

Borrowings in the Lexical-Semantic System of the Russian Literary Language

Gulnaz Inurovna Mardanova*

Kazan Federal University, Russia

Guzel Nurutdinovna Karimullina

Kazan Federal University, Russia

Karlygash Kurmangalikyzy Sarekenova

L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan

Abstract

The article presents an analysis of borrowings from Turkic languages in the semantic and functional aspects. The research material is academic dictionaries of the Russian literary language published since the 18th till the 20th c. The choice of the sources is due to the fact that the lexical variety of the language was at a certain stage of its development, reflected in lexicographic sources, and most fully of all – in thesauri, as this type of dictionaries is aimed at comprising, as completely as possible, the commonly used vocabulary of the literary language. Comparing of the lexicographic sources of various periods, the comparative analysis of the Turkic language units reflected in them allows tracing the life of the borrowed word in the language and the stages of its joining the system of the recipient language, and enables to reveal the features of functioning of the Turkic stratum within the Russian lexis.

The borrowings are also analyzed from the standpoint of their lexicographic registration. The Turkic language units are viewed in accordance with the parameters, characteristics and zones which are reflected in thesauri. It was found that during their functioning within the Russian language, the Turkic language units enter onto new systemic relations. By the end of the 20th century, the stratum of the borrowings under study is complemented with new meanings. Some Turkic language units, which had not been previously registered in the thesauri of the Russian literary language, gradually join the stratum of commonly used vocabulary and become lexicographically registered. Some Turkisms narrow their meanings. However, most Turkish elements remain semantically unchanged during the studied period.

Keywords: Borrowing; dictionary; Turkism; Lexicography; The Russian language.



CC BY: [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

One of the topical issues of contemporary linguistics is the comprehensive study of vocabulary of foreign origin. Among the Russian borrowings, Turkisms occupy a marked position. The issue of studying the Turkic-Russian language contacts, in particular, the research of Turkic elements in the Russian vocabulary, is of great interest for the linguists. The semantic features of Turkic borrowings in the system of the Russian language have also more than once become the object of research (Бакиров, 1992; Сеитова, 1999). However, despite the vast Russian literature devoted to the study of Turkic borrowings in the Russian language, there is still a shortage of summarizing researches, as well as the researches of the modern period (Oreshkina, 2013; Орешкина, 1994).

A comprehensive analysis of the Turkic language units registered in lexicographic sources is being performed at Kazan University within the frameworks of compiling a computerized collection “Turkic (Oriental) lexical elements in the Russian language” (Islamova *et al.*, 2014; Mardanova, 2017). One of its key tasks is description and analysis of semantic-functional changes of the Turkic stratum of the Russian vocabulary during the period under study.

2. Methods

The explanatory dictionaries of the Russian language of the academic type compiled in the 18th-21st centuries were used as the sources: 1) “Словарь Академии Российской” (1789-1794) (“The Dictionary of the Russian Academy”), 2) “Словарь Академии Российской, по азбучному порядку расположенный” (1806-1822) (“The Alphabetical Dictionary of the Russian Academy”), 3) “Словарь церковно-славянского и русского языка” (1847) (“The Dictionary of the Church Slavonic and Russian Language”, hereinafter DCR), 4) “Толковый словарь русского языка” под ред. Д.Н.Ушакова (1935-1940) («D.Ushakov’s Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language”, hereinafter UD), 5) “Словарь современного русского литературного языка” (1948-1965) (“The Dictionary of the Modern Russian Literary Language”, hereinafter LAD), 6) “Словарь русского языка” под ред. А.П.Евгеньевой (1981-1984) (“A.P.Evgenieva’s Dictionary of the Russian Language”, hereinafter SAD), 7) “Толковый словарь русского языка” С.И.Ожегова и Н.Ю.Шведовой (1997) (“Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language” by S.I. Ozhegov and N. Y. Shvedova, hereinafter OD), 8) “Большой толковый словарь русского языка” под ред. С.А.Кузнецова (1998) (“Large Dictionary of the Russian Language” edited by S.A.Kuznetsov, hereinafter LED), 9) “Новый словарь русского языка. Толково-словообразовательный”

Т.Ф.Ефремовой (2000), (“New Dictionary of the Russian Language. Explanatory and Word-Formative” by T. Efremova, hereinafter ED).

The research uses descriptive method (when analyzing the semantic-functional materials of the thesauri), as well as linguo-statistical (for quantitative characteristics of the Turkisms) and comparative methods.

3. Results and Discussion

The analysis showed over 850 Turkisms in the academic thesauri.

As is known, most borrowings undergo certain stages of adaptation when entering a new language and functioning within the recipient language. One of the important criteria of the borrowed word adaptation is broadening of its semantic scope. As, according to R.A. Yunaleeva, “the majority of Turkisms enter the Russian language sphere as monosemantic words <...>” (Юналеева, 2000) (about 500 units in the analyzed dictionaries), polysemy of the Turkic borrowings is mainly the result of their semantic development within the Russian language system. Often, the links between meanings of a polysemantic Turkism are lost within the Russian language, and the meanings are perceived as homonymic ones. For example, the analyzed sources registered about 40 Turkic words as homonyms. Some Turkic borrowings, according to the thesauri, exist in the language only within set expressions, see in UD: BASH [*Turkic* baş – head]. Only in an expression: bash na bash (traders’ argot) – 1) exactly the same amount. 2) an item for an item, without bargain. See also *belmes* – ni belmesa, *karachki* – na karachki, na karachkakh, *saltyk* – na svoy saltyk.

During the research, we found Turkic words and expressions (about 40 units), which are not registered in later lexicographic sources as they were not used in the Russian language. In the earlier dictionaries, some of them were considered to be obsolete. These units were marked as *ancient*, *obsolete*, *historic*; in some cases they had a respective comment in interpretation, see in LAD: DELIBA’SH, -a, m. In old Turkey – lance; guard of a Turkish pasha <...>; EMSHA’N, -a, m. *Obsolete*. Fragrant steppe grass <...> etc. Some units are characterized as used on a certain territory. Such words and meanings are marked as *oblast*.

There are quite a lot of Turkic borrowings which were registered, without any marks, in the dictionaries of the 18th-19th cc only: *artysh*, *akhun*, *bamberek*, *batman*, *kaptorga*, *karagush*, *karmak*, *mizgit*, *nakrachey* etc. The reasons for their absence in later dictionaries are not always clear. In our opinion, the complete disappearance of all these words from the Russian language is doubtful. A part of these words (or meanings) is absent only in the latest dictionary published in the 20th c. – ED. The author of this dictionary T.F. Efremova declared the maximally complete representation of the Russian vocabulary to be her goal; besides, she notes that one of the sources of her dictionary was LAD. Taking these facts into account, one may assume that the Turkic borrowings *aba*, *badryanka*, *bash*, *bashibuzuk*, *duvan*, *karachki*, *nasleg*, *postoly*, *talan* etc. were not included into the CE vocabulary due to their non-use.

Thus, the analysis of Turkic language units registered in thesauri showed the lexemes which were not included into the vocabulary of earlier dictionaries, but were included into the later ones. The largest part of them (285 units) is the words which were first registered in UD or LAD: *aga*, *ayda*, *bashlyk*, *gurda*, *imam*, *karavan-saray*, *kurultay*, *nargiule*, *odaliska*, *peri*, *tyubetyka*, *yalomok* etc.

As is known, the assimilated borrowings can be a source of new meanings in a recipient language (Ageeva et al., 2015). Our analysis of Turkic borrowings revealed about 200 new lexical-semantic variants. Over 20 units were first registered in DCR: *kapkan* ‘intrigues to catch the enemy’, *obezыana* ‘a person recklessly mimicking others’, *tma* ‘indefinite multitude’ etc. In UD, it becomes possible to register about 100 earlier not found meanings of Turkisms: *kalancha* ‘a tall person’, *sobaka* ‘predator, rapist’ etc. Since LAD, academic linguo-graphic sources reflect over 60 new meanings. In the second half of the 20th c, the new lexical meanings of Turkisms, registered in SAD, OD, LED and ED, do not exceed 40 units. About 20 lexical-semantic variants were first registered in SAD: *kirpich* ‘traffic sign’, *sabantuy* ‘a jolly party, a festival’ etc. At the end of the 20th c, LED first registers over 10 lexical meanings of words: *cheboty* ‘rude, inelegant footwear’, *chushka* ‘a dirty person’ etc. Only in ED, about 10 meanings of Turkic borrowings were registered: *kirpich* ‘an important element of something’, *lapsha* ‘something done carelessly’ etc. Also, it should be noted that ED registers ‘wood of such tree’ as one of the meanings of names of trees of Turkic origin (*alycha*, *karagach*, *kizil*, *saksaul*, *chinara* etc.). In some cases, only ED registers the meaning ‘an amount of something fit into a vessel’ for lexemes naming vessels. There are grounds to suppose that such semantic components of the above words existed in the Russian language long before they were registered in ED, but they were not consequentially explicated in later sources.

For some Turkic borrowings (21 units), the analysis showed meanings registered only in one of the thesauri under study. Only DCR registers 8 lexical-semantic variants: *sarana* ‘a root of this plant’, *chemodan* ‘a case for a weapon’ etc.; in UD there are 5 units: *kovcheg* ‘premises accommodating many people’, *tulumbas* ‘a chairperson of a party’ etc.; in LAD – 4 units: *loshad* ‘a clumsy, cloddish person’ etc.; in SAD – *shaytan* ‘a swearword’; in LED – 3 units: *sazan* ‘flesh of this fish’, *sunduk* ‘a clumsy, cloddish person’, *upyr* ‘a person causing displeasure, irritation’.

The analyzed linguo-graphic sources are characterized by specific features of presenting semantics. In the publications under study, the same meaning can sometimes be registered as a separate semantic component or within one lexical-semantic variant; compare in ED and LAD: KAYMA’K m. 1. Cream taken off boiled milk. 2. Cheese made of such cream; KAYMA’K <...> Cream taken off boiled milk; cheese made of such cream <...> etc.

ED presents substantivized adjectives as independent title units, namely, the adjectives denoting the colors of horses: *bulaniy* [*sorrel*], *chaliy* [*roan*], *chubariy* [*dappled*]. In LAD, OD and LED the adjectives are given within the entry of a noun, as one meaning, in SAD such words are registered as polysemantic, in UD the substantivized adjectives are not distinguished; compare in OD, SAD and LED: CHA’LIY, -aya, -oye. The color of an animal: with

white specks in the hair of basic color (usually gray), also (about a horse) light with black mane and tail or black with light mane and tail; CHA'LIY, -aya, -oye. 1. Gray with admixture of another color (usually about the color of a horse). <...> 2. *In the meaning of a noun* cha'liy, -ogo, m. A horse of this color <...>; CHA'LIY, -aya, -oye. [*Turkic chal*]. Gray with admixture of another color (about the color of a horse; a horse of such color) <...>.

4. Summary

The meanings of the Turkic borrowings which appear by the end of the 20th century are figurative, related to the basic meaning as metaphors or metonymies (Akhmerova and Gilazetdinova, 2015; Sadykova and Kayumova, 2014).

The most part of new lexical-semantic variants appeared as a result of metaphoric transference. The most productive models are: name of an animal → name of a person and name of an object → something similar to it: ISHA'K, -a, m. 1. Donkey and (*obl.*) hinny or mule. 2. *figur.* A person compliantly doing the hardest work (*coll.*) <...>; ALMA'Z <...> 1. Mineral <...> // <...> precious stone; diamond. // Something brilliant, shining like this stone, or exclusively valuable, outstanding <...> etc.

As a result of metonymic transference, 9 new semantic components of Turkisms appeared, most of them according to the models: name of a material → an item made of it, name of an animal (fish) → product made of it: ZHE'MCHUG <...> Precious mother-of-pearl substance in the form of grains <...> // An item, decoration made of this substance <...>; SEVRYU'GA f. 1. Valuable commercial fish <...>. 2. Flesh of such fish <...>. 3. A dish made of the flesh of such fish, etc.

The comparative analysis of the Turkisms from linguo-graphic sources revealed the lexemes having differences in interpretations. In the dictionaries of the 18th – 19th centuries, a lexeme *surma* has the meaning 'a musical tube, a pipe, a whistle'. In the dictionaries of the 20th century, two words are represented – *surma* and *zurna*. They are registered as variants in UD only, while in other dictionaries these lexemes have different meanings: *surma* 'an ancient Russian musical instrument', and *zurna* 'Oriental woodwind'. See also a Turkic word *pulo*, registered in all dictionaries (except OD). In LAD and LED this lexeme and its variants – *pul*, *pula* are described as variants of one word with the meaning 'a small coin of Oriental origin <...>', in ED the word *pul* has the meaning 'a subsidiary coin of Afghanistan <...>', and *pula*, *pulo* – 'a small coin of Oriental origin <...>'.

Some meanings of Turkic borrowings, registered in one dictionary, are given in another linguo-graphic source as an encyclopedic commentary, see in LED and ED: KO'ZYR <...> • In the pre-Petrine Russia *kozyr* was a high standup collar, covering the whole hindhead, made of satin, velvet etc. <...>; KOZY'R *obs.* 1. A high standup collar, covering the whole hindhead etc.

5. Conclusions

During their functioning in the Russian language, the Turkic borrowings join new systemic relations. By the end of the 20th century, the Turkic stratum is complemented with new meanings, which appear mostly by way of metaphoric transference. Some Turkic words, not registered earlier in the thesauri of the Russian literary language, gradually enter the stratum of commonly used vocabulary and become linguo-graphically registered. A number of Turkisms narrow their volume of meaning. Here it should be noted that eviction of lexical-semantic variants from the language takes place much slower compared to the process of a new meaning formation. The main part of Turkic elements remained unchanged in semantic aspect during the period under study.

In general, the multi-aspect study of Turkisms registered in academic thesauri presents, on the one hand, information about functioning of this stratum of vocabulary in the Russian language; on the other hand, – material for correcting various inaccuracies and defects related to registering the borrowed language units in linguo-graphic sources.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Ageeva, A. V., Abdullina, L. R. and Latypov, N. R. (2015). Semasiological relations between the lexical parallels in the French and Russian languages (a case study of the French borrowed vocabulary). *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 8(4): 53-60.
- Akhmerova, L. and Gilazetdinova, G. (2015). The specific features of psychological condition nomination as the discourse index in the contemporary Russian language. *XLinguae Journal*, 8(4): 15-23.
- Islamova, E. A., Safonova, S. S. and Bolgarova, R. M. (2014). Written records of the Kazan region of the XVI century: Historical, lexicological and lexicographical aspects. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(4): 321-24.
- Mardanova, G. (2017). Complex corpus of Turkisms of the Russian language, G.Mardanova, G.Karimullina, R. Karimullina., T.Karpenko. *Astra Salvensis*, (10): 145-50.
- Oreshkina, M. V., 2013. "The dictionary of borrowings into Russian from the languages of the peoples of Russia and the near abroad countries: Principles and concepts." In *IV International conference «Language, Culture and Society in Russian / English studies» (22 - 23 July, 2013) / University of London; School of Advanced Study; Institute of English Studies; Russian Academy of Sciences; Russian Academy of Linguistics; Moscow Institute of Foreign Languages. – London: Senate House, University of London. pp. 170–73.*

- Sadykova, A. G. and Kayumova, D. (2014). The semantic and cognitive characteristics of metaphorically redefined vocabulary (on the material of 'building' vocabulary). *Life Science Journal*, 11(11): 528-31.
- Бакиров, П. У. (1992). Семантические изменения названий лиц тюркского происхождения при заимствовании в русский язык / П.У.Бакиров // Актуальные проблемы лексикологии и лексикографии русского языка: тез. докл. Республ. науч.-метод. конф: Термез. 14-15.
- Орешкина, М. В. (1994). Тюркские слова в современном русском языке: (Проблемы освоения) / М.В.Орешкина.- М.: Academia., 8-9.
- Сеитова, Д. У. (1999). Лексико-сематическое освоение тюркизмов / Д.У.Сеитова // Русистика в Казахстане: проблемы, традиции, перспективы: докл. междунар. науч.-практ. конф.- Алматы. 146-48.
- Юналеева, Р. А. (2000). Тюркизмы в русском языке: (Проблемы полиаспектного исследования) / Р.А.Юналеева.- Казань: Таглитат. 8.