

WORD-FORMATION (SUFFIX -ЬJE/-НЬJE /-ЕНЬJE /-АНЬJE/-ТЬJE IN THE PROTO-SLAVIC LANGUAGE)

Merkulova O. V.

INTRODUCTION

In East Slavic linguistics, nouns -ьj(e) and its continuants have repeatedly been the subject of scientific studies. The origin of the suffix -ьje was found out by A. Meillet¹, V. Kolomiets², F. Slawski³, V. Martynov⁴, and others. The phonetic specificity of -j(a) functioning in the historical aspect have been studied by P. Zhytetskyi⁵, A. Krymskyi⁶, Zh. Varbot⁷, S. Bernshtein⁸. The vocabulary potency of the formant -и~ was determined by P. Bilousenko⁹. The nouns of the various lexical-semantic groups involved in the creation of this suffix were considered by R. Tseytlin¹⁰, K. Sharafutdinov¹¹, L. Polyuga¹², O. Koval¹³, T. Siroshstan¹⁴, and others.

¹ Мейе А. Общеславянский язык. Москва, 1951. 491 с. С. 287.

² Коломиец В. Т. Имя существительное. Имя прилагательное. *Историческая типология славянских языков*. Киев : Наукова думка, 1986. С. 58.

³ Slawski F. Zarys słowotworstwa prasłowiańskiego. *Słownik prasłowiański*. Wrocław. Warszawa. Kraków. Gdańsk : Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. T. 1–3. 1974–1979. T. 1. A–V. 1974. С. 85–86.

⁴ Мартынов В. В. Праславянская и балто-славянская деривация имен. Минск : Навука і техника, 1973. 58 с. С. 24.

⁵ Житецкий П. Очерк литературной истории малорусского наречия въ XVII вѣкѣ. Съ приложеніемъ словаря книжной малорусской рѣчѣ по рукописи XVII вѣка. Киевъ, 1889. 265 с. С. 92.

⁶ Крымскій А. О малорусскихъ отглагольныхъ существительныхъ на енно и инно. Санктъ-Петербургъ, 1907. 7 с.

⁷ Варбот Ж. Ж. Древнерусское именное словообразование. Ретроспективная формальная характеристика. Москва : Наука, 1969. 230 с. С. 94–95.

⁸ Бернштейн С. Б. Очерк сравнительной грамматики славянских языков: Чередования. Именные основы. Москва : Наука, 1974. 376 с. С. 298.

⁹ Білоусенко П. І. Питання словотвірної потенції і реалізації формантів (на матеріалі суфіксів -иц та -ство). *Нова філологія*. 2000. №1(9). С. 135–155.

¹⁰ Цейтлин Р. М. Лексика старославянского языка. Москва, 1977. 336 с.

¹¹ Шарафутдинов К. Отглагольные имена существительные с отвлеченным значением в гнездах движения. *Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования* : мат-лы III Республ. науч. конф. Ч. II Ташкент : Укитувчи, 1980. С. 253–258.

G. Rashchynska¹⁵, T. Vynokur¹⁶, L. Molodykh¹⁷ and other researchers carried out the analysis of derivatives taking into account the motivational stems to which **-j(a)** was joined. The functions of the confixes with the second component **-ьj(e)** at different stages of the history of the Ukrainian language were studied by S. Chekmenyova¹⁸, S. Voropay¹⁹, I. Khranova²⁰, O. Merkulova²¹, as well as the authors of the monograph on the history of the noun's confixal word formation²².

¹² Полюга Л. М. Українська абстрактна лексика XIV – першої половини XVII ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1991. 240 с. С. 79–91.

¹³ Коваль О. Ю. Творення іменників зі значенням опредметненої дії в давньоруськоукраїнській мові XI–XIII ст. (суфікси **-иє**, **-ьє**). *Вісник Запорізького національного університету: збірник наукових праць. Філологічні науки*. 2014. №2. С. 334–339.

¹⁴ Сіроштан Т. В. Назви дій у словотвірній системі праслов'янської мови. *Науковий вісник Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія: “Філологічні науки” (мовознавство)* : зб. наук. пр. 2017. № 7. С. 179.

¹⁵ Ращинская Г. Н. Отглагольные имена существительные на **-ння**, **-ення** (**-іння**), **-ття** в современном украинском языке : автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Львов, 1968. 21 с.

¹⁶ Винокур Т. Г. О семантике отглагольных существительных на **-ние**, **-тие** в древнерусском языке. *Исследования по словообразованию и лексикологии русского языка*. Москва : Изд-во “Наука”, 1979. С. 3–28.

¹⁷ Молодых Л. И. Отглагольное словообразование существительных в древнерусском языке. Уч. пособие по спецкурсу. Саранск, 1982. 85 с. С. 66–73.

¹⁸ Чекменева С. Х. Развитие именной конфикации в русском языке. На материале имен существительных с конечным элементом **-ие** : автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Казань, 1974. 19 с.

¹⁹ Воропай С. В. Система конфіксального творення іменників в українській мові XIX – XX століть : дис. ... канд. філол. наук. Запоріжжя, 2001. 209 с. С. 75, 89, 113, 115 і т. д.

²⁰ Храмова І. В. Розвиток конфіксальних іменників з кінцевим **-j(a)** в історії української мови (структури з просторовим значенням). *Вісник Запорізького державного університету: збірник наукових праць. Філологічні науки*. 1999. № 1. С. 158–166.

²¹ Меркулова О. В. Конфіксальні іменники з постпозитивним елементом **-ьj(e)** у праслов'янській мові. *Вісник Запорізького національного університету: збірник наукових праць. Філологічні науки*. 2006. №2. С. 162–168.

²² Білоусенко П. І. Нариси з історії українського словотворення (іменникові конфікси) / Білоусенко П. І., Іншакова І. О., Качайло К. А., Меркулова О. В., Стовбур Л. М. Запоріжжя-Кривий Ріг : ТОВ “ЛПС” ЛТД, 2010. 480 с. С. 24–35, 62–85, 121–150.

However, a comprehensive study of the suffixal nouns of the Slavic era, in the structure of which there is a suffix **-ьj(e)**, has not been in Ukrainian linguistics till now. This is what made our scientific research relevant.

The Proto-Slavic **-ьje** is derived from Indo-European **-iō (-ijo)**^{23,24,25} which produced derivatives with an abstract and collective meaning in the Proto-Indo-European language. It has been suggested that this suffix may have been peculiar to the original primary substantive adjectives of the neuter for **iō**-²⁶. Of course, the consequences of the word-forming processes in which **-ьje** was involved, are preserved in all Slavic languages, which has led many researchers to pay close attention to studying the history of this formant.

Scientists claim that the Proto-Slavic suffix **-ьje** was unlimitedly productive^{27,28} on creating abstract nouns of the neuter, since it joined any passive adjectival participle and gave an abstract noun from any verb²⁹. In clarifying A. Meillet's position, S. Bernshtein points out that the deverbal nouns from transitive verbs could only emerge when the suffixes **-еньje** and **-тьje** were formed, and these stems began to indicate only the process. The Proto-Slavic formations of the stems on **-ьje** date back to that later period when a clear system of aspectual verbal opposition was formed in the verb system based on later oppositions³⁰.

²³ Мейе А. Общеславянский язык. Москва, 1951. 491 с. С. 287.

²⁴ Коломиец В. Т. Имя существительное. Имя прилагательное (в гл. "Словообразование"). *Историческая типология славянских языков*. Киев : Наукова думка, 1986. С. 58.

²⁵ Sławski F. Zarys słowotworstwa prasłowiańskiego. *Słownik prasłowiański*. Wrocław. Warszawa. Kraków. Gdańsk : Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. T. 1–3. 1974–1979. T. 1. A-B. 1974. С. 86.

²⁶ Brugmann K. Grundriss der vergleichenden der indogermanischen Sprachen. В. II. Т. 2. Strassburg, 1906. S. 188–189.

²⁷ Мейе А. Общеславянский язык. Москва, 1951. 491 с. С. 287.

²⁸ Sławski F. Zarys słowotworstwa prasłowiańskiego. *Słownik prasłowiański*. Wrocław. Warszawa. Kraków. Gdańsk : Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. T. 1–3. 1974–1979. T. 1. A-B. 1974. С. 86.

²⁹ Мейе А. Общеславянский язык. Москва, 1951. 491 с. С. 287.

³⁰ Бернштейн С. Б. Очерк сравнительной грамматики славянских языков: Чередования. Именные основы. Москва : Наука, 1974. 376 с. С. 298.

1. The suffix **-нѣје** /**-енѣје** /**-анѣје**

Zh. Varbot qualifying **-(е)нѣје** as a complication of the primary **-ѣје**, singles out such sequences with this component.

The nouns on **-нѣје**/**-енѣје**/**-анѣје** are formed from the stems of the passive adjectival participles of the past tense on **-н-**, **-ен-** and **-ан-** by attaching the suffix **-ѣје**. The distribution of the suffixes **-н-** and **-ен-** in these nouns corresponded to their distribution in the respective adjectival participles: **-н-** combined with the verbal stems on **-ѣ-** and **-а-** and with the roots having terminal **-а**; **-ен-** combined with roots that began with a vowel and the stems on **-но/-нов-** and **-и**³¹. However, the process of restructuring in the nomina of this type began, apparently, in the Proto-Slavic language by defining a single suffix **-(е)нѣје**, which produced nomina with the meaning of the action (and its result) from a wider range of verbs than that for which it was possible to create adjectival participles on **-н-** and **-ен-**³². The suffixes **-нѣје** and **-енѣје** are related, in addition to functional similarity, by additional distribution relations. In the nouns which are not adjectival formations, **-нѣје** was combined with the verbal stems on **-ѣ-** and **-а-** and with the roots that have the terminal **ѣ** – та **-у-**; **-енѣје** was joined to the roots with the final consonants, the constituent **г**, **ѣ/ьн** (*жьнение* (*harvest*)) and **и** (at the boundary of the root and affix appear **в**: *опочивение* (*resting*)), to the stems on **-но/-нов-** та **-и**. Therefore, **-нѣје** and **-енѣје** can be considered as variants of the one suffix³³.

The appearance of the new suffix **-енѣје** (as well as **-анѣје**. – *О.М.*) broke the connection of verbal nouns with passive adjectival participles, the three-element word-chain “verb-adjectival participle-noun” could have lost the adjectival participial part³⁴, and so the infinitive stems³⁵³⁶³⁷ of any type of conjugation³⁸ became formative for these derivatives,

³¹ Див.: Варбот Ж. Ж. Древнерусское именное словообразование. Ретроспективная формальная характеристика. Москва : Наука, 1969. 230 с. С. 94.

³² Ibid. С. 95.

³³ Ibid. С. 95.

³⁴ Див. докладніше: Wojtyła-Swierzowska M. Prasłowiańskie abstractum. Sufiksálne nomina actionis. Formacje z podstawowym sufiksálnym **-n-**, **-t-**. Wrocław – Warszawa, 2003. 173 s. S. 26.

³⁵ Мейс А. Общеславянский язык. Москва, 1951. 491 с. С. 288.

³⁶ Ращинская Г. Н. Отглагольные имена существительные на **-ння**, **-ення** (**-іння**), **-ття** в современном украинском языке : автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Львов, 1968. 21 с. С. 7.

thus, we can talk about the polymotivation of formations of the mentioned type.

Nomina abstracta of the neuter could have different initial forms: nouns, adjectives, verbs³⁹. Researchers note the exceptional performance or even “expansiveness”⁴⁰ of this formant in the **deverbal** formation of the names of action and state that are often subjected to concretization.

1.1. Nomina actionis, the formal structure of which contains the suffix under consideration and its variants, are represented mainly by nouns with *iterative-durative* semantics. According to linguists, all the names of the action are “semantically endocentric”, because the meaning is formed within the very structure of the word, where the formant, acting as a marker of nominalisation, signals the “immobility” of the action that was named by the formative word⁴¹. In the Proto-Slavic days **-нѣ** /-енѣ /-анѣ joined both transitive and non-transitive verbs and verb forms.

Within n.actionis there are several subgroups.

A. Names of *actions undertaken within the framework of relationships (personal, legal, etc.)*, for example: **lelĕjanĕje* (ЭССЯ XIV 100) ‘a care’ from **lelĕati*, **lelĕti* ‘to care, to lull’ (Ibid 100-101); **lĕkanĕje* (XV 59) ‘a fright; frightening’ from **lĕkati* ‘to trap, to frighten’; **lizanĕje* (162) ‘an adulation’ від **lizati* ‘to adulate’; **l’ub(j)enĕje* (169) ‘love, love relationship’ from the adjectival participle **l’ub(j)enĕ*; **lobĕzanĕje* (241) ‘a caress, a kiss’ from **lobĕzati* (Ibid); **lobyzanĕje* (243) ‘caress, a kiss’ from **lobyzati* (Ibid); **lĕganĕje* (XVI 232) ‘deception’ from **lĕgati* and semantically close to it **lĕzĕje* (XVII 6) ‘deception’ from **lĕzĕb*, **lĕgati*, **lĕgŏ*; **lĕkanĕje* (XVI 241) ‘a cry, weeping’ from **lĕkati* ‘to cry, to complain’; **lĕstenĕje* / **lĕščĕnĕje* (XVII 94) ‘animal care; complaisance, flattery’ from **lĕstiti*; **navodjenĕje* (XXXIV 16) ‘belief in something, inclination to act’ from

³⁷ Бернштейн С. Б. Очерк сравнительной грамматики славянских языков: Чередования. Именные основы. Москва : Наука, 1974. 376 с. С. 299.

³⁸ Sławski F. Zarys słowotworstwa prasłowiańskiego. *Słownik prasłowiański*. Wrocław. Warszawa. Kraków. Gdańsk : Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. T. 1–3. 1974–1979. T. 1. A–B. 1974. С. 85.

³⁹ Мартынов В. В. Праславянская и балто-славянская деривация имен. Минск : Навука і техника, 1973. 58 с. С. 24.

⁴⁰ Wojtyła-Swierzowska M. Prasłowiańskie abstractum. Sufiksalne nomina actionis. Formacje z podstawowym sufiksальnym -n-, -t-. Wrocław – Warszawa, 2003. 173 s. S. 31.

⁴¹ Ibid. С. 14.

**navoditi*; **nudjenje* (XXVI 39) ‘violence, coercion, enforcement’ from **nuditi* ‘to force’; **orzvedenje* (XXXV 157) ‘separation, divorce’ from **orzvesti*; **otbyvanje* (161) ‘sale, payment of debt; departure, leaving’ from **otbyvati*; **otkazanje* (XXXVII 50) ‘a refusal; a will’ from the adjectival participle **otkazanъ*; **otbloženje* (151) ‘a delay, a postponement’ from **otbložiti* or **otbloženъ*; **otbločenje* (157) ‘excluding, separation’ from **otbločiti*, **otbločēnъ*; **otmetanje* / **otmētanje* (174) ‘abandonment, cancellation, refusal, renunciation’ from **otmetati*, **otmētanъ*; **otmēnenje* (183) ‘cancellation; retribution, reward’ from **otmēniti* ‘to cancel, to reward, to repay’; **otpiranje* (XXXVIII 17) ‘denial’ from **otpirati* (Ibid); **otprođenje* (58) ‘expulsion, exile’ from the past participle **otprođenъ* or directly from the infinitive **otprođiti* ‘to drive away, to scare’ (Ibid 56-57); **otprovědenje* (52) ‘answer, rejection, renunciation’ from **otprověđeti* ‘to answer; to refuse, to renounce’ (Ibid 53); **otprošenje* (73) ‘asking for forgiveness; begging; asking for permission to go’ from **otprošiti* (Ibid 72); **otpriščanje* (82) ‘release; the remission of sins’ from **otpusščati* ‘to release; to forgive sins’ (Ibid 83); **otpriščenje* (85) ‘release; forgiveness, forgiveness of sins’ from **otpusiti* ‘to release, to forgive, to forgive sins’, **otpusiti*, **otpriščēnъ*; **otpytanje* (86) ‘asking for forgiveness, justification’ from the infinitive **otpytati* or from the adjectival participle **otpytanъ*; **otprečenje* (95) ‘renunciation’ from **otprekti*, **otprečēnъ*; **otrékanje* (99) ‘renunciation’ from **otrékati* (*se*); **otpređenje* (113) ‘instruction, assignment, appointment; errand’ from **otpređiti* ‘to appoint, to assign, to send’ (Ibid 111); **otsodjenje* (176) ‘a withdrawal of smth under court decision’ from **otsoditi*, **otsodjenъ* obviously, the bookish word, its long standing is put in doubt (Ibid) and many others.

B. Names of *human transformative activity*: **koranje* (ЭССЯ XI 17) ‘digging, tillage’; **kosenje* (137) ‘mowing’ from the adjectival participle to **kositi* ‘to mow’; **košenje* (190) ‘mowing’ from the adjectival participle **košenъ* ‘mowed’; **lěpjenje* / **lěpěnje* (XIV 221) ‘molding, claying the walls’ from **lěpiti*; **lomanje* (XVI 13) ‘breaking; trenching the soil’ from **lomati*; **lomjenje* (20) ‘breaking’ from **lomiti*; **luranje* (178) ‘beating, breaking’ (**lupati* ‘to beat, to break, to chop’); **lupenje* / **lupjenje* (180) ‘peeling, tearing’ (**lupati* ‘to tear, to peel’); **luskanje* (191) ‘flaking, clicking’ from the adjectival participle **luskanъ* to **luskati*; **luščenje* (205) ‘scrubbing, peeling’ from the adjectival participle **luščenъ* to **luščiti*; **macanje* (XVII 110)

‘touching, smearing’ from **macati* ‘to touch’; **majanьje* (131) ‘back-breaking labour’; **maranьje* (207) ‘daubing, scribbling’ from the adjectival participle **maranъ* to **marati*; **nizanьje* (XXV 140) ‘stringing’ from **nizati* ‘to thread, to string’; **otъsěčenьje* (XXXVIII 151-152) ‘cutting, chopping away’ **otъsěkti*, **otъsěčenьjъ*; **otъsěkanьje* (155) ‘separation, chopping away’ from the adjectival participle **otъsěkanьjъ* (< **otъsěkati*) etc.

The lexical word-building meaning of “giving features that are called by a derivative word to the subject” was realized in single **adjectival** formations, namely: **лъščеньje* (ЭССЯ XVI 253) ‘filing, polishing’ from **лъščеньjъ* ‘shiny, polished’.

C. The names of *mental, speech, psycho-emotional* and other *processes* were slightly reconstructed in a lesser extent: **lepetanьje* (ЭССЯ XIV 124) ‘babbling’ from **lepetati*; **lepetěньje* (127) ‘babbling’ from **lepetěti* ‘to pronounce incomprehensible sounds (about children)’; **likovanьje* (XV 105) the iterative-durative noun to **likovati* ‘to rejoice, to sing, to dance’; **l’utovanьje* (228) ‘behaving heinously’ from **l’utovati*; **лъkanьje* (XVI 241) ‘crying, sobbing’ from **лъkati* ‘to cry, to complain’; **mareньje* (XVII 209) ‘dream, reverie’ from the adjectival participle **mareнь* to **mariti*; **navycenьje* (XXXIV 44) ‘learning, knowing’ from the adjectival participle to the verb **navyknoti* / **navykt’i*; **nedoumenьje* (124) from **nedoumeti* – perhaps, it is the bookish formation; **orzstrojenьje* (XXXV 17) ‘disagreement, break-up’ from the adjectival participle **orzstrojenъ*; **orzuměньje* (128) ‘understanding, clarity, comprehension’ from **orzuměti*; **orzvelčеньje* (158) ‘entertainment’ from **orzvelčenъ* or from **orzvelkti*; **orzveselenьje* (163) ‘entertainment’ from **orzveseliti*, this is, apparently, the late formation on a regular pattern; **orzъjarenьje* (206) ‘great annoyance, indignation’ from **orzъjariti(se)*; **orz(ъ)znаньje* (XXXVI 9) ‘consciousness, reason, ability to know, discerning’ from **orz(ъ)znati* ‘to know, to understand, to study’ (10), the Proto-Slavic antiquity, according to the compilers of the etymological dictionary of the Slavic languages, is doubtful [Ibid 10]; **otъpovědanьje* (ЭССЯ XXXVIII 50-51) ‘an answer’ from **otъpovědati* ‘to answer’ (Ibid 51); **тъrpěньje* (XXV 45) ‘patience’.

D. Nomina for the designation of *physical* and *physiological* processes are represented by a small group of derivatives, for example: **krоžеньje* (ЭССЯ XIII 37) ‘whirling, spinning, rotation’ from the adjectival participle **krоženъ* to the verb **krоžiti*; **kurenьje* (119) ‘smoking, fuming’; **kvašenьje* (159) ‘fermenting fermentation’ from

kvasiti*; **květenьje* (161) ‘bloom’ from the adjectival participle to the verbs **kvisti*, **kvьto*; **кypěньje* (264) ‘boiling’ from **кypěti*; **лѣzenьje* (XV 34) ‘hair shedding’ from the adjectival participle **лѣzenь* ‘crawling down; dropping down’; **ломьjenьje* (XVI 20) ‘convulsionary attack’ from **lomiti*; **лiranьje* (118) ‘adhesion’ from **lipati*; **loranьje* (XVI 37) ‘tearing, popping’ from **lopati(se)* ‘to pop’; **лurеньje* / **лurjenьje* (180) ‘hatching of chicks’ (лuriti* ‘to hatch (chicks)’); **majanьje* (XVII 131) ‘swing, oscillation’ from the adjectival participle **majanь* to **majati*; **n’ixanьje*, **n’oxanьje* (XXV 157) ‘sniffing’; **orzьblenьje* (XXXV 124) ‘death, decay’ from **orzьblěti*, **orzьbliti (se)*.

E. The names of an *objectified action related to the physical effort of a person or animal to perform an action*: **ьманьje* (VIII 223-224) ‘gathering, picking, capture’ from **ьmati*; **кpотеньje* (ЭССЯ XIII 32) ‘twirling’ from the adjectival participle **кpотень* of the verb **кpотiti*; **лamanьje* (XIV 25) ‘ламанья’ від **lamanь* до **lamati*, **ломьjenьje* (XVI 20) ‘breaking’ from **lomiti*; **lazanьje* (XIV 60) ‘creeping’ from **lazati*; **lazanьje* / **лаженьje* (60) ‘creeping, crawling’ from **laziti*, **лѣzenьje* (XV 34) ‘creeping’ from **лѣzti*; **летеньje* (XIV 145) ‘a flight’ from **letěti*; **lovjenьje* / **lovenьje* (XVI 110) ‘catching, hunting’ from **loviti*; **лuченьje* (161) ‘target throwing’ from **лučiti* ‘to throw, to dart, to hit the target’; **nosеньje* (XXV 224) ‘carrying’ from the adjectival participle to **nositi*; **отьбѣганьje* (XXXVI 125) the action for a verb **отьбѣgati*; **отьбiranьje* (163) the action for a verb **отьbirati*; **отьnesеньje* (XXXVII 214) ‘carrying’ from **отьnesti*; **отьpiranьje* (XXXVIII 17) ‘opening, unlocking smth’ from **отьpirati* (Ibid).

F. The objectified names of *the vital activity of beings, namely*: **ѣdenьje* (ЭССЯ VI 39) ‘food consumption’ from the adjectival participle **ѣdenь* to the verb **ѣsti*; **gatanьje* (105) ‘fortunetelling’ from **gatati* ‘to tell fortunes’; **lajanьje* (XIV 19) ‘barking, wrangling, cursing’ from the adjectival participle **lajanь* to the verb **lajati* ‘to bark’; **лежаньje* (161) ‘lying, resting’ from **ležati*, **лѣganьje* (181) ‘(frequent) lying’; **лѣченьje* (175) ‘treatment, cure’ from **лѣčiti (se)*; **лѣkovanьje* (198) ‘treatment’ from **лѣkovati(se)*; **лѣtanьje* (267) the name of an action to **лѣtati*; **lixovanьje* (XV 97) ‘deprivation’ from **lixovati* ‘to deprive’; **lijanьje* (103) ‘pouring’ from **lijati* ‘to pour’; **lizanьje* (162) ‘licking’ from **lizati (se)*; **lokanьje* (XVI 6) ‘swilling, guzzling down’ from **lokati* ‘to swill, to drink’; **loranьje* (37) ‘gorging a heavy meal’ from **lopati* ‘to gorge, to stuff oneself’ and so on.

G. The deverbatives that signify *the objectified physical or psychological influence* are infrequent: **loskotanьje* (ЭССЯ XVI 81) the

name of an action to **loskotati*; **матеньје* (XVII 186) ‘deception’ from **матень* to **mamiti* ‘to deceive’; **маненьје* (196) ‘alluring, deception’ from **манень* to **maniti* ‘to deceive’; **матаньје* (235) ‘deception, alluring’ from the adjectival participle **матань* to **matati* ‘to allure’.

The substantives that denote a single non-repetitive action occur less frequently among the reconstructed group, for example: **кораньје* (ЭССЯ XI 17) ‘a kick’ from **kopati* ‘to kick’; **мажаньје* (XVII 131) ‘a movement of the head or arm that signifies an order for action’; **мановеньје* (200) ‘a slight wave of the hand or a nod of the head’ from **мановень* to **manovati* ‘to nod, to wave’ etc.

Other nomina actionis: **лоротаньје* / **лорьтаньје* (ЭССЯ XVI 61) the name of an action from **lorotati* ‘to fight, bumping into something’; **лысканьје* (XVII 41) ‘light, shine, lightning’ from the adjectival participle to the verbative **lyskati* ‘to shine, to glitter’; **лытаньје* (54) the name of an action to **lytati* ‘to laze away’, with the formal motivation by the adjectival participle **lytanь*; **льščаньје* / **льščеньје* (101-102) ‘glitter, shine’ from **льščati* and the late transformation into an i-stem **льščiti* (see more Ibid 102); **назъваньје* (XXXIV 79) ‘naming’ from the adjectival participle **nazъvanь*; **несеньје* (XXV 14) ‘laying (eggs)’ from the adjectival participle **nesень* to the verbative **nesti*.

1.2. Quite small in quantitative terms, there was a group of reconstructions that indicated the state (of the human, nature, etc.) or sensation, namely: **льгьщеньје* (ЭССЯ XVII 70) ‘facilitation’ form **льгьщiti* ‘to facilitate’; **наводьненъје* (XXXIV 18) ‘flood’ from **navodьniti*; **отъčajаньје* (ЭССЯ XXXVI 171) ‘desperation’ **отъčajань*, **отъčajati*; **от(ь)jutjеньје*, **obtjutjеньје*, **občutjеньје* (XXXVII 36-37) ‘sensation’ (<**ot(ь)jutiti* ‘to sense’).

1.3. Few *nomina loci* on *-еньје* / *-аньје* kept in their semantic structure the seme of an action, denoting a place that arose as a result of the action named by the motive word, or characterized by acting or intended for such action, namely: **лажаньје* (ЭССЯ XIV 19) ‘a wait’ from the adjectival participle **lajanь* to the verb **lajati* ‘to lie in wait of trap’; **лежаньје* (161) ‘a place for lying’ from **ležati*; **лѣганьје* (181) ‘a place for lying, a den’ from **lęgati*; **orzvidlenъје* (XXXV 178) ‘a fork’ from **orzvidliti* ‘to split like a pitchfork’ or from **orzvidlenь*.

1.4. The following few nouns named an object or substance that appeared as a result of completing an action indicated by the deriving word: **кошеньје* (ЭССЯ XI 190) ‘a scythe’; **лѣрjеньје* / **лѣрѣньје* (XIV 221) ‘molded’; **лѣшеньје* (258) ‘wooden structures, downed wooden beams, scaffolding’ from **lěsiti* ‘to limit some land, to set

boundaries’ or from **lěxa* ‘artificial bordering of the land by special marks’ (see Ibid 184-187), **līzanŭje* (XV 162) ‘what the cattle licks; medicine in the form of thick syrup’ from **lizati* (*sę*); **maranŭje* (XVII 207) ‘what is scribbled, written or drawn unintelligibly’ from the adjectival participle **maranŭ* to **marati*; **nīzanŭje* (XXV 140) ‘bijouterie or ornaments made by stringing constituent elements’ from **nīzati* ‘to string’; **obdĕvanŭje* (XXVI 155) ‘clothes’ from the verb **obdĕvati*, formally motivated by the adjectival participle **obdĕvanŭ*.

1.5. The *collective* nouns are represented by single formations, which are caused primarily by the semantic characteristics of the motivational verbs and their forms: **ĕdĕnŭje* (VI 39) ‘food’ from the adjectival participle *ĕdenŭ* to the verb **ĕsti*; **jŭmanŭje* (ЭССЯ VIII 223-224) ‘possession, fortune, wealth’ from **jŭmati*, **jŭmĕnŭje* (VIII 226) ‘possession, fortune, wealth’ from **jŭmĕti*.

2. The suffix *-ŭje*

2.1. Almost the largest group with this formant consisted of the *collective* names, which had mainly **nominal** motivation. The names of the plants or their parts (the semantic valency **-ŭje** with derivative stems in the process of forming collective names was pointed out by F. Sławski⁴²), namely: **ablonŭje* (ЭССЯ I 43) ‘apple trees’ from **ablonŭ*; **arĕbŭje* (76) ‘rowan thicket’ from **arĕbŭ* ‘rowan’ (73); **bermenŭje* (I 195) ‘a burden’ from the stem **bermen-*; **bylŭje* (III 150) ‘plants, herbs, potion’ from **bylŭ* ‘a plant, a herb’ (149); **ĉerpŭje* (IV 73) ‘smithereens, shatters’ from **ĉerpŭ* ‘shatter’; **ĉervŭje* (83) ‘open toe shoes’ from **ĉervŭjŭ* ‘a shoe’ (84); **darŭje* (192) ‘(wedding) gifts’ from **darŭ*; **koldŭje* (X 126) ‘stacked logs’ from **kolda*; **kostŭje* (XI 174) ‘bones’ from **kostŭ*; **lepestŭje* (XIV 123) ‘pieces, flaps, plant petals’ from **lepestŭ* / **lepestŭ* ‘a piece, a flap, a petal’; **lĕsŭje* (254) col. (collective) ‘wood’ from **lĕsŭ*; **loxmotŭje* (XV 252) ‘rags, clobber’ from **loxmotŭ* ‘very old, worn, shabby clothes, rags’; **lomŭje* (XVI 30) ‘broken brush-wood, old things’ from **lomŭ* ‘a broken piece, a twig’ (Ibid 24-26); **lopotŭje* (66) ‘old clothes, pieces of something cut, rags’ from **lopotŭ* ‘something old, spoil’ (Ibid 64); **lŏtŭje* (152) ‘young linden forest; branches’ from **lŏtŭ* ‘bark, stem, linden stick without

⁴² Sławski F. Zarys słowotworstwa prasłowiańskiego. *Słownik prasłowiański*. Wrocław. Warszawa. Kraków. Gdańsk : Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. T. 1–3. 1974–1979. T. 1. A-B. 1974. C. 86.

bark'; **nityje* (XXV 133) 'threads' from **nity* 'thread'; **nivye* (139) 'crop fields, fields' from **niva* 'a field'; **orzdyje* (XXXVI 33) 'branches, lop, cut' from **orzga* 'a branch, a swish'; **rozgyje* (ECYM V 98) 'branches, rods', derived from **rozga* 'a cut, a twig, a rod' etc.

It should be noted that *-yje* provided an additional collection in semantics even in derivatives which did not belong to n.collectiva. This is clearly seen in the names of *the plants*, for example: **berstyje* (ЭССЯ I 200) col. 'elms, an elm forest' from **bersty* 'an elm'; **berzyje* (207) 'a birch forest' from **berza*; **derezyje* / *dereždyje* / **dereždyje* (IV 206) 'dry branches' from **dereza*, *derezga* 'steppe bush plant' (Review of Thoughts: Ibid IV 206-207) **dobyje* (V 97) 'oak grove, young oaks' from **doby*; **elšyje* (VI 26) 'an alder tree, an alder stand' (**elxa* 'an alder'), the variant **olšyje* (XXXII 83) 'an alder stand' (**olxa* 'an alder'); **glozyje* (VI 140) 'a hawthorn thicket' from **glogy* 'a hawthorn'; **grozdyje* (VII 142) col. 'grape bunches' from **grozdy*, **grozdy*; **kylčyje* (XIII 184) 'bushes, underwood, thickets' from **kylčy* 'a seedling; a stump; a small bush'; **koryje* (242) 'a (leafy) shrub' from **kory* 'a shrub'; **koryevye* (214) 'a shrub' from **koryevy* 'a thick, trimmed part of the branch while gathering of leaves; a bush' (Ibid); **kutyje* (283) 'branches with leaves' from **kuty* / **kuty* / **kuta* 'a branch, a decoration, a fringe'; **kvytyje* (166) 'flowers' from **kvyty*; **lepenye* (XIV 121) 'leaves' from **lepeny* / **lepeny* 'a leaf of a plant' (Ibid 119-120); **lěšyje* (259) 'a hazel grove, a hazelnut tree' from **lěšyje* with a phonetic simplification or from **lěsy*; **lěsyje* (254) 'an oakery' from **lěsy*; **listyje* (XV 148) 'leaves' from **listy*; **listvyje* (144) 'leaves' from **listva* or from **listy* + *-vyje*; **lobozyje* / **lobuzye* (240) 'branches, bushes, shrubs; coarse yellow grass not eaten by cattle' from **lobozy* / **loboza* 'wild grass, thickets, a flexible branch, a rod' (Ibid 239); **lopěnyje* (XVI 57) 'a yellow dock' (**lopěny* 'a broad-leaved plant'); **lorušyje* (74) 'a burdock; a burdock thicket' from **lorušy*; **lozinyje* (121) 'a grape-vine' from **lozina*; **lozyje* (122) 'a grape-vine, a vineyard, brush mat', col. from **loza*; **lrcyje* (134) 'a reed' from **lrcy* 'a creek, a swampland; a meadow by the river'; **lubye* (159) 'a soft bark of a tree' from **luby* 'a thin bark of a tree just below the outer bark'; **lupyje* (187) 'a peel (of fruits and vegetables)' from **lupy* 'hull'; **lyčyje* (XVII 10) 'a (hempen) bast, halm that is picked in the fields' from **lyko*, **lyky*; **malinyje* (163) 'raspberry, a raspberry bush' (**malina*); **ostrōzyje* (XXXVI 62) 'a bush of a prickly plant, mainly blackberries' from **ostrōga* 'blackberry, a thorn'; **ostyje* (72) 'a thorn, a prickle (on a plant)' from **osty* 'the same'; **osytyje* (80) 'a prickle, a thorn, wild grass, weeds' from **osyty* 'a thorn' (77).

The few **deadjectives** could also take on a collective meaning. F. Slawski believes that it is on the adjective stem that the collective function of the suffix **-ѣje** is developed⁴³. Such formations are represented in small numbers, namely: **berzovъje* (ЭССЯ I 207) ‘birch, birch firewood’ from **berzovъ*; **gobъzъje* (VI 186) ‘prosperity’ from **gobъzъ(jъ)* ‘rich, fruitful’; **lěskovъje* (XIV 243) ‘a hazel grove’ from **lěskovъjъ* ‘relating to a hazel grove’; **lěsovъje* (246) ‘a forest’ from **lěsovъjъ* ‘forestal’; **lipovъje* (XV 128) ‘lindens, a linden forest’; **listovъje* (144) ‘leaves’ most likely from the adjective stem **listov-*; **makovъje* (XVII 146) ‘soft fresh sprouts on a tree, grass’ from **makovъ(jъ)* ‘relating to a poppy’ – there may be a metaphorical meaning of ‘tiny, like a poppy-seed’ here; **orexovъje* (Скляренко 1998 219) від **orexovъ*; **tisovъje* (Ibid) from **tisovъ*.

Every once in a while it is possible to stumble across the **deverbatives** among the reconstructions of the analyzed group, for example: **dadъje* (ЭССЯ IV 182) ‘a tribute’ from the reduplicative stem *dad-*, compare the present tense **dadmъ* < **dati*; **kosъje* (XI 181) ‘branches that have been cut down’ from **kositi*; **kъrčevъje* (XIII 209) ‘uprooted stumps, roots’ from **kъrčevati*. **obbilъje*/**obvilъje* (XXVI 105) ‘prosperity’ from **obbilъ*/**obvilъ* ‘abundant, sufficient’.

2.2. The formant **-ѣje** was very productive in the creation of *nomina loci*. According to linguists, the adjectives of the neuter on **-iŋos** were often the basis for locative names, as well as for collective substantives. The latter can be considered as sets of objects, spatially combined and indivisible from this perspective⁴⁴. Our observations, however, give reason to speak of the predominance of the **substantive** motivation of the analyzed derivatives. Adjectives and verbs, according to our data, were rarely used as forming ones. For example: **barъje* (ЭССЯ I 160) ‘a swamp; a field under water’ from **bara* ‘still water, a puddle’ (153); **berъzъje* (210) col. from **bergъ*; **dup(ъ)lъje* (V 160) ‘a tree hollow’ from **dup(ъ)lo*; **ličъje* (XV 85) ‘a front, a face’ from **likъ*, **lice*; **luъzъje* (XVI 220) ‘puddles, mud’ from **luza* ‘a puddle’; **nebesъje* (XXXIV 100) ‘sky, heaven’ from the stem **nebes-*; **nizovъje* (XXV 145) ‘lowland’ from **nizovъjъ*; **nozъje* (XXVI 24) ‘a bed-foot, an underside of a bed’ from **noga*; **otъmělъje* (XXXVII 181) ‘a shoal, a

⁴³ Slawski F. Zarys słowotworstwa prasłowiańskiego. *Słownik prasłowiański*. Wrocław. Warszawa. Krakow. Gdańsk : Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. T. 1–3. 1974–1979. T. 1. A–B. 1974. С. 86.

⁴⁴ Мартынов В. В. Праславянская и балто-славянская деривация имен. Минск : Навука і техника, 1973. 58 с. С. 34

shallow' from **otъmělъ* 'the same', is restricted to East Slavic of the formation area (Ibid), **ustъje*⁴⁵ 'a mouth of the river' from **usta* 'the same'.⁴⁶

An additional seme of the result of an action named by a productive word could be realized in many locatives, and this obviously gives grounds for assuming multiple motivation for derivatives of the type in question, namely: **kъrčevъje* (ЭССЯ XIII 209) 'a place that is overgrown with bushes; a parcel of uprooted forest' from **kъrčevati* with the reduction of a suffixal *-a-*; **navolčъje* (XXXIV 27) 'a low riverbank with innings; innings' from **navolka*/**navolkъ* or from **navolčiti*, **navelkt'i*; **orzvidlъje* (XXXV 179) 'the place where something is divided, diverges in different directions' from **orzvidliti*.

2.3. The few **denominative** formations had *material-objective* semantics, namely: **červъje* (ЭССЯ IV 83) 'fur on an animal belly' (**červo*); **drъvъje* (V 143) col. 'hewn construction beams' from **drъvo*; **ěstъje* (VI 55) 'a dish' from **ěstъ*, **ěsti*; **kamenъje* (IX 135) 'stones' from **kamen-*; **kъrčъje* (ЭССЯ XIII 211) 'uprooted stumps, roots' from **kъrčъ* 'an (uprooted) stump' (Ibid 210); **lěpъje* (XIV 231) 'birdlime' from **lěpъ* 'glue, lime'; **lučъje* (XVI 164) col. 'kindling-wood for night fishing' from **lučъ* 'a splinter, a torch'; **otъrōbъje* (XXXVIII 137) 'mill offals' from **otъrōba* / **otъrōbъ* 'mill offals' (Ibid 132).

The **adjectives** and **verbs** were rarely in the role of motivational stems to the lexemes of the analyzed type, for example: **drobъje* (ЭССЯ V 121) 'small cereals; offal', cognate with **drobiti*; **lironъje* (XV 128) 'linden wood'; **lěsonъje* (XIV 246) 'hazel grove' from **lěsonъjъ* 'being a part of hazel grove'.

2.4. *Nomina abstracta* that designated *physical* or *mental processes*, *states*, or *character features* made up a small group, such as: **dъrtъje* (ЭССЯ V 227) 'tearing, shelling' from **dъrtъ* 'pieces, sawdust'; **krъvotočъje* (XIII 64) 'bleeding' from **krъvotočiti*; **lětъje* (ЭССЯ XV 20) 'summer'; **liceměrъje* (79) 'hypocrisy', related to **liceměrъ*, **liceměriti*; **l'ubъje* (187) 'love; aptitude for something' from **l'ubiti* or **l'ubъ*; **lomъje* (XVI 30) 'breaking' from **lomъ* 'an iron rod that breaks stones and breaks trees'; **lučъje* (164) 'a beam' from **lučъ* 'a beam'; **nedōzъje* (XXXIV 126) 'weakness, illness' from **nedōzъ* or from **nedōžiti*; **nenastъje* (176) 'bad weather' from the stem **nenastъ* 'the

⁴⁵ Sławski F. Zarys słowotworstwa prasłowiańskiego. *Słownik prasłowiański*. Wrocław. Warszawa. Kraków. Gdańsk : Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. T. 1–3. 1974–1979. T. 1. A-B. 1974. C. 86.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

same'; **neumьje* (XXV 58) 'loss of mind, madness' from **neumь*; **nevolьje* (86) 'reluctance; compulsion' from **nevol'a*, although in the case of iterative semantics the deverbative nature of the derivative is not excluded – from **nevoliti*; **nevьzgodьje* (88) 'trouble, misery, hard times' from **nevьzgodа* 'adversity, misfortune'; **novosedьje* (236) 'housewarming, new residence' from **novosedьь* 'new settler', on the other hand, the complex suffixal nature of this derivative is not excluded; **orzumьje* (XXXV 138) 'sense, cognition' from **orzumь*. Apparently, the spread of this Church Slavicism in the East Slavic territories took place in the book way (see Ibid); **otьdušьje* (XXXVI 222) 'rest' (**otьduxь* 'breathing, relief, rest' – 220); **otьmьstьje* (XXXVII 213) 'revenge, vengeance, retaliation' from **otьmьstь* / **otьmьsta*; **sьnьje* (Скляренко 1998 230) 'dreaming' from **sьnь*.

2.5. The few nouns were the names of the *objects* (these were mostly instrumental nouns), for example: **kopьje* (ЭССЯ XI 40) 'a spear, a pike' from **kopati* 'to pierce, to stab', the stem is **kop-*. The makers of the Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages (ЭССЯ) assume the ancient adjective nature of this derivative, the gender of which could agree with the noun: **kopьje dervo* 'the wood with which they beat or pierce' (see more ЭССЯ XI 41); **kosovьje* (XI 152) 'mowing is the place where they mow'; **kostьje* (181) 'a handle of a scythe' from **kosa*; **lězьvьje* (XV 39) 'a blade, an edge' from **lězvo*; **loskutьje* (XVI 86) col. to **loskutь* 'a cut of something'.

Occasionally, the reconstructed group of nouns on *-ьje* included the **denominative somatic** names, for example: **čel'ustьje* (ЭССЯ IV 44) 'faucets, a perish' from **čel'ustь*; **ličьje* (XV 85) 'a person, a face, an icon' from **likь*, **lice*; **nozьvьje* (XXVI 24) 'a part of a leg' from **noga*.

The **deadjectival** derivatives were less frequent, for example: **bělьje* (ЭССЯ II 86) 'everything that is made of white cloth at home; linen' from **bělь*; **starьje* 'old age, old things' from *starь* 'old'; **sьdorvьje* (Вступ 1966 118) 'health' from *sьdorvь* 'healthy'.

3. The suffix *-tьje*

3.1. The examined reconstructed Proto-Slavic derivatives show that this formant while being added to the infinitive or adjectival participle stems, participated mainly in the creation of *abstract* names.

A. The few reconstructions of the Slavic era had the semantics of long repeated action, for example: **bitьje* (ЭССЯ II 102) 'beating, fight' from **biti* or **bitь*; **ěstьje* (VI 55) 'nutritive process' from **ěstь*, **ěsti*; **krytьje* (XIII 73) 'hiding, concealment' from **kryti* and the adjectival

participle **krytъ*; **litъje* (XV 160) ‘casting, pouring’ from **liti*; **otъbitъje* (XXXVI 140) ‘repelling an attack; reflection; imprint’ < **otъbiti*; **otъbytъje* (160) ‘releasing from duties or discharging; withdrawal, departure’ (**otъbyti*); **otъdatъje* (199) ‘returning, release, retribution’ from the adjectival participle **otъdatъ*; **otъjētъje* (XXXVII 24) ‘taking out, deletion’ from **otъjētъ* ‘taken out, deleted’; **otъjъtъje* (46) ‘leaving, deleting, taking away’ from **otъjъti*; obviously, this is the West Slavic dialectism; **otъkrytъje* (92) from **otъkrytъ*; **otъrytъje* (XXXVIII 145) ‘tearing, excavation’ from **otъryti* ‘to excavate, to dig up’ etc.

B. The few names of *physical, mental processes and states* were semantically close to the previous group of deverbatives were, namely: **nytъje* (ЭССЯ XXVI 67) ‘whimper’ from **nyti*; **sъmētъje* (ЕСУМ V 475) ‘confusion’, connected with **sъmēsti* (< **sūmētti*) ‘to mix up, to confuse, to sting’, derived from **mēsti* (< **mētti*) ‘to trouble, to embarrass, to muddle’ (Ibid) **žitъje* (Вступ 1966 118) ‘living; a life’.

3.2. A few of the reconstructions under review were the *locatives* on -**тъje** which indicated *the territory, or the place* formed as a result of an action that was named by the derivative word, namely: **datъje* (ЭССЯ IV 196) ‘a gift, a donation’ from the adjectival participle **datъ* < **dati*; **ętъje* (VI 73) ‘a prison, a dungeon’ from **ęti* ‘to capture’; **krytъje* (XIII 73) ‘protection, a roof; a cover’ from **kryti* and the adjectival participle **krytъ*.

3.3. The nouns with *material-objective* or *substantive* meaning had the shade of collectiveness, for example: : **obbitъje* (ЭССЯ XXVI 108) ‘leftovers, leavings’ from the adjectival participle **obbitъ*; **obdětъje* (154) ‘clothes’ from the adjectival participle **obdětъ*; **otъmelъje* (XXXVII 173) ‘solid fragments of flax stems’ from **otъmelti* ‘to mill again, to grind’ (172); **tъrmetъje* (Куркина 1974 45) col. ‘flax or hemp solids; any waste to stoke the fire’, apparently, from **tъrmati* ‘to shred, to pick’ (Куркина 1974 45).

The following derivatives did not form separate lexical word-building groups: **bagatъje* (I 124) ‘a bonfire’ is a probable Proto-Slavic dialectism, cognate with Indo-European **bhog-* ‘to bake’ (Куркина 1974 45), Greek φόγω ‘to grill’, Old High German *bahhan* ‘to bake’ (ЭССЯ I 24); **litъje* (XV 160) ‘metal cast product’ from **liti*; **obbitъje* (XXVI 108) ‘upholstery, a stripe’ from the adjectival participle **obbitъ*; **obdōtъje* (XXVI 164) ‘a tumour, a swell’ from the adjectival participle **obdōtъ* to the verb **obdōti*; **otъličъje* (XXXVII 133) ‘a distinction’ from **otъličiti* ‘to distinguish’, **otъličati* ‘to distinguish’ or from

*отъlika (134) ‘what serves as a means of distinction; a difference’;
*отъмьртѣ (XXXVII 211) ‘a fatal case’ from *отъмьрѣ, *отъмьрти;
*веретье (Куркина 1977 45) ‘a sack of coarse fabric; rough fabric’ from
*vereti ‘to weave, to shuttle’.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the examined linguistic material of the Proto-Slavic era gives grounds for arguing that already at that time the suffix **-ѣ** and its continuents **-ѣ/-нѣ/-енѣ/-анѣ/-тѣ** occupied a significant place in the arsenal of means of the substantive derivation. The analyzed reconstructions of the structure under consideration show that each of the variants of the primary **-ѣ** has its own functions quite clearly entrenched.

The largest number of derivatives with the mentioned formant are the abstract names, the names of the subjectified action were of a considerable amount among them. Such derivatives were created mainly through suffixes **-енѣ / -анѣ** (*кошенье ‘mowing’, *lelĕjanĕje ‘care’, *nudĕjenĕje ‘violence, coercion’), the formant **-тѣ** took a less active part in the creation of nouns of this subgroup (*bitĕje ‘beating, fight’, *otĕdatĕje ‘returning, release, retribution’). The primary **-ѣ** did not compete with these suffixes in the formation of nomina actionis.

The names of mental, physical and physiological processes were most created by means of **-енѣ / -анѣ** (*l’utovanĕje ‘ferocity’, *orzveselenĕje ‘entertainment’, *krĕženĕje ‘whirling, spinning, rotation’, *loranĕje ‘tearing, popping’, *n’uxanĕje, *n’ĕhanĕje ‘sniffing’), **-ѣ** was involved in the derivation of the substantives of such semantics less often (*otĕdušĕje ‘resting’, *otĕmĕstĕje ‘revenge, vengeance, retaliation’) and (*nyĕje ‘whimper’, *sĕmĕtĕje ‘confusion’).

Many Proto-Slavic reconstructions had collective meanings. The structure of such derivatives often included the suffix **-ѣ** (*čerpĕje ‘smithereens, shatters’, *kostĕje ‘bones’, *rozĕgĕje ‘branches, rods’), n.collectiva with a clear sense of an action were formed with the help of the continuents **-енѣ / -анѣ** (*ĕdĕnĕje ‘food’, *ĕmanĕje ‘possession, fortune, wealth’).

The subgroup of names with locative semantics, in whose creation the suffix **-ѣ** was most actively involved, was noticeable, though somewhat smaller in quantitative terms (*barĕje ‘a swampland; a field under water’, *nebesĕje ‘heaven, sky’, *kĕrčĕvenĕje ‘a place that is overgrown with bushes; a parcel of uprooted forest’).

The variant suffixes **-енѣје** / **-анѣје**, **-тъје** were rarely involved in the formation of n. loci, keeping a shade of the verbal semantics in the derivatives (**lajanъje* ‘a wait’, **ležanъje* ‘a place for lying’, **ętbje* ‘a prison, a dungeon’).

The material-objective and substantive names are few among the examined derivatives (**košenъje* ‘a scythe’, **otъmelъje* ‘solid fragments of flax stems’, **červъje* ‘fur on an animal belly’, **kamenъje* ‘stones’, **otъrqbъje* ‘mill offals’).

Most of the reconstructed derivatives are motivated by verbs, which provided a significant preponderance of the names of the subjectified action. The nouns and adjectives were rarely used to derive new words (mainly there were names of subjects, n. loci and n. collectiva).

SUMMARY

The article describes the functions of the substantival suffix **-ъје** and its continuants **-енѣје** / **-анѣје**, **-тъје** in the Proto-Slavic language, it identifies the main semantic groups derivatives that were formed with their help; the motivation of the identified nouns is found out as well.

It is established that each variant of the primary **-ъје** has its own functions clearly assigned. The largest number of derivatives with the mentioned formant are the abstract names, among which a significant number were the names of the subjectified action (formed mainly by the suffixes **-енѣје** / **-анѣје**). The denomination of mental, physical, and physiological processes were also created, for the most part, by means of **-енѣје** / **-анѣје**. The suffix **-ъје** was included into the structure of collective derivatives the most frequently. The locative names had in their structure the formant **-ъје**; the variant suffixes **-енѣје** / **-анѣје**, **-тъје** were rarely involved in the creation of n. loci. Just a few of the reconstructions under consideration – the material-objective and substantive names, had both the primary **-ъје** and its continuants **-енѣје** / **-анѣје**, **-тъје** approximately equally involved into the process of their formation. Most of the reconstructed derivatives are motivated by verbs. The nouns and adjectives were involved in derivation of new words less often (these were mainly locatives, names with substantive, objective and collective semantics).

REFERENCES

1. Бернштейн С. Б. Очерк сравнительной грамматики славянских языков: Чередования. Именные основы. Москва : Наука, 1974. 376 с.
2. Білоусенко П. І. Питання словотвірної потенції і реалізації формантів (на матеріалі суфіксів *-иє* та *-ство*). *Нова філологія*. 2000. № 1(9). С. 135–155.
3. Білоусенко П. І. Нариси з історії українського словотворення (іменникові конфікси) / Білоусенко П. І., Іншакова І. О., Качайло К. А., Меркулова О. В., Стовбур Л. М. Запоріжжя-Кривий Ріг : ТОВ “ЛПКС” ЛТД, 2010. 480 с.
4. Варбот Ж. Ж. Древнерусское именное словообразование. Ретроспективная формальная характеристика. Москва : Наука, 1969. 230 с.
5. Винокур Т. Г. О семантике отглагольных существительных на *-ние*, *-тие* в древнерусском языке. *Исследования по словообразованию и лексикологии русского языка*. Москва : Изд-во “Наука”, 1979. С. 3–28.
6. Воропай С. В. Система конфіксального творення іменників в українській мові XIX – XX століть : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01. Запоріжжя, 2001. 209 с.
7. Житецкий П. Очерк литературной истории малорусского нарѣчья въ XVII вѣкѣ. Съ приложеніемъ словаря книжной малорусской рѣчѣ по рукописи XVII вѣка. Кіевъ, 1889. 265 с.
8. Коваль О. Ю. Творення іменників зі значенням опредметненої дії в давньоруськоукраїнській мові XI–XIII ст. (суфікси *-иє*, *-ьє*). *Вісник Запорізького національного університету: збірник наукових праць. Філологічні науки*. 2014. № 2. С. 334–339.
9. Коломиец В. Т. Имя существительное. Имя прилагательное (в гл. “Словообразование”). *Историческая типология славянских языков*. Киев : Наукова думка, 1986. С. 46–99.
10. Крымскій А. О малорусскихъ отглагольныхъ существительныхъ на *енне* и *інне*. Санктъ-Петербургъ, 1907. 7 с.
11. Мартынов В. В. Праславянская и балто-славянская деривация имен. Минск : Навука і техника, 1973. 58 с.
12. Мейе А. Общеславянский язык. Москва, 1951. 491 с.
13. Меркулова О. В. Конфіксальні іменники з постпозитивним елементом *-ьj(e)* у праслов'янській мові. *Вісник Запорізького*

національного університету: збірник наукових праць. Філологічні науки. 2006. № 2. С. 162–168.

14. Молодых Л. И. Отглагольное словообразование существительных в древнерусском языке. Уч. пособие по спецкурсу. Саранск, 1982. 85 с. С. 66–73.

15. Полюга Л. М. Українська абстрактна лексика XIV – першої половини XVII ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1991. 240 с.

16. Ращинская Г. Н. Отглагольные имена существительные на - ння, -ення (-іння), -ття в современном украинском языке : автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Львов, 1968. 21 с.

17. Сіроштан Т. В. Назви дій у словотвірній системі праслов'янської мови. *Науковий вісник Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія: "Філологічні науки" (мовознавство)* : зб. наук. пр. 2017. № 7. С. 177–181.

18. Храмова І. В. Розвиток конфіксальних іменників з кінцевим -j(a) в історії української мови (структури з просторовим значенням). *Вісник Запорізького державного університету: збірник наукових праць. Філологічні науки.* 1999. № 1. С. 158–166.

19. Цейтлин Р. М. Лексика старославянського языка. Москва, 1977. 336с.

20. Чекменева С. Х. Развитие именной конфикации в русском языке. На материале имен существительных с конечным элементом -ие : автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Казань, 1974. 19 с.

21. Шарафутдинов К. Отглагольные имена существительные с отвлеченным значением в гнездах движения. *Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования* : мат-лы III Республ. науч. конф. Ч. II Ташкент : Укитувчи, 1980. С. 253–258.

22. Brugmann K. Grundriss der vergleichenden der indogermanischen Sprachen. В. II. Т. 2. Strassburg, 1906. S. 188–189.

23. Pokorny J. Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. В. I. Bern – München, 1959. 1183 s.

24. Sławski F. Zarys słowotworstwa prasłowiańskiego. *Słownik prasłowiański*. Wrocław. Warszawa. Kraków. Gdańsk : Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Т. 1–3. 1974–1979. Т. 1. А-В. 1974. С. 85–86.

25. Wojtyła-Swierzowska M. Prasłowiańskie abstractum. Sufiksálne nomina actionis. Formacje z podstawowym sufiksальnym -n-, -t-. Wrocław – Warszawa, 2003. 173 s.

NOTATIONS LIST OF THE CITED SOURCES

Вступ 1966 Вступ до порівняльного вивчення слов'янських мов / за ред. О. С. Мельничука. Київ : Наукова думка, 1966. 595с.

ЕСУМ Етимологічний словник української мови / за ред. О. С. Мельничука : у 7 т. Т. 1-6. Київ : Наукова думка, 1982–2012.

Куркина 1977 Куркина Л. В. Этимологические заметки. *Этимология*. 1974. Москва : Наука, 1977. С. 44–59.

Скляренко 1998 Скляренко В. Г. Праслов'янська акцентологія. Київ, 1998. 342 с.

ЭССЯ Этимологический словарь славянских языков: Праславянский лексический фонд / под ред. О.Н. Трубачева. Вып.1-40. Москва : Наука, 1974-2016.

Information about the author:

Merkulova O. V.,

PhD in Philology,

Senior Teacher at the Ukrainian Language Department,

Zaporizhzhia National University

66-A, Zhukovskogo str., Zaporizhzhia, 69063, Ukraine