

About the First Volume of a Contactological Dictionary of Slavic Languages

Jovan Ajduković

In this paper, we will try to answer two questions that arose while I was working on the *Bulgarian Contactological Dictionary of Adaptation of 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 twentieth century was the golden age of Bulgarian 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

1 *Филкова П.* Староболгаризмы и церковнославянизмы в лексике русского литературного языка. Т. 1–3. София, 1987.

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

the three-volume dictionary by P. Filkova,¹ R. Pavlova's monograph,² and the works of B. Conev,³ L. Andrejčin,⁴ and K. Babov.⁵ Although there are many papers on Russianisms in Bulgarian, specialized dictionaries where they would be treated separately have not been published in the twentieth century. We think that the reason for this is the dominant influence of nineteenth- and twentieth-century etymology and historical linguistics on studying Russianisms, since the modern theory of languages in contact was established in the mid-twentieth century. However, R. Pavlova emphasizes the importance of making a complete inventory of loanwords that came through Russian and says that "making this inventory is the task of future researchers."⁶

One of the key issues is certainly a lack of clear criteria for distinguishing between loanwords from Church Slavonic 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 *z* instead of the Latin *h* (*герой*), a *φ* instead of the Greek *ν* (*ефир*), groups like *ля-, лю* (*абсолютен, юбиляр*), some words with *ав-*,

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

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

5 *Бабов К.* 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. С. 39–51.

6 *Павлова.* Болгарско-руските и руско-българските езикови связи.

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 Slavonic 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. Conev thinks that Church Slavonic influence is in fact Russian influence.⁸ According to R. Pavlova, contrasting literary words from the damaskins and Church Slavonic words could help in distinguishing between Russianisms and Church Slavonic words in Bulgarian works written between the seventeenth and nineteenth 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.

7 *Бабов К.* Международна лексика от гръцки и латински произход, възприета в българския книжовен език чрез руски език // Славистични изследвания. Кн. III. София, 1973.

8 *Андрейчин Л.* Роля на старобългарската и черковнославянската писмена традиция // Из историята на нашето езиково строителство.

9 *Павлова.* Болгарско-русские и русско-болгарские языковые связи.

10 *Цонев.* Руско-български паралели.

In the early twentieth century, B. Conev 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 Slavonic 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 seventeenth and eighteenth 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 dictionary contains more than 8,120 contact-lexemes under dominant Russian influence and there is the same number of Russian models, which makes a total of 16,240 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

11 *Леков Ив.* Характеристика на общите черти в български и източнославянски. Сб. БАН. 37. 1942. С. 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 допълнено издание. София, 1978.

15 *Павлова.* Болгарско-русские и русско-болгарские языковые связи.

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

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

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

18 Селективна библиографија у књ.: *Ajduковић J.* Увод у лексичку контактологију. Теорија адаптације русизама. Београд: Фото Футура, 2004.

19 Filipović, "Teorija jezika u kontaktu."

20 *Ajduковић J.* Русизми у српскохрватским речницима.

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 and 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 *Russianism* is a word containing at least one independent contacteme made by mapping the Russian model and/or internal activation 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-HEME*, *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 con-

21 Ibid.

22 *Ајдуковић*. Увод у лексичку контактологију.

tacteme is each linguistic element formed in a particular dominant contact situation through the activation or mapping of latent elements and empty places. Contactological cognitive sense and 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 supra-segmental 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 and 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

23 Ibid.

24 *Ајдуковић Ј.* О контактолошком речнику контактофразема. Rijeka: Ri-ječ, 2009. god. 15, sv. 2, str. 19–28.

of secondary importance.

III

The advance copy of the contactological dictionary was published in 2004²⁵ 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 *Bulgarian Contactological Dictionary of Adaptation of Contact-Lexemes under Russian Influence* contains five sections. Sections 1, 3, 4, and partially 5 deal with the contact-lexeme, whereas Sections 2 and partly 5 deal with the Russian model.

²⁵ *Ajduковић J.* Контактолошки речник адаптације русизама у осам словенских језика. Београд: Фото Футура, 2004.

²⁶ See Recensions/Reviews by P. Piper, B. Stanković, M. Nikolić, S. Ristić, P. Filkova, K. Petrova, Z. Fink, R. Dragicević, G. G. Tjapko, W. Pianka, B. Terzić, A. Zoltan, B. Stebić, M. Moser. Published In: *Suvremena lingvistika* 57–58 (Zagreb, 2004), pp. 149–150; *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* 40, (Warszawa: SOW, 2005), pp. 517–521; *Studia Russica* XXII (Budapest, 2005), pp. 309–311; Српски у нормативном огледалу. Београд: Београдска књига, 2006. С. 423–434; Научный Вестник Воронежского государственного архитектурно-строительного университета. Серия «Современные лингвистические и методико-дидактические исследования». Вып. № 1 (9). 2008. С. 182–183; *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, band 54 (2008), pp. 267–268; *Ajduковић J.* Библиографија са прилозима. Београд: Фото Футура, 2008.

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) БАРДАК²

(§2) РЕВОЛЮЦИОНЕН^{<1>}

(§3) РЕЗЕРВ

(§4) РЕЗЕРВА

The entry word is followed by the symbol for **transgraphematization**. 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, закъловам*), and (e) the orthography of the Russian model and formational/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>, <е(э)>, <и>, and <у>, of the unstressed <o> and open <е> 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> (*аванпорт, апарат, абат*). The second subtype of the first partial transphonemization (F1/2) involves adaptation of a number of Russian soft consonants (*взгляд, герб, гимн*).

The third subtype of the first partial transphonemization (F1/3) involves quantitative adaptation of <и> and <у> in the first or second degrees of reduction and adaptation of the Russian soft dental consonants [tʲ] and [dʲ] (*дублет, дурак, етюдник*). The fourth subtype of the first partial transphonemization (F1/4) involves substitution of the Russian vowel <ы> with the Bulgarian vowel <и> (*кадри, канти, кумис*). The first subtype of the second partial transphonemization (F2/1) involves adaptation of the Russian consonants <ж>, <ш>, <dʒ>, and <л> (*фарш, курзал, морж, джигит*). 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> (*нарвал, набат, фарфор*). 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> (*трактовка, денудация, абсорбция*). 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 <ч> with the Bulgarian consonant <ч>, and transphonemization of Russian long soft consonants by Bulgarian hard consonants (*рицар, авантюрист, аппаратчик, сесия*). The first subtype of free transphonemization (F3/1) involves adaptation of the Russian unstressed <е> in first- or second-degree reduction by the Bulgarian <е> (*почерк, аперцепция, апатичен, аркебуз*). The second subtype of free transphonemization (F3/2) involves substitution of the Russian <ъ> and <a> with the Bulgarian <о> (*моделистка, пеленгатор, архитектор*). The third subtype of free transphonemization (F3/3) involves adaptation of the Russian <щ'> into the Bulgarian <ш> and substitution of Russian hard consonants with Bulgarian palatalized consonants (*борш, вагрянка*). 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 (*свистя, старателен, интервьюрам*).

Transderivation is a general word formation principle according to which a contact-lexeme is adapted. A contact-lexeme (*босяк, инвентаризация*) that shares the same derivational stem and derivational morpheme as the Russian model is adapted through zero-transderi-

vation (D0). A contact-lexeme (*инкасатор, интелектуален*) 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 (*конвенционализъм, марширувам*) that shares the derivational stem with the model and a different derivational morpheme is adapted through second partial transderivation (D1/2). A contact-lexeme (*назубрям, оборудване*) 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 (*джунгла, диафрагма*).

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 (*бегемот, есер, негодяй*) that consists of a free morpheme adapted according to pronunciation, orthography, or both together and a zero bound morpheme of the model, that is, a bound morpheme of the model adapted according to orthography, undergoes zero-transmorphemization (M0). A contact-lexeme (*неподходящ, третейски, угоднича*) 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 (*фехтовка, указвам, министър*) 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 (*мишена, отверженик, миноноска*) that has identical gender to the model and different sound-endings undergoes partial transmorphologization of the noun-gender (TMR1). A contact-lexeme (*цел, отмел, мизансцен*) with different gender from the model undergoes free transmorphologization (TMR2). The basic form of a contact-lexeme (*включения, перило, подзоли*) 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

(*програмирам, проишнуrowам, маскирам*) 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, отишумявам, приютявам, сгупявам*) whose aspect is different from that of the model undergoes free transmorphologization of the verbal aspect (TMGv2).

Transsemantization can be zero, partial, or free. There are 26 semantic changes within partial transsemantization (five one-member changes, ten two-member changes, nine three-member changes, one 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 different from the semantics of the model, it is a case of free transsemantization (S#).

- (1) Zero-transsemantization (S0): *абатство, абстрактен, август, правосъдие*
- (2) Restriction of meaning in number of the model (S1Nm): *показателен, преработка, призрак, присъствие, свойство*
- (3) Restriction in a semantic field of the model (S1Fm): *ротание, самоуправление, средство, статистически*
- (4) Restriction in a semantic field of the replica (S1Fr): *свидетел, аероклуб*
- (5) Expansion of meaning in number of the replica (S2Nr): *титул, председателство, самоуверен, слушател, сходен*
- (6) Expansion of meaning in a semantic field of the replica (S2Fr): *акцесионен, девастация, екотип, ерозия, княгиня, комендантски, литера*
- (7) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S1Fr: *бака, удар*
- (8) Two-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm: *превъзходителство, пребивавам, представление, принадлежа, разсеян*

- (9) Two-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fr: *отработен, повестка, художество*
- (10) Two-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S2Nr: *прелест, преципитат, призвание, път, работник, състезание, точка*
- (11) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S2Fr: *клиентела, математически, медианта*
- (12) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S2Nr: *субект, субстрат*
- (13) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fr+S2Nr: *агентура, автор*
- (14) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S2Fr: *венгера*
- (15) Two-member type of semantic change S1Fr+S2Fr: *подковавам*
- (16) Two-member change of meaning S2Nr+S2Fr: *конгрес, настоятелство*
- (17) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm+S1Fr: *предписанием,*
- (18) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm+S2Nr: *сила, утроба, фигура*
- (19) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fr+S2Nr: *балаган*
- (20) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm+S2Fr: *бумага*
- (21) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fr+S2Fr: *синева*
- (22) Three-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S2Nr+S2Fr: *компресия*
- (23) Three-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S1Fr+S2Fr: *бърлога*
- (24) Three-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S1Fr+S2Nr: *бунгало*
- (25) Three-member type of semantic change S1Fm+S2Nr+S2Fr: *философ*
- (26) Four-member change of meaning S1Nm+S1Fm+S1Fr+S2Fr: *басурман*
- (27) Five-member type of semantic change S1Nm+S1Fm+S1Fr+S2Nr+S2Fr: *снемам*
- (28) Free transsemantization (S#): *асигнация, титуляр, титулярен*

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 (*оклад*). 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 **trans-conceptualization** label. Contact-lexemes that share identical concepts to the model²⁷ undergo zero-transconceptualization (*пространство, вселена, территория*). If the number of basic meanings of the concept of the contact-lexeme (*отчуждение*) and the model partly coincide, it is a case of partial transconceptualization (K1). Free transconceptualization (K2) was not attested.

Most dictionaries do not provide sufficient information about verb government. A contact-lexeme (*грозя*) whose pattern partly coincides with the pattern of the model undergoes partial **transsyntactization** of the verb government (SIA1). A contact-lexeme (*възпрепятствувам*) whose pattern differs from the pattern of the model undergoes free transsyntactization of verb government (SIA2). We have not identified any cases of zero-transsyntactization (*автоматизирам*).

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 (*плавник*) that is adapted through partial adaptation at one level at least undergoes overall partial adaptation (A1). A contact-lexeme (*вкусовицина*) that is adapted through free adaptation at one level at least undergoes overall 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

27 Айдукович Ђ. О понятии трансконцептуализация // Cognitive Modeling in Linguistics – 2008. Proceedings of the X-th International Conference, Bečić, Montenegro, September 06–13, 2008. Vol. 1. Kazan State University Press, 2008. С. 21–30.

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).

(§5) *непрерывно* S, adv (СРЯАН)²⁸

(§6) *прессовать* S, v-ipm-tr (СРЯАН)

(§7) *ситуация* I, n-f (СИС)²⁹

(§8) *автокар* Comp, n-m (СРЯАН)
автокара (ОСРЯ)³⁰

SECTION 3. The abbreviation *var.* is followed by phonological, morphological, and derivational variants of the lexeme (§9).

(§9) **АНГОБ**

var: *ангоба* (ГРЧД)³¹

SECTION 4. The abbreviation *oi:* (other information) is followed by 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 number of meanings of the contact-lexeme and the model are given in square brackets []. The symbol < refers to the direction of interlingual influence.

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

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

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

31 ГРЧД – *Габеров И.* Речник на чуждите думи в български с приложения. Трето издание. Gaberoff, 1998.

SECTION 5. 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 □.

(§10) АВТОБИОГРАФИЧЕСКИ e-d, F3/4, D0, adj, M1, S1N2M, LSA1, A2 (АРЧД)³²; S1Fм (СРЯАН)

автобиографический S, adj (НСРЯ)³³

var: *автобиографичен* (АРЧД)

oi: rus. (АРЧД; ГРЧД); <-ический > -ически>;

[place of stress: 6/6; number of meanings: Rus:2;1/Bul:1]

който се отнася до автобиография (АРЧД).

© #2: свойственный автобиографии, характерный для нее (НСРЯ).

©#связанный с жизнью автора; являющийся автобиографией (СРЯАН).

Some of the future volumes of the *Contactological Dictionary of Slavic Languages* will be devoted to the adaptation of contact-phrase-mes. And when the Russian influence is analyzed, we can switch to describing contact-lexemes and contact-phrase-mes created under Turkish, English, French, German, or any other influence. We can then 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.

32 АРЧД – Речник на чуждите думи, Българска академия на науките. София: Институт за български език, 1982.

33 НСРЯ – *Ефремова Т.Ф.* Новый словарь русского языка. Толково-словообразовательный. Москва: Русский язык, 2000. Электронная версия, «Грамота.ру», 2001–2002.