MAIN FEATURES OF GERMAN LANGUGE POLICY

Yury V. Kobenko, Nikolay A. Kachalov
National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University,
Tomsk Branch of Russian Presidential Academy
of National Economy and Public Administration

One of the most important characteristics of the German language policy is considered the *polycentrism* of forming the language idiom, i.e. when the language regulation is conducted by several normalizing societies that unite heterogeneous variants of words to a supradialectal system. Through interacting and changing of different languages and cultural traditions the processes of evolving literary norms may take quite unusual shapes and lead to the heterogeneity of the language stock. By this type of forming the literary idiom the codification of norms must be strict, but it is not always the case because the codification policy is usually adjusted by a particular language situation. Thus various periods in the history of German differ not only in presence or lack of a purposeful and conscious selecting and fixation of literary norms but also in their content, form, intensity of codification processes as well as in the various degree of practical impact of codification requirements.

There are two types of normalization processes typical for the German language: *retrospective* or conservative, it means those depending upon the state of the language and its usage, which was characteristic for previous periods of the development, and *progressive*, i.e. still at the development stage, sometimes involving solutions quite out of the ordinary.

It is significant that this character of normalization activities makes the problems of importing innovations within the contact bilingualism regular and even expected: codification requirements can either not be realized for a long time or be realized very inconsequently. The periods of strictness of codification norms are inevitably replaced by their relative liberalization or pointed shortage.

The common meaning is that the codification remains behind the real usage of language. The state of codification at different stages of language development may vary and serves as a sign of a certain historical period. By inspecting the characteristics of the modern codification processes in the literary German language, the following problems can be mentioned:

1) uncertain extent of the codification selectivity, i.e. how many language units are to be codified at different language levels of German;

2) uncertain degree of regarding the differentiation of language units including variants of words.

1. As is known, the codification of norms in Germany is noticeable more selective and less imperative: it usually sets only general frames and conditions of their usage. Newest tendencies towards preciseness in taking down the frequencies and consequently domination of different novelties by using mathematical computations apply only to few authors of modern German grammar editions. The divergence between the codification and the literary usage seem to belong to universal problems of codification processes because of the fundamental selectivity of the codification.

It needs to be noted that N. Semenyuk sees the core of this problem in a complicated interrelation of descriptive and prescriptive moments in codification of different language units: "The element of recommendation / non-recommendation is supposed to be crucial to the codification: a mere description of norms is clearly insufficient; it is necessary to reflect the recurrent usage as well as "near" tendencies of the language development" [2]. We can suppose, that the codification selectivity of a greater or lesser extent may give rise to new variants of words. However solid conclusions could be drawn only on the basis of a more diverse and extensive material requiring a special research. The selectivity of the codification is oriented towards a concrete speech modification, which influences the expansion of social and functional basis of the codification. Most definite it is in the orthographic prescriptions for those strata, which are hardly subject to codification, e.g. professional vernacular. The cause of the codification remaining behind the present usage is considered here its retrospectivity as a parameter of embracing language units to be codified at language levels of German.

2. Parallel using of certain language units and from it resulting variation at all language levels were always most debatable moments of the German codification policy. In my opinion, the depth and stability of codification impact determine the amount of present variants of words. The practice of forming the German literary idiom and of its codification transformations provides the ground for supposing that codification requirements of norms are unstable and superficial. It is partly caused by the historical polycentrism of forming the German literary idiom as well as irregularity of standardizing impulses that are radiated by different normalizing societies. The selectivity mentioned above plays here a pivotal role, because it leads to exaggeration of codification processes. Prescribed loan-formations often appear as variants to conventional foreign prototypes, being in fact somebody's inventions. The idea of duration and firmness of norms to be evolved leads automatically to conservation of certain language units and conscious repelling of others. Whether such standardizing measures towards differentiation of variants are righteous, remains still uncertain.

A chronological unevenness of codification processes at different language levels is typical of the history of German. This unevenness corresponds in a certain way with non-simultaneity of objective processes of norm forming in native language communication. Moreover codification processes are embarrassed and complicated where there is no real base of codification or the latter represents a heterogeneous formation, fitted together of elements different by descent and territorial belonging.

Large sections of German scholars hold the view that the German have no uniform language consciousness (*kein einheitliches Sprachbewusstsein*). Therefore the codification of variants of words can be impeded not only by heterogeneity of the German language idiom, but also by considering certain variants to prevail upon others according to their territorial belonging and stylistic value.

In was not until the beginning of the XX c. that the variants of German words were subject to codification [1]. L. Sütterlin and G. Wunderlich first became aware of several grammatical and lexical options' differing in use according to a certain functional style and their diglossic stratification. The belletristic literature stopped to be regarded the mainstay of the codification of norms according to G. Schieb [1]. Regarding the fact, that the codification is inferior to natural normalization processes, normalizers progressed towards differential interpretation of a norm, i.e. assigning them to certain functional strata.

From the end of the XX c. till the beginning of XXI c. with the liberalization of the literary norms the number of works dealing with differentiation of variants of words increases. In speech speakers according to M. Thurmair are deliberately declining codified patterns. She also states that some authors pronounce themselves in favor of the new understanding of norms and find that the period of strictness of codification prescriptions has passed by irrevocably [3. P. 3–8]. The reluctance of speakers at following the codified norms can be regarded as a cause of the literary norms' losing their strictness and is very characteristic of the current state of the German language development. Such extralinguistic factors as secularizing special areas of knowledge and weakening the tie of culture cause a variance of the present codification norm as well.

Every shift in the life of a society is accompanied by searching for "better" ways of codification and by need for a renewal of its functional base. Traditionally the German codification was based upon
– *official* and
– *semiofficial* ways of forming the literary norms.

These ways must consolidate the principle of polycentrism and contribute to a pluralistic approach to forming the literary norms. Among the first are activities of such lexicographic centers and publishing houses as DUDEN, Brockhaus, Wahrig, Langenscheidt etc., which codification base has been being formed by outstanding German scholars for many centuries.

The semiofficial ways in contemporary Germany are represented by activities of the puristic society *VWdS* (*Verein zur Wahrung der deutschen Sprache = Society Of Preservation Of German*) established in 1997 in Dortmund and known nowadays as *VdS* (*Verein deutsche Sprache = Society Of German*). The characteristic feature of VdS is retrospective orientation of codification. There is no endeavor to unify codification requirements of separate societies among its activities, but only to institutionalize individual and often unsystematic claims on having the last word in the codification policy. However some of its aesthetic creative tendencies, which can be traced back to J. Schottel's and Ph. von Zesen's word creations, merit recognition.

W. Voigt finds erroneous to decline utterly the ideas of purism "as an attentive measure", which is believed to be something artificial and obtrusive in Germany. He considers to be more artificial the products of word creation of marketing experts, advertising agency employees, pressmen and stringers, who obtrude these products on people [4. P. 307].

Conservative trends hindering foreign words – as well as any innovations – from penetrating the language could be crucial only in such cases, when their authority is enough to overshadow official centers and have influence on the survival of innovations being imported and pseudoborrowings. Still the only instrument of codification of those societies remains artificial ousting of invasive elements from the language stock as a result of a recommended usage of national analogs. Purist sentiments of VdS upon the problem of Anglo-Americanisms are woven into subject of importance and role of German in the modern society, while the notion of language correctness is of an abstract character.

In modern Germany codification measures are restrained by the teleological criterion of correctness. The individual forms of codification connected with activities of single grammarians and lexicographers are not combined practically with official ways of codification as it was in the XVIII and XIX cc. Voigt points out that conflicting forms of loyalty towards language novelties causes objectively the deficiency of language consideration and the permanently growing need for renewal of the codification base [4. P. 307].

The functional heterogeneity of the modern German language, i.e. its polyfunctionality and polyvalence, must condition on the extension of the codification base according to the extent of existing variance, the succession of advanced requirements and effectiveness of prescriptions from the viewpoint of different forms of language existence and levels.

REFERENCES

1. Schieb G. Zu Stand und Wirkungsgeschichte der kodifizierten grammatischen Norm Ende des 19. Jhs. // LS Beiträge zur Erforschung der deutschen Sprache. – Leipzig, 1981. – S. 159–160.
2. Semenyuk N. N. Evolving of literary norms and types of the codification processes. In: Language norm: Typology of codification processes. – Moscow, 1996. – P. 30.
3. Thurmair M. Standardnorm und Abweichungen. Entwicklungstendenzen unter dem Einfluss der gesprochenen Sprache. – In: DaF 1, 2000. – S. 3–8
4. Voigt W. Dokumentation zur Zukunft der deutschen Sprache. Außer einigen eigenen Texten Belegmaterial. – Berlin, seit 1997, mehrfach aktualisiert. – S. 304, 307.

INTERTEXTUAL CODE OF «AGATHA CHRISTIE'S POIROT» TV SERIES

Natalia Y. Nikonova, Ekaterina A. Palkina
National Research Tomsk State University

Screen adaptation is a way of artistic work perception. It considerably makes easier spectator's understanding of the information containing in literary text. «*Agatha Christie's Poirot*» TV-series are the most famous screen adaptation of Agatha Christie`s works about the detective Hercule Poirot. The texts of Agatha Christie have big amount of intertextual links. The creativity of English literature representatives (Sir A. Conan Doyle, W. Shakespeare, J. Keats, C. Dickens, L. Carroll) is very important in the cycle. It shows high developed national memory of the author. R. York notices that popular literature of the Victorian age (the Bible, the most well-known works of Shakespeare, Dickens, Kipling, Tennyson) is close to A. Christie. It may be reasonable to conclude that the author is inclined to classic literature; however A. Christie is also competent in modern culture.

In accordance with frontal analysis made maximum amount of English literature was discovered. The most powerful layer of researching texts forms the creativity of W. Shakespeare. In the screen adaptation of the novel «Curtain», the last from the cycle about Poirot, there is a quotation from «Othello» pronounced by Captain Hastings while doing «The Times» crossword: «*Jealousy is a green-eyed monster*» (act III, scene III). Принципиальное Essential attention pays to who uttered this phrase in the original.