

Проценко Екатерина Александровна

Доцент, кандидат филологических наук, Воронежский институт МВД России

Живокينا Майя Александровна

Доцент, кандидат филологических наук, ВУНЦ ВВС "Военно-воздушная академия им. проф. Н.Е.Жуковского и Ю.А.Гагарина"

**ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЕ МЕЖДУ РУССКИМ И АНГЛИЙСКИМ ЯЗЫКАМИ КАК ДВУСТОРОННИЙ
ВЕКТОР ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОГО ОБМЕНА**

Аннотация

Статья посвящена проблеме взаимодействия между английским и русским языками на протяжении последних десятилетий.

Лингвистический обмен рассматривается как двусторонний канал межкультурной коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: языковые контакты, межъязыковое перекодирование, русские заимствования, британская пресса.

Protsenko Ekaterina Alexandrovna

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Voronezh Institute of the Russian Ministry of the Interior

Zhivokina Maya Alexandrovna

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Military Education and Research Center "The Zhukovsky and Gagarin Air Force Academy"

RUSSIAN-ENGLISH INTERACTIONS AS A TWO-WAY CHANNEL OF LINGUISTIC EXCHANGE

Abstract

The article is devoted to the problem of Russian-English interactions during the last decades. Linguistic exchange is considered as a two-way channel of intercultural communication.

Keywords: language contacts, interlanguage recoding, russian borrowings, british press.

The XXIst century has begun as an era of innovations and globalization. A number of factors such as the extension of interlingual and international contacts, the formation of the European Union, the creation of a single market and other integration initiatives that the world has seen lately all determined the perception of a modern world as a global village. In this context we face the problem of a global language and nowadays English is the most evident claimant to this role. But we must not forget that international communication is a multi-way channel. This means that bilateral, if not multilateral, relations are expected to take place in situations of language contacts. Thus, we could suppose that the English language itself is influenced by different languages and several researches have proved that. In this paper we will focus on Russian-English interactions during the new millennium.

The dominance of the English language in today's world is apparent and remarkable. Numerous studies of the present role of English have been conducted and points of view are different, sometimes contradictory. Some authors see the origins of the unprecedented spread of English in colonial expansion of the British Empire, others explain it by "American-directed international economy" or deliberate language expansion. Various terms are used to refer to English as a means of international communication: "International and Intranational language", "World English", "Lingua Franca", "Global English" or "Globish", to name a few.

Without considering the reasons of the phenomenon, we can state that nowadays English is the most important foreign language that "dominates international communication in the fields of business, science and the media" [2, p. 6]. This domination has led, among other consequences, to the flow of borrowings, a continual process spread all over the world. The existence of words and expressions "shared by languages different enough to belong to different language families" [4, p.2] gives linguists reason to talk about globalisms such as *computer, know how, manager, fast food, speaker* etc.

Actually many languages are borrowing from English, Russian is no exception. But linguistic borrowing is not simply a capture of lexical items; as a result, a new word appears in another language environment with different pronunciation, different grammar categories and even meaning. The process is reinforced by various semantic processes such as broadening, narrowing or functional changes making the meaning of the borrowed word modified if not unrecognizable. Numerous studies in various languages have shown many divergences between the English etymons and loanwords in the recipient language.

Therefore the repatriation of lexical borrowings sometimes becomes impossible without some transformations or necessary comments.

For instance, British journalists underline that Russian "*kottedzhi*" have nothing in common with the English cottage from which the word is derived, resembling more a fortress than a typical English cottage: «*Today, wealthy "New Russians" are building "kottedzhi", which are more like fortresses than the English cottage from which the word derives: vast stone and brick structures with high fencing, a swimming- pool, a bath house and a 24-hour armed guard, in the depths of the birch forest.*» [Independent, 17.07.1999] It is remarkable that the word is re-coded again that is transcribed from the Russian variant «коттеджи» in order to be opposed to the English «cottage» (a small house, especially in the country).

Although borrowing was and still is the topic of investigation by linguists around the world, it should be acknowledged that many of the issues remain controversial. Modern researchers have left the traditional approaches of earlier studies in favour of the framework of code- mixing and code-switching. This approach enables to differentiate code mixing as a process from linguistic borrowing as "the end product". Accordingly, it is generally agreed that "when a linguistic item is borrowed it is integrated phonologically, morphologically and syntactically" [1, p.4]. However, it is still difficult to draw a clear line between a borrowing and a single word code-switching, especially for the European languages. For this reason and some others, we prefer considering different types of code mixing as a continuum between code homogeneity, on the one hand, and code switching which is an example of code heterogeneity, on the other hand. This continuum embraces various categories of language usage beginning with loanwords and loan translations as the closest to the language uniformity, through the use of occasional borrowings, exotic or culture-specific words to intra-sentential or intersentential switches which are the

examples of two languages juxtaposition.

As we focus on the study of linguistic exchanges between Russian and English, we think it is preferable to use the term “re-coding” instead of “code-mixing”. In fact, these two languages differ in its origins, linguistic families, grammar structures; moreover, they use different alphabet systems. Thus, even occasional or contextual borrowings presuppose changing of the language code, for example, “*lyogkogo para*” (may your steam be easy); *the tsar’-batiushka* (Little Father) and *the narod*(the people)”. These items actually do not belong to either language system, they are more likely a hybrid, a sort of linguistic crossing. Under that logic they may be called “inter- language” or re-coded lexical items and may represent the first stage in the process of linguistic borrowing.

Having regard to the above said, we analyzed the use of borrowed and recoded Russian words into the British press. According to Volodarskaya E. [3], the Oxford English dictionary numbered 499 Russian loanwords brought into English at different stages of its development. They can be classified into different groups such as historical (for example, *tsar*, *knez*, *bolshevik*, *Politbureau*), geographical (for example, *steppe*, *tundra*, *beluga*, *sable*) or technical terms (for example, *sputnik*, *lunokhod*, *ethnonym*), social and political words (for example, *perestroika*, *glasnost*, *apparatchik*, *subbotnik*) or colloquial vocabulary (for example, *babushka*, *samovar*, *rouble*, *shapka*, *vodka*). We have studied the use of Russian words in the British media through a quantitative and qualitative analysis of national daily newspapers and we can conclude that words of Russian origin are quite frequent in the British press. The corpus this study is based on exceeds 50 000 examples from British newspapers edited for the last 15 years.

As a whole, Russian loanwords used in British newspapers represent a large group of words belonging to different semantic fields and different periods of borrowing. We differentiated them using the criteria of frequency. The most frequent tend to be political terms such as *tsar*, *Stalinist*, *Kremlin*, and some borrowed culture-bound items, for example, *vodka* or *sputnik*. Signs of a trend towards the internationalization of some Russian borrowings are to be noticed; as a result, these words lose the national-specific status and pretend to become globalisms: “...so was the series of historic reforms that began in the mid-1980s when Mikhail Gorbachev introduced words such as *perestroika* and *glasnost* to the global dictionary” [Times, 23.05.2004]. British journalists write about *perestroika* not only in Russia but also in some European countries, China and even USA.

At the other end of this scale are exotic and culture-specific items such as *drozhki*, *izba*, *valenki*, *balalaika*, *matrioshka*, *samovar*, *kolkhoz*, *kulak*, *samizdat*, *elektrichka*, *siloviki* etc. A particular group of recoded lexical items naming the dishes of traditional Russian cuisine is wide enough: *borsch*, *shchi*, *solyanka*, *okroshka*, *kulebyaka*, *kholodets*, *rasstegay*, *golubtsy*, *pelmeni*, *oladi*, *vareniki*, *varenye*, *kvass*, *kulich* etc. Paradoxical as it is, Russian words appear in the British press more and more frequently despite the actual period of tension in international affairs and economic sanctions against Russia. For instance, one of the articles about the economic blockade of Russia is entitled “*Goodbye parmesan, hello pelmeni. Goodbye brie, hello borsch*” [Guardian, 07.08.2014].

As the examples above illustrate, we often have to do with the words not literally borrowed by the recipient language but rather re-coded from one language into another. By interlanguage recoding we primarily mean formal changes of the word (transcription or transliteration), as English and Russian languages use different alphabet systems, but some morphological or semantic transformations may also occur in these cases. The most remarkable example is the word *intelligentsia* which was borrowed from Russian «интеллигенция» although historically derived from Latin *intelligens*. This word was described as a foreign word in the Russian language dictionary while in the English language dictionaries it is considered to be of Russian or Check origin. In some contexts it is clearly perceived as a Russian borrowing, for example: “*Exceptional heroism was shown by our hard core - surrounded by glory are our whole working class, our kolkhozpeasantry, the Soviet intelligentsia, who under the leadership of party organisations overcame untold hardships and bearing the hardships of war...*” [Guardian, 26.04.2007]

In general, borrowed and recoded Russian words can be found side by side. The following sentence, for example, includes two words of Russian origin, i.e. *dacha* which can be considered as a loanword and a recoded phrase *Rublyovskoe Shosse*. Note that both items are used according to grammar rules of the English language (*dachasin* plural, *Rublyovskoe Shosse* with the definite article): “*Harley will open a second showroom this year on the Rublyovskoe Shosse, where many oligarchs and officials have their dachas*” [Telegraph, 18.06.2005]

The above arguments and given examples can be considered as samples of an inverse vector of language influence from Russian to English. The study of different British daily newspapers which reflect sociopolitical history day by day has shown that the Russian language is represented in the English-language media by a wide enough group of words including both linguistic borrowings and recoded lexical items.

To sum up, it should be mentioned that the process of intercultural communication in the framework of a globalizing but multipolar world may increase the interaction between languages and cultures; however, the vector of influence in this case is not exclusively one- sided. Sharing technical achievements or cultural values presupposes the exchange of specific linguistic items which are borrowed together with the concepts or phenomena they represent. The question still is: what is the ratio of this linguistic exchange between contacting languages in the dialogue of cultures? It seems that the direction and amount of borrowings is influenced by various factors and, first of all, extralinguistic ones.

References

1. Kamwangamalu N. M. The state of code-switching research at the dawn of the new millenium: focus on the global context / N.M. Kamwangamalu // South African Journal of Linguistics. Nov1999. Vol. 17. P. 256-278.
2. Seidlhofer B., Breiteneder A., Pitzl M.-L. English as a Lingua Franca in Europe: Challenges for Applied Linguistics // Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. №26/3. 2006. P. 3-34.
3. Volodarskaya E.F. Borrowing as a reflection of Russian-English contacts // Voprosy yazykoznaniya. №4. P. 96-116.
4. Witalisz A. Linguistic Globalization as a Reflection of Cultural Changes // Proceedings of the 19th Annual Conference

of the Global Awareness Society International, May 2011. Krakow, 2011. P. 1-24.

Живокина Майя Александровна

Доцент, кандидат филологических наук, ВУНЦ ВВС "Военно-воздушная академия им. проф. Н.Е. Жуковского и Ю.А. Гагарина" (г. Воронеж)

Проценко Екатерина Александровна

Кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Воронежский институт МВД России

КАТЕГОРИИ И ПРОТОТИПЫ: ОТ АНТИЧНОСТИ ДО СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКИ

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматриваются два подхода к исследованию категорий: классический или логический, берущий свое начало еще в учениях Аристотеля и современный или когнитивный, утверждающий, что процесс категоризации сложнее и предусматривает апелляцию к таким понятиям, как нечеткая логика, понятия с нечеткими краями, прототип, фамилное сходство.

Ключевые слова: категории, прототипы, фамилное сходство, нечеткая логика.

Zhivokina Mayya Alexandrovna

Associate Professor, PhD in Philology, Military Education and Research Center "The Zhukovsky and Gagarin Air Force Academy" (Voronezh)

Protsenko Ekaterine Alexandrovna

Associate Professor, PhD in Philology, Voronezh Institute of the Russian Ministry of the Interior

CATEGORIES AND PROTOTYPES: FROM CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY TO CONTEMPORARY LINGUISTICS

Abstract

The article considers two approaches to category studies: a classical or logical one principles of which were formulated by Aristotle, and a contemporary or cognitive one that deals with such concepts as fuzzy logic, fuzzy sets, prototype, family resemblance.

Keywords: category, prototype, family resemblance, fuzzy logic.

Categories, as a philosophical and linguistic notion, go back to ancient times. Aristotle was first who studied a number of concepts using

the semantic terms of the language. These general notions were essence, quality, relation, place, time, state, quantity and a few others [1]. Each category, according to the Greek philosopher, is characterized by a set of necessary and essential attributes which makes all the members of the category equal. Thus, the boundaries of the categories are clearly cut, the membership is based on the criterion 'true / false', all members of the category are equal and all the objects belong only this or that category having this or that attribute [6, p. 22].

Without denying the importance of Aristotelian categories for cognition, modern science admits that ordinary consciousness of a person classifies parts of reality in a different way. Scientists paying a tribute to the classical approach with its proportions and precision claim that not all concepts have a finite set of attributes, there are 'good' and 'bad' examples of the category and cases where it is not clear whether the object belongs to the category or not [7, p. 79].

The world around us is more complex than it seemed to Aristotle: most birds fly but not all of them; dogs, horses, birds are animate but stones, liquids and plants are inanimate and yet sea stars and bacteria are somewhere in between [9, p. 338]. Moreover, conceptual and language categories might not coincide: watermelon is a berry but we consider it a fruit and tomato is a berry though it is a vegetable for an ordinary person.

In usual circumstances we do not have any difficulty identifying, classifying and giving names to an infinite number of animate and inanimate objects. However, it is not always true. Let's consider, for example, knees, ankles and feet of human beings and branches and the trunk of a tree. "It may be fairly clear that one's kneecap belongs to one's knee and that the trunk of a tree includes the section which grows out of the ground. Yet at which point does one's knee end and where does one's thigh start? Where does a trunk turn into a treetop and where does a branch turn into a twig? Similar problems arise with landscape names and words denoting weather phenomena" [8, p. 1].

Here we come across 'the boundary' notion. Cars, tables, books have clear-cut boundaries. Boundaries of such concepts as a knee, trunk, valley, mist are fuzzy. This fuzziness has been the subject of studies of many philosophers and linguists whose interests lay in the sphere of the relations between word meanings and extra-linguistic reality. It led to the formation of the theory of fuzzy sets that was developed by a famous logician and mathematician L. Zadeh. In the attempt to analyze systems that cannot be analyzed with the help of Aristotelian criteria, he demonstrated that human mind and the processes of cognition cannot be exact and clear.

The contradictions between the classical approach to categorization and the real process of cognition were reflected in L. Wittgenstein's "Philosophical studies" in the 1950s. Proving that it is impossible to define a word in every detail, he introduced the term 'fuzzy concept'. His example of this concept that became classical was the word 'game'. Because you use this word to describe a wide variety of leisure activities (Olympic games, games with a ball, chess, card games etc.), the scientist came to the conclusion that it is hardly possible to give a definition to this word. "What is common to them all? – Don't say: 'There must be something common, or they would not be called games' – but look and see whether there is anything common to all. – For if you look at them you will not see something that is common to all, but similarities, relationships, and a whole series of them at that" [cit. 8, p. 25]. Such concepts, according to the philosopher, are grouped together by a network of overlapping similarities – family resemblances. This principle helps include new games that resemble the usual ones like relatives of a family take after each other in terms of appearance, traits of character, habits, manners etc.

L. Wittgenstein and later the psychologists S. B. Mervis and E. Rosch showed that the principle of family resemblance is an alternative