Acta 2009/3
Linguistica

Eurasia Academic Publishers

CONTENTS

Research

ABOUT THE FIRST VOLUME OF A CONTACTOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES[1]

Jovan Ajdukovich
(Belgrade, Serbia)

Summary: In this paper, we will try to answer two questions that arose while I was working on the *Contactological Dictionary of Adaptation of Bul-garian Contact-Lexemes under Russian Influence*. The first refers to the problem of selecting materials for the dictionary. The other is purely of a conceptual and terminological nature and is related to the first: why do we use the terminological phrase "contact-lexeme under dominant Russian influence" instead of the traditional term "Russianism"? And why do we use the term "contact-lexeme" instead of "loanword"? The content and structure of the dictionary will be presented in the third part of the paper.

I Bulgarian Slavists have always been interested in the problem of identifying Russianisms. The 20th century was the golden age of Bulga-rian Slavistics and it was the period of the most extensive research on language contacts between Bulgarian and Russian. Several important works were published during this period, the most notable being the three-volume dictionary by P. Filkova [1], R. Pavlova's monograph [2], and the works of B. Tsonev [3], L. Andreychin [4], and K. Babov [5]. Although there are many papers on Russianisms in Bulgarian, specialized dictio-naries where they would be treated separately have not been published in the 20th century. We think that the reason for this is the dominant influence of 19th and 20th century etymology and historical linguistics on studying Russianisms, since the modern theory of languages in contact was established in the mid-20th century. However, R. Pavlova empha-sizes the importance of making a complete inventory of loan-words that came through Russian and says that "making this inventory is the task of future researchers" [6].

---

[1] This paper is a new extended version of my talk at the International Conference of Bulgarian Studies "The Bulgarian Language and Literature in Slavic and Non-Slavic Contexts", Szeged, Hungary, 28th and 29th May 2009.

One of the key issues is certainly a lack of clear criteria for distinguishing between loanwords from Church Slavic and Russian, or between indigenous Bulgarian words and those that came through or from Russian. Attempts were made to establish fixed and systematic criteria, for example, that Russianisms are all lexemes with the suffix *-тел*, or those pointing to the kind of borrowing, that is, whether it is direct or through Russian. According to K. Babov, Russianisms are words that have a *г* instead of the Latin *h* (*герой*), a *ф* instead of the Greek *υ* (*ефир*), groups like *-ля-, -лю-* (*абсолютен, юбиляр*), some words with *ав-, ев-* (*август*), the group *-ей-* instead of *-ий-* in adjectives (*библейски*), those with the same stress (*граматика*), words containing the suffix *-ически* (*академически*), and international words that can be found in early translations from Russian conducted during the National Revival [7]. When discussing distinguishing between Russian and Church Slavic influences on modern standard Bulgarian, L. Andreychin and R. Pavlova insist that these two languages must be differentiated from one another. According to proponents of this theory, Russian influence begins in the 1840s due to the strong impact of Russian literature and scientific works. On the other hand, B. Tsonev thinks that Church Slavic influence is in fact Russian influence [8]. According to R. Pavlova, contrasting literary words from the damaskins and Church Slavic words could help in distinguishing between Russianisms and Church Slavic words in Bulgarian works written between the 17th and 19th centuries [9]. Bulgarian researchers mostly agree that the majority of the lexis that came into Bulgarian from or through Russian is composed of abstract lexemes, calques, and internationalisms. In our opinion, we should take into account the extralinguistic situation in which the influence of the dominant language in contact is exerted so as to determine the contactological value of a contact-lexeme. On the other hand, the need to determine contactological value once and for all does not have a foothold in modern contactology, but in etymology. Namely, the contactological value of lexemes in parallel texts can differ, and it depends on the dominant language in contact and other extralinguistic factors, while the etymological value of a lexeme is determined in the process of historical reconstruction.

Bulgarian researchers of language contacts between Russian and Bulgarian also disagree about lexical Russianisms in modern Bulgarian. In the early 20th century, B. Tsonev said there were 2,000 Russianisms [10], whereas I. Lekov thought that this number was "arbitrary and exaggerated" [11]. R. Pavlova wanted more precise statistic data and identified 1,070 Russianisms in the *Bulgarian Descriptive Dictionary*

[12], 838 in the *Dictionary of Contemporary Bulgarian* [13], and 271 Russianisms in the *Dictionary of Foreign Words* [14]. In her opinion, it is necessary to define criteria for differentiation between loanwords from Church Slavic or Russian and the lexis used in the Bulgarian documentary tradition in order to establish the exact number of Russianisms in Bulgarian [15]. In other words, it is necessary to make a complex and comprehensive research of the lexis of Bulgarian documents from the 17th and 18th centuries.

Therefore, the problem of identifying contact-lexemes under dominant Russian influence was solved in the first volume of the *Contactological Dictionary of Slavic Languages* by incorporating the lexis marked with appropriate lexicographical qualifiers in lexicographical sources and the words that are cited as Russianisms in relevant scientific sources. The author of the dictionary determined the contactological value of a certain number of lexemes. The complete set of 10 volumes contains more than 8,500 contact-lexemes under dominant Russian influence and there is the same number of Russian models, which makes a total of more than 17,000 lexemes. Just for comparison, the *Contactological Dictionary of Adaptation of Russianisms in Eight Slavic Languages* contains 3,802 Bulgarian Russianisms, whereas the corpus of all Russianisms in the analyzed languages and of the corresponding Russian models contains 15,424 lexemes. Therefore, the first volume, which is to be published in 2010, exceeds by far the number of contact-lexemes given in the advance copy.

II The uniqueness of this dictionary can be seen in the fact that its concept is based upon the works of R. Filipović, the founder of the Zagreb school of contactology [16], on our innovations in and reinterpretations of Filipović's theory [17], and on the results produced by leading researchers of inter-Slavic language contacts [18]. In the 1990s, we made significant reinterpretations of and innovations in R. Filipović's theory of language in contact and pointed to the necessity of using a cognitive approach in studying Russianisms. The main characteristics of the Belgrade-Zagreb school of contactology are synchronic description of the process of adaptation of the model into a replica and denying the possibility of structural changes in the receiving language. For example, in Filipović's opinion, phonemic importation does not lead to structural changes in the receiving language, but is instead a consequence of the activation of latent elements and of filling empty places in the system [19]. This approach to language contacts facilitates monitoring of the expansion and restrictions

on linguistic influence. Nowadays, contactologists have started to pay more attention to the extralinguistic aspects of language contact.

The *Contactological Dictionary* gives a description of the adaptation strategies of contactological units in terms of the theory we developed in two monographs and a number of papers. In the 1997 monograph [20], we introduced *transderivation* as the basic principle of formational adaptation of the model into a replica. Within morphological adaptation we defined *transmorphemization* as adaptation of the basic morphological form of the replica, whereas *transmorphologization* was defined as adaptation of morphological categories. In *transsemantization,* we introduced ten new semantic changes within partial semantic adaptation. At the level of lexis and stylistics, we developed three types of lexical-stylistic adaptation. We took into account these innovations while compiling the dictionary of adaptations of Russianisms in Serbo-Croat [21]. We analyzed a total of 1,089 Russianisms at the levels of phonology, derivation, morphology, semantics, lexis, and stylistics. In the 2004 monograph [22], we introduced the concept of *tertiary adaptation* (that is, primary-tertiary and secondary-tertiary adaptation), which refers to the influence of the intermediary language in primary and secondary adaptations. In transsemantization, we identified 28 semantic changes, whereas the level of verbal contact-syntaxeme government adaptation has three types of *transsyntactization*. In this book, we define adaptation as the process of activating latent elements or filling empty places in the system of the receiving language according to certain rules. In that respect, a *contact-lexeme under Russian influence* is a word containing at least one independent contacteme made by mapping the Russian model and/or internal activization of the receiving language under the dominant influence of Russian. At different linguistic levels, a contacteme can be manifested as a *contact-phoneme, contact-morpheme, contact-prosodeme, contact-derivateme, distributive contacteme, contact-grapheme, contact-grammeme, contact-styleme, contact-syntaxeme, contact-seme, contact-lexeme, contact-phraseme* or *contact-concepteme*. In our latest works, we completely abandoned the terms *borrowing* and *loanword*, because they belong to a theory of transfer that interprets language contact as the transfer of elements from the donor language into the borrowing language.

A *contacteme*, or the general unit of contactology is a quantum of structured knowledge about the dominant language influence. A contacteme is each linguistic element formed in a particular dominant contact situation through the activation or mapping of latent elements and empty

4

places. Contactological cognitive sense, some knowledge and information underlie each contactologically marked element. A researcher in this field is supposed to notice the correlation between a certain contact situation and the linguistic unit realized within it, to note the changes in contactological value and to manage them. As a result of this correlation, various kinds of relational and contextually marked classes appear at different levels. That element can be a linguistic unit or class at any level. At the level of phonetics, we can discern segmental and suprasegmental contactemes (sounds, syllables, words, utterances, stress in all its aspects, and intonation), whereas at other levels, contactemes are phonemes, graphemes, morphemes, words, grammemes, sememes, etc. For example, a phoneme in a certain position or sequence within a word represents a class [23]. Once determined, a contactological value can change under the influence of another dominant language, that is it can change in the course of time. A contacteme can remember something from its past, and memory of that past can have an impact on its usage [24]. Marking of contactological units can depend on the typology of linguistic structures, psychological, communicative, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic factors. Contactemes can be found in the individual's language awareness. Identifying them and determining their contactological value can be achieved through an associative experiment. Concerning psychological factors, the most important are strategies, opinions, affective states, attitudes, age, sex, abilities, motivation, and personality features. In terms of sociolinguistics, one language dominates through common language acceptance, ideology and practical usage. In the contactological dictionary, Russian is represented as the linguistically and extralinguistically dominant language, while the political impact of the subordinate language and the impact of the language with equal political power are of secondary importance.

III The advance copy of the contactological dictionary was published in 2004 [25] and has been very well accepted among Slavists in Serbia and abroad [26]. Unlike the "dictionary of identification" where we primarily determine the contactological value of contact-lexemes with an obligatory citation of the source and examples that proves a particular dominant influence, this dictionary is an "adaptation dictionary" because it describes the way that contactological units are adapted in the receiving language. A contact-lexeme can be a whole word as well as a word that is related to Russian just in traces. It does not have to have Russian origins, but it can instead originate from contact with dominant Russian where it is an integral part of the vocabulary. It can belong to just one part of

speech, one variant of the basic form, or a homonym, if the model is a homonym. Apart from that, a contact-lexeme can be a non-derived word or a word derived from it.

A dictionary article of the *Contactological Dictionary of Adaptation of Bulgarian Contact-Lexemes under Russian Influence* contains six sections. Sections 1, 3, 4, 5, and partially 6 deal with the contact-lexeme, whereas parts 2 and partly part 6 deal with the Russian model.

SECTION 1. The first section of the dictionary article provides a description of contactological adaptation of a contact-lexeme. Entry words are printed in bold capitals and arranged alphabetically. Homonyms are followed by number tags (§ 1). If we determine that a certain contact-lexeme is a homonym (§ 2), then we put the number tag into angle brackets (< >). The form variant of the Russianism (§ 3,4) is given as a separate entry.

(§ 1) БАРДАК[2]
(§ 2) РЕВОЛЮЦИОНЕН[<1>]
(§ 3) РЕЗЕРВ
(§ 4) РЕЗЕРВА

The entry word is followed by the symbols for **transgraphematization** and **transaccentuation** (Acc). The orthography of a contact-lexeme can be formed according to (a) the pronunciation of the Russian model (*кавьор, матрьошка*), (b) the orthography of the Russian model (graphemes of the contact-lexeme and of the model coincide; *дозор, матушка*), (v) the orthography of the Russian model (graphemes of the contact-lexeme and of the model do not coincide; *наклонност, артел*), (c) the pronunciation and orthography of the Russian model (*бельо, чертожник*), (g) the pronunciation of the Russian model and formational/morphological features of the receiving language (*гримьорен, закльопвам*), and (e) the orthography of the Russian model and formationnal /morphological features of the receiving language (*нагъл, закривам се*). The influence of the intermediary language (*пощальон, тилда*) is marked by (d).

The type of **transphonemization** of a contact-lexeme is determined according to the highest index of individual adaptations. Zero-transphonemization (F0) was not attested. The first subtype of first partial transphonemization (F1/1) involves the adaptation of the Russian stressed vowels <a>, <o>, <e(э)>, <i>, and <u>, of the unstressed <o> and open

6

<e> in foreign words, adaptation of Russian hard geminate consonants whose Bulgarian counterparts are short consonants and adaptation of Russian hard dentals and the palatal <r> (*бард*). The second subtype of the first partial transphonemization (F1/2) involves adaptation of a number of Russian soft consonants (*взгляд*). The third subtype of the first partial transphonemization (F1/3) involves quantitative adaptation of <i> and <u> in the first or second degrees of reduction and adaptation of the Russian soft dental consonants [tʻ] and [dʻ] (*бурсак*). The fourth subtype of the first partial transphonemization (F1/4) involves substitution of the Russian vowel <y> with the Bulgarian vowel <i> (*випуск*). The first subtype of the second partial transphonemization (F2/1) involves adaptation of the Russian consonants <ž>, <š>, <dž>, and <l> (*вулкан*). The second subtype of the second partial transphonemization (F2/2) involves substitution of the Russian <*a*> in the first-degree reduction with the Bulgarian vowel <a> (*абат*). The third subtype of the second partial transphonemization (F2/3) involves substitution of the Russian second-degree reduction vowel <ъ> with the Bulgarian vowel <a> (*бравада*). The fourth subtype of the second partial transphonemization (F2/4) involves adaptation of fifteen Russian palatalized consonants by Bulgarian hard consonants, substitution of the palatal <č> with the Bulgarian consonant <č>, and transphonemization of Russian long soft consonants by Bulgarian hard consonants (*билет*). The first subtype of free transphonemization (F3/1) involves adaptation of the Russian unstressed <e> in first or second-degree reduction by the Bulgarian <e> (*бревно*). The second subtype of free transphonemization (F3/2) involves substitution of the Russian <ъ> and <*a*> with the Bulgarian <o> (*бро-дяга*). The third subtype of free transphonemization (F3/3) involves adaptation of Russian <š':> into Bulgarian <š> and substitution of Russian hard consonants with Bulgarian palatalized consonants (*борш*). The fourth subtype of free transphonemization (F3/4) involves substitution of Russian vowels and consonants with Bulgarian sounds of different quality and articulation and substitution of Russian soft consonants with a Bulgarian consonant cluster (*ботанически*).

Transderivation is a general word formation principle according to which a contact-lexeme is adapted. A contact-lexeme (*ботаник*) that shares the same derivational stem and derivational morpheme as the Russian model is adapted through zero-transderivation (D0). A contact-lexeme (*вакууметър*) that has an identical derivational morpheme to that of the model and a different derivational stem is adapted through first partial transderivation (D1/1). A contact-lexeme (*ведомствен*) that shares the derivational stem with the model and a different derivational

morpheme is adapted through second partial transderivation (D1/2). A contact-lexeme (*виражавам се*) that has a different derivational stem and different derivational morpheme is adapted through free transderivation (D2). Contact-lexemes that are not derived are marked with the Roman numeral I (*виртуален*).

Our *Dictionary* records the part of speech that a contact-lexeme belongs to, its grammar categories of gender, number, reflexiveness, and transitivity/intransitivity. Contact-lexemes undergo all three types of **transmorphemization** of the basic morphological form. A contact-lexeme (*виражение*) that consists of a free morpheme adapted according to pronunciation, to orthography, or both together and a zero bound morpheme of the model, that is, a bound morpheme of the model adapted according orthography, undergoes zero-transmorphemization (M0). A contact-lexeme (*висмутов*) that consists of a free morpheme adapted according to pronunciation, orthography, or both together and a bound morpheme of the receiving language, undergoes partial transmorphemization (M1). A contact-lexeme (*високомолекулярен, високопревъзходителство*) that consists of a changed free morpheme of the model and a bound morpheme of the giving or receiving language undergoes free transmorphemization (M2).

The label of **transmorphologization** of the gender and number of the noun and of the verbal aspect is only used in case of partial or free adaptation. A contact-lexeme (*въздухоплавател*) that has identical gender to the model and different sound-endings undergoes partial transmorphologization of the noun-gender (TMR1). A contact-lexeme (*автогенеза*) with different gender from the model undergoes free transmorphologization (TMR2). The basic form of a contact-lexeme (*автосан*) that takes only one number from the model, most often nominative singular, undergoes partial transmorphologization of the number (TMB1). Free transmorphologization of the number (TMB2) was not attested. A contact-lexeme (*агитирам*) whose aspect is formally the same as that of the model, but has different semantics, undergoes partial transmorphologization of the verbal aspect (TMGv1). Adaptation of biaspectual verbs typical of one of the languages falls into this group. A contact-lexeme (*нагрубявам*) whose aspect is different from that of the model undergoes free transmorphologization of the verbal aspect (TMGv2).

Transsemantization can be zero, partial, or free. At this moment there are 28 semantic changes within partial transsemantization (five one-

8

member changes, ten two-member changes, nine three-member changes, three four-member change, and one five-member change). The type of semantic adaptation is determined for each source individually. A contact-lexeme whose meaning is identical to the meaning of the model undergoes zero-transsemantization (S0). A contact-lexeme with restriction of meaning in number (S1Nm) or in a semantic field (S1Fm; S1Fr) and expansion of meaning in number (S2Nr), or expansion of meaning in a semantic field (S2Fr), undergoes partial transsemantization. When the semantics of a contact-lexeme are differrent from the semantics of the model, it is a case of free transsemantization (S#).

(1) Zero-transsemantization (S0)
(2) Restriction of meaning in number of the model (S1Nm)
(3) Restriction in a semantic field of the model (S1Fm)
(4) Restriction in a semantic field of the replica (S1Fr)
(5) Expansion of meaning in number of the replica (S2Nr)
(6) Expansion of meaning in a semantic field of the replica (S2Fr)
(7) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S1Fr
(8) Two-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm
(9) Two-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fr
(10) Two-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S2Nr
(11) Two-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S2Fr
(12) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S2Nr
(13) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fr+S2Nr
(14) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S2Fr
(15) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fr+S2Fr
(16) Two-member change of meaning S2Nr+S2Fr
(17) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm+S1Fr
(18) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm+S2Nr
(19) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fr+S2Nr
(20) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm+S2Fr
(21) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fr+S2Fr
(22) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S2Nr+S2Fr
(23) Three-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S1Fr+S2Fr
(24) Three-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S1Fr+S2Nr
(25) Three-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S2Nr+S2Fr
(26) Four-member change of meaning S1Nm+S1Fm+S1Fr+S2Fr
(27) Four-member change of meaning S1Nm+S1Fm+S2Nr+S2Fr
(28) Four-member change of meaning S1Nm+S1Fm+S1Fr+S2Nr
(29) Five-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm+S1Fr+S2Nr+S2Fr
(30) Free transsemantization (S#)

The type of transsemantization is followed by a label for the type of **lexical-stylistic adaptation**, which can be zero (*абсолюция*), partial (*абат*), or free (*астраган*). If two sources share the same LSA, then only the first one is followed by a type label. A contact-lexeme that has undergone zero or partial transsemantization and whose certain lexical and stylistic values differ from the model undergoes partial adaptation (LSA1). A contact-lexeme whose lexical-stylistic values are different from the model and that is adapted through free transsemantization undergoes free LSA (LSA2).

Several contact-lexemes in our dictionary have a type of **transconceptualization** label. Contact-lexemes that share identical concepts to the model [27] undergo zero-transconceptualization (*взривател, вигилност*). If the number of basic meanings of the concept of the contact-lexeme (*ветеринар, владение, отчуждение*) and the model partly coincide, it is a case of partial transconceptualization (K1). The type "free transconceptualization (K2)" is identified in the word *астраган*.

Most dictionaries do not provide sufficient information about verb government. A contact-lexeme (*виражавам се*) whose pattern partly coincides with the pattern of the model undergoes partial **transsyntactization** of verb government (SIA1). A contact-lexeme whose pattern differs from the pattern of the model undergoes free transsyntactization of the verb government (SIA2). In the first volume of the dictionnary we have not identified any cases of free-transsyntactization.

At the end of the first section of each dictionary article, we provide information about the source and the type of **overall adaptation** of the contact-lexeme. The type of overall adaptation is determined according to the highest level of individual adaptations. A contact-lexeme (*абат*) that is adapted through partial adaptation at one level at least undergoes overall partial adaptation (A1). A contact-lexeme (*вкусовщина*) that is adapted through free adaptation at one level at least undergoes over-all free adaptation (A2).

SECTION 2. The Russian model is written in italics and its stress is not marked (§ 5). The number in the fourth section of the dictionary article points to the place of stress. Abbreviations referring to derivational pattern, part of speech, gender, number, (§ 6) aspect, and transitivity/ intransitivity are given after the entry word. Underived models are marked by the Roman numeral I (§7). Variants are given after the basic entry (§8).

10

(§ 5) *непрерывно* S, adv (МАС) [28]
(§ 6) *прессовать* S, v-ipm-tr (МАС)
(§ 7) *ситуация* I, n-f (СИС) [29]
(§ 8) *автокар* Comp, n-m (МАС)
       автокара (ОСРЯ) [30]

       SECTION 3. The abbreviation *вар.* is followed by phonological, morpholo-gical, and derivational variants of the lexeme (§9).

(§ 9) АНГОБ
       вар: *ангоба* (ГРЧД) [31]

       SECTION 4. The abbreviation *кс* is followed by contactological synonyms [32] of the contact-lexeme (§10).

 (§10) БЛЕСТЯЩ
       кс: *великолепен, пищен; благоприятен, щастлив; величествен, из-ключителен, превъзходен, божествен, грандиозен, достоен, отличен, великоле-пен; лъчезарен, блистателен*

       SECTION 5. The symbol ⌂ is followed by the information concerning the origin, morphology, formation, stress, the number of meanings, syntactic features, and lexical-stylistic aspects of the model and of the contact-lexeme according to cited sources. Information about the model is given in parentheses ( ), whereas our interventions are given in angle brackets < >. Information about stress and frequency of the contact-lexeme and the model are given in square brackets [ ]. The symbol < refers to the direction of interlingual influence.

       SECTION 6. The meanings of the contact-lexeme and dictionary sources are cited at the end of each dictionary article. The label © is followed by a description of semantic changes. The hash mark (#) refers to narrowed meanings of the contact-lexeme, whereas the asterisk (*) refers to widened meanings. Three dots (<...>) mean that some parts of the text are omitted. The meaning and description of semantic changes can be cited from two or more sources preceded by ¤.

(§ 11) АВТОБИОГРАФИЧЕСКИ e-d, Acc0 [33], F3/4, D0, adj, M1, S0, LSA0/1, A2 (АРЧД [34]/TCPJ [35]); S1N2m (АРЧД/CTCPJ [36]) ¤ S1Fm (АРЧД/ МАС)
   автобиографический S, adj (TCPJ; МАС; CTCPJ)

var: *автобиографичен* (АРЧД)

⌂ rus. (АРЧД; ГРЧД); <-ический » -ически>; [vowel under stress: Rus:6/

Bul:6; frequency: НКРЈ[37]/БНК[38]: +30/6]

который се отнася до автобиография (АРЧД) © #2: свойственный автобиографии, характерный для нее (СТСРЈ); © # связанный с жизнью автора; являющийся ав-тобиографией (МАС).

Some of the future volumes of the *Contactological Dictionary of Slavic Languages* will be devoted to the adaptation of contact-phrasemes. And when the Russian influence is analyzed, we can switch to describing contact-lexemes and contact-phrasemes created under Turkish, English, French, German, or any other influence. We can than describe the processes of adaptation in all other contact situations and compile a complete computer database. We would be happy if the International Committee of Slavists started a long-term contactology project that gathered teams from different countries.

References

[1] П. Филкова, Староболгаризмы и церковнославянизмы в лексике русского литературного языка. Т. 1-3, София, 1987.

[2] Р. Павлова, Болгарско-русские и русско-болгарские языковые связи, Народна просвета, София, 1979, 223 с.

[3] Б. Цонев, Руско-български паралели, Славянски глас, I, 1902; Руско-български паралели, Периодическо списание на Българското книжовно дружество 3-4, 1903, София, 249-259; Езикови взаимности между българи и руси. Сб. Памяти проф. А.К. Медведева, София, 1922.

[4] Л. Андрейчин, Из историята на нашето езиково строителство. София, Народна просвета, 1986. 225 с.

[5] К. Бабов, Руско-българските езикови контакти и въпросът за типологията на русизмите в българския език. Славянска филология, т. 15, София, 1978; „Международна лексика от гръцки и латински произход, възприета в българския книжовен език чрез руски език". Славистични изследвания, кн. III, София, 1973; „Лексикални калки в българския книжовен език, възприети от руския език", Съпоставително езикознание 4, София, 1978; „За руските думи и русизмите в академическия Речник на чуждите думи в българския език", Съпоставително езикознание 1, София, 1987: 39-51.

[6] Р. Павлова, Болгарско-русские и русско-болгарские языковые связи, На-родна просвета, София, 1979, 223 с.

[7] К. Бабов, „Международна лексика от гръцки и латински произход, възприета в българския книжовен език чрез руски език“. Славистични изследвания, кн. III, София, 1973.

[8] Л. Андрейчин, „Роля на старобългарската и черковнославянската писмена традиция“. Из историята на нашето езиково строителство. София, Народна просвета, 1986. 225 с.

[9] Р. Павлова, Болгарско-русские и русско-болгарские языковые связи, Народна просвета, София, 1979, 223 с.

[10] Б. Цонев, Руско-български паралели, Славянски глас, I, 1902.

[11] Ив. Леков, Характеристика на общите черти в български и източнославянски. Сб. БАН, 37, 1942, 1-104.

[12] Български тълковен речник. София, 1976.

[13] Речник на съвременния български книжовен език, Т. I, 1955, т. II 1957, т. III 1959.

[14] Речник на чуждите думи в български език, 4 преработено и допълнени издание, София, 1978.

[15] Р. Павлова, Болгарско-русские и русско-болгарские языковые связи, Народна просвета, София, 1979, 223 с.

[16] R. Filipović, Teorija jezika u kontaktu: uvod u lingvistiku jezičkih dodira, JAZU, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1986; Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo-razvoj-značenje. JAZU, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1990.

[17] J. Ајдуковић, Русизми у српскохрватским речницима. Принципи адаптације. Речник. Фото Футура, Београд, 1997; Увод у лексичку контактологију. Теорија адаптације русизама. Фото Футура, Београд, 2004; Контактолошки речник адаптације русизама у осам словенских језика. Фото Футура, Београд, 2004.

[18] В.: Селективна библиографија у књ.: J. Ајдуковић, Увод у лексичку контактологију. Теорија адаптације русизама. Фото Футура, Београд, 2004.

[19] R. Filipović, Teorija jezika u kontaktu: uvod u lingvistiku jezičkih dodira, JAZU, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1986.

[20] J. Ајдуковић, Русизми у српскохрватским речницима. Принципи адаптације. Речник. Фото Футура, Београд, 1997.

[21] Ibid.

[22] J. Ајдуковић, Увод у лексичку контактологију. Теорија адаптације русизама. Фото Футура, Београд, 2004.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ј. Ајдуковић, „О контактолошком речнику контактофразема“. Riječ, Rijeka, 2009, god. 15, sv. 2, str. 19-28.

[25] Ј. Ајдуковић, Контактолошки речник адаптације русизама у осам словенских језика. Фото Футура, Београд, 2004.

[26] See Recensions/Reviews by P. Piper, B. Stankovich, M. Nikolich, S. Ristich, P. Filkova, K. Petrova, Z. Fink, R. Dragicevich, G. G. Tjapko, W. Pianka, B. Terzich, A. Zoltan, B. Stebich, M. Moser. Published In: Suvremena lingvistika, 57-58, Zagreb, 2004: 149-150; Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej, 40, SOW, Warszawa 2005: 517-521; Studia Russica XXII, Budapest, 2005: 309-311; „Српски у нормативном огледалу“, Београдска књига, Београд, 2006: 423-434; „Научный Вестник Воронежского государственного архитектурно-строительного университета, Серия «Современные лингвистические и методико-дидактические исследования“, Вып. № 1 (9), 2008: 182-183; Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch, Band 54, 2008: 267-268; Ј. Ајдуковић, Биобиблиографија са прилозима. Фото Футура, Београд, 2008.

[27] Й. Айдукович, „О понятии 'трансконцептуализация'“, Cognitive Modeling in Linguistics – 2008, Proceedings of the X-th International Conference, Bechichi, Montenegro, September 06 – 13, 2008, Vol. 1, Kazan State University Press, 2008: 21-30.

[28] МАС – Словарь русского языка, Академия наук СССР, Институт русского языка, Т. 1-4, 2-е изд., испр. и доп., Русский язык, Москва 1981-1984.

[29] СИС – Словарь иностранных слов. 17-е изд., испр. Русский язык, Москва, 1988.

[30] ОСРЯ – Обратный словарь русского языка, Советская энциклопедия, Москва, 1974.

[31] ГРЧД – И. Габеров, Речник на чуждите думи в български с приложения, трето издание, Gaberoff, 1998.

[32] Ј. Ајдуковић, „Контактолошки синоними под руским утицајем у македонском контактолошком речнику“. XXXVI научна конференција – лингвистика. Зборник со реферати. Скопје: Универзитет „Св. Кирил и Методиј“, Меѓународен семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура, 2010: 43-56.

[33] Acc0 – the type of transaccentuation;

[34] АРЧД – Речник на чуждите думи, Българска академия на науките, Институт за български език, София, 1982.

[35] ТСРЈ – Толковый словарь русского языка. Под редакцией Д.Н. Ушакова. Государственный институт, Советская энциклопедия, Москва, 1935.

[36] СТСРЈ – Т.Ф. Ефремова, Новый словарь русского языка. Толково-словообразовательный. Москва: Русский язык, 2000. Электронная версия, „Грамота.ру“, 2001–2002.

[37] НКРЈ – Сайт Национального корпуса русского языка, www.ruscorpora.ru

[38] БНК – Български национален корпус, Институт за български език „Проф. Любомир Андрейчин“, http://search.dcl.bas.bg/ (2009).