

FOREIGN BORROWINGS IN THE FOCUS OF THE PROBLEM «LANGUAGE AND CULTURE»

Yu. A. Klipatska

Sumy State University; 40007, Sumy, Rumskyi-Korsakov st., 2;

e-mail: yklipatska@drl.sumdu.edu.ua

The article reveals foreign borrowings as a result of language contacts in the focus of the problem of “language and culture”. The extralinguistic reasons are analyzed, which had served to intensify the borrowing process in modern Russian-speaking society and caused changes in the type of communication that dominates in social practice and is defined by communicative paradigm. Change in communicative paradigm had entailed changes in the communicative core of the Russian lexicon, which are comparable to the “moment of explosion” regarding the “gradual” processes in the language. The communicative core of the lexicon is understood as the totality of the most frequent and communicatively significant lexical and phraseological units, which are used in all communicative spheres, denotatively significant for the speaking collective and reflecting the actual reality.

The question of significant role of English borrowings in the modern Russian literary language is raised. Such influence of the English language is explained by its status as a language of international communication and a language of communication in the leading economic states. This fact explains that in recent decades, Anglo-American ethnolinguistic culture has been playing the role of a linguocultural donor for other ethnolinguistic cultures-acceptors, in particular for Russian culture.

The article presents different points of view of linguists who raise the question about the quantity and quality of borrowed words, peculiarities of their development, relevance in speech, their relationship with original and previously borrowed vocabulary, etc. Summing up, we can say that borrowing lexical units, in particular English, is now represented by the universal sign of civilization, which consists in creation and development of a single information space.

Key words: *borrowings, lexeme, communicative core, language, culture, civilization.*

There are about 5000 languages on the globe [4, p. 330]. The speakers of these languages are representatives of different cultures and nationalities. All of them have their own characteristics and their own specificity, which is an integral part of the existence of humanity.

Development of any culture as a set of material and spiritual values is caused not only by its immanent ability to self-development, but also by ex-

ternal influence of other cultures. In this case, both internal and external trends are implemented in a continuous tense mutual influence. The internal vector of development provides culture with continuity of traditions, certain constancy, a core essence, in other words, it preserves the core of the cultural system. External intersections with other cultures are different in their activity and scale, but they always lead to certain changes and are carried out through different forms. Thus, the “external” culture, invading the “internal”, in the opinion of L. M. Lotman, should undergo the process of renaming in the language of the “internal” culture in order to “find a name for itself and a place in the language of the culture into which it is breaking” [3, p. 117]. As a result of this process, adoption, partial or full, of “alien” elements – borrowings takes place.

Language contacts, as a result of which borrowing takes place, have always interested scientists and at present stage of science development in various aspects are the object of research for many linguists (see works of M. A. Breuter, V. G. Kostomarov, L. P. Krysin, E. F. Volodarskaia, Ye. I. Guseva, S. S. Iziumskaia, R. N. Popova, E. V. Sergeeva, A. K. Kazkenova, Ye. V. Kakorina, I. V. Karasik, A. V. Zelenin, T. S. Pristaiko, et al.).

Borrowing is an integral process in the language system during language contacts, and, consequently, activation of this process in modern Russian-speaking society, where political, ideological openness has led to openness of the Russian language for external influences is logical.

The most intensive changes in the language occur at the lexical level. This area of language most sensitively reflects external influences on the social, political, and cultural life of society and is the most mobile subsystem that directly responds to changes in the language environment. In addition, according to Yu. M. Lotman, invasion in the sphere of culture from the outside is accomplished through naming, and external events do not affect a person until they are made “human”, i. e., they do not get semiotic meaningfulness [3, p. 118].

Borrowing of lexical items is a permanent process for a system of any language, and Russian is not an exception in this sense. However, in recent decades, the nature and intensity of borrowings in the lexical system of the Russian language have changed, acquiring bright, expressive features due to various social factors and cardinal changes in society as a result of the collapse of the USSR.

The purpose of this article is to determine the role of borrowings, as well as to identify the share of anglicisms in modern Russian language at late 20th – early 21st centuries in the focus of the problem “language and culture”.

Adoption of a significant number of new borrowings and widespread use of borrowings that previously existed as a special foreign language vocabulary was contributed, as L. Krysin noted, by such political, economic, and cultural conditions as awareness of different layers of the population of their country as part of the civilized world; prevalence in ideology and offi-

cial propaganda of interactive, unifying trends over trends reflecting the opposition of Soviet society and Soviet way of life to Western models; reassessment of social and moral values and shift of emphasis from class and party priorities to universal values; open orientation to the West in the field of economics, political structure of the state, in the fields of culture, sports, fashion, music, etc. [2, p. 36]. All these processes and trends served as an important stimulus, facilitating the activation of foreign language vocabulary.

Emergence of such a significant amount of borrowings in all areas of the Russian language functioning is a characteristic factor of the changed type of communication that dominates social practice, defined by I. A. Sternin as a communicative paradigm, from monological to dialogical. Change in the communicative paradigm led to a change in the communicative core of the lexicon of the Russian-speaking population. The communicative core of the lexicon is understood as “totality of the most frequent and communicatively significant lexical and phraseological units, which are used in all communicative spheres, denotatively significant for the speaking collective and reflecting actual activity” [7, p. 14].

Taking into account changes that have occurred in the communicative core of the Russian lexicon regarding borrowings, we can say that permeability of the lexical system of the Russian language for foreign-language elements has increased. In certain thematic areas, which include politics, market economy, show business, etc., the borrowed vocabulary has been activated. Vocabulary associated with totalitarian socio-political system of the country went into passive vocabulary of the Russian-speaking population. Thus, changes in the communicative core of the Russian lexicon are caused by extralinguistic reasons, since they are associated with fundamental changes in the life of Russian-speaking society.

Foreign lexemes existing in Russian vocabulary came to it at different times from different languages: Ukrainian, Polish, French, German, Italian, Latin, Greek, Georgian, Arabic, Turkic, Japanese, etc. Some of them gave lexical system of the Russian language only certain elements, while others brought much more into it, actively influencing the behavior of people and history paths.

It is important to note that among a number of other languages borrowings from English in the Russian vocabulary of the last decades are the most numerous, which is characteristic of the current state of the Russian language. These are such lexemes as: *arm wrestling, business, brand, briefing, glamor, digest, defroster, distributor, insider, insight, Internet, carting, camping, kidnapping, clipmaker, cracker, consulting, cursor, leasing, marketing, manager, modem, monitoring, laptop, office, offside, offshore, publicity, pampers, parking, public relations, popcorn, price list, printer, promotion, raver, remake, realtor, ringtone, siding, summit, sound track, server, speech, sponsor, supervisor, supermarket, tandem, tender, thriller, tuner, weekend, fast food, fashionable, fitness, franchising, fusion, hacker, holding,*

hospice, shake, shaping, shopping, show, exclusive, etc. Comparative analysis of foreign words dictionaries of the twentieth century, conducted by E. F. Volodarskaia, shows that borrowing rate of anglicisms in the last century has grown 5-8 times, and in the dictionary of foreign words by N. G. Komliev, published in 2000, their percentage is 25 % of the total number of borrowed units [1, p. 102-104].

Such a significant influence of English is explained by the fact that it is recognized as official in 44 countries of the world and has the status of a means of international communication. "It is a working language of most international organizations, scientific-technical information and computer space. The role of the English language as a global language predetermines the fact that it is the language of communication in the countries with leading economies. Therefore, in recent decades, the Anglo-American ethno-lingvo-culture has been playing the role of a linguocultural donor for other ethno-lingvo-cultures-acceptors that feel the consequences of such expansion" [5, p. 289].

Summing up the peculiarities of a modern stage of the Russian language development from the point of view of borrowings from the English language, E. F. Volodarskaia comes to conclusions: there is intensification of the use of earlier borrowings; there is interpretation of old borrowings in the direction of neutralizing their negative connotations; there is a semantic exploration of exotisms with the aim of their greater integration; there is reorientation of the borrowings of the monosemantic plan of the terminological corpus into the polysemantic words of the standard language; borrowing of English words acquires a special meaning because of their greater thriftiness and rationality compared with Russian descriptive synonyms; the first place in the quantitative composition take semantic groups that include computer vocabulary related to business, economics and management [1, p. 102].

The increased activity of the process under study makes linguists raise a question about the quantity and quality of borrowed words, peculiarities of their acquisition, relevance in speech, their relationship with original and previously borrowed vocabulary, etc.

It cannot be said that foreign words are perceived by researchers exclusively negatively. A restrained and objective approach to the issue of foreign borrowings is found in the works of N. V. Novikova, L. A. Beckett, G. A. Martinovich, et al. But some linguists consider that attitudes toward borrowings should be prompted by proportionality and consistency, and it should be an indicator of the strength of the mechanism of language self-regulation (I. S. Ulukhanov, E. F. Volodarskaia, L. P. Krysin, et al.). Such a spontaneous nature of borrowed vocabulary and its rapid adaptation in the Russian language cause negative attitude of the purists and revisers of the purity of the Russian language (O. A. Feofanov, et al.).

The considered points of view have the right to exist. In addition, between these opposites there is some interdependence. Due to the constant interaction of different cultures, the process of interpenetration of lexical units

into mutually contiguous languages is carried out. This is a permanent and “gradual” process, which is characteristic of the system of any language. However, in response to fundamental changes in society, the language, reflecting new linguistic consciousness of society and serving the needs of society, undergoes “moments of explosion”. So the Russian-speaking population painlessly masters foreign language lexical units that are equally part of the Russian language system and complement the “taste flavors” of modernity expressed in it, for example: *opposition*, *tamagotchi*, *karaoke*, *shrimp*, *deposit*, *dumpling*, etc. But cardinal transformations in society in the post-totalitarian period cause also an “explosive” process in the language. The flow of borrowed vocabulary at this stage is not always perceived by the Russian-speaking population, and sometimes it seems even useless for them, especially in situations where you can use traditional Russian words and not resort to foreign borrowings, for example: *manager* – administrator, *latent* – hidden, *permanent* – constant, *to prevail* – to dominate, *fashion* – mode, *fusion* – mixture, etc.

Continuing to talk about the correlation of the moments of explosion and gradual development as two alternating stages, we must also take into account development of their relations in a synchronous space, when they exist in a single, simultaneously working mechanism. Yu. M. Lotman points out that in a synchronously operating structure, some of the processes perform such an important function as innovation, others – continuity. However, contemporaries perceive these tendencies as hostile, although the researcher notes that in fact “these are two sides of a single, connected mechanism, its synchronous structure, and aggressiveness of one of them does not drown out, but stimulates development of the opposite” [3, p. 22].

Despite the intensive flow of borrowings in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, the Russian language, in our opinion, is not threatened with “clogging”. In this regard, we share the position of G. N. Skliarevskaia, that the Russian language is “a stable system that borrows alien elements well, adapting them to its own linguistic systems and forcing them to serve its purposes. ... The processes taking place in the Russian language at the turn of the century, only at first glance give the impression of linguistic disasters – in reality, they realize the flexibility and vitality of the modern language system, they have more natural than random and more hopeful than catastrophic” [6]. In other words, the flow of borrowings can be explained by the demand of society, but it does not prevent Russian culture from remaining a living creative tool for development of the nation, since Russian people’s own contribution to their culture far exceeds the amount of borrowings.

So, language is a way of preserving national identity of the people, developing their intellectual and spiritual potential. And even in the use and understanding of things moving from one nation to another, there is a great diversity, because here you can only talk about imitation, which cannot be an exact repetition, since it is not identical, i.e. not performed in the same cir-

cumstances. Borrowing of lexical units, in particular from the English language, nowadays seems to be a universal sign of civilization, which consists in creation and development of a single information space. Thus, English is in the category of world languages, like Latin and Greek, whose influence at a certain historical stage extended far beyond their original boundaries. English is an international language of educated people of all nations, knowing it you can go around the globe. And in this case, such a force as civilization contributes to strengthening of nationalities.

Література

1. Володарская Э.Ф. Заимствование как отражение русско-английских контактов / Э.Ф. Володарская // Вопросы языкознания. – 2002. – №4. – С. 96-118.
2. Крысин Л.П. Лексическое заимствование и калькирование в русском языке последних десятилетий / Л.П. Крысин // Вопросы языкознания. – 2002. – №6. – С. 27-34.
3. Лотман Ю.М. Культура и взрыв [Электронный ресурс]. – М., 1992. – Режим доступа: <http://lib.socio.msu.ru/l/library/>
4. Народонаселение стран мира. – М., 1984.
5. Привалова И.В. Интеркультура и вербальный знак (лингвокогнитивные основы межкультурной коммуникации): Монография / И.В. Привалова. – М.: Гнозис, 2005.
6. Склярская Г.Н. Слово в меняющемся мире: Русский язык начала XXI столетия: состояние, проблемы, перспективы [Электронный ресурс] / Исследования по славянским языкам. – Сеул, 2001. – №6. – С. 177-202. – Режим доступа: <http://www.philology.ru>.
7. Стернин И.А. Социальные факторы и развитие современного русского языка / И.А. Стернин // Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика. Серия: Язык и социальная среда. – Воронеж: ВГТУ, 2000. – Вып. 2. – С. 4-16.

*Стаття надійшла до редакційної колегії 9.02.2019 р.
Рекомендовано до друку д.ф.н., професором Костусяком Н. М.*

ІНШОМОВНІ ЗАПОЗИЧЕННЯ У ФОКУСІ ПРОБЛЕМИ «МОВА ТА КУЛЬТУРА»

Ю. О. Кліпатська

*Сумський державний університет;
40007, м. Суми, вул.Римського-Корсакова, 2;
e-mail: ykclipatska@drl.sumdu.edu.ua*

Дана стаття висвітлює проблему трактування та функціонування іншомовних запозичень у результаті мовних контактів у контексті питання «мови та культури». Подається аналіз позамовних факторів

інтенсифікації процесів запозичення у сучасному російськомовному суспільстві, а також висвітлюються зміни у способах спілкування, котрі домінують у соціальній практиці та визначаються комунікативною парадигмою. Зміни комунікативної парадигми спричинили зміни комунікативного ядра російської лексики, їх можна порівняти із «моментом вибуху», котрий відбувся у традиційно «поступовому» мовному процесі. Комунікативне ядро лексики визначається як сукупність найчастіше вживаних та комунікативно найважливіших лексичних та фразеологічних одиниць, які вживаються у всіх комунікативних сферах, денотативно значущих для відображення реальності.

У статті піднімається питання значної ролі англійських запозичень у сучасній російській літературній мові. Подібний вплив англійської мови пояснюється її статусом мови міжнародного спілкування та мови спілкування провідних країн з найвищим рівнем економічного розвитку. Саме тому в останні десятиліття англо-американська етнокультурна відіграла роль лінгвокультурного донора для багатьох етнолінгвістичних культур-реципієнтів, зокрема для російської культури.

Стаття представляє різні погляди лінгвістів на проблему кількості та якості запозичень, особливості їхнього розвитку та застосування, їхнього співвідношення та взаємозв'язку з оригінальною та попередньо запозиченою лексикою і т.д. У висновку, ми можемо стверджувати, що запозичені лексичні одиниці, зокрема з англійської мови, репрезентують характерну рису глобальної цивілізації, яка полягає в творенні та розвиткові єдиного інформаційного простору.

Ключові слова: запозичення, лексема, комунікативне ядро, мова, культура, цивілізація.