

Szeverényi S.

DERIVATIONAL SUFFIXES AS/OR CLASSIFIERS? – THE WORD-FORMATION OF THE NGANASAN ADJECTIVES

The Nganasan language is rich in adjectival suffixes. Some of the adjectival suffixes simply have been considered as derivational suffixes of “adjectiveness” without any further function, however several earlier studies on the Nganasan language have previously mentioned some correlations of certain semantic domains and the morphology of their terms. The paper provides deeper analysis of the linguistic data and depicts its typological parallels and uniqueness.

The domains referring VALUE and AGE seem to appear as a part of the domain of PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS and because of the low number of its members they have not become subjects of consideration. The correlation between domains and suffixes are not exclusive, e.g.: suffix of COLOUR also occurs in DIMENSION and PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS, e.g. *kolsajkuə* ‘long’ etc. Suffixes *-əgə* and *ńəəgə* clearly cover their own domain. Among the causes of the overlappings the different productivity of the suffixes, the different degrees of semantic transparency of the derived forms and the unclear origin of the suffixes with their unclear etymology can also be mentioned.

Although the correlations are strong and show strict tendencies, the suffixes can not be considered as classifiers because they dominate only their “own” domain, but not exclusively.

Key words: *Nganasan, adjectives, derivation.*

1. Aims

The aim of the paper is to present an interesting phenomenon of Nganasan. This language has numerous adjectival derivational suffixes, far more than any other Samoyedic (Nenets, Enets and Selkup) or other language in the area that has ever contacted Nganasan. Some of the adjectival suffixes simply have been considered as derivational suffixes of “adjectiveness” without any further function; however, several earlier studies on the Nganasan language have previously mentioned some correlations of certain semantic domains (e.g. COLOUR) and the morphology of their terms (e.g. the suffix *-JKUə* for colour). This paper presents a deeper analysis of the linguistic data (than in Szeverényi 2004) and discusses its typological uniqueness.

I apply Dixon’s approach to the semantic domains of property concepts (1982, 1991), namely, the lexicalization of prototypical property concepts to see if there is any correlation between Dixon’s semantic types and the derivation of the adjectives in the Nganasan language.

The Nganasan language belongs to the Samoyedic branch of the Uralic language family. Nganasan is one of the most endangered languages of the North-Siberian area. It has less than 125 speakers, and even the members of the oldest generation (above 50–60) use it rarely in everyday life.

The analysis is based on the following sources: 1) published texts (Wagner-Nagy 2002, Labanauskas 2001, Gusev 2008 and other folklore text collections); 2) reference grammars (e.g. Bořdt 1989; Tereshchenko 1966, 1979; Wagner-Nagy 2001, 2002); and 3) the material of a 2008 fieldwork in Ust Avam (supported by OTKA Fund, Hungary).

2. Description: The derivation of Adjectives

2.1. Verbs vs. Adjectives

Based upon their morphosyntactic features, adjectives and verbs form separate word classes in Nganasan. Adjectives are more closely related to nouns. Unlike verbs, adjectives cannot have direct markers of the TAM-categories. These can only be exhibited by the copula, mainly the verb of existence (*i-s’a* [Inf]). At the same time, there are property concepts, which can become stative verbs (e.g. *d’omil’ir-s’a* [Inf] ‘jealous; be jealous of somebody/something’). Some lexical items may have both verbal or adjectival forms, e.g.:

səŋku-tuə [PtPrs] ‘strong’ *səŋkə-gəə* [Adj] ‘strong’

2.2. Nouns vs. Adjectives

The inflectional properties of Nganasan adjectives “mainly” correspond to the properties of nouns: the adjectives can take number suffixes, but there are some restrictions with respect to case suffixes. In a predicative position, predicative suffixes can be added.

The prototypical property concept words typically bear nominal characteristics. However, there are far more static verbs in the domain of HUMAN PROPENSITY. In the case of words expressing physical properties, there is a tendency for the same stem to have both verbal and adjectival forms.

The most important distinction between nouns and adjectives lies in their derivation: there are moderative suffixes of gradable adjectives (e.g. *hirəgəə* ‘tall’ > *hirə-ʔlikū* ‘a bit taller’) and pure adjectival suffixes.

2.3. Word formation of the core adjectives in Nganasan

There are only a few – approximately a dozen – adjectives without derivational suffixes. Their ratio of occurrence is very limited; at the same time, the small range of relevant words makes it extremely difficult to define the word class of many lexemes. They characteristically consist of two syllables, and usually do not take moderative suffixes, so morphologically they cannot be separated from nouns. A smaller number of words of four syllables can be found with a seemingly foreign origin – this can be explained by the higher number of syllables and by their beginning with a vowel (e.g. *arəkəə* ‘beautiful’).

2.4. “Adjectival” suffixes

This category contains suffixes that are exclusively added to bound stems (Wagner-Nagy 2002: 86–87). A significant subset of these is non-productive and mainly expresses prototypical property concepts.

2.4.1. The suffix *-əgə* expressing various tastes and smells (‘it tastes like / smells like’)

This suffix has not been mentioned in previous Nganasan grammar descriptions, even though it has always existed, because of our incomplete knowledge. The first data in print about such a suffix appeared in the Kosterkina-Momde-Zhdanova dictionary in 2001. It is exclusively connected to the domains of SMELL and TASTE (thus it can be described as a suffix of FLAVOUR). I analysed the data for SMELL and TASTE in (Szeverényi 2009), here I just mention relevant information.

The etymology of the suffix is not clear, and it is especially significant from a typological point of view that it cannot be traced back to a word meaning a definite ‘taste’, ‘smell’ or to any word referring to any being or object bearing perceptually salient features. Such suffixes are difficult to find in other languages; at least those spoken in the surrounding area do not contain such a suffix at all.

The interviews conducted with the native speakers (in Ust-Avam, 2008) confirm that it is productive and frequent, for example:

<i>bahi-əgə</i> ‘smell and taste of wild deer’	<i>bahi</i> ‘wild deer’
<i>d’ebtu-əgə</i> ‘smell and taste of goose’	<i>d’ebtu</i> ‘goose’
<i>ɲobtə-əgə</i> ‘smell of an old person’	<i>ɲobtə</i> ‘smell’

The fact that it is used with Russian loanwords, too, proves its productivity: e.g. *lukaagə* ‘smells and tastes like onion’, see Rus. *luk* ‘onion’.

The function of this suffix is ‘taste and/or smell of somebody/something’ or that ‘a thing tastes like and/or smells like somebody/something’. The following examples illustrate that it can express solely smells as well:

Basu-tuə hunt-PTPRS	ɲanasa man	kintə-əgə smog-N _{taste}	d’indi-ʔə. hear-AOR3SG
‘The hunter smelled smoke.’			
<i>ɲiŋgə-tənu-ntu</i> nostril-LOC-GENPX3SG	<i>kintə-əgə</i> smog-N _{taste}	<i>čüñüʔə</i> feel-AOR3SG	
‘He/She smelled smoke in his/her nostrils.’			

2.4.2. *-ñəgə* ‘something has the taste and/or smell of something’

Nganasan has a morpheme *ñəgəə* meaning ‘something has the taste and/or smell of something’. It occurs exclusively as a suffix, never as a complete word. It can be connected to the word *ñaagəə* ‘good, fine, nice, tasty or tasteful’ e.g. *sakir-ñəgəə*: ‘sugar’ + ‘tasty’ > ‘sugary’, *sir-ñəgəə* ‘salt’ + ‘tasty’ > ‘salty’ or ‘something tastes like salt’. Examples:

<i>d’irñəgəə</i>	‘fatty (smell or taste of fat)’
<i>bñəgəə</i>	‘1. taste of water, watery, 2. taste or smell of vodka’
<i>kiriba ñəgəə</i>	‘something tastes like bread’
<i>čajñəgəə čaj</i>	‘fine tea / a drink that tastes like tea’

The Nganasan–Russian dictionary by Kosterkina-Momde-Zhdanova (=KMZ, 2001) (one in which the above-mentioned suffix occurs for the first time) contains this suffix as a separate entry, with the remark that it may as well be written solid with the preceding word. This fact also shows the uncertainty concerning its classification.

This affix has only one form, however there is a rare variant *-ńákə* – but this form is a result of an immense process of grammaticalization.

Regarding its function, the affix *-ńáəgə* is more likely to express tastes than the affix *-əgə*, and the latter rather refers to quality, but some counterexamples can be cited as well:

bańáəgə ‘sg smells like a dog’,

for dogs are rarely consumed by humans, and they do not have a positively pleasant smell...

An interesting process of grammaticalization occurs in which these affixes are concerned. Besides noun phrases involving the suffix *-əgə*, verb phrases of the same meaning can also be formed, e.g.:

hotə ‘onion’ *hotəəgə* *hotə(?)itü*
bahi ‘wild reindeer’ *bahiəgə* *bahi(?)itü*

The variant *bahi(?)itü* is formed in the following manner: *bahi-(?)i-tü*. The segment *-(?)i-* serves as a so-called sensitive suffix (Wagner-Nagy 2002: 131), to express likeness to a certain sensation; the suffix *-tü-* is an imperfective coaffix (-NTU) expressing time; and the 3rd person singular has a zero suffix. The following example demonstrates what happens to affixed forms with *-ńáəgə* if this particular affix should be supplied:

d’ir ‘fat’ *d’irńáəgə* *d’irńaintü*

The word ending *-əgə* is recognised as a suffix and this is what is omitted, irrespective of the stem. The following analyses are possible:

d’ir-ńá-i-ntü *d’irńá-i-ntü*
 or: fat-??-SEN-AOR3SG or: fat?-SEN-AOR3SG

According to one of the variants, *d’ir* is the stem, but *-ńá-* is supposed to be a suffix – which is completely unknown in the Nganasan language. In the other version, the stem is *d’irńá-*, but no stem like this is known in the language. So we are witnessing a re-analysis, in addition to a process of grammaticalization.

It is obviously difficult to define a precise difference in function between these suffixes – this can be a reason for the creation of a variant such as *d’irńaintü*. The choice of the suffixes can be influenced by the phonological structure of the base word as well. I aim to support this statement with the following facts:

(i) no suffix *-əgə* is connected to CVC stems (e.g. *čaj*, *d’ir*, *sIr*); therefore the variants **čajəgə*, **d’irəgə* are not well-formed. In case the second consonant of the stem prohibits *-ń-* as a following consonant (e.g. *-k-* in Rus. *luk*), it excludes *-ńáəgə* as well. In such cases, *-əgə* will be added (*lukəəgə*).

(ii) CVV stems (e.g. *taa*) also make it impossible to add *-əgə* (**taa+əgə*, **taəgə*).

2.4.3. The *-Kəə* suffix

This suffix was already discussed by Tereshchenko (1979: 118–119), Wagner-Nagy (2001: 152; 2002: 86) and Helimski (1998: 497). It is mentioned by the most important sources in the following manner:

Suffix	Castrén (19th c.)	Tereshchenko	Labanauskas	Helimski (1998)	KMZ (2001)
-Kəə	-gá (= -gəə)	-gə	-gə	-gəə	-gə(ə)

Notice that the sources have diverse opinions concerning the length of the vowel in the suffix – however, it must be added that the data provided by Castrén and Helimski are more reliable than the notes published by Labanauskas and Tereshchenko. The Nganasan dictionary reveals a conception that differs from the previously published ones: in adjectival forms, the regular form of the suffix is *-Kəə*, although the dictionary also mentions another version ending in a short vowel (*-Kə*). Words formed in this manner are nouns referring to abstract phenomena or people with these particular characteristics. The following pairs are listed in the dictionary:

čejkəgəə ‘quiet, modest’ ~ *čejkəgə* ‘quiet, modest person’, *česəgəə* ‘cold’ ~ *česəgə* ‘coldness, freeze’, *d’asəgəə* ‘wet’ ~ *d’asəgə* ‘wetness’, *hekəgəə* ‘warm’ ~ *hekəgə* ‘warmth’, *hojməgəə* ‘dark’ ~ *hojməgə* ‘darkness’, *ńersə(ə)gəə* ‘hostile, enemy, full of hatred’ ~ *ńersəgə* ‘enemy’.

Two different conclusions can be drawn here: the first one is that the suffix originally ended in a long vowel (as presented by Castrén) and its re-analysis was based upon the productive, relational adjectival suffix *-ə* and the lexicalization of forms with the suffix *-gəə*, e.g.:

hekə-gəə ‘warm’ > *hekəgə* ‘warmth’ + *-ə* [NREL] → ‘warm’.

According to the other theory, the suffix – as Tereshchenko consistently suggests – originally ended in a very short central vowel (ə), and later the derived form acquired the suffix of relational adjectives:

hekə-gə ‘warm’ > *hekəgə* ‘warmth’ → *hekəgə-ə*.

Since data provided by Castrén, Helinski and the KMZ-dictionary are more reliable from a phonological point of view than those given by Tereshchenko and Labanauskas, I wish to support the first theory here. I collected 45 lexemes consisting *-gə(ə)* suffix and expressing property concept, such as *d'obtə-gə(ə)* 'thin' (KMZ44), *d'erə-gə(ə)* 'thick, fat' (KMZ40), *hirə-gə(ə)* 'tall, high' (KMZ193), *tantə-gə(ə)* 'wide' (KMZ171), *d'ajsə-gə(ə)* 'noisy' (T112), *d'an(ə)-gə(ə)* 'hard' (C52: *janagā*), *d'arsə-gə(ə)* 'favourite' (KMZ56), *d'ühə-gə(ə)* 'soft' (KMZ52), *kata-gə(ə)* 'light, bright' (KMZ63), *kəsə-gə(ə)* 'clever, skilful' (KMZ84), *merə-gə(ə)* 'fast' (KMZ97) etc.

There are words where the suffix can definitely be separated from the stem, but there are no examples for adjectival use at all: *d'arə-gə* 'sickness' (T112, JN27), *d'asə-gə* 'moisture, dampness, humidity' (KMZ57), *nujbə-gə* 'sad, sombre (person)' (KMZ120), *hikə-gə* 'terror' (Ma76).

The stems of the adjectives exhibiting core adjectival suffixes are mostly bound stems. Many of these are of ancient origin, derived from Proto-Samoyedic and expressing property concepts. However, many words present a productive and semantically motivated stem, although the correlation between the stem and the derived form may be dubious, hence they are marked with a question mark):

<i>d'arsə-gə(ə)</i>	'favourite'	<i>d'arsi-</i> 'to like' (KMZ56)
<i>d'ühə-gə(ə)</i>	'soft'	? <i>d'ühi</i> 'blanket (for children on a sled)' (KMZ52)
<i>d'ürə-gə(ə)</i>	'deep'	<i>d'üri</i> 'depth' (KMZ50)
<i>hılə-gə(ə)</i>	'dangerous, fearful'	<i>hılə</i> 'fearful (thing)' (KMZ208)
<i>hirə-gə(ə)</i>	'high, tall'	<i>hirə</i> 'height, degree, level' (KMZ193)
<i>homə-gə(ə)</i>	'sharp'	?? <i>homa</i> 'edge; scythe' (B44)
<i>horə-gə(ə)</i>	'tidy'	?? <i>horə</i> 'face' (KMZ198)
<i>hurə-gə(ə)</i>	'steep'	? <i>hurajku</i> 'mound, hill, heap' (KMZ206)
<i>kata-gə(ə)</i>	'shining, bright'	<i>kada-r</i> 'light, shine' (KMZ60)
<i>merə-gə(ə)</i>	'fast'	<i>merə</i> 'quickly; soon' (KMZ97)
<i>ηəmnə-gə(ə)</i>	'fine, delicious'	? <i>ηəmsu</i> 'meat' (KMZ144), <i>ηəm-</i> 'eat' (KMZ143)
<i>najbə-gə(ə)</i>	'long'	<i>najbi d'a</i> [Gen-PO(ALL)] 'far away'
<i>tonsə-gə(ə)</i>	'storm, energetic'	?? <i>tonsī</i> 'storm' (KMZ175)
<i>ηu(η)kə-gə(ə)</i>	'many'	<i>ηu(η)kə</i> 'quantity' (KMZ137) <i>ηu(η)kəgə</i> 'many' (KMZ138)
<i>d'arə-gə(ə)</i>	'ill'	<i>d'ari</i> 'pain' (KMZ56) <i>d'arəgə</i> 'pain' (KMZ57)

The group of adjectives with the suffix *-Kəə* is not homogeneous either from a semantic or from a morphological point of view. At the same time there are some tendencies that have been unrecognised so far:

(1) Dimensional adjectives characteristically take the suffix *-Kəə* and no other suffixes of core adjectives (the single exception is *kolsajkuə* 'long' – but this is not a central term with the meaning 'long'). These usually belong to the positive pole, since dimensional adjectives of the negative pole have often been lexicalized with moderative or diminutive suffixes.

(2) There are numerous adjectives expressing PHYSICAL PROPERTIES (such as weight, surface, temperature etc.): these do take the suffix in question, but the number and ratio of the dimensional adjectives is much higher (because of the higher degree of semantic heterogeneity of this semantic type): *d'erə-gə(ə)* 'thick, fat', *d'obtə-gə(ə)* 'thin, narrow', *d'ürə-gə(ə)* 'deep', *hirə-gə(ə)* 'high, tall', *makə-gə(ə)* 'shallow, low', *najbə-gə(ə)* 'long', *tantə-gə(ə)* 'wide'

(3) While dimensional adjectives involving the suffix *-Kəə* do not have a verbal stem, adjectives depicting physical properties with the same suffix generally do: there can be only one form (nominal) of the dimensional adjectives involving the suffix *-Kəə* in attributive position, whereas adjectives of physical properties with the suffix *-Kəə* in attributive position may appear as present participles. This difference may arise from the fact that

participial forms express less permanent properties. Practical language use seems to prove that these forms are more common. Here are some examples:

	word class	Nganasan
DIMENSION		
‘high, tall’	Adj	<i>hirəgəə</i>
‘wide’	Adj	<i>tantəgəə</i>
‘thin, narrow’	Adj	<i>d’obtagəə</i>
‘long’	Adj	<i>nəjbəgəə</i>
‘deep’	Adj	<i>d’ürəgəə</i>
PHYSICAL PROPERTY.		
‘cold’	Adj	<i>česəgəə</i>
	PtImp	<i>čes’itiə</i>
‘hot’	Adj	<i>hekəgəə</i>
	PtImp	<i>hekutiə</i>
‘hard’	Adj	<i>tud’ajkuə nosəgəə</i>
	PtImp	<i>tud’aruə nos’üčüə</i>
‘soft’	Adj	<i>ńaməgəə</i>
‘heavy’	Adj	<i>səŋkəgəə</i>
	PtImp	<i>səŋkutua</i>
‘easy’	Adj	<i>holəgəə</i>
‘bitter’	Adj	<i>tasəgəə</i>
	PtImp	<i>tas’ütüə</i>

Some adjectives exhibit the suffix *-kəə* on the surface: *kors’ij-kəə* ‘hearty, kind’ (KMZ69), *labsə-kəə* ‘smallest/youngest child in the family’ (KMZ85), *ńalin-kəə* ‘joyful, brimming with life’ (HM39, HM71), *ńim-kəə* ‘older, senior’ (KMZ116), *ńil’ə-kəə* ‘own, born, related to’ (KMZ132), *ńojbu-kəə* ‘leader (shaman)’ (KMZ134), *talan-kəə* ‘lucky, successful’ (KMZ170).

Compared to the previous larger group, it is obvious that the stems in most of these cases have not become opaque:

- korsə* ‘thought, mind, soul’ (KMZ69)
- labsə* ‘cradle’ (KMZ85)
- ńil’ə* ‘own’ (KMZ132)
- ńojbu* ‘main, head of, leader’ (KMZ134), see *ńojbuə* ‘head’ (KMZ134)
- ńim* ‘name’ (KMZ115)
- tala* ‘success, luck’ (KMZ170)

Apparently, wherever the stems are related to nouns, the function of the suffix is closest to that of the nomen possessoris (‘supplied with sg’) such as ‘luck’ > ‘lucky’, ‘head’ > ‘boss, head’, ‘cradle’ > ‘infant in a cradle’ → ‘the smallest/youngest child in the family’).

The underlying forms of the stems in this group – except for the word *tala^N* – reveal a CVCV structure, there is no nasal at the end of the stem; should any nasal be found, it positively belongs to the suffix. The words *labsəkəə*, *ńil’əkəə* and *ńojbukəə* seem to show a form of suffix *-ŋkəə-* weakened by rhythmic gradation. If the stem ends in an empty nasal (e.g. *tala^N*), the suffix *-ŋkəə* is clearly possible. Since no precedent can be found for a nasal + nasal cluster (except *mn*), only a single nasal can appear on the surface, e.g., *tala^N* + *ŋkəə* > *talan-kəə*. Consequently, it is possible in terms of the material presented here that *-^Nkəə-* forms a nomen possessoris even though it is very rare and seems to have become unproductive.

4.4.4. The suffix *-^NKuə* ~ *-JKuə*

This group consists of two suffixes and was treated separately by former linguistic descriptions of the Nganasan language. Chrestomathia Nganasanica separates two suffixes (Wagner-Nagy 2002: 86–87):

- (1) *-Ka* ~ *-Kaʔa*
- (2) *-^NKuə* ~ *-JKuə*

This chart contains 55 words. This particular suffix generally appears in colour terms, e.g. *d'abakuə* 'red' (KMZ52), *d'end'a(j)kuə* 'colourless, transparent, light' (KMZ38), *d'irbakuə* 'grey(-haired)' (KMZ43), *d'oakuə* 'muddy (as color)' (KMZ44), *d'od'akuə* 'muddy, grey', *hočajkuə* 'light, bright' (KMZ199), *kičajkuə* 'grey' (KMZ65), *tođakuə* 'yellow ~ (brown, grey)' (KMZ174), *tusajkuə* 'black' (KMZ181), *tumkakuə* 'sem-dark, opaque, dull' (T79), but in another types as well, e.g. *d'abijkuə* 'chattering, talkative' (HM43), *d'erbajkuə* 'thick' (KMZ39), *lomnajkuə* 'soft' (KMZ88), *mandajkuə* 'round' (KMZ95), *nomšajkuə* 'sharp,' (KMZ119), *s'üma(j)kuə* 'peaceful, calm' (KMZ166), *tiŋgajkuə* 'wide, spacious' (KMZ183), *tobš'iküə* 'uncommon' (KMZ174) etc.

The ratio of the words that can be considered as morphologically transparent – namely, where the stem can be recognised with an occasional productive feature – is higher. When segmenting these word forms, one may encounter a problem similar to that of the suffix -Kəə. Some of the cases might involve re-analysis, that is, the phoneme ə can be perceived as a relational adjectival suffix, and the stem be extended with the ending -jku/-ku.

<i>mandajkuə</i>	<i>mandajku</i> 'round/circle' (KMZ94, 95)
<i>lalujkuə</i>	<i>lalujku</i> 'flat, round, oval sg (e.g. face)' (KMZ86)
<i>salajkuə</i>	<i>salajku</i> 'dirt, mud; muddy' (KMZ147)
<i>kabtujkuə</i>	<i>kabtujku</i> 'saucer; flatness, flat subject' (KMZ58)

From a synchronic point of view, they can really be treated as relational adjectival suffixes. However, in an overwhelming majority of the words with a productive stem, the situation is different:

<i>d'irba</i>	'white frost' (KMZ43)
<i>sīr</i>	'1. salt; 2. white; 3. grey(-haired)' (KMZ160)
<i>s'üümü</i>	'calm, silence, stillness of air' (KMZ166)
? <i>tiŋgüə</i>	'1. gap, 2. free time' (KMZ183)
? <i>tosu</i>	'new-born deer' > <i>tođakuə</i> 'yellow ~ brown ~ grey' (KMZ178)

I am inclined to treat these two suffixes as allomorphs of a single suffix. Except for the words *ani?ka* 'big' and *bənd'ika* 'all', hardly any word takes the suffix -Ka. The rest of the words call for the following analysis:

I consider the suffix ^NKUə ~ -JKUə to be a compound suffix: ^NKU+ə ~ -JKU+ə, supposing a probable loss of productivity and re-analysis. Therefore, only the suffix ə is to be treated as such at the end of words (this is a productive and quite frequent relational adjectival suffix, Wagner-Nagy 2002: 87). The augmentative suffix (-?ə) is taken by the stem of the relational adjectival suffix ending in -ku. The above-mentioned augmentative suffix connects to the genitive stem. In the case of stems ending in U, a change of vowels *u > a* (e.g. *s'irü* 'winter' NOM > *s'ira* PL.GEN) often occurs, and the ə of the augmentative suffix is assimilated.

<i>norba-kuə</i>	= <i>norba-</i> (bound stem) + ^N KUə ~ -JKUə	'restless, reckless'
<i>norbaku-ə</i>	= <i>norbaku-</i> 'restlessness, recklessness' + ə	'restless, reckless'
<i>norbaka-?a</i>	= <i>norbaku-</i> + ?ə	'restless, reckless'

The fact that a word can take only a single type of suffix of core adjectives is also important to mention. There are very few exceptions, e.g. *nujbajkuə* ~ *nujbəgə* 'sad'. At the same time it is impossible to define an underlying form, and it is quite apparent that application of the suffixes to certain semantic types is tendentious, but not exclusive.

4.4.5. The suffixes ^csəKə and -Kə

This suffix was first mentioned by Wagner-Nagy (2002: 87). She pointed out that the stems tend to be bound in these cases. Supporting her statement, the following lexemes were found:

adjectival form	other forms
<i>bəŋkə-səkə</i> 'happy, joyful' (KMZ232)	<i>bəŋkə-bü-si</i> [VKAUS] 'to cheer up sy' (KMZ32)
<i>d'abtu-səkə</i> 'danger; dangerous' (KMZ53)	No other data
<i>kandu?-səkə</i> 'hurtful' (KMZ61)	? <i>kandu?taša</i> 'to go down, to hide (sun)' (KMZ61); <i>kantuəd'a</i> 'to hide (sun)' (KMZ61); <i>kantüür's'a</i> 'to hide' (KMZ61)
<i>məñən-səkə</i> 'interesting' (KMZ103)	<i>məñüün's'a</i> 'to like; to love' (KMZ284)
<i>nojka-səkə</i> 'pretty, alluring' (KMZ119)	<i>nojka-btu-suədəə-iñə</i> [VKAUS-PTPERF-PLPxSG1] 'allure' (HM103)
<i>ŋirmin-səkə</i> 'noisy' (KMZ133)	<i>ŋirmi-nti-s'iə</i> [VIMP-PERF-SG3] (MU35) <i>ŋirmi</i> 'noise' (KMZ133)
<i>ŋəñən-səkə</i> '1. interesting; 2. surprised, wonderful' (KMZ145, H65)	<i>ŋəñün-s'a</i> [INF] 'to be surprised' (T177, T223) <i>ŋəñün-s'a</i> [NACT] 'astonishment' (T47, T60, T65, T114, B61)
<i>hüñən-səgə</i> 'fearful' (KMZ209)	<i>hüñ-hümsi</i> 'to get frightened' (KMZ209), <i>hüñ-msja</i> 'fright' (KMZ209)
<i>saləsəkə</i> 'difficult' (KMZ147)	No other data

A suffix -Kə can also be identified (Wagner-Nagy 2002:87):

<i>d'ıl'siti-kə</i> 'obedient' (KMZ41)	<i>d'ıl'siti-sji</i> 'to listen (to sy), to obey' (T34, MU29, Ma74, KNS183, SN8, T37)
<i>d'amələ-kə</i> 'muddled, difficult' (KMZ55)	No other data
<i>maansə-kə</i> 'interesting' (KMZ93)	<i>maans'üčüə</i> [PTIMP] (KMZ93); <i>mans'ündü?</i> [PTIMP-PL] (JN9); <i>maansəgubtusa</i> 'to be interested in' (KMZ93); <i>maansəδusa</i> 'to be interested in' (KMZ93)
<i>ñəŋkərə-kə</i> 'guilty' (KMZ111, HM125, C58, HM95)	<i>ñəŋkaru</i> 'guilt, guilty' (B35)
<i>miiʔni-kə</i> 'neighboring, close' (HM73, HM75)	<i>miiʔa</i> 'here, to this place' (KMZ355)
<i>məhələ-kə</i> 'interesting' (HM42)	<i>məhünsa</i> 'to like, to love' (T29) <i>məhəl'ütü</i> V [KIMP-SG3] 'to like, to love' (JN47)
<i>ηədiʔtə-kə</i> 'right, well' (HM91)	<i>ηəditəsi</i> 'to be right' (HM51, HM59, HM60, HM89, HM106)
<i>təbkələ-kə</i> 'stifling, sultry' (KMZ183)	<i>təbkələŋkə</i> 'choking, heavy breathing' (KMZ183) <i>təbkəl'isi</i> 'to be tight' (KMZ183)

The following can be stated in connection with the group of adjectives formed by the affixes ^csəKə and -Kə:

(1) The meanings of the words involving the suffix ^csəKə are more abstract – they do not express prototypical property concepts – unlike those involving the suffix -Kə. These belong to the semantic types set up by Dixon (1982, 1991) and labelled with higher ordinals, expressing qualities pertaining to the domain of VALUE ('difficult', 'interesting', 'offending', 'right, well', 'strange', 'dangerous') or they may refer to human properties ('obedient', 'happy', 'surprised', 'kind', 'attractive', 'guilty', etc.).

(2) The meaning of the derived form does not always correspond to the meaning of the verb (e.g. 'to see'; 'to say' > 'interesting'), so the derivation is accompanied by semantic change.

(3) The suffix ends in a single ə, but its relation to -Kə is still to be clarified.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, some correlations between semantic domains of property concepts and their morphological markers have been established:

domain	suffix	examples
TASTE&SMELL	-əKə	<i>koliəgə</i> 'smell and taste of fish', <i>hotəəgə</i> 'smell and taste of onion' etc.
TASTE	-həəgə	<i>kiribañəəgə</i> 'bread-tasted', <i>sirñəəgə</i> 'salty' etc.
DIMENSION	-Kə	<i>hirəgə</i> 'tall, high', <i>d'ürəgə</i> 'deep', <i>tantəgə</i> 'wide' etc.
PHYSICAL PROP.	-Kə (or -NTUə [PTIMP])	<i>hekəgə</i> ~ <i>hekutiə</i> 'warm', <i>merəgə</i> ~ <i>meritiə</i> 'fast' etc.
COLOUR	-JKUə	<i>tusəjkua</i> 'black', <i>d'abakua</i> 'red' etc.
HUMAN PROP.	-Kə, ^c səKə (but mostly stative verbs)	<i>maansəkə</i> 'interesting', <i>ηamnəntuə</i> 'hungry', <i>nujbajčutuə</i> 'sad'

The domains referring to VALUE and AGE seem to appear as part of the domain of PHYSICAL PROPERTIES but, because of the limited number of their members they have not been considered here. The correlation between domains and suffixes is not exclusive, they may overlap, when, for instance, a suffix of COLOUR also occurs in

DIMENSION and in PHYSICAL PROPERTIES, e.g. *kolsajkuə* ‘long’ etc. The suffixes *-əgə* and *ńəəgə* clearly have their own domain.

Nevertheless, it is far more important to observe the ratio of occurrence of these suffixes (especially in the case of the suffixes *-Kəə* and *-JKuə*) in a given domain (DIMENSION or COLOUR) rather than the number of domains where these suffixes may occur, e.g. the large majority of the dimensional adjectives of positive polarity take the suffix *-Kəə*, however, compared to the overall number of adjectives supplied with this suffix their number is not too significant, but they are still dominant in the domain of dimension.

Among the causes of such overlapping, the different productivity of the suffixes, the different degrees of semantic transparency of the derived forms and the unclear origin of the suffixes with their unclear etymology can also be mentioned. Although the correlations are strong and show strict tendencies, the suffixes cannot be considered as classifiers because they dominate only their “own” domain, but not exclusively. The phenomenon is unique in North Siberia, in the Uralic and Altaic and Paleo-Siberian languages: typological parallels have not yet been detected.

Abbreviations:

AOR = aorist	NREL = relational adjectival suffix
GEN = genitive	PTIMP = imperfective participle
INF = infinitive	PX = possessive suffix
LOC = locative	SEN = sensitive
NOM = nominative	SG = singular

Abbreviations of sources:

B = Bołdt 1989	KNS = Kosterkina et al. 1997
Ba = Bołdt 1974	L01 = Labanauskas 2001
B76 = Bołdt 1976	Ma = Mikola 1970
C = Castrén 1855	MU = Cheremisina–Kovalenko 1986
FN = Labanauskas 1992	SK = <i>Skazki</i> 1976
H = Helimski 1997	SN = <i>Skazki</i> 1980
HM = Helimskij 1994	SNa = Gluhij et al. 1981
JN = Aron – Momde 1992	T = Tereščenko 1979
KMZ = Kosterkina et al. 2001	

References

- Boldt E. P. *Imennoe slovoobrazovanie nganasanskogo jazyka* [Nominal derivation in Nganasan]. Novosibirsk, Nauka, 1989.
- Castrén, Mattias Alexander. *Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen*. St. Petersburg, Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1854.
- Cheremisina M. I., Kovalenko N. N. *Metodicheskie ukazanija k kursu “Obsčee jazykoznanie» (na materiale nganasanskogo jazyka)”* [Methodology guidelines for the course in “General Linguistics” (based on Nganasan data)]. Novosibirsk, Novosibirsk State University, 1986.
- Dixon R. M. W. *Where have all the adjectives gone? and other essays in semantics and syntax*. Berlin, Mouton, 1982.
- Dixon R. M. W. *A New Approach to English Grammar, on Semantic Principles*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1991.
- Gluhij J.A., Susekov V. A., Sorokina I. P. *Skazki narodov sibirskogo severa* [Tales of the people of Siberian North]. No. 4. Tomsk, 1981.
- Gusev V. 2008. Nganasan texts. ms
- Helimski E. Nganasan, in Abondolo, Daniel (ed.). *The Uralic Languages*. London – New York, Routledge, 1998, pp. 480–515.
- Helimskij Je. A. (ed.) *Tajmyrskij etnolingvističeskij sbornik* [Tajmyr ethnolinguistic collection]. Moscow, RGGU. 1994.
- Kosterkina N. T., Momde A. Č., Ždanova T. Ju. *Slovar nganasansko-russkij i rusko-nganasanskij* [Russian-Nganasan and Nganasan-Russian Dictionary]. St-Peterburg, Filial izdatel'stva “Prosveshenie”, 2001.
- Sobanski F., Kosterkina N. T., Nagy B. B. *Über die Tiere auf der Erde. Ein nganasanisches Märchen nebst Übersetzung und morphologischem Wörterverzeichnis, Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány* 38: 1997. pp.157–199.
- Labanauskas K. (szerk.) *Nganasanskij folklor* [Nganasan Folklore]. *Folklor narodov Tajmyra*, 1992, 3, Dudinka.
- Labanauskas K. *Nganasanskaja folklornaja xrestomatija* [Nganasan folk chrestomatie]. *Folklor narodov Tajmyra*, 2001, 6, Dudinka.
- Mikola T. *Adalékok a nganaszan nyelv ismeretéhez. Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, 1970, 72, pp. 59–93.

- Momde A. C., Aron N. M. *Jazyk nganasan* [The language of Nganasan]. Norilsk, Tvorcheskij Kollektiv Argish, 1992.
- Szeverényi S. 2007. *Tulajdonságfogalmak lexikai kategorizációja a nganaszban*. PhD-dissertation. ms
- Skazki narodov sibirskogo severa* [Tales of the people of Siberian North] No. 2. Tomsk, 1976, pp.37–44, pp.107–123.
- Tereshchenko N. M. *Nganasanskij jazyk* [Nganasan Language]. Leningrad, Nauka, 1979.
- Wagner-Nagy-Wagner-Nagy B. *Die Wortbildung im Nganasanischen = SUA 43*. Szeged, SZTE Finnugor Tanszék, 2001.
- Wagner-Nagy B. (szerk.) *Chrestomathia Nganasanica = SUAS 10*, Budapest – Szeged, MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet – SZTE Finnugor Tanszék, 2002.

Szeverényi S., PhD, Dr, assistant professor.
University of Szeged, Dep. of Finno-Ugric Studies.
6722 Szeged, Egyetem str. 2.
E-mail: szevers@hung.u-szeged.hu

Материал поступил в редакцию 20.10.2014.

Севереньи III.

СЛОВООБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫЕ СУФФИКСЫ КАК/ИЛИ КЛАССИФИКАТОРЫ? СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЕ ПРИЛАГАТЕЛЬНЫХ НГАНАСАНСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

Нганасанский язык богат атрибутивными суффиксами, некоторые из которых долгое время считались просто “деривационными суффиксами прилагательного” без каких-либо дополнительных функций. Однако несколько ранних исследований нганасанского языка отмечали некоторые корреляции определенных семантических значений с данными морфологическими показателями.

Данное исследование представляет более углубленный анализ языкового материала и описывает его типологические параллели и уникальные черты.

Семантические значения ЦЕННОСТЬ и ВОЗРАСТ выявляются в качестве составляющих значения ФИЗИЧЕСКИЕ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ, и в связи с немногочисленностью членов этой группы они не служили предметом отдельного рассмотрения. Корреляция между указанными семантическими значениями и суффиксами не эксклюзивна, например: суффикс обозначения ЦВЕТА может также появляться в примерах обозначения ПРОСТРАНСТВЕННЫЕ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ и ФИЗИЧЕСКИЕ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ *kolsajkuə* ‘длинный’ etc. Суффиксы *-əgə* и *-ŋəgə* также имеют четко определяемую семантику. Среди причин «наложений» семантических значений следует отметить различную продуктивность суффиксов, различную степень семантической прозрачности деривационных форм, неочевидную этимологию суффиксов и др.

Несмотря на то, что упомянутые корреляции достаточно устойчивы и демонстрируют четкие тенденции, данные суффиксы все же нельзя расценивать в качестве классификационных, так как их семантическая привязка может считаться скорее преобладающей тенденцией, но не эксклюзивной.

Ключевые слова: *словообразование, прилагательные, нганасанский язык.*

Список литературы

- Большт Е. П. Именное словообразование нганасанского языка. Новосибирск: Наука, 1989.
- Castrén M. A. *Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen*, St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1854.
- Черемисина М. И., Коваленко Н. Н. Методические указания к курсу «Общее языкознание» (на материале нганасанского языка). Новосибирск: Новосибирский гос. ун-т, 1986.
- Dixon R. M. W. *Where have all the adjectives gone? and other essays in semantics and syntax*. Berlin: Mouton, 1982.
- Dixon R. M. W. *A New Approach to English Grammar, on Semantic Principles*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- Глухий Я. А., Сусеков В. А., Сорокина И. П. Сказки народов Сибирского Севера. № 4. Томск, 1981.
- Gusev V. *Nganasan texts*. ms. 2008.
- Helmski E. *Nganasan*, in Abondolo, Daniel (ed.) *The Uralic Languages*, London – New York, Routledge, 1998. P. 480–515.
- Таймырский этнолингвистический сборник / под ред. Е. А. Хелимского. М.: РГГУ, 1994.
- Костеркина Н. Т., Момде А. Ч., Жданова Т. Ю. *Словарь нганасанского-русский и русско-нганасанский*. СПб.: Просвещение, 2001.
- Kosterkina N. T., Nagy B. B., Sobanski F. *Über die Tiere auf der Erde. Ein nganasanisches Märchen nebst Übersetzung und morphologischem Wörterverzeichnis, Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány 38*. 1997. P. 157–199.

- Лабанаускас К. (szerk.) Нганасанский фольклор // Фольклор народов Таймира. 1992. 3. Дудинка.
- Лабанаускас К. Нганасанская фольклорная хрестоматия // Фольклор народов Таймира. 2001. 6. Дудинка.
- Mikola T. Adalékok a nganaszan nyelv ismeretéhez. Nyelvtudományi Közlemények. 1970. 72. P. 59–93.
- Момде А. Ц., Арон Н. М. Язык Нганасан. Норильск: Творческий Коллектив Аргиш, 1992.
- Szeverényi S. Tulajdonságfogalmak lexikai kategorizációja a nganaszanban. PhD-dissertation. ms. 2007.
- Сказки народов Сибирского Севера 2. Томск, 1976. С. 37–44, 107–123.
- Терещенко Н. М. Нганасанский язык. Л.: Наука, 1979.
- Wagner-Nagy B. Die Wortbildung im Nganasanischen = SUA 43. Szeged: SZTE Finnugor Tanszék, 2001.
- Wagner-Nagy B. (szerk.) Chrestomathia Nganasanica = SUAS 10, Budapest – Szeged, MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet – SZTE Finnugor Tanszék. 2002.

Сегедский Университет, Департамент финно-угроведения.

Egyetem 2. 6722, Сегед.

E-mail: szevers@hung.u-szeged.hu