TURCOLOGICA

Herausgegeben von Lars Johanson

Band 60

2006

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Exploring the Eastern Frontiers of Turkic

Edited by
Marcel Erdal and Irina Nevskaya

2006

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek:
Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.ddb.de abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Bibliothek:
Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at http://dnb.ddb.de.e-mail: cip@dbf.ddb.de

For further information about our publishing program consult our website http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2006
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.
Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany
ISSN 0177-4743
ISBN 3-447-05310-0 978-3-447-05310-5

Table of contents

Marcel Erdal and *Irina Nevskaya*
Introduction vii

Ahmet Aydemir
Über Finitformen im Altai-Tuwinischen 1

Alisa Esipova
About the status of voice markers 11

Alisa Esipova and *Ljubov' Arbačakova*
Archaic vocabulary in Shor heroic epics 19

Dmitrij Funk
Anthroponymic patterns in traditional social culture and in epic texts 41

Lars Johanson
Nouns and adjectives in South Siberian Turkic 57

Геннадий В. Косточаков
Библейская терминология в шорском языке 79

Natal'ja Mixajlova
Imperativformen im Schorischen im Vergleich mit nahverwandten Türksprachen 83

Irina Nevskaya
The functional field of space in Turkic languages 91

Hans Nugteren and *Marti Roos*
Prolegomena to the classification of Western Yugur 99

Ajana Ozonova
Die syntaktischen Funktionen des Ablativs und des Dativs im Altaitürkischen 131

– 2000b. Tradicionnaja antroponimičeskaja model' čelkancev. In: Funk, D. A. (ed.). *Čelkancy v issledovanijax i materialax XX veka.* Moskva: Institut ėtnologii i antropologii RAN. 137–146.
– 2003. Moločno-belye koni v skazanijax taežnyx oxotnikov, rybolovov i sobiratelej. In: *Ėtnografičeskoe obozrenie,* 3, 53–60.
Funk, D. A. & Funk, I. I. 1990. O strukture seoka (roda) u čelkancev. In: Drobiževa L. M. (ed.). *Vsesojuznaja naučnaja sessija po itogam polevyx ėtnografičeskix i antropologičeskix issledovanij. 1988–1989: Tezisy dokladov, Čast' 2.* Alma-Ata. 77–79.
– & – 1991. K voprosu o processax transformacii rodovoj struktury u čelkancev. In: Tomilov, N. A. (ed.). *Etničeskaja istorija i kul'tura narodov Sovetskoj strany. Vsesojuznaja naučnaja konferencija molodyx učenyx: tezisy dokladov.* Omsk: Poligrafičeskaja laboratorija OmGU. 30–33.
Katanov, N. F. 1888. *Alfavitnyj ukazatel' sobstvennyx imen, vstrečajuščixsja vo vtorom tome obrazcov narodnoj literatury tjurkskix plemen, sobrannyx V.V. Radlovym.* St. Peterburg.
Kurpeško, N. N. 1990. Šorskie imena. In: *Literaturnyj Kuzbass* 4, 32–34.
Kurpeško-Tannagaševa, N. N. & Apon'kin, F. Y. 1993. *Šor-qazaq pazoq qazaq-šor söstük / Šorsko-russkij i russko-šorskij slovar'.* Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
Malinovskaja, S. M. 1996. Drevnesel'kupskaja antroponimija. In: Džarylgasinova, R. Š. & Šinkarev, V. N. (eds). *Imja i ėtnos.* Moskva: Institut ėtnologii i antropologii RAN. 99–103.
Potanin, G. N. 1883. *Očerki severo-zapadnoj Mongolii.* Vypusk 4. St. Petersburg: Tipografija V. Kiršbauma, v d. M-va Finansov, na Dvorcovoj ploščadi.
Potapov, L. P. 1949. Opyt datirovki šorskogo predanija o proisxoždenii zemledelija. In: *Izvestija Vserossijskogo geografičeskogo obščestva* 1/2, 411–414.
Radloff, W. 1866. *Obrazcy narodnoj literatury tjurkskix plemen, živuščix v Južnoj Sibiri i Dzungarskoj stepi. Čast' I. Podnarečija Altaja: altaicev, teleutov, černovyx i lebedinskix tatar, šorcev i sajancev.* St. Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii Nauk.
Rjumina-Syrkaševa, L. T. & Kučigaševa, N. A. 1995. *Teleut-Orus Sözlik/Teleutsko-russkij slovar'.* Kemerovo: Kemerovskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
Sanžeeva, L. T. 2000. *Onomastikon eposa "Geser". Avtoreferat dissertacii, predstavlennoj na soiskanie naučnoj stepeni kandidata filologičeskix nauk.* Ulan-Ude: Burjatskij NII jazyka, istorii i literatury.
Šorcy 1998. Šorcy. *Katalog ėtnografičeskix kollekcij muzeev Rossii. Čast' 4. Duxovnaja kul'tura.* Kemerovo: Kuzbassvuzizdat.
Smerdov, A. I. 1948. *Aj-Tolaj. Geroičeskie poemy i skazki Gornoj Šorii.* Novosibirsk: OGIZ.
Sokolova, Z. P. 1970. O proisxoždenii obsko-ugorskix imen i familij. In: Nikonov, V. A. (ed.). *Ličnye imena v prošlom, nastojaščem i buduščem.* Moskva: Nauka. 268–278.
Stebleva, I. V. 1965. *Poėzija tjurkov VI-VIII vekov.* Moskva: Nauka, Glavnaja redakcija vostočnoj literatury.
Subrakova, O. V. 1977. Sobstvennye imena personažej v xakasskom geroičeskom epose. In: *Voprosy xakasskoj filologii.* Abakan: KhakNIIYaLI. 117–123.
Tereščenko, N. M. 1966. Sobstvennye imena ljudej u nencev. In: *Voporsy finno-ugorskogo jazykoznanija, vypusk 3.* Moskva.

Nouns and adjectives in South Siberian Turkic

Lars Johanson

To the memory of Karl Heinrich Menges
(1908–1999)

0. Introduction

The Turkic varieties spoken in South Siberia—today counting as varieties of the standard languages Altay, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan and Tofan—are of particular linguistic interest. Although they do not, according to the traditional genetic classification, form a homogeneous subgroup of the Turkic family, they have many important traits in common. Despite contact-induced features adopted from Mongolic or imposed by originally Samoyedic- and Yeniseyic-speaking groups, they have also preserved numerous old features documented in East Old Turkic texts (known from the 8th century onwards).

Recent years have seen an upsurge of interest in South Siberian Turkic varieties. My own vivid interest in this fascinating linguistic area was awakened by the late Karl Heinrich Menges during his time as Visiting Professor at Uppsala in 1968. Since then, I have regularly come back to South Siberian Turkic in my own teaching and research. In the present article, which I dedicate to the dear memory of my first teacher in General and Comparative Turcology, I will employ material from the standard languages of South Siberia to illustrate the relationship between the word classes 'noun' and 'adjective'.

The existence of such morphosyntactically definable distinct word classes in Turkic languages has often been questioned. It is my conviction that combinations of various structural facts are required to demonstrate the classhood of nouns and adjectives in Turkic. My main purpose is to show that adjectives may function as nouns by way of markerless nominalisation processes, whereas nouns do not occur as adjectives. The situation in South Siberia provides typical and clear examples of this subtle but important demarcation.

The aim of this article is not to present new data, but to systematise the material already available. The cited examples are just samples without any pretensions to completeness.

1. Attitudes towards the 'noun' versus 'adjective' distinction

The attitudes of grammarians and other linguists towards the 'noun' versus 'adjective' distinction in Turkic vary considerably.

1.1. Traditional attitudes

Traditional grammars of Turkic languages tend to recognise lexemes as 'adjectives' according to the meaning of their translation equivalents in languages such as English, French, German and Russian. Turkic adjectives are thus identified as words that translate adjectives of those languages. This practice does not always lead to wrong results, since adjectives show certain semantic and syntactic similarities across languages. However, it does not establish a word class 'adjective' based on internal grammatical criteria.

1.2. Rejection of the distinction

Another common attitude is based on the conviction that nouns and adjectives cannot be distinguished in Turkic. The claim is that there are only 'verbs' and 'non-verbs', the latter constituting a superclass called 'nominals' ('Nomina', 'substantives', etc.). Certain nominals may be 'adjective-like' in meaning and / or function. They may exhibit conceptual bases and grammatical properties typical of adjectives in Russian or other European languages. However, this is not thought to be a sufficient basis for establishing a discrete word class 'adjective' in the languages concerned.

The description of many Turkic languages—including East Old Turkic and modern South Siberian Turkic—has been strongly influenced by Kaare Grönbech's radical rejection of a Turkic 'noun' versus 'adjective' distinction (1936: 2, 24, 26–27). Grönbech does not recognise any morphological, syntactic or semantic differences that would motivate the distinction in question. Turkic nominals are claimed to be nouns and adjectives at the same time. Words referred to as adjectives, since they often denote properties, do not to differ from other nominals. According to Grönbech, the reason for the allegedly lacking distinction is the incapability of distinguishing conceptually between nouns and adjectives:

> Dies hat seinen Grund darin, dass man auch nicht begrifflich zwischen ihnen sondern kann. Die Nomina bezeichnen nicht ein Wesen oder eine Sache, sondern deren Begriff in unbestimmtem Umfang, weder substantivisch noch adjektivisch festgelegt; dies heisst, man spricht vom Begriff, ohne zu betonen, ob derselbe als Sache oder als Eigenschaft zu verkörpern ist (1936: 2).

> Was dem türkischen Sprachdenken als ein und dieselbe Vorstellung erscheint, betrachten wir bald von diesem, bald von jenem Gesichtspunkt /.../ In allen Dialekten kann man 'Adjektiva' finden, die wir nur als Substantiva auffassen können. Oft steht man einem Wort ganz ratlos gegenüber (1936: 24).

According to certain Turcologists, modern languages are developing adjective classes under non-Turkic influence. Thus, Nikolaj A. Baskakov claims that the adjective, which, according to him, has been very weakly differentiated from the adverb and the noun until recent times, tends to develop into an independent part of speech in a language such as modern Altay (1958: 60).

It has often been claimed that Turkic adjectives are used freely as nouns, and nouns as adjectives. This opinion is often met with in grammars of Turkish. See, for example, Robert Godel (1945: 45): "La transposition de l'adjectif en nom ou du nom en adjectif est très libre, même pour les mots characterisés par un suffixe". However, the structuralist Lloyd B. Swift wants to save the reader of his grammar from this alleged fallacy: "Once having identified a particular 'word' in Turkish as an 'adjective' he is almost sure to be led astray whenever he finds it performing a nominal function and to end up mumbling nonsense about 'adjectives functioning as nouns'". Swift rejects the terms 'noun' and 'adjective', since they "generally describe neither form class nor function class but rather a kind of hybrid class called 'part of speech'" (1963: 3). He prefers to speak of 'substantives' belonging to different syntactic substitution classes, i.e. syntactic 'nominals' and 'adjectivals' (1963: 188). For the discussion on adjectives in Turkish, see Johanson 1990: 187–192.

1.3. Semantic and pragmatic approaches

Some grammarians distinguish nouns and adjectives exclusively on semantic grounds. They argue that a given lexeme is a noun if it designates an object; and an adjective if it designates a static property (Isxakov & Pal'mbax 1961: 178).

Certain Turcologists argue that the distinction between nouns and adjectives should be relegated to pragmatics. According to Marcel Erdal, a clear delimitation seems impossible in "Old Turkic and other typical Turkic languages". There is rather a continuum with many intermediate stages and uncertainties. "The question is not whether a given lexeme can be put solely to nominal or solely to adjectival use, but as what the addressee or reader takes it to be where the text gives him no clues for choice" (1991: 132, footnote 187). Compare attempts to define word classes on discourse-pragmatic grounds, for example Hopper & Thompson 1984 and Thompson 1989.

1.4. Prototypical nouns and adjectives

The impression that a number of Turkic nominals do not fall neatly into the word classes 'noun' and 'adjective' but exhibit properties of both has led some linguists to deal with the problem within a prototype-theory framework. It has thus been argued for Turkish that adjectives do not constitute a discrete word class, but that "the nominal class constitutes a continuum from prototypical noun to prototypical adjective, allowing for a large and essentially indeterminate intermediate segment" (Braun & Haig 2000: 91).

This is a good point of departure for distinguishing nouns and adjectives. I have claimed in earlier work that the only possibility to establish these parts of speech systematically is a classification of nominals according to their predilection for and aversion against particular syntactic functions (Johanson 1990: 190). The term 'noun' might be used for words that typically occur in certain syntactic substitution slots, primarily as head of noun phrases, and 'adjective' might be used for those which typically occur in attributive ("adnominal") slots. Subclasses might thus be established on the basis of typical and atypical occurrence in these basic syntactic functions.

1.5. The present approach

The approach applied in the present paper nevertheless differs from a prototype-theory treatment. My own position has always been that nouns and adjectives can be distinguished in Turkic, though the criteria for word class membership partly differ from those valid in languages such as Russian and English. Nouns and adjectives pattern together on certain criteria, and there may even be borderline cases between them, but most lexemes can be assigned membership in one of the two classes. The following typological discussion is mainly based on R. M. W. Dixon's work (1977, 1982, 2001).

2. Semantic features

2.1. Semantic features of nouns

With respect to differential semantic features, nouns are words used to refer to entities, i.e. indicating 'somebody' or 'something'. They answer the questions 'who?' and 'what?', e.g. Altay, Khakas, Shor *kem*, Tuvan *qïm* 'who?', Altay *ne(me)*, Khakas *nime*, Shor *no:*, Tuvan *čü:* 'what?'.

Across languages, lexical items with concrete reference—those referring to humans, body parts, flora, fauna, celestial and environmental entities, artefacts—are typically linked to noun classes. For our discussion of word classes, it is reasonable to assume that South Siberian Turkic words referring to animates, body parts, physical objects, natural phenomena, etc. are nouns. Their morphosyntactic behaviour may help us to decide upon the classhood of words of a less typical semantic profile.

Examples of South Siberian Turkic words referring to animates: Khakas *kïzï*, Altay, Tuvan *kiži* 'person', Altay *bala*, Khakas, Shor *pala* 'child', Altay, Shor, Tuvan *qïs*, Khakas *xïs* 'girl', Altay, Khakas, Shor *at* 'horse', Tuvan, Tofan *aʕt* 'horse', Altay, Tuvan, Tofan *balïq*, Shor *palïq*, Khakas *palïx* 'fish', Altay *tülkü*, Khakas, Shor *tülgü* 'fox', Tuvan *dilgi*, Altay *qoyon*, Khakas, Shor *qozan*, Tuvan *qodan* 'rabbit', Altay, Shor, Tuvan, Tofan *qu:*, Khakas *xu:* 'swan', Altay *uy*, Khakas *ïnek* 'cow', Shor *nek*, Tuvan *inek* 'cow', Altay, Shor, Tuvan *quš*, Khakas *xus* 'bird'.

Examples of words referring to body parts: Altay, Tuvan *baš*, Shor *paš*, Khakas *pas* 'head', Altay *yürek*, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan *čürek* 'heart', Altay, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan *sö:k* 'bone', Altay, Shor *qol*, Khakas, Tuvan *xol* 'hand, arm', Altay, Khakas, Shor *sayal* 'beard'.

Examples of words referring to physical objects and natural phenomena: Altay *tu:*, Khakas, Shor *tay*, Tuvan *day* 'mountain', Altay, Shor *ayaš*, Khakas *ayas*, Tuvan *ïyaš* 'tree', Altay, Shor, Tofan *taš*, Tuvan *daš* 'stone', Altay, Khakas *sap*, Tuvan, Tofan *sïʕp* 'handle', Altay, Khakas, Shor *köl*, Tuvan *xöl* 'lake', Altay *yer*, Shor, Khakas *čir*, Tuvan *čer* 'earth', Altay *toš*, Tuvan *doš*, Khakas *pus*, Shor *mus* 'ice', Altay *yïmïrtqa*, Khakas *nïmïrxa*, Shor *nïbïrtqa*, Tuvan *ču:rya* 'egg', Altay, Shor *qar*, Khakas, Tuvan *xar* 'snow', Altay, Tuvan *bulut*, Khakas, Shor *pulut* 'cloud', Altay, Khakas *tura*, Tuvan *bažïŋ*, Tofan *öy* 'house', Altay *yol*, Shor *čol*, Tuvan, Tofan *oruq* 'road', Altay *keme*, Khakas *kime*, Shor *kebe*, Tuvan *xeme* 'boat', Altay, Khakas *altïn*, Tuvan *aʕldïn* 'gold', Altay *kümüš*, Khakas *kümüs*, Tuvan *möŋgün* 'silver', Altay *su:*, Khakas, Tuvan *suy* 'water', Altay, Khakas, Tuvan *süt* 'milk', Altay, Khakas *kün*, Tuvan *xün* 'sun', Altay *temir*, Khakas *timïr*, Shor *tebir* 'iron', Altay *malta*, Khakas *paltï*, Tuvan *baldï*, Tofan *süye* 'axe', Altay *salqïn*, Khakas *čil*, Tuvan *xat* 'wind', Altay, Khakas, Tuvan *aŋ* 'game (wild animal)'.

2.2. Semantic features of adjectives

Adjectives primarily describe properties of entities, indicating what 'somebody' or 'something' is like ('so', 'such'). A semantic test criterial for adjectivehood is provided by interrogatives meaning 'how?', 'what kind of', e.g. Altay *qandïy*, Khakas *xayday*, Shor *qaydïy*, Tuvan, Tofan *qandïy*. These question words elicit answers in which the information wanted is expressed by an adjective. They are inappropriate if the anticipated answer is a noun.

Across languages, words of certain semantic types are closely associated with adjective classes. Our discussion of word classes starts from the assumption that South Siberian Turkic words expressing such concepts are adjectives. Their morphosyntactic behaviour may help us to decide upon the classhood of words of a less typical semantic profile.

The core semantic types typically associated with adjective include expressions of dimension ('big', 'small', 'long', 'tall', 'short', 'wide', 'deep', etc.), age ('new', 'young', 'old', etc.), value ('good', 'bad', etc.) and colour ('black', 'white', 'red', etc.).

Some examples of words representing core semantic types: Altay *yi:t*, Khakas *či:t*, Tofan *ni:t*, Tuvan *anïyaq* 'young', Altay *yaŋï*, Khakas, Shor *na:*, Tuvan *ča:* 'new', Altay *sarï*, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan *sarïγ* 'yellow', Altay, Shor, Tuvan *qïzïl*, Khakas *xïzïl* 'red', Altay *d'a:n*, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan *uluγ* 'big', Altay *d'aqšï*, Shor *čaqsï*, Khakas *čaxsï*, Tuvan *eki* 'good', Altay, Shor, Tuvan *so:q* 'cold', Khakas *so:x*, Altay, Khakas, Tuvan *tar* 'narrow', Altay, Shor, Tuvan, Tofan *semis*, Khakas *simïs* 'fat'.

With non-core concepts, the word class membership may be different across languages, for example between Turkic and English or Russian. More peripheral semantic types relatively closely associated with adjective classes include those expressing physical property and speed.

Some examples of the semantic types of physical property and speed: Altay *qatu*, Khakas *xatïγ*, Shor *qadïγ*, Tuvan *qaʕdïγ*, Tofan *qaʕïγ* 'hard', Altay *d'ïmžaq*, Khakas *nïmzax*, Shor, Tuvan *čïmčaq*, Tofan *čïmčžaq* 'soft', Altay *u:r*, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan *a:r* 'heavy', Altay *aru*, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan, Tofan *arïγ* 'clean', Altay *izü*, Khakas *ïzïg*, Shor *izig*, Tuvan *iziγ*, Tofan *iʕsiγ* 'hot', Altay *aču*, Khakas, Shor *ačïγ*, Tuvan *ažïγ*, Tofan *ačžïγ* 'sour, bitter', Altay *o:ru*, Khakas *ayïrïγ*, Shor *ayrïγ*, Tuvan, Tofan *a:rïγ* 'sick', Altay *ölgön*, Shor *ölgen*, Khakas *ölig*, Tuvan *ölüγ* 'dead', Altay *türgen*, Tuvan *dürgen*, Shor *tabïraq*, Khakas *tabïrax* 'fast', Altay *ara:y*, Khakas *ay ïrin*, Shor *kengerek*, Tuvan *o:žun* 'slow'.

3. Distributional features

With respect to distributional features, several grammatical slots in the clause may be filled by both nouns and adjectives. Both can be used as a predicate, a copula complement and a predicate complement. In the noun phrase, which offers the positions head and modifier, adjective-plus-noun constructions are typically found. A typical noun phrase has a noun as head, e.g. Altay *yi:t u:l* [young boy], *bay kiži* [rich person], Khakas *pözik tay* [high mountain], Tuvan *iziγ šay* [hot tea], *aq bulut-tar* [white cloud-PL], Tofan *uluγ taš* [big stone], Shor *köp qalïq* [many people].

Whereas the head position is primary to nouns, the modifier position is primary to adjectives. Under certain conditions, however, both nouns and adjectives can occupy either slot.

Items that have a conceptual basis typical of adjectives and typically function as modifiers may be used as heads, e.g. Altay *bay* [rich] 'a / the rich person', *pözïk-ter* [high-PL] 'heights', Khakas *kičig-ler* [small-PL] 'small ones', Tuvan *qïzïl-dar* [red-PL] 'red ones'.

Items that have a conceptual basis typical of nouns and typically function as heads of noun phrases may be used as modifiers, e.g. Shor *qïz pala* [girl child] 'daughter', *aŋčï kiži* [hunter person] 'hunter'.

This distributional pattern does not, however, imply that "nouns are used as adjectives". Even if nouns and adjectives can occupy both the modifier and the head slot, the conditions for this variation are, as we shall see, quite different.

4. Morphosyntactic behaviour of adjectives

When used as the head of a noun phrase, Turkic adjectives display a morphosyntactic behaviour typical of nouns. For example, they assume the same inflectional morphology as nouns. Turkic nouns in argument position inflect for number, case and person-number of the possessor. This marking, which indicates syntactic functions of the noun phrase, goes onto the word acting as head. Thus, adjectives used adnominally as head modifiers do not take the markers in question but are used in plain form, e.g. Tuvan *bedik day* [high mountain] 'a / the high mountain', *bedik day-lar-da* [high mountain-PL-LOC] 'on (the) high mountains'. As heads of noun phrases, however, adjectives take the same modifying suffixes as nouns do, i.e. they inflect for case, number and possessive, e.g. Khakas *kičig-ler-ibis-teŋ* [small-PL-POSS.2PL-ABL] 'from our small ones', Tuvan *qïryan-nar-ya* [old-PL-DAT] 'to the old people'. Compare East Old Turkic *eðgü-g* [good-POSS.2SG] 'your advantage', *aq-ïγ* [white-ACC] 'the white [horse]'.

The markers just indicate syntactic functions of the noun phrases, without modifying properties expressed by the adjectives. On the other hand, adjectives used as heads of noun phrases maintain other syntactic features typical of adjectives, for example the possibility of being modified by adverbs, e.g. Tuvan *dïqa uluγ-lar* [very big-PL] 'very big ones'.

5. Secondary semantic function of adjectives

It was stated above that Turkic adjectives primarily describe properties of entities. When they make up an entire noun phrase, without any stated noun, they may, however, also have a secondary semantic function. Their use is not only restricted to

elliptical cases, where a head noun is omitted under certain discourse conditions, i.e. where the entity described is not overtly expressed but contextually identifiable. Turkic adjectives are susceptible to genuine nominalisation in that they may, as heads of noun phrases, be used to refer to entities in a highly systematic way, e.g. Khakas *či:t*, Tofan *ni:t* 'young' → 'young person, youngster'. In these cases, the adjectives are not used *like* nouns, but rather *as* nouns.

This phenomenon may be seen as the result of a markerless transfer from a primary to a secondary function, a nominalising process without derivational markers. In its primary function, the adjective indicates a property of a given entity. In its secondary function, it indicates an entity that bears this property: somebody or something characterised by the primary adjective meaning. This process implies a shift from 'so / like this' to 'something / somebody that is so / like this'. The applicability of this markerless nominalisation varies across the Turkic languages. In principle, it is dependent on certain characteristics of the referents.

The markerless nominalisation is generally possible when the entities referred to are animates, in particular humans: 'somebody who is so / like this'. A headless adjective such as *uluγ* 'big' may thus be interpreted as 'somebody who is big'. Further examples: Altay *bay*, Shor *pay* 'rich' → 'rich person', Altay *qortuq* 'cowardly, timid' → 'coward', Tuvan *ma:dïr* 'brave, heroic' → 'hero', *ölüγ* 'dead' → corpse', Altay *o:rïγan* 'sick' → 'sick person, patient', Tuvan *qïrγan* 'old' → 'old person'.

Designations of origin and nationality are often nominalised adjectives, e.g. Altay, Tuvan *orus*, Khakas *orïs*, Shor *qazaq* 'Russian', Tuvan *qïdat* 'Chinese', *mo:l* 'Mongol(ian)', *yaqut* 'Yakut'. Compare East Old Turkic adjectives such as *türk*, *oγuz* and *qïrqïz*, e.g. *türk begler* 'the Turk begs', *oγuz yaγï* 'the Oghuz enemy', *qïrqïz qaγan* 'the Kirghiz ruler'. Note also the numerous similar cases of nominalisation in European languages, e.g. *the English*, *les Français*, *die Deutschen*, *russkie*.

The entity referred to may also be non-human, 'something that is so / like this', e.g. Khakas *ax*, Tuvan, Tofan *aq* 'white' → 'the white (of an egg, of the eye)', Khakas *pölïk* 'separated' → 'part', Altay, Shor *artïq*, Tuvan *aʕrtïq*, Khakas *artïx* 'superfluous, left over' → 'remnant', Shor, Tuvan *ayas* 'clear' → 'clear weather', Altay, Shor, Khakas, Tuvan *so:q* 'cold' → 'cold weather, the cold'. Compare cases such as East Old Turkic *soγïq*, Turkish *soğuk*. Nominalised adjectives are often used to refer to places or spaces, e.g. Tuvan *delgem* 'wide, spacious' → 'wide open space', Altay *qaraŋuy*, Shor *qarašqï* 'dark' → 'dark place', Altay *ïra:q* 'distant' → 'distant place', e.g. *ïra:q-taŋ* [distant-ABL] 'from far off'.

A nominalised adjective may bear a possessive suffix referring to a set or a context to which the entity belongs, i.e. Tuvan *qïzïl-dar-ï* [red-PL-POSS.3P] 'the red ones'. This is also the case with comparative and superlative uses, e.g. Shor *eŋne čaqšï-zï* [most good- PL-POSS.3P] 'the best one'.

6. Tertiary semantic function of adjectives

In South Siberian Turkic, plain adjectives can, like in older Turkic languages, be used in a tertiary semantic function, namely as abstract nouns, referring to the property expressed by the adjective as an abstract entity. Examples: Tuvan *čïlïγ* 'warm' → 'warmth', *bedik* 'high' → 'height', Altay, Shor, Khakas, Tuvan *so:q* 'cold' → 'cold(ness)'

This conversion further contributes to systematic homonymy, increasing the range of possible readings and making the interpretation highly dependent on the context. In this abstract use, however, lexemes are usually marked with a possessive suffix referring to the bearer of the property in question, e.g. Tuvan *daγ-nïŋ bediγ-i* [mountain-GEN high-POSS.3P] 'the height of the mountain', *xün čïlïγ-ï* [sun warm-POSS.3P] 'warmth of the sun'.

Though most modern Turkic languages use special suffixes to derive abstract nouns from adjectives, e.g. Turkish *iyi-lik* 'goodness', *derin-lik* 'depth', Altay *bay-lïq* 'richness', *čïn-dïq* 'truth', they have generally retained some cases of plain adjectives in the 'abstract entity' function, e.g. Turkish *doğru* 'true' → 'truth', *kolay* 'easy' → 'easiness, easy way (of doing something)'. Note that English often displays homonymy of this kind, e.g. in lexemes such as *cold* and *light*, which does not lead linguists to deny that English possesses adjectives.

In South Siberian Turkic, this kind of nominalisation, which represents properties as abstract entities, is observed in adjectives expressing dimension, physical property, similarity, qualification, quantification, position, etc.

Some examples: Altay *biyik*, Khakas *pözïk*, Shor *mözük*, Tuvan, Tofan *bedik* 'high' → 'height', Altay *o:ru*, Khakas *ayïrïγ* 'sick' → 'sickness'; Altay *izü o:ru* [hot sick] 'typhus', Altay *yïlu*, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan, Tofan *čïlïγ* 'warm' → 'warmth', Altay *izü*, Shor *izig*, Tuvan *iziγ*, Khakas *ïzïg*, Tofan *iʕsiγ* 'hot' → 'heat', Altay *čïn*, Khakas *sïn*, Shor, Tuvan, Tofan *šïn* 'true' → 'truth', Tuvan *arïq* 'tired' → 'tiredness', Altay, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan, Tofan *uzun* 'long' → 'length', Altay *yarïq*, Khakas *čarïx*, Shor *čarïq*, Tuvan *čïrïq* 'light, bright' → 'light, brigthness', Altay, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan *köp* 'much' → 'multitude', Altay *aču*, Khakas, Shor *ačïγ*, Tuvan *ažïγ* 'bitter' → 'bitterness, grief', Altay *serü:n*, Khakas *siren*, Shor *sere:n*, Tuvan *seri:n* 'cool' → 'coolness', Altay *čirik*, Khakas *ïrïk*, Shor *irik*, Tuvan *čirik* 'rotten' → 'rottenness', Shor *poš* 'free' → 'freedom', *šïm* 'silent' → 'silence, Tuvan *quryay* 'dry' → 'drought', Tofan *xïlïn* 'thick' → 'thickness', *öl* 'moist' → 'moisture'.

Compare East Old Turkic adjectives in their tertiary function as abstracts, e.g. *eδgü* 'good' → 'goodness, advantage', *arïγ* 'clean, pure' → 'cleanness, purity', *kèŋ* 'broad' → 'breadth', *teriŋ* 'deep' → 'depth', *beŋigü* 'eternal' → 'eternity', *bek* 'firm' → 'firmness', *kèrtü* 'truthful' → 'truthfulness', *beδük* 'big, great' → 'greatness', *kergek* 'necessary' → 'necessity', *qaraŋyu* 'dark' → 'darkness', *yïlïγ* 'warm' → 'warmth', *čïn* 'true' → 'truth', *ačïγ* 'bitter' → 'bitterness'.

In their tertiary abstract use, lexemes of this kind are, like in South Siberian Turkic of today, usually marked with a possessive suffix referring to the bearer of the property. Erdal concludes that "the Old Turks apparently did not have much use for abstracts unmarked for bearer" (1991: 126). He considers the possibility that the old Turks "may have been unable to conceive of pure ideas, like the Homeric Greeks", but finds it more likely that "they may have shared with other languages of the Chinese 'Sprachbund' the typological trait of having one form for abstract and adjective". A case in point would be *čïn*, copied from Chinese, 'true' → 'truth' (compare *čïn* ~ *šïn* ~ *sïn* above).

7. Primary, secondary and tertiary functions

In sum, it may be said that many adjectives have a triple functional pattern comprising primary, secondary and tertiary functions. Examples: Khakas *čayïn* (1) 'near', (2) 'something / somebody that is near' (place, neighbour, relative, etc.), (3) 'nearness', Altay *o:ru*, Khakas *ayïrïy* (1) 'sick', (2) 'sick person', (3) 'sickness', Altay *qaračqï*, *qaraŋuy*, Shor *qarašqï*, Tuvan *qaraŋuy* (1) 'dark', (2) 'dark place', (3) 'darkness', Altay *qortuq* (1) 'cowardly', (2) 'coward', (3) 'cowardice', Altay, Khakas *tar* (1) 'narrow', (2) 'narrow place', (3) 'narrowness', Altay, Shor, Khakas, Tuvan *so:q* (1) 'cold', (2) 'cold weather, the cold', (3) 'cold(ness)', Altay, Tuvan *tereŋ* (1) 'deep', (2) 'deep place', (3) 'depth'.

Compare the old triple pattern found in many East Old Turkic adjectives, e.g. *yaγuq* (1) 'near', (2) neighbour', (3) 'neighbourhood', *eδgü* (1) 'good', (2) 'somebody / something that is good' (3) 'the property of being good', *uz* (1) 'skillful', (2) 'craftsman, artisan', (3) 'skillfulness, craftsmanship', *alp* (1) 'sturdy', (2) 'somebody who is sturdy, warrior', (3) 'sturdiness', *yaγï* (1) 'hostile', (2) 'someone / something that is hostile, enemy', (3) 'hostility, the property of being an enemy', (1) *yo:q* 'nonexisting', (2) 'nothing', (3) 'nothingness'.

8. Nouns as modifiers in noun phrases

Cases of nouns filling the modifier slot in noun phrases are different from the secondary and tertiary uses of adjectives discussed so far. In the modifier position, nouns function as restrictive attributes without being adjectivalised.

Examples: Altay *temir yol*, Shor *tebir čol*, Tuvan, Tofan *demir oruq* [iron road] 'railway', Altay *taš tura*, Khakas *tas tura*, Tuvan *daš bažïŋ* [stone house] 'stone house', Altay *ayaš tura*, Khakas *ayas ib*, Shor *ayaš em (üy)*, Tuvan *ïyaš bažïŋ* [wood house] 'wooden house', Altay *altïn yüstük*, Shor *altïn čüstük* [gold ring] 'golden ring', Altay *toš qïr* [ice mountain] 'iceberg', *taš kömür* [stone coal] '(pit) coal',

kirpič čay [brick tea] 'brick-tea', Shor *qïs qarïndaš* [girl sibling] 'sister', *er qarïndaš* [male sibling] 'brother', *qïz pala* [girl child] 'daughter'.

In earlier work I have referred to this function as *identity apposition* (Johanson 1990: 190). On the criteria for appositions, see Hansjakob Seiler 1960. They are not psycholinguistic and not dependent on majority judgments (cf. Braun & Haig 2000: 91). The modifier in question is an optional constituent of the noun phrase, preposed to, and coreferential with, its head. Since the modifier position is primary to adjectives, nouns occurring here have often erroneously been taken to be adjectives. This shift from a primary use to a secondary attributive use is, however, not a transfer from noun to adjective. Turkic nouns need overt derivational markers in order to acquire adjectival meanings and functions. Nouns occurring as modifiers in noun phrases are not adjectives formed through markerless derivational processes or deprived of their markers along some path of grammaticalisation. They still refer to entities, and not to properties. They thus form a kind of compound with the noun they modify.

The main requirement is that an equational relationship obtains between modifier and head. The referent of the head *is* or *consists of* the entity expressed by the modifier. Nouns used as adnominal modifiers do not describe properties in the way adjectives do. They do not convey that the modified entity has some quality typical of the entity they designate, but rather that the modified entity *consists* of it. Thus, Tuvan *ïyaš* 'wood' is not 'wooden', *daš* 'stone' is not 'stony', and *demir* 'iron' is not 'ferrous'. Khakas *xïs pala* means a child who is a girl. Compare English *baby girl*, which is not a babyish girl, a childish girl or a girl for babies, but a girl who *is* a baby. Similarly, Shor *kümüš čüstük* 'silver ring' denotes a ring that consists of silver. Altay *kirpič čay* 'brick-tea' is tea constituting a "brick", i.e. a rectangular block of moulded and hardened tea leaves.

While almost every adjective may function as a modifier in a noun phrase, the applicability of noun modifiers is limited. Given the restrictions just mentioned, it is natural that the nouns used as identity appositions often refer to the material of which the entity consists, e.g. 'stone', 'wood', and to sex, e.g. 'woman', 'man', i.e. the semantic subtypes specified by Dixon (1982).

The identity apposition is wellknown in all Turkic languages, e.g. Turkish *kadın polis* [woman police] 'police woman'. Similar East Old Turkic examples are *qaŋ-ïm qayan* [father-POSS.1P.SG ruler] 'the ruler, who is my father', *temir qapïy* 'iron gate', *qïz oyul* [girl child] 'daughter'. These are not, as Grönbech claims, constructions formed in the same way as *aq at* 'white horse' and *eδgü èl* 'good realm' (1936: 24, 27). The roles of the adjectives *aq* and *eδgü* differ considerably from those of the nouns *temir* and *qïz* in their respective noun phrases.

Modifier-head sequences with a noun as head are not interruptable. Whereas a noun phrase can include several adjective modifiers, e.g. Tuvan *qïzïl bolyaš kök qarandaštar* 'red and blue pencils', it cannot comprise more than one noun modifier. Furthermore, noun modifiers and adjective modifiers cannot be coordinated with

each other. Thus, while it is possible to coordinate adjectives, e.g. Tuvan *čaraš bolyaš a:r örtektiy bilzek* 'the beautiful and expensive ring', a coordination such as **čaraš bolyaš altïn bilzek* 'the beautiful and golden ring' is not possible. Consequently, the use of the Turkish word *karanlık* in *karanlık ve gür orman* 'the dark and dense forest' shows that it is an adjective (Kuznecov 1976).

9. Further characteristics of adjectives

A few additional characteristics of adjectives will be mentioned here.

9.1. Participation in possessive constructions

An important criterion for nounhood in Turkic is the possibility of participating in possessive constructions of the type "noun + genitive + noun + possessive marker", and in possessive compounds of the type "noun + noun + possessive marker", e.g. Tuvan *bažïŋ-nïŋ eži-i* [house-GEN door-POSS.3P] 'the door of the house', *bažïŋ eži-i* [house door-POSS.3P] 'house door', Altay *bïčaq-tïŋ sab-ï* [knife-GEN handle-POSS.3P] 'handle of a / the knife', Tuvan *bižek sïʃv-ï* [knife handle-POSS.3P] 'knife-handle', Tofan *süye sïʃf-ï* [axe handle-POSS.3P] 'axe-handle'. Nouns take part in possessive constructions with other nouns. Nouns used in the identity apposition function, however, do not form possessive constructions with their heads, but are just adjoined to them.

Adjectives in their primary function of designating properties cannot occur in any of the two slots. In their secondary or tertiary nominalised function, designating bearers of the corresponding property or the property itself as an abstract entity, they can appear in both slots, e.g. Tuvan *eki-niŋ eki-zi* [good-GEN good-POSS.3SG] 'the best' (possessive compound of two nominalised adjectives). Compare Turkish *hasta* 'sick' in *hasta yatağ-ı* [sick bed-POSS.3P] 'sickbed' and *akıl hasta-sı* [mind sick-POSS.3P] 'insane person'.

9.2. Use in adverbal function

Many adjectives in plain form may, unlike nouns, be used in adverbal function, as modifier to a verb, e.g. Altay *yïlu kiyin-*, Tuvan *čïlïy kettin-* [warm dress] 'to dress warm', Tuvan *eki udu-* [good sleep] 'to sleep well', Khakas *suy tabrax ax-ča* [water fast flow-PRES] 'the water flows fast'.

9.3. Case government

Adjectives describing relations to entities cause the arguments referring to these entities to bear case markers or postpositions, e.g. Altay, Tuvan *bašqa*, Shor *pašqa*, Khakas *pasxa* (+ ablative) 'other (than)', Altay *d'üzündeš*, Khakas *tö:y*, Shor *čü:nnig*, Tuvan *dömey* (+ dative) 'similar (to)', Altay *qolbulu* (+ instrumental) 'connected (with)'. This is often the case with human propensity adjectives describing attitudes towards someone or something. The second argument, representing the entity towards whom or which the attitude is shown, may be expressed by an optional phrase marked by a case or a postposition, e.g. Tuvan *čoryа:r* (+ dative) 'proud (of)'. Nominalised relational adjectives are the only nouns that may govern cases and postpositions, e.g. Altay *bis-teŋ ïra:q* [we-ABL far] 'the one far from us', Khakas *ma-ya: čayïn-nar* [I-DAT near-PL] 'those close to me'.

9.4. Modification by adverbs

Adjectives may be modified by adverbs. When applied to adjectives susceptible to grading, premodifiers of this kind concern the descriptive content of the adjectives, e.g. Altay *sürekey yaqšï*, Khakas *uya: čaxsï*, Shor *mayat čaqšï*, Tofan *o:da ekï*, Tuvan *dïqa eki* 'very good', Tuvan *qončuy so:q* 'very cold', *a:žoq uluy* 'very big', Shor *tïŋ čü:nnig* 'very similar', Khakas *tïŋ tireŋ* 'very deep'.

9.5. Comparison

Lexemes describing scalable qualities may be marked for comparative or superlative degrees, e.g. Tuvan *uluy* 'big', *aˁrtïq uluy* 'bigger, *eŋ uluy* 'biggest'.

The parameter of comparison in constructions of the type 'X is more beautiful than Y' is almost exclusively filled by adjectives. A comparand, i.e. a standard of comparison, can be added as an additional argument ('than Y'), bearing an ablative marker, e.g. Altay *mï-naŋ ïra:q* [that-ABL distant] 'farther than that', Khakas *ay-daŋ čarïx* [moon-ABL bright] 'brighter than the moon', Tuvan *bažïŋ-dan bedik*, Tofan *öy-den bedïk* [house-ABL high] 'higher than the house'.

The superlative is formed analytically with particles such as *eŋ* 'most', e.g. Khakas *iŋ čaxsï*, Shor *eŋne čaqšï*, Tuvan *eŋ(ne) eki* [most good] 'best', Tuvan, Tofan *eŋ uluy* [most big] 'biggest'. It can also be expressed by a syntactic combination of a nominalised adjective in the ablative plus a plain adjective, e.g. Tuvan *eki-den eki* [good-ABL good] 'best', *ma:dïr-dan ma:dïr* [brave-ABL brave] 'most heroic', Khakas *ax-tan ax* [white-ABL white] 'whiter than white'. A third option is the combination of two nominalised adjectives, e.g. Khakas *čaxsï-niŋ čaxsï-zï*, Tuvan *eki-niŋ eki-zi* [good-GEN good-POSS.3P] 'best'.

Nouns normally lack these possibilities, e.g. Tuvan **a ʕrtïq daš* 'more stone', **eŋ daš* 'most stone'. However, nominalised gradable adjectives maintain this adjectival property and may thus participate in comparative constructions, e.g. Altay *eŋ yaqšï-zï* [most good-POSS.3P] 'the best one'. If noun modifiers were really adjectives, those representing scalable properties would be expected to take comparative and superlative markers.

There are exceptional cases, in which nouns representing typical qualities of certain entities may be used to describe these qualities. Khakas *at-tar-daŋ artïx at* [horse-PL-ABL more horse] 'the best of horses'. Such idiosyncratic usages do not disprove the nounness of *at* 'horse', just as *más brucha* 'more of a witch' does not invalidate the nounness of Spanish *brucha* 'witch'. In the same way, certain Turkish nouns are sometimes used to represent a property of which different degrees may be defined, e.g. *efendi* 'gentleman', *çok efendi* 'very much a gentleman', *daha efendi* 'more of a gentleman', *en efendi* 'most gentlemanly'; cf. *en kral köfteci* [most king meatball-maker], *daha bir kadın* [more a woman] (Braun & Haig 200: 86).

9.6. Intensifying and detensifying elements

Unlike nouns, Turkic adjectives may take intensifying and detensifying suffixes or particles of various kinds.

Intensive suffixes have comparative and similar functions, expressing high degrees of a given property: 'quite', 'rather', 'particularly', etc. Thus, East Old Turkic *-rAK* derives elatives and comparatives from adjectives and adverbs, e.g. *terin* 'deep' → *terin-rek* 'deeper', the only apparent exception being *beg-rek* from *beg* 'lord, master' (Erdal 1991: 62–63). Detensive suffixes and particles express a low degree of the property ('a little'), mostly colours, e.g. Tuvan *sarïγ* 'yellow' → *sarïγ-zïma:r* 'yellowish, *uluγ-zuma:r* 'rather too big, biggish', Tofan *sarïγ* 'yellow' → *sarïγ-sïγ* 'yellowish', Khakas *aq* 'white' → *aγ-amdïx* 'whitish', *xara* 'black' → *xara-mdïx* 'blackish'. The Khakas particle *arax* 'a little' has a similar function, e.g. *xïzïl arax* 'reddish'.

9.7. Partial intensity reduplication

Partial intensity reduplication occurs with a limited set of adjectives describing form, colour and other visible properties. The initial sequence *(C)V* of the adjective plus a consonant, mostly *p* or *m*, is preposed to the adjective, e.g. Khakas *xïzïl* 'red' → *xïp-xïzïl* 'blood-red', Tuvan *sarïγ* 'yellow' → *sap-sarïγ* 'very yellow', *aq* 'white' → *ap-aq* 'as white as snow', *qara* 'black' → *qap-qara* 'jet-black', *ča* 'new' → *čap-ča* 'brand new'. All old and modern Turkic languages use this device.

Tofan may form elatives by changing the last syllable of the adjective, e.g. *biči* 'small' → *biči:* 'very small', *bedik* 'high' → *bedi:* 'very high'.

10. Adjectivalising derivational suffixes

Derivational suffixes can be classified according to their ability to derive specific word classes from others. It is sometimes claimed that nouns and adjectives are not distinguished in Turkic word formation: the same suffixes are said to be used with all nominals (Grönbech 1936: 26).

It is true that certain Turkic derivational suffixes can be added to both nouns and adjectives, e.g. Turkish *çocuk-luk* 'childhood', *küçük-lük* 'smallness'. However, a number of derivational suffixes regularly form adjectives (Johanson 1998: 39–40).

Most native Turkic adjectives are, or go back to, derivations. Even in East Old Turkic texts it is difficult to find nonderived adjectives. Among the core semantic types, only a few adjectives, e.g. some colour adjectives, might be monomorphemic. As with many other Turkic languages, South Siberian Turkic displays adjective suffixes copied from other languages, e.g. Altay *-nïy*, *-skïy*, Khakas *-nay*, *-skay* from Russian. It is sometimes claimed that copied foreign suffixes have created the word class 'adjective' in Turkic. In fact, they have just contributed to the expansion of the inventories of adjectivalising devices.

Derived adjectives may of course be subject to markerless nominalisation according to the normal patterns, e.g. Tuvan *a ʕtïγ* 'provided with a horse' → 'horseman, rider on horseback', Shor *sayïštïγ* 'clever' → 'clever person', Tuvan *čïlïγ* 'warm' → warmth'.

10.1. The adjectivalising suffix type *-V(G)*

The old deverbal adjectivalising suffix type *-V(G)* is found in all South Siberian Turkic languages. Examples: Altay *ačï*, Khakas, Shor *ačïγ*, Tuvan *ažïγ*, Tofan *ačžïγ* 'sour, bitter', Khakas, Shor, Tuvan, Tofan *arïγ* 'clean', Khakas *ayïrïγ*, Tuvan, Tofan *a:rïγ* 'sick', Tuvan *bïžïγ* 'strong, hard', *či ʕdiγ* 'sharp', Altay *izü*, Khakas *ïzïg*, Shor *izig*, Tuvan *iziγ*, Tofan *i ʕsiγ* 'hot', Tuvan *dirïγ* 'alive', Altay *qatu*, Khakas *xatïγ*, Tuvan *qa ʕdïγ*, Tofan *qa ʕtïγ* 'hard', Altay *sarï*, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan, Tofan *sarïγ* 'yellow', Altay *toyu*, Tuvan *toduγ* 'full, satiated', Khakas, Tuvan, Tofan *uluγ* 'big', Tuvan *ölüγ* 'dead', Altay *yïlu*, Khakas, Shor, Tuvan, Tofan *čïlïγ* 'warm', Khakas *xoyïγ*, Tuvan *xoyuγ* 'thick', Khakas *xuruγ*, Shor *quruγ* 'dry'.

Compare East Old Turkic adjectives such as *arïγ* 'clean, pure', *tirig* 'alive', *qatïγ* 'hard', *ölüg* 'dead', *quruγ* 'dry', corresponding to Turkish *arı*, *diri*, *katı*, *ölü*, *kuru*.

10.2. The adjectivalising suffix type *-(V)K*

The old adjectivalising suffix type *-V(K)* is found in all South Siberian Turkic languages. Examples: Altay *ačïq*, Khakas *ačïx* 'open', Altay, Shor *artïq*, Tuvan *aʕrtïq*, Khakas *artïx* 'superfluous', Altay, Tuvan, Tofan *aqsaq* 'lame', Altay *čirik*, Khakas *ïrïk* 'rotten', Altay *yarïq*, Khakas *čarïx*, Tuvan *čïrïq* 'bright', Altay *uzaq* 'long', Altay *ïra:q* 'far', Altay *biyik*, Khakas *pözïk*, Tuvan *bedik*, Tofan *bedïk* 'high', Altay *quryaq* 'dry', Altay, Tuvan, Tofan *so:q*, Khakas *so:x*, Khakas *nïmzax*, Tuvan *čïmčaq*, Tofan *čïmčžaq* 'soft', Khakas *ni:k*, Tuvan *či:k* 'light', Khakas *tox* 'satiated', Khakas *üzïk*, Tuvan *üzük* 'torn', Tuvan *arïq* 'tired', Khakas *kirek* 'necessary', *pölïk* 'separated', Tuvan *buzuq* 'broken'.

Compare East Old Turkic adjectives such as *aqsaq* 'lame', *beδük* 'great', *soγïq* 'cold', *yïmšaq* 'soft', *toq* 'satiated', *kergek* 'necessary', corresponding to Turkish *aksak*, *büyük, soğuk*, *yumuşak*, *tok*, *gerek*.

10. 3. The adjectivalising suffix type *-lV(G)*

The adjective-forming suffix types also include *-lV(G)*, which produces "comitative" denominal adjectives with the meaning 'with, having, provided with, possessing, containing'. They answer questions such as 'provided with what?', e.g. Tuvan *čülüγ*.

Examples: Altay *qarlu*, Shor *qarlïγ*, Khakas, Tuvan *xarlïγ* 'snowy' ← 'snow', Altay *tu:lu*, Khakas, Shor *taylïγ* 'mountainous' ← 'mountain', Altay *su:lu*, Khakas *suγlïγ*, Shor, Tuvan *suγluγ* 'filled with water' ← 'water', Altay *süttü*, Khakas *süttïg*, Shor *süttig*, Tuvan *süttüγ* 'milky, with milk' ← 'milk', Altay *taštu*, Shor *taštïγ* 'stony' ← 'stone', Khakas *küstïg* 'strong' ← 'strength', Altay *buluttu*, Shor *puluttuγ* 'cloudy' ← 'cloud', Khakas *attïγ*, Tuvan *aʕttïγ* 'having a horse' ← 'horse', Altay *sayïštu*, Shor *sayïštïγ*, Tofan *sayïstïγ*, Tuvan *uγa:nnïγ* 'clever' ← 'intellect', Altay *ïrïstu*, Shor *ülüštüg* 'happy' ← 'happiness', Tofan *bö ʕrttüγ* 'with a cap' ← 'cap', *attïγ* 'with a / the name' ← 'name'.

The suffix can be added not only to individual lexemes but also to whole noun phrases, e.g. Khakas *uzun azax-tïγ* [long leg-ADJ] 'with long legs', *uluγ pas-tïγ* [big head-ADJ] 'with a big head', Tofan *öγ-ler-lïγ* [house-PL-ADJ] 'with houses', *ulica-lar-lïγ* [street-PL-ADJ] 'provided with streets', *bedïk öγ-ler-lïγ* [high house-PL-ADJ] 'with high houses', *qaʕš čïl-lïγ* [how.much year-ADJ] 'how old?'.

The products of this derivation may of course be subject to nominalisation, e.g. Tuvan *uγa:nnïγ* 'a / the clever person', *köstüktüg* 'somebody wearing spectacles'.

This suffix type has existed as an adjectivialising device in all Turkic languages known so far, also in East Old Turkic. I do not share the opinion that its general function in East Old Turkic "appears to have been the simple concatenation of two noun phrases" (Erdal 1991: 139). Its products behave in a manner typical of adjectives, e.g. assuming the comparative suffix *-rAK* as in *küč-lüg-rek* 'stronger'.

Grönbech (1936: 26–27) denies that it makes sense to define the East Old Turkic suffix as an adjective suffix. It would then not be comprehensible why it is attached to an 'adjective' such as *eδgü* 'good'. Rather, he claims, the suffix forms "nomina possessoris", the word *eδgü-lüg* meaning 'somebody who possesses goodness', etc. According to the analysis proposed in the present paper, however, *eδgü* is here a nominalised adjective used in its tertiary function, i.e. with the meaning 'goodness, virtue'. The derivate *eδgü-lüg* is an adjective formed from this stem and meaning 'possessing virtue, virtuous, meritorious'.

Like other adjectives, it may be subject to nominalisation, receiving a secondary meaning of 'somebody possessing virtue'. Erdal confirms that the East Old Turkic suffix "is added to all types of nominals, but hardly ever to adjectives as such" (1991: 147). It is a criterial fact that adjectivalising suffixes may not be added to underived adjectives in their primary function, but only to nominalised adjectives in their secondary or tertiary functions. For example, Turkish lacks items such as **korkak-lı* and **karanlık-lı* derived from *korkak* and *karanlık* in their primary meanings 'timid' and 'dark'. Turkish *kırmızı-lı* ← *kırmızı* 'red' cannot be used if *kırmızı* means 'red', but only if it is nominalised, referring to 'something that is red', e.g. 'having red parts' or 'dressed in red'.

10.4. Privative adjectives

The suffix type *-sVz*, meaning 'without, lacking, devoid of', produces privative adjectives in most Turkic languages. In South Siberian Turkic, the privative functions of the suffix type *-sVz* are fulfilled by the adjectives *yoq*, *čoq, čox* 'non-existing', which express 'without, lacking, devoid of', e.g. Altay *küč-i yoq*, Khakas *küz-i čox* [strength-POSS.3P non-existing] 'weak' (cf. Kirghiz *kücsüz*), Khakas *axča čox*, Tuvan *aqša čoq* 'without money, poor' (Kirghiz *aqčasïz*), Altay *su: yoq*, Tuvan *suγ čoq* [water non-existing] 'without water' (Kirghiz *su:suz*), Altay *uč-ï yoq* [end-POSS.3P non-existing] 'endless' (Kirghiz *učsuz*), Tuvan *ün čoq* [sound non-existing] 'silent' (Kirghiz *ünsüz*).

These adjectives can be nominalised to acquire secondary and tertiary meanings, e.g. Tuvan *aqša čoq* (*kiži*) 'the / a poor one', Altay *zakon yoγ-ï* 'lawlessness' (Kirghiz *zakon-suz-duq*).

East Old Turkic adjectives in *-sVz*, e.g. *suβsVz* 'without water', *kirsVz* 'without dirt, pure', *ögsVz* 'without conscience, unconscious', can be nominalised to get a secondary function, denoting somebody or something characterised by the primary adjective meaning, e.g. *yayïsVz* 'without enemies' → 'someone who lacks enemies'. They may also be nominalised to get a tertiary function, denoting the property

expressed as an abstract entity, e.g. *kirsVz* 'purity', *ögsVz* 'unconsciousness', *yaγïsVz* 'freedom from enemies', *beksVz* 'infirmity', *kèrtüsVz* 'untruthfulness'.

10.5. Other adjectivalising suffixes

A further adjectivalising suffix is *-KI*, expressing temporal or local affiliation, i.e. answering questions such as 'relating to what time?' and 'situated where?'. Examples: Khakas *pü:l-gi* [this.year-ADJ] 'relating to this year', *suγ-da-γï* [water-LOC-ADJ] 'lying in the water', Altay *eŋir-de-gi* [evening-LOC-ADJ] 'related to the evening', *ayïl-da-γï* [village-LOC-ADJ] 'located in the village', Shor *ayaq-ta-γï süt* [bowl-LOC-ADJ milk] 'the milk in the bowl'. In Tuvan, this suffix is used in temporal function only, answering to the question *qažanγï* 'relating to what time?', e.g. *küs-kü* [autumn-ADJ] 'autumnal'; cf. Tofan *qïš-qï:* [winter-ADJ] 'winterly, relating to winter'.

The highly productive denominal suffix *-ČI* forms words meaning 'active with regard to the concept expressed by the stem', e.g. Altay, Shor, Tuvan *aŋ-či*, Khakas *aŋ-ǰi*, Tofan *aŋ-šï* [game-AG] (1) 'hunting (pursuing game)', (2) 'hunter', Khakas, Tuvan *iš-či* [work-AG] (1) 'working', (2) 'worker', Altay *bičik-či* [script-AG] (1) 'literate (able to read and write)', (2) 'literate (someone who can read and write)', Altay *tögün-či*, Tuvan *mege-či* [lie-AG] (1) 'deceitful', (2) 'liar'.

Though the products of this derivation are mostly taken to be nouns due to their frequent reference to persons, they might rather be considered adjectives that are readily nominalised. Compare Azerbaijanian *arxa-çï* [back-AG] (1) 'backing, supportive', (2) 'supporter'. Adjectives of this kind are known in East Old Turkic already, e.g. *armaq-či* [game-AG] (1) 'deceptive', (2) 'deceiver', (3) 'deceitfulness' (*armaq-čisin üčün* 'because of his deceitfulness'; Erdal 1991: 126).

The same is true of the historically complex deverbal adjective suffixes of the type *-V(G) + -ČI*, e.g. Altay *üred-üčï*, Shor *ügred-igčï*, Tuvan *ö:red-ikči* [teach-AG] (1) 'teaching', (2) 'teacher', Tuvan *al-ïqčï* [take-AG] (1) 'receiving', (2) 'receiver', *nomču-qču* [read-AG] (1) 'reading', (2) 'reader', Khakas *iz-e:čï* [drink-AG] (1) drinking', (2) 'drinker'. Compare East Old Turkic *tapïγči* (1) 'serving', (2) 'servant', Turkish *kurucu* (1) 'founding', (2) 'founder', *ezici* (1) 'crushing', (2) 'crusher', *yırtıcı* (1) 'tearing', (2) 'predator'. Compare also primarily adjectival items such as Latin *agens* (1) 'driving', (2) 'driver' (>> English *agent*), *docens* (1) 'teaching', (2) 'teacher' (>> German *Dozent*, *Lehrender*).

Scalable adjectives of these two types may be modified by adverbs expressing degrees, e.g. Turkish *en yalancı* 'most deceitful', *çok ezici* 'very overwhelming'.

11. Adjectives derived from verbs

Since verbal coding allows object arguments, relational notions are often expressed by verbs in Turkic languages. This is true of human propensity items describing attitudes towards someone or something, e.g. Altay *sü:n-* 'to be happy (about)', Tuvan *ada:rγa-*, *xünne-* 'to be jealous (of)', Altay *qorqï-*, Shor *qoruq-*, Khakas *xorïx-* 'to be afraid (of)', Altay *ačïn-* 'to be angry (at / about)'.

It is thus also natural that adjectives of these kinds are often derived from verbs. It is a striking fact that most Turkic adjectives of the core types are of verbal origin, derived from verbs through adjectivalisation processes. There are not only synchronically transparent cases such as Altay *o:rïγan* 'sick' ← *o:ru-* 'to fall ill' and Tuvan *arγan* 'meagre' ← *ar-* 'become / be meagre,' *qïrγan* 'old' ← *qïrï-* 'to grow old'. Etymological data indicate essentially verbal coding of prototypically adjectival concepts. Derivations of these deverbal types include numerous adjectives expressing dimension, physical property, position, etc. Thus the Turkic dimension adjectives for 'long' and 'short', *uzun*, *qïsγa* etc., are derived from verbs meaning 'to become / be long' and 'to compress', respectively (Clauson 1972: 281, 288–289, 665–667).

This means that Turkic adjectives derived from verbs also include the types most closely associated with adjective classes in the languages of the world. It tells us that Turkic adjectives at archaic stages of development have been essentially 'verb-like', i.e. similar to verbs in their grammatical behavour. Although this is not the topic of the present article, we must call attention to the fact that similar structures are found in Mongolic and Tungusic.

What about Korean and Japanese, typologically similar languages that are sometimes claimed to be genetically related to "the other Altaic languages" (Miller 1971)? The adjective class in Korean is clearly verb-like (Ramstedt 1939: 34–35, 129–30). In Japanese the same is essentially true. Adjectives of the so-called *i*-class are similar to verbs in their grammatical behaviour, taking most of the inflections available to verbs. They have developed from deverbal nominals provided with a suffix *-ki*, e.g. Old Japanese *kataki* 'to be hard' ← *kata* 'something hard, solid'. (Compare Turkic *qat-* 'to become / be hard'; Old Japanese *katakute* morphologically parallels the East Old Turkic adverb *qatïγdï* 'firmly' ← *qatïγ* 'hard, firm'; Miller 1971: 286–287.) This archaic class includes items that are typically associated with adjective classes across languages, i.e. all age, colour and speed items as well as most items expressing dimension and physical property (see Dixon 2001).

12. Lexicalised highfocal postterminals

Many verb-like adjectives are lexicalised old participles, often originally highfocal postterminals exhibiting diathetic versatility, i.e. offering active or passive interpretations according to the actant structure (see Johanson 1999: 108–120).

Derived from intransitives, they express a property of the first actant, an intransitive subject (S). Examples: Tuvan *ölüγ* 'dead' ← *öl-* 'to die', *qaʿdïγ* 'hard' ← *qaʿdï-* 'to become hard', Khakas *aγïrïγ* 'sick' ← *aγïr-* 'to become sick'. Compare Turkish *soğuk* 'cold' ← *soğu-* 'to become cold', *yatık* 'lying' ← *yat-* 'to lie down / lie', English *gone* ← *go*, German *gestorben* 'dead' ← *sterben* 'to die'.

Derived from transitives, they express a property of the second actant, a transitive object (O). Examples: Tuvan *aʿžïq* 'open' ← *aʿš-* 'to open', *üzük* 'torn' ← *üz-* 'to tear', Khakas *pölīk* 'separated' ← *pöl-* 'to separate'. Compare Turkish *açık* 'open' ← *aç-* 'to open', *yırtık* 'torn' ← *yïrt-* 'to tear', English *closed* ← 'to close', German *getötet* 'killed' ← *töten* 'to kill'.

13. Paradigmatic participles

Paradigmatic, i.e. non-lexicalised, participles are commonly taken to be of adjectival nature. A participle such as Altay *kel-gen*, formed with *-GAn*, can be used as modifier or head in noun phrases, e.g. *kelgen kiži* 'a / the person who has come', *kelgen* 'somebody / something that has come'. In both functions, the participle may be said to serve as nucleus of a relative clause, 'who / which has come'. Forms such as *kelgen* are thus often said to be headless relative clauses.

However, the primary affiliation of those participles might also be analysed the other way around. Thus, *kelgen* might be regarded as a noun primarily functioning as nominal head (*kelgen*) and as such capable of occurring as identity apposition (*kelgen kiži*). Although this problem cannot be dealt with here, it should be noted that participles such as *kelgen* lack several typically adjectival properties. In particular, they cannot be used adverbally as adjectives commonly do. Verbal adverbs always take special converb forms such as *kelip*, which cannot be used as nouns or adjectives.

14. Conclusion

In spite of a long history of research, scholars have failed to recognise and prove the existence of the distinct word classes 'noun' and 'adjective' in Turkic. This is mainly due to the prejudice that an adjective class cannot have grammatical properties partly different from those in European languages. The situation in Turkic has thus been thought to provide evidence for nondiscrete word classes.

A detailed examination of internal grammatical properties, e.g. in the South Siberian Turkic languages, makes the difference between adjectives and nouns clearly visible. Several properties taken together provide a firm basis for the distinction. The syntactic and semantic regularities need to be studied carefully. 'Noun-like' properties resulting from systematic markerless secondary and tertiary derivation do not invalidate the existence of a word class of primarily adjectival nature. Talking of 'adjectives functioning as nouns' is far from nonsensical. On the other hand, we hardly find evidence for 'nouns functioning as adjectives', just nouns occurring as adnominal modifiers of the identity apposition type.

Finally, it is an interesting historical fact that most Turkic adjectives of the core types are of verbal origin, derived from verbs through adjectivalisation processes.

Acknowledgement

Work on this article was carried out while the author was Visiting Fellow at the Research Centre for Linguistic Typology (RCLT), Institute for Advanced Studies, La Trobe University. Sincere thanks are due to Bob Dixon and Sasha Aikhenvald—as well as to all Research Fellows, Visiting Fellows and PhD students working at RCLT—for most fruitful discussions. I have also profited very much from discussions with Nonna Sagaan, Visiting Researcher at the University of Mainz. I am grateful to Edith Moravcsik for highly valuable comments on a first draft of the article.

Transcription and abbreviations

The transcription follows the principles applied in Johanson, L. & Csató, É. Á. (eds) 1998. *The Turkic languages*. London: Routledge. The sign *γ* stands for fricative velars and velars vacillating between fricative and stop. The sign ʿ stands for the so-called pharyngealisation in Tuvan and Tofan words.

Abbreviations used in the glosses: ABL ablative, ACC accusative, ADJ adjectivaliser, AG agentive, DAT dative, GEN genitive, LOC locative, P person, PL plural, POSS possessive, SG singular.

References

Baskakov, N. A. 1958. *Altajskij jazyk. (Vvedenie v izučenie altajskogo jazyka i ego dialektov)*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Braun, F. & Haig, G. 2000. The noun/adjective distinction in Turkish: An empirical approach. In: Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (eds). *Studies on Turkish and Turkic languages*. (Turcologica 46.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 85–92.

Clauson, G, 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Dixon, R. M. W. 1977. Where have all the adjectives gone? In: *Studies in Language* 1, 19–80. [Revised version published as pp. 1–62 of Dixon 1982.]
Dixon, R. M. W. 1982. *Where have all the adjectives gone? and other essays in semantics and syntax.* Berlin: Mouton.
Dixon, R. M. W. 2001. Adjective classes. [Position paper for the International Workshop on Adjective Classes, Research Centre for Linguistic Typology, La Trobe University, 2002.]
Erdal, M. 1991. *Old Turkic word formation. A functional approach to the lexicon.* 1–2. (Turcologica 7.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Godel, R. 1945. *Grammaire turque.* Genève: Université de Genève.
Grönbech, K. 1936. *Der türkische Sprachbau.* 1. Kopenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard.
Hopper, P. J. & Thompson, S.A. 1984. The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language* 60: 703–752.
Isxakov, F. G. & Pal'mbax, A. A. 1961. *Grammatika tuvinskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija.* Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury.
Johanson, L. 1990. Studien zur türkeitürkischen Grammatik. In: Hazai, György (ed.). *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft.* 1. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 146–278.
Johanson, L. 1998. The structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, L. & Csató, É. Á. (eds). 1998. *The Turkic languages.* London: Routledge. 30–66.
Johanson, L. 1999. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Östen (ed.). *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe.* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 27–187.
Kuznecov, P. I. 1976. K voprosu ob imeni prilagatel'nom v tureckom jazyke. *Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* 1976: 6, 3–14.
Miller, R. A. 1971. *Japanese and the other Altaic languages.* Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.
Ramstedt, G. J. 1939. *A Korean grammar.* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 82.) Helsinki.
Seiler, H. 1960. *Relativsatz, Attribut und Apposition.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Swift, Ll. B. 1963. *A reference grammar of Modern Turkish.* (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic series 19.) The Hague: Mouton & Co.
Thompson, S. A. 1989. A discourse approach to the cross-linguistic category 'adjective'. In: Corrigan, R. & Eckman, F. & Michael Noonan, M. (eds). *Linguistic categorization.* (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science 4, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 61.) Amsterdam: Benjamins. 254–265.

Библейская терминология в шорском языке

Геннадий В. Косточаков

Библейская терминология в шорский язык стала проникать в 80-ые годы X1X века. Связано это с несколькими причинами, среди которых важнейшими были следующие две.

С 40-ых годов X1X века на Алтае, куда географически входит и Шория, стала действовать Алтайская духовная миссия. Главной ее целью было приобщение коренных жителей Алтая к православной вере и введение литургии на их родных языках. Для этого началась кропотливая и долгая работа по переводу Библии сначала на алтайский (телеутский) язык, затем уже и на другие языки. Лишь в 80-ые годы X1X века очередь дошла до шорского языка.

В начале 80-ых годов X1X века работа по переводу Библии на шорский язык была завершена и опробована на практике. В 1883 году в Казани вышла *Священная история на шорском наречии* [Анон. 1883, см. также Анон. 1884]. Переводчик не указан, но известно, что руководителем перевода и богословским редактором был начальник Кузнецкого (Шорского) отделения Алтайской миссии священник-миссионер В. И. Вербицкий, а переводчиком был семинарист Казанской духовной семинарии И. М. Штыгашев. Впоследствии В. И. Вербицкий стал протоиереем, а И. М. Штыгашев – священником-миссионером и начальником Матурского отделения Алтайской духовной миссии.

Понятно, что без наличия шорской библейской терминологии перевести Библию было невозможно.

Кроме того, библейская терминология снова стала утверждаться в шорском языке через сто с лишним лет после первого перевода Библии. Речь идет о том, что в 90-ые годы XX века под эгидой Института перевода Библии было переведено на шорский язык «Евангелие от Марка» (Косточаков 2004).

Для образования библейских терминов в шорском языке выбиралось два пути:

1) использовались и переосмыслялись
   a. термины, присущие шаманистской религии;
   b. слова, не имевшие к религии отношения;
2) давались описательные объяснения терминов на родном языке;
3) заимствовались термины из русского языка.