Thurneysen, Rudolf
   1946   *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
Toner, Gregory
   2013   *Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language 2013*. Belfast: Queens University. http://edil.qub.ac.uk/dictionary/search.php [last access 21 Jan 2015].
Tristram, Hildegard L. C.
   2010   Probleme bei der Quantifizierung morphologischer Komplexität im Altirischen. In: Karin Stüber, Thomas Zehnder and Dieter Bachmann (eds.), *Akten des 5. Deutschsprachigen Keltologensymposiums. Zürich, 7.–10. September 2009*, 407–426. Wien: Praesens.
Uhlich, Jürgen
   1993   *Die Morphologie der komponierten Personennamen des Altirischen*. Bonn/Witterschlick: Wehle.
Uhlich, Jürgen
   1997   Der Kompositionstyp 'Armstrong' in den indogermanischen Sprachen. *Historische Sprachforschung* 110(1): 21–46.
Uhlich, Jürgen
   2002   Verbal governing compounds (synthetics) in early Irish and other Celtic languages. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 100(3): 403–433.
Watkins, Calvert
   1963   Preliminaries to a historical and comparative analysis of the syntax of the Old Irish verb. *Celtica* 6: 1–49.
Wodtko, Dagmar S.
   1995   *Sekundäradjektive in den altirischen Glossen. Untersuchungen zur präfixalen und suffixalen Wortbildung*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
Wodtko, Dagmar S.
   2007   Das Verb im Lexikon: Indogermanisch und Irisch. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 4(2): 91–133.
Ziegler, Sabine
   1994   *Die Sprache der altirischen Ogam-Inschriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

David Stifter, Maynooth (Ireland)

115. Historical word-formation in Slavic

1. Introduction
2. Development of the word-formation system in Proto-Slavonic
3. Further development of the Proto-Slavonic word-formation system in Old Church Slavonic
4. Outlook
5. References

Abstract

The most important peculiarity of Slavic word-formation as compared to other Indo-European languages is the enormous productivity of affixation. Derivation surpasses compounding in importance and offers a wide range of affixes, particularly suffixes in

noun formation. This is a result of diachronic changes in the structure of Proto-Slavonic due to the influence of specific sound changes which led to a gradual shift of morpheme boundaries in the word, thus increasing the number and the formal complexity of the suffixes, and subsequently consolidating the semantic categories of word-formation. A further influence was exerted by the peculiarities of word-formation in Old Church Slavonic on the development of the word-formation systems of the written standard languages in the Slavia Orthodoxa.

1. Introduction

The diachronic study of word-formation aims at the reconstruction of the historically "real" processes employed in the formation of new words, i.e. it seeks to analyze word-formation in its dynamics, in the relationship of the derivational stem and the derived word as well as the means of word-formation in their origin and subsequent development on the morphological and semantic level.

Linguistic reconstruction includes an historical-comparative approach and the use of etymological methods. This has had the consequence that the historical word-formation of the Slavic languages has traditionally been confined to the etymological scrutiny of Proto-Slavonic (Varbot 1984), and its morpheme inventory was the centre of interest (Efimova 2006).

The most significant feature of Slavic word-formation as compared to that of other Indo-European languages is the enormous productivity of affixation. Derivation plays a leading role and exceeds compounding in importance. It makes use of a wide range of affixes, especially of suffixes in noun formation. In view of this fact, the two above mentioned approaches (etymology and morphemics) to a diachronic study of word-formation become plausible. They form the basis and backbone of this kind of linguistic investigation (Meillet 1961 [1902−05]; Vaillant 1964 [1948]).

The present description of the historical word-formation of Slavic is meant to complement the above-mentioned traditional etymological approaches with concepts and findings of contemporary word-formation theory. For this reason we operate with complex concepts (types and categories of word-formation) and include in the analysis both morphological and semantic aspects (cf. Mengel 1997, 2002, 2007). Our presentation is not meant to list each and every affix or word-formation procedure for all word classes, but rather aims at the description of the central phenomenon of the derivation of nouns by means of numerous suffixes with different forms and meanings, which constitutes a unique feature of Slavic compared to other Indo-European languages. The great diversity of suffixes arose as a consequence of specific phonetic laws in Classical Proto-Slavonic (5th−8th centuries AC). The historic dynamics of this development is presented in this article in its application to the word class of nouns.

Another specific feature of historical word-formation in Slavic goes back to characteristics of the first written language of the Slavs which arose as the language of translations of religious texts from Greek into Slavic in the course of the Christianization of the Slavs in the second half of the 9th century and which evolved in the 10th−11th centuries. This written language, which is known as classical Old Church Slavonic, Old Bulgarian or Old Slavonic is considered the first written fixation of Proto-Slavonic ever and was

based on the living South-Slavonic, Macedonian-Bulgarian dialects in the vicinity of Thessalonica. It was later enriched by West-Slavic (Moravian) and East-Slavic influences. However, Old Church Slavonic was from its very beginning heavily reliant on the creativity of the translators for the transmission of complex religious and abstract concepts that were missing from the everyday Slavic language of that time. The means, structures and processes of word-formation developed as a result of these translation activities and had repercussions for the word-formation procedures in the later Slavic languages.

On the other hand, Old Church Slavonic (9th−11th centuries) reflects, as mentioned above, the late state of Proto-Slavonic (7th−9th centuries). In this particular period of time, the phonetic laws which determined the specific Slavic means of word-formation and are generally responsible for the development of the particularities of a given word-formation system (cf. section 2), lost their former vigour. As a consequence, the Slavic word-formation system develops and stabilizes in this very period. Later on, the individual Slavic languages do not develop word-formation systems of their own that would considerably differ from these original word-formation routines in Common Slavonic. Slight differences may be observed with respect to the productivity of particular affixes and the influence of morphemes borrowed from other languages in the course of history (cf. section 4). This is why it is necessary to pay special attention to the word-formation of Old Church Slavonic when describing historical Slavic word-formation (cf. section 3).

In the following the abbreviations Psl. and OCsl. will stand respectively for the reconstructed Proto-Slavonic, the Proto-Slavonic elements in Old Church Slavonic and the Old Church Slavonic elements resulting from the activity of the first translators. All examples provided in this article are taken from historical dictionaries, language testimonies examined by myself (cf. Mengel 1997, 1998, 2007) and from further works cited individually.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the present article concentrates on derivation, particularly on suffixation in nominal structures. The derivation of adjectives and verbal word-formation, predominantly by prefixes descended from adverbs and prepositions (as in other Indo-European languages), will be referred to in smaller overviews only.

The formal and semantic mechanisms of the development of the suffixal word-formation of adjectives run parallel to those of nouns. Due to the fact that nouns and adjectives in Slavic originally constituted a single class of words, the derivation of both adjectives and nouns relies on the same primary suffixes. A description of the individual suffixes for adjectives in Old Church Slavonic (which remains valid for the individual Slavic languages, too) may be obtained from investigations dedicated to this particular topic (Brodowska-Honowska 1960; Grammatika 1993; Birnbaum and Schaeken 1997). For the sake of exemplification, we will only mention here the most important word-formation categories of the adjectives. To the latter belong qualitative adjectives (cf. OCsl. *kras-ьn-ъ* 'beautiful, red', *dob-r-ъ* 'good, benign', *slad-ok-ъ* 'sweet'), relational adjectives (OCsl. *osobь* [*osob-j-ь*] 'isolated, special'), and possessive adjectives (OCsl. *adam-ov-ъ* 'of Adam', *božь* [*bog-j-ь*] 'God's').

Prefixation as a word-formation procedure is not typical of Slavic nouns or adjectives, whereas it is highly productive in verbal word-formation. From the earliest stages of development right on to the present day, prefixes serve in the Slavic languages as a means of forming different *aktionsarten*. Worth mentioning here are the following: in-

gressive (cf. OCsl. *za-žešti* 'to set alight'), finitive (OCsl. *sъ-plesti* 'to finish with bind-ing'), completive (Russ. *do-pisat'* 'to complete a writing'), delimitative (Russ. *po-stojat'* 'to stand a while'), perdurative (Russ. *pro-rabotat'* (*ves' den'*) 'to work (all day long)'), distributive (Russ. *po-zapirat'* (*vse dveri*) 'to close (all the doors [one after the other])'), cumulative (OCsl. *sъ-zvati* 'to call [all] together'), total (Russ. *is-pisat'* 'to fill with letters') and attenuative (Russ. *pri-otkryt'* (*okno*) 'to open (the window) a bit'); cf. Gram-matika (1993); Birnbaum and Schaeken (1997).

Compounding will be dealt with in connection with Old Church Slavonic translations (cf. section 3.2).

2. Development of the word-formation system in Proto-Slavonic

2.1. Word-formation in early Proto-Slavonic

The difficulty of determining from an etymological point of view the motivational direc-tion of designations with the same roots in words such as Psl. **chvala* 'praise' and **chvaliti* 'to praise' (cf. Russ. *chvala : chvalit'*, Pol. *chwała : chwalić*, Serb. *chvala : chvaliti*, OCsl. *chvala : chvaliti*) (see Meillet 1961: 27), reflects the original interdepend-ence in the designation of objects (nouns) and variable characteristics of these objects (verbs, adjectives). The example **chvala − *chvaliti* also shows the early occurrence of the naming function of word-formation: new words were built up from already existing ones by means of formal non-lexical elements.

The formation of new words and of word forms was based on the same mechanisms. Originally the main role was played by v o w e l c h a n g e s in the root morpheme and the final sound of the stem, e.g., Psl. **mer-* : **mor-* in **merěti* 'to die' : **moriti* 'to kill', **morъ* 'plague' (cf. OCsl. *merěti : moriti, morъ*, Russ. *umeret' : umorit', mor*); Psl. **chvatati* (durative action) 'to seize' : **chvatiti* (sudden action) 'to grab' (OCsl. *chvatati : chvatiti*, Russ. *chvatat' : schvatit'*); Psl. **orbŏs* 'worker' : **orbās* 'female worker' (OCsl. *rabъ : raba*, Russ. *rab : raba*).

Regarding the regular vocalic stem endings in the noun-declension as well as the theme-vowels of the verbs in the four verb classes, one can assume genuine form-build-ing and word-building morphemes or suffixes. Already in its earliest period, Proto-Sla-vonic had other word-formation morphemes similar to the ones mentioned above, all of which were inherited from Proto-Indo-European. The suffix **-j-* proved very productive both in verbal inflection, for instance, as a supplement to the thematic suffixes of the verbs of the third class **-jo/je-* as in Psl. **plakati* 'to weep' − **plak-jo-on* 1st pers. sg. (OCsl. *plakati − plaču*, Russ. *plakat' − plaču*) and in the formation of nouns such as Psl. **zem-j-ā-s > *zemlja* 'earth' (OCsl. *zemlja*), Psl. **kon-j-ŏ-s > *kon'* 'horse' (OCsl. *konь*); Psl. **suchъ* 'dry' → **such-j-ъ > *suš'ъ* 'drought', Psl. **such-j-a > suš'a* 'dry land' (OCsl. *suchъ → sušь, suša*), Psl. **čędo* 'child' → **čęd-j-ъ > *čęḍь* 'people' (OCsl. *čędo → čędь*). The suffix is still used today, for instance, in the formation of Slavic generic adjectives (cf. Russ. *lisьja nora* 'fox hole' from *lisa* 'fox').

The above-mentioned Proto-Slavonic morphemes are primary suffixes that, as the examples show, were not yet clearly differentiated semantically and functionally.

The effect of the phonetic laws in Proto-Slavonic (5th−8th centuries), i.e. the tendency towards increasing the sonority of the syllables ("law of the open syllable") and a further

tendency towards palatalization of consonants, led to a remodeling of the word structure and to the development of new morphemes both in word-formation and inflection. Above all, the law of the open syllable, a tendency in Common Slavonic which resulted in the (re)arrangement of phonemes in a syllable from lower to higher sonority, caused a profound shift of morpheme boundaries, a phenomenon called metanalysis.

The most important consequence was a striking peculiarity of Slavonic word-formation in comparison with other Indo-European languages: the enormous productivity of word-formation by suffixation with a vast array of suffixes, especially in noun formation. Therefore, the most important word-formation procedure in Slavic, viz. derivation, will be dealt with in more detail and particular attention will be paid in the following to the diachronic developments in noun formation.

2.2. Effects of phonetic laws on derivation

The regular co-occurrence of a specific affix with the derivational stems of a specific word class and the parallel semantic increase in the derivative, i.e. the word-formation meaning, proves the existence of specific morphological word-formation structures (patterns) as well as of semantic word-formation types in the systems of the Slavic languages.

Word-formation types − according to Dokulil (1962) and Lopatin and Uluchanov (1970) − fulfill the following criteria: 1) identical word class of the base, 2) identical meaning/function of the formant, 3) identical semantic relation between the base and the derivative. Types with different formants, but identical word-formation meanings, and identical semantic relations between the base and the derivative can be united in word-formation categories (cf. section 2.2.3).

The diachronic development of the Slavic system of word-formation initially produced new word-formation suffixes on the basis of the inherited primary morphemes of Indo-European and resulted finally in the growth of the morphological variety and the consolidation of the respective semantic structures.

2.2.1. Increase in the number of suffixes and their formal extension

Relevant investigations (Meillet 1961 [1902−05]; Vaillant 1964 [1948]; Seliščev 1952; Grammatika 1993; Birnbaum and Schaeken 1997) confirmed that early Proto-Slavonic, apart from the above-mentioned stem endings *-ŏ, *-ā, *-ĭ, *-ŭ, *-ū had the following Indo-European primary suffixes for the formation of nouns: *-b-, *-v-, *-g-, *-j-, *-k-, *-l-, *-n-, *-r-, *-t-.

The remodeling of the word structure, due to the law of the open syllable, resulted in a shift of the morpheme boundaries in the words (m e t a n a l y s i s). The above-mentioned primary suffixes were eventually fused with the word root, a phenomenon comparable to the process of fusion of vocalic stem endings with the new word endings. The primary suffixes eventually lost their original functions, cf. Psl. *zvon-ŏ-s (> zvonъ) 'sound, ringing' → *zvon-k-ŏ-s > *zvǫkъ 'sound' (OCsl. zvonъ, zvǫkъ), Psl. *byti 'to be, exist' → *by-l-ь > *bylь 'true story' (OCsl. byti, bylь), Psl. *dati 'to give' →

da-r-ъ > *darъ* 'gift, present' (OCsl. *dati*, *darъ*), Psl. *sъpati* 'to sleep' → *sъp*-n-ъ > *sъnъ* 'sleep' (OCsl. *sъpati*, *sъnъ*), Psl. *vōldti* (> *vlasti*) 'to rule' → *vōld*-t-ь > *vōlttь* > *vōlstь* > *vlastь* 'power' (OCsl. *vlasti*, *vlastь*).

On the other hand, metanalysis led to a formally larger suffix by:

a) fusion of the primary consonantal suffixes with the stem endings,
b) combination of two (or more) primary (or newly formed) suffixes,
c) extension of the new suffixes by means of new endings.

As a result of this development, several new word-formation morphemes evolved, which were formally more complex and at the same time served to distinguish their function/ meaning more clearly. The number of derivational morphemes increased sharply, since one primary suffix gave rise to several new ones.

This will be demonstrated by the suffix *-k-*, which proved to be especially productive in early Proto-Slavonic. As in Indo-European, it was used for extending several word stems, originally without any significant semantic change (Meillet 1961: 333). The process of morpheme boundary shift resulted in the combination of the vocalic stem endings *-ŏ* (> -o) *-ā* (> a), *-ī* (> -i), *-ĭ* (> ь), *-ŭ* (> -ъ), *-ū* (> -y) with the suffix *-k-* and thus in the formation of the n e w suffixes -ok-, -ak-, -ik-, -ьk-, -ъk-, -yk- (cf. OCsl. *vid-ok-ъ* 'witness', *bliz-ok-ъ* 'relative'; ORuss. *ryb-ak-ъ* 'fisherman', *prost-ak-ъ* 'simpleton'; *zlat-ik-ъ* 'gold coin', Russ.-OCsl. *nož-ik-ъ* 'small knife'; OCsl. *dobyt-ъk-ъ* 'gain', *pęt-ъk-ъ* 'five pieces', *cvět-ьk-ъ* 'small flower'). The tendency towards palatalization affected a still larger number of new suffixes: in the third palatalization, the velar consonant *k became *c* after the vowels *i* und *ь*; this led to the development of the suffixes -ic- < -ik- (cf. OCsl. *čarodě-ic-ь* 'magician'), and -ьc- < -ьk- (OCsl. *vid-ьc-ь* 'witness', *star-ьc-ь* 'the elderly', *črьn-ьc-ь* 'monk', *cvět-ьc-ь* 'small flower', *studen-ьc-ь* 'well'), whereas the suffixes -ik- und -ьk- remained in use due to the inconsistencies in the remodeling process.

By the fusion of (two) suffixes more new suffixes were formed in early Proto-Slavonic. This was frequently caused by the regressive effect of the suffix -j- on preceding consonants with a tendency towards palatalization, e.g., Psl. *kj* > č: -ak-jo > -ačь (Seliščev 1952: 59; cf. OCsl. *kov-ačь* 'blacksmith', Russ. *borodačь* 'bearded', Cz. *bradáč* 'id.'), and -ik-jo > -ičь (OCsl. *gospod-ičь* 'son of the lord', ORuss. *sestr-ičь* 'nephew, son of the sister', *pьsov-ičь* 'dog-keeper'). The combination of the suffixes -ak- and *-ĭ-j-* resulted in the new suffix -ъčii/-ьčii (Seliščev 1952: 63; cf. OCsl. *kъnig-ъčii* 'book expert', *krъm-ьčii* 'helmsman').

The number of new suffixes was further increased by adding new endings: -ika < -ik-a (cf. OCsl. *bliž-ika* 'relative', *ǫž-ika* 'relative'); -ьka < -ьk-a (OCsl. *rǫč-ьka* 'handle'); -ъka < -ъk-a (OCsl. *kot-ъka* 'cat', *tet-ъka* 'aunt'); -ica < -ic-a (OCsl. *proroč-ica* 'fortune teller f.', *čarodě-ica* 'magician', *tьmьn-ica* 'dungeon', *grъl-ica* 'turtledove', *ryb-ica* 'small fish'); -ьce < -ic-e (OCsl. *slъn-ьce* < Psl. *sъlnьce* < Indo-European *sāul-/sul-* 'sun', *čęd-ьce* 'small child', *bljud-ьce* 'small bowl'); -ьca < -ьc-a (OCsl. *dvьr-ьca* 'small door', *sěč-ьca* 'hangman'); -yka < -yk-a (OCsl. *vlad-yka* 'ruler, sovereign').

The growth of the complexity of suffixes by the shift of morpheme boundaries (metanalysis) continued after the phonetic law of the open syllable had expired in late Proto-Slavonic. Mostly from the combination of two (or more) new suffixes, complex new suffixes of the second generation evolved.

The suffix *-ik-*, for example, was extended by the adjectival suffix *-ьn-*, and the suffix of the passive past participle *-en-* was extended to the new complex suffix *-ьnik-/-enik-*; cf. a) OCsl. *grěšьnikъ* 'sinner' (Psl. *grěchъ* 'sin' → **grěch-ĭ-n-ъ* > **grěš-ьn-ъ* 'sinful'; OCsl. *grěšьnъ* 'sinful' → *grěšьn-ik-ъ* 'sinner'; at the same time, OCsl. *grěšnikъ* can now be perceived as a denominal derivative (N → N): *grěchъ* 'sin' → *grěš-ьnik-ъ* 'sinner') and b) OCsl. *ljublenikъ* 'lover, beloved' (OCsl. *ljubiti* 'to love' → *ljubl-en-ъ* 'beloved' → *ljublen-ik-ъ* 'lover'; with *-enikъ* as a new complex suffix the noun has to be regarded as a deverbal derivative (V → N): OCsl. *ljubiti* 'to love' → *ljubl-enikъ* 'lover, beloved').

The following derivatives can thus be analyzed (without referring to an intermediate stage of derivation) as

− d e v e r b a l: OCsl. *zaštitьnikъ* 'guardian' (← *zaštititi* 'to protect'), *mǫčenikъ* 'martyr' (← *mǫčiti* 'to torment'), *istočьnikъ* 'spring' (← *istočati* 'to flow out'),
− d e n o m i n a l: OCsl. *kъnižьnikъ* 'book expert' (← *kъniga* 'book'), *žrьtvьnikъ* 'sacrificial altar' (← *žrьtva* 'sacrifice'), and
− d e a d j e c t i v a l: OCsl. *prazdьnikъ* 'holiday' (← *prazdьnъ* 'empty, free').

Thus in late Proto-Slavic (as well as in Old Church Slavonic as its first written fixation), the following secondary suffixes occur: **-k-* > OCsl. *-ok-ъ*, *-ak-ъ*, *-ik-ъ*, *-ika*, *-ьk-ъ*, *-ьka*, *-ъkъ*, *-ъka*, *-yka*, *-ьcь*, *-ьce*, *-ьca*, *-ica*, *-ačь*, *-ičь*, *-ьčii/-ьčii*, *-ьnikъ/-enikъ*.

The increase of the formal complexity of suffixes was furthermore enhanced by the doubling of a new suffix in certain derivations without creating a new meaning (affix pleonasm), as, for example, ORuss. *sestr-ičь*, *sestr-ič-ičь* (from *sestra* 'sister'), Russ. dial. *sestr-ičъ*, *sestr-ič-ičъ* (Dal' 1956 [1880−82]: IV, 179) 'nephew, son of the sister'; ORuss. *brat-ičь*, *brat-ič-ičь* (from *bratъ* 'brother') 'nephew, son of the brother', or it was due to the use of two different new suffixes in derivatives such as Russ.-OCsl. *bratъ* 'brother' → *brat-an-ьcь* 'brother' and ORuss. *brat-anъ* 'nephew'; OCsl. *vlasti* 'to reign' → *vlas-telь*, but also *vlas-telь-nikъ*, *vlas-tel-inъ*, *vlas-tel-janinъ* 'sovereign'. These approaches were largely practised by the translators of texts into Old Church Slavonic (and later into Church Slavonic) (see section 3.1.2).

2.2.2. Consolidation of word-formation semantics

In comparison to primary suffixes (including final stem vowels) with their primarily stem-extending function (Psl. **orb-* [cf. Russ. dial. *robi-ti* 'to work'] → **orb-ŏ-s* 'worker', **orb-ā-s* 'female worker'; **moriti* 'to kill' → **mor-ŏ-s* 'plague', **chvaliti* 'to praise' : **chval-ā-s* 'praise', see section 2.1), the new suffixes, thanks to their strength of formal expression are in a position to consolidate their share of meaning in the newly created word structures and to transmit these shares of meaning to derivatives of identical word structure, cf. Psl. **pēns-ŭ-k-ŏ-s* (originally without any diminutive meaning) > **pěs-ъk-ъ* (Grammatika 1993: 182) 'sand' (OCsl. *pěsъkъ*) vs. **domъ* (< **dom-ŏ-s*) 'house' → **dom-ъk-ъ* 'small house' (OCsl. *domъ* → *domъkъ*).

It is in this manner that regular word-formation structures (word-formation types) evolved which, by the combination of a certain suffix with the derivational stem of a certain morphological category (but independent of the individual lexical meaning), regularly produce an identical semantic increase compared to the meaning of the stem (in

the examples cited above, e.g., diminutiveness), in contemporary word-formation theory referred to as word-formation meaning (Lopatin and Uluchanov 1980: 136; cf. Mengel 2009: 776 ff.).

According to the nature of the semantic increase, transmitted and consolidated by the new suffixes, one can distinguish three major semantic types (cf. Dokulil 1968: 203 ff.):

a) T r a n s p o s i t i o n : The results are derivatives in which the affix merely has a syntactic function, changing the base's part of speech. Here belongs, for instance, the formation of a b s t r a c t n o u n s (reification of features, qualities and processes), cf. OCsl. *bogat-ъstvo* 'wealth' (← *bogatъ* 'rich'), *prišьl-ъstvo* 'arrival' (← *prišьlъ* 'arrived'), *rožd-ъstvo* 'birth' (← *roždьnъ* 'born'); *grъd-ostь* 'pride' (← *grъdъ* 'proud'), *prav-ostь* 'justice' (← *pravъ* 'just'), *krotъk-ostь* 'gentleness' (← *krot-ъkъ* 'gentle'); *prav-ota* 'justice' (← *pravъ* 'just'), *kras-ota* 'beauty' (← *kras-ьnъ* 'beautiful', *krasa* 'beauty'); *grъd-yni* 'pride' (← *grъdъ* 'proud'), *prav-yni* 'justice' (← *pravъ* 'just'); *spasen-ie* 'rescue' (← *spas-enъ* 'rescued'), *trъpě-nie* 'patience' (← *trъpěti* 'to endure') and others more.

b) M o d i f i c a t i o n : The derivatives and their bases refer to the same kind of objects, i.e. they always represent the same part of speech. The affix modifies the meaning of the base as, for example, in d i m i n u t i v e s , cf. OCsl. *grad-ьcь* 'small town' (← *gradъ* 'town'), *cvět-ьcь* 'small flower' (← *cvětъ* 'flower'); *cvět-ъkъ* 'small flower' (← *cvětъ* 'flower'); *ryb-ica* 'small fish' (← *ryba* 'fish'), *crьkъv-ica* 'small church' (← *crьky* 'church'); c o l l e c t i v e n o u n s , cf. OCsl. *kamen-ie* 'rock' (← *kamy/kamenь* 'stone') or f e m a l e p e r s o n a l n o u n s , cf. OCsl. *proroč-ica* 'female fortune teller' (← *prorokъ* 'fortune teller'), *vratar-ica* 'female guardian of the gate' (← *vratarъ* 'guardian of the gate'); *gospod-yni* 'mistress' (← *gospodь* 'master') and others.

c) M u t a t i o n : The meaning of the derivative is distinct from that of its base; the semantic change may (but need not) coincide with a change in the part of speech. Mutation is primarily characteristic of the formation of names for concrete objects or personal nouns, cf. the above mentioned examples with the suffix *-ьnikъ* and OCsl. *tvor-ьcь* 'creator' (← *tvoriti* 'to create'), *vid-ьcь* 'witness' (← *viděti* 'to see'), *star-ьcь* 'elder' (← *starъ* 'old'), *črьn-ьcь* 'monk' (← *črьnъ* 'black'), *studen-ьcь* 'well' (← *studenъ* 'cold'); *čarodě-ica* 'magician' (← *čaroděti* 'to conjure'), *tьmьn-ica* 'dungeon, prison' (← *tьmьnъ* 'dark'), *grъl-ica* 'turtledove' (← *grъlo* 'throat'); *dobyt-ъkъ* 'gain' (← *dobyti* 'to acquire'), *pęt-ъkъ* 'five pieces' (← *pętъ* 'fifth'); *kъnig-ъčii* 'book expert' (← *kъniga* 'book'), *krъm-ьčii* 'helmsman' (← *kъrma* 'stern'); *sir-ota* 'orphan' (← *sirъ* 'orphaned') and others.

The old stem extension by primary, polyfunctional, semantically undifferentiated suffixes, is thus replaced by new, semantically specified, word-formation structures with a distinct categorial meaning. The latter is based on new, semantically specialized suffixes. In this manner, instead of formations such as *chval-ā-s* (OCsl. *chvala*) 'praise', *orb-ŏ-s* (OCsl. *rabъ*) 'worker', *orb-ā-s* (OCsl. *raba*) 'female worker' (see section 2.1), new formally and semantically distinct types evolved such as OCsl. *chvalenъ* 'praised' (from *chvaliti* 'to praise') → *chvalen-ie* 'praise', *rabotati* 'to work' → *rabot-ьnikъ* 'worker', *rabъ* 'worker, slave' → *rab-yni* 'female worker, female slave'. The old (suffixless) word-formation procedure remains only in derivatives from verbal stems (Vaillant 1952: 228), cf. OCsl. *vъzrasti* 'to grow up' → *vъzrastъ* 'age'; *pojasati* 'to gird' → *pojasъ* 'girdle';

voda + nositi 'to carry water' → *vodonosъ* 'water carrier'; *izměniti* 'to betray' → *izměna* 'betrayal'; *ograditi* 'to enclose' → *ograda* 'fence'.

Owing to their genesis, the new suffixes combine with derivational stems of several word classes and − within a word class − with stems of different morphological categories (deverbal formations, e.g., can be derived from the infinitive stem or the present tense stem, or from participles) and convey different word-formation meanings, depending on the particular stems, e.g.:

a) *-yni*: ABSTR ← A; FEM.PERS ← N

The suffix *-yni*, combined with an adjectival stem, denotes an abstract concept (*grъdyni* 'pride'), whereas combined with a noun stem of a masculine personal noun it conveys the meaning of the female counterpart (*gospodyni* 'mistress').

b) *-ie*: ABSTR ← V; COLLECT ← N

The suffix *-ie* denotes an abstract verbal quality when combined with a passive past participle (*spasenie* 'rescue'), and when combined with a noun stem it expresses the meaning of a collective noun (*kamenie* 'rock' ← *kamy*/*kamen'* 'stone').

c) *-ica*: FEM.PERS ← N; AGENT FEM ← V; VARIA

The suffix *-ica* expresses the meaning 'female person' when combined with the stem of a masculine personal noun (*proročica* 'female fortune teller' ← *prorokъ*, *vratarica* 'female guardian of the gate' ← *vratarъ*). It also denotes a diminutive when combined with feminine noun stems, which can stand for living beings as well as concrete objects (*rybica* 'small fish', *crъkъvica* 'small church'). When combined with a verbal stem (infinitive stem) the suffix transmits the meaning of a personal noun (*čarodĕica* 'magician'). In combination with adjectival and nominal stems it forms expressions for concrete objects and animals (*tьmьnica* 'dungeon, prison', *grъlica* 'turtledove').

d) *-ьcь*: DIM ← N; PERS ← V, A; VARIA ← A

The suffix *-ьcь*, combined with a noun stem conveys the meaning of a diminutive (*gradьcь* 'small town', *cvĕtьcь* 'small flower'), combined with verbal and adjectival stems it denotes personal nouns (*tvorьcь* 'creator', *vidьcь* 'witness'; *starьcь* 'elder', *črьnьcь* 'monk') as well as denominations of concrete objects when combined with adjectival stems (*studenьcь* 'well').

e) *-ъkъ*: DIM ← N; N ← NUM

The meaning of a diminutive is transmitted by the suffix *-ъkъ* combined with a noun stem (*stanъkъ* 'small camp', *cvĕtъkъ* 'small flower', *domъkъ* 'small house'). It is used for the formation of concrete terms when combined with verbal stems or cardinal numbers (*dobytъkъ* 'gain', *pętъkъ* 'five pieces').

f) *-ьnikъ*: PERS ← A, V, N

The new suffix of the second generation *-ьnikъ*, in combination with adjectival, verbal and nominal stems forms personal nouns (*grěšьnikъ* 'sinner', *ljublenikъ* 'lover', *mǫčenikъ* 'martyr', *kъnižьnikъ* 'book expert') or denominations of objects (*prazdьnikъ* 'holiday', *istočьnikъ* 'source', *žrьtvьnikъ* 'sacrificial altar').

g) *-ota*: ABSTR ← A; PERS ← A

The suffix *-ota*, when combined with adjectives, can form both abstract quality nouns (*pravota* 'justice', *krasota* 'beauty') and personal nouns (*sirota* 'orphan').

The above-mentioned examples show that suffixes can establish different word-formation types fulfilling the criteria 1) identical word class of the base, 2) identical meaning/ function of the formant, 3) identical semantic relation between the base and the deriva-

tive (cf. Dokulil 1962; Lopatin and Uluchanov 1970), and that types with different formants, but identical word-formation meanings and identical semantic relations between the base and the derivative can be united in w o r d - f o r m a t i o n   c a t e g o r i e s :

a) Quality nouns

The meaning of an abstract quality is conveyed by combining the suffixes *-ьstvo*, *-ostь*, *-ota*, *-yni* (and others) with an adjectival stem (cf. *bogatьstvo* 'wealth', *grъdostь* 'pride', *pravostь* 'justice', *krotъkostь* 'gentleness', *pravota* 'justice', *krasota* 'beauty', *grъdyni* 'pride', *pravyni* 'justice') and others.

b) Action nouns

The meaning of action nouns is transmitted by combining the suffixes *-ьstvo*, *-ie*, *-nie* (and others) with verbal stems (cf. *prišьlьstvo* 'arrival', *roždьstvo* 'birth', *spasen-ie* 'rescue', *trъpěnie* 'patience').

c) Agent nouns/personal nouns

Personal nouns are formed by combining

– the suffixes *-ьсь*, *-icь*, *-ьca*, *-ica*, *-ьnikъ*, *-ačь*, *-yka*, *-okъ* (and others) with verbal stems (cf. *tvorьсь* 'creator', *čarodějicь* 'magician', *sěčьca* 'hangman; warrier', *čaroděica* 'magician', *zaštitьnikъ* 'guardian', *kovačь* 'blacksmith', *vladyka* 'sovereign, ruler', *vidokъ* 'witness'),

– the suffixes *-ьсь*, *-okъ*, *-ika*, *-akъ*, *-ičь*, *-ota* (and others) with adjectival stems (cf. *starьсь* 'elder', *blizokъ* 'relative', *bližika* 'relative', *prostakъ* 'simpleton', *pьsovičь* 'dog-keeper', *sirota* 'orphan'), and

– the suffixes *-ьnikъ*, *-akъ*, *-ačь*, *-arь*, *-ičь*, *-ъčii/ьčii* (and others) with noun stems (cf. *kъnižьnikъ* 'book expert', *rybakъ* 'fisherman', *rybarь* 'id.', *gospodičь* 'son of the lord', *kъnigъčii* 'book expert', *krъmьčii* 'helmsman').

d) Feminine personal nouns

The feminine counterparts are generated by combining masculine personal nouns with the suffixes *-ica*, *-yni* (and others) (cf. *proročica* 'female fortune teller', *vratari-ca* 'female guardian of the gate', *gospodyni* 'mistress').

e) Non-personal nouns

Most of the suffixes that generate personal nouns (and partly also those that produce diminutives) are similarly used to form designations of non-personal nouns (cf. *žrьtvьnikъ* 'sacrificial altar', *istočьnikъ* 'spring', *prazdьnikъ* 'holiday', *studenьсь* 'well', *tьmьnica* 'dungeon, prison', *dobytъkъ* 'gain', *zlatikъ* 'gold coin', *rǫčьka* 'vessel').

f) Diminutives

Diminutive meaning is expressed by the suffixes *-ьсь*, *-ъkъ*, *-ikъ*, *-ica*, *-ьca*, *-ьce* (and others) when combined with noun stems (cf. *cvětьсь* 'small flower', *cvětъkъ* 'id.', *nožikъ* 'small knife', *rybica* 'small fish', *dvьrьca* 'small door', *čjadьce* 'small child', *bljudьce* 'small bowl').

Derivatives belonging to the same category of word-formation, can also have identical roots/stems combined with different suffixes and sometimes even identical lexical meaning, referred to as word-formation synonymy (Ohnheiser 1979; Mengel 1997: 49 ff.), as the following examples show:

a) Abstract nouns: *grъd-ostь* : *grъd-yni* 'pride' (← *grъdъ* 'proud'), *prav-ostь* : *prav-ota* : *prav-yni* 'justice' (← *pravъ* 'just').

b) Agent nouns and denominal personal nouns: *vid-ьсь* : *vid-okъ* 'witness' (← *viděti* 'to see'), *kov-ьсь* : *kov-ačь* 'blacksmith' (← *kovati* 'to forge'), *čarodě-icь* : *čarodě-ica* 'magician' (← *čaroděti* 'to conjure'); *bliz-okъ* : *bliž-ika* 'relative' (← *blizъ* 'near'); *kъniž-ьnikъ* : *kъnig-ъčii* 'book expert' (← *kniga* 'book'), *ryb-akъ* : *ryb-ьnikъ* 'fisherman' (← *ryba* 'fish'), *pьs-arъ* (← *pьsъ* 'dog') : *pьsovičь* (← *pьsovъ* 'dog- (adj.)') 'dog-keeper' and many others.

c) Diminutives: *cvět-ьcь* : *cvět-ъkъ* 'small flower' (← *cvětъ* 'flower').

2.2.3. Consolidation of specialized word-formation structures

The extensive synonymy of word-formation types and the corresponding derivatives described in the previous section has been gradually suppressed/diminished by language use. This is reflected in the varying productivity of synonymous (and sometimes also homonymous) word-formation types.

For example, the suffix *-ota*, combined with adjectival stems for the derivation of personal nouns (cf. *sirota*), is already unproductive in Proto-Slavonic (Grammatika 1993: 189). However, it remains productive in the contemporary Slavic languages for the formation of deadjectival abstract nouns (OCsl. *pravota* 'justice'; Russ. *širota* 'breadth', Bul. *dobrota* 'benevolence').

The suffix *-yni*, combined with adjectival stems, by contrast, loses its productivity for the formation of deadjectival abstract nouns (cf. OCsl. *grъdyni*). In combination with stems of personal nouns, *-yni* in the meaning 'female person' (cf. OCsl. *gospodyni*) soon follows the productive word-formation type with the suffix *-ica*, which develops a high productivity for forming feminine personal nouns (cf. OCsl. *proročica*, *vratarica*) (Cejtlin 1977: 133).

The formation of personal nouns with the following suffixes becomes less and less productive:

a) *-icь*, *-ьca*, *-ica*, *-ačь*, *-yka*, *-okъ* (and some others) combined with verbal stems (cf. OCsl. *čaroděicь*, *sěčьca*, *čaroděica*, *kovačь*, *vladyka*, *vidokъ*),

b) *-okъ*, *-ika*, *-ičь* (and some others) combined with adjectival stems (cf. OCsl. *blizokъ*, *bližika*, *prostakъ*, *pьsovičь*) and also

c) *-akъ*, *-ačь*, *-ъčii/ьčii* (and others) in combination with noun stems (cf. OCsl. *rybakъ*, *kъnigъčii*).

The highest productivity is shown by the new suffix *-ьnikъ* (Cejtlin 1977: 90) combined with verbal, nominal and adjectival stems, followed by the suffix *-ьcь*, when joined to verbal and adjectival stems.

As has been mentioned above, all word-formation types which share a common general word-formation meaning belong to one and the same word-formation category.

The word-formation structures of transposition and modification show from the very beginning of their existence a relatively narrow specialization of their word-formation categories, cf.

T r a n s p o s i t i o n : The category of abstract nouns (transposition) is based on two word classes, on verbs (→ action nouns) and adjectives (→ quality nouns).

M o d i f i c a t i o n : The meaning of feminine personal nouns is transmitted by word-formation types in only one word-formation category, exclusively in combination with

stems of masculine agent/personal nouns. The formation of diminutives is also a matter of word-formation types in only one word-formation category, which comprises derivatives from noun stems of the group "objects" (in a broader sense persons are included).

M u t a t i o n : The word-formation structures of mutation, in the course of their development, are involved in far more complex semantic structures. If one presupposes, according to the above-cited examples, two word-formation categories (personal nouns; non-personal object nouns) the respective word-formation structures form derivatives from at least three parts of speech (N, A, V), cf. Mengel (1997: 187 ff., 2002); see also section 3.2.2.

3. Further development of the Proto-Slavonic word-formation system in Old Church Slavonic

The first written language of the Slavs, Old Church Slavonic, at its origin in 863 was based upon late Proto-Slavonic Macedonian-Bulgarian dialects in the Thessalonica region. During the 10th–11th centuries it was enriched by further West, South and East Slavic elements. In a sense, Old Church Slavonic adopted the word-formation system of Proto-Slavonic.

On the other hand, Old Church Slavonic evolves as the language of Bible translations and translations of religious, edifying literature from the highly developed Greek written standard language into one of the dialects of a language that had so far been unaffected by any rigid written norm. The receiving language was not in a position to adequately and fully render the subtle concepts of the books to be translated. On the lexical level, certain concepts and corresponding terms and denominations were missing. Apart from the numerous direct borrowings from Greek, the first translators had to rely on the denominative function of word-formation in order to solve the problem, i.e. they had to create the necessary abstract terms and designations of persons with their differing characteristic features.

The first translators, in their creative activity, used the available word-formation procedures and conventions of late Proto-Slavonic. Sometimes, though, they changed the very system.

3.1. Derivation

In the field of derivation, the increase in the length of suffixes and the consolidation of means of expression were deliberately continued.

3.1.1. Peculiarities in the formation of abstract nouns

Expressions of abstract features appear in Proto-Slavonic mostly in the form of deadjectival abstract nouns. As the above-mentioned examples show (see sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3), they are formed by the combination of certain suffixes with adjective stems and

are morphologically of the feminine gender. The formation of deverbal abstract nouns is less productive. They were originally formed by stems of participles (which represent the verbal features) in combination with the suffixes *-ie* (*spasen-ie* 'rescue', *chvalen-ie* 'praise') and *-ьstvo* (*prišьl-ьstvo* 'arrival', *rožd-ьstvo* 'birth'), which in combination with adjectival stems form deadjectival abstract nouns (*bogat-ьstvo* 'wealth'). As for their morphological gender, deverbal abstract nouns are neuter. By morpheme boundary shifting (metanalysis) the suffix *-ie* combined with the suffix of the passive past participle. This lead to the emergence of the new suffix of the second generation *-nie* which combined with infinitive stems (*trъpě-nie* 'patience').

For new abstract concepts the first translators preferably made use of the available Proto-Slavonic word-formation structures with the three above-mentioned suffixes *-ie*, *-nie*, *-stvo* (cf. OCsl. *ugožden-ie* 'favour', *blagoslavlen-ie* 'benediction'; *lichoima-nie* 'corruptibility', *oblada-nie* 'possession'; *blažen-stvo* 'blissfulness'). The suffix *-ie* enjoys the highest productivity amongst them. Based upon the word-formation type for collective nouns (*kamen-ie* 'rock', cf. section 2.1.2), it is also used in combination with nouns to form abstract terms (cf. OCsl. *bezzakon-ie* 'lawlessness; lit. without-law-ABSTR' ← *bezъ zakona* 'without law', *bezum-ie* 'madness; lit. without-reason-ABSTR' ← *bezъ uma* 'without reason', *velič-ie* 'greatness' ← *velikъ* 'great'), and develops in Old Church Slavonic into a specific mark for abstract terms (Chaburgaev 1986: 122). The use of the suffix *-ьstvo* in combination with noun stems, is also extended for forming abstract nouns (cf. OCsl. *bož-ьstvo* 'deity' ← *bogъ* 'God', *brat-ьstvo* 'brotherhood' ← *bratъ* 'brother', *episkop-ьstvo* 'bishopric' ← *episkopъ* 'bishop').

On the formal side of expression, the applicability of these suffixes is further extended. Analogous to the Proto-Slavonic process of suffix extension by morpheme boundary shifts (metanalysis), the two most productive suffixes *-ьstvo* and *-ie*, which transmit the same word-formation meaning in parallel word-formation structures, are arbitrarily combined into a new, complex suffix *-ьstvie*. Formations with this suffix (without word-formation synonyms) exist already in the most ancient documents of Old Church Slavonic (cf. *bratoljub-ьstvie* 'brotherly love' ← *bratъ* 'brother' + *ljubiti* 'to love', *podob-ьstvie* 'resemblance' ← *podobiti* 'to resemble', *synobož-ьstvie* 'God's sonship' ← *synъ Božii* 'God's son; lit. son God-POSS.ADJ') (Chaburgaev 1986: 123). Their productivity in the course of the history of Church Slavonic, especially in its Eastern Slavonic variant, is constantly increasing. This is reflected to a striking degree in the word-formation system of the contemporary Russian standard language, cf. Russ. *sledstvie* 'consequence' (← *sledovat'* 'to follow'), *spokojstvie* 'silence' (← *spokojnyj* 'silent').

When forming new abstract nouns, the first translators' approach in Old Church Slavonic was concentrated on having the suffix, e.g., *-stvo* or *-ie*, transmit initially the simple and transparent word-formation meaning of the Proto-Slavonic derivatives of the transposition type (deadjectival and deverbal abstract nouns). Later, the suffix was capable of combining with derivational stems of the main word classes and various morphological categories in the formation of derivatives with an abstract meaning.

3.1.2. Peculiarities in the formation of personal nouns

For coining new personal nouns in late Proto-Slavonic, several word-formation structures with a whole series of productive suffixes were available. They combined with deriva-

tional stems of various word classes, thus belonging to various word-formation types and producing different word-formation meanings of mutation (cf. sections 2.1.2−2.1.3). The first translators preferred the morphologically and semantically unequivocal word-formation structures.

In the translations into Old Church Slavonic the suffix *-telь* acquires very high productivity. Its origin is not fully traceable, but most probably goes back to Proto-Slavonic dialects. In combination with infinitive stems (most frequently of verbs ending in *-iti*), it formed new agent nouns (Grammatika 1993: 191), cf. OCsl. *krьsti-telь* 'baptist' (← *krьstiti* 'to baptize'), *iskusi-telь* 'seducer' (← *iskusiti* 'to seduce'), *iscěli-telь* 'healer' (← *iscěliti* 'to heal'), *obliči-telь* 'accuser' (← *obličiti* 'to accuse'), *světi-telь* 'light bearer' (← *světiti* 'to shine'), *mǫči-telь* 'torturer' (← *mǫčiti* 'to torture'), *uči-telь* 'teacher' (← *učiti* 'to teach') and others. Derivatives from other verbs are in a minority, cf. *vlas-telь* 'ruler, sovereign' (← *vlasti* 'to rule, reign'), *ži-telь* 'inhabitant' (← *žiti* 'to live'), *žę-telь* 'harvester' (← *žęti* 'to harvest'), *prěda-telь* 'traitor' (← *prědati* 'to betray') and others. Under the influence of Old Church Slavonic this productive word-formation type occurred in later Slavic written standard languages, cf. Russ. *izobretatelь* 'inventor' (← *izobretat'* 'to invent'), *potrebitelь* 'consumer' (← *potrebit'* 'to consume'), Bul. *potrebitel* 'consumer' (← *potrjabva* 'to be in need'), *poluča-tel* 'recipient' (← *polučava* 'to receive'), etc.

The suffix *-arь*, borrowed from Germanic and not productive in Proto-Slavonic (cf. Gothic *motareis*, OCsl. *mytarь* 'tax collector', see Meillet 1961 [1902−05]: 211, cf. also Lat. *-ārius*), is used in the most ancient documents of Old Church Slavonic exclusively to form personal nouns in combination with noun stems. These personal nouns mostly represent denominations of trades and professions according to the object of the respective activity mentioned in the derivational stem, cf. *vrat-arь* 'guardian of the door' (← *vrata* 'door'), *ryb-arь* 'fisherman' (← *ryba* 'fish'), *vrьtograd-arь* 'gardener' (← *vrьtogradъ* 'garden'), *klevet-arь* 'accuser' (← *kleveta* 'accusation') and others more. This word-formation type develops a high productivity in Old Church Slavonic and competes with the very productive Proto-Slavonic suffix *-ьnikъ* among others (cf. Meillet 1961 [1902/1905]: 212, see also sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2). Thus it was possible for derivatives of these two word-formation types to be used in Old Church Slavonic translations with the same roots to specify the lexical meaning, cf. *klevet-arь* (Gr. *katégoros*) 'accuser' : *klevet-ьnikъ* (Gr. *sukophántes*) 'slanderer'. This word-formation type also played an essential role in the subsequent history of certain written standard languages; in Bulgarian, for instance, it is used to form names of inhabitants (Duridanov 1970: 863 ff.).

In Old Church Slavonic translations, the translators created a new complex suffix to render the Greek terms for inhabitants. Based upon the Proto-Slavonic word-formation type with the suffix *-jan/ěn-* (< *-jē-n-*), which was used to form collective nouns according to the place of residence, tribal association, etc. (e.g., OCsl. *slav-jane* 'Slavs', *graždane* 'citizens', cf. in Nestor's Chronicle (beginning of the 12th century) ORuss. *pol-jane* 'the Polyans', *drěvl-jane* 'the Drevlyans' and other Old Russian tribes, see Iljinskij 1902: 31 ff.), and also upon the morpheme *-in/ьn-ъ* (< *-jŏ-n/ĭ-n-*) with the meaning 'singulative' (cf. OCsl. *židov-inъ* 'jew' ← *židovy* 'jews'), the suffix *-janinъ/-ěninъ* has evolved. (The morpheme *-in-* was also used to render the Greek root *mon-* mainly in compounds, cf. OCsl. *in-ok-ъ* (Gr. *moniós*) 'hermit', *in-o-rogъ* (Gr. *monókeros*) 'unicorn', *in-o-cędъ* (Gr. *monogenénes*) 'single child'.) The newly developed word-formation type is restricted to noun stems of the lexical-semantic group of (geographic) places of residence, cf.

OCsl. *galilě-janinъ* 'Galilean', *riml-janinъ* 'Roman', *samar-janinъ* 'Samarian', *egypt-ěninъ* 'Egyptian', *solun-janinъ* 'inhabitant of Thessalonica', etc. In later Slavonic written standard languages, especially in Russian, this word-formation type enjoys a high productivity in forming names of city dwellers, cf. Russ. *kirovčanin* 'inhabitant of Kirov' and others (cf. section 4).

The above-mentioned approach of the first translators in creating new denominations for persons in Old Church Slavonic is intended to achieve the most unequivocal meaning of mutation in the resulting derivatives. This is done by employing highly specialized word-formation structures with a certain suffix which combines with the derivational stem of only one particular class of words. The word-formation semantics of the personal nouns (in analogy to the formation of new abstract nouns) is thus consolidated and concentrated in the suffix.

By combining several morphemes into one new suffix (cf. *-janinъ/-ěninъ*) and by forming the derivatives by means of both the new and the already existing productive suffixes (e.g., *-telʼ*, *-ьnikъ* and *-ьcь*), the number of suffixes and their length are further increased to underline their semantic weight, cf. *vlas-telь* 'sovereign, ruler' (← *vlas-t-i* 'to reign') → *vlas-tel-inъ*, *vlas-tel-janinъ*, *vlas-tel-ьnikъ* 'id.', *čelęd-inъ* 'servant' (← *čelędь* collective noun 'servants') → *čelęd-in-ьcь* 'id.', and others. Especially this latter approach becomes a characteristic trait of Old Church Slavonic as the written and cultural language of the Slavs in comparison with their living colloquial languages and dialects (Uspenskij 1984). − In the field of adjectival word-formation, the doubling of the suffix *-n-* is a characteristic operation, e.g., *blaženьnъ* 'blessed, blissful', *vъždelenьnъ* 'desired, longed for', *neizglagolanьnъ* 'ineffable' (cf. Dobrev 2004: 22).

One of the most important principles of the first translators was the principle of variability, according to which a Greek word could be translated by several equivalent Slavonic lexical units in order to reach an improved understanding (Vereščagin 1972; Mengel 1998), cf. Gr. *katégoros* − *klevet-arь* (← *kleveta* 'claim'), *obliči-telь* (← *obliči-t-i* 'to accuse') both meaning 'accuser'; Gr. *telōnēs* − *myt-arь* (← *myt-o* 'tax'), *mъzdo-im-ьcь* (lit. 'tax-have/get/take-AGENT') both in the meaning 'tax collector'; Gr. *phoneús*, *miaphónos* − *ubi-ica* (← *ubi-t-i* 'to murder, kill'), *ubi-tel-ьnikъ* 'murderer'; Gr. *agathós*, *philágathos* − *blagodě-telь* lit. 'good-doer' (← *blago* + *dět'* lit. 'good (n.) do'), *blagoda-telь* lit. 'good-giver' (← *blago* + *dat'* lit. 'good (n.) to give'), *blagodat-ьnikъ*, *blagodav-ьcь* 'benefactor'. Thus, several synonymous denominations developed (rich synonymy was equally characteristic of the highly developed Greek written language), word-formation synonyms amongst others. As the above-mentioned examples show, new word-formations with new, specialized word-formation structures and suffixes (cf. *ubitelьnikъ*) were introduced in addition to the denominations already existent in Proto-Slavonic (e.g., *ubiica*).

In the course of the history of Church Slavonic, the procedure used by the first translators for coining new denominations of persons lead to a specialization of the other inherited word-formation types belonging to the word-formation category "personal nouns". By combining a certain suffix with the derivational stem of a word class within a definite lexical-semantic group, a very precise word-formation meaning was obtained (e.g., trades and professions, inhabitants, etc.). Our own studies of Russian Church Slavonic in the 11th−14th and 15th−17th centuries, in comparison to the East Slavic of the 11th−14th centuries and the East Slavic languages Old Russian, Old Ukrainian, Old Belarusian during the 15th−17th centuries, confirm such a specialization (Mengel 1997, 2002).

For translating designations of concrete objects and every-day events, the first translators into Old Church Slavonic made use of the colloquial vocabulary of the late Proto-Slavonic period or, if terms were missing in the local dialects, they usually took loan words from Greek (Chaburgaev 1986: 118), cf. *alavastrъ* 'vessel made of alabaster' (Gr. *alábastros*), *talantъ* 'monetary unit' (Gr. *tálantos*) and others. As a consequence, Church Slavonic is lacking in specialized word-formation structures of mutation in this semantic field.

The Modern Russian standard language, which consolidated itself in the second half of the 18th century by fusing Russian and Church Slavonic (i.e. the cult language of Russia from the 11th to the 17th centuries and beyond), included Church Slavonic in the new norm. Its word-formation system shows clear traces of this development in the field of expressions for persons and concrete objects, as explained in this section.

3.2. Composition

An important peculiarity of the translations into the Old Church Slavonic of the 10th–11th centuries consists in the large number of compounds in its lexis: 611 out of 9,616 words are compounds (Cejtlin 1977: 186, 273). The impression that the first translators deliberately promoted compounding in imitation of the Greek originals does not, however, correspond to reality.

Compounding of two existing words is already a typical trait of word-formation in the oldest known Indo-European languages (Jagić 1898: 528; Meillet 1961 [1902−05]: 300). Compounds represent a considerable part of the vocabulary in the individual languages including Slavonic. A large part of the compounds in the Old Church Slavonic translations is undoubtedly of Proto-Slavonic origin (Jagić 1898: 535; Taseva 2000: 205). Proof of the productivity of this word-formation procedure in Proto-Slavonic is the large number of compounds in the most ancient Slavonic toponymy and anthroponymy (Miklosich 1927 [1860−74]; Taseva 2008: 231 f.), and in the folk tales of the pre-Christian period (Grammatika 1993: 192).

A comparison of the corpus of Old Church Slavonic translations with their Greek originals reveals that the first translators employed a wide range of possibilities to render Greek compounds in Slavonic. They could be translated by a word group, cf. Gr. *lithoktoneĩn* − OCsl. *kameniemь pobiti* 'to stone; lit. stone-INSTR to beat' (Rečnik 2003: 289), by an available Slavonic equivalent that was not a compound, cf. Gr. *laxeutérion* − OCsl. *oskrъdъ* 'pickaxe' (Rečnik 2003: 286) or by borrowing from Greek, cf. Gr. *koinobiárkhes* − OCsl. *kinovi-archъ* 'abbot' (Rečnik 2003: 272).

Moreover, the translators used other word-formation procedures to render Greek compounds (cf. section 3.1.2), especially the prefixation of verbs. Prefixes (< adverbs and prepositions) formed the first component of the compound to be translated, cf. Gr. *makrothumeĩn* − OCsl. *po-trъpěti*, *prě-trъpěti*, *u-trъpěti* 'to endure, suffer much' (Rečnik 2003: 295).

Loan translations from Greek (cf. Gr. *makrothumeĩn*, corresponding to OCsl. *dlъgotrъpěti* lit. 'long-ADV-suffer', *mnogotrъpěti* lit. 'to much-suffer', both in the meaning 'to suffer long, much; to endure'; Rečnik 2003: 295) and the new creations on their pattern, represent a considerable part of the compounds in Old Church Slavonic. For the

most part, they are denominations of abstract concepts and philosophical or religious terms which had not previously existed in the target language.

The specific nature of their word-formation structure in comparison with Proto-Slavonic suffixless compounds (cf. *vodonosъ* 'water carrier', cf. section 2.2.2) lies in the fact that the Old Church Slavonic compounds, as borrowings or new creations, contain the above-mentioned productive suffixes for the formation of abstract nouns *-ie*, *-nie*, *-ьstvo*, *-stvie* (cf. section 3.1.1): OCsl. *blago-slavlen-ie* 'benediction, blessing' (← *blago-slaviti*, a calque of Gr. *eu-logeῖn* 'to benedict'), *licho-ima-nie* 'corruptibility', *brato-ljub-ьstvie* 'brotherly love; lit. brother-love-ABSTR', *syno-bož-ьstvie* 'being God's son; lit. son-God-POSS.ADJ-ABSTR', *sьrebro-ljub-ьstvo* 'avarice; lit. silver-love-ABSTR', cf. Gr. *philarguría*, and for denominations of persons *-telь*, *-ьсь*, *-ьnikъ* (cf. section 3.1.2): OCsl. *blago-dě-telь*, *blago-da-telь*, *blago-dat-ьnikъ*, *blago-dav-ьсь* 'benefactor', *mьzdo-im-ьсь* 'tax collector' (cf. Grammatika 1993: 194).

On the other hand, the majority of these borrowings and new creations consists of a denominal first and a deverbal second component, which is due to the model of the original language, and, in addition, to their specific lexical meaning. That is, they belong to a certain semantic group: abstract concepts (deverbal abstract nouns), and philosophical and religious terms (deverbal abstract and agent nouns). The high productivity of the first components *blago-* 'well' and *bog(o)-* 'God' is a common feature. As second components, *-ljubьсь* 'lover', *-tvorьсь* 'creator', *-davьсь* 'donator'; *-ljubie* 'love', *-tvorenie* 'creation' prove to be especially productive (Grammatika 1993: 192 ff.).

The combination of compounding and suffixation, developed in Old Church Slavonic, had a strong influence on the word-formation systems of subsequent Slavic languages, in which it enjoys a high productivity, cf. Russ. *nov-o-sel-ie* 'moving into a new home' (← *novyj* 'new' + *selit'sja* 'to settle down'), *perv-o-klass-nik* 'school beginner' (← *pervyj* 'first' + *klass* 'class') and others. (For similar constructions see article 33 on synthetic compounds in German.)

4. Outlook

The Proto-Slavonic word-formation system with its specific features with regard to the productivity of nominal derivation for the formation of new terms for objects, persons and their characteristics was inherited by the individual Slavic languages and the contemporary Slavic standard languages.

The word-formation system of Common Slavonic, as it is retraceable in late Proto-Slavonic (7th–9th centuries) and in Old Church Slavonic (written testimonies from the 9th/10th century onwards), experiences hardly any fundamental changes in later times. Slight changes do occur, but are limited to variability in the actual phonetic realization of some affixes as a result of particular phonetic laws valid in the individual Slavic languages. The reduction or full vocalization of the so-called reduced vowels or half-vowels (ь, ъ) may serve as an example which occurred at different points of time in the Western, Southern and Eastern group of Slavic languages respectively (in the Southern group in the 10th/11th centuries, in the Eastern in the 12th/14th centuries), triggering partly different results. As a consequence, ь and ъ occurring in Proto-Slavonic suffixes are realized in the individual Slavic languages as *a*, *e*, *o* or *ø* (zero) respectively, cf. *-ькъ*

(Psl.), *-ьkъ/-okъ/-kъ* (OCsl.), *-ok/-k* (Russ.), *-ak/-k* (Belarus.). Due to specific phonetic laws in the individual Slavic languages, the suffix *-ost'* (Psl./OCsl.) is realized as *-ość* (Pol.), *-ist'*/genitive *-osti* (Ukr.), *-asc'* (Belarus.), *-ost'* (Russ.), and the suffix *-tel'* (OCsl.) as, for instance, *-ciel* (Pol.), *-tel* (Czech), *-tel'* (Russ.). One and the same suffix can occur with a different frequency and can have a different productivity in different Slavic languages, such as the agent noun suffixes *-tel* and *-lac*, which nowadays are often exploited in language policy to underline the difference between Croatian and Serbian (see article 99 on word-formation and purism in Croatian). Some suffixes are well codified in one standard language, whereas they occur in other languages merely in dialects or other non-standard varieties. New suffixes only arise by affix merger or due to direct language contact, for example, with Turkish in Bulgarian, Macedonian, Bosnian and Serbian (see articles 167, 168, 166, 165). More recently, international affixes have been integrated. The conservation of patterns of composition, which proved less active in the Slavic languages, often also depends on direct language contact (cf. calques of German compounds, for instance, in Upper Sorbian − see article 155). Those languages whose literary tradition suffered historic interruptions (as, for instance, Czech or several Southern Slavic languages) experienced a revival of their original literary tradition during the "national resurrection" in the 19th century (as in Czech) or have stuck to the popular vernacular as the point of reference for the development of the standard language (as in Southern Slavic languages). Bulgarian, in its elevated style, has "reimported" numerous deverbal abstract nouns from Russian which had once been borrowed by the Russian language from Old Church Slavonic (i.e. Old Bulgarian).

The characteristic influences of (Old) Church Slavonic word-formation, which are attributable to the activities of the early translators, are evident and fertile in the development of the word-formation systems in the written standard languages of the *Slavia Orthodoxa*.

Church Slavonic played a decisive role especially in the development of the modern Russian literary language (i.e. the Russian standard language) during the 18th century. In the field of word-formation, the productive affixes of Old Church Slavonic and the complex suffixes derived from them prove to be enormously productive in modern Standard Russian. They serve the formal and semantic specialization of certain word-formation types within the framework of the word-formation categories. Thus, when it comes to form new names for certain city dwellers, the word-formation type "noun stem (name of the location) + (Old Church Slavonic) suffix *-anin*" is almost exclusively used, cf. Russ. *kirovčanin* 'inhabitant of Kirov', *narymčanin* 'inhabitant of Narym' (see above section 3.1.2). Its main rival is the word-formation type using the Proto-Slavic (Common Slavic) suffix *-ec*, cf., e.g., *leningradec* 'inhabitant of Leningrad'. Nevertheless, the suffix *-anin* is largely preferred when forming new names of inhabitants for two major reasons: firstly, its semantics was already narrowly specialized in Old Church Slavonic. The semantics of the suffix *-ec* is much broader, cf. Russ. *sverdlovec* 'student (staff) of the Sverdlov-Academy' as opposed to *sverdlovčanin* 'inhabitant of Sverdlovsk' (1924−1991; afterwards renamed Ekaterinburg), cf. also *kirovec* 'worker in the Kirov car factories' and *kirovčanin* 'inhabitant of Kirov'. Secondly, Russian names of inhabitants inherit by means of the suffix *-anin* the prestige which Old Church Slavonic traditionally enjoyed as the language of cult and culture until the 17th century and beyond. Thus, *-anin* preferably serves to form names of city dwellers, whereas when used to designate inhabitants of a village, it obtains a connotation of politeness, cf. *berezovčanin*

'inhabitant of the village of Berezovo' (Mengel 1997). The old suffixes stemming from Common Slavonic gradually lose their productivity within the word-formation category "name of inhabitants", as, for example, the suffix -*ič* (cf. *moskvič* 'inhabitant of Moscow').

5. References

Birnbaum, Henrik and Jos Schaeken
   1997   *Das altkirchenslawische Wort. Bildung − Bedeutung − Herleitung*. München: Sagner.
Brodowska-Honowska, Maria
   1960   *Słowotwórstwo przymiotnika w języku staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskim*. Kraków: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich.
Cejtlin, Ralja Michajlovna
   1977   *Leksika staroslavjanskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka.
Chaburgaev, Georgij Aleksandrovič
   1986   *Staroslavjanskij jazyk*. Moskva: Prosveščenie.
Dal', Vladimir Ivanovič
   1956 [1880−82]   *Tolkovoj slovar' živogo velikorusskogo jazyka*. Vol. 4. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannych i nacional'nych slovarej.
Dobrev, Ivan
   2004   XIV vek − klasicizăm ili prakriti. In: Lora Taseva (ed.), *Prevodi prez XIV stoletie na Balkanite. Dokladi ot meždunarodnata konferencija (Sofija, 26−28 juni 2003)*, 17−26. Sofija: Goreks Press.
Dokulil, Miloš
   1962   *Tvoření slov v češtine*. Vol. 1: *Teorie odvozování slov*. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd.
Dokulil, Miloš
   1968   Zur Theorie der Wortbildung. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 17: 203−211.
Duridanov, Ivan Vasilev
   1970   Edin nepoznat slovoobrazuvatelen tip v bălgarski: Žitelski imena na -*ar* (s usporedici ot drugite slavjanski ezici). *Isvestija ot Institut na bălgarski ezik* 19: 863−869.
Efimova, Valerija Sergeevna
   2006   *Staroslavjanskaja slovoobrazovatel'naja morfemika*. Moskva: Institut slavjanovedenija RAN.
Grammatika = Duridanov, Ivan Vasilev (ed.)
   1993   *Grammatika na starobălgarski ezik*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademija na naukite.
Il'inskij, Grigorij Andreevič
   1902   *O nekotorych archaizmach i novoobrazovanijach praslavjanskogo jazyka*. Praha: Grégr.
Jagić, Vatroslav
   1898   Die slavischen Composita in ihrem zeitgeschichtlichen Auftreten. *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 20: 519−556.
Lopatin, Vladimir Vladimirovič and Igor' Stepanovič Uluchanov
   1980   Slovoobrazovanie. In: Natal'ja Jur'evna Švedova (ed.), *Russkaja grammatika*. Vol. 1, 133−452. Moskva: Nauka.
Meillet, Antoine
   1961 [1902−05]   *Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave*. 2 Vol. Paris: Champion.

Mengel, Swetlana
  1997   *Wege der Herausbildung der Wortbildungsnorm im Ostslawischen des 11.−17. Jahrhun-*
          derts. Frankfurt/M.: Lang.
Mengel, Swetlana
  1998   Variabilität als Übersetzungsprinzip. In: Elena Bogdanova and Margot Sobieroj (eds.),
          Florilegium Slavicum. Liber ad honorandum Herbert Jelitte, 165−175. Frankfurt/M.:
          Lang.
Mengel, Swetlana
  2002   Semantičeskie i formal'nye korreljacii vnutri slovoobrazovatel'noj kategorii i slovoobra-
          zovatel'noj paradigmy. In: Swetlana Mengel (ed.), *Slavische Wortbildung. Semantik und*
          Kombinatorik, 329−342. Münster: LIT.
Mengel, Swetlana
  2007   Slovoobrazovatel'nye sinonimy: Jazykovoj fenomen meždu leksikoj, grammatikoj i slo-
          voobrazovaniem. In: Hanna Burkhardt and Alicja Nagórko (eds.), *Sprachliche Katego-*
          rien und die slawische Wortbildung, 131−142. Hildesheim: Olms.
Mengel, Swetlana
  2009   Wortbildungsbedeutung. In: Sebastian Kempgen, Peter Kosta, Tilman Berger and Karl
          Gutschmidt (eds.), *The Slavic Languages. An International Handbook of their Structure,*
          their History and their Investigation. Vol. 1, 775−781. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
Miklosich [Miklošič], Franz
  1927 [1860−74]   *Die Bildung der slawischen Personen- und Ortsnamen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
Ohnheiser, Ingeborg
  1979   *Wortbildung und Synonymie. Untersuchungen zur nominalen Wortbildungssynonymie in*
          der russischen Gegenwartssprache. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.
Rečnik = Argirovski, Mito, Natalija Andrijevska and Aleksandra Gurkova (eds.)
  2003   *Rečnik na grčko-crkovnoslovenski leksički paraleli*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik
          „Krste Misirkov".
Seliščev, Afanasij Matveevič
  1952   *Staroslavjanskij jazyk*. Vol. 2. Moskva: Prosveščenie.
Taseva, Lora
  2000   Ezikăt na prevodača Zakchej: Meždu knižovnoto nasledstvo i formalističnite tendencii
          na epochata. *Slavia* 69: 189−210.
Taseva, Lora
  2008   Imenuvaneto v srednevekovna Makedonija. In: *XXXIV naučna konferencija na XL me-*
          đunaroden seminar za makedonski jazik, literatura i kultura (Ochrid, 13.−30. VIII
          2007), 223−235. Skopje: Lingvistika.
Uspenskij, Boris Andreevič
  1984   Staroslavjanskij i Cerkovnoslavjanskij. In: Klavdija Vasil'evna Gorškova (ed.), *Aktu-*
          al'nyje problemy izučenija i prepodovanija staroslavjanskogo jazyka, 43−69. Moskva:
          Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo univerziteta.
Vaillant, André
  1964 [1948]   *Manuel du vieux slave*. Vol. 1: *Grammaire*. 2nd ed. Paris: Institut d'Études
          Slaves.
Vaillant, André
  1952   *Rukovodstvo po staroslavjanskomu jazyku*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoj literatury.
Varbot, Žanna Žanovna
  1984   *Pravoslavjanskaja morfologija, slovoobrazovanie i ėtimologija*. Moskva: Nauka.
Vereščagin, Evgenij Michajlovič
  1972   *Iz istorii vozniknovenija pervogo literaturnogo jazyka slavjan*. Vol. 1: *Perevodčeskaja*
          dejatel'nost' Kirila i Mefodija. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

Zemskaja, Elena Andreevna
   1992   *Slovoobrazovanie kak dejatel'nost'*. Moskva: Nauka.

Swetlana Mengel, Halle/S. (Germany)

116. From Ancient Greek to Modern Greek

Abstract

This article deals with word-formation in the diachrony of the Greek language. It provides a basic description of the structure, the properties and the evolution of affixal derivation (prefixation and suffixation) as well as compounding, while there are hints about the evolution of formations created by processes such as ablaut, backformation and reduplication. All issues are illustrated with examples, which, for reasons of clarity, are given in a phonological transcription.

1. Bibliographic sources

Unexpectedly for such a well-researched language as Greek, word-formation has received little attention from a diachronic point of view, and, in the case of Ancient Greek (hereafter AG), from a theoretical point of view as well. No diachronic accounts exist of the phenomenon, apart from the brief comparative overview (AG derivational suffixes and their survival or loss in Modern Greek (hereafter MG)) in the outdated Jannaris (1897: 287−311) and from Dieterich's (1928) list of MG derivational prefixes and suffixes with their previous history and origins. The only full-length description of AG word-formation remains Debrunner (1917), which can be complemented by Chantraine (1933) and Lühr (2008) for the nominal domain only. Fortunately, the historical description of Homeric word-formation by Risch (1973) can be applied to AG in general. The data (lists of suffixes by part of speech) is set out in the traditional grammars of Buck (1933: 441−530), Schwyzer (1939: 415−544) and Bornemann and Risch (1978: 306−319), while a survey of suffix productivity is possible through the reverse dictionaries of Buck and Petersen (1945) (for nominal suffixes only, but with an historical introduction and a