

## Problems of Creation of Etymological Dictionary of Suffixes of Ukrainian Language

Vasyl Luchick

Institute of Linguistics, National Academy of Sciences, Ukraine

### Abstract

"Etymological dictionary of suffixes of Ukrainian language" will become the first edition of such type in a Slavic linguistics. In regard of its preparation several problems existed: 1) lack of experience in this sphere; 2) not equal lexicographical study of suffixes in Slavic languages; 3) difficulties in reconstruction of the primary meaning; 4) determining the invariants of morphemes; 5) defining sources of suffixes.

**Key words:** suffix, dictionary, etymological, meaning, origin, Ukrainian language.

Etymology as a study connected with reconstruction of the primary (veritable) meaning of a word was originated in ancient Greek linguistics according to well known discussion about the character of names. But as a scientific method and separate linguistic branch it has been formed only after the appearing of comparative-historical linguistics which achieved great results during less than two centuries of its development. The main acquisition of it was the creation of etymological national dictionaries, related or prehistoric (for example, of primitive Slavonic language) the first of which was in Europe "Етимологічний словник романських мов" (1853) Ф.Діца and in Slavic studies – "Етимологічний словник слов'янських мов" (1886) Ф.Міклошича which was published in German language. "Етимологічний словник української мови" in two volumes Я.Рудницький published in Winnipeg during 1962-1982 and then came similar dictionary under the editorship of О.С.Мельничук in seven volumes (as for today 5 volumes are published).

Traditional for such dictionaries reconstruction of the primary bases and meaning lately was accompanied with the attention to clarification of old structure of the word including historical changes, motivative connections and functions of its structural elements: ablaut, allothesis, infixes, determinatives, affixes etc. Such units were explained only opportunely according to etymologizing of bases which come to reconstruction of roots with primary material semantics. Beside the roots, the origin of prefixes was specially defined at the beginning of a word and demanded explanation of their nature. They also often preserve etymological connections with the primary roots, that gives reasons to observe them in one row with full meaning morphemes. The example can be general Slavic prefix of Indo-European origin *у-(ъ-)*, that is used in a dimensional meaning (compare ukrainian *усувати*, рос. *убывать*, *убежать*, д.-р. *оуходити* and others) and together with proper preposition is studied in a separate dictionary article as a reflex *і.-с. \*au'' віддалятися, зникати''*. [Фасмер, с.142]. However much numerous and important in the case of forming old and modern bases suffixes have not been the object of systematical etymological explanation in a Slavic lexicography. Clarification of their origin and primary meaning is very important for understanding the nature of the word, its internal and external structure.

First attempt to constitute the origin of suffixes was made in Slavic lexicography by a well-known polish comparativist Ф.Славський who gave substantial "Нарис праслов'янського словотвору" in a preface to the first volume of "Праслов'янського словника"(1974).[Slawski,s.43-141]. To tell the truth, the author confines with analyzing suffixal morphemes only of verbs and nouns and word building construction of adjectives and compound words with etymological commentaries of formants planned to accomplish in one of the next volumes.

More full etymological analysis of suffixes than in preface of Ф.Славський for the next 35 years in a Slavic linguistics was not made by anyone. At the same time this essay of word building of primitive Slavonic language does not cover etymology of all suffixal morphemes of a basic language and leaves

without attention all the units which were formed in separate Slavic languages. This concerns Ukrainian language in which scores suffixes of post primitive Slavonic language origin function.

There is another situation in synchronic morphemics and word building. Under the influence of structuralism which was predominant abroad in the middle of XX century there was a rapid growth of studying modern morphemics and morphological world building. In Ukraine there are several monograph researches devoted to these problems І.І.Коваліка, В.О.Горпинича, А.Д.Зверева, Т.М.Возного, Н.Ф.Клименко, В.В.Грещука and others. As a result in a native lexicography several dictionaries in which suffixes were separated or interpreted with other morphemes in the structure of the word were published.

Thus the development of Ukrainian and in total slavic lexicography from morphemical to wordbuilding and explanatory dictionaries of affixal morphemes approached linguists for the necessity to create "Етимологічний словник суфіксів української мови" which together with traditional etymological dictionary will fill the system of comparative- historical analysis of basic morphemes of the Ukrainian language: roots, prefixes, suffixes. This idea was originated in the О.О.Потебніа Institute of linguistics of NAS of Ukraine in the department of general Slavic problems and East Slavic languages which began to work on this lexicographical edition.

Creation of "Етимологічного словника суфіксів української мови" is connected with overcoming of several problems. Firstly, there was no such dictionary in Slavic and world lexicography and to create something new was always complicated because of objective necessity to overcome unknown problems. Experience of competent lexicographers affirms that the best dictionaries in their first editions cannot be blameless. Т.Ф.Єфремова on this feature indicates using expression of the author who published the world known dictionary in three volumes "Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам" І.І.Срезневского who said that good and full dictionary cannot be composed from the first time. None of the books blanks and oversights conscious or unconscious are not so possible and fixed as in the dictionary and the most satisfactory dictionary during some period of time loses its dignity and needs to be fixed. [Єфремова, с.4].

Secondly, composing of the Etymological Dictionary of Suffixes of the Ukrainian Language as composing traditional etymological dictionaries provides attraction of the akin material from other Slavic and even Indo-European languages. As О.С.Мельничук mentioned that each etymological dictionary of the separate Slavic language marks definite link in a single indissoluble chain of general Slavic etymology which is in the structure of etymology of Indo-European languages and wider comparative-historical linguistics [Мельничук, с.9]. Taking into consideration that in different Slavic languages there is irregular usage of suffixes, the full value usage of definite material becomes complicated. That can have effect on the quality of separate dictionary articles.

Thirdly, suffixes are connective morphemes which are joined to root or widened with affixes bases in a derivational or grammatical function and that's why they are much more abstracted than roots with material meaning. As classifiers of the words, suffixes in contrast to roots with individual lexical meaning present generalized types of marching the derivational or grammatical semantics of which is very abstract that makes difficult to determine their primary semantics. In contrast to prefixes which often remain etymological connections with prepositions and primary roots, suffixes almost lose such connections with morphemes of full meaning. To form the word building semantics is complicated.

Fourthly, there is a problem in establishment structure and differentiation of suffixes. This is connected with the fact that in a theoretical word building the question about distinguishing the word and wordform is still open, about correlation polysemantic and ononyms morphemes, about segmentation words into affixes about міжморфемні interlayers in reference to them several terms are used: *формативи*, *інтерфікси*, *асемантими*, *структеми*, *субморфи*. If we take into consideration that morpheme is an elementary minimal language unit which is formally indivisible in the boundary of one word but it is divisible in semantics. That means it is bilateral unit which has the meaning and material expression and can modify as in the first also in the second case. [УМЕ, с.371-372] then dismembering functioning integral suffixes for important and unimportant components is unreasonably. The same is in the etymological dictionary unreasonably to oppose to separate morphemes phonetical variants as *-ак/-як*, *-уч(ий)/-юч(ий)*, *-б/-бл*, that occurred in the earlier mentioned dictionary of affixal morphemes Н.Ф.Клименко, С.А.Карпіловської and others. [Клименко, с.65-68]. In particular the last morph is a phonetical variant of suffix *-б-* and it was formed as a result of interaction between labial with archaic suffix *-j-*: *незганьблений*, *вирізьблений*, *вирізьблювати*. There are no so many reasons to distinguish as separate suffixal units vowel or consonant

complex that arise as a result of changing phonetical position of one or another affix. For example, given in "Словнику афіксальних морфем української мови" as separate suffix alomorph *-ель-* [Клименко, с.65] emerges as a phonetical variant of the noun formant *-л(о)* in case of interaction with the next formant: compare *сідельце < сідло < нсл. \*sedlo*. For this dictionary the contrasting is reasonable for its type and mission." This is part-valency dictionary of affixal morphemes of modern ukrainian literary language which is composed with the help of computer" [Клименко, с.5] and for computer translation. For etymological interpretation of suffixes this mechanical stamping of the word structure not taking into account the integrity of morpheme as invariant similar in meaning morphs is unnecessary.

Fifthly, it is not always possible to define the interposition or the tendency of expansion the suffixal model from one language into another. In a native linguistics there is a common thought that ukrainian language borrowed from Russian suffix *-чанин*, which was originated on the base of *-анин/ -янин* as a result of decomposing of the generating base ending with *-к-, -ч-, -ц-*. But this conclusion is neither proved by historical facts nor by special researches of the specialists. This suffix is well known in the names of citizens from Old Russian and Old Ukrainian leaflets and belongs to the most productive in the katajkonimichnij system of Ukrainian language: compare *Трубезьск-трубчане(1223)*, *Львов-львовчане(1407)*, *Глухів-глухівчанин*, *Суми-сумчанин*, *Стеців-стецівчанин* [див. Горпинич, с.86-87]. As to the Russian language it is less productive and as unnatural for it caused serious opposition of well-known linguists С.Сергеев-Ценский, Ф.Гладков та ін. [див. Потиха, с.191-192]. That's why it is unfoundedly to say that suffix *-чан(и)*, *-чанин* was borrowed from Russian language into Ukrainian. В.О.Горпинич as the most competent analyst of katajkonimichnich systems of East Slavic languages said that in Ukrainian language as in Russian and Byelorussian suffix *-чан-и (-чанин)* came in the store of general system of old Russian geographical names word building. [Горпинич, с.87].

Contrary to existing difficulties part of which is hard even to foresee the work, which has already begun, deserves approval. This edition will be useful for linguists, lecturers, students, teachers and for all who is interested in the etymology, history, morphemics and word building of the Ukrainian language. In particular the dictionary will be a good base for preparation of the academic edition "Historical word building of the Ukrainian language" which will end the set of works in different language levels.

#### ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Горпинич В.О. Назви жителів в українській мові. – К.: ВШ, 1979. – 158 с.
2. Ефремова Т.Ф. Толковый словарь словообразовательных единиц русского языка. – М.: Рус. яз., 1996. – 638 с.
3. Клеменко Н.В. Карпівська Є.А., Карпівський В.С., Недозим Т.І. Словник афіксальних морфем української мови. – К., 1988. – 434 с.
4. Клименко Н.Ф. Карпівська Є.А., Кислюк Л.П. Шкільний словотвірний словник сучасної української мови. – К.: Наук.думка, 2005.
5. Лучик В.В. Автохтонні гідроніми Середнього Дніпро-Бузького межиріччя. – Кіровоград, 1996. – 235 с.
6. Мельничук О.С. Вступ // Етимологічний словник української мови : В 7 т. / Відп. Ред. О.С. Мельничук. – К.: Наук.думка, 1982. – Т.1–С.7-13.
7. Онишкевич М.Й. Словник бойківських говірок: У 2 ч. – К.: Наук.думка, 1984. – Ч.2. – 515 с.
8. Полюга Л.М. Морфемний словник. – К.: Рад. школа, 1983. – 464 с.Р
9. Потиха З.А. Современное русское словообразование. – М.: Просвещение, 1970. – 384 с.
10. Скорська З.С. Українсько-російський словотвірний словник. – К.: Рад. школа, 1985. – 188 с.
11. Українська мова: енциклопедія. – Вид. 2-ге, випр. і доп. – К.: Укр. енци. ім. М.П.Бажана, 2004. – 821 с.
12. Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка: В 4 т. / Пер. с нем. и доп. О.Н.Трубачева. – 2-е изд., стер. – М.: Прогресс, 1987. – Т.4. – 864 с.
13. Цыганенко Г.П. Словарь служебных морфем русского языка. – К.: Рад. школа, 1982. – 240 с.
14. Яценко І.Т. Морфемний аналіз : словник-довідник: У 2 т. / За ред. Н.Ф.Клименко. – К.: ВШ, 1980. – Т.1. – 356 с.; 1981. – Т.2. – 352 с.
15. An Indo-European comparative dictionary / By Stuart E. Mann. – Hamburg, 1984-1987. – 1683 p.
16. Słowski F. Zarys słowotworstwa prasłowiańskiego // Słownik prasłowiański / Pod red. F. Słowskiego. – Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: PAN, 1974. – Т.1. – 487 s.

## To the Problem of Irregular Phonetic Phenomena in Language (Delabialization \*l'u- > \*li-)

Viktor Shulhach

Institute of Ukrainian Language, National Academy of Sciences, Ukraine

#### Abstract

This article is devoted to one of the cases of irregular phonetic changes in language – delabialization \*l'u- > li- (on the example of the Slavic anthroponymic vocabulary with the root \*L'ub-). Subject to this phenomenon the author restores a significant piece of the Pre-Slavic lexical fund. We emphasize that 36 pre-lexemes from the reconstructed list are absent in the "Etymological Dictionary of Slavic languages" by O.N. Trubachova.

**Keywords:** anthroponym, Pre-Slavic archetype, etymology

Delabialization, or change of the initial \*l'u- > \*li-, is referred to the number of so-called regular phonetic phenomena. According to historical and modern grammars, it is not known to all Slavic languages. If this regular phenomenon is at the appellate and at the proprietary levels in Czech, than, for example, in Bulgarian it is fixed sporadically in the eastern and western dialects<sup>1</sup>, and it is reflected in some written sources<sup>2</sup>. Such a situation is also in the Polish, Lower and Upper Lusatian languages, in several dialects of Russian and Ukrainian<sup>3</sup>. However, as it is evidenced by onomastics, especially anthroponymy, the geography of this phenomenon is much broader. In this case, naturally, the correction for the possible cases of the interlanguage influence should be made (for example, for Czech and Slovak), and it is also important to take into account the fact that the class of anthroponyms is mobile in the space, that is capable of "migrations".

The following is a Slavic anthroponymy with anlaut *Li- < L'u-* (a lexical-word system of derivatives with the root \*L'ub-). The material is given under the relevant Pre-Slavic archetypes.

\***Bogol'ubъ**: укр. *Боголюб* (Літ. ЖС 2007, № 6, 92).

\***Dol'uba**: укр. *Долиба* (КПУ Хм. 3, 368), пол. *Doliba* (SN II, 462) – славян. \**Dol'ubъ* [с *Taliub*, 791 г. – антропоним альпийських славян (Kronsteiner 210 – с реконструкцией)], ст.-блр. (производное) *Dolubow*, XVI ст. – название поместья (ПКГЭ II, 399).

\***Doľ'ubanyъ**: пол. *Doliban* (SN II, 462).

\***Doľ'ubičъ**: хорв. *Dolibič* (Leksik 135).

\***Doľ'ubosъ**: пол. *Dolibós* (SN II, 462).

\***Doľ'ubъсь**: укр. *Долибець* (PP 102).

\***L'uba, L'ubo, L'ubъ(ъ)**: ст.-укр. *Занко Либа*, 1552 г. (Тупиков 226), укр. *Ліб, Либа* (Горпинич, Тимченко 163), блр. *Ліба* (Бірыла 251), *Лібо* (г. Минск), *Лібов* (г. Могилев), русск. *Луб* (СМ 132), *Лубо* (г. Калуга), болг. *Луба* (Илчев 302), *Лубо* (Займов 139), хорв. *Lib, Libo, Liby* (Leksik 365, 366), пол. *Lib, Liba* (SN V, 587), чеш. *Liba, Libo, Liby* (ЧП), слов. *Liba, Libo* (TZ Bratislava 207), луж. *Liba* (Jordan 141), *Libo* (Wenzel II/1, 249). Ср. также славян. (производные) *Ліубоѡв* – топоним на территории Греции (Гильфердинг 287 – как *Любово*), *Либы*, XVI ст. – топоним в Жемайтин (Спрогис 167).

\***L'ubaxъ**: макед. (производное) *Лубаово* (варианты *Лубахово, Лубаво*) – топоним (Симовски 2, 61), пол. *Libach* (SN V, 587).

\***L'ub'axa, L'ub'axъ**: болг. *Лубяха* (Займов 139), (производное) *Лубяхово* – старое название с. Илинден в Гоцеделчевско.

\***L'ubajъ**: русск. *Лубаев* (Pamięć 2, 320).