



DOI: 10.22363/2618-8163-2024-22-4-598-614

EDN: AZAMRZ

Research article

Theory of Russian orthography in educational literature for students of the Republic of Belarus

Evgeniy E. Ivanov¹, Vladimir I. Kulikovich²¹Mogilev State A. Kuleshov University, *Mogilev, Republic of Belarus*²Belarusian State Technological University, *Minsk, Republic of Belarus* ivanov-msu@mail.ru

Abstract. The rigid framework for interpreting any “code of rules” significantly limits the theoretical aspects of doing research on them and requires a special explanation in relation to orthography as a section of linguistics, especially when there are several national variants of the literary language. The relevance of the study is substantiated by the urgent need for a theoretical description of the corpus of the most significant concepts of spelling used in teaching Russian in Belarus and creating a strategic plan for introducing innovations in spelling; the need to record changes in definitions determined by the transition to convergent learning; the influence of a complex of linguistic and extralinguistic factors, and the development of optional arguments for the codification of the Belarusian national version of the Russian language. The aim of the study is to determine the parameters and specifics of the theory of orthography in educational literature for teaching Russian in the Republic of Belarus. The material of the study contained the definitions and language illustrations of the main concepts of the theory of orthography (spelling, spelling rule, orthogram, spelling principle, spelling error, spelling norm, etc.) in textbooks and manuals on the Russian language for higher education institutions of the Republic of Belarus published from 2000 to 2024. The methods of parameterization and comparison, logical-linguistic and lexical-semantic analysis were used. The authors revealed that both specialized educational publications devoted only to spelling and comprehensive publications where spelling is part of the educational material lack the theoretical and meta-linguistic apparatus of either a significant part or the entire necessary base of the theory of orthography. There are different approaches to the positioning of orthographic terminology that coexist in various educational publications. This is mainly an orientation towards outdated traditions, the absence of modern concepts (such as “orthographic activity”, “orthographic picture of the language”, etc.). The theory of orthography in educational literature on the Russian language for higher educational institutions of the Republic of Belarus is based, as a rule, on the modern rules of Russian spelling, but is characterized, on the one hand, by innovative specificity, and on the other hand, by their conservative positioning in writing practice. This indicates different approaches to the formation of the orthographic linguistic personality, orthographic linguistic and metalinguistic consciousness of Belarusians studying the Russian language. The main principles of modern theory of spelling development should take into account orthographic innovations and national and cultural specificity in teaching the Russian language in higher educational institutions of the Republic of Belarus.



Keywords: the Russian language, theory and practice of orthography, spelling rule, terminology of orthography, higher education

Article history: received 05.05.2024; accepted 18.08.2024.

Contribution: Ivanov E.E. — research concept, scientific consulting, general concept of the article, processing of research results, writing and editing the article; Kulikovich V.I. — literature analysis, selection of primary material, summarizing the experience of researchers, data collection, analysis of data and results obtained, processing of the material, writing the article.

Funding. The study was carried out with the financial support of the State Scientific Research Program on 2021–2025 (Republic of Belarus), scientific project No. 20211335 (project manager — E.E. Ivanov).

Conflict of interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

For citation: Ivanov, E.E., & Kulikovich, V.I. (2024). Theory of Russian orthography in educational literature for students of the Republic of Belarus. *Russian Language Studies*, 22(4), 598–614. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2024-22-4-598-614>

Introduction

Any literary language functioning in a non-national and non-cultural environment inevitably changes at its different levels. Under certain conditions and under the influence of various factors, these changes can be almost unnoticeable or significant. The literary norm is believed to be an insurmountable barrier to transformations in the system of a literary language when it functions in a foreign national and foreign cultural environment; it is considered absolute outside the autochthonous communicative environment. Its strict observance, provided that the language has the status of a state language in another country, is legally enshrined in all socially significant spheres of communication: official-business, scientific-technical, educational, etc.

However, the literary norms of the state language may be also transformed to a greater or lesser extent in a non-national and non-cultural environment. Thus, the Russian language in the Republic of Belarus in the conditions of closely related Belarusian-Russian bilingualism, as a rule, has specific orthographic norms in written language practice (Lukashanets, 2018: 10). Such specificity is determined by the closely related Belarusian-Russian interference, the influence of the Belarusian national-cultural environment, the dynamics of the Russian language system in Belarus, largely independent of its changes in the Russian Federation for several decades after the collapse of the USSR in 1991. This has been repeatedly emphasized by Belarusian scientists studying Belarusian-Russian interference (Moshchenskaya, 1992), the peculiarities of the sociolinguistic status of the Russian language in Belarus (Mechkovskaya, 2005; Norman, 2010a), the correlation between norms and practices of its use (Norman, 2010b), linguistic-cultural and sociocultural aspects of Russian language functioning in Belarus (Maslova,

Muratova, 2010; Ivanov, 2021), its place in the Belarusian educational space (Ivanov, 2008; Akimova, Trofimovich, 2023), including in higher education (Fedotova, Laputskaya, 2015), the main issues of Russian language functioning at the present stage (Maslova, 2022).

The interaction between Russian and Belarusian languages is an important factor in the development of both languages (Maslova, 2015). In Belarus, the Russian language is a kind of generating, stabilizing, and regulating force for the Belarusian language” (Konyushkevich, 1994: 220). The Belarusian language, on the one hand, influences the Russian language (Goritskaya, 2021a), and on the other hand, is opposed to it, because the national intelligentsia consider that the Belarusian language should be different from the Russian language (Charota, 2012: 54).

The peculiarities of the Russian language in Belarus gave rise to a discussion about its status in relation to the Russian language in Russia. Thus, V.A. Maslova believes that today, the Russian language in Belarus is something more than a regiolect (a non-literary form of the national language), because the specificity of the ‘Belarusian’ Russian language is clearly manifested in different spheres of communication, not only in everyday speech (Maslova, 2015: 258). Authoritative Belarusian linguists believe that the Russian language in Belarus acts in its own variety (Starichenok, 2012a: 78), which is called “natsiolect” (Rovdo, 2002: 48; Norman, 2008: 295; Rychkova, 2010: 423), “national variant” (Volynets, 2009).

Despite the disagreements about the status of the “Belarusian variant of the Russian language”, most Belarusian scientists agree that the Belarusian variant of the Russian language is a dynamic idiom with significant lexical and grammatical variation. The specificity of Russian speech in Belarus is conditioned by linguistic contacts and intralinguistic factors of linguistic evolution, as well as the socio-political and cultural context of Belarusian-Russian bilingualism” (Goritskaya, 2021b: 243).

The specificity of the Belarusian variety of the Russian language was also noted by Russian linguists familiar with the linguistic situation in the Republic of Belarus, as a rule, when considering the peculiarities of the Russian language in the conditions of bilingualism (Antonova, Murashov, 2004; Somin, 2013), legal and socio-cultural aspects of its functioning (Kozlovitseva, Avdeeva, 2023). At the same time, Russian linguists usually qualify the Russian language in Belarus as “the Belarusian regiolect of the Russian language” (Somin, 2022: 33).

The Russian language in Belarus was also studied by a few Western European specialists, who paid attention mainly to the problem of national and linguistic identity in the situation of bilingualism (Kalita, 2010) and Belarusian-Russian interference in mixed Belarusian-Russian speech — “trasyanka” (Hentschel, 2016, etc.). However, Western European linguists do not focus on the specificity of the Russian language in Belarus when considering the varieties of Russian outside Russia (Mustayoki, 2013; Koteyko, 2014, etc.).

At the same time, the national variant of the Russian language is currently dynamically developing in the Republic of Belarus. This fact is obvious, has sufficient empirical verification and the necessary theoretical substantiation (Goritskaya, Norman, 2020; Goritskaya, 2021b). At the same time, if we compare the dynamics of orthographic norms of the Russian language in Russia and in Belarus, certain divergences in the written Russian language of Belarus at the orthographic level can be considered as an additional argument in favor of the formation of a national Belarusian variant of the Russian language (Lukashanets, 2018: 15).

One of the factors of the specificity of orthographic norms of the Russian language as the state language in a non-national and non-cultural environment under the conditions of Belarusian-Russian bilingualism in Belarus is the specific interpretation of the theoretical foundations of Russian orthography in Belarusian textbooks and teaching aids for institutions of higher education. Orthography, like any other “codex of rules”, has very strict limits for its interpretation. However, there is an urgent need for theoretical substantiation of the basics of orthography as a section of applied linguistics in textbooks, especially when there are several national variants of a literary language and, accordingly, several national variants of orthography.

In this regard, it is relevant to theoretically describe the corpus of the most significant concepts of orthography in teaching Russian in Belarus at the level of higher education. This could help (a) to create a strategic plan for innovations in the orthographic system, (b) to update and unify the interpretations of the main concepts of orthography and definitions of orthographic terms and their fixation in educational and reference publications with the transition to convergent learning, (c) to identify and take into account a set of various linguistic and extra-linguistic factors that determine the nature and dynamics of deviations from orthographic norms, (d) to develop optional arguments for codifying the orthographic rules of the Belarusian national variant of the Russian language.

The aim of the study is to determine the parameters and specifics of the theory of orthography in educational literature for teaching Russian in the Republic of Belarus at philological and linguistic faculties, non-profile humanities, and other specialties.

Methods and materials

The main research methods are heuristic and descriptive ones based on generalization, analysis, synthesis, parametrization, and comparison with the techniques of logical-linguistic and lexical-semantic analysis.

The material for the study included the definitions and linguistic illustrations of the main theoretical concepts of orthography (*orthography, orthographic norm, orthographic rule, orthographic principle, orthogram, orthographic error*, etc.) in

textbooks and teaching aids on Russian language for both profile and non-profile specialties at higher education institutions of the Republic of Belarus)¹.

The object of the study is all educational editions on the Russian language for higher education institutions in the Republic of Belarus in printed and/or electronic form published in 2000 to 2024. The subject of the study is the peculiarities of orthography concepts and terms in different types of Belarusian educational editions on the Russian language for higher education institutions (textbook, teaching aid, educational and methodical manual, workbook, reference book, educational and methodical recommendations, educational and methodical complex, training and teaching materials) and in different types of educational and program documentation (educational standard, model program, curriculum, etc.).

Results

It was found that most Belarusian educational publications present the theory of Russian orthography in the form of rules and basic spelling principles. There are no other elements of theoretical and meta-language apparatuses, or they are represented in an insignificant part of terms. It is quite indicative that this is characteristic of both comprehensive educational editions where orthography is only a separate part of the material and specialized educational editions which contain only orthographic material.

Different educational editions present different approaches to positioning and semantization of orthographic terminology. The first group of editions mainly repeat a relatively small number of terms from the school program, focus on the traditional (in Russian linguistics) terminological apparatus of orthography as a section of applied linguistics, and do not contain modern orthographic terminology (*orthographic activity, orthographic picture of language, functional orthography, Russian writing units, the role of orthography in society, orthographic literacy*, etc.). The second group of editions either give a simplified-schematic interpretation of orthographic terms based on their understanding in the Russian orthographic tradition or depart from this tradition to reflect certain tendencies in the Belarusian version of Russian orthography.

¹ Anisimova, E.A., Kavinkina, I.N., & Pustoshylo, E.P. (2010). *Phonetics. Phonology. Orthoepy. Graphics. Orthography*. Grodno: GrSU Publ. (In Russ.); Bozhenko, L.N. (2011). *Modern Russian orthography as a system in comparison with Belarusian spelling: a teaching aid*. Mozyr: MGPU named after I.P. Shamyakin Publ. (In Russ.); Moseychuk, T.V. (Ed.). (2014). *Russian language: workshop on spelling*. Mogilev: MSU Publ. (In Russ.); Starichenok, V.D. (Ed.). (2012). *Modern Russian literary language: a textbook*. Minsk: Higher School Publ. (In Russ.); Korabo, O.A., & Veremeyuk, G.A. (2016). *Workshop on Russian spelling: teaching aid for foreign students of philological specialties*. Brest: BrSU Publ. (In Russ.); Kotsevich, S.S. (2016). *Russian language. Phonetics. Orthoepy. Graphics. Orthography: educational and methodological complex*. Brest: BrSU Publ. (In Russ.); Glushko, E.I., & Lazareva, O.Yu. (2021). *Workbook on Russian spelling*. Minsk: BSPU Publ. (In Russ.).

The unification and expansion of theoretical and methodological foundations of Russian orthography in educational editions for higher school, as well as the development of a full-fledged consistent terminological apparatus of Russian orthography for teaching Russian to students, of profile specialties, first of all, has its own linguodidactic significance and should be justified in relation to the national variant of the Russian language in the Republic of Belarus.

Discussion

Theoretical substantiation of Russian orthography in the educational literature for students of the Republic of Belarus implies the consecutive consideration of three closely interrelated issues, (a) the identification of the degree of representation and volume of the orthography theory in educational editions of different types, (b) the establishment of the peculiarities of positioning and semantization of orthographic terminology in them, (c) the determination of the principles and role of the theory and meta-language of orthography in Belarusian educational editions on the Russian language.

Representation and volume of the theory of orthography in Belarusian educational publications on the Russian language

The theoretical basis of orthography in Belarusian studies is a system of hierarchically related concepts: orthographic principle, orthogram, type of orthogram, variant of orthogram, features of orthogram, orthographic rule, orthographic norm, and some others (Bozhenko, 2011: 22). Consequently, Belarusian educational literature on the orthographic problems of the Russian language can be divided into three groups, (a) editions without separate definitions of the basic concepts of orthography, (b) editions containing definitions of only two basic concepts: *orthography* and *orthogram*, (c) editions with a rather wide but not systematized set of orthographic concepts and their interpretations.

The first group of educational publications includes workbooks as one of the means of students' independent work (Glushko, Lazareva, 2021). There are books containing a system of exercises on all sections of orthography (Bychkovskaya et al., 2003) and books which contain exercises and tests, and the theory of orthography is represented in rules “oriented to the visual perception” (Moseychuk, 2014: 4). All these publications contain a relevant but unsubstantiated position: orthography is one of the most important sections of the Russian language (Zhovnerik, Galimskaya, 2018: 4; Moroz et al., 2013: 4). Orthographic concepts (*basic orthographic rules, orthograms, non-checkable orthograms, orthography sections, orthographic principles*, etc.) are not specifically defined, although they are used in the texts of the rules.

Such publications include one (didactic aids (exercises and tests)) or two (spelling rules, mostly in the form of tables, and didactic material) structural com-

ponents. The publications do not include theoretical information presenting orthography as a scientific discipline primarily due to their aim and functional purpose. Their aim is to automate the skills of literate writing, which is understood as the ability to write words correctly. Unfortunately, the aim is not fully achieved. Many students who successfully do tests on inserting letters, writing words with hyphens, together, or separately; with uppercase or lowercase letters, etc. in their written speech (writing a statement, an explanatory note, etc.) often make spelling errors, both minor and gross ones. At the same time, those few students who not only memorize, but also explain the correct spelling of words have a high level of orthography knowledge and do not make mistakes. This proves the importance of theoretical substantiation of the main aspects of orthography as a scientific discipline in textbooks and manuals. Spelling concepts in this case are an important prerequisite for students' educational and research activities and the key factor contributing to the conscious understanding of the necessity to study and apply existing orthographic rules with their respective theoretical justifications.

Educational editions of the first group contain manuals with no orthography section, for example, *Modern Russian Literary Language* (Starichenok, 2012b). The book contains theoretical material on phonetics, phonology, orthoepy, graphics, word formation, lexicology, phraseology, lexicography, morphology, and syntax. However, the concept of *orthographic norm* is mentioned here, and it requires a uniform spelling of certain words. There are two reasons for this attitude to orthography. The first one is that orthography is not an independent academic discipline in the standard curriculum on “Modern Russian Literary Language” for pedagogical specialties of philological profile. The second reason is the understanding of orthography only as a system of rules but not as a section of linguistics describing this system.

The second group of educational publications includes workshops on Russian orthography for developing practice-oriented professional competence of a future philologist and a systematic knowledge of modern orthographic norms. As a rule, the theoretical component of such publications explains only two key concepts *orthography* and *orthograms* and summarizes the basic spelling rules. The peculiarity of such publications is simplified explanations of the concepts from other sections of linguistics which are used in orthographic rules (*stressless vowels, paired consonants, word root, homonyms, morpheme, producing base, derived word, capital letter, lowercase letter, proper nouns*, etc.). For example, a derivational word is a word with its meaning and form derived from the meaning and form of the derivational base / word (Korabo, Veremeyuk, 2016: 22); lowercase letter is a small letter (Korabo, Veremeyuk, 2016: 30).

In the educational publications of the second group, the concept of *orthography* (from Greek *ortos* 'straight, correct' and *graph* 'to write') is interpreted, first of all, as a system of rules (a) about the spelling of words and their significant parts; (b) about consistent, hyphenated, and separate spelling; (c) about the use of capital and lowercase letters; (d) about word wrapping” (Korabo, Veremeyuk,

2016: 8). This definition lacks graphic abbreviations as the fifth section of spelling. This is the result of the traditional understanding that the rules of graphic abbreviations are used to save time and space (Kvacek, Yanovich, 1999: 73). Another definition of orthography as a scientific discipline uses the uncertain combination “can be called”. For example, orthography can also be called a section of linguistics which studies the spelling of words at a certain stage of this language development (Korabo, Veremeyuk, 2016: 8). In this case, students are provided with inaccurate understanding of Russian orthography as a conditional science rather than a full-fledged scientific discipline. The concept of an *orthogram* is considered in the second group of textbooks as central to the writing system. It is based on the problem of the writer's choice. For example, an orthogram (from Greek *ortos* 'straight, correct' and *grámma* 'letter') is a correct spelling to be chosen from possible ones (Korabo, Veremeyuk, 2016: 8). This definition does not fully reflect the essence of the concept of orthogram, because it does not indicate how exactly (from what options, due to what reasons, following what patterns, etc.) the student should make his/her choice.

The third group of educational publications includes few manuals with a lot of concepts from the theoretical basis of orthography. They include teaching aids for special courses, for example, “Modern Russian orthography in comparison with Belarusian orthography” (Bozhenko, 2011), teaching and methodological complexes (Anisimova et al., 2010; Kotsevich, 2016; 2018), and teaching materials for students' independent work (Makhon', 2003). Unlike the publications of the first and second groups with few concepts of orthography in disparate rules, the above-mentioned manuals contain orthographic theory in the form of microsystems correlated with a certain orthographic principle. The orthographic principle is the central concept of orthography; other concepts (*orthographic rule*, *orthogram*, *type of orthogram*, *variant orthogram*, *orthogram features*, etc.) are subordinated to it. These manuals are of great importance since they provide a systematic view of orthography as a scientific branch of applied knowledge about language and develop the orthography theory. The theory is a set of spelling rules that do not arise independently but are based on the certain linguistic theory (how, why and in what connection certain language units are correctly used in speech).

Positioning and semantization of orthographic terminology in Belarusian educational publications on the Russian language

A rather wide set of orthographic concepts in the educational editions of the third group and definitions of only some basic concepts of orthography in the editions of the second group establish two main trends in orthographic terminology positioning and semantization: the lack of a unified approach to the scientific interpretation of the most important terms and the difference in the amount of terminological material and in the volume of its explanations in different manuals.

The definitions of the terms *orthography*, *spelling*, *orthogram*, *orthographic principle*, and *orthographic rule* indicate the first trend. In some textbooks, the term *orthography* has only one meaning 'a system of generally accepted written rules for spelling' (Anisimova et al., 2010). Other manuals ascribe four meanings to the term *orthography* but without appropriate illustrations: 1) a historically developed system of spelling of a particular language; 2) rules ensuring uniformity in cases where variants are possible; 3) observance of these rules; 4) a part of linguistics (Kotsevich, 2016: 121; 2018: 33). At the same time, the term *spelling* is often given as the synonym-doublet of the term *orthography*. This contradicts the classical definition of spelling as orthography together with punctuation (Shapiro, 2018: 30). Some other manuals attribute only three meanings to the term *orthography*: "1) a historically developed, socially accepted system of spelling used by society; 2) a set of rules determining the uniform spelling of morphemes, words, word forms when variants are possible; 3) a section of linguistics that studies spelling in a certain historical period and establishes the rules of its unification" (Makhon', 2003: 4). All definitions position orthography first of all as a system of spelling and rules and only then as a scientific discipline (a section of applied linguistics). That is why the terms *orthography* and *spelling* are semantized as full synonyms, although they are not.

The constituent term *orthographic principle*, which do not have a unified definition in Russian linguistics, is interpreted in most Belarusian textbooks from the position of V.F. Ivanova (Ivanova, 1977). She stands on positions of Leningrad phonological school with its founder L.V. Shcherba and his pupils and followers L.R. Zinder, L.V. Bondarko, M.I. Matusevich, M.V. Gordina, L.A. Verbitskaya. The orthographic principles here are the initial base, a single beginning, a guiding idea, a guiding attitude for the writer to choose spelling (Makhon', 2003: 5); theoretical bases for which orthographic rules are formed and the choice of orthograms is made (Anisimova et al., 2010). Some authors of Belarusian manuals refer to five basic principles of orthography: phonetic, morphological, traditional, differentiating spellings, and spellings based on morphological-graphical analogies (Makhon', 2003). Others emphasize the historical nature of orthography and the dynamic nature of writing principles and argue that orthographic principles reflect the regularities of orthography of a particular language and allow the writer to choose a spelling from possible ones (Bozhenko, 2011: 26). Therefore, in its main letter-phoneme part, orthography of the modern Russian language is based on five principles: phonemic, which is the leading one; traditional-historical; differentiating; morphological; phonetic (Bozhenko, 2011: 43). Finally, some authors of textbooks emphasize only four main principles: morphological-phonematic, phonetic, traditional (traditional-historical), and the principle of differentiated writing (differentiated spelling) (Anisimova et al., 2010).

The definition of the term *orthogram* and classification of orthograms in educational publications are not unified. In some manuals, an *orthogram* is the basic orthography unit without classifying features. This is a spelling according to the

rules or tradition chosen from possible spellings as the only correct one (Kotsevich, 2016: 123; 2018: 34) or the correct (corresponding to the rules or tradition) generally accepted spelling which denotes a letter (phoneme) from possible ones (Anisimova et al., 2010). Other manuals provide close definitions. For example, orthogram is a spelling determined by an orthography rule (Makhon', 2003: 5). However, these manuals add such concepts as *orthogram differentiating feature*, *integral orthogram feature*, *orthogram variant*, *practical (real) and theoretical orthograms* (Makhon', 2003: 13–14). In other publications, orthogram is a derivative concept from the term *orthographic principle* (Bozhenko, 2011: 26); that has a synonymous term *phoneme spelling*. In this case, *orthograms* (phoneme spellings) are letters that designate phonemes in a weak position within one morpheme (Bozhenko, 2011: 58).

The term *orthographic rule* also has different interpretations. Some authors of textbooks believe that an orthographic rule is a provision on the choice of the way of spelling which is formulated, justified, and fixed in the language as a norm (Anisimova et al., 2010). Others consider that it is a spelling regulating a spelling norm according to linguistic conditions (Kotsevich, 2016: 124, 162; 2018: 34, 281). For others, spelling rules are ways of solving the writer's tasks (Makhon', 2003: 14).

The definitions of other orthographic terms from the theoretical basis of Russian orthography are not found in every textbook; most of them are presented schematically, inconsistently, superficially and require revision. Here are some typical examples. *The orthogram structure* is a given sequence of word analysis, which establishes the orthogram variant and applies the necessary rule in an optimal way (Makhon', 2003: 14). *Graphogram* is a spelling realized directly by sound, i.e. without applying the orthography rules (Makhon', 2003: 5). Graphic spellings are letters which denote vowel phonemes in a strong position after letters of unpaired consonants (Bozhenko, 2011: 57). *Orthographic practice* is a rule-making activity of a group of specialists" (Bozhenko, 2011: 17).

There are no special reference books for students on orthographic terminology in Belarus. Spelling terms are found in different volumes and with different definitions in few dictionaries of linguistic terms. Only some Belarusian educational publications on orthography have terminological glossaries that include only terms used in this teaching aid (Kotsevich, 2016; 2018).

Thus, the terminological base of Russian orthography in Belarusian educational editions for students lacks the necessary theoretical and methodological foundations, is not verified, not objective, not argued, not illustrated, and not systematic.

The principles and role of the theory and meta-language of orthography
in Belarusian educational editions on the Russian language

The amount of theoretical material on Russian orthography in educational publications for higher education institutions of the Republic of Belarus is condi-

tioned, by the positioning of orthography only as a “set of rules” and by the practical approach to it in educational and program documentation.

The scientific preferences and the level of professional competence of Belarusian authors also play an important role. Some of them do not distinguish between the concepts “theory of orthography” and “spelling rules” and deliberately simplify their representation in educational publications. For example, the preface in one educational and methodological manual on spelling draws attention to the fact that the presentation of theoretical information, i.e. the rules of Russian orthography, is oriented to the visual type of perception (Moseychuk, 2014: 4). Another educational and methodological manual lacks an interpretation of the basic concept “spelling rule”, but the author explains the important orthographic terms (*orthogram*, *graphogram*, etc.) through the complex term “*spelling rule*” (Makhon', 2003: 4).

Belarusian textbooks do not interpret neither the classical concepts *non-alphabetic signs*, *misspelling*, *orthographic acuity*, *reference spellings*, *orthography reform*, nor the concepts which reflect innovative trends in the theory of Russian orthography (*author's orthography*, *homoglyphs*, *orthographic activity*, *orthographic personality*, *orthographic picture of language*, etc.). Belarusian textbooks on Russian orthography are aimed at teaching to write competently and to use the rules to convey oral speech in writing. Hence the predominantly ontological definitions of the term *orthography* (*orthography is a system of rules*) in different textbooks. This means that the prescriptive role of orthography is more important than its descriptive role. Practice either dominates over theory or is identified with it.

This attitude to the theory of orthography results in the low level of theoretical knowledge of Russian orthography among Belarusian students; they have significant difficulties in understanding and explaining the linguistic essence and origin of orthographic rules. Moreover, there are no unified reliable sources of theoretical knowledge in Russian language teaching in higher education institutions of Belarus. Finally, this situation contributes to *codification subjectivism*, i.e. the predominance of authors' position when formulating spelling rules and compiling orthographic dictionaries.

It is necessary to emphasize in educational publications that orthography is a special section of applied linguistics, and the theoretical basis of this section nowadays is not limited to single concepts formed at school. The theory of orthography for Belarusian students is to be based on theoretical and empirical material from Russian and foreign linguistics. Main concepts of orthography in Belarusian educational publications are to highlight basic orthographic principles in modern Russian scientific discourse. The publications should consider the experience of Belarusian Russian language studies and the functioning of the Russian language in compact and mostly ethnically homogeneous Belarus in isolation from multi-regional and multi-ethnic Russian Federation.

The educational presentation of the modern theory of Russian orthography is based on four basic principles: 1) systematicity, which implies unified presentation of orthographic concepts in dictionaries, reference books, and teaching aids; 2) anthropologism, which takes into account the human factor in orthography and the role of orthography in the life of society; 3) semantic integrity, which provides the most accurate definition of complex concepts and compound terms; 4) expediency, which allows to limit the content of the theory according to communicative practice. This approach makes it possible to predict the results of teaching spelling, the level of orthographic literacy of the society, and the development of Russian orthographic system in its national variant in Belarus.

Through the system of theoretical concepts of orthography, Belarusians studying the Russian language should perceive orthography as a national treasure, as an important part of the cultural code of the Russian nation; as a linguistic heritage, which was created in accordance with significant linguistic and extra-linguistic factors in Russian literary language history; as a sample of the codified literary norm of written Russian speech, which significantly influenced the written Russian language.

Conclusion

Most Belarusian textbooks on the Russian language for higher educational institutions lack theoretical and meta-linguistic apparatuses of the theory of orthography. As a rule, the theoretical basis of orthography included sporadically in manuals for students (including philologists) is based on the rules of modern Russian orthography. These rules form the basis of orthographic theory in most educational publications on orthography. The definitions of significant orthographic concepts (*orthographic principle, orthogram, type of orthogram, variant of orthogram, identifying features of orthogram, orthographic rule, orthographic norm*) are inaccurate and unbalanced in the textbooks. However, they are characterized by partial innovative specificity and by conservative positioning, which testifies to the different approaches in forming orthographic linguistic personality, orthographic linguistic and meta-linguistic consciousness of the student.

The integral theoretical-methodological and meta-linguistic base of Russian orthography in educational publications on the Russian language for students of both humanitarian and non-humanitarian specialties in Belarus are to be based on the modern understanding of the rules of Russian orthography, reflect traditions and the latest trends in the theory and practice of Russian orthography, be guided by orthographic norms of the Russian language in the Russian Federation and in the national variant of the Russian language in the Republic of Belarus.

References

- Akimova, E.N., & Trofimovich, T.G. (2023). Russian language in the modern educational space of Belarus. *Russian Language Abroad*, (1), 123–126. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.37632/PI.2023.296.1.018>
- Anisimova, E.A., Kavinkina, I.N., & Pustoshylo, E.P. (2010). *Phonetics. Phonology. Orthography. Graphics. Orthography*. Grodno: GrSU Publ. (In Russ.).

- Antonova, S., & Murashov, A. (2004). Russian language in the conditions of bilingualism: The Belarusian path to success. *Practical Journal for Teachers and School Administration*, (1), 56–58. (In Russ.).
- Bozhenko, L.N. (2011). *Modern Russian orthography as a system in comparison with Belarusian spelling: a teaching aid*. Mozyr: MGPU named after I.P. Shamyakin Publ. (In Russ.).
- Bychkovskaya, Zh.E., Dolbik, E.E., Leonovich, V.L., et al. (2003). *Modern Russian language. Spelling workshop: A teaching aid*. Minsk: BSU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Charota, I.A. (2012). On the really significant and optimal status of the Russian Language outside Russia (based on the experience of Belarus). *Slovo.ru: Baltic Accent*, (2), 49–55. (In Russ.).
- Fedotova, I.E., & Laputskaya, I.I. (2015). “Belarusian” Russian, or what Russian language do Belarusian students speak. In Ya.S. Yaskevich (Ed.), *Russian as a means of communication in the modern integration space* (pp. 132–136). Minsk: NIHE Publ. (In Russ.).
- Glushko, E.I., & Lazareva, O.Yu. (2021). *Workbook on Russian spelling*. Minsk: BSPU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Goritskaya, O.S. (2021a). How does the Belarusian language influence Russian? In E.A. Bulat (Ed.), *Life of language in culture and society* (pp. 10–17). Minsk: MSLU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Goritskaya, O.S. (2021b). *Language and borders: lexical and grammatical specifics of the Russian language in Belarus*. Minsk: MSLU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Goritskaya, O.S., & Norman, B.Yu. (2020). Russian language in Belarus. In *Russian language outside Russia* (pp. 12–86). Ekaterinburg; Moscow: Armchair Scientist Publ. (In Russ.).
- Hentschel, G. (2016). Regular Variability or “Chaos”: The Question of Usage of a Mixed Language Variety on the Example of Belarusian “Trasyanka”. *Voprosy Yazykoznanii*, (6), 84–112. (In Russ.).
- Ivanov, E.E. (2021). Russian language and Russian culture in modern Belarus: ours or someone else’s? In S.Yu. Kamyshcheva (Ed.), *Language policy of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)* (pp. 60–61). Moscow: Pushkin Institute Publ. (In Russ.).
- Ivanov, E.E. (2008). The quality of linguistic education in the Republic of Belarus (in the aspect of intercultural communication). In M.I. Vishnevskii, V.V. Mosolov (Eds.), *Problems of the quality of education in Belarus and Russia in the context of integration processes. In 2 pts. Pt 1* (pp. 161–170). Moscow: RAE Publ. (In Russ.).
- Ivanova, V.F. (1977). *Principles of Russian orthography*. Leningrad: Publishing House of Leningrad State University. (In Russ.).
- Kalita, I.V. (2010). *Modern Belarus: Languages and national identity*. Ústí nad Labem: University J. E. Purkyně Publ. (In Russ.).
- Konyushkevich, M.I. (1994). Language situation in Belarus and features of functioning of the Russian and Belarusian languages. In V.M. Solntsev, V.Yu. Mikhailchenko (Eds.), *Language in the context of social development* (pp. 213–221). Moscow: IL RAS Publ. (In Russ.).
- Korabo, O.A., & Veremeyuk, G.A. (2016). *Workshop on Russian spelling: teaching aid for foreign students of philological specialties*. Brest: BrSU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Koteyko, N. (2014). *Language and politics in Post-Soviet Russia: a corpus assisted approach*. N.Y.: Palgrave Macmillan Publ.
- Kotsevich, S.S. (2018). *Modern Russian language: educational and methodological complex*. Brest: BrSU Publ. (In Russ.).

- Kotsevich, S.S. (2016). *Russian language. Phonetics. Orthoepy. Graphics. Orthography: educational and methodological complex*. Brest: BrSU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Kozlovitseva, N.A., & Avdeeva, A.I. (2023). Russian language in the Republic of Belarus and in the National Republics of the Russian Federation: Features of legislative regulation and functioning. *Samoupravlenie*, (1), 488–492. (In Russ.).
- Kvacek, V.E., & Yanovich, E.I. (1999). *russian language: Study Guide*. Minsk: University Press Publ. (In Russ.).
- Lukashanets, A.A. (2018). Russian orthography in the context of Belarusian-Russian state bilingualism. *Uchenye zapiski VGU im. P.M. Masherova*, 27, 10–15. (In Russ.).
- Maslova, V.A. (2015). Dialogue of Russian and Belarusian languages in the Republic of Belarus. *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, (5), 255–259. (In Russ.).
- Maslova, V.A. (2022). Russian language in the Republic of Belarus: Main Problems of functioning and research. *Russian Language Abroad*, (S1), 41–45. (In Russ.).
- Maslova, V.A., & Muratova, E.Yu. (2010). Russian language in the Republic of Belarus: Linguocultural and sociocultural aspects. In *Solving National-Language Issues in the Modern World. CIS and Baltic Countries* (pp. 304–314). Moscow: Azbukovnik Publ. (In Russ.).
- Makhon', S.V. (2003). *Modern Russian language: Methodological recommendations*. Minsk: BSU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Mechkovskaya, N.B. (2005). Post-Soviet Russian language: new features in sociolinguistic status. *Russian Linguistics*, 29(1), 49–70. (In Russ.).
- Moroz, A.N., & Galimskaya, U.P., & Yaroshevich, A.V. (2013). *Russian language. Spelling: workshop*. Minsk: Academy of Management under the President of the Republic of Belarus Publ. (In Russ.).
- Moseychuk, T.V. (Ed.). (2014). *Russian language: workshop on spelling*. Mogilev: MSU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Moshchenskaya, L.G. (1992). *How do Belarusians speak Russian?* Minsk: Universitetskoe Publ. (In Russ.).
- Mustajoki, A. (2013). Varieties of the Russian language: analysis and classification. *Voprosy yazykoznaniya*, (5), 3–27. (In Russ.).
- Norman, B.Yu. (2008). Russian language in Belarus today. *Die Welt der Slaven*, 53(2), 289–300. (In Russ.).
- Norman, B.Yu. (2010a). Russian language in Belarus: features of the sociolinguistic situation. In *Humaniora: lingua russica. Development and variability of language in the modern world* (pp. 175–192). Tartu. (In Russ.).
- Norman, B.Yu. (2010b). Russian language in modern Belarus: practice and norm. *Russian Language*, (6), 8–15. (In Russ.).
- Rovdo, I.S. (2002). Russian language in Belarus. In *Russian language: system and functioning. In 2 pts. Pt 1* (pp. 46–51). Minsk: BSU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Rychkova, L.V. (2010). Belarusian natiolect of the Russian language in the aspect of ecolinguistics. *Studia i szkice slawistyczne*, 10, 423–429. (In Russ.).
- Somin, A.A. (2013). Russian language in the Republic of Belarus. In M.M. Rovinskaya (Ed.), *Russian Language Abroad* (pp. 171–201). St. Petersburg: Zlatoust Publ. (In Russ.).
- Somin, A.A. (2022). Twelve words that help to understand the mentality and culture of Belarusians. *Russian Language Abroad*, (S1), 26–34. (In Russ.).

- Starichenok, V.D. (2012). Russian language in Belarus: state, prospects. *Slovo.ru: Baltic Accent*, (2), 76–80. (In Russ.).
- Starichenok, V.D. (Ed.). (2012). *Modern Russian literary language: a textbook*. Minsk: Higher School Publ. (In Russ.).
- Shapiro, A.B. (2018). *Russian spelling. 3rd ed.* Moscow: LENAND Publ. (In Russ.).
- Volynets, T.N. (2009). National variant of the Russian language in Belarus – myth or reality? In G.M. Mezenk (Ed.), *Acta Albaruthenica, Rossica, Polonica – VIII. In 2 pts. Pt 1* (pp. 16–21). Viciebsk: P.M. Masherov VSU Publ. (In Russ.).
- Zhovnerik, S.L., & Galinskaya, U.P. (2018). *Russian language. Orthography: educational and methodological manual. 4th ed.* Minsk: BSEU Publ. (In Russ.).

Bio notes:

Evgeniy E. Ivanov, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, Mogilev State A. Kuleshov University, 1 Kosmonavtov St, 212022, Mogilev, Republic of Belarus, Full Member of the Slavic Phraseological Commission of the International Committee of Slavists. *Research interests*: theory of language, comparative linguistics, linguistic-cultural studies, Russian studies, Belarusian studies, phraseology, paremiology, lexicography, linguodidactics. The author of over 470 scientific publications. ORCID: 0000-0002-6451-8111. SPIN-code: 8751-0620. E-mail: ivanov-msu@mail.ru

Vladimir I. Kulikovich, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Editorial and Publishing Technologies, Belarusian State Pedagogical University, Editor-in-chief of the scientific journal “Proceedings of BSTU. Series 4. Print- and mediatechnologies”, Belarusian State Technological University, 13a Sverdlova st, 220006, Minsk, Republic of Belarus. *Research interests*: theory and practice of orthography, Belarusian studies, Russian studies, linguodidactics, publishing, editing of publications, journalism. The author of more than 520 scientific and popular science publications. ORCID: 0009-0008-3753-8265. SPIN-code: 9023-2690. E-mail: nino-1924@mail.ru

DOI: 10.22363/2618-8163-2024-22-4-598-614

EDN: AZAMRZ

Научная статья

Теория русской орфографии в учебной литературе для студентов Республики Беларусь

Е.Е. Иванов¹, В.И. Куликович²

¹Могилевский государственный университет им. А.А. Кулешова, Могилев, Республика Беларусь

²Белорусский государственный технологический университет, Минск, Республика Беларусь

✉ ivanov-msu@mail.ru

Аннотация. Жесткие рамки интерпретации любого «кодекса правил» существенно ограничивают теоретические аспекты их изучения, однако требуют специального объяснения применительно к орфографии как разделу языкознания, особенно

в тех случаях, когда существует несколько национальных вариантов литературного языка. Актуальность исследования обусловили: насущная потребность теоретического описания корпуса основополагающих понятий орфографии, используемых в преподавании русского языка в Беларуси и значимых для создания стратегического плана внедрения новаций в орфографической системе; необходимость фиксации изменений в дефинициях, детерминированных переходом к конвергентному обучению; влияние комплекса лингвистических и экстралингвистических факторов; разработка опциональных аргументов для кодификации белорусского национального варианта русского языка. Цель исследования — определить параметры и специфику теории орфографии в учебной литературе по русскому языку в Республике Беларусь. Материалом для исследования послужили дефиниции и языковые иллюстрации основных понятий теории орфографии (орфография, орфографическое правило, орфограмма, орфографический принцип, орфографическая ошибка, орфографическая норма и др.) в учебниках и учебных пособиях по русскому языку для учреждений высшего образования Республики Беларусь, изданных с 2000 по 2024 г. Применялись методы параметризации и сравнения, логико-лингвистический и лексико-семантический анализ. Установлено, что как в специализированных учебных изданиях, посвященных только орфографии, так и в комплексных изданиях, где орфография является частью учебного материала, преимущественно отсутствует теоретический и метаязыковой аппарат либо значительной части, либо всей необходимой базы теории орфографии. В различных учебных изданиях сосуществуют разные подходы в позиционировании орфографической терминологии. Это преимущественно ориентация на устаревшие традиции, отсутствие современных понятий («орфографическая деятельность», «орфографическая картина языка» и др.). Теория орфографии в учебной литературе по русскому языку для высших учебных заведений Республики Беларусь базируется, как правило, на действующих правилах русской орфографии, однако характеризуется, с одной стороны, инновационной спецификой, а с другой — консерватизмом их позиционирования в письменной практике, что свидетельствует о наличии разности подходов в формировании орфографической языковой личности, орфографического языкового и метаязыкового сознания белорусов, изучающих русский язык. Определены основные принципы разработки современной теории орфографии, учитывающей орфографические инновации и национально-культурную специфику в преподавании русского языка в высших учебных заведениях Республики Беларусь.

Ключевые слова: русский язык, теория и практика орфографии, правила правописания, терминология орфографии, высшее образование

Вклад авторов: Иванов Е.Е. — концепция исследования, научное консультирование, общая концепция статьи, обработка результатов исследования, написание и редактирование статьи; Куликович В.И. — анализ литературы, подбор первичного материала, обобщение опыта исследователей, сбор данных, анализ данных и полученных результатов, обработка материала, написание статьи.

Финансирование. Исследование выполнено при финансовой поддержке Государственной программы научных исследований 2021–2025 гг. (Республика Беларусь), научный проект № 20211335 (руководитель — Е.Е. Иванов).

Конфликт интересов. Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи: поступила в редакцию 05.05.2024; принята к печати 18.08.2024.

Для цитирования: *Иванов Е.Е., Куликович В.И.* Теория русской орфографии в учебной литературе для студентов Республики Беларусь // Русистика. 2024. Т. 22. № 4. С. 598–614. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2024-22-4-598-614>