

ABOUT THE FIRST VOLUME OF A CONTACTOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES¹

Jovan Ajdukovich

Belgrade, Serbia

Summary: In this paper we will try to answer two questions which came up to me while I was working on the *Bulgarian Contactological Dictionary of Adaptation of Contact-Lexemes under Russian Influence*. The first one refers to the problem of selecting material for the dictionary. The other is purely a matter of conceptual and terminological nature and is related to the first one: why do we use 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. 20th century was the golden age of Bulgarian Slavistics and it was the period of most extensive research on language contacts between Bulgarian and Russian. Several important works were published during this period, and the most notable ones are the three-volume dictionary by P.Filkova [Филкова 1987], R.Pavlova's monograph [Павлова 1979], and the works of B.Tsonev [Цонев 1902; 1903; 1922], L.Andreychin [Андрейчин 1986], and K.Babov [Бабов 1973; 1978a; 1978b; 1987]. Although there are many papers on Russianisms in Bulgarian, specialized dictionaries where they would be treated separately were not 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 modern theory of languages in contact was established in the mid-20th century. However, R.Pavlova emphasizes the importance of making a complete inventory of loanwords which came through Russian and says that «making this inventory is the task of future researchers» [Павлова 1979].

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, i.e. whether it is direct or through Russian. According to K.Babov, Russianisms are words that have a *z* instead of Latin *h* (*герой*), a *φ* instead of Greek *υ* (*ефир*), groups like *-ля-*, *-лю-* (*абсолютен*, *юбиляр*), some words with *ав-*, *ев-* (*август*), group *-ей-* instead of *-ий-* in adjectives (*библейски*), with the same stress (*граматика*), words containing the suffix *-ически* (*академически*) and

¹ This paper is a very 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.

international words which can be found in early translations from Russian done during the National Revival [Бабов 1973]. 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 [Андрейчин 1986]. According to R.Pavlova, contrasting literary words from damaskins and Church Slavic words could help distinguishing between Russianisms and Church Slavic words in Bulgarian works written between the 17th and 19th centuries [Павлова 1979]. Bulgarian researchers mostly agree that the majority of lexis that came into Bulgarian from or through Russian are 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, contactological value of lexemes in parallel texts can differ, and it depends on the dominant language in contact and other extralinguistic factors, while 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 [Цонев 1902], whereas I.Lekov thought that this number was «arbitrary and exaggerated» [Леков 1942]. R.Pavlova wanted some more precise statistic data and identified 1,070 Russianisms in *Bulgarian Descriptive Dictionary* [БТР], 838 in the *Dictionary of Contemporary Bulgarian* [РСБКЕ], and 271 Russianisms in the *Dictionary of Foreign Words* [РЧДБЕ]. In her opinion, it is necessary to define criteria for differentiation between loanwords from Church Slavic or Russian and the lexis used in Bulgarian documentary tradition in order to establish the exact number of Russianisms in Bulgarian [Павлова 1979]. In other words, it is necessary to make a complex and comprehensive research on 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 contactological value of a certain number of lexemes. The dictionary contains more than 8,120 contact-lexemes under the dominant Russian influence and there is the same number of Russian models, which makes the 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 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 Zagreb school of contactology [Filipović 1986; 1990], on our innovations in and reinterpretations of Filipović's theory [Ајдуковић 1997; 2004a; 2004b], and on the results produced by leading researchers of inter-Slavic language contacts [Ајдуковић 2004a]. 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 the cognitive approach in studying Russianisms. Main characteristics of the Belgrade-Zagreb school of contactology are synchronic description of the process of adaptation of the model into 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 activation of latent elements and of filling empty places in the system [Filipović 1986]. This approach to language contacts facilitates monitoring the expansion and restrictions on linguistic influence. Nowadays contactologists started to pay more attention to extralinguistic aspects of language contact.

The *Contactological Dictionary* gives a description of adaptation strategies of contactological units in terms of the theory we developed in two monographs and a number of papers. In the 1997 monograph [Ајдуковић 1997] we introduced *transderivation* as the basic principle of formational adaptation of the model into the 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 [Ајдуковић 1997]. We analyzed the total of 1,089 Russianisms at the levels of phonology, derivation, morphology, semantics, lexis and stylistics. In the 2004 monograph [Ајдуковић 2004a] we introduced the concept of *tertiary adaptation* (i.e. 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-syntaxemes 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 *contact-phoneme*, *contact-morpheme*, *contact-prosodeme*, *contact-derivateme*, *distributive contacteme*, *contact-grapheme*, *contact-grammeme*, *contact-styleme*, *contact-syntaxeme*, *contact-seme*, *contact-lexeme*, *contact-phrase*

and *contact-concepteme*. In our latest works we completely abandoned the terms *borrowing* and *loanword*, because they belong to a theory of transfer which 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 activation or mapping of latent elements and empty places. Contactological cognitive sense, some knowledge and information underlie each contactologically marked element. The researcher of 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 [Ајдуковић 2004a]. Once determined, a contactological value can change under the influence of another dominant language, i.e. 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 [Ајдуковић 2009]. Marking of contactological units can depend on 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 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 a secondary importance.

III. The advance copy of the contactological dictionary was published in 2004 [Ајдуковић 2004b] and has been very well accepted among Slavists in Serbia and abroad [Ајдуковић 2008a]. Unlike the «dictionary of identification» where we primarily determine contactological value of contact-lexemes with an obligatory citation of the source and examples which prove a particular dominant influence, this dictionary is one of «adaptation dictionaries» because it describes the way of adapting contactological units in the receiving language. A contact-lexeme can be a whole word as well as a word which is related to Russian just in traces. It does not have to have Russian origin, 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 one, three, four and partially five deal with the contact-lexeme, whereas parts two and partly part five deal with the Russian model.

SECTION ONE. 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) according to the orthography of the Russian model (graphemes of the contact-lexeme and of the model coincide; *дозор, матушка*), (v) according to the orthography of the Russian model (graphemes of the contact-lexeme and of the model do not coincide; *наклонност, артел*), (c) according to the pronunciation and orthography of the Russian model (*бельо, чертожник*), (g) according to the pronunciation of the Russian model and formational/morphological features of the receiving language (*гримьорен, закльопвам*), and (e) according to the orthography of the Russian model and formational/morphological features of the receiving language (*нагъл, закривам се*). The influence of the intermediary language (*нощальон, 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. First subtype of first partial transphonemization (F1/1) involves the adaptation of Russian stressed vowels <a>, <o>, <e(э)>, <i> and <u>, of the unstressed <o> and open <e> in foreign words, adaptation of Russian hard geminate consonants which Bulgarian counterparts are short consonants and adaptation of Russian hard dentals and palatal <r> (*аванпорт, апарат, абат*). Second subtype of the first partial transphonemization (F1/2) involves adaptation of a number of Russian soft consonants (*взгляд, герб, гимн*). 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 Russian soft dental consonants [tʰ] and [dʰ] (*дублет, дурак, етюдник*). Fourth subtype of the first partial transphonemization (F1/4) involves substitution of the Russian vowel <y> with Bulgarian vowel <i> (*кадри, канти, кумис*). First subtype of the second partial transphonemization (F2/1) involves adaptation of Russian consonants <ž>, <š>, <dž> and <l> (*фарш, курзал, морж, джигит*). 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*). Third subtype of the second partial transphonemization (F2/3) involves substitution of Russian second-degree reduction vowel <ъ> with the Bulgarian vowel <a> (*трактовка, денудация, абсорбция*). Fourth subtype of the second partial transphonemization (F2/4) involves adaptation of fifteen Russian palatalized consonants by Bulgarian hard consonants, substitution of the palatal <џ> with the Bulgarian consonant <џ> and transphonemization of Russian long soft consonants by Bulgarian hard consonants (*рицар, авантюрист, апаратчик, сесия*). First subtype of free transphonemization (F3/1) involves adaptation of Russian unstressed <е> in first or second-degree reduction by Bulgarian <е> (*почерк, аперцепция, апатичен, аркебуз*). Second subtype of free transphonemization (F3/2) involves substitution of Russian <ъ> and <a> with Bulgarian <o> (*моделистка, пеленгатор, архитектор*). 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, вагрянка*). 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, интервюирам*).

Transderivation is a general word formation principle according to which a contact-lexeme is adapted. A contact-lexeme (*босяк, инвентаризация*) which shares the same derivational stem and derivational morpheme as the Russian model is adapted through zero-transderivation (D0). A contact-lexeme (*инкасатор, интелектуален*) which has identical derivational morpheme as the model and a different derivational stem is adapted through first partial transderivation (D1/1). A contact-lexeme (*конвенционализъм, марширувам*) which 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*) which has a different derivational stem and different derivational morpheme is adapted through free transderivation (D2). Contact-lexemes which are not derived are marked with the Roman numeral I (*джунгла, диафрагма*).

Our *Dictionary* records the part of speech a contact-lexeme belongs to, its grammar categories of gender, number, reflexiveness, transitivity/intransitivity. Contact-lexemes undergo all three types of **transmorphemization** of the basic morphological form. A contact-lexeme (*бегемот, есер, негодяй*) which consists of a free morpheme which is adapted according to pronunciation, orthography or both together and a zero bound morpheme of the model, i.e. bound morpheme of the model adapted according orthography, undergoes zero-transmorphemization (M0). A contact-lexeme (*неподходящ, третейски, угодничка*) which consists of a free morpheme which is 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*) which 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, отверженник, миноноска*) which has identical gender as 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). Basic form of a contact-lexeme (*включения, перило, подзопи*) which 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, проишуровам, 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 for one of the languages falls into this group. A contact-lexeme (*нагрубявам, отишумявам, приютявам, сглупявам*) 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 is 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): *роптане, самоуправление, средство, статистически*
- (4) Restriction in a semantic field of the replica (S1Fr): *свидетел, аеро-клуб*
- (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): *акционен, 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: *предписание*
- (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 the 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 which underwent 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 which 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 as the model [Айдукович 2008b] undergo zero-transconceptualization (*пространство, вселена, територия*). 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 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 the 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 the 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*) which is adapted through partial adaptation at one level at least undergoes overall partial adapta-

tion (A1). A contact-lexeme (*вкусовщина*) which is adapted through free adaptation at one level at least undergoes overall free adaptation (A2).

SECTION TWO. 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 the 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 Roman numeral I (§ 7). Variants are given after the basic entry (§ 8).

(§ 5) *непрерывно* S, adv (СРЯАН)

(§ 6) *прессовать* S, v-ipm-tr (СРЯАН)

(§ 7) *ситуация* I, n-f (СИС)

(§ 8) *автокар* Comp, n-m (СРЯАН)

автокара (ОСРЯ)

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

(§ 9) **АНГОБ**

var: *ангоба* (ГРЧД)

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

SECTION FIVE. The meanings of the contact-lexeme and dictionary sources are cited at the end of each dictionary article. Label © is followed by a description of semantic changes. Hash (#) refers to narrowed meanings of the contact-lexeme, whereas asterisk (*) refers to the widened ones. 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 ☐.

АВТОБИОГРАФИЧЕСКИ e, Acc0², F3/4, D0, adj, M1, S1N2m, LSA1, A2 (АРЧД); S1Fm (СРЯАН)

автобиографический S, adj (НСРЯ)

var: *автобиографичен* (АРЧД)

oi: rus. (АРЧД; ГРЧД); <-ический » -ически>; [the vowel

under stress: Rus:6/Bul:6; the number of meanings: Rus:2;1/Bul:1]

който се отнася до автобиография (АРЧД). © #2: свойственный автобиографии, характерный для нее (НСРЯ). © # связаный 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-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. Then we could describe the processes of adaptation in all other

² Acc0 – the type of transaccentuation.

contact situations and compile a complete computer database. We would be happy if the International Committee of Slavists started a long-term contactology project which would gather teams from different countries.

REFERENCES

- Ајдуковић 1997 – *Ајдуковић Ј.* Русизми у српскохрватским речницима. Принципи адаптације. Речник. Београд: Фото Футура, 1997.
- Ајдуковић 2004а – *Ајдуковић Ј.* Увод у лексичку контактологију. Теорија адаптације русизама. Београд: Фото Футура, 2004.
- Ајдуковић 2004б – *Ајдуковић Ј.* Контактолошки речник адаптације русизама у осам словенских језика. Београд: Фото Футура, 2004.
- Ајдуковић 2008а – *Ајдуковић Ј.* Библиографија са прилозима. Београд: Фото Футура, 2008. (See Recensions/Reviews by P.Piper, B.Stankovich, M.Nikolich, S.Ristich, P.Filkova, K.Petrova, Z.Fink, R.Dragicevich, G.G.Tjarko, 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. Београд: Београдска књига, 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).
- Ајдукович 2008б – *Ајдукович Ђ.* 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.
- Ајдуковић 2009 – *Ајдуковић Ј.* О контактолошком речнику контактофразама // *Riječ, Rijeka*, 2009, god. 15, sv. 2.
- Андрейчин 1986а – *Андрейчин Л.* Из историята на нашето езиково строителство. Софија: Народна просвета, 1986.
- Бабов 1973 – *Бабов К.* Международна лексика от гръцки и латински произход, възприета в българския книжовен език чрез руски език // *Славистични изследвания*, кн. III. Софија, 1973.
- Бабов 1978а – *Бабов К.* Руско-българските езикови контакти и въпросът за типологията на русизмите в българския език // *Славянска филология*, т. 15. Софија, 1978.
- Бабов 1978б – *Бабов К.* Лексикални калки в българския книжовен език, възприети от руския език // *Съпоставително езикознание*, кн. 4. Софија, 1978.
- Бабов 1987 – *Бабов К.* За руските думи и русизмите в академическия Речник на чуждите думи в българския език // *Съпоставително езикознание*, кн. 1. Софија, 1987.
- Леков 1942 – *Леков Ив.* Характеристика на общите черти в български и източнославянски // *Сб. БАН*, 37, 1942.

- Павлова 1979 – *Павлова Р.* Болгарско-русские и русско-болгарские языковые связи. София: Народна просвета, 1979.
- Филкова 1987 – *Филкова П.* Староболгаризмы и церковнославянизмы в лексике русского литературного языка. Т. 1-3. София, 1987.
- Цонев 1902 – *Цонев Б.* Руско-български паралели // Славянски глас, I, 1902.
- Цонев 1903 – *Цонев Б.* Руско-български паралели // Периодическо списание на Българското книжовно дружество, 3-4. София, 1903.
- Цонев 1922 – *Цонев Б.* Езикови взаимности между български и руски // Сб. Памети проф. А.К.Медведева. София, 1922.
- Filipović 1986 – *Filipović R.* Teorija jezika u kontaktu: uvod u lingvistiku jezičkih dodira, JAZU. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1986.
- Filipović 1990 – *Filipović R.* Anglicizmi u hrvatskom ili srpskom jeziku: porijeklo-razvoj-značenje. JAZU. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1990.

DICTIONARIES

- АРЧД – Речник на чуждите думи. Българска академия на науките, Институт за български език. София, 1982.
- БТР – Български тълковен речник. София, 1976.
- ГРЧД – *Габеров И.* Речник на чуждите думи в български с приложения. Трето издание. София: Gaberoff, 1998.
- НСРЯ – *Ефремова Т.Ф.* Новый словарь русского языка. Толково-словообразовательный. М.: Русский язык, 2000. Электронная версия – Грамота.ру, 2001-2002.
- ОСРЯ – Обратный словарь русского языка. М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1974.
- РСБКЕ – Речник на съвременния български книжовен език. София, т. I, 1955; т. II, 1957; т. III, 1959.
- РЧДБЕ – Речник на чуждите думи в български език. 4 преработено и допълнено издание. София, 1978.
- СИС – Словарь иностранных слов. 17-е изд., испр. М.: Русский язык, 1988.
- СРЯАН – Словарь русского языка. Академия наук СССР, Институт русского языка. Т. 1-4, 2-е изд., испр. и доп. М.: Русский язык, 1981-1984.