



LINGUO-CULTURAL AND PRAGMATIC PECULIARITIES OF THE PHENOMENON OF ANGLICISATION IN GEORGIA

Nino Kirvalidze

Ilia State University, Georgia

The paper considers the phenomenon of anglicisation as a multifaceted developing process associated with the increasing influx of English borrowings into the Georgian language. This process is related to the growing American influence as well as to the prestigious role of English as a lingua franca in almost every aspect of life at a global level. The influx of English words into Georgian is characterised by a number of socio-cultural and linguo-pragmatic peculiarities due to the sharp political changes and dynamic introduction of the market economy that have taken place since the country won its independence after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The research is based on the linguistic and pragmatic analysis of English lexical units imported into Georgian in the late 90-s and the first fifteen years of the new millennium. The survey has shown that Georgia welcomes English as an international medium of communication with the outside world, while it protects and promotes the Georgian language within the country as a means of national identity and cultural heritage.

Keywords: Anglicisation, Influx of English loan words, Multifaceted global process, Linguistic and pragmatic factors of anglicisation.

Introduction: Different Attitudes towards the Phenomenon of Anglicisation

The paper considers the phenomenon of anglicisation in Georgia as a developing process associated with the increasing influx of English borrowings into Georgian in the last 25 years since the country gained its independence after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Georgia (*Sakartvelo* – in the Georgian language) is a small country with ancient culture located at the crossroads of Eastern Europe and Western Asia in the Caucasus region of Eurasia. The change of the country's political orientation, as well as the democratisation of the society and its aspiration towards NATO and EU integration, have replaced the use of the Russian language by English due to the growth of both American influence and the prestigious role of English as a lingua franca in almost every aspect of life at a global level: politics, technology, science, business, mass media, communication, education, lifestyle, entertainment, etc.

The term *anglicism* etymologically derives from the word *England* and it was first used in the 17th century in connection with English expressions used in other languages (Oxford English Dictionary, 1989). Today its meaning has broadened, as the term is generally used to refer to English loans originating both from England and the States. Therefore, the term *americanism* is viewed as a subordinate of the term *anglicism* for the borrowings from the US.

Attitudes differ towards the phenomenon of anglicisation. The increasing international influence of English has been both welcomed and criticized by many. While some appreciate its political, economic and cultural advantages, others are sensitive to a possible threat to other languages and cultures. From the viewpoint of linguistics, lexical borrowing is a natural process which has been going on since the beginning of languages and language-induced contact. It cannot be denied that borrowing from foreign languages facilitates and enriches communication.

Yet, several scholars have pointed to possible risks of a global language. David Crystal gave a full treatment to these risks in his book *Language Death* (2000). A global language might cultivate an elite monolingual linguistic class, more complacent and dismissive in their attitudes towards other languages; or those who have such a language at their disposal – especially those who have it as a mother-tongue – might manipulate it to their own advantage at the expense of those who do not have it; or a global language might hasten the disappearance of minority languages; or – the ultimate threat – “make all other languages unnecessary” (Crystal 2003: 15).

However, the critique of the anglicisms is not so much about the fact that language is a means of communication, but rather about language being a symbol of the national and cultural identity of a speech community. “Anglicisms embody Anglophone or American social and cultural values, which can be perceived as a threat to one’s own values” – such was the attitude of French, German, Italian, Polish and Russian linguists at the Regensburg International Conference named *Anglicisms in Europe* (2006). These scholars warn that, with the most positive attitude to the social intention of obtaining universal basis for communication, the world should stay alert on the English language aggression into other tongues’ territories since there is a threat of a linguistic genocide as the absorption of minor cultures by the dominating language (the invader-tongue). For instance, T. Maximova from Russia discusses two scenarios reflecting different attitudes to the phenomenon of anglicisation: pessimistic and optimistic. According to the pessimistic scenario, there might be “a war” between languages claiming to dominate, which finally might lead to the effect of Babylon Tower. As a result, national cultures will be destroyed, cultural identities will totally disappear. From the optimistic viewpoint, this process of anglicisation can be resisted by two major factors. The most important one would be the language feature based on the power of the culture this language serves to. That is, the self-clearance of the language that helps get rid of alien language elements due to internal linguistic regulations. Temporal character of language influence would make another resistance: it presupposes short-termed existence of borrowings in the recipient language (Maximova 2006).

Nowadays, of all European countries it is France that has displayed the most organized and institutional purism directed against the influx of anglicisms. This picture was examined critically in the article by John Humbley (2008: 85-105), who questions the view of French as less susceptible to Anglo-Saxon influence than many other European languages. The author presents data on the influx of lexical anglicisms in French, German, Italian, Spanish and Rumanian, quoting the results of comparative studies and focusing in particular on the methods and sources available for such an examination. Örsi, another French scholar, concentrates on the etymological aspects of eliminating anglicisms from French in his paper *The De-Anglicization of the Vocabulary of Informatics in French* which is concerned with the techniques applied in the process of “frenchification” on the example of special vocabulary. The author discusses contact-induced motivation and strategies for the forms of French equivalents, such as their phonological or graphemic similarity to English source items, and transparency of semantic relationships as another type of motivation for replacements (Örsi 2008: 208-221). However, in view of the fact that more than half of the English vocabulary today originates from French, it has a certain ironical tinge that French commissions nowadays try to ban the English element from the French word stock.

In fact, this unwarranted purism should be replaced by the analysis of the rationale for using such linguistic innovations. The communicator’s social and economic intentions, such as maintaining professional credibility, confirming social expectations and compliance with the conventions of a given genre, can be considered as the rational motivation behind the lexical choice in favour of contact-induced items. Finally, other pragmatic factors, such as technical and time-saving considerations in the process of translation, may also play a considerable role in the choice of anglicisms.

In order to avoid negative connotations of English borrowings, linguists distinguish between *languages of communication* and *languages of identifications* (Crystal 2003). The advantage of this distinction is that English and one's own language are not perceived as competitors but rather as complementary possibilities of communication. Therefore, anglicisms should function as a means of communication and not of identification. But it is a fact that many people do not perceive the transfer of certain English or even "pseudo-English" words into their language through the advertising media or the entertaining industry as a meaningful kind of communication, but rather as an attempt to take over their national and cultural values.

A considerable contribution to the study of anglicisms has been made by Görlach's lexicographical project involving 16 European countries (Görlach 2001, 2002). Scholars participating in it observed that English was distributed relatively unevenly in the vocabulary of European languages, and this was predetermined by the history of the respective country, its connections with the Western world or with the United States, and also by its size and closeness of contacts. In countries like Denmark, Sweden, Norway and the Netherlands the influx of English terms has been widely accepted for decades and considered as a natural phenomenon, contrary to Eastern European countries like Poland, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria or Russia, where anglicisms have been gaining ground especially since the dissolution of the Soviet Union (Görlach 2002). Besides, countries with less than 10 million native speakers are more flexible than others as they are more concerned about the exchange with other countries than nations with 50 or 80 million speakers (cf. Juaristi 2008: 47-72).

At present the majority of scholars support the *Würzburg Declaration on European Language Policy*, which maintains the cultural and linguistic diversity of the European countries. English as a lingua franca should not replace linguistic diversity as a tertiary language since "only an active and intensified language policy corresponding to the cultural diversity of the European countries can guarantee the future of the European Union" (Ahrens 2003: 435). Both a lingua franca and a national language are wished for. The increasing interconnectedness and confluence with all parts of the world should be regarded as a necessary incentive to concerning oneself with one's own cultural identity and heritage, leading to its appreciation, promotion and protection.

Theoretical Framework of the Research: Borrowing and Related Terms

Researches on anglicisms concentrate on several main areas pertaining to borrowing, assimilation and integration processes, as well as on the criteria that account for the cognitive processes involved in the introduction of new contact-induced lexical items. Linguists focus on the main strategies concerning contact-induced lexical innovations, such as importation of a word from the source language, analogical innovation and independent innovation, and their further subdivisions based on the degree of adaptation and the presence of word-formation processes or semantic change. The fundamental issues widely discussed are the contexts of use which promote these different strategies, the speaker-related and hearer-related cognitive operations involved in each of them and the cognitive and communicative aspects which determine later uses of the resulting contact-induced items, etc. (Winter-Froemel 2008: 16-41; Alexieva 2008: 42-51; Dunn 2008: 52-71).

But what exactly is a borrowing? Though phonological, morphological and syntactic borrowings also exist, the term is usually applied to words and their meanings. Borrowing denotes the process as well as the object. As a process, it typically refers to the importation of a word or its meaning from one language into another. As an object, it denotes the form and/or the meaning of the item that originally was not part of the vocabulary of the recipient language but was adopted from some other language and made part of the borrowing language's vocabulary.

A second cause for the fuzziness of the term *borrowing* is its use for a subgroup of borrowing, namely *lexical borrowing*, in contrast to *semantic borrowing*. Lexical borrowings are also called *loan words* or *loans*. Both the form and the meaning of a foreign word become imported, and not only the meaning as is the case with semantic borrowing. Lexical borrowing is equated with *direct borrowing*,

i.e. a borrowing whose form is transferred directly from the source language, and not via another language, the latter case being usually called *indirect borrowing*.

A mixture of lexical and semantic borrowing results in hybrid formations, also called *mixed compounds*, *semi-calques* or *loan blends*, denoting a word or word combination that consists of elements of both source and receiver languages. Sometimes the expression *total substitution* is used for semantic loans, and *partial substitution* for hybrid formations. However, lexical borrowings in this terminology are not substitutions but importations.

Finally, there are *pseudo-borrowings*, or *pseudo-loans*. These are words or word elements in languages other than English that were borrowed from English but are used in a way native English speakers would not recognize. Pseudo-anglicisms often take the form of blends, combining elements of multiple English words to create a new word. An example of such pseudo-anglicism in Georgian is *klip-meikeri* (*clip-maker*), which is used to refer to a *music video director*. Another example of a pseudo-anglicism is *rekorsmeni* (*recordsman*) which corresponds to English *record-holder in sport*. Pseudo-borrowing can occur both on the formal and semantic level. For instance, the Georgian word *zumeri* (*zoomer*) is a lexical pseudo-loan, used to denote a continuous low-pitched signal, usually of a telephone. The word was coined on the basis of the English word *to zoom* and *-er* word-building suffix, though this lexeme does not exist in English.

Whether a word is perceived as foreign or not is also related to its degree of *adaptation* or *nativization*. Both terms refer to the adjustment of spelling, pronunciation and/or morphology of loan words to the structure of the receptor language. The degree of adaptation reflects the closeness of the contact and attitudes of the affected speech community. *Adaptation* is distinguished from *adoption*, which is defined as unmodified borrowing. However in practice, many scholars use *adaptation* and *adoption* synonymously, since few completely non-adjusted borrowings exist, at least regarding pronunciation.

Thus, we have discussed some universal terms and concepts of lexical borrowing that form the theoretical framework for linguistic classification of anglicisms in any language, including Georgian. The purpose of the present paper is, first, to define linguistically most typical groups of anglicisms, imported into Georgian for the last 25 years, and then discuss socio-cultural and pragmatic peculiarities of their functioning in various discourse types.

Linguistic Classification of Anglicisms in Georgian

The research has shown that, like many European languages, Modern Georgian distinguishes three main groups of anglicisms:

1. *lexical*, i.e. *direct borrowings*, when an English word is imported together with its form and meaning (or part of the meaning);
2. *transliterated*, i.e. *indirect borrowings*, which refer to loan formations in the Georgian language coined by analogy with their English etymons' structure and meaning;
3. *semantic borrowings*, i.e. when the borrowed meaning of an English etymon extends the meaning of a Georgian word broadening thus its referential field.

Lexical or Direct Borrowings

The analysis of anglicisms has revealed that there are two main groups of directly imported loan words in Georgian:

- a) loan words, that maintain English pronunciation and form. This group of anglicisms comprises terminological lexis, mostly word-combinations denoting different items and concepts of technology, science, art, mass-media, etc. For instance: *egzit-poli* (*exit poll*); *beibi-siTeri* (*baby-*

sitter); *konsaltingi* (*consulting*); *fabi* (*pub*); *isTebliSmenTi* (*establishment*); *ofis-menejeri* (*office manager*); *daijesti* (*digest*); *bilbordi* (*billboard*); *masmedia* (*mass-media*), etc.

- b) loan acronyms that have similar pronunciation and form in Georgian as their English etymons. For instance: *nato* (*NATO*), *unesko* (*UNESCO*), *unisefi* (*UNICEF*), *esemesi* (*SMS*), *ikao* (*ICAO*), *biseki* (*BSEC*), *piari* (*PR*), *dizei* (*DJ*), *opeki* (*OPEC*), *mapi* (*MAP*), *bibisi* (*BBC*), *sieneni* (*CNN*), *nasa* (*NASA*), *lazeri* (*LASER*), etc.

There are also some early borrowed anglicisms, that are phonetically and morphologically integrated into the Georgian language to such extent that it is difficult to recognise them as English. For instance, the word *title* has developed a whole set of derivatives constituting a separate word-family in the Georgian language with the help of Georgian word-building suffixes: *tituli*, *titulovani*, *satitulo*. Or the English word *irony*, which is also fully integrated into Georgian, having built its own word-family: *ironia*, *ironiuli*, *ironiulad*, *ironizireba*, etc.

It is almost a truism that “when a country adopts a language it adapts it in different ways” (Crystal 2003: 16). In other words, when an English word is directly imported into another language, it undergoes some orthographic, phonological and morphological changes until it becomes integrated into the receiver language. Georgian distinguishes four possible variants of spelling of directly imported anglicisms:

1. anglicisms are spelt by analogy with their English etymons’ pronunciation (e.g.: *bumi* < *boom*; *barmeni* < *barman*; *ragbi* < *rugby*; *imiji* < *image*, etc.);
2. the spelling of an anglicism fully coincides with the spelling of its English etymon (e.g.: *bardi* < *bard*; *gangsteri* < *gangster*; *monitori* < *monitor*; *interneti* < *Internet*, etc.);
3. the spelling of an anglicism coincides partly with the pronunciation and partly with the spelling of its English etymon (e.g.: *overoxaimi* < *overtime*; *spidometri* < *speedometer*; *matCpointi* < *match point*, etc.);
4. the spelling of an anglicism is formed under the influence of the mediator language, mostly Russian, through which it was imported into Georgian (e.g.: *Jiuri* < *jury*; *biujeti* < *budget*; *partniori* < *partner*, etc.).

Pronunciation of directly imported anglicisms is influenced by the peculiarities (that is, similarity-dissimilarity) of the phonological systems of both source and receiver languages. The research has shown that, due to these factors, anglicisms of this group undergo three types of phonological adaptation in the Georgian language:

1. zero transphonemization, i.e. when an anglicism is pronounced very close to its etymon due to the fact that both source and receiver languages possess similar sounds (e.g.: *zumi* [*zumi*] < *zoom*; *dedlaini* [*dedlaini*] < *deadline*; *lideri* [*lideri*] < *leader*, etc.). It should be noted that most anglicisms take the Georgian ending *-i* [i] as a morphological marker of adaptation;
2. partial transphonemization, i.e. when the pronunciation of an anglicism only partly coincides with the pronunciation of its etymon due to the fact that some elements differ phonologically in them. For instance: *televizia* [*televizia*] < *television*; *sporti* [*sporti*] < *sport*; *kompania* [*kompania*] < *company*, etc.;
3. full transphonemization, i.e. when some English phonetical elements, that have no equivalents in the Georgian phonetical system, are substituted freely in an anglicism. Free transphonemization refers mainly to English etymons with [w] and [f] in their pronunciation (e.g.: *uikendi* [*uikendi*] < *weekend*; *forvardi* [*porvardi*] < *forward*, *flirti* [*plirti*] < *flirt*, etc.).

By analogy with the phonological changes discussed above, we have singled out three main variants of morphological adaptation of directly imported anglicisms in Georgian:

1. levelling transmorphemization, i.e. when most imported anglicism take the Georgian suffixal inflexion of the nominative case *-i* [i], which is considered to be a universal morphological marker of their adaptation to the Georgian language. For instance: *blefi* < *bluff*; *testi* < *test*; *starti* < *start*, etc.;

2. partial transmorphemization, i.e. when an anglicism retains the suffix of its English etymon in some morphological form, while it adds a Georgian suffixal inflexion in its oppositional form. For instance, most anglicisms represented by nouns retain the English suffix *-er* in the singular, while their plural forms are coined with the help of the Georgian suffixal inflexion *-ebi* (*ebi*), replacing the English inflexion *-s*. E.g.:

(sing.) *spikeri* [*spikeri*] < *speaker*; (pl.) *spikerebi* [*spikerebi*] < *speakers*; (sing.) *testeri* [*testeri*] < *tester*; (pl.) *testerebi* [*testerebi*] < *testers*;

(sing.) *skaneri* [*skaneri*] < *scanner*; (pl.) *skanerebi* [*skanerebi*] < *scanners*,

There are cases when an anglicism retains its etymon's suffix and, at the same time, additionally takes a Georgian suffix *-eli/-uli*, which is synonymous with the English one in its meaning. For instance: *vegetarianeli* [*vegetarianeli*] < *vegetarian*; *ekstravagantuli* [*ekstravagantuli*] < *extravagant*, etc..

3. full transmorphemization, i.e. when the suffix of an English etymon can be substituted by a Georgian suffix with the same meaning and function. For instance, the English adjectival suffix *-ic* is frequently substituted by the Georgian adjectival suffixal allomorphs *-eli* /*-uli* /*-uri*: *sarkastuli* [*sarkastuli*] < *sarcastic*; *ironiuli* [*ironiuli*] < *ironic*; *analizuri* [*analizuri*] < *analytic*; *fantastiuri* [*fantastiuri*] < *fantastic*, etc.

It is worth mentioning that the majority of directly imported anglicisms are represented by nouns, since people usually borrow new concepts and things with their names, and most of them take the suffixal inflexion of the nominative case *-i* [I], which is considered, as it has been mentioned above, to be a universal morphological marker of their adaptation to the Georgian language.

As regards verbal and adjectival anglicisms, they are also coined according to the Georgian word-building rules. Hence, verbs are formed by means of Georgian verbal suffixes *-reba* (*-reba*) / *-roba* (*-roba*): *boikotireba* [*boikotireba*] < *boycott*; *investireba* [*investireba*] < *invest*, *adaptireba* [*adaptireba*] < *adapt*; *testireba* [*testireba*] < *test*; etc.). Adjectives are also modelled by analogy with Georgian forms via suffixation or prefix-suffixation (e.g.: *klasikuri* [*klasikuri*] < *classic*; *dinamiuri* [*dinamiuri*] < *dynamic*; *aqtiuri* [*akturi*] < *active*; *saskolo avtobusi* [*saskolo avtobusi*] < *school bus*, *sagazeTo statia* [*sagazeto statia*] < *newspaper article*, etc.).

Transliterated or Indirect Borrowings

Anglicisms of this type are represented by loan formations, mainly Georgian word-combinations that are coined by analogy with their English etymons with the help of translation. Many linguists, mostly purists, give preference to the use of transliterated anglicisms over their direct importation into a receptor language. Degree of closeness of transliterated anglicisms to their etymons varies and this makes it possible to subdivide them into the following groups:

- a) *loan translations* or *calques*, which imply complete translation of a borrowing. This group of transliterated anglicisms is quite numerous and most frequently used in Georgian. For instance:

Georgian *adamianis uflebebi* < EEnglish *Human rights*

Georgian *pirveli ledi* < English *First lady*

Georgian *civi omi* < English *Cold War*

Georgian *rkinis farda* < English *Iron Curtain*

Georgian *sisxlis banki* < English *Blood bank*

Georgian *mikrotalRuri* < English *microwave*

- Georgian *xelburTi* < English *handball*
 Georgian *savaWro niSani* < English *trademark*
- b) *loan rendering or semi-calques*, which imply partial translation of a borrowing retaining the meaning of its English etymon. Such transliterated anglicisms are:
- Georgian *caTambjeni* < English *skyscraper*
 Georgian *piradi mcveli* < English *bodyguard*
 Georgian *maRviZara saaTi* < English *alarm clock*
 Georgian *aviafosta* < English *airmail*
- c) *loan blends or mixed compounds*, represented by a hybrid word or word-combination that consists of elements of both source and receiver languages.
- Georgian *vebgverdi* < English *website*
 Georgian *esemes mdivani* < English *SMS Secretary*
 Georgian *avtomopasuxe* < English *autoresponder*
 Georgian *sim-baraTi* < English *SIM-card*
 Georgian *maRali-riski* < English *high-risk*
 Georgian *neTgazeTi* < English *Net Newspaper*
- d) *loan doublets*, when an English word is borrowed by the Georgian language in two forms: a) directly, retaining the English etymon's pronunciation and meaning, and b) indirectly via transliteration. Consider the following table:

English Loan Doublets in Georgian

English etymons	Direct borrowings	Transliterated borrowings
<i>Public relations</i>	<i>fabliq rileiSenzi</i>	<i>sazogadoebasTan urTierToba</i>
<i>fast food</i>	<i>fast fudi</i>	<i>swrafi kvebis obieqti</i>
<i>babysitter</i>	<i>beibisiteri</i>	<i>bavSvis momvleli</i>
<i>second hand</i>	<i>seqondhendi</i>	<i>meoradi saqoneli</i>
<i>mass-media</i>	<i>masmedia</i>	<i>masobrivi informaciis saSualebebi</i>
<i>cameraman</i>	<i>kamerameni</i>	<i>operatori</i>

Semantic Borrowings

When an English word finds its way into another language, mostly only one or a couple of its individual meanings are borrowed. Linguists often employ the term *loan meaning* to refer to the borrowing of a meaning through meaning extension of a word in the recipient language. An example of loan meaning is Georgian *Tagvi* (*mouse*): by analogy with the English word *mouse* in computer science, denoting “a small hand-held input device used to move a cursor on the computer screen”, this new meaning of the word *mouse* was extended to Georgian *Tagvi* (*computer mouse*). The same can be said about the Georgian word *mexsiereba* (*memory*), that has also received a new technical meaning in connection with a

computer. Once a French borrowing *menu* (*meniu*) has extended its semantic structure by acquiring the new meaning again from the English computer domain – *a list of options, usu. displayed on-screen showing the commands or facilities available*. New additional meanings of these and other words, for example, *resume* are classical examples of semantic borrowing.

Sometimes semantic borrowing gives a new life to a word of old Georgian origin in combination with an English word, denoting some modern concept. For instance, a hybrid loan blend – *hit aRlumi* (*Hit Parade*), which belongs to music terminological lexis. Thus, a loan meaning of an English etymon is added to a Georgian word extending its semantic structure.

Socio-Cultural and Functional-Semantic Peculiarities of Anglicisms in Different Types of Georgian Discourse

After the change of the Soviet regime in Georgia in the late 1990-s, all restrictions fell away and the veritable flood of English words started streaming in. It was not only a political question or one of mere fashion but there were too many new concepts arriving and too few people with the necessary knowledge of language to handle the problem. Although the majority of linguists, mainly Kartvelologists (i.e., experts of the Georgian language), have been concerned about preserving the purity of the language, it is impossible to deny the fact that the Georgian language has been actively increasing its vocabulary through the use of anglicisms which penetrated various styles and types of discourse (Megrelishvili et al. 2014).

The distribution of anglicisms in Georgia is characteristic mainly of the urban speech, particularly of Tbilisi, the capital of the country, which has gained importance as an administrative, political, educational and cultural centre. A great deal of loan words, which have come to be borrowed to suit the needs of the society, can be categorised into two groups:

- a) neutral terms of different professional domains ranging from new technologies, business, science and politics to pop-music, sport, etc. to name new objects and concept, denoting rapid changes in the world in different spheres of life;
- b) fashionable anglicisms that are socially and culturally marked as prestigious lexical units, used by elite groups of the society (journalists, politicians, people of the artistic world, students, etc.) to highlight their modernity, urbanity and intellectual abilities.

All the spheres of the distribution of anglicisms in Georgia are closely linked to mass-media and advertising, which has a very important role as far as language use is concerned. It is interesting that the media discourse influences the language of almost all social groups as it lost its bureaucratic character and became very varied, vivid, and emotional. These linguistic changes were affected by extralinguistic transformations, which were motivated by the pragmatic modification of values and meanings, as well as by the socio-cultural factors and contexts, assigning new meanings and connotations to the previously existing vocabulary.

The adaptation of language to reality and its communicative needs, is very interesting due to the multidimensional character of the change lingual units undergo. Indeed, when studying language adaptations, we can observe social interests and current problems, and the interrelation of society with other cultures. Therefore, in order to understand linguistic change, it is essential to observe and analyse social, political, historical, and cultural transformations happening in the world synchronically as well as historically.

Transformations of 21st century society brought an obvious tendency towards globalisation and standardisation (of business terms and practices, for instance). Linguistically, this trend is articulated in the form of lexical borrowing across the languages of the world with reference to various spheres of human activities. Linguists assume that our languages absorb the wisdom passed through the ages. This wisdom is presented through the ages in our languages through specific means of expression – set phrases, metaphorical and metonymic expressions, and realia, all of which, when read and studied in discourse, turn out to be a very reliable source of information about peoples' traditions and their general perceptions of the world (Wierzbicka, 2006: 8).

Numerous anglicisms have appeared recently in modern Georgian discourse as foreign words transferred directly to fill a semantic gap in those spheres of life which are undergoing the most dynamic modification or development. However, changes at the lexical level demonstrate transformations in native speakers' worldview and can be used to examine cognitive patterns of the culture in which these borrowed words and expressions appear (Munday, 2006: 56).

Thus, the special nature of modern borrowing is that, together with the word, it brings into the language the whole context (extralinguistic situation) in which it is normally used. That is why anglicisms possess a strong pragmatic core in their meaning. Obviously, the influx of anglicisms into Georgian is happening not just to compensate for a lack in the language and to quickly create a necessary word, but rather to transmit the meaning of 'newness' of the discussed object and 'belonging' to the globalized community, thus providing evidence of the reality of certain 'shared understandings' (Wierzbicka, 2006: 9).

At the beginning of the 21st century it is possible to identify the following main spheres in the use of anglicisms: economics and politics; technology; spheres of people's everyday activities, often pertaining to their senses of comfort and well-being; and the most recent category, the names of various kinds of services. Economics and politics were the first spheres where English borrowings appeared. It had to do obviously with the country's attempt to switch from a planned to a market economy, in order to adopt notions and strategies of democratic government procedures already common in the rest of the world. Georgians adopted such words as *governor* (*gubernatori*), *speaker* (*spikeri*), *mayor* (*meri*), *impeachment* (*impiCmenti*), *summit* (*samiti*); *deposit* (*depoziti*), *collapse* (*kolafsi*), *default* (*defolti*), *invoice* (*invoisi*), etc.

Though some of these borrowings have a corresponding equivalent in Georgian, the English terms are widely used by the population, demonstrating social and political changes which have taken place in the country. For example, the noun *univermaRi* ('department store') which clearly refers to a description of Soviet times, has been replaced by the synonymous *moli* ('mall') and calque expression *savaWro centri* ('shopping centre').

Quick linguistic changes are prompted by changes in our modes of communicating during modern dynamic times and can be explained first of all by the 'economy principle', which was formulated by the French linguist Martinet in the 1960s. This principle underlines the idea of transference of a greater volume of information in a smaller unit of time and is integral for a language's further development. The necessity for linguistic economy is caused by the compromise between efficient communication and the constant human desire to invest as little effort in this process as possible.

English terms usually have compact forms with broad conceptual meaning. For example, the political term *summit* (*samiti*) is more frequently used than its Georgian equivalent which is represented by the noun phrase, explaining the whole notion in a descriptive way: "a high profile international meeting of political leaders" (*Sexvedra umaRles doneze*). Another example of a compact political term is *impeachment* (*impiCmenti*), denoting a process in which an official is accused of unlawful activity, the outcome of which may include the removal of that official from office as well as criminal or civil punishment. This term successfully replaced the Georgian phrase, which explained the conceptual meaning of *impeachment* in a verbose way.

A number of anglicisms express concepts and objects, which already existed in our reality, but they have acquired some specific and new features of a denoted thing. A lot of such words are found in the group of job-titles. There is a very vivid example of the loan word *manager* (*menejeri*) which developed a lot of new compounds, in which the first component marks the sphere of occupation: *ofis-menejeri* (*office manager*), *finansuri menejeri* (*financial manager*), *biznes-menejeri* (*business manager*), *brendis menejeri* (*brand manager*), *kastingis menejeri* (*casting manager*), etc.

Most of the anglicisms which appear in everyday Georgian discourse these days tend to describe such aspects of the life as health, beauty, and fashion. Such words as *fitnesi* (*fitness*), *Seifingi* (*shaping*), *ioga* (*yoga*), *bodi-bildingi* (*bodybuilding*), *bodi-bari* (*body-bar*), *spa* (*spa*), *velnesi* (*wellness*), *brendi* (*brand*), *baieri* (*buyer*), *distributori* (*distributor*), *Sou-rumi* (*show-room*), *Sofingi* (*shopping*), *miqsi* (*mix*) and many others have become part of the vocabulary of modern Georgians. In the job market,

which has become more varied along with other spheres of people's lives, one can come across such phrases as *top-menejeri* (*top manager*), *aplikaciis forma* (*application form*), *ded-laini* (*dead-line*), etc.

It should be noted that, although English borrowings are so widespread in the language that they are not usually translated, their use depends upon a person's age and educational level. Besides this, communicative and linguistic competence, as well as international experience and psychological readiness are the factors which determine a person's willingness to include borrowings in everyday use. The users of modern borrowings signal their belonging to a world without boundaries, their wish to be a part of common problems and achievements. The component of 'newness' in anglicisms serves as a marker of fashion, prestige, and ideological preference. As the below-given example shows, the speaker chooses to use the English borrowing although there are other means of expression available in the Georgian language:

developeruli kompania "mgzavrebi" momxmarebels sTavazobs elitarul da stanadartul nomrebs mSenebare sastumroebSi bakuriansa da baTumSi (sityva da saqme, 06.12.2015). – (The Developer Company "Mgzavrebi" offers elite and standard apartments in the hotels under construction in Bakuriani and Batumi.)

This advertisement demonstrates how the use of the anglicism *developer* (instead of the native word – *samSeneblo*) transmits the feeling of something very prestigious and expensive highlighting that both Bakuriani and Batumi are fashionable resort places in Georgia for well-to-do people.

Obviously, the active process of borrowing new vocabulary stimulates an increase in synonyms – lexical variants with a similar meaning, which nevertheless differ in terms of their stylistic, connotational, and general pragmatic peculiarities. The words like *brifingi* (*briefing*), *daijesti* (*digest*), *egzitpoli* (*exit-poll*), *kastingi* (*casting*), *praimer* (*primary*) and many others reflect the reality and help to describe it efficiently and economically. Modern borrowings which are very numerous in the discourse of the 21st century have a very strong pragmatic reference, that is, the connotational emotional meaning of modernity which expressions acquire in certain contexts. The English word *show* has become a popular anglicism in Georgia, used in such word-combinations as *Sou biznesi* (*show business*), *naiT Sou* (*night show*), *realiT Sou* (*reality show*), *komedi Sou* (*comedy show*), *feSen Sou* (*fashion show*), *politikuri Sou* (*political show*), *Toq Sou* (*talk show*), etc. Thus, it can be assumed that pragmatic and semantic meanings of anglicisms are primarily intensified not by linguistic circumstances, but by extralinguistic factors, which serve as the socio-cultural context for their use.

Conclusions

The research has shown that the phenomenon of anglicisation in Georgia is a multifaceted global process, motivated by a number of socio-cultural and linguo-pragmatic factors. The growing influx of English words into Georgian confirms that the country and its people respond to the changing needs of communication, following changes in the world and ways of living. Nowadays English functions as a lingua franca, and this certainly has more advantages than disadvantages (for instance, anglicisms prevent the creation of new words through the language's own means, thus hindering its further development; or they may leave certain aspects of information unclear for the addressee due to the lack of language proficiency of the latter). The most obvious advantages of anglicisms in Georgian are as follows:

1. they extend the vocabulary of the Georgian language, making it adaptable to the current use;
2. their use testifies to people's increased knowledge and interest about the world around them, promoting more intense English language teaching programmes;
3. anglicisms acquaint the Georgian people with the Anglophone and world culture, at the same time making them aware of their own national and cultural identity through their own native language;

4. anglicisms are very flexible in their use and can be applied in thematically various discourses ranging from politics, business, new technologies and science to pop-music, sport, etc. to denote new objects and concepts in the respective spheres of life;
5. anglicisms promote the use of the economy principle, transferring more information in a smaller unit of time;
6. pragmatic and semantic meanings of anglicisms are primarily intensified not by linguistic circumstances, but by situational conditions, that is, extralinguistic factors, which serve as the socio-cultural context for their use.

Therefore, Georgia welcomes English as a lingua franca, as an international medium of communication with the outside world, while it protects and promotes the Georgian language within the country as a means of national identity and cultural heritage.

References

1. Ahrens, Rüdiger, ed. (2003). *European Language Policy*. Heidelberg: Winter.
2. Alexieva, Nevena (2008). How and Why are Anglicisms often Lexically Different from their English Etymons? In Fischer, Roswitha and Pułaczewska, Hanna (eds), *Anglicisms in Europe: Linguistic Diversity in a Global Context*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp.42-51.
3. Crystal, David (2000). *Language Death*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
4. Crystal, David (2003). *English as a Global Language*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
5. Dunn, Hohn (2008). Face Control, Electronic Soap and the Four-Storey Cottage with a Jacuzzi: Anglicisation, Globalisation and the Creation of Linguistic Difference. In: Fischer, Roswitha and Pułaczewska, Hanna (eds), *Anglicisms in Europe: Linguistic Diversity in a Global Context*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 52-71.
6. Görlach, Manfred (2001). *A Dictionary of European Anglicisms. A Usage Dictionary of Anglicisms in Sixteen European Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Görlach, Manfred (2002). *An Annotated Bibliography of European Anglicisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Humbley, John (2008). How to Determine the Success of French Language Policy on Anglicisms - Some Methodological Considerations. In: Fischer, Roswitha and Pułaczewska, Hanna (eds), *Anglicisms in Europe: Linguistic Diversity in a Global Context*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 85-105.
9. Juaristi, Patxi, Timothy Reagan & Humphrey Tonkin (2008). Language Diversity in the European Union. An Overview. In: Xabier Arzoz, Xabier (ed.), *Respecting Linguistic Diversity in the European Union*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 47-72.
10. Maximova, Tamara (2006). Anglicisms in Russian Mass-Media Discourse. In: Proceedings of the International Conference *Anglicisms in Europe*. Regensburg University, 26-28 September 2006, pp. 12-13.
11. Megrelishvili, Madonna, Koba Lomidze & Maia Alavidze (2014). *Adaptation and Integration of Anglicisms in Georgian in the Process of Globalization*. Kutaisi State University Press, Georgia (in Georgian).
12. Munday, Jeremy (2006). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London / New York: Routledge.
13. Örsi, Tibor (2008). The De-Anglicization of the Vocabulary of Informatics in French. In: Fischer, Roswitha and Pułaczewska, Hanna (eds), *Anglicisms in Europe: Linguistic Diversity in a Global Context*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 208-221.
14. Oxford English Dictionary (1989) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
15. Wierzbicka, Anna (2006). *English Meaning and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Winter-Froemel, Esme (2008). Unpleasant, Unnecessary, Unintelligible? Cognitive and Communicative Criteria for Evaluating Borrowings and Alternative Strategies. In Fischer, Roswitha and Pułaczewska, Hanna (eds), *Anglicisms in Europe: Linguistic Diversity in a Global Context*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 16-41.