

## **Grammatical Assimilation of Borrowings: Lexicographic Aspect**

**By**

**G.N. Karimullina**

Guzel Nurutdinovna Karimullina – Kazan Federal University, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Applied and Experimental Linguistics, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, guzel\_  
id Scopus: 56415030700  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9030-0722  
Email: [karimullina@list.ru](mailto:karimullina@list.ru)

**R.N. Karimullina**

Rezeda Nurutdinovna Karimullina – Kazan Federal University, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Applied and Experimental Linguistics, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, re  
id Scopus: 56414902800  
ORCID ID 0000-0002-0548-9445  
Email: [ka@mail.ru](mailto:ka@mail.ru)

**Y.V. Laykova**

Yulia Vladimirovna Laykova – Kazan Federal University, Postgraduate Student, Department of Applied and Experimental Linguistics, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication,  
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0909-9353

**K.K. Sarekenova**

Karlygash Kurmangalikyzy Sarekenova – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L.N. L.N. Gumilyov  
id Scopus 57192306014  
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1383-2247  
Email: [sareke.kk@gmail.com](mailto:sareke.kk@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

The article presents an analysis of borrowings from the Turkic languages in the morphological aspect. The research sources are academic dictionaries of the Russian literary language published from the 18th till the 20th centuries. The selection of sources enables to most comprehensively study the common lexis of the literary language. The comparison of lexicographic sources of various periods and the comparative analysis of the Turkic units represented in them allows tracing the morphological changes of a borrowed word in the language, as well as revealing the features of functioning of the Turkic layer within the Russian lexis. It was found that borrowed words acquire the grammatical categories inherent in the Russian nouns. Shaping of the gender category in borrowed nouns takes place in compliance with the Russian language norms. Thus, the grounds for referring the borrowed words to a masculine, feminine or neuter gender are, in most cases, formal markers of flections, which were present in the words in Tatar and preserved after their transition into Russian, as well as those acquired in the Russian language due to a phonetic transformation.

**Keywords:** borrowing, dictionary, Turkism, lexicography, morphological adaptation, the

Russian language.

## **1. Introduction**

The issue of language contacts has always been within the scope of the Russian and foreign linguistics. It is especially topical for a multi-national state like Russia (Galiullina & Yusupova, 2014; Gilazetdinova et al., 2014; Mardanova et al., 2017). Many researchers today highlight the importance of comprehensive study of Turkic elements in the Russian language (Oreshkina, 2013; Yunaleyeva, 2000; Gaynutdinova et al., 2020). Morphological adoption of borrowed words is, as known, determined by the degree of divergence between the grammatical structures of the interacting languages: the more grammar differences there are between the source language and the borrowing language, the more changes the borrowed words undergo.

The morphological adaptation of Turkic units, which was studied in a number of works (see (Kilmetova, 1984; Nazarov, 1984; Oreshkina, 1994; Timofeeva, 1990) and others), is manifested in conferring then the forms inherent in the Russian language system. The researchers mark that the morphological adoption of Turkisms is closely related to phonetic adoption. Also, an important role is played by the semantic factor. In general, the morphological assimilation of Turkisms implies correlation of the borrowed words with the lexical-grammatical classes, grammatical categories and norms of the morphological system of the Russian language.

The changes associated with the morphological characteristic of a borrowed word in the course of its functioning in the receiving language are minimal, but they exist. In Turkic borrowings, such changes can be traced by analyzing Russian explanatory dictionaries which provide several parameters of lexicographic description (orthographic, grammatical, stylistic, phraseological, etymological, etc.).

## **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", hereinafter AD-1), 2) "Словарь Академии Российской, по азбучному порядку расположенный" (1806-1822) ("The Alphabetical Dictionary of the Russian Academy", hereinafter AD-2), 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 overwhelming majority of Turkic borrowings registered in explanatory dictionaries of the 18th – 20th centuries belong to the noun category. They constitute 97% of the total number of Turkic words (about 800 units): ambar, baraban, bakhtarma, divan, karakurt, kumys, salma, etc. In the sources analyzed, adjectives were also found (18 units): ally, vzbalmoshnyy, igrenevyy, karakovyy, kauryy, takhinnyy, etc.; as well as verbs (8 units): bulgachit', kamlat', klyanchit', kochevat', tebenevat', khlobuchit', shamat', yakshat'sya; adverbs (2 units): nabekren' and chokhom; and interjections (2 units): ayda (gayda) and ura.

The borrowed nouns are classified in the Russian language, taking into account their morphological properties and semantic unity, into the following lexical-grammatical classes: common and proper, animate and inanimate, specific, substantial and abstract. Among the studied Turkic words, explanatory dictionaries register only 2 proper nouns: Mamay<sup>1</sup> (ED) and Mamon / Mamona. Among appellatives, the Turkic lexical units are classified into specific, substantial and abstract nouns. The prevailing number of words belongs to specific nouns (over 700): arba, bashnya, kazan, cheburek, etc. Substantial nouns include over 40 units: braga, yogurt, kumys, yugurt, etc. Abstract notions are about 20 units, among them kalym, magarych, etc.

In the Russian language, the peculiar Turkic notion of animacy / inanimacy is not reflected. In the Turkic languages, animate nouns comprise only names of people and mythological, fairytale creatures. All other nouns are inanimate. In the Russian language, all Turkic borrowings are classified into animate / inanimate in compliance with the specificity of this category in the recipient language: all words naming persons, animals and birds are animate.

The gender category is not inherent in the grammatical structure of the Turkic languages. Thus, the generic assignment of the borrowed nouns is determined based on the Russian morphological system. The assignment of the Turkic units denoting animate creatures to a specific gender is established by their biological gender. The criterion of gender differentiation of the borrowings denoting inanimate objects is the "formal markers of finals, which were present in the words in the source language and preserved after their transition into the Russian language, as well as those acquired in the Russian language as a result of a phonetic conversion" [8, P. 61].

The nouns of Turkic origin which we found in the Russian explanatory dictionaries can

---

<sup>1</sup> Here and further, the dictionaries in which the unit is mentioned are indicated in brackets.

be classified into three groups depending on their gender. 1. Masculine nouns. They are the most numerous (about 600 units). They include a) inflexible nouns denoting males: kadi, mufti, khadzhi, etc.; b) flexible nouns (animate and inanimate) with a zero flexion: ayvan, altyn, baybak, vilayet, garem, dzheyran, tabargan, chepan, shalman, shashlyk, yastyk, etc.; c) flexible nouns, denoting males, with a final –a: mirza, mulla, murza, pasha, etc. 2. Feminine nouns (over 200 units). This group comprises: a) inflexible nouns denoting females – peri; b) flexible Turkish borrowings (animate and inanimate) with a final –a: adzhika, arnautka, bakhtarma, karakulya, kaptorga, piala, ser'ga, sofa, tavolga, shan'ga, yurta, etc.; c) flexible nouns with a zero flexion: mechet', mizgit', lokhan', loshad', yuft', etc. 3. Neuter nouns. It is a small group of Turkish borrowings with a final –o / -e, -u (9 words): a) inflexible nouns: azu, dzhaylau (dzheylau), medrese and tyurbe; b) flexible nouns: kapishche, oko, pulo, tavro and tartaniye.

Besides the above groups, explanatory dictionaries contain the Turkish elements which belong to the epicene nouns: balabolka, balda, kaleka, kalika, khanzha, chumichka, etc. These words, except for the words kaleka, kalika and khanzha, appeared in the Russian language as a result of metaphoric transference of a word meaning (in the dictionaries, the interpretations of these nouns are, as a rule, labeled as “figurative”).

The category of number is inherent both in the Russian and Turkish languages. However, in the course of borrowing the inflectional shaping of Turkisms takes place on the basis of the grammatical system of the Russian language. Most of the Turkish borrowings with the meaning of a person and with the specific substantive meaning, which are registered in the explanatory dictionaries, show a morphologically expressed opposition in terms of the number category (about 700 units). Some Turkisms are only used in a singular form (about 90 units): ayran, arak, ba'sma, kamsa, kumys, kuter'ma, tomosha, etc. In the studied lexicographic sources, the borrowings of the latter group have a definite marker only in UD – “мн. нет”, that is, “no plural”. It should be noted that in UD the label “мн. нет” is given in the area of a grammatical comment only. To reflect the feature of using one of the meanings of a polysemantic lexical unit, a label “только ед.” (“singular only”). In other dictionaries such nouns are not labeled. Their area of a grammatical comment contains a flexion of the genitive case and an indication of gender.

A small part of Turkish borrowings has a plural form only (11 units): busy, kazanki, karachki, porty, toroka, tumany, chikchiry, sharovary (shalvary), shakhmaty, shtany, shury-mury.

In the lexicographic sources, except OD, these words are marked with various labels: “мн., ед. нет”, “ед. нет” - in UD; “мн.” - in AD-1, AD-2, DCR, LAD; SAD, LED, and ED. For these nouns, all dictionaries, except ED, give a flexion (sometimes a full form) of the genitive case: TOROKA', ов, ед. нет <...> (UD); BU'SY, bus, мн. <...>(SAD); SHAROVA'RY, -a' r. Broad pants <...> (OD); TUMA'NY мн. Broad sharovary as a part of women's garment <...> (ED). Such dictionaries as AD-1, AD-2 and DCR also indicate their gender: SHTANY', no'v, с. м. 2 скл. множ. Men's underwear <...> (AD-2); TOROKA', o'v, с. м. мн. Кош. Belts at a rear saddlebow <...> (DCR), etc.

Another small group comprises the words which have a singular form but are used mainly in the plural (about 40 units). Most of them denote footwear. These units are displayed uniformly in LAD, SAD, LED, and ED. In the former three dictionaries, the singular form is given in brackets with an indication of gender: I'CHIGI, -ov, MH. (ед. i'chig, -a, M.). Regional. A kind of light footwear without heels on a soft sole <...> (SAD). In LAD, a singular form also has a separate entry: I'CHIG. See I'chigi. I'CHIGI, -ov, MH. (ед. i'chig, -a, M.) <...> (LAD). In ED, singular nouns are given only in a separate entry: BABU'SHA ж. 1. See babushi; BABU'SHI MH. 1. Soft shoes without a heel counter (usually in the East). In other explanatory dictionaries such words are not such words are not displayed uniformly. In the dictionaries of the 18th – 19th centuries, these lexemes, with a few exceptions, are registered in the singular. For example, in AD-1, the word bakhily is given in the plural, in DCR – the words ichetygi, chirki. In OD, all the words are given in the plural. An exception is a Turkism bashmak. Undoubtedly, this can be explained by the presence of its homonym in the dictionary: BASHMA'K 1, -a', M. An ankle-high boot or a low shoe <...>; BASHMA'K 2, -a', M. (special). A device installed on a rail to stop wheels <...>. It should be noted also, that OD variably displays the part of the grammatical characteristic which indicates the correlate: in some cases, a word is given in the singular (see the examples above), in other cases – its flexion only; see, for example: CHEBOTY, -ov, ед. -ot, -a, M. (regional). High closed footwear (boots, shoes); CHUVYA'KI, -ov and -ya'k, ед. -ya'k, -a, M. Soft leather footwear from the Caucasus <...>. In UD, all lexemes of the studied group are displayed in the singular. An exception is the word chuvyaki, which is labeled "ед. нет" in this dictionary.

For unknown reasons, a unit registered in AD-1, AD-2, DCR, LAD, and ED, is displayed in the singular in earlier dictionaries and in the plural in the 20th century dictionaries: nakra – nakry 'a kind of a drum'. See also the word dzhinn 'an evil or kind spirit', which is given in LAD and SAD in the plural and in OD, LED, and ED – in the singular. In our opinion, an entry word in the singular is better justified, as it is in this form that it is used more often. This is also proved by a phraseological unit vypustit' dzhinna iz butylki, which is notably given in LAD and SAD.

## 4. Summary

The studied Turkic lexical elements contain a small group of inflexible nouns (12 words). These include a) nouns with a final -e (4 units): kofe, medrese, nargile, tyurbe; b) nouns with a final -i (5 units): kadi, mufti, peri, khadzhi, efendi; c) nouns with a final -u (2 units): azu, dzhaylau (dzheylau); d) nouns with a final -a (1 unit): Alla.

In the lexicographic sources, the nouns of this category are marked with synonymic labels: "нескл." (indeclinable) in UD, LAD, SAD, OD, and ED; and "неизм." (inflexible) in LED. The noun gender may be indicated before or after this label. For example: AZU' ср. нескл. <...> (ED); PE'RI, неизм.; ж. <...> (LED); KHADZHI', нескл., M. <...> (SAD), etc.

Of the marked inflexible nouns, the dictionaries refer to the masculine gender such units as Alla, kadi, mufti, khadzhi, efendi; to the feminine gender – peri; to the neuter gender – azu,

dzheylau (dzhaylau), medrese, tyurbe. A Turkism chaykhana is registered in all of the 20th century dictionaries. In UD and LAD, its variants are also displayed (chay-khane and chaykhane, respectively). UD refers both units to inflexible words, while LAD – chaykhane only. The absence of chaykhana variant with the respective label in the other lexicographic sources apparently indicates its inclusion into the group of declinable nouns.

One should specially note a lexeme *ura*, which in the analyzed explanatory dictionaries is referred to interjections. In UD, LAD and ED, this word is also displayed as an inflexible neuter noun (in UD and LAD there is also a feminine flexible *ura*): **URA'** 1. междом. A battle-cry of attacking troops. 2. междом. An exclamation, a cry, expressing a collective enthusiastic approval, excitement <...> 3. as a noun *ura'*, нескл., ср. и (colloquial) *ura',-y, ж.* The same. *Ura* broke out far away: the regiments saw Peter. Pushkin. <...> To shout *ura* <...> (UD).

Almost all of the 20th century dictionaries display the word *shury-mury* as a noun with an incomplete paradigm. Only OD and LED indicate the absence of the genitive case form of this unit in the grammatical area of its entry: **SHU'RY-MU'RY**, род. нет, дат. *shu'ram-mu'ram*; мн. <...> (LED).

## 5. Conclusions

Morphological adaptation of the borrowed units is expressed in their shaping into the forms corresponding to the system of the Russian language, that is, the morphological assimilation of Turkisms implies their correlation with the lexical-grammatical classes, grammatical categories of the Russian language system. Analysis of the Turkic lexical borrowings testifies to the inclusion of these borrowings into the grammatical system of the Russian language. Most of the Turkisms lose the morphological signs which they had in the source language and are shaped according to the Russian grammar laws. In our opinion, of special interest is the gender category of noun, which is absent in the Turkic languages. The gender variants of the studied borrowings, as reflected in explanatory dictionaries, function in the language without any visible changes – the variants registered in the dictionaries of the beginning of the 20th century are also present in the sources of the end of the 20th century (*kaptan – kaptana, mammon – mamona, tut – tuta, khabar – khabara, chinara – chinara, etc.*). The performed analysis demonstrates the need for a more structured approach to description without disturbing the integrity of the grammatical material available.

## Acknowledgements

This paper is performed as part of the implementation of the Kazan Federal University Strategic Academic Leadership Program.

## References

- G.Kh. Gilazetdinova, I.Zh. Edikhanov, A.A.Aminova, «Problems of ethnocultural identity and cross-language communication», *Journal of Language and Literature*, pp. 39-42, 2014.  
G.Mardanov, G.Karimullina, R. Karimullina, «COMPLEX CORPUS OF TURKISMS OF

- THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE», *Astra Salvensis*, № 10, pp. 145-150, 2017.
- G.R. Galiullina, A.Sh. Yusupova, «European linguistic borrowings in the Tatar sprachraum (by written sources of the XIX - XX centuries) », *Life Science Journal*, Vol. 11, Issue 7, pp. 697-700, 2014.
- Gaynutdinova A.S., Islamova E.A., Bolgarova R.M., Tatar Material Culture Vocabulary in Russian Dictionaries//*Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 2020, Vol.11, Is. Special Issue, P.164-171.
- Kilmetova 3.M. Phonetic, spelling and morphological development of the turkisms in Russian language // *Issues of improvement of teaching Russian in national schools*. Ufa, 1984. P.46-58.
- M.V. Oreshkina, «The Dictionary of borrowings into Russian from the languages of the peoples of Russia and the Near Abroad Countries: principles and concepts», *IV International conference «Language, Culture and Society in Russian / English studies» (22 - 23 July 2013)*, London, Senate House, University of London, pp. 170 – 173, 2013
- Nazarov O. Turkmen word in the Russian text. Ashgabat: Ylym, 1984.- P. 188.
- Oreshkina M.V. Turkic words in the modern Russian language: (problems of development). - M.: Academia, 1994. P. 160.
- R. A. Yunaleyeva, Türkisms in Russian language: (Problems of multi-aspect research), Kazan, Taglimat, 172 p, 2000.
- Timofeeva G.G. Adaptation borrowed from the Turkic language in Russian. Bilingualism and interference of the languages. Cheboksary, 1990. P. 43-49.