

University of Szeged
Faculty of Arts

SZABOLCS JANURIK

**English Loanwords in Present-Day Russian
(from the 1980s until now)**
Aspects of Linguistic Borrowing

Abstract of the PhD Thesis

Supervisor: Edit Dési (ELTE)

Szeged
2007

1. Introduction

The aim of my study was the analysis of the main tendencies prevailing in the orthographical-phonological, morphological-derivational, and semantic adaptation of borrowings of English origin having entered the Russian language in the past two decades, i.e. from the mid-1980s until now. I excluded fully adapted English borrowings from my analysis, I rather intended to give a most detailed account of the dynamics of the process and ways borrowing mechanisms work.

The topic is particularly up-to-date: the influx of English borrowings extraordinarily accelerated as a result of the fundamental political, social, economic, and cultural changes started in Russia in the mid-1980s as well as the change of regime and transition to market economy in the early 1990s.

Besides the linguistic description of the data, I found it essential to discuss the role of monolingual and bilingual speakers in borrowing (the social background that initiates and determines the adoption of English loanwords), along with the sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of the process. By these I understand the description of motivations (which non-linguistic factors direct and explain the influx of elements of English origin).

Nevertheless, the main emphasis of my paper is on the linguistic analysis of English borrowings, which fits in research on language contact and lexicology. I used 70 dictionaries published between 1980 and 2006 as the sources of my study.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Research on language contact

More than half a century has passed since 1953, which proved to be a significant year in the study of language contact. Two pioneering works were published in that year written by Uriel Weinreich (*Languages in Contact*) and by Einar Haugen (*The Norwegian Language in America*). The Swiss-American and Norwegian researchers emphasized for the first time that besides the mechanism of borrowing more attention should be paid to the study the psychological and social-cultural environment which determines the outcome of language contact.

2.1.1. THE ROLE OF BILINGUALISM IN BORROWING

Language contact and the bilingualism of speakers are prerequisites in borrowing which can occur without indirect contact or geographical closeness between speakers of the two languages. Bilingualism as relevant for borrowing forms a continuum ranging from basic knowledge to proficiency in the recipient language; thus any degree of bilingualism can result in borrowing.

2.1.2. TYPES OF INTERFERENCE

All cases involving the bilingual speaker's deviation from norms of either language, using an element or a structure as a result of language contact can be considered an interference phenomenon.

In case of phonetic interference, bilingual speakers attempt to reproduce sounds of the source language in the recipient language following the phonetic rules of the latter. First they strive to replicate the borrowed word with a phonetic form as close to the original as possible, and when monolinguals also start to use the borrowed element, they substitute the foreign sound with an element of the recipient language. Besides, under the influence of the source language certain rare sound clusters may occur more frequently in the recipient language (cf. the English nouns ending in *-nɪ* in Russian).

Morphology is considered to be the most impervious to interference, however, lexical borrowing might import into the other language (as parts of a bigger unit) foreign morphemes which do not occur on their own (*-бурзер, -zeit*). Syntactic interference is observable mainly on the level of phrases in the order of components (cf. English-like *Горбачёв-фонд* instead of the more Russian *фонд Горбачёва*).

The original model can be reproduced in the recipient language with importation (loanwords), substitution (loan translations and semantic calques), and as a combination of the two (hybrid calques). The outcome of the interference often cannot be predicted, because the attitude of speakers of the recipient language can promote, but also hinder the changes. If monolinguals accept a word borrowed by bilinguals, interference ceases to exist and becomes borrowing.

2.1.3. CLASSIFICATION OF TRANSFERRED ELEMENTS

Lexical elements appearing in the recipient language as a result of borrowing are traditionally categorized as borrowed words and foreign words. This approach has been debated, mainly because there is not any objective criterion which could soundly divide the two groups.

The degree of integration is a criterion frequently used: loanwords fit in the system of the recipient language in a way that monolinguals do not recognize their foreignness, which they do in case of foreign words. It is either because the concept is also foreign, occurring only in the original culture, or because the phonetic or orthographical form of the word is foreign, even when the concept itself is integrated.

The sense of foreignness is too subjective and relative a criterion for linguistics. In this quickly globalizing world, foreign phenomena can turn into domestic within an unusually short time. Therefore, I hereafter discard the distinction between foreign words and borrowed words, and use the term *loanword* by which I understand mainly words of foreign origin also used by monolinguals in the recipient language. These elements can represent different stages of the borrowing process.

2.2. Language change and neologisms

As a result of broadening international relations, impacts of the scientific and technological revolution, development of the media and a general increase in the pace of life, a “neological boom” has been detectable in the languages of the world since the middle of the 20th century. When new objects and concepts come into use, usually more forms co-exist, one of which usually prevails in the end. Neologisms, however, do not always refer to new objects or concepts, occasionally they can denote an object or a concept that existed before and has become relevant for external reasons.

2.2.1. TYPES OF NEOLOGISMS AND HOW THEY ARE RELATED TO BORROWINGS

A significant group of neologisms is formed by new words coming from other languages, a part of which seems new only to speakers of the recipient language, whereas they are old words in the source language. Recently, the Russian language has borrowed an increasing number of lexical elements which are considerably new even in English (e.g. the vocabulary of computer science, fashion, and music).

In spite of the influx of new borrowings, neologisms are overwhelmingly new derivations which are combinations of familiar words or word parts. These previously non-existent units are composed of already existing elements, therefore their novelty is relative.

A smaller amount of neologisms arise from the reinterpretation of the meaning of older words: as a result of foreign or internal borrowing secondary, less familiar meanings can also come forward, moreover, even entirely new meanings can emerge.

The behaviour of neologisms and new borrowings is comparable from many aspects, as the sense of novelty and foreignness are closely connected in the mind of speakers. If the concept denoted by the word becomes relevant, the passive lexical element enters the active language use, whereas words, considered as new not long ago, might become outdated quickly (e.g. *выкуп* ‘compensation warrant’).

2.2.2. NEOLOGISMS AND HOW BORROWINGS ENTER DICTIONARIES

The time when the word is first recorded in a dictionary does not inevitably mean the real time of its appearance, it rather indicates that the word was already in use at the given time. Dictionaries occasionally include also short-lived phenomena, at the same time a group of neologisms might be missing either because of the type of the dictionary or the decision of the dictionary’s compilers.

Dictionaries of neologisms reflect new tendencies better than any other dictionaries, as they include also marginal neologisms that get lost from the language later on. Neologisms’ way leads from speech to language, from occasional occurrence to repeated use and finally to the explanatory dictionary. If a neologism is included in the latter, it cannot be considered a neologism anymore as it has lost its novelty.

Despite their regular publication, dictionaries of neologisms record new words with a delay, what is more, they do not always enclose objective information about their first occurrence and distribution. Electronic dictionaries might be exceptions as they can react faster to the renewal of the lexicon and record changes in the language (there are also online dictionaries which are constantly enlarged and to which speakers themselves can add comments).

2.3. Problems of etymologization

In assigning English origin to a word, there are often differences between the dictionaries. In contemporary Russian lexicographical practice, historical aspects are paramount, compilers of the dictionaries tend to indicate the original source language (Greek or Latin stem). In the recipient language, however, lexical elements created by the English speech community from Greco-Latin stems (e.g. *микронпроцессор*) should be undoubtedly considered as words of English origin. At the same time, in case of some loans other Western European languages (mainly French and German) are indicated as the source language, though English influence is evident.

In my dissertation, I assigned English origin to every word that was included in English dictionaries. With no regards to the dictionary record, I precluded proper nouns (mainly brand names), proper noun phrases and words derived from personal names, whereas common nouns formed from proper nouns were included.

3. The linguistic and social background of borrowing

In the period of perestroika, significant changes began in the Russian language. Political and economic reforms started with the change of regime were reflected not only in changes of the vocabulary, but also in the liberalization of general language use. This process is detectable both in changes concerning linguistic preference and the weakening of norms.

3.1. Changes in linguistic preference and norms in the late 20th century

Along with the Russian language after perestroika, the linguistic norm has also changed becoming more dynamic and lenient towards varieties. Conscious detachment from language of the Soviet era caused more jargon to appear on the one hand, it facilitated the emergence of neologisms and new borrowings on the other.

The mixing of different styles and jargonization is far from being a novelty as the Russian language is concerned. The same tendencies already occurred in the 1920s, and the borrowing wave as a result of orientation towards the West recalls the times of Peter I. The uniqueness of the contemporary situation lies within the intensity of change as tendencies characteristic of the post-revolution era co-occur with a borrowing wave evoking the beginning of the 18th century in its intensity.

3.2. The influence of English in the era of globalization

After the Second World War, increase in the population as well as the political and economic force of the United States ensured the dominant role of the English language in the contemporary world. The prestige of American English has abruptly grown in the past decades.

English influence is multi-faceted: it is present in the media, in spoken language and special jargons as well. By now, American English has become almost the only source of borrowings in several European languages. The increase in its influence in Russian can be demonstrated, for instance, by the tendency that new English borrowings (*офис*) replace the earlier German (*кантора*) and French loans (*бюро*).

3.3. The role of social varieties in the dispersion of English borrowings

3.3.1. THE ROLE OF MEDIA LANGUAGE

As a result of its principal role, it is the media which reacts to everyday events most quickly. Mass communication devices reflect on new events almost instantly. Printed and electronic press has an important role in the dispersion of borrowings. The latest information coming from foreign news agencies needs to be quickly distributed. In a number of cases, however, it is often difficult to find the exact equivalent in the recipient language during the translation process, so journalists often simply leave the lexical element of foreign origin in the text. Consequently, the language of the media is becoming one of the main transmitters of English influence.

3.3.2. THE ROLE OF ADVERTISING LANGUAGE

The language of advertising is a new phenomenon in Russian. Previously almost non-existent, it emerged after the change of regime. From the early 1990s, Russians therefore imported the Western, especially English-language advertising techniques and marketing terminology. Borrowings have a double role in advertisements. Their use is explained by their terminological character, and they also serve the aims of prestige and fashion by their unusualness and novelty. In the language of advertising, Anglicisms with denominative and expressive function are thus intertwined.

3.3.3. THE ROLE OF TERMINOLOGY

Loanwords traditionally frequent in terminology can unambiguously express the required meaning without special expressivity or secondary meanings, because they are not as tightly connected to other members of the lexicon, as opposed to internal words of the recipient language.

Through the media, more and more technical terms enter the standard and become widely known. As a result of external as well as internal borrowing, the influx of foreign terminology is perceived more intensive in the standard where both new loans and technical terms already established in special jargons seem neologisms.

3.3.4. THE ROLE OF SLANG

Since the change of regime, technical terms have prevailed in the standard. Russian slang has traditionally relied heavily on loanwords and this is also characteristic of contemporary Russian youth language. The youth has a leading role in making new English borrowings popular, because with the help of satellite channels and the internet, they can follow changes in musical and computer trends better than their predecessors could, and consequently, their slang reacts more sensitively to them.

4. The borrowing process and its internal and external reasons

4.1. Phases in the borrowing process

In the process of the adaptation of foreign elements, it is a turning point when not only bilinguals but also monolingual speakers of the recipient language begin to use them in an active way. New lexical elements can be assimilated in favourable circumstances and enter the standard language. The dispersion of the object or the concept denoted by them in a broad context can be decisive in this process.

4.1.1. THE CRITERIA OF PARTIAL ADAPTATION

New borrowings emerging in Russian context in the first phase of their use are usually highlighted in Latin alphabet, with quotation marks, in italics or with full capital letters. New words and expressions (as less familiar technical terms) are accompanied by explanations in the text. Tautological expressions (*CD-диск* 'lit. CD disk', *сеть Интернет* 'lit. net of Internet') and different orthographical, phonetic and morphological variants reveal partial adaptation.

4.1.2. THE CRITERIA OF FULL ADAPTATION

In the strict sense, it is only lexical elements corresponding to the norms of the recipient language on every linguistic level that can be considered fully adapted.

The preservation of sound clusters unusual in Russian, the maintenance of foreign accent, the lack of conjugation in certain nouns, or slight derivational activity, however, cannot be viewed as inevitable obstacles of full adaptation since semantic integration is more significant than phonetic or morphological adaptation.

4.1.3. ADAPTATION ACCORDING TO LINGUISTIC LEVELS

Borrowing is a difficult and long process that occurs simultaneously at a number of levels (orthographical, phonetic, morphological, derivational and semantic) at the same time. The adaptation of borrowed lexical elements at different linguistic levels can proceed with various intensity. Phonetic adaptation usually is slower than orthographical or morphological one. The fate of loanwords in the system of the recipient language depends, however, mostly on their semantic integration.

4.2. Motivations for borrowing and the main semantic fields of loans

4.2.1. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL REASONS FOR BORROWING

The fate and chance for survival of new borrowings emerging as a result of non-linguistic motivations are usually determined by linguistic factors: the existence of a synonym in the recipient language, semantic differentiation, and derivational activity. Linguistic factors, however, can be overridden by social circumstances working in the other direction: changing views, preferences and customs resulting from the rearrangements in the content of society, for instance.

I discuss the internal and external reasons for borrowing as an integrated unit, because the two levels of motivation are interrelated, which precludes their separation into external and internal motives.

The main linguistic and extralinguistic reasons can be grouped into six types:

1. The lack of equivalence

In language contact, it is a frequent and natural phenomenon that speakers first cannot find an equivalent in their language to refer to a new, unfamiliar concept coming from a different culture, thus the feeling of the lack of lexical equivalence arises. By means of borrowing, the recipient language fills empty slots in its lexicon, in cases when the task could not be fulfilled by internal means in any way. Therefore, the adoption of a new object or concept can entail the borrowing of its foreign name too.

2. Differentiation of meanings

Another important reason for borrowing is the intention of the speakers to make a semantic differentiation between words and separate similar concepts by concretization. Apart from their basic meanings, loanwords can express special shades of meaning which differentiate them from their Russian synonyms. Semantic specialization usually takes place in the recipient language. The Russian equivalent with a general meaning (*убийца* ‘murderer’) or the older borrowing (*магнитофон* ‘tape recorder’) are joined by a new element (*киллер* ‘hitman’, *плеер* ‘walkman’) which denotes a concept or object becoming widely popular in the given period and which has not received a separate name yet.

3. Economy in expression

In our accelerated world, one-word expressions are often favoured over attributive phrases. Anglicisms entering the Russian language also serve this economy in expression. The lack of a compact and adequate denomination often leads to borrowing: for instance, *arm wrestling* known in Russia for a long time and denoted by the long name *борьба на руках* was replaced by the English *армрестлинг*.

4. Terminological features

As a result of repeated borrowing from the same source, in the lexicon of a given profession or a certain semantic field, accurate and transparent terminological sub-systems arise including a large number of one-word expressions, which do not only facilitate but also motivate further borrowing. Apart from the language of sports containing traditionally many words of English origin, this tendency is also characteristic of the language of computer science and politics. Moreover, thanks to their simple morphemic form, foreign terms can facilitate further derivation as well (e.g. *электронно-вычислительная машина – компьютер > компьютерный, компьютеризация*).

5. Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors

Contemporary Anglicisms spreading more and more in Russian do not always denote new objects or concepts, their psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic significance often overshadows their denoting function, as in the past decades English has become the language symbolizing the up-to-dateness about novelties in the modern, technically developed world. In case of professionals, the use of foreign elements gives them opportunity to prove their insider status and competence. At the same time, speakers of the recipient language do not always strive to find in the recipient language equivalents for the borrowing as a result of laziness or comfort.

6. The desire to be innovative

To fulfil the communicative function of the language, its lexicon has to be constantly renewed. Neologisms (especially of foreign origin) are capable of increasing expressivity by themselves because of their attractive novelty. The expressivity of lexical elements might wear out, their novelty fade, as resulting from frequent use, so the speakers intend to continuously refresh the language they use. It is especially true in the case of slang, but also common in other varieties.

The joint study of linguistic and extralinguistic motives of borrowing confirms the hypothesis that internal and external reasons are so intertwined that they are impossible to set apart. Every borrowing can be explained by several factors, however, in the majority of cases there is a dominant motive.

4.2.2. MAIN AREAS AND SEMANTIC FIELDS OF BORROWING

Anglicisms studied in my dissertation can be divided into ten thematic groups: 1) politics, society, public life; 2) science, technology, computer science, household appliances and office machines; 3) culture, art, and music trends; 4) sports; 5) economy and trade, finance and stock market; 6) goods, services, everyday life, words of general use; 7) mass culture, fashion, clothes, free time, entertainment; 8) crime, subculture, slang; 9) media, advertisements; 10) communication phrases.

5. The orthographical adaptation of English loanwords

5.1. The orthographical adaptation of English loanwords

English borrowings in contemporary Russian texts appear on the one hand 1) in Latin alphabet, and, on the other hand, in Cyrillic alphabet involving cases transcribed 2) according to the English pronunciation, or 3) the English orthography, or 4) as a mixture of the latter two in the Russian text. In the beginning of the borrowing process, orthographical adaptation shows a great variety.

5.1.1. TRANSPLANTATION

Transplantation means following the graphical principle, the mechanical transplantation of lexical elements from one language to the other. This method has its roots in the 19th century literature, and since the change of regime Russian has been flooded with foreign words keeping their original form, which almost exclusively arrived from English. The use of Latin alphabetic words is determined to a great extent by the type and topic of the text.

Since the 1990s, it is not only single foreign words that have been retained in their Latin alphabetic form in literary texts but also whole sentences, the names of chapters or even books (Pelevin: *Generation II*). The Latin alphabetic form can also be considered as an ornamental element, the use of which is motivated by the intention to create a foreign image in the language of the Russian media. The visual expressional power of Latin letters diverging significantly from the Cyrillic environment is present also in advertisements, especially in the case of brand names. The internationally known Latin alphabetic form makes the recognition of the name easier.

In the early phase of the borrowing process, it is a frequent phenomenon that the borrowed neologism retains its original form on the first occurrence, on the second occurrence, however, it appears in a transcribed form. As a result, the new loanword can occur within the same text (or even the same sentence) in different (Latin or Cyrillic alphabetic) forms.

5.1.2. TRANSLITERATION

Transliteration is also based on the graphical principle. However, in this case reproduction of the letters of the foreign word take place with the graphical means of the recipient language based on (sometimes highly incidental) correspondences between the two linguistic systems.

The principle of transliteration can be observed in the instances of *listing* > *лицтинг*, *plotter* > *плоттер*, *slogan* > *слоган*, *tabloid* > *таблoид*. The following of foreign spelling is especially prominent in cases where spelling and pronunciation in the source language differs: in the word *marketing* ['ma:kitiŋ] letters *r* and *g* do not appear on the surface according to the pronunciation rules of British English, still, these letters are included in the Russian written form (*маркетинг*).

Transliteration sometimes promotes the simplification of the phonetic form of the loanword in Russian. This process manifests itself, for instance, in the monophthongization of the diphthongs: *broker* ['broukə] > *брoкep*.

5.1.3. TRANSCRIPTION

As opposed to the two above-mentioned tendencies, transcription is not based on a graphic, but rather a phonetic principle: it reflects the phonetic form of the borrowing by means of the letters of the recipient language.

Transcription can only reproduce the Russified pronunciation of Anglicisms, as English-like features (diphthongs, aspirated and interdental consonants) cannot be incorporated into the Russian sound system, features strange to Russian ears cannot be imported. Russification of the pronunciation is a process in which the English sounds missing from the Russian phonetic system are replaced by Russian sounds similar to them.

The transcription principle is applied in the following cases: *image* ['ɪmɪdʒ] > *имидж*, *joystick* ['dʒɔɪstɪk] > *джойстик*, *know-how* ['nou-hau] > *ноу-хау*, *office* ['ɔfɪs] > *oфис*. The number of borrowings containing exact sound correspondences is relatively low, as the replacement of English sounds unfamiliar in Russian can also take place based on the written form of the source language (transliteration).

5.1.4. MIXED TYPE (PRACTICAL TRANSCRIPTION)

In practice, there is a compromise between transliteration and transcription. In practical transcription, more principles are applied at the same time: graphical, phonetic, phonemical, orthographical, moreover, also transcriptional traditions of the recipient language. These principles often contradict each other, and finally one of them proves to be stronger and prevails.

In contemporary Russian, there is a clear tendency to reflect the pronunciation of the source language more or less accurately, even though borrowings predominantly occur in writing, it is the phonetic form of the loanword which is taken into consideration with some regard to the written form. Thus, in the mixed type, it is undoubtedly transcription that dominates, transliteration is used only as a supplement.

In case of Anglicisms entering Russian, the tendency to mix the two transcribing models is observable in that some English derivational suffixes (*-er* [ə] > *-ep*, *-ing* [ɪŋ] > *-инг*) are reflected with transliteration, while letter clusters containing vowels (*ea* [i:] > *u*) are transcribed: *dealer* ['di:lə] > *дилep*, *leasing* ['li:sɪŋ] > *лизинг*.

The number of cases in which the written form of the borrowing can be attributed to either transcription or transliteration with absolute certainty is rather rare. In most of the cases, there is a compromise between the two types, still, the mixed type does not simply mean that transcribed and transliterated parts are mixed within the same word but it also means that in some parts of the word, both tendencies are applied with the same intensity, that is why it is impossible to separate them.

5.2. The rules of transcription

According to the 1956 Russian orthography effective until now, foreign words have to be written “as they occur in dictionaries”. This approach which offers no real solutions was inoperative even in the 1960s, and though many proposals have been created since, none of them has come into effect. In the absence of a unified transcription system, contemporary English borrowings enter the Russian language in a variety of forms.

Considering the data analyzed in the dissertation, transcription systems suggested by Giljarevskij–Starostin (1985), Timofeeva (1995) and Superanskaja (2000) require supplementation and amendment.

5.3. The comparison of English and Russian sound systems

Sound systems of the English and the Russian language show significant differences not only in quantity, but also in quality. There are not enough sounds in the recipient language for the reproduction of some of the foreign sounds, in other cases, there are too many sounds that could be applied as the equivalent of a foreign sound. This dichotomy can be observed in the comparison of English and Russian vowel and consonant systems.

5.3.1. VOWEL SYSTEM

There are significant differences between the vowel systems of the two languages in number (22 English sounds as opposed to five Russian vowels), in the place of articulation (middle vowels in English) and the manner of articulation (diphthongs occur only in English).

The reproduction of vowels of the source language is complicated by the fact that the short–long dichotomy of vowels is missing from the borrowing language. As a result, the difference between long and short English vowels is blurred and the two sounds coincide in Russian: [i:], [ɪ] > *u* (*leasing* ['li:sɪŋ] > *лизинг*). The same tendency occurs also in the case when the dichotomic pair of vowels is reflected in Russian by means of transliteration: [ə:], [ə] > *ep* (*server* ['sɜ:və] > *сервер*).

5.3.2. CONSONANT SYSTEM

Although the consonant systems of the two languages are closer to each other than their vowel systems, there are significant differences in this case as well.

Many English consonants are considered as unique as regards their articulation: the glottal fricative [h], the interdental fricatives [θ] and [ð], the velar nasal [ŋ] and the labiovelar glide [w] are all missing from the Russian language. However, Russian has significantly more consonants owing to the palatalized – non-palatalized pairs (in a proportion 37:24), thus, there are often two or three consonants which can be used to reproduce a foreign consonant.

While English consonants are reflected in Russian according to relatively regular correspondences, in the case of vowels, problems are caused by the fact that sometimes two or more sounds of the donor language have to be replaced by the same sound in the recipient language.

5.4. The orthographical adaptation of English loanwords

Bilingual speakers pronounce the sounds of two phonological systems in “no man’s land”. In the production of monolinguals, however, foreign sounds are perceived through similar native sounds. As a consequence of this, certain features of pronunciation in the source language can be less important and even lost if there are no such differentiations in the recipient language. Foreign sounds without an equivalent are usually substituted by the closest sound in the borrowing language.

5.4.1. SUBSTITUTION WITHOUT A CHANGE

In Group 1, the place of the English sound is taken by a Russian sound having almost identical features, that is, the English sound can be considered assimilated in Russian.

The English [i:] corresponds to Russian *u* in over 80 per cent of the examples: *cheeseburger* > *чизбургер*, *healer* > *хилер*. If the sound [i:] is indicated by the letter *e*, the Russian *u* is often replaced by *e*: *decoder* > *декодер*, *remake* > *римейк* / *ре-мейк*. The emergence of transliterated forms is explained by the analogical effects of earlier loanwords containing Latin elements (*депозит*, *репрессия*).

The English [e] basically corresponds to Russian *e*: *arm wrestling* > *армрестлинг*, *headhunting* > *хедхантинг*, *boyfriend* > *бойфренд*. In one-third of the cases the *э* plays some role as well: *heavy metal* > *хеви-метал* / *хэви-метал*. The hypercorrect form *ей* can be explained by the efforts to imitate pronunciation thought to be closer to English in *session* > *сеин* / *сейин* and *stretch* > *стретч* / *стреич*.

The English [ɔ:] is either transcribed by *o* or partially or completely transliterated by *op*: *talk show* > *ток-шоу*, *default* > *дефолт*; *short track* > *шорт-трек*, *skateboarding* > *скейтбординг*.

The English [u:] can appear in Russian as either *y* or *ю*: *Jacuzzi* > *джакузи*; *spooker* > *снукер*, *barbecue* > *барбекю*, *tuning* > *тюнинг*.

The majority of the English consonants are transferred into Russian by means of transliteration. Among the few exceptions are *ecstasy* > *экстази* and *fantasy* > *фэнтэзи* which are formed by the analogy of earlier loanwords (*экстаз*, *фантазия*). The form *leasing* > *лизинг* supposedly emerged under German influence (cf. Hung. *lizing*).

The English [tʃ] is usually transcribed by the Russian letter *ч*: *luncheon meat* > *ланчeнмит*, *venture* > *венчур*. There is a variation in loanwords including *tch* between the partially transliterated, hybrid-like *тч* and the clearly transcribed *ч*: *hatchback* > *хетчбэк* / *хечбэк*, *patchwork* > *пэтчворк* / *пэчворк*.

5.4.2. SUBSTITUTION BASED ON SIMILARITY

In Group 2, the English sound of the loanwords appears in the form of a similar Russian sound which is the closest to the original according to the place and manner of articulation.

The English [ɪ] predominantly corresponds to Russian *и*. In unstressed syllables, however, there might be some alternation between the transcribed and the transliterated variants, with the latter prevailing: *recruiting* > *рекрутинг*, *realtor* > *рѐэлтор*, *fitness* > *фитнес*.

The English [u] is substituted by its closest Russian equivalent *у*: *notebook* > *ноутбук*.

The English [a:] can be either transcribed by *а* or transliterated by *ap*: *casting* > *кастинг*, *rafting* > *рафтинг*; *darts* > *дартс*, *hardware* > *хардвер*. The only variation is present in *party* > *парти* / *пaти*.

The English [ɔ] is exclusively transcribed by *о* in Russian. Sometimes this sound is indicated by the letter *a* in English: *squash* > *сквош*.

The English diphthong [aɪ] is usually replaced by the Russian letter cluster *ай*: *high-tech* > *хай-тек*, *styling* > *стайлинг*.

The English diphthong [eɪ] mainly appears as *ей* in Russian: *shaping* > *шейпинг*, *delay* > *дилей*. The variation between the orthographically correct *ей* and the more foreign-like *эй* can be significant: *sale* > *сейл* / *сэйл*, *mainstream* > *мейнстрим* / *мэйнстрим*.

The English diphthong [aʊ] is generally reflected as *ау* in Russian: *accounting* > *экзаунтинг*, *soundtrack* > *саундтрек*. In the only alternation *browser* > *браузер* / *броузер*, the partially transliterated element *o* is preserved from the original orthographical form.

The English diphthong [ɔɪ] is mostly transcribed by the Russian letter cluster *ой*: *spoiler* > *спойлер*, *joystick* > *джойстик*. In spite of this, transliteration can also be used: *tabloid* > *таблоид*.

The English [dʒ] corresponds to Russian *дж*: *jogging* > *джоггинг*, *cartridge* > *картридж*. In words like *digitizer* > *диджитайзер* / *дигитайзер* variation is due to the transliteration of elements of Latin origin.

5.4.3. FREE SUBSTITUTION

In Group 3, due to the lack of an equivalent, the English sound of the loanword is replaced by a similar Russian sound. The basis for correspondence may be either phonological or orthographical, therefore, these free substitutions are characterized by a great deal of variation.

The English [æ] has no equivalent in Russian, and thus it can be substituted in several ways: *а*, *е*, *э*. About in a half of the corpus of my PhD thesis, the “quasi-transcribed” *е* or *э* is used, in one-third of the examples the traditional transliterated *а* occurs, while the rest of Anglicisms demonstrates double or multiple alternations:

hacker > хакер, *playback* > плейбэк, *trackball* > трекбол, *rap* > рен / рэн, *laptop* > лэптоп / лэптон, *cracker* > кракер / крекер / крэкер.

The forms *acid* > э́сид and *badge* > бейдж may have emerged as a result of hypercorrection, owing to the intention of Russian speakers to make their speech sound more like English, based on the fact that the English letter *a* does often denote the diphthong [ɪ].

The English [ʌ] has a more or less true equivalent but the Russian [ʌ] can occur exclusively in unstressed position. In the majority of new borrowings, the English [ʌ] is replaced by Russian *a* which is a sound closest to the original according to the place of articulation: *make-up* > мейк-ап, *summit* > саммит.

The English [ə:] has no Russian counterpart, so it is either transliterated by the corresponding English letter clusters or transcribed: *fishburger* > фишбургер, *server* > сервер, *workaholic* > уоркоголик; *sky surfing* > скайсёрфинг.

The English [ə] is usually substituted in Russian based on the original written form: *barter* > бартер, *modem* > модем, *promotion* > промоушн, *trustor* > трас-тор. If the English orthographical form has an *a*, there might be some variation: *merchandizing* > мерчандайзинг / мерчендайзинг.

The Russian letter combination *ep* can be shortened to *e* in order to block the emergence of a consonant cluster complicating the pronunciation in the recipient language: *underground* > андерграунд / андеграунд.

The English diphthong [eə] is mainly reproduced in Russian by the half-transcribed, half-transliterated sequence *ep* or *эр*: *timeshare* > таймшер / таймшэр, *welfare* > велфер / вэлфэр.

The English diphthong [ɪə] is most of all transliterated in Russian: *multimedia* > мультимедиа, *ambient* > амбиент ‘ambient’.

The English diphthong [ou] corresponds to the Russian letter cluster *oy* which is rather rare, that is why in about one half of the examples transliteration is applied: *holding* > холдинг, *poster* > постер, *toner* > тонер.

In one-third of the my corpus, preference is still given to the “quasitranscribed” method: *roaming* > роуминг, *promoter* > промоутер. Transcription is sometimes intertwined with the monophthongization of the diphthong [ou]: *roaster* > роастер.

Although the English glottal [h] absent from the borrowing language had caused serious problems before, nowadays it is generally substituted by Russian *x*: *hard rock* > хард-рок, *hip-hop* > хип-хоп, *hot dog* > хот-дог. The letter *z* which was common in earlier Western European borrowings appears in new loanwords only if the English loanword contains an element of Latin origin (*зунер-*) or a Western European geographical name (*Гамбург*): *hypertext* > зунертекст, *hamburger* > гамбургер.

The English [w] which is also missing from Russian continues to be substituted by the traditional *в*: *goodwill* > гудвилл, *software* > софтвер, *website* > вебсайт. The transcribed *y* occurs only in case of minor alternations: *walkie-talkie* > воки-токи / уоки-токи, *wow!* > вай! / уай!

The English [θ] and [ð] are traditionally reproduced in Russian by the partially transliterated *m*, though the “quasitranscribed” *э* can also replace the latter sound: *thriller* > *триллер*, *motherboard* > *мазерборд*.

The English [ŋ] is basically transliterated, that is the orthographical letter combination *нз* or *нк* is preserved: *banking* > *банкинг*, *link* > *линк*. In order to preclude the emergence of a consonant cluster, the letter *з* may be dropped during transcription: *leggings* > *леггинсы*.

It can be stated on the basis of the detailed analysis carried out above that the reproduction of English consonants in Russian causes less variation than the reflection of vowels. The assumption that foreign sounds without an equivalent in Russian (in Group 3) show more alternation than the rest of sounds (in Group 1 and 2) was justified as well.

5.5. Comparative analysis

Apart from a lot of similarities, the comparative analysis of the three transcription systems mentioned in 5.2. and the corpus of the dissertation reveals a number of differences between the ideal solution conceived by linguists and the everyday practice. Due to the lack of a unified set of rules, phonological substitution demonstrates a great deal of variation, and in the case of certain sounds recent English loanwords do not justify the statements of the offered transcription systems: [æ] is predominantly replaced by *э*, not *а*; the most frequent reproduction of [a:] and [ɔ:] (*ap* and *op*) is mentioned only in one of the sources (as secondary), while [w] corresponds to *в*, contrary to certain claims about the increasing role of *у*. In the future, experts working on a new set of transcription rules are recommended to pay more attention to actual tendencies typical of recent years.

5.6. Orthographical problems

5.6.1. THE *E/Э* ALTERNATION

According to the handbook of Russian orthography published in 1956, the letter *e* is written after consonants (with the exception of *мэр*, *нэр*, *сэр* and some proper names). In spite of this, there has been a growing tendency to use the letter *э* in new loanwords since the 1960s. By the 1980s, the pronunciation of hard consonants before [e] had become widely accepted and integrated into the Russian phonological system. The rather strict and in many aspects outdated orthographical principles are continuously violated by the speech community, while dictionaries taking into consideration the actual situation gradually turn to the variants with *э*.

It is generally the new and foreign-like character of loanwords that is emphasized by written forms including *э* and pronunciation of hard consonants. Moreover, the letter *э* relatively rarely used in the borrowing language starts to be a permanent companion to the English [æ]: *back vocal* > *бэк-вокал*, *fashion show* > *фэшин-шоу*.

5.6.2. THE PROBLEM OF DOUBLE CONSONANTS

Double consonants in English do not designate the length of a sound, instead, they indicate closed syllables and short preceding vowels. Since there are no such phonological rules in Russian, the early stages of the borrowing process is often characterized by an alternation between double consonants and (transliteration) and simplification (transcription): *офшор* / *офшор*, *плей-офф* / *плей-оф*, *топлесс* / *топлес*.

This orthographical variation can sometimes exist for a longer time, especially when there is a semantic split between the transliterated and the transcribed variant: *shredder* > *шреддер* (in offices) and *шредер* (in food industry).

Double consonants are quite often attributed a symbolic importance by speakers who try to emphasize the foreignness of a transferred lexical element: it is likely that the hypercorrect forms *dealer* > *диллер* and *healer* > *хиллер* emerged by the analogy of the loanword *киллер*.

5.6.3. COMPOUND WORDS

The lack of orthographical regulations concerning foreign compound words in Russian has been a problem for a long time. Loanwords consisting of more than one element in the source language are syntactically simplified during the borrowing process. They are taken as undivided units denoting one single object or concept in the recipient language, and as a consequence, their components written separately in English are joined by a hyphen or spelt as one word in Russian: *jam session* > *джем-сейшн*, *short track* > *шорт-трек*, *high tech* > *хай-тек* / *хайтек*, *body building* > *бодибилдинг*.

The overwhelming majority of Anglicisms can be considered neologisms standing at the beginning of the borrowing process, that is why orthographical alternation is so natural for them in the early stages that one can even claim this variation to be the norm.

5.7. The stress of English loanwords

The significant part of foreign lexical elements in Russian has had a word-final stress owing to French influence since the 18th and 19th century. This tradition is decisive even nowadays since it is a sign of higher level of adaptation if the stress moves towards the end of the word in new borrowings analogically to earlier loanwords. In spite of this, recent Anglicisms are rather characterized by the retention of the original stress.

The stress remains on the first syllable: *biker* ['baɪkə] > *байкер*, *cheeseburger* ['tʃi:z,bə:gə] > *чизбургер*, *piercing* ['pi:siŋ] > *пирсинг*.

The stress remains on the second syllable: *consulting* [kən'sʌltɪŋ] > *консалтинг*, *online* [ɔn'laɪn] > *онлайн*.

The stress remains on the third syllable: *engineering* [ˌɛndʒɪˈnɪərɪŋ] > *инжини́ринг*.

A smaller group of English loanwords studied in my PhD thesis shows variation in stress. Forms different from their models in the source language first of all occur if Anglicisms consisting of two morphemes are transferred into Russian: *overtime* [ˈoʊvəˌtaɪm] > *о́вертайм/оверта́йм*, *snowboarding* [ˈsnəʊˌbɔːdɪŋ] > *сно́убординг / сноуборди́нг*, *speechwriter* [ˈspiːtʃˌraɪtə] > *спичра́йтер / спичра́йтер*.

Sometimes both elements of the compound word can get a stress: *mountain bike* [ˈmaʊntɪn ˌbaɪk] > *ма́унтинба́йк*, *second hand* [ˌsekənd ˈhænd] > *сэ́конд-хэ́нд*.

The third group of English loanwords has a change in the place of stress.

1) The stress moves to the second element of the compound word: *copywriter* [ˈkɒpiˌraɪtə] > *копира́йтер*, *jackpot* [ˈdʒækˌpɒt] > *джекпóт*.

2) The stress moves towards the end of word because of the suffix or suffixoid (-*бол*, -*изм*, -*оид*): *streetball* [ˈstriːtˌbɔːl] > *стритбóл*, *ageism* [ˈeɪdʒɪzəm] > *эйджизм*, *factoid* [ˈfæktɔɪd] > *факто́ид*.

Most Anglicisms ending in *-инг* has a penultimate stress by analogy: *advertising* [ˌædvɛrˌtaɪzɪŋ] > *адверта́йзинг*, *powerlifting* [ˈpaʊəˌlɪftɪŋ] > *пауэрл́ифтинг*.

3) The stress can move closer to word-final position under the influence of an old loanword: *abstract* [ˈæbstrækt] > *абстра́кт* ‘short summary’, *winchester* [ˈwɪnˌtʃɛstə] > *винчэ́стер* ‘hard disk’ (cf. *абстра́ктный* ‘theoretical’, *винчэ́стер* ‘rifle’).

4) If there is a change in stress, the new place of stress is very often assigned by the secondary stress in English: *energizer* [ˈɛnəˌdʒaɪzə] > *энерджáйзер*, *insider* [ˈɪnˌsaɪdə] > *инса́йдер*.

More than 55 per cent of the examined 464 English loanwords in Russian retain the stress typical of the donor language. Stress variation and double stress occurs in about 22.5 per cent of the examples, and the proportion of Anglicisms going through a change in stress is basically the same.

6. The morphological adaptation of English loanwords

The morphological system of a language that subordinates loanwords to its own categories is the linguistic domain least exposed to the influence of other languages. Thus, the morphological adaptation of foreign lexical elements is often completed before and shows less variation than their phonological and semantic integration.

The distribution of loanwords according to parts of speech is not balanced. The percentage of nouns highly exceeds the proportion of other word classes: 75–80 per cent of all borrowings belong here. Unlike nouns borrowed directly and more easily, adjectives and especially verbs demonstrate a more complex process comprising two stages: borrowing is complemented by word formation, foreign roots are supplied with suffixes and endings of the recipient language. Words belonging to other parts of speech are very rarely transferred from one language into another: some adverbs (*non-stop* > *нон-сто́п*) and interjections (*wow!* > *вау!*) can be mentioned here.

6.1. Nouns

The dominance of borrowed nouns over transferred elements belonging to other parts of speech can be explained by several factors. On the one hand, foreign neologisms are adopted by the borrowing language basically in order to describe new phenomena, on the other hand, the derivation of new nouns from recently borrowed nouns also enlarges the number of elements in this word class.

Basic grammatical categories are expressed in the very first stage of the transfer independently of the orthographical form of loanwords. Borrowings written in Latin alphabet can also hold grammatical information: gender, number, and case are either expressed by syntactic means in Russian contexts or marked by separated endings (*remake*’ом). Therefore, it seems compulsory for all borrowed elements to be integrated into Russian grammatical categories.

6.1.1. THE CATEGORY OF GENDER

The gender of the overwhelming majority of nouns borrowed from English (as in the case of Russian nouns) is determined by the ending of the word. The only exceptions are words referring to persons: *яппи* ‘yuppie’ (masculine), *бизнес-вумен* ‘businesswoman’, *кавегёрл* ‘cover girl’ (feminine). Most of the Anglicisms end in consonants and, therefore, automatically belong to masculine nouns in the recipient language. In the corpus of my PhD thesis, this proportion is over 90 per cent. One of the reasons why the masculine gender prevails to this extent is the large number of lexical elements supplied with suffixes *-er* and *-ing* that are transferred from English into Russian.

Though the assimilation of Anglicisms is quite rarely accompanied by a change in gender assignment, minor variations can be observed between the masculine and the feminine. In a special group of loanwords, the gender of the equivalent in the borrowing language may have an influence on the morphological adaptation of the foreign element: *баг* > *бага* ‘bug in a computer program’ (~ *ошибка*), *гам* > *гама* ‘chewing gum’ (~ *жвачка*). The grammatical adjustment is also present in the case of feminine nouns denoting persons, especially in youth slang: *вайф* > *вайфа* ‘wife’ (~ *жена*), *френд* > *френда* ‘friend (a girl)’ (~ *подруга*).

Semantic analogy also plays an important role in the gender assignment of inanimate nouns having an irregular ending in Russian: *парти* ‘party’ (~ *вечеринка*, *тусовка*) is feminine, *экстези* ‘ecstasy’ (~ *наркотик*) is masculine, while *секьюрити* can be either masculine (~ *охранник* ‘security guard’) or feminine (~ *служба безопасности* ‘security service’) depending on its concrete meaning.

6.1.2. THE CATEGORY OF NUMBER

The overwhelming majority of Anglicisms is transferred into Russian as a singular noun and takes the plural ending *-ы* or *-и* (sometimes *-а*), like the lexical elements of the borrowing language. A group of foreign words is perceived as singular

in Russian, although in English they are used in the plural form (depluralization): *bucks* > бакс, *futures* > фьючерс. In some cases, morphological variants appear with or without the *-с* ending: *stickers* > стикер / стикерс, *flyers* > флайер / флайерс.

English nouns are borrowed in plural usually because these words in their relevant meanings are used exclusively in the plural form in the source language. These pluralia tantum words basically refer to paired objects (clothes, boots): *leggings* > леггинсы, *slacks* > слаксы, *sneakers* > сникерсы. Sometimes the Russian plural ending replaces the foreign inflection (*-s* > *-би*), but this occurs only exceptionally: *charts* > чарты.

6.1.3. THE CATEGORY OF CASE

Morphologically adapted borrowings are integrated into the gender, number and case system analogically to Russian nouns. If the morphological adaptation is only partial or completely missing, these categories are expressed by syntactic means, in the context of surrounding words.

Among recently borrowed Anglicisms, the following elements are not adjusted to the Russian case system: *мультимедиа* 'multimedia', *паблик рилейшнз* 'public relations', and *роялти* 'royalty'. Another group of indeclinable loanwords consists of feminine nouns ending in a hard consonant or *-и*: *гёрлфренд* 'girlfriend', *группи* 'groupie'.

Non-declension can be motivated by extralinguistic factors as well: an effort to be accurate for the sake of the better identification of the original form (trademarks written in Latin alphabet: *ручки от Parker*) or emphasis on the foreign origin of the word by which the speaker wishes to prove his or her competence in a foreign language. This phenomenon is also illustrated by cases when some neologisms are left uninflected in the recipient language even if they could be declined without a problem, having no irregular features in their morphological structures.

6.2. Adjectives

The direct borrowing of adjectives is a rare phenomenon: in most of the cases, it takes place in slang. Contrary to this, standard language is more characterized by the derivation of adjectives from transferred nouns.

Borrowing is usually accompanied by derivational adjustment which is decisive from the point of view of the morphological formation of adjectives. Without incorporating the suffixes of the recipient language, these neologisms used attributively in a sentence would belong to the group of analytic adjectives.

6.2.1. BORROWING OF ADJECTIVES

About one-eighth of recent adjectives taken from English can be considered as the result of direct borrowing into Russian slang: *old* > оловый, *fine* > файновый, *cheap* > чиповый.

English adjectival roots without grammatical adaptation are often used as nouns in Russian, that is why they are supplied with the suffixes of the borrowing language in order to maintain their role as an adjective: *зуд* ‘a good thing’ > *зудовый* ‘good’, *янг* ‘a young man’ > *янговый* ‘young’, *кул* ‘an expert in programming’ > *кульный* ‘cool’; *форин* ‘foreigner’ > *форинский* ‘foreign’. Exceptionally, there are some indeclinable adjectives as well: *вайт* ‘white’, *рашен* ‘Russian’, *хай* ‘high quality’.

To somewhat less extent, the direct borrowing of adjectives is also characteristic of words composed of Latin elements and the relevant meanings of which emerged in English: *дигитальный* ‘digital’, *интерактивный* ‘interactive’, *компатибельный* ‘compatible’, *экссклюзивный* ‘exclusive’.

6.2.2. ANALYTIC ADJECTIVES

The growing number of Russian attributive compounds modelled after noun + noun constructions often used in English may be due to several features present in the system of the borrowing language. Apart from words like *жар-птица*, *царь-колокол* containing prepositive indeclinable adjectives, the integration of foreign neologisms built analogically is also facilitated by the fact that there is a large number of expressions like *пионерлагерь*, *спорткомплекс* in Russian which are easily replaced by the attributive compounds *пионерский лагерь*, *спортивный комплекс*. This variation can often be observed in the case of new loanwords as well: *холдинг-компания* / *холдинговая компания* ‘holding company’, *компакт-диск* / *компактный диск* ‘compact disc’, *мультимедиа-компьютер* / *мультимедийный компьютер* ‘multimedia computer’.

Foreign-like models containing analytic adjectives and attributive compounds more common in Russian corresponding to them show a great degree of variation: *адресбук* / *адресная книга* ‘address book’, *бизнес-школа* / *школа бизнеса* ‘business school’, *факс-бумага* / *бумага для факса* ‘fax paper’. This is especially true if the second part of the original English construction is substituted by a Russian noun.

Some of the prepositive elements can maintain their Latin-alphabet orthographical form: *CD-ROM-диск* ‘CD-ROM’, *DVD-плеер* ‘DVD player’, *Internet-адрес* / *интернет-адрес* ‘internet address’, *PR-кампания* ‘PR campaign’, *VIP-билет* / *вин-билет* ‘VIP ticket’, *Web-страница* / *веб-страница* ‘webpage’.

New creations incorporating Russian lexical elements as well as earlier borrowings demonstrate the productivity of the recurring components, serve as models for the emergence of further constructions of the same type, and because of the lack of an equivalent in English they can be considered as a result of Russian word formation: *арт-тусовка* ‘artists’ party’, *бизнес-леди* ‘businesswoman’, *брейк-конкурс* ‘break-dance competition’, *вип-ложа* ‘VIP seat’, *кантри-ансамбль* ‘country band’, *техно-дискотека* ‘techno party’.

6.3. Verbs

Like adjectives, verbs are also very rarely transferred from one language into another. The only exception may be slang in which speakers try to refer to a well-known activity more expressively than the usual way. In standard language, however, new verbs created from borrowed nouns and adjectives prevail. A clear distinction between these two processes (verb borrowing and verb derivation) is quite often difficult to make.

Due to the lack of a corresponding noun in Russian, the possibility of word formation in the borrowing language can be excluded since Russian verbal suffixes simply function as tools for a morphological adjustment. Without these suffixes, verbs of English origin cannot be integrated into the Russian conjugational system: *eat* > *итать*, *use* > *юзать*, *boot* > *бутить*, *print* > *принтить* / *принтовать*, *escape* > *искейпнуть*, *take* > *мейкануть*.

In the case of new borrowings, the higher level of adaptation is designated by the use of verbal prefixes which are assigned by the analogy of the Russian semantic equivalents: *приаттачить* 'attach' (~ *приложить*), *забутить* 'boot' (~ *загрузить*), *напринтить* / *отпринтить* 'print' (~ *напечатать* / *отпечатать*).

6.4. Word Formation

Although it is widely accepted among Russian researchers that one of the most evident sign of loanword adaptation is the active role these transferred lexical elements play in word formation, further (adjectival and verbal) forms of Anglicisms can appear even at the moment of borrowing due to the analogical use of Russian suffixes: *толлинг* 'tolling' – *толлинговый*, *толлинговать* (cf. *лизинг* 'leasing' – *лизинговый*, *лизинговать*).

Apart from the morphological features of the root, the derivational adaptation of loans is influenced by extralinguistic factors: communication needs deriving from the up-to-dateness of the object or concept in question generate further nominal, adjectival, and verbal forms. The most typical way is suffixation but prefixation and combination of the two methods frequently occur as well (especially in verbs).

6.4.1. DERIVATION OF NOUNS

Nouns derived from English loanwords can be classified according to the semantic features of the derived forms:

1) names of persons on the basis of their profession or activity: *ботл|ер* 'beggar collecting empty bottles', *брейк|ер* 'break-dancer', *снукер|ист* 'snooker player', *шорт-трек|ист* 'short-track skater', *мультимедий|щик* 'expert in multimedia', *пиар|щик* 'PR specialist', *гринпис|овец* 'Greenpeace activist';

2) differentiation of female persons: *бизнесмен|ка* 'businesswoman', *сноубордист|ка* 'snowboarder', *бодибилдер|ша* 'bodybuilder', *киллер|ша* 'murderer';

3) names of various objects: *тишот|ка* ‘T-shirt’, *писиш|ка* ‘personal computer’, *флоп|ак* ‘floppy’, *сидиш|ник* ‘CD-ROM drive’;

4) abstract concepts: *ауд|ирование* ‘audit’, *спонс|ирование, спонсор|ство* ‘sponsoring’, *имиджмейкер|ство* ‘image building’, *интернет|изация* ‘internetization’, *экссклюзив|ность* ‘exclusive feature’.

Because of the existence of parallel suffixes in English and Russian (-er || -ep), sometimes it can be difficult to decide whether it is a derivation in the borrowing language or a direct borrowing: *рафт|инг* > *рафт|ер* < *rafter*, *рекрут|инг* > *рекрут|ер* < *recruiter*.

The variation of the suffix -ep / -op in Russian when there is only one variant in English can be explained by the balancing effect of analogy: *distributor* > *дистрибьютор* / *дистрибьютер*, *realtor* > *риэлтор* / *риэлтер* (cf. similar names of profession: *брокер* ‘broker’, *дилер* ‘dealer’).

The derivational adaptation of loanwords is facilitated to a large extent if the model in the source language contains a suffix which has an analogous suffix in the recipient language: *indoctrination* > *индоктрин|ация*, *age|ism* > *эйдж|изм*, *monetar|ist* > *монетар|ист*, *scient|ology* > *сайент|ология*.

6.4.2. DERIVATION OF ADJECTIVES

As in the case of borrowing of adjectives, the suffix -ов- plays a significant role in the derivation of adjectives from foreign stems: *онлайн|овый* ‘online’, *файл|овый* ‘file’, *хит|овый* ‘hit’. Its importance is further increased by the fact that adjectives derived from English loanwords ending in -инг contain this element as well: *консалтинг|овый* ‘consulting’, *роуминг|овый* ‘roaming’, *холдинг|овый* ‘holding’.

The suffix -н- is often used in inanimate nouns, while -ск- is added to names of professions: *модем|ный* ‘modem’, *оффшор|ный* ‘offshore’, *таймшер|ный* ‘time-share’, *дайвер|ский* ‘diver’, *девелопер|ский* ‘developer’, *хилер|ский* ‘healer’.

However, there are some minor variations as contrary to the general tendency. Suffix variation is a natural companion to the early stage in the process of adaptation of foreign neologisms in Russian: *винчестер|ный* / *винчестер|ский* ‘winchester’, *спонсор|ный* / *спонсор|ский* ‘sponsor’, *интернет|овский* / *интернет|ный* / *интернет|ский* ‘internet’, *пиар|овский* / *пиар|ный* / *пиар|ский* ‘PR’.

6.4.3. DERIVATION OF VERBS

The vast majority of English loanwords takes only one verbal suffix in Russian: *браузер|ить* ‘to browse’, *чат|ить* ‘to chat’, *рэп|овать* ‘to rap’, *шопинг|овать* ‘to go shopping’, *дилер|ствовать* ‘to work as a dealer’, *апгрейд|ировать* ‘to upgrade’, *спонс|ировать* ‘to sponsor’, *ваучер|изировать* ‘to provide with compensation warrants’, *дигитал|изировать* ‘to digitalize’.

Verbs derived from foreign nouns (sometimes from adjectives) are easily integrated into the aspectual system of Russian. Like verbs of the borrowing language,

non-prefixed verbs containing the suffix *-и-*, *-ова-*, *-а-* or *-ствова-* are imperfect, while verbs with the suffix *-ну-* are perfect: *кликать / кликнуть* ‘to click’, *хакерить / хакернуть* ‘to hack’.

Neologisms including the terminological suffix *-ирова-* or *-изирова-* are usually claimed as biaspectual verbs in dictionaries. With the transition from terminology to the standard language, these verbs can take a prefix and become perfect (*спонсировать – проспонсировать*).

6.4.4. BORROWING OF SUFFIXES AND SUFFIXOIDS

Foreign morphemes frequently recurring in loanwords can be gradually separated and they can play an active role when attached to other stems. The suffix *-инг* of English origin, for example, is sometimes connected to lexical elements of the borrowing language (*магазининг, сбербанкинг*), which indicates that the transferred morpheme, irrespectively of its low productivity, is on the way to become an independent suffix in Russian.

Parts of words repeated several times in the recipient language can sometimes serve as a basis for the emergence of suffixoids: *имиджмейкер* ‘image-maker’, *нюсмейкер* ‘newsmaker’ → *клип|мейкер* ‘video director’, *слух|мейкер* ‘gossipy’, *шлягер|мейкер* ‘successful songwriter’. Another type is a suffixoid taken from English and attached even to Russian stems: *-бургер* ‘-burger’ (*гамбургер, фишбургер, чизбургер, чикенбургер*), *-гейт* ‘-gate’ (*дачагейт, Ельцингейт, Кремлегейт, урангейт*), *-оголик* ‘-aholic’ (*покупкоголик, сетеголик, трудоголик*).

7. The semantic adaptation of English loanwords

Besides orthographical, phonological, and morphological studies, relatively less attention has been paid to the semantic adaptation of foreign lexical elements in literature so far. At the same time, the semantic integration of borrowings often precedes their orthographical and morphological assimilation: therefore, the meaning of *фитнес / фитнесс* (‘fitness’) or *флайер / флайерс* (‘flyer’) is quite clear in spite of their orthographical variants and unstable grammatical forms.

The process of semantic adaptation of loanwords is usually divided into two stages: 1) transfer with a meaning characteristic of the donor language, 2) use in the recipient language, which in many cases presumes the emergence of new meanings as well. Most neologisms of English origin in the corpus of my PhD thesis have not gone beyond stage 1.

7.1. Borrowing of English loanwords in the original meaning

In the early stages of borrowing, the semantic features of English loanwords in Russian are formed under the influence of two linguistic systems. This unstable starting period is characterized by the blurredness of semantic borders, and later on,

out of the temporary meanings which depend on the context, it is the most frequent meaning which is preserved in the end. Thus, the emerging lexical meaning in most cases follows the prototype in the source language (with some modifications) due to the correcting activity of bilingual speakers.

7.1.1. BORROWING OF MONOSEMANTIC ENGLISH WORDS

It is mainly terminology where lexical meanings in two languages can coincide. Special terms with only one meaning in the donor language are usually transferred to the borrowing language in this definition-like sense:

- politics: *speechwriter* > *спичрайтер*;
- computer technology: *laptop* > *лаптоп*;
- music: *soundtrack* > *саундтрек*;
- sports: *body building* > *бодибилдинг*;
- economy: *audit* > *аудит*;
- media: *prime time* > *прайм-тайм*.

In some cases, the exclusive meaning is preserved in the standard usage as well (*boyfriend* > *бойфренд*, *poster* > *постер*).

7.1.2. BORROWING OF POLYSEMANTIC ENGLISH WORDS IN ONE MEANING

Transferred lexical elements in the recipient language have a semantic structure which is more simple than in the donor language: polysemantic words in most cases are borrowed in one meaning. Speakers of Russian perceive the loanwords with a rich semantic content in English only in one concrete meaning corresponding to their communication needs, while irrelevant (and often non-terminological) meanings are simply not taken into consideration. It is not always the basic meaning in the source language that takes part in the borrowing process. Quite frequently, one of the secondary meanings is given preference: *notebook* ‘book for notes’ > *ноутбук* ‘small computer’, *printer* ‘pressman’ > *принтер* ‘printing device’, *fitness* ‘suitability’ > *фитнес* ‘sport’, *sale* ‘selling’ > *сейл* ‘selling things at reduced price’.

7.1.3. BORROWING OF POLYSEMANTIC ENGLISH WORDS IN MORE THAN ONE MEANING

Borrowing in more than one meaning at once is a rare phenomenon (intensive language contact and high level of bilingualism is needed). The examined elements can be divided into two groups depending on whether the original semantic structure is reflected in the recipient language partially or completely:

1) not all English meanings are borrowed: *driver* ‘someone who drives animals’ – *драйвер* ‘computer program’ + ‘car driver (slang)’, *hit* ‘shot, blow’ – *хит* ‘popular song’ + ‘any successful or popular thing’, *single* ‘one-way ticket’ – *сингл* ‘record with one song’ + ‘tennis match between two players’;

2) both English meanings are transferred into Russian: *banner* > *баннер* ‘piece of cloth stretched for advertising’ + ‘advertisement on a website’, *slogan* > *слоган* ‘advertising slogan’ + ‘campaign slogan’, *steak* > *стейк* ‘beef steak’ + ‘a slice of meat or fish fried’.

For speakers of Russian, the interrelation between certain meanings of polysemantic English loanwords is not always clear, and this contributes to the emergence of homonyms in Russian: *label* > *лейбл*₁ ‘label on a piece of cloth’, *лейбл*₂ ‘record company’.

7.2. Semantic changes of English loanwords in Russian

Loanwords are not always used in the meaning which appeared at the moment of borrowing. New meanings which are absent from the source language and present only in the recipient language indicate a progress in the integration of foreign lexical elements. There are two types of semantic change: specialization and generalization (semantic extension).

7.2.1. CHANGE IN THE MEANING TAKEN FROM ENGLISH

A word which has a general meaning in the source language is often borrowed in a special sense. The following English loanwords changed their meanings and became more concrete in Russian usage, having lost their original and more general meanings in the meantime: *killer* → *киллер* ‘professional killer, hitman’, *provider* → *провайдер* ‘mobile and internet provider’, *security* → *секьюрити* ‘security service’, ‘security guard’. These semantic changes are in close contact with the motivating forces behind borrowing, among others, the need for specialization and the intention to increase prestige.

7.2.2. THE EMERGENCE OF NEW MEANINGS

The semantic structure of certain English loanwords can get more complex in Russian usage in case it is supplemented by new meanings. There are several ways of semantic extension:

1) in parallel with the special meaning, it is possible for a non-terminological meaning to appear in the standard language too (determinologization): *cartridge* → *картридж* ‘toner cartridge’ + ‘any replaceable element’, *leasing* → *лизинг* ‘long-term hiring’ + ‘lending’;

2) one of the elements of the English compound replaces the whole expression, taking on its meaning (condensation): *fast food (network)* → *фаст-фуд* ‘fast food’ + ‘fast food network’, *second hand (shop)* → *секонд-хенд* ‘second hand object’ + ‘second hand shop’;

3) conversion of trademarks into common nouns: *(Sony) Discman* → *дискмен* ‘any portable CD player’, *Pampers* → *памперсы* ‘nappies’.

The emergence of new meanings is quite rarely characterized by specialization. In these cases, speakers of Russian modify the basic meaning of the loanword preserving the meaning typical of the source language too: *player* → *плеёр* ‘machine for playing music’ + ‘walkman’, *trader* → *трейдер* ‘merchant’ + ‘broker’ + ‘stock market speculator’, *voucher* → *ваучер* ‘coupon’ + ‘compensation warrant’ + ‘tourist voucher’.

7.3. Loan translation

The largest group of English loan translations in Russian consists of attributive compounds: *fast food* > *быстрое питание*, *mountain bike* > *горный велосипед*, *new wave* > *новая волна*, *soap opera* > *мыльная опера*.

The number of semantic calques is also significant: *digital* > *цифровой*, *mouse* > *мышь*. These examples can be considered a subtype of semantic extension, since it is only the meaning of the English word that is borrowed.

If one of the components of the compound word remains in its original form, while the other component is replaced by a Russian word, it is a hybrid whose first element can be either an inflected (*address book* > *адресная книга*, *hard disk* > *жесткий диск*) or an uninflected (*country club* > *кантри-клуб*, *rap music* > *рэп-музыка*) adjective.

8. Conclusion

In my PhD thesis, I intended to carry out a complex study of English loanwords transferred recently into Russian. I examined the psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic factors motivating the borrowing of foreign words, and then I analyzed the orthographical, phonological, morphological, derivational as well as semantic adaptation of Anglicisms.

Finally, comparing data from three widely used dictionaries of Russian published in recent years, I claimed that over one-third (exactly 38.5 per cent) of the examples in dissertation can be considered more or less assimilated in present-day Russian.

Publications Concerning the Topic of the PhD Thesis

1. Английские лексические элементы в современном русском и венгерском языках рекламы. [English Lexical Elements in Present-Day Russian and Hungarian Advertising Language.] *A szláv nyelvek oktatásának elmélete és gyakorlata. A II. nemzetközi konferencia előadásai*. Pécs, 1994. 337–344.
2. Фонетическое освоение американизмов в русских рекламных текстах. [The Phonological Adaptation of Americanisms in Russian Advertisements.] *A szláv nyelvek oktatásának elmélete és gyakorlata. A III. nemzetközi konferencia előadásai*. Pécs, 1996. 51–59.
3. Грамматическое освоение американизмов в современных русских и венгерских рекламах. [The Grammatical Adaptation of Americanisms in Russian and Hungarian Advertisements.] *Studia Russica XVI*. Budapest, 1997. 231–238.
4. *Сканер, пейджер, дискман*. Об американизмах в русской лексике, связанной с электронной техникой. [Scanner, pager, discman. Americanisms in Russian Electrotechnical Terminology.] *Nyelv, stílus, irodalom. Köszöntő könyv Péter Mihály 70. születésnapjára*. Budapest, 1998. 264–269.
5. О семантическом освоении англо-американских заимствований в русском языке. [The Semantic Adaptation of American English Loanwords in Russian.] *Studia Russica XVII*. Budapest, 1999. 237–240.
6. Свое и чужое в русском компьютерном сленге (на материале одного словаря). [Russian and Foreign Elements in Computer Slang (On the Basis of a Dictionary).] *Studia Russica XVIII*. Budapest, 2000. 354–361.
7. Англо-американские неологизмы в современном русском языке. [American English Neologisms in Present-Day Russian.] *Русское слово в мировой культуре. Материалы X Конгресса МАПРЯЛ. Русский язык и русская речь сегодня: старое – новое – заимствованное*. Санкт-Петербург, 2003. 559–566.
8. Об «аналитических прилагательных» английского происхождения в русском языке. [Analytic Adjectives of English Origin in Russian.] *Studia Russica XXII*. Budapest, 2005. 263–273.
9. О новых несклоняемых английских заимствованиях в русском языке [New Indeclinable English Loanwords in Russian.] *Вестник Филиала Института русского языка имени А. С. Пушкина*. Budapest, 2007. 127–132.
10. Об англо-американских заимствованиях и реалиях в романе В. Пелевина «Generation П». [American English Loanwords and Realia in Victor Pelevin's Novel *Generation P*.] *Русская литература в формировании современной языковой личности*. Санкт-Петербург, 2007. 244–250.