Univerzita Karlova

Filozofická fakulta

Katedra Blízkého Východu

Diplomová práce

Bc. Vitali Brezhnev

Morfologická adaptace a extrakce afixů u turkických lexikálních přejímek v ruštině a srbštině

Morphological adaptation of Turkic lexical borrowings and extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Viktor Elšík, Ph.D.

Praha 2022

Poděkování

Chtěl bych tímto poděkovat Mgr. Viktoru Elšíkovi PhD. za odborné vedení této práce a za čas a trpělivost, kterou mi během jejího vypracování věnoval.

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto diplomovou práci vypracoval samostatně a výhradně s použitímcitovaných pramenů, literatury a dalších odborných zdrojů a že tato práce nebyla využitav rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze, dne 31. 7. 2022
Vitali Brezhnev

Klíčová slova:

Morfologická adaptace – turečtina – turkické jazyky – ruština – srbština

Key words:

Morphological adaptation – Turkish – Turkic – Russian – Serbian

Abstrakt:

Současná práce se zabývá morfologickou adaptací u turkických výpůjček v ruštině a srbštině z hlediska jejich skloňování, časování a slovotvorby a také extrakce turkických afixů. Tyto dva jazyky na opačných koncích slovanského světa měly během dlouhodobého jazykového kontaktu obrovský vliv od sousedních turkických národů. Cílem práce je porovnat principy morfologické adaptace a extrakci afixů u turkických výpůjček v obou jazycích a zjistit, jak velký je mezi nimi skutečný rozdíl.

Abstract:

The current work considers the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian in terms of their inflectional and word-formation characteristics as well as the affix extraction of Turkic affixes. The two languages being in the opposite ends of the Slavic world have had a huge influence from neighbouring Turkic peoples during a long-term language contact. The goal of the work is to compare the principles of the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings and the extraction of Turkic affixes in both languages and find out how much the actual difference between them is.

Contents

1.   Introduction

The current study is inspired by the research of Jikia *Non-lexical modifications of Turkish interference* (not published yet) in some Georgian dialects and the work of Tadinova *Тюркские лексические заимствования в системе северокавказских языков* 'Turkic lexical borrowings in the system of north-Caucasian languages' (2006).

The work of Marika Jikia studies the influence and the loan grammar of one Turkic language, Azerbaijanian on the furthermost Eastern Georgian dialect Ingilo (e.g. grammatical intensive of Turkish origin: წითელი [c'iteli] 'red' > წიმწითელი [c'imc'iteli] 'very red')*, on the one hand, and of another Turkic language, Turkish on the furthermost Western Georgian dialect Chveneburi (e.g. calque of Turkish morphological model for Tur. *burada* 'here' bu-ra-da [here-ADV-LOC] > აქში [aqši] [here-LOC] vs native Georgian აქ [aq], i.e. the Laz dialect uses an excessive suffix of locative case), on the other hand. The aim of the study was to compare the difference in the influence of two similar Turkic languages on two Georgian dialects geographically located in the furthermost eastern and western ends of the Georgian language. Similarly, the current work aims to compare the differences in the morphological adaptation in Turkic borrowings as well as the extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian. The two languages are spread in the furthermost northeastern and southwestern parts of the Slavic world and have somewhat similar history of contact with the neighbouring Turkic languages. However, each language has had its distinct experience of the language contacts.. Thus, the goal of the study is to find out how much differently and in what manner have the two Slavic languages acquired and morphologically adapted the borrowings from the Turkic languages.

Tadinova (2006) aims at the study of the phonetical, morphological and lexico-semantical adaptation of Turkic borrowings in the North Caucasian languages. The current work is inspired by, and partly follows the line of, the study of the morphological adaptation in the mentioned study. Similarly, the current work studies the morphological adaptation of Turkisms[1] in Russian and Serbian dividing the study into two parts: *Inflectional characteristics of Turkic borrowings in*

---

[1] Here and further throughout the work the term *Turkism* is used in a wide sense, i.e. borrowings from Turkic languages and not only from Turkish.

Russian and Serbian and *Word-formation characteristic of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian* and brings the conclusion at the end.

Thus, on the basis of these two works, personal scientific interest of the author in the results of the study and the help of more experienced colleagues, this work aims at discovering the key differences between the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings and the extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian.

1.1 Goal

The hypothesis that the current work checks is that the morphological adaptation of the borrowings and the extraction of the affixes of the similar Turkic languages in the similar Slavic languages should not be different in principle.

The research question of the current study is whether the similar Slavic languages, Russian and Serbian, which have had different experiences of the language contacts with similar Turkic languages would process the Turkic borrowings in principally similar ways.

To answer the research question and check the hypothesis the current study considers the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings as well as the extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian in terms of their inflection and word formation. The two languages being in the opposite ends of the Slavic world have had a huge influence from neighbouring Turkic peoples during a long-term language contact. The goal of the work is to compare the principles of the morphological adaptation of the Turkic loanwords and the extraction of Turkic affixes in both languages and find out how much the actual difference between them is.

1.2 Methodology

Depending on the goals and objectives of the study, the methodology in the study includes, descriptive method, comparative analyses and typological research.

Descriptive method aims at analysing the structure of the language on different levels, including phonology, morphology, morphonology, morphosyntax and semantics etc. This method was used in most parts of the work, including the study of the inflectional characteristics of Turkic borrowings as well as the extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian.

Comparative analysis was used to study how similar was the influence of foreign Turkic borrowings on related Russian and Serbian. It was used to compare different Turkic borrowings in these languages to find common features.

Typological research assumes the comparison of the structure of two different languages to find similarities and differences between them. This method was used when studying the inflectional adaptation of the Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian.

1.3 Sources

The primary sources for the study are the work of Oreshkina (1994) for the study of Turkisms in Russian, and the works of Škaljić (1966) as well as of Radić (2001) for the study of Turkic borrowings in Serbian. Other sources for the study of Turkisms in Russian and Serbian used in the work include the work of Stanislaw Stachowski (2014), the work of G. Karimullina and R. Karimullina (2015) and others. The main dictionaries used in this work are: for Russian - of Max Vasmer et al. (1986), for Serbian: of Pešikan et al. (2014) and of Stevanović et al. (1976). The sources for the study of morphological adaptation in general include the works of Bauer (2004), Martin Haspelmath (2009), Winfred (1962), Frans Plank (1994) and others. The principle for the structure of the work was inspired by the doctoral thesis by Tadinova (2006). The work also includes citations and references in smaller portions of other authors' works.

1.4 Structure

The chapter *Turkic borrowings into Russian and Serbian* consists of three subchapters, which give a compact description of Turkic and Slavic languages and a brief history of their language contacts.

The subchapter *Turkic languages* gives general information about the languages of Turkic origin, their history, the area of spread, some linguistic features, etc. It primarily considers the Turkish language, as one of the main sources of Turkisms and Eastern borrowings (words borrowed from Arabic, Persian and other languages of the Middle-East) in general into Serbian.

The subchapter *Slavic languages* is dedicated to describing the history, division and some linguistic features of the Slavic languages, relevant to the current study. It mainly focuses on Russian and Serbian in correspondence to the main topic of

this work.

The final subchapter *Historical context* shortly describes the course of the language contacts between the mentioned Slavic languages and the Turkic languages. The subchapter starts from the recorded most ancient contacts between the Slavic and Turkic languages and goes onwards through the centuries. It systematizes and divides the history of the language contact into three main phases. The chapter also shortly talks about the history of the study of Turkisms in Russian and Serbian and about some features and influence of Turkic borrowings onto Russian and Serbian. This information is needed to understand the causes, ways and the further development of the Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian.

The chapter *General description of morphological adaptation* presents a brief introduction into the process of morphological adaptation, provides definitions and examples of different terms needed to better comprehend further parts of the study.

The chapter *Inflectional characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian* describes the degree of morphological adaptation of the Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian in terms of grammatical inflection. It is shown in a variety of grammatical categories characteristic for Russian and Serbian.

The chapter *Word-formation characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian* describes the degree of morphological adaptation of the Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian in terms of word-formation. That is shown on the examples of the formations of nouns, adjectives and verbs from the stems of Turkic origin.

In the chapter *Morphological derivation as the indicator of the assimilation process of Turkic words in Russian and Serbian languages* it is argued that the morphological derivation of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian, i.e. their ability to form new words on the basis of the recipient language may indicate the assimilation of these words in the recipient language. The chapter brings examples of morphological derivation of the Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian and indicates its most widespread processes.

The chapter *Affix extraction* describes the borrowed Turkish affixes in Serbian. It considers such aspects, as their formal adaptation, derivation and productivity, hybrid formations, competitive suffixes etc.

In the chapter *Conclusion* the results of the analysis made in the previous chapters are summarized. The comparative analyses of Turkic borrowings between

Russian and Serbian is provided and the principal differences between the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings and the extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian are formulated.

2. Turkic borrowings into Russian and Serbian

2.2 Turkic languages

The Turkic languages are a large group of languages with the common ancestor, the Proto-Turkic language. They are spoken by the Turkic peoples of Eurasia from Central Asia and Siberia to the West reaching the Western Asia, Eastern and Southern Europe (Gadzhieva 1997: 17).

There are different versions of the internal genealogical classification of the Turkic languages, belonging to Samojlovich (1922), Baskakov (1969), Menges (1968), Johanson (1998) and others (Blazhek 2019: 80-90).

Samojlovich (1922) created the classification based on the phonetical isoglosses (Blazhek 2019: 83) and divided the Turkic languages into Bulgarian, Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, Central and Southwest groups.

Baskakov (1960), whose classification is counted as classical (Blazhek 2019: 85) put the Proto-Turkic language on the top with the East and West Hunnic groups. The East Hunnic group is divivded into Kirgiz-Kipchak and Uyghur-Kipchak groups, while the West Hunnic is divided into Oghuz-Karluk-Kipchak and Bulgarian groups.

According to Johanson (1998: 81-83), who used the combination of geographical, genetic, and typological approaches (Blazhek 2019: 87) the Turkic languages can be genetically classified the following way: the Proto-Turkic divided into the Common Turkic and the separate Chuvash and Arghu-Turkic, which later became Khalaj. The Common Turkic then divided into the Siberian, Uyghur (southeast), Kypchak (northwest) and Oghuz (southwest) groups (Johanson 1998: 81-83).

The Turkic languages are characterized as a dialect chain (Comrie et al. 1981: 7). This means that the neighbouring dialects and languages are mutually understandable. However, the differences become bigger over the distance, thus the further apart the less mutually understandable the dialects and languages are for the speakers (Crystal 2011: 144). In addition, different Turkic languages have acquired various borrowings through language contact and influence of neighbouring non-Turkic languages, such as for example Persian in case of Turkish and Azerbaijanian (Gadzhieva 1997: 33). Thus, for example, the Turkish and Azerbaijanian languages are very similar to each other, similar connection is between the Kazakh and Kyrgyz languages (Gadzhieva 1997: 18-19). However, the Turkish and Kazakh speakers

will have much more difficulties in understanding each other mostly due to the phonetical differences in words (Gadzhieva 1997: 19). A similar case may be observed in other language groups, such as Slavic languages (Katzner & Miller 2002: 18).

The Turkic language with the greatest number of speakers is Turkish, spoken mainly in Asia Minor and the Balkans. Its native speakers account for about 40% of all Turkic speakers (Gadzhieva 1997: 17). Similarly to other Turkic languages some of the main characteristic features of the Turkish language are: agglutination, vowel harmony, and the absence of grammatical gender (Gadzhieva 1997: 23). All these features are foreign to the Russian and Serbian language. Thus, the current work studies and compares how the two Slavic languages morphologically adapt Turkic borrowings in terms of their structure and assimilation in the recipient languages.

Agglutination is a morphological process, in which morphemes are attached one after each other and each of them has a single meaning (Bussmann et al. 2006: 30). For example, in Turkish: *ev-ler-im-de* [house-PL-1P.POS-LOC].

The Turkish language is primarily an agglutinative language (Gadzieva 1997: 23). The primary way of the inflection and word-formation in Turkish is suffixation. Thus, affixes in Turkish are used to represent cases, number, tense, person, negation etc. For example: *araba-lar-ınız-dan* 'from your cars', consisting of [car-PL-2PL.POS-ABL].

The vowel harmony of Turkish represents a system of interchangeable vowels in suffixes of a word, based on a previous vowel to create 'a harmony of sounds' in the word. Therefore, most of the suffixes in Turkish have either two allomorphs (simple vocal harmony system) with interchanging vowels *a* and *e* or four allomorphs (complex vocal harmony system) with interchanging vowels *ı, i, u, ü*. For example, *da/de* locative suffix, which belongs to the simple vocal harmony system: *arabada 'in a car'* with *-da* because of the previous back vowel *a*; *evde* 'at home' with *-de* because of the previous front vowel *e*. An example of the complex vocal harmony system is *-lık/-lik/-luk/-lük* abstractness and collective suffix (Csató & Johanson 1998: 35-36): *arkadaşlık* 'friendship' with *lık* after the vowel *a*; *kardeşlik* 'brotherhood' with *-lik* after *e*; *boşluk* 'emptiness' with *-luk* after *o*; *büyüklük* 'size' with *-lük* after *ü*.

Unlike the Turkic languages Russian and Serbian do not have such vocal

harmony systems and, thus, when, for example, Serbian borrowed and adapted the Turkish suffix *-lık/-lik/-luk/-lük* it only kept one form, *-luk.* That is to avoid confusion further in the work in why in the Turkish examples the suffix four forms have while in Serbian it is only presented in one.

2.3 Slavic languages

Slavic languages is a group of Indo-European languages which comes from the common ancestor, the Proto-Slavic language. The languages are distributed in a number of countries of Central and Eastern Europe, Balkans and Northern Asia. Slavic speakers make up the majority of the population of Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and Poland. Compact groups of speakers in Slavic languages are present in Kazakhstan, in the countries of Central Asia and South Caucasia, in Moldova, in the Baltic and other European countries. Slavic languages are divided into three groups: eastern, southern and western (Skorvid 2015: 396-397). The main modern representatives of the East Slavic languages are Belarusian, Russian, Ukrainian and the regional Carpatho-Rusyn languages and dialects South Slavic - Bulgarian, Macedonian, Slovenian, Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian language (or Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, Serbian); West Slavic - Czech, Slovak, Polish, the regional Kashubian language, as well as minor Lusatian language (Sorbian; with two literary languages - Upper and Lower Sorbian) and Pannonian Rusyn. These groups - originally tribal dialects of the Proto-Slavic language - developed as a result of the migration of the Slavs from the second half of the 1st millennium AD especially in the western (up to the Elbe River basin), southwestern (Alps) and southeastern (Balkans) directions (Jakushkina 2015: 66-67).

Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian language (BCMS) is a term to refer to the forms of speech employed by Serbs, Croats, Montenegrins, and Bosnians (Vrabec 2021: 7). A similar term, Serbo-Croatian, was substituted by the more flexible term of BCMS.

The language area of BCMS is traditionally divided into three dialect groups: Kajkavian, Čakavian, and Štokavian Serbian mainly belongs to the Štokavian group (Vrabec 2021: 7).

The vocabulary of Serbian is characterized by a large number of Turkish

borrowings. While the neighbouring Croatian language is characteristic for lexical purism (tendency to remove borrowings), Serbian is known for the widespread use of borrowings (Jakushkina 2015: 66-67).

The Serbian literary language uses Cyrillic and Latin alphabets. The Serbian part in the current work will be presented in the Latin alphabet.

Russian language is an eastern Slavic language spoken by Russian people and the state language of the Russian Federation as well as some other post-Soviet countries.

The Russian dialects historically consist of two large groups: The Northern and Southern dialects (which are primarily located in the Northern and Southern parts of the European part of Russia respectively), as well as the intermediate Central Russian dialects (Lopatin & Uluhanov 2015: 69-72).

The vocabulary of Russian has been influenced by different by lexical borrowings from a wide range of languages throughout the history. One of the group of languages which had a significant impact on Russian are Turkic languages (Lopatin & Uluhanov 2015: 69-72).

2.4 Historical context

The interaction of the Slavic and Turkic peoples, which began from ancient times, is reflected in historical sources, as well as in the structure of modern literary language and vernacular speech (Buribajeva 2013: 100).

The historical process of the language contacts between the Slavic and Turkic people is primarily divided into three phases (Stachowski 2014: 1199):

- The first phase from the beginning of the millennium until the 7th century, in which most of the Turkic borrowings became common Slavic. For example: Slav. *klobukъ* 'hat' < Tur. kalpak 'hat'; Slav. *tljmač* 'translator' < Tur. *tylmač* 'translator', comp. Ger. *Dolmetscher* (Vasmer et al. 1986 IV: 72) (Stachowski 2014: 1199).

- The second phase from the 7th century until the 14th century, which is characteristic for more intense Turkic-Slavic contact (Stachowski 2014: 1199). During this period different Turkic peoples and tribes migrated into the Eastern Europe and Balkans. Their languages and dialects had a strong influence on the vocabulary of the Slavic people, however the impact on each individual Slavic

language was different due to the vast geographical area and the peculiarities of the language contacts between individual languages. For example, Bulgar Turks migrated to the region of Danube in the 7th century and founded Balkan Bulgaria (Stachowski 2014: 1199). Later they were completely assimilated by the local population, however some Bulgar words were borrowed into Old Church-Slavonic, from where they entered Russian, Serbian and other languages of Orthodox Slavs (Stachowski 2014: 1199). For example: Rus. *бисер* 'glass beads' < OCS *бисьръ* < turk. *büsra* 'glass beads' (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 168) (Stachowski 2014: 1200). There was also an intense contact between Russian and Cuman, as well as Pecheneg and Khazar (Stachowski 2014: 1199). For example: Rus. *амбар* 'granary' < Tur. *ambar* 'granary' (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 75) (Stachowski 2014: 1201).

- The third phase lasted from the 14th century mainly until the 17th century for the western and eastern Slavic languages and until the 20th century for the southern Slavic languages (Stachowski 2014: 1199). This is the period where most of the Turkisms, primarily from Turkish, enter Serbian (Škaljić 1966: 11). For example: Srb. *čekić* 'hammer' < Tur. *çekiç* 'hammer' (Stevanović et al. 1976 VI: 856).

There are no recorded direct Turkic borrowings in Czech, Upper Sorbian, Lower Sorbian and Slovene, unless these are Turkisms from Common Slavic. (Stachowski 2014: 1201). Most of the Turkic loanwords entered these languages through Hungarian, Serbian, Croatian for Czech and Slovene and further, possibly through Czech and German were borrowed into Upper and Lower Sorbian (Stachowski 2014: 1202).

The concept of Turkism is a complex topic. It is important to consider both the question of ancient borrowings into the Turkic languages and the possible language contacts of the early Turks (Dybo: 2007: 3; Buribajeva 2013: 101).

Many Russian linguists in their works define the term Turkism the following way (Buribajeva 2013: 101; Shchitova 2008: 20; Ogienko 2012: 30; Ivanov 1990: 42; Abdulloev: 133): these are eastern words, i.e. borrowings from Turkic, , Arabic, Persian and other languages of the Middle East, regardless of the original source (Nazarov 1984: 11), for which Turkic languages are the source languages and/or intermediary languages (Buribajeva 2013: 100). The same opinion is shared by Serbian linguists, such as Abdulah Škaljić (1966: 24): since the number of words that came to Serbian from Arabic and Persian directly is relatively small the author connected all the words (except for a few proper names) with the Turkish language.

Due to this circumstance Škaljić came up with the general title for all the words 'Turkisms', although as the author confirms himself, they are very often ultimately Arabisms and Iranisms (Škaljić 1966: 24).

Even though, the first Turkic words began to penetrate the southern Slavic languages long before the appearance of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan region, it is the Turkish language that had the most influence on the Slavic languages of the Balkans (Škaljić 1966: 11). The Turkish language and culture brought an absolutely new culture to the Balkans: the eastern, Islamic culture (Škaljić 1966: 11).. The Turkish administration, army, the native Slavic inhabitants who went to study to Constantinople brought and spread new terms and forms to the local languages, a great part of which remained and was adopted first mainly by the vernacular speech and later entered the literary languages (Škaljić 1966: 12). These are the primary reasons for the existence of so many eastern words (including Arabic, Persian and Turkish) in the southern Slavic languages, particularly Serbian (Škaljić 1966: 12).

Serbian folk songs (and oral tradition in general) are abound with words of Eastern origin. Serbian collectors of folk songs, even those who, as well-known writers, sang in the spirit of folk songs themselves, were not supporters of cleaning the songs from those borrowings. It is understandable that such folk songs constantly influenced everyday speech (Škaljić 1966: 13).

The history of the study of Turkish borrowings in Serbia dates back to the 19th century and is connected to one of the most famous Serbian linguists and language reformers Vuk Karadžić. Even though the research of Turkisms in Serbian existed before, his interest in this topic became more organized and professional (Radić 2001: 12). Since this period, a whole series of researchers, collectors of lexical material and scholars of Turkish lexical influences have appeared (Franc Miklošič, Petar Skok, Abdulah Škaljić, Asim Peco and others). Some of the modern researchers of Turkish borrowings in Serbian are Prvoslav Radić, Mirjana Teodosijević and others.

3. General description of morphological adaptation and affix extraction

Morphology is the study of the internal construction of words (Devlin et al. 2004: 14984). Morphology is commonly divided into inflection and word-formation (Plank 1994: 1671; Crystal 2011: 314). Inflection is the change in the form of a word to mark such distinctions as tense, person, number, gender, mood, voice, and case (Crystal 2011: 243). Word-formation is commonly divided into derivation and compounding (Plank 1994: 1671). Whereas in compounding the constituents of a word are themselves lexemes (i.e. words (Haspelmath 2009: 37)), this is not the case in derivation. Derivation is traditionally defined as the formation of new words by various means, such by adding new affixes to it (Bussmann et al. 2006:294; Plank 1994: 1672).

Borrowing is term that refers to a word or a morpheme which is copied from one language to another or the process of this itself. Borrowed words usually go through a morphological adaptation in the recipient language to be able to successfully function and interact with other elements of the language.

The morphological adaptation of borrowed words in the recipient language assumes that they would be subordinate to the morphological norms of the recipient language (Tadinova 2006: 166). In theory, the borrowed word should acquire inflectional and word-formation characteristics typical to the word class it belongs to in the recipient language (Tadinova 2006: 166). However, in some cases this does not take place or happens only partly or does take place at all (Pakerys 2016a: 242).

Loanword is defined as a word which was borrowed, transferred or copied from one to another language. The language which the word came from is called the *donor language* and the language which the word entered is the *recipient language.* The original word in the donor language is called the *source word.* The morphological structure of the source word in the recipient language is usually unanalysable. It means that it cannot be divided into morphemes because they are foreign to the recipient language (Haspelmath 2009: 37). For example, Russian has the loanword Rus. *янычар* 'janissary', borrowed from Turkish *yeni-çeri* [new army] 'elite Ottoman troops'. This is a transparent compound (consists of two lexemes) in Turkish, but since Russian has no other words with the elements *yeni* or *čeri*, the loanword is unanalysable for Russian native speakers. However, when a language borrows multiple complex words from another language, the elements

may recur with a similar meaning, so that the morphological structure may be reconstituted (Haspelmath 2009: 37-38). For example, Serbian due to the numerous Turkish loanwords in it recognises some suffixes, like *-luk* 'collective suffix with usually abstract meaning' and can even create its own words using the suffix with non-Turkic stems. For example, Srb. *divlji* 'wild' > *divljaluk* 'barbarity' (Radić 2001: 73).

Loanwords are opposed to native words, i.e. words 'which we can take back to the earliest known stages of a language' (Lehmann 1962: 212). However, the borrowing can be so ancient that it may be impossible recognise it or trace back its history. Thus, a native word can always possibly be in fact a borrowing, all depends on how much is known about the history of the language and this word particularly (Haspelmath 2009: 38).

A loanword may have several possible donor languages and may be unclear which one it came from. Such situation is true for some Turkic borrowings in Russian since it has had a long-term language contact with a number of Turkic languages in different periods of history. The Russian word *колпак* 'high-crowned cap of Central Asian origin' must have been borrowed from a Turkic language (Vasmer et al. 1986 III: 297), but whether it was Turkish (*kalpak*) or Kyrgyz (*калпак*) is unclear.

When a compound or derived word consists of elements from different languages, it is called a *hybrid* (Bussman 2006: 523). For example, in Serbian *soba* 'room' + Tur. dimin. suffix *-džik* > *sobadžik* 'a small room'.

Competitive suffixes are two or more suffixes in one language which have similar meaning in one language and can create words with synonymous meaning from the same stem. For example, in Serbian *bogati* 'rich' > *bogataš* vs *bogatlija* '*vernac*. richman' (Pešikan et al. 2014 I: 681).

Word-final is a letter or sound occurring at the end of a word. In Russian and Serbian words acquire grammatical gender based on their word-finals (except when they have masculine or feminine meanings in the real world, such as *father, mother, brother* etc.).

Affix extraction considers borrowing of an affix from another language through the internal analyses of the loanwords from that language (Elšík 2007: 3).

4. Inflectional characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian

There is a number of structural differences in terms of morphology between Turkic, on the one hand, and Russian and Serbian on the other hand. For example, there is only one Declension and Conjugation class in Turkic languages (Stachowski 2014: 1202), while Russian and Serbian have three declension classes and as well as two (for Russian) and three (for Serbian) conjugation classes.

Another difference is that Turkic adjectives and numerals are indeclinable, unless they are in form of a noun (Stachowski 2014: 1202). For example: *Farklı yerlerden geldiler* 'They came from different places':

Fark-lı yer-ler-den gel-di-ler.

[difference-ADJ place-PL-ABL come-PST.PFV-PL]

Beşe kadar kaldılar 'They stayed until five':

Beş-e kadar kaldı-lar

[five-DAT until stay-PST.PFV-PL]

One of the most important differences between Turkic and Slavic is the absence of the grammatical gender in Turkic. According to Stachowski (2014: 1202) this may be the reason for the inflectional monotony in Turkic.

For all these reasons the Turkic borrowings had to undergo a significant morphological adaptation in Russian and Serbian (Stachowski 2014: 1202).

4.2 Category of animacy

Animacy-inanimacy is a grammatical category of nouns in Russian and Serbian. The category of animacy usually but not always corresponds to the reality, i.e. in Russian people and animals are animate, even if not alive, however plants are always inanimate.

The Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian act similarly in terms of the morphological adaptation to the category of animacy. They tend to acquire to be animate or inanimate based which of these signs the words with similar lexical meanings have. For example [Turkic borrowing – native word]: Rus. anim. *ишак* 'donkey' – anim. *зверь* 'animal'; Rus. *inanim. баклажан* 'aubergine' – *inanim. овощ* 'vegetable'; Srb. *anim. mušterija* 'client' – *anim. кирас* 'client'; Srb. *inanim. biber* 'pepper' – *inanim. povrće* 'vegetable'.

4.3 Category of gender

Grammatical gender is a category characteristic of nouns (and other parts of speech in agreement with them) in various languages (in Russian and Serbian particularly) used to group the words into several inflectional classes. The acquired category of gender usually corresponds to the biological sex of the object or its absence. However, in Russian and Serbian this principle is generally disregarded, and nouns are assigned to a particular gender (masculine, feminine or neutral) based on their word-final (except when they have masculine or feminine lexical meanings, like *father, mother, brother*, etc.).

The category of grammatical gender is absent in the grammatical structure of the Turkic languages. However it is an fundamental category of nouns in Russian and Serbian, because it plays an essential role in the inflection of nouns and their agreement (combination) with other parts of speech, e.g. adjectives. Therefore, during the morphological adaptation the Turkic borrowings in Russian generally acquire the category of the grammatical gender by the following means (Oreshkina 1994: 61; Karimullina & Karimullina 2015: 186):

1.   For living beings, the grammatical gender is assigned based on which biological sex the lexical meaning of the word corresponds to: *батрак* 'hired farmworker' (Oreshkina 1994: 61).

2.   For inanimate objects, the grammatical gender is assigned taking into account the word-final of the loanword (Oreshkina 1994: 61). Thus, the loanword acquires the same grammatical gender as the class of words with the similar word-final (Oreshkina 1994: 61). For example: native Russian *воротник* 'collar' and *сундук* 'chest'; *ног**а*** 'leg' and *казн**а*** 'treasury'.

3.   In cases where it is difficult to assign a loanword to one or another grammatical gender, for example, in the case of invariable inanimate nouns or when the loanwords have word-finals nontypical for Russian (e.g. *-и* or *-у*) the grammatical gender is assigned according to semantic connections and analogies with words of similar lexical meaning in Russian (Oreshkina 1994: 61). For example: *машкачири* 'national Uzbek porridge' matches up with the feminine word *каша* 'porridge'; *наскаду* 'snuffbox made from little pumpkin' correlates with the feminine word *табакерка* 'snuffbox' (Oreshkina 1994: 61).

In addition to these groups, there are also Turkic elements in explanatory dictionaries that belong to nouns of a common gender (Oreshkina 1994: 61) (i.e.

referring to either gender based on the context): *балаболка* 'chatterbox', *балда* 'blockhead', *калека* 'cripple', *ханжа* 'hypocryte', etc.

There is also a number of Turkisms in Russian which have variational pairs (Oreshkina 1994: 61). Thus, one word from the pair has a zero ending and another has the word-final *-a.* The words with the zero ending are assigned masculine gender, while the ones with *-a* in the end are assigned feminine gender respectively. For example: *папах – папаха* 'a type of hat', *сарыч – сарыча* 'a type of kite', *чинар – чинара* 'plane tree', etc.

The principle of assigning grammatical gender to the Turkic loanwords in Serbian is similar to Russian. The analysis of the Tukic loanwords in Serbian shows that the majority of the Turkish nouns in Serbian generally acquire grammatical gender based on the following principles:

1. For living beings, the grammatical gender is assigned based on which biological sex the lexical meaning of the word corresponds to. For example: *m. janičar* 'janissary'; *kaduna* 'lady'.

2. For inanimate objects, the grammatical gender is assigned taking into account the word-final of the loanword. Thus, the loanword acquires the same grammatical gender as a native Serbian word with the similar word-final. For example: *m. sat* 'watch'; *f. džámija* 'mosque'.

3. In cases where it is difficult to assign a loanword to one or another grammatical gender, for example, in the case of invariable inanimate nouns or when the loanwords have word-finals nontypical for Serbian (e.g. *-u* or *-y*) the grammatical gender is assigned according to semantic connections and analogies with equivalent words or words of general lexical meaning in Russian.

4. In addition to these groups, there are also Turkic elements in explanatory dictionaries that belong to nouns of a common gender, i.e. the noun acquires the gender based on the context. For example: *ašikčija* 'lover, both a man or a woman'.

Whilst in Russian borrowed Turkic adjectives append grammatical gender endings (e.g. *чал-ый -ая -ое* < Tur. *çal* 'grey'(Vasmer 1986 IV: 313), in Serbian the words may retain their gender indeclinable form, e.g. *ačik* 'open' (Stachowski 2014: 1202).

4.4 Category of number

Number is a grammatical category which marks quantity. The category of number generally but not always corresponds to the real number of the referents of the marked object. For example, Rus. *ножницы* 'scissors' only has plural form (i.e. it is a plurale tantum) and can define one object as well as several of them.

The category of number is characteristic of both Slavic and Turkic languages. However, in the process of the adaptation, the inflectional forms of Turkisms proceed on the basis of the grammatical systems of the Russian (Karimullina & Karimullina 2015: 186) and Serbian languages, as shown below.

Most Turkic loanwords in Russian and Serbian that have a concrete subject meaning are used in both singular and plural (Oreshkina 1994: 61). The correlation of borrowed words with this category occurs, as a rule, in accordance with the norms of Russian and Serbian. In these languages the plural form is usually indicated by an ending. For example, native Russian word ending in -*a*: hand-NOM.SG *рук-а* 'hand' > hand-NOM.PL *рук-и* 'hands'; Turkism hat-NOM.SG *шапк-а* 'hat' > hat-NOM.PL *шапк-и* 'hats'. For a Serbian word ending in -*a*: hand-NOM.SG *ruk-a* 'hand' > hand-NOM.PL *ruk-e* 'hands'; Turkism sock-NOM.SG *čarap-a* 'sock' > sock-NOM.PL *čarap-e* 'socks'.

Some nouns do not have the opposition 'singularity – plurality' in their lexical meaning, therefore, they belong to a group of nouns used either only in the singular (singularia tantum) or only in the plural form (pluralia tantum) (Oreshkina 1994: 62). Examples of singularia tantum nouns of Turkic origin in Russian are *айран* 'a type of a milk drink', *калым* 'bride price'. An example of a plurale tantum is *манты* 'a type of a dumpling'. In vernacular speech, pluralia tantum nouns may have singular forms derived from the corresponding words: *манты - мантышка* (Oreshkina 1994: 62).

Interesting in terms of the of the category of number is the history of of the Turkish word *yeniçeri* 'an elite Ottoman regiment' *yeni-çeri* 'new.army'. It went through a transformation when borrowed into Russian and Serbian. Since its word-final is -*u / -i* (a typical plural ending in Russian and Serbian) it was perceived as a plural ending, even though the word in Turkish is singular. For this reason, the loanword lost -*i* and became Rus. *янычар* / Srb. *janičar* meaning 'a soldier of the janissary regiment.' The plural form Rus. *янычары* / Srb. *janičari* correspondingly means *soldiers of the janissary regiment* and not the regiment itself.

Some borrowed nouns in Russian, which end on *-и*, however, vary in number. For example, Turkic *курбаши* is used both as singular and plural. When used as singular, the word becomes invariable (Oreshkina 1994: 66). For example: *История Ибрагим-бека: Басмачество одного курбаши с его слов* 'The story of Ibrahim-bek: Basmachism of one kurbashi from his words' (Gusterin 2014: 7).

4.5 Category of case

Case is a grammatical category of certain parts of speech (e.g. noun) which indicates the, function and the relation of the inflected word to other parts of a sentence. There are similar case systems in Russian and Serbian with the absence of the vocative case in Russian. The cases are as follows: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, locative, instrumental, vocative (only in Serbian).

Declension is a type of inflection of certain parts of speech, primarily nouns, in grammatical cases. There are three noun declension classes both in Russian and Serbian, which group words by the paradigm of declension. The primary indicators of the declension class are the word's word-final and gender.

Turkic loanwords which are perceived as nouns mostly follow the same declension paradigm as the native words in Russian and Serbian with the same endings. For example, the native words *warrior* (rus, *воин*, Srb. *ratnik*) and borrowed *janissary* (Rus. *янычар*, Srb. *janjičar*):

Russian	**Class II** masc. ending in a consonant in nom. and neut. ending in -**o** / -**e** in nom.	
SINGULAR	*'warrior'*	*'janissary'*
Nominative	воин	янычар
Genitive	воин-а	янычар-а
Dative	воин-у	янычар-у
Accusative	воин-а	янычар-а
Instrumental	воин-ом	янычар-ом
Locative	воин-е	янычар-е
PLURAL	*'warriors'*	*'janissaries'*
Nominative	воин	янычар

Genitive	воин-ов	янычар-ов
Dative	воин-ам	янычар-ам
Accusative	воин-ов	янычар-ов
Instrumental	воин-ами	янычар-ами
Locative	воин-ах	янычар-ах

Serbian[2]	**Class** **I** masc. ending in a consonant in nom. and neut. ending in -o / –e in nom.	
SINGULAR	*'warrior'*	*'janissary'*
Nominative	ratnik	janjičar
Genitive	ratnik-a	janjičar-a
Dative	ratnik-u	janjičar-u
Accusative	ratnik-a	janjičar-a
Instrumental	ratnikom	janjičarom
Locative	ratnik-u	janjičar-u
Vocative	ratnič-e	janjičar-e
PLURAL	*'warriors'*	*'janissaries'*
Nominative	ratnic-i	janjičar-i
Genitive	ratnik-a	janjičar-a
Dative	ratnic-ima	janičář-ima
Accusative	ratnik-e	janjičar-e
Instrumental	ratnic-ima	janjičar-ima
Locative	ratnic-ima	janjičar-ima
Vocative	ratnic-i	janjičar-i

Among the Turkic borrowings in Russian a rather significant group of invariable nouns stands out, belonging to the so-called indeclinables and ending in various vowels. These words are the names of specific objects and persons, abstract concepts and various kinds of phenomena (Oreshkina 1994: 62-63). For example:

---

[2] The sequence of cases in the Serbian table is adjusted to the sequence in the Russian to avoid confusion.

мумиё 'blackish-brown powder or an exudate from high mountain rocks', *джайляу* 'summer highland pasture in Central Asia'. The difficulty is in determining the grammatical gender of these words. It is carried out by semantic connections and analogies with equivalent Russian words or words of general meanings, as explained in the subchapter *Category of gender*.

4.6 Category of degree

Category of degree usually refers to three forms of an adjective or adverb: positive, comparative and superlative (Bussman 2006: 285). There are three levels of degree in Russian and Serbian:

(a) positive, or basic level of degree: *Суп был вкусный / Supa je bila ukusna* 'The soup was tasty';

(b) comparative, which is used to compare the degrees of the property of objects an adjective or adverb relates to, based on the lexical meaning of it: *Главное блюдо было вкуснее / Glavno jelo je bilo ukusnije* 'The main course was tastier';

(c) superlative, which indicates the highest degree of the property of the object, , based on its lexical meaning: *Десерт был самый вкусный / Desert je bio najukusniji* 'The dessert was the tastiest'.

According to the dictionary of Turkisms in the Russian languages (Shipova 1976) most of the Turkic adjectives in the basic Russian lexicon are the names of colours in general (*алый* 'bright red, scarlet', *бурый* 'brown, fulvous', *карий* 'dark-brown, hazel', etc.) and equine coat colours (*буланный* 'dun', *игреневый* 'skewbald', *караковый* 'darkbay', etc.).

Most of the adjective can form comparative and superlative forms. For example: *pos. алый* 'bright red, scarlet': *cmpr. алее, sup. алейший.*

A similar picture can be observed in Serbian, where the adjectives of Turkic origin form comparative and superlative forms according to Serbian grammatical rules. For example: *pos. dertli* 'miserable, sickening': *cmpr. dertliji, sup. najdertliji* (Škaljić 1966: 44).

4.7 Categories of tense, aspect and mood

Verb is a part of speech which indicates a process or state in time (Bussman 2006: 1263). In Russian and Serbian verbs conjugate, and have the grammatical categories of aspect, voice, mood, tense, person, and number.

Conjugation is a way of inflecting verbs in tense, person, number, mood, voice, and aspect (Bussman 2006: 230).

There is a number of borrowed verbs from Turkic languages in Russian. For example: *кочевать* 'lead a nomad's life'< tur *köçmek* 'move, migrate' (Vasmer 1986 II: 357)*, камлать* 'practice shamanism, tell fortunes' < Tur. *kamlamak* 'practice shamanism, tell fortunes' (Vasmer 1986 II: 175)*, якшиться* '*vernac. dissapr.* be in touch with someone' < Tur. *yakşı* 'good; well' (Vasmer 1986 IV: 553) etc. (Karimullina & Karimullina 2015: 185). Most of them are formed by adding a Russian verb adaptation suffix to a Turkic root. Some verbs of this type can be interpreted as derived from borrowed nouns or adjectives *(якши-ть-ся < yakşı* 'good')*, but there are cases that do not seem to have nominal bases, but rather verbal stem *(kam-la-mak > кам-ла-ть),* where *-la-* is originally a Turkic verb formation suffix (Kononov 1956: 256) and *-mak* is an infinitive suffix (Kononov 1956: 190-191). The verbs derived from Turkisms are conjugated the same way as the native Russian verbs. They have the categories of mood, number, person etc. For example, in Present Tense:

The native Russian verb *учить* 'to teach':

Present Tense	sg	pl
1st person	*уч-у*	*уч-им*
2nd person	*уч-ишь*	*уч-ите*
3rd person	*уч-ит*	*уч-ат*

Similar situation with the borrowed Turkic verbs is in Serbian. The verbs generally conjugate according to the grammatical rules of the recipient language. For example:

Native Serbian verb *gledati* 'to watch, look, see':

Present Tense	sg	pl
1st person	*gleda-m*	*gleda-mo*
2nd person	*gleda-š*	*gleda-te*
3rd person	*gleda*	*gleda-ju*

According to Škaljić (1966: 41-44), most of the Turkic verb loanwords are borrowed by means of the suffixes *-isa-(ti)* and *-i-(ti)* in the following ways:

1. by adding the suffix to the stem of a Turkish verb (Škaljić 1966: 41; Stachowski 2014: 1203)*.* For example*: benze-mek* 'to resemble' > *benzeisati* 'to resemble'*; duy-mak* 'to hear, to feel' > *dujisati se* 'to recall, to remember'.

2. By adding the suffix on the basis of the Turkish definite perfect (which is obtained by adding the suffix *-di* or *-ti* or *-du*, *-tu* and the personal pronoun to the present base) (Škaljić 1966: 42; Stachowski 2014: 1203). For example:

Tur. inf. *boya-mak* 'to paint' > Tur. pfv *boya-dı* 'he/she painted' > Srb. inf. *bojadisati* 'to paint'

Tur. inf. *konuş-mak* 'to talk' > Tur. pfv *konuş-tu* 'he/she talked'> Srb. inf. *konuštisati* 'to talk'

Tur. *anla-dı-m* 'I understood'> Srb. *anladim-i-ti* 'understand'

Many Turkic verbs are compound, i.e. consist of a noun or an adjective (usually of foreign origin (Stachowski 2014: 1203)) and an auxiliary verb such as *etmek* 'do', *olmak* 'be' etc. When borrowed into Serbian the auxiliary verbs are replaced with the Serbian words, such as *biti* "to be"*, činiti, učiniti* "to do", while the main word remains unchanged (Škaljić 1966: 43; Stachowski 2014: 1203). For example:

Tur. *kayıp* "loss, disappearance" > Srb. *gaip biti* "to disappear, to get lost" (Škaljić 1966: 44).

Many Serbian verbs of Turkic origin are derived using native Serbian prefixes: *na-, o, po-, pre-, pri-, pro-, raz-, s-, u-* (Škaljić 1966: 45). For example, to create a perfective aspect of a verb: *ipfv baksuzirati* > *pfv izbaksuzirati* 'to jinx'; *ipfv begenisati* > *pfv zabegenisati* 'to love', etc.

Similarly, in Russian many verbs of Turkic origin can be derived using native Russian prefixes. For example, to create a perfective aspect of a verb: *ipfv булгачить* > *pfv набулгачить* 'to confuse, harass''.

4.8 Loss of grammatical categories of Turkic borrowings

The inflectional categories typical of Turkic languages are usually lost in borrowings into Russian. Thus, some loanwords include inflectional affixes of the source language which are no longer perceived as affixes in the recipient language. For example, *bilmez* > *бельмес*, only used in the form *не бельмеса* – 'knows absolutely nothing'.

Turkic *bil-mez* consists of the route *bil* 'to know' and the affix *-mez,* which represents simple present tense in the 3ʳᵈ person in a negative form or a participle in a negative form. Thus, the word originally means 'does not know, ignorant'. However, the Russian speaker did not perceive the negative suffix as sufficient and added Russian negative particle *не* to express the negative meaning. It is also worth noticing that the word is used only in the phrase *не бельмеса* and thus only in negative form in Russian.

In Serbian the situation is more complex due to the large number of Turkish loanwords and loan grammar in Serbian. The morphemes in Turkish borrowings which are present in Serbian in the form of loan grammar are usually perceived in the recipient language with the same meaning as they have as part of loan grammar. For example: *-suz* (*Tur. bahtsız* 'unlucky' > *baksuz* 'unlucky person'). However, this is normally not true for Turkish borrowings which have suffixes that Serbian did not loan. For example, the Serbian synonyms *begenisati* 'to like' < Tur. *beğen-mek* 'to like' (Škaljić 1961: 129-130) and *begendisati* 'to like' < *beğen-di* '3ʳᵈ p. sing. pfv* liked'(Škaljić 1966: 130)). In this example Serbian does not perceive the Turkish suffix *-di* and took the Turkish verbal stem *beğen-* equal to 3ʳᵈ p. sing. perfect form *beğendi*.

There is a small number of Turkic adverbs, interjections and particles which entered Russian and Serbian (Stachowski 2014: 1203). For example: Rus. *айда* '*inj.* expresses exclamation' and Serbian *hajde* '*inj.* expresses exclamation' < Tur. *hayda* / *haydi* '*inj.* expresses exclamation' (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 64).

A large number or Russian and Serbian anthroponyms have Turkic origin. For example, the personal name *Timur* (< Tur. *tümür / demir* 'iron') (Superanskaja 2005: 211), the surnames *Jakšić* (< Tur. *yakşı* 'good; well') or (Baskakov 1979: 142). The Turkic words used for surnames consist of different parts of speech, including nouns, verbs and adjectives as well as phrases. For example: *Булатов* < Tur. *n. bulat* 'type of steel alloy' (Baskakov 1979: 139); *Булгаков* < Tur. *adj.*

bulgak 'fidgety, restless' (Baskakov 1979: 49); *Bujuklić* < Tur. *büyük kılıç* 'big sword'. Generally, when adapting a Turkic word for a surname in Russian the Russian suffix typical for surnames e.g. *-ов (Аксаков), -ев (Тургенев), -ин (Бутурлин)* is attached. Similarly, in Serbian a typical suffix for surnames (*-ić, -ov-ić, -ev-ić*) is usually attached to a Turkic word to create a surname *(Karadžić, Hasanbegović),* unless the word-final of the Turkic already looks like one of them *(Bujuklić).* Some surnames used to be nicknames or names before becoming surnames. For example, *Годунов < Годун* < Tur. *gödün* 'thoughtless, reckless'. Both in Russian and Serbian the grammatical categories of the Turkic words in surnames are not perceived.

5.   Word-formation characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian

Word-formation as described earlier subdivides into two groups: creating words using two or more lexemes, i.e. compounding (e.g. Rus. *язык-о-знание* 'linguistics' < *язык* 'language' + *знание* 'knowledge'), and creating words by attaching affixes to a stem, i.e. derivation (e.g. *bağım* 'dependence' > *bağımsız* 'independent' > *bagımsızlık* 'independence' via the addition of the suffixes *-sız, -lık* etc.).

Through the process of the word-formation adaptation the Turkic loanwords subordinate to the grammatical rules of the recipient language. They become able to inflect and derive into new formations, using the means of the recipient language (Oreshkina 1994: 67).

When adapting to the word-formation system of the recipient language, loanwords pass through a zone of variation (Oreshkina 1994: 67-68). Word-formation variants are understood to be two (or more) words that have a common stem, with the same lexical and grammatical meanings, but with different synonymous affixes or allomorphs (different morphemes of the same affix) (Rus. *чабанствовать / чабановать / чабанить* 'graze cattle' (Vasmer et al. 1986 IV: 308)) (Oreshkina 1994: 67-68).

The word-formation productivity (ability to create new formations) of Turkisms in Russian is varied. Most of the Turkic loanwords do not participate or participate weakly in the derivational processes of Russian, i.e. they do not have derivatives at all or have one derivative word (Oreshkina 1994: 74). However, there is a still number of loanwords which do have derivational chains (a group of formations in which one formation derives from another) (Oreshkina 1994: 74).

The majority of derivatives from Turkisms in Russian are nouns, adjectives, as well as verbs. And the predominant way of their formation is suffixation: *дувал* 'mudbrick wall' (Myznikov 2019: 181) > *дувал-ище* '*augment.* mudbrick wall', *арык* 'irrigation canal'(Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 92) > *арыч-ек* '*dimin.* irrigation canal' (Oreshkina 1994: 71).

To conclude, most of the Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian are able to form new words, using native affixes.

5.2 Formation of nouns

The most common way of forming nouns from Turkic borrowings in Russian is affixation. For example: Tur. *djigit* 'brave young man, rider' > Rus. *джигит* '*styl.* brave young man' > *джигитовка* 'performance of stunts while riding a horse'.

Another way to form a noun from Turkic borrowings is by compounding stems, where the first stem is usually a Turkism and another one is Russian. For example: *сел-е-защита* 'mudflow protection' < *сель* 'mudflow' + *защита* 'protection', *вилаят-исполком* < *вилаят* 'vilayet, an administrative division' + *исполком* (shortform for *исполнительный комитет*) 'executive committee'.

There is high productivity in the noun word-formation from borrowed Turkic stems in Russian with suffixes *-щик (-чик),* for example: *сабантуй* '*vulg. vernac.* feast' (Vasmer et al. 1986 III: 541) > *сабантуйщик* '*vulg. vernac.* reveler.'), *-ист (дудук* 'an type of flute' (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 550) – *дудукист* 'a player on this instrument'), *-ник (сайгак* 'a type of an antelope in Central Asia' (Vasmer et al. 1986 III: 545) – *сайгачник* 'a hunter on this animal' (Oreshkina 1994: 71)).

Sometimes derivatives of Turkic stems in Russian have doublets (equivalents) in the form of complete Turkic loanwords (e.g. *караванщик* vs *караванбаши* < Tur. *karavanbaşı* 'caravan leader'). These words usually have a synonymous lexical meaning. Generally, they have become archaic and obsolete (Oreshkina 1994: 72).

There are doublets, where both words are the product of word-formation of a Turkic stem with a native Russian suffix. Just like with the doublets of Turkic loanwords, one of the words usually becomes an archaic or an obsolete form (*караул* 'guard, watch' > *караульщик* 'sentry' / *караульник* '*arch.* sentry', where the latter is no longer in use) (Oreshkina 1994: 72). However, sometimes a change of lexical meaning of the word licences its retention in the language alongside a new lexical form (*саман* 'adobe' > *саманник* 'a barn for keeping adobe' vs. *саманщик* 'a worker producing adobe' (Oreshkina 1994: 72).

A similar picture with word-formation of Turkish loanwords is observed in Serbian, where one of the most productive way of formations of nouns from Turkic stems is affixation. And similarly to Russian, some of the Turkish borrowings in Serbian have doublets (parallel formations) of Turkish stems with attached Serbian suffixes and complete Turkish loanwords with the same meaning, e.g.: Srb. *bojar* vs Srb. *bojadžija* 'dyer', where Tur. *boya* > Srb. *boja* 'paint' > Srb. *bojar* and Tur.

boyacı > Srb. *bojadžija.*

5.3 Formation of adjectives

The formation of adjectives from Turkic borrowings in Russian is usually performed via affixation of Turkic borrowed noun forms. Russian adjective-forming suffixes (e.g. *-ов- / -ев-, -ин-*) are typically used. For example: *лошадь* 'n. horse' > *лошад-ин-ый.*'*adj.* horse'.

There is a common occurrence of variability in adjectival derivations of Turkic borrowings in Russian, as for example with the suffixes *-ов- / -ев- (алыча* '*n.* cherry-plum' > *алчевый / алчовый* '*adj.* cherry-plum'*, камыш* '*n.* cane' > *камышевый / камышовый* '*adj.* cane'*), -н- / -ов- (-ев-) (кишмиш* '*n.* sultanas' > *кишмишный / кишмишовый* '*adj.* sultanas'*, чинар* '*n.* plane (tree)'> *чинарный / чинаровый* '*adj.* plane (tree)'*)* (Oreshkina 1994: 72). Such parallel formations can coexist for a long time, until one of them becomes obsolete or its lexical meaning changes, for example, in the pair *караковый – каракулый* 'dark bay' (about the color of horses), where the latter is no longer used (Oreshkina 1994: 72).

The formation of adjectives from Turkic borrowings in Serbian is similar to Russian and is usually performed via affixation to Turkic borrowed noun forms: *jogurt* 'yogurt' > *jogurtni* 'like yogurt'; *jogurtovi* 'of yogurt'.

5.4 Formation of verbs

The verb formation in Russian from Turkisms is usually performed via affixation and mostly using Russian verb-forming suffixes (*-ова-, -ева-, -и-* etc.). For example: *джигит* 'a skillful and brave horseman' > *джигит-ова-ть* 'to perform complex stunts on horseback'*, атаман* 'a Cossack chief' > *атаман-и-ть* 'to be an ataman' etc.

There is an interesting example of the adjective *алый* 'bright red, scarlet' (*Алые паруса - Scarlet Sails*), which dates back to the Turkic *al* (red). The adjective is a parallel synonym for the native Russian *ярко-красный* 'bright red'. The adjective became the basis for the verb *алеть* (Korkmazova 2004: 19).

The verb *алеть* aquired two meanings: 1. become scarlet; 2. be visible (*Вдали алеют маки* 'Poppies can be seen in the distance') (Korkmazova 2004: 19).

According to Škaljić, Serbian verbs of Turkic origin are formed from Turkic

words in the following ways (Škaljić 1966: 41-44):

By adding the suffix *-isa-(ti)* to some Turkish nouns and adjectives. For example:

a.   From nouns: Tur. *budala* 'stupid or obsessed person' > Srb. *budalasati* 'to go crazy'

b.   From adjectives: Tur. *sürgün* 'expelled person' > Srb. *surgunisati* – 'to expel someone'

By adding Serbian suffix *-ova-(ti)*. For example:

1.   From Turkish nouns: Tur. *bayram* 'holiday' > Srb. *bajram-ova-ti* 'to celebrate'

2.   From Turkish adjectives: Tur. *battal* 'extinct, cancelled' > Srb. *batal-i-ti* 'to abandon'

6.   **Morphological derivation as the indicator of the assimilation process of Turkic words in Russian and Serbian languages**

Generally, inflectional characteristics are attached to a borrowing by default (Pakerys 2016b: 177), so that it could function and interact with other words in a sentence. For example, nouns of Turkic origin in Russian, as shown in the previous chapters, have the characteristics typical for a native Russian noun: they have a gender, can be inflected for grammatical case (except for invariable nouns) etc. Thus, it is typical for the Turkic loanwords to have the characteristics of the parts of speech which they belong to in the recipient language. However, the word-formation characteristics, i.e. the ability to create new words by compounding or derivation is not obligatory for borrowings (Pakerys 2016b: 177). The word-formation productivity of borrowings shows the level of the assimilation of those words in the recipient language (Pakerys 2016b: 179).

Borrowed Turkisms, revolving in the lexical system of Russian and Serbian, form new lexical items by 'expanding' the root through affixation or compounding. The formation of derivational structures occurs with the help of native Russian and Serbian formal means, such as affixation. Moreover, the creation of morphological structures is subject to certain patterns characteristic of the recipient languages.

In addition, both native and borrowed nouns can be formed by the way of compounding. For example: Srb. *težak-baša* 'first farmer in a village' - from *težak* 'farmer' and Tur. *baş* > Srb. *baša* 'head'; Rus. *шапк-о-закидательство* 'overconfident approach' - from Tur. *şapka* 'hat' > *шапка* 'hat' and *закидывать* 'to throw'.

Some Turkic stems can participate not only in the formation of verb forms, nouns, adjectives, but also adverbs based on Russian and Serbian systems with the help of their native word-building means. For example: Tur. *hazine* 'treasury' > Rus. noun *казна* 'treasury' > adj. *казенный* 'adj. state' > adv. *казённо* 'formally, in a bureaucratic way'; Tur. *güç* 'power, strength' > Srb. adj. *đučan* 'adj. hard'> Srb. adv. *đučno* 'adv. hard'. Thus, the Turkic stems are involved in the formation of different parts of speech both in Russian and Serbian.

Turkic borrowings quickly adapted to the inflectional and word-formatoin systems of Russian and Serbian (Stachowski 2014: 1203). This can be confirmed by the acquisition of the inflectional characteristics of the recipient languages as well as the ability to create new formations resulting in derivational chains using

the means of the recipient languages.

7. Affix extraction

Whilst in Russian there is no obvious trace of loan grammar from any Turkic language, Serbian did acquire some Turkish suffixes through the long-term language contact and a large number of borrowings (Škaljić 1966: 44-45; Stachowski 1961: 42). For this reason, this part of the study devotes more attention to the semantic adaptation of the formations with the Turkic loan grammar in Serbian to research the spread of these phenomenon in a better way.

Serbian acquired some Turkish suffixes (including the ones of Persian and Arabic origin, which came into Turkish) which were the most common in Turkish loanwords and started using them in word-formation of native words as well as non-Turkic loanwords. Since Serbian unlike Turkish does not have the vowel harmony system, it uses only one allomorph of each borrowed suffix.

7.1 Suffix *-čija* / *-džija*

Tur. *-cı (-ci, cu, cü)* > Srb. *-čija / -džija*

The suffix *-cı (-ci, -cu, -cü)* in the Turkish language is mainly used to create names of professions or occupations. The subject of occupation derives from the base of the word, which means what or where the person performs his or her work. For example: Tur. *şarkı* 'song' > *şarkıcı* 'singer'. Through lexical borrowings, this suffix became independent in Serbian, and here it became the most productive suffix of Turkic origin (Radić: 2001: 17). In Serbian this suffix appears in the *-či / -dži* form, that is, in its adaptation form *-čija / -džija*. At the same time, the shorter, more original form *-či / -dži* is mostly non-existent in the modern language and noun forms with this suffix are marked as archaic in explanatory dictionaries (Radić: 2001: 17). The suffix received the Serbian ending *-ja* so that formations with it could declinate (Škaljić 1966: 27). Thus, morphological variety of forming morphemes in Serbian is reduced to one form, *-džija* (Radić: 2001: 18).

The Serbian literary language, having included a wide vernacular speech lexicon in its vocabulary, also accepted a number of formations with the suffix *-čija / -džija*. To a considerable extent such formations are used by writers, among other things, as one of the stylistic means in describing certain social environments (Radić: 2001: 18). In the Serbian literary language, the suffix *-čija / -džija* creates derivations from nouns (*gitardžija* 'guitarist'), verbs (*zgrtadžija* 'grinder') and, more rarely, adjectival and adverbial bases (*badavadžija* 'lazy person') and is also present in the

39

compound-suffix formation (*dangubdžija* 'idler' < *dan* 'day' and *gubiti* 'to kill') (Radić: 2001: 18).

According to Radić (2001: 24) derivatives with the suffix *-čija / -džija* appear in the Serbian literary language in the class of persons, with not just the basic meaning of the performer of the action, but also to the meaning of a person with a certain characteristic:

- who (rather) often, or constantly does something: *zbor* 'meeting' > *zbordžija* '*pej.* participant or organizer of gatherings (who goes to gatherings too often, who calls unnecessary gatherings, etc.);

- who likes something (and understands it), i.e. who enjoys something (too much): *dim* 'smoke' > *dimdžija* 'very passionate smoker';

- who gladly does something a lot: *pravda* 'truth' > *pravdadžija* '*pej.* one who likes to justify himself, who often litigates, a brawler'. (Radić: 2001: 24)

Serbian literary language only peripherally includes forms of *-čija / -džija* in its formation system (Radić: 2001: 27). The majority of such formations belong to vernaculars, archaic, folk, individual speech, etc. (Radić: 2001: 28). This is indicated by numerous references to the form with a competitive, i.e. more common, usually domestic (domesticated) suffix (e.g. *mljekadžija* vs *mljekar* 'milkman') (Radić: 2001: 28). However, domestic (domesticated) suffixes may also create competitive formations with the stems of Turkic origin. For example: Tur. *boyacı* > Srb. *bojadžija* vs Tur. *boya* > Srb. *boja* > *bojar* 'dyer' (Radić: 2001: 28).

Thus, not only does the suffix of Turkic origin *-džija* have the ability to form hybrid formations with native Serbian or non-Turkish borrowed words (Srb. *govoriti* 'to speak' > *govordžija* '*pejor. expres.* orator'; Fr. *bonbon* 'candy' > Srb. *bonbon* > Srb. *bonbondžija* 'candy maker'), but it may also create a competitive formation to a form with a domestic suffix (Srb. *lovac* vs *lovdžija* 'hunter').

7.2 Suffix *-lija*

Tur. *-li (-lı, -lu, -lü)* > Srb. *-lija*

The suffix *-li (-lı, -lu, -lü)* in the Turkish language is generally used to form descriptive adjectives from nouns. The adjective usually means the presence of what the noun it derives from means (Tur. *kuvvet* 'strength' > *kuvvetli* 'strong') or

belonging to it (Tur. *Bulgaristan* 'Bulgary' > *Bulgaristanlı* 'Bulgarian').

In Serbian, this suffix appears in the adaptation form of *-lija*, whose formations, from the formal-grammatical aspect, are noun derivatives. Here, the original form *-li* is preserved to a limited extent in adjectival formations, especially in the speech of the Muslim population (Radić: 2001: 34). However, while the derivatives with the suffix *-li* are very rare, the suffix *-lija* is represented in a significant number of derivatives, and in certain categories it, together with its derivatives, has renewed its productivity (Radić: 2001: 34). According to Škaljić (1966: 27) the Turkish suffix *-li*, similarly to the suffix *-čija* / *-džija*, received the Serbian ending *-ja* so that formations with this suffix could declinate.

In the Serbian literary language, the suffix *-lija* forms derivatives from nouns (*kaput* 'coat' > pej. *kaputlija* 'townsman' (Stevanović et al. 1976 II: 662)), adjectives and adverbs (*bogati* 'rich' > *bogatlija vernac.* 'rich man' (Pešikan et al. 2014 I: 681)) and, more rarely, verb bases (*točiti* 'to pour' > *točajlija vernac.* 'cupbearer' (Stevanović et al. 1976 VI: 246)). It is also present in the compound formation (*maločaršilija* (from *mali* and *čaršija* 'market') 'a. member of the petty bourgeoisie, the class of owners of small estates, small traders and artisans, craftsmen. b. *fig. pej.* limited and selfish man, couple; a man who tries to present himself as more respectable than he is' (Stevanović et al. 1976 III: 286)). In addition to full stems (*paragraflija* '*pej.* the one who blindly adheres to the paragraph, etiquette, the one who excessively adheres to social ethics, excessively rigid, polished man' (Radić: 2001: 40)) truncated stems (shortened by removing part of it) (*maločaršilija* from *mali* and *čaršija*) participate in the formation (Radić: 2001: 35).

The derivatives with the suffix *-lija* appear in the Serbian literary language almost exclusively in the class of beings, usually persons, with the basic meaning of bearers of traits, less often, performers of actions (Radić: 2001: 39). The formations are rare in the literary language and mostly belong to archaisms and vernacular speech, being widely represented in vernaculars (Radić: 2001: 39). Moreover, in contrast to the literary language, vernaculars show an abundance of derivatives of *-lija* precisely in the class of different clothing, jewellery, materials, architecture as well as some food items, fruit-growing, etc. (Radić: 2001: 39).

The semantic meaning of the derivative with the suffix *-lija* in Serbian was expanded through innovative creative processes. There is a large number of

examples where the suffix *-lija* has the function of a stylistic-semantic intensifier. Thus, *etiketlija* would mean someone who excessively adheres to social ethics, an excessively rigid, polished person, etc. Thus, the suffix *-lija* stepped into the sphere of modifying creative means of augmentative-pejorative (expressing contempt or disapproval with greater intensity), or augmentative-affirmative (expressing agreeing or support with greater intensity) use (Radić: 2001: 40). The stylistic character of formations with the suffix *-lija* is more visible in folk poetry, but above all in the framework of the sound-rhythmic organization of verses and special poetic manners, especially in the archaic poetry (Radić: 2001: 40).

Therefore, formations with the suffix *-lija* in the Serbian literary language have a stylistic feature to a great extent, and therefore a peripheral status in the creative system. The suffix is less and less common in use and there is "humorous tone" of certain derivatives. This suffix is not found in some modern grammar books in the section of word formation. However, even though a large number of derivatives of *-lija* belong to archaisms, vernaculars, or historicisms, some linguists argue that the suffix has not completely lost its productivity especially in terms of style (familiarity, irony, pejorativeness) and can be used to build new words, both from domestic and foreign base (Radić: 2001: 43). These new words, however, like most of the old ones, will be stylistically marked (Radić: 2001: 43).

7.3 Suffix *-luk*

Tur. *-lık (-lik, -luk, -lük)* > Srb. *-luk*:

Suffix *-lık (-lik, -luk, -lük)* can be used in the Turkish language to create noun derivatives from bases of various parts of speech: nouns, adjectives, numbers, etc. Such nouns usually have an abstract meaning (*güzel* 'beautiful' > *güzelik* 'beauty'), but they can also belong to other semantic categories, for example the category of places, or objects of a purposeful character, i.e. means (*göz* 'eye' > *gözlük* 'glasses'). Through a large number of borrowings of complete Turkish formations with the suffix *-lık (-lik, -luk, -lük)* it has become independent in Serbian in the form of *-luk* (Radić: 2001: 63). The Serbian literary language included the suffix *-luk* in its production system due to the consequence of its wider representation among Serbian writers (Radić: 2001: 64). In the Serbian literary language, the suffix *-luk* forms derivatives from nouns (*lažovluk* '*expres.* the ability, the skill of lying' (Ivanović 2005: 95; Radić: 2001: 66)), adjectives (*divljaluk* 'barbarity' (Radić:

2001: 73)) and, more rarely, verb bases as well as numbers (*dvaesluk* '*arch.* twenty' (Pešikan et al. 2014 IV: 81; Radić: 2001: 177)) and adverbs (*nazadluk* '*vernac.* regression' (Pešikan et al. 2014 XIII: 704) (Radić: 2001: 64).

The productivity of the suffix *-luk* can be confirmed by its occasional appearance in the language of media, e.g. in Serbian political broadcasts, such as *ustašluk* 'rebellious behaviour' (Radić: 2001: 71) etc. Such forms mostly have a pejorative meaning and are conducive to emotional language. The suffix is often used to create new hybrid formations. The meanings of these formations move to a greater extent in the direction of emphasizing the pejorative component, regardless of whether the suffix only reinforces the pejorativeness of the stem, or whether this pejorativeness is realized by the suffix. Such formations are occasionally used in political speeches, where within the appropriate context, they reinforce and (over)emphasize the negative, and often negative connotative (secondary) meaning of the base word (Radić: 2001: 70-72).

There is one significant function of the suffix *-luk*, which we can be occasionally observed with other Turkish suffixes (e.g. *- čija / -džija*) as well. There are elements of stylistic-semantic intensification which are present in a range of formations with the suffix (Radić: 2001: 72-73). For example, *gavanluk* is 'great wealth' (Pešikan et al. 2014 III: 139), *dušmanluk* is 'great enmity' (Pešikan et al. 2014 V: 63), even 'hatred'. Probably, in large part due to stylistic and semantic intensification, the suffix *-luk* also appears as hyper-productive in a range of formations (Radić: 2001: 72-73).

Thus, it can be concluded that formations in *-luk* are to a large extent stylistic devices, and are, understandably, on the creative periphery of the Serbian literary language (Radić: 2001: 75). The peripheral role of the suffix *-luk* is confirmed by the status of its derivatives in contemporary dictionaries, which are mostly: Turkisms, vernaculars, less often archaic, folk, historical, colloquial words or, which is also often the case, it is referred to a form with a competitor, i.e. with a more common suffix (*barbarluk* vs *barbarstvo* 'barbarity'). Such characteristics and connotative features that express essential stylistic values influence the preservation of his productivity in Serbian (Radić: 2001: 78).

7.4 Suffix *-ana / -na*

Pers. *hana* 'house' (later *hane*), > Tur. *-hana* (later *-hane*) > Srb. *-ana / -na*

The Turkish suffix *-hana* is originally the Persian word *hana* 'house' used in Persian compound nouns. Originally a Persian word meaning 'house' it came to Turkish becoming a suffix for creating names of places (Stachowski 1961: 1) (e.g. Tur. *çay* 'cow' > *çayhane* 'teahouse'). From the numerous complete Turkish formations with this suffix in Serbian, the noun suffix *-(h)ana* was singled out, and became a derivational suffix for non-Turkic borrowings. Since in Serbian vernaculars with this suffix generally occur without initial *h*, the standardization of these formations remained in the form of the morpheme *-ana / -ne* (after vowels) (Radić: 2001: 79). Thus, this suffix in Serbian became one of the few Turkish formative morphemes that have a vowel in the initial position, which limited the range of linguistic occurrences at the morpheme junction (Radić: 2001: 79).

In the Serbian literary language, the suffix *-ana* forms derivatives from nouns (*led* 'ice' > *ledana* 'a room where ice is kept and thus maintains a low temperature' (Pešikan et al. 2014 XI: 298)) and, more rarely, verbs (*strelati* 'shoot' > *streljana* 'shooting range' (Stevanović et al. 1976 VI: 24)) and adjectival bases (*mrtav* 'dead'> *mrtvana* 'music performed at funerals' (Pešikan et al. 2014 XIII: 201)) and is also present in compound-suffix formations (*termo-* 'thermal' + *electro-* 'electric' > *termoelectrana* 'thermal power station' (Stevanović et al. 1976 VI: 192)) (Radić: 2001: 83).

The suffix has been widely used in the field of technology with polysemic references (Radić: 2001: 83). Thus, the same form can refer to an **object** where products are produced and stored (*ekser* 'nail' > *ekserana* 'a department in a factory where nails are produced and kept' (Pešikan et al. 2014 V: 165)), a **place** where it is extracted, but also processes a certain material (*sadra* 'gypsum > *sadrana* 'a place where gypsum is extracted' (Stevanović et al. 1976 V: 607)), where semantic overlaps between the category of **place** and **object** (device) are included (*kreč* > *krečana* 'a pit where lime is slaked or burnt' (Pešikan et al. 2014 XIII: 509)). The derivatives with this suffix are still present in the modern Serbian language, and certain innovation processes are visible on the creative level, marked above all by the development of the productivity of the suffix (hybrid formations, emergence of subject categories, etc.) (Radić: 2001: 83-84). A good illustration of this are modern jargons, where innovations have advanced even more (*abort* 'abortion' > *abortana*

'a motel near a major city where couples in love or adultery stop by' (Andrić 1976: 1)). i.e.A large number of formations became slang words through the metaphorization of the original meanings. For example: *ledana* 'a room where ice is kept and thus maintains a low temperature' vs *ledana* '*slang.* frigid, cold woman' (Pešikan et al. 2014 XI: 298); *krečana* 'a pit where lime is slaked or burnt' vs *krečana* '*slang.* person with dementia' (Pešikan et al. 2014 XIII: 509). At the same time, metaphorization further increased the scope of polysemy (Radić: 2001: 83-84).

The basic determination of the formation with *-ana* in Serbian is their local meaning, and their predominantly colloquial use (Radić: 2001: 85). At the same time, lots of these words are sometimes used in the language of media or individual politicians both in their direct and less frequently figurative meaning (*mrtvana* as 'morgue' or 'room with butchered corpses' (Pešikan et al. 2014 XIII: 201)) (Radić: 2001: 85). Nevertheless, in the creative system of the Serbian literary language, the suffix *-ana* has, for the most part, a peripheral role (Radić: 2001: 85). Most of the formations in dictionaries belong to one of the categories: Turkisms, vernaculars, an archaism etc., or by referring to a form with a competing suffix (*ledana* vs *ledara*, *pivana* vs *pivara* 'brewery') (Radić: 2001: 86). Nevertheless, many linguists argue that the suffix in modern days is at least much less productive, than in the older times (Radić: 2001: 85-87).

To conclude, suffix *-ana* still survives despite various cultural-civilizational and industrial-technological changes. Although limited to a relatively small number of formations, it ensured a permanent presence in the Serbian literary language in a number of forms, expressing a kind of latent productivity thanks to its original creative linguistic economy (Radić: 2001: 94).

There are some other suffixes of Turkic origin in Serbian, which appear in a much smaller number of derivatives in the language. Most of the formations with these suffixes nowadays belong of archaisms, historical words, vernaculars and words made for poetic purposes (Radić: 2001: 95). These are suffixes: *-li, -baša, -i, -ile, -dar/-tar, -suz, -džik.*

7.5 Suffix *-li*

Tur. *-lı (-li, -lu, -lü)* > Srb. *-li*

The suffix *-li* is an immediate continuant of the Turkish formative morpheme, which in Turkish is used to build derivatives from noun stems (as discussed in the paragraph about suffix *-lija*). Most often, they are formed from nouns (*biber* 'pepper' > *biberli* 'peppered' (Pešikan et al. 2014 I: 537)), and rarely adjectives (*gvozden* '*adj*. iron'> *gvozdenli* '*adj*. iron' (Pešikan et al. 2014 I: 225)), or verbs (*trošiti* 'to spend' > *trošali* '*vernac*. spender' (Stevanović et al. 1976 VI: 307)) (Radić: 2001: 96). Despite the participation of a number of non-Turkish stems (*gvozden* > *gvozdenli*) in the formations with *-li* these words did not have their wider representation in the creative system of Serbian (Radić: 2001: 96). However, this increased the stylistic marking of these formations especially in folk poetry (Radić: 2001: 96). From there they, together with other Turkisms, entered the Serbian romantic poetry of the 19th century (Radić: 2001: 97). The stylistic character of this creative morpheme is also confirmed by its presence among writers whose local idiom is not characterized by this linguistic trait (Radić: 2001: 97-98). Formations with *-li*, with a certain participation of non-Turkish stems, appeared as a function of creative-semantic innovations on a stylistic, especially poetic level (Radić: 2001: 98). Regardless of the relatively wider territorial representation of these formations, they appear in the Serbian literary language as stylistic devices in much less amount now than before (Radić: 2001: 98).

7.6 Suffix *-baša*

Tur. *baş* 'head' > *-başı* 'head, main'> Srb. > *-baša* 'head, main'

The Turkish form *-başı* comes from the Turkish word *baş* 'head' and a third person possessive suffix *-ı (-i/-u/-ü)*. It was adapted into Serbian in the form of *-baša*. It has also preserved the noun feature in Serbian (*baš* 'head, elder'; *baša* elder, head, champion), from where it originates and the semi-compound character of a series of forms with it in the first part (*čaršija* 'bazaar' > *baš-čaršija* 'main square, usually covered' (Pešikan et al. 2014 I: 361)) (Radić: 2001: 99). However, some linguists also consider words with *četobaša* '*fol. poet*. 'troop commander' (< *četa* 'troop') type formations as compounds(Radić: 2001: 99).. In favour of this speaks the appearance of these formations with a connecting vowel *-o-*, as well as the fact that in the forms with *-baša* the Turkish form replaces the second part of the

compound, (*četobaša* vs *četovođa* 'troop commander') (Radić: 2001: 99).

The morpheme *-baša* appears in the category of derivatives with the meaning of 'main, prominent performer of the action'. Turkish military language as well as administrative-territorial and especially guild organization in the Ottoman period must have played a significant role in the spread of it (Radić: 2001: 99). The morpheme first appeared within a number of complete Turkish loanwords, i.e. formations with a Turkish stem (Tur. *avcıbaşı* 'chief of hunters' > *avcibaša* 'chief of hunters'), but later the formations with *-başa* from non-Turkic stems started to appear in vernacular speech (Radić: 2001: 99). With time these words transferred into the Serbian literary language (*vuk* '*fig.* brave young man, initially *wolf* > *vukobaša* '*metaph.* brave warrior, warrior, chief warrior' (Pešikan et al. 2014 II: 118)) (Radić: 2001: 100). The morpheme can create formations from non-Turkic nouns (*dever* 'brother-in-law' *deverbaša* '*fol. poet.* 'the main brother-in-law in the wedding party' (Pešikan et al. 2014 IV: 133)), as well as verbs (*čistiti* 'to clean' > *čistibaša* 'overseer of stables and horses' (Stevanović 1976 VI: 883)) (Radić: 2001: 101).

The survival of the suffix and the former beginnings of the development of its larger stylistic dimension are best indicated by its appearance in older didactic and humorous forms (Radić: 2001: 101). Similarly, to other rare suffixes of Turkish origin *-baša* is used less and less in the moder Serbian literary language (Radić: 2001: 101).

7.7 Suffix *-i*

Arab./Pers. *-i* (Škaljić 1966: 291) > Tur. *-i* > Serb. *-i*

In the Turkish language suffix *-i* is mainly used to create adjectives from noun stems. There is a small number of examples of the use of this suffix in Serbian. It is generally used to form adjectives (mainly describing colours) and is mostly used in i.e. folk poetry (*n. golub* 'pigeon' > *adj. golubi* 'of ash colour' (Škaljić 1966: 291)) (Radić: 2001: 101-102).

The morpho-semantic closeness between the Turkish suffixes *-i* and *-li* in Serbian affected mutual competition, and even the crossing of these creative morphemes (*karpuza* 'watermelon' > *karpuzi vs karpuzli* 'like watermelon, of watermelon colour') (Radić: 2001: 102). This also includes an adaptation form *-i* > *-ija* (*kuršum* 'plumb; bullet' > *kuršumlija* vs *kuršumija* '*vernac.* of plumb colour')

(Radić: 2001: 102).

7.8 Suffix -*ile*

Turkish *ile* (suffix form: *-la, -le*) > Srb. *-ile*

The suffix *-ile* is originally a Turkish postposition *ile* (suffix form: *-la, -le* 'with; with the help of, by'). In Serbian it is mostly attached to noun stems, creating derivatives with an adverbial meaning (Radić: 2001: 103). The suffix first entered Serbian in the framework of complete Turkish borrowings, i.e. formations with a Turkism as a stem (*adet* 'custom' > *adetile* 'by custom' (Pešikan et al. 2014 I: 28)). From the vernacular speech individual cases of these formations entered the Serbian literary language (*avaz* 'voice' > *avazile* '*vernac.* loudly' (Pešikan et al. 2014 I: 12)). There is also a small amount of hybrid formations (*namera* 'intention' > *namerile* (Radić: 2001: 104) vs *namerno* 'willfully, intentionally'; *ruka* 'hand' > *rukaile* (Radić: 2001: 104) vs *rukama* 'with hands, without using tools') (Radić: 2001: 103-104).

7.9 Suffix -*suz*

Persian *-dar* > Tur. *-dar / -tar* > Srb. *-dar / -tar*

Suffix *-dar / -tar* usually appears in derivatives of noun stems, with the basic meaning of the performer of the action (i.e. the person in charge of something), rarely also of purposeful prepositions (means) and is generally used in vernacular speech (Radić: 2001: 104).In addition to noun stems, other parts of speech may participate in formations (*znat* 'know' > *znadar* '*arch.* knowledgeable, connoisseur' (Radić: 2001: 118)). Certain formations indicate the presence of stylistic-semantic intensification but also the predominantly poetic milieu in which they occur (*čuvati* 'to keep, to guard' > *čuvadar* 'guardian' (Stevanović 1976 VI: 897)) (Radić: 2001: 104).

7.10 Suffix -*suz*

Turkish *-sız (-siz, -suz, -süz)* > Srb. *-suz*

The suffix *-sız (-siz, -suz, -süz)* is an adjective-forming morpheme in Turkish that is most often attached to noun stems, and means the absence of what is expressed by the stem word (equiv. 'without', 'no') (Tur. *şeker* 'sugar' > Tur. *şekersiz*

'without sugar'). In Serbian, these formations appear more often as noun and adjective forms and in some examples, they also have an adverbial meaning (Radić: 2001: 106). They are primarily a feature of vernacular speech (*lezet* '*vernac*. taste, sweetness' > *lezetsuz* 'tasteless, unsweet'). However, a number of formations with this suffix are also found in literary texts (*baksuz* 'man of bad luck', Tur. *bahtsız*) (Radić: 2001: 106). There is a small number of hybrid formations with this suffix as well (*brk* 'moustache' > *brkesuz* / *brkosuz* '*vernac.* someone who shaves his moustache' (Pešikan et al. 2014 VII: 183)) (Radić: 2001: 106).

7.11 Suffix *-džik*

Turkish *-cık* (*-cik, -cuk, -cük*) > Srb. *-džik*

In the Turkish language, this formative morpheme has the function of a noun diminutive suffix. The Serbian vernaculars have formations with the suffix *-džik* to a limited extent but may include hybrid formations. The suffix is also recorded in form of *-džika*, with a feminine ending *-a* (*kaduna* 'lady' > *kadundžika* vs *kadunica* '*dimin.* lady' (Lavrovskij 1870: 227). In the vernacular, this suffix can appear in other functions as well. Since its basic function is diminutive, it appears in the name of a number of children's games (*beštašadžik* 'child game'). In a limited number of examples, this suffix entered literary texts from vernacular speeches, and created hybrids (*soba* 'room' > *sobadžik* vs *sobica* 'a room for chests and suits next to a larger room') (Radić: 2001: 106-107).

8.   Conclusion

The history of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian brings along a complex process of their morphological adaptation and the extraction of Turkic affixes in the recipient languages. The two Slavic languages mostly similar in vocabulary and grammar were influenced by also mutually similar Turkic languages. However, the duration, intensity of the language contacts as well as the conditions and areas (cultural, political, economic, social, etc.) in which they took place played a significant role in the difference of the processes of language borrowing from the Turkic languages between Russian, on the one hand, and Serbian, on the other hand. While the flow of the Turkic borrowings into Russian was strong until the 17th century, and then started to become weaker until disappeared (Stachowski 2014: 1207), in the case of Serbian it prolonged until the beginning of the 20th century. Moreover, from the 15th until the 19th century Serbia was under the Ottoman rule and the state language was Turkish (Stachowski 2014: 1208). Despite the purification processes a large number of Turkic loanwords as well as affixes remained in the language and kept the derivation ability (Stachowski 2014: 1208).

The study has presented the analyses of the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings and the extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian in various aspects, including the inflectional and word-formation characteristics.

In terms of the inflectional characteristics of the Turkic loanwords, the situations in Russian and Serbian are very similar. Turkic loanwords mostly acquire the grammatical categories, which are characteristic of the parts of speech they belong to in the recipient languages. Most of the Turkic loanwords in Russian lose their native grammatical categories, i.e. the Russian speakers do not distinguish them in the loanwords. Moreover, there are no attested cases of any Turkic loan grammar or affixes which are widely used in Russian. However, in Serbian in many cases the situation is absolutely opposite. Due to the closer and more intense contact of the Serbian speakers with the Turkic languages (particularly Turkish), the Serbian vernacular speech and later the literary language borrowed a great number of loanwords. This caused some of the Turkish grammar, such as the affixes, to be perceived in Serbian. The suffixes are effectively used with non-Turkic words, mostly in derivation. Some of them compete with native suffixes.

In terms of the morphological derivation as the indicator of the assimilation process of the Turkic borrowings the study has shown that most of the Turkic

loanwords in Russian and Serbian can effectively derive other forms.

The extraction of Turkic affixes in Serbian seem to be the most distinctive feature of the Turkic borrowings between the Serbian and Russians.

To conclude, the study showed that the hypothesis about the similarity of the morphological adaptation of the borrowings and the extraction of affixes of similar Turkic languages in similar Slavic languages is wrong.

The current work focuses on the morphological aspect of the adaptation of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian. Thus, the study can be further supplemented with phonological and semantic adaptations. The study can be also expanded to a broader scale of all Slavic languages, for which the current work may become the basis. As Kowalski put it in 1929 at the 1st Slavic Congress in Prague, the history of Turkic loanwords is one of the most interesting sheets on the cultural history of the Slavic peoples and their mediating role between West and East (Stachowski 2014: 1208).

Abbreviations

ADJ. – adjective

ADV. – adverb

Arab. – Arabic

OCS – Old Church Slavic

POS. - positive

arch. – archaic

CMPR. - comparative

DIM. – diminutive

dissapr. - disapproving

expres. – expressive

Fr. – French

Iran. – Iranian (languages)

IPFV – imperfective aspect

metaph. – metaphorical

N. - noun

PFV – perfective aspect

Pers. - Persian

Rus. – Russian

Slav. - Slavic

slang. - slang

Serb. – Serbian

SUP. - superlative

Tur. – Turkic

V. - verb

vernac. – vernacular

References

Abdullojev 2001 =Абдуллоев, Д. 2001. *К вопросу о некоторых восточных словах, вошедших в русский язык 'On the question of some oriental words included in the Russian language'.* Российская академия наук, Музей антропологии и этнографии им. Петра Великого (Кунсткамера).

Andrić 1976 = Андрић, Д. 1976. *Двосмерни речник српског жаргона и жаргону сродних речи и израза 'Two-way dictionary of Serbian jargon and jargon-related words and expressions'.* Београдски издавачко-графички завод.

Baskakov 1960 = Баскаков, Н. 1960. *Тюркские языки. 'Turkic languages'.* Москва.

Baskakov 1969 = Баскаков, Н. 1969. *Введение в изучение тюркских языков 'Introduction into the study of Turkic languages'.*

Baskakov 1979 = Баскаков, Н. 1979. *Русские фамилии тюркского происхождения 'Russian surnames of Turkic origin''.* Nauka.

Blažek, V., Schwarz, M. & Srba, O. 2019. *Altaic Languages.*

Buribaeva 2013 = Бурибаева, М. 2013. *Тюркские слова в русском языке как результат языковых контактов 'Turkic words in Russian as a result of language contacts'.* Irkutsk: Вестник Иркутского государственного лингвистического университета, (1 (22)), 99-105.

Bussmann, H., Kazzazi, K., & Trauth, G. 2006. *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics.* Routledge.

Comrie, B., Hewitt, B. G., Payne, J. R., & Lass, R. 1981. *The languages of the Soviet Union (No. 2).* CUP Archive.

Crystal, D. 2011. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics.* John Wiley & Sons.

Csató, É., & Johanson L. 1998. *The Turkic Languages.* Routledge.

Devlin, J., Jamison H. L., Matthews P. M., & Gonnerman, L. M. 2004. *Morphology and the internal structure of words.* Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 101, no. 41 (2004): 14984-14988.

Dybo 2007 = Дыбо, А. 2007. *Лингвистические контакты ранних тюрков : лексический фонд : пратюркский период 'Linguistic contacts of the early Turks : lexical fund : Proto-Turkic period'.* Москва: Вост. лит.

Elšík, V. 2007. *Affix extraction: A case study on Hungarian Romani.*

Gadzhieva 1997 = Гаджиева, Н. 1997. *Тюркские языки 'Turkic languages'.* Языки мира: Тюркские языки.

Gusterin 2014 = Густерин, П. 2014. *История Ибрагим-бека. Басмачество одного курбаши с его слов 'History of Ibrahim-bek. Basmachism of one kurbashi from his words'.* Saarbrucken: LAP LAMBERT.

Haspelmath, M. 2009. *Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues.* Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook (2009): 35-54.

Ivanov 1990 = Иванов, В., ed. 1990. *Грамматическая интерференция в условиях национально-русского двуязычия 'Grammatical interference in the conditions of national-Russian bilingualism'.* Наука.

Ivanović 2005 = Ивановић, Н. 2005. *Значења изведених апстрактних именица у српском језику (на материјалу из Речника САНУ и Речника МС) 'Meanings of derived abstract nouns in the Serbian language (based on material from the SANU Dictionary and MS Dictionary)'.* Наш језик 36, no. 1-4: 86-99.

Jakushkina 2015 = Якушкина Е. 2015. *Сербскохорватский язык 'Serbo-Croatian'.* Москва: In Большая российская энциклопедия. Том 30.

Johanson, L. 1998. *The History of Turkic.* London & New York: In: The Turkic Languages : Routledge, 81–83.

Johanson, L., & Johanson, É. Á. C. 2015. *The Turkic Languages.* Routledge.

Karimullina & Karimullina 2015 = Каримуллина, Г. & Каримуллина, Р. 2015. *Толковые словари русского языка как источник изучения морфологической адаптации заимствований 'Explanatory dictionaries of the Russian language as a source for studying the morphological adaptation of borrowings'.* Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного гуманитарно-педагогического университета, (10), pp.184-189.

Katzner, K., & Miller, K. 2002. *The languages of the world.* Routledge.

Korkmazova 2004 = Коркмазова, Л. 2004. *Освоение в русском языке тюркизмов с неясными основами. PhD diss. 'The adaptation of Turkisms with unclear basis in the Russian language. PhD diss.* Дагестанский государственный педагогический университет.

Lavrovskij 1870 = Лавровский, П. 1870. *Сербско-русский словарь 'Serbian - Russian dictionary'.* Типография Императорской Академии Наук.

Lehmann, W. P. 1962. *Historical linguistics: An introduction.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Lopatin & Uluhanov 2015 = Лопатин В. & Улуханов И. 2015. *Русский язык 'Russian language'.* Москва: In Большая российская энциклопедия. Том 29.

Menges, K. H. 1968/1995. *The Turkic Languages and Peoples. An Introduction to Turkic Studies.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Myznikov 2019 = Мызников, С. 2019. *Русский диалектный этимологический словарь 'Russian dialect etymological dictionary'.* Москва: Нестор-История.

Nazarov 1984 = Назаров, О. 1984. *Туркменские слова в русском тексте 'Turkmen words in the Russian text'.* Ылым.

Ogienko 2012 = Огиенко, И. 2012. *Иноземные элементы в русском языке: История проникновения заимствованных слов в русский язык 'Foreign elements in the Russian language: The history of the penetration of borrowed words into the Russian language'.* Либроком.

Oreshkina 1994 = Орешкина, М. 1994. *Тюркские слова в современном русском языке: проблемы освоения 'Turkic words in modern Russian: issue of adaptation'.* Academia.

Pakerys, J. 2016a. *Morphological adaptation of adjectival borrowings in modern Lithuanian.* Baltistica 51, no. 2 (2016): 239-269.

—. 2016b. *On the derivational adaptation of borrowings.* SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics 13, no. 2 (2016).

Pešikan 2014 = Пешикан, М. et al. 1959–2014. *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног и народног језика 'Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian literary and colloquial language', I-XIX.* Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности.

Plank, F. 1994. *Inflection and derivation.* The Encyclopedia of language and linguistics, vol. by RE Asher. (1994): 1671-1678.

Radić 2001 = Радић, П. 2001. *Турски суфикси у српском језику: са освртом на стање у македонском и бугарском 'Turkish suffixes in the Serbian*

language: with reference to the situation in Macedonian and Bulgarian'. Институт за српски језик САНУ.

Samojlovich 1922 = Самойлович, А. 1922. *Некоторые дополнения к классификации турецких языков 'Some additions to the classification of Turkic languages'.* Российская государственная академическая типография.

Shchitova 2008 = Щитова, О. 2008. *Сибирские заимствования русских говоров среднеобского пограничья XVII в.: по материалам деловой письменности 'Siberian Borrowings of Russian Dialects of the Middle Ob Borderlands of the 17th Century: Based on Materials of Business Writing'.* In Человек-текст-эпоха, pp. 10-34.

Shipova 1976 = Шипова, Е. 1976. *Словарь тюркизмов в русском языке 'Dictionary of Turkisms in the Russian langauage'.* Nauka.

Skotvid 2015 = Скорвид, С. 2015. *Славянские языки 'Savic languages'.* In Большая российская энциклопедия. Том 30. Москва, 396-397.

Stachowski, S. 1961. *Przyrostki obcego pochodzenia w języku serbochorwackim 'Suffixes of foreign origin in the Serbo-Croatian language'.* Vol. 27. Nakł. Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego,.

—. 2014. *Türkischer Einfluss auf den slavischen Wortschatz 'Turkish Influence on the Slavic Vocabulary'.* In Halbband 2 (pp. 1198-1210). De Gruyter Mouton.

Stevanović et al. 1976 = Стевановић, М. et al. 1967–1976. *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика 'Dictionary of Serbi-Croatian literary language', I–VI.* Нови Сад – Загреб: Матица Српска.

Superanskaja 2005 = Суперанская, А. 2005. *Современный словарь личных имён: Сравнение. Происхождение. Написание 'Modern Dictionary of Personal Names: Comparison. Origin. Writing'.* Москва: Айрис-пресс.

Škaljić, A. 1966. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku 'Turkic borrowings in Serbo-Croatian'.* Sarajevo: Svjetlost.

Tadinova 2006 = Тадинова, Р. 2006. *Тюркские лексические заимствования в системе северокавказских языков 'Turkic lexical borrowings in the system of North Caucasian languages'.*

Vasmer 1986 = Фасмер, М., Ларин, Б. & Трубачев О. 1986. *Этимологический словарь русского языка, 'Etymological dictionary of the Russian*

language' I-IV. Прогресс.

Vrabec, Ž. 2021. *Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin and Serbian: An Essential Grammar.* Routledge.