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Abstract

The relevance of the article is justified by the fact that answering the question on typical ways of expressing connotation in borrowed words and their connection with the history and ethnos development the presented article fills the research gap in linguistics. The objective of the article is to summarize the comparative study of semantic (primarily connotative) evolution of two words ‘orda’ (Mongolian ‘ordu’ Knan’s palace, headquarters) – ‘ulus’ borrowed from Mongolian. The principal method of the research involves semantic context analysis. The analysis consists of 3 stages. At the first stage the semantic analysis of the words in Russian National Corpus, precedent texts (proverbs, idioms, popular quotations etc.) and modern Russian dictionaries reveals the fixed connotations in the language and brings out stereotypical images in the Russian culture. The second stage focuses on Russians’ individual perceptions of the words and summarizes the results of an associative experiment – respondents’ reactions to the stimulus ‘orda’, ‘ulus’. Thirdly, the semantic network analysis of the words performed on modern social media texts (chats and forums) reveals the typical semantic context of the words represented by collocations. Based on the principles of explanation, expansionism, functionalism and anthropocentrism as the main principles of modern linguistics paradigm the article might be of interest to linguists pursing research in semantics, students majoring in Linguistics and Cultural studies and teachers of Russian.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Historical Background

On the territory of the modern Republic of Tatarstan the two ethne, Tatars and Russians, have been living together as enemies, rivals, neighbours and fellow-citizens since the IXth century when a Turkic nomadic tribe of Bulgars moved north from the steppes of the Azov region, settled in the Volga-Ural region and founded the Bulgar khanate (Fakhrutdinov, 1986; Shamiloglu, 1990). Later those tribes were absorbed by Genghis Khan's Golden Horde and became part of his army. Together with the advances of the army and expansion of the Horde they migrated to the west and invaded new territories. Finally all the Horde tribes came to be called Tatars/Tartars by Russians and Europeans and the period of Golden Horde dominance is nowadays regarded as the Tatar yoke/Tatar-Mongolian yoke (Halperin, 1982).

At its peak the territory of the Golden Horde spread from the Urals to the Carpathian Mountains, extending east deep into Siberia. The Horde was gradually turkified and islamized, especially under their greatest khan, z Beg (1313-41). The Turkic tribes concentrated on animal husbandry in the steppes, while their subject peoples, Russians, Mordvinians, Georgians, and Armenians, paid tribute. The epidemic of plague of 1346-47 marked the beginning of the Golden Horde's decline and disintegration. The Russian princes won a signal victory over the Horde general Mamai at the Battle of Kulikovo in 1380. Mamai's successor and rival, Tokhtamysh, sacked and burned Moscow in retaliation in 1382 and reestablished the Horde's dominion over the Russians. However, Tokhtamysh had his own power broken by his former ally Timur, who invaded the Horde's territory in 1395, destroyed settlements and deported most of the region's skilled craftsmen to Central Asia, thus depriving the Horde of its technological edge over resurgent Muscovy. In the 15th century the Horde disintegrated into several smaller khanates, the most important being those of the Crimea, Astrakhan, and Kazan. The last surviving remnant of the Golden Horde was destroyed by the Crimean Khan in 1502 (Khudyakov, 1923; Gumilev, 1992).
1.2 Status of the Problem

The latest changes in society such as globalization, westernization, glocalization, etc., brought a number of changes in Russian people’s views and values. The changes in views result in behavioral stereotypes changes which are also well observed in speech, especially in the speech of young people. If not supported by historical memory of ethnos and nation, people may lose their ethnic and national identity thus shifting from one social group to another.

Anselm Strauss argues that to understand people one must “be prepared to view them as embedded in historical context” (Strauss, 1959) as in the course of constructing and maintaining the identity an ethnos identifies, shares, and passes along to future generations common ideas, values and stereotypes. The scholar’s views are especially significant at the moment for Russians as we are going through an extremely hard period in our history being so much influenced by a number of different cultures and peoples.

The words and their meaning are also being changed, but it is not by a chance that the semantic colouring of ‘orda’ in the Russian discourse has not changed dramatically since the time it was borrowed in the 14th century. The negative connotations of the word in Russian are probably caused by the role of the Mongolian invasion and the ‘Tartar Yoke’ played in the Russian history and the deep rooted fears of ethnic Russians. For centuries the word meant blood-shedding raids and humiliating tribute. ‘Orda’ (horde) was a strange and terrible world with its own laws and customs threatening the existence of the state of Rus’ itself.

Unlike the word ‘ulus’ which some scholars describe as the one which Russians ‘were sufficiently comfortable with and applied it to themselves (Presniakov, 1918; Halperin, 1982), the borrowed ‘orda’(a horde) has always been pejoratively connotated in Russian though Tatars and Russians had co-existed preserving their political autonomy and independence for many centuries.

The word “orda” does not only bear certain (mostly negative) connotative semantic components, it also reflects certain attitudes and values of the society that have been accumulated in the course of the long use of the word.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Literature Review

N. Gumilev defines “ethnos” as a group of people who oppose themselves to all other such-like groups on the basis of their unconscious feeling of mutual relatedness and togetherness which leads to the opposition of “us” to “them” (Gumilev, 1992).

The modern paradigm defines ethnic identity as one’s sense of belonging to an ethnic group and the part of one’s thinking, perceptions, feelings, and behavior that is due to ethnic group membership (Trimble & Dickson, 2005). It is nowadays viewed not as something inborn and natural, but as “social constructions” (Paltridge, 2008) that are “‘done’ in context” (Swann, 2002). People acquire, construct and represent their ethnic identity through their use of language and other discursive means (De Fina et al, 2006). We believe that cultural knowledge is embedded in the language in which it is communicated, but deny the validity of an iconic relation between the two (Boas, 1911; Sapir, 1949; Whorf, 1942).

We share M. Bakhtin’s view on no word being anonymous as a word is always used by somebody and it is related to the past texts and hypothetically – to the future texts it may occur in (Bakhtin, 1986). Word meanings registered in dictionaries and corpora preserve all the previous contexts of a word usage. Thus, the fixed semantic components of a word constitute the “so-called common ground” (Fairclough, 2003). On the one hand, they reflect the dominant views and attitudes of an ethnos towards a particular referent, and on the other hand, the fixed values surrounding a particular idea are imposed on individuals and predetermine their textual worlds, discursive practices and identities (De Fina, 2006).

2.2 Thematic Justification

The authors find the problems raised in the paper crucial since answering the question on typical ways of expressing connotation in borrowed words and their connection with the history and ethnos development they fill the actual research gap in linguistics.

2.3 Objective of the Research

The main objective of the research presented in the paper is to summarize the comparative study of semantic (primarily connotative) evolution of two words ‘orda’ (Mongolian ‘ordu’ Knan’s palace, headquarters) – ‘ulus’ borrowed from Mongolian.
2.4 Methods of the Research

While performing the research the authors applied the following methods in the interrelation and interdependence:

- **Descriptive method** includes observation and classification of the investigated material,
- **Comparative method**, aimed at identifying of general and specific features of the compared languages at all levels of the text,
- **Contextual analysis** aimed in this case at the study of micro and macro context that allows to determine in relation to the studied unit the implementation conditions of its meanings, additional associations, connotations, and to set the function of the unit in the text, which is an integral system.

The theoretical and methodological basis of the research formed primarily works of domestic historians and linguists, such as M. G. Khudyakov (1923), M. M. Bakhtin (1986), R. G. Fakhrutdinov (1986), L. N. Gumilev (2008) and others. The study also includes the works of international authors on anthropology and linguistics such as T. A. van Dijk (1977); Ch. J. Halperin (1982); U. Shamiloglu (1989); N. L. Fairclough (1995); J. E. Trimble & R. Dickson (2005); A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin & M. Bamberg (2006); J. Peoples & G. Baley (2012) and other prominent researchers in the field.

2.5 Factual Material and Stages of the Research

At the first stage the semantic analysis of the words in Russian National Corpus, precedent texts (proverbs, idioms, popular quotations etc.) and modern Russian dictionaries reveals the fixed connotations in the language and brings out stereotypical images in the Russian culture. The second stage focuses on Russians’ individual perceptions of the words and summarizes the results of an associative experiment – respondents’ reactions to the stimulus ‘orda’, ‘ulus’. Thirdly, the semantic network analysis of the words performed on modern social media texts (chats and forums) reveals the typical semantic context of the words represented by collocations.

3. Results.

3.1 First Stage of the Research. Semantic Analysis

The semantic context analysis of all senses registered in the **Explanatory Dictionary of Russian Language** (1999) of the studied words are conducted in three corpora: 1) Russian national Corpus; 2) The authors’ associate corpus; 3) Computer mediated discourse of non-professional chats on history topics.

The entry of the word ‘orda’ in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian language (1999) fixes connotative semantic components (one neutral and two pejorative), thus reflecting certain attitudes and values accumulated by the Russian ethnos: 1. **Hist.** large Turkic and Mongolian feudal states in the Middle Ages, a seat of Turkic and Mongolian rulers. Zolotaya orda Golden Horde. Krymskaya orda. Crimean horde || Unions of nomadic tribes. 2. **Figurative; used with modifiers (attributes). Disparaging.** Enemy forces; army. Fashistskie ordy. fascist hordes. 3. **Figurative; of smb, modified by adjectives. Coll.** A crowd, a chaotic and noisy crowd, a gathering of smb [The soldiers/ were tightly surrounded by a horde of artisans in tattered coats. Grigorovich, Organ Grinders of Petersburg. A horde of dirty little Cossacks hooted after Prokofiev. Sholokhov, Quiet Flows the Don. [From turk., mong. ordu — Knan’s palace, headquarters].

Proverbs as precedent texts are axiological signs and as such function within a semiotic space of culture revealing the ethnus’ values and attitudes. Russian proverbs dating back to the times of the Golden Horde reveal the dual nature of the referent and its Russian nominations. Four of the five registered in Dal’s Dictionary are not connotatively marked and refer to the historic phenomenon – the feudal states, seats of Turkic and Mongolian rulers (Sense 1 in the Dictionary entry): Like khan, like horde. Kakov xan, takova i orda. Where there is the khan (tsar), there is the horde (people). Gde Khan (zhar), tut i orda (i narod). Seniors and honoured even in the horde. Starshih i v orde pochitayut. Let me be in the Horde, but not in a mess. Ashhe by i v orde, tolko by v dobre. And there is only one – The honour in the Horde is worse than evil. Zlee zla pochet v orde – preserving the ethnic memory of orda as an enemy.

Modern precedent texts oppose Russians and Mongolians: Russians, surrender, we are a horde! - And we are a warrior host. Russkie sdavajtes, nas - orda! - a nas - rat! KVN, “Utomlyonnye Solncem”. Barbarians are changing the world/ wipe off the map cities and lands/ Gold and cashmere/ Greedy, evil horde (Song Carthage). Varvary menyayut mir, stirayut s zemli goroda. zoloto i kashemir, zhadinaya, zlaya orda (Pesnya Karfagen).

The first level of the study involves a corpus-based semantic analysis of ‘orda’ in Russian National Corpus; it is aimed at bringing out typical connotations and revealing stereotypical image(s) of orda created throughout the long history of its use in various discourses.
The Russian National Corpus (RNC) registers a wide range of written and oral texts of various genres and forms from the 17th century on. The corpus consists of numerous sub-corpora: poetic, mass media, oral, parallel (English – Russian), historical, etc. (http://ruscorpora.ru/search-orthlib.html).

Table 1. Orda in Russian National Corpus (RNC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-corpus</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>accentologic</th>
<th>oral</th>
<th>poetic</th>
<th>newspaper</th>
<th>Parallel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of papers</td>
<td>85 996</td>
<td>66 887</td>
<td>3 525</td>
<td>65 608</td>
<td>332 720</td>
<td>1 506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of sentences</td>
<td>19 362</td>
<td>1 931 925</td>
<td>1 623 625</td>
<td>956 449</td>
<td>12 920 590</td>
<td>4142 533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of words</td>
<td>229 968</td>
<td>14 747 503</td>
<td>10 754 403</td>
<td>9 671 137</td>
<td>173 518 798</td>
<td>54 028 815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers with Orda in</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of entries of Orda</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent set phrase – Zolodaya orda Golden Horde (dated 1863) – is used to define (1) a body of Mongols that overran eastern Europe in the 13th century and dominated Russia until 1486 and as a geographical name (2) the region comprising most of what is now European Russia, a part of Mongol Empire from mid 13th to end of 14th century. The people of the Golden Horde were a mixture of Turks and Mongols, with the latter generally constituting the aristocracy. Genghis Khan’s grandson Batu expanded the Mongolian domain in a series of brilliant campaigns that included burning of the city of Kiev in 1240.

Over 90 entries in RNC and 265 000 Russian documents with ‘orda’ in Google certify that the referent still arouses interest and is being much written about. The range of texts in which the set phrase is used include historical and modern, academic literature and fiction, prose and poetry. E.g. The Golden or Saray Horde dominating over Russia was torn apart by feuds. Vladychestovavshaya nad Rossieyu Zolotaya ili Sarajskaya orda v ego vremya razdiralas mezhdousobiyami. Well, have a look: this is the main road in Zamoskvorechie district – Bolshaya Ordynka that screams that once there had been the Golden Horde, and the way there was along this road. Nu smotrite: vot glavnaya zamoskovoreckaya magistral—Bolshaya Ordynka, chto pryamo krichit o tom, chto byla takaya Zolotaya Orda i v nee ezdili po etoj doroge. (Derkach & Bykov, 2001).grammatical functions of the noun studied vary, but it is primarily used as a subject both in prose and poetry, in literal and figurative meanings. E.g. The heyday of violets in a plain, where a horde is galloping, have you recognized the look of Death? Valery Bryusov. Song of the Ancient People (1923.03.19). Rascvet fialok v ravnine, gde skachet orda, ty oblik smerti uznal li? V. Ya. Bryusov. Pesnya drevnego naroda (1923.03.19). The official statistics says that over a year, this ‘iron horde’, devours 4 million tons of fuel! (Butaev, 2004). Za god eta ‘zheleznaya orda’, po ofitsialnoj statistike, shhiraet 4 miliona tonn topliva! (Butaev, 2004).

The National Corpus registers ‘orda’ (horde) (Senses 2, 3 in the Dictionary entry) primarily in collocations with adjectives, nouns and verbs thus realizing typical syntactic patterns of the Russian language: Adjective + ‘orda, orda+ Noun, Verb + ‘orda’. All the collocations registered are classified into unmarked, ameliorative, and pejorative. Unmarked are the cases conveying neither emotiveness nor evaluation of the referent. E.g. And the ice golden horde suffered a crushing defeat in the Battle of Yaroslavl. I vot ledovaya zolotaya orda poterpela sokrushitelnoe porazhenie v bitve pod Yaroslavlem (Korobatov, 2005).

The pejorative connotation is realized in the sentence: Yes, and the first time you go stupefied that way, along’ll come a heathen war-party out of the Utah country, kill a few gardeners, tear up the irrigating system, spoil our crops, and dump stones in the well before we can start defending ourselves (Walter, Canticle, 1960). Da, i kogda nibud, kogda vy budete v takom odurmanennom sostoyanii, iz rajona Yuty yavitsya yazycheskaya orda, ubet sadovnikov, razrashit irrigacionnuju sistemu, razgrabit nash urozhaj i zabrosaet kamnyami kolodec, prezhde chem my suneem dat otpor. Verbs used as predicates to orda determine the spectrum of possible activities: kill, tear, spoil, dump stones thus intensifying pejorative connotation.

Meliorative connotations though much rarer are still registered in RNC. E.g. Among the apple-trees with ovaries full, / there roams an easy horde / of golden-belly people ...Mezh yablo, zavyazyami polnyx/kochuet legkaya orda/zolotobryuxogo naroda... (Paseka, 1928).

The range of adjectives collocating with ‘orda’ include: Zolotaya golden (93), dikaya wild (12), zheleznaya iron (9), razgulnaya riotous (2), Sarajskaya Horde, Sinya blue, Belaya white, belo-golubaya white and blue,
Batyeva of Batyi (2), policeyskaya police (2), pribegshaya arrived, germanskaya German, pechenezhskaya of Pechenegs, peterburgskaya from St. Petersburg, konnaya equestrian, celaya whole (3), Gitlerovskaya Hitler, krestyanskaya peasant, neterpelivaya impatient, chernaya black, razbitaya broken, derzkaya daring, nochnaya night, rastakaya-to bad, zlaya evil, kosoglazaya cross-eyed, rabochaya working, banditskaya bandit, sluchajnaya of no organization, poganaya savage, svirepaya ferocious, zlobnaya vicious, raznolica of different faces, svetlaya bright, legkaya light, pestraya mottled, schastlivaya happy, veselaya cheerful, poslushnaya obedient, neugomonnaya restless, smeshnaya funny etc. The most typical contexts - the adjectives wild and iron - occur in various modifications in 21 contexts. Orda is represented as the embodiment of a number of evil features: zlaya evil, banditskaya bandit, poganaya savage, svirepaya ferocious, zlobnaya vicious. The negative features that orda is endowed with include ‘wild’, ‘cruel’, ‘frightening’, ‘unclean/dirty’, ‘noisy’, ‘treacherous’.

The next suggestive context are the collocations with the word in its figurative meaning in which the context may acquire some positive or ironic evaluation. Positive characteristics attributed to orda are few: schastlivaya happy, veselaya cheerful, poslushnaya obedient, neugomonnaya restless, smeshnaya funny.

Table 2. Connotation of collocations Adj+ ‘orda’ in Russian National Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of adjectives collocating with ‘orda’</th>
<th>412</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked occurrences</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>≈34,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameliorative connotation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>≈7,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pejorative connotation</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>≈58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in 412 contexts 143 adjectives are unmarked, 31 – ameliorative, 238 – pejorative. Thus, the noun ‘orda’ is coloured negatively 7.6 times more than positively. The stereotypical negative image of ‘orda’ that is wild, black, riotous, evil, cross-eyed, bandit, savage, ferocious, vicious reflects the painful moments in the history of the Russian nation.

Used as a subject ‘orda’ collocates with verbs (V+N) denoting primarily movement (rushed pomchals, hlynula) and violence (smash razgromit), attacked napadala, kill ub’et, destroy razrushiit, plunder razgrabit, stone zabrosaet kamnyami. Отвергавшая орда, которая снесет и запаччет любого, кто не пожелает жить по ее законам! (The furious horde, which will aweep away anyone who is reluctant to live according to its laws) (Kitchin, 2002). Positively marked verbs are few: In the steppe sings the horde / | | It runs obediently behind the red flag (Bakhtin, 2002).

Collocations with nouns also reflect the concept based of historic memories of the ethnors: horde of rapists orda nasilnikov, a horde of greedy predators orda zhadnyh hisshnikov, a horde of fighters orda bojcov. Historic parallels of conquerors and enemies are nominated alike: Nazi horde fashistov orda, a horde of swaggering knights chvanlivykh rycarej orda, a horde of drunken Teutons orda tevtonov pyanyh.

Figurative meaning of Russian ‘orda’ implies a mass, a huge amount of sth/ sb, usually unpleasant: a newsmen horde gazetchikov orda., a horde of ghosts prizrakov orda, a horde of thugs orda shpany., a horde of servants orda slug., a horde of Dynamo fans orda fanatov-dinamovcev., a horde of vampires orda vampirov, a horde of cockroaches orda tarakanov, chocks horde orda churok., a horde of hungry naked people orda golodyh, nagnylyud., a horde of thieves and robbers, a horde of troops, a horde of relatives, a starving horde, a horde of photographers and youngsters, a horde of shooters do not recognize any terms and hunting regulations, a horde of infidels, unwashed horde of little Cossacks ruling Bolshevik horde, horde of rabid shpargotsev, a horde of drunken soldiers killing their officers orda razbojnikov i grabitelej, orda vojsk, rodstvennikov orda, orda zabityx nerassuzhdashxshix lyudej, orda ogolodavshix puteshestvnikov, kak sarancha, orda raznoplemennykh fotografov i maloletok, orda strelkov, ne priznayushshaya nikakix srokov i pravil ooxy, orda basurnan, orda nemtyux kazachat, pravayushshaya orda bolshevikov, orda osataneley shpargocev, orda pyanyx soldat, ubivayushshix svoix oficerov.

In a number of poetic and academic texts the word nominates inanimate objects: a horde of golden uniforms mundirov zolotyh orda, and abstract notions: a horde of mistrust, orda nedoveriya. It collocates with the words meaning a period of time: a horde of such years takih godov orda, a horde of centuries stoletij orda.

Unmarked nominative collocations (Noun + (Prep/Adj) Noun (and N)) are few: a horde of his brothers and...
sisters *orda ego bratev i sester*, a horde of writers and poets *orda pisatelej i stihotvorev*, a horde of old Soviet and foreign journalists *orda eshhe sovetskih i zarubezhnyh zhurnalistov*, a horde of kids, *orda malyshej*). They are typically used with pejorative verbs: a horde of students *swarmed into... lomanulas orda shkolnikov*.

The broader semantic context typically intensifies the pejorative connotation of ‘orda’: *the horde whose vile troops* (orda, chi podlye otryady). The semantic contexts contains the words: *battle, barbarian, swept across Asia* etc.

**ULUS** (settlement or camp of some ethnic groups in Siberia) *tat. Horde, a country conquered by a Khan* *(Complete dictionary of foreign words included in the use of the Russian language, 1907)*. The following definitions of the «ulus» can be found:

an encampment of nomads; a camp of yurts, tents; a village; 2) (an area, belonging to a certain Turkic or Mongolian race or descent Union; 3 territorial-administrative unit in the Yakut ASSR and the Kalmyk autonomy areas with district rights *(The Dictionary of Foreign Words, 1933)*.

In the Russian National Corpus the noun «ulus» (Tatar) collocates with adjectives (A+N, N+A) (Note 1) in 315 contexts, of which 68 adjectives are negative, 70 positive and 177 unmarked. Thus the noun “Ulus” is predominantly unmarked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total occurrences of “Ulus”</th>
<th>315</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative occurrences</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>=22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive connotation</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>=22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked connotation</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most typical context of the word ‘ulus’ is an adjective nominating some geographical area, size (small, big, tiny etc.), characteristics (separate, quiet, poor, criminal etc.) or a possessive adjective/pronoun (native, non-native, his, her, their, native, etc). The verbs collocating with ulus are few: razvalit (break, ruin) ulus, razdrobit (will fracture) ulus, proslavit (will make famous) ulus, etc.

Collocations of the model noun+ noun are many: glava ulusa (head of U), administraciya ulusa (administration of U), naselenie ulusa (population of U), raspad/rasval (ruining of U).

Collocations structured by the model noun + prep+ noun: life in ulus, destabilizaciya v uluse are quite numerous.

There are also a number of set phrases with the adjective ulusny (belonging to ulus, that of ulus) typically in plural: ulusnye knyazya, ulusnye I ratnye knyazya (*ulus and martial rulers*).

**3.1 Second Stage of the Research. Opinion Survey**

On the second stage of the research aimed at revealing Russian individuals perception of the words ‘orda’ and ‘ulus’ we interviewed 327 people and pursued a semantic analysis of the lexical group of reactions received. The interview was held according to stratified multi-staged selection in 7 towns and 6 rural districts of the Russian Federation, 154 Russian monolingual males and 173 Russian monolingual females aged 19 – 60 among of different professions (workers, clerks, high school, college and University students) were asked the question: “What associations do you have when you hear the word *orda/ulus*?”. According to the reproduced associations we modeled the basic layer (containing levels of senses, perceptions, images, notions) of the concepts ‘orda’/‘ulus’. The majority of respondents (87% of men and 96% of women) describe ‘orda’ as bloodthirsty, ugly, scary, armed, angry, countless, carrying death cavalry, dark, armed (krovozhadnaya, bezobraznaya, strashnaya, vorozhdnaya, ozverevshaya, nesmetnaya, nesushhaya smert konnaya orda, temnaya, razbojnaya), which means that the concept ‘orda’ in Russian monolingual mentalese is of an image-bearing character associating ‘orda’ with referents of the corresponding ethnic culture: tents, raids, weapons, noises, horses, nomadism. As for ‘ulus’ over 80% of Russians admitted that they do not know the meaning of the word.

**3.3 Third Stage of the Research. Discourse Analysis**

Semantic Network analyses of *orda* in computer mediated corpus of texts created by nonprofessional communities discussing historic events, demonstrates the participants’ attitude towards the history of the country, changes in society, new phenomena and textbooks published in the Russian Federation. We studied the discourse of 12 groups which have 10 and more members. Virtual discussions where anyone can conceal his/her face and where there are no taboos or census participants have an advantage of speaking their mind without restraint due to absence of any social bonds with interlocutors in real life.

4. Discussion

Semantic Network analyses of *orda* in computer mediated corpus testifies to deep consonance in how Russians interpret the meaning of ‘orda’ thus realising and presenting their ethnic identity. With very few exceptions where the connotation is either neutral or positive a typical collocation in computer mediated communication is negative.


Positive: The situation with the history of the Horde is the same – it was admired and studied by all of Europe and the whole world, and then when there was no more need it was announced a mass of barbarians and savages and now even direct Horde descendants are spiting on the memory of their ancestors, the good and the bad. “…S istoriej ordy to zhe samoe - ej voshishhalis, u nee uchilis, vsya Evropa i ves mir uchilisya, a potom kogda nuzhda otpala - na nee posypalis vse tumaki, ohyavili varvarami i dikaryami i sejchas dazhe priyamne potomki ordyneev plyuyut na pamyat o svoih predkah, takih kakimi oni byli, so vsemi plyusami i minusami (Lingvoforum).)…

Negative: In our opinion, the total gap between Russia and Western countries began when the Horde yoke was established in Russia. Na moj vzglyad, totalnoe otstavanie Rossii ot zapadnyh stran nachalos imenno vo vremya ustanovleniya na Rusi ordynskogo iga (istoriya).

Typically the discussions are conducted by monolingual Russians, but if a community member has a Tatar parent it does affect the views on the role the Golden Horde played in the history of Russian state: My mother is Tatar, my father is Russian, but to be offended by the word «basurmanin» (mussulman) – what should a person think of? On the contrary, it seems to us foolish that the new conception of a high school history textbook the collocation Mongol-Tatar yoke is forbidden and substituted with - Golden Horde yoke. Moya mat' tatarka, otec russki, no chtoby oskorbitysa na slovo «basurmanin» – eto chto v golove dolzhno byt? naoborot, mne kazhetsya duryu, chto v Novoi koncepcii shkolnogo uchebnika istorii zapreshheno upominat mongolo-tatarskoe igo, vnesto nego – igo zolotoi orda (nevaforum).

Thirdly, the semantic network analysis of the word ‘orda’ performed by the authors on modern social media texts (chats and forums) reveals the typical semantic context of the word represented by nouns: fascists, insects, fans, vampires; adjectives: dirty, filthy, chickly, scabby, lousy, hungry, multilingual; verbs: whoop, howl, catcall, squawk, mass, pinch out from sb, hammer the enemy etc.

5. Conclusions

1. The word ‘orda’ functions in the Russian discourse in five different senses: as a proper name nominating a number of geographical objects on the territory of the former Soviet Union (predominantly in its Asian part), as a contracted version of the term Golden Horde (Zolotaya Orda(dated 1863)), an organized vicious enemy, a crowd, a mass of something.

2. The etymology and dynamics of the semantics of the word ‘orda’ and history of the Russian ethnos account for the word’s marked pejorative connotation in the Russian language.

3. A typical image of a horde is not just a large gathering, but one that behaves in an unruly manner, like a mob. The semantic contexts contains the words: battle, barbarian, swept across Asia etc.

4. Computer mediated discussions of non-professionals on the history of Russian ethnos reflect a new tendency in the semantics of the word ‘orda’ and the word’s semantic dynamics: mostly pejorative stereotypical image of a dangerous and aggressive horde begins acquiring elements of positive evaluation of the Golden Horde role in
Russian history thus marking the turn in the word semantics: the word begins gradually acquiring ameliorative connotation.

5. The reasons for the appearing change in the Russians attitude towards Golden horde which is clearly displayed in a number of forums online lie in the changed political context of the Russian Federation.

6. Recommendations

The method of the research described in the article can be used in further comparative study of semantic evolution of borrowings. The research can contribute to comparative semantic studies in Linguistics and Comparative Studies. The research can be used as the basis for the works revealing the typical ways of expressing connotation in borrowed words and their connection with the history and ethnos development, the field that represents the research gap in linguistics.
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