

DOI: 10.24411/2470-1262-2020-10103

*УДК (UDC) 811.161.
Tamara V. Kuprina,
Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia B. N. Yeltsin
Yekaterinburg, Russian Federation*

*Svetlana M. Minasyan,
Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University
Yekaterinburg, Russian Federation*

*Куприна Тамара В.,
Уральский федеральный университет
им. первого Президента России Б. Н. Ельцина,
Екатеринбург, Россия*

*Минасян Светлана М.
Российский государственный
профессионально-педагогический университет,
Екатеринбург, Россия*

*For citation: Kuprina T., Minasyan S.M., (2021).
Modern Trends in Russian Lexical System Development: Theoretical Aspect.
Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science
Vol.6, Issue 1 (2021), pp. 53-61 (in USA)*

*Manuscript received: 17/02/2021
Accepted for publication: 25/03/2021
The author has read and approved the final manuscript.
CC BY 4.0*

**MODERN TRENDS IN RUSSIAN LEXICAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT:
THEORETICAL ASPECT**

**СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ РАСШИРЕНИЯ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОЙ
СИСТЕМЫ РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА: ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТ**

Abstract:

The relevance of the research presented is due to the constant updating of the lexical composition of the Russian language in the context of global processes. The aim of the article is the theoretical substantiation of the processes of neologization of the Russian lexical system. The article presents the views of both Russian and foreign authors on the problem. It is concluded that the lexical system of the Russian language is a flexible one that reacts to all changes in the environment and self-organizes. Moreover, the process of self-organization is often not amenable to regulation but is solely determined by the desire of certain social groups.

Keywords: Russian language, neologism, neology, neonymy, globalization, lexical system

Аннотация:

Актуальность представленного исследования обусловлена постоянным обновлением лексического состава русского языка в условиях глобальных процессов современности. Целью статьи является теоретическое обоснование процессов неологизации русскоязычной лексической системы. В статье представлены взгляды как российских, так и зарубежных авторов на указанную проблему. Сделан вывод о том, что лексический состав русского языка представляет собой гибкую систему, реагирующую на все изменения в окружающей среде, и является самоорганизующейся. Причем процесс самоорганизации часто не поддается регулированию, а определяется исключительно желанием определенных групп общества.

Ключевые слова: русский язык, неологизм, неология, неонимия, глобализация, лексическая система

Introduction

Neologization of the lexical system of any language is a complex and diverse process. At the present stage, the neologization process is going on rather quickly and requires constant updating of knowledge in this area.

The genetic composition of the newest borrowings in Russian is presented as follows: from the English language (74.3%), gallicisms (8%), Germanisms (3%), Europeanisms (2.4%), Eastern origin (4.8%), of Latin and Greek origin (7.5%), a few of the Slavic languages [12].

Among Russian studies, there are a number of works devoted to the problems of neologization (N. F. Alefirenko, E. A. Zemskaya, V. G. Kostomarov, M. A. Krongauz, L. P. Krysin, E.V. Marinova, etc.).

So, in the monograph “Modern Russian language: active processes at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries” L. P. Krysin notes that along with such obvious changes in the literary language as the intensification of the process of borrowing foreign language lexis, jargonization of many spheres of everyday and public communication in the contemporary Russian language there found peculiar “growth points”, indicating the beginning of deep processes taking place in the language [7].

In one of the newest monographs, E.V. Marinova points out that the traditional nature of the topic does not diminish its relevance. For example, problems related to the typology of foreign words (in particular, neologisms) have not been sufficiently developed. Apparently, the typological description of foreign language lexis should be based on a multidimensional classification. ... The process of formation of a new phraseological unit on the basis of a foreign language neologism deserves a separate consideration. The very fact of such phrase formation testifies to the entry of a new foreign language word into the language system and, obviously, it can be considered as a criterion for mastering a foreign language word, which, according to our data, has not yet been noted in special linguistic literature [12].

The occurring phenomena demonstrate the dynamism of the lexical system and lead to hybridization, i.e. the creation of words consisting of different components (English-Russian,

Russian-English, with digital and other graphic elements), which some studies at the end of the XX century suggest to call “mixed” (Russian: миксты) [3] or “blends” as a later version (Russian: бленды) [19].

Consequently, the *relevance* of the presented article is due to the need to study the growing volume of neologisms and appearance of a large number of hybrid phrases (phrasemes) in many languages, the lexical system of the Russian language is no exception.

The *purpose* of the article is to theoretically substantiate the neologization of the lexical system, which occurs on the basis, on the one hand, of its globalization, i.e. enrichment with new lexical units when interacting with lexical systems of other languages, and jargonization within the system, on the other hand, which leads to its hybridization.

Theoretical aspect of neological research

Interest in the topic of neologization of lexical systems has led to the formation of a separate direction of philological knowledge “Neology”. Neology is a field of knowledge that studies new lexical units that appear in a given language at a certain period of time [18, 24].

In literature, there made a distinction between general neology, terminological neology or neonymy and, accordingly, commonly used neologisms, terminological or neonyms (new denominations) and neosems (new meanings). Neonyms are denominational necessity and more stable than common neologisms. Neonymy manifests itself in a terminological vacuum. The forms of neologisms and neonyms are formed in the same way on the basis of the linguistic means of a given language.

Neology and terminology make it possible to analyze the cultural, scientific, political and ideological evolution of a given society. Neology and terminology should be studied at an interdisciplinary level as new topics of lexical semantics. The goal is to formally, semantically and functionally describe lexical units that acquire new functions and meanings in a specific context [20].

A neological category can also be structured in terms of prototypical effects, where its elements are flexibly distributed in a continuum that reflects differences. Neologisms are subjective and relative entities that stand out from the discursive background because of the surprise they cause; therefore, the psychological criterion is the natural method of recognizing them. In the process of recognizing neologisms, three stages are distinguished: recognition, interpretation, confirmation [21].

There is also a gender discrepancy: women are more conservative and use more standard forms of language than men. In general, new words appear every day, which determines the linguistic dynamics and changes taking place in a given society [17].

Consequently, the problem of neologization of the lexical system of any language remains relevant and requires interdisciplinary research, since it combines not only linguistic aspects but also psychological, emotional, gender, professional, etc.

Methods of Research

For the theoretical substantiation of the variability and self-organization of the Russian lexical system, we have analyzed a number of characteristics of the globalization process with a projection into the lexical system. Interviews and included observations are conducted to confirm the attitudes of various strata of the society.

Results and Discussion

What is the system of the Russian language at the present stage? At present, the linguistic situation is treated as a transition to a polystylistic culture which includes the entire diversity of interacting cultures and subcultures as contacts with numerous cultures of other countries are intensifying. As a consequence, the lexical system undergoes a massive filling with foreign words, primarily from the English language.

As noted by T. Popova, the creative potencies of Russian word formation are activated due to the interaction with the system of another language. The ability of the Russian language to absorb and process the avalanche of borrowed elements that have flooded it many times makes it possible to optimistically predict its future: the tolerance of the Russian language allows it to develop successfully, expanding the system of motivational bases, word-building models, types and word-formation methods at the expense of borrowing processes [13].

If we compare the development of the linguistic system with the process of development of globalization and regard them as complementary phenomena, we also note the transition to a new level which induces indignation of certain levels of society. Thus, we can give the following definition of the globalization of the language lexical system.

The globalization of the language lexical system is the process of transition from a static, relatively stable organization of individual language lexical systems to their constantly developing interaction according to the laws of synergy and complementarity [10].

Let us consider the Russian lexical system according a number of parameters [8]:

1. The openness of the system is determined by its interaction with a professionally-oriented environment. Moreover, numerous economic nominations increasingly penetrate into everyday discourse, enriching it with new nominations of objects and phenomena. In turn, lexical units of normative, colloquial and slang discourse adapt in the linguistic and economic environment, taking on new meanings.

2. The non-linearity or multidimensionality of the system is due to the multiplicity of development processes both in one language and in several languages that are not always related. As a result, we have such complementary concepts as Renglish (Russian + English), Romglish (Romanian + English), Denglish (Deutsch + English), etc. Thus, a new complementary multilingual system is created being in constant development.

... Achieving a critical level in recent decades, the increase in the number of specific features in the Russian language, functioning in a foreign-language environment, again actualizes the problem of regional variants of the Russian language. ... Currently, there are already studies devoted to regional variants of the Russian language in Ukraine, Lithuania, the United States, Germany, etc. ... Thus, it is possible to say quite definitely not about the potential, but about the actual formation of certain linguistic entities that differ from the national Russian language on the phonetic, grammatical, semantic and lexical levels [4].

Similar phenomena are observed in the CIS countries. As V.N. Arutyunyan (Armenia) notes, the development of a whole range of social and economic processes has led to the formation in modern Armenia of such conditions where a person within his/her language abilities can switch from one language system to another. It can be not only the three main languages (Armenian, Russian, and English) but also the fourth that is, the language of the country where

the family lived (Bashkir, Tatar, Ukrainian, Moldovan, Bulgarian, Czech, Hungarian, Georgian, Arabic, Hebrew and etc.). ... [2].

3. The attraction of the lexical system is due to its openness, flexibility to the perception of new nominations while interacting with the environment, including new economic systems and management subcultures.

4. Bifurcation is the point of choosing a possible direction of development by a system. Fear of getting out of balance means fear of bifurcations or changes. Thus, one can explain the rejection by a part of the society of numerous borrowings, especially from the “alien” (mainly Anglo-American) environment. However, deviation from norms or marginality can lead to a qualitatively new level of development.

5. Instability means that a closed system becomes open to interaction through information or other impacts. With the current strengthening of the impact of information flows, the professional environment and the interaction of heterogeneous languages in the context of globalization and integration, the Russian-language lexical system cannot remain constant and free of neologic renewal.

6. Emergence (dynamic hierarchy) is the basic principle of the system passing through bifurcation points, i.e. loss of stability. In public life, it provokes the activation of various social movements. As for the language system, it is due to the requirements of prohibiting the use of foreign language terminology, the “purification” of the Russian language. However, the acceptance of existing changes allows us to perceive such dynamic hierarchy as a natural and dynamic, mobile creative consciousness as a new type of thinking.

As noted by Yu. M. Lothman, the metaphor of the “break of epochs” is connected with the crisis reorganization of the social structure, in particular, with the modification of linguistic consciousness. Such transformations are caused by the so-called altered states which provoke neologic “outbreaks” in the most emotionally and expressively sensitive zones of the modern semiosphere beyond which there is neither communication nor language [1].

This phenomenon provokes the alignment of a new conceptual apparatus, increases the need for nomination. All this leads to the so-called “terminological explosion”, i.e. to the mass emergence of new terms, terminological fields and entire terminological systems and introduces serious changes in existing terminology systems [11].

According to our research, the attitude to Anglo-American borrowings is really ambiguous that can cause a state of absolute frustration and rejection of new realities. This phenomenon is especially common in the age group over 45 and even among people with higher education. We can identify the following options for perception.

1. Full perception and understanding of the inevitability of the situation. This group of communicants is ready to learn English or, indeed, already studying it, motivating it by the fact that they do not want to feel “rejected”, or it can contribute to their career growth. They can start learning English even being over 60.

2. Understanding of the inevitability of the situation but the mastery of the language at the domestic level, often with distortions in perception and understanding and, consequently, misuse of words and phrases. For example, *know-how* is represented as “I do not know”, “I do not understand” (Cf. : I do not know how to do it. For me it's just know-how). Perhaps this term is associated with a simpler homonymous homophonic form of the particle “no”.

3. Misunderstanding of the current situation and complete rejection of foreign terminology. The assessment is made at the level “I hate English” or “we have to forbid it all”.

Meanwhile, it has long been noted that the mastering of other language contributes to the expansion of the vocabulary of people and a deeper comprehension of the surrounding world. In this regard, the methodological function of a multilingual culture makes it necessary to enter into creative interaction within the humanities, to dialogue of cultures, actualizing the possibilities of the processes of cultural and linguistic pluralism in modern science and education [14].

Here comes into force one more law – the optimization of information, on the basis of which social adaptation is carried out, or activity, where the direct factor is the direct reflection or adaptation to the environment [16]. Thus, the conceptual sphere of the Russian-language personality is renewed, which is connected with the transformation of cognitive consciousness.

However, some researchers [15] note that excessive use of borrowing can lead to a certain transformation of the linguistic picture of the world. New words often transform the emotional assessment of certain realities, which leads to a change in the representation of the speakers of the language about the surrounding reality.

Conclusion

Thus, the lexical system of any language is especially sensitive to changes in the life of the linguistic community, the lexis never remains constant. The emergence of new words is mainly associated with the need to designate new concepts that arise in the development of science or the professional sphere, and the need to express the nuances of meanings caused by a deeper understanding of the nature of this phenomenon, the search for a more economical form of expression that makes the communication process more expressive. While creating neologisms, there used various variations, including “spontaneous” linguistics, which is confirmed both by Russian and foreign researchers.

It is especially important, since “sometimes inexperienced native speakers amaze with the accuracy of their metalanguage comments so much that “spontaneous linguistics” is extremely close to “scientific linguistics” [5].

Neologisms are simultaneously a manifestation of the evolution of language and the evolution of knowledge, which occur quickly enough. The concept of “neologic feeling” is fundamental as a criterion for defining neologisms and neonyms [23].

We can agree with Maroneze Bruno Oliveira, Lara Gananca and Joao Henrique, who consider the creation of a neologism as an onomasiological (from concept to nomination) and semasiological (from nomination to concept) process. The creation of a neologism begins with a concept that arises in the mind of the creator in order to express this or that concept linguistically (onomasiologically); the neologism decoder, on the other hand, starts with the form (semasiologically) to determine meaning. It raises several questions: 1. Onomasiologically, what linguistic resources are used to create a neologism with a given meaning; what resources are best suited for the communicative intention of the neologism creator; what phonological, syntactic, semantic factors impact the choice of the creation mechanism. 2. Semasiologically, what are the possible meanings of the neologism; what mechanisms the listener uses to interpret the neologism [22].

One of the options can be a context in which the neologism is created or used, the genre to which it belongs, the semantic level and stability in a given community. ... Language as a mirror reflects various essences of mental components in the process of world perception [6].

In general, the lexical system of the Russian language is flexible enough and shows low stability in the context of global processes in various spheres of life. The culture of speech increasingly includes a colloquial style based on borrowings and jargonization of professional spheres, forming hybrid variants, the so-called mixed or blends.

The existence of professional jargons allows individuals to feel like members of a certain closed professional community who easily understand each other. Jargons are a means of professional communication, otherwise one would have to speak English or use a cumbersome descriptive translation. However, mixed variants quickly penetrate into other spheres of life and are used not only by professional communities but also in the everyday life of ordinary citizens.

A distinctive feature of jargons is the predominance of multifunctional lexical units. On the one hand, by origin they are professional jargon. On the other hand, outside the professional context, they are perceived as neologisms, since in many cases they do not have Russian synonyms but descriptive translation often does not correspond to the principles of linguistic economy [9].

In this case, neologization is a kind of solution to the nomination problem, as it allows simplifying and speeding up the process of adaptation of the English terminology.

References:

1. Alefirenko, N.F. (2008). *Frazeologiya v svete sovremennykh lingvisticheskikh paradigm: Monografiya [Phraseology in the light of modern linguistic paradigms: Monograph]*. M.: Publishing House "Elpis", 270 p. (In Russ.)
2. Arutyunyan, V.N. (2011). Osobennosti yazykovoy situatsii v Armenii i vozmozhnosti ikh ispol'zovaniya v protsesse prepodavaniya russkogo yazyka [Features of the linguistic situation in Armenia and the possibility of their use in the process of teaching the Russian language]. *Russkiy yazyk i literatura vo vremeni i prostranstve. XII kongress Mezhdunarodnoy assotsiatsii prepodavateley russkogo yazyka i literatury [Russian language and literature in time and space. XII Congress of the International Association of Teachers of Russian Language and Literature]*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 33-38. (In Russ.)
3. Bash, L. M. (1989). Differentsiatsiya termina «zaimstvovaniye»: khronologicheskiye i etimologicheskiye aspekty [Differentiation of the term "borrowing": chronological and etymological aspects] (No 4, pp. 20-34). *Vestnik Mosk. un.-ta. Ser. 9. Philology*. (In Russ.)
4. Belousov, V.N. (2011). Sostoyaniye, problemy i perspektivy funktsionirovaniya russkogo yazyka kak sredstva mezhnatsional'nogo obshcheniya v zarubezhnykh stranakh v sovremennoy geopoliticheskoy situatsii [State, problems and prospects of the functioning of the Russian language as a means of interethnic communication in foreign countries in the modern geopolitical situation]. *Russkiy yazyk i literatura vo vremeni i prostranstve. XII kongress Mezhdunarodnoy assotsiatsii prepodavateley russkogo yazyka i literatury [Russian language and literature in time and space. XII Congress of the International Association of Teachers of Russian Language and Literature]*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 39-44. (In Russ.)
5. Bulygina, T.V., & Shmelov, A.D. (2000) «Stikhiynaya lingvistika» [«Spontaneous linguistics»]. *Russkiy yazyk segodnya: Sb. Statey [Russian language today: Col. articles]* (issue 1. pp. 9-18). M.: Azbukovnik. (In Russ.)
6. Klimchukova, A. (2004). Psikhologicheskiye i lingvisticheskiye osobennosti vospriyatiya dukhovnykh tekstov [Psychological and linguistic features of the perception of spiritual texts].

- Chelovek. Soznaniye. Kommunikatsiya. Internet [Individual. Consciousness. Communication. Internet]*. Warsaw: Institute of Russian Studies, University of Warsaw, 601-606. (In Russ.)
7. Krysin L.P. (2008). *Sovremennyy russkiy yazyk: aktivnyye protsessy na rubezhe XX-XXI vekov [Modern Russian language: active processes at the turn of the XX-XXI centuries]*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures, 712 p. (In Russ.)
 8. Kuprina, T. (2009). Neofrazeologiya: poisk ekvivalentnykh sootvetstviy (na primere angliyskogo i russkogo yazykov) [Neophraseology: search for equivalent correspondences (on the example of English and Russian languages)]. *V poiskakh ekvivalentnosti IV. Sbornik dokladov, pročitannykh na mezhdunarodnoy nauchnoy konferentsii [In search of equivalence IV. Collection of reports read at the international scientific conference]*. Preshov, Slovakia, 122-131. (In Russ.)
 9. Kuprina, T.V., & Minasyan, S.M. (2011). Sources of Modernization of Russian Lexical System. *Obrazovatel'nyye tekhnologii v virtual'nom lingvo-kommunikativnom prostranstve: IV Mezhdunarodnaya virtual'naya nauchno-prakticheskaya konferentsiya po rusistike, literature i kul'ture: Sbornik nauchnykh dokladov [Educational technologies in virtual linguistic and communicative space: IV International virtual scientific and practical conference on Russian studies, literature and culture: Collection of scientific reports]*. USA, Vermont: Middlebury College / Yerevan: Limush, 120-123.
 10. Kuprina, T., & Zhuravleva, J. (2007). *Russkiy ili angliyskiy: neologizatsiya v polistilisticheskoy kul'ture [Russian or English: neologization in polystylistic culture]*. *AUSPICIA. A reviewed magazine for questions of social sciences* (No 1, pp. 10-14). Czech Republic: VSERS. (In Russ.)
 11. Leichik, V.M. (2007). *Terminovedeniye: predmet, metody, struktura [Terminology: subject, methods, structure]*. M.: Izdatel'stvo LKI, 256. (In Russ.)
 12. Marinova, E. V. (2021). *Inoyazychnyye slova v russkoy rechi kontsa XX – nachala XXI v.: Problemy osvoyeniya i funktsionirovaniya [Foreign words in Russian speech of the late XX - early XXI century: Problems of development and functioning]*. M.: LENAND, 536. (In Russ.)
 13. Popova, T.V. (2005). Tolerantnost' russkogo slovoobrazovaniya (na materiale novoobrazovaniy kontsa XX veka) [Tolerance of Russian word formation (based on the new formations of the late twentieth century)]. *Filosofskie i lingvokul'turologicheskiye problemy tolerantnosti [Philosophical and linguoculturological problems of tolerance]*. M.: OLMA-PRESS, 132-153. (In Russ.)
 14. Sokolov, E. A., & Bulankina, N. E. (2008). *Problemy polikul'tur i poliyazychiy v gumanitarnom obrazovanii [Problems of multiculturalism and multilingualism in humanitarian education]*. M.: Universitetskaya kniga; Logos, 208. (In Russ.)
 15. Chudinov, A.P. (2006). *Politicheskaya lingvistika [Political linguistics]*. M.: Flinta: Nauka, 256. (In Russ.)
 16. Yugay, G.A. (2007). *Golografiya Vselennoy i novaya universal'naya filosofiya [Holography of the Universe and New Universal Philosophy]*. M.: Kraft+, 400 (In Russ.)
 17. Canete Gonzalez, Paola (2017). Women and Men Facing Lexical Innovation. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, Vol. 19, Issue 2, 219-233.
 18. Druta, Inga (2017). Consideration on Neonimy and the Neonims. *International Conference on Globalization, Intercultural Dialogue and National Identity*, 214-218.
 19. Prearo-Lima, Rafael (2019). Lexical Blends and Neologisms: some concepts and problematization. *Entrepalavras*, Vol. 9, Issue 3, 38-56.
 20. Guerrero Ramos, Gloria (2017). New Perspectives for Terminology and Neology in Lexical Semantics. *Rilce-Revista de Filologia Hispanica*, Vol. 33, Issue 3, 1385-1415.

21. Lavale-Ortiz, Ruth M. (2019). Bases for the Theoretical Foundations of Neology and Neologism: Memory, Attention and Categorization. *Circulo De Linguistica Aplicada a la Comunicacion*, Issue 80, 201-226.
22. Maroneze, Bruno Oliveira, Lara Gananca, Joao Henrique (2020). Onomasiological and Semasiological Perspectives in Studies on Neology. *Laborhistorico*, Vol. 6, Issue 1, P.204-224.
23. Rijo da Fonseca Lino, Maria Teresa (2019). Neology and Neonymy in Portuguese Language: Identification Criteria. *Linha d Agua*, Vol. 32, Issue 3, 9-23.
24. Vega Moreno, Erika, Llopart Saumell, Elisabet (2017). The conceptual delimitation of newness and neologicity. *Rilce-Revista de Filologia Hispanica*, Vol. 33. Issue 3, 1416-1451.

Information about the authors:

Tamara V. Kuprina (Yekatiireburg, Russia) - Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Translation, Academic Department of International Economics and Management, Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia B. N. Yeltsin. Research interests: neology, cross-cultural communications, cross-cultural didactics. <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8184-2490>; SCOPUS Author ID 55811001900. SPIN-code 8892-1348. E-mail: tvkuprina@mail.ru

Svetlana M. Minasyan (Yerevan, Armenia) - Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Theory and History of Pedagogy, Armenian State Pedagogical University named after Kh. Abovyan. Department of Russian and Foreign Languages, Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9301-4927>; SCOPUS Author ID:56576171400; SPIN-code 765 668; SPIN-code 6745-3510. Research interests: neology, cross-cultural communications, cross-cultural didactics. E-mail: s.minasyanpmesi@gmail.com

Contribution of the authors. The authors contributed equality to the present research.