

Galicisms in the Russian Language: Theory and Practice of Language Contact Study

Anastasia Vladimirovna Ageeva, Natalia Viktorovna Gabdreeva and
Karina Muratovna Amirkhanova
Kazan Federal University, Kremliovskaya Str 18, 420008 Kazan, Russian Federation

Abstract: The present study deals with studies and analyzes the lexical innovations of French origin in the Russian language on materials of fiction, opinion journalism as well as etymological, defining and foreign dictionaries under well-defined criteria of foreign word extraction. Various investigations dedicated to the study of language contacts offer variety of criteria describing the functioning of foreign vocabulary in the Russian lexical system as the result of interaction of various manifestation of language contacts. On the basis of analysis of different approaches to the assimilation typologies and considering also numerous general and specific characteristics of lexical neologisms assimilation in modern Russian (graphic-phonetic, morphological and semantic), the authors offer a clear and complete image of current trends the reception and adaptation of foreign language vocabulary of French origin in the Russian language of the recent period, describing its basic laws and models as well as the types of possible deviations at all language levels.

Key words: Gallicism, prototype, correlate, etymon, variation, adaptation, lexical meaning

INTRODUCTION

One of the central problems in historical and modern lexicology is the problem of language contacts and linguistic borrowing. It is common knowledge that borrowing is one of the most important sources of vocabulary replenishment in any language. "There is no and can be no pure, unmixed language unity," wrote Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, the Kazan school of linguistics founder. By 'mixing', he meant narrowly the process of language migration.

The problem of original/borrowed balance in the Russian language is the continuation of a more general and long standing dispute between the Westernizers and the Slavophiles about Russia's peculiar development. Thus, in 1921, the term 'Eurasianism' was used for the first time to reflect that peculiarity. They also discussed determining of culture-historical type, scope and amount of borrowing of Western stereotypes. Such prominent historians, philologists, translators and public figures as Mikhail Lomonosov, Alexander Pushkin, Vladimir Dal, Pyotr Chaadayev, Vissarion Belinsky, Nikolai Trubetzkoy, Lev Gumilev were involved in that dispute. In linguistics, that confrontation resulted in acceptance and denial of borrowing as a means of the lexical system development. And today, this dispute is still acute but the main points are form and own/foreign quantitative ratio.

Today's theory and practice of language contact study involve analysis of loanwords with different etymologies (Germanisms, Grecisms, Polonisms, Gallicisms, Turcisms, etc.) in different historical periods, detailed description of the mechanisms and stages of migration process and accompanying phenomena, identification of the key criteria for an adapted word (semantic independence, word-formation productivity, semantic derivation, phonetic and morphological assimilation, etc).

There are two major areas of focus to be mentioned among the works on French loanwords. Firstly, Gallicisms and loanwords of other origin have been studied together in the Soviet and Russian linguistics. These works are of historical nature and focus on general patterns of loanword development in connection with the main tendencies in the language evolution. They study such problems as specifying sources of foreign words and their assimilation criteria, significance of loanwords in the history of the Russian language. All published materials related to the study of bilingualism, linguistic borrowing process and characteristics of loanwords in Russian investigate words with different etymologies together and analyze only certain aspects of the vocabulary assimilation (Huttle-Worth, 1963; Ageyeva *et al.*, 2015a, b). But according to other linguists, studying

words borrowed from one particular language gives a better explanation to the methods of their assimilation into a recipient language as well as the specificity of their assimilation. "Language system consists of individual systems: phonological, morphological and lexical and their elements are bound together by oppositions; in order to see how loanwords enter a recipient language system, one should examine the adaptation of the same group of loanwords to a borrowing language system in general".

Thus, the researches of Ageeva, Gabdreeva, Gak, G.M. Gottlieb, Granovskaya, Kaliniewicz, Cubberley should be pointed out in the first place among the works related directly to the cultural relations of the French and Russian people and also French elements in the Russian language (Ageeva *et al.*, 2015a, b; Ageeva, 2008a, b; Cubberley, 1993). Most of them deal with the different aspects of functioning of lexemes in the Russian language: patterns of grammatical and phonetic assimilation, derivation aspect, semantic assimilation results.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methods used in the present study include linguistic description methods (examination, description, classification, comparison), as well as lexical-semantic and comparative methods and the method of synchronic description of language which are considered to be traditional for lexical-historical research. Statistical method of quantitative and percentage description was used when studying some aspects of the problem.

We rely on the concept of Leningrad scientists and the concept that we are developing with the French material (Ageeva *et al.*, 2015a, b). It provides a comprehensive approach in the study of borrowed foreign vocabulary that combines phonetic, morphological and lexical-semantic aspects and enables to trace common language tendencies, trends and consistent patterns of linguistic change through the history of certain words.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Since, the subject at hand is vocabulary of French origin, it should be defined what is meant by this notion. We believe that the group of Gallicisms consists of words borrowed directly from the French language and words borrowed from other languages via French. Consequently we reckon among Gallicisms.

Lexemes that have characteristic signs of the donor language; their "foreign origin is not disguised". For

example, the words *áþðí*, *íáíþ*, *íðððáð*, *íààíóáçæü*, *áóáóàð*, etc.; Lexemes that were influenced by French pronunciation rules and which meanings are close to the prototype: *èàíçíè*, *áðèèèèàíò*, *ííðð*, *íèèèáð*, etc.;

Lexemes that came into the Russian language from other languages through French and changed their meaning in it. The meaning was formed in the French language and then incorporated into Russian: *óóíááíáíò*, *ááíáðáè*, *íàààçèí*, *èíúáàèý*, etc.

The evident features of French words, as well as directly unexpressed markers were defined and systematized:

- Letter combinations *óà*, *óè*, *ãè*, *ëü* (*èððáííáí*, *éóéóàðú*, *óèýè*, *æèáíòð*, *æèííáð*, *æüóáðíàò*)
- Initial letter *ý* *ýíáííèíá*
- Final combinations *-àèü*, *-áèü*, *-áð*, *-í*, *-áíí*, *-áíò*, *-àæ* (*áááèü*, *ááðáíò*, *áíòèíáðíèíèðáíò*, *ððíèèèáð*, *èáííáð*, *íáèíóíí*, *èííèíðááíí*, *æíóáæ*, *óáðáæ*, *òàòóáæ*)
- Prefixes *íþð-*, *ááç-*(*íþððááèèçí*, *ááçèíóíðíàòèèý*, *ááçèíóááðáòèèý*)
- Particles *íðáíüáð-*, *áàèà-*, *íðáííí-*, *ííðò-*, *ááái-* (*íðáíüáð-íèíèíòð*, *íðáíüáð-èèáá*, *áàèà-èííóáððò*, *íðáííí-àòóáæá*, *íðáííí-èííóáðáíòèèý*, *ííðòíííá*, *ííðòíèèáá*, *áááííííò*, *áááíááðá*)
- Final vowels *þ*, *è*, *í*, *á* (*íáíþ*, *ðáçþíá*, *ááóèèá*, *áþííóüá*, *íþ*, *òðáááííòè*, *áíèíá*, *íàðáí*, *èíáèíí*, *ááíáí*), etc

However, many prototypes have no pronounced formal features. These features should also be treated very carefully; they should not be seen in absolute terms because they may coincide with letter combinations in original words. The key selection criterion was the principle of identification of vocabulary with different etymologies: phonetic-semantic correlation, i.e., similarity of content plane and expression plane of a prototype and a correlative word in the period of borrowing. This principle became the defining one, because as we noted earlier, many words have no morphological, semantic and other pronounced markers. We see fit to quote Hugo Schuchardt whose statements were cited by P. Ya. Chemykh *et al.* (2006) in the Etymology dictionary: "...we cannot expect mathematically accurate results either in phonetics or in semantics; probability is stamped on all our etymological operations".

Foreign words are not mechanically transferred into the recipient language, but undergo assimilation or Russification, i.e. every word is adapted to the recipient system at all levels of language. Assimilation process is a close interaction of three factors: influence of a donor language (especially at the beginning), assimilation laws of a recipient system and functioning of words in speech. The aspects of reception are subject to many reasons:

- Convergent and divergent features of language systems that come in contact
- Level of system readiness to the influence of a foreign language
- Present language policy
- Presence and level of bilingualism
- Relations in the synonymic row (hyper-hyponymic relations) and thematic group

Thus, borrowing is a complex language process that results in creation of a new word characterized by phonetic, semantic changes and grammatical appearance under the recipient system laws.

At the phonetic level, assimilation of a foreign word (prototype) may be expressed in substitution of sounds that are missing in the phonetic system with close or similar ones. In the 18th century, a variant range in case of assimilation was quite large; a word could have 10-12 variants in the Petrine era and in the middle of the century. The 19th century is characterized by narrowing of variant ranges and development of unified patterns of French phonemes substitution.

Variant range is not large in the modern Russian language, as the assimilation patterns developed in Russian for borrowing in earlier periods provide a fixed phonetic and morphological form of lexemes and a very limited number of variants. Phonemic variants in the modern Russian language can be reduced to three types: variations of *á/ý* when reproducing final French *é/et*: *àtèiá* (*àtèiy*), *ãtãã* – *ãtãý*, *èãéã* – *èãéý*, *èãtã* – *èãtý*, *tãòã* – *tãòý*, *òðèãtèèòã* – *òðèãtèèòý*.

variations of *ã/æ* due to characteristics of phonetic and graphic system of the French language and existence of lexemes with the same root in Russian, previously borrowed from French (sound [æ] in the stem) or from Latin (sound [ã] in the stem), e.g.: *tãðãtã*, *tãðãtèiãtèèè*, *tãðãtèiãtè*, but *tãðtã*, *tãðtãtèiãtèèçt*, *tãðtãtèèçt*.

pronunciation/omission of a final silent consonant: *ãðtãtã*-*ãðtãtãtãð*, *òðãtãtãð*-*òðãtãtãðò* and so on which reflects the “struggle” of the graphic form of a prototype with its pronunciation.

Morphological assimilation is expressed in a variety of processes related to modification of divisibility of lexemes and change of grammatical features. Formal grammatical features of a prototype play a pivotal role in the morphological assimilation of foreign vocabulary. Morphological Russification is accompanied by the following processes:

- Changing of a correlate’s part of speech as compared with a prototype (royal, adj.-*ðtýtèü*, n.; laqué, adj.-*èãèã*, n.; osé, part.-*tãçã*, n.; glacé, part.-*tãtýñã*, n.; invariant, adj.-*tèiãtèèiãt*, n.; intime, adj.-*tèiòtè*, n.; clair, adj.-*tèãð*, n)

- Forming of compounds or fusions (borrowed directly from the donor language: *sac-voyage*, *m-ñãtèãtýtæ*, *jour fixe*, *m-tãóðòtèèñ*, *force majeure*-*tãtãñ-tãtãtð*, *premier-ministre*-*tãtãtãtð-tèièñòð*, *carte blanche*-*tãtðò-tãtãtã*, or formed according to an analytic word-building pattern in the recipient language: *tãtãtãtð-tèèãã-tãtãtãtð* (premier) and *tèèãã*, *tãtãñ-tãtãtð-tãtãñ* (presse) and *tãtãtð*, as well as *tãtã-tèiíòãtð-tãtã* (gala) and *tèiíòãtð*, *tãtã-tãtãñòãtèiãtèã*, *tãtãtãtè-tãtãt* (avant) and *tãtè*, *tèiòtè-tãtètãtè-tèiòtè* (intime) and *tãtètãtè*, etc)

- De-etymologization and rebracketing, when a part of a stem becomes a flexion, for example *jalousie* *tãtèpçtè* (coll.), and conversely, an ending or an article (determiner) is qualified as part of a stem: *la crosse*-*týtèðtãñ*

The existence of morphological variants can be explained by typological features of French and Russian and different grammatical means for expressing the category of gender. This difference in formal markers generated the largest class of variants represented by gender synonymy: *tãtèãtãtè-tãtèãtãtèã*, *tãtètãtètèy* *tãtètèièðtãtãtèã*, *tãtãtã-tãtãtãtã*, *tãtãtã-tãtãtãtã*.

As a result of morphological assimilation French nouns may retain their category of gender, change it or form a class of neuter nouns that is absent in French. The process of adding to the declension paradigm was influenced by the following factors: gender in a donor language; nature of a stem; gender of a synonymous Russian word.

Semantic assimilation is the assimilation of all components of lexical meaning (denotative, significative, connotative, ethnocultural). Various changes that may occur in semantic structure of foreign prototypes in the Russian language are characterized, in general, by two opposite trends: reduction and extension of semantic range.

Reduction or narrowing of a semantic range. By narrowing we mean both reduction of a word’s semantic structure, i.e. autochthonous independent meanings and narrowing of a conceptual field, for example, the noun *ñtãtãtãtã* (*tãtãtãtãtãtã*) has a rather diverse structure of meanings in French and the main is ‘forme échançrée de la Lune lorsque sa surface éclairée visible est inférieure à la moitié d’un disque.’ The other semes ‘forme du croissant de la Lune, et, spécialement, emblème des musulmans, des Turcs; petite pâtisserie en pâte levée et feuilletée en forme de croissant; 4. techn. Instrument à fer recourbé qui sert à élaguer les arbres.’ are secondary to the first one (Le Petit *et al.*, 1994). The lexeme *tãtãtãtãtã* entered the Russian language with the meaning ‘puff pastry roll in the shape of a horseshoe or crescent, usually with filling’ (Shagalova *at al.*, 2009). So, its semantic structure was significantly simplified.

This group also includes such words as *iaðiiü* (parole-word, speech)-a codeword, character set; *oaiiii* (chanson-song)-one of the genres in popular music, etc.

Extension of a prototype's semantic range. By extension of a semantic range we mean both increase in the number of a word's meanings and the expansion of the application sphere of a word. Semantic development can be divided into two types according to its etymology:

second borrowing, for example, the word *défilé* (ääôëää) Passage étroit encaissé entre deux parois rocheuses abruptes.. Ensemble de personnes qui défilent, particulièrement en parade. Passage en file ou en rang dans un but de démonstration: défilé de mode.' The word 'ääôëää' entered the Russian language as a military term meaning 'narrow pass between obstacles (mountains, swamps, lakes, etc.), usually used by defending forces to retard the enemy'(Le Petit *et al.*, 1994). In the last decades of the past century the lexeme borrowed the second meaning 'fashion show' from French;

developing of semantic innovations in the Russian language, for example, *légionnaire* (ääëüiäð) 'Soldat ou membre d'une légion, antiq. rom. Soldat d'une légion, Soldat de la Légion étrangère, membre de 'ordre de la Légion d'honneur' (Le Petit *et al.*, 1994). The lexeme 'ääëüiäð' entered the Russian language with the meaning 'soldier of a legion'. In the 1990s the additional seme: 'athlete hired for pay to play for a sports club or national team of a certain country' was formed through the semantic development (Shagalova. *et al.*, 2009).

The third model is illustrated by the process of keeping French lexemes with a prototype's semantic structure, for example such Russian and French correlates as: *iëëëii*-million, *êiëääëöy*-collection, *êðöüä*-croupier, *ñððääëëç*-surréalisme and others. Even when content plane remains the same, however, expression plane may undergo phonetic, morphological, orthographic changes dependent on characteristics of recipient systems: sound substitution, change of grammatical features, gemination, iotacism, etc.

CONCLUSION

Through the analysis of phonetic, morphological and lexical-semantic structure of French prototypes and foreign words in the recipient language, the authors of

this study came to conclusion that foreign vocabulary of French origin is being comprehensively and actively assimilated by the Russian language and incorporated into the Russian language system. During this process foreign words lose their original characteristics and get new ones common for a recipient language. Words undergo assimilation at all levels of language structure: phonetics, morphology and semantics.

This study is an attempt to trace common patterns of assimilation and evolution of the French origin vocabulary in the Russian language through the history of particular words.

This study invites further research, of course: a detailed analysis of the French foreign vocabulary from sources such as print media, promotional materials, and Internet discourse is among the points of interest. Moreover, it is interesting to carry out a comparative study of the adaptation mechanisms and assimilation patterns specific to vocabulary with different etymologies. And finally, future research could examine a complete picture of functioning of Gallicisms in Russian making use of data compiled from classical and modern literature, translations, opinion journalism and promotional materials.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

REFERENCES

- Ageeva, A.V., L.R. Abdullina and N.R. Latypov, 2015a. Semasiological relations between the lexical parallels in the french and russian languages (A case study of the french borrowed vocabulary). *J. Sustainable Dev.*, 8: 53-60.
- Ageyeva, A.V., V.N. Vassilyeva, G.I. Galejeva, 2015b. Language situation in the Russian society at the start of the 19th century: Bilingualism or diglossia? *J. Language Literature*, 6: 322-326.
- Cubberley, P., 1993. The phonological dynamics of foreign borrowings in Russian. *Aust. Slavonic East Eur. J.*, 7: 49-74.
- Huttle-Worth, G., 1963. Foreign words in Russian: A historical sketch. Berkely, Los Angeles, pp: 1550-1850.