the culture of conscious regulation of linguistic life is being reproduced and which suppresses the attitude characterized by "leave your language alone". The above also revives the opposition between the "natural" and the "artificial" cultivation of language, i.e. between the conviction that natural language corresponds to natural cultivation, and the attitude which from the point of view of a "naturalist" is "artificial" that also this language is in conformity with the external cultivating regulation. This paper enters into such opposition and provides argumentation in favour of the attitude that adequate cultivation of the standard language requires taking into consideration its character. It defends the thesis about authentic cultivation of the standard language, i.e. about the "genuine" linguistic and metalinguistic activities causing adaptation changes in the language, or acting against changes. It reacts to the fact that when viewing the life of a language

---

[1] "The theory of language management stresses that the source of all linguistic problems occurs within the micro-phenomena on the level of utterance."

[2] "to free oneself from the situation when linguists or other subjects, on the basis of very limited experience from linguistic usage, were determining what is and what is not a problem."

from the position of linguistic planning and linguistic management, the concentration of attention upon the social aspects of the functioning of language shifts to the background the impact of the character of language upon the linguistic activities of the individuals. If, within explaining the activities of the language user, we sufficiently take this fact into consideration, we again come across the question of the naturalness and authenticity of language.

2. **Naturalness and interventions into language**

For highlighting the problem concerning the idea of naturalness with regard to the natural language, we can briefly return to the discussion on natural morphology that was created by Mayerthaler (1981) in his universal pragmatic theory. According to this theory, labelled as natural are the morphological structures corresponding to the criteria of optimal coding, i.e. constructional iconicism (the asymmetry of the content elements is represented as a construction-related symbolization asymmetry), uniform symbolization (one function is represented by one form) and paradigm transparency (degree of homomorphy and polymorphy). These criteria are perceived as principles of natural morphology by which its dynamics are governed (preferred are forms better corresponding to optimal coding). Werner, who explains morphological changes on the basis of linguistic economy (of decisive importance is frequency in the text), raised the question what is it that should be considered to be natural: "Should it be a principle given in advance: "natural" are, if possible, the most simple, unified, iconic assignments of content-related categories to inflected expressions – an ideal at which part of morphological changes is directed, but which, however, again and again meets with obstacles? Or should we accept as "natural" the complicated situations dominating in our languages which are again and again initiated and strengthened, and search for explanations with regard to them?" (Werner 1989: 34–35). Should we then deem as being "natural" those morphological changes that establish complicated, non-unified circumstances in natural languages (and as we find them in such languages, they are "natural"), or should we deem as being "natural" the changes which initiate a transparent, unified order, but meet with obstacles? It is clear that "naturalness" is placed here into a relationship with the opposite cognitive approach to morphology: into cognition with idealization vs. without idealization. At the background of this opposition (in addition to other factors) lies the fact that forwarded into the centre of attention are not the same data about morphology, and they are being perceived in a differentiated manner from the point of view of their relevance for the cognition of morphological changes.

Is conscious interference into the standard language for cultivating it natural or is it artificial? Is it not the case that its cultivation is natural when the members of the linguistic community use it for their purposes and modify it with regard to their needs, ideas and feelings, without its usage being consciously regulated by any subjects? If we say that external conscious interventions are natural, we rely on perceiving these instances of interference as substantial parts of linguistic usage. As being natural are deemed the complicated relationships (similarly to the situation in natural languages) which came about from the natural usage of language and conscious interference into its functioning (the complicatedness is caused by the conflicts and disparities in the command of the language, which are brought about by instances of intentional interference). This was the mental basis on which Cameron (Cameron 1995) based her theory of verbal hygiene. By this theory she reacts to the perception of the standard language that registers intentional interference separately from the ordinary linguistic usage (e.g. Kaplan –

Baldauf 1997). She places into the foreground the experiential cognizance that the individuals do not delimit themselves to language usage only, but they also react to it, which results from their inclination to improving the language, to "cleaning" it, hence to linguistic "hygiene". With regard to the above, intentional interventions into language represent normality in the life of language, and not activities which would contravene the naturalness of language. On the contrary, it would be unnatural if the functioning of language were not intervened by "verbal hygienists". Within this frame of thought, also the model of simple linguistic management represents normal metalinguistic activity, i.e. natural interference into language: If somebody notices any deviation from the norm, they can, but do not have to, create an "adjustment design", and it is natural that it can, though does not have to, aim at carrying out this plan (whether the person succeeds depends on his or her power to exert influence).

Here naturalness is connected with normality in such a manner that it is derived from it. This is a well-known phenomenon that we denote as naturalization of normality (as normality forms the culture, we perceive our culture as our natural environment). The opposite standpoint is that normality is a derivative of naturalness: normal is that which corresponds to naturalness. However, in this case we have to do with another normality – a postulated "genuine", authentic normality. Here the expression *natural* means "corresponding to the nature of the given entity". With regard to the above, interventions are natural when they correspond to the nature of language. This statement implies interventions that are assessed on the basis of the degree of naturalness of the intervention: interventions can be natural, less natural or unnatural (similarly to the more or less natural morphological structures in the above mentioned universal-pragmatic theory of natural morphology). The ideal state comprises only natural interventions. This ideal constitutes the measure of assessing the interventions, hence ensuing from the above is the maxim of metalinguistic activity: Your metalinguistic activity should correspond to the character of language, so "Be natural!". Hence, metalinguistic activities are perceived here with an idealization that is justified by the "pressure" of the character of language as its objective quality that is being exerted upon its users. A testimony about this "pressure" is provided by any ordinary empirical finding from linguistic usage that is usually not in the centre of attention when explaining the behaviour and activities of language users. We can currently observe – and from this point of view the Slovak linguistic environment constitutes a very good spot for observation – that in spite of repeated instructions about the correctness of some expressions that are intellectually accepted by the language users, they continue to use those forms of language which are in compliance with their linguistic feeling (linguistic critics and educators register them as notoriously made mistakes). Let us give one distinct example from standard Slovak: not even the decades-lasting permanent instructions concerning erroneousness of using the secondary preposition *kvôli* in causative meaning has prevented its still being used in this way, although the users mentally accept the recommended preposition *pre* (e.g. *neprísť pre chorobu* "fail to come due to illness" is accepted as a good structure). The explanation that this is a classic problem of getting rid of somebody´s habits does not come into consideration, as such linguistic expressions mean so to speak automated reactions that are inherent to the character of the mother tongue (cf. below). At this point we have to focus on the character of language.

3. **On the character of language**

What is concerned is the mother tongue. From the aspect of cultivating it, it is important how we gradually master it and have at our disposal its means, how it is changing in its constitutive environment – in communication, and how its users can use it both as a means of interaction and as a means of thinking. The following characteristic features of language become foregrounded: spontaneous acquirability, disponibility, and changeability, as well as intentional adaptability. Characteristic of language is the fact that we can make use of its means in such a manner that we can spontaneously adopt it within communicative activity, we can use its means in such a way that in the stream of communication the particular expressions automatically appear at the tip of our tongues, it can spontaneously undergo changes, and we can adapt it to our variable intentions. It has features that are necessary for its functioning as a tool adapted to its activities, based on the interaction of spontaneous, conscious reactions, and of conscious, intentional acts. Similarly to the case of using other means, both the rationality and the effectivity of language usage depend on this interaction. Within the abilities of language users, this interaction is developed as the coordination of behavioural and action-based linguistic competence. Natural command of language is based on the interaction of these competences, i.e. on the ability to coordinate unconscious linguistic reactions (linguistic behaviour) and intentional linguistic acts (linguistic activities). Why is this so?

We can find the answer in the nature of the human being as an active creature. As such a creature, it is set upon achieving goals. This is a naturally determined feature present also in other living beings. Inherent to creatures set upon achieving goals is rationality comprised in the fact that the reactions needed for carrying out the goals take place automatically (instinctively, reflexively), so the individual can fully concentrate upon his or her goal. On the basis of this rationality the human being exists as a behavioural-action-oriented creature that within his or her activities profits from the automatic activation of reactions as a precondition for achieving goals, which allows for concentrating the energy upon the goal itself. Humans strengthen this rationality by often automating their operations to allow for more concentrated realization of their intentions (the actions of a driver can serve as a befitting example). Any automation of operations in favour of rationalization is a manifestation of the "pressure" of the fundamental order of the nature of humans as active beings, i.e. of the "pressure" upon exerting the natural state of the participants in which they occur only when the behavioural aspect of their activity does not diminish their energy needed for carrying out their intention. This is a state when the consciousness of the participant is concentrated only upon his or her intention, as the presupposed dispositions for its realization are activated outside their consciousness.

The mechanism of linguistic activity constitutes a specific case of the mechanism of human activity consisting in the interaction of behavioural and action-related reactions. This is an intentional-emergent mechanism directing our linguistic activities in such a manner that it leads us towards the intention evoked within the given interactive situation, adjusting us to using adequate linguistic means (in compliance with paralinguistic and extra-linguistic means) within varying degrees of awareness, and it activates the process of the emergence of expressions, without any need of activating the linguistic consciousness. The fact that grammatically correct expressions emerge from the linguistic memory automatically, without any involvement of consciousness, is enabled thanks to the fact that we acquire our maternal language spontaneously, unconsciously, within the usage of its means. These means are stored in our memory without our being aware of them, and in the same way, they also emerge from it when we need them during the process of realizing our intentions. What is thus stored in our linguistic memory comprises our "not-knowledge-based" grammatical disposition. This does not mean explicit or implicit grammatical knowledge, but a representation of our disposition to

grammatical behaviour in compliance with the grammatical rules (this disposition is explained in Dolník 2017). On the basis of this disposition, our grammatical behaviour corresponds to grammatical rules, without us consciously or unconsciously observing them. This explanation is in line with Wittgenstein and his "practice-oriented" understanding of rules according to which grammatical rules are "written" into linguistic usage, while the following of these rules also means merely usage, while the bearer of the language only follows them "blindly" (Wittgenstein 1984). The above is also connected with J. R. Searle´s "background" and the interpretative proposal of his idea that "a human being is able to come up with and develop a complex of abilities which are sensitive to the specific structures of intentionality, while not being constituted by this intentionality. Humans develop skills that are so to speak functionally equivalent to the system of rules without their containing any representations or internalizations of these rules" (Searle 2013: 152). Hence, grammatical behaviour ranks in the number of the types of behaviour that correspond to rules, but not because we would be consciously or unconsciously following them, but because in our linguistic usage we have developed a complex of dispositions or abilities by which we react to rules. We have developed these dispositions within the process of socialization during which we were also under the influence of grammatical rules, namely as they "required" that we adopt abilities for a behaviour that is in conformity with the rules. It seems reasonable to us to assume that an individual acquires "not-knowledge-based" grammatical disposition by applying the disposition for analogical behaviour, by which the individual reacts to the grammatical behaviours carried out in linguistic usage, i.e. to grammatical examples into which grammatical rules are "written", and thus the individual specifies his or her disposition to analogical behaviour.

Disposition to unconscious and analogical behaviour, i.e. behaviour "in line with and in the sense of" the one perceived, or else enlivened from the past, also constitutes the basis of spontaneous linguistic changes. Such behaviour leads to the extension of the collocation of a particular element that can become stabilized in the linguistic community without its getting into the attention of the language users as constituting a change. This process is described as diachronic and synchronic dynamism of language. However, we feel inclined to stressing that these are natural changes, because they stem from the natural usage of language based on the interaction of behavioural and action-related linguistic competence in which behavioural competence is not faced with "artificial" obstacles, i.e. with corrective reactions on the basis of knowledge about the language. These changes represent manifestations of the character of natural language.

4. **Character of Standard language**

Let us remind ourselves that the representatives of the Neogrammarian School stressed the importance of the "folk language" (dialect) for linguistic investigation while reasoning that it means language within its natural development that flows unconsciously, unintentionally, in contrast to literary language that develops consciously, and so it is an "artificial" language (well-known is also the analogy *literary language : folk language = natural plants : plants grown in a gymnasium*; in its research also botany prefers plants growing in a natural environment). The "artificiality" of the standard (literary) language is clearly manifested when it is introduced into life as a common public language, it is codified and it settles in the society within the education of its members. They learn it and are facing the pressure of the consciously controlled linguistic standard, and are led to getting oriented according to the codification

representing the highest level of awareness in relationship to language. By strengthening this language in the life of the society there was instigated the culture of its conscious regulation and the orientation of its users upon the most conscious bearers of the language. The protagonist of the theory of linguistic culture of the Prague School explains: "Norma spisovného jazyka se vytváří, vzniká i dále vyvíjí vždy za teoretických zásahů, a to teorie jazykové i mimojazykové; norma spisovného jazyka jest složitější soubor jazykových prostředků než norma jazyka lidového, poněvadž funkce spisovného jazyka jsou bohatěji rozvinuty a přesněji rozlišeny, a konečně norma spisovného jazyka je uvědomělejší a závažnější než norma lidového jazyka a požadavek její stability je důraznější"[3] (Havránek 1932: 35). Also after more than half a century it is stressed that by the modern linguistic communities the standard language cultivation has to be "vedome podporovať, lebo s komplikovanou organizáciou spoločnosti a s prevahou tzv. duševnej práce nad telesnou zväčšuje sa aj ich závislosť od stavu jazyka[4]" (Kráľ – Rýzková 1990: 15). These quotes present the conviction that awareness is a trait of the character of the standard language, this being determined by its functions and importance in the life of the society. Hence, conscious interventions into it are not unnatural.

However, what is it that is happening in the process that we call democratization of the standard language? The answers include the following. Its social basis becomes extended and on a certain stage of this process the circle of its users actually includes all members of the society. It penetrates into various communication spheres and situations, including those in which the individuals adopt it in the same way as people adopt the mother tongue. If the individual speakers acquire it in this way, i.e. if they do not learn it, but they acquire it spontaneously, unconsciously, unintentionally, the standard language functions as a natural language within its own conditions. The development of the linguistic community has achieved the stage in which its standard language can function as a "folk" language of a higher order. Its members acquire behavioural linguistic competence during the practical usage of the language, within which their "not-knowledge-based" grammatical disposition and ability to use the rationality of the interaction of behavioural and action-aimed linguistic competence in communication is maturing.

Within the democratization process, the standard language loses its "artificiality", while this process is being influenced by the above mentioned culture of its conscious regulation that naturalizes this "artificiality" for the language users. Within the Slovak linguistic environment, this discrepancy is very distinct. On the one hand, the users of the standard language manifest their preparedness to carry out linguistic activities in the sense of the rationality of the interaction of behavioural and action-based linguistic competence, and they manifest that it is natural for them to rely on their own "not-knowledge-based" grammatical disposition. However, on the other hand, they are under the influence of the normative power of the above-mentioned culture, which is in line with the tradition of the approach to standard language from the times of introducing it into life and its stabilization in the linguistic community. The source of this force is also the fact that for users the linguistic phenomena, too, represent potential stimuli for reaction (similarly to any other phenomena), as well as the fact that we are creatures

---

[3] "The norm of the standard language is created, it arises and further develops always within theoretical interference, both of the linguistic and extra-linguistic phenomena; the norm of the literary language is a more complex system of linguistic means than that of the norm of the folk language, as the functions of the standard language are more awareness-based and more binding than the norm of the folk language, and the requirement of its stability is more assertive."

[4] "consciously supported, because with the complicated organization of the society and with the prevalence of the so called intellectual work over physical work also their dependence on the state of the language is growing"

endowed with logics. Similarly to Cameron (cf. above) as a protagonist of "verbal hygiene", also Starý, who is critical of the theory of linguistic culture of the Prague School, stresses: "Zasahovat do jazykové praxe … je jedním z přirozených sklonů mluvčích. Průběh jazykové praxe je tak spoluurčován reflexí této praxe, přičemž tato reflexe je zároveň součástí jazykové praxe samé"[5] (Starý 1995: 145). Yes, the reactions of the users to what occurs in practical linguistic usage constitute part of this usage, but only those instances of interference into it are natural which correspond to the character of the standard language accepted as mother tongue. Any unnatural interference on the part of the users means manifestations of the fact that, just like in any other areas of life, also in the linguistic sphere they react to the particular stimuli with differing motivation, though at the same time they get into a more or less hidden conflict with what they experience as the command of their own language and its natural usage. As beings endowed with logics, they accept what corresponds to judgment, but contradicts to that which is being used and is in harmony with the character of language. Metalinguistic reactions based on logical reasoning (supported by abstract – out-of-context – inference) are usually accepted without the question how could "illogical" structures become consolidated. In addition, we can often see that metalinguistic reactions in the name of adhering to rules have to face elements that after their linguistic analysis turn out to be dynamic phenomena, i.e. there occurs artificial interference into the synchronic dynamism of language based on spontaneously instigated changes inherent in natural language. Let us provide at least one example from the Slovak environment: For a long time we have been confronted with the explanation that female first names of the type *Dáša, Máša, Soňa*, based on the particular declension pattern, have the ending *-e* in the genitive singular (*Dáše, Máše, Sone*), which reacts to the fact that in practical linguistic usage this case occurs in the form with the suffix *-i*, which is not even restricted only to the names of this type (*počujeme od Soni* "we hear from Soňa", *z Európskej únii* "from the European Union", *z Banskej Bystrici* "from Banská Bystrica", etc.). This spontaneous change is being interfered into, although already several decades ago, within systemic depiction of the synchronic dynamism of Slovak morphology, this change was described by a Slovak linguistic expert (Dvonč 1984: 47). The above means interference into natural linguistic behaviour that is "intimately" familiar to the language users, so they behave in this way, although they acknowledge the logical character and correctness of the declension according to the particular pattern.

5. Authentic cultivation of the Standard language

We can state that language users are inclined to interfere into language, but are also inclined to prefer such linguistic activity within which their behavioural linguistic competence functions are undisturbed, without any interference. The first inclination stemmed from the metalinguistic reaction by which the language user reflexively corrects himself or herself when pronouncing some erroneous form, or also corrects other language users. By reinforcing the social importance of the correctness of linguistic structures and of the appropriateness of their usage, these reflexive reactions have developed into conscious metalinguistic instances of interference manifested by critical linguistic reactions, turning with questions to linguistic advisory services, or by publicly expressing their attitude to linguistic matters. Well, we can

---

[5] "To interfere into the practical linguistic usage… is one of the natural inclinations of speakers. Consequently, the course of practical linguistic usage is co-determined by the reflection of this practical usage, while this reflection is at the same time part of the practical linguistic usage itself"

label this inclination as being natural – as it was done by Starý, the above quoted author, because it is natural that people express their assessment of what they perceive or what they do. Nevertheless, it is natural for a human being in the position of observer of what exists and what is happening around him or her, as to what is being observed, to express also their evaluative attitude reflecting their needs, interests, etc.

The second inclination is inherent to the person who experiences his or her language as a means of communication that was created within the activities of humans as behavioural-action-oriented beings. It was from this mode of man´s existence that his or her behavioural and action-oriented linguistic competence arose. The interaction of these competences means the natural command of language, i.e. its usage on the basis of its natural acquisition, understood as the linguistic state of the individual that pertains as a comfort ensuing from this rationality. This state of comfort is experienced by the language user within the events of communication in which he or she is dealing exclusively with linguistic activities, as for them the corresponding linguistic behaviour functions automatically, without the need of any conscious interference into its functioning. Ideal for him or her is the state when all the activities can be carried out within this linguistic comfort. Reflected in this ideal is the inclination of the language user to preserving the original character of linguistic activity, i.e. its authenticity, as such linguistic activity is optimally adapted to the behavioural-action-aimed structure of his or her coming to terms with life. Ideally, the linguistic activity of language user is maximally natural within each communication event, its linguistic authenticity is not violated, the interaction of its behavioural and action-related linguistic competence is perfect, and the intention-emergent mechanism functions continuously. Concisely formulated, in its ideal state, linguistic feeling is a perfect servant of linguistic activities, because it always functions without the attention and the will of language users.

In Slovak linguistics, already in 1933 there existed the following consideration: „Najdôležitejším činiteľom v bežnom spisovnom úze je *jazykový cit*. On temer sám udáva smernice, ktorými sa spravujú spisovatelia a ľudia, hovoriaci spisovnou slovenčinou. ... Keby bola spisovná slovenčina už vo všetkom ustálená, keby sme mali jednotný jazykový cit, tak by sme v ňom nachodili najspoľahlivejšieho poradcu. ... Jazykový cit ... u nás je jednotný len v základných veciach, v podrobnostiach je až priveľa odchýlok a nepresností. Preto jazykový cit nemôže nám byť nateraz jedinou spoľahlivou oporou pri riešení otázok správnosti jazykovej“ [6] (Bartek 1933–1934: 6). By stating that "for the time being" linguistic feeling cannot be the only pillar, Bartek indicates that in future this could be the case. By the above he indicated that the development of standard Slovak is heading towards the strengthening of the role of linguistic feeling within the cultivation of this language. That is a direction to the ideal state when it is only linguistic feeling that decides about linguistic correctness. What picture is offered by the 80-year development since the statements by Bartek? Standard Slovak has arrived at such stage of democratization that Slovaks have a mother-tongue command of it, but at the same time they are under the permanent influence of metalinguistic discourse and intervention practices by which attention is directed at conscious control of linguistic correctness. On the one hand, language users manifest their inclination to being guided by their

---

[6] "The most important phenomenon in ordinary standard usage is *linguistic feeling*. Nearly only on its own it determines the guidelines governing the writers and the people speaking standard Slovak…. If Slovak were already in everything stabilized, if we had the same linguistic feeling, then we would find a most reliable advisor in it…. Linguistic feeling… is unified here only within the basic matters, while concerning the details there are too many deviations or imprecisions. As a result, for the time being, linguistic feeling cannot be the only reliable pillar in resolving the questions of linguistic correctness"

behavioural linguistic competence, because they perceive standard Slovak as their mother tongue, and, on the other hand, their inclination to intervening into the language, which is in conflict also with their linguistic feeling, gets supported and encouraged by metalinguistic discourse. The language user who experiences his or her language as a natural means of communication, as a product of its acquisition, and who is also under metalinguistic surveillance, is exposed to the feeling of insecurity. This insecurity can be faced by authentic cultivation of the standard language.

Authentic cultivation of this language is aiming at supporting the tendency towards the above mentioned ideal state. This cultivation supports the autonomous character of the behavioural linguistic competence, and in this way also the tendency at asserting endogenous linguistic standards. It means the supporting of the development of linguistic activities within the spirit of their rationality and in the name of the expansion of the linguistic comfort in communicative life. Of course, an ideal state of linguistic activities occurs in an ideal situation of the cultivation of language which is created by the ideal linguistic community. Such community is marked by being governed by the standards formed by the natural coordination of the linguistic behaviour of its members, including the sense for variability in them, hence also the natural tolerance with regard to the differentiation of linguistic structures, and is marked by the fact that metalinguistic discourse is oriented upon the usage and development of language with regard to its being adapted to the changing communication needs and interests, i.e. upon the topical motivational worlds of the members of the society. However, there is the question whether ideal linguistic activity, ideal situation, ideal linguistic community are not only linguistic constructs.

Let us remind ourselves that the same question was raised also by Habermas in relationship to his concept of ideal speech situation. He answered it in the following way: "An ideal speech situation is neither an empirical phenomenon nor a mere construct, but it is a reciprocally carried out imputation indispensable in discourses" (Habermas 2011: 194). As imputation he denotes the fact "that within carrying out speech acts counterfactually, we act in such a manner as if ideal linguistic situation were not merely fictitious but real" (ibid.: 195), and thus also in the case that it is fictitious, it is effective in communication, and the partners in communication anticipate it. Hence, of importance is the fact that the ideal linguistic situation represents a constitutive power in linguistic communication, by being real in the sense that the communicative partners "anticipate" it, because "only this anticipation guarantees that the really gained consensus may be connected with the claim for a reasonable consensus" (ibid., p. 194). It is useful to remind ourselves also of the inspirational source given by Habermas – the ideas of Apel – who spoke about ideal communication society as a utopic principle functioning in each current communication (Apel 1976). This train of thought leads us to postulating the principle of idealness in relationship to the behaviour and acting of man, thus also to his or her linguistic activity taking place in the linguistic community. With regard to this activity, within which the individual experiences his or her language, this principle functions as a principle of naturalness, affecting the communicative partners in such a manner that they experience the attractiveness of the linguistic comfort. This is manifested by them in their inclination to be guided by a "free" behaviouristic linguistic competence and its expansion in the sense of the statement: "It would be ideal if we had this comfort always and everywhere" (that would be possible only in an ideal linguistic community). Ideal linguistic activity, ideal linguo-cultivation situation, ideal linguistic community, are not only linguistic constructs, but they are authentic states (activities, situations, communities) in the perception of language by its users. They exist as perceptions, as experience of the naturalness and genuine character of language, as means of

communication on the basis of the constant character of the rationality of the linguistic activity of humans as behaviourally-action-oriented beings. The users of language as its experiencers enter into linguistic communication with an anticipation of ideal states, and so they can experience the natural functioning of the behavioural linguistic competence and its being disturbed by interference.

As the language user is not only its experiencer, but also its episodic or systemic observer, added to experiencing language is perceiving it with activated consciousness, as a result of which the user is inclined to intervening also into the linguistic behaviour (hence not only into the linguistic activities). If starting with the presumption that also in this position the users are oriented upon the ideal state – i.e. a most regular, a most logical, a most exact, a most simple, a most clear language, which presupposes the most self-aware users – we realize that this is an ideal stemming from the discourse about language, by which the metalinguistic culture developed within the period of introducing the standard language into the life of the society, and also the corresponding intervention activities are maintained. Nevertheless, if there exist conditions for the functioning of the standard language as a natural language in the true sense of the word, this metalinguistic culture is not in conformity with them. These conditions are in conformity with the rationality of linguistic activity, hence with the authentic cultivation of the standard language. Such cultivation supports the optimization of the interaction of linguistic behaviour (behavioural linguistic competence) and linguistic activities (action-based linguistic competence), hence the optimal functioning of the intentional-emergent mechanism governing linguistic activities.

References

Apel, Karl-Otto. 1976. *Sprachpragmatik und Philosophie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bartek, Henrich.1933. O správnosti jazykovej [On Linguistic Correctness]. In: *Slovenská reč*, 1933– 1934, vol. 2, No. 1. 1–16.

Cameron, Deborah. 1995. *Verbal Hygiene*. London/New York: Routledge.

Dolník, Juraj. 2017. *Jazyk v sociálnej kultúre* [Language in Social Culture]. Bratislava: VEDA, vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.

Dvonč, Ladislav. 1984. *Dynamika slovenskej morfológie* [Dynamism of Slovak Morphology]. Bratislava: VEDA, vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.

Fishman, Joshua A. 2006. *Do Not Leave Your Language Alone: The Hidden Status Agendas Within Corpus Planning in Language Policy*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2011. *Teória jazyka a východiská sociálnych vied* [Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns]. Bratislava: Kalligram.

Hall, Robert A. 1950. *Leave Your Language Alone!* Ithaca – N. Y.: Linguistica.

Haugen, Einar. 1959. Planning for a Standard Language in Modern Norway. In: *Anthropological Linguistics*.,1(3). 8–21.

Havránek, Bohuslav. 1932. Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura [The Tasks of the Standard Language and its Culture]. In: *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura*. Eds. B. Havránek and M. Weingart. Praha: Melantrich. 32– 84.

Jernudd, Bjorn H. & Gupta, J. D. 1971. Towards a Theory of Language Planning. In: *Can Language Be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Eds. J. Rubin – B. H. Jernudd. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii. 195–215.

Kaplan, Robert B. & Baldauf, Richard B. 1997. *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kráľ, Ábel & Rýzková, Anna. 1990. *Základy jazykovej kultúry* [Basics of Linguistic Culture]. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

Mayerthaler, Will. 1981. *Morphologische Natürlichkeit*. Wiesbaden: Athenaion.

Nekvapil, Jiří. 2010. O historii, teorii a modelech jazykového plánování [On the History, Theory and Models of Language Planning]. In: *Slovo a slovesnost*, vol. 71, No. 1 53–73.

Neustupný, Jiří V. 2002. Sociolingvistika a jazykový management [Sociolinguistics and Language Management]. In: *Sociologický časopis/Czech Sociological Review*, vol. 38, No. 4. 429–442.

Rubin, Joan. 1986. City Planning and Language Planning. In: *Language Planning: Proceedings of an Institute*. Eds. E. Annamalai & B. H. Jernudd & J. Rubin. Mysore – Honolulu: Central Institute of Indian Languages – East-West Center. 105–122.

Searle, John R. 2013. *Die Konstruktion der gesellschaftlichen Wirklichkeit. Zur Ontologie sozialer Tatsachen*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Starý, Zdeněk. 1995. *Ve jménu funkce a intervence* [In the Name of Function and Intervention]. Praha: Univerzita Karlova.

Werner, Otmar. 1989. Sprachökonomie und Natürlichkeit im Bereich der Morphologie. In: *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung*, 1989, 42, Vol. 1. 34–47.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1984. *Werkausgabe in 8 Bänden. Band 4: Philosophische Grammatik.* Hrsg. Von R. Rhees. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Juraj Dolník
Department of Slovak
Faculty of Arts, Comenius University
Gondova 2
814 99 Bratislava
Slovak Republic
juraj.dolnik@uniba.sk