

Univerzita Karlova

Filozofická fakulta

Katedra Blízkého Východu

Diplomová práce

Bc. Vitali Brezhnev

**Morfologická adaptace a extrakce afixů u turkických lexikálních
přejímek v ruštině a Serbštině**

**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 použitím citovaných pramenů, literatury a dalších odborných zdrojů a že tato práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze, dne 21. 12. 2022

Vitali Brezhnev

Klíčová slova:

Morfologická adaptace – turečtina – turkické jazyky – ruština – Serbština

Key words:

Morphological adaptation – Ottoman Turkish – Turkic – Russian – Serbian

Abstrakt:

Současná práce se zabývá morfologickou adaptací u turkických výpůjček v ruštině a Serbštině z hlediska jejich skloňování, časování a slovtvorby 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 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.....	10
1.1 Goal.....	11
1.2 Methodology.....	11
1.3 Sources.....	13
1.4 Structure.....	13
2. Turkic borrowings into Russian and Serbian.....	15
2.1 General description of morphological adaptation and affix extraction.....	15
2.2 Turkic languages.....	18
2.3 Slavic languages.....	27
2.4 Historical context.....	31
3. Inflectional characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian.....	36
3.1 Category of animacy.....	36
3.2 Category of gender.....	37
3.3 Category of number.....	40
3.4 Category of case.....	41
3.5 Category of degree.....	42
3.6 Categories of tense, aspect and mood.....	43
3.7 Loss of grammatical categories of Turkic borrowings.....	51
4. Word-formation characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and	

Serbian	54
4.1 Formation of nouns	55
4.2 Formation of adjectives	56
4.3 Formation of verbs	57
4.4 Morphological derivation as the indicator of the assimilation process of Turkic words in Russian and Serbian languages	59
5. Affix extraction	62
5.1 Suffix <i>-džija</i>	62
5.2 Suffix <i>-lija</i>	64
5.3 Suffix <i>-luk</i>	65
5.4 Suffix <i>-ana / -na</i>	67
5.5 Suffix <i>-li</i>	69
5.6 Suffix <i>-baša</i>	69
5.7 Suffix <i>-i</i>	70
5.8 Suffix <i>-ile</i>	71
5.9 Suffix <i>-dar</i>	71
5.10 Suffix <i>-suz</i>	72
5.11 Suffix <i>-džik</i>	72
6. Conclusion	73
A list of the words of Turkic origin used in the current work	76
Common Slavic	76
Russian	76
Serbian	79

Abbreviations.....	84
References.....	86

1. Introduction

The current study is inspired by the research of Jikia *Non-lexical modifications of Ottoman 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, Azerbaijani on the furthestmost Eastern Georgian dialect Ingilo (e.g. grammatical intensive of Ottoman Turkish origin: *წითელი* [c’iteli] ‘red’ > *წიმიწითელი* [c’imc’iteli] ‘very red’), on the one hand, and of another Turkic language, Ottoman Turkish on the furthestmost Western Georgian dialect Chvneburi (e.g. calque of Ottoman Turkish morphological model for OttTur. *burada* ‘here’ bu-ra-da [here-ADV- LOC] > *აქში* [aqʃi] [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 furthestmost 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 furthestmost 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-semantic 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 Turkic borrowings¹ in Russian and Serbian dividing the study into two parts: *Inflectional characteristics of Turkic borrowings in 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

Since the historical contacts between Serbian and Ottoman Turkish were more intensive than that of Russian with other Turkic languages (Kipchak, Tatar, Crimean Tatar, Ottoman Turkish etc.) the hypothesis that the current work checks is that the level of the penetration of Turkic borrowings in Serbian is stronger than that in Russian.

The research question of the current study is how different is the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings and the extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian.

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 Slavic languages have had independently from each other 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 borrowings 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. In the chapter *Conclusion* the results of the analysis made in the previous chapters are summarized.

Descriptive method aims at analysing the structure of the language on different levels, including morphology, morphonology, semantics etc. This method is also used to identify whether the word is native or foreign as well as study whether the borrowed word has its

own affixes and whether it is able to have affixes in the recipient language. This method was used in many parts of the work, including the study of the inflectional characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian, the process of the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings as well as the extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian etc. For example, when describing the borrowing of the verbs from Ottoman Turkish into Serbian which is very versatile. If the usual process of borrowing consists of taking the Ottoman Turkish verb's stem as the root for the Serbian verb (e.g., OttTur. *benze-mek* 'to resemble' > *benze-isati* 'to resemble'; *duy-mak* 'to hear, to feel' > *dujisa-ti se* 'to recall, to remember', where *-mak/-mek* and *-ti* are the infinitive endings), there are cases where Past Tense verb form is taken whole as a root of the Serbian verb. OttTur. *boya-mak* INF 'to paint' > OttTur. *boya-di* paint-PST.3SG 'he/she painted' > Serb. *bojadisati* 'to paint'; OttTur. INF *konuş-mak* 'to talk' > OttTur. *konuş-tu* PST.3SG 'he/she talked' > Serb. *konuştisati* INF IMPFV 'to talk'; OttTur. *anla-di-m* PST.1SG 'I understood' > Serb. *anladum-i-ti* INF IMPFV 'to understand'. Parallel forms can be also found, for example: Serb. *begenisati* and *begendisati* 'to like', which both derive from the Ottoman Turkish verb *beğen-mek* 'to like'. These examples give the ability to suggest that there are two types of borrowings: those borrowed by people who spoke Ottoman Turkish and thus understood its structure (e.g., Serb. *begen-isati* < OttTur. *begen-mek*) and those who did not speak it and just took the verb in the form they heard it (e.g., Serb. *anladum-iti* 'to understand' < OttTur. *anladum* PST 1 SG 'understood' < OttTur. *anla-mak* INF 'to understand').

The comparative analyses of Turkic borrowings between Russian and Serbian was used to study differences between the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings and the extraction of Turkic affixes in Russian and Serbian. The method helps identify how similar or different is the penetration level of Turkic borrowings in the recipient languages. Thus, the study shows that there are a lot of similarities in morphological adaptation of Turkic loanwords in Russian and Serbian. For example, normally Turkic loanwords in both Russian and Serbian have the inflectional characteristics of the recipient language similarly to the native words, they can have suffixes and derive. However, one of the brightest examples of the difference in this process is the extraction of Ottoman Turkish suffixes in Serbian, while there is no evidence of the extraction of any suffixes of Turkic origin in Russian.

to find similarities and differences between them. This method was used for example when studying the loss of the grammatical categories of the Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian. For example, when comparing the Ottoman Turkish passive voice formation suffixes *-n* and *-l* with their analogy in Serbian, particle *se*. Another example of using the typological analyses was when studying the morphological adaptation of the Tat. *bilmes* > Rus. *бельмес*. There the Tatar suffix *-mes* lost its grammatical meaning and as the analogy the domestic Russian *ne* was added to the word etc.

1.3 Sources

The primary sources for the study are the work of Oreshkina (1994) for the study of Turkic borrowings 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 Turkic borrowings 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).

1.4 Structure

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

The chapter *Inflectional characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian* studies 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* studies 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.

The chapter *Affix extraction* describes the borrowed Ottoman 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

2.1 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 as by adding new affixes to it (Bussmann et al. 2006:294; Plank 1994: 1672).

Word-formation adaptation is one of the processes that loanwords can go through after being borrowed into the recipient language. The aim of adaptation is to adapt a foreign lexeme in such a way that it can be included in some declension types.

Some linguists (Táborská 2020; Rusínová 2002), put the morphological and word-formation adaptations on one level. In this case the morphological adaptation includes inflectional adaptation is accompanied by pronunciation adaptation and sometimes orthographic adaptation (Táborská 2020: 42; Rusínová 2002: 311; Dokulil: 1977; 1978).

Word-formation adaptation is indeed closely related to morphological adaptation, which is why some linguists mention it as part of the morphological adaptation (Svobodová 2009: 46; Plank 1994: 1671; Crystal 2011: 314). The current work is based on the latter mentioned studies. For this reason, the morphological adaptation consists of inflectional and word-formation adaptations. Word-formation adaptation consists of compounding and derivation. The main difference between the two approaches is mostly the definition of the terms. Whilst for the first approach the process of adaptation is viewed in the scale of morphological (inflectional adaptation) accompanied by pronunciation (phonetical) adaptation and word-formation adaptation, the latter approach (used in this work) divides the process of adaptation into phonetical, morphological and semantical adaptation. In other words, the term morphological for the first approach is equal to the term inflectional for the second approach, which combines it with word-formation adaptation into the general morphological adaptation term.

The borrowed word becomes a motivator for further derivation. Appropriate word-formation affixes are attached to the bases of words, they become part of compounds, or participate in the creation of abbreviations. Word-formation adaptation includes not only the issue of inflection, but, unlike inflectional adaptation, it also deals with semantic classification (Táborská 2020: 43). According to Rusínová (2002: 311–312) with word-formation adaptation, unlike inflectional adaptation, the goal is above all to achieve segmentability, which is a prerequisite for the ordinary speaker to recognize both semantic, as well as formal word structures (Táborská 2020: 43; Rusínová 2002: 312). Gradually, as the word is incorporated into the vocabulary of the recipient language, it enters word-formation relationships more and more often (Táborská 2020: 43).

“If the segmentability is clear, then it does not play much of a role whether the instrument of adaptation of the borrowed base was a domestic or foreign formant, which was adapted only morphologically and has already created a number of representatives in the language, just as it does not matter whether the word is segmented according to the formation in the original language” (Rusínová 2002: 311–312).

Nouns, adjectives and verbs are most easily subject to word-formation adaptation (Táborská 2020: 43). In the case of verbs, the addition of a word-formation formant as an inflective function to another verbal base is a necessary condition for their further use in the recipient language (Táborská 2020: 43; Kroupová 2016: 187). These newly formed forms are evidence of domestication taken over by the recipient language (Táborská 2020: 43; Svobodová 2013: 145).

Inclusion in the vocabulary of the recipient language requires the loanword to actively participate in other word-formation processes (Rusínová 2002: 312). Therefore, an important stage of word-formation adaptation is the combination of a foreign word base (phonetically and inflectionally adapted by an ending or a word-formation formant with an ending) and a native word-formation formant (Rusínová 2002: 311–312). In other words, it involves the inclusion of the borrowed word in domestic word-formation relationships:

OttTur. *bayram* ‘holiday’ > Serb. *bayram* ‘holiday’ > Serb. *bajram-ova-ti* ‘to celebrate’;

OttTur. *bahtsız* ADJ ‘unlucky’ > Serb. *baksuz* ADJ ‘unlucky person’ >
Serb. *baksuzirati* V IPFV ‘to jinx’ > *izbaksuzirati* V PFV ‘to jinx’

OttTur. *bahtsız* ADJ ‘unlucky’ > Serb. *baksuz* N ‘unlucky person’ > *baksuznik* N ‘bad luck bringer’

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 Ottoman Turkish *yeniçeri* ‘elite Ottoman regiment’ < *yeni* ‘new’ + *çeri* ‘army’. This is a transparent compound (consists of two lexemes) in Ottoman Turkish, but since Russian has no other words with the elements *yeni* or *çeri*, 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 Ottoman 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, Serb. *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 to 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 Ottoman Turkish (*kalpak*), Tatar (*калпак*) or Kyrgyz (*калпак*) etc. is unclear. Similar situation with obscurity of the source language is with many other Russian words of Turkic origin such as *карий* ‘dark-brown, hazel’ (< Tat., CrimTat., Bashk., OttTur., etc. *kara* ‘black’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 199), *алый* ‘bright red, scarlet’ (Tat., Kip., Chag. *al* ‘scarlet’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 74) etc.

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’ + OttTur. 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 (Elšik 2007: 3).

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). Turkic languages have historically had contacts with Tunhus-Manjur, Mongolian and Chinese languages in the East; Ural languages in the North; Iranian and Semitic languages in the South; Slavic languages as well as Greek, Albanian, Romanian in the West (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 (Blažek 2019: 80-90). Some of these classifications are briefly demonstrated below to show the variety of approaches to the topic. The last classification by Baskakov (Blažek 2019: 85) is explained in more details targeting the languages of the Bulgar, Oghur and Kipchak groups which influenced Russian and Serbian the most. This classification is considered to be a classical model (Blažek 2019: 85). It is important to consider that Turkic languages cannot always be clearly divided into genetic groups (Gadzhieva 1997: 21). As a result of multiple mixing and redistribution some of the Turkic languages (e.g., Crimean Tatar, Uzbek) share a phenomenon that whilst some of their dialects (e.g., South coast dialect of Crimean Tatar, Kipchak dialects of Uzbek) belong to the language by their features, according to the decisive classification parameters they belong to different genetic groups (Gadzhieva 1997: 21).

A classification based on the phonetical isoglosses was created in 1922 by Samojlovich (Blažek 2019: 83). It divides Turkic languages into six groups: r-group (Bulgar group), d-group (Uyghur or Northeast group), tau-group (Kipchak or Northwest group), tag-lik group (Chagatay or Southeast group), tag-lı group (Kipchak-Turkmen or Central group) and ol-group (Southwest group) (Blažek 2019: 83; Gadzhieva 1997: 19).

According to Johanson (1998: 81-83), who used the combination of geographical, genetic, and typological approaches (Blažek 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), Kipchak (northwest) and Oghuz (southwest) groups (Johanson 1998: 81-83).

One of the most contemporary models was presented in 2017 (and later updated (Hammarström 2021)) by Hammarström and others). Similarly, to the previous table by

Johanson this model classifies the Turkic languages considering typology, genetics and geography. The table part of the online Glottolog project and is being constantly updated (currently Glottolog 4.6 version) (Hammarström 2021).

In the table by the Hammarström (2021) the ancient Proto-Turkic evolves into Common Turkic and Old Bulgar, with the latter having Chuvash as the only successor. The Common Turkic evolves into North Siberian, Central Siberian, Kipchak, Oghuz and Turkestan languages.

Kipchak is divided into East Kipchak, North Kipchak, South Kipchak, Unclassified Kipchak, West Kipchak language groups. East Kipchak subdivides into Kirgiz (Northern Kirgiz and Southern Kirgiz), Southern Altai (Altai-Kizi, Telengit, Teleut). North Kipchak consists of Bashkir (Burzhan, Kuvakan, Yurmaty), Tatar (Baraba Tatar, Astrakhan Tatar, Kasimov, Kazan Tatar, Tepter Tatar, Tobol-Irtysh Tatar, Tomsk Tatar, Ural Tatar, West Tatar). South Kipchak contains Karakalpak (Northeastern Karakalpak and Southeastern Karakalpak), Kazakh (Northeastern Kazakh, Southern Kazakh, Western Kazakh), Nogai Alabugat Tatar, Black Nogai, Central Nogai, Karagash, White Nogai, Yurt Tatar)); unclassified Pecheneg/Cumanic. West Kipchak includes Crimean Tatar (Central Crimean, Cuman, Dobruja Tatar, Northern Crimean, Southern Crimean), Krymchak, Karachai, Balkar, Karaim (Eastern and Western), Kumyk (Buinaksk, Khaikent, Khasavyurt), Urum).

Oghuz evolves into Nuclear Oghuz and Salar. The Nuclear Oghuz group consists of East, Central and West Oghuz and Qashqai languages. East Oghuz languages are Khorasan Turkic and Turkmen, Central Oghuz group consists of Azerbaijani (North Azerbaijani and South Azerbaijani) and Salchuq languages. West Oghuz languages contain Ottoman Turkish (Anatolian Ottoman Turkish, Cypriot Ottoman Turkish, Karamanli, Ottoman Turkish, Syrian Turkmen Ottoman Turkish), Rumelian Ottoman Turkish and Gagauz languages.

One of the most classical models of classification of Turkic languages was created by Baskakov (Blažek 2019: 85). It considers the history, phonetics, vocabulary and grammar of the studied languages (Baskakov 1952; Baskakov 1960).

According to Baskakov (1960) the classification of Turkic languages is mainly a periodization of numerous unifications and collapses of different Turkic tribes which led to the graduate separation of the common Turkic language into other new forms and

languages. (Baskakov 1960: 121). During the first millennium the Hunnic empire, which united numerous Turkic, Tungus-Manjur and other tribes, collapsed into two parts, which Baskakov (1960) calls West Hunnic and East Hunnic groups (Blažek 2019: 85). According to Baskakov (Baskakov 1969: 153-154), the formation of the two Hunnic states and the stable duration of their separation led to the development of distinct Turkic tribes and languages. Even though the tribes and languages kept mutual contact as the result of the separation they have possessed distinctive features. These features today divide all Turkic languages into West Hunnic and East Hunnic language groups.

West Hunnic group consists of four groups: 1). Bulgar language group; 2). Oghur language group; 3). Kipchak language group; 4). Karluk language group (Gadzhieva 1997: 20; Baskakov 1952).

Bulgar language group consists of Bulgar, Khazar and modern Chuvash (Gadzhieva 1997: 20; Baskakov 1952).

Oghur language group divides into three subdivisions: a). Oghur-Turkmen (Oghuz language of X-XI centuries and Turkmen); b). Oghur-Bulgar (Uz, Pecheneg, Gagauz, Surguch, Yuruk and other); c). Oghur-Seljuk (Seljuk, Ottoman Turkish, Old Azerbaijani, Modern Azerbaijani, Ottoman Turkish, South coast dialect of Crimean Tatar, Urum) (Gadzhieva 1997: 20; Baskakov 1952).

Kipchak group consists of a). Kipchak-Oghur (Kipchak, Polovets (Cuman), Karaim, Kumyk, Karachay, Balkar, Crimean Tatar); b). Kipchak-Bulgar (Western Golden Horde Turkic, Tatar, Bashkir); c). Kipchak-Nogai (Nogai, Karakalpak, Kazakh, Kipchak dialects of Uzbek).

Karluk group, which divides into two branches: Karluk Uyghur (Karakhanids state language and post-Karakhanid period language) and Karluk-Khwarezmian (Karluk-Khwarezmian, Eastern Golden Horde Turkic, Chagatay of XII-XIV centuries, Old Uzbek, Modern Uzbek, Modern Uyghur) (Gadzhieva 1997: 20; Baskakov 1952).

East Hunnic group divides into two branches: 1). Uyghur-Oghur group 2). Kyrgyz-Kipchak group. Uyghur-Oghur group consists of three subdivisions: a). Uyghur-Tukü (Old Oghuz of Orkhon-Yenisey inscriptions, Old Uyghur, Tuvi, Tofalar); b) Yakut (Yakut, Dolgan); c). Khakas (Khakas with all the dialects, Kamas, Shor, Chulyum); d). Kyrgyz-Kipchak (Old Kyrgyz, Kyrgyz, Altai).

Some of the main distinguishing features of the **West Hunnic** group in phonetics are substitution of ancient *z, d, t* by *r* or *y* (e.g. ComTurk. *adak / azak / atah* > WestHun. > *ayak* ‘leg’) (Baskakov 1969: 230), a larger degree of differentiation of deaf and voiced consonants: *b - p, k - d, s - h, d - t*. In the grammatical structure West Hunnic languages have more developed structure of a complex sentence and a greater number of conjunctions, including those borrowed from other languages as well as a smaller number of contracted forms of compound verbs (Baskakov 1969: 230). The vocabulary of the languages of West Hunnic group are richer in borrowings from Arabic and Iranian languages and have less borrowings from Mongolian than those of East Hunnic group. (Baskakov 1969: 230) These are some main features which distinguish the languages of West Hunnic group from the languages of East Hunnic group (Baskakov 1952: 121-123).

Bulgar language group includes the ancient Bulgar, Khazar and the modern Chuvash languages (Baskakov 1969: 231). This group was originally formed among the ancient population of the Volga region (rus. *Поволжье*) of the Bulgars (VI-XIV centuries), as well as the later Danube Bulgars and Khazars, that are the direct descendants of the tribes that were part of the Western Hunnu (Baskakov 1960: 104). The modern descendant of the Bulgar group is the Chuvash language, which has kept the ancient language structure (Baskakov 1969: 231; Baskakov 1960: 104).

In the phonetical structure, Chuvash is characteristic of having a special vowel system, which consists of three open and six close vowels (Baskakov 1952: 123). Another distinctive feature is the replacement of some vowels at the beginning of words of languages of other groups by diphthongs and diphthongoid combinations (e.g. *yert* ‘drive’ instead of *ert*; *vut* ‘fire’ instead of *ot* etc.) (Baskakov 1960: 104). Chuvash language is also characteristic for the phenomenon of rhotacism as well as lambdacism (Baskakov 1952: 124). In case of rhotacism, alternating consonants in other languages: *s/z ~ t/d ~ y* in other languages are replaced by *r* in Chuvash (e.g., *par* ‘ice’ instead of *buz*; *ura* ‘leg’ instead of *adak ~ azak ~ ayak*) (Baskakov 1952: 124). In the case of lambdacism, the consonant *ʃ ~ s* in other languages is replaced by *l* (e.g., *hel* ‘winter’ instead of *kıʃ ~ kıs*; *alak* ‘door’ instead of *iʃik ~ esik*) (Baskakov 1952: 125). In terms of grammar Chuvash has a peculiar form of morphology and syntax, which differs from other Turkic languages (Baskakov 1960: 106). The Chuvash vocabulary is characteristic by a large number of words, which do not exist in other Turkic languages (e.g., *aram* ‘woman’, *kurka* ‘scoop’ etc.) as well as borrowings from Slavic and Finno-Ugric languages (Baskakov 1952: 125).

Oghur language group divides into three subgroups: Oghur-Turkmen, Oghur-Bulgar and Oghuz-Seljuk subgroups (Baskakov 1960: 117). Typical phonetical characteristics of Oghur languages is having eight vowels (in contradiction to Kipchak or Karluk languages) (Baskakov 1960: 117); voiced initial consonants *t* and *k*, e.g., *gör-* (instead of *kör-*) ‘to see’, *dil* (instead of *til*) ‘language’ etc. (Baskakov 1960: 117); dropped *b/p* in *ol-* (instead of *bol* ~ *pol* ~ *pul*) ‘to be’ etc. (Baskakov 1960: 117); dropped *y* in some words before and after closed vowels, e.g., *it* (instead of *yit*) ‘dog’, *ir* (instead of *yir*) ‘song’ etc. (Baskakov 1960: 117) Oghur languages also have some differences in grammar as well as unique words in their base vocabulary, such as *kurt* ‘wolf’, *el* ‘hand’, *alın* ‘forehead’ etc. (Baskakov 1960: 118).

Oghuz-Turkmen subgroup is one of the earliest unions of Oghur languages includes the Oghuz language, as well as the modern Turkmen and Trukhmen languages. It differs from the later Oghuz-Seljuk group both phonetically and grammatically (Baskakov 1960: 118-119).

Oghuz-Bulgar subgroup consists of ancient Pecheneg and Uz languages as well as modern Gagauz language. The ancient Pecheneg and Uz tribes (that later became part of the Gagauz people) speaking the common language with Oghuz people fell into the environment of Bulgar and Kipchak languages. There they acquired some new characteristics. However they kept the core vocabulary and grammar of the Oghur language group. (Baskakov 1960: 119). Thus, the Oghuz-Bulgar group has common attributes with e.g., Chuvash, such as the palatalization of consonants in position before front vowels.

Oghuz-Seljuk subgroup is a later subgroup of Oghur languages (Baskakov 1952: 127). It consists of ancient Seljuk and Ottoman Turkish, as well as modern Azerbaijanian and Turkish (Baskakov 1952: 127). Some of its main differences from the characteristics of Oghuz-Turkmen subgroup are: In the phonetic structure: a) the presence of dialectally optional interdental consonants θ - δ in the Turkmen language instead of alveolar *s* - *z* in the Turkish language, which belongs to the Oghuz-Seljuk subgroup, e.g., the Turkmen $\theta\delta$ vs Turkish *söz* ‘word’, etc.; b) the preservation of explosive *b* and spirantization in Turkmen vs the transition to *v* in Turkish, e.g., the Turkmen *ber-* "give" vs Turkish *ver-*; c) the presence of primary long vowels in Turkmen, which is a reflection of the ancient origin of the languages of this group and their connections with the Eastern Turkic languages (cf. the same primary longitudes, e.g., in the Yakut language and the absence of primary longitudes, e.g., in Turkish), etc. (Baskakov 1952: 127). In grammatical structure: a) past participle

form in *-an/-en* (< *gan/gen*) in Turkmen language instead of participles in *-dik/-dik/-duk/-dük* and *-miş/-miş/-muş/-müŝ* in the Turkish language of the Oghuz-Seljuk subgroup; b) the loss of the *intermediate -a/-e-* for the future participle on *-cak/-cek* and its preservation (*-acak/-ecek*) in Turkish, e.g., Turkmen *ber-jek* [berdʒek] "he will give" vs Turkish *ver-ecek*; c) the loss of *u* in the participle forms of verbs ending in a vowel sound, e.g., the Turkmen *oku-p* "he has read", *ber-me-p* "he has not given" vs Turkish *oku-y-up* and *verme-y-ip* (*-y-* here is an obligatory connecting sound between two neighbouring vowels in Turkish), etc. (Baskakov 1952: 127).

Kipchak language group consists of Kipchak-Bulgar, Kipchak-Oghur and Kipchak-Nogai subgroups. (Baskakov 1952: 127). The main features of the languages belonging to the Kipchak group are: in the phonetic structure; a) the presence of eight to nine vowels, within which the narrow vowels *ɪ, i, u, ü* have a peculiar characteristics of sounds of incomplete formation; b) correspondence to more ancient combinations of vowel and consonant *ag > au, eg > iy, ög > üy*, etc., for example, in the words: *tag > tau* 'mountain', *teg- > tiy-* 'to touch', *ögren - > üyren-* 'to learn', etc., as well as some characteristic features of the morphology and vocabulary of the Kipchak languages (Baskakov 1952: 127).

Kipchak-Bulgar subgroup includes ancient Western Golden Horde Turkic, modern Tatar and Bashkir (Baskakov 1952: 127). Since Tatar and Bashkir were formed under the influence of Bulgar and Kipchak languages they share common characteristics of both language groups. in the phonetic structure: a) the presence of nine vowels, which are closer in nature to the vowel system of the Bulgar group of languages, i.e., to the Chuvash language, and differ from it mostly by articulation (Baskakov 1952: 127). Kypchak-Bulgar languages differ from the Bulgar (Chuvash) languages mainly in the absence of palatalized variants of consonant phonemes that are found in the Chuvash language and the absence of such consonant phonemes as *ç*, which is replaced by either *y, j* or *c [dʒ]*, and the phoneme *v*, which until recently was absent in the Kypchak-Bulgar languages and has only recently been introduced into the language along with borrowed Russian vocabulary (Baskakov 1952: 127).

Kipchak-Oghur includes ancient Polovets (Cuman), Karaim, Kumyk, Karachay, Balkar, Crimean Tatar etc. Kipchak-Oghur differs from other languages of the group mostly phonetically, e.g., by the presence of *ş* instead of *s* in words, e.g., *taş* instead of *tas* 'stone' (comp. Turkish *taş* 'stone') and *ç* instead of *ş*, e.g., *kaç* instead of *kaş* 'to run' in other languages of the Kipchak group (comp. Turkish *kaç* 'to run'), however some Polovets

dialects and Karaim do not have these features (Baskakov 1952: 127). Also in the beginning of there is a primary presence of *y* instead of *c* [dʒ], e.g., *yol* instead of *col* (Baskakov 1952: 127).

Kipchak-Nogai subgroup consists of Nogai, Karakalpak, Kazakh, Kipchak dialects of Uzbek etc. (Baskakov 1952: 128). The formation of this subgroup is connected to the disintegration of the Golden Horde and the development of other languages (Baskakov 1952: 128). This subgroup differs from more ancient Kipchak-Bulgar and Kipchak-Polovets mostly phonetically, e.g., by the absence of the phoneme *ç* and the use of *ş* (*kaş* < *kaç*- 'to run', *kış* < *kış* 'winter'), consonant alternation of *m/b/p* depending on the neighboring consonant etc. (Baskakov 1952: 128).

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 Ottoman Turkish and Azerbaijanian (Gadzhieva 1997: 33). Thus, for example, the Ottoman Turkish and Azerbaijanian languages are very similar to each other both in vocabulary and grammar, similar connection is between the Kazakh and Kyrgyz languages (Gadzhieva 1997: 18-19). However, the Ottoman 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).

According to the anthropological data as well as the monuments of material culture it can be assumed that the ancient Turkic speech was formed in Southern Siberia and Central Asia, on a vast territory from Altai through the Sayan Mountains to Baikal (Gadzhieva 1997: 21). In around V century Bulgar tribes began migrating to the Kama region (Gadzhieva 1997: 21). In the period of V-X centuries Oghuz, ancient Uyghur and other Turkic tribes were migrating and settling in the territories of modern-day Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan (Gadzhieva 1997: 21). The period of X-XV centuries is characteristic of the division of the Turkic peoples into smaller tribal groups: in the West into Kipchaks (Kipchak-Bulgar tribes, Kipchak-Polovets tribes, Kipchak-Nogai union), Oghuzs (Oghuz-Bulgar, Oghuz-Turkmen, Oghuz-Seljuk tribes),

Karluks (Karluk-Khwarezmian, Karluk-Uyghur tribes); in the East into Kyrgyz-Kipchak, Khakas, Yakut, Tuva and Altai tribes (Gadzhieva 1997: 21). In around XV began the process of consolidation of the Turkic tribes resulting in the formation of the languages, such as Karakalpak, Nogai, Kazakh and other (Gadzhieva 1997: 21). Whilst during the Middle Ages there was a process of formation of Turkic languages, the period of XV-XX centuries is characteristic of the further development of these languages (Gadzhieva 1997: 21).

There is much evidence of Kipchak forms in Oghur languages as well as vice versa (Gadzhieva 1997: 22). For example, in the Derbent dialect of Azerbaijanian there is a present tense formation suffix *-at*, which is typical for Kipchak languages, as well as transgressive formation suffix *-gaç* located in Ayrum dialect, which is also characteristic of Kipchak languages (Gadzhieva 1997: 22). Such evidence as well as the vast area of settlement of Turkic peoples confirm the traces of multi-layered migration processes (Gadzhieva 1997: 22).

Two periods of large Turkic migrations into Caucasia and Black Sea regions, from Siberia in VI-IX centuries and from the Middle East in XI-XIII centuries, have left the clearest linguistic traces of the route of their evidence. (Gadzhieva 1997: 22). For example, the existence of three closely related Turkmen, Azerbaijani and Ottoman Turkish, who are stretched in a line coming from the East to the West (Gadzhieva 1997: 23).

There are typical characteristics for separate groups of Turkic languages, based not on their genetic belonging, but rather geographical location, which indicates their development process in the very region (Gadzhieva 1997: 23). Thus, Turkic languages of the Caucasia as well as the Caspian region are characteristic for a larger amount of voiced anlaut as well as sonorization (Gadzhieva 1997: 23).

The Turkic language with the greatest number of speakers is **Ottoman Turkish**, spoken mainly in Asia Minor and the Balkans and the official language of the Republic of Turkey. Its native speakers account for about 40% of all Turkic speakers (Gadzhieva 1997: 17). Before the proclamation of the Republic of Turkey the official name of the state was Ottoman Empire and the language of the main population Ottoman Turkish (Kononov 1997: 394). Similarly to other Turkic languages, some of the main characteristic features of the Ottoman 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 Ottoman Turkish: *ev-ler-im-de* [house-PL-1P.POS-LOC].

The Ottoman Turkish language is primarily an agglutinative language (Gadzieva 1997: 23). The primary way of the inflection and word-formation in Ottoman Turkish is suffixation. Thus, affixes in Ottoman 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 Ottoman 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 Ottoman 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*; *büyüklik* ‘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 Ottoman 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 Ottoman 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 with 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 (Yakushkina 2015: 66-67).

A vital role in the formation of the modern Slavic languages was played by Old Church Slavic, the first Slavic literary language (IX-XI centuries) (Tolstoy & Turilov 2016: 183; Bussmann et al. 2006: 829). It has influenced different Slavic languages, including Russian and Serbian.

In phonology typological characteristics of Slavic languages are a great number of palatal and palatalized consonants, forming pairs of palatalized (soft) and non-palatalized (hard) consonants, which is most extreme in Russian (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 6). Another characteristic of Slavic language is an extensive set of morphophonological alternations within inflectional and derivational morphology (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 6), e.g., in Serbian *g : z* in NOM SG *noga* 'leg' > LOC SG *nozi*, NOM SG *vojak* 'soldier' > NOM PL *vojaci*, *k : ĉ* in *krik* 'a shout' > *kričati* 'to shout'.

Slavic languages have rich morphology and all of them (excluding Macedonian and Bulgarian) have case systems (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 6). Slavic languages are also characteristic of having grammatical genders (masculine, feminine and neuter), as well as the category of animacy / inanimacy, number, aspect etc.

Slavic inflectional affixes often encode several grammatical categories within themselves (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 6). For example, in Russian *студентов* ‘students’ (GEN PL) the inflectional affix *-ов* indicates both the case and the plural number (compare GEN SG *студента*). Additionally, nouns and verbs in the Slavic languages are separated into declensional and conjugational classes. Thus, Serbian *sin* ‘son’ in ACC SG is *sina* with the suffix *-a*, whilst *dom* ‘woman’ in ACC SG is *dom* with zero suffix.

Major patterns of verb derivation in Slavic languages are suffixation and prefixation (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 342).

Common suffixes forming verbs from nouns in Russian and Serbian include Rus. *-а(ть)*, *-и(ть)*, *и(ть)* (biaspectual, from foreign bases), *-и(ть)* / *-и(ть)* / *-и(ть)* / *-и(ть)* (domestic and foreign, often bi-aspectual) etc., Serb. *-а(ти)*, *-и(ти)*, *-и(ти)* (biaspectual, from foreign bases), *-а(ти)*/*-и(ти)* (domestic and foreign, often bi-aspectual), etc. (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 342): Serb. *karta* N ‘a card’ > *kartati se* V ‘to play cards, gamble with cards’, Serb. *boja* N ‘a dye’ > *boj-i-ti* V ‘to paint, dye’, Serb. *torpeda* N ‘torpedo’ > *torped-ira-ti* V ‘to torpedo’; Serb. *gost* N ‘a guest’ > V *gost-ova-ti* ‘to be a guest’, *mačevati se* ‘to fight with swords’. Some denominals are also formed via prefixation-suffixation: Rus. N *лицо* ‘face’ > *о-без-лиц-и-ть* V ‘to depersonalize’, Rus. ; Serb. Latin N ‘Latin’ > *po-latin-iti* ‘to Latinize’, Serb. *šuma* N ‘forest’ > *о-бе-шум-и-ти* V ‘to deforest’ (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 342).

Verbs derived from Serbian (descriptive) adjectives mean 1. ‘to become ...’; 2. ‘to make something ...’ (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 342). The verb formation suffix *-(j)-e-(ti)* has only the first meaning: *gladan* ADJ ‘hungry’ > *gladn-j-e-ti* ‘to become hungry’. *-i-(ti)* can form both the transitive *kiseo* ADJ ‘sour’ > V *kisel-i-ti* ‘to make sour’, with intransitive *kisel-i-ti se* V ‘to become sour’ (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 342). The suffix *-a-(ti)* can form verbs with both meanings and often attaches to comparatives: ADJ COMP *jači* ‘stronger’ > V *jač-a-ti* (1) to become stronger; (2) to strengthen something (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 342). Prefixation-suffixation is widespread: ADJ *sposoban* ‘capable’ > V *о-sposob-i-ti* ‘to make something/someone capable’; ADJ ‘hrabar’ ‘brave’ > V *о-bes-hrabr-i-ti* ‘to discourage’ (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 343).

Verbs in Russian and Serbian are derived from other verbs by prefixation, suffixation or use of the ‘reflexive’ particle *-ся* in Russian and *se* in Serbian (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 343), which has different functions, such as reflexivity (i.e., an object does something to

themselves), reciprocity (objects mutually do something) etc. There are also some verbs, which cannot be used without *-ся / se*, e.g.: in Russian *смеяться* ‘to laugh’, *бояться* ‘to be afraid’, *становиться* ‘to become’ etc.; in Serbian *smijati se* ‘to laugh’, *bojati se* ‘to be afraid’, *pojavit se* ‘to appear’ etc. The particle can intransitivize a verb, for example: in Russian *держатъ* V_t ‘to hold smth’ > *держаться* V_t ‘to hold oneself to’; Serbian *držati* V_i ‘to hold smth’ > *držati se* V_t ‘to hold oneself to’ (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 343). Dropping a basic verb's *-ся / se* can transitivize it, as Rus. *приближаться* ‘to come closer’ > *приближатъ* V_t ‘to bring closer’, Serb. *približiti se* V_i ‘to come nearer’ > *približiti* V_t ‘to bring closer’ (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 343).

Slavic verbs are characteristic of having aspect, which means that verbs typically have a pair of perfective and imperfective form, which is usually performed (apart for some exceptions, e.g., ‘to give’ IMPFV *давать*, PFV *дать*) by affixation for creating a perfective form (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 11). For example, Rus. IMPFV *видеть* ‘to see’ and PFV *увидеть* ‘to see’. Prefixation can also change the meaning of the verb. For example, Rus. *братъ* IMPFV ‘to drink’, *убратъ* PFV ‘to put away’, *выбратъ* PFV ‘to choose’, *набратъ* PFV ‘to collect’ etc. Apart from the rich use of affixes, Slavic languages are typical for having lots of prepositions (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 7).

Another notable feature of the Slavic languages is agreement, which stands for correspondence of inflectional categories (e.g. case, number etc.) of the words in a phrase (Crystal 2011: 18; Bussmann et al. 2006: 32). Thus, in a noun phrase *красивый цветок* ‘beautiful flower’ the adjective *красивый* stands in M NOM SG, matching the corresponding features in the head noun (Comrie & Corbett 1993: 14). Specific inflectional characteristics of Russian and Serbian nouns and verbs are described in more details in chapters 4.1-4.6 of the current work.

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 Ottoman 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 (Yakushkina 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 East 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: ComSlav.. **klobukъ* ‘hat’ < ComTurk. kalpak ‘hat’; ComSlav. **tljmač* ‘translator’ < ComTurk. *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. *бѹцѣп* ‘glass beads’ < OldRus. *бѹцѣръ* < Bulg. **büsra* ‘glass beads’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 168) (Stachowski 2014: 1200). There was also an intense contact between Russian and Cuman (Polovets) and Kipchak, as well as Pecheneg and Khazar (Stachowski 2014: 1199). For example: Rus. *амбар* ‘granary’ < OldRus. *анбаръ* < Kip. *ambar* ‘granary’ < Iran. *anbar* (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 Turkic borrowings, primarily from Ottoman Turkish, enter Serbian (Škaljić 1966: 11). For example: Serb. *čekić* ‘hammer’ < OttTur. *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 Turkic borrowings 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 Turkic borrowing 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 Turkic borrowing 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 Ottoman Turkish language.

Due to this circumstance Škaljić came up with the general title for all the words ‘Turkic borrowings’, although as the author confirms himself, they are very often ultimately Arabisms and Iranisms (Škaljić 1966: 24). Such perspective is also supported by other linguists, such as Stachowski (2014), who claims that the term ‘Turkic borrowings’ is a broad concept and includes not only native Turkic words, but also words from other foreign languages which came to Slavic languages through Turkic mediation. In the latter case, some of these languages may have never had contact with Russian or Serbian (such as Chinese or Indian) but entered them via Turkic languages adapting their morphological and phonetical features. This fact clearly justifies the term Turkic borrowings in the broader sense (Stachowski 2014: 1200).

There can be indicated several etymological layers of Turkic borrowings in Slavic languages, especially Russian (Stachowski 2014: 1199-1200). Due to the geographical area where Russian has been historically spoken (Eastern Europe with the expansion to Siberia from around XVI century) it has been in long-term contact with Turkic languages of Bulgar, Kipchak and Karluk groups as well as slightly later contact with the languages of Oghuz group (Stachowski 2014: 1199-1200).

The oldest Turkic borrowings into Slavic which can be traced to the beginning of the I millennium (Stachowski 2014: 1200). Many of them can be found in most of modern Slavic languages (Stachowski 2014: 1199-1200). For example the Common Slavic **klobukъ* ‘hat’ (< ComTurk. *kalpak* ‘hat’)(Stachowski 2014: 1199) can be found in modern East Slavic languages (e.g. Russian *клобук* ‘Orthodox clergy’s hedgear’; Ukrainian *клобук* ‘Orthodox clergy’s hedgear’), as well as West Slavic languages (e.g. Polish *klobuk* ‘a soft felt hat worn by highlanders or Orthodox clergy’s hedgear’; Czech *klobouk* ‘hat’) and South Slavic languages (e.g. Serbian *klobuk* ‘a type of hat’, Croatian *klobuk* ‘a type of hat’). Another example of an ancient Turkic borrowing into Common Slavic is **tljmač* ‘interpreter’ < ComTurk. *tylmač* (Stachowski 2014: 1199-1200). It can be also found in all branches of Slavic language family: e.g., Russian *толмач* ‘arch. interpreter’, Ukrainian *товмач* ‘arch. interpreter’, Polish *tlumacz* ‘translator’, Czech *tlumočník* ‘interpreter’, Serbian ‘*tumač*’ ‘interpreter’, Croatian ‘*tumač*’ ‘interpreter’.

The next etymological layer of Turkic borrowings into Slavic languages is primarily connected to the migration of Turkic Bulgars in VII-XI centuries into Eastern Europe (Volga Bulgars) and Balkans (Danube Bulgars) (Stachowski 2014: 1200). They mostly influenced Old Russian (Volga Bulgar dialect) and Old Church Slavonic (Danube Bulgar

dialect) (Stachowski 2014: 1200). For example: Rus. *бусер* ‘glass beads’ < OldRus. *бусьръ* < Bulg. **büsra* ‘glass beads’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 168) (Stachowski 2014: 1200). Rus. *лошадь* ‘horse’ < OldRus. *лоша* (Gen. *лошате*) ‘horse’ < Bulg. **laša* ‘horse’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 525) (Stachowski 2014: 1200); comp. Chuvash *laša* ‘horse’, Balkar and Karachay *alaša* ‘horse’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 525), which are descendants of Bulgar language group. Another interesting example is Russian *хозяин* ‘host’ < OldRus. *хозя* ‘host’, which according to some linguists (Stachowski 2014: 1200; Vasmer et al. 1986 IV: 254) also originates from Bulgar languages – comp. Chuvash *xoza* ‘host’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 IV: 254).

The Cuman (Polovets) layer (XII-XII centuries) (Stachowski 2014: 1201) had impact mostly on Old Russian, which evolved into modern Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian (Stachowski 2014: 1201). According to some linguists (Stachowski 2014: 1201; Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 424, 468) includes a number of loanwords from Cuman (Polovets), Pecheneg, Kipchak, Khazar, such as: Rus. *лачуга* ‘hut’ < OldRus. *алачуга, олачуга* ‘tent, hut’, comp. Chag. *alaçuga* (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 468); Rus. *курган* ‘burial mound’ < OldRus. *коургань* (1. burial mound; 2. fortress), comp. Chag. *kuryan* ‘fortress’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 424).

The Kipchak layer (XII-XIX centuries) includes borrowings from Kipchak languages (Gadzhieva 1997: 20; Baskakov 1952), such as Crimean Tatar, Western Golden Horde Turkic, Tatar, Bashkir, Nogai, Karakalpak, Chagatay, Uzbek etc.) as well as few from Ottoman Turkish into Russian and other East Slavic languages (Stachowski 2014: 1201). During this period many words of non-Turkic origin (from Arabic, Iranian, Chinese, Sogdian and others) entered Russian via Turkic languages (Korkmazova 2004: 10). Some examples of such borrowings are: Rus. *аркан* ‘lasso’ < CrimTat., Tat., Chag. *arkan* ‘thick rope’, Balk. *arqan* ‘lasso’; Rus. *амбар* ‘granary’ < OldRus. *анбарь* < Kip. *ambar* ‘granary’ < Iran. *anbar* (Stachowski 2014: 1201; Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 75); Rus. *табун* ‘Horse herd’ < Chag., Tat. *tabun* ‘Horse herd’, CrimTat. *tabum* ‘Horse herd’ (Stachowski 2014: 1201; Vasmer et al. 1986 IV: 7).

The Ottoman Turkish layer (XIV-XIX centuries) is the largest group of borrowings in the South Slavic languages due to the more intense historical and linguistic contact with them (Stachowski 2014: 1201; Škaljić 1966: 11-13). There are also fewer Ottoman Turkish loanwords into Russian and other East Slavic languages (Stachowski 2014: 1201). However, there are only few borrowings into West Slavic languages (Stachowski 2014:

1201). Some examples of Ottoman Turkish loanwords are: Serb. *begenisati* ‘to like’ < OttTur. *beğenmek* ‘to like’, Serb. *čekić* ‘hammer’ < OttTur. *çekiç* ‘hammer’, Serb. *konuštisati* ‘to talk’ < OttTur. pfv *konuş-tu* ‘he/she talked’ < OttTur. inf. *konuş-mak* ‘to talk’, Rus. *янычар* ‘a soldier of the janissary regiment’ < OttTur, *yeniçeri* ‘janissary regiment’.

Even though, the first Turkic words began to penetrate the South Slavic languages long before the appearance of the Ottoman Empire in the Balkan region, it is the Ottoman Turkish language that had the most influence on the Slavic languages of the Balkans (Škaljić 1966: 11). The Ottoman Turkish language and culture brought an absolutely new culture to the Balkans: the eastern, Islamic culture (Škaljić 1966: 11). The Ottoman 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 Ottoman Turkish) in the southern Slavic languages, particularly Serbian (Škaljić 1966: 12).

Serbian folk songs (and oral tradition in general) are abounded 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 Ottoman 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 Turkic borrowings 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 Ottoman Turkish lexical influences have appeared (Franc Miklošič, Petar Skok, Abdulah Škaljić, Asim Peco and others). Some of the modern researchers of Ottoman Turkish borrowings in Serbian are Prvoslav Radić, Mirjana Teodosijević and others.

3. Inflectional characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian

There is a number of structural differences in terms of morphology between Turkic, on 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).

3.1 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. In Turkic languages the opposition of animacy-inanimacy is irrelevant, because nouns

denoting people are animate and nouns denoting all other beings are inanimate (category of person/non-person) (Oreshkina 1994: 61).

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 on the words with similar lexical meanings. For example [Turkic borrowing – native word]:

Rus. anim. *мушак* ‘donkey’ (< Tat. *мушак* [iʃäk] ‘donkey’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 146) – anim. *зверь* ‘animal’;

Rus. anim. *батрак* ‘hired farmworker’ (< Tat. *батрак* [batak] ‘hired farmworker’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 134) – anim. *рабочий* ‘worker’;

Rus. *inanim.* *баклажан* ‘aubergine’ (< OttTur. *patlıcan* ‘aubergine’ < Iran. بادمجان [badimžan] ‘aubergine’ < Arab. الباذنجان [al-badhinžan] ‘aubergine’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 110) – *inanim.* *овощ* ‘vegetable’;

Serb. anim. *mušterija* ‘a client’ (< OttTur. *müşteri* ‘a client’) – anim. *kupac* ‘client’;

Serb. anim. *kaduna* ‘lady’ (< OttTur. *kadın* ‘woman’) – anim. *žena* ‘woman’;

Serb. *inanim.* *biber* ‘pepper’ (OttTur. *biber* ‘pepper’) – *inanim.* *povrće* ‘vegetable’.

3.2 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 a 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:

Rus. *аксакал* ‘a village elder’ < Tat. *ак сакал* [aq saqal] ‘a village elder’, liter. ‘a white beard’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 66);

Rus. *батрак* ‘hired farmworker’ < Tat. *батрак* [batraq] ‘hired farmworker’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 134) (Oreshkina 1994: 61);

Rus. *курбашу* ‘Basmachi movement regiment’s chief’ < Uzb. *قورباشى* *qo'rboshi* [qorboši] ‘Basmachi movement regiment’s chief’;

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 borrowed *сундук* ‘chest’ < OldRus. *сундукъ* ‘chest’ < Kip. *sunduq*, *synduq* ‘chest’ < Arab. *صندوق* [sunduq] ‘chest’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 III: 804);

native Russian *нога* ‘leg’ and borrowed *казна* ‘treasury’ < CrimTat. *хазна* [xazna] ‘treasury’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 160);

native Russian *рог* ‘horn’ and borrowed *очаг* < CrimTat. *оцаг* [ožak] ‘hearth’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 III: 177).

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. *-u* or *-y*) the grammatical gender is assigned according to semantic connections and analogies with words of similar lexical meaning in Russian (Oreshkina 1994: 61). For example: *машикачири* ‘national Uzbek porridge’ (< Uz. *moshkichiri* [moshkichiri] ‘national Uzbek porridge’) matches up with the feminine word *каша* ‘porridge’.

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):

балда ‘1. *arch.* cudgel, sledgehammer; blockhead. 2. *vern.* head’ < Tat. *балта* [balta], CrimTat. *balta* [balta] ‘axe’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 114);

There is also a number of Turkic borrowings 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: *сарыч* – *сарыча* ‘a type of kite’ (< Turk. *saryča* ‘a type of kite’, comp. Chag. *sar* ‘kite’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 III: 564), *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 Turkic loanwords in Serbian shows that the majority of the Ottoman 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’ < OttTur. *yeni çeri* ‘Ottoman elite regiment, literary *new army*’; *f. kaduna* ‘lady’ < OttTur. *kadın* ‘woman’. In the case of *kaduna* it can be seen that Serbian speakers added the feminine ending *-a* (comp. Serb. *žena* ‘woman’).

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’ < OttTur *saat* ‘watch’; *f. džamija* ‘mosque’ < OttTur. *cami* 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. *-i* or *-u*) the grammatical gender is assigned according to semantic connections and analogies with equivalent words or words of general lexical meaning in Serbian.

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’ < OttTur. *aşıkçı* ‘lover’. Whilst in Russian borrowed Turkic adjectives append grammatical gender endings (e.g. чал-ый -ая -ое < OttTur. çal ‘grey’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 IV: 313), in Serbian the words may retain their gender indeclinable form, e.g. Serb. *ačik* ‘open’ < OttTur. *açık* ‘open, clear’ (Stachowski 2014: 1202), Serb. *čališkin, čališkan* ADJ ‘hardworking’ < OttTur. *çalışkan* ADJ ‘hardworking’ (Škaljić 1966: 161).

3.3 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 Turkic borrowings 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’; Turkic borrowing hat-NOM.SG *шанк-а* ‘hat’ > hat-NOM.PL *шанк-и* ‘hats’. For a Serbian word ending in *-a*: hand- NOM.SG *рук-а* ‘hand’ > hand-NOM.PL *рук-е* ‘hands’; Turkic borrowing sock-NOM.SG *čarap-а* ‘sock’ > sock-NOM.PL *čarap-е* ‘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 Ottoman 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 Ottoman Turkish is singular. For this reason, the loanword lost *-i* and became Rus. *янычар* / Serb. *janičar* meaning ‘a soldier of the janissary regiment.’ The plural form Rus. *янычары* / Serb. *janičari* correspondingly means *soldiers of the janissary regiment* and not the regiment itself.

Some borrowed nouns in Russian, which end on *-u*, however, vary in number. For example, Turkic *курбаши* (< Uzb. قورباشى *qo'rboshi* ‘Basmachi movement regiment’s chief’) 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).

3.4 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, animacy 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 word-finals (see Zalizniak (2003)).

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: *мумиё* ‘blackish-brown powder or an exudate from high mountain rocks’ < Kyrg., Uzb. *mumiyo* ‘blackish-brown powder or an exudate from high mountain rocks’ < Iran. *موم* [mum] ‘wax’ (Oreshkina 1994: 62-63), *джайляу* ‘summer highland pasture in Central Asia’ < Turk., Kyrg. *жайлоо* [žajloo] ‘summer highland pasture in Central Asia’ (Oreshkina 1994: 62-63). 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 3.2 *Category of gender*.

3.5 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 Turkic borrowings in the Russian languages (Shipova 1976) most of the Turkic adjectives in the basic Russian lexicon are the names of colours in general, e.g., *алый* ‘bright red, scarlet’ (< Tat., Kip., Chag. *al* ‘scarlet’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 74)), *бурый* ‘brown’ (< Turk. *bur* ‘fulvous’ < Iran. *bor* ‘blonde, red’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 249), *карий* ‘dark-brown, hazel’ (< Tat., CrimTat., Bashk., OttTur., etc. *kara* ‘black’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 199) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 199) etc., and equine coat colours particularly, e.g., (*буланый*

‘dun (equine colour)’ (< Tat. *bulan* ‘deer’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 238), *игрневый* ‘skewbald’ (< Turk. *jagran* ‘liver-chestnut’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 189), *караковый* ‘dark bay’ (< Turk. Chag. *karaq* ‘black, dark’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 189), etc.

Russian adjectives of Turkic origin usually are able to form comparative and superlative forms. For example:

Rus. *алый* POS ‘bright red, scarlet’ > *более алый* CMPR ‘more scarlet’ > *самый алый* SUP ‘the most scarlet’,

Rus. *бурый* POS ‘brown’ > *более бурый* CMPR ‘brownier’ > *самый бурый* SUP ‘the brownest’,

Rus. *карий* POS ‘hazel’ > *более карий* CMPR ‘more hazel’ > *самый карий* SUP ‘the most hazel’,

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:

dertli POS ‘miserable, sickening’ (< OttTur. *dertli* ‘sorrow’) > *dertliji* CMPR ‘more miserable’ > *najdertliji* SUP ‘the most miserable’ (Škaljić 1966: 44),

ferkli POS ‘different’ (< OttTur. *farklı* ‘different’) > CMPR *ferkliji* ‘more different’ > *najferkljii* SUP ‘the most different’ (Škaljić 1966: 44),

ačik POS ‘open’ (< OttTur. *açık* ‘open’) > *ačiknije* CMPR ‘more open’ > SUP *najačiknije* (Škaljić 1966: 44).

3.6 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’ < Turk., Uyg., Chag. *köç-* ‘move, migrate’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 357), *камлать* ‘to practise shamanism, tell fortunes’ < Chag. *kamla-* ‘to practise shamanism, tell fortunes’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 175), *якшиться* (= *якшатся*) ‘*vernac. dissapr.* be in touch with someone’ < Kip. **jakšy*, Tat. *яхиш* [jaxšy], Uyg. *jaxšy* ‘good; well’ (Vasmer et al. 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 (*яхиш-ть-ся* < *yakşı* ‘good’), but there are cases that do not seem to have nominal bases, but rather verbal stem (*кам-ла-мак* > *кам-ла-ть*), where *-ла-* is originally a Turkic verb formation suffix (Kononov 1956: 256) and *-мак* is an infinitive suffix (Kononov 1956: 190-191). The verbs derived from Turkic borrowings are conjugated the same way as the domestic Russian verbs with the identical endings (*якшатся* ‘*vernac. dissapr.* be in touch with someone’ and *общаться* ‘to communicate’), i.e., by adding an appropriate ending to the base of the verb in accordance with the classification of Zaliznyak (2003). They have the categories of mood, number, person etc. For example, in Present Tense:

Conjugation type 1a, verbs on *-ать* (Zaliznyak 2003):

Present Tense	<i>дела-ть</i> ‘to do’	<i>камла-ть</i> ‘to practice shamanism’
1 SG	<i>дела-ю</i>	<i>камла-ю</i>
2 SG	<i>дела-ешь</i>	<i>камла-ешь</i>
3 SG	<i>дела-ет</i>	<i>камла-ет</i>
1 PL	<i>дела-ем</i>	<i>камла-ем</i>
2 PL	<i>дела-ете</i>	<i>камла-ете</i>
3 PL	<i>дела-ют</i>	<i>камла-ют</i>

Conjugation type 2a, verbs on *-овать* (Zaliznyak 2003):

Present Tense	<i>рисова-ть</i> 'to draw'	<i>джигитова-ть</i> 'to perform stunts on horseback'
1 SG	<i>рисую</i>	<i>джигиту-ю</i>
2 SG	<i>рису-ешь</i>	<i>джигиту-ешь</i>
3 SG	<i>рисует</i>	<i>джигиту-ет</i>
1 PL	<i>рису-ем</i>	<i>джигиту-ем</i>
2 PL	<i>рису-ете</i>	<i>джигиту-ете</i>
3 PL	<i>рисуют</i>	<i>джигиту-ют</i>

Conjugation type 2b, verbs on *-ать* (Zalizyak 2003):

Present Tense	<i>ноче-ть</i> 'to spend night'	<i>кочева-ть</i> 'to lead a nomad life'
1 SG	<i>ночу-ю</i>	<i>кочу-ю</i>
2 SG	<i>ночу-ешь</i>	<i>кочу-ешь</i>
3 SG	<i>ночу-ет</i>	<i>кочу-ет</i>
1 PL	<i>ночу-ем</i>	<i>кочу-ем</i>
2 PL	<i>ночу-ете</i>	<i>кочу-ете</i>
3 PL	<i>ночу-ют</i>	<i>кочу-ют</i>

Conjugation type 1a, verbs on *-ать* (Zalizyak 2003):

Present Tense	<i>обща-ть-ся</i> ‘to lead a nomad life’	<i>якша-ть-ся</i> ‘to spend night’
1 SG	<i>обща-ю-сь</i>	<i>якша-ю-сь</i>
2 SG	<i>обща-ешь-сь</i>	<i>якша-ешь-сь</i>
3 SG	<i>обща-ет-сь</i>	<i>якша-ет-сь</i>
1 PL	<i>обща-ем-сь</i>	<i>якша-ем-сь</i>
2 PL	<i>обща-ете-сь</i>	<i>якша-ете-сь</i>
3 PL	<i>обща-ют-сь</i>	<i>якша-ют-сь</i>

In Russian, similarly to Serbian many verbs of Turkic origin have both forms of aspect using native Russian prefixes. For example: OttTur. *bulgamak* ‘to mix, confuse’ > Rus. *булгачить* IPFV ‘to confuse, harass’ > *набулгачить* PFV ‘to confuse, harass’, Tat. *yakşı* ADJ ‘good, well’ > Rus. *якшаться* V IPFV ‘vernac. *dissapr.* be in touch with someone’ (< Kip. **jakşy*, Tat. *яхши* [jaxşy], Uyg. *jaxşy* ‘good; well’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 IV: 553) > *поякшаться* PFV ‘vernac. *dissapr.* be in touch with’.

According to Škaljić (1966: 41-44), Serbian verbs of Ottoman Turkish origin are formed by means of the infinitive suffixes *-isa-(ti)*, *-i-(ti)* and *-ova-(ti)* in following ways:

1. The suffix is added to the stem of the Ottoman Turkish verb (the Ottoman Turkish infinitive suffix *-mak/-mek* is taken away). For example:

OttTur. *benze-mek* ‘to resemble’ > *benzeisati* ‘to resemble’ Škaljić (1966: 137);

OttTur. *anla-mak* ‘to understand’ > Serb. *anlaisati* ‘to understand’ Škaljić (1966: 95);

OttTur. *bitir-mek* ‘to finish’ > Serb. *bitirisati* ‘to finish’ Škaljić (1966: 146);
OttTur. *kazan-mak* ‘to win’ > Serb. *kazanisati* ‘to win’.

2. By adding the suffix to the basis of the Ottoman Turkish definite perfect (which is

formed by adding the suffix *-di* or its allomorphs and the personal suffix, which in case of third person is zero affix) (Škaljić 1966: 42; Stachowski 2014: 1203). For example:

OttTur *anla-mak* INF ‘to understand’ > OttTur. *anla-di-m* PST 1 SG ‘I understood’ > Serb. INF IMPFV *anladum-i-ti* ‘to understand’ (Škaljić 1966: 95);

OttTur *bayıl-mak* INF ‘to faint’ > OttTur. *bayıl-di* PST 3SG ‘fainted’ > Serb. INF IMPFV *bajildisati* ‘to faint’ (Škaljić 1966: 113);

OttTur. INF *boya-mak* ‘to paint’ > OttTur. PST 3SG *boya-di* ‘he/she painted’ > Serb. INF IMPFV *bojadisati* ‘to paint’ (Škaljić 1966: 146);

OttTur. INF *konuş-mak* ‘to talk’ > OttTur. PST 3SG *konuş-tu* ‘he/she talked’ > Serb. INF IMPFV *konuştisati* ‘to talk’ (Škaljić 1966: 415);

OttTur. INF *alış-mak* ‘to get used to’ > OttTur. PST 3SG *alış-ti* ‘he/she got used to’ > Serb. INF *alıştisati* ‘to get used to’.

3. By adding the suffix to Serbian nouns and adjectives of Ottoman Turkish origin (see 4.3 *Formation of verbs*).

As can be seen in the examples above in some cases a verb in the Past Tense with personal suffix is taken as a stem for a Serbian verb and the Serbian native personal ending is added when the verb is conjugated. In the case of Serb. *bojadisati* this is Past Tense 3. person singular < OttTur. *boya-di* ‘he/she painted’ as well as *konuştisati* ‘to talk’ < OttTur. PST *konuş-tu* ‘he/she talked’. There is a case of the Ottoman Turkish verb in Past Tense 1. person singular used as a stem - Serb. *anladum-i-ti* ‘understand’ < OttTur. *anla-di-m* ‘I understood’. This evidence shows the intensity of language contacts between Ottoman Turkish and Serbian. It may be assumed that the speakers apparently understood each other did not understand the local morphology.

Some of the borrowed Ottoman Turkish verbs in Serbian have the reflexive particle *se*, with no form without *se*. For example: *davranisati se* ‘to resist’ (Škaljić 1966: 208) < OttTur. *davranmak* ‘behave’, *davrandisati se* ‘to resist’ (Škaljić 1966: 208) < OttTur. *davrandı* PST 3 SG ‘he/she behaved’ < OttTur. *davranmak* ‘behave’, *şubhelenisati se* ‘hesitate’ < OttTur. *şüphelenmek* ‘hesitate’, *hastalenisati se* ‘to get sick’ < OttTur. *hastalenmek* ‘get sick’, *hastalendisati se* < OttTur. *hastalenmek* PST 3 SG ‘he/she got sick’ < OttTur. *hastalenmek* ‘to get sick’, etc. There are two common features among the observed verbs of this type. The first feature is that they are all borrowed with the Ottoman Turkish reflexive suffixes *-n* and *-l*. A

parallel can be made between these suffixes and the reflexive particle *se*. Similarly to the Serbian reflexive particle, the Ottoman Turkish suffixes *-n* and *-l* also add the meaning of passive voice to the verb. Similarly to the case of the Russian loanword *бельмес* in *не бельмеса* ‘absolutely incompetent’ < Tat. *bilmes* 1. ‘does not know’ 2. not knowing (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 149) (see 3.7 *Loss of grammatical categories of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian*), the Ottoman Turkish suffixes *-n* and *-l* lost their meanings in Serbian and the domestic *se* was added. Serbian speakers did not perceive the suffixes as sufficient and added the Serbian particle. Another feature is that each of these borrowings have synonyms with *se* among domestic words (e.g., *bajlisati se / bajildisati se - onesvijestiti se, zanijeti se* ‘to faint’ (Škaljić 1966: 113), *davranisati se / davrandisati se - snaći se* ‘to cope’, *oduprijeti se* ‘to resist’ (Škaljić 1966: 208), *hastalendisati se - razboliti se* ‘to get sick’). Thus, additional reason could be that since the synonyms of these words have the reflexive particle, Serbian speakers felt natural to add it to the borrowings as well.

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). Ottoman Turkish *olmak* ‘to be’ is replaced with Serbian *biti* ‘to be’, while *etmek* ‘to do’ is replaced with *činiti* ‘to do’, which is in an imperfective aspect and its opposition perfective aspect form *učiniti* ‘to do’. For example: Serb. *gaip biti* ‘to disappear’ < OttTur. *gayb olmak* ‘to disappear’ < *gayb* ‘loss, disappearance’ < Arab. *غائب gaib* ‘to be absent’ (Škaljić 1966: 44), Serb. *pişman biti* ‘to regret’ < OttTur. *pişman olmak* ‘to regret’ < OttTur. *pişman* ‘regretful’ < Iran. *پشیمان pişman* ‘regretful’ (Škaljić 1966: 519), Serb. *halas biti* ‘to be saved’ < OttTur. *halas olmak* ‘to be saved’ < OttTur. *halas* ‘salvation’ < Arab. *خَلَّاصٌ halas* ‘salvation’ (Škaljić 1966: 304), Serb. *azap činiti* ‘to torture’ < OttTur. *azap etmek* ‘to torture’ < OttTur. *azap* ‘torment’ < Arab. *عذاب azab* ‘torment’ (Škaljić 1966: 106), Serb. *bihuzur činiti* ‘to disturb’ < OttTur. *bihuzur etmek* ‘to disturb’ < OttTur. *bihuzur* ‘unrest, disorder’ < Iran. *بی bi* ‘without’ + Arab. *حُضُورٌ huḍur* ‘peace’ (Škaljić 1966: 106), Serb. *dovu činiti* ‘to torture’ (NOM *dova*) < OttTur. *dua etmek* ‘to pray’ < OttTur. *dua* ‘a pray’ < Arab. *دعا dua* ‘a pray’ (Škaljić 1966: 106).

Many Serbian verbs of Ottoman Turkish origin have both forms of aspect using native Serbian prefixes: *na-*, *o-*, *po-*, *pre-*, *pri-*, *pro-*, *raz-*, *s-*, *u-* (Škaljić 1966: 45). For example:

OttTur. *bahtsız* ADJ ‘unlucky’ > Serb. *baksuzirati* V IPFV ‘to jinx’ > *izbaksuzirati* V PFV ‘to jinx’; OttTur. *beğenmek* INF ‘to like’ > Serb. *begenisati* INF PFV ‘to like’ > *zabegenisati* INF PFV ‘to like; OttTur. *kazan-mak* > Serb. *kazanisati* IPFV ‘to win’ > *zakazanisati* PFV ‘to win’ etc.

The situation with the conjugation of the Serbian verbs of Turkic origin is similar to that in Russian. The verbs generally conjugate according to the grammatical rules of the recipient language. For example, in Present Tense:

Verbs on *-ati* conjugate the following way:

Present Tense	<i>gleda-ti</i> ‘to look’	<i>begenisa-ti</i> ‘to like’
1 SG	<i>gleda-m</i>	<i>begenisa-m</i>
2 SG	<i>begenisa-š</i>	<i>begenisa-š</i>
3 SG	<i>gleda</i>	<i>begenisa</i>
1 PL	<i>gleda-mo</i>	<i>begenisa-mo</i>
2 PL	<i>gleda-te</i>	<i>begenisa-te</i>
3 PL	<i>gleda-ju</i>	<i>begenisa-ju</i>

Verbs on *-iti* conjugate the following way:

Present Tense	<i>radi-ti</i> ‘to work, to do’	<i>anladimi-ti</i> ‘to understand’
1 SG	<i>radi-m</i>	<i>anladimi-m</i>
2 SG	<i>begenisa-š</i>	<i>anladimi -š</i>

3 SG	<i>radi</i>	<i>anladimi</i>
1 PL	<i>radi-mo</i>	<i>anladimi -mo</i>
2 PL	<i>radi-te</i>	<i>anladimi -te</i>
3 PL	<i>rad-e</i>	<i>anladimi-e</i>

In cases of compound verbs (N+V compounds) the verbal part is conjugated as a single verb:

Present Tense	<i>bihuzur činiti</i> ‘to disturb’	<i>gaip biti</i> ‘to disappear’
1 SG	<i>bihuzur čini-m</i>	<i>gaip sam</i>
2 SG	<i>bihuzur čini-š</i>	<i>gaip si</i>
3 SG	<i>bihuzur čini</i>	<i>gaip je</i>
1 PL	<i>bihuzur čini-mo</i>	<i>gaip smo</i>
2 PL	<i>bihuzur čini-te</i>	<i>gaip ste</i>
3 PL	<i>bihuzur čin-e</i>	<i>gaip su</i>

In conclusion, there are two types of borrowings from Ottoman Turkish into Serbian: by people who spoke the language and took solely the stem (e.g. *duy-mak* ‘to hear, to feel’ > *dujisati se* ‘to recall, to remember’) and by people who borrowed what they heard, the whole form (e.g. OttTur. PST 1 SG *boya-di* ‘he/she painted’ > Serb. *bojadisati* INF ‘to paint’). Moreover, there are examples of parallel forms. For example: Serb. *begenisati* and *begendisati* ‘to like’, which come from the stem of the Ottoman Turkish verb *beğen-mek* ‘to like’ and its definite perfect third person singular form *beğendi* respectively as well as Serb. *bajilisati se* < OttTur. *bayılmak* ‘to faint’ and *bajildisati se* < OttTur. *bayıldı* ‘he/she fainted’ < OttTur. *bayılmak* ‘to faint’, *hastalenisati se* ‘to get sick’ < OttTur. *hastalenmek* ‘get sick’, *hastalendisati se* < OttTur. *hastalendi* PST 3 SG ‘he/she got sick’ < OttTur. *hastalenmek* ‘to get sick’ etc.. As another

example of this feature there are the parallel forms *anlaisati* and *anladum-i-ti* ‘to understand’, where *anlaisati* comes from the stem of the Ottoman Turkish verb *anla-mak* ‘to understand’, and its definite perfect first person singular form *anladim* where the past form 1. person singular of the Ottoman Turkish verb is used as the stem for the Serbian verb.

To conclude, there are Serbian and Russian verbs of Turkic origin that can derive and create perfective/imperfective oppositions.

3.7 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, *bilmes* > *бельмес*, only used in the form *не бельмеса* – ‘knows absolutely nothing’.

Tatar *bil-mes* consists of the root *bil* ‘to know’ and the affix *-mes*, 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 Ottoman Turkish loanwords and loan grammar in Serbian. The morphemes in Ottoman 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* (OttTur. *bahtsız* ‘unlucky’ > *baksuz* ‘unlucky person’). However, this is normally not true for Ottoman Turkish borrowings which have suffixes that Serbian did not loan. For example, the Serbian synonyms *begenisati* ‘to like’ < OttTur. *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 Ottoman Turkish suffix *-di* and took the Ottoman Turkish verbal stem equal to 3rd p. sing. perfect form *beğendi*. Similarly to this *konuštisati* ‘to talk’ < OttTur. PFV *konuştı* ‘he/she talked’ < OttTur. INF *konuşmak* ‘to talk’, where the Serbian verb’s stem is 3rd p. sing. perfect form of the original Ottoman Turkish verb. Additionally in the cases like *hastalendisati se* < OttTur. *hastalendi* PST 3 SG

‘he/she got sick’ < OttTur. *hastalenmek* ‘to get sick’ not only the past tense suffix *-di* is ignored, but also the passive voice formation suffix *-n* and thus the Serbian verb receives its domestic reflexive particle *se* (see 3.6 *Categories of tense, aspect and mood*).

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

There are not many Russian or Serbian names of Turkic origin, however many surnames come from Turkic languages. For example, personal names:

Rus. *Тимур* (< Chag. *timür* ‘iron’) (Superanskaja 2005: 211; Baskakov 1979: 251),

Rus. *Руслан* (< Turk. *arslan* ‘lion’) (Baskakov 1979: 101);

the surnames:

Rus. *Аксаков* < Turk., Kip., Tat., Bashk., CrimTat. ADJ *aqsaq* ‘lame’ (Baskakov 1979: 141),

Rus. *Баскаков* < Tat. *баскак* [basqak] ‘Tatar collector of taxes for Khan’ (Baskakov 1979: 31),

Rus. *Булатов* < Kip. N *bolat* ‘type of steel alloy’ < Iran. پولاد [polad] ‘steel’ (Baskakov 1979: 139),

Rus *Булгаков* < Turk. *bulgak* ‘fidgety, restless’;

Serb. *Jakšić* < OttTur. *yakşı* ‘good’,

Serb. *Karadžić* ‘Serbian surname’ < OttTur. *karaca* ‘1. blackish 2. roe deer’ (Šimunović 1985: 130),

Serb. *Hasanbegović* (< OttTur. *Hasan* (< Arab. حسن [hasan] ‘handsome, brave, good’) + *bek* ‘Turkish noble title’),

The Turkic words used for surnames consist of different parts of speech, including nouns, adjectives as well as phrases. For example:

Rus. *Аксаков* < Turk., Kip., Tat., Bashk., CrimTat. ADJ *aqsaq* ‘lame’ (Baskakov 1979: 141),

Rus. *Баскаков* < Tat. N *баскак* [basqaq] ‘Tatar collector of taxes for Khan’ (Baskakov 1979: 31),

Rus. *Булатов* < Kip. N *bolat* ‘type of steel alloy’ < Iran. *پولاد* [polad] ‘steel’ (Baskakov 1979: 139);

Serb. *Bujuklić* < OttTur. *büyük* ‘grand, big’ + *kılıç* ‘sword’.

Serb. *Jakšić* < OttTur. *yakşı* ADJ ‘good’,

Serb. *Karadžić* < OttTur. *karaca* ‘1. blackish 2. roe deer’.

Generally, when adapting a Turkic word for a surname in Russian the Russian suffix typical for surnames e.g. *-ов* (*Аксаков*), *-ев* (*Тургенев*), *-ин* (< *Бухарин*) 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*).

4. 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’ > *bağımsızlık* ‘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. *чабан* (< OttTur., CrimTat. *çoban* ‘herder’ < Iran. *شبان* [šuban] ‘herder’) > *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 Turkic borrowings 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 Turkic borrowings in Russian are nouns, adjectives, as well as verbs. And the predominant way of their formation is suffixation: *дувал* ‘mudbrick wall’ (< Kyrg. *dubal* ‘wall’) (Музников 2019: 181) > *дувал-ице* ‘augment. mudbrick wall’, *арык* ‘irrigation canal’ (< Kaz., Tat., CrimTat. Bashk. *aryk* ‘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.

4.1 Formation of nouns

The most common way of forming nouns from Turkic borrowings in Russian is affixation. For example: Nog. *джигит* [dʒigit] '(brave) young man' > 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 Turkic borrowing and another one is Russian. For example: *селе-защита* 'mudflow protection' < *сель* 'mudflow' (< Turk. Chuv. *sel* 'mudflow' < Arab. سيل [sayl] 'torrential stream') + *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* 'a type of flute' (< OttTur. *düdük* 'a type of flute') (Acharyan 1902: 340) – *дудукист* 'a player on this instrument'), *-ник* (*сайгак* 'Saiga antelope' < Chag. *saygak* 'chamois' (Vasmer et al. 1986 III: 545) – *сайгачник* 'a hunter on this animal' (Oreshkina 1994: 71)).

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' (< Chag., Tat. *karaul* 'guard, watch') (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 195) > *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' (< Chag., CrimTat. *saman* 'adobe')) (Vasmer et al. 1986 III: 552) > *саманник* 'a barn for keeping adobe' vs. *саманщик* 'a worker producing adobe' (Oreshkina 1994: 72).

A similar picture with word-formation of Ottoman Turkish loanwords is observed in Serbian, where one of the most productive way of formations of nouns from Turkic stems is affixation. For example:

OttTur. *bekar* 'single (not married)' > Serb. *bećar* 'single (not married)' > Serb. *bećarovanje* 'a lifestyle of a not married person') (Škaljić 1966: 127).

OttTur. *Türk* 'Turk' > Serb. *turk* 'Turk' > Serb. *turkovanje* 'a lifestyle according to

Islamic rules’) (Škaljić 1966: 625).

OttTur. *bekar* ‘single (not married)’ > Serb. *bećar* ‘single (not married)’ > Serb. *bećarina* ‘*augm.* single (not married) person’) (Škaljić 1966: 127).

Some of the Ottoman Turkish borrowings in Serbian have doublets (parallel formations) of Ottoman Turkish stems with attached Serbian suffixes and complete Ottoman Turkish loanwords with the same meaning, e.g.: Serb. *bojar* vs Serb. *bojadžija* ‘dyer’, where OttTur. *boya* > Serb. *boja* ‘paint’ > Serb. *bojar* and OttTur. *boyacı* > Serb. *bojadžija*.

4.2 Formation of adjectives

The formation of adjectives from Turkic borrowings in Russian is usually performed via affixation of Turkic borrowed noun forms. Russian adjective-formation suffixes (e.g. *-ов-* / *-ев-*, *-ин-*) are typically used. For example: *лошадь* N ‘horse’ (< OldRus. *лоша* (Gen. *лошате*) ‘horse’ < Bulg. **laša* ‘horse’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 525) (Stachowski 2014: 1200)) > *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’ (< Azer. *aluça* ‘cherry-plum’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 74) > *алчевый* / *алчовый* ADJ ‘cherry-plum’,

камыш N ‘cane’ (< Kip., Tat., CrimTat. *kamiş* ‘cane’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 176) > *камышевый* / *камышовый* ADJ ‘cane’);

-н- / *-ов-* (*-ев-*):

кишмиш N ‘sultanas’ (< OttTur., Tat., Chag. *kişmiş* ‘sultanas’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 243) > *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* – *каракульый* ‘dark bay’ (<

Turk. Chag. *karaq* ‘black, dark’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 189), 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’.

4.3 Formation of verbs

The verb formation in Russian from Turkic borrowings is usually performed via affixation and mostly using Russian verb-formation suffixes (-ова-, -ева-, -и- etc.). For example: *джигит* ‘a skillful and brave horseman’ (< Nog. *джигит* [dʒigit] ‘(brave) young man’) > *джигит-ова-ть* ‘to perform complex stunts on horseback’, Tat. *батрак* *batrak* ‘hired farmworker’ > *батрак* ‘hired farmworker’ > *батрачить* ‘1. to work as a hired farmworker; 2. work hard without sparing’.

There is an interesting example of the adjective *алый* ‘bright red, scarlet’ (*Алые паруса* - *Scarlet Sails*), which dates back to the Turkic *al* (red, scarlet) (< Tat., Kip., Chag. *al* ‘scarlet’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 I: 74). 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* acquired two meanings: 1. become scarlet; 2. be visible (*Вдали алеют маки* ‘Poppies can be seen in the distance’) (Korkmazova 2004: 19).

According to Škaljić, some Serbian verbs are formed from the borrowed Ottoman Turkish nouns and adjectives in the following ways (for borrowed Ottoman Turkish verbs see 3.6 *Categories of tense, aspect and mood*) (Škaljić 1966: 41-44):

By adding the suffix *-isa-(ti)/-esa-(ti)* to some Ottoman Turkish nouns and adjectives of Ottoman Turkish origin (Škaljić 1966: 42-43). For example:

1. From nouns:

OttTur. *budala* ‘stupid or obsessed person’ > Serb. *budalasati* ‘to go crazy’ (Škaljić 1966: 151)

2. From adjectives:

OttTur. *tembel* ‘lazy’ > Serb. *dembel* ‘lazy’ > Serb. *dembelisati* ‘to be lazy’ (Škaljić 1966: 41-44)

OttTur. *sürgün* ‘expelled person’ > Serb. *surgunisati* – ‘to expel someone’ (Škaljić 1966: 575)

OttTur. *Türk* ‘Turk’ > Serb. *Turk* ‘Turk’ > Serb. *turkesati* ‘to speak Turkish’ (Škaljić 1966: 625)

By adding the suffix *-i-(ti)*, *-a-(ti)*, *-ova-(ti)* to some Ottoman Turkish nouns and adjectives of Ottoman Turkish origin (Škaljić 1966: 43). For example:

1. From Serbian nouns of Ottoman Turkish origin:

OttTur. *bayram* ‘holiday’ > Serb. *bayram* ‘holiday’ > Serb. *bajram-ova-ti* ‘to celebrate’ (Škaljić 1966: 112)

OttTur. *bekar* ‘single (not married)’ > Serb. *bećar* ‘single (not married)’ > Serb. *bećar-ova-ti* ‘to be single (not married)’ (Škaljić 1966: 112)

OttTur. *dostluk* ‘friendship’ > Serb. *dostluk* ‘friendship’ > Serb. *dostluč-i-ti* ‘to be friends’ (Škaljić 1966: 116)

2. From Serbian adjectives of Ottoman Turkish origin:

OttTur. *battal* ADJ ‘extinct, cancelled’ > Serb. *batal-i-ti* V ‘to abandon’ (Škaljić 1966)

OttTur. *rahat* ADJ ‘comfortable’ > Serb. *rahat* ADJ ‘content’ > Serb. *urahatiti se* V ‘calm down, feel comfortable and peaceful’ (Škaljić 1966: 632)

Russian and Serbian (Škaljić 1966: 45) verbs of Turkic origin similarly to the domestic ones (see 3.6 *Categories of tense, aspect and mood*) are able to change their lexical meanings via affixation:

Nog. *дџигит* [džigit] ‘(brave) young man’ > Rus. *дџигит* ‘styl. brave young man’ > *дџигитовка* ‘performance of stunts while riding a horse’

Nog. *дџигит* [džigit] ‘(brave) young man’ > Rus. *дџигит* ‘styl. brave young man’ >

джигит-ова-ть ‘to perform complex stunts on horseback’

Tat. *батрак batrak* ‘hired farmworker’ > *батрак* ‘hired farmworker’ > *батрачить* ‘1. to work as a hired farmworker; 2. work hard without sparing’

OttTur. *bihuzur* ‘unrest, disorder’ > Serb. *bihuzur* ‘unrest, disorder’ > *bihuzuriti* IMPFV ‘to disturb’ > *uzbihuzuriti* PFV ‘to disturb’ (Škaljić 1966: 142)

OttTur. *durmak* ‘1. to stop 2. hold, remain’ > *durati* IMPFV ‘to endure’ > *nadurati* PFV ‘to overcome something by suffering, to win, to withstand’ (Škaljić 1966: 482)

OttTur. *dürbün* ‘binocular’ > Serb. *durbin* ‘binocular’ > *durbiniti* IMPFV ‘watch through binoculars’ > *nadurbiniti* PFV ‘point the binoculars at something’ (Škaljić 1966: 482)

OttTur. *bayılmak* ‘to faint’ > *bajilisati se* IMPFV ‘to faint’ > *obalijestiti se* PFV ‘to faint’ (Škaljić 1966: 113)

Some verbs of Turkic origin in Serbian similarly to domestic verbs (see 3.6 *Categories of tense, aspect and mood*) can change meanings and become intransitive by adding the reflexive particle:

OttTur. *beğenmek* ‘to like’ > Serb. *begenisati* IMPFV ‘to like’ > Serb. *begenisati se* ‘to be liked’ (Škaljić 1966: 129)

OttTur. *eğlenmek* ‘to entertain oneself’ > *eglenisati* ‘to talk’ > *izeglenisati se* ‘to express oneself’ (Škaljić 1966: 263)

OttTur. < *aşık* ‘one in love’ > Serb. *ašik* ‘a lover, one in love’ > Serb. *ašikovati* ‘to have a mutual love conversation’ > *zaašikovati se* ‘start mutual love conversation and dating’ (Škaljić 1966: 643)

4.4 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 Turkic borrowings, 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:

Serb. *težakbaša* ‘first farmer in a village’ < *težak* ‘farmer’ and *baša* ‘head’ (< OttTur. *baş* ‘head’) (Radić: 2001: 100),

Serb. *četobaša* ‘head of a regiment’ < *četa* ‘regiment’ and *baša* ‘head’ (< OttTur. *baş* ‘head’) (Radić: 2001: 100),

Serb. *deverbaša* ‘main’ < *dever* ‘the main brother-in-law in the wedding party’ and *baša* ‘head’ (< OttTur. *baş* ‘head’) (Radić: 2001: 100),

vukobaša ‘*metaph.* brave warrior, warrior, chief warrior’ < Serb. *vuk* ‘wolf’ + *baša* ‘head’ (< OttTur. *baş* ‘head’) (Pešikan et al. 2014 II: 118; Radić: 2001: 100),

Rus. *колпаковидный* ADJ ‘in a form of a high-crowned cap’ < *колпак* N ‘high-crowned cap’ (< Tat., Kyrg., OttTur. *kalpak* ‘high-crowned cap’) + *вид* N ‘type, form’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 297),

Rus. *татароведение* < *татарин* ‘Tatar’ (< Tat., Chag., Tur., *tatar* ‘Tatar’) + *ведеть* ‘to know’ eye’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 IV: 27),

Rus. *кареглазый* ADJ ‘hazel-eyed’ < карий ‘darkbrown, hazel’ (< Tat., CrimTat., Bashk., OttTur., etc. *kara* ‘black’) (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 199) + *глаз* ‘eye’ (Vasmer et al. 1986 II: 199).

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: CrimTat. *хазна* [xazna] ‘treasury’ > Rus. noun *казна* ‘treasury’ > adj. *казенный* ‘adj. state’ > adv. *казённо* ‘formally, in a bureaucratic way’; OttTur. *güç* ‘power, strength’ > Serb. adj. *đučan* ‘adj. hard’ > Serb. 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-formation 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. For example:

Nog. *джигит* [džigit] ‘(brave) young man’ > Rus. *джигит* ‘styl. brave young man’ > *джигитовка* ‘performance of stunts while riding a horse’

Nog. *джигит* [džigit] ‘(brave) young man’ > Rus. *джигит* ‘styl. brave young man’ > *джигит-ова-ть* ‘to perform complex stunts on horseback’

Tat. *батрак* *batrak* ‘hired farmworker’ > *батрак* ‘hired farmworker’ > *батрачить* ‘1. to work as a hired farmworker; 2. work hard without sparing’

OttTur. *pişman* ‘regretful, repentant’ > *pişmaniti se* IMPPFV ‘to repent, to regret’ > *popişmaniti se* PFV ‘to repent, to regret’ (Škaljić 1966: 521)

OttTur. *anlamak* INF ‘to understand’ > OttTur. *anladım* PST 1 SG ‘I understood’ > Serb. INF IMPFV *anladumiti* ‘to understand’ > *anladumiti* > *anladumi!* IMP ‘understand’ (Škaljić 1966: 95);

OttTur. *dürbün* ‘binocular’ > Serb. *durbin* ‘binocular’ > *durbiniti* IMPFV ‘watch through binoculars’ > *nadurbiniti* PFV ‘point the binoculars at something’ (Škaljić 1966: 482)

5. Affix extraction

Whilst in Russian there is no obvious trace of loan grammar from any Turkic language, Serbian did acquire some Ottoman 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 Ottoman Turkish suffixes (including the ones of Persian and Arabic origin, which came into Ottoman Turkish) which were the most common in Ottoman Turkish loanwords and started using them in word-formation of native words as well as non-Turkic loanwords. Since Serbian unlike Ottoman Turkish does not have the vowel harmony system, it uses only one allomorph of each borrowed suffix.

5.1 Suffix *-džija*

OttTur. *-ci* (*-ci, cu, cü*) > Serb. *-džija*

The suffix *-ci* (*-ci, -cu, -cü*) in the Ottoman 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: OttTur. *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 *-dži* form, that is, in its adaptation form *-džija*. At the same time, the shorter, more original form *-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 decline (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 *-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 *-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 compound-suffix formation (*dangubdžija* ‘idler’ < *dan* ‘day’ and *gubiti* ‘to kill’) (Radić: 2001: 18).

According to Radić (2001: 24) derivatives with the suffix *-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 *-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: OttTur. *boyacı* > Serb. *bojadžija* vs OttTur. *boya* > Serb. *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-Ottoman Turkish borrowed words (Serb. *govoriti* ‘to speak’ > *govordžija* ‘pejor. expres. orator’; Fr. *bonbon* ‘candy’ > Serb. *bonbon* > Serb. *bonbondžija* ‘candy maker’), but it may also create a competitive formation to a form with a domestic suffix (Serb. *lovac* vs *lovdžija* ‘hunter’).

5.2 Suffix *-lija*

OttTur. *-li* (*-li*, *-lu*, *-lü*) > Serb. *-lija*

The suffix *-li* (*-li*, *-lu*, *-lü*) in the Ottoman 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 (OttTur. *kuvvet* ‘strength’ > *kuvvetli* ‘strong’) or belonging to it (OttTur. *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 Ottoman Turkish suffix *-li*, similarly to the suffix *-džija*, received the Serbian ending *-ja* so that formations with this suffix could decline.

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).

5.3 Suffix *-luk*

OttTur. *-lik* (*-lik*, *-luk*, *-lük*) > Serb. *-luk*:

Suffix *-lik* (*-lik*, *-luk*, *-lük*) can be used in the Ottoman 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' > *güzellik* '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 Ottoman Turkish formations with the suffix *-luk* (*-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 (*divljašluk* ‘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 Ottoman Turkish suffixes (e.g. *-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: Turkic borrowings, 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).

5.4 Suffix *-ana / -na*

Pers. *hana* ‘house’ (later *hane*), > OttTur. *-hana* (later *-hane*) > Serb. *-ana / -na*

The Ottoman Turkish suffix *-hana* is originally the Persian word *hana* ‘house’ used in Persian compound nouns. Originally a Persian word meaning ‘house’ it came to Ottoman Turkish becoming a suffix for creating names of places (Stachowski 1961: 1) (e.g. OttTur. *çay* ‘tea’ > *çayhane* ‘teahouse’). From the numerous complete Ottoman 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 / -na* (after vowels) (Radić: 2001: 79). Thus, this suffix in Serbian became one of the few Ottoman 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: Turkic borrowings, 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*, *-suz*, *-džik*.

5.5 Suffix *-li*

OttTur. *-li* (*-li, -lu, -lü*) > Serb. *-li*

The suffix *-li* is an immediate continuant of the Ottoman Turkish formative morpheme, which in Ottoman 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 (*gvozdén* ‘adj. iron’ > *gvozdénli* ‘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-Ottoman Turkish stems (*gvozdén* > *gvozdénli*) 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 Turkic borrowings, 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-Ottoman 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).

5.6 Suffix *-baša*

OttTur. *baş* ‘head’ > *-başı* ‘head, main’ > Serb. > *-baša* ‘head, main’

The Ottoman Turkish form *-başı* comes from the Ottoman 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 Ottoman 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’. Ottoman 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 Ottoman Turkish loanwords, i.e. formations with a Ottoman Turkish stem (OttTur. *avcibaşı* ‘chief of hunters’ > *avcibaša* ‘chief of hunters’), but later the formations with *-baša* 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 Ottoman Turkish origin *-baša* is used less and less in the modern Serbian literary language (Radić: 2001: 101).

5.7 Suffix *-i*

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

In the Ottoman 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 Ottoman Turkish suffixes *-i* and *-li* in

Serbian affected mutual competition, and even the crossing of these creative morphemes (*karpuz* ‘watermelon’ > *karpuzi* vs *karpuzli* ‘like watermelon, of watermelon colour’) (Radić: 2001: 102). This also includes an adaptation form *-i* > *-ija* (*kuršum* ‘plumb; bullet’ > *kuršumlja* vs *kuršumija* ‘vernac. of plumb colour’) (Radić: 2001: 102).

5.8 Suffix *-ile*

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

The suffix *-ile* is originally a Ottoman 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 Ottoman Turkish borrowings, i.e. formations with a Turkic borrowing 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).

5.9 Suffix *-dar*

Persian *-dar* > OttTur. *-dar* > Serb. *-dar*

Suffix *-dar* 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’ > *čuvad* ‘guardian’ (Stevanović 1976 VI: 897)) (Radić: 2001: 104).

5.10 Suffix *-suz*

Ottoman Turkish *-süz* (*-süz*, *-suz*, *-süz*) > Serb. *-suz*

The suffix *-süz* (*-süz*, *-suz*, *-süz*) is an adjective-forming morpheme in Ottoman Turkish that is most often attached to noun stems, and means the absence of what is expressed by the stem word (equiv. 'without', 'no') (OttTur. *şeker* 'sugar' > OttTur. *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 (Serb. *lezet* 'vernac. taste, sweetness' > *lezetsuz* 'tasteless, unsweet'). However, a number of formations with this suffix are also found in literary texts (*baksuz* N 'man of bad luck' < OttTur. *bahtsız* ADJ 'unlucky') (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).

5.11 Suffix *-džik*

Ottoman Turkish *-cık* (*-cık*, *-cuk*, *-cük*) > Serb. *-džik*

In the Ottoman 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).

6. Conclusion

The history of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian brings along a complex process of their morphological adaptation in the recipient languages. The two Slavic languages with mostly similar basic 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 Ottoman 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. The descriptive method, comparative analyses and typological research were used for this study.

The descriptive method was used to identify, find the etymology and discover the original morphemes of the donor language in the borrowings. For example, the Russian word *бельмес* of Tatar origin, which comes from Tat. *bel-mes* know-3SG.PST 1. ‘does not know’ 2. ‘not knowing’. The original word consists of the root and a morpheme representing Present Tense 3 person singular, which was not perceived in the recipient language, and instead a Russian negative particle *не* was added to that. Interestingly enough, the word *бельмеса* is only used in Genitive in combination with the negative particle: *не бельмеса* ‘absolutely incompetent’. This shows that the Russian speaker was aware of the negative sense of the word however the original morpheme was not perceived. Similarly in Serbian there are studied evidences of Turkish verbs in Past forms being used as the root for Serbian verbs in infinitive. Serb. *anladum-i-ti* ‘understand’ < OttTur. *anladı-m* understand.PST.1SG ‘I understood’. Similar examples are: Serb. *bojadisati* ‘to paint’ < : OttTur. *boya-di* paint-PST.3SG ‘he/she painted’, Serb. *konuštisati* INF IMPFV ‘to talk’ <

OttTur. *konuş-tu* PST.3SG ‘he/she talked’, etc. Such examples identify the intensity of language contacts between Ottoman Turkish and Serbian. Apparently, the Serbian speaker understood Ottoman Turkish but did not understand the local morphology.

The comparative analyses were used to contrast the borrowings and the strategy of Turkic borrowing between Russian and Serbian. It has shown that the morphological adaptation of them is similar in both languages in terms of inflectional and word-formation characteristics. Most borrowings are assimilated and act like domestic words, being able to inflect and derive. There are only a few exceptions in Russian like *не бельмеса* ‘absolutely incompetent’ which is only used in this very form. Thus, it may be assumed that the contacts between Ottoman Turkish and Serbian were more intense. But the brightest difference that the comparative analyses allowed to find is the affix extraction in Turkic borrowings in Serbian, which does not take place in Russian. The list of extracted affixes includes Serb. *-luk* < OttTur. *-lık* (*-lik*, *-luk*, *-lük*), Serb. *-lija* < OttTur. *-li* (*-li*, *-lu*, *-lü*), Serb. *-džija* < OttTur. *-ci* (*-ci*, *cu*, *cü*), etc.

Typological research was used to compare Serbian and Russian with structurally different Turkic languages. It helped identify the parallels between the languages when studying the loss of the grammatical categories of the Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian. For example, in case of the morphological adaptation of the Tat. *bilmes* > Rus. *бельмес*, in which the Tatar suffix *-mes* lost its grammatical meaning and as its analogy in the Russian language, the negative particle *не* was added to the word. Another example of its use was during the study of the reasons for attaching the reflexive particle *se* to some Turkic borrowings. It turned out that similarly to the previous case in Russian the morphemes of the donor language were not perceived (passive suffixes *-n* and *-l*) and their analogy in Serbian, particle *se* was attached to the verbs.

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. Turkic loanwords in Russian lose their native grammatical categories, i.e., the Russian speakers do not distinguish them in the loanwords.

In regards to the word-formation characteristics of Turkic borrowings in Russian and Serbian the study has also shown similar strategy of the morphological adaptation of Turkic borrowings in both languages. Loanwords can effectively derive and produce new forms in a similar way to the domestic words. This fact proves the high level of assimilation of the

borrowings in the recipient languages.

In terms of affix extraction, 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 Ottoman Turkish), the Serbian vernacular speech and later the literary language borrowed a great number of loanwords. This caused some of the Ottoman 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. For example, Serb. *mljeko* > *mljeka-džija* vs *mljek-ar* 'milkman', where the form with the Turkic suffix *mljeka-džija* competes with the native Serbian *mljek-ar*.

The extraction of Turkic affixes in Serbian seems 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 denser penetration of the Turkic borrowings into the Serbian compared to that into the Russian proved to be true.

The current work focuses primarily 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).

A list of the words of Turkic origin used in the current work

Common Slavic

*klobukъ ‘hat’ < OttTur. kalpak ‘hat’

*tljmač ‘translator’ < OttTur. tylmač ‘translator’

Russian

айда ‘inj. expresses exclamation’ < OttTur. hayda / haydi ‘inj. expresses exclamation’

Аксаков < Turk., Kip., Tat., Bashk., CrimTat. ADJ *aqsaq* ‘lame’

аксакал ‘village elder’ < Tat. *ak sakal* ‘village elder’, liter. ‘white beard’

алый ‘bright red, scarlet’ < Tat., Kip., Chag. *al* ‘scarlet’

алыча ‘cherry-plum’ < Azer. *aluça* ‘cherry-plum’

амбар ‘granary’ < OldRus. *анбарь* < Kip. *ambar* ‘granary’ < Iran. *anbar*

аркан ‘lasso’ < CrimTat., Tat., Chag. *arkan* ‘thick rope’, Balk. *arqan* ‘lasso’

арык ‘irrigation canal’ < Kaz., Tat., CrimTat. Bashk. *aryk* ‘irrigation canal’

баклажан ‘aubergine’ < OttTur. *patlıcan* ‘aubergine’ < Iran. *بادمجان badimcan* ‘aubergine’ < Arab. *الباذنجان al-badhinjan* ‘aubergine’

Баскаков < Tat. N *баскак* [basqaq] ‘Tatar collector of taxes for Khan’ (Baskakov 1979: 31),

батрак ‘hired farmworker’ < Tat. *батрак batrak* ‘hired farmworker’

батрачить ‘1. to work as a hired farmworker; 2. work hard without sparing’ < *батрак* ‘hired farmworker’ < Tat. *батрак batrak* ‘hired farmworker’

бисер ‘glass beads’ < OldRus. *бусьрь* < Bulg. **büsra* ‘glass beads’

буланный ‘dun (equine colour)’ < Tat. *bulan* ‘deer’

Булатов ‘Russian surname’ < Kip. N *bolat* ‘type of steel alloy’ < Iran. *پولاد [polad]* ‘steel’

Булгаков ‘Russian noble surname’ < Turk. *bulgak* ‘fidgety, restless’

булгачить ‘to confuse, harass’ < Turk. *bulgamak* ‘to mix, confuse’

бурый ‘brown’ (< Turk. *bur* ‘fulvous’ < Iran. *bor* ‘blonde, red’)

вилаят ‘vilayet, an administrative division’ < OttTur. *vilayet* ‘vilayet, an administrative division’

Годунов ‘Russian noble surname’ < OttTur. *gödün* ‘thoughtless, reckless’

джайляу ‘summer highland pasture in Central Asia’

джайляу < Turk., Kyrg. *жайлоо* [žajloo] ‘summer highland pasture in Central Asia’

джигит ‘styl. brave young man’ < Nog. *джигит* [džigit] ‘(brave) young man’

дувал ‘mudbrick wall’ < Kyrg. *dubal* ,wall’

дудук ‘a type of flute’ < OttTur. *diidiük* ‘a type of flute’

игрневый ‘liver-chestnut’ < Turk. *jagran* ‘liver-chestnut’

ишак ‘donkey’ < Tat. *ишәк* [išäk] ‘donkey’

казна ‘treasury’ < CrimTat. *хазна* [xazna] ‘treasury’

камлать ‘to practise shamanism, tell fortunes’ < Chag. *kamla-* ‘to practise shamanism, tell fortunes’

камыш ‘cane’ < Kip., Tat., CrimTat. *kamiş* ‘cane’

караковый ‘darkbay’ < Turk. Chag. *karaq* ‘black, dark’

караул ‘guard, watch’ < Chag., Tat. *karaul* ‘guard, watch’

кареглазый ADJ ‘hazel-eyed’ < карий ‘darkbrown, hazel’ (< Tat., CrimTat., Bashk., OttTur., etc. *kara* ‘black’) + *глаз* ‘eye’

карий ‘darkbrown, hazel’ < Tat., CrimTat., Bashk., OttTur., etc. *kara* ‘black’

кишмиш ‘sultanas’ < OttTur., Tat., Chag. *kişmiş* ‘sultanas’

колпак ‘high-crowned cap’ < Tat., Kyrg., OttTur. *kalpak* ‘high-crowned’

колпаковидный ADJ ‘in a form of a high-crowned cap’ < *колпак* N ‘high-crowned cap’ (< Tat., Kyrg., OttTur. *kalpak* ‘high-crowned cap’) + *вид* N ‘type, form’,

кочевать ‘lead a nomad’s life’ < Turk., Uyg., Chag., *köç-* ‘move, migrate’

курбаши ,Basmachi movement regiment’s chief’ < Uzb. *قورباشى qo'rboshi* ‘Basmachi movement regiment’s chief’;

курган ‘burial mound’ < OldRus. *коурганъ* 1. burial mound; 2. fortress; comp. Chag. *kuryan* ‘fortress’

лачуга ‘hut’ < OldRus. *алачуга, олачуга* ‘tent, hut’, comp. Chag. *alaçuga*

лошадь ‘horse’ < OldRus. *лоша* (Gen. *лошате*) ‘horse’ < Bulg. **laşa* ‘horse’

мумиё ‘blackish-brown powder or an exudate from high mountain rocks’ < Kyrg., Uzb. *mutiyo* ‘blackish-brown powder or an exudate from high mountain rocks’ < Iran. *موم* [mum] ‘wax’

сабантуй ‘vulg. vernac. feast’ < Tat. *сабантуй* [sabantuy] ‘holiday of the end of spring field work among the Tatars and Bashkirs’

сайгак ‘Saiga antelope’ < Chag. *saygak* ‘chamois’

саман ‘adobe’ < Chag., CrimTat. *saman* ‘adobe’

сарыча ‘a type of kite’ < Turk. *saryça* ‘a type of kite’, comp. Chag. *sar* ‘kite’

сель ‘mudflow’ < Turk. Chuv. *sel* ‘mudflow’ < Arab. *سيل* [sayl] ‘torrential stream’

сундук ‘chest’ < OldRus. *сундукъ* ‘chest’ < Kip. *sunduq, synduq* ‘chest’ < Arab. *صندوق* [sunduq] ‘chest’

табун ‘horse herd’ < Chag., Tat. *tabun* ‘horse herd’, CrimTat. *tabum* ‘horse herd’

татароведение < Rus. *татарин* ‘Tatar’ (< Tat., Chag., Tur., *tatar* ‘Tatar’) + Rus. *ведеть* ‘to know’

Тимур < Chag. *timür* ‘iron’

хозяин 'host' < OldRus. *хозя* 'host' < Bulg. **хоза*, comp. Chuvash *хоза* 'host'

чабан 'herder' < OttTur., CrimTat. *çoban* 'herder' < Iran. شېبان [šuban] 'herder'

чабанствовать = *чабановать* = *чабанить* 'graze cattle' < Rus. чабан 'herder' < OttTur., CrimTat. *çoban* 'herder' < Iran. شېبان [šuban] 'herder'

чальный < Turk., OttTur., Uyg. *çal* 'grey'

чинара 'plane tree' < OttTur. *çınar* 'plane tree'

якшаться = якшиться 'vernac. dissapr. be in touch with someone' < Kip. **jakšy*, Tat. *яхши* [jaxšy], Uyg. *jaxšy* 'good; well'

янычар 'a soldier of the janissary regiment' < OttTur. *yeniçeri* 'janissary regiment'

Serbian

ačik 'open' < OttTur. *açık* 'open, clear'

adet 'custom' < OttTur. *adet* 'custom'

alištisati 'to get used to' < OttTur. PST 3 SG *alış-tı* 'he/she got used to' < OttTur. INF *alış-mak* 'to get used to'

anladumiti 'understand' < OttTur. *anladım* 'I understood'

anlaisati 'to understand' < OttTur. *anlamak* 'to understand'

ašik 'a lover, one in love' < OttTur. < *aşık* 'one in love'

ašikčija 'a lover' < OttTur. *aşıkçı* 'a lover'

ašikovati 'to have a mutual love conversation' < Serb. *ašik* 'a lover, one in love' < OttTur. < *aşık* 'one in love'

azap činiti 'to torture' < OttTur. *azap etmek* 'to torture' < OttTur. *azap* 'torment' < Arab. عذاب *azab* 'torment'

bajildisati se INF 'to faint' < OttTur. *bayıl-dı* PST 3 SG 'fainted' < OttTur *bayıl-mak* INF

‘to faint

bajilisati se ‘to faint’ < OttTur. *bayılmak* ‘to faint’

bajramovati ‘to celebrate’ < Serb. *bayram* ‘holiday’ < OttTur. *bayram* ‘holiday’

baksuz N ‘unlucky person’ < OttTur. *bahtsız* ADJ ‘unlucky’

baksuzirati V IPFV ‘to jinx’ < Serb. *baksuz* N ‘unlucky person’ < OttTur. *bahtsız* ADJ ‘unlucky’

baksuznik N ‘bad luck bringer’ < baksuz N ‘unlucky person’ < OttTur. *bahtsız* ADJ ‘unlucky’

baša ‘head’ < OttTur. *baş* ‘head’

bataliti ‘to abandon’ < OttTur. *battal* ‘extinct, cancelled’

bayram ‘holiday’ < OttTur. *bayram* ‘holiday’

bećar ‘single (not married)’ < OttTur. *bekar* ‘single (not married)’

bećarina ‘*augm.* single (not married) person’ < *bećar* ‘single (not married)’ < OttTur. *bekar* ‘single (not married)’

bećarovati ‘to be single (not married)’ < *bećar* ‘single (not married)’ < OttTur. *bekar* ‘single (not married)’ <

begendisati ‘to like’ < OttTur. *beğen-di* PFV 3 SG ‘liked’

begenisati ‘to like’ < OttTur. *beğenmek* ‘to like’

begenisati se ‘to be liked’ < begenisati ‘to like’ < OttTur. *beğenmek* ‘to like’

biber ‘pepper’ < OttTur. *biber* ‘pepper’

bihuzur ċiniti ‘to disturb’ < OttTur. *bihuzur etmek* ‘to disturb’ < OttTur. *bihuzur* ‘unrest, disorder’ < Iran. بی *bi* ‘without’ + Arab. حُضُورُ *ḥuḍur* ‘peace’

bihuzuriti ‘to disturb’ < OttTur. *bihuzur* ‘unrest, disorder’ < Iran. بی *bi* ‘without’ + Arab. حُضُورُ *ḥuḍur* ‘peace’

bitirisati 'to finish' < OttTur. *bitir-mek* 'to finish'

boja 'dye' < OttTur. *boya* 'dye'

bojadisati 'to paint' < OttTur. pfv *boya-dı* 'he/she painted' < *boya-mak* 'to paint'

bojadžija 'dyer' < OttTur. *boyacı* 'dyer'

budalasati 'to go crazy' < OttTur. *budala* 'stupid or obsessed person'

Bujuklić 'Serbian surname' < OttTur. *büyük* 'grand, big' + *kılıç* 'sword'.

čališkan = *čališkin* ADJ 'hardworking' < OttTur. *çalışkan* ADJ 'hardworking'

čaršija 'bazaar' < OttTur. *çarşı* 'bazaar'

čekić 'hammer' < OttTur. *çekiç* 'hammer'

četobaša 'head of a regiment' < Serb. *četa* 'regiment' + *baša* 'head' (< OttTur. *baş* 'head')

dangubdžija 'idler' < Serb. *dan* 'day' and Serb. *gubiti* 'to kill' + *-džija* (< OttTur. *-ci*)

davrandisati se 'to resist' < OttTur. *davrandı* PST 3 SG 'he/she behaved' < OttTur. *davranmak* 'to behave',

davranisati se 'to resist' < OttTur. *davranmak* 'behave'

dembel 'lazy' < OttTur. *tembel* 'lazy'

dembelisati 'to be lazy' < Serb. *dembel* 'lazy' < OttTur. *tembel* 'lazy'

deverbaša 'main' < *dever* 'the main brother-in-law in the wedding party' and *baša* 'head' (< OttTur. *baş* 'head')

dostlučiti 'to be friends' < Serb. *dostluk* 'friendship' < OttTur. *dostluk* 'friendship'

dostluk 'friendship' < OttTur. *dostluk* 'friendship'

dovu činiti 'to torture' (NOM *dova*) < OttTur. *dua etmek* 'to pray' < OttTur. *dua* 'a pray'
< Arab. دعا *dua* 'a pray'

đučan 'adj. hard' < OttTur. *güç* 'strength, power'

duşmanluk is ‘great enmity’ < OttTur. düşmanlı ‘enmity’

džamija ‘mosque’ < OttTur. cami mosque

eglenisati ‘to talk’ < OttTur. eğlenmek ‘to entertain oneself’

ferkli ‘different’ < OttTur. farklı ‘different’

gaip biti ‘to disappear’ < OttTur. gayb olmak ‘to disappear’ < gayb ‘loss, disappearance’
< Arab. غائب *gaib* ‘to be absent’

gaip biti “to disappear, to get lost” < kayıp “loss, disappearance”

hajde ‘inj. expresses exclamation’ < OttTur. hayda / haydi ‘inj. expresses exclamation’

halas biti ‘to be saved’ < OttTur. halas olmak ‘to be saved’ < OttTur. halas ‘salvation’
< Arab. خَلاص *halas* ‘salvation’

hastalendisati se < OttTur. hastalendi PST 3 SG ‘he/she got sick’ < OttTur. hastalennemek
‘to get sick’

hastalenisati se ‘to get sick’ < OttTur. hastalennemek ‘get sick’,

izbaksuzirati V PFV ‘to jinx’ < Serb. baksuzirati V IPFV ‘to jinx’ < OttTur. bahtsız ADJ
‘unlucky’

izeglenisati se ‘to express oneself’ < eglenisati ‘to talk’ < OttTur. eğlenmek ‘to entertain
oneself’

Jakšić ‘Serbian surname’ < OttTur. yakşı ‘good’

janičar < Tur, yeniçeri ‘janissary regiment’

jogurt ‘yogurt’ < OttTur. yoğurt ‘yogurt’

kaduna ‘lady’ < OttTur. kadın ‘woman’

Karadžić ‘Serbian surname’ < OttTur. karaca ‘1. blackish 2. roe deer’

kazanisati ‘to win’ < OttTur. kazanmak

konuštisati ‘to talk’ < OttTur. PFV konuştu ‘he/she talked’ < OttTur. INF konuşmak ‘to talk’

mušterija ‘a client’ < OttTur. *müşteri* ‘a client’

nadurbiniti PFV ‘point the binoculars at something’ < Serb. *durbiniti* IMPFV ‘watch through binoculars’ < Serb. *durbin* ‘binocular’ < OttTur. *dürbün* ‘binocular’

pişman biti ‘to be repentant, regretful’ < OttTur. *pişman olmak* ‘to regret, repent’ < OttTur. *pişman* ‘regretful’ < Iran. پشیمان *pešman* ‘regretful’

pişmaniti se ‘to repent, to regret’ < OttTur. *pişman* ‘regretful, repentant’ < Iran. پشیمان *pešman* ‘regretful’

popişmaniti se PFV ‘to repent, to regret’ < *pişmaniti se* IMPPFV ‘to repent, to regret’ < OttTur. *pişman* ‘regretful, repentant’ < Iran. پشیمان *pešman* ‘regretful’

sat ‘watch’ < OttTur *saat* ‘watch’

šubhelenisati se ‘hesitate’ < OttTur. *şüphelenmek* ‘hesitate’,

surgun ‘expelled person’ < OttTur. *sürgün* ‘expelled

surgunisati – ‘to expel someone’ < Serb. *surgun* ‘expelled person’ < OttTur. *sürgün* ‘expelled person’

težakbaša ‘first farmer in a village’ < *težak* ‘farmer’ and *baša* ‘head’ (< OttTur. *baş* ‘head’)

urahatiti se ‘to calm down, feel comfortable and peaceful’ < Serb. *rahat* ADJ ‘content’ < OttTur. *rahat* ADJ ‘comfortable’ < Arab. راحة [rāḥa] ‘rest, comfort’

vukobaša ‘*metaph.* brave warrior, warrior, chief warrior’ < *vuk* ‘wolf’ + *baša* ‘head’ (< OttTur. *baş* ‘head’)

zaašikovati se ‘to start mutual love conversation and dating’ < Serb. *ašikovati* ‘to have a mutual love conversation’ < Serb. *ašik* ‘a lover, one in love’ < OttTur. < *aşık* ‘one in love’

zabegenisati INF PFV ‘to like’ < *begenisati* INF IMPFV ‘to like’ < OttTur. *beğenmek* INF ‘to like’

zakazanisati INF PFV ‘to win’ < *kazanisati* INF IPFV ‘to win’ < OttTur. *kazan-mak* INF ‘to win’

Abbreviations

ADJ. – adjective ADV. – adverb

Arab. – Arabic

augm. - augmentative

Azer. - Azerbaijani

arch. – archaic CMPR. – comparative

Balk. - Balkar

Bulg. - Bulgar

Chag. - Chagatay

ComSlav. – Common Slavic

ComSlav. – Old Church Slavic

COMP – comparative degree

ComTurk. – Common Turkic

CrimTat. – Crimean Tatar

DIM. – diminutive

dissapr. – disapproving

EastHun. – East Hunnic

expres. – expressive Fr. – French

IPFV – imperfective aspect

Iran. – Iranian

Kaz. - Kazakh

Kip. – Kipchak

Kyrg. - Kyrgyz

liter. - literally

metaph. – metaphorical

N – noun

Nog. - Nogai

OldRus. – Old Russian

OttTur. – Ottoman Turkish

PFV – perfective aspect Pers. - Persian

POS. - positive

Rus. – Russian

Serb. – Serbian

slang. - slang

SUP. - superlative

Tat. - Tatar

Turc. – Turkic

V – verb

V_i – intransitive verb

V_t – transitive verb

vernac. – vernacular

WestHun. – West Hunnic

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).

Acharian 1902 = Աճարյան, Հ. "The Loanwords from Turkish in the Colloquial Armenian Language of Constantinople as Compared to the Dialects of Van, Gharabagh, Nor-Nakhichevan". *Թուրքերէնէ փոխառեալ բառերը Պօլսի հայ ժողովրդական լեզուին մէջ համեմատութեամբ Վանի, Ղարաբաղի եւ Նոր-Նախիջեանի բարբառներուն*. Moscow, Vagharshapat, 1902.

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 1952 = Баскаков, Н. А. 1952. "К вопросу о классификации тюркских языков. 'On the issue of classification of Turkic languages'." *Известия АН СССР. Отделение литературы и языка 11, no. 2* (Известия АН СССР. Отделение литературы и языка 11, no. 2 (1952): 121-134.) 121-134.

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

Baskakov 1969 = Баскаков А.Н. 1969. *Введение в изучение тюркских языков: Учебник для гос. ун-тов, 2-е изд., испр. и доп.* Москва: Высш. шк.

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

Baskakov 1979 = Баскаков, А. 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. & Corbett, G. G. 1993. *The Slavonic languages*. London and New York: 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.
- Elšik, 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'*. Saarbrücken: LAP LAMBERT.
- Hammarström, Harald and others. 2021. *Glottolog 4.6*. Accessed 2022. <https://glottolog.org/resource/languoid/id/turk1311>.
- Haspelmath, M. 2009. *Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues*. Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook (2009): 35-54.
- Иванов 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, по. 1-4: 86-99.

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

Johanson, L., & Johanson, Ё. Ђ. С. 2015. *The Turkic Languages*. Routledge.

Karimullina & Karimullina 2015 = Каримуллина, Г. & Каримуллина, Р. 2015. *Толковыє словари руского 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.

Кононов 1997 = Кононов А. Н. 1997. “Турецкий язык 'Turkish language'.” In *Языки мира: Тюркские языки 'Languages of the World. Turkic languages'*.

Korkmazova 2004 = Коркмазова, Л. М. 2004. *Освоение в русском языке тюркизмов с неясными основами "Adaptation of Turkic borrowings with unclear origin in Russian"*. Makhachkala.

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.

Kroupová 2016 = Kroupová, M. . 2016. “Slovesa cizího původu vsoučasné češtině se zřetelem kjejich lexikografickému zpracování “Verbs of foreign origin in contemporary Czech with regard to their lexicographical” [online].” In *Zborník príspevkov zXXV. kolokvia mladých jazykovedcov (Častá-Papiernička 23. – 25. 11. 2016)*, , 187–198.

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.

Muznikov 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 Mrušacedonian and Bulgarian'*. Институт за српски језик САНУ.

Rusínová 2002 = Rusínová, Z. . 2002. *Slovotvorná adaptace přejatých slov a její povaha* “*Word formation Adaptation of borrowed words and its nature*”. – *Čeština doma a ve světě*. Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy.

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

Serebrennikov 1961 = Серебренников, Б. А. 1961. “К проблеме классификации тюркских языков.” *Вопросы языкознания* 4, 59-73.

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 language*’. Nauka.

Skotvid 2015 = Скорвид, С. 2015. *Славянские языки* ‘*Slavic 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.

Svobodová 2009 = Svobodová, D. 2009. *Aktuální pohledy na uplatnění cizojazyčných*

přejímek české slovní zásobě “Current perspectives on the application of foreign language borrowings in the Czech vocabulary” –In: Wolińska, O., Szymczak-Rozlach, M. *Języki zachodniosłowiańskie w XXI w.* Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Šimunović 1985 = Šimunović, Petar. 1985. *Naša prezimena: porijeklo, značenje, rasprostranjenost* "Our surnames: origin, meaning, distribution.". Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.

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

Táborská 2020 = Táborská, K. 2020. "Slovotvorná adaptace nových francouzských přejímek v češtině." "Word-formation Adaptation of Recent French Borrowings in Czech". Филологически форум 6, no. 2 (12) .

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

Tolstoy & Turilov 2016 = Толстой Н. И., Турилов А. 2016. “Старославянский язык 'Old Church Slavic'.” In *Большая российская энциклопедия. Том 31.* Москва: 183-184.

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.

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

Zaliznyak 2003 = Зализняк, А. А. 2003. *Грамматический словарь русского языка.* Русские словари.