Larissa Naiditch

RUSSIAN IMMIGRANTS OF THE LAST WAVE IN ISRAEL. PATTERNS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF LANGUAGE USAGE

Foreword

The linguistic situation in Israel provides us with innovative and unique material on languages in contact, which stems from a specific cultural, sociological and linguistic reality in this country. The objective of this study is to reveal several characteristics of the Russian language in Israel (henceforth RI). I refer to the language of immigrants of the last wave that have come to Israel during the last 12 years. My informants were predominantly young people – students and schoolchildren with more or less fluent Russian, using it at home. I do not consider in this paper the process of language attrition that could be a subject of a separate study. This research may provide additional material to the discussion on general laws of linguistic interference, and contribute to the descriptions of Russian abroad, i.e. in contact with different languages. This has been a subject of many concrete studies of the last decade, e.g.: Russian in the USA, in Germany, Austria, Belgium, France, Finland, etc. The comparison of all these data can show, how the same linguistic system behaves in different contact situations. There are few investigations of Russian in Israel (Moskovich, 1978; Orel, 1994; Geldbach, 2001; Garussi, Zlatopol'skij, 2001, Naiditch, 2000, Najdič, 2001), where only some aspects of the problem are considered; the work on such important subjects, as sociolinguistic and linguistic patterns of code-switching, for example, is still at an initial stage.

The main purpose of this paper is to give a general survey of Russian in Israel in terms of the domains of its use, and to reveal its chief linguistic characteristics, taking into account the general concepts of linguistic interference. In several cases, our material permits us to make conclusions about the development trends not only of RI, but also of Russian in the metropolis.

1. Multilingualism in Israel and the status of Russian

Besides its two official state languages, Hebrew and Arabic, many minority languages are broadly used in Israel, their status depending on various factors.

Israel is a multilingual country "in fact and in history", but "has operated essentially as a [...] monolingual country since its independence in 1948" (Spolsky, Shohamy, 1999, 96; see also Ben Rafael, 1994). From the point of view of typology of language policies, the linguistic situation in Israel belongs to a type where "one language is recognised as associated with the national identity; others are marginalised" (ibid.). Hebrew, a revitalized language, won the struggle against several rival languages (Yiddish, German) and is now considered as the language of Israeli identity and as a symbol of national unity and independence. English in Israel is recognized as an important second language that is not only used by immigrants from USA, England, Canada, Australia, but also enjoys the status of a language of official communication, of science, and of culture. It is often used at conferences, for scientific public-cations, and sometimes as a common language in communication between speakers of different languages in Israel; American TV programs are especially popular in Israel.

The long lasting policy of monolingualism has substantially weakened the positions of other languages. Many of the minority languages, e.g., Yiddish, French, Romanian, Spanish, Hungarian, Amharic, and German, are still used for everyday communication at home, especially by older populations; in some families they are preserved as languages of culture. But there was no stimulus to preserve these minority languages among new generations of speakers. During the last decade, monolingualism in Israel "has been challenged, on the one hand by the mixed success of resistance to language shift by Arabic, Russian, Yiddish, and many other languages, and on the other by the fact that Hebrew is now forced to compete with English in an increasing number of domains" (Spolsky, Shohamy, 1999, 106). Little by little, a new ideology and language policy, encouraging multilingualism and multiculturalism, is being developed. A new policy on language education in Israeli schools has been adopted, according to which in spite of only two languages of instruction (Hebrew and Arabic) the study of English as the most important foreign language, and of other languages, especially French and Russian, is encouraged.

It is known that the vitality of a minority language depends on three main classes of factors: status variables (attitudes toward a certain minority group and its language), demographic variables (population numbers, immigration/emigra-tion rates, compact/non-compact residence), and institutional support variables. The following remarks will contribute to our understanding of how these factors act in concrete cases, especially in that of RI. The years 1989-1999 are called the decade of the "great aliya" (the latter means in Hebrew 'repatriation to Israel', literally 'rising'). During this period more than 900,000 persons were repatriated to Israel, more than 84% of them from the countries of the former USSR. Practically all know Russian, and for most - 89% of Ashkenazic Jews

from the former USSR - it is a mother tongue. According to the latest figures (December 9, 2002), the number of repatriates from the former Soviet Union since 1989 has reached 1,080,796. Not only the number of repatriates, but also their educational and cultural level are important to our study (Aptekman et al., 1999). Thus, 68% of adult repatriates from the former USSR, who came to Israel during 1990-1992, have an academic education. For the inhabitants of Jerusalem these numbers are even higher: generally 75.4%, and for women – 77.3%. These repatriates came chiefly from big cities (Moscow, St.Petersburg, Kiev, Kharkov, Tashkent, Odessa). It is also known that the Jewish intelligentsia, which was as a rule highly assimilated, played a substantial role in Russian culture. Several sociological investigations demonstrated the trend among young immigrants of recent years "to choose a Russian rather than a Jewish identity" (Leshem, Lissak, 1999, 151). "[...] students from the former Soviet Union in Israeli institutions of higher learning [...], even if they are fluent in Hebrew and are well acquainted with Israel and the Israeli society [...] continue to cling to their Russian identity and culture" [ibid.]. I would add (according to my own personal and scientific experience) that their Russian cultural orientation does not exclude their self-identification as a Jew and an Israeli. B.Spolsky and E.Shohamy list a number of factors "that have tended to encourage the preservation of Russian in Israel". First, the group of Russian speakers "is large enough demographically to support the continued use of the Russian language". A second factor is the nature of the recent group: the new immigrants do not reject their Russian cultural identity (Spolsky and Shohamy, 1999a, 236). Of course, linguistic attitudes of speakers are not so straightforward. Thus, the former conclusions contradict to the research by Kraemer et al., 1995, where a negative attitude towards the Russian language in a group of adolescent immigrants from Russia has been shown. These contradictions seem to be natural if differences of in-group psychology and orientation, depending on such various factors as cultural level, age of immigration, place of residence, social status of family, etc. are taken into account. The preservation of cultural values is caused by high social consolidation among immigrants, partly as a reaction to hostility in Israeli society towards the immigrants during the 90's, and is constantly nourished by the contacts between Israel and the former countries of the USSR (Leshem, Lissak, 1999, 152, 162). Thus, language choice in bilinguals depends on cultural and linguistic attitudes, whereby, as shown by H.Pfandl (2000, 165-166, 1994), three behavior types can be singled out: the assimilative, the antiassimilative, and the bicultural. In our case behavior also depends on the orientation of the person. In "Russian oriented" groups of youth in Israel, these attitudes manifest themselves in a clear-cut difference between in-group communication in Russian, also demonstrating Russian linguistic and

cultural preferences (books, songs, TV, anecdotes, etc.), and communication with *others* in Hebrew.

Russian also has institutional support in Israel: it is studied in several schools (Garussi, Zlatopol'skij, 2002; Najdič, 2002; Kolčinskaja, 2002), there are TV and radio broadcasts, newspapers and magazines in Russian (there exist 4 daily and 10 weekly national Russian newspapers and many regional ones). A new TV channel *Israel plus* in Russian with Hebrew cues has been launched. Russian clubs, libraries, and bookshops, theater guest performances from Russia, TV, internet, and e-mail enable up-to-date knowledge of Russian cultural life. Linguistic preferences also depend on attitudes toward different minority groups in society, and on their prestige – factors that work in contradictory ways in the case of RI. Such variables as wealth, employment, social status, - all of which are rather low in the case of repatriates from Russia (at least in comparison with those from USA and Canada) - tend to lower the prestige of Russian; but they are opposed by a strong trend to cultural autonomy of Russian speaking immigrants.

The usage domains of Russian differ depending on speaker and situation in a striking and even contradictory manner. The functions of Russian and Hebrew can, for example, be distributed as follows: **Situation I.** *Russian* - language restricted to communication at home, for the young generation to conversate with parents and grandparents; *Hebrew* – language used in workplace and in education, for cultural tasks (reading, TV, radio, etc.), for communication with friends. **Situation II.** *Russian* - language used for conversation at home and with friends, for cultural purposes (reading of books, newspapers, and magazines; TV, radio, etc.), and partially in workplace. *Hebrew* – language used in workplace and in education, reading being restricted to official letters or text-books for schools and universities. Between these extremes lie numerous intermediate cases. The distribution of these domains also manifests itself in the opposition of oral and written communication. For many speakers Hebrew is only a language of oral conversation, e.g., in shops, in banks, etc., whereas for other groups of Russian speakers it is Russian that has the function of an oral code, predominantly at home. For several speakers there even exists a difference in reading and writing abilities in Russian: bilingual children fluently reading in Russian sometimes have not mastered Russian writing. Several specific features concerning language choice by bilinguals in Israel are determined by the difficulties in mastering reading in Hebrew for adult learners, which are, in turn, caused by the peculiarity of the Hebrew system of writing (in most cases only consonants are written). That is why for many immigrants, who have come to Israel as adults, Hebrew remains an oral code, sometimes restricted to an everyday level, and replaced in more complicated tasks by other languages (Russian, English). The latter contradicts the high status and high prestige of

Hebrew and, more generally, the idea of a clear-cut opposition of high and low language in diglossic situations. Paradoxically, this opposition does exist in the situations described, but Hebrew and Russian can not only differ in their domains and status, but even exchange roles, depending on the proficiency and attitudes of speakers. Besides these general factors, the choice of code in concrete situations depends, of course, on the style (register) of speech, the supposed orientation of addressee, the genre and subject of communication, etc. (Fishman, 2000 = 1965, Myers-Scotton, 1993a, 79-88). Alternating use of both languages (code-switching) may occur more or less unconsciously or mark a certain register of speech.

2. Linguistic interference

In considering the characteristics of RI, both linguistic and extralinguistic factors should be taken into account. The former refer to 1) contact phenomena, predominantly the influence of Hebrew on Russian, 2) diaspora or *Sprachinsel* phenomena (e.g., the well known conservatism of languages of "linguistic islands"). Extralinguistic factors may include differences in life conditions and environment that can lead, e.g., to changes in vocabulary. Linguistic attitudes, conscious and unconscious, must also be taken into account. Thus, the well-known linguistic conservatism of the Russian language of aristocratic émigrés in France and in other European countries was caused not only by ignorance of innovations, but also by a conscious trend for preservation of pre-revolutionary Russian as opposed to the language of the Soviets (Zemskaja, 1998). In contrast to this attitude, Russian speakers in Israel of today strive to make their language close to that of the metropolis, a goal made possible by access to Russian TV, internet, theater, etc., and by relatively convenient communication with native speakers in the metropolis. Thus, the traditional notion of a *Sprachinsel* is challenged. On the other hand, a trend to develop a specific variant of Russian can also be observed.

Special characteristics of RI can be seen on all levels of the language. The most frequent interference is in intonation; it takes place even in the speech of informants with perfect Russian, and deserves separate research by means of instrumental analysis. Although the shifts in the grammar of RI are minimal, two syntactic peculiarities can be mentioned: 1) the usage of the conjunction *esli* in indirect questions (*Ja ne znaju, esli on pridet* 'I do not know, if he will come'); 2) the replacement of the conjunction *kotoryj* by *čto* (*Knigi, čto my čitali* 'Books that we have read') - both leading to the merging of different types of subordinate clauses. There are many parallels to the former example in other bilingual situations (Pfandl, 1997, 387-389). The latter is observed only in a limited number of speakers who have lived in Israel for many years.

All these phenomena are not nearly so prominent as interference in vocabulary. Many types of changes summed up by Weinreich (1963) are present in RI; two kinds of shifts should be especially singled out: 1) shifts in the usage of Russian words; 2) the usage of Hebrew words in Russian speech.

2. 1. Shifts in the use of Russian words and expressions in RI

2. 1. 1. Loan translation of idioms. Typical examples of this kind are expressions with several verbs. Thus, phrases with the verb *vzjat'* or *brat'* 'to take' in RI seem to be loan translations from Hebrew. They have created what can be called, according to Weinreich, semantic extension. E.g.: *vzjat' (brat') kurs, vzjat' (brat') avtobus, vzjat' (brat') tremp* 'to take a course (of lectures)', 'to take a bus', 'to take a lift'. The following example shows a broader use of the verb *dat'* 'to give' in RI : *Nam dali besplatnyj zvonok* lit.: 'a free call was permitted (given) to us'. The verb *delat'* 'to do, to make' is also more frequently used in RI than in Standard Russian; e.g., in such expressions as: *sdelat' aliju, sdelat' doktorat, sdelat' pervuju stepen* ' to make aliya, to "do" (to write) a doctorate, to "do" (to take) a first degree' that can be translated into Russian only in descriptive way: 'uechat' v Izrail', 'zaščitit' kandidatskuju dissertaciju', 'okončit' neskol'ko kursov i polučit' stepen' bakalavra', the differences in the referent itself being obvious. The broad use of these verbs, which are close to auxiliaries - "passe-partout" verbs according to Stangé-Zhirovova (1997, 220), is observed in many bilingual situations. Cf. numerous examples with the word *delat'*, *brat'*, and *vzjat'* in the Russian language of emigrants living in different European countries and in the USA (Zemskaja, 2001, 261) , e.g., in Russian in America: *brat' kurs, brat' russkij jazyk* 'to take a course, to take a course of Russian' (Endrjus, 1997; Andrews 1998, 30-31; Benson, 1960, 171), from the language of French-Italian-Russian trilinguals: *V škole perevodčikov ja vzjala anglijskij, italjanskij i russkij* 'in the translators' school I have taken English, Italian and Russian', *Babuška govorila: "brat' vannu"* 'the grandmother used to say *"brat' vannu"* (lit."to take a bath")' (Zemskaja, 1998, 43), *brat' rendez-vous* 'to make an appointment (with a physician)' (from my records of a Russian speaker living in France); for further examples see Granovskaja 1995, 34-35; Glovinskaja, 2001, 450-451. All these authors considered the mentioned expressions to be calques from French, from German, and from English. The creation of these loan translations (calques) from different languages is promoted by the existence of such Russian expressions, as *brat' uroki* 'to take lessons' or *brat' taksi* 'to take a taxi' (cf. N.Stangé-Zhirovova, 1997, 220). They can be described in terms of shifts in lexical syntagmatics. The *"do-*constructions" including the Hebrew nominal elements are considered in 2.3.5.

2. 1. 2. Changes in semantic features of Russian words in RI. Another kind of change concerns the inner semantic structure of a lexeme and can be regarded as a lexical (semantic) paradigmatic shift. Thus, the word *lekcija* meaning in Russian 'lecture' is strictly differentiated from *doklad* 'paper or report at a conference or meeting' (in contrast to the latter, the former serves for studies and does not always contain new data or approach). Since in Hebrew both these notions are designated by one and the same word *harcaa*, the meaning of the word *lekcija* in RI is broadened, often designating a paper at a conference as well. *Professor iz Ameriki čital lekciju na seminare* instead of *delal doklad* 'A professor from America gave a lecture' instead of 'read a paper'. Thus, the object of borrowing becomes the semantic structure of a lexeme. Similarly, the verb *učit'* 'to learn' has in RI a broader sense and usage: *ja uču fonologiju* 'I study phonology'. In Standard Russian this verb designates the study of a more concrete subject, e.g. *učit' francuzskij jazyk* 'to learn French', but *zanimat'sja fonologiej, izučat' fonologiju* 'to study phonology'. Cf. also in Standard Russian *my èto prochodili*, in RI *my èto učili* 'we have learned it'. Shifts of this kind, which could be called paradigmatic, manifest themselves, of course, in syntagmatics. In summing up the examples given above, cf. the Standard Russian (neutral style): *Ja zanimajus' fonologiej i slušaju lekcii professora A.*, and RI: *Ja vzjal kurs professora A. i uču fonologiju,* both meaning 'I have taken the course of Professor A., and I am studying phonology'. To add pragmatic differences to the example above, in Standard Russian one would call the lecturer by family name, or in case of personal communication by the first name followed the father's name, in RI only first name is used as a rule.

The hidden shifts in semantic structure of lexemes in RI can be observed in word associations, which we have demonstrated by means of tests in Russian-Hebrew bilinguals (Naiditch, 1999). Thus, the associative reaction to the adjective *krasnyj* 'red' generally has in RI the following peculiarities distinguishing them from Standard Russian: less reactions connected with Soviet symbolism, more "negative" reactions - 'blood, war, violence'. These shifts are caused by linguistic and extralinguistic factors and lead in extreme cases to shifts in semantic fields.

2. 2. Code-switching and mixing.

2. 2. 1. General considerations. The most striking peculiarity of RI is the use of Hebrew words and phrases. Code-switching, the alternative use of several languages by bilingual speakers in the same conversation, is now the subject of a branch of linguistics (see, e.g., Heller, Pfaff, 1996). The modern point of view on code-switching is based on the Matrix Language Frame model, according to which one language called the matrix language (ML) "is more dominant in ways

crucial to language production" and "sets the grammatical frame in the unit of analysis. The other language(s) is referred to as embedded language (EL). However, both languages are "on" at all times during bilingual production; the difference is a matter of activation level" (Myers-Scotton, Jake, 2000, 282). In the cases described here the degree of the activation of the EL (Hebrew) strongly depends on situation and on the linguistic competence of the speaker. An unequivocal distinction between code-switching and borrowing, often discussed in literature (Poplack, Sankoff, 1984; Muysken, 1995, 190-191), cannot be drawn in many examples represented in our material. We agree with Sarah G.Thomason (1997, 191) who writes: "I believe, in fact, that it is impossible to draw an absolute boundary between code-switching and borrow-ing. This does not mean that they are the same thing. Certainly many code-switches never become borrowings, and if the two phenomena are seen as residing at opposite ends of a continuum, then some things may be definite code-switches and others may be definite borrowings, with a fuzzy boundary between the two". To examine the linguistic characteristics of these phenomena in our case, we shall describe different kinds of lexical inclusions from Hebrew into Russian.

All possible types of what is called code-switching, code mixing and borrowing can be observed in RI. In summarizing earlier work and taking into account the structural differences between Russian and Hebrew, the following criteria of differentiation between these different phenomena of lexical interference can be proposed: 1) the regularity of use of the word; 2) its use only by speakers of low proficiency in ML (Russian), resulting from its attrition, and high proficiency in the EL (Hebrew) as opposed to its use by all speakers; in other terms, its use by those who mastered and often used the EL having it "on" during the discourse, or also by speakers predominantly activating the ML in their conversation. 3) the degree of integration of corresponding lexemes into the phonetic, grammatical and lexical system of the ML. 4) their stylistic markedness as foreign, unusual, etc. as opposed to neutrality. 5) an additional criterion, which does not always apply, concerns the possibility of replacement of the word by its correspondent in the ML. From these points of view several degrees of integration of an EL lexeme into the ML can be singled out. "Smaller units, usually words and idiomatic expressions, which are borrowed from one language and inserted into the sentence of another language" are called thereafter *mixes*, following the terminology proposed by Elite Olshtain and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (1990, 60-61). The mixes are close to loan-words; they are well integrated into the system of the ML and regularly used by all speakers. The terms *loan-word* or *borrowing* are here avoided only because of a special idiom, i.e. the mixed language of bilingual speakers that is considered here (cf., ibid.71). On the other hand, the term *switch* is not used here in order to stress the

regular character of such elements and their general correspondence to the system of the ML, in difference to occasionally used and less integrated into the system switches. As opposed to mixes, which are used regularly, nonce loans are occasional incorporations into the ML, but they can also be well integrated in the system of the ML (Muysken, 1995, 190, Haugen, 1950). Nevertheless, we analyze code-switching and borrowing as "ends of a continuum, subject to the same constraints or embedded language hierarchies" (Pfaff, 1997) - the point of view that corresponds to the concepts of many scholars (Thomason 1997, 191).

In the Hebrew words interwoven into Russian speech, the following lexical classes can be singled out: 1) nouns and noun phrases; 2) verbs; 3) discourse markers. Extreme (from the point of view of integration into the ML) examples are words used by all speakers of RI, not dependent on their proficiency in Hebrew. As usual for languages in contact, most of these "represent culturally bound elements that are part of Israeli life" (Olshtain, Blum-Kulka, 1990, 69); they are predominantly nouns well integrated into Russian morphology. Examples (word stress is given only in cases when it is not on the last syllable): *tachana* 'station, stop', *kartis* '(bus) ticket', *misrad* /misrat/ 'office', *pkida* '(she) clerk', *mazkira* /mask'ira/ 'secretary', *mištara* 'police', *kaspomat* 'bankomat', *kanjon* 'mall', *šuk* 'market', *mivca* /m'ifca/ 'sale', *maškánta* 'mortgage', *šomer* /šamer/ 'watchman', *kvijut* 'tenure position', *švita* 'strike', *rišaijon* 'license (for work)', *tipul'* 'treatment', *mivchan* /m'ifxan/ 'exam', *bóchan* 'test (in school), *bagrut* 'matriculation exam', *mazgan* 'air conditioner', *chaver* 'boyfriend', *chavera* 'girl friend', *mesiba* 'party', *tijul'* 'excursion', *šutaf* 'roommate', *nikaijon* '(professional) cleaning', *rámkol'* 'loud-speaker (in telephone)'. All words listed above fully correspond to the notion of mix used by Olshtain and Blum-Kulka. Moreover, all obey the criteria of word borrowing. They are used by all Russian speakers, independent of their proficiency in Hebrew; their replacement by a Russian equivalent would be unnatural. E.g., the utterance *U tebja v mašine est' mazgan*? 'Do you have an air conditioner in your car?' is neutral for RI; *kondicioner* instead of *mazgan* would sound unnatural. *Kupila brjuki po mivce* 'I bought trousers in a sale' (stylistical neutral), "po skidke" or "na rasprodaže" unnatural for RI, etc.

Nonce loans, which are stylistically marked, are often used in student's slang. They can be considered as transitional cases between mixes and switches. E.g.: *Ja ètu sugiju uže rešil* 'I have already solved this problem'. *U nas byla bchira* 'We had a choice', *Segodnja tri raza ošiblas'. Kakaja buša!* 'I have been mistaken today three times. I am ashamed!' *U nee net gvulja* 'She has no limit'. The reasons for use of these words instead of Russian ones are to be looked for predominantly in communicative situations. As transitional cases can be considered words that are relatively frequent, but could be replaced by their

Russian equivalents: *chómer* /xomer/ 'material', *machšev* /maxšef/ 'computer', *maabada* 'laboratory'.

2. 2. 2. Phonetic Adaptation of Mixes. The phonology of mixes corresponds in principle to the phonological pattern of Russian; the phonemes of Russian are used, and the rules of their distribution are kept. The consonantal system of Russian contains a correlation of palatalization lacking in Hebrew. Because of this, each consonant in the borrowed word has to be attributed to one of the members of this correlation. Usually the consonants in mixes are perceived as unpalatal (according to their phonetic realization), unless they are before [i], where they are phonetically palatalized: [m'ifxan] 'exam', [s'ifr'ija] 'library'. The palatal consonants are here in the position of neutralization (they could be considered as archiphonemes or as the corresponding palatal phonemes; we choose the second solution). Before /e/ neutralization does not occur, because non-palatalized consonants can be used in words of foreign origin: cf.Russian words /gazel'/, /kašne/, etc.; in RI: /šamer/ 'watchman', /mivne/ in Hebrew 'structure', in RI 'core in dental surgery'. A special case is the rendering of the Hebrew sonant /l/, which is phonetically not very close to Russian velarized /l/ and is in several cases replaced by the Russian palatal /l'/. Thus, in final position it is rendered as /l'/: /gvul'/ 'border', /tijul'/ 'excursion', /m'ikragal'/ 'microwave'; before and after /a/ and /o/ as /l/: /lašon/ 'language', /lama lo/ 'why not?', /talmit/ 'pupil'; before and after /i/, /e/ as /l'/: /kl'ita/ 'absorbtion', /m'il'ga/ 'stipend'. Before /u/ variants are possible: /tluš/ 'pay check' , but /cil'um/ 'copy'. Different variants of the same word, as /al'vaa/ - /alvaa/ 'loan', occur.

The rules of neutralization of phonemic oppositions in Russian are kept in mixes as well: cf. examples [šamer] 'watchman', [taxna] 'programme', etc., where the vowel of the unstressed first syllable is in the position of neutralization and is pronounced according to the Russian norm (in Hebrew [šomer], [toxna]). In the auslaut position, the Russian "devoicing rule" is always kept in mixes, the correlation of voice being neutralized (as opposed to Hebrew): e.g., [m'israt] *misrad* 'office', [maxšef] *machšev* 'computer', but /misrada/, /maxševa/ the same in gen.case. The syntagmatic neutralization (in consonantal clusters) generally obeys similar rules in both languages. As for the rules of phonotactics in Russian, they are sometimes broken: /pk'ida / 'she clerk'.

2. 2. 3. Morphological adaptation of mixes. Several morphological types of Russian nouns are generally reduced to two or three in RI: 1) words ending in *a*, e.g., *mištara* 'police', *bchina* 'exam' are treated as the Russian feminines of the corresponding class (e.g., Russian *mečta*); in most of them the nominative singular has an end stress, the "a" being interpreted as flexion; examples with stress on the stem, like *maškánta* 'mortgage', are rare; 2) words ending in a

consonant, e.g., *mivchan* [m'ifxan] 'exam', *ul'pan* 'language school', *pakid* 'clerk' are treated as masculines of the corresponding type, e.g., *tuman*, or – animate - *ded*; 3) nouns ending in *-e* remained unchanged: *choze* [xaze] 'contract'; these few words correspond to the Russian group of borrowed lexemes like *šossé* 'highway' that do not change in declension. Words ending in "ijá" (with a stressed vowel in auslaut) correspond to the general type 1, i.e., they are declined as *koleja*, etc., and not as *lekcija* - e.g., nom. *sifrija*, dat. *sifrie* [s'ifr'ije], because of their stress pattern.

The rules above show that the gender of the words is generally dictated by its auslaut in nom.sg. in RI. Thus, in several examples the gender of Hebrew words is changed, most cases of this type being words ending in *t* that are feminines in Hebrew and become masculines in RI: /xanut/ 'shop', /p'irsómet/ 'advertisement', etc. E.g.: *ty mne sdelal takoj persomet* 'you have made me such an advertisement'. Hebrew words, the written form of which ends in the letters "alef" or "ayn", pronounced in the modern Hebrew as /a/, e.g., [mifca], are also reinterpreted as feminines. But the gender of the words designating animate objects, especially persons, is in most cases treated according to their referent; if they end in vowel, they do not change in paradigm: *on byl mumchè* 'he was a specialist', *menja napravili k mumchè* 'I was sent to a specialist (physician)'. In type 1 mentioned above, the declension in singular obeys that of the corresponding group in Russian with no stress shift, i.e. as *plita, strana*, etc., and not as *ruka*. In one of his letters N.S.Trubetzkoy (1985, 296) pointed to a group of nouns of the "Oriental origin" ending in *-a*, including old loanwords – *kuraga, alyča*, etc., as well as such toponyms, as *Machačkala* or *Ankara*, that are declined. In mixes of this group mentioned above the declension takes place as well, but the formation of plural in mixes is problematic. Sometimes the plural is avoided. To explain this phenomenon the development trend of the corresponding morphological noun group should be kept in mind. According to a frequent morphonological pattern of this type for Modern Standard Russian, the stress in plural is shifted from the flexion to the word stem: cf. *plitá - plíty, travá - trávy*. The non-movable stress on the flexion survives only in a few nouns of this type: *mečtá - mečtý* (Zaliznjak 1967: 166, where the list of these words is given). As grammarians of Russian point out, this phono-morphological type became obsolete, because of the long-lasting process of the maximal accentual differentiation between singular and plural in nouns ending in *-á* (Zaliznjak, 1967, 164-166, see also Chazagerov, 1973, 50-57, 64-67). As for Hebrew mixes used in RI, they demonstrate reluctance for stress shift. E.g., the paradigm of the mix *švitá* 'strike' coincides with that of the Russian word *plitá* in the singular, but the plural form of the latter is *plíty* with a stressed word root, whereas the form **švíty* is impossible. On the other hand, the plural with end stress is also avoided, because of the unproductivity of this phono-

morphological pattern. This difficulty leads to the avoidance of the plural in nouns like *tachana, sadna, mivca,* etc.; in many cases the Hebrew plural (ending in *-ot* or in several cases in *-im*) is used; hybrid forms with the Russian plural marker following the Hebrew one are also possible: *U nas segodnja v supere mivcaim / mivcaimy /mivcy* (the latter variant rare). 'Today we have sales in our supermarket' (from *mivca* 'sale'). *My organizuem sadnaoty* 'We are organizing workshops' (from *sadna* 'workshop'). *Tam sidjat pkidot* 'Clerks (fem.) are sitting there' (from *pkida* 'clerk - fem.'). The impossibility of stress shift in mixes, as well as in other non-integrated foreign lexemes, is confirmed by many other examples in Standard Russian; cf. the declension of foreign family names: nom. [bal'zák] - gen. [bal'záka] Balzac as opposed to [kazák] - [kazaká] 'Kozack', or to the family name *Zaliznjak* pronounced with the stress shift (*Zaliznjaká,* etc.), because of a clear-cut morphemic division. I have an additional example demonstrating the dependence of stress pattern in declension on morphological structure of lexemes in Russian. The family name *Rošal* – that of a physician who has become famous because of his courageous aid during the terror attack on the concert hall in Moscow in 2002 is of Jewish origin; that is why a stress shift in it is impossible. But in an interview a Russian TV journalist pronounced mistakenly *Rošal'á, Rošal'ú,* what immediately caused false connotations: *-al'* could be perceived as suffix, like in Ukrainian nouns and family names – *moskal', koval', Koval'.* Stress shift is excluded not only in type 1 of mixes, but in other patterns as well. Compare, e.g., *šuk* – gen. *šúka* 'market' (with no stress shift) corresponding to the type of declension pattern *zvuk* – *zvúka,* but not to *žuk - žuká.* An interesting exception is the word *ravak* 'bachelor' ('unmarried man') with the possible genitive *ravaká,* based on the reinterpretation of *-ák* in the end of the word as the Russian suffix of nouns denoting living persons, e.g., *durák* 'fool', or maybe under the influence of the Russian *cholostják* 'bachelor'. These examples show, how strong the connection of Russian stress with morphology is: the morphological reinterpretation immediately changes the accentological word pattern. The plural forms of mixes of class 2 generally correspond to the Russian pattern: *kaspomaty, bagruty, chavery, tijuli.*

To sum up the plural formation in mixes, it has to be noted that in Russian it is a part of declension, the flexion being synthetic and denoting number and case simultaneously, whereas in the morphology of mixes different principles could be used as well. There are three main possibilities of forming plural from mixes: 1) regular Russian plural according to the rules of Russian morphology in the corresponding morphological class; 2) Hebrew plural by means of the suffixes *-im* and *-ot.* 3) Hybrid plural including the Hebrew plural formative followed by the Russian one. Examples. **Type 1** – *Vse polučili rišaijony.* 'All have received work licenses', *U nas načalis' mivchany* 'Our exams have

begun'. **Type 2** – *Ty slušala chadašot*' 'Have you heard the news?' **Type 3.** *Kakie chadašoty? - Chadašotov nikakich* 'What's new? - No news'. *Voz'mi chaviloty!* 'Take the packages!' *Vy kupili titulimy?* 'Have you bought diapers?'. To explain the choice of a certain plural type, several factors have to be taken into account. The morphological factors include the above-mentioned impossibility of stress shift in paradigms and the avoidance of the regular Russian plural of nouns of the 1st class. The semantic factors are connected with the predominant use of these nouns in plural, because of their meaning, and the borrowing as a result of this of a lexeme in its plural form that is sometimes perceived as singular. In several cases these words are in Hebrew close to pluralia tantum. E.g. *titulim* 'diapers', *chacilim* 'egg-plants' or 'a meal, a salad of egg-plants', *chadašot* 'news', *pasim* 'streaks' (a kind of hair dying). In all these nouns double marking of plural by means of adding the Russian flexion is possible: *titulimy*, etc. In well known cases of double marking of plural in borrowings from English into Russian: *džinsy* 'jeans', *čipsy* 'French fries', *butsy* 'a kind of boots', *tajcy* 'tights' these factors are also important. The contact situation factors include language oriented and speaker oriented causes. Whereas the former are dependent on the grade of adaptation of a lexeme to the ML (Russian), the latter depend on linguistic proficiency and linguistic orientation of the speakers. Thus, in the example: *Odin iz samych lučšich chanujotov* 'one of the best shops' recorded by us, the double plural form is caused by Hebrew dominance on the part of the speaker; the form *chanuty* 'shops' is more usual. Interesting examples are the words *miluim* 'army service in reserve' and *picuim* 'compensation' – plural forms in Hebrew reinterpreted as masc.sg. in RI: *on byl v meluime* 'he served in the army reserve', *my ne polučili nikakogo picuima* 'we have not received any compensation'. Cf. the old loan-words *serafim* and *cheruvim* (Moskovich, 1978, 169). The frequently used Hebrew word *ole* 'repatriate' with plural *olim* was reinterpreted in RI in such a way, that the latter form became singular, the plural being formed by the Russian marker "y" (*olimy*), the word stem being a basis for word formation *olimovskij* - adj. 'belonging to repatriates'. The cause of this reinterpretation lies in the "non-comfortable" form *ole* (as it has been mentioned above, the nouns ending in vowel are not declined), and in the frequent use of this word in plural. These examples indirectly show that, although the forms of both numbers represent one and the same lexeme, there is a relative morpho-semantic autonomy of singular and plural forms.

Because of the similarity of phonological structure of several Hebrew and Russian words, convergence can take place. Such words, as, e.g., *chajdak* 'microbe', *dikaon* 'depression (disease)' are easily integrated into the vocabulary of RI. Since Russian and Hebrew belong to substantially different structural types, this similarity is restricted to a superficial level. The

discontinuous pattern of the root, different roles of consonants and of vowels in the framework of a lexeme, the usage of specific prefixes in Hebrew, all these lead to the morphological restructuring of the corresponding mixes: cf., e.g., the word /m'ištara/ 'police' containing the root *š-t-r*" and the prefix *mi-* in Hebrew that is perceived in RI as consisting of the root *mištar-* plus the flexion -*a* (the latter like in Hebrew). (About the psycholinguistic status of the root in Hebrew in contrast to other languages see Ephratt, 1997).

2. 2. 4. Word formation in mixes. Several means of Russian word formation are used in mixes, e.g., for nouns: the suffix -*ščik* - *betachonščik* 'watchman', -*ik* - *datik* 'a religious person', and occasional "emotive" suffixes: *pkiduška, chaverjuga, mesibucha, mesibuška* 'clerk (fem.), friend, party'; for adjectives: - *ovsk*- *olimovskij* 'belonging to new repatriates'. In the words *datišnyj* 'religious (on the Jewish religion)' and *datišnik* 'a religious Jew' from the Hebrew adjective *dati* the Russian infix *š* is used, as in Russian nouns and adjectives derived from the stem ending in a vowel: *kinošnyj, kinošnik, kegebešnyj, kegebešnik, gaišnik, gaišnyj* (cf., Zemskaja, 1992, 101, where a pejorative semantic component of nouns ending in -*šnik* is pointed out). This means of word formation, which has been considered as non-standard, is obviously productive: cf. also the noun *pisiška* from PC 'personal computer' in professional jargon. A suffix can be added to the Hebrew plural forms of nouns if they are close to pluralia tantum (see above): *chacilimčiki* 'egg-plants', *pasimčiki* 'streaks' (in hair-dressing) – both in plural form (double plural) and with diminutive suffix, cf. also in Standard Russian *džinsiki* 'jeans' (diminutive form).

2. 2. 5. Compound nouns and attributive groups. Hebrew compound nouns consisting of two parts, one in the form of status constructus, are also used as mixes, many of them are declined as regular nouns in Russian; only their second part changes (in contrast to Hebrew, where the changes occur in the first part): e.g., *prišlos' echat' domoj iz misrad apnima* "I had to go home from the Ministry of Interior', *mne sdelali v banke orat kevu* 'One has made a standing order for me in the bank', *byl v kupat cholime* 'I have been to the health fund (clinic)', *v pinat ochele postavili divan* 'one has put a sofa in the dining room', *u menja ne bylo s soboj teudat zeuta* 'I have not taken my identity card', *pošel v misrad klitu* 'I went to the Ministry of Absorption', *u nas net dud šemeša* 'we don't have a solar boiler'. The compound nouns included in these examples *misrad apnim, orat keva, pinat ochel', teudat zeut, misrad klita, dud šemeš* have to be considered as mixes or loan words. They are pronounced as lexical unities, the accentual structure of which corresponds to that of Hebrew words: the chief stress lies on the second word (the attribute), predominantly on the last syllable,

with an additional, weaker, stress on the first syllable. In most cases, there are no border signals of the juncture between the two parts of the compound noun: [p'i-‚na-tó-xel'], [(‚)dut-šé-meš], [m'is-‚rat-ap-n'ím] (or [m'is-‚rad-ap-n'ím]), [m'is-‚rat-kl'itá]. The integration of these lexemes into RI was facilitated by the existence of compound nouns, in which only the second part is declined: *stop-kadr, marš-brosok, val's-fantazija, krem-pudra, grim-ubornaja,* and also such loan-words as *rachat-lukum, krem-brjule* (Comrie, Stone, Polinsky, 1996, 113). Another example would be *den' roždenija* 'birthday', where in colloquial Standard Russian only the second part is declined: *byl na den' roždenii* 'I have been to the birthday'. M.V.Panov (1999, 152-162), describing such examples, as *radioizvestija, èlektropribory, èrzac-patriotizm, čudo-molot,* etc., proposed the notion of analytic adjectives (see also Zemskaja, 1992, 54f.). We tend to consider our examples above as compound nouns, because of their semantic and prosodic structure (association of the first elements with a noun, additional stresses). In cases, where the Hebrew compound nouns are not integrated in the system of RI and the switches are rather occasional, the declension of the first part of the compound is possible: *zanimalas' icuvom pnim,* 'I was making the interior design', *ezdila v Tel' Aviv v snif našego misrada delat' icuvy pnim* 'I was going to Tel Aviv to the division of our office to make an interior design'. As has been pointed out, the compound form can be replaced by one part of it, usually in status constructus, although variants are possible: *tluš / tluš maskoret* 'pay check', *teudat / teudat zeut* 'identity card' (in spite of the fact that the form *teudat* in Hebrew is used only in compound noun, the correct noun form being *teuda*).

There are also examples of switching of Hebrew attributive groups of the type noun + adjective: *on pridumal klalim gmišim dlja svoej tochny* 'he invented flexible rules for his (computer) program' (*klalim gmišim* – as in Hebrew, without flexions of Russian); *my eli manu chamu* 'we ate *mana chama* – a brand name for a kind of instant food', *mana* meaning 'portion' noun, fem., *chama* 'hot' adj.fem. *ja mogu k nej ne chodit' celyj god, a ba sof ej napisat' avodu tovu* 'I might not attend her (lessons) the whole year and finally write her a good paper' (*avoda* 'work, paper' noun, fem; *tova* – good adj. fem.). In the two latter examples, both elements are declined according to the rules of Russian.

In the rare cases, where a single adjective is switched, it follows the noun and is treated as an apposition, whereby the rules of agreement can vary: *èto ne byl urok mesudar* 'this was not a regular lesson' (*mesudar* 'regular' – adj., masc.sg); *Ja ne nadenu ètu bluzku kchulú* 'I shall not put on this blue blouse' (*kchula* 'nom.fem.sg. "-u" the flexion of the Russian acc.); *ezdila opjat' v sifriju leumit* (the adj. *leumit* is the form of the Hebrew sg.fem. without any changes, whereas the noun has the flexion of the Russian acc.), 'I was going once more to

the National Library'; *mne nužno vzjat' dva kursa klali* 'I must take two general courses' (*klali* – the Hebrew form of adj. sg., without agreement with the noun).

The word order in the noun phrase corresponds to the rules of the EL in Hebrew (the adjective follows the noun) and seems to violate the rules of the ML (Russian). Similar examples of adjectives borrowed into Russian from French (where the word order in the noun phrase is the same as in Hebrew) can be found. Cf. the contrasting pairs with French loan-words more vs. less integrated into Russian: *platje bež* - *beževoe platje* 'beige (fawn colored) gown', *jubka plissè* – *plissirovannaja jubka* 'the pleated skirt', *dama èmansipè* – *èmansipirovannaja dama* 'emancipated woman', and the similar examples from the colloquial RI: *deduška dati* – *datišnyj deduška* 'religious grandfather'. The hypothesis that the word order in attributive groups corresponds to the rules of the EL is also contradicted by several examples from Russian in the USA, where adjectives which switched from English, follow the noun: *èto bylo mesto sovsem sejf* 'This was quite a safe place' (Andrews, 1998, 62), *ja kupila mašinu sèkand-chènd* 'I have bought a second-hand car' as opposed to *Ja kupila poderžannuju mašinu* or even *juzanuju mašinu* ('used car') (Andrews, 1998, 34). Andrews compared these examples with non-concordant attributes following the noun as opposed to adjective + noun groups, as, e.g.: *polosataja rubaška* vs. *rubaška v polosku* 'striped shirt', *borodatyj mužčina* vs. *mužčina s borodoj* 'a bearded man', etc. The expression *sèkand-chènd* 'second hand' is now used in Russian in the metropolis as well; there is even a song about *devčonka sèkand-chènd* 'a second hand girl'. Our recordings of Russian in Austria demonstrate the possibility of the pre-position of the adjective in the cases of Russian as ML and German as EL: *Prišlos' prinimat' homeopathische tabletki* 'I had to take homeopathic tablets'; *èto byli allgemeine vybory* 'there were general elections' (in both cases the adjective is in German plural form). Why does the adjective here precede the noun? Certainly, because it corresponds to the word order in both ML, and EL. But how to explain then the word order in the examples from the Russian-English? I suppose, this contradiction can be understood keeping in mind the "flexive nature" of German. The flexive and agreed adjective (here it agrees with the noun in number) tends to pre-position. A.A.Šachmatov (1963, 295-296) pointed out that there exist several non-declinable adjectives including those of foreign origin and gave the following examples: *On tozhe byl v novom s igoločki, chot' i ne iz ves'ma tonkogo sukna mundire, v pike bezukoriznennoj belizny žilete...* 'He was also in a brand-new uniform of rather coarse material, in a piqué vest of a pristine whiteness' (Pisemskij "Tysjača duš"), and *Rjadom s nej sidela smorščennaja i želtaja ženščina let 45, dekol'te, v černom toke.* 'Next to her a wrinkled and yellow woman of approximately 45 was sitting, décolleté in a black toque' (Turgenev "Dvorjanskoe gnezdo") [the bold is mine – L.N.]. Such use of adjectives seems now to be obsolete; we would say in these cases:

v pikejnom žilete, and *dekol'tirovannaja*. Also seen from these examples is the trend of the placement of the declined and agreed adjective before the noun and, the non-declined adjective after the noun. As for the postposition of an adjective, it is observed when it is similar to a predicative (cf., Šachmatov, 1963, 309), or it is part of a phraseme: *èto bylo mesto spokojnoe, sirota kazanskaja*. Thus, we tend to differentiate between adjectives as members of attributive groups and the elements called by Panov "analytic adjectives", the latter being closer to parts of compounds. In spite of all these assumptions, our examples of switched adjectives are not numerous enough to warrant final conclusions. Variations in the word order of switched attributes can also be demonstrated by examples from Russian mass media: *novosti on-line* 'on-line news', but *on-line centr* 'on-line center' (both examples from Russian internet). Generally, the word order in switched adjectives is rather unpredictable in terms of the code-switching model. The violation of both the equivalence constraint, and the Morpheme Order Principle (Myers-Scotton, 1993, 76-77, 82-83) is known in this case from the description of several contact languages (Poplack, 2000 = 1979/80, 229; Myers-Scotton, 1993, 29; Berk-Selikson, 1986; Clyne, 2000 = 1987, 262). In case of RJ such a violation does not take place, in our opinion.

Finally, several examples of attributive groups containing one Russian and one switched noun should be mentioned: *Zdes' taarich vydači* 'Here is the date of the loan (in the library)'. *To, chto emu predložili, èto nicul' truda*. 'What was proposed to him is the exploitation of the work'.

2. 2. 6. Semantics of mixes. The semantics of mixes corresponds to universal laws known in contact linguistics. As has been mentioned above, mixes are often words, the meaning of which is connected with Israeli life. Several semantic classes of these include: specific parts or peculiarities of houses and apartments - *merpéset* 'balcony', *pinat ochel'* 'dining room'; meals: *uga* 'cake'; Israeli organizations *kupat cholim* 'health fund', terminology connected with finances: *al'vaa* 'loan', *maškánta* 'mortgage', etc. (Moskovich, 1978, 166-168; Orel, 1994). Special attention should be paid to professional conversation, including army, school and university jargon, where code-switching is a universal law. In these cases two situations could be discerned: 1) the alternation of languages can be a marker of emotive speech and of a we-code; 2) mixes are special professional terms known to speakers only in their second language or used by them only in situation of their work connected with the Hebrew environment (Fialkova, 1999). E.g., from the lexicon of the dental surgeon: *tipul' šoreš* 'treatment of the root', *charsina* 'porcelain' (thus, a dental surgeon would say: *farforovaja čaška* 'porcelain cup', but *charsinovaja koronka* 'porcelain crown'), a hair-dresser: *pasimčiki sovsem natural'nye* 'the streaks (plural, diminutive) are rather natural', but, of course, *polosataja rubaška*

'striped shirt'; a seller: *pištanovyj pidžak* 'a linen jacket'. A librarian instructing her colleagues: *Zdes' taarich vydači. Esli est' takciv, to oto davar. Pishesh', tofes kladeš' sjuda.* 'Here is the date of the loan. If there is a budget, it is the same. You write, and put the form here'. Similarly in the conversation of school children and students: *U nas byl mivchan po sifrutu* 'we had an exam in literature'. *Ja tebe dostanu chómer dlja mivchana teoreti* 'I shall get you material for the theoretical exam'. Cf. the following excerpts from a text told by a Russian-speaking schoolboy living in the USA, where the terms connected with the school life are in English: *Ona [učitel'nica] daet credit ne tol'ko za spelling. Ja zabyl napisat' definition k nekotorym slovam, kotorye ja polučil dlja spelling test. Ja choču vyčislit' svoj average. Byl takoj issue, vybirali class representative.* (Recordings were made by me in the USA - Albany, State New York; English words were pronounced without interference of Russian, I give them in English spelling).

Semantic shifts of Russian lexemes in RI have already been mentioned. Similar changes in Hebrew words include **specialization of word meaning** (as in the examples above from professional slang) - *sifrut* in Hebrew 'literature', in RI 'literature as a subject in school', *chaver* /xaver/ in Hebrew 'friend or boyfriend', in RI 'boyfriend', *chaverut* in Hebrew 'friendship', in RI ' living as girlfriend and boyfriend', *mivca* /m'ifca/ in Hebrew 'operation', 'sale', in RI only 'sale', *nikudot* in Hebrew 'points', in RI 'points as a mark in school and at the university'. Thus, in many cases a less abstract, more concrete meaning is chosen. Hebrew words used more or less occasionally sometimes also have a specialized meaning; e.g., *gvul'* in Hebrew 'boundary, limit', in RI sometimes used in the meaning 'limit'. As a result of ellipsis a part of an expression is given the meaning of the whole, whereby status constructus of a compound or a noun instead of noun + adjective are used. E.g.: *polučil tluš* (instead of *tluš maskoret*) 'I have received a pay check'. *Byl na tachane* (instead of *na tachane merkazit*) 'I have been at the central bus station', *Ja položil proezdnoj vmeste so svoim teudatom* (instead of *teudat zehutom*; *teudat zehut* 'identity card', *teuda* 'document') 'I have laid my month card together with my identity card'.

2. 2. 7. Verbs in code-switching and mixing. The mixing, switching and borrowing of verbs are, as is well known, far less common than those of nouns, a universal rule for which Weinreich provided lexico-semantic, rather than grammatical and structural reasons - "the items for which new designations were needed [...] have been, to an overwhelming degree, such as are indicated by nouns" (Weinreich, 1963, 37). Only a few Hebrew verbs are used more or less regularly in RI: adnominal verbs *(ot)ciljumit'* 'to make a copy' from /cil'um/ 'copy', *švitovat'* 'to strike' from *švita* 'strike', *nikajonit'* 'to clean (professionally)' from /n'ikajon/ 'cleaning', *šmirit'* 'to work as a watchman, to

guard' from *šmira* or from *šomer* 'watchman', *metapelit'* 'to care, to nurse, to babysit' from the present form (and also the participle pres. used as a noun) of the corresponding verb. E.g.: *Otcil'um' ètu statju!* 'Copy this article!' Sometimes additional verbs are used: *(u)mistadrit'* 'to organize, to regulate' from the present form of the corresponding Hebrew verb. These verbs belong to productive types ending in *–it'/at* and *-ovat'/-ujut* (cf.: Zemskaja, 1991, 205, where verbs in American Russian are described). In several cases mentioned above, the verbal word formation is based on analogy: *švitovat'* like *bastovat'* 'to strike' or *buntovat'* 'to rebel'; *nikajonit'* like colloquial *inženerit'*, *šoferit'* 'to work as an engineer, as a driver' (a noun meaning a specialty vs. verb – 'to work as'), or *kalamburit'* 'to make a pun', *bazarit'* 'to make an uproar' (a result and an action). In cases of morphological adaptation of mixes, the Russian aspect is expressed by means of the presence or absence of prefixes: *otciljumit'* / *pereciljumit'* vs. *ciljumit'*, *metapelit'* vs. *prometapelit'*, *umistadrit'*. Cf. an example from Russian in the USA that I have recorded: *mašinu zalokala* 'I have locked the car' with the Russian prefix designating the perfective aspect (soveršennyj vid). The following example demonstrates aspectual nuances of Russian verbs achieved by means of prefixation and suffixation: *Ty inogda tekst na disketu zašmirivaj!* 'Save the text occasionally on a disk!' (in *zašmirivat'* the prefix does not contradict the imperfective aspect - nesoveršennyj vid, if followed by the corresponding suffix). The differences between the switching of nouns and verbs are obvious from a stylistic point of view as well. Whereas several noun-mixes are stylistically neutral and used by all Russian speakers in Israel, all verbs are more or less marked, the less marked of them being *(ot)ciljumit'* 'to make a copy'. The frequent switch of verb is a marker of slang, of a we-code.

Besides this, switching of the whole verb in the form corresponding to that of Hebrew is observed, especially in the students' slang. *Ty možeš', nakonec, lehiraga?* 'Can you finally calm down!'(infinitive) , *Ja tak ictamcamti v ètoj rabote, čto basof vyšlo po reva-amud* 'I limited myself (past, 1st person) in this work in such a way, that finally it became a quarter of a page', *U menja minimal'nyj sikuj lefateach skarlatinu. Skoree vsego, daže esli ja efateach mašehu, ničego ne budet.* 'I have a minimal chance of developing (infinitive) scarlatina. Most probably, even if I develop (future tense) something, nothing will happen', *Ja chalamti, čto polučila ètu otmetku*' 'I dreamed (past) that I received this mark'. *Ja soveršenno ne mitmaca v russkich terminach* 'I am not expert (verb in present) on Russian terms'. These cases of code-switching, rather than mixing (in the sense explained above), are irregular. Although different verb forms can be switched occasionally, the inclusion of an infinitive can be considered as the most frequent and "natural" kind of verb-switching,

probably because of the closeness of the infinitive to nominal grammatical forms.

Expressions with the verb *sdelat'* 'to do' plus a Hebrew noun are close to borrowings of a verb: *ja tebe mogu sdelat' hadrachu* 'I can instruct you' (*hadracha* 'instruction'); *ty dolžen sdelat' chipus* 'you must do a search' (i.e. computer search), *my delaem chisachon* 'we save [money]' (*chisachon* 'saving'), *my s vami derech kicur nepravil'no sdelali* 'We took the wrong short cut'. In most of these cases an ad-verbal noun is used. Thus, these constructions can be considered as a means to include the verb into the ML (although in Hebrew the structures of this type are possible as well). A similar strategy of verb borrowing is known in other contact situations; see Muysken 1995, 191-192, where examples from Surinam Hindustani, from Tamil, and from Navaho are given. It is supposed that such constructions in borrowings are especially typical in the geographic area extending from Turkey to India (Myers-Scotton and Jake, 2000, 303-304 with the reference to Boeschoten). As it can be seen from the examples above, in RI different strategies of verb borrowing are possible.

2. 3. Discourse markers in RI

According to a universal law of contact linguistics, the system of discourse markers of the ML is usually substantially influenced by the EL. In RI Hebrew modal particles and adverbs are commonly used. They often have a phatic function (contact with the addressee) or a modal, emphatic one (expression of emotions). Examples: *bè sèdèr* 'OK', *bèèmet* 'really', *jófi* 'excellent', *bèdijuk* 'exactly', *bè mikrè* 'by chance', *mamaš* 'really', *ma pitom?* 'how come?', lit. 'why suddenly?' *nachon* 'correct'. Sometimes these are used with Russian verbs as adverbs and switched intrasententially: *Ty ne znaeš' bè mikrè, gde moi knigi? – Ja bèèmet ich ne videla.* 'Do you know, by any chance, where my books are? -- I really did not see them'. In other cases they form a sentence: *Jofi!* 'Excellent!', *Baruch ha šem!* 'Thank God!' (lit. 'blessed be the Name!'), *Bèsèder!* 'OK'. Several of these words can be switched both inter- and intrasententially: *Ty zavtra uezžaeš? – Ma pitom?* 'Do you leave to-morrow? -- How come?' *Ma pitom ja dolžen emu pomogat'!?* 'Why should I help him!?' Most emphatic mixes express positive emotions: *tov* 'good', *tov meod* 'very good', *mècujan* 'wonderful', *jofi / joffi* 'excellent' (the latter sometimes with emphatic lengthening of the consonant).

3. Conclusion

In the multilingual society of Israel, Russian has the status of a language spoken by a community that has a strong motivation to preserve and broadly use it. The domains of its use vary according to individual attitudes of speakers and situation. Because of the possibilities of numerous contacts with the speakers of Russian in the metropolis, the modern development trends of Russian can be observed in RI as well, and the traditional notion of an idiom of a *Sprachinsel* as an archaic variety of language is challenged. The peculiarities of RI are caused by linguistic interference and by shifts in culture and in life conditions. The influence of Hebrew is observed on all levels, the most substantial being lexical interference. Observations on RI generally correspond to what we know of code-switching and -mixing, and contribute to a typology of these phenomena. Lexemes, which we have called mixes, after Sh.Blum-Kulka and E.Olshtain, are more or less close to loan words. In many cases they may be considered as such, if we recognize RI as a variant of Russian. However the border between switching and mixing is fluid. Mixes which have integrated into the phonological and morphological system of Russian reflect the laws and development trends of Russian grammar. To show the functions of grammatical markers in Russian, L.V.Ščerba invented for his students a phrase with pseudo-words containing non-existing roots, but real grammatical morphemes and suffixes, the famous: *Glokaja kuzdra šteko budlanula bokra i kudrjačit bokrenka* (cf. the famous *Jabberwocky* by Lewis Carroll). Code-switching provides the linguist with similar data, also experimental, but taken from real life.

Acknowledgments

Literature

Andrews, D.R. 1999. *Sociocultural Perspectives on Language Change in Diaspora: Soviet Immigrants in the United States,* Amsterdam-Philadelphia.
Aptekman, D., Bileckij, B., Goldman, L., Šraibe, E. 1999. *Desjatiletie bol'šoj alii. The ten years of the Great Immigration in Israel,* Jerusalem.

Ben Rafael, E. 1994. *Language, Identity and Social Division: The Case of Israel*, Oxford.
Benson, M. 1960. American-Russian Speech, *American Speech* 35, 3, 163-174.
Berk-Selikson, S. 1986. Linguistic constraints on intrasentential code switching, *Language in Society* 15, 313-348.
Chazagerov, T.G. 1973. *Razvitie tipov udarenija v sisteme russkogo imennogo sklonenija*, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta.
Clyne, M. 2000 = 1987. Constraints on code-switching: how universal they are? *The Bilingual Reader*. Ed. by Li Wei. London-New York, 257- 280. First published in *Linguistics* 1987, 25, 739-64.
Comrie, B., Stone, G., Polinsky, M. 1996. *The Russian Language in the Twentieth Century*, Oxford.
Èndrjus, D.R. 1997. [Andrews] Pjat' podchodov k lingvističeskomu analizu jazyka russkich emigrantov v SŠA, *Slavjanovedenie* 2, 18-29.
Ephratt, M. 1997. The Psycholinguistic Status of the Root in Modern Hebrew, *Folia Linguistica* XXXI, 1-2, 77-103.
Fialkova, L. 1999. Russkij jazyk v izrail'skoj torgovle. (Jazyk immigrantov v svete sociolingvistiki), *Rusistika segodnja* 1-2, 80-89.
Fishman, J.A., 2000 = 1965. Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When, *The Bilingual Reader*. Ed. by Li Wei. London-New York, 89-106. First published in *La Linguistique* 1965, 2, 67-88.
Garussi, J., Zlatopol'skij, Ju. 2002. Russkij jazyk v Izraile, *Russkij jazyk v diaspore: problemy sochranenija i prepodavanija*. Sbornik statej pod redakciej G.V. Chruslova, Moskva, 162-169.
Geldbach, S. 2001. Notizen zum israelischen Russisch, Böttger, K., Dönninghaus S., Marzari R. (Hrsg.), *Beiträge der Europäischen Slavistischen Linguistik (Polyslav)* 4, München, 87-97.
Glovinskaja, M.Ja. 2001. Obščie i specifičeskie processy v jazyke metropolii i èmigracii, Zemskaja, E.A. (red.), *Jazyk russkogo zarubež'ja. Obščie processy i rečevye portrety*, Moskva-Wien (=*Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, Sonderband 53).
Granovskaja, L.M. 1995. *Russkij jazyk v "rassejanii". Očerki po jazyku russkoj èmigracii pervoj volny*, Moskva.
Haugen, E. 1950. The Analysis of Borrowing, *Language* 26, 210-231.
Heller, M., Pfaff, Carol W. 1996. Code-switching, Goebl, H. (Hrsg.) *Kontaktlinguistik: ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung.* 1.Halbband, Berlin-New York.
Kolčinskaja, E.V. 2002. K probleme sochranenija russkogo jazyka v Izraile: kul'torologičeskij podchod, *Russkij jazyk v diaspore: problemy sochranenija i prepodavanija*, Sbornik statej pod redakciej G.V. Chruslova, Moskva, 170-192.
Kraemer, R., Zisenwine, D., Levy Keren, M., Schers, D. 1995. A study of Jewish adolescent Russian immigrants to Israel: language and identity, *International Journal of Sociology of Language* 116, 153-159.
Leshem, E., Lissak, M. 1999. Development and Consolidation of the Russian Community in Israel, Shalva Weil (ed.), *Roots and Routes. Ethnicity and Migration in Global Perspective*, New Vistas in Education and Society Series. The Magnes Press, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Milroy, L., Muysken, P. (eds.) 1995. *One speaker, two languages*, Cambridge.
Moskovich, W. 1978. Interference of Hebrew and Russian in Israel, *Slavica Hierosolimitana* 2, 215-234.
Muysken, P. 1995. Code-Switching and Grammatical Theory, Milroy, L., Muysken, P. (eds.), *One speaker, two languages*, Cambridge, 177-198.
Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Duelling Languages. Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*, Oxford.
Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Social Motivation for Codeswitching*, Oxford.
Myers-Scotton, C., Jake, J.L. 2000. Matching lemmas in a bilingual language competence and production model: evidence from intrasenetential code-switching, *The Bilingual Reader*. Ed. by Li Wei. London-New York, 281-320.
Naiditch, L. 1999. Associative and Semantic Word Fields in Bilinguals: the Case of Russian-Hebrew Bilingualism, *Langue and Parole in Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective: Selected Proceedings of the XXXIst Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, St Andrews 1998*. Ed. By Ch.Beedham. Elsevier, 189-199.
Naiditch, L. 2000. Code-Switching and -Mixing in Russian-Hebrew Bilinguals, *Languages in Contact* Ed. by D. Gilberts, J. Nerbonne, J. Schaeken, Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 277-282 *(= Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 28)*.
Najdič, L. 2002. Russkij jazyk v Izraile, *Russkij jazyk v diaspore: problemy sochranenija i prepodavanija*. Sbornik statej pod redakciej G.V. Chruslova, Moskva, 193-218.
Olshtain, E., Blum-Kulka Sh. 1990. Happy Hebrish: Mixing and switching in American-Israeli family interaction, Gass, S., Madden, C., Selinker, L. (eds.) *Variation in Second Language Acquisition: Discourse and Pragmatics*. Clevedon Multilingual Matters, 59-83.
Orel, V. 1994. Russkij jazyk v Izraile, *Slavjanovedenie* 4. 35-43.
Panov, M.V. 1999. *Pozicionnaja morfologija russkogo jazyka*, Moskva.
Pfaff, Carol W. 1997. *Contacts and Conflicts: perspectives from code-switching research. Language choices*. Ed. by Martin Pütz. Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 341-360.
Pfandl, H. 1994. O jazyke russkoj èmigracii, *Russkaja reč* 3, 70-74.
Pfandl, H. 1997. Normabweichungen und Regelverstöße bei den Emigrant(inn)en mit russischer Erstsprache und Lernenden des Russischen als Fremdsprache: Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten, *Ars transferendi. Sprache, Übersetzung, Interkulturalität. Festschrift für Nikolaj Salnikow zum 65.Geburtstag*. Hrsg. von D. Huber und E. Worbs. Peter Lang, 373-394.
Pfandl, H. 2000. Sprachwahl als Verfahren und Sprache in der Identitätskonstruktion, Stadler, W., Binder, E., Kalb, H. (Hrsg.) *Junge Slawistik in Österreich*, Innsbruck, 149-167.
Poplack, Shana 2000 = 1979/80. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching, *The Bilingual Reader*. Ed.by Li Wei. London-New York, 221-256. First published in *Linguistics* 1979/80, 18, 581-618.

Poplack, Shana, Sankoff, D. 1984. Borrowing: the synchrony of integration, Linguistics 22, 99-135.

Šachmatov, A.A. 1963. Sintaksis russkogo jazyka. Redakcija i kommentarii E.S. Istrinij. Photomechanic Reprint. The Hague: Mouton.

Spolsky, B., Shohamy, Elana 1999. Language in Israeli society and education, International Journal of Sociology of Language 137, 93-114.

Spolsky, B., Shohamy, Elana 1999a. The Languages of Israel. Policy, Ideology and Practice. Buffalo-Toronto-Sydney: Clevedon Multilingual Matters, Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 17.

Stangé-Zhirovova, N. 1997. Langue source - langue cible: contribution à la typologie du transfer linguistique, Slavica Gandensia 24, 213-225.

Thomason, Sarah G. 1997. On mechanisms of interference, Language and its Ecology. Ed. by Stig Eliasson and Hakon Jahr. Berlin-New York (= Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 100).

Trubetzkoy, N.S. 1985. N.S. Trubetzkoy's Letters and Notes. Prepared for Publication by Roman Jakobson, Berlin-New York-Amsterdam.

Weinreich, Uriel 1963. Languages in Contact, Second Printing, The Hague.

Zaliznjak, A.A. 1967. Russkoe imennoe slovoizmenenie, Moskva.

Zemskaja, E.A. 1992. Slovoobrazovanie kak dejatel'nost', Moskva.

Zemskaja, E.A. 1998. O tipičnych osobennostjach russkogo jazyka èmigrantov pervoj volny, Izvestija AN, serija literatury i jazyka 57, 4, 39-47.

Zemskaja, E.A. 2001. Obščie jazykovye processy i individual'nye rečevye portrety, Zemskaja, E.A. (red.) Jazyk russkogo zarubež'ja. Obščie processy i rečevye portrety. Moskva-Wien (= Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. Sonderband 53).