



DOI: 10.22363/2618-8163-2025-23-2-225-240

EDN: FHVPNE

Research article

Borrowing in modern Russian language: related linguistic processes

Natalia V. Gabdreeva^{id}✉, Anastasia V. Ageeva^{id}Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, *Kazan, Russian Federation*✉n.gabdreeva@mail.ru

Abstract. The study examines the main linguistic processes accompanying borrowing in modern Russian language. The relevance of the work is defined by actual views on the language system as a complex synergistically organized whole being in constant contact with external resources and dynamic evolution. The aim of the study is to systematize the procedural characteristics of the comprehensive inclusion of foreign vocabulary in the lexical system of the modern Russian language. The material of the work is the data of online versions of Russian-language periodicals, including both journalistic materials and readers' comments. The methodology of the work is based on the dynamic synchrony model, which allows us to record and describe the development of the main language processes accompanying language transfer. The key development trends of latest foreign-language vocabulary corpus in the Russian language at its main linguistic levels are established. General and specific characteristics in the formation of phonemic-graphemic appearance of foreign units are presented, including the most common types of variability and their factors. Structural modifications of lexical units in the process of borrowing are analyzed, and this allows us to draw a conclusion about the intensification of hybridization and composition according to the model of analytical languages. The growth of analyticism in substantive and adjectival grammatical categories is recorded. The patterns of redistribution of semantic links among foreign-language and native words are given. They include the growing productivity of semantic loan translation, the formation of associative relations (synonymous series, antonymic pairs, and hyper-hyponic paradigms), and the “gamification” of colloquial speech. The aim to represent and explain those processes, many of which are recorded for the first time in such an extensive factual material, is undoubtedly one of the priorities of modern science.

Keywords: Kazan linguistic school, foreign-language vocabulary, de-etymologization, re-decomposition, hybridization, a composite, loan translation, gamification

Contribution: Gabdreeva N.V. — collection of material, concept and supervision of the study, data verification, writing text; Ageeva A.V. — collection of material, data analysis and processing, implementation and design of the study.

Conflict of interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Article history: Received: 05.09.2024. Accepted: 18.11.2024.

© Gabdreeva N.V., Ageeva A.V., 2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

For citation: Gabdreeva, N. V., & Ageeva, A. V. (2025). Borrowing in modern Russian language: related linguistic processes. *Russian Language Studies*, 23(2), 225–240. <http://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2025-23-2-225-240>

Introduction

The idea about the variability of any living language is a program provision of the Kazan Linguistic School, which anticipated the development of linguistics for many years. This variability, according to the representatives of the association, can correspond to the intralinguistic logic or be brought from outside (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963; Bogoroditsky, 1915; Bulich, 1886; Krushevsky, 1883). At the same time, the linguistic processes accompanying “language mixing” only seem sporadic since their correct understanding and interpretation requires a detailed diachronic analysis of lexical Big Data. Recent works by Russian and foreign specialists devoted to the main factors in the development of foreign-language terminology in the Russian language appeal to combinatorial (digital-analog) methods of processing extensive linguistic data, reveal functional-quantitative parameters of linguistic units in various discursive practices (Bobyreva, Ageyeva, 2024; Iziumskaya, Melikova, 2023), establish the laws of their grammatical development (Marinova, 2024), create basic linguistic-cognitive models of terminological systems (Matskevich, Shchitova, 2023; Trofimova, Shchitova, 2022), determine the measure and degree of influence of extralinguistic factors in linguistic processes (Grechukhina, 2023; Yuhan et al. , 2024). The relevance of our work is thus based on the modern view of language as a complex, actively functioning open-type system.

The most important characteristic of an open system is the constant data exchange with the external environment (in our case, the human society itself, in isolation from which the language does not function) or related systems, other languages. Accordingly, the dynamics of social life, cultural views and scientific and technological progress exert pressure on language systems, set convergent vectors for their evolution. For example, the increasing complexity of scientific knowledge requires the standardization and unification of terminological apparatus; this in turn almost always intensifies the transfer of lexical units. In the case of mass borrowing, not only words but a certain part of reality is transferred into the receptor language (Ageeva, 2019: 62; Shmelev: 103). So de-ethymologization cannot fully perform its function, and the development of assimilation models in the language requires more time and effort. These conditions are favorable for the activation of various processes in the zone of direct language contacts; they are caused by interacting systems allomorhism.

The scientific novelty of our work should be defined both in terms of the specificity of the linguistic material, a significant part of which is not recorded by Russian lexicography and is included for the first time in the field of linguistic analysis, and in terms of improving the methodology of modern linguistics, which

operates with huge arrays of unstructured data that require a balanced combination of traditional and digital processing methods.

The conceptual basis of the presented work are the works of Kazan linguistic school (I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, V.A. Bogoroditsky, S.K. Bulich, N.V. Krushevsky), that laid the foundations of the modern interpretation of language as a constantly changing system of interrelated units at different levels and developed the methodology of dynamic synchronicity, dialectically combining synchronic and diachronic studies within the framework of a comprehensive analysis of linguistic phenomena and processes. Dynamic synchrony was successfully applied in linguistic contactology in the field of borrowing by E.E. Birzhakova, L.A. Voynova, L.L. Kutina, N.V. Gabdreeva, R.M. Svetlova, G.M. Lisina, L.P. Krysin, L. Meng, A.V. Kuryanovich, J. Cao, M.G. Sokolova (Birzhakova, Voynova, Kutina, 1972; Gabdreeva, Svetlova, Lisina, 2024; Krysin, 2018; Meng, Kurjanovich, Cao, 2023; Sokolova, 2024).

Thus, **the aim of this study** is to establish and systematically describe the linguistic processes accompanying borrowing of foreign language vocabulary and manifesting themselves at all the main layers of the language system.

Materials and methods

The tasks of the presented study require the comparative method to identify the key points of the contacting languages convergence. The method of semantic and contextual analysis of lexical units was used to explain the evolution of signifiers and to understand semantic processes. Relevant trends in Russian language development were reconstructed with the method of modeling linguistic processes. The factual base was evaluated through corpus methods, description, and formalization.

The material of the study includes data of a continuous sampling from online versions of Russian-language mass media, including general articles (Kommersant¹, Snob², Forbes Russia³, Vokrug Sveta⁴), thematic resources (VOICEMAG⁵, Marie Claire⁶, The Symbol⁷, Sports.ru⁸, N+1⁹, Naked Science¹⁰, RB.RU¹¹, Mel¹², Ferra.ru¹³, Habr¹⁴, etc.). The illustrative base thus amounted to about 700 neologisms of

¹ Kommersant. Retrieved September 1, 2024, from <https://www.kommersant.ru>

² Snob. Retrieved October 4, 2024, from <https://snob.ru>

³ Forbes Russia. Retrieved September 1, 2024, from <https://www.forbes.ru>

⁴ Vokrug sveta. Retrieved November 22, 2024, from <https://www.vokrugsveta.ru>

⁵ VOICEMAG. Retrieved March 6, 2024, from <https://www.thevoicemag.ru>

⁶ Marie Claire. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from <https://www.marieclaire.ru>

⁷ The Symbol. Retrieved November 20, 2024, from <https://www.thesymbol.ru>

⁸ Sports.ru. Retrieved June 12, 2024, <https://www.sports.ru>

⁹ N+1. Retrieved November 13, 2024, <https://nplus1.ru>

¹⁰ Naked Science. Retrieved November 14, 2024, <https://naked-science.ru>

¹¹ RB.RU. Retrieved September 1, 2024, from <https://rb.ru>

¹² Mel. Retrieved September 12, 2024, from <https://mel.fm>

¹³ Ferra.ru. Retrieved October 10, 2024, from <https://www.ferra.ru>

¹⁴ Habr. Retrieved November 21, 2024, from <https://habr.com/ru/articles/>

foreign origin, the overwhelming majority of which are not yet fixed in lexicographic sources. The semantics, collocative potential, and variability of these lexemes was done with the help of Russian National Corpus¹⁵.

Results

A foreign word is not only a grapheme-phoneme cipher that can be easily reconstructed with the elements of the receiving system. It is an element of the foreign language system, and it functions in a multitude of vertical and horizontal, paradigmatic and syntagmatic, relations. In case of occasional borrowings, de-etymologization successfully eliminates the former relations of a foreign word, while assimilation builds new structures around it, both at separate language levels and between them. Mass borrowings destabilize the receiving system and activate convergent processes at all language levels in assimilation.

The most significant features in the development of the foreign-language layer in modern Russian language include:

1. The emergence and explosive growth of new thematic groups of foreign-language lexicon and the filling of lacunas in established topics. The overwhelming majority of the newest units are not reflected in dictionaries of foreign words. At the same time, previously recorded neologisms of foreign origin grow in frequency and gradually enter the general language fund.

2. Transcription is the only means of formalizing the phonetic-graphic parameters of foreign neologisms, but at the same time there are cases of stable transliteration. Phonemic, graphemic, and phoneme-graphemic variation of units intensifies, and this indicates assimilation models that take into account both the influence of the donor language and the requirements of the receptor language.

3. Word-formation and inflectional paradigms of foreign words have several multidirectional vectors, where reduplication remains a leading trend and adapts the foreign word to the morphology of the receptor language. The influence of re-decomposition is only occasional. Hybridization is widespread; it is expressed both in forming foreign bases with native word-formants and native bases with foreign ones. High word-formation activity is in the sphere of analytic composite formation, while their models may be fully or partially borrowed.

4. The incorporation of foreign language units into the morphological system of the receptor language is complicated by the growth of analyticism in expressing nominative grammatical categories. The number of indeclinable nouns and adjectives is still significant.

5. The structure of foreign-language vocabulary meanings is strongly influenced by the semantics of their prototypes. This preserves associative and hierarchical relations between borrowed units and actualizes loan translation. A new phenomenon is gamification of colloquial speech, which is caused by the meaning generalization among the units related to a once narrow sphere, the video game industry.

¹⁵ Russian National Corpus. Retrieved March 1, 2023, from <https://ruscorpora.ru/>

Discussion

I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay focuses on language mixing, which is “the beginning of all life, both physical and mental”, a universal factor in the development of any national language: Russian, Polish, English, Armenian, or Latvian (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963: 363). It is mixing that provides a language with its originality, faceting its essence for many centuries. Mixing is an ambivalent process; it destabilizes the system by enriching it with new lexical, grammatical, and phonetic elements; on the other hand, it rationalizes and impoverishes it by eliminating redundancy in expressing grammatical meanings. Mixing is a catalyst of analogy that brings forms to a common denominator; it can affect the structure of language, for example, by an increase in analyticism or a change in accentual type (Baudouin de Courtenay, 1963: 366).

N.V. Krushevsky discusses possible violations of intralanguage laws in his “Essay on the Science of Language” and considers borrowing as the main factor of these violations. Analyzing phonetic laws, he mentions “double forms”, e.g., French champs ‘field’ and camp ‘camp’, the first being “primary-national”, while the second is the result of external influence (Krushevsky, 1883: 57). In morpheme genesis, he singles out ‘re-integration’ and emphasizes that foreign-language words are subject to the process no less than native words (Krushevsky, 1883: 107). At the intersection of semantics and morphology, he asserts the special role of smoothing the traces of the origin and word composition, which allows a unit to emancipate itself from its parents, narrow its meaning and turn into the real name of a given thing” (Krushevsky, 1883: 135).

The main theses of the Kazan linguistic school in the field of word formation and morphology were developed by its prominent representative V.A. Bogoroditsky. In particular, it is he who introduces terms *reduplication* and *re-decomposition*, now important in Russian linguistics; he considers the former as a phenomenon where the morphological parts fusion makes the word lose its ability to be understood in relation to its composition; its meaning is preserved only in its integrity (Bogoroditsky, 1881: 81–82). Re-decomposition is understood as such a displacement of morphological boundaries, which makes the word decompose into morphemes in a different way (Bogoroditsky, 1915: 61).

In I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay’s assertion about the universal character of borrowing, we point out its two key characteristics:

- the extensive growth of foreign neologisms, both denominative words and units of other levels (sounds, morphological components, and elements of syntax) (Baudouin de Courtenay 1963: 93);
- intensive development of the lexical system due to the increased frequency of foreign words in Russian texts and new syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations as a result.

Thus, borrowing as replenishment of the Russian lexical system with new elements is characterized by many factors that transform all main linguistic tiers.

We illustrate this thesis and analyze the processes at different levels accompanying borrowing in modern Russian language.

Foreign language vocabulary functioning

First, we consider functional-quantitative parameters of borrowing with their main trends.

1. The emergence of new thematic groups (IT, beauty sphere, game industry, etc.). Russian scientists provide a detailed analysis of vocabulary formation in such spheres as fashion, cooking, art, politics, science and technology, etc. (Sorokin, 1965; Birzhakova, Voinova, Kutina, 1972; Cherkasova, Smolina, Koporskaya, 1981; Yakhina, 2011; Andrianova, 2009). 2010–2024 activate the new “windows” of interlingual transfer. The first among them is the IT sphere with its nuclear lexicon formed at the turn of the century (*browser, console, file, domain, address, printer, service, laptop adapter, gadget, desktop, joystick, display, laptop, modem, monitor, pixel, cooler, slide, traffic, file, driver, interface site, server, scanner, provider*, etc.). Some of the earlier units went out of use and replenished the passive lexicon due to technology obsolescence (*floppy disk / floppy diskette, pager, facsimile, CD, CD/DVD-ROM, Pentium, slider, player*). Linguistic changes in this sphere are so active that new units are recorded nearly every day. For example, the rapid development of social networks produced such units as *blog, tag, stream, account, login, vlog, superchat, donate, podcast, follower, hashtag, script, monetization*, etc. Modern hardware, physical media gave us *tablet, ultrabook, netbook, smartphone*, and new virtual technologies activated such words as *messenger, router, Starlink, neural network, VR-glasses, deepfake*. In total, we recorded more than 200 foreign languages in this group at different stages of assimilation, from occasional units and inclusions to full-fledged terms with a stable form, unique semantic structure, and realized derivational potential.

The intensive growth of the video game industry gave the Russian language such terms as *guide, gameplay, cut-scene, location, shooter*, as well as numerous slang words both within the game discourse and far beyond it: *achivka* (from achieve), *nub* (from newbie), *level, hil / hilka* (from heal), *buff, mid* (from mid lane), *tilt, push, cheater*. The total number of words in this category reaches, according to various calculations, about 200 units and continues increasing, not so much due to new foreign languages, but due to the high productivity of their bases: *hil – hilka – hiler – hilit’ – otkhililit’ – otkhililit’sya* (from heal); *cheat – cheater – cheaterit’ – cheaternut’ – cheatresky – anticheat* (from cheat); *nub – nubas – nubyara – nubyatnik* (from nub), etc.

Only slightly inferior to the previous spheres (about 180 units), the beauty industry is represented by such thematic categories as cosmetic products (*baking, cushion, highlighter, nude, primer, anti-serne, booster, glitter, sculptor, bronzer*), beauty service (*spa, nail art, microblading, makeup, visage*) and cosmetology (*botox, radiesse, filler, lifting, peeling, biorevitalization, mesotherapy, cavitation*,

lymphatic drainage, aquaphorosis, electroporation, emollient, squalane, retinol, niacinamide, collagen, hyaluron, glutathione). A group of plastic surgery terms stands apart: *rhinoplasty, blepharoplasty, facelift, liposuction, panniculectomy, lipofilling*.

At the same time, new words appear in the fields with already established terminology:

politics and diplomacy: *atlanticism, bail-in, bi-patrid, briefing, visaran* (from visa running), *globalism, deglobalization, narrative, ombudsman, profiling, trolling, ubuntu, highly likely, sherpa, etatization* (from French *etat* ‘state’).

economics and finance: *banking, volatility, geofinance, deplatforming, depository, crowdfunding, cryptocurrency, cashback, offshore, pitch, relocation, stagflation, trade-in, friendshoring, freemius, franchise, franchising, hedging, shering, yuanization*.

jurisprudence: *bipolide* (from Latin *bi* ‘two’ and Greek *polis* ‘state’), *delict, gambling, demurrage, disclaimer, drafting, interpellant, insider, counterparty, mutcourt* (from moot court), *pirate, pliding, substance, redomiciliation* (from Latin *domicilium* ‘residence’), *ecocide*.

fashion: *bras, sabots, degrade, uggs, desu, bandeau, balconette, bustier, botillions, vintage, couturier, loafers, pret-a-porter, melange, chelsea, sweatshirt, longsleeve, jeggings, moms, skinnies, buggy, balloon, bootcut, boyfriends, tote, crossbody, messenger, oxfords, derby, brogues, slip-ons, croptop, paisley, sling, shacket, bispoke, bomber, capsule, collab, lookbook, birkenstocks, kafa, cape, merch, mules, oversize, hommage, palazzo, poncho, hoodie, riviera, choker, trench*.

art: *actionism, arte povera* (from Italian ‘poor art’), *assemblage, visualization, deconstruction, kinetism* (from Greek ‘moving’), *curator, message, mimesis, minimalism, net-art, performance, ready-made, transavant-garde, finissage, hapenning, edition, estimate, collage, marchand*.

media and journalism: *event, infographics, live, lead, longread, media quintet, parquet, paywall, podcast, programmatic, pilot, plasma, rendering, wraparound, screenshot, slug line, standup, storytelling, time code, factchecking, factoid, fake, deepfake, fid, chromakey*.

medicine and health care: *halo, glare effect, gonioscopy, LASIK, femto lasik, microkeratome, laparoscopy, covid, ebola, ozempik*.

linguistics and philology: *intertext, linguocide, pidgin, anacoluth, concordancer, durative, parenthesis, frame, script, slang*.

construction and architecture: *glorietta, mixboard, pillar, billboard, boho, broderie, boiserie, loft, clash, mossarium, bollard, armstrong, decking, provence, topping, siding, flashing*.

sports: *banye, brakage* (from French *braquage* ‘a turn’), *boot fitting, waltzing, snowboarding, strep, kant* (from German *kante* ‘edge’), *carving, hockey stop, freeride, playoff, plow, Ratrac, slalom, ski pass, telemark, ace, derby, lacrosse, peloton*.

culinary and restaurant industry: *snack*, *suvid* (from French *sous vide* ‘sauced’), *wok*, *ramen*, *spatula*, *moti* (from Japanese ‘rice cake’), *hollandaise*, *liaison*, *poached*, *nicoise*, *agar-agar*, *ganache*, *meringue*, *trimoline*, *steak*, *confit*, *flambü*, *biryani*, *bresaola*, *dressing*, *rack*, *quesadilla*, *quinoa*, *coleslaw*, *kefte* (from Turkish *kofte* ‘to chop’), *ramen*, *miso*, *tom yum*, *pho-bo*, *ciabatta*, *latte*, *cappuccino*, *sous chef*, *sushi*, *roll*, *pasta*, *parfait*.

We cannot demonstrate a complete picture of the non-iconic lexicon within one study, so we have deliberately excluded newest foreign units recorded previously (including our own works). Nevertheless, even the newest material show that the etymology of units is quite heterogeneous and varies depending on the subject matter; Anglicisms dominate, but some categories still retain close ties with Romance languages (French and Italian) and Oriental languages (Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese).

2. Increased frequency of lexemes in minority groups. According to Russian National Corpus, most lexical units borrowed in the 18th – 19th centuries and a significant number of foreign words of the late 20th – early 21st centuries are now growing in frequency in Russian texts (Ageeva, 2019: 54–175).

3. Active use of a significant layer of foreign-language units not recorded in modern dictionaries of foreign words.

Specificity of expression and language transfer

Formal features of foreign-language lexicon is considered in many scientific works (Ageeva, Abdullina, Gabdreva, 2023; Marinova, 2024; Matskevich, Shchitova, 2023; Trofimova, Shchitova, 2022; Yakhina, 2019). In our opinion, the processual side of foreign language lexicon adaptation is more evident in a level-by-level consideration of the receptor language system.

1. In terms of phoneme-grapheme form of foreign-language units, we observe:

a. Predominance of transcription as a mechanism for formalizing the oral and written appearance of foreign-language units. This tendency was established at the turn of the 18th-19th centuries and is still relevant. However, in oral colloquial speech there are units whose form was recreated by transliteration, e.g., *кринге* (also *кринж*, from English *cringe* ‘to shrink’), *итем* (from English *item* ‘object’), *ласик* (from English *LASIC*). They are few, but relatively frequent. This does not allow us to draw a definite conclusion about their occasional character.

b. Variative graphemic, phonemic, and phoneme-graphemic types. The first type includes all possible variants of the foreign-language unit’s graphic design that do not directly affect their sounding, e.g. simultaneous functioning of transliterated, non-transliterated, and contaminated units: *Момс джинс* / *Moms Jeans* / *Moms джинс* / *Moms Jeans* / *Момс Jeans*. This category also includes units with fluctuations in the plural / separate / hyphenated forms (*кروطон* / *кروط-тон* / *кروط тон* ‘kروطop’, *гайдлайн* / *гайд лайн* / *гайд-лайн* ‘guideline’), clusters of identical consonants (*дафлкот* – *даффлкот* ‘dufflecote’, *джеггинсы* – *джегинсы* ‘jeggings’),

блоггер – блогер ‘blogger’) and non-functional alternations of э/е (*гемблинг* – *гэмблинг* ‘gambling’).

The second group includes alternations of hard and soft consonants before [э]: *чи[тэ]* / *[т’э]р* ‘cheater’, *конкордан[сэ]* / *[с’э]р* ‘concordancer’.

The third group contains functional alternations of graphemes caused by incorrect reading of the original word (*ламборгини* – *ламборджини* ‘lamborghini’, *чаабатта* – *чабатта* ‘ciabatta’, *этлижер* – *атлейжер* *athleisure* (art + leisure)), parallel influence of several languages (*макарон* – *макарун* ‘macaroon’) or differences in transcription systems (e.g., the Russian language uses Polivanov system to render Japanese words, while the English-speaking world uses the Hepburn system to render Japanese vocabulary; as a result, we have variants *суси* – *суши* ‘sushi’, *Митсубиси* – *Митсубиши* ‘Mitsubishi’).

2. The derivational potential of the foreign-language lexicon in the Russian language is rapidly expanding due to several factors.

a. De-ethymologization gives foreign-language units Russian word-forming affixes and thus includes them in the paradigms of gender / number / declension for nominal parts of speech and conjugation for verbal ones. As noted above, simplification is characteristic for the Russian language, for foreign words as well (Andrianova, 2009; Yakhina, 2011). The most frequent are foreign nouns Pluralia tantum combined with native affixes of number: *chips* – *чипс-ы*, *moms* – *момс-ы*, *jeggings* – *джеггинс-ы*, *storis* – *сторис-ы*, *shorts* – *шортс-ы*. They are now particularly widespread in comparison with previous periods. Native speakers do not perceive the actual reduplication of affixes as redundant. Moreover, some units occasionally have the full number paradigm is recorded occasionally, where the foreign Plural form acts as Singular: *чипс* – *чипсы*, *сторис* – *сторисы*, *шортс* – *шортсы*.

b. Re-decomposition is a deeper long-term morphological process, so it is less frequent among the foreign-language lexicon. It is characteristic only of sub- and nonstandard speech, where we register few cases of redistribution of the final vowel base in favor of the inflection: *подними жалюзи* ‘raise the blinds’ – *не играй жалюзьями* ‘don’t play with the blinds’, *принт пейсли* ‘paisley print’ – *платье в пейслях* ‘paisley dress’.

c. Hybridization. Simplification and re-decomposition affect mainly word-formation characteristics of foreign units and embed the unit within the rigid framework of the existing paradigm. Word-formation models of the hybrid type, on the contrary, represent the widest field for linguistic experiments. Nevertheless, all these variants can be divided into two types: foreign units with Russian affixes and Russian units with foreign affixes.

Hybrid models of the first type can be nominative, adjectival, and verbal.

Substantives have suffixal derivation $N + \text{suffix} = N$, the most productive suffixes are (a) diminutive (-ик (*файлик* ‘file’, *сайтлик* ‘site’, *тренчик* ‘trench’, *бложик* ‘blog’, *макияжик* ‘make up’), -ок (*нетбучок* ‘netbook’, *лучок* ‘look’), -чик (*кремчик* ‘cream’, *топчик* ‘top’)); (b) feminine (-к-, forming both animate (*блогерка* ‘a female blogger’, *директорка* ‘a female director’, *редакторка* ‘a fe-

male editor’, *геймерка* ‘a female gamer’) and inanimate feminine nouns (*хилка* ‘feminine noun from heal’, *бардотка* ‘feminine noun from Bardot’, *митенки* ‘mittens’); suffixes with abstract meaning (*kripota* ‘feminine noun from creepy’).

Adjective word-formation is realized in the model $N + \text{suffix} = A$, where the most frequent suffixes are *-ов-* (*кринжовый* ‘adjective from cringe’, *криповый* ‘adjective from creepy’, *фреймовый* ‘adjective from frame’, *сленговый* ‘adjective from slang’, *фейковый* ‘adjective from fake’) and *-н-* (*капсульный* ‘adjective from capsule’, *сасный* ‘adjective from sassy’, *кульный* ‘adjective from cool’, *офшорный* ‘adjective from offshore’).

Two derivational models are realized in verb word formation. Categorical features of the verb are expressed in the model $N + \text{suffix} = V$, where Russian affixes *-и-* (*чилить* ‘verb from chill’, *стопить* ‘verb from stop’, *банить* ‘verb from ban’, *байтить* ‘verb from bite’, *дебажить* ‘verb from debug’), *-а-* (*дефать* ‘verb from defend’, *лайкать* ‘verb from like’, *бафать* ‘verb from like’), *-ну-* (*ультануть* ‘verb from ultimate’, *хелпануть* ‘verb from help’, *бомбануть* ‘verb from French bombe’). In previous periods, the borrowed suffix *-иров-* (*манкировать* ‘verb from French *manquer*’, *телефонировать* ‘verb from telephone’, *визировать* ‘verb from visa’, *дезавуировать* ‘verb from *desavouer*’, *парировать* ‘verb from French *parer*’) used to be the main category-forming suffix of foreign verbs. The model $\text{prefix} + V = V$ conveys new meanings to an existing verb unit (*забайтить*, *забанить*, *отдефать*, *отхилить*). There are also consonant alternations functionally determined by combinatory factors: *з* in auslaut / *ж* before *-и*, e.g., *блог* – *бложик*, *влог* – *вложик*, *дебаг* – *дебажить*; *к* in auslaut / *ч* before *-ок*, *-ик*: *лук* – *лучок*, *бук* – *бучок*.

Hybrids of the second type are mainly nouns and adjectives with foreign suffixes. Now suffixes *-ист* and *-изм*, as well as the verb suffix *-иров-* become less productive. On the contrary, more frequent are the suffixes *-ант* (*отливант* ‘from verb to pour off’, *подписант* ‘from verb to sign’, *содержант* ‘from verb to support’, *отъезжант* ‘from the verb to leave’, *покупант* ‘from the verb to buy’, *выбирант* ‘from the verb to elect’) (Senko, Tsakalidi, 2017); *-инг* (*избинг* ‘from *izba*’, *деревнинг* ‘from village’, *жабогадюкинг* ‘from *Zhabogadyukino*’); *-аж* (*листаж* ‘from page’, *погонаж* ‘from linear meter’, *сенаж* ‘from hay’, *подхалимаж* ‘from bootlick’); *-абельн-* (*читабельный* ‘readable’, *играбельный* ‘playable’, *узнавабельный* ‘recognizable’, *стрелябельный* ‘shootable’); *-ибельн-* (*носибельный* ‘wearable’, *ходибельный* ‘walkable’, *смотрибельный* ‘watchable’, *исполнибельный* ‘performable’) and even *-ическ-* (*богический* ‘from God’).

d. Composition formation. Along with active functioning of various composites, new models of word formation emerge. The latter can be conditionally categorized into two groups: borrowed where both components are foreign (*активист-шик* ‘activist-chic’, *стейк-фрит* ‘from French *steak-frites*’, *смайт кэжуал* ‘smart-casual’, *стритстайл* ‘streetstyle’, *пауэр-сьют* ‘power-suit’, *концепт стор* ‘concept-store’, *чат-бот* ‘chat-bot’, *румтур* ‘room tour’, *клоуз-тест* ‘cloze-test’, *парфюм-бар* ‘perfume-bar’, *порт-куто* ‘from French *porte couteau*’)

and contaminated where one of the components is foreign, the second is Russian (*смарт-часы* ‘smart watch’, *бьюти-новинка* ‘beauty novelty’, *интим-услуги* ‘intimate-services’, *диско-звучание* ‘disco sound’, *дипфейк-образ* ‘deepfake image’, *ню-снимок* ‘nude photo’). The units referred to the first group can be borrowed “ready-made” (*дасстер-коут* ‘duster coat’, *стритстайл* ‘streetstyle’, *шатдаун* ‘shutdown’) or formed as a composite in the Russian language (*ретро-ниша* ‘retro niche’, *кейс-чемпион* ‘case champion’, *копинг-стратегия* ‘coping strategy’, *барбекю-зона* ‘barbecue zone’, *магазин-бар* ‘shop bar’, *эго-документ* ‘ego document’).

There emerge new words with the same elements, and certain particles can be pointed out (Gabdreeva, Khabibrakhmanova, Kochurova, 2023): prefixoids *овер-* ‘over-’ (*оверсайз* ‘oversize’, *овердрафт* ‘overdraft’, *овертайм* ‘overtime’), *бьюти-* ‘beauty-’ (*бьюти-лайфхак* ‘beauty-lifhack’, *бьюти-модель* ‘beauty-model’, *бьюти-индустрия* ‘beauty-industry’), *ивент-* ‘event-’ (*ивент-менеджмент* ‘event-management’, *ивент-дизайн* ‘event-design’, *ивент-продакшн* ‘event-production’) and suffixoids *-кор* ‘-core’ (*хардкор* ‘hardcore’, *софткор* ‘softcore’, *метал-кор* ‘metalcore’, *френчкор* ‘Frenchcore’), *-стайл* ‘-style’ (*стритстайл* ‘streetstyle’, *спортстайл* ‘sportstyle’). They are consistently included in composites formed on the basis of the receptor language (*овер-* with the meaning “over”: *овер много* ‘over a lot’, *овертупой* ‘over silly’, *овергрубо* ‘over rudely’; *бьюти-* in the meaning of “care”: *бьюти-новинка* ‘beauty novelty’, *бьюти-математика* ‘beauty math’, *бьюти-рутина* ‘beauty routine’; *ивент-* in the sense of “event”: *ивент-анализ* ‘event analysis’, *ивент-агентство* ‘event agency’, *ивент-идея* ‘event idea’; *-кор* in the meaning of “aesthetics”: *рашн кор* ‘Russian core’, *балет-кор* ‘ballet core’, *традвайф кор* ‘tradwife core’, *Анна Каренина кор* ‘Anna Karenina core’; *-стайл* in the meaning of “style”: *оптстайл* ‘wholesale style’, *студент-стайл* ‘student style’).

3. In terms of morphology, there still is a great number of indeclinable nouns (*латте* ‘latte’, *эспрессо* ‘espresso’, *эль ниньо* ‘el nico’, *багги* ‘buggy’ *палаццо* ‘palazzo’, *угги* ‘uggi’) and adjectives (*бургунди* ‘burgundy’, *таун* ‘taupe’, *вери пери* ‘very peri’, *диско* ‘disco’). There is practically no genitive variation for these units; the grammatical category of gender (as well as number) is assigned to the analytic forms semantically.

Modern semantic trends in the sphere of foreign-language lexicon

As for their meaning, it can be analyzed only under conditions of stable semantic structure of lexical units, but it is currently far from stabilization. That is why let us outline some trends that seem promising.

1. Semantic calquing, when a foreign-language sememe is implied to native units (*whey, milk, cloud, network*) or word-for-word translation of a complex foreign-language term (*умные часы* ‘smart watch’, *умный дом* ‘smart house’, *тихая роскошь* ‘quiet luxury’, *бежевые мамы* ‘beige moms’, *дедушкин стиль* ‘grandpa’s style’, *стеклянная кожа* ‘glass skin’, *лисы глаза* ‘fox eyes’, *испанский стыд* ‘Spanish shame’, *укол красоты* ‘beauty injection’).

2. Synonymic series within foreign language terminology (concealer - corrector, *highlighter* - *luminizer*, *gamepad* - *joystick*, *brandbook* - *guidebook* - *logobook*); antonymic pairs (*buff* - *debuff*, *long* - *short*); logical-hierarchical paradigms (coffee: *espresso*, *latte americano*, *ristretto*, *raff*; coat: *trench*, *duffle coat*, *overcoat*, *polo*, *pardessus*).

3. Gamification of colloquial speech. Unlike the above-mentioned processes that have been the subject of linguistic research (Ageeva, Abdullina, Gabdreva, 2023; Marinova, 2024), this trend has not been previously recorded by Russian scholars. In his paper “Modern tendencies of word formation in web slang (on the material of the French language)” N.R. Dementyev notes the limited communicative intentions of video game slang, but mentions that some units enter “generally established forms of colloquial and literary speech” (Dementyev, 2022: 4048). We state that the transfer of video game vocabulary (almost entirely foreign) into colloquial speech is quite massive. Such units include nouns (*скилл* ‘skill’, *ульта* ‘superpower’, *чит* ‘unfair advantage’, *имба* ‘something excellent’, *дроп* ‘discarded items’) and verbs (*доджить* ‘avoid’, *дефать* ‘protect’, *хелпануть* ‘help’, *сейвить* ‘save’, *пушить* ‘exert increased pressure’, *ультануть* ‘do the unimaginable’, *спидранить* ‘do something with maximum speed’). This trend may be due to both the widespread video games, which have become the main means of leisure for young people, and English-Russian bilingualism among young people, who no longer perceive anglicisms as something alien.

Conclusion

More than a century ago, on September 21 (October 4, new style), 1900, the introductory lecture to the course “Comparative Grammar of Slavic Languages in Relation to Other Ario-European Languages” was delivered at St. Petersburg University. In this lecture, Ivan A. Baudouin de Courtenay made the revolutionary statement that there is no “linguistic purity”. He criticizing a traditional idea of linguistic evolution isolated from interlingual contacts and urged his listeners to look into any dictionary and make sure that there are many words “simply learned or mysterious and of dark origin”. In the same lecture, the founder of two schools of Russian linguistics spoke ironically of his colleagues who absolutized the “unchanging nature” of language.

Today we realize that the basic nature of language, its identity and specificity are created by changes. These changes can be determined by its internal laws or by external influence. Being a complex, living and open system, language consistently and creatively incorporates foreign elements, passes them through phonological, morphological and semantic “sieve”, according to the metaphoric expression of Lev V. Shcherba, a student of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay. Our article shows how this sieve functions and outlines those actual trends that will probably, to a greater or lesser extent, constitute the nature of the Russian language in the future.

These attempts at linguistic forecasting define the prospects of our research. The foreign lexicon of the Russian language requires a detailed diachronic study at all linguistic levels in order to record and describe the systemic characteristics of the linguistic processes accompanying borrowing, their formation, and evolution in time. In this context, the project of V.V. Vinogradov Institute of the Russian Language of the Russian Academy of Sciences — The National Dictionary Fund promises to become a unique tool for diachronic language analysis. Comparative studies involving data from other languages that have undergone mass borrowing at different stages of their existence or are currently undergoing it are also relevant.

An applied aspect of such research could be the study of the effectiveness of language purism state policy and regulating foreign language vocabulary in the past and present in many states.

References

- Ageeva, A. V. (2019). *Convergent-divergent characteristics of the Romanesque layer in the language of Russian fiction of the 19th – 21st centuries*. (Doctoral dissertation, Cheboksary). (In Russ.). EDN: BAFJEL
- Ageeva, A. V., Abdullina, L. R., & Gabdreeva, N. V. (2023). Functions and semantics of foreign language beauty vocabulary in the modern Russian language. *Russian Language Studies*, 21(4), 393–405. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2023-21-4-393-405> EDN: GBAYSQ
- Andrianova, N. S. (2009). *Military and scientific-technical terminology of French origin in modern Russian*. (Candidate dissertation, Kazan). (In Russ.). EDN: QENQXH
- Baudouin de Courtenay, I. A. (1963). *On the mixed character of all languages. Selected works on general linguistics*. Moscow: Academy of Sciences of the USSR Publ. (In Russ.).
- Birzhakova, E. E., Voinova, L. A., & Kutina, L. L. (1972). *Essays on the historical lexicology of the Russian language of the 18th century: Language contacts and borrowings*. Leningrad: Nauka Publ. (In Russ.).
- Bobyreva, N. N., & Ageeva, A. V. (2024). French internationalisms in Russian sports terminology. *Philology. Theory & Practice*, 17(10), 3644–3649. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20240515> EDN: SAMDKH
- Bogoroditsky, V. A. (1915). *Lectures on general linguistics*. Kazan: Imperial University Publ. (In Russ.).
- Bogoroditsky, V. A. (1881). Linguistic notes. Issue I: On morphological absorption. *Russian philological bulletin*, VI(3), 58–92. (In Russ.).
- Bulich, S. K. (1886). *Borrowed words and their significance for the development of language*. Warsaw: Mikhail Zemkevich Publ. (In Russ.).
- Cherkasova, E. T., Smolina, K. P., & Koporskaya, E. S. (1981). *History of the vocabulary of the Russian literary language of the late 17th – early 19th centuries*. Moscow: Nauka Publ. (In Russ.).
- Dementyev, N. R. (2022). Modern trends in web slang word formation (by the material of the French language). *Philology. Theory & Practice*, 15(12), 4047–4053. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20220660> EDN: GQHCPH
- Gabdreeva, N. V., Khabibrakhmanova, A. R., & Kochurova, S. V. (2023). Dictionary of composites: New empirical data. *Philology and Culture*, (3), 14–20. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.26907/2782-4756-2023-73-3-14-20> EDN: ZWRGGY

- Gabdreeva, N. V., Svetlova, R. M., & Lisina, G. M. (2024). Arabic borrowings in the Russian language transmitted to Russian through French. *Philology and Culture*, (3), 12–18. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.26907/2782-4756-2024-77-3-12-18> EDN: UTGGRM
- Grechukhina, Z. R. (2023). Influence of external and internal laws of language on the meaning of terms in the synchronic aspect (based on the material of the French language). *Linguistics and Education*, 3, 16–28. (In Russ.). <http://doi.org/10.17021/2712-9519-2023-4-16-28> EDN: PPVWYW
- Izyumskaya, S. S., & Melikova, O. S. (2023). Modern newspaper discourse and anglicisms: Communicative and functional. *Scientific Review. Pedagogical Sciences*, (1), 42–46. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.17513/srps.2469> EDN: HRHUFO
- Krushevsky, N. V. (1883). *Essay on the science of language*. Kazan: Imperial Kazan University Publ. (In Russ.).
- Krysin, L. P. (2018). Word-formation activity of a foreign word: structural and functional aspects. In *Modern Russian linguistics and linguodidactics: collection of scientific works, dedicated to the 95th anniversary of N.M. Shansky* (pp. 285–289). Moscow: MFUA Publ. (In Russ.). EDN: XRIPEd
- Marinova, E. V. (2024). Russian terminology of the digital society: grammatical features in the focus of neology and neography. *Russian Language Studies*, 22(2), 225–241. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2024-22-2-225-241> EDN: SESKAP
- Matskevich, N. A., & Shchitova, O. G. (2023). Xenogeneity in Russian architectural and design terminology. *Tomsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin*, (4), 43–51. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.23951/1609-624x-2023-4-43-51> EDN: FOPWLM
- Meng, L., Kurjanovich, A. V., & Cao, R. (2023). Borrowed vocabulary as a fragment of the Russian language picture of the world: Linguoculturological description. *Russian Language Studies*, 21(4), 406–423. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2023-21-4-406-423> EDN: GBGUYS
- Senko, E. V., & Tsakalidi, T. G. (2017). Functional dynamism of Russian word formation (by the example of the suffix -ant in the contemporary Russian language). *Philology. Theory & Practice*, (12-1), 150–154. (In Russ.). EDN: ZREEJZ
- Shmelev, D. N. (1973). *Problems of semantic analysis of vocabulary*. Moscow: Nauka Publ. (In Russ.).
- Sokolova, M. G. (2024). “Fresh or not fresh?” (linguistic portrayal of the word Фреш (Fresh) in Modern Journalistic Discourse). *Russian Speech*, 1, 49–59. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.31857/S0131611724010042> EDN: JHZUPF
- Sorokin, Yu. S. (1965). *Development of the vocabulary of the Russian literary language: 30–90s of the XIX century*. Moscow; Leningrad: Nauka Publ. (In Russ.).
- Trofimova, N. A., & Shchitova, O.G. (2022). Cognitive frame modeling of the term system of the subject area “Building materials” in the Russian of the XXI century. *Tomsk State Pedagogical University Bulletin*, 65–75. (In Russ.). <http://doi.org/10.23951/1609-624X-2022-1-65-75> EDN: JHZUPF
- Yakhina, R. R. (2011). *English-Russian language contacts of the late 20th – early 21st centuries in comparative terms*. Kazan: Yaz Publ. (In Russ.). EDN: QWKOCp
- Yakhina, R. R. (2019). Language adaptation of English technical terms in the Russian Language. *Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Series “Linguistics”*, 16(3), 18–24. (In Russ.). <https://doi.org/10.14529/ling190303> EDN: FNZHEB
- Yuhan, Lazareva, O. V., Barov, S. A., & Vered, V. T. (2024). Peculiarities of formation of the term system of international trade: Linguocultural and ecolinguistic aspects. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 15(2), 457–473. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2024-15-2-92-474> EDN: OLJZNY

Bio notes:

Natalia V. Gabdreeva, Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Russian as a Foreign Language, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, 18 Kremlevskaya St, Kazan, 420008, Russian Federation. *Research interests*: historical and descriptive lexicology, language contacts, semantics. The author of over 270 works. ORCID: 0000-0003-0816-2672. SPIN-code: 292398. Scopus ID: 57191980069. E-mail: n.gabdreeva@mail.ru

Anastasia V. Ageeva, Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Professor at the Department of European Languages and Cultures, Higher School of Foreign Languages and Translation, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, 18 Kremlevskaya St, Kazan, 420008, Russian Federation. *Research interests*: historical and descriptive lexicology, language contacts, sociolinguistics, neology and neography. The author of over 150 works. ORCID: 0000-0002-2046-2865. SPIN-code: 518277. Scopus ID: 56033254700. Researcher ID: D-9364-2015. E-mail: anastasia_ageeva@mail.ru


DOI: 10.22363/2618-8163-2025-23-2-225-240

EDN: FHVPNE

Научная статья

Займствование в русском языке новейшего периода: сопутствующие языковые процессы

Н.В. Габдреева  , А.В. Агеева 

Казанский (Приволжский) федеральный университет, Казань, Российская Федерация
 n.gabdreeva@mail.ru

Аннотация. Рассмотрены основные лингвистические процессы, сопутствующие заимствованию в русском языке новейшего периода. Актуальность исследования определяется современными взглядами на языковую систему как на сложное синергетически организованное целое, находящееся в постоянном контакте с внешними ресурсами и характеризующееся динамичным развитием. Цель исследования — систематизация процессуальных характеристик всестороннего включения иноязычной лексики в лексическую систему русского языка на современном этапе. Материалом работы выступают данные онлайн-версий русскоязычных периодических изданий, включающие журнальные статьи и комментарии читателей. Методология работы основана на применении модели динамической синхронии, позволяющей зафиксировать и описать в развитии основные лингвистические процессы, сопровождающие трансфер языковых единиц. Установлены основные тренды развития корпуса новейшей иноязычной лексики русского языка на основных ярусах языковой системы. Представлены общие и частные характеристики процессов становления фонемно-графического облика иноязычных, включая наиболее распространенные типы вариативности и факторы, их актуализирующие. Проведен анализ структурных модификаций лексических единиц в процессе заимствования, позволяющий сделать вывод об интенсификации процессов гибридизации и композитообразования по модели языков аналитического типа. Зарегистрирован рост аналитизма в оформлении субстантивных и адъективных грамматических категорий. Приведены закономерности перераспределения семантических связей в сфере иноязычной и исконной лексики, среди которых выделяются рост продуктивности семантического калькирования,

выстраивание ассоциативных (формирование синонимических рядов, антонимических пар) и иерархических отношений (развитие гиперо-гипонимических парадигм), «геймификация» разговорной речи. Репрезентация и экспликация подобных процессов, многие из которых впервые фиксируются для столь обширного фактологического материала, бесспорно, являются одним из приоритетов современного научного знания.

Ключевые слова: Казанская лингвистическая школа, иноязычная лексика, гибридизация, деэтимологизация, опрощение, переразложение, композит, семантическая калька, геймификация

Вклад авторов: Габдреева Н.В. — сбор материала, концепция и руководство исследованием, верификация данных, написание текста; Агеева А.В. — сбор материала, анализ и обработка данных, осуществление и дизайн исследования.

Конфликт интересов: Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи: поступила в редакцию 05.09.2024; принята к печати 18.11.2024.

Для цитирования: Габдреева Н.В., Агеева А.В. Заимствование в русском языке новейшего периода: сопутствующие языковые процессы // Русистика. 2025. Т. 23. № 2. С. 225–240. [http://doi.org/ 10.22363/2618-8163-2025-23-2-225-240](http://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2025-23-2-225-240)