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

The domains referring value and age seem to appear as a part of the domain of physical characteristics and because of the low number of its members they have not became subjects of consideration. The correlation between domains and suffixes are not exclusive, e.g.: suffix of colour also occurs in dimension and physical characteristics, e.g. kolsajku ‘long’ etc. Suffixes -əgə and -əəgə clearly cover their own domain. Among the causes of the overlaps the different productivity of the suffixes, the different degrees of semantic transparency of the derivated forms and the unclear origin of the suffixes with their unclear etymology can also be mentioned.

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

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

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

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

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

2. Description: The derivation of Adjectives

2.1. Verbs vs. Adjectives

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

san'ku-tua [PtPrs] ‘strong’

san'ka-gəə [Adj] ‘strong’

2.2. Nouns vs. Adjectives

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

The prototypical property concept words typically bear nominal characteristics. However, there are far more static verbs in the domain of human propensity. In the case of words expressing physical properties, there is a tendency for the same stem to have both verbal and adjectival forms.
The most important distinction between nouns and adjectives lies in their derivation: there are moderative suffixes of gradable adjectives (e.g. hirəəgə́ ‘tall’ > hira-ʔiškii ‘a bit taller’) and pure adjectival suffixes.

2.3. Word formation of the core adjectives in Nganasan

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

2.4. “Adjectival” suffixes

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

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

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

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

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

bahi-əgə́ ‘smell and taste of wild deer’
đebtu-əgə́ ‘smell and taste of goose’
ŋəbta-əgə́ ‘smell of an old person’

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

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

Basu-tu ənasa kinta-əgə́ d'indiʔə.

‘The hunter smelled smoke.’
ŋəntu-ŋu-nu  kinta-əgə́ ʒuŋuʔə.

nostril-LOC-GENPx3SG smog-Ntaste hear-Aor3SG

‘He/She smelled smoke in his/her nostrils.’

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

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

d'irińəəgə́ ‘fatty (smell or taste of fat)’
būńəəgə́ ‘1. taste of water, watery, 2. taste or smell of vodka’
kiriba ńəəgə́ ‘something tastes like bread’
čajńəəgə́ čaj ‘fine tea / a drink that tastes like tea’

The Nganasan–Russian dictionary by Kosterkina-Momde-Zhdanova (=KMZ, 2001) (one in which the above-mentioned suffix occurs for the first time) contains this suffix as a separate entry, with the remark that it may as well be written solid with the preceding word. This fact also shows the uncertainty concerning its classification.
This affix has only one form, however there is a rare variant -ňəə – but this form is a result of an immense process of grammaticalization.

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

\(\text{bahi} \) ‘wild reindeer’ \(\text{bahi}(-?)\text{ittü} \)

\(\text{hot} \) ‘onion’ \(\text{hotəə}(-?)\text{ittü} \)

The variant \(\text{bahi}(-?)\text{ittü} \) is formed in the following manner: \(\text{bahi}(-?)\text{ittü} \). The segment \(-(-?)\text{ittü} \) serves as a so-called sensitive suffix (Wagner-Nagy 2002: 131), to express likeness to a certain sensation; the suffix \(-\text{ittü} \) is an imperfective coaffix\((-\text{NTU})\) expressing time; and the 3rd person singular has a zero suffix. An interesting process of grammaticalization occurs in which these affixes are concerned. Besides noun phrases involving the suffix \(-\text{ittü} \), verb phrases of the same meaning can also be formed, e.g.:

\(\text{hotəə} \) ‘onion’ \(\text{hotəə}(-?)\text{ittü} \)

\(\text{bahi} \) ‘wild reindeer’ \(\text{bahi}(-?)\text{ittü} \)

The word ending \(-\text{ittü} \) is recognised as a suffix and this is what is omitted, irrespective of the stem. The following analyses are possible:

\(\text{dir} \) ‘fat’ \(\text{dirəə}(-?)\text{ittü} \)

or: \(-\text{ittü} \)

According to one of the variants, \(\text{dir} \) is the stem, but \(-\text{ittü} \) is supposed to be a suffix – which is completely unknown in the Nganasan language. In the other version, the stem is \(\text{dirəə} \), but no stem like this is known in the language. So we are witnessing a re-analysis, in addition to a process of grammaticalization.

It is obviously difficult to define a precise difference in function between these suffixes – this can be a reason for the creation of a variant such as \(\text{dirəə}(-?)\text{ittü} \). The choice of the suffixes can be influenced by the phonological structure of the base word as well. I aim to support this statement with the following facts:

(i) no suffix \(-\text{ittü} \) is connected to CVC stems (e.g. \(\text{čaəəj} \), \(\text{dəər} \); therefore the variants \*\(\text{čaəəj} \), \*\(\text{dəər} \) are not well-formed. In case the second consonant of the stem prohibits \(-\text{ittü} \) as a following consonant (e.g. \(-\text{k} \) in Rus. \(\text{luk} \)), it excludes \(-\text{ittü} \) as well. In such cases, \(-\text{ittü} \) will be added (\(\text{lukəə} \).)

(ii) CVV stems (e.g. \(\text{taa} \)) also make it impossible to add \(-\text{ittü} \) (*\(\text{taa}+\text{ittü} \), \*\(\text{taa} \)).

2.4.3. The -Kǝ suffix

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Kǝ</td>
<td>-gǝ (= -gəə)</td>
<td>-gə</td>
<td>-gə</td>
<td>-gəə</td>
<td>-gə(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\(\text{čejkǝǝgə} \) ‘quiet, modest’ \(\sim\) \(\text{čejkǝǝgə} \) ‘quiet, modest person’, \(\text{česəgə} \) ‘cold’ \(\sim\) \(\text{česəgə} \) ‘coldness, freeze’, \(\text{dəəsəgə} \) ‘wet’ \(\sim\) \(\text{dəəsəgə} \) ‘wetness’, \(\text{hekəgə} \) ‘warm’ \(\sim\) \(\text{hekəgə} \) ‘warmth’, \(\text{hojiməgə} \) ‘dark’ \(\sim\) \(\text{hojiməgə} \) ‘darkness’, \(\text{ňeɾsə(ǝ)} \) \(\text{gəə} \) ‘hostile, enemy, full of hatred’ \(\sim\) \(\text{ňeɾsə(ǝ)} \) ‘enemy’.

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

\(\text{hekə-gəə} \) ‘warm’ > \(\text{hekəgə} \) ‘warmth’ + -ə [NKL] ‘warm’.

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

\(\text{hekə-} \) ‘warm’ > \(\text{hekəgə} \) ‘warmth’ → \(\text{hekəgə-} \).
Since data provided by Castrén, Helimski and the KMZ-dictionary are more reliable from a phonological point of view than those given by Tereshchenko and Labanauskas, I wish to support the first theory here. I collected 45 lexemes consisting -gə(ə) suffix and expressing property concept, such as dọhta-ga(ə) ‘thin’ (KMZ44), dera-ga(ə) ‘thick, fat’ (KMZ40), hīra-ga(ə) ‘tall, high’ (KMZ193), tanta-ga(ə) ‘wide’ (KMZ171), dajsa-ga(ə) ‘noisy’ (T112), dən(ə)-gə(ə) ‘hard’ (CS2: janagą), darsa-ga(ə) ‘favourite’ (KMZ56), dūha-ga(ə) ‘soft’ (KMZ52), kata-ga(ə) ‘light, bright’ (KMZ63), kasa-ga(ə) ‘clever, skillful’ (KMZ84), mera-ga(ə) ‘fast’ (KMZ97) etc.

There are words where the suffix can definitely be separated from the stem, but there are no examples for adjectival use at all: dura-ga ‘sickness’ (T112, JN27), darsa-ga ‘moisture, dampness, humidity’ (KMZ57), nujha-ga ‘sad, sombre (person)’ (KMZ120), hika-ga ‘terror’ (Ma76).

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

| darsa-ga(ə) | ‘favourite’ | ḍarsi- ‘to like’ (KMZ56) |
| dūha-ga(ə) | ‘soft’ | ḍūhī ‘blanket (for children on a sled)’ (KMZ52) |
| dūra-ga(ə) | ‘deep’ | ḍūrī ‘depth’ (KMZ50) |
| hīla-ga(ə) | ‘dangerous, fearful’ | hīla ‘fearful (thing)’ (KMZ208) |
| hīra-ga(ə) | ‘high, tall’ | hīra ‘height, degree, level’ (KMZ193) |
| homo-ga(ə) | ‘sharp’ | ?? homa ‘edge; scythe’ (B44) |
| hora-ga(ə) | ‘tidy’ | ?? hora ‘face’ (KMZ198) |
| hur-ga(ə) | ‘steep’ | ?? hurajku ‘mound, hill, heap’ (KMZ206) |
| kata-ga(ə) | ‘shining, bright’ | kata-r ‘light, shine’ (KMZ60) |
| mera-ga(ə) | ‘fast’ | mera ‘quickly; soon’ (KMZ97) |
| namna-ga(ə) | ‘fine, delicious’ | ? namu ‘meat’ (KMZ144), nam- ‘eat’ (KMZ143) |
| nujha-ga(ə) | ‘long’ | nujḥa-r [Gen-PO(ALL)] ‘far away’ |
| tonsa-ga(ə) | ‘storm, energetic’ | ?? tonsl ‘storm’ (KMZ175) |
| ḡu(ŋ)ka-ga(ə) | ‘many’ | ḡu(ŋ)ko ‘quantity’ (KMZ137), ḡu(ŋ)ko ‘many’ (KMZ138) |
| dara-ga(ə) | ‘ill’ | ḍarih ‘pain’ (KMZ56), ḍarə ‘pain’ (KMZ57) |

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

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

2. There are numerous adjectives expressing PHYSICAL PROPERTIES (such as weight, surface, temperature etc.): these do take the suffix in question, but the number and ratio of the dimensional adjectives is much higher (because of the higher degree of semantic heterogeneity of this semantic type): ḍera-ga(ə) ‘thick, fat’, ḍōhta-ga(ə) ‘thin, narrow’, dūra-ga(ə) ‘deep’, hīra-ga(ə) ‘high, tall’, mako-ga(ə) ‘shallow, low’, nujha-ga(ə) ‘long’, tanta-ga(ə) ‘wide’

3. While dimensional adjectives involving the suffix -Kɵ do not have a verbal stem, adjectives depicting physical properties with the same suffix generally do: there can be only one form (nominal) of the dimensional adjectives involving the suffix -Kɵ in attributive position, whereas adjectives of physical properties with the suffix -Kɵ in attributive position may appear as present participles. This difference may arise from the fact that
participial forms express less permanent properties. Practical language use seems to prove that these forms are more common. Here are some examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word class</th>
<th>Nganasan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'high, tall'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'wide'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'thin, narrow'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'long'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'deep'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL PROPERTY.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'cold'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PtImp</td>
<td>česitiə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'hot'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PtImp</td>
<td>hekuəə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'hard'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PtImp</td>
<td>nosiçiə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'soft'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'heavy'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PtImp</td>
<td>səŋkutuə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'easy'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'bitter'</td>
<td>Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PtImp</td>
<td>təɾuɾuə</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some adjectives exhibit the suffix -kəə on the surface: kors'iy-kəə ‘hearty, kind’ (KMZ69), labə-kəə ‘smallest/youngest child in the family’ (KMZ85), nalan-kəə ‘joyful, brimming with life’ (HM39, HM71), nim-kəə ‘older, senior’ (KMZ116), ŋil-e-kəə ‘own, born, related to’ (KMZ132), ĕojbu-kəə ‘leader (shaman)’ (KMZ134), talaN-kəə ‘lucky, successful’ (KMZ170).

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

kors ‘thought, mind, soul’ (KMZ69)
labsə ‘cradle’ (KMZ85)
ŋilə ‘own’ (KMZ132)
ŋojbu ‘main, head of, leader’ (KMZ134), see ŋojbuə ‘head’ (KMZ134)
nim ‘name’ (KMZ115)
tala ‘success, luck’ (KMZ170)

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

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

4.4.4. The suffix -Kuə ~ -JKuə

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

(1) -Ka ~ -Kaʔa
(2) -Kuə ~ -JKuə
This chart contains 55 words. This particular suffix generally appears in colour terms, e.g. *dabakua ‘red’* (KMZ52), *d'enafajku ‘colourless, transparent, light’* (KMZ38), *d'irbaku ‘grey (haired)’* (KMZ43), *doakua ‘muddy (as color)’* (KMZ44), *d'odakua ‘muddy, grey*, *hocaįkua ‘light, bright’* (KMZ199), *kicąįkua ‘grey’* (KMZ65), *todaĮku ‘yellow ~ (brown, grey)’* (KMZ174), *tusajku ‘black’* (KMZ181), *tumakų ‘sem-dark, opaque, dull’* (T79), but in another types as well, e.g. *dąbįkua ‘chattering, talkative’* (HM43), *d'erbajku ‘thick’* (KMZ39), *lomnajku ‘round’* (KMZ95), *nujba ‘sharp, sharp’* (KMZ119), *siiųjų(k) kuo ‘peaceful, calm’* (KMZ166), *tingajku ‘wide, spacious’* (KMZ183), *tobsiķiu ‘uncommon’* (KMZ174) etc.

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

| mandajku | mandajku ‘round/circle’ (KMZ94, 95) |
| laļųjąku | laļųjąku ‘flat, round, oval sg (e.g. face)’ (KMZ86) |
| salajku | salajku ‘dirt, mud; muddy’ (KMZ147) |
| kąbųjku | kąbųjku ‘saucer; flatness, flat subject’ (KMZ58) |

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

| *d'irba* | ‘white frost’ (KMZ43) |
| *sir* | ‘1. salt; 2. white; 3. grey (haired)’ (KMZ160) |
| *siumų* | ‘calm, silence, stillness of air’ (KMZ166) |
| ? *tingia* | ‘1. gap, 2. free time’ (KMZ183) |
| ? *tusų* | ‘new-born deer’ > *todaĮku ‘yellow ~ brown ~ grey’* (KMZ178) |

I am inclined to treat these two suffixes as allomorphs of a single suffix. Except for the words *aniųka ‘big’* and *bońdika ‘all*, hardly any words take the suffix -Ka. The rest of the words call for the following analysis:

I consider the suffix -Jkus – -Jkūs to be a compound suffix: -Jkus ~ -Jkūs, supposing a probable loss of productivity and re-analysis. Therefore, only the suffix ι is to be treated as such at the end of words (this is a productive and quite frequent relational adjectival suffix, Wagner-Nagy 2002: 87). The augmentative suffix (-?) is taken by the stem of the relational adjectival suffix ending in -ku. The above-mentioned augmentative suffix connects to the genitive stem. In the case of stems ending in U, a change of vowels -e > a (e.g. *sirū ‘winter’* Nom > *sirą Pl.Gen) often occurs, and the ι of the augmentative suffix is assimilated.

| norba-ku | norba- (bound stem) + -Jkus ~ -Jkūs ‘restless, reckless’ |
| norbaku-ι | norbaku- ‘restlessness, recklessness’ + ι ‘restless, reckless’ |
| norbaku-α | norbaku- + α ‘restless, reckless’ |

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

**4.4.5. The suffixes -JsuKų and -Ka**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective form</th>
<th>other forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bąka-sąka</em> ‘happy, joyful’ (KMZ232)</td>
<td>*bąka-bių-sį [VKaus] ‘to cheer up sy’ (KMZ32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dąbų-sąka</em> ‘danger; dangerous’ (KMZ53)</td>
<td>No other data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kando-sąka</em> ‘hurtful’ (KMZ61)</td>
<td>? *kando-sısa ‘to go down, to hide (sun)’ (KMZ61); *kanto-wa ‘to hide (sun)’ (KMZ61); *kanto-wa ‘to hide’ (KMZ61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mańąn-sąka</em> ‘interesting’ (KMZ103)</td>
<td>*mańąn-sı ‘to like; to love’ (KMZ284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nųja-sąka</em> ‘pretty, alluring’ (KMZ119)</td>
<td>*nųja-b투-suδSql-sısa [VKaus-Pię-Piłu-PlPn-Sg1] ‘allure’ (HM103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nįriņ-sąka</em> ‘noisy’ (KMZ133)</td>
<td>*nįriņį-nit-sı [VIMP-Pię-Sg3] (MUS35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nųjan-sąka</em> ‘1. interesting; 2. surprised, wonderful’ (KMZ145, H65)</td>
<td>*nųja-n-sı [INF] ‘to be surprised’ (T177, T223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*nųja-n-sı [NACT] ‘astonishment’ (T47, T60, T65, T114, B61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hīlant-sąga</em> ‘fearful’ (KMZ209)</td>
<td>*hīt-hı̃msı ‘to get frightened’ (KMZ209), *hīt-m}sja ‘fright’ (KMZ209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>saląsąka</em> ‘difficult’ (KMZ147)</td>
<td>No other data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A suffix -Kə can also be identified (Wagner-Nagy 2002:87):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASTE &amp; SMELL</td>
<td>-Kə</td>
<td>kolIaga ‘smell and taste of fish’, hotaIaga ‘smell and taste of onion’ etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASTE</td>
<td>-səqə</td>
<td>kiribaIaga ‘bread-tasted’, sirIaIaga ‘salty’ etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td>-Kə</td>
<td>hiraIaga ‘tall, high’, dIurIaga ‘deep’, taniIaga ‘wide’ etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL PROP.</td>
<td>-Kə (or -NTU) [Pr1Mp]</td>
<td>hekIaga ~ hekutia ‘warm’, merIaga ~ meritIa ‘fast’ etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOUR</td>
<td>-JKUə</td>
<td>tusajkuə ‘black’, dIabakkuə ‘red’ etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN PROP.</td>
<td>-Kə, -səsəKə</td>
<td>maansəka ‘interesting’, (but mostly stative verbs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The domains referring to VALUE and AGE seem to appear as part of the domain of PHYSICAL PROPERTIES but, because of the limited number of their members they have not been considered here. The correlation between domains and suffixes is not exclusive, they may overlap, when, for instance, a suffix of COLOUR also occurs in
DIMENSION and in physical properties, e.g. *kolsajkə* ‘long’ etc. The suffixes -əgə and ńəəgə clearly have their own domain.

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

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

**Abbreviations:**

- **AOR** = aorist
- **ARC** = relational adjectival suffix
- **GEN** = genitive
- **PRIMP** = imperfective participle
- **INF** = infinitive
- **PX** = possessive suffix
- **LOC** = locative
- **SEN** = sensitive
- **NOM** = nominative
- **SG** = singular

**Abbreviations of sources:**

- B = Bol’dt 1989
- Ba = Bol’dt 1974
- B76 = Bol’dt 1976
- C = Castrén 1855
- FN = Labanauskas 1992
- H = Helimski 1997
- HM = Helimskij 1994
- JN = Aron – Momde 1992
- KMZ = Kosterkina et al. 2001
- KNS = Kosterkina et al. 1997
- L01 = Labanauskas 2001
- Ma = Mikola 1970
- MU = Cheremisina–Kovalenko 1986
- SK = Skazki 1976
- SN = Skazki 1980
- SNa = Gluhij et al. 1981
- T = Tereščenko 1979
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Северны ЫН.

СЛОВООБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫЕ СУФФИКСЫ КАК ИЛИ КЛАССИФИКАТОРЫ? СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЕ ПРИЛАГАТЕЛЬНЫХ НГАНАСАНСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

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

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

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

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

Ключевые слова: словообразование, прилагательные, нганасанский язык.

Список литературы


Castrén M. A. Grammatik der samojedischen Sprachen, St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1854.


Лабанаускас К. (ред.) Нганасанский фольклор // Фольклор народов Таймыра. 1992. 3. Дудинка.
Лабанаускас К. Нганасанская фольклорная хрестоматия // Фольклор народов Таймыра. 2001. 6. Дудинка.