



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2022.6.16>

UDC 811.161.1'06:81'271
LBC 81.411.2-553



Submitted: 13.05.2022
Accepted: 19.09.2022

ACTIVE PROCESSES IN MODERN RUSSIAN: POSSIBILITIES OF ECOLOGICAL AND LINGUISTIC STUDY

Elvira N. Akimova

Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Moscow, Russia;
National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University, Saransk, Russia

Galina T. Bezkorovaynaya

Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow, Russia

Svetlana V. Ionova

Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Moscow, Russia

Abstract. The article considers possibility of applying the ecological-and-linguistic approach to the study of active processes that characterize the current state of the Russian language, text production, including electronic communication. The specificity of the ecological approach in linguistics, its distinction from the orthological approach, as well as the structural analysis of linguistic units are displayed, visible active processes that dominate in phonetics, vocabulary, graphic encoding and text creation are registered. The authors consider the usefulness of the ecological approach in linguistics, its distinction from the orthological approach, as well as the structural analysis of linguistic units. The analysis made provision for defining language democratization as the major trend, which is noted in word functioning, changes in phrase and sentence structures; numerous borrowings of words and parts of words from the English language support the globalization trend. There is a tendency in strengthening the subjective aspect of the text content in public communication that is marked by the shift towards evaluative-expressive-emotional colloquial speech style. The opposing trend is text intellectualization, it appeals to background knowledge of the reader, the use of abbreviated forms in information coding. The authors conclude that a long-term ecological monitoring of these trends and the use of the ecological-and-linguistic approach to classification of linguistic phenomena are required.

Key words: modern Russian language, active processes, ecological linguistics, linguistic consciousness, speech style culture, language levels, discourse, electronic communication.

Citation. Akimova E.N., Bezkorovaynaya G.T., Ionova S.V. Active Processes in Modern Russian: Possibilities of Ecological and Linguistic Study. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], 2022, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 204-214. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2022.6.16>

УДК 811.161.1'06:81'271
ББК 81.411.2-553

Дата поступления статьи: 13.05.2022
Дата принятия статьи: 19.09.2022

АКТИВНЫЕ ПРОЦЕССЫ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ: ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ ЭКОЛОГО-ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОГО ИЗУЧЕНИЯ

Эльвира Николаевна Акимова

Государственный институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина, г. Москва, Россия;
Национальный исследовательский Мордовский государственный университет им. Н.П. Огарева,
г. Саранск, Россия

Галина Тиграновна Безкоровайная

Российский экономический университет им. Г.В. Плеханова, г. Москва, Россия

Светлана Валентиновна Ионова

Государственный институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина, г. Москва, Россия

Аннотация. Цель статьи – охарактеризовать возможности использования эколого-лингвистического подхода в изучении активных процессов в современном русском языке, в текстовом производстве, в том числе в электронной коммуникации. Показана специфика экологического подхода в языкознании, его отличие от ортологического подхода и структурного анализа языковых единиц. Описаны доминирующие изменения в фонетике, лексике, графическом коде (Э.Н. Акимова), в текстотворчестве (Г.Т. Безкоровайна, С.В. Ионова). Установлено, что сохраняется общая тенденция демократизации языка, выражающаяся не только в функциональных изменениях лексических единиц, но и в структурных изменениях словосочетаний и предложений, продолжает действовать тенденция к глобализации, реализующаяся в основном в многочисленных заимствованиях слов и частей слов из английского языка. Выявлены тенденция к усилению субъектного аспекта содержания текстов в публичном общении, обнаруживающаяся в их сближении с оценочно-экспрессивно-эмоциональной разговорной речью, и тенденция к интеллектуализации текста, предполагающая обращение автора к фоновым знаниям читателя, использованию сокращенных форм кодирования информации. Утверждается, что для оценки влияния этих процессов на язык необходим многолетний экологический мониторинг указанных тенденций с применением эколого-лингвистического подхода к классификации языковых фактов.

Ключевые слова: современный русский язык, активные процессы, экологическая лингвистика, языковое сознание, культура речи, языковые уровни, дискурс, электронное общение.

Цитирование. Акимова Э. Н., Безкоровайна Г. Т., Ионова С. В. Активные процессы в современном русском языке: возможности эколого-лингвистического изучения // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2, Языкознание. – 2022. – Т. 21, № 6. – С. 204–214. – (На англ. яз.). – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2022.6.16>

Introduction

Modern discourse practice proceeds in the conditions of two fundamental and contending tendencies – trends of globalization and that of national identity. In this context, language as a means of preserving the identity of the people, a tool for strengthening and developing national culture, an effective means of communication and information exchange has become more significant. In modern linguistics and sociolinguistics the environmental conditions for the existence of the language are defined as the natural, social and cultural conditions that preserve the identity of an ethnic community and its language: the integrity of the territory, the preservation of national culture, traditional areas of native speakers activity, and also a high level of national identity (Mikhalchenko (ed.), 2006). With this approach, the purity of a language itself, its correctness, integrity and consistency while performing its basic functions are the objects for special studying and description in a pair with the language norm decay and destruction. The most obvious examples of destructive speech in any linguistic culture are those that have a sharp, categorical form, which is indicted by obscene,

indecent and rude words. The use of obscene words in speech in an invective (offensive) function is submitted not only to public censure, but also to a punishment under the law. For linguists the processes that occur in modern Russian speech practice, though they might be assessed as antisocial speech behavior, are considered to be worth of rigorous scientific interpretation and qualifications in terms of ecological linguistics. These include some active processes in modern Russian, which are perceived as critical aspects of its use not only by specialists, but also by ordinary native speakers. In this context, traditional research issues are gaining new significance, such as borrowing into the national language, interpenetration of elements of different language systems, formation of precedent texts and texts of culture to preserve national concepts, problems of changing the mechanisms of speech communications under the influence of international computer technology, etc.

In this article active processes in modern Russian are interpreted from the standpoint of ecolinguistics. The following research aspects are considered: a) the ecology of the Russian language vocabulary; b) the ecology of the Russian language at other levels; c) ecology of the functioning

Russian language. This approach reflects the methodology of modern research in the field of ecolinguistics.

Material, methodology, methods

The scientists and researchers from related scientific branches have discussed the interrelation between language and environment, that is how the language functions, developing or degrading its forms. In 1912, E. Sapir published his program article “Language and Environment” [Sapir, 1912]. However, in the 90-ies of the last century in connection with the understanding of small nations’ fate, their cultures and languages by scientific community this problem received special acuteness and relevance. The term “ecology” (the science studying the relationship between organisms and external factors) was introduced by an American linguist Einar Haugen in 1869. In the 20th century, the term expanded its semantics and was used together with other refined definitions as “ecology of culture” [Likhachev, 1997]. E. Haugen was the first who united the concepts “ecology” and “language” in his report “Ecology of Language” thus nominating the science that relates the language and its environment and the ways how the society encodes it [Haugen, 2001].

Since then the ecological linguistics has been developing abroad in two main directions: *environmental linguistics*, transferring environmental terms, principles and methods of studies in language and *linguistics and language (linguistic) ecology* that studies the reflection of environmental issues in linguistics by using linguistic terms and methods and exploring the role of a language in describing environmental problems [Garner, 2005; Alexander, Stibbe, 2014; Couto, 2014].

In works by foreign scholars, the methodology of ecolinguistics is developing mainly as the communicative and sociological concepts of language, in line with it go the studies of varieties of the language environment (language galaxies) and the gravitational model of languages [Calvet, 2007], the context of non-metaphorical linguistic ecology [Garner, 2005; Salikoko, 2020], the theory of contacting language communities [Nelde, 1989; Thomason, 2001], the concept of the economic strength of language communities [Ammon, 2015, S. 193].

The Russian linguistics regards the language ecology not only in the context of concepts of external security of the language [Marusenko, 2015], but also together with such processes as complementary ones, developing both aspects of this approach [Skovorodnikov, 1992; Shakhovskiy (ed.), 2013, pp. 89-98; Akimova, 2016; Ionova, 2016b]. Ecological linguistics is understood as a science that combines ecology and linguistics and studies the interaction between a language, a human being as a linguistic personality and his environment. Language is considered as an integral component of relationships between a man, a society and nature. The functioning and development of a language are represented as ecosystem, and the surrounding world – as a language concept [Ivanova, 2007, p. 41].

According to Professor A. Skovorodnikov’s definition, ecology of language (linguistic ecology, ecological linguistics) is a branch of a linguistic theory and practice, which, on the one hand, is connected with the study of factors that negatively affect the development and use of the language, and on the other hand, with the search for ways and means of enriching the language and improving the practice of speech communication [Skovorodnikov, 1992, p. 111].

Following the traditions of western linguists, the Russian linguistics treats the language ecology in connection with sociolinguistics. Considering ecological linguistics, they focus on language environment concept and pay special attention to the multi-purpose mechanisms of language usage by a human being as well as the language ability to act positively or abusively. For the second trend, the term *linguisede* has been worked out to point to destruction and self-liquidation of the linguistic system. The Russian linguists also continue the traditions of ecological linguistics in connection with the culture of language science – orthology, which studies the communicative qualities of speech: correctness, accuracy, consistence, purity, propriety, etc. In this respect, the word *ecology* is regarded as ecology of a soul (A.T. Lipatov, V.S. Milovatsky, L.I. Skvotzov, A. Skovorodnikov, et al.). Currently ecological linguistics concerns the means directed to the saving as well as enriching and developing of a language, studying the means of effective communication, fighting hidden risks at each stage of communicating [Sirotinina, 2013].

The Russian and foreign linguists who devoted their studies to the ecological approach in their research (L.A. Verbitskaya, D.S. Likhachev, A. Skovorodnikov, L.I. Skvortzov, O.B. Sirotinina, E.V. Ivanova, S.V. Ionova, E.N. Akimova, E. Sapir, E. Haugen, M. Garner, R. Alexander, A. Stibbe, H.H. Couto, et al.) have constituted theoretical base of the investigations in ecological linguistics.

The authors of the article, supporting them, claim that any language system is in the state of constant evolution; a thorough analysis of language usage practice is capable of presenting marks of changes and development, their observation helps note transformation tendencies and changes. The enlargement of usage spheres of modern Russian resulted in notable alterations in styles of verbal communication. Thus, media discourse has got the place of a majoring sphere of communication and public opinion representation. The e-communication has become a competitor to it. The intercultural interactions lead to translanguial exchange, that is, while communicating, people borrow some elements from other languages, and it results in cross-influence and incorporation of foreign language elements and models into the system and structure of a native language. Observation of modern Russian language profile points to such trends as lowering norms of stylistic register in communication, growing influence of colloquial norms and types of communication. It is also worth mentioning that due to enlargement of information technologies communication the language has developed some new ways of producing and expressing messages, etiquette norms which differ from traditional and real communication practice.

The material for this research was taken from printed samples as well as e-materials of M. Epstein site “Word of the year 2016–2019”, private catalogues of language (E. Akimova), speech (G. Bezkorovaynaya) and text samples (S. Ionova), examples from several other sources. The method of parameter sample selection, structural analyses, and communicative analyses were used. The authors took into account the point that an ecology approach cannot be identical to the orthology one as well as structural analyses of the language units in terms of traditional linguistics.

The main method of the research in this study is a long-term monitoring based on the systematic,

specially organized analyses of the language units as well as speech samples, procedure of their correlation with the laws of textual organization and functions within the existing norms. For monitoring the following important factors were chosen: the object for observation, correlation of the data, the means of comparing, and the criteria of the real things. The first stage included the definition of the active processes in modern Russian, with a special focus on the ecology of Russian language vocabulary, its connections with word formation, some phonetic, syntagmatic and stylistic peculiarities.

Results and discussions

The ecology of the Russian language vocabulary

It should be stated that one of the risks the current society is facing is strengthening of the process of the national language’s core of “blurring”, which occurs due to the broadening of the information and linguistics exchange processes [Barron, Bruce, Nunan, 2000]. This trend is noted in the Russian studies in terms of certain changes in the lexical system of the Russian language and speech.

In the Russian speech and native speakers conscience the following processes, sometimes contradictory, are found: 1) impoverishment of the word stock, elimination of numerous culture bound words and phraseologisms (*бытие, распули, крестный путь, ничтоже сумняшеся, паче чаяния*); 2) dismissal of semantics of the important words and definitions (*соборность, милосердие, благотворный, держава*); 3) semantic blurring of some words (*клиенты, правые, левые, радикалы, консерваторы*); 4) numerous borrowings (*коучер, дауншифтер, прокрастинация, джус, джемпинг*); 5) abbreviation overuse (*ФГБОУ ВПО, ФЦПРЯ*); 6) abundance of clichés (*вызовы времени, вертикаль власти, цивилизованные страны*); 7) euphemisms, language craftiness (*маломобильные группы населения, ночные пансионаты*); 8) language abuse in the form of labeling (*совок, пиарея, толераст*); 9) bureaucratic words (*реализация, наработка, подвижки, на предмет написания, по вопросу*); 10) cussing, vulgar communication;

11) cynical nominations and technocratism (*раб-сила, человеческий материал, людское сырьё, движение контингента, человеко-единица*); 12) language criminalization (*мочить, крыша, заказать* (кого), *подлянка, тёрки*).

According to some researchers, at the same time nowadays we may notice the decreasing tendency of the uncontrolled language democratization. O.B. Sirotinina writes that there is no permissiveness in the speeches of modern media, there is noticeably less non-literary language, swearing on the air is absolutely excluded on the main channels, offensive language is not excluded in the literary language, but it is used much more carefully with many reservations (*as it seems, I think, as they say, according to rumors*), proving that this is a personal (or someone else's, but not a journalist's) opinion, and not an accusation of lying or humiliation of the applicant [Sirotinina, 2013, p. 26].

The processes of accepting and adjusting borrowings, mainly from English, to the norms of the Russian language are on the way. Thus, a number of foreign language concepts with special area of usage have been borrowed and partially assimilated to suit new communication requirements (*дедлайн, селфи, бокс-офис, мультиплекс, трекер, тримминг, спойлер, бэкграунд, тренд, шоурум, флешмоб, мэм, шоурум, фэйк, лайк*, etc.).

Having passed the stages of semantic inclusion and graphical adaptation, such lexemes are no longer perceived by Russian users as foreign words, because they naturally fill the conceptual lacunas in the Russian conceptual map in the field of nominating new phenomena and professions. The process of borrowings consolidation in the Russian discourse is actively expanding, which may be proved by the examples: *омбудсмен* – an official professional rights defender; *провайдер* – organization professionally providing access to the Internet and other electronic facilities; *шопер* – the one who helps customers to be navigated in the labyrinth of a supermarket and abundance of goods; *маркетолог* – specialist in market relations; *брокер* – professional mediator between a buyer and a seller on the stock exchange; *дилер* – a man selling and buying by himself the stocks on a stock exchange. However, the backward movement is also observed. Some recently borrowed words, which at the beginning

of the 21st century got the status of fashionable words, at the moment are losing popularity in modern Russian speech practice. For instance, O.B. Sirotinina noted that by the end of the 20th century the borrowed word *teenager* appeared [Sirotinina, 2013, p. 17]. In 1990s it was used in a pair with the Russian *подросток* by Russians without any semantic or functional distinctions. Fortunately, it didn't get a common usage status and gradually the media started to give the preference to the Russian word. Therefore, in 2012–2013 the use of *teenager* was rare, whereas *подросток* was regularly used in mass media.

There is now a decay in active use of such expressions as *как бы* (*Мне это как бы нравится; Я как бы согласен*); adverbs with the transformed meaning *абсолютно, конкретно, короче* (*Я короче приехал в Москву короче; Ледяные фигуры растаяли конкретно*); non-semantic adverbs *достаточно, довольно, относительно* (*Разногласий, конечно, достаточно (довольно / относительно) много; Езжу я туда достаточно редко*), etc.

An online project titled *Word of the Year* supplies the material of rapid dynamics of fashionable words and expressions, their usual meanings and process of deteriorations is represented by the action The Word of the Year (see the site of a linguist Michael Epstein – <https://newtonew.com/culture/poigraem-v-slova-slovo-goda>). The Russian Word of the Year in 2021 was a nomination *anti-language*, it points to negative of the political language, the language of a lie, hatred and propaganda in the Russian public discourse. In this regard, the expanding phenomenon of the so-called “irresponsible” nomination, which reflects a characteristic feature of the public communicative behavior of Russian people in media, has been noticed currently. It consists of the process of pigeonhole, labeling and marking the subject of speech with tags that establish negative connotation and intense semantics: *фашизм, геноцид, террор, война, антисемитизм, шовинизм, репрессия, экстремизм, враг, тоталитарный, сектанты, пятая колонна* и др. (*fascism, genocide, terror, war, anti-Semitism, chauvinism, repression, extremism, enemy, totalitarian, sectarians, the “fifth column”*).

This phenomenon is mostly typical of propaganda battles and information wars, but today

it is moving into the everyday communication, mass and interpersonal communication.

Over the last five years in the field of Internet communication the quality of Russian, which was noted in the previous years, has clearly improved and the number of speech errors as well as the spread of Internet slang have decreased. The readers prefer the high-quality texts of high information content.

The modern Russian language is still absorbing innovations in the field of electronic communications and information technology. The enrichment of the semantics of language units with lexico-semantic variants borrowed from the thematic area of information technology continues. For example, the noun *oblako* with the meaning “the Internet service where one can store and use data from the Internet” has already been commonly used as a new lexical-semantic version of this word, although it has not yet been fixed in the explanatory dictionaries of the Russian language. Noting the theoretical and practical importance of learning the Internet language, researchers have been analyzing the technical “acquisitions” of the Internet for ten years, considering the factors of positive and negative influence of information technologies on the changes in the vocabulary of the Russian language. Today the spread of such innovations and their impact on the sphere of human communication haven’t been considered as vandalism, the destruction of norms, harm, “spoiling the language”. Instead the place of these units in the Russian language system is being discussed.

Studying the interactive forms of computer-mediated communication features brings changes in the communicative theory of politeness, where the change in application of traditional rules and norms during communication is fixed. Thus, on the pages of Russian-speaking general focus forums over the past three years new etiquette forms of communication news sites have been fixed, namely: a) the spread of addressing to uncertain communities and various groups of people (*people, comrades, everyone*); b) the emphasis on persons based on associations with professions, similarity of interests (lawyers, fishermen, parents of first-graders): *Юристы, подскажите название закона; Здравствуй-те, рыбаки*; c) the use of special types of

person’s nominations, including a user nickname: *Lastochka, а какая у вас температура в квартире?; Привет, пеней!; Царь, давно с живыми людьми общались?;* d) the spread of evaluative nominations in address (*Спасибо тебе, добрый человек, за поддержку; Расскажи нам правду, умник!; Ничего не поняли из твоей новости, грамотей; Ты даже этими словами убиваешь, террорист!*); e) the spread of the “on a first-name basis” communication style; f) the YOU-communication, joined with addressing by a user nickname (*Спасибо тебе, Nova34!; А ты, Тимофеев Николай, мог бы и поактивнее отстаивать свой лозунг; Тебе, любитель крупного шрифта, места на сайте не жалко*).

YOU-communication is especially noteworthy in that the criterion for choosing the form of communication “on you” here is not age and social status, but the situational status of a person, a nickname. The 22 years old traveler may address the 52-year old person: *Вова, а эти моменты действительно ценятся? А pupil being dogs coach can give advice to a pensioner: Звонарев, тебе нужно братья за мелкие породы, а то может характера не хватить* [Yakhnich, Ionova, 2013]. As can be seen from the above samples these markers are related to communicative risks and they contribute to breaking the link between generations and social cultures. They indicate the maintenance of the tendency to the general decrease of the mode of communication in society, the gradual elimination of traditional etiquette norms as regulators of social relations, the increase of the degree of “conflictogenity” of speech behavior.

The ecology of the Russian language at other levels

The linguists note active processes at all language levels. In phonetics, it is the final affirmation of the Moscow norm of the retention of the unstressed [и]. The retention of the unstressed [э] of St. Petersburg norm has almost disappeared, and even the middle sound between [и] and [э] in the first pre-stressed syllable is not pronounced [Verbitskaya, 2001, pp. 66-69].

The accentual norms, experiencing the flourishing of variability, are more shifted than ever. This is confirmed by normative dictionaries

(Ivanova, Lopatin (eds.), 2004). The norms of stress are “blurring”, first of all, due to the idea of unimportance of their observance, this is motivated by the fact that “everything is so clear”.

In the field of phraseology, the redistribution between the groups of phraseological units associated with the lack of background knowledge occurs: more and more combinations and even unities are passed into phraseological fragments. It should be noted that new phraseological units have appeared *белый и пушистый, скелет в шкафу, золотой парашют, оборотень в погонах, девушки с пониженной социальной ответственностью*. Basically, they belong to politics: *коридоры власти, двойные стандарты*; sports: *с подачи, уйти в аут*; military: *глухая оборона, понуждение (принуждение) к миру*. Jargonization of phraseology is noted: *с колес, закаты в асфальт, до фонаря, из-за бугра* [Malinski, 1992].

Word formation has become the real ground of experimental platform for making new speech forms. The following phenomena are noted in it: 1) the use of colloquial and jargon models that were previously on the periphery of the language: *чернуха, кидалово, бухло*, etc.; 2) activation of some word-formation models – action names with suffixation: *сочинизация (всей страны), демедведизация*), high productivity of names: *перестроечник, рекламист, подписант – отъезжант, дежурант, универсант, интересант (конфликта)*; 3) widespread use of foreign prefixes and prefixoids: *деполитизация, суперпрофессионал*, etc.; 4) the growth of the use of complex words with international elements: *бизнес-, хит-, шоу-, поп-, рок-, видео-*, etc.; 5) the abundance of abbreviations: *Ингнет, ЧР, РИ*; 6) Expansion of the circle of truncations: *маргинал, безнал, инфа*; 7) hybrid words (centaur words, telescope words): *трепортаж, моменталитет, пофигуристы*.

It is common knowledge that morphology and syntax are the most stable levels of the system, preserving conservativeness in the name of languages self-identification. Nevertheless, some scholars argue that in the modern Russian language, for example, an expansion of the functions of transitive verbs occurs [Epstein, 2007]. This refers to cases such as *его ушли с работы, няня гуляет ребенка, расходы пополам: я тебя обедаю, а ты меня ужина-*

ешь; говорящий хомяк не только детей привел в восторг, но и взрослых улыбнул. Some other processes are also indicated: a) the formation of occasional forms of the number of nouns that are formed in the system superficially (*дети родился; мелкий и пугливый люди пошел*); b) expressively meaning full rethinking of the singular formations of the singular from Pluralia Tantum (*новый штан; мой машин*); c) the transition of relative adjectives to qualitative ones by the formation of occasional forms of degrees of comparison (*мебель чуток деревяннее; стеклянный звук*); d) the formation of real participles of the future tense (*прочитающий внимательно статью*) and anomalous forms of passive participles (*звонок, звонимый мною*) [Radbil, 2008]. It is easy to notice that all these examples are taken from the Internet: most native speakers perceive them as occasional.

The dynamics of modern Russian syntax refers not only to its system peculiarities (unit forms, their meanings and functions), but also the sphere of its functioning. The syntax system is influenced by the democratization of the language [Zifonun, 2018] (expansion of the speech habits, increasing of the personification), the pressure of foreign languages, style diffusions when the colloquial as well as jargon expressive means, using the graphs and pictograms, using both Cyrillic and Latin graphs.

The ecology of the functioning Russian language

The next step in research should be presented as an interpretative analysis of the word usage in speech practice that is based on the ecological balanced principle.

Considering the peculiarities of modern communication in Russian linguistic culture, it is necessary to remind the general ecological linguistic pattern: significant violations in microsystems lead to the destruction of macrosystems. Considering the features of modern communication in Russian linguoculture, it is necessary to recall the general ecological linguistic pattern: significant violations in microsystems lead to the destruction of macrosystems. Changes in language generate cognitive risks associated with understanding the meaning of the text [Shakhovskiy (ed.), 2013,

pp. 89-98; Ionova, 2016a]. Some of the generating functions of the text and the selection of language tools are transferred to the operational systems of computers, which has become an external medium and a means of storing information. The method of processing, storing and reproducing previously obtained information becomes easier than formulating and verbalizing new knowledge. In this case only the task of processing and storing information that is not directly related to creative thinking and obtaining new knowledge is “removed”. Therefore, the technologization of mechanical actions associated with the collection, storage and processing information can be attributed to objective phenomena and false risks of modern communication.

However, the processes of forming an individual vocabulary, verbal individualization, mastery of the variable ways of representing knowledge on the part of native speakers may be at risk. The tendency to democratization and spontaneity of speech in the text generation process leads to the simplification of phrases and sentences, the subjectivity of texts, increasing their appreciation, emotionality, dialogue potential, polyphony, styles mixing. How should we treat this from the point of view of the ecological linguistic postulates? On the one hand, the facts mentioned above serve as evidence of the expansion of creative and adaptive possibilities of the Russian language, as well as of the fact that Russian, as many people mistakenly think, is not dying out [Salikoko, 2020]. On the other hand, the verbal information, especially the one that is connected with the slang use, cannot help causing emotional protest, as it is simply non-ecological: it violates the moral conduct, aesthetics and correctness of human communication, primarily in mass media.

At the same time, some studies give a positive assessment of jargon as means of stylizing a living speech element, creating a special, friendly, laid-back tone are noted today. It seems that the urgent problem of forming a common jargon in the language (Ermakova, 1999), and especially in the modern media language, requires philologists to take a principled position of rejection of this negative trend: it can be registered, but it cannot be accepted and even approved.

Due to the Web 2 tools, conversational style has been fully legalized in written Internet communication. The main function of such

communication is not only transmitting the message but constructing the meta-message which defines the reasons and aims of the writer, conditions and context of the message, different degrees of independence and collectivity of the message (a possibility to communicate with others), possibility to interrupt, cooperate and respect the rules of politeness. To a certain extent, the system of iconic signs, which assists the verbal message range, supports the fact, too. Environmental assessment of these events cannot be considered homogeneous and therefore the Russian Internet segment needs to be monitored, new tendencies of internet communication should be studied from the scientific point of view, which, perhaps, reflects the tendency of functional possibilities of the Russian language to develop.

At the end of the last century, some prominent linguists (M. Gorbanevsky, A. Dulichenko, V. Shaklein and others) expressed their opinion about the threat of turning the richest Russian literary language into an English-jargon-vernacular entity. Nowadays it is possible to state that this negative scenario in its pure form has not been realized, since there are many tendencies in the modern Russian language that may oppose each other at the same time, and might be multidirectional; various factors of functioning and development coexist, mutually reinforcing, or, conversely, “extinguishing” each other. At the same time, there is a tendency towards a general decrease in the mode of communication in society, the conflictogenity of speech behavior, noted by Russian scientists over the years: a gradual change in traditional etiquette norms as regulators of social relations, widening the gap between the vocabulary of generations, not conducive to the relationship between social cultures. Therefore, these patterns relate to communicative risks in Russian linguistic culture [Sirotnina, 2013].

The ecological evaluation of the above-mentioned processes in terms of keeping the structure of the language and orthological evaluation demands widening of research spheres and taking into account the pragmatics of speech, changes in mentality and in the environment of modern communicants [Kibbee, 2003]. It is necessary to consider the above enumerated tendencies in the system of modern Russian and ecommunication as a positive reflection of the flexibility of the Russian

language. The linguistic cultural approach to modern challenges, regular and wide-scale monitoring of Russian segment in the Internet, text communication seem to be the most suitable ones for studying linguistic events.

Conclusion

The results of our study clearly show that ecolinguistics is the science of the relationship between language and the environment, that might register both language development or degradation. Our observations show that changes in the language can be noticed at almost every level and in every area of the Russian language operation due to peculiarities of communicative style and types of communication. From the point of view of the language systemic norms these changes are often assessed as violence and destruction, a violation of the natural laws of language development and language units usage. They are associated with the process of democratization of oral speech, the permissible mixing of styles and the reflection of spontaneous speech in writing. Computer communication causes changes in cognitive processes associated with the generation, perception and processing of information. In this regard, new ways of verbal and non-verbal expression are being formed and cultivated in the modern Russian language. Nevertheless, these changes are not only regressive or destructive, but also positive and creative. Ecological linguistics helps to collect any samples on the material of active-life speech practice and with its language tools of analysis to record some changes or innovations, then verify trends and language patterns and consider whether they are worth being noted in normative grammar or language manuals or be labeled as obviously erroneous uses. In any case the changes demonstrate real-life language functioning with the variations of communicative patterns, either positive or conflicting, which requires the usage of the ecological approach and a methodology of complex language research for solving the problems of anthropocentric linguistics.

REFERENCES

- Akimova E.N., 2016. Lingvoekologicheskaya interpretatsiya aktivnykh processov v sovremennom russkom yazyke [The Linguistic Interpretation of Active Processes in Modern Russian]. *Vestnik Mariyskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* [Vestnik of the Mari State University], no. 3 (23), pp. 40-44.
- Alexander R., Stibbe A., 2014. From the Analysis of Ecological Discourse to the Ecological Analysis of Discourse. *Language Sciences*, vol. 41, pp. 104-110.
- Ammon U., 2015. *Die Stellung der deutschen Sprache in der Welt*. Berlin, München, Boston, De Gruyter Publ. XVII, 1294 S.
- Barron C., Bruce N., Nunan D., 2000. Introduction. *Knowledge and Discourse. Towards an Ecology of Language*. Harlow, Pearson Education, pp. 1-12.
- Calvet L.-J., 2007. Approche sociolinguistique de l'avenir du français dans le monde. *Hérodote*, no. 3 (126), pp. 153-160.
- Couto H.H. do., 2014. Ecological Approaches in Linguistics: A Historical Overview. *Language Sciences*, vol. 41, pp. 122-128.
- Epstein M., 2007. O tvorcheskom potentsiale russkogo yazyka. *Grammatika perekhodnosti i tranzitivnoe obshchestvo* [On Creative Potential of Russian Language. Transitivity Grammar and Transitive Society]. *Znamya*, no. 3, pp. 193-208.
- Garner M., 2005. Language Ecology as Linguistic Theory. *Kaijian Linguistik dan Sastra*, vol. 17, no. 33, pp. 91-101.
- Haugen E., 2001. The Ecology of Language. Fill A., Mühlhäusler P., eds. *The Ecolinguistics Reader: Language, Ecology and Environment*. London, Continuum International Publishing Group, pp. 57-66.
- Ionova S.V., 2016a. Lingvistika novogo yazykovogo soznaniya i informatsionnykh tekhnologiy [The Linguistics of Innovative Language Conciseness and Informatics Technology]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 6-16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2016.3.1>
- Ionova S.V., 2016b. O dvukh aspektakh ekolingvisticheskikh issledovaniy [On Two Aspects of Ecolinguistic Studies]. *Ekologiya yazyka i kommunikativnaya praktika* [Ecology of Language and Communicative Practice], no. 1 (6), pp. 10-25.
- Ivanova E.V., 2007. Tseli, zadachi i problemy ekolingvistiki [Aims, Tasks and Challenges of Ecological Linguistics]. *Pragmaticheskiy aspekt kommunikativnoy lingvistiki i stilistiki* [Pragmatic Aspect of Communicative Linguistics and Stylistics]. Chelyabinsk, Obrazovanie Publ., pp. 41-47.

- Kibbee D., 2003. Language Policy and Linguistic Theory. *Language in Globalizing World*. Cambridge, Cambridge univ. press, pp. 47-57.
- Likhachev D.S., 1997. Kontseptosfera russkogo yazyka [The Concept Sphere of the Russian Language]. Neroznak V., ed. *Russkaya slovesnost. Antologiya*. Moscow, Academia Publ., pp. 279-288.
- Malinski T., 1992. Vozniknovenie novykh frazeologicheskikh edinits [Emergence of New Phraseological Units]. *Rusistika*, no. 2, pp. 67-76.
- Marusenko M.A., 2015. *Evolutsiya mirovoy sistemy yazykov v epokhu postmoderna: Yazykovye posledstviya globalizatsii* [Evolution of World System of Languages in the Postmodern Epoch: Globalization Inference on the Language]. Moscow, VKN Publ. 496 p.
- Nelde P., 1989. Ecological Aspects of Language Contact or how to Investigate Linguistic Minorities. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 73-86.
- Radbil T.B., 2008. Innovatsionnye protsessy v leksike i grammatike russkogo yazyka Interneta [The Innovation Process in Vocabulary, Grammar of the Russian Internet Language]. *Croatica et Slavica Ladertina*, no. 4, pp. 240-244.
- Salikoko S.M., 2020. Globalization and the Myth of Killer Languages. URL: <http://mufwene.uchicago.edu/publications/globalization-killerLanguages.pdf>
- Sapir E., 1912. Language and Environment. *American Anthropologist. New Series*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 226-242.
- Shakhovskiy V.I., ed., 2013. *Emotivnaya lingvoekologiya v sovremennom kommunikativnom prostranstve* [Emotive Linguistic Ecology in Modern Communicative Area]. Volgograd, Peremena Publ. 450 p.
- Sirotnina O.B., 2013. *Russkiy yazyk: sistema, uzus i sozdavaemye imi riski* [Russian: System. Usus, and Appearing Risks]. Saratov, Izd-vo Sarat. un-ta. 116 p.
- Skovorodnikov A.P., 1992. Ob ekologii russkogo yazyka [About the Ecology of the Russian Language]. *Filologicheskie nauki*, no. 5/6, pp. 104-111.
- Thomason S.G., 2001. *Language Contact Publisher*. S.I., Edinburgh University Press. 320 p.
- Zifonun G., 2018. Die demokratische Pflicht und das Sprachsystem: Erneute Diskussion zu einem gesellschaftsgerechten Sprachgebrauch. *Sprachreport*, Jg. 34, S. 44-56.
- Verbitskaya L.A., 2001. *Davayte govorit pravilno* [Let Us Speak in a Right Way]. Moscow, Vyssh. shk. Publ. 239 p.
- Yakhnych M.A., Ionova S.V., 2013. Obrashchenie kak proyavlenie rechevoy kultury v internet-kommunikatsii [Addressing as Manifestation of Speech Culture in the Internet Communication]. *Ekologiya yazyka i kommunikativnaya praktika* [Ecology of Language and Communicative Practice], no. 1, pp. 246-256.

DICTIONARIES

- Ermakova O.P., Zemskaya E.A., Rozina R.I. *Slova, s kotorymi my vse vstrechalis: Tolkovyy slovar russkogo obshchego zhargona* [The Words with Which We All Meet: The Dictionary of Russian Common Jargon]. Moscow, Azbukovnik Publ., 1999. 320 p.
- Ivanova O.E., Lopatin V.V., eds. *Russkiy orfograficheskiy slovar* [Russian Spelling Dictionary]. Moscow, s.n., 2004. 960 p.
- Mikhailchenko V.Yu., ed. *Slovar sotsiolingvisticheskikh terminov* [Dictionary of Social and Linguistic Terminology]. Moscow, In-t yazykoznaniya Ros. akad. nauk, 2006. 312 p.

Information About the Authors

Elvira N. Akimova, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Department of Russian Philology and Cross Cultural Communication, Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Akademika Volgina St, 6, 117485 Moscow, Russia; Professor, Department of Russian Language, National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University, Bolshevistskaya St, 68/1, 430005 Saransk, Russia, akimovaen@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0883-2173>

Galina T. Bezkorovaynaya, Candidate of Sciences (Philology), Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages № 3, Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Stremyanny Lane, 36, 117997 Moscow, Russia, bezkorovaynaya.GT@rea.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0088-3619>

Svetlana V. Ionova, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Department of General and Russian Linguistics, Pushkin State Russian Language Institute, Akademika Volgina St, 6, 117485 Moscow, Russia, sionova@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6361-741X>

Информация об авторах

Эльвира Николаевна Акимова, доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры русской словесности и межкультурной коммуникации, Государственный институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина, ул. Академика Волгина, 6, 117485 г. Москва, Россия; профессор кафедры русского языка, Национальный исследовательский Мордовский государственный университет им. Н.П. Огарева, ул. Большевикская, 68/1, 430005 г. Саранск, Россия, akimovaen@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0883-2173>

Галина Тиграновна Безкоровайна, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков № 3, Российский экономический университет им. Г.В. Плеханова, пер. Стремянный, 36, 117997 г. Москва, Россия, bezkoovaunaya.GT@rea.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0088-3619>

Светлана Валентиновна Ионова, доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры общего и русского языкознания, Государственный институт русского языка им. А.С. Пушкина, ул. Академика Волгина, 6, 117485 г. Москва, Россия, sionova@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6361-741X>