



Analytical Study of English Borrowings in Sub-Dialects of the Region

G.N. Karimullina¹, R.N. Karimullina², Y.V. Laykova³

¹Department of Applied and Experimental Linguistics, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; guzel_karimullina@list.ru

²Department of Applied and Experimental Linguistics, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; re_ka@mail.ru

³Department of Applied and Experimental Linguistics, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; julaikova@mail.ru

Abstract

An analysis of English language borrowings used in the Middle Volga region's subdialects is presented in this article. The subdialects of this area are fascinating because they belong to the oldest group in the Kazan Volga region. The study's primary source was a dialect dictionary written by M.F. Moiseyenko and released at the start of the twenty-first century. The Volga-Sviyaga region's contemporary subdialects' lexicon is reflected in the dictionary. The distinctiveness and diversity of the vocabulary offered in the reference book attest to the interactions between the local (Turkic) peoples, making it valuable. There are roughly 80 lexical units of Turkic origin in the dictionary. The majority of them are not listed in literary language thesauruses, analysis revealed. Additionally, linguistics were discovered, which are exclusive to the studied region based on comparative data from lexicographic sources. Overall, this source's analysis and the linguistics it uncovered allow for the bridging of the gap in identifying the total number of Turkisms (linguistics) in the English vocabulary and complement the materials of the reference books already in print on borrowings into the language. The use of a thorough research methodology, which is based on an in-depth analysis of the characteristics of Turkic borrowings functioning in the English language, ensures the conclusions' scientific reliability and viability. Descriptive and statistical approaches were thus employed in their interaction and interrelation.

Keywords: English Language; Lexicography; Dialect Dictionary.

1. Introduction

In-depth examination of the borrowed lexicon in the English language is a current linguistics task. The researchers state that "the English lexicology is not indifferent to the issues related to what the specificity of borrowings from various languages is in the aspect of their interaction with the indigenous lexis, what their history of functioning and modern status are, and what the unit weight of genetically various foreign words in a certain layer of the English vocabulary is" (Yunaleeva, 2000). Although borrowings—lexical units that underwent a Turkic stage in their development—occupy a significant portion of the modern English vocabulary, they have not received enough attention (Gilazetdinova et al., 2014); this is especially the case for lexis in contemporary lexicographic sources (Islamova et al., 2014).

It is important to remember that the modern English language's standard form does not capture all of the lexemes that have (Turkic) origins. For this reason, one should not confine themselves to analyzing literary language facts when researching Turkic borrowings. Studying the English folk subdialects' materials could help close the knowledge gap regarding the total number of Turkisms in the English language <...> (Kononov, 1969). The study of this layer of the English lexis in different subdialects has been the subject of numerous works, such as those on Siberian subdialects [6–7, etc.], north-east Bashkiria (Mardanova, 2017) in the "Dictionary of English folk subdialects" [9], and others.

2. Literature Review

Zoon Politicon calls a human being. They depend on one another to survive because they are unable to live apart. In every region of the world where humans exist, there is a social community, and communication is a necessity. They then require a language-based system for communication. Language is used by people to communicate their needs, feelings, and other experiences. The most crucial component of communication is language. Language has a number of distinct qualities. First, language is a social agreement; it is arbitrary. Individuals did not have to speak correctly or in

accordance with the law; as long as the recipient understood what was being said, there was no issue. Every social group has an arbitrary structure of its own. Moreover, language is spoken at all times. According to Ramelan, everyone on the planet speaks a language, regardless of color or ethnicity. It indicates that they are always able to manipulate the sounds made by their vocal organ in order to convey ideas. He clarified that every community, whether it be a primitive tribe or one residing in the deepest African jungles, has its own language. We can observe that certain tribes in our nation, particularly those in the interior of Papua and other regions, speak a language unique to them (Ramelan, 1992).

Because linguistics satisfies the criteria of science in general, it is sometimes referred to as "linguistics science," or the scientific study of language. It implies that the field of linguistics should have a distinct, objective focus that is ever-changing. Particularly, linguistics focuses on a number of areas, including sociolinguistics, pragmatics, morphology, anthropological linguistics, and more. The study of the interaction between language and society is known as sociolinguistics. Furthermore, sociolinguistics investigates a social and cultural aspect of language. This study covers a wide range of subjects, including dialect, taboo words, and linguistic accents. In addition, borrowing words is another topic covered by sociolinguistics. According to the Merriam Webster dictionary, borrowing refers to the adaptation of words or phrases from one language to another. The word "loan" is another word for "borrowing." However, loan is a component of the word borrowing, according to Haugen. Ronald Wardhaugh claims that borrowing is an additional method of expanding language's vocabulary. The technical word for incorporating something from one language into another is borrowing. "A word that has been borrowed from another language, a term that was originally not part of the lexis of the recipient language but was taken from some other language and became part of the vocabulary of the borrowing language," is what Campbell defines as a 1998 loanword. According to Falk, who was cited in Siahaan, a loaned or borrowed word becomes part of the borrower language's standard vocabulary. For example, the English word "culture" comes from the German word "kultur," which is now commonly used in everyday speech. Similarly, the Indonesian word "komputer" comes from Greek, which was then translated into English as "computer." According to Wardhaugh, "need" and "prestige" are two elements that have been brought up a lot (Masthrie, 2000; Wardhaugh, 2000; 1972).

According to Haugen, borrowing is the act of transferring linguistic elements from one language system into another, which happens whenever two cultures come into contact over an extended length of time. As far as we are aware, Indonesia was involved in colonial and international trade for several centuries. The two elements greatly influenced Indonesian, particularly in terms of language. However, Indonesian nationalism is well-established. Nonetheless, a number of nations, including the Netherlands, Japan, England, etc., have colonized Indonesia. One of those languages was not used as a second language by Indonesians. Similar to Malaysia, which was colonized by England and now speaks English as a second language. In the age of globalization, information and technology are expanding quickly. Global communication is possible between people. The colonial and globalization eras have had a significant impact on the Indonesian language. Because of this circumstance, Indonesians are able to assimilate and appropriate vocabulary from multiple languages (Haugen, 2010).

In this instance, English's status as an international language has a significant impact. As is well known, Indonesians occasionally use English words in spoken and written communication, depending on the context. Writing can be found in articles, magazines, daily news, and other publications. Additionally, many communities' borrowings of English words can be found in everyday speech. We can presume that formal communication and large cities are the main contexts in which English borrowing words are used. However, the researcher discovered that Tawangharjo sub-district Javanese speakers also incorporate English vocabulary into their everyday speech (Ulya Dewi, 2018).

3. Methodology

We will be discussing the Linguistics included in M.F. Moiseyenko's 2002 publication, "Dictionary of the English subdialects of the Volga-Sviyaga region." The lexis of the English subdialects "which formed in the territory of the so-called late settlement and testify to the contacts between the English peoples of this region <...>" (Yunaleeva, 1973) makes this edition interesting for Turco-Rossica. The author notes that "the belonging of a word to dialect vocabulary was determined by comparing the subdialect data and the material of literary language according to the "Dictionary of Modern English Literary Language" <...> the dictionary is differential in relation to the literary language." The material for this dictionary was gathered between 1960 and 1966. Of the more than 4,500 entry units in the reference book, roughly 80 are linguistics and their derivatives. In the study, the linguostatistical approach was employed in addition to the descriptive method for examining the dictionary materials (for quantitative characteristics of the Linguistics).

4. Results

Four words from the Linguistics presented have phonetic-graphical variants: shadriviy – shchadriviy, torba – rush, komarit' – chimarit', and kozonok – kazanok. We believe that the dictionary material derived from the speech of the Volga-Sviyaga region explains the existence of the variants kozonok and kazanok, while the existence of the corresponding alternation in Turkic languages explains the alternation b // m in the variants torba and torna. The analysis also turned up the word "kir'ka," which is a phonetic-graphical variation of a literary language unit. There are only two monosyllabic words in the dictionary: pai and little. The vast majority of the linguistic terms in the dictionary are multisyllabic. Within the multisyllabic units, there are 24 two-syllable words (such as per month, the city, stomach, Adam's apple, sanding, like, full, bag, half, etc.); 28 three-syllable words (such as poor man, bulge, kiziki, priyarok, slob, ribbon, freighter, chaevnik, Chakhchurs, etc.); 16 four-syllable words (such as brainy, a lump, difference banchiki, swears, Talinochka, splash, chatterbox, etc.); 4 five-syllable words (such as jam yourself, talk too much, slob, alcoholic beverages, etc.).

The accentual analysis revealed that the majority of derivationally unformed words—such as bad'ya, karandash, nayan, saban, tokmach, chapan, chumara, yarym, etc.—have an accent on the final syllable, which is typical of Turkic languages. For the two double-syllable words, oshkur and torba/torna, which do not have any English affixes in their composition, the accent is on the first syllable. Twenty-eight words—poor man, kungashka, to mechniy, talovi, grumbles, Howeika, shadrivina, sharabalnik, sharabarashnik, etc.—have the second syllable stressed; ten words—brainy, nestokaryo, jam yourself, slob, swears, chatterbox, etc.—have the third syllable stressed; and one word—perebulgachit'—has a stress on the fourth syllable. The M.F. Moiseyenko dictionary's linguistic analysis is divided into three parts of speech: nouns (54 units), adjectives (12 units), and verbs (10 units). The majority of the 28 registered nouns (badger, Bastrig, Adam's apple, bunk, Kochkar', priyarok, product, commodity, tokmach, chapan, baller, yar, ardent, etc.) are masculine in gender. The feminine gender comprises 20 nouns, such as pin, bump, like, salami, ribbon, bag, the man, shade, and so on. There were none of the neutral gender nouns. The dictionary also includes terms that are primarily used in plural in a subdialect; the corresponding singular forms are not provided in the reference book. Examples of these terms are kiziki, which means "pressed dung used as fuel," sabanchiki, which means "bridge abutment made of thick logs," sergi I, which means "oat panicles," sergi II, which means "plant," and chakhchurs, which means "shoes with elastic bands on the sides." The morphological characteristics of the verbs listed in the dictionary can be used to categorize them into four groups:

- 1) perfective, transitive – talk over', over-talk', lash out';
- 2) perfective, intransitive – to jam, to jam, to stomp;
- 3) imperfective, transitive – bulge;
- 4) imperfective, intransitive – kharchit'sya, chebotarit', chumarit' (chimarit').

The majority of the Linguistics listed in M.F. Moiseyenko's dictionary are monosemantic: salma, which means "sort of noodles made of rye flour," bag, which means "sack, bag," Adam's apple, which means "mouth, chap," pencil, which means "a jocular name for a short person," and badger, which means "quarrelsome, evil, battlesome person." Five polysemantic lexemes are present: bonfires 1. Plaything bones made from cow's legs. 2. nakhlobuchit, a neat, well-built, not very tall person 1. Use a damper to seal the chimney mouth. 2. Slam yourself, beat someone. 1. Low on the forehead, bind a shawl. 2. Become irate, pout, and pai 1. One person's portion of the hay-mowing plot. 2. A portion of anything divided, etc. Homonymic Linguistics are also present: cumara II refers to a bribe or payment, and chumara I is a dish made of pea flour.

5. Discussion

The dictionary's contents also make it possible to examine the systemic connections between linguistics, specifically synonymy: splash // shade, alcoholic // alcoholic beverages, jam yourself // get caught up, Bolshebashiy // thick. All of the members of the synonymic pairs in the aforementioned examples are linguistics, or derivatives based on them. The words of origin (which are written in bold) are synonyms in three of the analyzed elements: kulgashka // Balkir' "clay vessel for milk"; sanding // edge "waist cincher of trousers or a skirt"; Shadrivi (shchadriviy) // curative "pocky"; half // startup "plot of land <.>." M.F. Moiseyenko refers to this dialect dictionary as the differential type, as was previously mentioned. "Present both the words lacking in the literary language <.>, and the words, in any way differing

from the literary language <...>" is the requirement for such an edition. (Anikin, 1988). The "Dictionary of Modern English Literary Language" contains terms like "wooden or iron bucket for getting water from a well," "untidy, inaccurate person," "type of plough," "dwelling premise between a roof and a ceiling in a house," and "a fenced part of a log house before an English stove" that all have the same meaning but lack labels, according to linguistic analysis.

The rationale behind the inclusion of these terms is unclear, given that the dialect data in the dictionary was verified using resources from the "Dictionary of Modern English Literary Language." It should be mentioned that the following units labeled as "regional" have the same meaning as the M.F. Dictionary and are listed in the "Dictionary of Modern English Literary Language." Moiseyenko: "That's it, nagging person," "sort of noodles made of rye flour," "willow twig," "chatterbox, be a shoemaker," and "shoemaker;" with a label that reads "colloquial," such as "bulge," "disturb, annoy," "talk too much," "make disturbed, annoyed," "sack," and complaints "be fed." One word, optional—tall (obsolete)—has two accentual variants, according to the "Dictionary of Modern English Literary Language." We also found the variant labeled as "obsolete" in the dictionary we analyzed (Moiseenko, 2002).

6. Conclusion

There are roughly twenty interdialect words among the linguistics that have been examined; these are lexemes that are present in different dialects but have the same meaning. Comparing these units to the contents of V. Dahl's "Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great English Language" and the "Dictionary of the English folk subdialects" revealed these units. The following are some of the units; the regions in which they are used with the same meaning are indicated in brackets: "waist cincher of trousers or a skirt" (Arkhangelsk, Novosibirsk, Irkutsk, Omsk oblasts); "pressed dung used as fuel" (Novosibirsk, Samara, Voronezh, Tambov oblasts); "bones from cow's legs used for playing" (Pskov oblast); "beat someone" (Smolensk, Kaluga oblasts); etc. A substantial portion of M.F. The words "big-headed," "a jocular name for a short person," "clay vessel for milk," "headland, pit in a river," "wick," "sack, bag," "(one shoe)," "rag-picker," and other local dialect terms comprise Moiseyenko, which have more than 30 units. The materials from this study can be used to describe English borrowings lexicographically since some of the lexemes mentioned above are absent from linguistics dictionaries currently in use. Consequently, the examination of the Volga-Sviyaga region's dictionary of subdialects and the Linguistics it reveals allow for the augmentation of the materials found in reference books on English borrowings and fill in the blank regarding the total number of Turkisms (Linguistics) in the English language's vocabulary.

Acknowledgement

This paper is performed as part of the implementation of the Kazan Federal University Strategic Academic Leadership Program.

References

- Anikin, A. E. (1988). Turkisms in Russian dialects of Siberia. *Grammar Studies in Turkic Languages, Novosibirsk*, 134-167.
- Gilazetdinova, G. K., Edikhanov, I. Z., & Aminova, A. A. (2014). Problems of ethnocultural identity and cross-language communication. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(3), 39-42.
- Haugen, E. (2010). The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), p. 210.
- Islamova, E. A., Safonova, S. S., & Bolgarova, R. M. (2014). Written Records of the Kazan Region of the XVI century: Historical, lexicological and lexicographical aspects. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(4), 321-324.
- Kononov, A. N. (1969). Notes from a Turkologist in the margins of the Dictionary of Russian Folk Dialects. *Izv. AN SSSR*, 25(3), 226-229, 1966; 28(6), 531-538.
- Mardanova, G. (2017). Complex corpus of Turkism's of the Russian language. *Astra Salvensis*, 10, 145-150.
- Masthrie, R. (2000). *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, p. 249.
- Moiseenko, M. F. (2002). *Dictionary of Russian Dialects of the Volga-Sviyazhsk Interfluve*. Kazan, 158 p.
- Ramelan, M. (1992). *Introduction to Linguistics Analysis*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press, p. 12.

Ulya Dewi, F. (2018). *A Sociolinguistics study of English Borrowing Words Used by Javanese People in Tawangharjo sub-District and its Contribution for English Teacher at the 7th Grade of Junior High School*. English Language Education.

Wardhaugh, R. (1972). *Introduction to Linguistics*. USA: Mc Graw Hill, Inc, p. 181.

Wardhaugh, R. (2000). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell. Massachusetts, USA, p. 37.

Yunaleeva, R. A. (1973). *Dialectal Turkisms as a Source for Studying Interdialectal and Interlingual Contacts*. Meeting on general issues of dialectology and history of language: Abstract. report and jointly. Yerevan, October 2-5, 1973. Moscow, 151-152.

Yunaleeva, R. A. (2000). *Turkisms in the Russian Language: (Problems of Multi-Aspect Research)*. Kazan, 172 p.



© 2023 by the authors. Licensee Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).