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ABSTRACT

The present article analyzes lexical innovations of French origin in the Russian literary language on materials of fiction, opinion journalism, as well as etymological, defining, and foreign dictionaries under well-defined criteria of foreign word extraction. Investigations of Russian and foreign linguistics dedicated to the study of language contacts offer a variety of criteria describing the functioning of foreign vocabulary in the Russian lexical system as the result of interaction of various manifestations of language contacts. The authors highlight the main principles and possibilities of using methods of corpus analysis in the process of studying language contacts in a historical perspective. The material of this research consists of the Gallicisms in the sphere of culinary and gastronomy that came to the Russian language at the end of the 18th-19th centuries and were recorded in numerous works of Russian literature. Diachronic analysis of their functional development using the methods of corpus linguistics makes it possible to determine and demonstrate some general and particular processes in the field of foreign language vocabulary: the development of the form and content of the loanwords, the periodization of their maximum and minimum occurrence, and the correlation of language data with extra-linguistic factors.
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1. Introduction

In the current linguistic situation, there is an active use of neologisms of foreign origin: the source of updating the vocabulary of the Russian language - like any other - is borrowing. Being a direct consequence of the Gallophilia of the Russian society of the 18th and 19th centuries, which was one of the strongest traditions of the Russian nobility, the lexical items of French origin filled many lexical and thematic groups, actively displacing the original units and earlier borrowings from everyday life [Ageeva et al. 2019]. Today, borrowing becomes again an important source of enrichment for the Russian vocabulary — French borrowings dominate along with Anglicisms in the total number of neologisms, which confirms the relevance of this study. According to a number of scientists [Diana Patricia Varela Cano 2020; Craig, 2017; Pennycook, 2016; Popescu, 2013; Cubberley, 1993], the borrowing of foreign language vocabulary is a complex diachronic process, each time reflecting uniquely the depth and intensity of language contacts in relation to different language combinations, and even within the same combination - to different eras. “The main component of language (dictionary unit) and text (word usage) is a word. It goes through a long development in the language and in the texts in this language and only after that it is included in the modern terminological dictionary” [Baranova et al. 2019, 456].
In this regard, we can speak about the dualism of the main characteristics of borrowing – the unity of form and content, characteristic of every linguistic sign.

The influence of the pronunciation, morphological, and even phraseological and syntactic norms of the donor language on the formalization of a borrowed element in Russian was considered by us earlier [Ageeva, Abdullina 2018; Ageeva, Abdullina et al. 2019]. The purpose of this study is to establish some of the particular patterns of the substantial evolution of the Russian language due to the borrowing of a significant array of French vocabulary by the Russian language at the turn of the 18th–19th centuries.

2. Material and Methods

The material of our work was the works of Russian fiction of the 19th century (A.S. Pushkin “Eugene Onegin”, “Roman in Letters”; etc., M. Lermontov “Princess Ligovskaya”, “Hero of Our Time”, N.V. Gogol “The Government Inspector”), as well as data from explanatory and etymological dictionaries of Russian and French languages. The semantics of the word “evolution” itself implies a diachronic analysis of the functional and semantic characteristics of this material over the more than two centuries of their development in the Russian language; the materials and the tools of the Russian National Corpus (RNC) and “Centre National des Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales” (CNRTL) provided invaluable help for this research.

The methods used in the present paper include linguistic description methods (examination, description, classification, comparison), as well as lexical-semantic and comparative methods and the method of diachronic description of language which are considered to be traditional for lexical-historical research. Statistical method of quantitative description was used when studying some aspects of the problem.

3. Results

In this work, we will proceed from the ideas of D. N. Shmelev, who points to the interdependence of intra- and extra-linguistic factors within the lexicon of one language, the links between which create a unique reflection of reality, its cast, unique for the native speakers of a given language [Shmelev 1973, 103]. Applying this statement to the theory of linguistic contacts, we can talk about the imposition of a fragment of another reality into the one existing in the system of the recipient language. Thus, from the point of view of content, borrowing is not a simple “introduction of new objects”—it often changes the coordinate system itself.

The intensity of the French-Russian language contacts in the 18th-19th centuries is unprecedented; practically all spheres of life in Russian society were formatted. Russian culture adapts new styles of clothing, new ways of organizing leisure, the interior and architectural elements, new forms of art; the military sphere and the government structure are completely reformed; the scientific and philosophical paradigm is changed. Taking into consideration the breadth of the research material, we limit ourselves to a small area: culinary and gastronomy.

The westernization of Russian society entails the spread of the French cuisine: it becomes fashionable to hire French cooks; many French cookbooks are being translated into Russian. This leads to a noticeable increase in Gallicisms in the field of gastronomy. French names are adopted for meat dishes:

- linguette – лангет “langet” (langet), escalope – eskalop “eskalop” (escalope), filet – филе “fil’e” (fillet), côtelette – котлета “kotleta” (chop), entrecote – антрекот “antrekot” (entrecote), sauté – сюте “sote” (sauté), ragout – рагу “ragu” (stew);
- vegetables:asperge – спаржа “sparzha” (asperagus), artichaut – артишок “artishok” (artichoke), cornichon – корнишон “kornishon” (gherkin), salade – салат “salat” (salad);
- gravy and seasonings: sauce – соус “sous” (sauce), marinade – маринад “marinad” (marinade), basil – базилик “bazilik” (basil), vanille – ваниль “vanil’” (vanilla);
- alcoholic and refreshing drinks: orangeade – оранжад “oranzhad” (orangeade), limonade – лимонад “limonad” (lemonade), cognac – коньяк “konyak” (cognac), champagne – шампанское “shampanskoe” (champagne);

The adoption of the art of serving requires the designation of tableware: бутылка – бутыл “bottle”, vase – ваза “vaza” (vase), вазон – вазон “vazon” (vason), бокал – бокал “bokal” (glass).

The spread of gourmet restaurants leads to the activation of such units as restauration – ресторан “restoran” (restaurant), café – кафе “ кафе” (cafe), buffet – буфет “bufet” (buffet), etc. We will study several examples of the specifics of corpus analysis methods applied to the study of language contacts in a diachronic perspective.
4. Discussion

The word кулинария “kulinarya” came to the Russian language relatively late: there is no lexicographical record of this unit before the beginning of the twentieth century (Popov 1911: 211).
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**Fig. 1. The distribution of the frequency of occurrence of the word кулинария**

The frequency of occurrence of the given lexeme quite accurately repeats the curve of the socio-economic situation of the Russian Empire, the USSR and, lastly, the Russian Federation. It is important to note that the first time the word in its primary and main meaning “the art of cooking” is used in literature by A. Chekhov in 1885-1886:

Что касается меня, то я почти уверен, что многоговорящие старожилы, помимо кулинарии и чревоугодия, имеют и другие конечные цели... “Chto kasaetsya menya, to ya pochti uveren, chto mnogogovoryaschie stariki-blinyi pomimo kulinarii i chevougodiya, imeyu i drugie konechnye tseli...” A. P. Chekhov «Blinyi» [RNC].

The maximums of the graph fall on the middle of the 20's (New Economic Policy), the end of the 50's (post-war economic growth), the beginning of the 80's (apogee of the period of stagnation), the end of the 90's and, lastly, the second decade of the 21st century. The growth of occurrence in the 1950's is caused by the appearance of a new meaning of the word – “a store of ready-made dishes and processed food”, the first fixation of which in the literature was made during this period:


Near-zero and extremely low values on the graph were due to the cataclysms of the beginning of the last century and the hunger during the war years. Such an interpretation does not explain, however, its significant, if not critical, decrease of usage in the late 1930’s. It may be due to the reasons of not only economic, but of a socio-ideological nature, namely the fight against the so-called “servility to the West,” expressed in extremely puristic policy of the censorship apparatus.

The relatively low frequency rate of the lexeme (not more than 5 occurrences per 1 million word forms) in the texts of fiction is explained by a wider usage of the earlier German borrowing кухня “kukhnya”, which, influenced by the French language, had received the meaning “cuisine”:

Cuisine - préparation des aliments; art, manière d’apprêter les aliments. Cuisine bourgeoisie, familiale, villageoise; cuisine chinoise, française ‘Cuisine - food preparation; art of cooking. Bourgeois, family, village cuisine; Chinese, French cuisine’ [CNRTL].

There are no Russian analogs of the French word soupe; having changed the grammatical gender into masculine in the process of morphological adaptation, the Gallicism суп “sup” began to denote “a liquid dish made of meat with vegetables and various seasonings or dairy” [Chudinov 1910, 828], being a generic term for Russian borscht, shchi, solianka, botvinnik and other liquid dishes. According to the national corpus of the Russian language, the so-called first fixation of the unit in the Russian written sources refers to the notorious work «Юности честное зерцало, или Показание к житеискому обхожденню» (1717) “Yunosti chestnoe zertsalo, ili Pokazaniye k zhiteiskomu obhodzeniyu”:

Въ другихъ странахъ, когда невѣста въ день замужества своего имѣеть итѣ въ церковь предугоштять и при неѣ двѣицами обѣвающимися съ сахаромъ и корицѣ вареное вино, доброй винной супъ, подвѣшиваютъ ихъ, да бы кушать увѣчавая: что отъ того можетъ быть изрядно красивы, когда поѣдутъ въ церковь. Но жели невѣста отъ себя сама не можетъ быть со спѣть красна, то винно въ супѣ не долго можетъ
краску въ ліць содержать а кроме того говориться принужденная любовь, и прітворная краска не долго постоять “V drugih stranah, kogda nevesta v den zamuzhstva svoego imeet itti v tserkov predugotovlyat, i pri nel devitsam obretayuschchimsya s saharom i koritseyu varenoe vino, dobroy vinnoi sup, podchivayut ih, da byi kushali. uveschavaya: chto ot togo mogut byit izryadno krasylny, kogda poitut v tserkov. No ezhe li nevesta ot sebya sama ne moghet byit so styidno krasna, to vinnoi sup ne dolgo mozhets krasku v litse soderzhat, a krome togo govoritsya prinuzhdennaya lyubov, i pritvornaya kraska ne dolgo postoyat” [RNC].

Presumably, this quotation describes mulled wine (с сахаром и корицею вареное вино “s saharom i koritseyu varenoe vino”— wine boiled with sugar and cinnamon); the Russian reader of the “Zertsalo” is expected to understand the meaning of the word soup: the concept (wine soup) is explained with its use. According to the “Historical dictionary of the gallicisms of the Russian language”, this lexeme is fixed somewhat earlier - in 1711: Спера одно постановь суп на большом блюде: суп раковыя “supra odny postavit sup na bolshom blyude: sup rakovaya” [Epishkin 2010: 4248], - noticeably matching the morphology of the prototype, having feminine grammatical gender. The gender synonomy is registered until the middle of the 18th century (e.g.cyn and cyna -- “sup” and “supa”), however, in 1782 I. Nordstet fixes only one form, which later becomes the main one.

As can be seen from the graph, by the end of the 18th century the usage of the unit becomes more frequent in literary fiction (10-20 occurrences per 1 million word forms). Such frequency is due to the work of N.M. Karamzin and his “Letters of the Russian Traveler” (1793), where the culinary predilections of the French are described. For example:

Две вещи отменные приметил я во французских обержах: первое, что в ужин не подают супа, следственно он soupe sans soupe “Dve veschi otmennyye primetil ya vo frantsuzskih oberzhah: pervoe, chto v uzhin ne podayut supa, sledstvenno on soupe sans soupe” [RNC].

The beginning of the century is marked by the only absolute minimum, but after 1812 the values only increase. It is important to note that originally the word soup did not serve as a hypernymic nomination; it was used alongside with borsch, cabbage soup or the names of other dishes:

Русский нашел хороший пирог и добрые щи; немец - бутерброд, ветчину и сосиски, француз - суп и соусы, а англицианин - ростбиф и бифстек “Russkii nashel horoshiy pirog i dobrye chehi; nemets - buterbrod, vetchinu i sosiski, frantsuz - sup i souysi, a anglickiyanin - rostbif i biftseks.” V. T. Narezhnyi. Rossisskii Zhilblaz, ili Pohozhdeniya knyazya Gavrily Simovovicha Chistyaykova (1814) [RNC].

As was accompanied by a clarifying word French soup, German soup, onion soup:

Кулеяка вкуснее во сто раз, когда ее подают перед французским супом и пастетом. “Kulebyaka vkusnee vo sto raz, kogda ee podayut pered frantsuzskim supom i pastetom.” F. V. Bzugarin. Melochnaya lavka (1825-1843) [RNC].

The need for clarifications disappears by the 1830’s, as we see in the following note from 1836:

А что если б твои домашние, приятель, сложились в одну душу, бир джан олуб, бас составляли нам хотя хынкалут? - обратил он речь к хозяйну. (”Rod supu s chesnokom i i lapshoyu,” A. A. Bestuzhev-Marlinskiy “Mulla-Nur” [RNC].

This example demonstrates the formation of hyper-hyponymic relations, the characteristic of the modern semantics of the word, one of the consequences of which is an increase of its functional status.

The expansion of the spectrum of word meanings, however, does not always lead to a sharp increase of its frequency. We will study the example of Galicism бланманже “blanmanzhe” (blanc manger), which entered the Russian language in the 18th century (recorded by I. Nordstet and N. Yanovsky) and reached the maximum of the distribution in the 1820-1840’s.
The literary fiction of the given period (A.S. Pushkin, F.V. Bulgarin, later - A.I. Herzen, F.M. Dostoevsky) fixes a notable popularity of this dessert (up to 5 entries per 1 million word forms); however, later the graph steadily shows near-zero values. The episodic use of the word in the texts of the twentieth century is represented by a slight increase in values not exceeding 1 occurrence per 1 million word forms, which can be explained by the expansion of the semantics of the word due to the emergence of the new sense – “something sophisticated, beautiful, belonging to a higher society,” presumably due to the wide usage of the lexeme in classical literature describing the life of high society. Compare:

(...) a сидели мы часа три, и обед был славный; пирожное бланманже синее, красное и полосатое... “a sideli myi chasa tri, i obed byil slavnyj; pirozhnoe blanmanzhe sinee, krasnoe i polosatoe...” A. S. Pushkin. Baryshnya-krestyanka (1830); - Приготовьте мне чего-нибудь... - Бланманже по-каторжански, — сбросил я. - Хоть бы и бланманже, — сказала Цира, зевая. "Prigotovitei mne chego-nibud... - Blanmanzhe po-katorzhanski, - sostril ya. - Hotya byi i blanmanzhe, - skazala Tsira, zevaya: “Elena Haetskaya. Sinie strokzoj Vavilona/ Obretenie Enkidu (1997) [RNC].

It is important to note that the Historical Dictionary of Gallicisms fixes a separate, albeit occasional, sememe “idyll”:

В общем, с Французей у нас вышло полное бланманже - и глубокое уважение прав человека и гражданина. “V obschem, s Frantsiey u nas vyshlo polnoe blanmanzhe - i glubokoe u vazhenie prav cheloveka i grazhdanina” Kontinent 2003 [Epishkina 2010, 881].

The usage of the unit in earlier literature can also be an example of applying this meaning:

Царица не прислала к тебе на перрон, с ресницами, опущенными низ, — божество от тебя отвернулось, — так зажем тебе узнавать время? «Не зная, а бланманже», как ты в шутку ее называл, — на перрон к тебе не пришла. “Tsaritsa ne prishla k tebe na perron, s resnitsami, opuschenymi niz; bozhestvo ot tebya otratvilo, - tak zhem tebe uznat vremya? Ne zhatchina, a blanmanzhe”, kak ty v shutku ee nazival, - na perron k tebe ne prishla”. Venedikt Erofeev. Moskva-Petushki (1970) [RNC].

However, in contrast to previous cases, no significant increase in frequency was registered, which indicates a gradual displacement of the lexical unit from the active vocabulary as a result of the concurrence with its shorter synonyms: mous, zhele “muss, zhele” (mousse, jelly).

5. Summary

Thus, summing up the research, we can conclude that "at the present stage of development, the variability of speech is of great interest to linguists" [Deputatova et al. 2019, 117]. Corpus linguistics allows to see the main peculiarities of this variability and the methods of corpus analysis of texts provide remarkable opportunities for the study of foreign language lexics in a diachronic perspective, making it possible to trace not only the active processes in the sphere of borrowing and assimilation (first fixation, development of a form, activation of new meanings, entry into a language pattern, archaization, reactivation), but also the links to the extralinguistic component of language development - economic, sociohistorical and cultural specifics of the evolution of society.

6. Conclusions

Convergent features are due to two factors: firstly, the objective nature of the referential component of the lexical meaning of units, which determines the process of cognition and structuring of reality; secondly, the intensity of direct French-Russian linguistic contacts, which significantly changed the picture of the world of native speakers of the Russian language, which resulted in the formation of new genera-species relations. Divergence takes place in details and is determined more likely by the general and particular historical laws of the development of each specific language system.
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