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ABSTRACT

A language is so constructed that the speaker is able to draw out of its resources whatever he wishes to communicate, yet whenever cultural borrowing occurs he cannot altogether avoid borrowing the words which are associated with it.

Russian written records indicate that the language has been exposed to numerous foreign influences from very early times. With the intense introduction of "Westernization" since the sixteenth-century both English and French have had a considerable influence on Russian and especially in the twentieth-century this has even increased. For the purpose of this study, therefore, the writer has chosen to analyse English and French loanwords that are found in use in present-day Russian; examples from other languages, especially German, will be given occasionally insofar as they support the arguments presented.

This thesis attempts an overall description of the morphological assimilation of loanwords. Phonological analysis and discussion of the socio-cultural context is given consideration in order to enable the reader and the analyst to see this paper as a whole. It was necessary to
abstract linguistic elements at different levels of analysis so that some problems that are not explainable at the morphological level, would not be left unsolved.

To some extent future borrowings into the Russian language in connection with cultural borrowing may be predicted.

The pronunciation of a loanword depends on the degree of assimilation and whether or not the speaker is aware of the fact that it is a borrowing or wants to alert the listener as well. On the whole, loanwords are subject to phonological as well as morphological adjustments.

Loanwords are sometimes under the pressure of both the native and foreign morphological systems, which in turn causes fluctuation of forms. Important external factors in the assimilation of loanwords at both levels are the audio and visual means of communication involved in transferring a loanword from either English or French into Russian.

An interesting feature for future investigation is the analysis of loanwords on the lexical level and the correlation of lexical patterning with morphology in the process of loanword assimilation.
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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

A language is so constructed that no matter what any speaker of it may desire to communicate, no matter how original or bizarre his idea or fancy, the language is prepared to do his work. He will never need to create new forms or force upon his language a new formal orientation — unless, poor man, he is haunted by the form-feeling of another language and is subtly driven to the unconscious distortion of the one speech-system on the analogy of another.

Edward Sapir (1924)

Approximately 23,000 foreign words and terms were listed recently which have entered Russian at all stages of its development and thus, reflect the history of the people and the conditions for borrowing. With the intense introduction of "Westernization" in the 16th century, words borrowed from all European languages made their appearance in speech as well as writing, and with the expansion of Russian political power, these words greatly increased in number. Furthermore, modern technology, World Wars, revolutions, everyday social life, have all brought in new borrowings and stabilized the old ones.

The corpus for the present study is drawn mainly from Lösın's and Petrov's Slovar' Inostrannyx Slov (1955 and 1964),
Max Vasmer's *Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1958), and from *Slovar' Russkovo Jazyka* (1961). In addition, several contemporary newspapers and literary works have been reviewed by the writer for the occurrence and abundance of foreign words.

Loanwords dealt with in this thesis are mainly the ones which are established in Russian (as used in the Soviet Union) and have either received dictionary recognition or appeared in print, since no field work was possible. The forms are identified by the transfer of the phonemic sequence from language Y into X. Hence, according to Uriel Weinreich, "When a speaker of language X uses a form of foreign origin not on-the-spot borrowings from language Y, but because he has heard it used by others in X-utterance, then this borrowed element can be considered, from the descriptive viewpoint, to become a part of language X." In this statement X may represent Russian, and therefore, Y symbolizes any other language(s).

The point Weinreich makes can be interpreted as if the item has been diffused from Y to X, or more traditionally, the speakers of language X have borrowed it from Y, or according to a still newer terminology, a case of interference has occurred between Y and X.

The term chosen by the present writer is borrowing, which is a traditional and technical term in linguistic science, sub-divided by Leonard Bloomfield into Cultural, Intimate and Dialectal borrowing (*Language*, 1933; pp. 444-95). Weinreich
states, however, that these distinctions overlap, combining as they do the problem of extent of borrowing (cultural vs. intimate) with that of the language distance (language vs. dialect). In brief, borrowing is an inexact term also in the sense that the process takes place without the donor's consent or awareness, it does not effect the donor. Thus, there has been some suggestions to replace this terminology with the anthropological terms diffusion and acculturation. But it is best to restrict these to non-linguistic cultural items. In recent literature a new term has appeared, interference, initiated by the Prague school in Europe, and introduced to America by Weinreich. To quote from him, "those instances of deviation from the norm of either language which occurs in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact will be referred to as interference phenomena". The modern American school of linguists has decided to retain the term "borrowing" but with a new additional significance. Hockett's definition is, "whenever two idiolects come into contact, one or both may be modified. In face-to-face communication, either speaker may imitate some feature of the other's speech; when the contact is indirect, as in reading, the influence can pass only in one direction. The feature which is imitated is the model; the idiolect (or language) in which the model occurs, or the speaker of the idiolect, is called the donor; the idiolect (or language)
which requires something new in the process is the borrowing idiolect (or language). The process itself is called "borrowing" ....\(^8\)

For the most part, however, the influence of literary persons is evident, especially in the rendering of the loanwords. Firstly, "the literate person who knows nothing of the foreign language but has seen the written notation of the foreign form, interprets the latter in terms of native orthography", and secondly, one encounters interpretations given by "literate persons who know something of the foreign pronunciation and orthography"\(^9\).

Contemporary Russian writing system is morphophonemic, therefore, with the aid of sufficient linguistic corroboration written forms of loanwords can be assessed adequately.

**Terminology for borrowing**

American linguists, especially Einar Haugen, have established a well defined terminology for the description of borrowing based primarily on the relationship between morphemic and phonemic substitution. These terms are loanwords, loan-blends and loanshifts.

**Loanwords**

Loanwords are free morphemes which have been imported without other morphemic substitution than the minimal essential inflection. A further division can be made according to the extent of their phonological, morphological even syntactic
substitution. The phonemic substitution may be partial or complete or even none, according to Haugen).

If borrowing firstly involves bilinguals as the channel for the process, and also considering some prestige factors included, we can assume several consequences in articulatory habits. These may be summed up in a nutshell:

1) a bilingual speaker introduces a new loanword in a phonetic form as near that of the model language as he can;
2) if he had occasion to repeat it, or if other speakers also take to using it, a further subdivision of native elements will take place;
3) if monolinguals learn it, a total or practically total substitution will be made.¹⁰

For instance, Eng. broker > Russ. bróker is now completely assimilated, and is pronounced as /brókir/. From Eng. starter in Russian literary style /stárter/, a partially assimilated form is used, whereas in colloquial Russian /start'ór/ is used, which is actually a loanblend. English /ɪʃ/ usually /i/ in Russian, as in biznes, klíper, ténnis, therefore, one would expect this to take place all the time, but it is not so, in kréngel's < Eng. cringles the change is from /i/ to /e/.

As for the morphological adaptation of loanwords, the subject is best introduced by a quotation from Bloomfield: "Grammatically, the borrowed form is subject to the system of borrowing language, both as to the syntax and as to the
indispensable inflections and the fully current 'living' constructions of composition and word formation. This phenomenon will be discussed in detail in the subsequent chapters.

**Loanblends**

Loanblends are sometimes referred to as hybrid loans because they are formed by partial morphemic substitution and in the case of Russian also by means of addition. Thus, a loanblend includes all loans that consist of importation and some substitution of native morphemes beyond those of inflection or simply consist of an addition of native morpheme to a foreign morpheme. A good example of a loanblend in Russian is *agressivnyj* from French *agressif* + Russian adjectival ending. Russian *sportsmenka* < Eng. *sportsman* is another type of loanblend, actually referred to as a loanblend derivative. Another example of this type is *pudlingovanie* from English *puddle*.

A large group of compounds show only partial importation, therefore, they are loanblends as well; e.g.:


**Loanshifts**

By this term we imply that a shift of context has taken place on the part of the native word, that is morphophonemic substitution without importation. There are two subdivisions under this classification: semantic loans and loantranslations,
sometimes called as calques.

Loan translation in one sense could be included under this heading -- a shift does take place but this time in the form and not the meaning. The loan is derived from native sources, but cannot be called a neologism in its strict sense. This is a direct imitation of a foreign model yet created within the borrowing language; e.g.:

**poluostrov** "peninsula" or translated as 'half+ island' from German 'Halbbinsel'

Borrowing of the cultural item or of a new idea may not necessarily mean that the language is going either to import or translate the word denoting it, but may use a loan creation which may describe it even more adequately than the comparable term used in the language of the cultural group in contact; for example,

**Russ. vezdeixon < Eng. jeep**
tr. as 'a motor vehicle capable of going anywhere'

**Theoretical problems**

Bilingual description emphasizes not a historical but a descriptive operation and postulates the same levels of analysis as a synchronic monolingual description with one reservation that the two languages must be described by the same method.

Ferdinand de Saussure's "Cours de Linguistique générale" is credited with providing a theoretical foundation for the treatment of language as a synchronic self-contained system,
and thus, introducing a priority of analysis of "états de langue". From this idea arose the conception of linguistic structure. The linguistic schools of Geneva, Copenhagen and Prague proclaim some dependence on the conception of linguistic structure, whereas the London and American linguists deny any allegiance to de Saussure. "It is impossible to say that those theories which derive from de Saussure manifest some dichotomy, some dualism, e.g., signifiant and signifié, form and substance, expression and content, form and content, etc., whereas the London and traditional American schools have insisted much more on a purely formal approach and grammatical description and have produced what might be called a syntagmatic-paradigmatic theory of linguistic analysis."12

Descriptive linguists, says Martinet, put too much emphasis on "structure" so that sometimes they ignore the observable facts which reflect the linguistic reality, or even set up theoretic constructions to fit their preconceptions. Nevertheless, facts must be stated, and stated technically and in a manner so that it should be found applicable on a "renewed connection with experience". To quote from Leonard Bloomfield, "the postulation method can further the study of language, because it forces us to state explicitly whatever we assume, to define our terms, and to decide what things may exist independently and what things are independent."13
Levels of analysis

American scholars, Bloch, Harris, Hockett, Trager, etc., practice the theory of "compartmentalization" which accepts that the levels should be clearly distinguished from each other, occurring in ascending order beginning with phonology and progressing via morphology and syntax. The London school, Firth, Allen, Palmer, etc., accepts these levels but in a different way. Still another approach is taken by Pike and his followers ("integration") which maintains that the theory of levels analysis exists, "but there must be mixing of levels with mutual dependence of one level on another." Accordingly, both the phoneme and morpheme are considered as the smallest units, but in two perspective hierarchies. The theory of Firth and his colleagues of the London School, on the other hand, refuses to arrogate to any level a hierarchical importance. Theirs is a polysystematic approach, i.e. the analyst may proceed from any level.

Approach taken

The most recent trend in linguistics is towards a mutual dependence of one level on another. In this particular study of loanwords it would be impractical to draw a fast line of division between the so called "levels", for example, between morphology and phonology, because the physical counterpart of a morpheme in English is not necessarily a morpheme in Russian but may only be a phoneme. For example, in Russ.
bute < Eng. boots, /s/ is only a phoneme whereas in English in this case -s is a morpheme as well which marks the plural number.

The present writer owes the analysis made in this thesis mainly to the theory deriving from the American view of linguistics, especially Einer Haugen's. The statement underlying the reasoning in this paper is that, "any account of a language will be an adequate statement, provided it describes, comprehensively and economically, what is heard (and read) in the language and enables the analyst to 'renew connections' with further experience of it." In this paper the emphasis is on the latter one, that is, what is read in the language.

Since some restrictions and limitations must be made as to the extent of the subject of loanwords in Russian, the emphasis is put mainly on English and French loanwords, although some from other languages, especially German, will be quoted. (Examples from the latter are only important insofar as they enable us to establish morphological similarities with other loans and trends in the process of assimilation of loanwords in Russian.)

Transcription and symbols

Throughout this paper Russian examples are shown in transliteration except in cases where phonemic transcriptions are used. The latter ones appear between slant bars, / /; [ ] indicates allophones. The sign ~ denotes alternations of
forms; # indicates a zero or unreal desinence.

In the phonemic transcription /k/ indicates a plain consonant and /k'/, a palatalized consonant, and so on.

Stress is indicated by the acute diacritic, /'/, which appear above the stressed vowel. It was omitted in monosyllabic words since here any marking is redundant. The stress is marked in all polysyllabic words in Russian even in transliteration (this is in accordance with transliteration of Russian used by scholars like J.W. Perry and others).

The transliteration system employed in the corpus of this paper, in the footnotes and in the bibliography is identical to the one set up by J.B. Rudnyčkyj, University of Manitoba, 1958 (in paper read to CLA).

Abbreviations used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arm.</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>consonants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ger.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung.</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations used (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ.</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Vowel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER I


3 Fizkul'tura i sport (Moscow), Sovetskij sport (Moscow), and Izvestija (Moscow); any other references used will be mentioned in the bibliography.

4 Although, no specific field work was conducted, the writer has consulted U.B.C.'s Russian exchange student (1965-66), and a few other native Russian speakers, but since they did not serve as informants all the way through this paper they will not be mentioned as such.


6 It was suggested that one might add to this sentence the following: that there is no intention of the borrower(s) ever returning the words "borrowed" and no expected demand on the part of the donor(s) that the words "borrowed" ever be returned.

7 Weinreich, op. cit. p. 1.


11 Bloomfield, L. op. cit. p. 453.


The term is used by Bursill-Hall.

Bursill-Hall, op. cit. p. 126.

Ibid., p. 186.
CHAPTER II

CONTEXT OF SITUATION

In the appellation context of situation (Firth), or socio-cultural level, we include implications concerning non-linguistic statements which are of great relevance to the subject, and thus enable the analyst and the reader to see this paper as a whole. In other words the relevant features will be: motivation and trend of the times, relationship between the countries where cultural borrowing takes place, the content of cultural borrowing and the nature of the medium of mass communication.

Motive and time

The speaker of Russian, or of any other language must have some motive for the borrowing which may be prestige or need filling\(^1\). For one or both reasons foreign words have entered into the Russian vocabulary already from very early times\(^2\). We find evidences of Greek, Germanic and Turkic loan-words in the eleventh century Rus' manuscripts and writs (gramoty). From the twelfth-century on the influx of Germanic words increased greatly. In the fifteenth-century manuscripts the influence of Polish on Russian in conjunction with the
renewed influence of Latin manifested itself in many borrowings. By the end of the seventeenth-century numerous West European words have filtered into the language. Westernization of the Russian society in the eighteenth-century introduced many French as well as English words. Recently some cultural influences of the English-speaking world, particularly of America, have been reported from the Soviet Union.

Original source

The original source of most borrowings is easily established, for instance, alfavit, ambrózija, kátarsis, síntaksis < Greek. Some examples from other languages will be shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bot, bejšílót, garpún, górdón', grot, kréjser</td>
<td>Dutch⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bul'dóg, bum, bumeráng, mikst, pamflét, símpleks</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afrónt, bastión, donžőn, krup, redán, suflé</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glétčer, landšáft, tancmějster, kitél', múfel'</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gusár, gonvéd, páprika, guljáš</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kóka, bas, pórtó, konfettí, tessitúra, tokkáta</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kőkeks, pál'ma, skul'ptúra, temperáment, kórpus</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indígo, don, šokolád, gitára, dúra, naxáxa</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is impossible to verify in most cases of borrowing from English whether or not the loanword is from British English (RP) or from some other variant of English (i.e., American, Australian, etc.), therefore, any such distinctions will be disregarded in this paper.
Russian has been under the influence of several languages at the same time either directly or indirectly, as it is shown by prolog 'introductory speech' < Gr. πρότογος, Lat. prologus, Ger. Prolog, Fr. prologue, Pol. prolog. Scholars like Lomanosov and Karamzin had equal knowledge of several languages, thus, borrowing may have taken place directly from Greek or from any of the other languages mentioned above. This hypothesis is confirmed by other loanwords entering Russia via another language or even languages rather than directly from the donor language. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Russian Form</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ger.&gt;Pol.&gt;Russ.</td>
<td>: delf'ín</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.&gt;Lat.&gt;Ger.&gt;Pol.&gt;Russ.</td>
<td>: dekán, duél', klass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hun.&gt;Pol.&gt;Russ.</td>
<td>: gusár</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.&gt;Fr.&gt;Ger.&gt;Russ.</td>
<td>: píka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.&gt;Fr.&gt;Russ.</td>
<td>: medál'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.&gt;Ger.&gt;Russ.</td>
<td>: kárla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.&gt;Fr.&gt;Russ.</td>
<td>: dublón</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of close phonetic similarity of words in two or more languages the etymologies of loanwords are often obscure; for instance, some of the nautical terminology in Russian, which was borrowed mainly from Dutch, may be given such entries in an etymological dictionary as bot 'boat' < possibly from Dutch boot; dok 'dock' < possibly Dutch dok, Fr. dock, Ger. Dock. The date in which the word is first listed may weight
the decision in favour of a particular language; in the case of bot and dok in favour of Dutch.

Sometimes the possibilities are so numerous that etymologists disagree on the answer, for example, granit may have been borrowed from any of the following < D. Granit, < Fr. granit, < It. granito, or Lat. granus; žona 'zone' < Fr. zone, < Lat. zona, or Gr. τόνων. Furthermore, discrepancies are evident even among noted authorities: гòспиталь < Ger. Hospital according to the Slovar' Russkovo Jazyka (Akademija Nauk, 1958), and Slovar' Inostrannix Slov (1964); Vasmer's Russisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch gives the entry < Ger. Hospital or D. hospitaal, whereas the 1947 and 1958 editions of the Slovar' Inostrannix Slov by Lëxin and Petrov give the Fr. Hôpital as the donor form. Although, the phoneme /g/ may be a spelling pronunciation of the French word, the position of the stress and the presence of /s/ indicate that the more authentic one is < Ger. Hospital.

Because many of the loanwords found in Russian are common to the West European languages Russian lexicographers prefer to accept the classical Latin or Greek forms as the source of direct borrowing. Another tendency in Russian linguistics is to refer to such loanwords as "international terminology"⁶, thus avoiding any particular attachment to any one nationality. However, the present writer disagrees with this approach because it makes it impossible to pursue a comparative analysis without examining the donor form since the
aim of such analysis is to show the change (may it be on
the phonological, morphological or syntactical level) which takes
place or fails to take place in the process of assimilation of
loanwords into Russian.

**Role and distribution**

Words were introduced with the cultural importations
and they reflect the sphere of activity where the nation's
prestige has been high as well as the time or period of contribu-
tion, for instance, the Dutch borrowings are chiefly mari-
time terms and belong in the main to the Petrine Age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Original Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bowsprit</td>
<td>бугшприт</td>
<td>&lt; D. boegspriet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clipper</td>
<td>клипер</td>
<td>&lt; D. klipper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruiser</td>
<td>крейсер</td>
<td>&lt; D. kruiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staysail</td>
<td>стаксель</td>
<td>&lt; D. stagzeil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipper</td>
<td>шкипер</td>
<td>&lt; D. schipper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

French and German fashions of the eighteenth-century
left impressions in the Russian vocabulary; e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Original Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dressing-gown</td>
<td>шлайфрок</td>
<td>&lt; Ger. Schlafrok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabman</td>
<td>фурман</td>
<td>&lt; Ger. Fuhrmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dressing-coat</td>
<td>фрак</td>
<td>&lt; Fr. Frac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carriage</td>
<td>екипаж</td>
<td>&lt; Fr. équipage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neck-tie</td>
<td>галстук</td>
<td>&lt; Ger. Halstuch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numerous borrowings have been introduced into the
Russian language in the course of the twentieth-century as the result of new inventions, new ideas and discoveries, and political upheavals. The main influencing forces were the two World Wars and the October Revolution which have caused considerable changes not only within the social system but in the language as well.

Despite the official resistance of foreignisms and the striving towards purity, loanwords were introduced in the sphere of art, music and literature. With the invention of film came a series of new words into Russian.

- e.g. film’ <Eng. film
- festivál’ <Fr. festival
- sketč <Eng. sketch (theater)
- multiplikátor (<Lat.) multiplicator

Radio and television brought:
- mikrofón (<Gr.) microphone
- detektor (<Lat.) detector
- anténa (<Lat.) antenna
- rekórd <Eng. record

The above mentioned examples did not come directly from Greek or Latin but probably indirectly either through English or through one of the other West European languages.

The preeminence of the English speaking world in athletics, especially since World War I, resulted in the influx
of English sporting terms into various languages. Russian has received her share of "loans", especially in terms for boxing, soccer and tennis. Most frequently are used the following: boks 'boxing'; futból 'football'; kort 'tennis-court'; láun-ténnis 'lawn tennis'; direkt (direct) 'straight punch'; strejt (straight) 'straight punch'; nokáut 'knock-out'; partnér 'partner (tennis) or sparring partner (in boxing)'; fol 'foul'; frí kík 'free kick'; kórner (corner) 'corner kick'; golkíper 'goal-keeper'; pénalti 'penalty'; set 'set'. For additional examples of sporting terms the reader should consult Morton Benson's article, "English loan words in Russian sport terminology".

Sport terms are so numerous that they may be grouped semantically in different ways; one is according to the type of sport (as illustrated by Morton Benson) and the other according to the following three semantic categories:

1) denominational aspect of the sport activity
2) appellation of the sport objective, article and timing
3) words designating the doer of the sport

These groups may be illustrated by the following examples:

1) basketból 'basketball'; xokéj 'hockey'; vaterpólo 'water polo'; ténnis 'tennis'; futból 'football';
2) rink 'rink'; gol 'goal'; tajm 'time'; start 'start'; fíniš 'finish'; ol 'all';
3) líder 'leader'; golkíper 'goal keeper'; šempión 'champion'; kapitán 'captain' from Fr. 'capitain'.

The vocabulary of the Russian motorist offers another interesting linguistic study. Most of the words were borrowed from the West, especially from English and French.

- e.g. avtomobil' 'automobile'
- mašína 'engine'
- benzín 'gasoline'
- reservuár 'gasoline tank'
- akselerátor-akcelerátor 'accelerator'
- motór 'motor'
- stárter 'starter', 'ignition'
- cilíndr 'cylinder'
- karbjurátor 'carburettor'
- akkumuljátor 'accumulator', 'battery'
- defékt 'defect' (e.g. flat tire)
- garáž 'garage'
- révers -revérs 'reverse'
- šofér 'chauffeur'

The English word 'clutch' was not adapted because of its close phonemic resemblance to the word ključ 'key'. Yet klub 'club' was borrowed despite the existence of the homonym klub 'puff'.

With the help of the American lend-liz (land-lease act) is connected the introduction of new cars both American and
European make; thus, the following names appear in everyday speech and literature in the Soviet Union: ford, studebaker, vilis, dodž, Ševrole, mersedes, fiat, jaguar, pežo, tatr, and so on.

Scientific terminology also presents a special field of study. This field is expandable indefinitely. Scientific workers create words or expressions for the new ideas or discoveries in their field of endeavour, that is new words are concomitant with new ideas, new things. Furthermore, terminology is terminology by virtue of its content and not by virtue of peculiarities in the linguistic structure of its expression.

Scientific terminology is 1) systematic, 2) productive and 3) specialized. Nomenclature is one of the most important specialized segments of the terminology. By definition nomenclature is the "system of names used in a particular branch of knowledge or art, or by any scholar or individual; especially, the names used in classifications, as distinguished from any other terms". More specific designations may be, for example, "nautical terms", "chemical terminology", "legal terms", "mathematical terms", "nomenclature of chemical laboratory equipment", etc.

Examples taken from scientific terminologies:

bor 'bor' Chemistry
propil 'propyl'
kamfőr 'camphor'
The First World War contributed numerous foreign words to the Russian language, some of which were lost but some are still in use. The word *avtomát* was first used during this period. Other loanwords characteristic of this time are mandát, deputát, dezertír, provocátor, sabotáž, kupon and so on. Typical loanwords from the years 1917-26 are aziotáž, al'jáns, garánt, kantón, kartel', pakt, finiš, etc. World War II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>keprók</td>
<td>'cap rock'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlorófórm</td>
<td>'chloroform'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trómel'</td>
<td>'trommel'</td>
<td>Metallurgy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flavít</td>
<td>'flavit'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>érlift</td>
<td>'air lift'</td>
<td>Mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zigzág</td>
<td>'zig zag'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kontakt</td>
<td>'contact'</td>
<td>Electronics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reáktor</td>
<td>'reactor'</td>
<td>Electrical engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vákuum</td>
<td>'vacuum'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konsól'</td>
<td>'consol'</td>
<td>Road construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asfál't</td>
<td>'asphalt'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salát</td>
<td>'salad'</td>
<td>Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>súport</td>
<td>'support'</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absórbent</td>
<td>'absorbent'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eskalátor</td>
<td>'escalator'</td>
<td>Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gudróń</td>
<td>'goudron'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenzór</td>
<td>'tensor'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šalé</td>
<td>'chalet'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contributed among many other words the following: rezistáns, veterán, kadét, and tank.

Borrowings may be allocated in several different semantic categories as we have already seen. For further examplification a few more groupings will be listed which are believed to have entered into the Russian language in the course of the twentieth-century. Obviously this study does not aim at exhausting the subject; The reader or any other student working in the field could furnish additional examples from his/her own experience.

Some of the recent loanwords from everyday life:
Foods, beverages -- sóda (<It. soda), pot-o-fe, konsomé, bef bulí, krem brjulé, džin, kornfléks.
New clothing, articles, et al -- negližé, šin'ón, nejlón, reglán, blju džins, korsáž, šórti, teflón, megatón.

The great influx of foreign words caused remarkable concern among the Soviet officials and literary men in the 1920's, who called for a return to linguistic moderations. Lenin himself said,

"Russkij jazyk my portim. Innostrannye slova upotrebljaem bez nadobnosti. Upotrebljaem ix nepravil'no. K čemu govorit' "defekty", kogda možno skazat' "nedočety" ili "nedorostki" ili "probely".

Konečno, kogda čelovek, nedavno naučivšijsja čitat' voobšče i osobenno čitat' gazety, prinimaetsja userdno
čitat' ix, on nevol'no usvaivat' gazetnye oboroty reči. Imenno gazetnyj jazyk u nas, odnako, tože načinaet portit'ja. Esli nedavno naučivšemosja čitat' prostitut'no upotrebljat', kak novičku, inostrannie slova, to literatoram prostitut' etovo nel'zja. Ne pora li nam ob'javit' vojnu upotrebleniju slov bez nadobnosti?...

Nevertheless, most of the loanwords are here to stay in the Russian language surviving alongside the loantranslations, thus giving rise to many lexical doublets or simply stylistic variants. 

Examples:

aviátor — lētčik
aeroplán — samolēt
lingvístika — jazykoznáníie
lingvíst — jazykovéd
FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER II

1 See Hockett, pp. 404-405

2 Concerning loanwords in very early times consult:


5 Dutch words in Russian are discussed by Van Der Meulen, R. in his De Nederlandsche Woorden in het Russisch. Der Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1944.

6 This is used according to Bel'čikov's terminology cited in his book, Internacion'al'naja terminologija v russkom jazyke. Moscow, GU-PIMPR, 1959.

7 The subject of language under the Soviets is discussed by A. and T. Fesenko in their book, Russkij jazyk pri sovetax.

8 The borrowings of sporting terms in other languages have been discussed already in the following papers:


In the Soviet epoch sport has become a very important and necessary part of social life, declared Andreev and Zambržickij in their article, "Imennoe slovoobrazovanie v sportivnoj terminologii", Prazvitie sovremennovo russkovo jazyka. Moscow, Ak. Nauk, 1963. pp. 119-35.

Due to the emphasis on sport a completely new terminology was needed most of which were borrowed from the West mainly by the younger generation.


On opinions of Soviet officials concerning loanwords see:


This is a transliteration of a quote from: Fesenko, A. and T. Russkij jazyk pri sovetax. New York, Rausen Bros., 1955. p. 22.
CHAPTER III

PHONOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

The English loanword 'gulf stream' appears in Lëxin's dictionary as *gol'fstrím, gol'fstrém* and *gol'fštrém* which indicates the acceptability of various pronouncements. According to the command of English on the part of the original introducer and the later user, foreign sound sequences may be spoken or replaced by different native sequences. A close examination of loanwords, however, will reveal the fact that in many cases a spelling pronunciation is followed, especially when the loanword was received other than by the "ear-route", and the introducer was unfamiliar with the foreign language but has seen the written notation of the word, interpreting the latter in terms of Russian orthography. Thus, the external factors involved in the assimilation of loan elements are:

1) different channels of borrowing -- oral and written
2) socio-cultural background of the original introducer and/or that of the later user.

In the afore mentioned example the English [i:] was interpreted as the Russian [i] by some speakers and as [e] by
others. In other words phonetic substitution takes place. Because Russian has considerably fewer vowel phonemes than English and French the vowels will either carry a greater functional load or will transfer the task of differentiation to the consonants.

\textit{e.g.} Fr. \texttt{/byst/} > Russ. \texttt{/b'ust/}

Here the French phoneme \texttt{/y/} is rendered by a centred allophonic variant of the Russian \texttt{/u/}, i.e. [ü], which must be accompanied by palatalization, thus \texttt{/b/} > \texttt{/b'/}.

Under stress five vowel phonemes are operative in Russian, specifically \texttt{/i, e, a, o, u/}. Allophonic variants of these phonemes are phonetically conditioned by the presence or absence of a preceding and/or following palatalized consonant. To be concrete, a specific French or English phoneme may be equated with an allophonic variant of a phoneme in Russian.

English has at least ten vowel phonemes, \texttt{/i, i, e, e, a, o, AO, o, u/} although certain dialects may have more\textsuperscript{1}, and at least three diphthongs \texttt{/ai/, /au/, and /oi/}. In addition to the phonemes listed above, the central, unstressed \texttt{/ə/} has a heavy functional load in English. In Russian [ə] is only an allophonic variant of \texttt{/a/} or \texttt{/o/} in weakly stressed non-initial position, after 'hard' consonants.

In contrast with Russian, French has eight normal oral vowels, \texttt{/i, e, e, a, o, u/}, four abnormal oral vowels,
/y, ø, œ, ø/, and four nasal vowels, /ɛ, å, ɔ, ɔe/.

Aufhebung or neutralization may reduce the number of French phonemes from sixteen to fourteen\(^2\) in the speech of some people, thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
/a/ \\
/q/ & \quad /a/ \\
/ɛ/ & \quad /ɛ/ \\
/œ/ & \quad /œ/
\end{align*}
\]

The phoneme carrying the functional load in the former instance is referred to as /a/ passe-partout.

In brief, because of the great gaps in the Russian inventory (no nasalized vowels, diphthongs, etc.) the original introducer and the later user will fail to identify or to discriminate between particular foreign sounds, which will, of course, be manifested by the substitution of one phoneme for another or the dropping of the sound; compare Russ. /m'ît'ink/ for Eng. /mîty/. Phonetic substitution is prevalent both in the vocalic and consonantal systems; e.g., the Russian alveolar-trill [r], or palatalized [r'] will replace the English alveolar frictionless continuant [r] as well as the French velar [R].

Bel'čikov, the Russian linguist, calls phonemic substitution a "dlitel'nij process" because one has the choice between klub and klob, bul'evár and bul'vár, i.e. the spelling
of the original form vs. the pronunciation. Furthermore, pressures imposed on Russian by two languages at the same time create not only two different forms but a confusion of forms; e.g. *novel'ist* vs. *nuvel'ist*. The latter one is from Fr. *nouvelliste* /nuvɛlɪst/ whereas the former one shows both French and English influence, from Eng. *novel* /nəˈvɛl/.

**Vowels**

This section deals with the general tendencies shown by phonetic substitutions in the vocalic system of contemporary Russian. It is expected that the patterns set up are applicable to new loanwords coming into Russian, although, phonetic substitutions will vary in degree for different speakers, also it will vary according to the degree of assimilation into the Russian language.

Partial assimilation is evident in the following examples:

- /r'ɛjder/ <Eng. raider
- /skùter/ <Eng. scooter
- /f'ìder/ <Eng. feeder
- /kont'ɛjner/ <Eng. container

According to one informant *kont'ɛjner* is pronounced as /kont'ɛjner/, although /kant'ɛjner/ is also found in speech according to Morton Benson.
Complete assimilation is found in:

broker /bʁòk'ir/ <Eng. broker
káter /kát'ir/ <Eng. cater
džémper /dʒěmp'ir/ <Eng. jumper

Not only is /e/ accompanied by palatalization of the consonant but it is replaced by /i/.

1. Russian /i/

This phoneme has two allophonic variants in Russian, [i] and [i]. The former one occurs i) word initially, ii) after vowels, iii) after palatalized consonants; the latter one, only after non-palatalized consonants. This phoneme or one of its allophones is substituted for the following English and French phonemes:

**English**

i) /i/ and /ɪ/ > in Russian
   e.g. from bill /bɪl/ >Russ. /b'ɪl'/
   cliff /klɪf/ /kl'ɪf/
   lady /lɛdi/ /l'ɛd'i/ or /lɛd'i/

ii) /e/ > /i/
   Eng. broker /brəkər/ >Russ. /brək'ir/

Here /e/ >Russ. /e/, which in weakly stressed position >/i/. This is not the only explanation for this change. If the
English [-er] is replaced by the Russian [-er], then the word automatically becomes a loanblend, and unstressed /e/ is replaced by /i/. Although, this replacement seems to be the tendency in some examples, not all borrowings ending in [-er] are completely assimilated into the Russian language.

**French**

i) /i/ > Russ. /i/
   e.g. /grif/ > Russ. /gr'if/

ii) /e/ in final position > Russ. /i+/n/
   As a rule, levelling takes place in all diphthongs and triphthongs, and all French nasalized vowels > Russ. vowel + nasal consonant.
   
   e.g. /satê/ > Russ. /sat'ın/

2. Russian /e/

Phoneme /e/ has [ɛ] and [e] as allophonic variants. 
[ɛ] occurs word finally and before non-palatalized consonants, whereas [e] occurs before palatalized consonants.

**English**

i) /e/ and /ɛ/ converge on Russian /e/

   e.g. /velvet/ > Russ. /v'el'v'êt/
   /welz/ > /v'el's/
   /grép,frût/ > /gr'ēp,frùt/
   /gréd'er/ > /gr'ēd'er/

In the last two examples /e/ > Russ. /e+/j/.
ii) /a/ > /e/

   e.g. /lærnmən/ > Russ. /läjnsm'ěn/

Russ. /e/ <Eng. /a/ is not always preceded by a palatalized consonant:

   Eng. cat /kat/ > Russ. /ket/
   cab /kab/ > /keb/
   tandem /tándəm/> /těnd'em/

iii) in partially assimilated loanwords /ə/ > /e/ sometimes; and /ʌ/ > /e/.

An example of the former one is seen in feeder /fɪdər/ > Russ. /f'ider/, the weakly stressed Eng. /ə/ > /e/ which is replaced by [ɛ].

Sometimes /ə/ may be dropped altogether, as in:

   blister /blístər/ > Russ. /bl'istr/

iv) /a/ > Russ. /e/+/'j/

   e.g. liner /lárnər/> Russ. /léjner/

French

i) /e/ >Russ. /e/

   e.g. décret /dekrɛ/> Russ. /d'ekr'ět/

   The final /t/ indicates spelling pronunciation.

ii) /ɛ/ >Russ. /e/

   from Fr. apprêts /aprɛ/> >Russ. /apr'ët/

      parenthèse /parətɛz/> Russ. /parant'ës/
      dièse /djɛz/> >Russ. /dięs/
iii) /ā/ > Russ. /e%/n/
e.g. from Fr. compliment /kɔ̃plimə̃/ > Russ. /kampl'emmɛnt/ but there is another possibility:
Fr. agrément /agremə̃/ > Russ. /agremen/
from /ā/ to /e%/n/ and not to /e%/n/
The final /t/ in the first example is due to the influence of spelling.

3. Russian /a/

It has [a] and [æ] as two of its allophonic variants; [æ] occurs after palatalized consonants and [a] in all other stressed positions.

**English**

i) /a/ > Russ. /a/
e.g. starter /stærər/ > Russ. /stærər/

ii) /a/ > Russ. /a/
e.g. jazz /jæz/ > Russ. /dʒæs/

iii) /æ/ in stressed position sometimes > Russ. /a/
e.g. bumper /bʌmpər/ > Russ. /bʌmpər/, /bʌmp'er/

iv) /ar/ > Russ. /a%/j/
e.g. iceberg /aːrsberg/ > Russ. /aːsberk/, /aːs'bærk/
   slide /slaid/ > Russ. /slajt/

v) /au/ > Russ. /a%/u/
e.g. boyscout /bɔːrkɔut/ > Russ. /bajskɔut/
tower /təvar/ > Russ. /təuər/
French

i) both /a/ and /a/ > Russ. /a/
e.g. apache /apas/ > Russ. /apas/
pas de quatre /pad'ekat/
> Russ. /pad'ekat/

ii) / dossier > Russ. /a+/n/
e.g. dentiste /dantist/ > Russ. /dantist/
plantage /plataz/ > Russ. /plantaz/
entente /atat/ > Russ. /antant/ or antanta/

English

i) /o/ > Russ. /o/
e.g. goal /gol/ > Russ. /gol/

ii) /o/ > Russ. /o/
top /top/ > Russ. /top/
The choice here is greatly influenced by the orthography.

iii) / or /o+/j/ > Russ. /o+/j/
e.g. boy /boi/ > Russ. /boi/

French

i) /o/ and /o/ > Russ. /o/.
ii) Fr. /œ/ and /œ/ are replaced by the allophonic variant of Russ. /o/, viz. [œ], only if /o/ is strongly stressed and is preceded by a palatalized consonant.

   e.g. Fr. grimeur /grimœr/ > Russ. /gr'im'ör/
   curieuse /kyrjœz/ > Russ. /kur'jóə/,

but

   Fr. majeur /mažær/ > Russ. /mažór/, (mažór)

The phonemes /ʒ, ʒ, c/ are always hard in Russian unless they occur geminated, whereas /ʒ/ and /ʒʒ/ are always soft.

   Fr. pas de deux /padœdœ/ > Russ. /pad'ed'ě/

Although Fr. /œ/ occurs in final position here, [œ] was not found finally in loanwords. It is, however, found in final position in Slavic words.

In orthography [œ] is represented by ø.

iii) /ʒ/ > Russ. /o+/n/

   e.g. Fr. saison /sɛʒɔ/ > Russ. /sezɔn/

An anomaly is:

   Fr. galon /galɔ̃/ > Russ. /galûn/

   interpreted as /u+/n/

5. Russ. /u/

The phoneme /u/ like all other vowels in Russian has
two allophonic variants, [u] and [ü]. The latter one is a centered vowel occurring only after a palatalized consonant.

**English**

i) both Eng. /u/ and /v/ > Russ. /u/
   e.g. from Eng. foot /fut/ > Russ. /fut/
   Eng. boot(s) /buts/ > Russ. /bútsi/

ii) spelling pronunciation:
   e.g. grubber /grübær/ > Russ. /grúb'ær/

iii) the diphthong /a/ becomes two separate phonemes in Russian, viz. /a/+/u/ and /o/+/u/; because of the influence of orthography /au/ may be represented by /o/+/u/:
   e.g. from clown /klávn/ > Russ. /klóvn/

**French**

i) Fr. /u/ > Russ. /u/
   e.g. from Fr. coulage /kuláž/ > Russ. /kuláž/

ii) Fr. /y/ is replaced by [ü] in Russian, an allophone of /u/, but only if a palatalized consonant precedes it:
   e.g. Fr. étude /etýd/ > Russ. /et'úd/
   refuge /refýž/ > Russ. /r'ef'úž/
   culotte /kylót/ > Russ. /k'ulót/

**Consonants**

Although, the Russian phonemes /t/, /d/ and /n/ are
represented by the same symbol as the English /t/, /d/ and /n/, they are in fact phonetically different, the Russian set having a dental and the English an alveolar articulation, but since there is no question of phonemic opposition here, only phonetic adjustment is involved in the process of assimilation of loanwords, Russian dentals replacing English alveolars.

In order to aid the reader in the precise correspondences, English, French and Russian consonants will be compared by the use of the following tables:

### English Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Inter-Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stops</strong></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affricates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ĉ</td>
<td>ķ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ĵ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nasals</strong></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>ĭ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricatives</strong></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>θ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>ċ</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ĺ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lateral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frictionless Continuant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-vowels</strong></td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
### French Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stops</strong></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nasals</strong></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricatives</strong></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ş</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lateral</strong></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trill</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semivowel</strong></td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

### Russian Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stops</strong></td>
<td>p, p'</td>
<td>t, t'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k, k'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b, b'</td>
<td>d, d'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affricates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ş</td>
<td>[j]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nasals</strong></td>
<td>m, m'</td>
<td>n, n'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fricatives</strong></td>
<td>f, f'</td>
<td>s, s'</td>
<td>ş</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v, v'</td>
<td>z, z'</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lateral</strong></td>
<td>l, l'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trill</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r, r'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semivowel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3**
Since Russian consonants are greater in number (Russ.: 31, Eng.: 22, Fr.: 17), they are able to carry a greater functional load than the vowels; as a matter of fact, examples have already been given where the functional load was transferred from the vowel to the consonant (e.g. Fr. fuselage /fjzlaʃ/ > Russ. /f'uz'elâz/, here /f/ > /f'/ in Russian.)

There are, nevertheless, 'cases-vides' in the system; Russian lacks the following consonants, /w, ʃ, θ, h, p, ɲ/. Thus, /w/ is replaced by /v/ or /v'/ in Russian, /ʒ/ and /θ/ by /t/ or /d/, /h/ by /g/ or /x/, /p/ by /n'/ or /n/ and /ɲ/ by /n'/+g/.

e.g. Eng. waterways /ˈwɔtərwejz/ > Russ. /ˈvʌtˈɛrvˈeɪjs/
Eng. fathom /ˈfæθəm/ > Russ. /ˈfədəm/ 
Eng. handball /ˈhændbɔːl/ > Russ. /ˈɡandbɔːl/ 
Fr. vigogne /vilʒ/ > Russ. /vilʒən/ 
Eng. {-ing}, /-ɪŋ/ > Russ. /-ɪŋk/

Loss of voice

As a rule, voiced consonants are replaced by their voiceless counterparts in final position even though the orthography shows the morphophoneme. This rule applies not only to Slavic words but to loanwords also; for example, Eng. ring > Russ. ring /rˈink/ is pronounced the same as Eng. rink > Russ. rink /rˈink/.

Stress

Stress is phonemic in Russian. Furthermore, the
place of stress is a determining factor in the pronunciation of the vowels. The full value of the vowels is realized only in a strongly stressed position; in weakly stressed position /e, a, o/ are replaced by their respective allophones depending on their position in relation to the stressed syllable. Fully assimilated loanwords are governed by the same rules as native Russian words. Russian has no set pattern like Czech or Polish, but like English each word is assigned a stress, which may be movable or immovable from one syllable to another in the declension or conjugation of that word.

Some loanwords tend to retain the stress on the originally stressed syllable, for instance, in French stress is fixed to the last syllable, a pattern which loanwords from French rigidly follow. Thus,

from Fr. décadence > Russ. dekadáns
Fr. Jalon > Russ. žalón
Fr. girandole > Russ. žirandól'
Fr. riposte > Russ. ripóst

Moreover, an earlier borrowing róman from Fr. roman /romá/ was changed to román.

Most loanwords have "fixed" stress, in other words, an immovable stress all the way through the declension or the conjugation of that word; e.g.:

Fr. descente > Russ.-desánt -- Nominative singular
A number of loanwords, however, have a movable stress, for instance:

Fr. galon  > Russ. galún  -- Nominative singular
          galuná  -- Genitive singular, etc.

Loanwords ending with the suffix -az retain the stress on the stem in almost all cases, but even here exceptions may be found,*

e.g. Fr. bagage > Russ. bagáž  -- Nominative singular
          bagažá  -- Genitive singular, etc.

from Fr. montage > Russ. montáž  -- Nominative singular
          montažá  -- Genitive singular

Loanwords ending in -or are found to have both 1) fixed and 2) mobile stress. The former one indicates that the word is only partially assimilated, thus the stem is stressed all the way through the declension:

(from Lat.) Russ. direktor  -- Nominative singular
          dirigéktorý  -- Nominative plural

A more colloquial style of Russian shows a strong tendency to move the stress to the desinence in the plural; thus,

diréktory vs. (colloq.) direktorá  -- Nominative plural
Loanwords from English have a less systematic pattern of stress in Russian than the ones from French: it is even possible to say that they show no regularity at all. They may either keep the stress in its English position or allocate it to another syllable. Interference of another language may be an influencing force in this case, for example,

Eng. college /koli/ > Russ. kólédź, that is /kól'edź/ or /kal'edź/ by analogy with Fr. collège /kɔlɛʒ/. Spelling pronunciation also contributes to the inconsistent pattern of assimilation in loanwords because the borrower may be ignorant of the position of stress in the donor word. If the Russian speaker saw Eng. college in writing, he had the choice of whether to stress the first or the last syllable.

Lastly it should be pointed out that, although stress is phonemic in Russian, not a single minimal pair was found among English and French loanwords in which stress was the distinctive feature.

Orthography

It has already been noted that fluctuations in accent pattern and pronunciation are due to the twofold influence of oral and written communications. Specific examples of this are given below:
Fr. agrément /agrémá/ > Russ. agrémán /agré'mán/
or agrémánt /agré'mént/
but only one form of:
Fr. argot /argó/ > Russ. argó /argó/
Influence of oral communication is seen in:
Fr. hangar /ãgár/ > Russ. anglár /angár/
but
Fr. hypnotiseur /ipnotizöør/ > Russ. gipnotízër
/gipnot'iz'ór/

Number of syllables

Generally, the original number of syllables in loan-words is retained, although a possibility of decreasing or increasing them does exist. Omission of an inserted vowel reduces the number of syllables.

e.g. Eng. single /síngel/ > Russ. /s'íngl/

Sound changes, however, may be due to factors other than phonological -- sometimes orthographical but sometimes grammatical. Grammatical factors at play in the process of assimilation will be discussed later on. Note that,
Fr. la cuvette (f) > Russ. kjuvët /k'uv'ët/ or kjuvéta /k'uv'ëta/
marker of feminine gender
The latter example illustrates that the Russian speaker has a "feeling" for the French gender, therefore, the change here is due to a grammatical factor.
FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER III


2 Other instances of neutralization may occur with some speakers, for example:

\[ /e/ \} /o/ \} /\phi/ \} /\check{o}/ \]
\[ /\varepsilon/ \} /\varphi/ \} /\varphi/ \]


4 A complete description of Russian stress will be found in Forsyth, J. *A practical guide to Russian stress*. London, Oliver and Boyd, 1963.
CHAPTER IV

MORPHOLOGIC TYPES IN LOANWORDS

Types of morphological structure

According to the distribution of the immediate constituents morphemes may be grouped into several classes or types. The author has selected Bloomfield's classification as the model. His outline is designed to insure as comprehensive an analysis of the divergences as possible:

A. Secondary words, containing free forms:
   1. Compound words, containing more than one free form: door-knob, ...
   2. Derived secondary words, containing one free form: boyish, ...

B. Primary words, not containing a free form:
   1. Derived primary words, containing more than one bound form: re-ceive, ...
   2. Morpheme words, consisting of a single (free) morpheme: boy, ...

This theory, however, is applicable only within one language because the borrowed form is subject to the adaptation of the so called system of the borrowing language. In the process of borrowing, morphemes may do any of the following:
--- remain the same morphologic type
--- join another type
--- or even cease to be recognized as morphemes.

Occasionally, two forms of the same word may be borrowed simultaneously because of these possibilities; "thus, from Russian we get not only bolshevik but also the Russian plural bolsheviki, which we use alongside the English plural-derivation bolsheviks". This example indicates that there is a tendency to replace the foreign morphemes by a native one, in this case the plural [-i] of Russian was replaced by the English plural [-s]. Furthermore, other recognizable morphemes are replaced by a corresponding native one, thus giving rise to numerous loanblends. For example,

Čempionstvo < Eng. championship

where

{-stvo} = {-ship}

Nevertheless, such types of loanwords as kopártneršip < Eng. copartnership are found in Russian, in which case no substitution has taken place from -ship to -stvo.

The morphological structure of loanwords may be simple or complex, that is they may be "monomorphemic" or "polymorphemic". A single morpheme, free or bound, constitutes the simple structure, and more than one morpheme also
free or bound, constitutes the complex structure.

**Free and bound morphemes**

Bound morphemes never occur in isolation; such forms are prefixes, suffixes, supræfixes, infixes, subtractives, replacives and some roots. [-ing] is a bound morpheme in English but in Russian it is not recognized as a morpheme at all. Therefore, loanwords such as 'meeting' > Russ. miting become free morphemes in Russian. By definition, "free morphemes are those which may be uttered in isolation"⁴; they may be actually or potentially free. This applies to loanwords as well; for example, Russian {futból} is an actually free morpheme which becomes potentially free in the form futbólist, {futból}+{-ist}. The latter example is no longer a loanword in the narrow sense but an extension of one because now we have a loanword + a native suffix, exactly a loanblend.

**Compound words**

1) Russ. biznesmén < Eng. businessman
bojskáut < Eng. boyscout
vaterprúf < Eng. waterproof
tájmšit < Eng. timesheet
spidómetr < Eng. speedometer

2) lokáut < Eng. lock-out
nokáut < Eng. knock-out
pikáp < Eng. pick-up ~ pick up
pulóver < Eng. pullover, Fr. pullover, Ger. Pullover
The morphological analysis of these words listed above reveals some of the interesting shapes of compound words in Russian. The various features of the adapted form in comparison with the original form may be described accordingly: the class (part of speech, etc.) to which it belongs (and belonged), the class of the component member, in what manner the parts are amalgamated, features of juncture, accent and so on. We should also ask if these are typical loanwords.

The above mentioned list of loanwords represents only
a limited number of the numerous types that are to be found in Russian. What is interesting about the first seven groups in comparison with the original forms of English and French is the presence of only one accented kernel. This indicates that the adapted form is treated as one unit, one word, whether its original form is a syntactic, semi-syntactic or morphological structure. These, therefore, are simple morphemes.

Furthermore, these groups indicate the Russian speakers' ignorance and/or indifference to the morphology of the source language, whereas group eight demonstrates the speakers' awareness of the English compound word. The pattern changes from a primary -secondary stress to primary - primary stress; /skɪtrə nz/ > Russ. /sk'et'ɪŋ r'ɪŋ/. It may be argued here that since [rink] is a legitimate morpheme in Russian < Eng. rink, it may have been an additional determining factor for open juncture, and primary stress on both members of the compound word.

Although, the English morpheme {man} is found in several loanwords in Russian, it has not yet been adapted in a free form. In addition to the examples mentioned in group one of the compound words, the following words containing {man} may be added to the list:

- bušmén < Eng. bushman
- džentel'mén < Eng. gentleman
  (or) džentel'men
- kongressmén < Eng. congressman
lajnsmén (or) < Eng. linesman
lajnsmen
polismén < Eng. policeman
rekordsmén < Eng.*recordsman
sportsmén < Eng. sportsman
jaxtsmén < Eng. yachtsman

By analogy with words like *sportsmén, Russian derived
rekordsmén < Eng. *recordsman, i.e. record+man. (These words
may possibly have come from the plural rather than the
singular form in English; i.e. bushmen, etc.) Unlike
English, the primary stress is almost always on mén. The
above listed are frozen morphemes in the Russian language and
are treated in the same manner as dol'mén < Fr. dolmen.

As a matter of interest, it should be pointed out
that the stress pattern is very systematic in this group of
examples, even though *ol'dermen < Eng. alderman (according to
Lexin and Petrov, < Eng. olderman) is an exception to the
rule. In English {man} would never receive a primary stress
in the above mentioned group of compounds; note the differ­
ence in stress, juncture, pronounciation and meaning in
English between gentleman /ˈgentləmən/ and gentle man/ˈgentləmən/.

Working with morphemes transferred from one language
into another makes it almost impossible to formulate any
hard-fast rules about compounds. Even within one language
compound words present discrepancies among linguists. Leonard
Bloomfield argues accordingly,

"In meaning compound words are usually more specialized than phrases; for instance, blackbird, denoting a bird of a particular species, is more specialized than the phrase black bird, which denotes any bird of this color. It is a very common mistake to try to use this difference as a criterion. We cannot gauge meanings accurately enough; moreover, many a phrase is as specialized in meaning as any compound: in the phrase a queer bird and meat and drink, the words bird, meat are fully as specialized as they are in the compounds jailbird and sweetmeats." 

Then, how is the term 'compound word' defined? To quote from Bloch and Trager, "a word made up wholly of smaller words is called a compound." This definition is disputed by other linguists, for example Professor Hockett in his book, "A course in modern linguistics", states that "...blackbird, bluebird, blackboard ... are a special sort of sequence of two words, with a lowering of stress on the second word (thus /blæk + bɔrd/): their structure is syntactic, not morphological." The present writer may argue against this and tend to agree with Bloch and Trager on the idea that in English, "compounds differ from phrases in the phonetic modification of their components, in the kind of juncture between them, in the stress pattern, or in a combination of these features." On the basis of this definition blackbird is a compound and black bird is a phrase, because they differ in stress and juncture.
English spelling conventions\(^\text{11}\), which are ambiguous about the juxtaposed type of compounds, confuse the Russian speaker whether the construction is morphological or syntactic, although, a hyphen is used as a criterion, but not consistently. Consequently, the following fluctuation may result:

Russ. vátervejs < Eng. water-ways
váter-žakét < Eng. water-jacket
vaterklozet < Eng. water-closet
vaterpólo < Eng. water-polo

There is no apparent reason for the difference, except for the fact that 'ways', 'closet' and 'polo' are not realized as separate morphemes in Russian whereas 'jacket' (< Fr. jacquette) is.

Frequently, the hyphen placed between the two words is used in Russian to render an originally syntactic structure. To be correct, the word in group eight is written as skéting-rínk with the hyphen, and so are the following examples:

Russ. láun-tennis < Eng. lawn tennis
lást-ből < Eng. last ball
stípl'-čez < Eng. steeple chase
tajm-čárter < Eng. time charter

Comparing tájmšit < Eng. timesheet (or time sheet) with the last example listed above, there seems to be no apparent reason
for the difference. By showing some examples below, the reader will see that sometimes the hyphen is preserved in the same manner as it was in the original form indicating a juncture and the joining of two separate morphemes:

Russ. gőpper-fíder < Eng. hopper-feeder
píng-póng < Eng. ping-pong
pres-papé < Fr. presse-papiers

In French, 'bona fide' compound words are joined by a hyphen. Even though this technique is quite consistent throughout the language, the Russian speaker fails to make any distinctions in the adaptations of such constructions as Russ. kastét < Fr. casse-tête and źežlón < Fr. chaise long. As a matter of fact, the Russian speaker proceeds further on and synthesizes not only compounds but also asyntactic (e.g.: odekolón < Fr. eau de Cologne) and syntactic constructions, such are listed in group 5, 6, and 7.

Some compound words present no decision to the Russian speaker where the elements of the word group or phrase have already been fused together in the donor language. For example, from German the following examples were taken:

Russ. blíckrig < Ger. Blitzkrieg
blokgáuz < Ger. Blockhaus
bruderšáft < Ger. Bruderschaft
gofméjster < Ger. Hofmeister
Naturally a question arises about Unter-offizér < Ger. Unteroffizier. By analogy with the other examples why was it not realized as one morpheme? Perhaps the introducer was aware of the fact that the compound consists of two morphemes in German, and in adapting this word he wanted to indicate this by separating them.

The number of elements fused together in Russian may be two or three, never more than three except in specialized technical terms. It is never more than two in loans from English. French is the main source of the fusion of three elements, namely the French asyntactic construction. Examples of it may be found in group 5, also see below:

Russ. bul'denez < Fr. boule de neige
kaptenármus < Fr. capitaine d'armes
kordebalét < Fr. corps de ballet
placdárm < Fr. place d'armes
fajdešín < Fr. faille de Chine
šarabán < Fr. char-à-bancs

Other languages also contributed similar constructions, for instance Portuguese auto de fe > Russian autodafé, and Dutch bij-de-wind > Russian béjdevind, and so on.
It does occur, although rarely, that the compound word gives rise to two different forms. Such an example is the English 'black rot' > Russian blek-rot or blekrot. This indicates some indecision on the part of the borrower: whether to treat the new form as a syntactic or as a morphological arrangement. Similar reasons hold true for the Italian 'bel canto' > Russian bel' kénto or bel'kánto.

Since "each language has a different system for combining morphemes, and within each system there are restrictions"¹², these restrictions must be strictly observed. Nevertheless, when a compound word is borrowed into Russian, the morphemes composing this word are not rearranged or altered to comply with the rules that apply to native morphemes. For instance, the class of NV (i.e. noun+verb) words is highly productive in Russian but not so in English. On the other hand, in English, it is possible only in the following arrangement: N+V+agential morpheme (agential suffix). One good example of this is brush(+)breaker > Russian brúšbreker.

Russ. brekváter   < Eng. breakwater
portmoné        < Fr. porte-monnaie
portpáž         < Fr. porte-page
portsigár       < Fr. porte-cigar

In the donor language these words listed above are of the VN type.

In its simplest form a compound consists of the
juxtaposition of two words; the more numerous ones drawn into the Russian language are of the NN type. The first component never undergoes morphological adaptation.

The following are some of the N-N>N loanwords:

Russ. arorút < Eng. arrowroot
batterfljáj < Eng. butterfly
bótdék < Eng. boat-deck
bel'bót < Eng. whale-boat
gajdróp < Eng. guide-rope
gómrul (or) < Eng. home rule
gómrul'
xendból < Eng. handball

A similar rule holds true in a N-N compound where the first component is in the possessive rather than the nominative case in the donor language; e.g.:

Eng. traveler's check > Russ. trávelerscěk

No attempt to change [-s], the marker of the possessive case in English to the marker of the corresponding (genitive) case in Russian, is shown here.

It is noteworthy that the N-N>N-N arrangement is also possible; for instance, Eng. yacht club > Russ. jaxt-klúb.

The morphological analysis of Adjective+Noun compounds reveals the fact that whether the loanword is adapted as one
or two words, the adjectival component is not treated as an adjective in Russian, that is, it lacks the derivational suffix of an adjective and is not declined; e.g.:

- Russ. blanfíks < Fr. blanc fixe
- grossbáuer < Ger. Grossbauer
- fal'stárt < Eng. false start
- Sôrtgorn < Eng. shorthorn

More examples of this type are found in group three.

In conclusion it is possible to say that the loanwords discussed in this chapter are unanalyzed compounds, which were simply transferred from the donor language into Russian, where they are used as substantives.

**Derived secondary words**

According to the definition earlier given to describe this term, derived secondary words contain one free form + a bound morpheme. Affixation is by far the most common process in the formation of derivatives in Russian as well as in English and French. This process involves: prefixation, infixation and suffixation.

Prefixes are primarily words without an independent existence in the language, although originally they developed out of independent words. The contact of Russian with various foreign languages led to the adaptation of numerous derivational morphemes as well: new prefixes, infixes and
suffixes have been introduced. The fate of the same loanwords borrowed into different languages is worthy of mention here: certain French loanwords found both in English and Russian were assimilated and used in a different manner. For instance, in English \{demi\} occurs
-- as a prefix
-- as an independent word
-- in compounds

In Russian, on the other hand, \{demi-\} is found only in compound words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian word</th>
<th>French equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>demikotón</td>
<td>&lt; Fr. demicoton (demi-coton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demimond</td>
<td>&lt; demimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demisezón</td>
<td>&lt; demi-saison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although, there is a general tendency in Russian to replace foreign affixes in loanwords, especially suffixes, many of them retain their original form. Sometimes there is competition between native and foreign suffixes. It is best illustrated by banalitét and banál'nost' <Fr. banalité (the ending -tet in Russian indicates German influence).

Foreign derivational suffixes on the whole play a greater and more interesting part in the Russian language than prefixes and infixes, therefore, this thesis will elaborate on them.

Nominal and verbal suffixes

In Russian, in nominal derivation the suffix is always
added to the root or stem ending in a consonant. This is an established rule in the language and the speakers have no choice but to use them. In terms of both stem ending and suffix the following possibilities of combination exists in native Russian words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of derivation</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>CVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

This chart includes only simple suffixes since we are concerned with simple suffixes in this paper. Following Clayton Dawson's\(^\text{13}\) definition, a simple suffix contains no more than one vowel (i.e. in pronunciation).

Following the tables illustrating the patterns of derivational formations in Russian, English and French both in the nominal and verbal categories, foreign suffixes with the highest frequency of occurrence will be considered and discussed. English, in comparison with Russian is richer in the possibilities of combinations:
French has more possibilities of combination than Russian but less than English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of derivation</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>CVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>CCVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-V-</td>
<td>CVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-V-</td>
<td>CCV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

The three tables immediately preceding indicate that in the nominal systems of both English and French the stem may end
not only in a consonant as in Russian but also in a vowel, and that suffixes may end either in a vowel or in a consonant.

The verbal system provides a greater possibility for suffixation in Russian than the nominal system because it permits the suffix to be added to an open stem:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of derivation</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>CVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-V-</td>
<td>CVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-V-</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

In English, possibilities are less:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of derivation</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-V-</td>
<td>VCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

In French we have the following:
What the present writer wants to point out in the following paragraphs is the presence of numerous loanwords of morpheme + derivational morpheme type, also the influence of the latter component imposed on the coining of Russian words. Some of these suffixes behave in the Russian language in such a manner that a question arises: are these borrowings really loanwords or loanblends?

The suffixes will be discussed in the following order: -ade, -age, -ance, -ant, -at, -ement, -er, -et, -eur, -euse, -ing, -ism, and -ist.

**Suffixes**

1) Fr. -ade /-ad/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Fr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ade</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

(Stem means stem ending)

**Examples:**

Russ. arkád < Fr. arcade  
promenád < Fr. promenade  
maskarád < Fr. mascarade
The stress in these examples is kept on the last syllable as it was in French, although it is somewhat more strongly marked. This proves the theory that loanwords from French into Russian adapt the stress pattern of the original (the primary stress is always on the ultimate in French). In case of suffix -ade this statement can be further proven by the following examples which have not only kept the stress pattern but the gender as well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russ.</th>
<th>&lt; Fr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anfiláda</td>
<td>l'enfilade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baljustráda</td>
<td>la balustrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barrikáda</td>
<td>la barricade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaval'káda</td>
<td>la cavalcade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rokáda</td>
<td>la rocade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estakáda</td>
<td>l'estacade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eskaláda</td>
<td>l'escalade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esplanáda</td>
<td>l'esplanade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estráda</td>
<td>l'estrade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The choice is merely of individual taste between arkád and arkáda < Fr. l'arcade because they both mean the same thing.

2) Fr. -age/-až/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Fr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-age</td>
<td>-issage</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

Examples:

Russ. abordáž < Fr. abordage
As the result of the reinterpretation of these loanwords, although only very few, such forms are found in the language as listáž from the Russian word líst + áž.

3) Fr. -ance /ás/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Fr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ance</td>
<td>-escence</td>
<td>-C/-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

In Russian the suffix changes from VC to VCC, from /-ás/ to /-ans/ (See chapter 3, 2. Russ. /e/, French iii).
Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russ.</th>
<th>Fr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dekadáns</td>
<td>décadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>séáns</td>
<td>séance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diližáns</td>
<td>diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rezonáns</td>
<td>résonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferáns</td>
<td>préférance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konferáns</td>
<td>conférance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reveráns</td>
<td>révérence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not one example of Russian word + French suffix -ance has been found.

4) Fr. -ant /-a/-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Fr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ant</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ante</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

It is referred to as an 'adjectival verbal' in French, and is very productive in that language. In Russian the suffix has the VC 'shape', never V alone. Most of the loanwords containing this suffix came into Russian via German.

Examples:

Russ. brilliánt (or)

bril'jánt < Ger. Brillant, < Fr. brilliant
This suffix is also used to form new derivatives in Russian, e.g. kurs, kursánt.

5) Fr. -at/-a/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Fr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-at</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-V-</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

Examples:
- Russ. kombinát < Fr. combinat (<Lat.)
- secretariát < Fr. secretariat

The spelling influence accounts for Russ. /-at/.

In spite of the fact that this suffix is quite productive in French, only few loanwords containing it are found in Russian.

6) Fr. -ement /-mã/
In Russian this suffix is rendered as CVCC, /-ment/ or VCVCC, /-ement/.

Examples:

Russ. angažemént < Fr. engagement
akkompanemént < Fr. accompagnement
divertismént < Fr. divertissement

This suffix has another variant in French which gave rise to the following loanwords:

Russ. assortimént < Fr. assortiment
komplimént < Fr. compliment

Not all loanwords ending in -ment in Russian originated from French; e.g. Russ. indossamént is from It. indossamento via Ger. Indossament.

7) Eng. -er /-/ər/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Eng.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-er</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

Numerous words containing this suffix have been borrowed into Russian, as well as French and other languages. According to Jean Dubois, "les mots en -er désignent soit des noms d'agent soit des noms d'appareils ou d'instruments: cette
bisémié est exactement parallele à celle du suffix français
-eur." \( ^{14} \) Loans ending in Fr. [-eur] will be discussed under
no. (9).

Suffix [er] is very productive in English and
resulted in a wealth of loanwords in Russian, some of which
are listed below:

Russ. bámper < Eng. bumper
bárrister < Eng. barrister
bójler < Eng. boiler
bróker < Eng. broker
búinker < Eng. bunker
búster < Eng. booster
búfer < Eng. buffer
víper < Eng. whipper

Note that the primary (strong) stress falls on the initial
syllable in both languages in this group of examples.

In spite of the abundance of loans terminating in -ér,
this suffix is not productive in Russian in the derivation
of new words from Slavic roots.

8) Fr. -et, -ette /-st/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Fr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-et</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ette</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17
Examples:

Russ. bagét < Fr. baguette
burét < bourette
bjuvét < buvette
vinegrét < vinaigrette
kaskét < casquette
korvét < corvette
kurbét < courbette
lafét < lafette
egrét < aigrette

(Both in French and Russian the primary stress falls on the final syllable.) No examples have been found of Russian root + this suffix.

9) Fr. -eur /-œr/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant (see below)</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Fr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-eur</td>
<td></td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

Examples:

Russ. dublēr < Fr. doubleur
kontrolēr < controleur
montēr < monteur
sutenēr < souteneur
egutēr < égoutteur
In addition to this list numerous other loanwords especially relating to the theater are to be found in Russian; e.g. актёр, гримёр, etc. Phonologically speaking the French phonemic vowel, /œ/, is identified with the Russian phonetic allophone, [ö], which is always preceded by palatalization. In other words, it is signalled by the preceding palatalized consonant. This means that /ž/ and /š/ should be 'soft' in the following situation. However, this pronunciation, according to the Soviet linguist Avanesov, is being "crowded out".

    e.g. Russ. dirižёр  < Fr. dirigeur
         vol'tižёр  <  voltigeur
         vojažёр  <  voyageur
         montažёр  <  montageur
         akušёр  <  accoucheur
         retušёр  <  retoucheur

Another phonological change that may take place is from Fr. /œ/ to Russian /e/, which occurs under stress, and no softening of the adjacent consonants; e.g.:

    Russ. defibré  < Fr. défibreur
          dispašёр  <  dispacheur
          kollekcionёр  <  collectioneur

Sometimes the French {−eur} is added to non-French words, for instance, Eng. box + Fr. −eur > Fr. boxeur > Russ. boksёр.
In contemporary Russian this suffix is used in forming new derivatives from Russian roots, therefore, it may now be regarded as completely assimilated into the language.

Examples:

Russ. kioskér is from kiosk + suffix -ër
Šumër is from Šum + suffix -ër

The following are accepted variants of -eur in contemporary French: -seur, -isseur
-iteur
-ateur
-isateur
-ificateur

Russian interprets them, however, as the suffix -tor, -ator or -itor. This is the underlying explanation for the following changes (note that the primary stress is no longer on the ultimate in Russian):

Russ. al'ternátor < Fr. alternateur
dezorganizátor < Fr. désorganisateur
komposítor < Fr. compositeur
deklinátor < Fr. déclinateur
indikátor < indicateur

These loanwords show complete assimilation, but not débitóř < Fr. débiteur.
Because of the presence of /t/ in Fr. éjecteur > Russ. езектор, and détecteur > Russ. детекtor, it is possible to say that these are regarded as having the suffix Russ. [-tor] rather than Fr. [-eur], and consequently a morphological substitution as well as a phonological is involved. Therefore, these may no longer be called loanwords in the narrow sense but loanblends. In Fr. égoutteur > Russ. егутер no morpheme substitution takes place, *егутор does not exist in Russian.

What appears to be -tor, in Russian may have its origin either in the French suffix, as it has been already discussed, or in the English suffix -or; e.g.:

Russ. директор < Eng. director
dезинфектор < disinfecter
оператор < operator

Although, the /t/ here is part of the root in English, it became part of the suffix in Russian.

Not all words containing this suffix have corresponding forms in the languages from which they were borrowed. Russian creates new words by adding this suffix to foreign stems, thus arriving at a special type of loanblend.

Examples:

Russ. improvisátor derived from Russ. improvisáciija
Russ. klassifikátor derived from Russ. klassifikácia

A few exceptions are found, which in spite of linguistic rules are formed by analogy with other examples, for instance, Eng. partner > Russ. партнёр, Eng. punter > Russ. понтёр. Two possibilities are permitted even in the speech of the same individual in the case of Eng. converter > Russ. конвёртер vs конвёртор. This is, however, an anomaly.

The most unusual treatment was given to the French word déserteur > Russ. dezertír; although the accent kernel correlates with the stress in the original (i.e. on the ultimate), the phoneme /o/ was replaced by /i/ which appears in orthography as well. It should be mentioned, that only in weakly stressed position may this phonemic substitution take place in Russian. If the (primary) stress is absent, then /o/ > /a/ > /i/.

10) Only one loanword has been found in Russian containing the French suffix -euse/-eux:

Russ. курёз < Fr. curieuse /kyrjóz/ (feminine form).

11) Eng. -ing /-ɪŋ/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Eng.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ing</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

In Russian the suffix becomes distinctly -ing /-ink/.
Examples:

Russ. blúming (or) < Eng. blooming
bljúming
bráuning < browning
démping < dumping
dóping < doping
kémping < camping
kréking < cracking
klíring < clearing
króssing < crossing
miting < meeting
sljábing < slabbing
snájping < sniping

Many loans terminating in -ing were borrowed into French as well. Russian, on the one hand, kept the stress in its original position, while French, on the other hand, shifted the accent to the final syllable, "c'est-à-dire vers -ing devenue l'élément marquant".  

Some of the words ending in -ing may be found in combination with other suffixes; e.g.: tréner < Eng. trainer, tréning < Eng. training, the English stem is train. Although, this does not exist as an independent loanword in Russian other stems might, for example, stárting < Eng. starting, the stem is start > Russ. start.

12) Fr. -ique /-ik/
Jean Dubois refers to it as "le suffix d'adjectif", but it also denotes substantives in French. It already has a counterpart in Russian, namely {-ik}, therefore, it may be argued that

i) it merged with genuine Slavic -ik, or that

ii) it was simply analyzed as the Russian suffix -ik.

Thus, foreign words containing this suffix could be classified in Russian either as loanwords or loanblends.

This suffix is so productive in Russian that it is added to both native and foreign roots to derive new words. The following words are results of such an arrangement:

Russ. fornìk < Eng. (American) Ford+-ik

ekipázik < Fr. équipage+-ik

root+suffix+suffix

13) Fr. -isme /ism/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix (in Fr.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-isme</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>/C-</td>
<td>VCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-V-</td>
<td>VCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

The origin of words containing this suffix is difficult to determine, that is, they might have come directly from the classical languages, or perhaps borrowed directly from
French, German or English. Bielfeldt (pp. 186-188) gives over 400 words in -ism, most of which one could refer to as "international terms". Some of them, however, are purely Russian derivatives. Two examples of loanblends in Russian will be given below:

Russ. fordizm < Eng. Ford (Henry Ford) + -izm
recordizm < record + -izm

Derivation by means of this suffix is very productive in all three languages, Russian, English and French.

14) Eng. -ist, Fr. -iste, /-ist/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-iste</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC (in Fr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ist</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-C-</td>
<td>VC (in Eng.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

The suffix -ist is the product of 18th century French influence on Russian. Nevertheless, not all loanwords of this type were borrowed from French or indirectly from French into Russian. Some of the words entered into the vocabulary through sources other than the donor language. The French influence is still very strong because the stress on the final syllable is prevalent all the way through. Approximately 400 words in -ist are listed by Bielfeldt (pp. 224-226). In contemporary
Russian it is one of the most productive suffixes.

As was the case with some of the other suffixes, Russian took the liberty of deriving nouns in the following manner: loanword + suffix, loanword + -ist, when no equivalent is found in the donor language even though derivation by means of this suffix is productive. The arrangement of stem and suffix in Russian may be:

-\(C\) + -VCC(\(-\)) and -\(V\) + -VCC(\(-\))

Examples:

Russ. from fútúból (< Eng. football) > futbolíšt
régbì (< Eng. rugby) > regbíšt
taksí (< Fr. taxi) > taksíšt
kanóe (< Eng. canoe) > kanoeíšt

/i/ is dropped in front of the suffix -ist, but interestingly /e/ is kept in kanóe.

In technical terminology in Russian -ist- has a specialized meaning, indicating an abundance of that quality. Compare:

górna\(j\)a městnost' - 'a place where there are mountains'
górnostajá městnost' - 'a very mountainous place'

Roots combined with {-ist} often occur with {-izm}; for example:
Russ. turizm, turist - Eng. 'tourism', 'tourist'
dualism, dualist - Eng. 'dualism', 'dualist'
optimizm, optimist - Eng. 'optimism', 'optimist'

These suffixes discussed are not the only ones found in loanwords that were borrowed into Russian, but they are certainly the most frequently encountered ones. Two examples will be given of the less frequently encountered suffixes:

1) Fr. {-ie}, jalousie > Russ. zaljuzi
2) Fr. {-oire}, dortoir > Russ. dortuar

A close examination of numerous Russian suffixes will establish correspondences with English and French suffixes; this applies in particular to suffixes used exclusively within the sphere of technical and scientific nomenclature. They may not be called loanwords in its strict sense, but perhaps loanblends. The following are only a few of the examples which show correspondences between English and Russian suffixes used in chemical terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian suffix</th>
<th>English suffix</th>
<th>Russian examples</th>
<th>English examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-on</td>
<td>-on(e)</td>
<td>sul'fon</td>
<td>sulphon(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-an(e)</td>
<td>spiran</td>
<td>spiran(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-en</td>
<td>-en(e)</td>
<td>okten</td>
<td>octen(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-in</td>
<td>-yn(e)</td>
<td>gidrazin</td>
<td>hydrazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-in(e)</td>
<td>-in(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-il</td>
<td>-yl</td>
<td>toluil</td>
<td>toluyl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-id</td>
<td>-id(e)</td>
<td>imid</td>
<td>imid(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-at</td>
<td>-at(e)</td>
<td>gidrat</td>
<td>hydrate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22
FOOTNOTES -- CHAPTER IV

1 Bloomfield, L.  Language.  

2 Ibid.  p. 453.  
In addition to bolsheviki, we get bolshevist and bolshevic.  
lists bolsheviki as the plural form of bolshevik, and  
bolsheviks as an alternative.  In the Third ed,(1963)  
bolsheviks is given first as the plural form and bolsheviki  
given as an alternative.  The New 'Standard" Dictionary of  
the English Language (New York, Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1962)  
gives the only entry as bolsheviki - nominative plural.  
In brief, possibly, bolsheviki entered into the English  
language first and the others are later derivations of it.

3 Mr. Harshenin suggested that perhaps čempionštvo is simply  
a new form in Russian derived from čempion + štvo to create  
an abstract noun.

4 Nida, E.A.  Morphology.  
Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1949, p. 81.

5 Phonemically, it can be accepted that either [-man],  
/-man/ or [-men], /-men/ was the model for Russian /-men/.  
In speech both /a/ and /ɛ/ can converge on the Russ. /e/.

6 This example can be verified only in the 1958 edition of the  
Slovar' Inostrannyx Slov, p. 242.

7 Bloomfield, op. cit. p. 247.

8 Bloch, B. and Trager, G. L. Outline of linguistic analysis.  
Baltimore, Md., Linguistic Society of America, 1942, p. 54.

9 Hockett, C.F.  A course in modern linguistics.  
Note that /+/ marks juncture and it is defineable only  
in terms of pronunciation.

10 Bloch and Trager, op. cit. p. 66.

11 For spelling conventions see Ball, A. M., Compounding and  
12 Nida, op. cit., p. 78.


15 Ibid., p. 73.
CHAPTER V

GENDER, NUMBER AND CASE

What gender is

Gender as a grammatical category is very important in contemporary modern Russian. It is a basic characteristic of all Russian nouns and also characteristic through grammatical agreement of satellite adjectives and verbs (for instance of the past tense and participle forms). Speaking about gender, Nicolas Durnovo states that

"nous appelons "genre" le phénomène de l'accord des substantifs avec certaines formes particulières des adjectifs aux mêmes cas. C'est en ce sens que nous distinguons, en russe moderne, quatre genres au singulier: le masculin animé, le masculin inanimé, le féminin et le neutre; -- et, au plurier, deux genres: le genre animé et le genre inanimé."

Present day linguists, however, deny the existence of four such genders in Russian since the distinction is made only in the Accusative singular and Accusative plural. Russian grammar books on the whole discuss three genders: masculine, feminine and neuter. This division can further be reduced to two categories: feminine and non-feminine. The well known linguist, Roman Jakobson, puts forth his argument in the favour of this classification in the following manner:
"Russian case forms distinguish two numbers -- the marked plural vs. singular, and in all the grammatical cases of the unmarked singular, two genders -- the more specified, marked feminine vs. non-feminine. The feminine gender signals that the given noun cannot designate a male human being, unless in expressive, particular pejorative language (cf. ón - svóloč', stérya, étakaja drján i razmaznjá). The unmarked non-feminine, in turn, splits into two genders, distinguished, however, only in the unmarked, nominative case (and in accusative when merging with nominative).

Russian non-feminine nominative forms display a distinction between the marked neuter and the less specified, unmarked masculine."

The reader will find among the hypocoristics numerous genuine Russian Christian names which have the appearance of a feminine noun proper, although the adjective modifying it will be declined according to the non-feminine, more precisely the masculine - animate declension.

How to determine the gender of nouns

The gender of a noun is determined by the phonetic association of the last sound of the word in its Nominative Singular form. This statement provides only a general rule and does not include all possibilities. Due to hierarchical considerations sometimes the idea of gender prevails in spite of the phonetic shape of the terminating sound of the word which may otherwise have placed it into another category. Even the native speaker may be puzzled by this. Overwhelmed by the problem of gender, Mučnik quotes an interesting dialogue between a mother and her child:
- Mama, baran on?
- On.
- Ovca - on?
- Ona.
- A počemu papa - on? Nado by pap, i ne papa?¹

Similar questions arise in our analysis of gender: Why is a word masculine when it should be feminine, or vice versa? In the following paragraphs an attempt will be made to analyse some of the problems and to provide answers to some of the questions that one may ask about loanwords in regard to gender.

All loanwords must fall into one of the categories of gender in Russian, and generally the formal criteria for determining their gender is the same as for all other nouns. Loanwords were selected mainly from English and French. Examples taken from these languages, however, do not provide an adequate assessment of gender in loanwords. For this reason, in addition to English and French, German examples are included insofar as they consolidate the theoretical problems encountered in borrowings in the aforementioned languages. Like Russian, German has three categories of gender whereas French has only two and English has none. The gender pattern of these languages compared with that of Russian is best illustrated by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23
Is gender predictable in loanwords? Words borrowed from English, or any other language lacking gender as a formal grammatical category, are assigned to a gender in Russian according to the rules still to be mentioned. Loanwords already having a gender in the donor language may preserve it but not necessarily always. An originally compound word whether treated as a compound or as a simple morpheme is governed by the same rules in Russian as a morpheme-word. Exceptions will always be found, some of which will be given considerations under the appropriate headings.

Non-Feminine

Masculine

General rules

Generally, the gender of a noun in Russian can be determined without much difficulty by examining the final sound of the word in the nominative, singular case (which is the conventional entry in dictionaries or glossaries). In brief, the phonetic shape of the terminating (or final) sound of the stem is the criterion. The following terminating sounds are characteristic of Russian masculine nouns:

1) non-palatalized consonants
2) palatalized consonants
3) yod

To what degree are these rules applicable to loanwords?
Firstly, all English loanwords ending in a non-palatalized consonant were drawn into the masculine category without any exception. The following examples seem very few in comparison with the actual number that are present in the Russian language.

**Examples:**

**English:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ajsberg</td>
<td>ájsberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al'kléd</td>
<td>ál'kléd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>átom</td>
<td>átom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balášt</td>
<td>balášt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedlám</td>
<td>bedlám</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>berkšír</td>
<td>berkšír</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bíznes</td>
<td>bíznes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bixeviorízm</td>
<td>bixeviorízm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blok</td>
<td>blok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blum</td>
<td>blum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bojkót</td>
<td>bojkót</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss</td>
<td>boss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**French**

Numerous loanwords borrowed from French retained their original gender, that is, they were already masculine in French. The underlying reason for no change is, of course, structural; the following examples all terminate in non-palatalized consonants:
Russ. abandón < Fr. l'abandon
abonemént < l'abonnement
aviatór < l'aviateur

Any student of French would know that certain endings are linked with specific genders in that language, for instance all nouns ending in [-eur] are masculine in French. But since the final /-r/ falls into the category of non-palatalized consonants, this is the only accepted reason for all loanwords containing this suffix to be in the masculine category.

Russ. adjul'tér < Fr. l'adultère
ażiotáž < l'agiotage
akkompanemént < l'accompagnement
akkordeón < l'accordéon
aksessuár < l'accessoir
albóm < l'album
al'truízm < l'altruïsm

The fact that the suffixes {-age}, {-ement}, {-oir} and {-isme} denote masculine nouns is not as overly significant as the fact that /-z/, /-t/, /-r/ and /-m/ are the terminating sounds of the words which were borrowed from French.

Russ. ambaláz < Fr. l'emballage
angažemént < l'engagement
antík < l'antique
antrepreněr < l'entrepreneur
The change in gender in the next group of examples provides the first assessment of evidence of the phonetic association of gender. These loanwords were originally feminine in French but since they all end in consonants (i.e. non-palatalized consonants) there can be no question as to which category of gender they will belong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russ.</th>
<th>Fr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anturáž</td>
<td>l'entourage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ballón</td>
<td>le ballon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ballonét</td>
<td>le ballonet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russ. aváns</th>
<th>Fr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akánt, akánf</td>
<td>l'acanthe (Gr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alljúr</td>
<td>l'allure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al'kóv</td>
<td>l'alcove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al'jáns</td>
<td>l'alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambusjúr</td>
<td>l'embouchure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antrekót</td>
<td>l'entrecôte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arbalét</td>
<td>l'arbalet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>armjúr</td>
<td>l'armure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arxitráv</td>
<td>l'architrave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assonáns</td>
<td>l'assonans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bagét</td>
<td>la baguette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baláns</td>
<td>la balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ball</td>
<td>la balle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bar'ér</td>
<td>la barrière</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is interesting about German in comparison with Russian is that it also has three grammatical categories of gender; this fact will be of great importance later on. We encounter numerous masculine nouns from German which like the examples taken from French underwent no change of gender. They also end in a (non-palatalized) consonant. The following list of loanwords from German further substantiates the interpretation given.

Russ. abzác < Ger. der Absatz
abláut < der Ablaut
ábris < der Abriss
ánsljus < der Anschluss
bakstéjn < der Backstein
blik < der Blick
bürgraf < der Burgraf
gelérter < der Gelehrter

*Note: the capital letter in initial position is only an orthographical device in German.

It is interesting to note, that some of the German feminine nouns became masculine in Russian insofar as they ended in a consonant in Russian. Corresponding findings were already observed in loanwords from French.
Examples:

Russ. generalitét < Ger. die Generalität
incúxt < die Inzucht
kegel'bán < die Kegelbahn
kljuft < die Kluft
lancét < die Lanzett

The next group of loanwords were feminine substantives in German, but are masculine in Russian because they have the structural shape of masculine nouns due to the result of apocope.

Russ. rejs < Ger. die Reise
šlejf < die Schleife
šljuz < die Schleuse
šnečk < die Scnecke
špic < die Spitze
štamp < die Stampe (< It.)
štandárt < die Standarte (< It.)
štrač < die Strafe
štuf < die Stufe

The following group of examples provides conclusive evidence of the importance stem endings play in the assignment of gender of loanwords in Russian. These were neuter nouns in German which were absorbed by the masculine gender in Russian.
All of the above mentioned loanwords end in non-palatalized consonants, which constitutes their being in the masculine gender in Russian.

Secondly, we mentioned that loanwords terminating in a palatalized consonant in Russian may be absorbed by the masculine category of gender. Theoretically, the original gender of the loanword may have been masculine, feminine or neuter. There are a few examples which end in a soft l, /l'/, borrowed from any of the three languages concerned which joined the declension often referred to as the "soft masculine declension". They had no gender in English but they did in both French and German.

Interestingly, no change of gender occurred in the following loanwords from French.
Russ. ártíkl' < Fr. l'article
kontról' < le contrôle
mistrá'l' < le mistral
polišínél' < le polichinelle < It. pulchinella
prófil' < le profile
ridíkjúl' < le ridicule
spektákl' < le spectacle
tjúl' < le tulle

A parallelism is observed in loanwords from German:

Russ. véksel' < Ger. der Wechsel
vínkel' < der Winkel
kégel' < der Kegel
flígel' < der Flügel
šénkel' < der Schenkel
špátel' < der Spatel

Change of gender is found in a few loanwords which were feminine in the donor language and joined the soft masculines in Russian. The reader will note that the terminating sound of such loanwords is a palatalized consonant.

from French

Russ. kápsjúl' < Fr. la capsule
kokil' < la coquille
konsól' < la console
Similar examples from German will add support to the conclusion derived on the basis of loanwords from French. The next group of nouns was feminine in German but are regarded as masculine in Russian.

from German

Russ. fúxtel' < Ger. die Fuchtel
Špíndel' < die Spindel

Furthermore, there are a few examples which belong to the soft masculines but were neuter in the donor language. The determining factor at play here is, of course, the final sound of the word.

from German

Russ. véntil' < Ger. das Ventil
mitel' < das Mittel
panél' < das Paneel
Špil' < das Spill

*Note: The examples used for illustration in the above mentioned lists all end in /-l'/ in Russian.

Thirdly, loanwords ending in a yod may be classified as masculine nouns in Russian. Borrowings ending in a yod
are less numerous than the ones ending in (palatalized or non-palatalized) consonants, as a matter of fact, there are only very few of them. The English \(-ey\) /i/ in final position was interpreted as /-ej/ in Russian, which automatically included all nouns of this type in the masculine category of gender, for example:

Russ. atórnej < Eng. attorney  
žokéj < jockey  
glej < gley  
trolléj < trolley

Also, words ending in /-i/ (as occurring in diphthongs like /øy/, etc.) in English would very likely join this group; e.g. Russ. permaloj < Eng. permalloy.

For similar reasons the following French and German words were taken into this group (hypothetically, they may have been taken from any of the three genders):

Russ. konvój < Fr. convoi  
lakéj < laquais  
aldréj < Ger. Aldrei  
vérkblej < Werkblei

Summary

It may be concluded on the basis of the above examples that, although there are more examples found in one group
than in another, the more abundant group does not provide
a habitual repository for new and unassimilated loanwords
in Russian but only shows the tendencies. The extent of the
tendencies is further illustrated by the following two tables
which were set up on the selected word list (compiled by the
present writer) that contained loanwords in all three genders
from all three languages. The number of masculine substantives
were as follows:
1) from English -- 216 (out of the total: M 86%, N 7%)
2) from French -- 478 (out of the total: M 64%, N 13%)
3) from German -- 248 (out of the total: M 82%, N 3%)

Out of these loanwords which joined the masculine
declension (stem ending in plain consonant) the percentage of
the original gender is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Original gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

*Note: It is pointless to add English here since it lacks
grammatical gender.

Loanwords which are in the 'soft masculine declension'
in Russian indicate a different set of ratios:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Original gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

These figures indicate that the highest percentage of both 'hard' and 'soft' masculine loanwords in Russian originated from nouns already masculine in the donor language; the next highest in number is drawn from the feminines, and the smallest from the neuters.

**Neuter**

Neuters also belong to the non-feminine category; this group as the appellation indicates, "signals lack of sex reference". The formal rule for categorization of the gender of neuter in Russian is — all nouns ending with the desinence {-о} (о/е/ё). The first one has a stem ending in a plain consonant, and the latter two have stem endings in palatalized consonants.

Only a handful of loanwords from English are found in this group in Russian, some of which are:

- Russ. bándžo < Eng. banjo (< Sp.)
- búngalo (or) < bungalow (< Hindi)
- bëngalo
- magnéto < magneto
- superkárgo < supercargo
All loanwords in this group, which came from French originally belonged to either the masculine or the feminine category. The decision hinges on what the stem ending is in Russian. Therefore, regardless of whether they were masculine or feminine in French, if the stem ends in /-o/ or /-e/, the loanword is a bona fide neuter noun in Russian. Orthographically, final /-o/ in French may be represented by one of the following: -o, -au, and -eau. They may be followed by a -t which is omitted in speech.

**Examples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russ.</th>
<th>&lt; Fr.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>assó</td>
<td>l'assaut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bjuró</td>
<td>le bureau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dépó</td>
<td>le dépôt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domino</td>
<td>le domino (&lt; It.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žabó</td>
<td>le jabot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>žakó</td>
<td>le jacquot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landó</td>
<td>le landau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large number of words borrowed from French belong to the 'soft' neuters because they end in /-e/, which in French orthography may be represented by -é, -ée, -er and -et.

**Examples:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russ.</th>
<th>&lt; Fr.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abreżé</td>
<td>l'abregé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreżé</td>
<td>l'agregé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veržé</td>
<td>le vergé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plaké</td>
<td>le plaqué</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theoretically, all loans ending in /e/ and /ɛ/ would be expected to join the neuters. Examples of the former one are listed above; examples of loans ending in /-ɛ/ in French are rare in Russian: Fr. *le relais* > Russ. rele. The sound /-ɛ/ appears in spelling as -ai, -ais, etc.

**Feminine**

Russian feminine substantives end in the nominative singular form with the desinence -a/ja. This criterion is pertinent to loanwords as well. If the loanword ends in -a, it is very likely to be adopted as a feminine noun in Russian.

from English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russ.</th>
<th>Eng.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>veránda</td>
<td>veranda (&lt; Hindi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gorilla</td>
<td>gorilla (&lt; African)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from French

Russ. patuá < Fr. le patois /patwá/
rezedá < le réséda /rezedá/
tremá < le tréma /tremá/

*Note: These are all masculine in French.

The next group of examples were feminine in French and are feminine in Russian. The interpretation can contain information such as final -e was replaced by -a in Russian, and as the result of this, they now are bona fide feminine nouns. Since the final -e is absent in pronunciation in French and they all end in a consonant, one would have expected these words to be masculine in Russian. But regardless of whether or not these loanwords are considered a representation of speech or writing, there is no structural justification for their being in the feminine category. One could say, however, that the borrower had a "feeling" for the French gender. Loanwords of this type are numerous in Russian:

Russ. avantjúra < Fr. l'aventure
akkoláda < l'accolade
amal'gáma < l'amalgame
ambrazúra < l'embrasure
antánta < l'entente
báza < la base
baljustráda < la balustrade
What is more interesting is the presence of masculine nouns in the feminine category in Russian. In pronunciation these loans end in a consonant and, therefore, should be masculine in Russian; in writing they end in -e, and on the basis of this, they should be neuter.

Examples:

Russ. ámbra  < Fr. l'ambre
    tan'téma  <   le tantième
    fára    <   le phare

In addition to these, similar examples were found in German where the weakly stressed final -e was replaced by -a in Russian.

Russ. bírža  < Ger. die Börse
    gardína  <   die Gardine
    granáta  <   die Granate
    djúza  <   die Düse

Russian feminine nouns like the masculines may end in a palatalized-consonant; a number of loanwords share the same feature. We have observed that numerous loanwords ending in /-l'/ in Russian belong to the masculine category; now we will note that some of the loans with /-l'/ are feminine.

Examples:

Russ. banderól'  < Fr. la banderole
It is interesting to note that the gender of these loans listed above corresponds to the one in the donor language. However, this is not always the case, for example the next group of loans were masculine in French and are regarded as feminine in Russian:

Russ. antrésol' < Fr. l'enresol

detál' < le détail

kadríl' < le quadrille

modél' < le modèle

emál' < l'émail

The following loanwords ending in /-l'/. are significant insofar as the same interpretations are applied. They belong to the feminine category in Russian and originally may have been masculine, feminine or neuter nouns in the donor language.

Examples:

Russ. drel' < Ger. der Drell

panél' < das Paneel
Summary

On the basis of a selected word list (compiled for this thesis) the following statistics have been derived. The distribution of feminine nouns in Russian is:

1) from English -- 12 (out of the total: F 5%)
2) from French -- 168 (out of the total: F 23%)
3) from German -- 48 (out of the total: F 15%)

Distributions of the original gender were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Original gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

It is evident from these statistics that the highest number of feminine nouns were drawn from the already feminine ones; the next highest percentage is from the masculine, and the smallest from the neuters. This information may force us to believe that the Russian speaker has a "feeling" for the gender of the loanword in the donor language. However, linguistically we cannot accept this fact. These figures showing a high percentage of homologues with identical gender may not be overly significant. On the whole, it was found
that the largest group of loanwords is masculine, then feminine, and the smallest group is neuter. From the overall size of this group of loanwords, the following figures were derived:

1) Masculine loanwords — 66%
2) Feminine loanwords — 25%
3) Neuter loanwords — 9%

This indicates that all 'changes' of gender were (and are) in the direction of masculine. Of those that retained their gender, a number of them are to be explained as getting their gender by homophony. Several examples show the retention of original gender, a fact which cannot be ignored altogether especially if phonological change accompanies it.

Loanwords ending in any of the consonants (palatalized or plain) and in -a/-ja and -o (o/e/ë) may be grouped under one of the three genders in Russian. In native Russian words these are the only permissible terminating sounds of the substantives in the nominative singular in addition to these /-i/ in the nominative plural. There are a few loanwords, however, that end in other than the said vowels in the nominative singular, namely in -u/-ju. For example:

Russ. interv'jú < Eng. interview
kakađú < cockatoo
míld'ju (or)
míl'd'ju < mildew
akažú < Fr. l'acajou (m)
These are considered as indeclinable neuter nouns in Russian.

Hierarchical consideration of gender over grammatical category

Certain loanwords have the structural shape of one category but are treated as if they belonged to another one. Examine the following:

Russ. ragú < Fr. le ragoût
sapažú < le sapajou
avenjú < l'avenue (f)
inženjú < l'ingenue (f)
menjú < menu
parvenjú < parvenue
revjú < revue

The first has the structural shape in Russian of a plural noun, the second, as a masculine and the third one, as a (non-declinable) neuter noun, but they are all treated as feminine nouns, that is, adjectives modifying any of them or the past tense of the verb, etc. will receive feminine endings in all declensional and conjugational forms.

Oscillation of gender of loanwords

Stylistic variations and personal preference is one of the causes of oscillation between two genders, most commonly
between masculine and feminine. Mučnik, a Russian linguist, lists 65 examples of this type, for instance: film - říma, avantjúr - avantjúra, gljukóz - gljukóza, and so on. The two variants are permitted sometimes even in the literary language.

The two different forms may be the result of simultaneous borrowings from different source languages as illustrates the example above.

Sometimes the form used in the prostorčie differs from the one in the literary language; for instance, rel'sa (prost.) vs. rel's (lit.), arabéska (prost.) vs. arabésk (lit.)

In the everyday speech loanwords may even be declined even if the literary language does not permit it. For example, Russ. pal'tó, pal'tá, pal'tú, .... (kafé >) kaf'éj, kaféja, kaféju, etc.

Furthermore, the gender of the loanword in Russian may change in time if the word is "well-worn". For example, Russ. boá < Fr. le boa was at one time neuter but now it is used as a masculine noun; the change effected other words also relating to generic and specific names of plants and animals.

Number

In the substantival category of loanwords just as the regular native nouns signal either the singular or the plural. They may be categorized, depending whether they are:
1) used in both singular and plural
2) used only in the singular
3) used only in the plural

Category I (used in both singular and plural)

Most of the borrowings fall into this category. Some of them, however, have a [##] ending in the plural. A good example of this is \textit{paltó} < Fr. \textit{paletot}, Sp. \textit{palletoque}, ultimately < Lat. \textit{palla}: \textit{novie paltó} (sing.) and \textit{novie pal'to} (pl.). It has been mentioned that in everyday speech this loanword alongside with others may be declined, thus we find \textit{palt'a} \textendash \textit{palt'is} as its plural nominative form.

Category II (used only in the singular)

The following are only used in the singular form:

1) Numerous technical terms which are used in the collective sense: atmosféra, etc.
3) Abstract nouns: \textit{risk} < Fr. risque, It. risico.

Category III (used only in the plural)

Here are included loanwords that usually appear in pairs, for instance

\textbf{Russ. pantalóny} \textendash \textit{Fr. pantalones}
\textbf{bútsy} \textendash \textit{Eng. boots}
This category offers three different methods of assimilation and will be discussed separately under group a, b and c.

Group a

Under this heading are listed those words which show replacement of foreign plural morpheme by the Russian plural morpheme. This indicates, of course, that these loanwords are analyzed by the borrower.

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brídži</td>
<td>breeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blóndy</td>
<td>blondes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brízy</td>
<td>brises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debáty</td>
<td>débats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lándy</td>
<td>landes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pássy</td>
<td>passes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group b

This group of loanwords is actually used in the singular sense in Russian but were adapted from the donor language in their plural form. The underlying reason for this is that the Russian speaker was not aware of the fact that he is borrowing the plural form of the noun. English loanwords ending in -s which may be the plural {-s} appears to the Russian speaker as a consonantal stem ending of masculine nouns in the nominative singular. Therefore, the word is adapted without the truncation of the -s and assumes a singular meaning.
in Russian.

Examples:

Russ. bátens < Eng. battens
bims < beams
bifštéks < beefsteaks
kornfléks < cornflakes

Group c

This group of loanwords have the structural shape of plural nouns in Russian but are actually used in the singular sense. If the loanword ends in /-i/ in Russian, most frequently it is classified as a non-declinable noun.

Examples:

Russ. víski < Eng. whiskey;
kókni < cocney
déndi < dandy
lóbbi < lobby
dérbi < derby
póni < pony
džéntri < gentry
pénalti (or) < penalty
pénal'ti
džersi (or) < jersey
džersé
régbí < rugby
The following examples are from French:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russ.</th>
<th>Fr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>бу́зі</td>
<td>bougie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>жалжузі</td>
<td>jaolousie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>жюрі</td>
<td>jury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>парі</td>
<td>pari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>рамолі</td>
<td>ramolli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>șасі</td>
<td>chassis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


   Note the definition given:

   "Russian has three genders: masculine, feminine and neuter. Generally, the gender of a Russian noun depends on its form and has no meaning. This is obviously so with names of inanimate objects, or with abstract nouns, some of which are masculine, others feminine, and still others neuter: ....

   In the case of names of male and female beings, the meaning is for the most part reflected in the form: most nouns denoting male and female beings have endings indicative of the corresponding grammatical gender." p. 44.


CHAPTER VI

MORPHOLOGICAL CLASSES OF LOANWORDS

Russian morphology distinguishes such word classes as nouns, adjectives, pronouns, verbs and so on\(^1\). It does not, however, recognize such a part of speech as the definite article. Nevertheless, the presence of foreign definite articles in Russian is verifiable. The following borrowings were 'imported' into Russian along with their appropriate definite articles and are regarded as one morpheme. The only explanation of this phenomenon is that they were unanalyzed borrowings in the receiving language and came in by the "ear-route".

Russ. lácó < It. l'atto
   al'pári < It. al pari, alla pari
   al'séko < It. al seco
   trjum < D. het ruim -- in rapid speech this is reduced to 't ruim

Loanwords of this type are so rare in Russian that we can infer that the definite article will never be borrowed with the noun. As a matter of fact, the exact proportion of this type of loanword is four out of 20,000 examples\(^2\).

Similarly, prepositions are borrowed in a "prepositional" relationship but never independently; this is what was earlier
referred to as a semi-syntactic arrangement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>azúr</td>
<td>à jour</td>
<td>a konto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-kónto</td>
<td>&lt; Fr. en face</td>
<td>a konto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anfás</td>
<td></td>
<td>en face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tet-a-tét</td>
<td>tète-à-tête</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tet-de-pón</td>
<td>tète-de-pont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mizancéna</td>
<td>&lt; Fr. mise en scène</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

En, de, a and à are all prepositions in the above examples. On the whole, Fr. de and à have the highest degree of occurrence in loanwords entering Russian. Insofar as they are set, colloquial expressions in the donor language, the borrower makes no attempt to replace any part of them by a corresponding native one.

Nouns

Examples shown in the former chapters indicate that morphologically speaking there has been a noun-to-noun transference of borrowings, or putting it differently, a word which was formerly in the nominal class was adapted by the nominal class of Russian. Only isolated examples of adjectives used as substantives in Russian are found, for example, Russ. direkt < Eng. direct (adj.).

The amount of material available indicates that the largest number of loanwords belong to the nominal category, examples in the other classes being very few in comparison to the ones used as nouns. (N.B. in other classes loanwords
= loanblends) This, in turn, is justified by the strict morphological rules that govern the language.

**Adjectives**

Borrowed adjectives without the proper adjectival suffix are very uncommon in Russian. The only two encountered are -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>беж</td>
<td>&lt; Fr. beige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pink</td>
<td>&lt; Eng. pink</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjectives occurring in compound words or in syntactical arrangements forgo the adjectival suffix. These are, as it was pointed out (see chapter 3), not recognized as an independent part of speech in the compound word mainly because they never occur separately in Russian. The following adjectives constitute the first component of compound loanwords:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Latin/English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>бел'я</td>
<td>&lt; It. bel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бел'я</td>
<td>&lt; Fr. bel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бол</td>
<td>&lt; Fr. beau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бон</td>
<td>&lt; Fr. bon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бел</td>
<td>&lt; Eng. black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бл</td>
<td>&lt; Eng. blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>щор</td>
<td>&lt; Eng. short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>фал</td>
<td>&lt; Eng. false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>щаб</td>
<td>&lt; Eng. half</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as in бел'я́нто | < bel canto
bel'я | < Fr. bel | bel'я́з | < bel étage
бомонд | < beau monde
бонвиван | < bon vivant
blesk-вáрни́ц | < black varnish
блу́джинс | < blue jeans
шóртгóрн | < shorthorn
фал'стáрт | < false start
xавта́йм | < half-time
In contrast with the substantives, loanword adjectives are attested exclusively with Russian suffixes, i.e. they are actually classed as loanblends. The formation of the loanword adjective consists of foreign root + native derivational suffix + desinential suffix ( {-ij} ).

Examples:

Russ. agressívnyj < Fr. agressif, -ive
maniakálnyj < maniacal
mašinál'nyj < machinal
nazal'nyj < nasal
pikántnyj < piquant
remontántnyj < remontant
unitárnyj < unitaire
frontál'nyj < frontal

By analogy with this formation, new adjectives are added constantly to the Russian language derived from loanword nouns (these are called loanblends as well). Therefore, there is no justification in the supposition that foreign adjectives found in Russian have a corresponding adjectival form in the donor language. For example:

Russ. bagétnyj (or)
bagétovyj < Russ. bagé < Fr. baguette
bárževýj (or)
barževôj < Russ. bárž < Fr. barge
This illustration is showing the most productive and common way of deriving adjectives from substantives in Russian. The following suffixes were used in the derivational process of the above listed words: -yj, -ii, -nyj, -ovyi, -evyi, and -skij. Once the adjectival suffix has been added, these so called adjectival loanwords behave exactly in the same manner as regular Slavonic adjectives: they are declinable. Another feature of these adjectives is that they never occur in the "short" form.

Verbs

To arrive at the full stem of the verb, English verbs were adapted without any change in the original stem. The English marker of the infinitive {to}, never appears in Russian. French verbs, however, undergo truncation and lose the marker of the infinitive. Although there are four infinitive endings in French, namely -er, -ir, -oir, and -re, all borrowed verbal forms are taken from the -er conjugation. The explanation for this is that it is the only productive and
the largest group of verbs in French.

In contemporary Russian new verbs show a definite tendency to join the open and most productive class. The procedure for joining this class, therefore, is the following:
1) the truncation of former verbal ending (if any)
2) the adding of the Russian infinitive ending

Thus,

\[\text{stem} + \text{ova} + t'\]
\[\text{stem} + \text{irova} + t'\]
\[\{-t'\}\] being the marker of the infinitive. (Compare this to the original Slavic verbs where the infinitive marker has not one but the possibility of three allomorphs, 
\[ -t' \sim -t'i \sim -\text{\v{c}}.\])

The newly assimilated verbs belong to the productive class, thus, "given the full-stem, it is as a rule possible to foretell the exact form of the whole conjugational paradigm in regard to the stem, the desinence, and also the place of stress". By the appellation 'productive', we include the group of verbs that are polysyllabic with accented full stems. The terminology used here is derived from Roman Jakobson:

"When in the accentual alternation, the basic form of the stem is never stressed or when the stress oscillates between two different syllables of the stem in the finite forms, we label such full-stems as unaccented as opposed to the accented full-stems."
The last portion of this chapter is devoted to a brief discussion of the predictability of the whole conjugational paradigm of borrowed verbs.

**Conjugation**

Because loan verbs are taken into the verbal class mentioned above, an adequate assessment of 'uniformity' within this group can be provided. Thus, in the conjugation of these verbs the following procedure is involved:

--- truncation of the stem and concomitant change takes place

1. e.g. Russ. miting < Eng. meeting (< to meet) - nominal form mitingovat' - verbal form miting + ová

2. -t', the marker of the infinitive is dropped

miting + ová

2) is truncated

3) Now a concomitant change must take place because the morphophoneme {o} precedes the group -vá.

Thus,

mitingij + desinence

The place of stress is determined by the syllabicity of the verb, and since -ová- is never in initial syllable in loanword verbs, -új- is always going to carry the stress.
Present tense

We already know that loan verbs are of the -ová/-írova-type. Once the form stem+verbal suffix is produced, the choice of desinence becomes clear for the Russian speaker. The presence of linguistic corroboration now allows us to make the following statements: the accent is irremovable, therefore, in the infinitive and all finite forms of such verbs the stress falls on the very same syllable of the accented full-stem. The present tense desinence of loanword verbs begins with a high vowel -- with /-i/ -- for all finite forms except 3 Plural (i.e. third person plural), which takes /-u/. These occur in non-terminal positions. The first person singular takes /-u/ which occurs as a free suffix, that is, it is in a terminal position. Note that the morphophoneme of the finite form is {-e} which is replaced in speech by /-i/.

An example of the present tense conjugation of loan verbs is as follows:

Russ. finišírovat' < Eng. (to) finish
(The order of the conjugation is 1st person, 2nd person, ... singular, 1st person, etc... plural)

finišír- uj- u
finišír- uj- eš
finišír uj- et
finišír uj- em
Phonemically, the desinences are: /-u/, /-i$/,
/-it/ /-im/ /-ite/ /-ut/.

Preterit

As in all Slavic verbs, in loan verbs the non-terminal
suffix -l denotes the Preterit tense which is followed by a
suffix indicating the Gender or the Plural member:

1) masculine #
2) feminine -a
3) neuter -o
4) plural -i (before -i, 1>1')

In conclusion, a few examples of the transference
from verb to verb are given.

from English Russian borrowed the following:

Russ. importirovat' < Eng. (to) import
servirovat' < serve
terrorizirovat' < terrorize
from French:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russ.</th>
<th>Fr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abonirovat'</td>
<td>abonner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avizirovat'</td>
<td>aviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ažjustirovat'</td>
<td>ajuster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akkompanirovat'</td>
<td>accompagnner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aranžirovat'</td>
<td>arranger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOOTNOTES — CHAPTER VI


2 Examples were taken from *Slovar' Inostrannyx Slov*, 1955 edition.


5 Ibid. p. 157.

6 Roman Jakobson, in the above mentioned article, describes briefly but adequately the conjugational pattern in present-day Standard Russian.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summing up the major findings the question arises, can we determine whether a loanword shows a characteristic behaviour pattern of its own in Russian? What will be the degree of assimilation? Evaluations of the analytical problems dealt with in this thesis will be made along these lines.

The group of loanwords discussed show the following notable features:

1) There is a trend towards borrowings from all spheres of life, social, economic, political, and so on, which are in use not only in the literary language but also in the prostoréchie and in dialectal forms of Russian. Stylistic variants of the same loanwords sometimes appear in the different levels of the language (literary, colloquial, etc.).

2) Most of the loanwords are substantives; there are also adjectives and verbs.

3) The treatment of loans in spelling shows various degrees of adjustment both phonological and morphological.

4) In phonetic adjustment, the Russian speaker generally replaces the foreign phonemes and allophones by the phonemes or
their respective allophones of his speech. Insofar as the phonetic systems are similar, the change involved will be minor. "Well-worn" words tend to be almost completely or are completely assimilated. Sound changes are due to:

-- cases-vides in the system
-- spelling pronunciation
-- morphological adjustments

In stressed position the following substitutions can be expected (the following table is based on examples discussed in Chapter 3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>/i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/I/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>/e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɛ/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/ɛ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>/ɔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʊ/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/ʊ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʌ/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/ʌ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/œ/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/œ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
all nasalized vowels and diphthongs are broken down into vowel + consonant or vowel + semivowel and vowel + vowel sequences respectively.

In unstressed positions the value of vowels is realized differently in Russian (as well as in English, etc.)

If Russian lacks the consonant present in a foreign word being borrowed it will be replaced by the next closest consonant. The exact correspondences are:

Eng. /w/ → Russ. /v/
/θ/ → /t/ or /ð/
/ŋ/ → /n/ + /ŋ/ or /n'/

Fr. /ɲ/ → /n/ or /ŋ'/

The English /h/ > Russ. /g/ or /x/; the letter h which appears only in writing in French may appear in loanwords in Russian as /g/.

Sometimes the foreign consonant may be imitated as for example Eng. /j/ > Russ. /a/ + /z/.

5) As far as the discussion of loanwords on the morphological level is concerned, it seems that both secondary and primary words are assimilated into Russian. A formal characteristic of compounds as a whole is that they are unanalyzed in the receiving language. Secondary words have established two definite patterns:
i) They undergo no morphological adjustment, or
ii) They introduce new models in derivation; i.e. if
frequently encountered a suffix becomes analyzed by the host
language, and used in the formation of hybrid words, which
consist of a foreign stem + suffix, and also used in the
formation of Russian stem + suffix combination.

The gender of the loanword substantive is determined
by the phonemic shape of the ending, although sometimes it
appears that the gender of the word in the donor language
is also given some considerations by the borrower.
Oscillation of gender results in an inconsistent pattern of
gender transfer from the donor language into Russian. The
numerical relationship of genders indicated that masculine
loanwords are the greatest in number, then feminine, and
finally, the least in number are the neuters. The tendency
as indicated in the overall size of these groups, therefore,
is in the direction of the masculine, which is explainable
by homophony. These conclusions were derived on the basis
of a selected loanword list from English, French and German
from the 1955 edition of Slovar' Inostrannyx Slov.

On the whole, loanwords are declined in Russian with
only a few exceptions and even these tend to be declined in
the conversational style and in dialects. Loanwords which
do not fit into one of the grammatical paradigms of gender
are, of course, non-declinables.

Adjectives and verbs which function as adjectives and
verbs in Russian must be attested with the appropriate suffixes. In contemporary Russian both loan adjectives and verbs are absorbed by the so called "productive classes", in which on the bases of patterns set up in this thesis -- stress, conjugation, declension, suffixes and so on -- are predictable.

1) Formation of adjectives:
   foreign stem + derivational suffix + ij, aja, etc.

2) Formation of verbs:
   foreign stem + derivational suffix + t'

Study for the future

It is evident that a loanword may become an additional (new) element or it may conflict with the element already present in the recipient language. In both situations, the new word may survive in Russian, although a specialization or generalization at the lexical level of the language structure will take place, by which process the meaning narrows or even becomes distorted. A specific example of the narrowing of meaning is fen < Eng. fan, used only in the sense of 'an electric ventilator'. A specialization of meaning is best illustrated by refjìk < Fr. refuge, which in Russian means 'a traffic island where passengers are waiting to get on a bus, streetcar, etc.', as opposed to the meaning in French, which is 'refuge; shelter (for the poor); (bird)
In order to distinguish meaning between a native term and a loanword, or the meaning of the loanword in the donor and recipient languages, abstract types of internal as well as external situations must be attempted. Such an attempt leads to a definite overlapping at the socio-cultural levels of analysis. An analysis of these presents as an interesting problem for future study.
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