

Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University

Faculty of Humanities  
Department of European Studies

**Kristina Ayvazyan**

**EXTRALINGUISTIC FACTORS OF DEVELOPMENT  
OF THE SOVIET AND POST-SOVIET RUSSIAN LANGUAGE**

of the Doctoral Dissertation submitted for acquiring academic degree of  
**Doctor of Philology**

**Summary**

Academic Advisor:  
Prof. Marine Aroshidze

Batumi  
2020

## Introduction

The language dynamics, as Ferdinand De Saussure was affirming and its development is conditioned by Inter or extra Linguistic factors but in some historical periods of concrete nations' when development of social-political paradigm is intensive due to some conditions, renovation process of Linguistic paradigm is very fast.

The Soviet and Post-Soviet period were very important in development of Russian language. So why the study of these periods changes is essential to analyse modern state of Russian Language. However, the linguistic paradigm was changed in this time and anthropocentric view became a winner. Currently, interdisciplinary research is in the centre of attention. Themes of research offered by us request linguistic as well as social linguistic approaches.

**Topicality** of the following theme represents this that in the General globalization conditions and subsequently of Social-political paradigms radically changes, renovation of Linguistic system was developed with rapid tempo in the 21-st century. Peculiarity of Russian Language function was conditioned by changes of Linguistic politic and Linguistic situation in Post-Soviet space. These processes are not researched well, especially the function of Russian Language in Post-Soviet Georgia. Also we have to mention that function of Russian Language is changed in modern Policultural Society but in Media text there are educated some interesting Linguistic processes which have to be described and acknowledged in field of anthropocentric paradigm.

- Sociolinguistic concept is profoundly discussed by the examples of Russian Language System.
- Dynamic of Linguistic changes is analysed with cultural memories.
- Research of Linguistic situation and Linguistic person changes in Georgia and Armenia
  - All of the above mentioned define urgency of our doctoral theme

**Purpose and objectives of the study:** The purpose of this work is to examine the reflection of changes in the socio-political paradigm on the development of the Russian language, which serves the following tasks:

- 1) Socio-linguistic analyse of Russian Language system;
- 2) Examines the dynamics of language changes as markers of cultural memory;
- 3) Systematization of Russian language development history in Soviet and post-Soviet times;
- 4) Discussing the linguistic situation of the modern South Caucasus (Georgia and Armenia);

The **novelty** of this work is that, Soviet period is well studied in Russian Lingusitic and less studied Post-soviet period. So why our study focuses on study of Post-soviet changes and their comparative analyse with Soviet processes. In addition, the novelty of the research is the agnosticity of Soviet and post-Soviet concepts to modern generations and the peculiarity of functioning of modern Russian language in Georgian cultural space.

The **theoretical and practical significance** of the dissertation is to deepen and clarify the historical fate of the Russian language, to study its functioning in the Georgian cultural space. The research findings can be used to a number of disciplines and lectures: History of Russian Language, Modern Russian language, Theory of Communicaiton, Text Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, Cognitology, etc.

Our research **methodology** is complex, it ensures effectiveness and reliability of the findings. The following methods were used in the research process: Process of Linguistic description, Basic way of comparative-typological research methods, Method for determining linguistic equivalence. Extralinguistic factors of Russian language development are studied in the diachronic aspect. Empirical material of our study is as follows:

The **research material** is taken from lexical, grammatical and other references to Russian-language changes of the Soviet period, as well as data analysis of publicist texts in contemporary mass media. Empirical material has an important place in terms of personally observable facts, events, and processes of realistic speech practise. We also used electronic resources when analyzing empirical material (Links to relevant electronic library websites are listed in the bibliography).

The purpose and objectives of the research were structured as follows: the work consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and a bibliography.

The first chapter of this work - **Socially conditioned language changes**- is the theoretical basis of the study, which deals with the main interrelations of language and society, consisting of the following paragraphs: 1.1 Extralinguistic factors of language development; 1.2 Language and Society: Intra and Interlingustics; 1.3 Dynaimcs of Lingustic changes and Cultural memory of Society.

Chapter Two - **The Development of the Russian Language System in the Soviet Period** - discusses the rapid changes of the Russian language system after the victory of the Socialist Revolution, it consists of three paragraphs: 2.1 Changes of Lexical System; 2.2 Changes of morphemics and word formation; 2.3 Changes of grammatical systems.

Chapter Three - **The Peculiarities of the Development and Functioning of the Modern Russian Language System in the Post-Soviet Republics** - consists of three paragraphs, which discuss: 3.1 Changes of language system in Post-soviet period; 3.2 Funtioning of Russian language in Post-soviet republics; 3.3 Lingustic situation in the South Caucasus (in Georgia and Armenia). The final section - conclusion of the work summarizes the theoretical and practical thesis of the study.

## Chapter I. Socially conditioned language changes

## **1.1 Extralinguistic factors of language developments**

The distinguishing features of modern linguistics are: Attitude to language as a social phenomenon; An interdisciplinary approach to the active use of data in the related sciences - Cultural anthropology, ethnopsychology, psycholinguistics, sociology, etc.; Explanation of all language changes taking into account interlanguage or external factors; Under modern conditions, as well as previous experience in linguistics, adequate language teaching is not possible without consideration of extralinguistic factors. These include demographic parameters (number of speakers of a particular language), type of settlement (compact, enclave and dispersion), age differentiation of language carriers , etc., social structure of society, cultural-linguistic features (existence of scriptural traditions, cultural-linguistic contacts, etc.) (According to the Dictionary of Russian Academy of Sciences, 2006), the socio-political-economic paradigm.

All of these goals and circumstances are extralinguistic and manifest to varying degrees in almost all socio-political-economic paradigms. Extralinguistic factors in life of society, on the different stage, with different degrees, may cause provoke of global and / or private changes. Global changes affect all or a significant part of the subsystem.

Global language changes caused by extralinguistic factors: Creation of alphabet, legislative and material support, establishment of new forms of languages (e.g., literary), new functional styles, the problem of extinction of languages.

Examples of the influence of private extralinguistic factors include: the development of new genres and stylistic trends in literature, processes of neologization and archaism / process of semantics changes, etc.

In that way, for the actual study, linguistic phenomena must be discussed in the ratio of synchronous and diachronic aspects. Today no one has doubt about this. It is formulated in the report of B.V. Gornung: "...Any fact of language exists and can be understood in a system only if it is defined by two types of connections - connection to other elements of the system in which it is given in some historical time and And the connection themselves to the previous and subsequent states of this fact"(Gornung, 1960:11).

In order to establish the legality of the use of the terms "synchrony" and "diachrony" in linguistics, Ferdinand De Saussure (1857-1913) wrote: "Everything about the static aspect of our science is synchronous, and everything about evolution is diachronic. The nouns "synchrony" and "diachronic" indicate the state of language and the phase of evolution" (Saussure, 1977:114)

## **1.2 Language and Society: Intra- and Interlinguistics**

Ancient philosophers thought firstly of the connection between language and society but modern sociolinguistics relies on the works of science that they are Ferdinand De Saussure and Antonie Maier as well as American Ethnolinguists: F. Boas, E. Sepir, B. Worff; V. Mathesius, B. Gavranek, I. Wachek (School of Paris); T. Fringes (School of Leipzig).

Ferdinand De Saussure has raised a very important issue concerning the language system and public relations. He formulated the following postulates: Language system and society;

Intra- and interlinguistic controversy; Specified the place of linguistics in the humanities and in other sciences.

Intra- and Inter-Linguistics controversy - one of De Saussure's most famous dichotomies, which expanded the scope of linguistics with these postulates, stimulated the development of linguistic theory, as well as defined the place of linguistics in other sciences of man and society. "Nation's rituals influence on language, on the other hand, language formate a nation" (F. De Saussure).

One of the most important conditions for language development is the relationship between external and internal factors. It is precisely this condition that represents the sociolinguistic aspect of language learning.

Occasionally, sociolinguistic factors can stimulate the development of internal language processes, but in some cases, depending on how changes have occurred at one or another period of society's life, internal language processes may also be slowed.

Any change of language is intralinguistic or interlanguage in any way. In the everyday life, the social factor further stimulates the internal processes of languages, while on the other hand the internal laws of languages become less slow as a result. As a result, the language mechanism begins to operate in accelerated mode.

Reality, man and language are closely connected - perfectly satisfies the distinctive features of modern linguistics.

### **1.3 Dynamics of Linguistic changes and "Cultural memory of Society"**

Language is a chronicler, it covers everything that happens in human life: History, Culture, its qualitative assessment and timely transmission from generation to generation. We like it or not everything is fixed in the language, which creates people's mentality, national identity , etc.. "The past in the collective memory is constantly being reorganized" (M. Khalbawsk)

An interesting example of manipulation of "cultural memory" was presented by Marina Aroshidze. History in Russia has recently renewed. They do not want to admit that they have conquered Siberia by force. They say: "Siberia connection." What kind of connection is there if there is an epic picture by Surikov of "Conquest of Siberia by Ermak" (1895), there is also Alexander Tchaikovsky's opera "Ermak." As it said, "What is written with a pen cannot be cut with an ax." This is evidence in the language that denies the novelty in the history of the Russian Federation. «The past is reopened in the present. It is modeled in the current environment" (Jan Asmann).

"Language is one of the peculiar semiological systems that has the primary meaning of communication in mankind. This system is also a means of developing thinking and a way of transmitting cultural-historical customs from generation to generation (O. Akhmanova).

There is a huge variety of forms of cultural memory. These are objects, material buildings, fine art, etc. and against the backdrop of these varied forms and ways of memory fixation, the language represents the universal meaning for important event's memorization

of memory in people's life. In other words, the main, basic, universal source of knowledge about the inner world, the culture of the people - is language (Akhmanova 1966: 35).

## Chapter II The Development of the Russian Language System in the Soviet Period

### 2.1 Changes of Lexical System

The length of our study covers a very saturated period in people's lives, from the transition of the imperial Russian state to the modern era of the Russian Federation. However, in terms of language, this is a very short time. During the last century, there have been many changes in the language related to both extralinguistic and interlinguistic factors.

XX-XXI centuries. Fundamental changes in the socio-political-economic paradigm have defined the dynamics of language processes in the Russian state (October Socialist Revolution, Civil War, New Economic Policy, Establishment of the USSR, Great Patriotic War, Post-war Perestroika, Russian Federation). Firstly, the changes were reflected in the lexical level. The changes in the life of the country were so rapid that in the two decades following the revolution many words were removed from the vocabulary, as the celebrating realities also erupted from the life of the society, namely: Abolition of class divisions - archaization / neologization- (*государь – комсомол*) – theory of class divisions - The struggle for the clearing of the Russian language. The Great Patriotic War and the Postwar Period - Military Professional Terms, Borrowed Words, Replacing Terms with Russian Terms (*бульдозер – тракторный отвал*). The era of advanced socialism – neologization (*акваланг, кемпинг*), word formation by the personal markers (*пищевик, нефтяник*).

The Soviet government abolished all the class divisions and civil ranks that existed in Tsarist Russia, which led to a large number of words being discarded: *государь, государыня, царевич, князь, граф, барон, фрейлина* , etc.. New forms of political organization and life, socialist ideology - all this leads to mass formation of new words and concepts or profound semantic changes to old words and expressions: *совет, комсомол, ударник, ударничество* , etc.

In the passive fund of the dictionary, there are also disappeared new words which created after revolution. Such words belong to the so-called one-day neologisms: *женотделка, орабочение, избач; шкраб (школьный работник — учитель)* , etc.. We come across also some borrowing words: *концерн* (De.), *такси*, (Fr..), *свитер* (En.) (In 1920s) *детектор, троллейбус*, (En.); *лейка* (De.); *слалом* (No.); *метро* (Fr.); *силос* (Sp.) (in 1920-30s).

As Shklyarevsky points out, the theory of "class language" which was widespread in the 1920s, led to a nihilistic attitude towards past cultural heritage and the language of Russian classical literature, the writer's right to reduce the "proletarian" language and to adversely affect the development of Soviet literature ( Shkliarevski, 1984: 49).

Linguists have opposed the use of jargon (L.V. Sherba, E.D. Polivanov, G.O. Vinokuri, L.P. Yakubinsky). The struggle for the purity of the Russian language was conducted by M.

Gorky opposed the creation of proletarian and Rapsovian vulgar-sociological theories, special "revolutionary language", "proletarian language", "honest technology".

Gorky also considered a linguistic error that may lead readers to misunderstand the author's passion for "professionalism", the innate words and expressions of people in particular professions: "... there is no need to over-use workshop terminology" (Gorky, 1931-1933: 74).

According to Shkliarevsky's research we can say that the attitude toward borrowed words was very peculiar in the early 40's and 50's. On the one hand, during the World War II, German words were widely used which were connected to the names and characteristic of the enemy equipment (*юнкерс, фаустпатрон, фоккевульф*), the structure of the German army and the political system of fascist Germany (*фюрер, гестапо, гитлерюгенд*). The word *полицай*, the nicknames of German soldiers - *ганс, фриц* was used with a sharply negative expression (Shkliarevsky, 1984:67).

Replacement attempts were accepted with Russian words (often unsuccessful attempts) of a series of technical and scientific terms: *бульдозер — тракторный отвал, скрепер — тракторная лопата*; the same process is also fixed in sports terminology: *тайм — половина игры, корнер — угловой удар, офсайд — вне игры, голкипер — вратарь, гандбол — ручной мяч, etc..*

In the 50's and 70's, the Russian language was filled with words denoting new realities in different spheres of life: *акваланг, кемпинг, мотель, нейлон, ралли, шорты, джинсы*. In the 80's, a fund of similar words was filled by the way of adding suffixes: -к(а), -лк(а), -ик, which are very numerous and still growing: *электричка (электрический поезд), зачетка (зачетная книжка), самоходка (самоходное орудие), зенитка (зенитное орудие), подсобка (подсобное помещение), узкоколейка (узкоколейная дорога)* (Shkliarevsky, 1984:58)

## 2.2 Changes of morphemics and word formation

Changes of morphemics and word formation in the Soviet period were as follows: acronym (МГУ, КНДР), syllable shortening (*мин, информ*), shortened words (*ветврач, военкомат*), connection of the words root (*бензоколонка*), substantivation (*буровая, уборочная*), new roots (*парт-партдисциплина*), and affixal way (*ленивец, комсомолец*), and semantic changes (*дипломант*).

A. Mason objectively mentiones such linguistic phenomena of the post-revolutionary period as active abbreviation, the expansion of non-literary vocabulary (Jargons, dialects, spoken words), significant influence of foreign language, as well as aspiration to create new denots (*милиция вместо полиции, народный комиссар вместо чиновника*), new naming of cities and inventing new personal names (Политическая лингвистика 1 (43), 2013:201).

In 1925, academician L. V. Sherba wrote: "Short words have become almost a symbol of revolutionary language" (Журналист №2 1925:5).

During the years, after revolution, many short words of various semantics were common: *авиабаза, агитпункт, агротехника, Азнефть, ветврач, военкомат, всеобуч, Главлит, горсовет, etc.* (Russian Language and Soviet Society, 1968:80).

Since the 1930s, the creation and use of syllable acronym has gradually declined, but has been active for some time during the Great Patriotic War: *мин — минометный, информ — информационный, мото — моторизованный*, etc.. The use of non-syllable initial abbreviations has increased since the late 40's, also defined the spheres where were used initial acronyms: *КНДР, ПОРП, МОК, НАТО, МГУ, НИИ*, etc.. The root “парт”- has become very productive in Soviet period. In the explanatory dictionary of Russian Language by S. I. Ozhegov has fixed 17 forms of similar word formation type: *партбилет, партактив, партдисциплина, партячейка*, etc.. The word formation with particles was also productive: соц- (социалистический), проф- (профсоюзный), тех- (технический): *соцсоревнование, соцдоговор, соцстроительство; профактив, профдвижение, профстаж, профработник; техминимум, техучеба, техпропаганда*, etc.. In the 50s and 60s, forms: по-...ому: *по-деловому, по-бытовому, по-честному, по-трезвому, по-умному, по-теле- визионному* were activated, have spread meanings: «с какой-то точки зрения», «в соответствии с какой-то нормой»: *по-государственному, по-лагерному* (Shklyarevsky, 1984: 58-64).

### 2.3 Changes in the Grammatical System

Unlike the vocabulary of a language, the other levels of the language system are less sensitive towards external influences, and thus, show slower pace in adopting changes. However, over the past hundred years, a number of changes have taken place in the morphology of the modern Russian language, whose analysis may lead to the formation of a path for the development of the morphological system. The reasons for these changes lie in the internal laws of the language (for example, the activation of analytical forms), and on the other hand, the change in the social structure of society and its active interaction with standard and non-standard speech. "Social influences on the morphological system are related to the internal tendencies of the development of grammar" (Russian Language and Soviet Society, 1968:10).

The tendency towards becoming more analytical language has intensified in the Russian language, which also manifested in the creation of a new class of analytical adjectives. Such adjectives denote the property of the object, and the name is connected simply with the sequence and not with the form of sex, number, turnover, for example: *платье беж, цвет электрик, в костюме хаки, коми язык*. The group of analytical adjectives is the result of the distribution of names borrowed from different properties denoting the subject. Some of them have become (in the form of) Russian adjectives (*бежевый, бордовый, гротескный*), but many have not undergone "Russification" (*хинди язык, кофе мокко, брюки клеш, до диез, стиль модерн, вес брутто, часы пик, программа-минимум, etc.*). Therefore, with confidence in the Russian language of the Soviet era, we can talk about the separation of the adjective special analytical class.

The following changes have been found in syntax: democratization, the transition of the structures of the spoken language to common literary use, the enrichment of the syntactic system, the aspiration towards linguistic economy, the simplification, the compression events.

Particularly noticeable changes took place in the composition of the produced prepositions, which were filled in as a result of the transition from other parts of speech (nouns, verb and verb conjugation form (participle), etc.): e.g. *в память ...*, *с учетом ...*, *в свете ...*, *в условиях ..* etc. e.g.:

*Как строится самолет, с учетом фигурки пилота,  
так строится небосвод с учетом фигурки удода, и это наши пятый удод.* (А. М. Парщиков.

Удоды и актрисы «В саду оказались удоды...» (1986);

*В условиях нашей системы коллектива — это чуть ли не святая святых.* (Владимир Войнович. Иванькиада, или рассказ о вселении писателя Войновича в новую квартиру (1976).

One of the most important processes in the development of the Russian language during the Soviet period is the so-called Segmentation of expression, or "separation of part of expression - segment (syntactic, intonation)" (Russian Language and Soviet Society, 1968: 302).

Examples of the segmented structures are as follows:

*Капитан первого звездолета — наши, советский!*» (Komsomolskaya Pravda №88 (11028), 1961);

*Обряд — не забава!* (Sovetskaya Kultura, №77 (4773), 1974)

E.A. Ivanchikova describes the processes of the influence of oral metaphors in the standard language in the words "restraint, compression, condensation, simplification" (Ivanchikova, 1966: 14-15).

This statement is easily confirmed by the newspapers of that period:

«Рабочие спортсмены - бойцы революции»;

«Силос — важнейшая задача в развитии животноводства»;

«Нефть- на службу социалистическому строительству»; (Беднота, №131 (3633), 1930)

«Сегодня — выборы! За Родину, за партию, за коммунизм!»;

«Какао, нефть и монополии»;

«Свободу колумбийским патриотам!» (Pravda, №71 (17753), 1967).

Analyzing the processes of the development of the Russian language in the Soviet period, we conclude that the cardinal changes in the social structure have led to significant changes in the Russian language, not only in vocabulary but also in word production, morphology, and to a lesser extent syntax. the formation of the socialist camp in the initial stage of the Russian language has undergone arasaliteraturo folk speech and vulgarism strong attack, and the development of socialism in the Russian language was strengthened in the various manifestations of serious social disease - "kantselariti", the mass use of literary language in a different style krontiku i character.

### Chapter III The Peculiarities of the Development and Functioning of the Modern Russian Language System in the Post-Soviet Republics

#### 3.1 Changes in the language system in the post-Soviet period

The collapse of the Soviet empire, the breakdown of the habitual way of life, the protracted period of perestroika with its many ethnic conflicts and economic crises intensified the processes

of language transformations. And how can one not recall here the vulgarization of the Russian language in the process of the "revolutionary" desire to create a "proletarian" language: during the period of perestroika, a huge stream of previously considered obscene language poured into the media. We believe that a new wave of vulgarization of the Russian language, a decrease in grammar norms that is observed in our time, is largely caused by the rapid pace of technological progress, when chats, Facebook, classmates and other social networks entered our lives along with computers and the Internet. even flaunt conscious delinquency of linguistic norms.

In a living language, the processes of self-development are in contact with external processes. The modern era has actualized many language processes, which in other conditions could be less noticeable, more smooth. The following factors can be attributed to external factors participating in the accumulation of new quality elements by the language: changing the circle of native speakers, the spread of education, the territorial movements of the masses, the creation of a new statehood, the development of science, technology, international contacts, etc. This also includes the factor of active action of the media (print, radio, television), as well as the factor of socio-psychological restructuring of the person in the new statehood and, accordingly, the degree of its adaptation to new conditions (Russian language of the late XX century, 2000: 9).

However, according to some researchers, the decisive factor in linguistic development is the action of internal laws: the fact is that language is a systemic formation and is constantly developing according to the linguistic laws of dynamic open structures. Usually, the law of systemicity (which is both a property and quality of a language) is referred to internal laws; the law of tradition holding back innovation processes; the law of analogy (a stimulator of undermining traditionality); the law of economy (or the law of "least effort"), which is especially actively focused on accelerating the pace in society; the laws of contradictions (antinomies), which are essentially "instigators" of the struggle of opposites embedded in the language system itself (Valgina 2003: 13).

While sharing the point of view of N.S. Valgina on this issue, I would like to note nevertheless that the analysis of empirical material shows a different degree of intensity of the ongoing processes in different subsystems of the language. The most dynamic level of the language system is the lexical level. It is the vocabulary and phraseology that react most flexibly to social changes; scientific linguists do not have time to record all neoplasms and outdated elements. Fortunately, with the advent of electronic dictionaries, this process was significantly simplified, and new dictionary entries were sent to appear promptly. The most static level is phonetic. In our study, we covered a rather saturated period of time from the point of view of socio-political-cultural transformations, however, in the field of the phonological system, only one significant discovery can be made that was made by an outstanding scientist, R.I. Avanesov. His main works are devoted to historical and descriptive Russian dialectology, the history of the Russian language, historical and descriptive phonetics, phonological theory, Russian orthoepy and spelling (Educational portal Slovo, February 18, 2017, <https://www.portal-slovo.ru/philology/45080.php>) Only thanks to a simple observation in the age of electronics and general technological progress, R.I. Avanesov managed to detect and describe the emergence of a new consonant in the phonetic system of the Russian language - the so-called back-speaking N. The strong position in which this appears t consonant, is its presence at the end of a word as part of a combination of consonants in front of any posterior consonant: *пункт*.

Phonetic changes in the post-Soviet period include aggravated in the 90s of the XX century. the problem of Russian stress and its codification. This circumstance can be explained by the increasing role of public speech. Professional, business, conversational speech is increasingly

enhancing the influence on public, official speech. In this regard, the processes prepared by the language system itself are accelerated and the former strict literary norms are shaken (Golub, 2009: 16). The reasons for the accent changes are mainly intrasystemic. This is a clash of the laws of analogy and tradition, as well as the law of antinomies, in particular, the antinomies of the *Uzus* and the possibilities of language

In the 90s of the XX century. we have witnessed serious changes in the socio-cultural-political order in the life of a once united country. Naturally, these changes seriously affected the internal system of the Russian language, in particular, the vocabulary, word-formation system and inflection. These innovations were the impetus for changes for which the language was evolutionarily ready, they caused the so-called "Neological boom", which in a sense continues today. And intensive replenishment of the dictionary is accompanied by active archaization. What is leaving the Russian language in recent decades! First of all, bureaucratic, official elements leave the language. The Russian language has been sick for a very long time with a serious illness - the "office". The entire nation, the entire "happy" community of *HOMO SOVIETIKUS*, was infected by the clerical office. It is enough to recall such expressions as *зеленые массивы*, *головные уборы*, *макаронные изделия*, etc. Currently, *макароны* is often used instead of *макаронных изделий* in the vocabulary of the post-Soviet space, and in the speech of young native speakers who are sensitive to new trends, we often find a lexeme *настя*.

An analysis of the lexical content of the semantic paradigm of the kitchen demonstrated that this paradigm has expanded and transformed beyond recognition. The Japanese "суси", adapting in Russian as "сushi", formed a new word for the person preparing this food - *сушист* (a graphic illustration of the law of analogy, cf. : *флорист*, *пианист*, etc.). On sites for searching for work, you can often find ads like: "Требуется повар и сушист в кафе/ресторан." The menu has also changed a lot, enriched with previously unknown national dishes. Now choosing *плов*, *овощной суп*, *жаренное мясо/овощи*, etc. is not fashionable. Instead, restaurants offer *ризотто*, *минestrone*, *овощи гриль*, etc. Thus, a peculiar substitution of Russian tokens by borrowed ones took place, but the reasons for this substitution may be different: 1) in some cases this is due to the refinement of the semantics of the new token (*овощи гриль* - grilled vegetables (the law of economy); 2) for advertising (exotic is attractive), attracting the attention of the client (*творожный ролл* - *творог с мятой в листьях сулугуни* - cottage cheese with mint in the leaves of suluguni, *смузи* - *свежесqueezed fruit smoothies* - smoothies - freshly squeezed fruit juice with pulp); 3) sometimes borrowing is the nominee of a new concept: *фейсбук*, *кулер*, *модем*, etc.

It should also be noted that in the conditions of intense intercultural relationships, such lexical and semantic processes acquire a great appeal-influencing function on the addressee, which is facilitated by the general interest of the people in Western trends and the desire to travel. It is not for nothing that the tourism industry is currently developing rapidly and, in addition to cultural, scientific, wedding and other tourism, gastronomic tourism has become one of the most widespread in the world. Thanks to him, many dishes of Georgian cuisine: *хачапури*, *аджарские хачапури*, *хинкали*, *сациви*, *боржоми*, etc. are no longer perceived by Russian-speaking tourists as something unknown and exotic. The Russian language actively absorbs similar vocabulary from different languages (for example, from Turkish: *айран*, *баклаев*).

Naturally, adopting the notation of realities and gaps of different cultures, the language is full of foreign words. Fashionable, convenient for modern society tokens with Russian equivalents appear in all socially demanded spheres of life. Very vivid examples of the foregoing were cited by a fine connoisseur of modern Russian, academician V.G. Kostomarov: *конверсия*

/conversion - transformation, *стагнация* /stagnation, *консенсус* /consensus - agreement, agreement, *имидж* /image-image, *коттоновый* /of cotton, *реперный* - key, important, *транспарентный* /transparent - transparent (Kostomarov 1994: 81-83). According to N.S. Valgina, the modern desire for borrowing reproduces two historical lines: on the one hand, it is really the need for a radically changed life (change of political, economic, ideological orientations), on the other - Americanomania, when not only technical innovations, but also living standards are attractive, manner of behavior and communication, tastes. Now English words are crowding out not only Russian, but also words of other languages that were previously borrowed and have taken root in the Russian language (for example: *сэндвич* instead of the German word *бутерброд*, *слоганы* instead of the German word *лозунги*; *хит* instead of the German word *илягер*; *аниматор* instead of the French word *мультиплекатор*; *дисплей* instead of French *Экран*, *дентист* instead of *стоматолог*, etc.

The collapse of the totalitarian system led to the fact that the Russian language of the post-Soviet period "suffocates in a frantic run." Belinsky's famous words about the language of the Petrine era are still relevant today, when multilingual foreign-language inclusions are often incomprehensible to the mass media, which translates into public disapproval: *Надеюсь, что консенсус по этому вопросу не вызывает сомнений, а импичмент и ротация нам не понадобятся. "Тем более что racket в нашем маркетинге ... не обнаружился. Другое дело - менеджмент и мониторинг. Без них, как и без конверсии, не обойтись. Остается определить рейтинг нашей встречи"* – "I hope that consensus on this issue is not in doubt, and we will not need impeachment and rotation. Moreover, the racket in our marketing ... did not show up. Another thing is management and monitoring. Without them, as well as without conversion, you can not do. It remains to determine the rating of our meeting" (AIF 2010 No. 9).

However, according to E.A. Zemsky, the "spoilage" of the language about which so much is written, affects not the language system, but speech ability, the ability to speak. New conditions for the functioning of the language, the emergence of a large number of unprepared oral public texts gives the impression of an increase in the number of errors. However, some linguists believe that the "clumsiness" of speech reveals "developmental tendencies in the language". Language is a self-cleaning system. Until recently, there was talk of "consensus," even family, everywhere. Where is the word? Several years passed and it died. In totalitarian times, the language was dried, it lacked life-giving moisture, now it is oversaturated with it. Excess - will leave. Emancipation, the ability to freely express one's thoughts and feelings, playing with and with the help of the language - this is what is characteristic of the Russian language of our time (Linguistics online, accessed February 28, 2016, <http://linguistics-online.narod.ru/index / 0-396>).

An equally interesting process that takes place in Russian at the end of the 20th - beginning of the 21st century is the return to active use of obsolete vocabulary, the so-called process of lexical dearchization. Traditions, spiritual and cultural values lost during the time of socialism are being revived, which activates archaic vocabulary, pre-revolutionary realities related to the sphere of religion, education, administrative-territorial division, social structure of society. Slavisms replenish the layer of high and Church Slavonic vocabulary, gallicisms are found in the names of professions and occupations: *губернатор/губернантка, консьерж/консьержка, крупье, модель, продюсер*; clothes, shoes, accessories: *ридикюль, портмоне, ботфорты, пантуфли, неглиже*; in words and phrases characteristic of the language of high society: *журфикс, сауре, рандеву, комильфо, моветон*.

Compared to speech, intrasystem changes are less noticeable. Obviously, the language system changes more slowly than the conditions for the functioning of the language or the

structure of the discourse. Changes in grammar are often associated with changes in vocabulary. Here it is necessary to note the quantitative growth and activation of the use of two classes of non-declining names: 1) analytical adjectives and 2) abbreviations. If vocabulary and word formation give great scope for linguistics, then morphology constantly puts prohibitions and restrictions. Moreover, going beyond the established boundaries in the use of grammatical forms more often than not is an erroneous use, and not an emerging tendency (Valgina, 2003: 155).

The analysis of empirical material allowed us to verify that the most active processes of Russian word formation include: functional dynamism (drinking, partying); activation of certain word-building models (-ization: legalization, updating, demonstration; -ist: makeup artist, stylist); growth of nominal prefixation (aftertaste, postmodernism, antidepressants, superpower, super-sentence, quasitext, mega-sentence); "composite explosion" (hit parade, pop music, rock festival, video battle); new round of "abbreviation explosion" (STS, OSCE). Анализ эмпирического материала позволил нам убедиться в том, что к наиболее активным процессам русского словообразования относятся: функциональный динамизм (пьянка, гулянка); активизация определенных словообразовательных моделей (-изация : легализация, актуализация, демонстрация; -ист: визажист, стилист); рост именной префиксации (послевкусие, постмодернизм, антидепрессанты, сверхдержава, супер-предложение, квазитекст, мегапредложение); "композитный взрыв" (хит-парад, поп-музыка, рок-фестиваль, видео-битва); новый виток "аббревиатурного взрыва" (СТС, ОБСЕ).

Zemskaya EA, Valgina and other scientists emphasize the growth of analyticism and agglutinative features in the structure of a derived word. Analytical forms differ from synthetic ones in that their grammatical meaning is transmitted outside the limits of a given word, i.e. the function and meaning of these forms are revealed in context, in relation to other words. That is why morphological analyticism proper is closely intertwined with syntactic analyticism and becomes a common feature of grammar. For example, in the so-called agreement in meaning (agreement is a syntactic category), the grammatical gender of a noun (morphological category) is determined either by the form of the adjective or the form of the verb: *хорошая врач*; *врач пришла к больному*. The syntax enhances the expansion of lengthy constructions, the syntactic compression of phrases, simple sentences, the whole text, which is clearly demonstrated by the modern press and television: *Хороший текст - дороже денег. Написание статей - это не работа, а состояние души; Как жиরуют хозяева жизни* (AiF, 2006, No. 25)

Thus, it should be recognized that dramatic changes in the social structure caused significant changes in the Russian language, not only in vocabulary, but also in word formation, morphology (to a lesser extent in syntax). Language development is an organic process in which both external and internal laws of language development are intertwined. At the system level, the most important process of our time is the growth of CPY analyticism, which, while remaining an inflectional language, is in a transitional stage from a synthetic system to analyticism.

### **3.2 Functioning of the Russian Language in the Post-Soviet Republics**

For 30 post-Soviet years, serious changes have occurred in the functioning of the Russian language. The ideology of the new independent states that emerged after 1991 was based on the struggle against the imperial heritage, which included the suppression of the Russian language in the language of the "titular" nationality from most areas of communication. This process was most rapid in the 1990s. In resolving the language issue, individual post-Soviet states went their separate ways.

In Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, the most Russified republics of Central Asia, given the high share of the Russian and Russian-speaking population and its socio-political importance, they tried to develop a fairly tolerant line with respect to the Russian language, which received official status and retained a wide presence in the information and cultural spheres. This allowed to significantly reduce the conflictogenic potential of the "Russian" problem. Recently, however, a sharp question has arisen in Kyrgyzstan about the fate of the Kyrgyz language.

The problems of language policy have also become aggravated in Kazakhstan. In March 2018, Kazakh President Nazarbayev said that it was necessary to expand the scope of the Kazakh language. "The process of transition to the Latin alphabet is historically important for our people. At the same time, it is necessary to continue work on raising the status of the Kazakh language ... ". After Nazarbayev's statement in the country, there is a boom in enrollment in state language courses, 500 people a day (among them there are ministers) (Novaya Gazeta, appeal date June 11, 2019, <https://novayagazeta.ru/articles/2018/03/05/75708-i-vyrvat-russkiy-vash-yazyk>).

The problem of the Russian-speaking population has reached a high level of conflict in the Baltic republics. Latvia and Estonia in the Soviet period actually turned into two-communal republics: along with the "titular" population, an extensive Russian-speaking diaspora formed here, and in a number of localities (Daugavpils and Narva regions), Russian and Russian-speaking constitute the majority of the population. The collapse of the USSR provoked a protracted conflict between these communities, associated with the unwillingness of the Latvian and Estonian states to see Russian-speaking residents as their full citizens. This has led to political discrimination on the ethnolinguistic basis of a significant part of the population and the emergence of a non-citizen institution unique to modern Europe. As a result, some local politicians are beginning to question the course towards building a mono-ethnic state. The statement of the new Latvian president Andris Berzins, who stated that he did not intend to politicize the language sphere and was ready to use both the state Latvian language and non-state Russian throughout his work in such a high position, is indicative. And although Berzins subsequently received a rebuke from the Latvian Minister of Culture Sarmitē Elerte, who adheres to the traditional "discriminatory" point of view on the Russian issue, this statement itself seems symbolic and testifies to the fact that in the relatively near future in Latvia a transition to a more tolerant Russian-speaking policy is possible of the population

The most interesting situation is with the Russian language in Ukraine and Belarus. Ukraine and especially Belarus are the most Russified republics of the former USSR. In the Soviet period, these two republics were considered along with Russia as the informal core of the Soviet state, which was reinforced by the ideological doctrine of the "three fraternal peoples", which have common roots dating back to Kievan Rus and are therefore "doomed" to live together. However, after the collapse of the USSR, the language policy in Ukraine and Belarus was quite different. Nationalist sentiments in Ukraine are historically stronger than in Belarus; In addition, Ukrainian nationalism has its own base region in the west of the country. Therefore, after gaining independence in conditions of general ideological disorientation, Ukrainian nationalists headed for the model of national construction. In the linguistic sphere, this was reflected in giving the Ukrainian language a monopoly state status and in consistent measures to Ukrainianize the state apparatus, the education system and the information space. As a result, the volume of teaching the Russian language in Ukrainian schools was reduced to one hour per week, starting from the fifth grade, and the study of Russian literature was included in the course of foreign literature. However, the reverse side of Ukrainianization was a sharp decline in literacy in the Russian-speaking

regions of Ukraine. So, it became quite common tragicomic phenomenon when Ukrainian schoolchildren write in Russian, using Ukrainian spelling.

In Belarus, where the nationalist movement is much weaker than the Ukrainian one, in 1995, at the initiative of President Alexander Lukashenko, a referendum was held, following which Belarus became the only CIS country after Russia, where the Russian language acquired full-fledged state status. After this, measures for the linguistic Belarusianization of the state apparatus, the education system and the media were curtailed, and the country returned to the status quo familiar from Soviet times, when the main language of everyday communication is Russian, while Belorussian performs a purely symbolic function. The 2009 census data revealed a significant decrease in the role of the Belarusian language in Belarusian society. Thus, the language situation in Belarus is unique in its own way. However, it is also impossible to consider the language issue in Belarus closed. The language policy, as well as the authoritarian style of government of President Lukashenko, contributed to the radicalization of the nationalist opposition, which advocates the state monopoly of the Belarusian language. Therefore, in the future, a surge of “de-Russification” practices cannot be ruled out.

The situation with the Russian language in the post-Soviet republics remains complex and ambiguous. The scope of the Russian language in all but Belarus and Russia and the former union republics has noticeably narrowed, and in a number of the least Russified countries (Georgia and Lithuania) it has been minimized. However, talking about the end of the era of the Russian language in the post-Soviet space is, of course, impossible. In most post-Soviet states, the Russian linguistic, cultural and informational presence remains quite strong. Moreover, as nationalist radicalism fades away, the advantages that fluency in the Russian language gives are gradually being realized. Therefore, the task of a number of post-Soviet states is not so much the struggle with the Russian language as the harmonization of the language sphere, the development of an optimal model for the correlation of Russian and “titular” languages.

### **3.3 The Linguistic Situation in the Southern Caucasus (Georgia and Armenia)**

The Russian language is one of the most important factors contributing to the integration processes in the post-Soviet space and the preservation of cultural ties. At the same time, in recent years in Georgia and Armenia there has been a tendency to reduce its use in public life, education, the media, etc.

The issue of the Russian language has historically been an extremely sensitive topic for the politically active part of society. Even in Soviet times, Georgia and Armenia were the only union republics that refused to make Russian the official language in their legislation. In Georgia, an attempt to change the language article in the Basic Law led to mass protest rallies of the Georgian intelligentsia and nationalist citizens in Tbilisi and other cities of the republics. The apogee of protests fell on April 14, 1978, when an extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of the GSSR was appointed, which was to approve the draft new constitution. The demonstrators began to disperse only after E. Shevardnadze read out a statement to them about maintaining the state status of the Georgian language.

A similar situation has developed in neighboring Armenia. According to the Constitution of the Armenian SSR of 1978, Armenian was the only state language (Constitution (Basic Law) of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic. Adopted at the extraordinary seventh session of the Supreme Council of the ArmSSR of the ninth convocation. April 14, 1978 Yerevan: Hayastan, 1982. 51 from.). It led the entire workflow in the republican ministries. In Armenia and Georgia,

the national language was taught in schools from the 2nd grade, while in other Soviet republics - from the 4th.

In the early 1990s, in Armenia, a sufficiently strict language legislation was adopted, which ensured the complete monopoly of the Armenian language in all spheres of the republic's activity. Subsequently, any attempts to soften the law "On Language" ran into active resistance of a significant part of society. The Armenian nationalists, especially the intelligentsia, considered raising the status of the Russian language as an attempt on sovereignty and independence

The new government of Armenia began to consider strengthening the position of the Armenian language as a priority. In particular, the new Minister of Education and Science, Araik Harutyunyan, advocated imposing large fines on the organizers of any events in the republic, including scientific symposia, if they do not provide full simultaneous translation into Armenian (Sputnik Armenia, July 25, 2018, <https://ru.armeniasputnik.am/society/20180610/12573760/ministr-obrazovaniya-gotovit-shtrafy-za-narushenie-zakona-o-yazyke.html>). The state and official language in Armenia is the literary Armenian language, the second most prevalent is Russian, which is spoken by both bilingual Armenians and ethnic Russians, as well as representatives of 11 registered national minorities: Yezidis, Assyrians, Ukrainians, Poles, Greeks, Belarusians, Georgians, Germans, Kurds, Jews. The language of interethnic communication in the USSR was Russian. Many Armenians received education in Russian, therefore, for a certain number of Armenians over 40 years old, this language remains the language of the cultural and civilizational field (Arshak Sarkisyan "Russian in Armenia: a view of the philologist").

The current legislation of the Republic of Armenia does not provide any obstacles to the development of minority languages, in particular Russian, and at the same time establishes the supremacy of the state language. Most of the laws of Armenia and government decrees are translated and translated into Russian. On the official website of the National Assembly there are Russian versions of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia, Civil, Family and Labor Codes, as well as the Criminal, Criminal Procedure, Customs, Land Codes and other important laws and legal acts. The authorities of the republic periodically inform ethnic communities of their rights and opportunities provided for by national and international treaties. In particular, the Ministry of Justice periodically publishes and reprints official directories, codes and laws of the Republic of Armenia in the language of national minorities. But official clerical work and official correspondence between state bodies, institutions and departments are conducted in Armenian. The relations of state bodies with the population, the administrative process and administrative acts are also adopted in the Armenian language (Law of the Republic of Armenia on the Basics of Administration and Administrative Proceedings (clause 2 of article 27, article 93 and paragraph 4 of article 59) // National Assembly Of the Republic of Armenia.Official website., Date of observance July 25, 2018

<http://www.parliament.am/legislation.php?sel=show&ID=1937&lang=rus>). In practice, persons who speak the languages of national minorities in the Republic of Armenia, in the manner prescribed by law or in accordance with international treaties, may submit a statement in their native language. However, the response of the administrative authorities will be in Armenian. The Russian language continues to be used in Armenia in places where public services are provided: in transport, postal services, and at the airport. But in large cities of Armenia, primarily in Yerevan, most of the signs, names are mainly written either only in Armenian, or in Armenian and English.

In the field of education in Armenia, the Russian language is represented at all levels: secondary, secondary and higher. It is studied as a compulsory subject as a foreign language, but

in the mid-2000s. the number of hours for his teaching was reduced. Higher education in modern Armenia is possible in both Armenian and Russian, due to the presence of a large number of branches of leading Russian universities.

In Georgia, language reform proceeded in an even more severe form. The main difference was that the Russian language has lost the status of a compulsory subject and has become the second foreign language of its choice. In accordance with the course of development chosen by the Government of Georgia, which focuses on Georgia's entry into a single European educational space, all secondary schools in Georgia were swept by a wave of "Anglomania", under the pressure of which they ceased to choose not only Russian, but also such European languages as German and French. Only specialized language schools offer in-depth study of these languages. In higher education institutions of Georgia, English has become mandatory for all specialties, only students of several specialties have the opportunity to choose a second foreign language (English Philology, Tourism, International Relations)

The procedure for broadcasting in Georgia is regulated by the Law on Broadcasting adopted on May 22, 2012 N6256. According to the wording of Article 38 "Broadcasting Language / Languages" dated November 1, 2016 (04/04/2016 N5020): An authorized Georgian broadcaster, existing in general national broadcasting, must place programs in the state language of Georgia on the broadcasting grid, except as otherwise specified by the legislation of Georgia or (i) by the Commission. An authorized local broadcaster that broadcasts in Georgia must post on the broadcasting network, including at the best time, news programs and public-political programs also in the state language of Georgia (Broadcasting Law, accessed June 20, 2018 , <https://matsne.gov.ge/ru/document/download/32866/44/ru/pdf>).

As for television in Armenia, there are also quite strict legislative restrictions. According to Article 5 of the Law "On Television and Radio", on 09.10.2000, the language of television and radio broadcasts broadcast on the territory of the Republic of Armenia is Armenian. The Armenian Law "On Television and Radio" allows public television and radio companies to provide airtime for broadcasting special programs and broadcasts in the languages of national minorities of the republic. At the same time, there is a severe restriction: the total duration of such programs should not exceed one hour per week on television, and on the radio - one hour per day (National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia. Official website, appeal date July 30, 2018, <http://www.parliament.am/legislation.php?sel=show&ID=1464&lang=rus>)

As for printed materials in Russian, several Russian-language newspapers are published in the Republic of Armenia, including magazines such as "Voice of Armenia", "New Time", "Republic of Armenia", "Arguments of the Week in Armenia", "Ether", "Business Express", "Literary Armenia", "Armenian", "Yerevan", etc. However, they are hardly noticeable in the information space due to the small circulation. The Russian language has no restrictions and is widely spoken only in the Armenian segment of the Internet. All the most visited news websites, regardless of their political orientation, have a Russian-language version. According to the latest edition of Article 3 "Language of Mass Media" of the Law of the Republic of Georgia on the Press and Other Mass Media (The Georgian Law No. 1000 of 28 October 1997, *Parlamentis Utskebani*, No. 44, 11.11.1997, p.118) in the language of the press and mass media Information is the official language - Georgian, in Abkhazia - also Abkhazian. In Georgia, the dissemination of media in any other language is permitted. On the territory of Georgia, the free provision and dissemination of information in the languages of national minorities, as well as other languages, is provided. (Legislative Gazette of Georgia, Law of the Republic of Georgia. On the Press and

Other Mass Media, appeal date September 3, 2019  
<https://matsne.gov.ge/ka/document/view/32548?publication=4>.

The existing situation of the Russian language in Georgia and Armenia does not allow preserving bilingualism that prevailed in the Soviet era, when Russian acted as the “second native language” for the majority of the population. This is reflected in the objective data of a drop in the level of knowledge of the Russian language. This situation is especially noticeable on the example of the younger generation. Whereas artificial bilingualism was prevalent in Georgia, at present the child does not have time to fully master the Russian language at school, so bilinguals appear naturally in mixed families.

As you know, several national minorities peacefully coexist in Georgia, partly scattered in cities, villages, villages, in some cases they are concentrated in different regions of Georgia. According to the data of the Center for National Minorities of Europe, they make up about a sixth of the country's population, but the level of their social inclusion in post-Soviet Georgia is quite low (Tom Trier, Technical Minorities and Elections. European Center for Minorities Georgian Parliament, 16 July 2019 <https://goo-gl.su/Ox8YPyw>). The main reason for this is ignorance of the state Georgian language. Therefore, the state is conducting focused work in this direction, which is expressed in a number of social programs, including educational ones. So, for several years (from the 2010-2011 academic year), according to Article 58/5 of the Law on General Education, textbooks on a number of subjects are issued in bilingual language in national schools and sectors at Georgian public schools.

Georgia's previous Education Act 1997 granted ethnic minorities the right to receive education in their native language. Article 4 of the Law stated that “the State, on the recommendation of local authorities, creates conditions for Georgian citizens for whom the Georgian language is not their native language, in the creation of such institutions or sectors of basic or secondary education, where training will be conducted in their native language.” In accordance with the 1997 Law on Culture, the state also committed itself to creating equal conditions for the cultural development of all regions (Article 20)

At present, Georgia has adopted some new regulatory standards in the field of general and higher education, in which an attempt is made to regulate the problems of using the state language and minority languages in a slightly different way. According to the new Law on General Education 2005, “the language of instruction in general educational institutions is Georgian, and in the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic it is Georgian or Abkhazian” (Article 4.1), although at the same time, “citizens whose native language is not Georgian language, have the right to receive a complete general education in their native language” (Article 4.3). This, of course, indicates that education in minority languages is allowed in Georgia, but at the same time, the new Law provides for the gradual transition of all ethnic schools to new general Georgian curricula, according to which the literature, history and geography of Georgia, as well as “other social sciences” »Should be taught in these schools only in Georgian (According to Articles 5.4 and 58.5) (Sakartvelos Sakanonmdeblo Matsne, the Georgian law on General Education, accessed 30 July 2019, <https://mat.sne.gov.ge/ka/document/view/29248?publication=80>).

In addition, Article 89 of the Law establishes the unified national entrance examinations in Georgian for all state-accredited higher education institutions (Journal of Laws of Georgia, Law of Georgia on Higher Education, accessed August 2, 2019, <https://matsne.gov.ge/ru/document/view/32830?publication=78>).

As for the Armenian community of our hometown - Batumi, it is mainly represented by the Armenian and Russian-speaking population. If the state carries out planned work in this direction, then the Armenian community has seriously thought about a counter step. Realizing that without knowledge of the state language, a person cannot be a full-fledged citizen and contribute to the development of the country, enjoy public benefits and, finally, be fully integrated into society, the Armenian community decided to make the process of studying the Georgian language more intensive and, to this end, collecting enough the number of signatures, the community turned to the Ministry of Education of Georgia with a request to open classes at the state school, where Armenian and Russian-speaking children will study in Georgian, and they will also additionally study the Armenian language under the state program. To which a positive response was received. And for the third year already, one of the Batumi Public Schools has been accepting first-graders, ethnic Armenians, from mostly Russian-speaking families.

What does this give in terms of language? Already now we can talk about the first results. First-graders, for whom, at the beginning of the school year, the only language spanning all spheres of their life was the Russian language, they mastered Georgian writing / reading, elementary speaking skills. At the same time, they did not lose their thought-speech skills in Russian, because in the family they also continue to communicate in Russian. And in 11-12 years, we will see a generation of Batumans no longer even bilinguals, but polilinguals who will speak the state Georgian and native Armenian languages, as well as the language of communication in the family - the Russian language and, of course, the English language.

Seeing the relevance and relevance in the study of the state language by the indigenous population, as well as emigrants from Ukraine, Kazakhstan and other countries, the Armenian community in the person of the A. Mantashev Batumi Cultural and Educational Center launched another unprecedented project - the Summer Integration School of the Georgian Language and Culture, which began its work free of charge on July 1, 2019. On a regular basis, the "guest of the week" rubric was introduced at the Summer Integration School of the Georgian Language and Culture. "Guests of the week" are famous people in the city, country, honorary citizens of Georgia. During one of their conversations with children and parents, they all note the relevance of the project and the importance of knowledge of the state language for healthy integration in society, friendship and relations of peoples, culture and cultural values, tolerance. All these values have always been supported in multicultural Georgia, which has become native to many nationalities.

Returning to the language, I want to note that one of the most important results of owning two or more languages is the perception of a different culture and the ability to adequately translate your own. If a person speaks more than one language, he enriches his spiritual world, establishes strong emotional relationships with people who speak this language, he opens up the cultural world of another people.

In modern conditions of globalization and integration (today in the European Union there are twenty-three official languages), students and young professionals are increasingly finding themselves in a foreign culture, when the possession of several foreign languages becomes a necessary condition for their competitiveness (European Parliament in a simplified language, accessed May 23, 2017, <https://goo-gl.su/xXEJ5x>). Linguistic, or rather, communicative competence (in addition to professional competence) is one of the most important conditions for successful employment and career. Thus, the linguistic personality develops according to the multicultural and bi / multilingual principle, and the education system and public policy should create all the conditions for this, as is the case in multinational Georgia, in which representatives

of all nationalities can receive full-fledged language education, which is the basis of any professional activity.

## Conclusions

The history of the development of the language confirms the enormous role of extralinguistic factors, which have always had a strong influence on the development of the entire language system, and first of all, on vocabulary. A change in sociopolitical paradigms is always somehow reflected in the language of each particular period.

In modern conditions, as well as looking back at the previous experience of linguistic science, an adequate study of the language is not possible without taking into account extralinguistic factors.

A review of the scientific literature on the topic suggests that the external and internal linguistics identified by F. de Sosyur, which was later transformed into intra-and inter-linguistics, reflects the close interconnection of language and society and, within the framework of the modern anthropocentric linguistic paradigm, is rich material for studies of a sociolinguistic nature.

Moreover, the combination of C / D aspects gives the most complete picture of the language unit.

V. G. Kostomarov: "We need to be saved, not the language." Language is a universal instrument. If we are interested in success, a happy life, normal relations, democracy, then the language will reflect this. If you and I are interested in sex, banditry, drugs, then the language will be dealt with by others. Language gives what we need. Therefore, one cannot speak of degradation of the language. We can talk about the state of society that uses this language when something good is removed to the periphery of the language, and something bad is taken from the periphery; we are observing this. We need to be saved, not the language.

The intensive updating of the lexical system reflects a large number of economic, socio-political, technical and cultural innovations taking place in the life of the entire post-Soviet space. With the activation of word-formation processes, the most important contributor to lexical neologisms are foreign language borrowings (mostly English-American, to a lesser extent - from other European languages and from the Turkish language).

Language development is an organic process in which both external and internal laws of language development are intertwined. At the system level, the most important process of our time can be considered the growth of analyticism of the SRY, which, while remaining an inflective language, is in a transitional stage from a synthetic system to analyticism.

Being not only a universal property of communication, but also a unique marker of cultural memory, the language stores relics of past eras in the national picture of the world and thereby becomes the most important marker of the collective cultural memory of this community.

The history of the development of the Russian language confirms the enormous role of extralinguistic factors, which have always had a strong influence on the development of the entire language system, and first of all, on the vocabulary of the Russian language. The change in sociopolitical paradigms always somehow reflects in the language of each particular period, but the epochs associated with the creation and then collapse of the socialist camp became especially

significant and contrasting eras in the development of Russian society and the Russian language: pre-revolutionary era, Soviet society, period adjustment of our days.

In modern conditions, as well as looking back at the previous experience of linguistic science, an adequate study of the language is not possible without taking into account extralinguistic factors.

In the initial stage of the formation of the socialist camp, the Russian language suffered a powerful onslaught of vernacular and vulgarisms, but thanks to the focused work of the best representatives of Russian literature, it was able to cope with these temporary problems. During the period of developed socialism in the Russian language, various manifestations of a very serious social illness became more active - the office, which acquired a chronic character.

An analysis of journalistic empirical material suggests that the modern Russian language of the post-Soviet period is characterized by similar phenomena of breaking literary norms that were observed during the period of revolutionary transformations, which indicates the enormous role of socio-political events in the development of the language.

The intensive updating of the lexical system reflects a large number of economic, socio-political, technical and cultural innovations taking place in the life of the entire post-Soviet space. With the activation of word-formation processes, the most important supplier of lexical neologisms are foreign-language borrowings (mostly English-American, to a lesser extent - from other European languages and from the Turkish language).

Being not only a universal property of communication, but also a unique marker of cultural memory, the language stores relics of past eras in the national picture of the world and thereby becomes the most important marker of the collective cultural memory of this community.

#### Publications:

1. Kristina Aivazyan-Tatevosyan, Extralinguistic nature of the linguistic changes, International scientific periodical edition #25/2015: pg. 41-45, ISSN 1520-4363, Tbilisi 2015;
2. Kristina Aivazyan-Tatevosyan, Diachronic functioning of Russian inscription and outdoor advertising (Soviet and post-Soviet period), International scientific periodical edition # 28/2017: pg. 27-31, ISSN 1520-4363, Tbilisi 2017;
3. Kristina Aivazyan-Tatevosyan, Bi-multilinguals as part of intercultural communication and modification of functionality of Russian language in Batumi, International scientific periodical edition #32/2019: pg. 63-66, ISSN 1520-4363 Tbilisi 2019

#### Bibliography

1. Анищенко О.А. Генезис и функционирование молодежного социолекта в русском языке национального периода. Изд. Флинта, Наука; М., 2010.

2. Антология мировой философии [Текст]: в 4 т. / Под ред. И.Ф. Нарского [и др.]. - М.: Мысль, 1971. - Т.3.
3. Архив А. М. Горького. М., 1966, т. 11.
4. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов, М., 1966.
5. Бодуэн де Куртенэ, И.А.Избранные труды по общему языкознанию [Текст]: в 2 т. / И.А. Бодуэн де Куртенэ. - М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1963. - Т. 1.
6. Булаховский Л. А. Курс русского литературного языка. Киев, 1952.
7. В.П. Даниленко «Синхрония и диахрония в лингвистике» УДК 81.00 ББК81
8. Валгина Н.С. Активные процессы в современном русском языке. Изд. Логос; М., 2003.
9. Вахек Й. Лингвистический словарь Пражской школы. Русский перевод. М., «Прогресс», 1964.
10. Виноградов В..В Основные этапы истории русского языка (Виноградов В. В. Избранные труды. История русского литературного языка. М, 1978.)
11. Виноградов В.В. Очерки по истории русского литературного языка XVII-XIX вв. Издание второе, переработанное и дополненное. М., Учпедгиз, 1938. Первое издание книги вышло в 1934 г.
12. Вопросы языкознания, 1966, № 6, с. 213
13. Голуб И.Б. Риторика: учитесь говорить правильно и красиво. М., 2009.
14. Горбачевич К. С. Нормы современного русского литературного языка. М., 1981.
15. Горнунг Б.В. Единство синхронии и диахронии как следствие специфики языковой структуры // Соотношение синхронного анализа и исторического изучения языков. М., 1960.
16. Горький А.М. О литературе. М., 1937.
17. Горький А.М. т. 26,1931-1933.
18. Горький А.М. т. 27,1933-1936.
19. Григорьева Т.М. «Чужесловие» в русском языке и русской ментальности. Сибирский федеральный университет, Красноярск, 1979.
20. Гумбольдт В. Язык и философия культуры. М., 1985. Русский перевод Гулыга О.А.
21. Гумбольдт, В.Избранные труды по языкознанию [Текст] / В. Гумбольдт. - М.: Прогресс, 1985.
22. Даниленко, В.П.Общее языкознание и история языкознания [Текст]: курс лекций / В.П. Даниленко. - М.: Флинта: Наука, 2009.
23. Дергачев А.В. Глобалистика. Изд. ЮНИТИ-ДАНА, М., 2005.
24. Едличка А.О пражской теории литературного языка. «Пражский лингвистический кружок», 1967.
25. Жирмунский, В.М. О синхронии и диахронии в языкознании [Текст] / В.М. Жирмунский // Вопросы языкознания. - 1957. - № 5. - С. 42-52.
26. Журавлев В.К. Внешние и внутренние факторы языковой эволюции. М., 1982
27. Журналист, 1925, № 2.
28. Звезда, 1929, № 9
29. Зеегинцев, В.А.История языкознания XIX и XX веков в очерках и извлечениях [Текст]: в 2 ч. / В.А. Звегинцев. - М.: Учпедгиз, 1960. -4.1.

30. Иванчикова Е.А. Развитие синтаксиса современного русского языка. М., 1966.
31. Каде Т.Х. Русская телевизионная терминология. В кн.: формирование и функционирование специальной лексики в русском языке. Днепропетровск, 1978.
32. Карапулов Ю.Н. Великий... могучий... многострадальный... Неделя, 1989, № 40.
33. Кортунов С.В. Становление национальной идентичности: Какая Россия нужна миру: учеб. пособие для студентов вузов. М., Изд. Аспект Пресс, 2009.
34. Костомаров В.Г. Языковой вкус эпохи. — М., 1994.
35. Крысин Л.П. Иноязычное слово в контексте современной общественной жизни. Русский язык конца XX столетия (1985-1995). М., 2000.
36. Крысин Л.П. Иноязычные слова в современном русском языке. М., 1968.
37. Крысин Л.П. Языковое заимствование как проблема диахронической социолингвистики. Диахроническая социолингвистика. М., 1993.
38. Лейчик В.М. Люди и слова. Изд. «Наука». М., 1982.
39. Лернер К.Б. Социальная природа языка и процесс языкового взаимодействия. Тбилиси. 1989.
40. Мейе А. Введение в сравнительное изучение индоевропейских языков. Русский перевод. М.-Л., 1938, Первое издание вышло в 1903 г
41. Муратова К. Д. М. Горький в борьбе за язык как орудие культуры. М., 1953
42. Немецкая диалектография. Сборник статей. Перев. с нем. СигалН.А. М.,1955г.
43. «Новое в лингвистике», IV.,Изд. «Прогресс», М.,1965.А. Соммерфельт. Французская лингвистическая школа; Якобсон Р.О. Разработка целевой модели языка в европейской лингвистике в период между двумя войнами.
44. «Новое в лингвистике», VII, Социолингвистика. Изд. «Прогресс», М.1975, Уильям Лабов «О механизме языковых изменений»; Чемоданов Н.С. «Проблемы социальной лингвистики в современном языкоznании».
45. Новое в русской лексике. Словарные материалы-77. Под редакцией КотеловойН.З. М., 1980.
46. Новое в русской лексике. Словарные материалы-78. Под редакцией КотеловойН.З. М., 1981.
47. Новые слова и значения: Словарь-справочник по материалам прессы и литературы 60-х годов. Под ред. КотеловойН.З. и СорокинаЮ.С. М., 1971.
48. Одоевский В. Ф. Соч. В 2-х т. Худож. лит., т. 2.М., 1981.
49. Панов М.В. Аналитические и синтетические языки. Словарь юного филолога. Составитель М.В. Панов. М., 1984.
50. Панов М.В. Из наблюдений над стилем сегодняшней периодики. Язык современной публицистики. М., 1988.
51. Панов М.В. Об аналитических прилагательных. Фонетика. Фонология. Грамматика. М., 1971.
52. Пауль, Г.Принципы истории языка [Текст] / Г. Пауль. -М.: Изд-во ин. лит-ры, 1960.
53. «Полный словарь иностранных слов». Смирнова В. М., 1908.
54. «Пражский лингвистический кружок». Изд. «Прогресс»,М., 1967
55. Первый Всероссийский съезд баячей будущего. Хроника. За семь дней. 1913. №32.

56. Политическая Лингвистика. Выпуск № 1 (43) / 2013 Спиридонов Д.В., Филатова К.Л.0, Чудинов А.П. Французская лингвистическая советология: Андре Мазон;Мазон А. Лексика войны и Революции в России.Русский перевод СпиридоновД.В., ФилатоваК.Л.

57. Прокопович Н.Н. О процессах структурного преобразования словосочетаний в современном русском языке. В кн.: Развитие синтаксиса современного русского языка. М., 1966.

58. Рамишвили Г.В. Языкоzнание в кругу наук о человеке. ВФ. 1981. № 6.

59. Реформатский А. А. Введение в Языковедение АСПЕНТ ПРЕСС Москва 1996

60. Русские писатели о литературном труде.т. 4. Л., 1956.

61. Русский язык и советское общество (Социолингвистическое исследование). М.,1968.

62. Русский язык и советское общество. Лексика современного русского литературного языка. М., 1968.

63. Русский язык и советское общество. Морфология и синтаксис современного русского литературного языка. М., 1968.

64. Словарь русского языка в 4-х томах. Под ред. Евгеньевой А.П. и др. М.,1981.

65. Словарь русского языка Ожегова С.И. Под ред. Шведовой Н.Ю. М.,1972

66. Словарь современного литературного русского языка в 17-ти томах. М., 1948-1965

67. Соссюр, Ф. Труды по языкоzнанию [Текст] / Ф. де Соссюр. - М.: Прогресс, 1977.

68. Толковый словарь русского языка в 4-х томах. Под ред. Ушакова Д.Н. М.,1935-1940

69. Ушинский К.Д. Избранные труды педагогические сочинения в 2-х томах. т.2. М., 1954.

70. Фортунатов Ф.Ф. Избранные сочинения [Текст]: в 2 т. / Ф.Ф. Фортунатов. - М.: Учпедгиз, 1956. - Т. 1.

71. Хрестоматия по истории русского языкоzнания [Текст] / Сост. Ф.М. Березин. - М.: Высш. шк., 1973.

72. Хроленко А.Т. Основы современной филологии. Изд. «ФЛИНТА». М., 2013.

73. Черейский И. Разговор по существу. Литературная газета. № 41.11.10.89.

74. Шведова Н.Ю. Активные процессы в современном русском синтаксисе. М., 1966.

75. Шкляревский Г.И. История русского литературного языка. Советский период. Изд. «Вища школа», Харьков, 1984

76. Mathesius, V. Noveproudý a smcry v jazykovcdncmbadani [Text] / V, Mathesius // Z klasickehoobdobiPrazskeskoly 1925-1945. Cesk. akad. ved. Pramenyceske a slovenskelingvistiky. Radaceska. - Praha, 1972, - №2.

### E-resources

77. [http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc\\_philosophy/1101/%D0%A1%D0%98%D0%9D%D0%A5%D0%A0%D0%9E%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%AF](http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_philosophy/1101/%D0%A1%D0%98%D0%9D%D0%A5%D0%A0%D0%9E%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%AF) Энциклопедический словарь. М.: Гард арики. Под редакцией А.А. Ивина. 2004. 23.06.2016 0:10

78. <http://studopedia.org/1-21380.html> Концепция Ф.Соссюра 20.06.2016 14-37

