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The present study has delved into the different ways the Greek prefix συν- has been translated in the Church Slavonic language. Our research was conducted on the available Church Slavonic translations of four Byzantine hymns (the Akathistos Hymn, the Great Canon of Repentance by St. Andrew of Crete, the Alphabetical Shichera from the Great Canon service and the Antiphons of the Great and Holy Friday) examined in the South and East Slavonic manuscripts of the 11th — 15th century. The textological study of the Slavonic translation revealed the existence of eight versions of the texts caused by several successive corrections of the Slavonic text in accordance with the Greek original. Based on these results, the linguistic textological method was applied in order to reveal the main differences between said versions in regard to the conveyance of the words with the prefix συν-.

We examined a total of 46 words in 58 contexts and separated them in four categories depending on their grammatical characteristics. The comparative analysis of the structures corresponding to the συν- prefix in the Slavonic translation revealed eight different ways in which the semantics of this prefix could be conveyed in the target language. The results of our research showcased the different role the calque word formation in accordance with the Greek pattern played in the Slavonic noun and verb derivation. The relatively small amount of calque verbs with the prefix съ-, which is the Church Slavonic equivalent of the Greek συν-, is a result of the weak aspect formation potential of this prefix in comitative semantics.

Therefore, the linguistic textological method helps us arrive at conclusions that are of interest to the fields of translation theory, history of the Church Slavonic language, Greek — Slavonic language communication, and comparative linguistics.
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Introduction

Verb and noun prefix derivation had a significant role in the evolution of all Indo-European languages. According to the data provided by comparative historical linguistics, the preconditions for this process had already been established in the Proto-Indo-European language through the formation of a special category of immutable relational adverbs and their later transition into the verb’s preposition (Gamkrelidze, 1984: 355–358). The agglutinative nature of these relational elements and their semantic and structural autonomy was not only preserved in the Proto-Indo-European language, but also persisted after its diversification (Tabachenko, 2011: 19–22); i. e. when each of the new derivative languages created its own derivation system, which developed according to the logic of that language in connection to its other morphological, lexical, and syntactic components, patterns, and regularities. In Russian as well as in the other Slavonic languages, such regularities were the core for the formation of the grammatical category of the verb aspect, accompanied by the development of perfective semantics in those specific types of verbs. The other tendencies included the gradual expansion of prepositions and the replacement of non-prepositional types of nouns by prepositional ones (Maslova, 1972; Tabachenko, 2011: 4).

Despite the relatively independent evolution of derivation in each of the Indo-European languages, their mutual influence in language history along with the process of cultural and linguistic intercommunication is also reported. A typical example of this phenomenon is the Byzantine-Slavic cultural communication, clearly expressed in the creation of the Church Slavonic language with the specific purpose of transferring the Greek cultural and linguistic heritage to the Slavs. In practice, this process was carried out through the translation and subsequent correction of the most important texts of the Byzantine Christian culture and their later adaptation to the environment of the target language. Among these texts hymnography was of a special importance, forming a significant part of the textual associates of the medieval man and regulating the usage in the sphere of religious literacy. In addition, the sacred
nature of these texts forced Slavic scribes to be especially careful to deliver an exact translation not only in terms of semantics, but also preserving the form of the Greek hymn. Consequently, the hymnographic texts, successively corrected in accordance with the Greek original, provide rich material for studies on linguistic history, not only concerning the peculiarities of the Greek-Slavonic language interaction, but also providing information on linguistic phenomena of Slavonic origin in their comparison with the Greek language. However, the available hymnographic material has not been sufficiently used for linguistic textological, comparative and historical linguistic analysis so far.

**Statement of the problem**

The present research constitutes an attempt to analyze comparatively the derivational processes in the Greek and the Church Slavonic language from a historical perspective, based on the Slavonic translations of four Byzantine texts of the Triodion cycle: the Akathistos Hymn; the Great Canon of Repentance by St. Andrew of Crete; the Alphabetical Shichera from the Great Canon service; and the Antiphons of the Great and Holy Friday. More specifically, we examine the ways the Greek verb and noun derivatives with the prefix σύν- were translated in the South and East Slavic versions (9th-14th century) of the Church Slavonic translations of the hymns noted above.

**Materials and methods**

This research was conducted on the Greek academic and church editions (Migne, 1860; Triodion, 1867; Trypanis, 1968) as well as the Church Slavonic manuscripts of the 11th-15th century (Triodia; Pentecostaria; Kondakaria; and Sticheraria), which contain the abovementioned texts. Additionally, in certain cases, later Slavonic manuscripts and editions were examined for comparison purposes. The analysis of the material in the Church Slavonic language was based on the results of the previously carried out textological study of the abovementioned translated hymns (Borisova, 2016; Borisova, 2018), which helped distinguish the main versions (reductions) of said translations in the Church Slavonic tradition. In more detail, the following versions were examined in this study:

1. The early South Slavonic version (end of 9th — beginning of 10th century), which reflects the first Slavonic Glagolitic translation (Borisova, 2016: 39–42). Only several fragments of one manuscript (Triodion (Bitolski) Bulgarian, 12th century, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Archive (BAN), Sofia, code 38) have been saved with the small
fragments of the Great Canon and the Akathistos being preserved, as well as the larger part of the Stichera — hereinafter referred to as Bitol.

2. The early South Slavonic version (end of 9th — beginning of 10th century), which reflects the first Slavonic Cyrillic translations (Borisova, 2016: 23–35). The texts under investigation in one manuscript (Triodion and Pentecostarion, first half of the 13th cent., Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), code F.n.I. 68) were saved in its entirety, along with fragments of the other three manuscripts — hereinafter referred to as Version A.

3. A version of unknown origin (probably also part of the early traditions). Only odes 2–9 of the Great Canon were saved in the compilation of the Zagrebski Triodion (Borisova, 2016: 104–108) (Triodion and Pentecostarion (Zagrebski), 13th cent., Zagreb Archive, Skopje, code IV d 107) — hereinafter referred to as Zagreb.

4. The version corresponding to the first stage of the Preslav correction (Borisova, 2018), which was preserved in a relatively large number of East Slavonic manuscripts (Triodion, notched, 11th-12th century, State Historical Museum (GIM) (Moscow), Sinodalni collection, code 319 and Pentecostarion, notched, end of 12th cent., State Historical Museum (GIM) (Moscow), Voskresenski collection, code 27) — hereinafter referred to as Version B.

5. The version created during the second stage of the Preslav correction (Borisova, 2016: 42–50), preserved in South Slavonic manuscripts (studied by Triodion and Pentecostarion, end of the 13th cent., State Historical Museum (GIM) (Moscow), Khludov collection, code 133) — hereinafter referred to as Version C.

6. The version created as a result of a systematic liturgical book correction carried out on Mount Athos at the end of the 13th century (Borisova, 2016: 61–69) (studied by Triodion, 14th century, manuscript collection of Saint Catherine’s Monastery (Sinai), code Slavonic 23 and Pentecostarion, 1359, manuscript collection of Saint Catherine’s Monastery (Sinai), code Slavonic 24) — hereinafter referred to as Version D.

7. A version which also probably had the Mount Athos origin (Borisova, 2016: 169–198), but which, contrary to the previous one, was preserved in only one Bulgarian manuscript (Triodion, 15th century, Russian National Library (Saint-Petersburg), code F.n.I. 55) — hereinafter referred to as Version E.

8. The version that circulated in the East Slavonic territories at the end of 14th-15th century, preserved in a large number of Triodia manuscripts (studied by Triodion, end of 14th century, manuscript collection of the Holy Trinity-St. Sergios Lavra, code 304.I. 25) — hereinafter referred to as Version F.
We do not provide the letter indication for the Bitol. and Zagreb. versions not only because these versions were saved in only one manuscript, but also because they had no influence over later traditions. Opposite to the other versions which form the historic sequence of the evolution of the text, Bitol. and Zagreb. remain as “dead ends” in the Church Slavonic tradition.

It should also be noted that the aforementioned versions could not be found in all the hymns under research, due to the fact that each one of them has its own history in the Church Slavonic manuscript tradition. More specifically, Version D did not contain the Alphabetical Shichera from the Great Canon service with the incipit Ἅπας ὁ βίος — всє жити. Instead of this, another text with the incipit ἀνω τὸ ὄμμα — горэ очима мыслисєма (Borisova, 2016: 137) was used. We therefore lack information regarding this version of the hymn. On the other hand, the Versions E and F, which appeared after the corrections of the Triodion, had not affected the Pentecostarion text, including the Antiphons (Borisova, 2018). In addition, some versions didn’t contain specific contexts, either due to the omission of the corresponding troparia and verses, or due to the lexical differences of the Greek original used as a source for the translation. In terms of the Zagreb., Bitol., and E versions preserved in only one manuscript, the discovery of some contexts was rendered impossible due to the lacunae in the manuscript.

The study of the language material was carried out as per the linguistic textological method (Panin, 1995) as well as the comparative method for analysis of certain phenomena in various languages.

**Theoretical framework**

The subject of the present research was the Greek prefix συν-, which, depending on the sound following it, could take any of the following forms: συμ-/συγ-/συλ-/συρ-/συσ-/συ-. This prefix originated from the adverb συν (together), which could also be used as an independent word or preposition agreeing with the Dative case and having a similar meaning. The prefix with comitative semantics (common action with more than one subjects or objects) was a productive morpheme of verb and noun derivation in the Greek language (Stamatakos, 1972: 940–941). In its comitative meaning it corresponds to the Slavonic prefix съ-, originating from the Proto-Slavic *sъ/ *stъn/ *sъ (Vasmer, 1987: 539) probably sharing no common origin with the Greek one (according to Max Vasmer, this Slavonic prefix etymologically corresponds to the Greek adverb ὁμοῦ (Vasmer, 1987: 540)). It should be highlighted that the Slavonic language has another homonymous съ- prefix, which has a spatial meaning of removal or descent (Maslova,

Results and Discussion

In the texts under research, we discovered a total of 46 words with said prefix in 58 different contexts, including 28 verbs (and participles), 11 nouns, 5 adjectives, and 2 adverbs. It should also be noted that in 8 words the prefix συν- is used together with another prefix on the first (e. g. συνάναρχος) or second (e. g. ἀσύγχυτος) position.

When discussing the contexts examined below, we used the following indication system with the relative numbers in brackets:

- Akathistos Hymn — hereinafter referred to as Ak (number of oikos in the Greek tradition from 1 to 24);
- Great Canon of Repentance by St. Andrew of Crete — hereinafter referred to as GC (ode number: number of heirmos (only for odes 2 and 3 with two heirmos): troparion number (excluding heirmos), T — the Holy Trinity troparion, Th — Theotokion);
- Alphabetical Shichera from the Great Canon service — hereinafter referred to as AS (sticheron number);
- Antiphons of the Great and Holy Friday — hereinafter referred to as An (antiphone number: troparion number (Th – Theotokion)).

The results of our investigation are presented in four following categories, the lexical meaning interpretations are provided according to the Ancient and Byzantine Greek dictionary sources (Lampe, 1961; Stamatakis, 1972):

1. Nouns, adjectives and adverbs with the prefix συν- with its comitative meaning:
   1.2. συγγονος (born together) GC (5:4): βατζ (Versions B, C) — σφραδσκοτζ (Versions D, F) see also: ύπο των συγγόνων — ῃ ῥοζδενις εκεγο ῃ βρατία (Zagreb.).
   1.3. συμβουλή (advice, counsel) GC (2:1:8): σεβετζ (Versions A — F).
   1.4. συμφώνως (with one voice, in accord) An (10: Th): ςελλαζζο (Version C).
   1.5. συνάναρχος (also without beginning, likewise without source or origin) GC (8: T): σεζημαζηζοζ (Version A) — ῃβεζημαζηζοζ (Zagreb.) — σεβεζημαζηζοζ (Versions B — F).

1.7. συνείδησις (consciousness, conscience) GC (1:7): съвестъ (Versions B — F); GC (4:4): съвестъ (Versions A — F); Ak (21): съвестъ (Versions A — F).

1.8. συνθρόνος (sharing a throne, reigning together with) GC (4: T): състольнъ (Versions A, B) — съпрестольнъ (Zagreb., Versions C, D, F).


The translation of the words in this category was mainly accomplished thanks to the calque (loan-translation) with the use of the corresponding Slavonic prefix съ. Only in one case (1.1) was the comitative semantics of the prefix συν- not conveyed in the translation (an attempt to achieve this in Version E was unsuccessful due to the unclear etymological form of the word съвъпросителъ). It is worth mentioning that the early loose translation σύγγονος (born together) — брата (brother) (which was, however, correct in the certain context referring to the Moses brothers) was later replaced with the calque from Greek. In Zagreb. the expositive translation was achieved combining the conveyance of both meaning and etymology (form): the brother of the birth. It should also be stressed that in the early (up to the 10th century) versions, translators and scribes seemed to have faced difficulties when combining two prefixes within one word (1.5.; 1.8.).

2. Verbs denoting human emotions with the prefix συν- (comitative semantics), and their derivatives:


2.2. συγχώρησις (agreement, forgiveness) Ak (13): прощение (Versions A — F).

2.3. συγχωρέω (accept, forgive) GC (1:19): оцести — простити (Versions B — F).

2.4. συμπαθέω (be sympathetically affected) An (4:1): милосърди (Versions A — D).

2.5. συμπαθῶς (sympathetically, in sympathy) GC (1:12): милостъ (Version A) — милостивъ (Versions B — F).

2.6. συνίημι (perceive, understand) An (3: 1–7): рачуемъ (Versions A — D); An (7:2): рачуемъ (Versions A — D); An (11:1): рачуемъ (Versions A — D).

Contrary to the previous group, the translation that conveys the meaning (and not the form) of the word is obviously preferred here to the morpheme calque, especially for the words where the prefix was already nonsemantic.
3. Intransitive stative or motion verbs with the prefix συν- (comitative or common location semantics), and their derivatives (middle-passive verbs were examined separately only if they changed their meaning in the middle-passive voice and if they are analyzed separately in the dictionaries):

3.1. συγκατάβασις (descent, association with) GC (9:6): съмърение (Versions A, B) — пришествие (Zagreb.) — съхождение (Versions C, E) — величества (Version D) — поществе (Version F), see also сънизъхождение (modern Church Slavonic version); Ak (15): съсъщие (Version A) — съхождение (Versions B — F), see also сънизъхождение (modern Church Slavonic version); An (11:1):


3.2. συγκατακαίομαι (burn together) GC (2:2:9) (συγκατακαίομαι):

3.2.1. συγκατακαίομαι (burn together) GC (2:2:9) (συγκατακαίομαι):


3.3. συγκατακαίομαι (be crucified together) GC (9:22) (συνεκρέμαντο):

3.3.1. συγκατακαίομαι (be crucified together) GC (9:22) (συνεκρέμανтo):


3.5. συγκατακαίομαι (be crucified together) GC (9:22) (συνεκρέμανтo):

3.5.1. συγκατακαίομαι (be crucified together) GC (9:22) (συνεκрέμαнтo):

3.6. συγκατακαίομαι (be crucified together) GC (9:22) (συνεκрέμαнтo):

3.7. συγκατακαίομαι (be crucified together) GC (9:22) (συνεκрέμαнтo):

3.8. συγκατακαίομαι (be crucified together) GC (9:22) (συνεκрέμαнтo):

See e. g.:

ἐν μέσῳ δὲ τῶν συμφωνούντων, αὐτὸς εἰστήκεις αὐτὸς συμφώνων: σφίζε ζητέοντας ιματαίοις καυματισθείς πάντων καταπέτασθαι.
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3.10. συνάγομαι (come together) An (1:1): συναγάλλομαι συναγάλλεται τῇ γῇ: р ад¹и съ съ рад¹и съ (Versions Α—F), see e. g.: χαῖρε, ὅτι τὰ οὐράνια συναγάλλεται τῇ γῇ.

3.11. συνδιάγω (go through together) Ak (16): συνδιάγωσθεν συνδιαγωσθεδυν συнδиаговъ тῇ γῇ: συνδιάγω (Versions Α—C) — συνдιάγω (Version D) — συνδιάγω (Version F), see e. g.: ἡμῖν μὲν συνδιάγοντα:

3.12. συνεκτείνομαι (extend together or along with) Ak (20): распростьрети (Versions B, D, F) — распростьрети (Version C) — распростьрети (Version E), see e. g.: συνεκτείνεσθαι σπεύδων, τῷ πλήθει τῶν πολλῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σοῦ: распростьрети (Versions B, D, F) — распростьрети (Version C) — распростьрети (Version E), see e. g.: συνεκτείνεσθαι σπεύδων, τῷ πλήθει τῶν πολλῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σοῦ.

3.13. συνέρχομαι (come together, assemble) GC (7:9): повинжати (Bitol.), присътата (Zagreb.), повинжати съ (Versions A, B, F), приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити sъ (Zagreb.) — повинжати съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити sъ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити sъ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити съ (Version C), послучавати (Version D), сънити (Version E), see e. g.: сънити съ, приложити sъ (modern Church Slavonic version).


3.15. συσκοτίζω (darken) GC (9:23): ωμράματι съ (Versions A, B) — пълврхкннти (Versions D, F).
Most words in this group have various translations in different Slavonic versions as evidence of the difficulties Slavic translators faced when attempting to find an exact Slavonic equivalent. Calquing is used in different stages of the texts’ history (see e. g. συμπνίγομαι — съдравити (Versions A, B), συγχορεύω — съликъствовати (Versions A, E, F), συνέρχομαι — съниити (Version E), συγκατάβασις — сънизъхождение (modern Church Slavonic version)), but not as a main method of semantics conveyance. A more detailed analysis of the words in this group will be provided below, along with the next and final group.

4. Transitive stative or motion verbs with the prefix συν- with the meaning “perform an action over several objects together”, and their derivatives:


4.3. συγκαλύπτω (cover together) GC (6:2): покрыти (Versions A, B, D, F, Zagreb.) — покрыти (Version C).

4.4. συγκαταδικάζω (condemn with) GC (4:24): възди (Versions A — E, Zagreb.), see e. g. μὴ τῷ Φαρισαίῳ συγκαταδικάσῃς με: не съ фарисеевъ възди мс (Zagreb.) — не съ фарисеевъ възди мс (Version D).


4.6. συλλαμβάνω (take together, arrest, conceive, become pregnant) An (5: Th) (συλλαβοῦσα): γαματи (γαμνьше) (Versions A — D); Ak (19) (συλληφθέντας): възди (Version A) — възди (Versions D — F); An (7:1) (сълнатьсй): имати (имьшимь / эмшыи) (Versions A — D).

4.7. σύλληψις (taking together, arrest, conception) Ak (2; 4; 6): γαματи (Versions A — F).


4.9. συμφύσω (mix, confuse) GC (5:14): съмевити (Version A) — съмовити (Versions B, C) — съмовити (Version G) — съмевити (Version F), see e. g.
Once again, as was the case in the previous group, one can observe plenty of variants for most words in the versions under research. Calquing is not an often appearing phenomenon as it was generally used in relatively later versions (see e. g. συναριθμέω — съ числити and συσσείω сътръсиви in the modern Church Slavonic version, συγχέω — съльти (version E), συγγράφω — съписати (Version D)). It can be easily observed, however, that Slavic translators attempted to transmit — when that was possible — not only the lexical but also the etymological meaning of the word. For example, they chose the variant напасть to express the Greek συμφορά, conveying in this way, if not the meaning of the prefix, at least the sense of “motion” of the root.
напасть is the derivative of падать — *fall*, while συμφορά of the Greek φέρω (*bring*).

To sum up the results of the comparison between the Greek and the Slavonic variants, one can easily realize that there was a variety of ways to convey the meaning of the words with the Greek prefix συν-, including:

1. calquing (loan translation) — copying the structure of the Greek word (typical examples were mentioned above);
2. use of Slavonic semantic equivalents with no regard for maintaining the structure and without including the prefix at all, or with another prefix (see e.g. συλλαμβάνω — *схвати*, συγκαλύπτω — *покрыти*; сунέχω — *тишти*, συγκύπτω — *неночкъ*; / гръбати е);
3. use of another prefix (not съ-) corresponding more or less to the meaning of the Greek συν- in these words (and their contexts) with the most common “equivalents” being σ — for stative verbs and при- for verbs of motion (see e.g. συνέχω — съдрогати/съдръжати/събърят; συμφόρα — пръчкяти, συμβърва — прървяти, συνάγομαι — събратис; συνάριθμεω — съчетати, συνέρχομαι — присътчати; / пръстове);
4. use of a separate word (adverb) that corresponds semantically to the meaning of the Greek prefix and is used either without (*συγκύπτουσα — не съфарисе* или) or in combination with the съ- prefix, doubling its meaning (συγκύπτουσа — *нигдешъ* сънятьма; съвърхват — събрата възви);
5. use of the preposition+case construction for dependent nouns instead of the Greek constructions without prepositions (Tabachenko, 2011: 283–300). The meaning of the Greek prefix is conveyed by the Slavonic preposition съ with the Instrumental case of the noun. As was the case in the previous paragraph, these constructions can be used without or in combination with the съ- prefix, doubling its meaning (συγκύпτουσα — *нигдешъ* сънятьма; съвърхват — събрата възви);
6. in some cases, in order to convey the meaning of the Greek prefix, the translator uses a semantically non-corresponding root (see e.g. συνέχω — съдрогати / съмърт; съвървати; съвървать — съмъртян; съвърхват — съмъртен).
convey the meaning of the Greek root at all and conveys only the prefix (see e. g. συγγράφω — съвокупи; συνάπτω — съвъзкипятъ);

7. instead of both Greek prefixes συν- and κατα- (see συγκατάβασις — сънизъхождение), only one prefix съ- is used for the translation of some double-prefix verbs and their derivatives. The existence of homonymous Slavonic prefixes makes it difficult to understand which one of the two prefixes was conveyed; in the Slavonic translation, these prefixes were divided only after Nikon’s correction when the calque сънизъхождение was created;

8. lastly, there is a large enough number of verbs, the semantics of prefix of which are not conveyed at all (see e. g. συλλαμβάνω — и м а т и; συμπνίγομαι — фыдэентъ ә; συγκρέμαμαι — бивети).

Conclusion

Summarizing the results of our research, one can easily see that the linguistic textological analysis of the Church Slavonic equivalents for the words with the Greek prefix συν- helped us arrive at conclusions significant for the fields of translation theory, history of the Church Slavonic language, Greek — Slavonic language communication, and comparative linguistics.

More specifically, we examined the various translation techniques employed to convey the meaning of the words with the abovementioned Greek prefix, especially in cases when the Church Slavonic language did not have an exact equivalent for the Greek word. It seems that the creators of the early Slavonic versions (up to Version D) preferred finding a “loose” Slavonic correspondence, while in the later versions, they tended to come up with an exact equivalent according to the calque word formation.

As far as the history of the Church Slavonic language is concerned, based on the results of our research, it is possible to date some basic processes of the development of the Slavonic languages, e. g. the so-called “preposition expansion” (Tabachenko, 2011: 283–300). Our data showed that this phenomenon can be chronically placed in the mid-10th century, with the preposition constructions appearing in place of the Greek and Early Slavonic non-preposition ones starting from Version C (see examples 3.5; 3.12; 4.11). The return to the non-preposition constructions in Nikon’s version and in the modern Church Slavonic language occurred due to the rift between the Russian and Church Slavonic languages and the conscious orientation of the latter towards the Greek model (see examples 3.9; 3.12).
The translation of the words with the prefix συν- from Greek could be seen as an example of successful language communication and interaction, since it contributed to the creation of new calque derivatives — both nouns and verbs, — many of which, such as совет, совесть, согласно, снисхождение, have enriched the vocabulary of the Church Slavonic and Russian language.

It has become obvious from the results of this research that the calquing process was more successful and long-standing in the noun formation process in comparison with verb formation. The reasons for this dissimilarity could be discovered through a comparative analysis of prefix derivation in both languages. While the Greek language continues to use prefixes as a means of creation of new words by conveying various meanings — including the comitative one — and using the same prefixes for both noun and verb derivation, in the Russian language, the processes of noun and verb derivation follow different paths. Contrary to the noun prefix derivation process, which creates new words, in the case of verb derivation, the prefixes, combined with lexical semantics, express a grammatical meaning; the meaning of the new rapidly forming grammatical category of verb aspects. The usage of verb prefixes as a main method for the formation of perfective aspects led to the “re-structuring” of the verb prefix system of the Church Slavonic language, with the emphasis being placed on the prefixes that denote perfective meaning in the form of either a temporal or a spatial limit. The comitative prefix съ-, which could not denote a temporal or spatial limit and therefore had extremely weak potential for aspect formation (Panova, 2014) was moved to the periphery of the verb-prefix system. Language found other ways to convey comitative semantics, namely the prepositional noun constructions. This is why, contrary to the noun calques, verb calques with this specific prefix have generally not managed to enjoy widespread usage in the Church Slavonic and Russian language or changed their meaning. This happened due to the fact that, in contrast to the comitative prefix, the homonymous spatial prefix съ-, which could be used in the formation of perfective aspect, became more productive (Panova, 2014). Therefore, in several verbs created as calques, the comitative prefix съ- was later re-interpreted in the system of the Russian language as a spatial or completely non-semantic perfective prefix (see examples 3.1, 3.2, 3.10, 3.12, 3.13, 3.14, 4.2, 4.9, 4.13, 4.14).

Another tendency that characterized the evolution of the Russian verb system was the predominance of motion over stative verbs as a result of the inability of the stative verbs to form perfective derivatives, due to their imperfective semantics. In this framework, comitative semantics were reviewed within the spatial categories to
mean “drawing together”, “coming closer”, “approaching one another” (see examples 3.4, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 3.13, 4.11), which could now be expressed with the prefix при- along with the prefix съ- (see e. g. the translation ἡμῖν μὲν συνδιάγοντα — съчетающе съ нами / къ намъ приближающа). This was probably due to the interference of the homonymous Slavonic prefix съ- as well as the influence of the Greek language confronting the logic of the Russian language that the new perfective spatial semantics of the prefix съ- as “moving from many positions into another single position” (Russkaia grammatika, 1980: 387; Panova, 2014) has appeared (see e. g. συνάγομαι — събратис).

For a more complete picture of the role of the Greek-Slavonic language interaction in regard to the evolution of the prefix derivation system of the Church Slavonic and Russian languages, further research should be conducted on other translations of Greek prefixes in the early Church Slavonic tradition.
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В работе рассмотрены способы перевода греческого комитативного префикса συν- на церковнославянский язык на материале ранних церковнославянских переводов четырех греческих гимнографических текстов (Акафиста Богоматери, Великого покаянного канона Андрея Критского, Алфавитных стихир из последования Великого канона и Антифонов Великой Пятницы). Для исследования привлекались научные и церковные издания греческого оригинала гимна в сопоставлении с южнославянскими и восточнославянскими рукописями XI–XV веков. На основании текстологического анализа данных рукописных источников было выделено восемь последовательных редакций исследуемых
произведений, появившихся в результате справ славянского текста по греческому оригиналу. Лингвотекстологическое исследование данных редакций выявило различия между ними в способах перевода греческих слов с приставкой συν- и их контекстов. Всего в рассмотренных текстах было обнаружено 46 лексем с данным префиксом в 58 контекстах, разделенных на основании грамматических и семантических признаков на четыре категории. В целом было выявлено восемь различных способов передачи семантики греческого префикса, используемых славянскими переводчиками и редакторами, в числе которых было и словообразовательное калькирование с использованием префикса съ-, славянского эквивалента греческому συν-. Результаты исследования показали, что калькирование греческих префиксальных структур в разной степени использовалось в глагольной и именной славянской деривации. Наибольшее число закрепившихся в языке казек относятся к именному словообразованию, в то время как славянский глагол имел ограниченные возможности для префиксального выражения комитативной семантики, обладавшей чрезвычайно низким аспектным потенциалом. Это приводит к перенесению комитативной семантики с префикса на предложнопадежные конструкции, к переосмыслению префикса на основе пространственных категорий либо его десемантизации.

Ключевые слова: лингвотекстологический метод, историческое словообразование, префиксальная деривация, гимнография, церковнославянские переводы, приставка συн-.
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