Russian Borrowings in Greek and Their Presence in Two Greek Dictionaries

Zoe Gavriilidou
Democritus University of Thrace
E-mail: zoegab@otenet.gr

Abstract

This paper focuses on Russian loanwords, loanblends and loanshifts that entered the Greek lexicon during various historical periods and how they have been recorded into two major dictionaries of Modern Greek (MG), the *Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek* (DSMG) (1998) and the *User's Dictionary* of the Academy of Athens (UD) (2014). It also aims at the analysis of the semantic fields of all documented Russian borrowings in the history of Greek, following a classification scheme which was originally used for typological comparison (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009c). In the first part of the paper, we consider the contact situations that led to borrowing from Russian into Greek and the reasons for borrowing, which include, among others (a) response to major political events, such as the October 2017 Revolution, the Soviet era, the 1987 Perestroika; (b) literary translations of Russian masterpieces in Greek and Greek literature, such as the work of Nikos Kazantzakis or Miltiadis Karagatsis; and (c) religious affinity. Then we compare how these borrowings are recorded in DSMG and UD. In the next section, we offer a morphophonological analysis of borrowings. The semantic fields in which the borrowings belong to are also studied. Finally, the paper provides experimental data for supporting Anastassiadis's (1994) claim that lexical fields, in which loanwords abound, reflect a stereotypic image of the country where the donor language is spoken.

Keywords: loanword, borrowing, loanshift, loanblend, internationalism, loan translation, calque, structural borrowing

1 Introduction

Borrowing is an interesting phenomenon of language contact which leads to language change and has been extensively studied in the recent literature (Thomason & Kaufman 1992; Thomason 2001; Johanson 2002; Haspelmath 2008; Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009). It sometimes reveals the type of relations between people speaking the donor and the recipient language, reflects the stereotypes established in a given culture about the 'other civilization' and "symbolizes the foreign and the strange" (Stubbs 1998: 19).

Previous research on language contact and borrowing focuses on:

a) The typology of borrowings (Haugen 1950; Humbley 1990; Anastassiadis 1994; Matras & Sakel 2007);
b) The reasons (cultural influence, historical events, stereotypes, denomination needs) that motivate borrowing (Haspelmath 2008);
c) The type or intensity of linguistic contact that leads to borrowing (Thomason & Kaufman 1992);
d) The parts of speech that are more easily borrowed among languages (Van Hout & Muysken 1994; Myers-Scotton 2002; Matras 2007);
e) The borrowability scales (Matras 1998);
f) The connection between borrowing and lexical meaning (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009);
g) The synchronic or diachronic analysis of loanwords;
h) The adaptation and inclusion of borrowings in the receiving language.

There is also a large amount of previous research on lexical borrowing from English or French in Greek (Contossopoulos 1978; Apostolou-Panara 1991; Anastassiadis 1994), however no previous study has focused on borrowings from Russian into Greek, even though the phenomenon is not peripheral. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to investigate Russian borrowings that entered Greek lexicon and also shed light to the reasons for borrowing and account for the social and attitudinal factors that affect it. Our aim is also to investigate how these borrowings are included in two major dictionaries of Modern Greek (MG), the *Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek* (DSMG) (1998) and the *User's Dictionary* of the Academy of Greece (UD) (2014).

In the first part of the paper, after a brief presentation of the borrowing classification adopted in the present study, we consider the contact situations that led to borrowing from Russian into Greek and the reasons for borrowing. Then, we present the data collected from the two above-mentioned dictionaries: More specifically, a) We classify Russian borrowings following the typology of Haugen (1950) and Anastassiadis (1994) and provide quantitative data. b) Furthermore, we elaborate on their phonological and morphological adaptation and integration into Greek. c) The semantic description of Russian borrowings is also investigated. d) Then, we identify frequent Russian loanwords that are absent from the macrostructure of DSMG and UD, and propose new entries for these words to be included in the macrostructure of these dictionaries. e) Finally, we investigate, through a brainstorming experiment, the stereotypes that Greek speakers have with regard to Russian civilization and Russians, in order to provide experimental data for supporting Anastassiadis' (1994) claim that lexical fields, in which loanwords abound, reflect an image of the country where the donor language is spoken.

In this study, the term *borrowing* is used to refer to "the incorporation of foreign elements into the speakers' native language" (Thomason & Kaufman 1992). Additionally, we will refer to the language from which a loanword has been borrowed as *donor language* or L2, and the language into which it has been borrowed as the *recipient language* or L1. Finally, borrowing is a historical dimension, which can be studied if information on the linguistic diachrony of the involved languages is available. Therefore, in this paper we will use the methods of diachronic linguistics. However, we will perform a synchronic analysis of the output of borrowing from Russian to Greek.

2 Theoretical Issues

One of the best known typologies of lexical borrowing, adopted in the present study, is that of Haugen (1950), who distinguishes among *loanwords, loanblends* and *loanshifts*. *Loanwords* are words that, at some point in the history of a language, entered its lexicon as a result of language contact (e.g. καπίκι [capici] 'kopeck'). A specific category of loanwords are *internationalisms*, which are loanwords that entered simultaneously in different recipient languages (e.g. Perestroika). Loanwords belong to what is known as *material borrowing* (Matras & Sakel 2007).

Loanblends, on the other hand, are words constructed in the recipient language by a native and a foreign part (e.g. γυφτέ [jifte] (gipsy-like) from the word γύφτος 'gipsy' and the borrowed from French suffix –é). Finally, *loanshifts* include *loan translations* or calques (e.g. αναθεωρητισμός [anaθeoritizmos] 'revisionism'), which are complex lexical units, either monolexical or polylexical, that are created by item-by-item translation of the source-term, and *semantic borrowings* (e.g. the new meaning 'political officer of the communist party' that was added in the medieval word κομισάριος [komisarios] 'commissary'). Semantic borrowings are borrowings of the *signified* of a word of the donor language (L2) that attaches to a semantic field of an already existing word in the recipient language (L1). Loan translations and semantic borrowings are indirect or partial borrowings (Humbley 1990) and belong to what is known in the literature as *structural borrowing* (Matras & Sakel 2007).

3 Linguistic Contact Between Greek and Russian

Borrowings are connected with the history of a nation and its relations with others more closely than any other part of the lexical inventory. Furthermore, the duration and intensity of language contact, the cultural or linguistic affinity between the L1 and L2, political, religious or other types of bond between people speaking L1 and L2, the roles and status of these languages, the attitudes and stance of people speaking the recipient language towards those speaking the donor language or other sociolinguistic factors play a vital role in determining the degree and outcome of borrowing between L1 and L2. Thus, only a complex study of linguistic items and historical events can facilitate the answering of important questions, such as the time of introduction of a borrowing from L2 to L1, the donor and intermediary language or any changes in form and meaning that may happen.

Greek has integrated in its vocabulary Russian borrowings. In order to understand the process of borrowing, one must consider the following facts: Greek and Russian coexisted in a bilingual context from the end of the 1980's and after in Northern Greece in bilingual communities of people repatriated to Greece from the former Soviet Union. However, during that period Russian did not leave any noteworthy traces in Greek. Consequently, there was no direct contact between Greek and Russian that motivated the introduction of Russian loanwords, but only an indirect relation between the two languages. This relation is reciprocal, since Greek as a donor language, in the past, gave more loanwords to Russian, especially in the ecclesiastical or everyday vocabulary, than it borrowed from Russian. During the 20th century, Greek borrowed from Russian mainly due to:

a) Historical or political events, such as the October Revolution which in 1917 established the Soviet regime in Russia, or Perestroika in the late 80's. As Stubs (1998) claims, words embody facts of history and are often borrowed into a language in response to world political events;
b) Literary translations of Russian masterpieces (e.g. the work of Pushkin or Dostoyevsky) in Greek, which introduced words referring to culturally bound terms such as ντάτσα [datsa] 'dacha', ίζμπα [izba] 'isba', ουσάνκα [usanka] 'ushanka', βότκα [votka] 'vodka';
c) The publication of literary masterpieces of Greek authors such as *Russia: A Chronicle of Three Journeys in the Aftermath of the Revolution* (1928) by Nikos Kazantzakis or *Junkermann* (1939) by Miltiadis Karagatsis, which also introduced everyday vocabulary from Russian;
d) Terms referring to Russian technology such as σπούτνικ [sputnik] 'sputnik', κοσμοναύτης [kosmonaftis] 'cosmonaut', etc.

Russian borrowings were introduced in Greek either directly through literary translations (e.g. βότκα [votka] 'vodka', γιάφκα [jafka] 'javka', καπίκι [kapici] 'kopeck', πιροσκί [pirosci] 'piroschki', μπαλαλάικα [balalaika] 'balalaika'), or indirectly with the intermediate of French (e.g. ινστρούχτορας [instruxtoras] 'instructor', κολεκτιβισμός [kolektivizmos] 'collectivism', πογκρόμ [pogrom] 'pogrom'), English (e.g. περεστρόικα [perestroika] 'perestroika', μολότοφ [molotof] 'molotov', σπούτνικ [sputnik] 'sputnik' , σφυροδρέπανο [sfiroδrepano] 'hammer and sickle'), or rarely from Turkish (τελατίνι [telatini] 'veal skin').

In the following section, we will focus on how these borrowings are recorded in the macrostructure of two major dictionaries of Modern Greek, the *Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek* and the *User's Dictionary* of the Academy of Athens.

4 Russian Loanwords in DSMG and UD

4.1 The DSMG

The *Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek* (DSMG) is a modern and comprehensive definitional, orthographic, and etymological dictionary of Modern Greek. It was published in December 1998 by the

Institute for Modern Greek Studies of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, and is the product of many years of methodical labor. It is the first dictionary of Modern Greek to set forth lexicographical principles. It was first released in 1998 in paper form and then as an online application available at http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/tools/lexica/triantafyllides/.

By performing a number of advanced searches in the online DSMG, sixty-five borrowings of Russian were retained. All words including the label 'Russian' as language of origin in the field of etymology or in the lexicographic article were considered. It was noted that DSMS provided the primary etymon for each entry and also the transition of the term – via an intermediate language – from the donor language to Greek. This principle was applied systematically to all entries.

The majority of these were loanwords (58 out of 65) (e.g. σαμοβάρι [samovari] 'samovar', κεφίρ [kefir] 'kefir', αταμάνος [atamanos] 'ataman', κνούτο [knuto] 'knut, whip', κοσμοδρόμιο [kozmoδromio] 'cosmodrome', κουλάκος [kulakos] 'kulak', μαζούτ [mazut] 'mazut', μαμούθ [mamuθ] 'mammoth'. Among them there were a lot of internationalisms (e.g. βότκα [votka] 'vodka', περεστρόικα [perestroika] 'perestroika'). The loan translations were less frequent (nine out of 65): e.g. ερυθροφρουρός [eriθrofruros] 'red guard', σφυροδρέπανο [sfiroδrepano] 'hammer and sickle', Λευκορωσία [lefkorosia] 'Byelorussia', υπερσιβηρικός [ipersivirikos] 'Trans-Siberian', etc. The majority of loan translations found in DSMG macrostructure entered Greek through the intermediate of French language, except for the word σφυροδρέπανο [sfiroδrepano] 'hammer and sickle' which entered Greek vocabulary through English.

In some cases, in the dictionary's word list parallel couples of loanwords and loan translations with the same meaning were attested in the DSMG: e.g. ρεβιζιονιστής [revizionistis] 'revisionist' vs. αναθεωρητής [anaθeoritis] 'revisionist'. As loan translations are more transparent and adapted in Greek language, they are preferred by Greek speakers.

Semantic borrowings from Russian were extremely rare in DSMG: characteristic examples are the medieval word κομισάριος [komisarios] 'official' and the savant word επίτροπος [epitropos] 'commissioner' in which the new meaning of 'political officer of the communist party' was added in the 20th century.

No loanblends were found in DSMG. Actually some occasional, ludic creations in –vski, -ov and –its found in literature or advertisements are never included in dictionaries.

The above mentioned data confirm that both material and structural borrowing occurred from Russian to Greek, although material borrowing is much more frequent than the structural one. This is in line with previous research which found that at the lowest level in the borrowability scale borrowing is limited to the lexical level, and mainly to content words. Structural borrowing is only found at the higher levels. According to the scale, the existence of structural borrowing in a language generally implies that words have also been borrowed (Matras 1998, 2011).

Fifty-eight (58) out of sixty-five (65) borrowings found in DSMG were nouns, five (5) were adjectives and only two (2) verbs. This finding is in line with previous research on borrowability scales (Van Hout & Muysken 1994; Myers-Scotton 2002; Matras 2007). Van Hout and Muysken (1994: 42) account for the greater ease of nouns than verbs to be integrated in other languages by stating that "A very important factor involves one of the primary motivations for lexical borrowing, that is, to extend the referential potential of a language. Since reference is established primarily through nouns, these are the elements borrowed most easily". Matras (2007: 48) claims that the difficulty of verbs to be integrated in another language

> "lies in the conceptual complexity of the verb, and the fact that when borrowed and integrated, the verb is expected to perform two operations: The first is to serve as a referential lexical

item – a content word, not dissimilar to a noun, adjective, or descriptive adverb. The second is to initiate the predication and so to serve as the principal anchor point for the entire proposition of the utterance. This latter function constitutes its *verbness.* It appears that borrowing of verbs is motivated by a similar need for modifying the inventory of lexical-referential expressions as the borrowing of nouns (and no doubt various specific semantic motivations could be postulated for groups of lexical content words). Speakers thus allow the lexical component of the verb to "cross" the mental demarcation boundary between languages, i.e. they license themselves to employ the same action/ event signifier in any speech interaction. The bare lexical stem, however, is not always sufficient in order to assume the role of predication-initiator. A great number of languages therefore require this additional, crucial function to be explicitly marked out in the verbal expression; in other words, they need to transform the strictly "lexical" depiction of an action/event into a predicate".

4.2 The UD

The *User's Dictionary* of the Academy of Athens (UD) is a user's definitional, orthographic, and etymological paper dictionary of Modern Greek. It was published in 2014 by the Academy of Athens, and is the product of almost ten years of compilation. It includes 75,000 entries, 5,000 neologisms, and more collocations than any other Greek dictionary.

The UD includes only 38 words with Russian as language of origin in the field of etymology. All 38 are direct loanwords; no loan translations from Russian are attested in UD, because this dictionary considers English as the donor language of all loan translations after 1950 and French as the donor language of loan translations before this. Actually, UD includes in its entry list only direct loanwords from Russian, while DSMD includes both direct and indirect borrowings (loanwords, calques or semantic loans) providing the initial etymon in Russian. Thus the etymon of the entry μενσεβίκος [mensevikos] 'Menshevik' in the UD is the French word *Menshevik*, while in DSMG the etymon is the Russian word *men´shevik.* This discrepancy in the lexicographic practice between the two dictionaries reflects a methodological difference in the description of word origin, and explains why more words in DSMG are characterized of Russian origin than in UD.

From the thirty-eight borrowings from Russian in UD, thirty-six are nouns and only two adjectives.

4.3 Comparing DSMG and UD Entries

Definitions of the common entries in the two dictionaries are not divergent. This is probably due to the use of more or less the same textual sources. Additionally, no variability in spelling of the head entries was attested between DSMG and UD.

Differences were mainly found in the details in the etymology part; DSMG provides more exhaustive etymological information than UD, while UD includes in some cases, parallel types in other languages with a chronology of the first appearance of these words (e.g. in the etymology part of the word ματριόσκα [matrioska] the user can read [< Rus. matrëshka, Engl. matrioshka, 1964]). The etymology part of both dictionaries should be ameliorated by incorporating information on word-forms and meanings from donor languages, together with dates of attestation in those languages wherever possible, in order to provide a much fuller picture of the process of integration of individual words into Greek. These sources will allow users to realize the systematicity in the borrowing process and identify contemporaneous borrowings into other languages in Europe, showing that Greek is part of a network of languages which share in the process of borrowing and semantic development.

As far as coverage is concerned, from the sixty-eight Russian borrowings recorded in DSMG, the following eleven are absent from the UD macrostructure:

αγκιτάρω [agitaro] ‘agitate’
αταμάνος [atamanos] ‘ataman’,
ερυθροφρουρός [eriθrofruros] ‘red guard’,
κουλάκος [kulakos] ‘kulak’
λευκορωσικός [lefkorosikos] ‘Byelorussian’
ουκάζιο [ukazio] ‘ukase’
ρασκόλνικος [raskolnikos] ‘Raskolnik’
σπούτνικ [sputnik] ‘sputnik’
σταχανοφισμός [staxanofizmos] ‘stakhanovism’

According to Podhajecka (2006: 132), the word ουκάζιο [ukazio] ‘ukase’ is mis-etymologized as Russian, since it is French. So the etymology of that word in DSMG should be revised. The other ten borrowings should be added in UD.

Similarly, the entry list of DSMG has to be augmented with the following twelve words found only in UD:

απαράτ [apparat] ‘apparat’
γκλασνοστ [glaznost] ‘glasnost’
δούμα [δuma] ‘douma’
καλάσνικοφ [kalasnikof] ‘kalashnikof’
KGB [kaïebe] ‘KGB’
ματριόσκα [matrioska] ‘matrioshka’
μπάμπουσκα [babushka] ‘babushka’
πάβλοβα [pavlova] ‘pavlova’
πολίτ-μπιρό [politburo] ‘Politburo’
σοβχόζ [sovxoz] ‘sovkhoz’
στάρετς [starets] ‘starets’
τάιγκα [taiga] ‘taiga’

Furthermore, the entry list of both dictionaries has to be supplemented by the following words which are not included either in DSMG’s or UD’s macrostructure, even though they are quite widespread in oral or written language:

απαράτσικ [aparatsik] ‘aparatchik’
βογιάρος [vojaros] ‘boyar’
γκουλάγκ [gulag] ‘Gulag’
ίζμπα [izba] ‘isba’
κομσομόλ [komsomol] ‘komsomol’
Κρεμλίνο [kremlino] ‘Kremlin’
μπαλακλάβα [balaklava] ‘balaklava’
μπελούγκα [beluga] ‘Beluga’
μπλινί [blini] ‘blini’
μπορτς [borts] ‘borsch’
ναρόδνικος [naroδnikos] ‘narodnik’
NKVD [nikavede] ‘NKVD’
ντάτσα [datsa] ‘dacha’,
ουσάνκα [usanka’] ‘ushanka’
σαμιζντάτ [samizdat] ‘samizdat’

Finally new senses in already existing entries should also be added (e.g. the sense 'in the former Soviet Union and other communist countries a member of a children's movement that aimed to foster communist ideals' in the entry πιονιέρος [pioøeros] 'pioneer' or the sense 'form of address to Stalin' in the entry πατερούλης [paterulis] 'dear father'.

5 Phonetic and Morphological Adaptation of Loanwords in L1

The source words of loanwords often include morphophonological properties in the donor language that do not fit into the morphophonological system of the recipient language. This is the reason why often loanwords undergo changes in order to adapt to the recipient language. The procedure of changing in order to better fit to the morphophonological system of the recipient language is called *adaptation* or *intergration* (Haspelmath 2009).

For instance, Russian [S] becomes [s] in Greek in order to adapt to the Greek phonological system which does not have a [S] sound: με**νσ**εβίκος [me**ns**evikos] 'menshevik'. However, the degree of adaptation varies according to the age of the loanword, the knowledge of the donor language by recipient language speakers, and their attitude toward the donor language. Thus, loanwords found in the DSMG and the UD, contain rare consonant clusters and word endings that oppose to the phonological constraints and the phonotactic patterns of Greek:, μπο**λσ**εβίκος [bo**ls**evikos] 'bolshevik', καλά**σν**ικοφ [kala**sn**ikof] 'kalashnikof', νομε**νκλ**ατούρα [nomenklatura] 'nomenclature', γιά**φκ**α [ja**fk**a] 'javka', ρασκό**λν**ικος [raskolnikos] 'Raskolnik', σπού**τνικ** [spu**tn**ik] 'sputnik', βό**τκ**α [vo**tk**a] 'vodka', πογκρό**μ** [pogro**m**] 'pogrom', σοβιέ**τ** [sovie**t**] 'soviet'. These are cases of primary adaptation (Anastassiadis 1994) and behave like foreignisms. Instable signifiers (e.g. [kefir] vs. ([kefiri], [tundra] vs. [tunδra]), are also found in our data. They may denote that the loanword is in a process of adaptation. These formal variants can coexist for a considerable stretch of time, although the prevailing direction of phonological adaptation is from polyformity to uniformity (Baldunčiks 1991).

Loanword adaptation makes loanwords easily usable in the recipient language. For instance, languages with inflection and gender classes, such as Greek, need to assign verbs a person and tense inflection, and nouns a gender and inflection class in order to be used in syntactic constructions which require gender agreement. Thus, all verbs coming from Russian were integrated in the Greek inflectional system with the use or the suffix –άρω [aro] as in αγκιτάρω [agitaro] 'agitate' (for the morphological adaptation of loan verbs see Wohlgemuth 2009). All animate nouns were classified in the category of masculine nouns by the use of the ending –ος [os] or –ας [as], as in ρασκόλνικ**ος** [raskolnikos] 'Raskolnik', μπολσεβίκ**ος** [bolsevikos] 'bolshevik', αταμάν**ος** [atamanos] 'ataman', κουλάκ**ος** [kulakos] 'kulak', ινστρούχτορ**ας** [instruxtoras] 'instructor' (for gender assignment in loanwords see Anastassiadis 1994; Stolz 2009). Inanimate nouns ending in the vowel –a were classified in the category of feminine nouns: e.g. νομενκλατούρ**α** [nomenklatura] 'nomenclature', γιάφκ**α** [jafka] 'javka'. A number of inanimate nouns ending in a consonant were classified in the category of neutral with the attachment of the ending –ο or -ι as in κνούτο [knuto] 'knut' or σαμοβάρι [samovar] 'samovar'. Only a number of inanimate nouns ending in a consonant remained morphologically non-adapted to Greek, and these were classified to the class of neutrals. These are uninflected words, e.g. σπούτνικ [sputnik] 'sputnik', καλά**σν**ικοφ [kala**sn**ikof] 'kalashnikof'. Out of the 58 loanwords in DSMG, 16 are uninflected. Six out of 36 are uninflected loanwords in UD. These words are in the phase of primary morphological adaptation (Anastassiadis 1994).

6 Semantic Fields of Borrowings

In order to provide a systematic and comparative approach to the study of loanwords from Russian to Greek and the semantic categories they belong to, the Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009) semantic fields catalogue from their study *Loanwords in the languages around the world* will be used. This catalogue contains the following 24 semantic fields (see Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009): 'The physical world', 'Kinship', 'Animals', 'The body', 'Food and drink', 'Clothing and grooming', 'The house', 'Agriculture and vegetation', 'Basic actions and technology', 'Motion', 'Possession', 'Spatial relations', 'Quantity', 'Time', 'Sense perception', 'Emotions and values', 'Cognition', 'Speech and language', 'Social and political relations', 'Warfare and hunting', 'Law', 'Religion and belief', 'Modern world', and 'Miscellaneous function words'. According to Tadmor (2009), the semantic field in which a word belongs affects the probability of that word being borrowed. In other words, certain semantic fields are better candidates for borrowing than others. For instance, semantic fields like 'Religion and belief', 'Social and political relations', 'Clothing' or 'The house' correspond to domains which have been affected by intercultural influences (Tadmor 2009: 64). These fields are more prone to borrowing. On the other hand, semantic fields like 'Sense perception' or 'Spatial relations' are least amenable to borrowing, since practically every language is expected to have indigenous words for such concepts.

Our data are distributed in the following semantic fields, in descending order:

- social and political relations (e.g. φράξια [fraksça] 'fracsija', αγκιτάτσια [aïitatsça] 'agitation', κομισάριος [komisarios] 'political officer of the communist party', πογκρόμ [pogrom] 'pogrom', περεστρόικα [perestroika] 'perestroika', αταμάνος [atamanos] 'ataman');
- religion and belief (e.g. σαμάνος [samanos] 'saman', ουνία [unia] 'unja', ουνίτισσα, [unitisa] 'female supporet of unja', ρασκόλνικος [raskolnikos] 'Raskolnik');
- food and drink (e.g. βότκα [votka] 'vodka', πιροσκί [piroski] 'piroshki', κεφίρ [kefir] 'kefir', πάβλοβα [pavlova] 'pavlova');
- the house (e.g. σαμοβάρι [samovar] 'samovar', μπάμπουσκα [babushka] 'babushka');
- clothing and grooming (e.g. αστρακάν [astrakan] 'astrakan', ουσάνκα [usanka] 'ushanka');
- basic actions and technology (e.g. κοσμοναύτης [kozmonaftis] 'cosmonaute', κοσμοδρόμιο, [kozmoδromio] 'cosmodrome' σπούτνικ [sputnik] 'sputnik', μαζούτ [mazut] 'mazut');
- physical world (e.g. στέπα [stepa] 'steppe', τούντρα [tundra] 'tundra', τάιγκα [taiga] 'taiga');
- animals (κουτάβι [kutavi] 'puppy', μαμούθ [mamuθ] 'mammoth');
- warfare and hunting (e.g. κνούτο [knuto] 'wip', μολότοφ [molotof] 'molotof').

In accordance with Tadmor (2009), the majority of our data are loanwords which refer to 'Social and political relations', 'Religion and belief', 'Food and drink', 'The house'.

The most prolific field is that of politics, with many loanwords relating to the period of the Soviet Union. The great impact of the Russian Revolution and the subsequent Communist regime marked the end of the old autocratic rule (czarism) and largely influenced modern communities and their languages with the new borrowings which refer to new forms of social organization, new institutions, and new ranks. These words were introduced in the Greek language as loans with a denotative meaning; however, they acquired specific positive connotations in the leftist political vocabulary, and were used with the aim to declare a left-wing political identity and ideological proximity to the Soviet regime and communism. In some other cases, they had negative connotations expressing the depreciation of speakers towards the Communist regime: ιντελιγκέντσια [inteliïentsia] 'intelligentia' (vs. διανόηση [δianoisi 'intellectuals'), αγκιτάτορας [aïitatoras] 'agitator', ρεβιζιονιστής [revizionistis] 'revisionist', προβοκάτσια [provokatsça] 'provocation' (vs. πρόκληση [proklisi] 'provocation').

The data that belong to other categories are products of borrowing for external reasons (they result from the extra-linguistic realm and are related to material-economic or cultural reasons). More specifically, they are borrowings used to denominate new notions or objects which refer to Russian culture and belong to the semantic fields of 'Food and drink', 'The house' or 'Clothing' (e.g. βότκα [votka] 'vodka', πιροσκί [piroski] 'piroshki' , σαμοβάρι [samovar] 'samovar', μπαλαλάικα [balalaika] 'balalaika'). These three semantic fields are similar, since globalization and continued migration have contributed to the spread and adoption of such words worldwide.

In line with Tadmor (2009), no Russian loanwords belonging to the semantic fields of the physical world, kinship, the body, motion, possession, spatial relations, quantity, time, sense perception, emotions and values, cognition, speech and language were found in Greek.

6.1 Stereotypes and Borrowing

Anastassiades (1994) argues that by studying the semantic fields of L1 where borrowings from L2 abound it is possible to account for the reasons for borrowing, since borrowings reflect the image that L1 speakers have of the country where the donor language is spoken or their stance towards it. This image does not represent reality (in the sense that it is not a photographic imprint of it), but it has a symbolic value.

In order to collect quantitative data for studying the possible correlation between a) the stereotypic representations that L1 speakers have in mind about L2 speakers, and b) the semantic fields of Russian loanwords in Greek, a brainstorming experiment was held on Facebook. The stimulus word was 'Russia'. More particularly, the participants were asked to post which idea, word or image was recalled first when they heard the word 'Russia'.

Five hundred and six subjects, aged 19 to 70 years old participated in the research by posting their answer in a period of 48 hours. Table 1 shows their answers.

Table 1: Frequency of the recalled words, ideas or images

Words/ideas/images	Frequency
Putin	**48**
Communism	**38**
Vodka	**37**
Red Square	**34**
cold	**33**
red	**30**
baboushka	**27**
Orthodoxy, St. Petersburg	**23**
Moscow	**21**
Tsar	**20**
Stalin, Dostoyevsky	**10**
ballet	**8**
revolution	**7**
Red Army, perestroika, CCCP	**6**
Soviet Union, Kremlin, steppe, Gorbachev, bear	**5**
literature, Lenin, Romanov	**4**
Tchaikovsky/Tolstoy/ushanka/Bolshoi/Siberia	**3**
hammer and sickle, piroshki, Chekhov	**2**
Cold war, Pushkin, oligarchs, mafia, Gulag, Rasputin, Volga, proletarian, samovar, Dr. Zhivago, caviar	**1**

As one can see from Table 1, the majority of answers refer to different political regimes of Russia (tsarist period, Soviet era or Perestroika). Actually, the correlation of the representations and stereotypes emerging from the brainstorming, with the semantic fields where there is high borrowing from Russian, indicates that most borrowing takes place in the field of politics, whether it concerns the tsarist (e.g. κουλάκος 'kulak'), the Soviet (e.g. κομισάριος 'commissary'), or the post-Soviet period (e.g. Perestroika, oligarchs).

A lot of stereotypes refer to toponyms and geography (vast unpopulated areas), Russian literature, ballet, food and climate conditions (cold), and the Russian mafia. These stereotypical perceptions are associated with everyday vocabulary words that refer to typical Russian clothing (μπαλακλάβα 'balaklava', ουσάνκα 'ushanka') drink (βότκα 'vodka', σαμοβάρι 'samovar'), music (μπαλαλάικα 'balalaika'), geographical terms (τάιγκα 'taiga, τούνδρα 'tundra', στέπα 'steppe').

Russian borrowings enriched the political vocabulary of the left Part in Greek. Russian loanwords are used by L1 speakers who want to express their sympathy to the Left or ironically by others who want to criticize it. This vocabulary stereotypically reflects the image of a country that was marked by the Communist regime or Perestroika and its positive (glasnost) or negative results (oligarchs, mafia, etc.). The results revealed a pattern of responses with older people (aged 45-70) associating the word 'Russia' mainly with its Soviet history, and the younger ones showing more negative stereotypes and associating Russia with corruption, lack of democracy and the rise of oligarchs.

7 Conclusions

This paper investigated Russian loanwords, loanblends and loanshifts that entered Greek lexicon during various historical periods and how they have been recorded into two major dictionaries of Modern Greek. The comparison of the two dictionaries showed that the routes of loanwords did not always overlap. There were discrepancies between the two works in the number of entries of Russian origin as a result of different lexicographic practices adopted during the dictionary compilation process. The paper also offered a morphophonological analysis of Russian loanwords in Greek. The study of the semantic fields in which Russian borrowings in Greek belong revealed that the most prolific semantic fields were 'Social and political relations', 'Religion and belief', 'Food and drink' and 'The house'. These results confirmed the observation of Tadmor (2009: 64) that "different languages display a remarkable degree of consistency with regard to which fields are more or less affected by borrowing". Finally, the paper provided experimental data supporting Anastassiadis's (1994) claim that lexical fields, in which loanwords abound, reflect the stereotypic image of the country where the donor language is spoken.

References

Anastassiadis, A., (1994). *Neological borrowing in Greek* [IN GREEK]. Thessaloniki.

Andreitsenko, E., (2014). *Greek loanwords with Orthodox religious content in the evolution of Russian* [IN GREEK], Epikairotita.

Apostolou-Panara, A-M., (1991). English loanwords in Modern Greek: An overview. *Terminologie et Traduction,* 1, pp. 45-58.

Baldunčiks, J,. (1991). West European loanwords in Latvian. In. Ivir V & Kalogjera D. (eds) Languages in contact and contrast, pp. 15-24, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Contossopoulos, N., (1978). *L'influence du français sur le grec, emprunts lexicaux et calques phraséologiques*. Athènes.

Haspelmath, M. (2008). Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability. In T. Stolz, D. Bakker & P.-R. Salas (eds.), *Aspects of language contact: New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romancisation processes*, pp. 43–62. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, M. & Tadmor, U., (2009). *Loanwords in the world's languages*. The Hague: De Gruyter Mouton.
Haugen, E., (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language,* 26, pp. 210-231.
Hout, R., & Muysken, P., (1994). Modelling lexical borrowability. *Language, variation and change,* 6(1), pp. 39-62.
Humbley, J., (1974). Vers une typologie de l'emprunt lexical. *Cahiers de Lexicologie,* 25(2), pp. 46-70.
Johanson, L., (2002). *Structural factors in Turkic language contact*. London: Curzon.
Matras, Y., (1998). Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics,* 36, pp. 281-331.
Matras, Y., (2007). The borrowability of structural categories. In G. Bossong, B. Comrie & Y. Matras (eds) *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*, pp. 31-74, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Matras, Y., & Sakel, J,. (2007). *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Matras, Y., (2011). Universals of structural borrowing. In P. Siemund *Linguistic Universals and language variation*, pp. 204-233. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Myers-Scotton, C., (2002). *Language contact: bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Podhajecka, M. (2006). Russian borrowings in English: similarities and differences in lexicographic description. In R. W. McConchie et al. (eds.) *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX),* Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp.123-134.
Stolz, C., (2009). A different kind of gender problem: Maltese loanword gender from a typological perspective. In B. Comrie, R. Fabri, E. Hume, M. Mifsud, T. Stolz. M. Vanhod (eds) *Introducing Maltese linguistics*, pp. 321-353, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Stubbs, M., (1998). German loanwords and cultural stereotypes. *English Today*, 14(1), pp. 19-26.
Tadmor, U., (2009). Loanwords in the world's languages: Findings and results, In Haspelmath, M. & Tadmor, U., (eds). *Loanwords in the world's languages*, pp. 55-75, The Hague: De Gruyter Mouton.
Thomason, S., (2001). *Language Contact*. Georgetown University Press, Washington.
Thomason, S., & Kaufman, T., (1992). *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Wohlgemuth, J., (2009). *A typology of verbal borrowings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.