"Threats and challenges": English–Russian interaction today

ALEXANDRA A. RIVLINA*

ABSTRACT: Language contacts have been extensively studied linguistically and sociolinguistically. This paper argues that cross-cultural analysis of language transfer can also prove useful in contact linguistics. One of the latest borrowings from English into Russian, the semantic calque *vyzov vyzovy* ('challenge/ challenges') used often in the cliché *ugrozy i vyzovy* ('threats and challenges'), makes certain shifts in the Russian world view traceable. *Challenge*, a key word in English, is untranslatable into Russian and the trite Russian translation equivalent for *challenge – problema* ('problem') reveals important differences between the two cultures: the Anglophone (especially, American) linguaculture, whose dominant values are individual success and activity, competitiveness, positive thinking, sense of adventure, etc., perceives difficulties as "stimuli" and conceptualizes them in terms of *challenges*; contrary to this, the Russian linguaculture, which is, if compared with the Western cultures, "being-oriented," "relationship-oriented," "passive" and "pessimistic," encourages the discussion of difficulties in terms of *problems*. The borrowing of the concept *challenge* by extending the meaning of *vyzov* registers a shift of the Russian value system in the direction of increased agentivity, assertiveness, positivism, competitiveness, etc. Such borrowings are "challenges" rather than "threats" to the Russian language and culture and they call for a more in-depth linguacultural analysis of English–Russian interactions.

INTRODUCTION

Language contacts have been extensively studied within the traditional comparative and structural linguistic paradigms: various language contact situations have been described linguistically and sociolinguistically in terms of language transfer, positive and negative interference, code-mixing and code-switching, individual and group bilingualism and multilingualism, pidginization and creolization of languages, etc. (Odlin, 1993; Trudgill, 1983: 123–90). Today, within the framework of the modern anthropocentric paradigm, linguistics focuses on relationships between language, culture, and thought; and this view of language that unites language, culture, and culture-specific ways of conceptualization has proven itself useful in many linguistic spheres, including language contact studies. The term "linguaculture" (Agar, 1997) has been coined and is used more and more widely,[1] bilinguals are also seen as biculturals, and the idea of "interlanguage" (Selinker, 1996) is further developed and supported by the idea of "interculture" (Khaleeva, 1999). The issue of primary importance is the effect, if any, of language transfer on human consciousness and vice versa, i.e., the linguistic evidence of cultural and cognitive shifts.

Another major factor featuring in the domain of modern contact linguistics is the globalization of the English language which has created a new type of language contact situation and a new type of bilingualism, "where one of the languages within the speaker is the global language, providing access to the world community, and the other is a regional language, providing access to a local community" (Crystal, 2000: 19). The interactions of local languages with global English have resulted not only in a set of borrowings in each particular language but also in a number of regional variants of English – Englishes

* English Department, Blagoveshchensk State Pedagogical University, 4, Ostrovskogo 4, Blagoveshchensk, Russia, 675006. E-mail: rivlina@mail.ru

(Crystal, 2000: 130–4; Proshina, 2001), representing hybridized world views which are yet to be studied. The linguacultural issues specifically addressed here are as follows: first, how national linguacultures are influenced by global English and, second, what socio-cultural changes necessitate, facilitate, and sustain such linguistic influences. This facet of research can be seen as "the third dimension" in international communication studies (Khaleeva, 1999), developing and supplementing contrastive cross-cultural linguistic studies proper.[2]

The Russian language has not been investigated in its interaction with English as thoroughly as many other languages with a longer history of language and culture contacts, for example, East-Asian languages, or Indian languages. It was only at the end of the twentieth century that Russia underwent revolutionary changes of its social life, which allowed it to fully join the world community politically and economically. The social changes could not but change the linguistic situation in Russian society: there was a considerable increase in English–Russian translations in all genres and spheres, including the mass media, mass culture, advertising, etc.; besides, there was a dramatic rise in the number of Russians learning English as a foreign language and achieving if not "native-like fluency" then at least "reasonable competence" in English. Russian became massively exposed to global English language communication; as David Crystal stated, Russia joined the "expanding circle" of world Englishes (Crystal, 2000: 61). Since language transfer including borrowings makes its way into the host languages "through the medium of the bilingual individuals" (Trudgill, 1983: 177), and individuals bilingual in English along with Russian (both professionally and non-professionally) have become increasingly common, Russian has experienced a wave of English influences.

CONTACT AND CONVERGENCE

Linguistic

English-influenced innovations in modern Russian are registered by scattered references (Mechkovskaia, 2000: 122–4; Palazhchenko, 2002: 41–3; Sen'ko, 1994; Shaposhnikov, 1998; Ter-Minasova, 2000: 104–7) and by not very numerous special linguistic research (Krysin, 2000; Rivlina, 2001) on virtually every lingual level: **lexical borrowings and calques**, e.g., *gamburger* – 'hamburger', *ut'echka mozgov* – 'brain drain', etc.; **semantic changes** of Russian lexical units, some of them interpreted as semantic calques (e.g., the verb *kontrolirovat'*, which used to mean only 'to test', or 'to check' in Russian, under the influence of its English counterpart *to control* developed the meaning 'to rule', or 'to command', as in *kontrolirovat' igornyi biznes* – 'to control the gambling industry'), among other changes of lexical units are the changes in connotations (e.g., the words *aggressivnyi, ambitsioznyi, provokativnyi* – 'aggressive, ambitious, provocative' tend to lose the negative connotations that they used to have in Russian originally), changes in frequency rate (e.g., the borrowing *atlety* – 'athletes', which used to be a rare and stylistically marked word, tends to become stylistically neutral and more frequently used in modern Russian), changes in derivational patterns (e.g., a number of "pseudo-borrowings" created in Russian with the help of borrowed English words and morphemes, such as *profi*, *a pro*, or *imidzh-maker* – 'image-maker' by analogy to *news-maker*), etc.; **grammatical influences**, e.g., the increased use of grammatically unchangeable forms and "noun + noun" word-combinations, as in *Alexandr Masliukov show*, or, the increased use of previously uncountable (Singularia Tantum) nouns in the plural, e.g., *biznessy* –

'businesses', *ugrosy i vyzovy* – 'threats and challenges', etc.; **phonological influences**, e.g., in borrowed words like *Florida*, or *Washington* the accent is shifted back to the first syllable like in English, though previously they were adjusted to the Russian accentual pattern (with the accent on the second or the third syllable); in addition, some researchers state that English intonation patterns are traceable in Russian TV hosts' presentations; **graphics and punctuation**, e.g., the use of capital letters instead of small letters in the names of companies or titles of texts, the reduction of the use of quotation marks in the names of companies or titles of texts; also, the change in the arrangement of quotation marks, when both components are placed in the upper part of the text, while in Russian the first component of quotation marks is regularly used at the bottom of the line; **stylistic influences**, e.g., the transfer of some stylistic features and devices from English, such as *sto-s-chem-to-neizvestno-kakoi film o Borise Grebenshchikove* – 'one-hundredth-or-nobody-knows-which movie about . . .'; additionally, researchers see the reasons for the increased use of euphemisms and clichés in Russian as being the English language influence along with some inner socio-linguistic reasons; **discourse influences**, e.g., the transfer of certain standardized text patterns, such as TV and newspaper news presentation patterns, or business letter arrangements and envelope address arrangements. Among other influences Russian researchers register the reduced use of traditional Russian patronymics, especially in the names of entertainment personalities and political figures, the transfer of some non-verbal communicative features, including gestures, etc. Since lexical changes are always more numerous and more evident than the changes in any other linguistic sphere, English lexical influences in Russian are studied in greater detail and are further analyzed from various perspectives, for example, from the point of view of their semantic functions: the words are borrowed to denote new phenomena (*gamburger* – 'hamburger', *daidzhest* – 'digest', etc.), or to provide a concise nomination for a referent which was unlexicalized or had a compound nomination in Russian (e.g., *snaiper* – 'sniper' to denote 'a sharpshooter'), or to specify the meaning of wider Russian terms (e.g., the English word *image* was borrowed by Russian, *imidzh*, to specify the meaning of its Russian equivalent *obraz* in contexts where the intentional formation of the general opinion in people's minds is implied), or to provide stylistically colored synonyms for Russian words (e.g., the word *prezent* – 'a present, a gift' is often used humorously instead of its Russian equivalent *podarok*). The meanings of some of the borrowings remain intact (*hamburger*), while other English borrowings are transformed in the process of transfer to meet the nominative needs of the Russian language and society (*imidzh*, *prezent*). There are some other linguistic aspects of English–Russian interaction discussed in Krysin (2000), Mechkovskaya (2000: 122–4), Palazhchenko (2002: 41–3), Rivlina (2001), Sen'ko (1994), Shaposhnikov (1998), Ter-Minasova (2000: 104–7).

Cultural

The present stage of English – Russian interaction is treated as another episode in the history of the "culture dialogue" between Russia and the West. Russian semiotician Iuri Lotman demonstrated that Russian culture went through a number of similar episodes in its history when its contacts with foreign cultures intensified and transformed Russian culture and language to a greater or lesser extent: at the time of Russia's baptism (around 988]sc[AC), at the time of Peter the Great's reforms (the beginning of the eighteenth century), and all through the nineteenth century. Lotman subdivides the periods of

intensified culture dialogue into stages: whenever one culture starts to borrow heavily from another culture, at first, foreign texts occupy a higher cultural position. They are considered to be "more beautiful" and "more civilized" than "rude" and "outdated" domestic texts and they tend to preserve their "foreignness." Later the "imported" foreign texts and vernacular texts start to be adjusted to each other: the number of translations and adaptations grows, "imported codes" are incorporated into the structure of the host culture, "imported" ideas are no longer accepted as "perfect," people tend to search for their abandoned "roots" and identities. Lotman maintains that the host culture may reach the stage when imported ideas and concepts become so much imbedded into it, so much adjusted and transformed, that they are no longer perceived as borrowed, and the host culture starts transmitting them to other recipient cultures (Lotman, 1999: 198–200). This description correlates with what is distinguished in historically-oriented translation studies as the two types of translation strategies, which "inevitably emerge in response to the domestic cultural situation" (Venuti, 1998: 240): "domesticating," or "resistant" translation strategies, "a conservative and openly assimilationist approach" aimed at "an ethno-centric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values" (p. 242), and deliberately "foreignizing" strategies which put "an ethnodeviant pressure" on domestic values through a close literal adherence to the foreign text, used as "an instrument of cultural innovation'" (p. 242). Non-professional bilinguals, especially those whom Selinker called "attempted learners" ("i.e., the vast majority of second language learners who fail to achieve native speaker competence" (Selinker, 1996: 175–6)), also contribute to the process of language and culture evolution; they intuitively pinpoint cultural differences and tend to borrow a lot, first of all, because their language mixing is often unconscious, "unfocused" (Odlin, 1993: 144–7), besides, they are not properly equipped with necessary translation skills to thoroughly domesticate foreign texts and are less restricted by translation norms and requirements. Foreignizing influences of professional and amateur translators are especially obvious during periods of intensified culture contacts.

English – Russian interaction during the last two decades can also be seen as going through two successive stages. At the first stage the influence of English was rather hectic: Russia was trying to catch up with the world English language community and Russian borrowed a number of lingual features from English indiscriminately.[3] Gradually, as the minimum stock of notions shared by the world English language community crucial for mutual intelligibility was built up in Russian, the hunger for innovations was somewhat appeased and the influx of borrowings and other linguistic changes subsided and stabilized. Some of the earlier redundant borrowings disappeared (like the much criticized *developery* – 'developers'), others were partly substituted by Russian neologisms: for example, the word *media* was replaced by the Russian abbreviation *SMI* which stands for *sredstva massovoi informatsii* – 'the means of mass information'; the borrowing *media* remained, though, as part of compound words *mediaimperiia* – 'media empire', *mediaproduct* – 'media product', *mediaprostranstvo* – 'media space', etc. (Palazhchenko, 2002: 43). Arguably, the present stage in English–Russian interaction can be seen as the stage of adjustment which follows the initial "honey-moon" or "culture clash" reactions (Rivlina, 2001).

In linguistic and cultural terms, of particular interest are the English language influences which do not merely reflect the surface, material culture elements borrowed (such as *hamburger* or *computer*), but those which reveal the shifts in the host culture's core of basic values and assumptions. It is at the present, adjustment stage of English – Russian interaction that certain modifications of the Russian set of cultural values and culture-

specific ways of conceptualization can be traced through some of the concepts that have been "transplanted" and appropriated.

One of the examples which makes certain linguacultural shifts of Russian traceable is the concept rendered by the semantic calque *vyzov/vyzovy* (from English *challenge/challenges*) used often in the cliché phrase *ugrozy i vyzovy* – 'threats and challenges'. This cliché is widely used today in Russian political discourse by the mass media and by such key political figures as president Putin, or Minister of Defense Ivanov when they talk about *global'nye ugrozy i vyzovy* – 'global threats and challenges', *ugrozy i vyzovy terrorisma* – 'threats and challenges of terrorism', etc.

This expression could be seen as just another case of borrowing a calque from English but for the fact that the Russian word *vyzov/vyzovy* in its original meaning is not at all equivalent to the English *challenge/challenges*. The fact is, the word *challenge* has always presented a huge difficulty in English – Russian translations. Most translators (Palazhchenko, 2002: 163; Serkova, 2004: 72) define this word as "untranslatable," and the two translation equivalents usually suggested in Russian – *problema* ('problem') and *vyzov* are not acceptable in many contexts, being semantically and stylistically different from *challenge*. The word *vyzov* in Russian means 'a wish, expressed through glances, words, or actions, to engage in a struggle, or an argument'; as the Russian translator A. Mikhalev puts it, only "if it's a matter of a duel or a clash with accepted opinion, the word 'challenge' is easily rendered by *vyzov*" (Serkova, 2004: 72). The rest of the semantic scope of the word *challenge*, 'a call to engage in a contest of skill, strength, etc.; a difficulty in an undertaking that is stimulating', makes the Russian linguists resort to other translation options, words like *stimul* – 'stimulus', or explicatory translations like 'task which is stimulating', 'a difficulty which requires a lot of skill and ingenuity', and others (Palazhchenko, 2002: 163–4). Stylistically, the use of *vyzov* for *challenge* makes the Russian translation a bit "clumsy" (Palazhchenko, 2002: 163), since *vyzov* is considerably less frequent in Russian than *challenge*, which is a common everyday word in English.

Another standard translation equivalent, *problema* ('problem'), also overlaps with the word *challenge* in just one semantic component – 'difficulty'. The difference between the two concepts becomes particularly obvious in comparing the adjectives derived from the two words: the adjective *challenging* means 'needing the full use of one's abilities and effort; difficult, but in an interesting way', while *probleatichnyi* in Russian means 'full of difficulties', or 'causing difficulties', like the adjective *problematic* in English. That is why sentences like *The creation of a new company is extremely challenging* pose great problems (or challenges?) to Russian translators (Leontovich, 2003: 120; Serkova, 2004: 72).

Though *challenge* is most often translated into Russian as *problema*, and *challenging* as *problematichnyi*, careful cross-cultural examination shows that the difference between the two concepts is not merely quantitative, but qualitative: *challenge* is actually one of the key concepts[4] in the anglophone, especially American, linguaculture, epitomizing the true essence of a national mentality which values individual will and individual activity, competitiveness, individual success and achievement, positive thinking, sense of adventure and risk-taking. *Problema*, on the contrary, conforms to the attitudes to life that linguacultural research points out as crucial to the traditional Russian outlook: non-agentivity, a tendency to fatalism, resignation, submissiveness, a lack of emphasis on the individual as an autonomous agent, "achiever," and controller of events (Wierzbicka, 1992: 395). Also, in the Russian collectivist culture, which is basically "relationship-oriented," it is quite natural to share one's problems and hardships: Russians often (if compared with Western

Europeans or Americans) lament and talk about their problems to demonstrate trust and sincerity; a negative, pessimistic outlook is generally believed to arouse sympathy and to make people closer. Contrary to this, people belonging to the Anglo-Saxon individualist culture try not to complain too much, unless confiding their troubles to their close ones, so as not to appear to be "a loser"; Anglo-Saxon culture tends to disapprove of uninhibited discussions of problems and difficulties, and native speakers of English are more inclined to view difficulties as "challenges." The Western "ego" culture promotes a personality which is "autonomous," "active, assertive, and aggressive," "harsh and solid," "self-expanding," etc. (Wierzbicka, 1992: 137). That is why many English euphemisms which use the concept of *challenge* are particularly "alien" to the Russian mentality, for example, the expressions *physically challenged*, or *visually challenged*: the idea of a disabled person challenging his or her bad luck does not translate easily into Russian (Leontovich, 2003: 121; Palazhchenko, 2002: 164; Serkova, 2004: 72). Thus, *challenge* presents a case of cultural untranslatability, which occurs when a feature or a concept relevant for the source language text has a different value or is completely absent in the culture of the target language (Serkova, 2004: 108). The words *challenge* and *problema* embody two entirely different (though overlapping) cultural concepts, which can be added to various linguistic evidence revealing important cross-cultural oppositions: the "collectivism" of Russian culture opposed to the "individualism" of anglophone culture; the "passivity" and "being-orientedness" of Russian culture opposed to the "agentivity" and "doing-orientedness" of anglophone culture; the "femininity" or "maternal principle" of Russian culture opposed to the prevalence of "masculinity" or "paternal principle" in the West and so on (these and other cross-cultural differences between the two cultures are described in Karasik, 2004; Lebed'ko, 1999; Leontovich, 2003; Ter-Minasova, 2000; Wierzbicka, 1992: 169–174, 395–444).

It is exactly these linguacultural differences that have caused the "trite" translation option *challenge – problema* (Palazhchenko, 2002: 163) to no longer be acceptable in the new socio-cultural climate in Russia. Russian bilinguals have chosen to borrow the concept of *challenge* by extending the meaning of the Russian word *vyzov*, which has made this word similar to its English, previously partial, equivalent *challenge* not only within the cliché *ugrozy i vyzovy* – 'threats and challenges', but in other contexts, as well. For example, the Minister of Education, A. Fursenko, said in one of his recent interviews: *kakie problemy ili, kak seichas priniato govorit', vyzovy stoiat pered liud'mi?* – '. . . what problems, or, as many are prone to say nowadays, challenges, do people face today?' (the weekly *Argumenty i Facty*, April 2004). This example shows that the extensive use of the word *problema* in Russian is perceived as not only "trite," but also as outdated and inadequate. The cultural shift linguistically registered by the Russian native speakers seems to support the prediction which Wierzbicka made in 1992: "As the twentieth century draws to a close, some of the Russian attitudes . . . are visibly changing. Sooner or later, changes of this kind can be expected to be reflected in language" (Wierzbicka, 1992: 443). And, more specifically, this English-influenced innovation meets the expectations voiced by Russian translator A. Mikhalev: "The profound changes my country is now experiencing give one grounds to hope that the Russian language will soon have a word that corresponds exactly to the daring English 'challenge'" (Serkova, 2004: 72). Borrowings like *vyzov/vyzovy*, *ugrozy i vyzovy* are restricted in their use; the majority of Russians understand them but never use them in their own speech. Still, these marginal, peripheral segments of "overlapping semiospheres," the "hot spots" in culture dialogue combining

the features of the two cultures, are the driving force of semiotic development, i.e., the development of language and culture (Lotman, 1999: 183–4).

Semantic calques

One must admit that in cases of semantic calques like *vyzov/vyzovy* it is often more difficult than in cases of transliteration/transcription borrowings to prove the cause-consequence connections between the linguistic change and the foreign influence. For example, Russian linguists are arguing whether the Russian word *krutoi* ('steep, abrupt, hard, severe, harsh') developed its slangish figurative meanings similar to *tough* or *cool* – 'disrespectful, calmly self-confident, powerful, great' (*krutoi paren* – 'a tough guy', *krutaia muzyka* – 'cool music', *Kruto!* – 'Cool!') under the influence of the English words *tough* and *cool*, or independently, due to a similar semantic development process conditioned by similar extralinguistic circumstances (Karasik, 2004: 216; Mechkovskaia, 2000: 123). It is probable that the semantic change has been triggered both from within and from outside the native linguaculture at the same time.

The double linguacultural forces at work are particularly obvious when value concepts are imported, concepts which are endowed with "generative value potential," i.e., which can "create coordinates for new systems of values" (Karasik, 2004: 225). The development of the Russian word *vyzov*, on the one hand, is influenced by its English counterpart and, on the other hand, responds to and is sustained by the inherent semiotic and cultural needs of the Russian language and culture's shifting in the direction of increased agentivity, assertiveness, positivism, competitiveness, etc.[5] Modifications of dominant culture values cause the assimilation of words that denote the appropriated value concepts. They are welcome and seen as an "enrichment" of the recipient language and culture, as with the concept *vyzov*, or the concept *fair play*, analyzed in Karasik (2004: 215). If not, the borrowed value concepts are often transformed in a negative sense or are used humorously, registering the resistance to or even the rejection of the borrowed value concepts by the recipient linguaculture. Karasik comments on the derisive connotations that the borrowed word *piar* – 'PR', 'public relations' acquired in Russian: he states that the idea of the professionally organized intentional formation of a positive public image for a company or a person contradicts the accepted stereotypes of social behavior in Russian culture, with its high value of sincerity and emotional ties between people and its negative attitude to formalities and to open demonstrations of friendliness to strangers; the concept is seen as substituting sincere emotional attitudes with an artificially friendly communicative climate, alien to the traditional dominant Russian values (Karasik, 2004: 217).

The term "interaction" may be more appropriate in contact linguacultural analysis than the term "influence," or "transfer," since, as has been demonstrated in this article, Russian, as well as any other local language, is not "the passive end," or "the experiencer" of the influence exerted by the global English language, but it actively "selects" (through its bilinguals) the units it requires due to specific socio-cultural changes; more than that, it transforms the borrowed concepts in accord with its own conceptual and cultural systems.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, one more aspect of contact linguistics must be mentioned: the perennial disputes about the benefits and the damages brought by the influence of a foreign

language, the influence of global English in particular, on local languages and cultures (Crystal, 2000: 19–20; Odlin, 1993: 145–7; Proshina, 2001: 17–22). Russia has had its share of negative attitudes and misgivings connected with the process (Karasik, 2004: 223–4; Leontovich, 2003: 184–6; Palazhchenko, 2002: 41–3; Russkii Iazyk, 1999: 14–8; Ter-Minasova, 2000: 105–6), especially during the initial, the most prolific, "unfocused" and hectic stage of English–Russian interaction. Prominent Russians, including the writers Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Vasilii Belov, and others, voiced their concerns about what they saw as "corruption," "contamination," or "violation" of Russian by "alien" words and concepts. As the influx of English borrowings is becoming more "focused" and more discriminated today and the imported concepts are transformed and adjusted to the Russian culture system, these "doomsday" attitudes must gave way to a more in-depth analysis of linguacultural effects of English – Russian interaction. It is imperative that the influences of English as a global language be seen not as "threats" but as "challenges" both by researchers and the Russian public.

NOTES

1. Agar finds the term "linguaculture" "appealing," but admits that it creates problematic associations with "agriculture" and so on among English speakers (Agar, 1997: 466). Nevertheless, in Russian linguistics the term is becoming ever more popular, especially in translation studies (A Translations Studies Reader, 2004) and cross-cultural communication studies (as in Karasik, 2004; Leontovich, 2003; Ter-Minasova, 2000). [1]
2. Some researchers think intercultural studies should be established as a field of research separate from cross-cultural studies: they see cross-cultural studies as those that compare the characteristics of two or more cultures, and intercultural studies as those that focus on the interaction of two or more cultures and answer the main question of what happens when cultures interact (at the interpersonal level, group level or international level); monocultural and cross-cultural studies serve as necessary precursors to intercultural studies (Hart, 1998): a thorough understanding of intercultural transformations depends very much on a thorough understanding of cross-cultural differences.
3. Massive borrowings from English were part of a much broader linguistic process, which some Russian linguists characterize as "the celebration of verbal freedom" (Russkii Iasyk, 1999: 14): many linguistic norms were violated at the time, including stylistic norms of low-colloquial and slang word use, grammatical norms of case form use and preposition use, phonological accent pattern norms, etc., which is only natural at the time of sweeping social and cultural change, when new groups of population gain access to the means of communication (Russkii Iasyk, 1999: 11–14; Ter-Minasova, 2000: 108–9). [2]
4. The terms "key concepts" and "key words" (as in Anna Wierzbicka's *Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words*) are used in cross-cultural linguistic studies to denote notions crucial for one linguaculture and irrelevant or completely non-existent in another linguaculture. Agar characterizes such concepts as "the rich points," which can be highlighted in juxtapositions of two languages, as "vertical cliffs," which are untranslatable and problematic in shaping the communicative competence in L2 learners, and as "putty," since they are "puttied thickly into far-reaching networks of association and many situations of use" (Agar, 1997: 467). Among other linguistic evidence of the salience of key culture concepts is their high frequency, high derivational potential, extensive use in proverbs and idioms, etc. In Russian, Wierzbicka distinguishes the following key concepts: *avos'*, *dusha*, *toska*, *sud'ba* and several others (Wierzbicka, 1992: 169–74, 395–444). In American English, besides *challenge*, Leontovich points out the key concepts of *privacy* and *efficiency* (Leontovich, 2003: 120–1).
5. The same cross-cultural and intercultural analysis can be applied to explain the above mentioned shifts in the connotations of the concepts *aggressivnyi, ambitsioznyi, provokativnyi* – 'aggressive, ambitious, provocative': these concepts used to have negative connotations in Russian due to the submissiveness of the Russian "relationship-oriented," "collectivist," "being-oriented," etc. culture; the loss of this negativity demonstrates the obvious transformations of the dominant values and attitudes in these spheres of the Russian linguaculture.

REFERENCES

Agar, Michael (1997) The biculture in bilingual. In *Sociolinguistics: A Reader and Coursebook*. Edited by Nikolas Coupland and Adam Jaworski. New York: St. Martin's Press, pp. 464–71.

Crystal, David (2000) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hart, William B. (1998) What is intercultural relations? In *The Edge: The E-Journal of Intercultural Relations*, **1**(3), http://www.hart-li.com/biz/theedge (accessed March 12, 2004).

Karasik, Vladimir (2004) *Iasykovoi Krug: Lichnost', Contsepty, Diskurs* [Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]. Moscow: Gnosis.

Khaleeva, Irina I. (1999) Intercultura: tret'e izmerenie mezhkulturnogo vzaimodeistviia? [Interculture: the third dimension of intercultural interaction?] In *Actual'nye Problemy Mezhculturnoi Kommunikatsii*. Moscow: Moscow State Linguistic University Press, pp. 5–14.

Krysin, Leonid P. (2000) Inoiazychnoe slovo v kontekste sovremennoi obschestvennoi zhizni [A foreign word in the context of modern social life]. In *Russkii Iazyk Kontsa XX Stoletiia (1985–1995)* [The Russian Language at the End of the Twentieth Century (1985–1995)]. Moscow: Iazyki Russkoi Kultury, pp. 142–61.

Lebed'ko, Maria G. (1999) *Culture Bumps: Overcoming Misunderstandings in Cross-Cultural Communication*. Vladivostok: Far Eastern State University Press.

Leontovich, Olga A. (2003) *Rossiia i SShA: Vvedenie v Mezhshculturnuiu Coomunikatsiiu* [Russia and the USA: Introduction into Cross-Cultural Communication]. Volgograd: Peremena.

Lotman, Iuri M. (1999) *Vnutri Mysliashchikh Mirov* [Inside the Thinking Worlds]. Moscow: Iazyki Russkoi Kultury.

Mechkovskaia, Nina B. (2000) *Obshchee Iazykoznanie: Strukturnaia i Sotsial'naia Tipologiia Iazykov* [General Linguistics: Structural and Social Typology of Languages]. Minsk: Amalfeia.

Odlin, Terence. (1993) *Language Transfer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palazhchenko, Pavel R. (2002) *Moi Nesistematicheskii Slovar'* [My Unsystematic Dictionary]. Moscow: R. Valent.

Proshina, Zoya G. (2001) *Angliiskii Iasyk i Kultura Narodov Vostochnoi Asii* [The English Language and Culture of the East-Asian Nations]. Vladivostok: Far Eastern State University Press.

Rivlina, Alexandra A. (2001) Teaching translation and interpreting as a cultural clash adjustment process. In *People, Languages and Cultures in the Third Millennium*. Proceedings of the 2000 FEELTA international conference. Vladivostok: Far Eastern State University Press, pp. 447–52.

Russkii Iazyk Kontsa XX Stoletiia (1985–1995) (2000) [The Russian Language at the End of the Twentieth Century (1985–1995)]. Moscow: Iazyki Russkoi Kultury.

Selinker, Larry (1996) Interlanguage. In *Second Language Learning: Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Related Aspects*. Edited by Betty Wallace Robinett and Jacquelyn Schachter. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, pp. 173–96.

Sen'ko, E. V. (1994) *Innovatsii v Sovremennom Russkom Iasyke* [Innovations in Modern Russian]. Vladikavkaz: Ir.

Serkova, Nelly (ed.) (2004) *A Translation Studies Reader*. Khabarovsk: Khabarovsk State Pedagogical University Press.

Shaposhnikov, Vladimir (1998) *Russkaia Rech' 1990-kh: Sovremennaia Rossiia v Iasykovom Otrazhenii* [Russian Speech in the 1990s: Modern Russia in Linguistic Reflection]. Moscow: MAPL.

Ter-Minasova, Svetlana G. (2000) *Iasyk i Mezhkulturnaia Kommunicatsiia* [Language and Intercultural Communication]. Moscow: Slovo.

Trudgill, Peter (1983) *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Venuti, Laurence (1998) Strategies of translation. In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. Edited by Mona Baker. London, New York: Routledge, pp. 240–4.

Wierzbicka, Anna (1992) *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configuration*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Author Query Form

Dear Author,

  During the copy-editing of your paper, the following queries arose. Please respond to these by marking up your proofs with the necessary changes/additions. Please write your answers on the query sheet if there is insufficient space on the page proofs. Please write clearly and follow the conventions shown on the attached corrections sheet. If returning the proof by fax do not write too close to the paper's edge. Please remember that illegible mark-ups may delay publication.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Query Refs.	Query	Remarks
1	Au: There's nothing corresponding to this in the reference list. Please could you give full publication details.	
2	Au: This is in the reference list with the date (2000). Which is correct?	
3	Au: Are there editors for this volume?	
4	Au: Again, are there editors?	