ABSTRACT:

Introduction to the Theory of Language Correctness. The theme of this Thesis is the novel conceptualization of the subject field, which is, in the Czech context, traditionally dealt with within the theory of language cultivation, from the perspective of the so-called ontological "socialism" (esp. Itkonen, 1978; 2003). The first two chapters explain why the subject field of the (theory of) language cultivation is to be newly approached from this very perspective. The conceptual discussion in **the first chapter** identifies three underresearched factors (reaction of the Protectorate elites to the Nazi occupation policy; variety-based approach to the "language" and physicalism) that had negative effect to the debate on these questions and therefore they should not be taken into consideration; the terminological discussion in **the second chapter** supports the claim that it is not suitable to associate the traditional term (theory of) language cultivation with this novel conceptualization. **The third chapter** introduces in detail the so-called ontological "socialism" according to which there are not only spatiotemporal entities, i.e. language means, but also non-spatiotemporal entities, i.e. language rules qua actually existing social facts, in the subject field of linguistics. **The fourth chapter** provides a detailed overview of language rules, the mode of its existence in the form of the so-called three-level common knowledge and shows that/why these rules are inherently normative in nature. **The fifth chapter** shows that the knowledge of language rules exerts certain "pressure" on language users in interactions and describes the mechanism of this "pressure". The description is then applied as a basis to determine the criterion of language correctness, i.e. the compliance of the (used) language mean with the corresponding language rule known to the language users taking part in interaction. **The sixth chapter** confronts this novel criterion and the original criteria that have been discussed so far (especially) in the Czech tradition. It shows that the quality of being or not being in accordance with these criteria (identified expert ones) does not have any direct impact on the language users' interactional behavior. In **the seventh chapter** we outline the first and thus just approximate view on the scope of the subject field of the theory of language correctness. We identify its crucial entities and suggest the novel, coherent definitions of the key concepts: usage, norm and codification. **The eighth chapter** elaborates this view further. It outlines the course of the language change as it is seen from the perspective of ontological "socialism". Such background makes it possible to identify important distinction between the so-called clear and less-than-clear cases. We claim that in the less-than-clear cases the

users of language represent a relativizing factor: some language means are not correct absolutely but are only correct for some users and not for others. **The ninth chapter** concerns the phenomenon of non-zero reaction to the used language mean which is not in compliance with the shared language rule. It documents that these non-zero reactions have negative effect on the continuous course of interactions for it disturbs the language users and it plays crucial role for the possibility of experimental research into the non-spatiotemporal language rules. **The tenth chapter** presents two possible modes of acquiring the language. Based on the difference between unconscious language acquisition of the rules and conscious learning of the rule-sentences we argue that both of these modes are of equal importance for research. **The eleventh chapter** gets closer to and specifies the real scope of the subject field of the theory of language correctness. It describes how the knowledge of language rules is distributed among particular language users. On this background we identify the importance of the criterion of the text's openness to the public and the primacy of internal rules shared by the interaction participants over the external rules and/or rule sentences which are not shared by the interaction participants. **The twelfth chapter** comments on the relation between rules and language usage. It points out that the incorrect language means which are not in compliance with the shared rule are being used anyway. In relation with this fact, we concern there the question of usability of language corpora for the purposes of research into correctness of selected language means. We reach the conclusion that using corpus for the purposes mentioned above has its limits. The topic of the last, **thirteenth chapter** is the relation between language rules and the rule-sentences, i.e. codification. It deals with the possible modes of resolving the mismatch between the rule and the rule-sentence, taking the perspective of both linguists and language users. We argue that the very possibility to successfully interfere into the shared rules through the rule-sentences is far from self-evident. The thesis is closed by the **Conclusion** which proposes the contours of a research program that would be useful to establish in light of the "socialist" conceptualization of the theory of language correctness: empirical and experimental research into correctness of chosen language means and the research of conditions under which the language users reconstitute their current shared rule into a new one.