Review article / Обзорная статья

# Language as an Instrument of Social Control and People Management

## Irina I. Klimova ⓘ ✉, Nina A. Kozlovtseva ⓘ

Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation,
*49, Leningradsky Prospekt, Moscow, Russian Federation, 125167*
✉ IIKlimova@mail.ru

**Abstract.** Since ancient times the importance of human language in the process of social management has been very high. The emergence of rhetoric in Ancient Greece and Rome as an art of eloquence and its further development in the theory of argumentation (In the Russian science — the theory of persuasion) contributed to the understanding of language as an instrument of control and management of public opinion. In today's world of information wars, the policy of soft power acquires particular relevance, primarily based on these functions of language. Word is now not only a key tool in information wars, but also one of the most efficient means of defense. Of course, there is already a number of researches on the role and place of language as a management tool, but it is generally dominated by works of foreign scientists. It seems important to follow the development of Russian in-home scientific thought regarding the issues under study, as well as to determine within which sciences at the present stage this issue is being studied. In this regard, the purpose of the research is to streamline approaches to understanding language as a tool of control and management of a society and assess the prospects of language development as an efficient tool of society management, which would help to identify the key aspects for the implementation of efficient language policy of the state in the era of world information wars.

**Keywords:** language policy, language planning, interdisciplinarity, management, control

LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY

# Язык как инструмент контроля и управления обществом

## И.И. Климова ⬦ ✉, Н.А. Козловцева ⬦

Финансовый университет при Правительстве Российской Федерации,
*125167, Российская Федерация, г. Москва, Ленинградский проспект, д. 49/2*
✉ IIKlimova@mail.ru

**Аннотация.** Значимость человеческого языка в процессе управления обществом высоко ценилась с древнейших времен. Риторика, появившаяся еще в Древнем Риме и Греции и трансформировавшаяся позднее в теорию аргументации (или же теорию убеждения), стала отправным пунктом для понимания языка в качестве инструмента контроля и управления мнением общества. На современном этапе информационных войн особую актуальность приобретает политика «мягкой силы», основанная в первую очередь на данных функциях языка. Слово на современном этапе развития общества является не только ключевым инструментом в информационных войнах, но также и одним из наиболее эффективных средств защиты. Несомненно, уже существует значительная база исследований, посвященных роли и месту языка как инструмента управления, однако же, как правило, в ней превалируют работы зарубежных исследователей. Представляется значимым проследить развитие отечественной научной мысли относительно изучаемого вопроса, а также определить, в рамках каких наук на современном этапе изучается данный вопрос. В связи с этим цель исследования заключается в систематизации отечественных подходов к пониманию языка как инструмента контроля и управления обществом и оценке перспектив развития языка в данном направлении, что будет способствовать выявлению ключевых аспектов для проведения эффективной языковой политики государства в эпоху мировых информационных войн.

**Ключевые слова:** языковая политика, языковое планирование, междисциплинарность, управление, контроль

## Introduction

On the modern stage of the civilizational development language becomes the main means not only for human communication, but also the means to control the social organization. Such understanding of the role of language has been formed in the course of millennia (starting from Ancient Greece and Ancient Roma), and nowadays it's reflected in a great many of interdisciplinary studies as well as directly in the linguistic policies of certain states. As to the Russian in-home science, the issues of the language role in the management of a society have been underway not in a single decade period, still, the bulk of the studies is based on the foreign research, while in this country during the centuries there have existed in-home scientific-research studies on the issue both in the framework of proper linguistic studies and the adjoining scientific fields. Studies and generalization of the achievements of the Russian in-home scientific research ideas determine the *novelty* and *relevance* of this work.

In this connection, *the goal of the study* is the analysis and generalization of the domestic research results, dealing with both synchronic and diachronic studies of the language function reflecting the control and management of a society considering not only proper linguistic, but also interdisciplinary approaches.

*The tasks of the work include*:

1) diachronic analysis of linguistic studies of the issue under investigation;
2) synchronic analysis of the interdisciplinary layer of Russian studies dealing with the issue under investigation;
3) description of the language development prospects in the digital space and the specifics of its use as a tool of control and management of a society taking into consideration new realia.

In this work, the *object* of the study is language as a tool of control and management of a society, and the *subject* is the achievements of the Russian in-home scientific research understanding language as a tool of control and management of a society both in synchronic and diachronic aspects.

The works of Russian in-home linguists make up the *material* of the study. As to the diachronic aspect, there were selected the works treating language, to a variety degree, from the perspective of its controlling function. As to the synchronic aspect, there was selected the layer of relevant studies concerning various aspects of language as a tool of control and management of a society from the point of view of various scientific-research activities. In the final part, a number of trends and prospects of modern language development was allocated, mainly those which are able to influence the realization of its function of control and management of a society. This part of the work treats modern, primarily linguistic studies dealing with the specifics of the Internet discourse, trends and prospects of the Internet communication development and introduction of the artificial intelligence in various spheres of human communication.

The analysis and generalization of the given material allowed determine Russian domestic trends of the controlling function of language, modern understanding of the realization of this function by means of various sciences and the trends of linguistic development considering their influence on the function of control and management of a society.

The *methodology* of the study is based on the application of inductive, deductive and descriptive methods used to observe, analyze and generalize various approaches of issues under the investigation. Within the frames of the descriptive method, we used the procedures of observation and interpretation, classification and systematization of the analyzed phenomena.

## Diachronic aspect of studying language as a tool of control and management of a society

The research of the language role in the control and management of a society is traditionally based on the linguistic studies. In Russian in-home linguistics, M.V. Lomonosov was the first scholar who wrote about such understanding of language, and he stated that "the eloquence is the art to speak about each and every given matter with elegance, and in doing this, to persuade others into your own opinion" [1. P. 15]. In the opinion of M.V. Lomonosov, the Russian language with all its might has got a natural abundance, beauty and power, whereas it doesn't give way to any single European language" [1. P. 16]. In the context of high popularity of the French language in Russia of that time this remark has acquired a specific significance.

A.A. Barsov as a Lomonosov's disciple and the author of the Russian language grammar stated the importance of fixing the norms of the State official language which is used in the country to maintain document circulation saying that the Russian Grammar means the skills to read properly, speak and write in Russian according to its best and most rational use [2].

I.S. Ryzhskij became the first one among the Russian in-home linguists who spoke about proper "physiognomy (face)" of various languages reflecting peculiarities of national understanding of the world (i.e., linguistic worldview). He insisted that while the appearance of representatives of different nations had got peculiar features, so every language had got its unique peculiarities, as well [3]. Similar understanding of the rol<e of language as a mirror of peculiarities of thought and world perception of its bearers was shared by I.I. Sreznevskij, who remarked that "reason and activity of a nation are reflected in the national language <…>. Changes taking place in the reason and activity of the nation do reflect, as well, in its language" [4. P. 37]. It's also significant that in the Russian science he was the first scholar to distinguish not only inner, interior, but also outer, exterior factors (social, political, economic, religious, etc.) influencing changes in language.

F.I. Buslayev paid special attention to studying dialects of the Russian language and their correlation with the literary norm. In his opinion, they mirror the history and worldview of the nation much deeper due to the power of their imagery, which is why their studies allow provide the existence of the Russian language as the only one State language over the country's territory [5].

The significant area of the scientific thought maintaining the understanding of the process of management of a society by means of language comprised the study of connections between ideas and words, launched by A.A. Potyebnya [6]. According to his opinion, word functions as a mediator in the course of human communication and helps establish the communication among people. In his works, A.A. Potyebnya developed the ideas of W. von Humboldt who studied peculiarities of an addressee perception of speech. At this, from the point of view of A.A. Potyebnya, the communication doesn't mean simply to convey one's ideas and thoughts to any other person, but to provoke a conversation partner create his own ideas and thoughts [7]. This thesis formed the emerging basis of the Russian psycholinguistics reviewing the principles of efficient interaction of the authorities and society by means of language.

In his works, F.F. Fortunatov mentioned the social aspect of language considering every language to have got its own history, and therefore studying human language in the context of its history makes an integral part of the science about life and activity of social communities [8].

A.A. Shakhmatov also shared the opinion about the high significance of social factors in the process of language development. He elaborated the theory of psychological communication proceeding from a psychological approach to understanding the specifics of communication process. From his point of view, human mentality is based on the definite amount of perceptions which are determined by men's precedent experience and the events surpassed, and emotions. Communication means a mental action based on similar perceptions [9]. In this connection, non-efficiency of communication could be stipulated by the differences in experience and feelings, i.e., it's vital to consider similar experience of both sides of the communication process.

In his writings, I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay followed the theory of W. von Humboldt and developed Humboldt's ideas. In his opinion, "the worldview characteristic of linguistic thinking, becomes a general worldview of a man" [10]. He put forward his personal idea and understanding of the nature of language's origins. He believed that the problem should be interpreted from the point of view of psychology. A man could be able of psychological development only through communication with other people, therefore he defines linguistics to be a psychological-and-sociological science.

Further elaboration of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay's ideas took place in the works by Eu.D. Polyvanov, and the Russian linguistics assigns the creation of the term of "language policy" to him. The linguist highlighted anew the

tasks of linguistics. As to him, a linguist is an expert able to fulfill various functions: 1) be a constructor of modern linguistic cultures; 2) be a linguistic politician who is able to present a picture of linguistic future; 3) "be a general linguist" and linguistic historiographer; 4) be an historian of culture and some definite cultures [11].

The notion of language as a means to unite people "in their common activity" thanks to "common understanding" as "the sociological factor of primary importance" was accepted by V.A. Bogoroditckij [12]. In the context of such understanding of language, its development is determined not only by cultural aspects of social development, but also by economic progress so that consequently, societies being at different stages of economic development would operate different "mental tools", and thus possess different linguistic toolkits.

Proceeding from the said above, issues of interaction and interdependence of society and language were of great interest among the Russian in-home linguists from the very start of the science in Russia. Later on, such understanding of language has spread beyond the limits of proper linguistic studies and acquired the interdisciplinary context.

## Synchronic aspect of linguistic studies as a tool of control and management of a society

As is known, a distinctive, unique feature of modern science lies in its *interdisciplinary approach* which enables the possibility to observe objects under the study by means of methodologies of various scientific spheres. As was proved above, even earlier in Russian in-home science research, there were attempts to study the role and functions of language not only in the fames of linguistics. Denoting psychological and social dependence of language, Russian scholars of the previous centuries created the basis for interdisciplinary linguistic research as a tool of control and management of a society.

From the end of the 19th century, representatives of the Russian in-home science viewed language as a social phenomenon which laid the fundamentals of its studies *in the frames of sociological sciences.*

In the opinion of a sociologist and culturologist P.A. Sorokin, the basic unit of the society analysis should be considered "social interaction" including individuals, acts and conductors. At this, according to P.A. Sorokin, two key conductors of social interaction are language and writing system. He also marked such a specific feature of political language as its transformations under the revolutionary influence which is speech coarsening [13].

Modern sociologists emphasize the importance of forming of compatible, highly cultural and professionally mobile personality as the key implication of a society and labour market. Crucial elements of training such employees are both linguistic and communicative aspects [14].

No doubt, the sociological approach to language studies is one of the key approaches in understanding language as a tool of control and management of a society because it involves both sides of the study — language and society. Sociology of language (sociolinguistics) has been formed in the context of the research of social language function of understanding and describing social processes, relations and various ways of their representation in language.

Language as the object of study *in psychology* was discussed in Russian in-home science from the times of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay. Psychologists devoted quite a number of works to study language, thinking and consciousness. It's impossible to speak adequately about the function of language to control a society without taking into account psychological aspects of its use. According to the opinion of L.S. Vygotskij, a word represents a socio-cultural mediator between the world and an individual [15]. According to S.L. Rubinshtein, it is only speech that could open for an interlocutor the consciousness of another person, thus making it available for influences of various types [16]. In the opinion of A.N. Leontyev, the task of any psychological theory of speech activity includes the study of interrelations between the individual worldview of a man and his speech [17].

At the interface of linguistics and psychology, there emerged psycholinguistics as a part of scientific knowledge. The research of a psycholinguist I.N. Gorelov deals with non-verbal communication studies. One of the schools of psycholinguistics comprised neurological linguistic approaches. Neurolinguistics compiling methods of neuropsychology and linguistics was developed by a psychologist A.R. Luria. The object of his research made up the role of speech in forming consciousness of a man [18].

The significance of the psychological approach for linguistic studies was stressed by the acceleration of pseudoscientific theories, e.g., a theory of neurolinguistic programming (NLP), whose authors declared the existing links of neurological processes with language and behaviour patterns by means of special techniques to reach the goals set. Although the efficiency of NLP isn't proved scientifically, the idea itself denoted a vivid potential of language as a tool of control and management of a society.

As to *philosophical knowledge*, a world reflected in language is an object of human activity. "Philosophy improves the overlapping of a linguistic worldview and the real, and, to a certain extent, governs the world construction primarily in the social sphere" [19. P. 97]. In the opinion of Z.M. Orudzhev, even if a man would lose labour tools, he would still retain a word. If there were a word, "the loss of labour tools itself just slightly changes the situation" [20. P. 53].

It seems of interest to study the interconnection of emergence and development of civilization and language from a socio-philosophical point of view. As is proved, every civilization type possesses its own specific character of interrelations with language [21]. The majority of representatives of humanities carry out their studies in a socio-cultural context, which is stipulated by linguistic specifics to be the

mirror of national culture" [22]. "Language is a tool of culture. It is formed by a personality of a man, a language bearer, through imposed on him by language and comprised in language the view of the world, mentality, attitudes to other people, etc., i.e., through the national culture of people using this language as the means of communication" [22. P. 86]. However, R.O. Shor thinks language to be a cultural tool which is created and transmitted by an aggregate group of people [23]. Such understanding gives way to study language within the frames of culturology.

From the point of view of culture studies, language is reviewed in two aspects: as an entity determining the cultural processes and an entity being formed under the influence of a culture. A culturologist and philologist D.S. Likhachev introduced a notion of the language "conceptual sphere" as a concentrate of culture which contains not only general culture of a certain nation, but its individual representation [24]. In his opinion, "any language conserves "the inner powers" of a nation — its predisposition to emotion, the variety of characters and attitudes towards t world" [25. P. 424]. These remarks are extremely useful for considering national and cultural peculiarities in the course of intercultural communication.

In all modern societies, linguistic issues are subjected to regulation on behalf of the state [26], thereby making the objects of linguistic policies. In *political sciences* language is viewed both as a tool of authorities and as an object of influence of the policies themselves [27]. Such understanding of language formed the object of studies of political linguistics and linguopolitology.

The term "language policy and planning" (LPP) was put forward by O.A. Seliverstova. Its author understands LPP as "activity for planning and realization of affecting language and its functioning in a society, as well as theoretical prerequisites forming the base of this activity" [28. P. 16]. LPP could have inner, interior and outer, exterior predisposition, while the exterior LPP is connected with the spread of language and culture beyond the state's borders making a part of its policy of "Soft Power" [28].

Modern linguistic policy is studied both by means of sociological and proper linguistic methods [29]. In the frames of linguistic policies, language fulfills a number of functions (revealing exterior and interior predispositions):

"1. Integration (interior) means a union of nations of a state in general socio-cultural space on the basis of the state (official) language.

2. Sociolization (interior) means the assistance to foreign citizens in mastering sociocultural norms and values of the state by linguistic means.

3. Translation (exterior) means the formation of the adequate image of the country in the world community.

4. Communication (exterior/interior) let create an adequate intercultural dialogue among various nations of the country, and also with representatives of other countries" [30. P. 57].

Language policy served to be the base to form two scientific-research trends: sociolinguistics and linguistic sociology, studying political and ideological aspects

of language policy and also possible consequences of its realization [29]. In its turn, political linguistics studies the issues of language convergence and the policy to form the language of politics and the immediate activity of politicians and politologists. [31].

No doubt, at present language is still an object of *linguistic research*. In Russian mentality, on its own, the notion of "Power" is one of the basic dimensions of social stratification in the society and is considered to be a value [32]. So, for example, according to the data of the latest research, the Russian generation Z representatives demonstrated substantial growth of the strife to obtain the authority power (from 1 % to 9,3 %) to compare with the two previous generations which were reflected in the core of linguistic consciousness [33. P. 644].

The final goal of any speech strategy concerns the improvement of the worldview modeling of its addressee [34], which puts a great responsibility on the people using language for control and management of public opinion. At that, the existence of the definite goal of speech determines not only the presentation of facts, but it also determines speech structure and the choice of linguistic means [35] to influence the willing, intellectual and emotional spheres of an addressee [36].

In this context, the pragmatic function of language starts to dominate, because it renders the purposeful influence on the behavior and psychological condition of a man which in its essence, could be considered as a linguistic manipulation, that is the influence by linguistic means necessary for hidden intrusion into the psyche and mentality of an addressee, the goals, wishes, intentions, relations and orientations different from his own.

The most vivid example of the realization of the function of control and management of a society is its application in advertising technologies, which reveal the tasks to strengthen positive features of an object or phenomenon and smothering a negative influence of any demolishing features. It facilitates the image of goods and services by means of purposeful merging of perception and focusing on their advantages.

Generalizing the said above, let's note that a broad spectrum of the results of the Russian in-home interdisciplinary studies allows discuss the issues of control and management of a society by means of language from different positions which nowadays is of critical significance, when word becomes the arms and the most important tool of defense in informational wars, and language occupies a new level of the digital transformation.

## Modern vectors of the development of language as a tool of control and management of a society

In the 21st century, the limits of using human language have substantially widened, and the functional area of its implementation have undergone radical changes. The industrial epoch starting with the great English bourgeois revolution

made it cornerwise "technology" and technical progress as the means of the efficiency of human labour. By the end of the 20th century, the technological space has completely overtaken the space of a man's life, embracing his whole life down to the ground, his habits and needs; it has changed the character of his life and, in the core, the shape of mentality. Then 21st century got to the mark of the new post-industrial change of the essence of life: the life space of a man was filled with digital technologies which transformed the *analogue* space of a man's life into a *digital* one. Instead of a vast spectrum of shades of meanings and senses, now for the goals of communication, one has to choose such set of shades which could be relevant to the current moment of history and the current generation for clearly denoted goals. Language pragmatics becomes the object of observation of programmers whose tasks are to turn language into the governed tool of application and controlled perception.

Described processes came into being in the language space which nowadays functions as a mighty tool of management of a human society and state institutions. Human speech materialized in key documents of state and society management is perceived not as the area of the structured discourse space, but as a set of management data. In the context described hereby, under the notion of "data" one has to understand fixed collocations of large and small lexico-syntactical structures being regularly reproduced in the restricted specified types of discourse and other conventionally independent contexts. These lexico-grammatical collocations are revealed not by a man himself, but by a machine which receives as a pattern to decipher a certain final list of interpretations presenting an etalon pattern to decipher other analogous collocations in the frame of a definite synonymic matrix.

In this case, the co-occurrence of the elements of language and speech is explained not from the standpoint of well-known in linguistic categories of language, but from the standpoint of frequency, reproduction of lexico-morphological sequence. The interpretation of the result of applying human speech (like, for example, the appearance of a number of 'motional replies to the human speech, public reaction, significant events in human life, etc.) would be explained not through semantics, or sematic sequences, but from the point of view of frequency, reproduction of such a lexico-grammatical sequences and the frequency of forthcoming predictable reactions, which have been earlier identified in other similar communicative contexts. In the given context, special significance is attained to various elements of the Internet discourse, e.g., hashtags, analysis of cognitive mechanisms and communicative intentions lying in the basis of selecting, or the creation of those give the evidence of different communicative intentions of communicators. Modern researchers distinguish the following types of hashtags depending on communicative intentions: hashtags-imperatives, hashtags-performatives, hashtags-metaphors, hashtags-thematic markers, hashtags-subject headings, hashtags-summaries, hashtags-meta-texts [37]. One more significant phenomenon is the use of foreign re-decoded lexis in modern media- and Internet space [38].

Under the conditions of digitalization of human society by means of language, the crucial factor makes the unification of language as the means of human communication which primarily supposes the unification of lexical sequence and lexico-syntactical forms within the vividly structured communicative space. In this case, the more unified becomes the reproduction of speech by people, the easier and more efficient seems the management of the speech space, and consequently, of the society itself. In its turn, the given unification is complicated by an outside influence, conditioned by various types of crises at present which dynamically come one after another and serve to facilitate situational discourses. Thus, the study of perforated, end-to end schemes of neo-formations of the same time sample (e.g., the coronavirus pandemia) demonstrate the actualization of the process of nominating the most relevant notions and realia, the growth of usual and occasional neo-formations taling into account national specifics [39].

One of the keys means to make an algorithm of speech use, the first step to teach human speech to "clever machines" and essential narrowing of the controlled speech use makes a thesaurus which ensures the space of everyday language use be exclusively limited by the use of codified lexis and fixed speech collocations under the new experts' control — "engineers of digital communication". Such "mapping" of the language functional sphere is realized with *the system of headings classification*. Specialized thesauruses are divided into hierarchical rubrics, constructed on the principle of notional-semantic inclusion (nesting) and distribution of lexical units in each sector according to its functional loading. In fact, each sector (rubric) determines the order of using linguistic units belonging to it, and thus putting beforehand communicative accents of the future professional speech acts.

There are elaborated and actively introduced into use programmes to process live human speech. Grammarly, Google Smart, DeepL and many other programmes provide for the automation of translation and text editing in compliance with the adopted standards of managing and conserving information in the given format so that any act of communication, which have earlier occurred in the group of communicants could be easily discovered and defined by means of search tools be used to self-teaching of a digital machine in the frames of the already formed communicative algorithm. With the allocation of quite a big amount of reference texts to be analyzed, the automatically applied norms of speech use by means of regulated supplements are able to embrace completely and in detail involve the whole space of human communication managing and regulating it.

To a greater extent, the described communicative mechanization processes is supported by the line of linguistic studies started with Noam Chomsky and structural linguistic theories. The core of this idea contains the active search of "the generative origins" of language which would have allowed substantially faster "to diagnose" text characteristics and adapt it to specific communicative needs of people. The results of those studies have an applied significance in the discourse theory and cognitive linguistics.

For the scholars conducting the studies of various types of discourse, there arose the task to determine linguistic limits of a communicative code in the frames of professional and near-professional communities which firstly let determine communicative norms of those communities and exclude from a communicative sphere "aliens" which don't comply with composed speech practices: and secondly support the acceleration of discourse algorithmization and the following use of the determined algorithms to manage a society through the elaborated digital services.

## Conclusion

On the basis of the carried out analysis, it seems possible to conclude that the use of language as the tool of control and management of a society is determined by the inventory of quite a number of various factors not linguistic proper, but also political, social, psychological, cultural, and the other ones. They have to be understood and taken into consideration because without them the discussed function of language couldn't be fully evaluated and realized. The origins of this process date back into the history of "the pagmatization" of language and the efforts to normalize its use. Regarding of the Russian in-home approached towards the study of these issues both in synchronic and diachronic aspects and also the standpoints of various sciences would allow more fully and adequately form the language policy of any state and fulfill linguistic planning on the basis of the data completed.

The understanding of the modern state of language development and the key trends influencing its transformation in the context of realization of the function of control and management of a society looks like more significant in the context of forming the basis of linguistic studies and determining the perspective scientific trends of research in the given sphere.

One might think that the obtained results of the study could ensure more efficient linguistic planning which would have reflected the specifics of the poly-cultural Russian society, and also the exterior and interior socio-cultural and geopolitical challenges.

## References

1. Lomonosov, M.V. (1952). Brief guide to eloquence. In: *Complete collection of works, Tom the seventh. Works on philology* (1739–1758). Moscow—Leningrad: USSR Academy of Sciences Publ. URL: http://lomonosov.niv.ru/lomonosov/nauka/rukovodstvo-k-krasnorechiyu/index.htm (accessed: 28.08.2022) (In Russ.).
2. Russian grammar (1981). B.A. Uspensky (Ed.). Moscow. (In Russ.).
3. Rijskiy, I. (1806). *Introduction to the circle of literature.* Kharkov. (In Russ.).
4. Sreznevsky, I.I. (1959). *Thoughts on the history of the Russian language.* Moscow: Uchpedgiz. (In Russ.).
5. Buslaev, F.I. (2023). *On the teaching of the Russian language.* Moscow. (In Russ.).

6. Potebnya, A.A. (1989). *Word and myth.* Moscow. (In Russ.).

7. Potebnya, A.A. (1999). *Complete Works*: *Thought and Language.* Moscow: Labyrinth. (In Russ.).

8. Fortunatov, F.F. (1956–1957). *Selected works.* In 2 vols. Moscow. (In Russ.).

9. Shakhmatov, A.A. (1925). *Russian Syntax.* Leningrad. (In Russ.).

10. Baudouin de Courtenay, J. (1929). Influence of language on worldview and mood. *Prace Filologiczne*, XIV, 184–225. (In Germ.)

11. Polivanov, E.D. (1931). Historical linguistics and language policy. In: *For Marxist linguistics.* Moscow: Federatsiya. pp. 10–35. (In Russ.).

12. Bogoroditsky, V.A. (1991). *Essays on Linguistics and Russian language*. Moscow. (In Russ.).

13. Sorokin, P.A. (2010). *Sociology of the Revolution*. Moscow: Russian Political Encyclopedia. (In Russ.).

14. Staritsyna, O.A. (2010). *Linguistic Management Culture*: *Analysis of the State and Conceptual Definition of its Optimization* [dissertation]. Ufa. (In Russ.).

15. Vygotsky, L.S. (1996). *Thinking and speech*. Moscow. (In Russ.).

16. Rubinstein, S.L. (2017). *Basics of general psychology*. Saint Petersburg: Peter. (In Russ.).

17. Leontiev, A.N. (1969). *Language, speech, speech activity.* Moscow. (In Russ.).

18. Luria, A.R. (1979). *Language and consciousness*, E.D. Chomsky (Ed.). Moscow: MSU Publ. (In Russ.).

19. Lavrenyuk, K.V. (2002). *Language in the System of Social Relations*: *Social and Philosophical Aspect* [dissertation]. Stavropol. (In Russ.).

20. Orugev, Z.M. (2004). *Way of thinking of the epoch. Philosophy of the past*. Moscow: URSS. (In Russ.)

21. Khayrova, S.R. (2003). *Language and Civilization*: *The Social and Philosophical Aspect of the Interaction* [dissertation]. Volgograd. (In Russ.).

22. Ter-Minasova, S.G. (2000). *Language and Intercultural Communication*. Moscow: Slovo. (In Russ.).

23. Shor, R.O. (2019). *Language and Society*: *Sociolinguistics Research. Criticism of «Naive Ideas» of people about their language and linguistic prejudices*. (In Russ.).

24. Lihachev, D.S. (1993). Concept of the Russian language. *Izvestija. Akademii nauk. Serija literatury i jazyka*, 52 (1), 3–9. (In Russ.).

25. Lihachev, D.S. (1989). *Notes and observations*: *From notebooks of different years*, Leningrad: Sovetskiy pisatel'. pp. 410–436. (In Russ.).

26. Blinov, E.N. (2011). Political Philosophy of Language: Towards a New Typology of Actuality. *Epistemology & Philosophy of Science*, 29 (3), 165–175. (In Russ.).

27. Chernych, S.S. (2017). Language and speech as instruments of power. *Historical, Philosophical, Political and Law Sciences, Culturology and Study of Art. Issues of Theory and Practice*, 12 (86), 197–200. ( (In Russ.).

28. Seliverstov, O.A. (2017). *Language policy as a tool for the implementation of «soft power» in the political discourse of the XXI century* (on the material of Russian, American and Chinese media) [dissertation]. Great Novgorod. (In Russ.).

29. Grishaeva, E.B. (2018). Language as an instrument of political power and as an object of influence of politics. *Language and culture*, 41. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/yazyk-kak-instrument-realizatsii-politicheskoy-vlasti-i--kakobekt-vozdeystya-politiki (accessed: 28.08.2022). (In Russ.).

30. Kozlovtseva, N.A. (2018). *Formation of the image of the Russian world in modern conditions*: *potential of humanitarian cooperation* [dissertation]. Moscow. (In Russ.).

31. Taisina, E.A. (2012). Language is not neutral. *Scientific notes of Kazan University*, 154 (6), 131–142. (In Russ.).

32. Philippovich, A.Y. & Cherkasova, G.A. (2021). *Man, state, power — associative base (Republic of Crimea)*. Simferopol. (In Russ.).

33. Ufimtseva, N.V. (2022). The image of Power Based on the Materials of the Crimean Associative Dictionary. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 13 (3), 630–647. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2022-13-3-630-647 (In Russ.).

34. Issers, O.S. (1999). *Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech*. Omsk. (In Russ.).

35. Odintsov, V.V. (1982). *Compositional types of speech*. In: Kozhin A.N. et al. *Functional types of Russian speech*. Moscow. (In Russ.).

36. Borisova, I.N. (1999). Purpose category and aspects of text analysis. In: *Genres of speech.* Saratov. pp. 81–97. (In Russ.).

37. Yudina, N.V. & Seliverstova, O.A. (2022). Hashtag as a Unit of Internet Discourse: Cognitive and Pragmatic Perspective. *Issues of Cognitive Linguistics*, 3, 108–115. https://doi.org/10.20916/1812-3228-2022-2-108-115 (In Russ.).

38. Merkulova, I.A. & Protsenko, E.A. (2022). Recoded words in Russian media space. *Russian Language Studies*, 20 (3), 284–297. https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2022-20-3-284-297 (In Russ.).

39. Marinova, E.V. (2022). Semantic dominants of 2020 neologisms as a means of coding reality in the Russian language. *Russian Language Studies*, 20 (4), 449–466. https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2022-20-4-449-466 (In Russ.).

## Библиографический список

1. *Ломоносов М.В.* Краткое руководство к красноречию // Полное собрание сочинений. Т. 7. Труды по филологии (1739–1758 гг.). М.—Л., Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1952.

2. Российская грамматика / под ред. Б.А. Успенского. М.: Изд-во Московского гос. ун-та, 1981.

3. *Рижский И.* Введение в круг словесности. Харьков, 1806.

4. *Срезневский И.И.* Мысли об истории русского языка. М., Учпедгиз, 1959.

5. *Буслаев Ф.И.* О преподавании отечественного языка М.: Юрайт, 2023.

6. *Потебня А.А.* Слово и миф. М., 1989.

7. *Потебня А.А.* Полное собрание трудов: Мысль и язык. М.: Лабиринт, 1999.

8. *Фортунатов Ф.Ф.* Избранные труды. В 2 томах. М.: Учпедгиз, 1956–1957.

9. *Шахматов А.А.* Синтаксис русского языка. Ленинград, 1925.

10. *Baudouin de Courtenay J.* Einfluß der Sprache auf Weltanschauung und Stimmung // PraceFilologiczne. 1929. T. XIV. C. 184–225.

11. *Поливанов Е.Д.* Историческое языкознание и языковая политика // За марксистское языкознание. М.: Федерация, 1931. С. 10–35.

12. *Богородицкий В.А.* Очерки по языковедению и русскому языку. М.: Лабиринт, 1991.

13. *Сорокин П.А.* Социология революции. М.: Российская политическая энциклопедия, 2010.

14. *Старицына О.А.* Языковая культура управления: анализ состояния и концептуальное определение ее оптимизации тема: дисс. … канд. социологических наук. Уфа, 2010.

15. *Выготский Л.С.* Мышление и речь. М.: Лабиринт, 1996.

16. *Рубинштейн С.Л.* Основы общей психологии. СПб.: Питер, 2017.

17. *Леонтьев А.Н.* Язык, речь, речевая деятельность. М.: Просвещение, 1969.

18. *Лурия А.Р.* Язык и сознание / под ред. Е.Д. Хомской. М: Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 1979.

19. *Лавренюк К.В.* Язык в системе общественных отношений: социально-философский аспект: дисс. … канд. философских наук. Ставрополь, 2002.

20. *Оруджев З.М.* Способ мышления эпохи. Философия прошлого. М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2004.

21. *Хайрова С.Р.* Язык и цивилизация: социально-философский аспект взаимодействия: дисс. … канд. философских наук. Волгоград, 2003.

22. *Тер-Минасова С.Г.* Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. М.: Слово, 2000.

23. *Шор Р.О.* Язык и общество: исследование по социолингвистике. Критика «наивных представлений» людей о своем языке и языковых предрассудков. Киров: Изд-во Вятского гос. университета, 2019.

24. *Лихачев Д.С.* Концептосфера русского языка // Известия Академии наук. Серия литературы и языка. 1993. Т. 52. № 1. С. 3–9.

25. *Лихачев Д.С.* Заметки и наблюдения // Из записных книжек разных лет. Л.: Советский писатель, 1989. С. 410–436.

26. *Блинов Е.Н.* Политическая философия языка: к новой типологии вэикулярности // Эпистемология & Философия науки. 2011. № 29 (3). С. 165–175.

27. *Черных С.С.* Язык и речь как инструменты власти // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. 2017. № 12 (86). Ч. 4. С. 197–200.

28. *Селиверстова О.А.* Языковая политика как инструмент реализации «мягкой силы» в политическом дискурсе XXI века (на материале российских, американских и китайских СМИ): автореф. дис. … канд. филол. наук. Великий Новгород, 2017.

29. *Гришаева Е.Б.* Язык как инструмент реализации политической власти и как объект воздействия политики // Язык и культура. 2018. № 41. [Электронный ресурс] Режим доступа: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/yazyk-kak-instrument-realizatsii-politicheskoy-vlasti-i-kak-obekt-vozdeystviya-politiki (дата обращения: 28.08.2022).

30. *Козловцева Н.А.* Формирование образа Русского мира в современных условиях: потенциал гуманитарного сотрудничества: дисс. … канд. культурологии. М., 2018.

31. *Тайсина Э.А.* Язык не бывает нейтральным // Ученые записки Казанского университета. 2012. № 154 (6). С. 131–142.

32. *Филиппович А.Ю., Черкасова Г.А.* Человек, государство, власть — ассоциативная база (Республика Крым) / под ред. Уфимцевой Н.В., Титаренко Е.Я. Симферополь, 2021.

33. *Уфимцева Н.В.* Образ власти по материалам крымского ассоциативного словаря // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. Т. 13. № 3. С. 630–647. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2022-13-3-630-647

34. *Иссерс О.С.* Коммуникативные стратегии и тактика русской речи. Омск, 1999.

35. *Одинцов В.В.* Композиционные типы речи // Функциональные типы русской речи. / А.Н. Кожин и др. М.: Высшая школа, 1982.

36. *Борисова И.Н.* Категория цели и аспекты текстового анализа // Жанры речи : сб. науч. ст. Саратов, 1999. С. 81–97.

37. *Юдина Н.В., Селиверстова О.А.* Хештег как единица интернет-дискурса: когнитивно-прагматический подход // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. 2022. № 3. С. 108–115. https://doi.org/10.20916/1812-3228-2022-2-108-115

38. *Меркулова И.А., Проценко Е.А.* Функционирование перекодированной лексики в русском медиапространстве // Русистика. 2022. Т. 20. № 3. С. 284–297. https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2022-20-3-284-297

39. *Маринова Е.В.* Семантические доминанты новообразований 2020 года в аспекте кодирования действительности в русском языке // Русистика. 2022. Т. 20. № 4. С. 449–466. https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2022-20-4-449-466

**Information about the authors**:

*Irina I. Klimova*, PhD in Philology, Professor, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation; *e-mail:* IIKlimova@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-5142-1890; eLibrary SPIN-code 9951-3145

*Nina A. Kozlovtseva*, PhD in Cultural Studies, Associate Professor, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation; *e-mail:* nina_kozlovtseva@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-2323-0752; eLibrary SPIN-code 1115-0523

**Сведения об авторах**:

*Климова Ирина Иосифовна*, кандидат филологтческих наук, доцент, профессор, руководитель департамента иностранных языков и межкультурной коммуникации факультета международных экономических отношений, Финансовый университет при Правительстве Российской Федерации; *e-mail:* IIKlimova@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-5142-1890; eLibrary SPIN-код 9951–3145

*Козловцева Нина Александровна*, кандидат культурологии, доцент, заместитель руководителя по научной работе и международной деятельности департамента иностранных языков и межкультурной коммуникации факультета международных экономических отношений, Финансовый университет при Правительстве Российской Федерации; *e-mail:* nina_kozlovtseva@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-2323-0752; eLibrary SPIN-код 1115-0523