

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.22.04>.

**UDC:** 811.161.1'373.45–112

**Nataliia M. Kuvshynova**

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University,  
Kyiv, Ukraine



**Liudmyla A. Vozniuk**

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University,  
Kyiv, Ukraine



## ASSIMILATION OF BORROWINGS IN THE LANGUAGE-RECIPIENT

### **Bibliographic Description:**

Kuvshynova, N. M., Vozniuk, L. A. (2021). Assimilation of Borrowings in the Language-Recipient. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 22. 43–57. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.22.04>.

### **Abstract**

*In the Russian language of the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries, the significant part of foreign words were German lexical borrowings. According to the degree of development of the language loanwords recipient traditionally distinguish two main groups of words - assimilated and unassimilated. One of the main bits of*

foreign words, allocated according to the degree of assimilation, are actually borrowing assimilated words about the skill that scientists have no disagreements. The only problem in this sense is to hold the line between borrowing and internationalism. Internationalism represented, first of all, in the terminological lexicon. By the terms-internationalism: a) socio-political lexicon: congress, constitution, minister, meeting, party, politics, revolution, republic, resolution, senate, etc.; b) scientific terminology: biology, geography, geodesy, geology, zoology, history, linguistics, mathematics, physics, etc.; c) the technical name: unit, antenna, apparatus, harvester, monoplane, tank, tractor; d) art criticism lexicon: aria, ballet, drama, genre, novella, opera, poetry, tenor, etc.

When classifying loanwords must be considered the formal features (assimilation of words in the borrowing language) and functionality (use of words in the borrowing language). According to the degree of adaptation of lexical units in the system of the Russian language-recipient, both full and partial assimilation of the German-language vocabulary is possible. Partially assimilated vocabulary can be divided into the following groups: 1) German vocabulary assimilated at the graphic and grammatical levels; 2) German-language vocabulary assimilated at the grammatical level; 3) German-language vocabulary assimilated at the word-formation level; 4) German-language blotches with preceding and following Russian equivalents.

The research is based on actual data obtained by different linguists, and on the results of the author's own observations.

**Keywords:** lexical borrowing, assimilated words, unassimilated words, language-source, language-recipient, internationalisms, terminological vocabulary.

## 1. Introduction.

Foreign language vocabulary is the object of research in lexicology, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cultural linguistics, communicative linguistics, translation studies. In modern linguistics loanwords are considered one of the most important sources of replenishment of the lexical composition of any language. In this regard, in linguistics, various classifications of foreign language vocabulary are developed and used, in particular, according to the sources of borrowing (etymology of the loanword). Thus, some German linguists (R. Ginderling and others) came to the conclusion that the lexicon of the German language includes words from fourteen languages. According to R. Ginderling, the contacts of German are the most extensive (after Russian) of the European languages. In the Russian language, borrowings from a fairly significant number of foreign languages are recorded (Крысин, Фомин, Шанский, etc.).

Analyzing the phenomenon of borrowing as a problem of lexicography, G. A. Khaburgaev emphasized that the establishment of a foreign language etymology of a word does not automatically include it in the category of borrowings of a given language, therefore it is necessary to search for correct lexicographic designations for lexical borrowings that entered the Russian language at different periods of its history and that do not stand out in any way “from the general circle of words of the corresponding lexical-semantic groups” (Хабыраев, 1989). The methodology of etymological studies of borrowed vocabulary allows solving many issues, including the establishment of lexical borrowing and systematization of foreign language vocabulary.

According to the degree of mastering the borrowed vocabulary by the recipient language, two main groups of words are traditionally distinguished – assimilated and non-assimilated. R. F. Brandt in the “Act of speech” (1882), and after him E. F. Karsky in the work “About using of foreign words in the Russian language” (Карский, 1916, p. 46) highlighted two categories foreign words: 1) words already mastered by the language and 2) words, re-accepted.

I. I. Ogienko identified three kinds of words: 1) words borrowed from ancient times and fully mastered in the Russian language so that foreign origin is no longer felt; they are freely used and have derivatives (for example, the words *буква*, *бутылка*, *вишня*, *кадка*, *лошадь*, *молоко*, *плита*, *пушка*, *сапог*, *стекло* etc.), in German terminology they are called *Lehnwörter* (borrowings); 2) foreign words, but used in Russian language quite often, as a result of which they acquired “citizenship rights” and even penetrated into the spoken language (*доктор*, *аптека*, *солдат*, *школа*, *студент*, *гимназия* и т. д.); 3) foreign words that are not often used in

Russian language – these are called barbarisms; such words are easily replaced by the corresponding Russian and are used only among intellectuals, they are not known to the folk language (*констатировать, культивировать, индустрия, гастрический* и т. п.); these words, like the words of the previous kind, are called *Fremdwörter* (foreign words) (Огиенко, 1915, p. 10–11). In this connection, the statement of D. S. Lotte about I. I. Ogienko's classification is interesting, stressing that the author also takes into account the "degree of spread" of borrowings, including "morphological" and "phonetic form", when classifying them in this way. According to Lotte, "To a person who does not know foreign languages or even to a person who does, but does not give much thought to the origin of a word, it will seem "own" or "foreign" not because of the age or novelty of its borrowing" (Лотте, 1982, p. 10).

D. S. Lotte established the following criteria for classifying a word as "foreign" and "own" (assimilated)": 1) how extent the sound combinations of the word correspond to the conventional sound combinations of the borrowing language; 2) how extent the morphological form and individual formalities of the word correspond to those generally accepted in the receiving language, harmonizing with the whole structure of the language; 3) whether there are derivatives of the word in question or it has not yet formed its nests (Лотте, 1982, p. 10). He proposes the following classification of the types of borrowings: 1) original borrowings (among them original and transformed); 2) transformed originals; 3) those formed from borrowed or borrowed elements (representing tracing elements). The criterion of "degree of assimilation" is the main criterion in assessing borrowings (Лотте, 1982, p. 15).

## **2. Aim and Objectives.**

**The aim and objectives** of the study are to consider German lexical borrowings in Russian language, to reveal the essence of understanding borrowed vocabulary in linguistics and the basic principles of its classification, as well as to describe the patterns of assimilation of foreign language vocabulary in the recipient language.

## **3. Results.**

In modern linguistics, the problem of identifying borrowed words has received a different direction for its solution. So, S. V. Grinev believes that the question of determining the signs of borrowing, posed by linguists of the late XIX<sup>th</sup> and early XX<sup>th</sup> centuries (R. F. Brandt, E. F. Karsky, I. I. Ogienko and others), lost its acuity and was transformed into the question of "mastering" borrowings (that is, the process of their loss of these features) and the use of these features to highlight words of foreign origin for certain stylistic purposes (Гринёв, 1982, pp. 109–110). Such a statement, first of all, should be viewed from the position that native speakers are not aware of these features as such. However, in semantics, in our opinion, the "context specificity" is a fairly weighty sign of borrowing. The peculiarity of the vocabulary of foreign origin lies in the fact that it functions in the system of the Russian language, being itself a special subsystem different from the Russian language. In speech use, it has a strong "trace" component or component of attachment, which makes it less free in combinations and context (Пономаренко, 1976, p. 3).

One of the main categories of foreign words, distinguished by the degree of assimilation, are borrowings, that is, assimilated words, about the qualifications of which scientists have no disagreements.

The only problem in this sense is the line between borrowings and internationalisms. Thus, R. A. Budagov takes internationalisms beyond the limits of borrowings (Будагов, 1953); S. Y. Sorokin and M. M. Makovsky believe that they are a mixture of two planes: the

history of the borrowing language and the history of the migratory vocabulary (Сорокин, 1965, pp. 44, 135).

Internationalization is a phenomenon that is inherent in all languages of the world, and the number of internationalisms in languages is constantly increasing. A special feature of internationalisms was formulated by A. A. Beletsky: internationalisms are "lexical units that function no less than in three languages, moreover, from non-closely related language families" (Белецкий, 1976, pp. 3–5). T. G. Ponomarenko expands this definition, supplementing it with other characteristic features of internationalisms: these are words that "are used in many non-closely related languages and at the same time retain the commonality of semantics and phonetic-morphological construction, preferably in the field of concepts in the field of culture, science, politics, art; as a rule, they have no analogues in the language of distribution" (Пономаренко, 1976, p. 72).

The processes of internationalization in Slavic literary languages were studied by V. V. Akulenko, A. A. Beletsky, L. P. Krysin, O. K. Bezpoyasko, A. V. Charnetskaya, and others. Thus, O. K. Bezpoyasko characterizes productive derivational types, identifies derivational models of borrowed words, considers the issue of synonymy of international affixes. Researchers believe that "with regard to the system of the entire language, internationalisms are a single whole, in the middle of which there is a continuous process of development, which manifests itself in an increase in the number of word-formation morphemes, in a change in the nature of the unifying bases, in the expansion of the sphere of use, in the emergence of new models" (Безпояско, 1993, p. 11).

Internationalisms are presented, first of all, in terminological vocabulary. Internationalism terms include: a) socio-political vocabulary: *конгресс, конституция, министр, митинг, партия, политика, революция, республика, резолюция, сенат* etc.; b) scientific terminology: *биология, география, геодезия, геология, зоология, история, лингвистика, математика, физика* and etc.; c) technical names: *агрегат, антенна, аппарат, комбайн, моноплан, танк, трактор*; d) art criticism vocabulary: *ария, балет, драма, жанр, новелла, опера, поэзия, тенор* etc. F. O. Nikitina believes that we can talk about "the existence of an international terminological area", in which "there are general processes, and even certain word-formation tendencies (common elements from classical languages, similar word-formation models)" (НИКИТИНА, 1999, p. 115). The researcher believes such linguistic phenomena are due to the influence of the extralinguistic sphere.

Most internationalisms in the Russian language are of Greek or Latin origin. In the XVII<sup>th</sup> and XIX<sup>th</sup> centuries a number of international words entered the Russian language from Western European languages (French, German, English). A significant part of internationalisms are words, which appeared due to changes in social and political life, culture, education and everyday life. Among the internationalisms of German origin, the following can be noted: *абрис, вексель, гильза, ландшафт, лейтмотив, маклер, офицер, рейс, штат* and others (Йеликте, 1994, p. 73).

The classification of unassimilated (partially assimilated) words, on the contrary, is ambiguous, which is caused by the specifics of the direction of study of foreign language vocabulary. German linguist E. Haugen (Хайген, 1972) proposes to divide "imported lexemes" (based on the material of the English and Norwegian languages) into three types: 1) borrowed words proper; 2) borrowing-hybrids; 3) loan translation. According to E. Haugen's typology, words of foreign origin are divided into: 1) words without morphemic substitution (loan-words); 2) words with partial morphemic substitution, or hybrids, semi-borrowings (loan-blends); 3) words with full morphemic substitution (semantic loans) (Хайген, 1972, p. 352). The borrowings themselves fully reproduce the foreign language model, while the tracing copies only reproduce the meanings (Хайген, 1972, pp. 344–382). E. Haugen's classification of foreign

language vocabulary is based on the structural differentiation of borrowed words and proceeds not from what is transferred, but from what is not transferred, but replaced.

In Russian linguistics, the division of borrowings “according to the level of morphemic substitutions” is accepted by such researchers as M. F. Brofman (Брофман, 1961), K. L. Egorova (Егорова, 1971), A. S. Zorko (Зорко, 1972), E. E. Birzhakova (Биржакова), A. Voinova (Войнова), L. L. Kutina (Кутина, 1972). So, S. A. Zorko distinguishes borrowings with phonemic substitution and borrowings with morphological-phonetic adaptation (Зорько, 1972). In general, this approach leads to the classification of borrowings according to the degree of their assimilation in the recipient language.

According to another classification (V. N. Toporov, G. F. Odintsov, D. E. Rosenthal, M. A. Telenkova, etc.) barbarism and exoticism stand out among unassimilated words. The term “barbarism” is defined as a word or phrase of a foreign language, built on the model of another language, contrary to the norms of this language, violating the purity of speech (Розенаталь, 1976, p. 139); a foreign word or expression not fully mastered by the language and perceived as foreign (Zorko, 1972, p. 117). The main criterion for distinguishing barbarisms is their writing using the letters of the alphabet of the source language (Володина, 1997). However, there is an opinion that the transfer of barbarisms in the text in Russian letters does not change their character (Загородская, 1987). A more objective sign of these units is that barbarisms mean not only foreign realities, – they have correspondences in Russian and can be translated into Russian (Бажина, 1972).

“Exotisms” are borrowed words with obvious belonging to any nationality, country, which describe national characteristics. These include the names of institutions and organizations (*бундестаг, ландтаг*), monetary units (*дойчмарка, евро, талер, крона*), names of foods, drinks, positions, titles, etc. These are words that, although they are used in Russian, have something non-Russian in their meaning, reminiscent of their foreign language origin (for example, *сейм, меджлис, пиала, лаваши, хурал, сантим, кюре, аул, кишлак, фрау, джок, зурна, гонак*). Exoticisms are usually used by authors when it is not about Russian reality, but about the life of some other people. Exoticisms are replaceable and irreplaceable. Interchangeable words include such words that can be translated into Russian without much damage to the meaning: *мистер – господин, фрау – госпожа, консьерж – привратник* etc. The use of such exoticisms is caused only by the need to convey the local flavor. Exoticisms are “irreplaceable”, untranslatable, cannot be replaced by the Russian equivalent, for example, the word cannot *франк* translate as *рубль*, *лаваши* replace with a word *хлеб* or *лепёшка*. Untranslatable exoticisms include the words: *сари, лавониха, чонгури, тамтам, чалма, иена, доллар*.

The interest of scientists in the differentiation of the concepts of “barbarism” and “exoticism” takes place there and then, when barbarisms are considered as a stage in the development of a foreign language word. So, N. S. Arapova gives the concept of “graphic barbarism”, arguing that exoticisms tend to turn into well-known words, that is, they are mastered that not all foreign-language lexemes have passed the “stage of barbarism”. Exotism can be “recorded in the text as barbarism”, like any borrowing, and depending on the time of development, it can exist in the Russian language for a long time as barbarism (Арапова, 1989, p. 10).

G. A. Khaburgaev singles out “proper borrowings” and phenomena that seem to be borrowed – “quasi-borrowings” (Хабургаева, 1989, p. 7). According to this classification, G. A. Khaburgaev argues, if barbarisms (as units of text, not a language) are separated from borrowings proper, as well as exoticisms used in describing realities belonging to speakers of other languages (due to which, at best, they can be characterized only as “passive borrowing”), it turns out that the rest of the mass of words usually attributed by etymological dictionaries to borrowed vocabulary, as a rule, are vocabulary units, which in morphological

terms and in their word-formation activity, in terms of lexical compatibility and synonymic connections in the functioning language system, and even in the linguistic consciousness of the speakers of the modern Russian language, they do not stand out from the general circle of words of the corresponding lexical-semantic groups. Based on this typology of borrowed words, the current state of the language presupposes only the functioning of barbarisms as “text units” and exoticisms (ethnographisms in the terminology of G. A. Khaburgaev) as the only representatives of the borrowed vocabulary, since the rest of the vocabulary units do not stand out in any way and do not differ from the general circle of words.

L. M. Bash continues the ideas of G. A. Khaburgaev on dividing foreign language vocabulary into “proper borrowing” and “quasi-borrowing”, but considers them differently (Баш, 1989, pp. 27–28).

The subgroup of barbarism is the purest example of borrowing, in which the degree of adaptation is zero. More precisely, these are not even borrowings yet, but alien inclusions in oral and written speech, characterizing, as a rule, the language of the educated part of society (there is a fairly complete set of barbarisms in the Dictionary of Foreign Expressions and Words, compiled by A. M. Babkin and V. V. Shendtsov (Бабкин, 1970)). Examples of barbarism are the philosophical term *alter ego*, the commonly used *addieu*, *tête-à-tête*, etc.

The transliteration subgroup is the next stage of borrowing, the first degree of adaptation, mastering the word in comparison with barbarisms, however, the connection with the source language is still very strong here. Transliteration as a lexical phenomenon is understood as the translation of a word from one graphics system to another, the transfer of someone graphics by means of their graphics; strictly speaking, a letter-by-letter translation. Examples of transliteration include lexical forms such as *каприччио*, where the spelling is “и” after “ч” takes place only because the letter “и” was in the Italian prototype of this word, and in the Italian language “и” carries the load of a purely graphic index (it does not sound in any way in Italian) on the corresponding pronunciation of the previous with [ч], therefore, the borrowed, mastered word will appear in the form *каприччо*. See also *Джиованни – Джованни, гидальго – идальго, Ивангое – Айвенго* etc.

The subgroup of borrowing proper, or borrowing in the narrow sense of the word, is when the term “borrowing” does not mean a whole complex of lexical phenomena, but a well-defined set of vocabulary that can really be considered borrowed into Russian from other languages. In other words, this type of borrowing is understood as words that came into the Russian language from other languages (not native), transmitted by means of their (native) graphic system (not barbarism), which did not undergo on the basis of the recipient language no significant re-registrations, transformations.

The subgroup of internationalisms is an intermediate position between borrowing and quasi-borrowing. These are words presented in different, and not closely related, languages – many of these words go back to ancient languages. They have varieties: “cosmopolitan words” and “international words”. Cosmopolitan words are based on Greek or Latin, or both, since classical languages still retain the role and significance of international (at least all-European) storehouses, from which material is drawn for creating vocabulary of this kind. Examples of such internationalisms are words like *цивилизация, культура, философия* etc. *International* words are borrowed by most of the world’s languages. Among such internationalisms can be called, for example, Russian *спорт*, French *sport*, German *sport* < English *sport*; English *sputnik*, German *Sputnik* < Russian *спутник* etc. The group of quasi-borrowings, according to L. M. Bash, includes three subgroups: 1) *actually re-registration* – borrowed words that have undergone “processing” in the recipient language (“borrowings in the narrow sense of the word”); any morphemic rethinking of a borrowed word, which leads to its formal deformation in comparison with the source language: *институт* (lat.

institutum), лекция (lat. lectio), партия (french. partie), летальный (lat. letalis) etc.; 2) *Mixed words* are also re-formulations, but unlike the previous group, it is obviously impossible to say whether these words are actually re-formations of a borrowed word or whether they are formed on Russian soil from a borrowed word according to certain models operating in the language (it is difficult to determine whether an adjective *мажорный* is proper Russian education (using the suffix -н-) from a borrowed French noun *мажор*, *actively used in Russian, or is it a re-registration on Russian soil (adaptation) of the French adjective majeure*); *минорный, династический, арбитражный, бравировать, аргументировать, жестикулировать* etc.); 3) *hybrid words are actually Russian words, created on the basis of borrowed words, but already on Russian soil* (Bash, 1989). N. M. Shansky wrote: "Under the primordially Russian word is meant any word that has arisen in the Russian language (...), regardless of what etymological parts (primordially Russian or borrowed) it consists of" (Шанский, 1972, p. 71, 1993). Thus, *шоссейный* (formed on Russian soil with the suffix -н- from borrowed *шоссе*), *форсить* (from borrowed *форс*) etc.

While recognizing that the named type of vocabulary has all the rights to be considered Russian proper, one should nevertheless consider it as a kind of quasi-borrowing, since the foreign root underlying these, albeit Russian, words does not allow them to be fully identified with the primordially Russian derivatives formed on Russian soil, but from Russian roots. So, the word *шоссейный* nevertheless, it should be terminologically (as a lexical phenomenon) *distinguished*, for example, *from the word дорожный, форсить* – from *воображать* and the like. Thus, the subgroup of borrowed words (actually borrowings) can be attributed to foreign language vocabulary in traditional terminology, and quasi-borrowed vocabulary corresponds to assimilated vocabulary, the "foreign language" of which is revealed through etymological analysis (Bash, 1989, pp. 27–31).

In translation practice, the terms "xenolexeme" and "xenism" are often used. Xenolexeme is any non-native Russian word, the term is opposed to the word xenism in the meaning of "borrowed from another language, but not assimilated word or expression that exists in any language" (Захаренко, Комарова, Нечаева, 2006, p. 336). In the linguistic and cultural literature, the study of xenolexemes as a means of cultural influence and "import" of designated concepts or realities presupposes a terminological definition and classification of borrowed vocabulary in this aspect as well. Thus, S. Vlahov and S. Florin characterize the translation of realities as "conditional borrowing", since realia "can turn into a borrowed word, losing to some extent the status of reality" (Влахов, Флорин, 1986, p. 35). In the meaning of realities in the literature, the names "non-equivalent vocabulary", "exotic vocabulary", "barbarisms", "localisms", "ethnographisms", "ethnolexemes", "spaces", "(random) gaps", "words with a zero equivalent", "ethnocultural", "ethnocultural studies", "cultural-connotative", "regional studies" vocabulary. Defining the general scheme of transmission of realities in translation, S. Vlahov and S. Florin name the following principles: 1) transcription, transliteration; 2) translation. The first principle refers to the transmission of realities by "foreign language inclusions", the second – to the transmission of neologisms, "replacement of realities", "approximate" and "contextual" translation. At the same time, when transmitting or translating realities as "neologisms", the author (works) forms a "tracing paper", "half-calico", "mastering" and uses a "semantic neologism" (Влахов, Флорин, 1986, p. 170).

The issues of the entry (reproduction) of foreign language units as a factor in the development of the Russian language are to some extent covered by N. N. Bykhovets, A. N. Garkavets, I. T. Derkanbaeva, who note that the ways of transmission and reproduction of foreign language units differ in the case of translation. According to the general scheme,

there are two main ways: 1) untranslated reproduction; 2) translated reproduction. In the case of untranslated reproduction, “unadapted “written” or “oral quotation”, “graphic image”, “adapted oral quotation” or “sound image”, the translation product can be judged as a foreign language inclusions. The following are graphically quoted: a) the proper names of people; b) proper geographical names and microtoponyms; c) the names of institutions, firms, enterprises, newspapers; d) sports complexes, names of models of missiles, aircraft, ships, industrial technologies; e) socio-political programs, events, competitions, etc.; f) titles of works; g) abbreviations; h) appellative ethnocultural vocabulary and terms specific to the author’s definition, phraseological units, as well as the most typical modal words, phrases, emotional expressions, interjections (Быховец, Гаркавец, Дерканбаева, 1989, p. 180).

A. A. Bragina, according to the degree of adaptation of foreign language vocabulary and the active use of native speakers, distinguishes three groups of borrowings: 1) stable lexical borrowings, obeying the language system, carrying a nominative, conceptual-differentiating function; 2) borrowings that have already submitted to the language system, but stylistically still limited (mainly in written language); their function fluctuates between the function of the nominative and the function of the “label” – characteristics; 3) borrowings are temporary, fragile, not yet sufficiently assimilated by language (they are accompanied by an interpretation-description) (Брагина, 1973, p. 159). The first group is included in the active vocabulary, the second group is on the verge between active and passive vocabulary, and the third group refers to a passive vocabulary or a vocabulary of a certain era.

Scientists often use the term “foreign language inclusion” in relation to borrowing, but its definition is not clear. The terms “barbarism”, “exoticism” or “not transliterated”, or “untranslated” word / expression are used at the same time.

The issue of delimiting and ordering these terms has been repeatedly discussed in modern linguistics, in particular in the works of A. M. Babkin (1970, 1981–1987) and V. V. Shandetsov (1981–1987), Y. T. Listrova (1985), V. P. Berkova (1973).

The main characteristic features of foreign language inclusions are the correspondence of the verbal design (in non-Russian, rarely in Russian, graphics) to the world of material objects of the native speakers of the recipient language, that is in the receiving language there are synonymous words, duplicating the “foreign” expression, these are not only material objects, but, in the main, common human concepts and expressions, universal for all languages.

The term “foreign language inclusion” was introduced by L. A. Leontyev (Леонтьев, 1966, p. 56). This unit covered all cases of the manifestation of the borrowed word in the Russian language. According to the researcher, these are 16 combinations at the lexical, morphemic, phonemic levels and the level of sound types, in the modern classification – loan translation. L. A. Leontyev understands by a foreign language inclusions a direct insertion of a foreign word in the graphics of the source language, and a Russian word in a foreign graphics or in a foreign language sound design, and a piece of a foreign text. The filling of the term “foreign language inclusions” in its author’s understanding is not widespread. Foreign language inclusions in accordance with this classification are passive to the system, for example, of the Russian language and therefore are not neologisms. In the system of the borrowing language, in the future, the borrowed word can acquire the function of characteristic-evaluation (comparison). Then the borrowed neologism becomes a motivated sign: it reveals its inner form or receives a certain understanding, sometimes not coinciding with the source language (Леонтьев, 1966, p. 160).

V. P. Berkov sees the main difference between exoticism and foreign language inclusions in functionality: the former denote a phenomenon that is foreign to a given linguistic community, while the latter, on the contrary, are characteristic of it, although



materially and etymologically both lexical layers are phenomena of the same order. The difference between foreign language inclusions from foreign words is, first of all, that the latter are practically assimilated by the language. The border between foreign words with a nominative meaning and foreign words is not always clear, and transitional cases are possible, since such inclusions, assimilating, often pass into the category of foreign words (Берков, 1973, p. 34).

A. M. Babkin argues that foreign expressions, regardless of whether they are felt by the native speakers of the language in which they are used, exactly as foreign languages, and regardless of the justification and desirability of their use, are facts of the language using them (Бабкин, 1994, p. 3). According to D. Schutte, words that are not morphologically included in the system of the Russian language should be called "quotation words" (Шютте, 1997, p. 145).

Y. T. Listrova believes that "foreign language inclusions" are used by bilinguals in communication for certain stylistic purposes and with their inherent irregularity. Y. T. Listrova proposes to delimit occasional words of foreign origin and phraseological units that have gone beyond bilinguals and have become "signs" of monolingual speech used in print media from "foreign language inclusions" proper. All words and expressions of foreign origin, despite the graphic aspect of their reproduction, are not "foreign language inclusions", but function as ordinary borrowings in the Russian language. Exotisms are also not foreign language inclusions, since they are "a fact of the language that adopted them" (Листрова, 1985, pp. 58–59).

According to Haugen's typology, as noted earlier, one of the ways of assimilation of borrowed vocabulary is tracing, which can be complete or partial. Tracing as a way of replenishing the Russian dictionary occupies a marginal position, nevertheless there are a lot of loan translation units in the Russian language and they deserve special analysis. The issue of tracing was handled by N. S. Arapova (2009), T. F. Efremova (1974), V. N. Komissarov (2001) and others.

As it is known, a loan translation is called a special type of borrowing of foreign words, expressions, phrases. A loan translation appears when there is a need to convey a concept that has appeared in a foreign language environment, and direct borrowing for any reason is impossible. In this case, the derivation or semantic structure of a foreign word is borrowed.

By word-forming loan translation is meant a lexical neoplasm (new both in terms of meaning and in terms of sound / lettering), which was not previously noted in the recipient language, reproducing both the morphological structure of the traced prototype and the morphemic semantics that make up its morphemic semantics, and this word is created from native (and not borrowed) morphemes, so loan translation of this type usually does not feel like a borrowed word. In other words, this is a word obtained by an "after morphemic" translation of a foreign word into a borrowing language. So, the Russian geological term traces it. *Aufschichtung*: German prefix *auf-* translated by the Russian prefix *на-*; German root *-schicht-* transmitted to Russians *-иасм-*; German suffix *-ung* transmitted by the Russian suffix *-аниј-(э)*. Or other examples: German *Goldsucher* tracing Russian gold digger (German. *Gold* – Russian *золото*; German *such(en)* – russian *иск(а-ть)*; German *-er* – russian *-тель*); Russian word *выглядеть* formed according to the German model *aussehen* (prefix *вы* = German *aus-*; verb stem *глядеть* = German *sehen*); the words hydrogen and oxygen are tracing papers, respectively, Greek *hudor* – "вода" + *genos* – "род" и *oxys* – "кислый" + *genos* – "род"; English *sky-scraper* in Russian has tracing paper *небоскреб*. The following borrowings came to the Russian language: *биография* (Greek *bios* – "жизнь" + *grapho* – "пишу" – жизнеописание), *правописание* (Greek *orthos* –

“правильный” + grapho – “пишу”) etc. Many linguistic terms are tracings of Latin terms in Russian: *именительный, наречие, нарицательный*. Derivative tracing copies in Russian are also: *достопримечательный, жизнеописание, носорог, летописец, живопись* (Greek); *глазомер, новообразование, сверхчеловек, представление, полуостров, человечность* (German); *благосостояние, переворот, предрассудок* (French); *полузащитник, небоскрёб, полупроводник* (English) etc. Such tracings are also called lexico-derivational (Розенталь, 1976, 2010).

In addition to word-formative ones, semantic tracing papers are distinguished. Consequently, semantic loan translation is original words that received new meanings under the influence of the corresponding words of another language. The borrowed structure is materially expressed by the primordial means of the recipient language. In the semantic tracing paper, moments of borrowing and original word creation are organically merged, and the emphasis in the study of this layer of vocabulary is usually placed on the element of borrowing, therefore loan translation is considered as “скрытое заимствование”. So, Russian *картина*, denoting “произведение живописи”, “зрелище”, under the influence of the English language began to be used also in the meaning “кинофильм” – this is a tracing of an English ambiguous word *picture*, having meaning in the source language “картина, рисунок”, “портрет”, “кинофильм, съёмочный кадр”.

In the case of derivational tracing, a new word with the semantics of the traded word is formed from the original Russian elements according to the model of a foreign language word in the Russian language. With semantic tracing, the meaning of a foreign word is borrowed by the word of the recipient language.

The loan translation can be complete or partial. In case of partial tracing, only part of the word is literally translated; in this way lexical half-loan translation is formed. This type of borrowing – lexical half-loan translation – is words in which word-for-word translated foreign language and Russian word-formative elements are combined. For example, the word *гуманность* has a Latin root *human-us*, but a Russian suffix is added to it *-ость* (ср. *гуманизм*) or in the compound word television are connected by the Greek *tele-* and Russian *видени-е* stems.

In Russian, for tracing, sometimes not only original Russian words are used, but also borrowings. However, this requires that borrowing be well mastered. So, in the middle of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> century foreign language *crystal* tried to trace the word *хрусталь*, etymologically also foreign language, but mastered long ago (to such an extent that in the minds of many speakers it is perceived as akin to the verb crunch and the adjective *хрункий*). These tracing paper existed for almost a century before finally giving way to borrowing a *crystal*. Word-formation tracing paper *судоверфь* has a borrowed word as its second component *верфь*. However, the word *верфь* borrowed from the Dutch language at the turn of the XVII<sup>th</sup> – XVIII<sup>th</sup> centuries, and the loan translation *судоверфь* has a German word as its prototype.

Loan translation was especially active in the XVII<sup>th</sup> – XVIII<sup>th</sup> centuries (first half of the XX<sup>th</sup> century). At the end of the XVII<sup>th</sup> – XVIII<sup>th</sup> centuries a whole series of words appeared, modeled on foreign languages, mainly German. So, as a result of derivational-semantic tracing, complex words such as *взаимодействие* (Wechselwirkung), *всесторонний* (allseitig), *жизнедеятельный* (lebenstätig), *жизнерадостный* (lebensfroh), *закономерный* (gesetzmässig), *общеизвестный* (allgemeinbekannt), *первооснова* (Urgrund), *потусторонний* (jenseitig), *правомерный* (rechtmässig), *противопоставить* (entgegenstellen), *равнозначный* (gleichbedeutend), *свободомыслие* (Freidenkertum), *целесообразный* (zweckmässig) etc.

In the XVIII<sup>th</sup> century when choosing the components for a new Russian word, tracing a foreign language sample, preference was given to the book, that is, Church

Slavonic, version. This tendency is revealed when tracing *Wasserverdraegung* – the selected form of displacement (not water ejection). Such loan translation as bark (shell of the globe), plaque (shade) and a number of others also entered the Russian language (Ефремов, 1974). In the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the number of word-building loan-translation (in comparison with semantic ones) is increasing. The main source of derivational tracing is German. A huge amount of scientific and philosophical literature during this period was translated from the German language. From the second half of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century due to technical progress, the number of technical terms is increasing. As in scientific terminology, a certain percentage here belongs to tracing papers. During this period, as a rule, words that have arisen in German, French and English are traced. The role of individual languages increases and decreases. Loan translation and borrowings are similar in one thing: their source is the language in which a new word first appeared in a particular area. In turn, the Russian language, from which up to the middle of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century European languages borrowed only exoticism, became a source of borrowing and loan translation, as soon as Russian scientists, technicians, inventors and public figures said a new word in the field of science, technology and social structure. They are: *утка (газетная)* – French *canard*, *утончённый* – French *raffine*, *человечность* – German *Humanität*, *движение* – German *Bewegung*, *близорукий* – German *kurzsichtig* etc. (Захарченко, 2006).

For borrowing a language contact is required, which implies at least a minimal acquaintance with a foreign language. But if direct borrowing is available to a person who is familiar with a foreign language superficially, without mastering this language, then tracing paper can be created only by those who knows the foreign language well, feel well the morphological structure of the word, semantic connections within the word-formation nest, etc. If direct borrowing is done orally, the borrowed word may deviate significantly from the prototype, let us see words like *крахмал*, *лобзик*, *рулет*, *стамеска*, *фуганок*, *шпингалет* etc. In direct borrowing, the internal form of the word being borrowed is ignored; in tracing, the emphasis is on it. Therefore, errors that occur during tracing arise due to incorrect morphological division of a word or due to a misunderstanding of the image underlying the nomination.

The creation of tracing paper is an act of conscious lexical creativity; the fixation of tracing paper in the language or its loss occurs spontaneously. Derivational and semantic tracing papers have a common goal – to convey by means of the recipient language the images that form the basis of the nomination in the donor language. Tracing books are most often of a book nature or are elements of various terminological systems. Tracing and direct borrowing interact: tracing can replace direct borrowing, but there are also opposite cases when borrowing is more viable in the presence of tracing paper.

#### 4. Conclusions.

When classifying borrowed vocabulary, both formal features (assimilation of words in the borrowing language) and functional (use of words in the borrowing language) should be taken into account. Y. S. Sorokin singles out his indicators – this is the requirement for “stability, uniformity and normalization of the form” (Сорокин, 1965, pp. 62–63). L. P. Krysin sees signs of complete assimilation of a word in the graphic and phonetic transmission of foreign words by the appropriate means of the borrowing language and its correlation with certain grammatical classes and categories (Крысин, 2000, p. 35). Although, it should be noted, according to L. P. Krysin, V. M. Aristova, the classification of layers of borrowed vocabulary according to the degree of its assimilation is not legitimate enough, since it will be anachronistic in relation to the constantly developing lexical system of the language (Аристова, 1978, p. 8).

According to the degree of adaptation of lexical units in the system of the Russian language-recipient, both full and partial assimilation of the German-language vocabulary is possible. Partially assimilated vocabulary can be divided into the following groups: 1) German vocabulary assimilated at the graphic and grammatical levels; 2) German-language vocabulary assimilated at the grammatical level; 3) German-language vocabulary assimilated at the word-formation level; 4) German-language blotches with preceding and following Russian equivalents.

The prospect of further research is seen in the study of the processes of assimilation of foreign language vocabulary, which occurs at different language levels, with the involvement of more factual material that belongs to different styles of speech. This makes it possible to obtain more complete data on the processes of assimilation in a particular language in various forms of its existence.

### References

- Hinderling, R. (1987). Das Deutsche in Sprachkontakt. Baltisch/Deutsch. In: SG 1. 908–918 S. [In German].
- Peters, B. (1968). Deutsch-slawischer Wortaustausch / B. Peters // In: Mitzka Walter. Wortgeographie und Gesellschaft. Festgabe für L. E. Schnitt. – Berlin: 1968. [In German].
- Putschke, W. (1988). Skizze eines semantischen Wortbildungsmodells / W. Putschke // Deutscher Wortschatz: Lexikologische Studien- Ludwig Erich Schitt zum 80. Geburtstag von seinen Marburger Schülern / Hrsg. von Munske H. H. et. al. B.; N. V. S. 75–92. [In German].
- Richter, E. (1918). Fremdwortkunde. Leipzig. [In German].
- Richards, A. A. (1960). Metaphor and symsol. London.
- Schütte, D. (1997). Computerbildschirm kompjuternij displej: Der at. u. russ. Computerwortschatz unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Entlehnung. Frankfurt a. M. etc: Lang, 1997. – 296 S. [In German].
- Арапова, Н. С. (2009). Кальки в русском языке послепетровского периода. Опыт словаря. [Tracing paper in the Russian language of the post-Petr period. Dictionary experience]. *Изд-во Моск. ун-та*. 319 с. [In Russian].
- Арапова, Н. С. (1989). Варваризмы как этап в освоении иноязычного слова. [Barbarisms as a stage in the development of a foreign language word]. *Вестник МГУ. С. 9, Филология. № 4. С. 9–16*. [In Russian].
- Аристова, В. М. (1978). Англо-русские языковые контакты (англицизмы в русском языке). [English-Russian language contacts (anglicisms in Russian language)]. *Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та*. 150 с. [In Russian].
- Бажина, И. Н. (1972). О взаимовлиянии языков. [About the mutual influence of languages]. *Русская речь. № 6. С. 92–98*. [In Russian].
- Баш, Л. М. (1989). Дифференциация термина «заимствование»: хронологический и этимологический аспекты. [Differentiation of the term "borrowing": chronological and etymological aspects]. *Вестник МГУ. Сер. 9. Филология. № 4. С. 22–34*. [In Russian].
- Белецкий, А. А. (1976). Лексическая ассимиляция как один из законов развития языка. [Lexical assimilation as one of the laws of language development]. *Тезисы докл. на научн. конф. КГУ. С. 3–5*. [In Russian].
- Биржакова, Е. Э., Войнова, Л. А., Кутина, Л. Л. (1972). Очерки по исторической лексикологии русского языка XVIII века. [Essays on the historical lexicology of the Russian language in the 18th century]. *Языковые контакты и заимствования. Наука*. 431с. [In Russian].
- Брагина А. А. (1973). Неологизмы в русском языке. [Neologisms in Russian language]. 224 с. [In Russian].
- Брофман, М. В. (1961). Принципы классификации заимствованных слов. [Principles for the classification of borrowing words]. *В кн.: Программа и тез. докл. XV науч. конф. проф.-преподав. состава, посвящ. 40-летию КазССР*. 33 с. [In Russian].
- Будагов, Р. А. (1953). Очерки по языкознанию. [Essays on linguistics]. 280 с. [In Russian].
- Быховец, Н. Н., Гаркавец, А. Н., Дерканбаева, И. Т. и др. (1989). Языковые ситуации и взаимодействие языков. [Language situations and language interaction]. *АН УССР, Ин-т языковедения*. 204 с. [In Russian].
- Влахов, С., Флорин, С. (1986). Непереводимое в переводе. [Untranslatable in translation]. С. 35–170. [In Russian].

- Володина, М. Н. (1997). Теория терминологической номинации. [Terminological nomination theory]. С. 148–174. [In Russian].
- Егорова, К. Л. (1971). Типы лингвистических заимствований (на материале англицизмов и англо-американизмов в современном французском языке). [Types of linguistic borrowings (based on the material of Anglicisms and Anglo-Americanisms in modern French)]. [In Russian].
- Ефремов, Л. П. (1974). Основы теории лексического калькирования. [Fundamentals of the theory of lexical tracing]. *Алма-Ата : Изд-во КазГУ*. 191 с. [In Russian].
- Загорская, О. В. (1987). Семантическое освоение лексических заимствований. Семантика слов и семантические конструкции. [Semantic mastering of lexical borrowings. Semantics of words and semantic constructions]. С. 99–107. [In Russian].
- Зорько, А. С. (1972). Сравнительное исследование заимствований в родственных языках (франко-итальянские контакты): Дис. канд. филол. наук. [Comparative study of borrowings in related languages (Franco-Italian contacts): Dis. Cand. philol. sciences] 248 с. [In Russian].
- Йелитте, Г. К., Шиндлер, Н. (1994). К вопросу о развитии интернациональной терминологии в русском и немецком языках. Deutsch-russische Sprach-, Literatur- und Kulturbeziehungen im 20. Jahrhundert. [About the development of international terminology in Russian and German] С. 70–209. [In Russian].
- Карский, Е. Ф. (1921). Белорусы. Очерки словесности белорусского племени. Старая западно-русская письменность. [Belarusians. Essays on the literature of the Belarusian tribe. Old Western Russian writing]. Т. III. 246 с. [In Russian]
- Карский, Е. Ф. (1916). Белорусы. Т. 3. Очерки словесности белорусского племени. [Belarusians. V. 3. Essays on the literature of the Belarusian tribe]. *Кн. 1. Народная поэзия. М. типолитогр. т-ва И. Н. Кушнерева и К<sup>о</sup>. XIV, 557 с.*
- Комиссаров, В. Н. (2001). Современное переводоведение. Учебное пособие. [Modern translation studies. Tutorial]. *ЭТС*. 424 с. [In Russian].
- Крысин, Л. П. (2000). Иноязычное слово в контексте современной общественной жизни. Русский язык конца XX столетия (1985–1995). [Foreign language word in the context of modern social life. Russian language at the end of the XX century (1985–1995)]. 480 с. [In Russian].
- Леонтьев, А. А. (1966). Иноязычные вкрапления в русскую речь. Вопросы культуры речи. [Foreign language inclusions in Russian speech. Questions of the culture of speech]. Вып. 7. С. 56. [In Russian].
- Листрова, Ю. Т. (1985). К вопросу о разграничении иноязычных заимствований и иноязычных вкраплений (на лексич. уровне) в русской речи. Материалы по русско-славянскому языкознанию. [About the issue of distinguishing between foreign language borrowings and foreign language inclusions (at the lexical level) in Russian speech. Materials on Russian-Slavic linguistics]. С. 58–59. [In Russian].
- Листрова-Правда, Ю. Т. (1979). Из наблюдений над использованием немецких вкраплений в произведениях А. И. Герцена. Материалы по русско-славянскому языкознанию. [From observations of the use of German inclusions in the works of A.I. Herzen. Materials on Russian-Slavic linguistics]. С. 91–97. [In Russian].
- Лотте, Д. С. (1982). Вопросы заимствования и упорядочения иноязычных терминов и термиоэлементов. [Issues of borrowing and ordering foreign language terms and term elements]. 108 с. [In Russian].
- Сорокин, Ю. С. (1965). Развитие словарного состава русского литературного языка в 30-е – 90-е годы XIX века. [The development of the vocabulary of the Russian literary language in the 30s - 90s of the XIX century]. 665 с. [In Russian].
- Шанский, Н. М. (1972). Лексикология современного русского языка. [Lexicology of the modern Russian language]. С. 75. [In Russian].
- Шанский, Н. М. (1993). Эвристические задачи по морфемике и словообразованию. [Heuristic problems in morphemics and word formation]. *Рус. яз. в шк. №6*. – С. 35–39. [In Russian].
- Хабургаев, Г. А. (1989). Заимствование как проблема лексикографии и исторической лексикологии русского языка. [Borrowing as a problem of lexicography and historical lexicology of the Russian language]. *Вестн. Моск. ун-та. Филология. Сер. 9. №4*. С. 3–16. [In Russian].
- Хауген, Э. (1972). Процесс заимствования. Новое в лингвистике. Языковые контакты. [Borrowing process. New in linguistics. Language contacts]. Вып. 6. С. 344–382. [In Russian].

### *Sources of Illustrative Material*

- Бабкин, А. М., Шендцов, В. В. (1994). Словарь иноязычных выражений и слов, употребляющихся в русском языке без перевода. [Dictionary of foreign language expressions and words using in Russian without translation]. В 3-х кн. 1344 с. [In Russian].

Бабкин, А. М., Шендецов, В. В. (1981–1987). Словарь иноязычных выражений и слов. [Dictionary of foreign language expressions and words]. 2-е изд. Т. I – 1981; Т. II – 1987. [In Russian].

Безпояско, О. К., Городенська, К. Г., Русанівський, В. М. (1993). Граматика української мови. Морфологія. [Ukrainian language grammar. Morphology]. *Либідь*. 336 с. [In Ukrainian].

Берков, В. П. (1973). Двужычная лексикографія (словник). [Bilingual lexicography (dictionary)]. 191с. [In Russian].

Брагина, А. А. (1986). Лексика языка и культура страны. [Language vocabulary and culture of the country]. 151с. [In Russian].

Гринёв, С. В., Лотте, Д. С. (1982). Терминологические заимствования. Вопросы заимствования и упорядочения иноязычных терминов и терминологических элементов [Предисл. Т. Л. Канделаки, С. В. Гринёва]. [Terminological borrowings. Issues of borrowing and ordering foreign language terms and term elements]. С. 108–135. [In Russian].

Захаренко, Е. Н., Комарова, Л. Н., Нечаева, И. В. (2006). Новый словарь иностранных слов. [New Dictionary of Foreign Words]. 2-е изд., *степ. Азбуковник*. 784 с. [In Russian].

Карский, Е. Ф. (1921). Белорусы. Очерки словесности белорусского племени. Старая западно-русская письменность. [Belarusians. Essays on the literature of the Belarusian tribe. Old Western Russian writing]. Т. III. 246 с. [In Russian].

Листрова-Правда, Ю. Т. (1979). Иносистемные языковые явления в русской художественной литературе 19 в. (На материале немецких вкраплений). [Inosystem linguistic phenomena in Russian fiction of the 19th century. (Based on the material of German inclusions)]. [In Russian].

Никитина, Т. Г. (1999). Так говорит молодежь. Рус. речь. [This is what the youth say]. № 4. С. 115–117. [In Russian].

Огиенко, И. И. (1915). Иноземные элементы в русском языке. История проникновения заимствованных слов в русский язык. [Foreign elements in Russian. The history of the penetration of borrowed words into the Russian language]. 136 с. [In Russian].

Пономаренко, Т. Г. (1976). Лексико-семантическая группа и ее обусловленность. Языковые значения. [Lexico-semantic group and its conditionality. Language meanings]. 182 с. [In Russian].

Розенталь, Д. Э., Теленкова, М. А. (1976). Словарь-справочник лингвистических терминов. [Dictionary-reference of linguistic terms]. *Просвещение*. 543 с. [In Russian].

Розенталь, Д. Э., Голуб, И. Б., Теленкова, М. А. (2010). Современный русский язык. [Modern Russian language]. *Айрис-Пресс*. 448 с. [In Russian].

## Бібліографічний опис:

Кувшинова, Н. М., Вознюк, Л. А. (2021). Асиміляція іншомовних запозичень у мові-реципієнті. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 22. 43–57. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.22.04>.

## Анотація

У російській мові XVII – XVIII століть значну частину іншомовних слів склали німецькі лексичні запозичення. За ступенем засвоєння запозиченої лексики мовою-реципієнтом традиційно виділяють дві основні групи слів - асимільовані і неасимільовані. Одним з основних розрядів іншомовних слів, що виділяються за ступенем асиміляції, є власне запозичення, тобто асимільовані слова, з приводу кваліфікації яких у вчених немає розбіжностей. Єдиною проблемою в цьому сенсі є проведення межі між запозиченнями та інтернаціоналізмами. Інтернаціоналізми представлені, в першу чергу, в термінологічній лексиці. До термінів-інтернаціоналізмів відносяться: а) суспільно-політична лексика: конгрес, конституція, міністр, мітинг, партія, політика, революція, республіка, резолюція, сенат і под.; б) наукова термінологія: біологія, географія, геодезія, геологія, зоологія, історія, лінгвістика, математика, фізика та ін.; в) технічні найменування: агрегат, антена, апарат, комбайн, моноплан, танк, трактор; г) мистецтвознавча лексика: арія, балет, драма, жанр, новела, опера, поезія, тенор тощо.

При класифікуванні запозиченої лексики повинні враховуватися як формальні ознаки (асиміляція слів у мові, що їх запозичує), так і функціональні (вживання слів у мові, що їх запозичує). За ступенями адаптації лексичних одиниць у системі російськомовного реципієнта можливо як повне, так і часткове асимілювання німецькомовної лексики. Частково асимільована лексика може бути розділена

на наступні групи: 1) німецька лексика, асимільована на графічному та граматичному рівнях; 2) німецька лексика, асимільована на граматичному рівні; 3) німецькомовна лексика, асимільована на словотворчому рівні; 4) німецькомовні вкраплення з попереднім і наступним російськими еквівалентами.

Проведене дослідження базується на фактичних даних, отриманих різними лінгвістами, і результатах власних спостережень автора.

**Ключові слова:** лексичні запозичення, асимільовані слова, неасимільовані слова, мова-джерело, мова-реципієнт, інтернаціоналізми, термінологічна лексика.