Word-Formation
HSK 40.5

Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft

Handbooks of Linguistics
and Communication Science

Manuels de linguistique et
des sciences de communication

Mitbegründet von Gerold Ungeheuer
Mitherausgegeben (1985–2001) von Hugo Steger

Herausgegeben von / Edited by / Edités par
Herbert Ernst Wiegand

Band 40.5

De Gruyter Mouton

Word-Formation

An International Handbook
of the Languages of Europe

Volume 5

Edited by

Peter O. Müller
Ingeborg Ohnheiser
Susan Olsen
Franz Rainer

De Gruyter Mouton

ISBN 978-3-11-043094-3
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-042494-2
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-042751-6
ISSN 1861-5090

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

© 2016 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Typesetting: Meta Systems Publishing & Printservices GmbH, Wustermark
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
Cover design: Martin Zech, Bremen
♾ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Volume 5

XVI. Word-formation in the individual European languages

Indo-European (continued)

Baltic

169. Lithuanian · Bonifacas Stundžia 3089
170. Latvian · Agnė Navickaitė-Klišauskienė 3107

Albanian

171. Albanian · Monica Genesin and Joachim Matzinger 3124

Greek

172. Greek · Angela Ralli 3138

Indo-Iranian

173. Ossetic · David Erschler 3157
174. Tat · Gilles Authier 3179

Non-Indo-European

Uralic

175. Nenets · Beáta Wagner-Nagy 3197
176. Finnish · Kaarina Pitkänen-Heikkilä 3209
177. Estonian · Krista Kerge 3228
178. Permic · László Fejes 3260
179. Mari · Timothy Riese 3275
180. Mordvinic · Sándor Maticsák 3288
181. Hungarian · Ferenc Kiefer 3308

Basque

182. Basque · Xabier Artiagoitia, José Ignacio Hualde and Jon Ortiz de Urbina . . 3327

Semitic

183. Maltese · Joseph Brincat and Manwel Mifsud 3349

Turkic

184. Turkish · Jens Wilkens 3367
185. Bashkir · Gulnara Iskandarova 3386
186. Tatar · László Károly 3398
187. Crimean Tatar · Henryk Jankowski 3414
188. Gagauz · Astrid Menz 3433
189. Karaim · Éva Á. Csató 3442
190. Chuvash · Galina N. Semenova and Alena M. Ivanova 3451

Mongolic

191. Kalmyk · Danara Suseeva 3468

Northwest Caucasian

192. Abkhaz · Viacheslav A. Chirikba 3489
193. Adyghe · Yury Lander 3508
194. Kabardian · Ranko Matasović 3527

Northeast Caucasian

195. Rutul · Mikhail Alekseyev 3536
196. Budugh · Gilles Authier and Adigözel Haciyev 3546
197. Udi · Wolfgang Schulze 3564
198. Aghul · Timur Maisak and Dmitry Ganenkov 3579
199. Archi · Marina Chumakina 3595
200. Khinalug · Wolfgang Schulze 3605
201. Lak · Wolfgang Schulze 3622
202. Dargwa · Nina Sumbatova 3638
203. Bezhta · Madzhid Khalilov and Zaira Khalilova 3658
204. Botlikh · Mikhail Alekseyev 3678
205. Akhwakh · Denis Creissels 3685
206. Avar · Madzhid Khalilov and Zaira Khalilova 3694
207. Khwarshi · Zaira Khalilova 3707

Subject index 3721
I. Terminological index 3721
II. Language index 3767
Map of languages 3777

Volume 1

Acknowledgements v
Introduction vii

I. Word-formation as a linguistic discipline

1. The scope of word-formation research · Hans-Jörg Schmid 1
2. Word-formation research from its beginnings to the 19th century · Barbara Kaltz and Odile Leclercq 22
3. Word-formation in historical-comparative grammar · Thomas Lindner 38
4. Word-formation in structuralism · Wolfgang Motsch 52
5. Word-formation in *inhaltbezogene Grammatik* · Johannes Erben 66
6. Word-formation in onomasiology · Joachim Grzega 79
7. Word-formation in generative grammar · Rochelle Lieber 94
8. Word-formation in categorial grammar · Ulrich Wandruszka 112
9. Word-formation in natural morphology · Hans Christian Luschützky 123
10. Word-formation in cognitive grammar · John R. Taylor 145
11. Word-formation in optimality theory · Renate Raffelsiefen 158
12. Word-formation in construction grammar · Geert Booij 188
13. Word-formation in psycholinguistics and neurocognitive research · Gary Libben 203

II. Units and processes in word-formation I: General aspects

14. The delimitation of derivation and inflection · Pavol Štekauer 218
15. Units of word-formation · Joachim Mugdan 235
16. Derivation · Andrew Spencer 301
17. Conversion · Salvador Valera 322
18. Backformation · Pavol Štekauer 340
19. Clipping · Anja Steinhauer 352
20. Composition · Susan Olsen 364
21. Blending · Bernhard Fradin 386
22. Incorporation · Jason D. Haugen 413
23. Particle-verb formation · Andrew McIntyre 434
24. Multi-word expressions · Matthias Hüning and Barbara Schlücker 450
25. Reduplication · Thomas Schwaiger 467
26. Word-creation · Elke Ronneberger-Sibold 485
27. Allomorphy · Wolfgang U. Dressler 500

III. Units and processes in word-formation II: Special cases

28. Affective palatalization in Basque · José Ignacio Hualde 517
29. Parasynthesis in Romance · David Serrano-Dolader 524
30. Affix pleonasm · Francesco Gardani 537
31. Interfixes in Romance · Michel Roché 551
32. Linking elements in Germanic · Nanna Fuhrhop and Sebastian Kürschner . 568
33. Synthetic compounds in German · Martin Neef 582
34. Verbal pseudo-compounds in German · Christian Fortmann 594
35. Particle verbs in Germanic · Nicole Dehé 611
36. Particle verbs in Romance · Claudio Iacobini 627
37. Particle verbs in Hungarian · Mária Ladányi 660
38. Noun-noun compounds in French · Pierre J. L. Arnaud 673
39. Verb-noun compounds in Romance · Davide Ricca 688
40. Co-compounds · Bernhard Wälchli 707
41. Multi-word units in French · Salah Mejri 727
42. Multi-word expressions and univerbation in Slavic · Olga Martincová 742
43. Compounds and multi-word expressions in Slavic · Ingeborg Ohnheiser . . . 757
44. Paradigmatically determined allomorphy: the "participial stem" from Latin to Italian · Anna M. Thornton 780

Volume 2

IV. Rules and restrictions in word-formation I: General aspects

45. Rules, patterns and schemata in word-formation · Heike Baeskow 803
46. Word-formation and analogy · Sabine Arndt-Lappe 822
47. Productivity · Livio Gaeta and Davide Ricca 842
48. Restrictions in word-formation · Livio Gaeta 859

V. Rules and restrictions in word-formation II: Special cases

49. Argument-structural restrictions on word-formation patterns · Holden Härtl 876
50. Phonological restrictions on English word-formation · Renate Raffelsiefen . 894
51. Morphological restrictions on English word-formation · Lothar Peter 918
52. Semantic restrictions on word-formation: the English suffix *-ee* · Heike Baeskow 932
53. Dissimilatory phenomena in French word-formation · Marc Plénat 945
54. Closing suffixes · Stela Manova 957
55. Closing suffix patterns in Russian · Dmitri Sitchinava 972

VI. Semantics and pragmatics in word-formation I: General aspects

56. Motivation, compositionality, idiomatization · Daniela Marzo 984
57. Word-formation and folk etymology · Sascha Michel 1002
58. Categories of word-formation · Volkmar Lehmann 1020
59. Schemata and semantic roles in word-formation · Hanspeter Ortner and Lorelies Ortner 1035
60. Word-formation and argument structure · Manfred Bierwisch 1056
61. Word-formation and metonymy · Manfred Bierwisch 1099
62. The pragmatics of word-formation · Lavinia Merlini Barbaresi 1128

VII. Semantics and pragmatics in word-formation II: Special cases

63. Noun-noun compounds · Christina L. Gagné and Thomas L. Spalding 1143
64. Gender marking · Ursula Doleschal 1159
65. Singulatives · Paolo Acquaviva 1171
66. Collectives · Wiltrud Mihatsch 1183
67. Action nouns · Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1195
68. Action nouns in Romance · Livio Gaeta 1209
69. Verbal nouns in Celtic · Paul Russell 1230
70. Nominalization in Hungarian · Tibor Laczkó 1241
71. Result nouns · Chiara Melloni 1253
72. Quality nouns · Franz Rainer 1268
73. Status nouns · Hans Christian Luschützky 1285
74. Agent and instrument nouns · Franz Rainer 1304
75. Patient nouns · Susanne Mühleisen 1316
76. Place nouns · Bogdan Szymanek 1327
77. Intensification · Franz Rainer 1339
78. Negation · Marisa Montero Curiel 1351
79. Negation in the Slavic and Germanic languages · Jozef Pavlovič 1360
80. Spatial and temporal relations in German word-formation · Ludwig M. Eichinger 1373
81. Adverbial categories · Davide Ricca 1390
82. Denominal verbs · Andrew McIntyre 1406
83. Valency-changing word-formation · Dieter Wunderlich 1424
84. Word-formation and lexical aspect: deverbal verbs in Italian · Nicola Grandi 1467
85. Word-formation and aspect in Samoyedic · Beáta Wagner-Nagy 1482
86. Verbal prefixation in Slavic: a minimalist approach · Petr Biskup and Gerhild Zybatow 1492
87. Denumeral categories · Bernhard Fradin 1515
88. The semantics and pragmatics of Romance evaluative suffixes · Martin Hummel 1528
89. Morphopragmatics in Slavic · Alicja Nagórko 1545

Volume 3

VIII. Foreign word-formation, language planning and purism I: General aspects

90. Types of foreign word-formation · Wieland Eins 1561
91. Word-formation in Neo-Latin · Thomas Lindner and Franz Rainer 1580
92. Foreign word-formation, language planning and purism · Wolfgang Pöckl . 1598

IX. Foreign word-formation, language planning and purism II: Special cases

93. Foreign word-formation in German · Peter O. Müller 1615
94. Foreign word-formation in English · Klaus Dietz 1637
95. Foreign word-formation in Italian · Claudio Iacobini 1660
96. Foreign word-formation in Polish · Krystyna Waszakowa 1679
97. Word-formation and purism in German · Mechthild Habermann 1696
98. Word-formation and purism in French · Petra Braselmann 1708
99. Word-formation and purism in Croatian · Branko Tošović 1720
100. Word-formation and language planning in Estonian · Virve Raag 1730
101. Individual initiatives and concepts for expanding the lexicon in Russian · Wolfgang Eismann 1744

X. Historical word-formation I: General aspects

102. Mechanisms and motives of change in word-formation · Franz Rainer 1761
103. Change in productivity · Carmen Scherer 1781

XI. Historical word-formation II: Special cases

104. Grammaticalization in German word-formation · Mechthild Habermann . . . 1794
105. The grammaticalization of prepositions in French word-formation · Dany Amiot 1811
106. The Romance adverbs in *-mente*: a case study in grammaticalization · Ulrich Detges 1824
107. Grammaticalization in Slavic word-formation · Krystyna Kleszczowa 1842
108. The origin of suffixes in Romance · David Pharies 1854

XII. Historical word-formation III: Language sketches

109. Historical word-formation in German · Peter O. Müller 1867
110. Historical word-formation in English · Klaus Dietz 1914
111. From Latin to Romance · Éva Buchi and Jean-Paul Chauveau 1931
112. From Latin to Romanian · Marina Rădulescu Sala 1957
113. From Old French to Modern French · Franz Rainer and Claude Buridant . . 1975
114. From Old Irish to Modern Irish · David Stifter 2000

115. Historical word-formation in Slavic · Swetlana Mengel 2021
116. From Ancient Greek to Modern Greek · Io Manolessou and Angela Ralli . . 2041
117. The history of word-formation in Uralic · Johanna Laakso 2061
118. From Old Hungarian to Modern Hungarian · Tamás Forgács 2079
119. Historical word-formation in Turkish · Claus Schönig 2096

XIII. Word-formation in language acquisition and aphasia

120. Word-formation in first language acquisition · Hilke Elsen and Karin Schlipphak 2117
121. Word-formation in second language acquisition · Cornelia Tschichold and Pius ten Hacken 2137
122. Word-formation in aphasia · Carlo Semenza and Sara Mondini 2154

XIV. Word-formation and language use

123. Word-formation and text · Anja Seiffert 2178
124. Word-formation and brand names · Elke Ronneberger-Sibold 2192
125. Word-formation and planned languages · Klaus Schubert 2210
126. Word-formation and sign languages · Ronnie B. Wilbur 2225
127. Word-formation and technical languages · Ivana Bozděchová 2251
128. Word-formation and literature · Peter Handler 2266
129. Word-formation and orthography · Hannelore Poethe 2289
130. Word-formation and visuality · Lorelies Ortner 2306

XV. Tools in word-formation research

131. Dictionaries · Renate Belentschikow 2333
132. Corpora · Ulrich Heid 2354
133. Internet · Georgette Dal and Fiammetta Namer 2372

Volume 4

XVI. Word-formation in the individual European languages

Indo-European

Germanic

134. German · Irmhild Barz 2387
135. English · Ingo Plag 2411
136. Dutch · Geert Booij 2427
137. Frisian · Jarich F. Hoekstra 2451
138. Yiddish · Simon Neuberg 2465

139. Faroese · Hjalmar P. Petersen 2487
140. Danish · Hans Götzsche 2505
141. Norwegian · John Ole Askedal 2525
142. Swedish · Kristina Kotcheva 2554
143. Icelandic · Þorsteinn G. Indriðason 2578

Romance

144. Portuguese · Bernhard Pöll 2600
145. Spanish · Franz Rainer 2620
146. Catalan · Maria Teresa Cabré Castellví 2641
147. French · Franck Floricic 2661
148. Ladin · Heidi Siller-Runggaldier 2682
149. Sardinian · Immacolata Pinto 2693
150. Italian · Franz Rainer 2712
151. Romanian · Maria Grossmann 2731

Celtic

152. Breton · Elmar Ternes 2752
153. Welsh · Paul Russell 2769
154. Irish · Brian Ó Curnáin 2782

Slavic

155. Upper Sorbian · Anja Pohontsch 2811
156. Polish · Alicja Nagórko 2831
157. Kashubian · Edward Breza 2852
158. Czech · Ivana Bozděchová 2872
159. Slovak · Martina Ivanová and Martin Ološtiak 2892
160. Ukrainian · Ievgeniia Karpilovska 2913
161. Belarusian · Alâksandr Lukašanec 2932
162. Russian · Igor' S. Uluhanov 2953
163. Slovene · Irena Stramljič Breznik 2979
164. Croatian · Mario Grčević 2998
165. Serbian · Božo Ćorić 3017
166. Bosnian · Branko Tošović 3038
167. Bulgarian · Cvetanka Avramova and Julia Baltova 3049
168. Macedonian · Lidija Arizankovska 3070

Map of languages 3087

Zetterstéen, Karl Vilhelm
1945 *Türkische, tatarische und persische Urkunden im schwedischen Reichsarchiv.* Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Henryk Jankowski, Poznań (Poland)

188. Gagauz

1. Introduction
2. General overview
3. Composition
4. Derivation
5. Reduplication
6. References

Abstract

This article outlines the main devices of word-formation that are productive in Gagauz. As is common in Turkic languages, Gagauz engages mainly compounding and suffixation to derive new words. Since Gagauz word-formation resembles Turkish word-formation very closely, emphasis is placed on those developments characteristic of Gagauz, most of them triggered by intensive contact with Slavic languages and with Romanian.

1. Introduction

Gagauz is a Turkic language with about 250,000 speakers, mainly in the Republic of Moldova and in Ukraine. The oldest written sources for Gagauz date back to the early 20th century and consist of folktales gathered by a Russian ethnographer. Before its official establishment by the Soviet government in 1957, Gagauz as a written language was used only by a handful of individuals. Even today, the majority of Gagauz speakers probably prefer to write in either Russian or Romanian, including those living in the autonomous region Gagauziya of the Republic of Moldova. Gagauz must be regarded as an endangered language (see Menz 2006 for general information on the Gagauz people and Menz 2003 on the status of the endangerment of the language).

Like Turkic languages in general, Gagauz is agglutinative and thus employs a large number of suffixes for derivational purposes. It belongs to the Oghuz branch of the Turkic languages, and is linguistically very close to Turkish. Due to its long and intensive contact with Slavic languages, however, Gagauz has developed features not found in Turkish. While these features are most obvious on the level of lexicon and syntax, changes on the morphological level, though minor in number, are highly significant for

research on language contact and on linguistic typology. Since Gagauz word-formation resembles Turkish word-formation very closely, I will put an emphasis on those features that are unique to Gagauz and/or have developed in a special way.

All linguistic examples are given in the new Latin orthography of Gagauz that was introduced in the Republic of Moldova in the year 2000.

In Turkic languages in general, suffixes undergo morphophonological changes according to the environment into which they are inserted. These changes are rule-bound and thus predictable. In the following sections, suffixes are given in standardized form; capital letters are used to indicate possible changes according to vowel and consonant harmony. In these standardized forms capital *A* represents the low vowels *a* or *e*, capital *I* the high vowels *i*, *ı*, *ü*, or *u*; *C* stands for *c* and *ç*, *K* for *k* or ∅, *L* for *l* or *n*, and *D* for *d* or *t*. Brackets signal the possible loss of a consonant or vowel depending on the preceding vowel or consonant. By and large I have followed the system established in Johanson and Csató (1998: xv−xx).

Since Gagauz is a language with relatively few speakers, and research on it first began at the turn of the 20th century, few studies focusing on Gagauz word-formation exist. Word-formation is treated in the chapters on morphology in the grammar books of Pokrovskaja (1964) and Özkan (1996). Kolca (1973) deals with compounding in general, while Apostolova (2010) addresses the formation of botanical terms, most of them formed by compounding. The most relevant dictionaries for Gagauz are Baskakov (1973) and Čebotar' and Dron (2002).

2. General overview

The main processes of word-formation in Gagauz are compounding and suffixation. Like all other Turkic languages, Gagauz does not engage prefixes or infixes for derivation, though intensified adjective formation (see section 6) is sometimes (mis-)understood as prefixing. Reduplication plays a significant role in the formation of adverbs.

Conversion is not productive. There are, however, some cases of polysemous noun and verb stems like *acı* 'pain' and *acı-* 'to feel pain' or *don* 'frozen' and *don-* 'to freeze'. Backformation is not attested in Gagauz.

Some of the problematic areas regarding the distinction between syntax and morphology in Turkish have been discussed extensively. Since both languages are similar in this respect, the issues as well as the conclusions of the debate are just as relevant for Gagauz.

One field of debate concerns the establishment of distinctive word classes in Turkic languages in general and in Turkish in particular (for this discussion with respect to Turkish, see Johanson 1990: 187−191). Gagauz, like all other Turkic languages, has a morphologically distinct class of nominals and one of verbs. Any stem that can take the suffix for negation *-mA* is a verb. Within the class of nominals, however, there is no morphologically clear-cut distinction between noun and adjective. Almost any adjective can be used as the head of a noun phrase − but not *vice versa*, i.e. nouns cannot function as adjectives − without undergoing a derivational process, which is why various authors have regarded them as belonging to a single class of nominals. The border between the two classes is rather fluid, with some gradation (see Braun and Haig 2000), but adjectives nevertheless form a separate word class on the basis of syntactic and semantic features (Johanson 2006).

Another area of dispute is whether voice suffixes should be understood as derivational or inflectional elements (see section 4.3.2).

3. Composition

Composition, i.e. the formation of new words out of at least two stems, is very productive in Gagauz. Noun compounding is most productive.

3.1. Nominal compounds

There are two structurally different types of nominal compounds. The more productive type consists of two or more juxtaposed nominals with the head marked with a possessive suffix, i.e. N+N-POSS. The second, less productive compound type consists of two juxtaposed nominals, i.e. N+N.

Compounds of the first type are in most, but not all, cases endocentric: compare endocentric *domuz yaanı-sı* 'pork; lit. pig meat-POSS3SG' and *gün tut-ul-ma-sı* 'solar eclipse; lit. sun grip-PASS-SUFF-POSS3SG', with exocentric *gün batı-sı* 'West; lit. sun sinking-POSS3'.

The simple juxtaposition of two nouns forms determinative compounds in which "[t]he referent of the head *is* or *consists of* the entity expressed by the modifier" (Johanson 2006: 67). This type is possible only with certain kinds of nouns, most often denoting a kind of material as in *yapaa çorap* 'wool stocking' ← *yapaa* 'wool' + *çorap* 'stocking', *demir kapı* 'iron door' ← *demir* 'iron' + *kapı* 'door'.

One type of coordinative compound (dvandva) results from the combining of two related concepts to form a single, new concept, such as *ana-boba* 'parents' ← *ana* 'mother' + *boba* 'father', *soruş-cuvap* 'pourparler' ← *soruş* 'question' + *cuvap* 'answer'. A second type of coordinative compound consists of nominals that are synonyms or semantically very close. The resulting compound refers to a concept that can be understood as the sum of the two parts: *çayır-çimen* 'fields and meadows; lit. meadow-lawn', *çayır-bayır* 'green area; lit. meadow-hill'.

If the head of a compound is a lexicalized participle and the first element an argument of the head, no possessive is necessary either, e.g., *aaç kakan* 'woodpecker' ← *aaç* 'wood' + *kak-an* 'pick-PART', *Kervan-kıran* '(planet) Venus; lit. caravan breaker' ← *kervan* 'caravan' + *kır-an* 'break-PART'.

Most of the nominal compounds with the combination adjective + noun contain a colour adjective: *maavi çiçek* 'blueweed; lit. blue flower', *al beegir* 'chestnut horse; lit. red horse', *kara damar* 'vein; lit. black artery'.

3.2. Adjectival compounds

A type of intensified adjective is constructed through the combination of two semantically related adjectives: *hırdıllı-partallı* 'completely ragged; lit. ragged-tattered'. Other

types of intensified adjectives can consist of a combination of an adjective with semantic content and a kind of (at least synchronically) meaningless echo-element, as in *ufak-tefek* 'tiny; lit. small-*tefek*' or the partial reduplication of the adjective with the replacement of the initial consonant by the labial *m*-: *çürük-mürük* 'all decayed; lit. rotten-motten' (see also section 5).

3.3. Verbal compounds

Verbal compounds are generally formed with a nominal element, either a noun or verbal noun/infinitive, followed by a light verb. In most cases, either *et*- or *yap*- 'to do' or *ol*- 'to become, be' function as the light verbs. The nominal element is generally a loanword of either Arabo-Persian, Slavic or Romanian origin. With Russian nominal elements there is a strong tendency to integrate infinitives by means of *et*- and nouns by adding *yap*-, as, e.g., *adaptirovat et*- 'to adapt' and *adaptirovat ol*- 'to become, be adapted' (< Rus. *adaptirovat*'), *agressija yap*- 'to exert aggression' (< Rus. *agressija*). With Arabo-Persian loans the light verb *et*- is more common, e.g., *neet et*- 'to intend' (< Tur. *niyet* 'intent' < Arab. *nīya*), *seftä yap*- 'to begin' (< Arab. *sifṭāḥ* 'beginning'). A distribution of *et*- and *yap*- comparable to that of Russian loans could not be observed.

Recent loanwords from Turkish are integrated by using the light verb *et*-, e.g., *önder-lik et*- 'to lead' ← *önder-lik* 'leadership' < Tur. *önder* 'leader'. The Turkish base *önder*, which is a non-transparent derivation from *ön* 'forefront', does not function in Gagauz; instead a derivation with the agent noun suffix *-CI* is used: *önderci* 'leader' (see section 4.1.1 for this suffix).

Some verbal compounds with an Arabo-Persian loanword as the nominal element are written in closed form: *azet*- 'to like' (< Arab. *ḥaẓẓ* 'enjoyment') and *metet*- 'to praise' (< Arab. *madḥ* 'praise').

Other light verbs that can appear in compounds without loosing their semantics completely and are thus functionally much more restricted, are *çek*- 'to pull', *ver*- 'to give', *koy*- 'to lay', and *ur*- 'to beat', e.g., *soluk çek*- 'to breathe' ← *soluk* 'breath', *söz ver*- 'to promise' ← *söz* 'word', *amenda koy*- 'to impose a fine' ← *amenda* 'fine', *mitani ur*- 'to bow' ← *mitani* 'obeisance'. *Koy*- in its function as a light verb is often a dialectal alternative for *yap*-. The light verb *çek*- 'to pull' is used in a variety of compounds that denote the execution of a physical punishment: *dayak çek*- 'to beat up' ← *dayak* 'stick', *kötek çek*- 'to flog' ← *kötek* 'baton', *lobut çek*- 'to beat' ← *lobut* 'blow', *solak çek*- 'to strike a blow with the left hand' ← *solak* 'left hand', as well as in compounds that designate the suffering of a calamity, such as *aaçlık çek*- 'to famish' ← *aaçlık* 'starvation, famine', *acı çek*- 'to suffer from pain' ← *acı* 'pain'.

4. Derivation

Like Turkic languages in general, Gagauz has a broad inventory of derivational suffixes, both for nominal and verbal derivation. Suffixes are strictly divided into two groups: those that attach to nominal stems and those that attach to verbal stems. The distinction between noun and adjective is − morphologically speaking − not clear-cut, at least for

roots. Instead, there is a class consisting of words that tend to function syntactically as nouns, as opposed to others that function mainly as adjectives. Almost any adjective can in principle function as the head of a noun phrase and thus behave like a noun. I therefore treat in what follows nominals (adjectives and nouns) together, separately from verbs.

More than one derivational suffix can attach to a root; their order is variable as long as they form a meaningful combination. Changes in meaning and function occur with the changed suffix order. Compare the following examples that consist of exactly the same morphological material. The order of the attached derivational suffixes results in different semantic content and dictates the word class to which the resulting words belong: *adam-nık-sız* 'cruel' ← *adam-nık* 'humanity ← *adam* 'human being' vs. *adam-sız-lık* 'state of being deserted, loneliness' ← *adam-sız* 'deserted' ← *adam* 'human being'.

It is also possible to have the same derivational suffix twice in one word, though usually not directly following one another: *dooru-luk-suz-luk* 'injustice' ← *dooru-luk-suz* 'unjust' ← *dooru-luk* 'truth' ← *dooru* 'accurate'.

In what follows, I will concentrate mainly on productive suffixes and mention non-productive ones only when necessary.

4.1. Nominal derivation

4.1.1. Denominal nominals

The denominal suffix *-CI* derives personal nouns, e.g., *işçi* 'worker' ← *iş* 'work', *yalancı* 'liar' ← *yalan* 'lie'. In rare cases it also attaches to loanwords that already denote an occupation but are no longer transparent to the speakers of Gagauz. Thus a Persian loan like *başçıvan* 'gardener' − consisting of *başçe* 'garden' (< Pers. *bāġča*) and the Persian suffix *-van* − is no longer sufficient to denote the occupation in Gagauz, hence the suffix *-CI* is attached, resulting in the form *başçıvancı*. For further examples of the same phenomenon see Özkan (1996: 102).

The denominal suffix *-LIK* derives nouns from nominals with a variety of meanings. The suffix is attested already in Old Turkic with this variety of meanings, which Erdal (1991, Vol. 1: 121) summarizes as "hav[ing] the relational element of 'purpose, designation' in common, or, if one so prefers, the sememe 'for'". With its broad meaning the suffix has survived in virtually all Turkic languages. It can be used to form abstract nouns expressing the state denoted by the root, e.g., *ahmaklık* 'stupidity' ← *ahmak* 'fool', *körlük* 'blindness' ← *kör* 'blind', or a place for the object denoted by the base, e.g., *odun-nuk* 'woodshed' ← *odun* 'wood'. It can also be used to form nominals denoting 'objects or concepts intended for or suitable for X', e.g., *abalık* 'fabric suitable to make a cape' ← *aba* 'a kind of cape'. In some instances the attachment of *-LIK* to a root can result in the lexicalization or *ad hoc* formation of two semantically different nominals. We thus find, e.g., nouns like *hacılık* that has an abstract meaning 'pilgrimage' and a place-noun meaning 'site of pilgrimage, holy site'. The suffix *-LIK* also follows other derivational suffixes, either nominal, e.g., *arıcı-lık* 'apiculture' from *arı-cı* 'apiarist', or adjectival, as in *bitkisiz-lik* 'endlessness' from *bitki-siz* 'endless' ← *bitki* 'final'.

Gagauz has two denominal suffixes that express either the smallness of or endearment and pity for the person or object denoted by the stem. The diminutive suffix *-CIK*

attaches to nouns and adjectives, cf. denominal *oda-cık* ‘small room’ ← *oda* ‘room, chamber’. Nominals ending in *-k* lose their last consonant before the suffix, e.g., *yapracık* ‘little leaf’ ← *yaprak* ‘leaf’, *alça-cık* ‘low’ ← *alçak* ‘low’. Nominals ending in *-Ik* lose their final consonant before the suffix and take a variant with a low vowel in *-CAK*, e.g., *ericäk* ‘little plum’ ← *erik* ‘plum’ (see Pokrovskaja 1964: 104−105). In the case that the diminutive noun has a possessive suffix, endearment semantics come into effect, e.g., *bobacıum* ‘my dear daddy; lit. father-SUFF-POSS1SG’ ← *boba* ‘father’. The suffix also serves to derive anatomic, botanic, and zoological terms, like *altıncık* ‘nasturtium’ ← *altın* ‘gold’, *bademcik* ‘tonsil’ ← *badem* ‘almond’, *kızılcık* ‘European cornel’ ← *kızıl* ‘red’, *sırcık* ‘starling’ ← *sır* ‘cattle’, *büründük* ‘natural silk’ ← *bürüm* ‘*bot.* cyst’. A derivation from the pronoun *hepsi* ‘all’ is *hepsicii* ‘all-SUFF-POSS3SG’, with basically no semantic difference.

The second suffix is *-CAAz* (compare Turkish *-CAğIz*), which attaches to any noun, often without a change in meaning. The suffix is sometimes shortened to *-CAz*. Especially with objects, the added meaning is often quite blurred and there seem to be only pragmatic reasons for using it. The extensive use of diminutives is a special feature of all Balkan Turkic dialects.

The non-harmonic suffix *-(y)ka*, copied from Slavic, is used to derive female forms of personal nouns. It is the only non-stressable derivational suffix and the only bound marker borrowed into Gagauz. While it probably came into the language by way of borrowed lexemes like Rus. *nemka* ‘German woman’ and the like, it became productive in Gagauz, especially with denotations for professions, nationalities and geographic origin. With professions it often derives female forms from nouns derived with a denominal *-CI* or a deverbal *-(y)ICI*, e.g., *aşçı-yka* ‘female cook’ ← *aş-çı* ‘cook’ ← *aş* ‘food, dish’, *üüredici-yka* ‘female teacher’ ← *üüred-ici* ‘teacher’ ← *üüred-* ‘to teach’.

4.1.2. Deverbal nominals

The suffix *-mAk* derives action nouns from verbs. Any verb can be nominalized with *-mAk*, though some are lexicalized to a higher degree than others, e.g., *yaşamak* ‘life’ ← *yaşa-* ‘to live’, *düşünmäk* ‘thought’ ← *düşün-* ‘to think’. Other deverbal noun-forming suffixes include *-(y)Iş*, e.g., *bakış* ‘gaze’ ← *bak-* ‘to look’, *gidiş* ‘departure’ ← *git-* ‘to go away’, and *-mA*, e.g., *annatma* ‘story’ ← *annat-* ‘to tell’. Changes in syntax due to language contact have caused these derivations to no longer be used as predicates of non-finite clauses, as is the case in Turkish, but to function as simple nouns.

The suffix *-(y)ICI* forms agent nouns and nominals denoting occupations and habits from verbs: *güdücü* ‘herdsman’ ← *güt-* ‘to herd’, *verici* ‘generous’ ← *ver-* ‘to give’.

4.2. Adjectival derivation

4.2.1. Denominal adjectives

The suffix *-LI* attaches to nouns to form relational and qualitative adjectives, e.g., *küülü* ‘from the village, villager’ ← *küü* ‘villager’, *tuzlu* ‘salty’ ← *tuz* ‘salt’. In

Gagauz as well as in other Turkic languages influenced by Russian, there seems to be a growing tendency to use the suffix *-LI* to mark nominals that are actually adjectives or could function as attributes without derivation. One thus finds forms such as *altın-nı* 'golden' derived from *altın* 'gold, golden' or loanwords like *grotesk-li* 'grotesque' (< Rom. *grotesc* from Italian *grottesco*).

The suffix *-kI* derives adjectives from nouns and adverbs denoting time or location, e.g., *büün-kü* 'today's' ← *büün* 'today', *içerki* 'indoor' ← *içer* 'room'.

The privative suffix *-sIz* attaches to nouns mainly to form adjectives that denote the absence of the entity denoted by the base, e.g., *ses-siz* 'soundless, silent' ← *ses* 'sound', *uyku-suz* 'sleepless' ← *uyku* 'sleep', *acızgansız* 'merciless' ← *acızgan* 'mercy'.

4.2.2. Deadjectival adjectives

The suffix *-(A/I)cIk* attaches to adjectives that express intensity in several dimensions. Words ending in *-k* lose their last consonant before the suffix. The choice of the vowel attached after stems ending in consonants other than *-k* is not phonologically predictable in terms of lowness or highness, thus *az-ıcık* 'very little' ← *az* 'little', but *dar-acık* 'very narrow' ← *dar* 'narrow'. The suffix intensifies the degree of the original meaning: *ufacık* 'tiny' ← *ufak* 'small', *incecik* 'very slim' ← *ince* 'slim'.

The stressed suffix *-CA* (for the unstressed *-CA* see section 4.4) derives adjectives from adjectives, either roots or derived ones, that tone down the semantic content of the base: *kısa-ca* 'shortish' ← *kısa* 'short', *tuz-lu-ca* 'somewhat salty' ← *tuz-lu* 'salty' ← *tuz* 'salt'.

4.2.3. Deverbal adjectives

The suffix *-(I)lI* forms adjectives with resultative semantics from transitive verbs, e.g., *kurulu* 'built' ← *kur-* 'to build'. In Turkish, *-(I)lI* can, as Erdal (2000: 28) has demonstrated, "be added only to monosyllabic stems or to stems whose second syllable consists of a vowel, and only to simple, neither deverbal or denominal bases". This restriction to non-derived stems is not, or perhaps more precisely, no longer valid in Gagauz, where the suffix derives adjectives from transitive verbs of any length and also from derived ones, e.g., *yapış-tır-ılı* 'fixed; lit. adhere-CAUS-SUFF' or *terbi-ed-ili* 'trained; lit. education-do-SUFF'. Like in Turkish, the derived adjectives in Gagauz refer to an "attained state" (Erdal 2000: 28–29), hence their resultative semantics. Since the use of participles has significantly declined in contemporary Gagauz in general and the perfect participle in *-mIş* is no longer used attributively, a semantic opposition between adjectives in *-(I)lI* and perfect participles of passives stems in *-mIş*, as is the case in Turkish (Erdal 2000: 28), does not exist.

Adjectives derived by *-(I)lI* function either as attribute or as copula complement and are particularly frequent in predicative function, e.g., *annı-sın-da yaz-ılı* 'It is written on her forehead; lit. forehead-POSS3SG-LOC write-SUFF'. The function of these adjectives in Gagauz very much resembles those of Russian past passive participles.

4.3. Verbal derivation

4.3.1. Denominal verbs

The only productive denominal verbal suffix in modern Gagauz is the suffix *-LA*. It mostly attaches to genuine Gagauz nominals to form transitive verbs with the meaning 'to do, make X', e.g., *hazırla-* 'to prepare' ← *hazır* 'ready, available' and *varakla-* 'to gild, gold-plate' ← *varak* 'gold leaf'. The formation of intransitive verbs is, if only much rarer, also possible with this suffix, e.g., *köstekle-* 'to stumble' ← *köstek* 'hobble'. In some rather rare cases it also derives verbs from loanwords of Russian origin, like *vaksala-* 'to polish' (< Rus. *vaksa* 'shoe polish'). The denominal derivation of verbs from Russian loanwords, however, is significantly more rare than compounding with Russian nouns or infinitives (see section 3.2) and is used mainly in written form.

4.3.2. Deverbal verbs

Apart from some non-productive elements, Gagauz derives 1. reflexive/passive verbs using *-(I)n* and *-(I)l*, as in *tutun-* 'to hold on' and *tutul-* 'to be held' ← *tut-* 'to hold'; 2. causative verbs using *-DIr*, *-t*, and *-(I)r*, as in *düzdür-* 'to make someone repair' ← *düz-* 'to repair'; and 3. reciprocal verbs using *-(I)ş*, as in *atış-* 'to throw at one another, quarrel' ← *at-* 'to throw'. As mentioned in section 2, some researchers regard these suffixes not as derivational but inflectional. Arguments in favor of inflection include the fact that no change in word class takes place and that almost any verb can be expanded by these voice suffixes. On the other hand, more than one suffix of this category can be applied to a root. Forms like *az-dır-ıl-* 'to be made angry' ← *az-dır* 'to cause an inflammation, make angry' ← *az-* 'to become inflamed', *tutuştur-* 'to set fire to' ← *tutuş-* 'to ignite' ← *tut-* 'to hold' are actually quite numerous. These examples also demonstrate that the semantic content of the derived verb is not always a straightforward causative, passive or reciprocal of the base verb. Moreover, this suffix category is the one closest to the root. Verbs derived by reflexive/passive, causative or reciprocal suffixes can be further derived by deverbal nominal derivation, e.g., *yapılmak* 'pretense' ← *yapıl-* 'to pretend' ← *yap-* 'to do'.

4.4. Adverbial derivation

The unstressable suffix *-CA* and its expanded version *-CAsInA* derive adverbs from nominals: *enikunu-ca* 'carefully' ← *enikunu* 'careful', *üfke-li-cä* 'angrily' ← *üfke-li* 'angry' ← *üfke* 'anger', *ad-ın-ca* 'by name' ← *ad* 'name', *adam-casına* 'humanly, decently' ← *adam* 'human'.

The diminutive suffix in *-CIK/-CAK* (see section 4.1.1) also derives adverbs from adjectives and adverbs, as in *çabucak* 'quickly' ← *çabuk* 'quick', *kısacık* 'shortly' ← *kısa* 'short', *şindicik* 'just now' ← *şindi* 'now'.

The ablative suffix *-DAn* is "borrowed into the derivational system" (cf. article 14 on the delimitation of derivation and inflection) to derive temporal and locational adverbs

from nominals, e.g., *arka-dan* ‘from behind’ ← *arka* ‘backside’, *hep-tän* ‘completely’ ← *hep* ‘always’, *an-sız-dan* ‘unexpectedly, all of the sudden’ ← *an-sız* ‘unexpected’ ← *an* ‘moment’.

Similarly, the dative case *-(y)A* in combination with a third person singular possessive suffix serves to derive adverbials from nouns or adjectives: *aykırı-lı-ın-a* ‘diagonally; lit. diagonal-POSS3SG-DAT’ ← *aykırı-lık* ‘diagonal, cross beam’ ← *aykırı* ‘crosswise’, and *hakına* ‘actually; lit. verity-POSS3SG-DAT’ ← *hak* ‘verity’, *dik-in-ä* ‘vertically; lit. vertical-POSS3SG-DAT’ ← *dik* ‘vertical’.

5. Reduplication

Intensive adjectives are formed by a partial reduplication of the initial syllable of an adjective stem. The first consonant is substituted most frequently by a *p*, and less often an *s* or *m*: *ap-ak* ‘bright white’ ← *ak* ‘white’, *kos-koca* ‘huge’ ← *koca* ‘big’, *düm-düz* ‘completely flat’ ← *düz* ‘flat, even’.

Total reduplication of nouns forms distributive adverbials, as in *adım-adım* ‘gradually’ ← *adım* ‘step’, *buka-buka* ‘bit by bit’ ← *buka* ‘bite, mouthful’, *alay-alay* ‘in groups, here and there’ ← *alay* ‘group’.

The total reduplication of adjectives or adverbs serves to derive intensified adverbs *üüsek-üüsek* ‘very highly’ ← *üüsek* ‘high’ and *may-may* ‘very nearly’ ← *may* ‘nearly, almost’.

6. References

Apostolova, Anna
2010 Gagavuz dilinin botanik terimlerinin kimi yapı ve anlam özellikleri. In: Mustafa Argunşah, Âdem Terzi and Abdullah Durkun (eds.), *Gagavuz Türkçesi Araştırmaları Bilgi Şöleni*, 19−25. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Baskakov, Nikolaj A. (ed.)
1973 *Gagauzsko-russko-moldavskij slovar’. 11.500 slov.* Moskva: Sovetskaja Ėnciklopedija.

Braun, Friederike and Geoffrey Haig
2000 The noun/adjective distinction in Turkish: An empirical approach. In: Aslı Göksel and Celia Kerslake (eds.), *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages*, 85−92. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Čebotar’, Petr A. and Ion Dron
2002 *Gagauzca-rusça-romınca sözlük*. Chişinău: Pontos.

Erdal, Marcel
1991 *Old Turkic Word Formation. A Functional Approach to the Lexicon*. 2 Vol. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Erdal, Marcel
2000 The Turkish resultative deverbal adjective. *Turkic Languages* 4(1): 22−30.

Johanson, Lars
1990 Studien zur türkeitürkischen Grammatik. In: György Hazai (ed.), *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Vol. 1, 146−301. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Johanson, Lars
2006 Nouns and adjectives in South Siberian Turkic. In: Marcel Erdal and Irina Nevskaja (eds.), *Exploring the Eastern Frontiers of Turkic*, 57−78. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Johanson, Lars and Éva Á. Csató (eds.)
1998 *The Turkic Languages*. London: Routledge.
Kolca, Elena K.
1973 Obrazovanie složnych slov v gagauzskom jazyke. In: *Studij de leksikografie ši leksikoložie − Issledovanija po leksikografii i leksikologii*, 173−183. Kišinev: Štiinca.
Menz, Astrid
2003 Endangered Turkic languages: The case of Gagauz. In: Mark Janse and Sijmen Tol (eds.), *Language Death and Language Maintenance. Theoretical, Practical and Descriptive Approaches*, 143−155. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
Menz, Astrid
2006 The Gagauz. In: Ergun Çagatay and Doğan Kuban (eds.), *The Turkish-Speaking People. 2000 Years of Art and Culture from Inner Asia to the Balkans*, 371−383. München: Prestel.
Özkan, Nevzat
1996 *Gagavuz Türkçesi grameri. Giriş − ses bilgisi − şekil bilgisi − cümle − sözlük − metin örnekleri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
Pokrovskaja, Ljudmila A.
1964 *Grammatika gagauzskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija*. Moskva: Nauka.

Astrid Menz, Istanbul (Turkey)

189. Karaim

1. Introduction
2. General overview
3. Composition
4. Derivation
5. Conversion
6. Reduplication
7. References

Abstract

This article does not provide an exhaustive survey of Karaim word-formation as the common Turkic word-formation devices are presented in other articles of this volume. It will focus on the productive suffixes and copied, non-Turkic, features. The language studied is the Lithuanian variety of the Turkic language Karaim. Karaim employs typical Turkic strategies of composition and a relatively large number of derivational suffixes. Under the influence of the dominant Slavic-Baltic languages, it has also adopted some non-Turkic strategies in its word-formation.