

## Substantive Confixation As An Object Of Academic Research\*

Ekaterina A. KHUZINA, Oksana G. GUNKO

Kazan State Federal University

**Abstract.** *The article examines the ways of substantive confixation emergence as an independent way of word-production in the Old Russian language (XI-XIV centuries), and also they prove the position that confixation is not primordial, but a later phenomenon in Russian language. The study of confixation development ways leads to the understanding of Russian confix appearance mechanism as the result of a peculiar composition of the former suffixal formations that appeared on the basis of prepositional and case forms and later reoriented to the motivation by the original forms of a producing word. The data of the Old Russian language historical dictionaries are used as the material for analysis. The study is carried out taking into account the structural, semantic and stylistic characteristics of derivative formations on the basis of nominal historical word formation ideas developed by the Kazan Linguistic School.*

**Key words:** Old Russian language, substitution confixation, confixation, word formation, morpheme, confix.

### Introduction

In our study, we proceed from the proposition that confixation is not a primordial, but a later phenomenon in Russian language. This is argued by the following arguments:

1) An argument is a general theoretical, a linguistic one: the Old Russian language was syncretic and syntagmatic. A basic unit text unit was a syntagma, there was no zero suffixation, a substitutive and non-changing truncation, and other morphological features peculiar to modern Russian word formation, and a two-element (bilateral) complication of a producing basis - later phenomena occurring at a higher level of linguistic thinking, and the development of linguistic categories. By the fourteenth century, due to the breakdown of syncretism, a word becomes the basic unit of language and text, the language paradigmatic becomes stronger, on the basis of which rethinking and re-motivation of the suffixal formations that appeared on the basis of non-original prepositional-case combinations, from indirect forms to the original ones. This, in its turn, led to a specific re-adaptation of the former suffixal words and the development of a new way of morphemic word-production, which we qualify as a confixation following V.M. Markov, that is, the method of the producing basis complication in pre and postposition of a two-element intermittent morpheme simultaneously - a confix.

2) An argument is a textual, a verbal one: the ability to correlate a word in which an emerging noun confix appears with one-root development in a text. Our opinion that some formations in the Old Russian language can be qualified as confixal one is based on the fact that they meet with the original forms in one text and enter into relations of correlation with them. Since the XIIIth century we can talk about the typical nature of the in-text correlation of considered nouns with the original forms. In fact, during this period (the end of the Old Russian period) a

---

\* The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

new motivation acquired the status of word-formation relations and it began to serve as the model for the development of words with a confix structure.

The study of substantive confixation ways emergence fills in the gaps in the description of confixation development historical process as a relatively independent way of morphological word-production in Russian language. Confixation as an independent way of word development could appear only in the period of linguistic unit semantic syncretism destruction, during which the language paradigmatic strengthening took place. And for this, in its turn, it is necessary that some changes occur in the language associated with the development and the change of native speaker thinking type. In this regard, watching the Russian word-formation system of the 11th-14th centuries, it is necessary not only to investigate the emergence of a new way of word-production, but also to think about the transformations in the ethnos worldview that could lead to the emergence of a new naming matrix - confixation.

### **Materials and methods**

An integrated approach was used in this article. Its basis is a multidimensional method of confixation description: from the point of view of confixation interaction with the system of the Old Russian language word development as a whole; from the point of view of the semantic potential of generating and derived words; from the point of view of contextual semantic modifications of confixes - when a linguistic unit leaves the system and turns into a specific speech situation, where structural links may look different. The latter aspect is especially important, since it is textual motivation that often indicates the change of the internal form in the derivatives under study, and therefore, one of the ways of confixation appearance in Russian language.

The correctness of the observation results interpretation in the word-forming system of the Old Russian language is determined on the one hand by the combination of the diachronic approach with the synchronic one, and, on the other hand, by the formal approach with the semantic one. The examples are found in the historical dictionaries as an empirical basis for research: "The dictionary of the Old Russian Language (XI-XIV centuries)" - hereinafter referred to as DicORL, "The materials for the Dictionary of the Old Russian Language" by I.I. Sreznevsky - further "The dictionary index to the Old Russian language dictionary".

### **Results and discussion**

An important theoretical issue is the choice of a term: traditional science says that there are the prefix-suffix and the prefix-postfix way of word-formation in these cases, singling out two affixal morphemes in a derived word. But at the end of the sixties of the 20th century a new confixal interpretation of these formations appeared. In the scientific literature the term "confix" was used by N.V. Yushmanov in 1928 during the description of Semitic languages. Concerning Russian language, the term "confix" was introduced by V.M. Markov in 1967 and

substantiated the legitimacy of its use with reference to intermittent morphemes.<sup>1</sup> Later, in order to substantiate the existence of confixation, many arguments are given in the works.

### Conclusions

The Old Russian period of Russian language development marked the potential ways of confixed word-production appearance. The confixation in Russian language appeared in the second half of the fourteenth century, using a number of linguistic possibilities for this purpose.

The main way was the primordial Slavic development of confix structures on the basis of a peculiar re-development of prepositional form suffix complications in the course of the Old Slavic semantic syncretism collapse and the strengthening of the original forms in the paradigm. The Old Russian language has strong correlation with prepositional and case forms, this is confirmed by the widespread and frequent use of the adnominal forms like *перед городом, без бора, за рекой, при мосте*, etc. The number of confix types in the Old Russian language was determined by the number of so-called primary prepositions, since the source of the confix prepositive element are prepositions, and not prefixes. These are the prepositions *безъ, въз, за, изъ, между, на, надъ, о, объ, передъ, по, подъ, при, с(о), оу*; less often the prepositional case forms with the prepositions *отъ, про* were formed with suffixes.

It is significant that two systems - the first components of confixes and prepositions - turn out to be closer to each other than prepositions and prefixes, which again confirms that we do not deal with the prefix-suffixed word-formation but with the suffixation of prepositional forms and the further confixation, developing by reintegration into the suffixal derivatives arising on the basis of prepositional-case forms. The coincidence of the same prepositional elements of the structures under consideration with the prefixes is historically conditioned and is associated with the existence of prepositional-prefixing parallelism in the Slavic languages since ancient times.

Let's note that in the process of language evolution the South and East Slav variants of prepositions participated in the development of confixation:

- the book preposition between - *междоушци*.
- folk conversational *меж, между, меж* – *межимисць*.
- a book preposition *предъ* – *предъолтари*.
- a folk colloquial *передъ* – *передъгородъ*.

G.A. Nikolaev (1991)<sup>2</sup> wrote that confixation developed in the XI-XIV centuries is "one of the means of text syntagm compression into a word". This compression was formalized by the means of suffixation, and the prepositional-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. M. Markov, "Remarks on confixation in modern Russian," in *Selected works on Russian language: Coll. of articles*, Kazan, DAS, 2001, p. 104-109.

<sup>2</sup> G. A. Nikolaev, G.A. 1991. "The forms of nominal word-formation in the language of the XIIth century, in V. V. Kolesov (ed.), *Old Russian language of pre-Mongolian time. University collection*, Leningrad, The publishing house of Leningrad State University, p. 155-162.

case forms were complicated in the Old Russian language by certain suffixes: -и-ь (порди), -ьство (безчадьство), -ьникъ (нарамьникъ), -ьница (възглавьница), -ница (завьница), -, -ькъ (бездомькъ), -ьщина (Задонщина), -ька (подъшьяка). Such book suffixes as -тие, -ение, -ние, -ость, -тель did not participate in the formation of confixation, because they had not prepositional-case forms as a producing basis, but were formed on the basis of verbs or adjectives. The most regular suffix is the suffix -и-ь, and it actively works with both book and folk-conversational basic elements. So, in the "Index Dictionary of the Old Russian Language (XI-XIV centuries)" they fixed about 300 names, which from the standpoint of further relations could be qualified as confixal ones, 148 of units were with the postpositive -и-ь.

The substantive with the following structure: безъ...и-ь, безъ...ьство, безъ...ькъ ь, въз...ьница, за...и-ь, за...ица, изъ...и-ь, между-меж...и-ь, на...ьникъ, надъ...и-ь, не...ьстви, о...и-ь, о...ькъ, предъ-передъ...и-ь, передъ...ьница, по...и-ь, по...ька, подъ...и-ь, подъ...ьникъ, при...и-ь, при...ица, с(о)...ьникъ, съ...ьница, оу...и-ь, оу...ина are referred to the genetic basis - the prepositional-case forms of a noun. For example, the substantives formed by the suffixation of the prepositional-case form with безъ signify the absence of the producing basis; The substances formed by means of the prepositional-case form with the preposition за have a spatial meaning (the thing that is behind the object called the producing base); между-меж means the thing between the objects called the producing base; на - an object that is on the producing basis; под - an object that is under the producing basis; при - the thing at the producing base, etc. In the Russian formations with a forming confix structure, the basic semantic load is borne by the initial element of the confix, the final element forms the part of speech, generic and stylistic affiliation of a word.

Turning to the other way of the confixal way of word formation appearance in the Old Russian language, let's note that calquing was of great importance for the development of the Russian word-formation system of the literary and written language. For example, a significant layer of abstract vocabulary of the Old Russian language, characteristic of its use for church literary monuments of translated works of Byzantine writers is made precisely by calquing. A translator, trying to convey an original meaning of an original, created calques, which were fixed in the dictionary and widely used in the original literary monuments of the Old Russian language.

Calqued structures of the confix type were distributed in the book texts, promoting the development of a confixation way of morphological word-production, at that the calques gave already prepared confix structures. This is due to a high probability that at the borrowing of a number of morphologically divided words from a typologically close language, these units will be perceived not as monoliths, but as the forms that have certain parts.

The units on *и* were especially productive. In favor of this assertion<sup>3</sup> cites the following argument: most units of this type are found in Old Russian written monuments of translated origin and have Greek correspondences.

We believe that at the end of the XIIth century we deal with a similar word-building process, which is ensured by the use of the word-formation series model, since "a word model and its morphological structure are reproduced at similar word-formation, only they are filled with new lexical material"<sup>4</sup>. The consequence of this process is the repeatability of a word structure with the borrowing of some common word-formation value of a model, associated with the word-forming elements represented in it. But there was no blind imitation here. A translator used the word-forming abilities of the Old Russian language. You can see in the monuments that the calqued formations, pouring into the speech of the ancient Russian society, created the models for the development of new words from the East Slavonic lexical material.

Since the calqued confixal structures were not characteristic of the derivational system of the Old Russian language of the 11th-12th centuries and did not have support from it at first, then the confixal units were perceived as occasional. The speakers of the language tried to comprehend the calques as suffix ones, to interpret through prepositional-case forms and through adjectives: *безълоби* – *безълобьни* – *безъ зълобы*; *безправди* – *безъ правды*. Calqued forms turned out to be in the circle of close words, and a word began to be mastered in the word-formation relation. Besides, the calqued words, like *созвучь*, *соцветь*, "provoked" the comprehension of Russian words, such as *подворь*, as confusional ones, for example: *а на которьмь подворьи стоятъ немци... не поставити на томь двор князю. ни татарина. ни иного которого посла и велель еси товарь его розграбити на д капи воску. Гр 1229 сп. 1270–1277 (DicORL)*. In the course of the word-building mastery of these words, they received the motivation in Russian and strengthened the structure, not characteristic for the word-forming system of the Old Russian language: *городъ* – *погородъ*, *дождь* – *бездождь*, *родъ* – *сьроди*, *мзда* – *възмзди*, etc.

A part of the confix types was developed by the interaction of primordially popular suffixation of prepositional case forms and Greek calques of the confix type. For example, the words *възгорь* (Ig.Dan.16), *възводь* (Novg.chron., 1176), etc., on the other - such explicit calques as *възглави* - (Jur. ev., 1119), *възмзди* (Verse 1156-1163, 104), *възбращьстви* - (Amart., XIII-XIV centuries). S.H. Khekmeneva draws attention to the fact that "often two or more Greek words, somewhat different from each other, correspond to several Russian ones *αρχνομία* – *безакони*, *безаконьно*, *безаконьстви* (Chr. Georg. Am. 124, 384, 570)<sup>5</sup>».

<sup>3</sup> S. P. Obnorsky, "Prefix "без-" in Russian," in *Selected works on the Russian language*, Moscow, State Educational and Pedagogical Publishing House of RSFSR Ministry of Education, 1960, p. 195-206.

<sup>4</sup> E. S. Kubryakova, *The types of linguistic meanings: semantics of a derived word*, Moscow, Nauka, 1981.

<sup>5</sup> S. Kh. Chekmeneva, *The development of nominal suffixation in Russian language (based on the material of nouns with a finite element -ue/ -ье): Dis. by the cand. of philol.*, Kazan, 1974.

### Summary

This study allows us to recreate the picture of the nominal substantive resource evolution, in which the spiritual information extracted and processed by an ethnos is preserved above all. In essence, we talk about the forms in which an ethnos tried to embody the accumulated knowledge about the world and about itself, the way the most suitable matrices of substantive names were created and selected. On the one hand, as is known, no further process of cognition is possible without a nomination.<sup>6</sup> And on the other hand, the nominative formula determines and assigns the logic of the verbal content organization and, consequently, the proper arrangement of the semantic accents, which is subsequently projected into the ethnos culture and mentality.<sup>7</sup>

We turned to the substantive confixation, since the study of this word-production method allows us to identify the most characteristic processes of its formation and development: the interaction of the calqued structures and primordial suffixal forms; the strengthening of linguistic paradigmatics associated with the destruction of syncretism, and its impact on the re-motivation of former derivative units; the emergence of qualitatively new word-formation means and, accordingly, new word-formation structures.<sup>8</sup>

Summarizing the abovementioned results, it should be noted that confixation is the result of previously fixed object relations complex rethinking.<sup>9</sup> The emergence and further development of nominal confixation in the Old Russian language was organized by two sources: 1) East Slavic one - the suffixation of prepositional-case forms of nouns - the primordial Slavic path; 2) Greek - the calquing of ancient Greek formations - the path of structural borrowing. The interaction of the Slavic and Greek material led to the fact that the units appear by the end of the Old Russian period, using an original form of a noun as the producing basis.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, the confixation formed in the Old Russian language is the result of a complex rethinking of previously fixed object relations in the observed and perceived world of ancient Russians.

---

<sup>6</sup> N. V. Yushmanov, *The Grammar of Literary Arabic language*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, 2008, p. 168.

<sup>7</sup> E. Donalies, "Das Konfix. Zur Definition einer zentralen Einheit der deutschen Wortbildung. Deutsche Sprache, Zeitschrift für Theorie," in *Praxis H, II* (2012), p. 144-159.

<sup>8</sup> J. Erben, *Introduction to the German word formation. Enlarged edition*, Berlin, Erich Schmidt Verlag GmbH & Co., 2009, p. 65-66.

<sup>9</sup> E. Donalies, *The word formation of Dechen: an overview*, Tübingen, Narr Franke Attempto Verlag GmbH+Co. KG, Tübingen, 2008, p. 192.

<sup>10</sup> A. Seifert, 2008. *Antonomie und Isonomie fremder*, 2008, p. 41, p. 95-96.