Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej, 57
Warszawa 2022
Article No. 2712

Citation:
Romanik, A. (2022). Common usage vs codified standard: Problems with the codification of anglicisms in the contemporary Russian language. *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*, *57*, Article 2712. https://doi.org/10.11649/sfps.2712

DOI: 10.11649/sfps.2712

Anna Romanik
(University of Białystok, Białystok)

Common Usage vs Codified Standard: Problems with the Codification of Anglicisms in the Contemporary Russian Language

1. Introduction

At present, English has the status of the world's "global language", also referred to as a "lingua franca" (Crystal, 2003, p. 30; Firth, 2009, p. 147; House, 2003, p. 556; Jenkins, 2007, p. 200). Its dominating position as a tool of interpersonal communication used by people of different nations in many areas of life is undeniable and its influence on other national languages – significant. The contemporary Russian language is under a big influence of English, which becomes the object of multi-dimensional linguistic research (Khoutyz, 2010, p. 197). Foreign elements in the language constitute a serious challenge to prescriptive linguists, because their job is not only to document and describe the phenomenon itself but also to sanction new items in the Russian language system, which is a responsible practical task.

The topic of this article is the codification of the most recent borrowings of British and American English origin in the system of the contemporary Rus-

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 PL License (creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl/), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2022.
Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences
[Wydawca: Instytut Slawistyki Polskiej Akademii Nauk]

sian language. The analysed anglicisms include the words that function in two different areas: the common usage and the codified standard. As signalled in the title, those two terms are juxtaposed. Such a juxtaposition of language use and standard is conventional, but in this context it is justified, as the proposed research is meant to show.

The analysis will be accompanied by some facts illustrating the history of loanwords found in the Russian high-circulation lifestyle magazines (*Cosmopolitan*, *Elle*, *Glamour*, *Vogue*, *Домашний очаг*) published between 2016 and 2020. The study covered all types of texts published in these periodicals (articles, advertisements, reviews, correspondence, editorials, interviews, etc.). The choice of magazines of this type as the source of anglicisms was not random. They are an important means of lexical transfer and a platform for the popularization of loanwords (Кулешова, 2011, p. 52). It seems that foreign words, which are a popular type of neologism, can serve as a good example of what happens to lexical innovations from the moment when they appear in the language until the time when they are "officially" absorbed by the system, i.e. recorded in a dictionary. Here, the discussion will be based on studying the presence of the items excerpted from the above-mentioned sources of anglicisms in the most recently published lexicographic publications (prescriptive spelling dictionaries). The reason for choosing this type of dictionary is that they typically contain an extensive record of vocabulary and are meant to be the source of correct spelling of any innovations that appear in the language.

This study project also compares common usage resulting from the way anglicisms are used in press articles with literary standards sanctioned by adequate institutions and approved by prescriptive linguists in Russia. In short, the spelling of selected loanwords that have been popularized by the media will be compared with the spelling recommended by specialist prescriptive dictionaries. It is a particularly interesting and important task because the results of this study will not only show the formal side of the codification process of foreign elements in the Russian language system (the method of spelling standardization, etc.) – they can also reveal some threats to the tradition and stability of the Russian national language, which have been developed by historical and cultural heritage.

A discussion about the linguistic norms requires great caution, since in the relatively broad literature related to this topic we can always find contradictory viewpoints on the very essence of this linguistic phenomenon, which,

in consequence, has resulted in the absence of a uniform definition of this term (Шмелев, 2017, p. 185). Bearing in mind that issues related to linguistic norms are delicate and, at the same time, complex research matters, these deliberations do not include any categorical statements. The proposed text should be treated as an idea of how to organize a certain portion of knowledge in the given field based on some subjective observations of linguistic reality.

2. Research methods

The proposed analysis is based most of all on the traditional methods of synchronic description. The project involves both a theoretical discussion and the presentation of an empirical study reflecting on the phenomenon in focus.

The research was conducted to show how the process of loanword codification happens in the contemporary Russian language. It involved excerpting research material (loanwords of English origin) from texts published in the above-mentioned top-ranking Russian-language magazines. Then, the selected anglicisms were confronted with the resources of the two most recently published spelling dictionaries with a prescriptive status. The first of them is currently the biggest academic Russian spelling dictionary (*Russkiĭ orfograficheskiĭ slovar'*, 2016; hereinafter referred to as ROS, 2016), which contains about 200,000 items (words and phrases), including the latest lexemes that entered the Russian language in the twenty-first century. The second spelling dictionary (*Ob"iasnitel'nyĭ russkiĭ orfograficheskiĭ slovar'-spravochnik*, 2017; hereinafter referred to as OROSS, 2017) is another publication of the Russian Academy of Sciences, which, despite its smaller size (20,000 vocabulary items), contains entries with very useful information for the reader – the spelling rules and, in many cases, the origin of a given word. Although a spelling dictionary with additional explanations is not a novelty in lexicography, this publication, according to its authors, is the first one in the history of academic lexicography to integrate two ways of constructing dictionary entries: by providing a relevant rule and etymology (OROSS, 2017, p. iii). Both publications have the recommendation of the Russian Academy of Sciences – an institution that has an official mandate to "lay down the rules".

In order to examine the lexical items selected and the way they function in the codified standard more thoroughly, the study also involved the use of resources available in the Russian National Corpus database, which records

textual innovations found, among others, in the media discourse. However, the aim was not to confront the spelling of all the excerpted units with the Corpus data. As it is here, references to the Corpus data are made only to examine the popularity of particular spelling variants of anglicisms.

The results obtained using the quantitative method should not be generalized and applied to the Russian language as such, as they only present certain linguistic phenomena observable in a particular, narrowly defined kind of discourse at a particular time. However, based on the results of the study, which give an idea of the situation in a given area of language at a given time (the language of the selected magazines), we can expect the same tendencies in a wider perspective.

3. Common usage / codified standard / codification (terminology explained)

The linguistic norm has become the object of meticulous research and heated discussions worldwide. There have been a lot of inspiring and valuable publications in this field, contributed by linguists from different countries, e.g. R. Bartsch (1987), L. Bauer (2013), E. B. Beshenkova (Бешенкова, 2016), M. Bugajski (1993), D. Cameron (1995), K. S. Gorbachevich (Горбачевич, 1978), O. E. Ivanova (Иванова, 2017), A. Kiklewicz (2017a, 2017b), L. P. Krysin (Крысин, 2017), A. Markowski (2011), I. V. Nechayeva (Нечаева, 2011), J. Puzynina (1997) and others.

Despite the abundance of studies focused on the linguistic norm, the concept is still vague, multi-aspectual, internally diversified and, thus, ambiguous. In the literature, we can find numerous classifications of the linguistic norm, which take into account different aspects and areas (broad or narrow definitions of the term). The Russian linguist L. P. Krysin points out that the fact that this term can be understood broadly or narrowly leads to certain chaos as the boundaries between other similar concepts become fuzzy. For instance, the norm is often equated with common usage and is treated as its synonym. In his view, the norm, in the broad sense, means the result of tradition, a long-lasting habit of using certain language items and their combinations (in this sense, it may indeed be equated with common usage). On the other hand, in the narrow sense, the norm is the result of codification, a collection of recommendations on the use of lexical units (Крысин, 2017, p. 23).

A similar distinction is postulated, among others, by J. Puzynina, who differentiates between the common usage and the codified standard. She views the c o m m o n u s a g e as a set of socially accepted language items and the methods of their integration into sentences and texts. She emphasizes, at the same time, the fuzziness of the concept itself and questions the precision of the term "socially accepted". She defines the c o d i f i e d s t a n d a r d as a set of clear assessments by the experts, related to language units, their form, meanings and the ways in which they can be combined to form sentences, and – in a broader sense – the ways they can be used in larger texts (Puzynina, 1997, p. 1). On the other hand, A. Markowski, one of the leading Polish prescriptive linguists, adds that the codified standard is developed with the use of linguistic reflection and intentional reference to tradition and the knowledge of the language system. It is a standard in the form of descriptions, prescriptions and models. It is only present in the general variety of the language. It is taught and popularized, constantly cultivated and developed intentionally and purposefully (Markowski, 2011, p. 30).

The concept of a codified linguistic norm is inseparably linked to codification. According to its dictionary definition, c o d i f i c a t i o n is the process of describing and consolidating the standard language usage in dictionaries, grammar books, textbooks, etc. The official codification is consolidated in formal legal acts, government regulations and other documents (Караулов, 2003, p. 270). Thus, the vocabulary is codified when it is allowed for use in the literary language, i.e. included in the resources of the relevant prescriptive dictionaries.

4. Codification of loanwords in the contemporary Russian (research results and discussion)

4.1. Introductory remarks – anglicisms in magazine discourse

The transfer of lexis of foreign origin into the contemporary Russian language is an intensive process that constitutes a great challenge for prescriptive linguists. Their task is to take a stand on the presence of borrowings in the spoken language. Eventually, loanwords are either included in dictionary resources (codified) or ignored (not codified). The process of standardization of anglicisms is not easy for several reasons. Firstly, the number of borrowings

is relatively large and their entry into the Russian language is spontaneous and uncontrolled, which results in a "lexical mess". Secondly, despite the fact that the borrowing of words of English origin has been going on for several centuries, the Russian language still does not have any uniform rules of their adaptation (graphic, phonetic or morphological), which could facilitate the synergy of those two different languages. Although spelling rules are being improved, they still have some obvious shortcomings. And, finally, the media certainly do not make the task easier for prescriptive linguists. It is the scene of a vigorous linguistic revolution that the codifiers have to face and deal with. Let us stop at this point and take a closer look at this situation.

The Russian-language media and, in particular, the analysed magazines are a carrier of numerous borrowings (Кулешова, 2011, p. 52). The authors of texts published in Russian magazines (journalists, columnists, copywriters, etc.) are eager to use the vocabulary of foreign origin (mainly British and American English). This is partly motivated by the pragmatic need to name certain things (Григорьян, 2018, p. 172), but another factor at play is what can be called snobbism. The authors of such texts want to show their command of English, which, according to many modern cosmopolitans, raises the status of discourse participants, adds a certain prestige to the text and proves the author's education and openness to the world. What is more, borrowings are used to attract the reader's attention because such intriguing foreign elements have a great persuasive potential.

However, regardless of the reasons why so many loanwords appear in the media, it is an objective phenomenon, which is extensively discussed by specialists in the field of prescriptive linguistics. The consequences of this dynamic process of absorbing foreign lexis include, among others, some problems related to spelling and graphic representation and a phenomenon that can be called "semantic confusion", i.e. sometimes Russians use new loanwords without really knowing their true meaning. Larisa Ratsiburskaia emphasizes that journalists tend to use foreign words their readers do not understand, thus giving their texts a pseudo-scientific flavour (Рацибурская, 2008, p. 226).

While adopting loanwords, the media, sometimes unconsciously and sometimes quite intuitively or even thoughtlessly, ignore the standard rules of linguistic correctness and create their own language patterns and models. They propagate and popularize their own spelling of lexical innovations among the general public. In consequence, the linguistic practice in the media is treated as a correct model to be followed by the target audience. Magazine readers can rightly assume that

the language used by the authors of articles (mostly erudite, well-educated and outspoken people) reflects the generally accepted standards of correctness since the texts are edited by specialists. Most probably, only a small percentage of Russians refer to language guides or dictionaries to check up the correct grammatical form, spelling or pronunciation of a difficult word of foreign origin. People usually adopt the form that they see or hear in their environment.

4.2. Loanword codification study

The anglicisms found in the press constitute quite a numerous group. However, only those units that were recorded at least three times in the texts were included in the study. The analysis covered 56 selected loanwords.

The study showed that nearly 50% of the anglicisms excerpted from lifestyle magazines, i.e. functioning in language use, are not recorded in the consulted prescriptive spelling dictionaries, which means that they have not been codified. Those are, for example, such words as: *аутфит*, *бодипозитив/боди-позитив*, *буллинг*, *виш-лист*, *воркшоп*, *комьюнити*, *концепт-стор*, *ланч-бокс*, *лукбук*, *массмаркет/масс-маркет*, *милениал*, *мудборд*, *оверсайз*, *ресайклинг*, *рэп-баттл*, *снэп*, *сторис*, *сторителлинг*, *стриминг*, *стрит-фуд*, *фейк-ньюс*, *фримаркет*, *фудшеринг*, *фэшионист(а)*, *хештег/хэштег*, *челлендж*, *читмил*, etc. The popularity of those units among language users is diverse, as shown by the frequency of their occurrence in the Internet. This group also includes the most recent anglicisms (*сторителлинг*, *фудшеринг*), whose absence in the dictionaries is not surprising because it is natural that a certain amount of time is needed for a word to enter the literary language. However, what is surprising is the absence of those borrowings that have been present in the Russian language for a relatively long time and enjoy a considerable popularity (e.g. *ресайклинг*, *фейк-ньюс*).

The other part of the empirical material (the remaining 50%) has been codified, i.e. recorded in the consulted dictionaries, which is equal to gaining the status of lexemes. The question that appears at this point is whether the fact that only a half of the vocabulary under scrutiny is recorded in prescriptive publications indicates a cautious approach to the standardization of foreign lexis and a restrictive nature of the norm, based on which certain units are selected while others are dismissed. Maybe such a percentage of words adopted in the literary language should be seen as impressive, considering that anglicisms enter the Russian language at a really fast pace. It seems that a definitive,

unambiguous answer to these questions is not possible. The attitude one may have to the number of codified borrowings is absolutely subjective.

A separate commentary must be given to the anglicisms that function in the common use and, at the same time, have been recorded as headwords in the consulted prescriptive dictionaries, which proves their presence in the Russian language system. A vast majority of this type of borrowing has the same form of transcription in the common usage of the media discourse and in the codified standard. The following units can serve as an example: *байер*, *бэкграунд*, *мессенджер*, *ноу-хау*, *офсайд*, *пресс-релиз*, *реди-мейд*, *скай-фай*, *сталкер*, *стрит-арт*, *стритстайл*, *тайминг*, *тимбилдинг*, *троллинг*, *фейсбилдинг*, *фейслифтинг*, *фрилансер*, *чек-лист*, *чизкейк*. The same was confirmed by a study on the codification of lexical innovations conducted by O. E. Ivanova (Иванова, 2017, p. 84), a Russian researcher and co-author of the above-mentioned spelling dictionary (ROS, 2016).

Codified anglicisms whose prescribed form differs from the common use in the analysed media are in the minority. The spelling of some of those words deserves a more thorough analysis.

An example of spelling confusion (the differences in spelling) is the English loanword *suite* (a type of hotel room). Although ROS (2016) makes a clear recommendation how the word should be transcribed (*сюит*), different variants have been found in magazines (*сьют*, *сюит*, and even in the form of an inclusion written in the Latin alphabet: *suit*). This situation can be illustrated with the following examples from source material:

- *В холле, лобби и* ***сьютах*** *развешены десятки картин из коллекции владельцев отеля – семьи Сольдевила-Касалс* (*Elle*, March 2017, p. 346);
- *Бронировала* ***сьют*** *с видом на океан, а получила стандарт с окнами во двор* (*Cosmopolitan*, July 2018, p. 177);
- *Самые маленькие* ***сюиты*** *отеля можно назвать небольшими только условно: 100 м2 (с учётом балкона), ванная комната с джакузи, отдельная гардеробная – что ещё может понадобиться одинокому путнику или счастливым влюблённым?* (*Vogue*, February 2018, p. 100).

Despite dictionary recommendations, in the usus we can notice a more frequent use of the variant *сьют* (out of 12 recorded occurrences of this word in the analysed magazines, the form *сьют* appeared nine times, while its alternative transcription, *сюит*, showed three times).

The situation is similar for such words as *продакшен*, *промоушен*, *ресепшен*, *фешен*, *фьюжен*, *экшен*, which, according to the recommendations of dictionary

editors, should be spelled with a final [*шен*] (Янурик, 2017, p. 357). It is interesting that, in the OROSS dictionary entries of these headwords, it is mentioned that different spelling variants are used, but there is also a prescribed version of the word's transcription, which is consistent with its pronunciation and the spelling rule given in the linguistic guide – a set of rules and patterns (OROSS, 2017, p. 550) appears in the dictionary. Despite those recommendations, in the analysed magazines, these borrowings function in alternative variants (*промоушен*/*промоушн*, *ресепшен*/*ресепшн*, *фешен*/*фэшн*, *фьюжен*/*фьюжн*, *экшен*/*экшн*). However, in terms of statistics, the variant with the final [*шн*] is more frequently recorded in the texts of the periodicals in focus. For instance, the analysis of the said magazines published in 2018 shows that the variant *фэшн* was recorded three times as often as *фешен* – the variant recommended by the dictionaries.

The dominance of the "non-dictionary" version of transcription of the abovementioned words with the final [*шн*] is also confirmed by the data compiled in the Russian National Corpus (hereinafter referred to as RNC, n.d.). Although they are prepared based on other written media, they still illustrate similar linguistic tendencies observable in the mass media. The proportions in which both spelling variants are used in the press discourse according to RNC (n.d.) are shown in Table 1 below.[1]

Table 1. The proportions of spelling variants of anglicisms with a final [*шен*/*шн*] in the usus (the transcription consistent with the dictionary recommendation versus the transcription inconsistent with the dictionary recommendation). The figures were recorded in the Russian National Corpus as of 10 February 2021.

Transcription with final [*шен*] (as recommended by ROS)	Number of units recorded in the RNC (as of 10 Feb 2021)	Transcription with final [*шн*] (not recommended by ROS)	Number of units recorded in the RNC (as of 10 Feb 2021)
продакшен	16	*продакшн*	483
промоушен	78	*промоушн*	92
ресепшен	43	*ресепшн*	112
фешен	22	*фэшн*	338
фьюжен	6	*фьюжн*	89
экшен	255	*экшн*	392

[1] Statistical data from the Russian National Corpus (a sub-corpus of the contemporary mass media, prepared on the basis of press articles published in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries) http://www.ruscorpora.ru/ (as of 10.02.2021).

As we can see, there is a significant disproportion between how often the alternative spelling variants of anglicisms with final [*шен*] and [*шн*] are used in the press discourse. However, the data compiled in RNC (n.d.) shows that in print media, the dominance of transcription inconsistent with the recommendations of prescriptive spelling dictionaries does not apply to all anglicisms which have different spelling variants. Quite an opposite situation in the common use (the dominance of the variant recommended by the codifiers) can be observed in the case of some other borrowings, as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. The proportions of spelling variants of selected anglicisms found in the usus (the transcription consistent with the dictionary recommendation versus the transcription inconsistent with the dictionary recommendation). The figures were recorded in the Russian National Corpus as of 10 February 2021.

Transcription of the unit (as recommended by ROS)	Number of units recorded in the RNC (as of 10 Feb 2021)	Transcription of the unit (not recommended by ROS)	Number of units recorded in the RNC (as of 10 Feb 2021)
уик-энд	1,062	*уикенд*	381
селебрити	71	*селебритис**	15
трекинг	22	*треккинг*	4
стретчинг	12	*стрейчинг*	6

* It should be emphasized that the spelling of a word may depend on its meaning. This is the situation we have in the case of the doublet *селебрити*/*селебритис* – *селебрити* means 'a popular and famous person/people', while *селебритис* may be used to mean 'popular and famous people' or the 'elite'. The quantitative data from the Corpus refer to the *селебрити*/*селебритис* variants used in the first sense, i.e. 'a popular and famous person/people'.

In the case of anglicisms whose written form is unstable, we observe an obvious competition between alternative spelling variants, as shown in the tables above. It seems that the trends spontaneously and intuitively created and then popularized by the common use often win with the codified standard, which is intentionally established, restrictive and based on linguistic traditions. A similar observation was made by S. M. Kuz′mina, a Russian researcher in the field of prescriptive linguistics and co-author of the first edition of the ROS. She points out that systematic discrepancies between the recommended spelling rules and the actual spelling practice indicate that the norm has a passive character and that the common usage wins with the linguistic norm, which means that the latter should be revised and made more precise (Кузьмина, 2010, p. 52).

There may be several reasons for the co-existence of alternative spelling forms. On the one hand, it might result from the fact that text authors and editors do not care too much about linguistic correctness or maybe they even disregard the already sanctioned literary norms and, thus, the obligation to preserve the purity of one's native language. It is also a sign that linguistic role models are changing. On the other hand, text authors may also be overwhelmed by the fast pace of changes taking place in the language and are confused about the correct spelling of numerous lexical innovations. However, at the same time, Kuz′mina argues that the conflict between the codified norm and the common usage is one of the most important impulses for language development, which sets the ground for the evolution of spelling. She adds that the said evolution results from two parallel processes: a free and spontaneous development of the language, and its intentional, science-based construction (Кузьмина, 2010, p. 52).

4.3. Contemporary prescriptive linguistics – problems and challenges

The current inflow of loanwords (mainly English ones) into the Russian language is quite a challenge for the codifiers. As they admit themselves, the lexis of foreign origin is problematic due to the scale and pace of its adoption into the language and the fact that the whole process of standardization happens in a relatively short period of time (Иванова, 2017, p. 82). What makes the task even more complicated is that many of those words are included in dictionaries at an early stage of their written language existence, when their development is still uncertain. Additionally, standardization is done by specialists (linguistic role models) who represent different attitudes to the vocabulary of foreign origin (rather liberal, strict or even purist). It happens that the opinions held by some codifiers are opposed to those of others (Цынк, 2016, p. 29). Hence, one challenge is to reach a compromise on whether to include a given unit in a prescriptive dictionary and, thus, give it a status of a regular element of the Russian language system, and yet another challenge is to give it a proper form in terms of grammar, spelling, etc.

Despite the enormous effort made so far to establish the principles of incorporating foreign elements into Russian, it sometimes happens that the criteria of including a new unit in dictionaries are not quite clear. The analysis of the indicated dictionary resources leads to the following question: Why did the relatively "fresh"

anglicisms such as *оверсайд-деливери* and *риск-тейкер* (which, by the way, are not recorded in the RNC) find their way into the ROS dictionary while other commonly used units such as *массмаркет*/*масс-маркет* have not been included, despite their similar or even greater popularity in society? This phenomenon gives the impression that there is an element of chance in the decision-making process leading to the incorporation of new words into prescriptive dictionaries. Such a situation may be referred to as codification subjectivism, which seems to be an inseparable element of the work performed by codifiers. Obviously, this observation is not meant as criticism, and its purpose is not to diminish in any way the value of the work performed by prescriptive linguists or the fruits of their labour, i.e. the dictionaries. Quite to the contrary, the multitude of the problems discussed herein shows what a complex task it is to curb and regulate lexical innovations occurring in the course of intense and dynamic development of civilization and interactions between different language systems.

This leads to the following question: What else can be done to make the loanword codification process less subjective and more objective? Certainly, this is yet another challenge faced by the Spelling Committee at the Russian Academy of Sciences and other language regulators. What seems to be necessary at present is to improve the existing formal issues related to loanword adaptation and, at the same time, their standardization. We need to develop a new paradigm of codification of foreign borrowings, which would be based on appropriate methodology and uniform (possibly simplified) spelling rules. If the intuitive actions of codifiers are replaced by a relatively restrictive systemic approach, lexicographers may get a chance to tidy up the "spelling mess" among the borrowings functioning in everyday use and gain control over a balanced registration of neologisms in dictionaries.

The conclusions drawn from the observations made above lead to yet another reflection. There is no doubt that language codification is made considerably more difficult due to the power of the media, which introduce English borrowings and use them in quite a casual and carefree way (often with variable spelling). As far as the language is concerned, the mass media are rather chaotic. What is more, they develop very dynamically, with an increasing number of them, which means that there are more and more participants in the media discourse who create the language based on control and dictatorship. The power of the media cannot be ignored, as it is well known that they are the source of language patterns and models, taking this privilege away from literature (Валгина, 2003, pp. 4–5). This is an undeniable fact that regulators must deal with.

5. Conclusions

The analysis showed that the consulted prescriptive dictionaries do not record approximately half of the anglicisms found in the examined periodicals. This means that the process of their full adoption into the language system is not complete. On the other hand, the remaining lexical units have been recorded in the dictionaries and, thus, have been fully introduced into the Russian language. The study also revealed another problem that concerns most language users, that is, the inconsistency between the transcription of particular units in the codified standard represented by specialist dictionaries and the common usage reflected in the press. Based on the conducted analyses, we can formulate a thesis that the codified standard and the common usage are in permanent competition, which seems to be a natural and, most importantly, inevitable linguistic phenomenon in the times of globalization and dynamic civilizational development, including the media, which play a particularly important role in popularizing language patterns and models. The norm must stand the test of time.

Abbreviations

OROSS – *Объяснительный русский орфографический словарь-справочник* (Бешенкова et al., 2017).

RNC – *Национальный корпус русского языка*, n.d.

ROS – *Русский орфографический словарь* (Лопатин & Иванова, 2016).

Bibliography

Bartsch, R. (1987). *Norms of language: Theoretical and practical aspects*. Longman.

Bauer, L. (2013). *Watching English change: Introduction to the study of linguistic change in standard Englishes in the twentieth century*. Routledge.

Bugajski, M. (1993). *Językoznawstwo normatywne*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Cameron, D. (1995). *Verbal hygiene*. Routledge.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Firth, A. (2009). The *lingua franca* factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *6*(2), 147–170. https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2009.009

House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *7*(4), 556–578. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00242.x

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.

Khoutyz, I. (2010). The pragmatics of anglicisms in modern Russian discourse. In R. Facchinetti, D. Crystal, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *From international to local English – and back again* (pp. 197–208). Peter Lang AG.

Kiklewicz, A. (2017a). Norma językowa w gramatykach funkcjonalnych. *Poradnik Językowy*, *2017*(7), 23–37.

Kiklewicz, A. (2017b). Status i granice normy językowej w świetle lingwistyki funkcjonalnej. *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego*, *73*, 65–80.

Markowski, A. (2011). *Kultura języka polskiego: Teoria, zagadnienia leksykalne*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Puzynina, J. (1997). Problem kodyfikacji normy języka polskiego. *Poradnik Językowy*, *1997*(6), 1–8.

Бешенкова, Е. В. (2016). Вариативность, узуальная норма и политика нормализаторов. *Сибирский филологический журнал*, *2016*(3), 35–42. https://doi.org/10.17223/18137083/56/3

Валгина, Н. С. (2003). *Активные процессы в современном русском языке*. Логос.

Горбачевич, К. С. (1978). *Нормы современного русского литературного языка*. Просвещение.

Григорьян, Е. (2018). Взаимодействие языковых миров в современной русской речи. *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*, *9*(2), 171–180. https://doi.org/10.31648/pw.3123

Иванова, О. Е. (2017). Неравномерность процесса письменного освоения слов и словарная кодификация. *Верхневолжский филологический вестник*, *2017*(4), 82–89.

Крысин, Л. П. (2017). К соотношению системы языка, его нормы и узуса. *Коммуникативные исследования*, *2017*(2(12)), 20–31.

Кузьмина, С. М. (2010). Нормы орфографии и современная письменная практика. In Л. П. Крысин (Ed.), *Современный русский язык: Система – норма – узус* (pp. 47–67). Языки славянских культур.

Кулешова, Н. А. (2011). Язык моды в эпоху глобализации (об англо-американских заимствованиях в русской, испанской и французской версиях журнала Vogue). *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, *2011*(1), 52–61.

Национальный корпус русского языка [RNC]. (n.d.). Retrieved February 10, 2021, from https://ruscorpora.ru

Нечаева, И. В. (2011). *Актуальные проблемы орфографии иноязычных заимствований*. "Азбуковник".

Рацибурская, Л. В. (2008). Иноязычные элементы в современных российских СМИ. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, *4*(1), 225–235. https://doi.org/10.15291/csi.421

Цынк, С. В. (2016). Об отношении к норме русского языка в XXI веке. *Вестник Ульяновского государственного технического университета*, *2016*(2), 28–30.

Шмелев, А. Д. (2017). Возможна ли кодификация языковых норм в эпоху социальных и культурных изменений? *Труды Института русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова*, *2017*(13), 184–191.

Янурик, С. (2017). Английские заимствования с исходом на *-ш(е)н* и *-ж(е)н* в русском языке последних лет в свете словарных и корпусных данных. *Труды Института русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова*, *2017*(13), 356–366.

Dictionaries

Бешенкова, Е. В., Иванова, О. Е., & Чельцова, Л. К. (Eds.). (2017). *Объяснительный русский орфографический словарь-справочник* [OROSS]. "АСТ-Пресс Книга".

Караулов, Ю. Н. (Ed.). (2003). *Русский язык: Энциклопедия*. Научное издательство "Большая Российская энциклопедия".

Лопатин, В. В., & Иванова, О. Е. (Eds.). (2016). *Русский орфографический словарь* [ROS]. "АСТ-Пресс Книга".

Bibliography (Transliteration)

Bartsch, R. (1987). *Norms of language: Theoretical and practical aspects*. Longman.

Bauer, L. (2013). *Watching English change: Introduction to the study of linguistic change in standard Englishes in the twentieth century*. Routledge.

Beshenkova, E. V. (2016). Variativnost′, uzual′naia norma i politika normalizatorov. *Sibirskiĭ filologicheskiĭ zhurnal*, *2016*(3), 35–42. https://doi.org/10.17223/18137083/56/3

Bugajski, M. (1993). *Językoznawstwo normatywne*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Cameron, D. (1995). *Verbal hygiene*. Routledge.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Firth, A. (2009). The *lingua franca* factor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *6*(2), 147–170. https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2009.009

Gorbachevich, K. S. (1978). *Normy sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo iazyka*. Prosveshchenie.

Grigor′ian, E. (2018). Vzaimodeĭstvie iazykovykh mirov v sovremennoĭ russkoĭ rechi. *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*, *9*(2), 171–180. https://doi.org/10.31648/pw.3123

House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *7*(4), 556–578. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00242.x

IAnurik, S. (2017). Angliĭskie zaimstvovaniia s iskhodom na *-sh(e)n* i *-zh(e)n* v russkom iazyke poslednikh let v svete slovarnykh i korpusnykh dannykh. *Trudy Instituta russkogo iazyka im. V. V. Vinogradova*, *2017*(13), 356–366.

Ivanova, O. E. (2017). Neravnomernost′ protsessa pis′mennogo osvoeniia slov i slovarnaia kodifikatsiia. *Verkhnevolzhskiĭ filologicheskiĭ vestnik*, *2017*(4), 82–89.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.

Khoutyz, I. (2010). The pragmatics of anglicisms in modern Russian discourse. In R. Facchinetti, D. Crystal, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *From international to local English – and back again* (pp. 197–208). Peter Lang AG.

Kiklewicz, A. (2017a). Norma językowa w gramatykach funkcjonalnych. *Poradnik Językowy*, *2017*(7), 23–37.

Kiklewicz, A. (2017b). Status i granice normy językowej w świetle lingwistyki funkcjonalnej. *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego*, *73*, 65–80.

Krysin, L. P. (2017). K sootnosheniiu sistemy iazyka, ego normy i uzusa. *Kommunikativnye issledovaniia*, *2017*(2(12)), 20–31.

Kuleshova, N. A. (2011). IAzyk mody v ėpokhu globalizatsii (ob anglo-amerikanskikh zaimstvovaniiakh v russkoĭ, ispanskoĭ i frantsuzskoĭ versiiakh zhurnala Vogue). *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, *2011*(1), 52–61.

Kuz′mina, S. M. (2010). Normy orfografii i sovremennaia pis′mennaia praktika. In L. P. Krysin (Ed.), *Sovremennyĭ russkiĭ iazyk: Sistema – norma – uzus* (pp. 47–67). IAzyki slavianskikh kul′tur.

Markowski, A. (2011). *Kultura języka polskiego: Teoria, zagadnienia leksykalne*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Natsional′nyĭ korpus russkogo iazyka [RNC]. (n.d.). Retrieved February 10, 2021, from https://ruscorpora.ru

Nechaeva, I. V. (2011). *Aktual′nye problemy orfografii inoiazychnykh zaimstvovaniĭ*. "Azbukovnik".

Puzynina, J. (1997). Problem kodyfikacji normy języka polskiego. *Poradnik Językowy*, *1997*(6), 1–8.

Ratsiburskaia, L. V. (2008). Inoiazychnye ėlementy v sovremennykh rossiĭskikh SMI. *Croatica et Slavica Iadertina*, *4*(1), 225–235. https://doi.org/10.15291/csi.421

Shmelev, A. D. (2017). Vozmozhna li kodifikatsiia iazykovykh norm v ėpokhu sotsial′nykh i kul′turnykh izmeneniĭ? *Trudy Instituta russkogo iazyka im. V. V. Vinogradova*, *2017*(13), 184–191.

TSynk, S. V. (2016). Ob otnoshenii k norme russkogo iazyka v XXI veke. *Vestnik Ul′ianovskogo gosudarstvennogo tekhnicheskogo universiteta*, *2016*(2), 28–30.

Valgina, N. S. (2003). *Aktivnye protsessy v sovremennom russkom iazyke*. Logos.

Dictionaries

Beshenkova, E. V., Ivanova, O. E., & Chel′tsova, L. K. (Eds.). (2017). *Ob″iasnitel′nyĭ russkiĭ orfograficheskiĭ slovar′-spravochnik* [OROSS]. "AST-Press Kniga".

Karaulov, IU. N. (Ed.). (2003). *Russkiĭ iazyk: Ėntsiklopediia*. Nauchnoe izdatel′stvo "Bol′shaia Rossiĭskaia ėntsiklopediia".

Lopatin, V. V., & Ivanova, O. E. (Eds.). (2016). *Russkiĭ orfograficheskiĭ slovar′* [ROS]. AST-Press Kniga.

Common Usage vs Codified Standard: Problems with the Codification of Anglicisms in the Contemporary Russian Language

Summary

This article focuses on the important problem of codification of the most recent borrowings of British and American English origins in the contemporary Russian language. Standardization of loanwords is a current issue of vital importance, as it has a global reach, which means that it affects not only the Russian language but many other national languages that are under the influence of the English language – the contemporary *lingua franca*. The codification of the lexis of foreign origin is examined based on material obtained from contemporary lifestyle magazines published in Russian. This type of press disseminates borrowed neologisms particularly intensively and, at the same time, creates the language use of the given discourse. The excerpted vocabulary items have been confronted with the lexis of the most recent Russian spelling dictionaries. The deliberations contained in this paper show a fragment of linguistic reality changing under the influence of ubiquitous English language, where common usage competes with the linguistic norm. The article shows the difficulties caused by lexical transfer of loanwords faced by specialists in prescriptive linguistics (e.g. a common problem of orthographic variation).

Norma uzualna vs norma skodyfikowana. O problemach kodyfikacji anglicyzmów we współczesnym języku rosyjskim

Streszczenie

Niniejszy artykuł zwraca uwagę na istotny problem kodyfikacji najnowszych zapożyczeń anglo-amerykańskiej proweniencji we współczesnej ruszczyźnie. Temat standaryzacji zapożyczeń jest aktualny i niezwykle ważny, bowiem ma on zasięg globalny, zatem dotyczy nie tylko języka rosyjskiego, lecz wielu innych

języków narodowych, które znajdują się pod wpływem angielszczyzny – współczesnej *lingua franca*. Badanie kodyfikacji leksyki obcego pochodzenia oparto na materiale zaczerpniętym z najnowszych rosyjskojęzycznych czasopism kolorowych typu *life style*. Ten rodzaj prasy szczególnie ochoczo rozpowszechnia zapożyczone neologizmy, jednocześnie kreuje uzus danego dyskursu. Wyekscerpowany materiał porównano z leksyką zawartą w najnowszych słownikach ortograficznych języka rosyjskiego. Niniejsze rozważania dają obraz fragmentu rzeczywistości językowej zmieniającej się pod wpływem wszechobecnej angielszczyzny, w której uzus konkuruje z normą językową. Ponadto wskazano tu szereg problemów wywoływanych zapożyczeniami leksykalnymi, z którymi zmagają się specjaliści z obszaru językoznawstwa normatywnego (np. powszechny problem wariantywności ortograficznej zapożyczeń).

Keywords: anglicism; media discourse; Russian language; codification; linguistic norm; common usage

Słowa kluczowe: anglicyzm; dyskurs medialny; język rosyjski; kodyfikacja; norma językowa; uzus

Anna Romanik, University of Bialystok, Białystok, Poland
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2733-6503
Correspondence: a.romanik@uwb.edu.pl

The preparation of this article was financed from a grant funded by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education under the Regional Initiative of Excellence programme for the years 2019–2022, project number 009/RID/2018/19, the amount of funding: PLN 8,791,222.00.

Competing interests: The author has declared that she has no competing interests.

Publication history: Received: 2021-12-09; Accepted: 2022-09-02; Published: 2022-12-24