

*Kocherha H. V.,**Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Ukrainian Linguistics and Applied Linguistics
Cherkasy National University named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi*

THE INTRA-NOMINAL VOCABULARY OF THE SUFFIXED NOUNS OF THE OLD UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE OF THE 15TH – 18TH CENTURIES: STRUCTURAL AND WORD-FORMING ASPECT

Summary. The article found out that the nouns of the Old Ukrainian language of the 15th–18th centuries have an extensive system of word formation, in particular, they are characterized by a great variety of word-forming formants, just like the nouns of the modern Ukrainian language. It is obvious that certain affixes (in particular, suffixes) of the Old Ukrainian language have passed into the heritage of the modern language, some are rare and have fallen out of use, and still others have acquired certain phonetic changes in the modern language. Some of the suffixes in the modern language have a different word-forming meaning. The intra-nominal word-form is analyzed according to the part-language belonging of the word-form and the semantics of suffixes, their productivity, frequency and regularity of use are characterized. The analysis of the intra-nominal word structure of suffixed nouns in the book and written language of the 15th–18th centuries gives reason to talk about their wide functioning in book styles, and therefore, attests to their high usage in written monuments of the above-mentioned period. A large number of these lexemes have been inherited by the modern Ukrainian literary language, some are obsolete due to the disappearance of the concepts they denoted.

It was found that among suffix nouns, the largest group consists of nouns denoting persons by action, occupation, religious beliefs, and attitude to various social processes; a group of neuter nouns denoting a specific action is large in quantitative terms; a significant group of derived nouns is feminine nouns with an abstract meaning. All the mentioned groups of words belong to different word-forming types, as they are formed by different word-forming formants.

Key words: the Old Ukrainian language, word-forming formants, intra-nominal word-form, structural-word-forming aspect, semantics.

Formulation of the problem. Word-forming derivation is qualified as the process of creating secondary nominative units with the status of a word. Word-forming derivatives arise through the transition from one linguistic sign – a source unit already present in the lexical fund, to another linguistic sign – a derivative unit that appears in the language as a new lexical unit to name a certain fragment of extra-linguistic reality through the associative connections between the corresponding dictum and the mechanism of word-forming motivation [1]. The most common method of morphological type of word formation in the Old Ukrainian literary language of the 14th–18th centuries was suffixation of bases, equally productive in the category of nouns, adjectives and verbs as in the modern Ukrainian literary language, this makes it possible to characterize the grammatical system of the Old Ukrainian literary language of the 14th–18th

centuries, in particular its word-forming subsystem, which serves as **the relevance** of the research.

Analysis of recent research and publications. In the field of the history of the Ukrainian word-form, in particular the suffixal one, it is worth noting the research of S. Bevzenko, L. Beregovenko, P. Bilousenka, A. Hryshchenko, L. Humetska, O. Krovtytska, K. Lenets, A. Maiboroda, N. Moskalyov, G. Nayenko, V. Nimchuk, L. Polyuga, N. Romanova, S. Samiyenko, P. Tymoshenko, V. Tokar and others, which deserve attention for their factuality, perfection, representativeness and relevance. M. Plyusch notes that the central task in the field of word formation is the study of the word formation system of the language from a synchronic point of view with a clear distinction between modern (living) and historical word formation [2, p. 86]. At the same time, for the scientific study of the language, diachronic word formation is no less important than synchronous word formation, since numerous word formation models of the modern language were formed in the past and went through a difficult path in their functioning, activating or losing their productivity. That is why the place of one or another word-forming model in the complex and branched word-forming system of the modern language can be determined based on the history of the language [2]. I. Vyhovanets emphasizes the need for a linguistic study of procedurality, dynamism of morphology throughout the historical development of the language, chronology and territorial limits of the distribution of suffixes and other morphological phenomena. Of particular importance is the researcher's need to study the inter-level relationships between the morphology of the Ukrainian language in its history and the phenomena of historical word formation [3, p. 67]. V. Rusanivskyi also emphasizes the use of the principles of the system of language and the procedurality of phenomena in the study of the history of a word-form, noting that the real linguistic meaning of all derivational phenomena can be clarified when approaching the word-formation from the position of knowing the mechanism of the system's activity, that is, considering the word-formation system in a dynamic aspect. In this way, a complex chain of cause-and-effect relationships between all components of the derivation process can be revealed, which leads to the natural appearance of the corresponding word [4, p. 75]. For the transformation of a motivating word into a motivated one, the character of the elementary derivational processes that flow between the creative morphemes in the word and the conditions of conjugation of word-forming units is of essential importance. The tendency to align creative bases and preserve the structure of motivating words [5, p. 136–147] are related, in our opinion,

to the phenomena of linguistic analogy. The most productive types of word formation in the ancient Ukrainian language, as well as in the modern one, were morphological, dominant in the category of nouns, adjectives and verbs [6]. A common method of morphological type of word formation was the suffixation of bases, equally common in the category of the above-mentioned parts of speech. The motivation of a derived word is its most essential property. It assumes the existence of the source of the name in the composition of the motivated word in the form of a creative base. The appearance of a new word through the word-forming act is determined, on the one hand, by the need to name a new reality, and on the other hand, by the functioning of the word-forming system of the language: the interaction of its word-forming resources, as well as the relationships that exist between the members of the system [7]. Thus, the derivative is included in the lexical fund of the language as a unit characterized by double conditioning: extralinguistic and intralinguistic factors [8]. H. Kocherha notes that "... establishing the direction of derivation is associated with a certain number of problems, the solution of which requires taking into account the diachronic factors of the Proto-Slavic and East Slavic word-formation, the regularities of the modern word-formation system of the Ukrainian literary language, the principles of its assimilation of foreign roots and lexemes, certain cognitive and onomasiological processes" [9, p. 11]. It is impossible to find out the peculiarities of a derived unit of language, to characterize the word-forming and motivational mechanisms without analyzing word-forming types, the dynamics of their development, morphological phenomena that accompany the corresponding derivational processes and motivational features of the onomasiological structures of distinct verbal units [10].

The purpose of the article – to find out the structural-word-forming and semantic-motivational features of the intra-nominal word-formation of suffixed nouns of the Old Ukrainian language of the 15th–18th centuries.

Presentation of the main research material. Nouns, the motivating word of which are nouns, are formed with the help of such suffixes: -еньє (-аньє), -аніє; ъє, -цств (о), -ств (о), -зств (о) (for the neuter gender), -никъ (-аникъ), -ц (а), -арь, -ецъ, -оръ, -ань, -огъ, -тель, -анинь, -ист (а), -окъ, -ей, -ай, -аль, -ань (to indicate the masculine gender), -ость, -иц (а), (ов) ниц (а, я), -ин (я), -к (а), -очк (а), -ух (а), б (а), -ин (а), -щин (а), -н (я), -ек (а), – (ш) изн (а), он (а), -анк (а), -от (а) – for the feminine gender nouns. In the proposed studio, we will analyze nouns according to the formal indicator - formants. The analysis was carried out according to the productivity of suffixes. For neuter nouns, the highest performance has the suffix -еньє (-аньє), -аніє. These suffixes are the most commonly used in the Old Ukrainian language and have a high activity of functioning. Their semantics is diverse: – objectified action: *обхоженъ* ← *обход* (11, p. 23); *обысканіє* ← *обыскъ* (11, p. 23); *порубанъ* ← *порубка* (11, p. 177); *примушанъ* ‘принуждение’ ← *примушь* (11, p. 227); – to denote the processes: *пуцанъ* ‘заговеньє’ (11, p. 260) ← *пуца*; – to denote parts of the building: *склепленъ* ‘an arch’ ← *склепъ* (11, p. 324). Quite active are formants -цств (о), -ств (о), -зств (о). They have an extensive system of values. In the Old Ukrainian language, they function with the following meanings: – to denote a collective: *опатство*, *опацтво* ‘an abbey’ ← *абат* (11, p. 45); *огурство* ← *огурца* ‘a stubborn, rude’ (11, p. 29); *офѣрництво* ‘a priesthood’ ← *офѣрникъ* ‘a priest’ (11, p. 75); *панство* ← *пан* (11, p. 83); *панецтво*, *панство*, *панецтво* ← *папа*

(11, p. 84); *патріарховство* ← *патріарх* (11, p. 88); *потомство* ← *потомокъ* (11, p. 192); *птаство* ‘birds’ ← *птахъ* (11, p. 256); *самовладство* ‘an autocracy, an independence’ ← *самовладца* (11, p. 307); – to indicate a way of life: *прибыштво* ‘a vagrancy’ (11, p. 217) ← *прибышиъ* ‘an alien, a vagabond’ (11, p. 217); – to indicate the totality of occupations, positions: *обозництво* ‘a convey post’ ← *обозный* (11, p. 15); *перекупництво* ‘repurchase, petty bargaining’ (11, p. 96) ← *перекупникъ* (11, p. 96); *обѣтованъ* ‘a promise’ ← *обѣтъ* (11, p. 25); – with an abstract meaning: *пророцтво* ← *пророк* (11, p. 249); – with generalized action semantics: *приступство* ‘an agreement’ ← *приступъ* ‘a beginning, an introduction’ (11, p. 236); *щекарство* ‘лай’ ← *щеканъ* ‘bark, barking’ (11, p. 506) etc. Suffix -иц (е) can be used: – to indicate the locative: *пасъчище* ‘the place where the beekeeper is’ (11, p. 87) ← *пасъка*; *просище* ‘the place where the millet grew’ ← *просо* (11, p. 249); – to indicate magnification, roughness: *путище* ‘a way’ (11, p. 259) ← *путь*: this meaning of the suffix has also been preserved in the modern language. Formants -иск (о), -елск (о) function: – in neuter nouns to designate natural phenomena, elements: *огниско* ‘a fire, a hearth’ ← *огонь* (11, p. 27); – on the designation of spatial concepts: *паствиско* ‘a pasture’ ← *пасовище* (11, p. 87); – to denote abstract concepts derived from the names of creatures: *приятелско* ‘a friendship, a companionship’ (11, p. 242) ← *приятель*; – with a rough meaning, the motivating word of the derivative is an abstract noun – non-being: *смѣховиско* ‘a laughing stock’ ← *смѣхъ* (11, p. 336). A suffix is used to denote objects -ив (о): *огниво* ‘a unit’ ← *огонь* (11, p. 27). The suffix functions in neuter nouns to indicate smallness, tenderness -к (о): *овчатко* ‘a little lamb’ ← *овця* (11, p. 26). The suffix -ерк (о) functioned in the neuter gender with the meaning of caressing, diminutiveness: *ядерко* ‘a little core’ ← *ядро* (11, p. 510).

To denote masculine nouns in the Old Ukrainian language the following suffixes were used: -никъ (-аникъ), -ц (а), -арь, -ецъ, -оръ, -ань, -огъ, -тель, -анинь, -ист (а), -окъ, -ей, -ай, -аль, -ань. Most of these formants denote the names of persons, some suffixes have the object meaning of a non-being. Let's analyze each of the suffixes by meaning: suffixes -никъ (-аникъ) actively functioned in the Old Ukrainian language and were used: – to designate persons by the locative feature: *огородникъ* ‘a peasant who had an estate with vegetable gardens, without shared land; a gardener’ ← *огородъ* (11, p. 29); *осадникъ* ‘a settler, a farmer’ ← *осада* ‘a settlement, an estate’ (11, p. 51); *пустеликъ* ‘hermit’ (11, p. 258) ← *пустыня*; *рольникъ* ‘an agriculturalist, a farmer, a plowman’ ← *роля* ‘an arable land, a cornfield, a field, a plow’ (11, p. 290); *повѣтникъ* ‘a county dweller, a landowner’ (11, p. 124) ← *повѣтъ* (an administrative-territorial unit); – for designation of persons by occupation, craft: *олѣйникъ* ‘selling or making butter’ ← *олѣекъ* ‘a fragrant oil’ (11, p. 42); *оружникъ* ‘a gunsmith, a squire, an armed’ ← *оружже* (11, p. 51); *папѣрникъ* ‘a paper manufacturer’ ← *папѣръ* ‘a paper’ (11, p. 84); – for naming the names of persons by physical characteristics: *слиникъ* ‘a strongman’ ← *сила* (11, p. 320); – on designation of persons by family relations: *южникъ* ‘a relative’ (11, p. 509) etc. In addition to the names of persons, this suffix is homonymous and can have the following semantics: – to designate specific objects – dishes: *окропникъ* ‘a vessel for boiling water, a kettle, a coffee pot’ ← *окропъ* (11, p. 39); – other objects: *повѣтряникъ* ‘a weather vane’ ← *повѣтре* (11, p. 124); *ручникъ* ‘a towel’ (11, p. 302); – plants: *ранникъ* ‘a medicinal plant, in the Ukrainian folk language this name is given to four plants’ (11, p. 267) ← *рана*.

Suffix -ц (а) is quite productive in the Old Ukrainian language. It was used to designate persons by various signs. It does not function in the modern language. In the researched source, this formant was used: – to designate persons by action and type of occupation: *оборонця* ‘a defender’ ← *оборона* (11, p. 17); *отпорця* ‘an adversary fighting back’ ← *отпорь* (11, p. 103); *перешкодця* ‘interfering, hindering’ ← *перешкода* (11, p. 103); *поступця* ‘a follower’ ← *поступь* ‘a progress, a production’ (11, p. 189); *приводця* ‘a leader, an instigator, a culprit’ (11, p. 219) ← *приводь* ‘a leadership, a guidance’ (11, p. 219); *потварця* ‘a slanderer, a defamer’ (11, p. 190) ← *потварь* ‘a slander’; *рядця* ‘a ruler, an organizer’ (11, p. 305) ← *рядь*; *отравця* ‘an executioner’ (11, p. 48), as for the motivating word, there are no common root lexemes in the dictionary through which it would be possible to find out the creative word. Therefore, we consider the motivation to be opaque, one in which the connection between the derivative and the creative word has been lost; – to designate persons in relation to the object: *справця* ‘a manager, a ruler; a doer, a perpetrator’ ← *справа* (11, p. 353); – to designate persons according to a qualitative feature: *похлѣбця* ‘a flatterer, a caresser’ ← *похлѣбство* ‘a flattery, a sweet talk’ (11, p. 199); – with the meaning of the name of persons determined by causation: *причинця* ‘a culprit’ ← *причина* (11, p. 240); *проступця* ‘a criminal’ (11, p. 251). To name persons the suffix -арь was widely used. It was used: – to designate persons by type of activity: *овчарь* ‘a shepherd’ ← *овчя* (11, p. 26); *пугатарь* ‘a plowman, a farmer’ (11, p. 111) ← *пуг*; *склярь* ‘a glazier’ (11, p. 325); – for the names of persons in relation to some process, phenomenon: *практикарь* ‘a fortune teller, an astrologer’ (11, p. 208) ← *практика*; – for the names of persons by the subject of the action: *пушкарь* ‘a gunner, a cannoneer’ (11, p. 259) ← *пушка*. Proto-Slavic suffix -тель is often used, but a small number of derivatives are created from nouns with this suffix. It was used to denote persons by action: *помститель* ‘an avenger’ (11, p. 165) ← *помста*; *потѣшитель* ‘a consoler’ (11, p. 197) ← *потѣха*. The main meaning of the suffix -анинь: – is the creation of the residents' names. In the studied material, it functions: – to designate persons by the locative sign: *подворчанинь* ‘a courtier’ ← *подварокъ* ‘a yard, a manor’ (11, p. 131); – on a territorial basis: *поднѣстрянинь* ‘a resident of the Dniester region’ (11, p. 136) ← *Поднестровье*; *подмѣщанинь* ‘a suburban’ (11, p. 211) ← *предместье*. Suffix -ист (а) is borrowed from the Latin language. It is used to designate persons by occupation: *органиста* ‘an organ player’ (11, p. 50) ← *органь*; the motivating word is the name of a musical instrument. Suffix -ей in the Old Ukrainian language realizes its infrequency. It functions with the meaning of abstractness: *привилей* ‘a privilege’ (11, p. 218) ← *привилле* ‘a freedom’ (11, p. 218). The suffix -ай is not actively used. The following meanings of it have been revealed: – to indicate the names of persons by action: *провожай* ← *проводник* (11, p. 245); *ратай* ‘a plowman’ (11, p. 267) ← *рать*; – to denote a set of persons: *рожай* ‘a clan; a gender’ (11, p. 276) ← *род*.

The following suffixes functioned to designate feminine nouns in the Old Ukrainian language: -ость, -иц (а), (ов) ниц (а, я), -ин (я), -к (а), -очк (а), -ух (а), б (а), -ин (а), -шин (а), -н (я), -ек (а), – (ш) изн (а), он (а), -анк (а), -от (а). Let's analyze the meaning of each of the specified suffixes.

Formant -ость shows the greatest productivity: – for denoting the locative: *околичность* ← *околиця* (11, p. 38); *оселость* ‘an estate’ (11, p. 52) ← *оселя* ‘an manor’; – with the semantics of the objectified action: *омыльность* ← *омылка* ‘an error’

(11, p. 43); – with the semantics of belonging to something, with the semantics of influence on the subject: *подданость* ‘an obedience, a submission’ (11, p. 132) ← *подданный* (11, p. 133). Suffix -иц (а) was used: – to indicate the locative: *свѣлица* ‘a lamp, a top’ ← *свѣло* ‘a light’ (11, p. 313); – to denote persons of the female gender: *положница* ‘a childbirth, a woman in labor’ (11, p. 160) ← *положенье*; – to indicate the female gender, formed from the masculine nouns: *пасѣрбица* ← *пасѣрбь* (11, p. 86); – to denote beings (animals) of the female gender: *самица* ← *самка* (11, p. 307); *ядровица*. Formant æ (ов) ниц (а, я) has the following semantics: – to indicate the locative: *оливница* ‘an olive grove’ ← *олива* (11, p. 41); *пивница* ‘a beer storage cellar’ ← *пиво* (11, p. 106); *полбожница* ‘a temple of demigods’ (11, p. 157) ← *полубог*; *садовница* ‘a garden’ (11, p. 306); *скарбница*, -ця ‘a treasury; a storage, a pantry; a sacristy’ ← *скарбь* (11, p. 322); – to indicate specific items: *письменница* ‘a grammar’ (46, p. 107) ← *письмо* ‘writing, a composition’ (11, p. 107); Suffix -ин (я) functioned to designate female persons formed from the masculine nouns: *пророкня* ‘a prophetess’ ← *пророкъ* (11, p. 249); today this suffix shows its productivity in connection with the activation of feminatives. A rather productive multi-meaning suffix in the Old Ukrainian language -зн (а) in the modern language, it loses its regularity and is used only to denote a few abstract concepts: the word for example has gone out of use: *роботизна* ‘a work, a side work, an obligatory work’ (11, p. 274). Some suffixed nouns of the Old Ukrainian language had parallel suffixes that had the same meaning: *родителка* – *родительница* (11, p. 275). Suffixes functioned in parallel to denote persons by action -ач і -ц (а): *розливач* і *розливца* ‘shedding blood’ (11, p. 281). Phonetically modified are suffixes не- and нье. Suffixes of the Old Ukrainian language were a means of distinguishing the gender category (this method and means is preserved in the modern Ukrainian language as well): *розвязок* (masc.) – *развязка* (fem.) – ок/к. Such nouns also differ in gender category: *свѣчарка* ‘a woman making or selling candles’ (11, p. 314) ← *свѣчарь* (11, p. 314); the means of such a distinction is a suffix to denote persons of the female gender -к and masculine gender -арь; the suffix is a means of distinguishing gender in such nouns as *селянинь* – *селянка* (11, p. 317). Suffix -ець with the meaning of the masculine gender is opposed to -ниц (а) to indicate the female gender: *сестринець* ‘a nephew, a sister's son’ – *сестриница*, *сестрична* ‘a niece, a sister's daughter’ (11, p. 319). Some suffixes of the Old Ukrainian language caused a change in the gender category. Thus, the word *сливникь* ‘a liqueur on plums’ (11, p. 330) in the old Ukrainian language belonged to the masculine gender, in the modern language it functions as a lexeme *слив'янка*, which has a feminine gender: the means of expressing gender category in these words are suffixes: -нак/янк (а). Some suffixes function as homonyms: for example, the suffix -ок can have a diminutive meaning and denote a specific subject that does not have such semantics: *рубѣнокъ* ‘ум. от рубѣнь – рубин’ (11, p. 299).

Conclusions and perspectives of the study. So, some suffixes were productive in the Old Ukrainian language and did not lose their word-forming function in the modern language, while others, actively used, do not function in the modern language or get along with phonetic modifications. The following suffixes are the most productive for masculine nouns: -никь, -арь, -ц (а), -ець, -анинь to designate persons by profession, occupation, various signs, actions, relationships. The suffix -окъ functioned actively with the objective

meaning. Such formants for marking the masculine gender turned out to be unproductive and irregular: -огъ, -ист, -ик, -ань, -ей, -ай, -ань. For feminine nouns, the following suffix formants are actively used: -ость with a dominant locative and abstract meaning, -иц (а) to designate persons by action, formed from masculine nouns by the same sign; -ниц (я), -от (а), -ин (а), (ш) ин (а), - (ш) изн (а). The last two suffixes in the Old Ukrainian language were productive, because they were actively used lexemes that became motivational for derivatives, in particular, these were words used to designate various taxes and fees. Since today such lexemes have gone out of active use and have become historicisms, the productivity of suffixes -щин (а) and -щизн (а) was lost. Non-productive suffixes include the following: б, -он (а), -н (я), -ек (а). Actively used suffixes for neuter nouns are: -цत्व(о) та цत्व(о), -зत्व(о), -ств(о), which have a dominant meaning of collectivity, totality. These suffixes have the same meaning in the modern Ukrainian language. The only difference is that some lexemes have gone out of use, therefore they have become rare, although these suffixes have not lost their word-forming function. Other suffixes active in the researched period, such as: -анье, -енье, -ье – today are out of use. The perspective of further scientific research can be seen in the analysis of verbal nouns of the Old Ukrainian language of the 14th–18th centuries, which serves as a perspective for scientific studies.

Література:

1. Васильченко В. М. Мотивація та її типи. *Наукові записки: збірник наукових статей Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова*, 1998. Вип. 1. С. 184–189.
2. Плющ М. Я. Граматика української мови : у 2 ч. Ч. 1. Київ, 2005. 286 с.
3. Вихованець І. Р. Частина мови в семантико-граматичному аспекті. Київ, 1988. 156 с.
4. Русанівський В. М. Структура українського дієслова. Київ, 1971. С. 90.
5. Стишов О. Сучасне українське словотворення: основні тенденції розвитку. *Мовознавчий вісник / за ред. Г. І. Мартинової*. Вип. 8. Черкаси, 2009. С. 136–147.
6. Бісовецька Л. А. Відіменний суфіксальний словотвір дієслів у мові писемних пам'яток Київської Русі XI–XIII ст.: монографія. Київ: Інститут мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні НАН України, 1999. 212 с.
7. Горпинич В. О. Українська словотвірна дериватологія. Дніпропетровськ, 1998. 189 с.
8. Карпенко Ю. О. Синхронічна сутність лексико-семантичного способу словотвору. *Мовознавство*, 1992. № 6. С. 3–10.
9. Кочерга Г. В. Мотивація відіменникових дієслів у сучасній українській мові (когнітивно-ономасіологічний аспект): дис... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.01. Одеса, 2003. 200 с.
10. Васильченко В. М. Мотивація і словотвірне вираження відносних прикметників в історії української мови (відіменникові деривати): автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01. Київ, 2000. 20 с.
11. Тимченко С. Матеріали до Словника писемної та книжної української мови XV – XVIII ст. : у 2 кн. / упор. В. В. Німчук, Г. І. Лиса. НАН України, Українська Вільна Академія Наук у США. Київ–Нью-Йорк, 2002–2003. Кн. 1–2.

Кочерга Г. Внутрішньоіменниковий словотвір суфіксальних іменників староукраїнської мови XV–XVIII ст.: структурно-словотвірний аспект

Анотація. У статті з'ясовано, що іменники староукраїнської мови XV–XVIII ст. мають розгалужену систему словотвору, зокрема вони характеризуються великою різноманітністю словотворчих формантів, як і іменники сучасної української мови. Вочевидно, що окремі афікси (зокрема суфікси) староукраїнської мови перейшли в спадок сучасній мові, окремі є раритетними та вийшли з ужитку, ще інші – набули в сучасній мові певних фонетичних змін. Окремі із суфіксів в сучасній мові мають інше словотвірне значення. Проаналізовано внутрішньоіменниковий словотвір за частиномовною належністю твірного слова та схарактеризовано семантику суфіксів, їхню продуктивність, частотність і регулярність уживання. Проведений аналіз внутрішньоіменникового словотвору суфіксальних іменників книжної та писемної мови XV–XVIII ст. дає підстави говорити про їхнє широке функціонування в книжних стилях, а отже, засвідчує їхню високу уживаність у писемних пам'ятках вище зазначеного періоду. Чисельна кількість цих лексем успадкована сучасною українською літературною мовою, окремі є застарілими у зв'язку зі зникненням понять, які вони позначали.

З'ясовано, що серед суфіксальних іменників найбільшу групу складають іменники на позначення осіб за дією, родом занять, за релігійними переконаннями, за стосунком до різних суспільних процесів; великою в кількісному вимірі є група іменників середнього роду на позначення опредмеченої дії; значну за обсягом групу похідних іменників становлять іменники жіночого роду з абстрактним значенням. Усі зазначені групи слів належать до різних словотвірних типів, оскільки сформовані різними словотвірними формантами.

Ключові слова: староукраїнська мова, словотвірні форманти, внутрішньоіменниковий словотвір, структурно-словотвірний аспект, семантика.