https://doi.org/10.59076/2603-2899.2026.3.06

Tatiana Borisova (Athens, Greece)

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CHURCH SLAVONIC EQUIVALENTS OF GREEK DERIVATIVES WITH THE PREVERB *KATA-* IN SELECTED TRANSLATED HYMNOGRAPHIC TEXTS

Prefixation is a significant phenomenon not only from the grammatical and comparative-historical perspective, but also with regard to the linguistic representation of the world. Each Indo-European language formed its own system of prefixal derivation in accordance with its internal morphological, lexical, and syntactic organization. With regard to Greek, the language has proven to be remarkably conservative in terms of derivational morphology, owing both to the lack of phonological reduction at the end of words and to its prolonged diglossic tradition, which favored the retention of archaic patterns of derivation and compounding (Monolessou, Ralli 2015: 2042). In the Slavic languages, and particularly in Russian, these developments became closely associated with the emergence of verbal aspect as a grammatical category, as well as with the formation of perfective verbal semantics (Табаченко 2010: 7).

At the same time, the historical evolution of each of the Indo-European derivational systems did not occur in complete isolation. Processes of linguistic and cultural interaction frequently led to mutual influence among languages. One of the most significant examples of such interaction is the Byzantine–Slavic cultural sphere, within which the Church Slavonic language[1] was created as a medium for transmitting the linguistic and cultural heritage of Byzantium to the Slavic world. This transmission was realized primarily through the translation, revision, and adaptation of key texts of Byzantine Christian culture into the Slavic linguistic environment. Among these texts, hymnography occupied a particularly

[1] In the present study, the term "Church Slavonic" is used to designate the literary and liturgical language of the Orthodox Slavs throughout the successive stages of its historical development, from its origins in the ninth century with the missionary and literary activity of Cyril and Methodius (Old Church Slavonic) to its continued use in the liturgical practice of several Slavic Orthodox Churches. The study focuses primarily on the East Slavic recension (izvod) of Church Slavonic.

prominent place. Hymnographic literature constituted a substantial part of the textual universe of medieval Slavic society and played a significant role in shaping religious literacy and linguistic usage. Moreover, the sacred status of liturgical and hymnographic texts imposed especially strict standards of translation accuracy upon Slavic translators and scribes. Their aim was not merely to reproduce the semantic content of the Greek originals, but also to preserve, as faithfully as possible, their structural and stylistic features. As a result, hymnographic texts, repeatedly revised and corrected against the Greek originals over the centuries, represent exceptionally valuable material for the study of linguistic history.

Let us stress that the evidence derived from the comparative diachronic analysis of Byzantine hymnographic texts is valuable not only for comparative and contrastive morphology, but also for the investigation of Greek–Slavonic language contact and the potential impact of Orthodox Christianity in its Byzantine form on the Slavic, especially Russian, worldview as reflected in language.

For the purposes of the present investigation, four hymnographic texts from the Triodion cycle were selected:

- The Akathist Hymn to the Theotokos (hereafter abbreviated as Ak; references indicate the number of the oikos according to the continuous Greek numeration from 1 to 24; K = Koukoulion);
- The Great Canon of Repentance by St. Andrew of Crete (hereafter abbreviated as GC; references include the number of the ode, followed by the number of the heirmos (only for odes 2 and 3, which contain two heirmoi) and the number of the troparion; the abbreviations T = Trinity troparion, and Th = Theotokion are also used);
- The Alphabetical Stichera from the Service of the Great Canon (hereafter abbreviated as AS, followed by the number of the sticheron, Th = Theotokion);
- The Antiphons of Great Friday (hereafter abbreviated as An; references indicate the number of the antiphon followed by the number of the troparion, Th = Theotokion).

These texts were selected for their highly structured poetic form, which relies extensively on the recurrence of morphological patterns, including prefixed formations. This feature appears to have prompted Slavic translators and redactors to pay particular attention to reproducing the morphological structure of the words in the hymns through equivalent translation strategies. All the texts belong to the Triodion cycle and were presumably translated and subsequently revised within a common textual milieu, which facilitates their linguo-textological analysis. Their widespread popularity in the Slavic liturgical tradition further accounts for their selection. As integral components of Orthodox liturgical practice, these texts were translated at an early stage of the Church Slavonic tradition, incorporated into the Slavonic Triodion, and subsequently transmitted and revised within the Triodion manuscript tradition.

The research is based on Greek academic and ecclesiastical editions (Migne 1865; Τριώδιον 1867; Δετοράκης 2021: 167–190), Church Slavonic manuscripts dating from the 11th to the 16th century (Triodia, Pentecostaria, Kondakaria, and Sticheraria) containing the relevant texts (Борисова 2020: 537–544), as well as Slavonic printed editions of the 17th–20th centuries (Постная Триодь 1663; Триодь Постная 1912).

The data were collected and analyzed using the linguo-textological approach, understood as "a system of research procedures employed in the study of diachronic manuscript copies of the same text with the aim of reconstructing the history of the language as reflected in the evolution of the text's linguistic form" (Панин 1995: 101).

The linguo-textological analysis was based on previously obtained results of the textological investigation of the translated hymns conducted in our earlier research (Борисова 2020). That study enabled us to identify the principal versions of these translations within the Church Slavonic tradition and to outline the major stages in their historical development. More specifically, the following stages were examined:

1. Early Old Slavonic stage (late 9th – early 10th century).

This stage reflects the earliest Slavonic translations produced by the disciples of SS Cyril and Methodius (Борисова 2020: 50–62; 66–76). Manuscript evidence suggests the existence of several relatively independent versions, created in different regions of the South Slavic world and possibly associated with the Glagolitic and Cyrillic traditions respectively. Although these versions have not survived in complete form, they can be partially reconstructed based on fragments preserved in South Slavic manuscripts of the 12th–13th centuries (Triodion (Bitolski), 12th century, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Archive (BAN), Sofia, code 38; Triodion and Pentecostarion, first half of the 13th century, Russian National Library (Saint Petersburg), code F.п.I.68; Triodion and Pentecostarion (Shafarikovski), 12th–13th century, Russian National Library (Saint Petersburg), code F.n.I.74; Triodion and Pentecostarion (Zagrebski), 13th century, Zagreb Archive, code IV d 107). This stage is hereafter designated as Stage 1.

2. Preslav revision stage (mid-late 10th century).

This phase began with the Preslav recension and revision of the texts (Борисова 2020: 62–66). A substantial body of material from this stage has been preserved in East Slavic manuscripts of the 11th–14th centuries, as well as in Bulgarian manuscripts of the 13th century. As characteristic representatives of this stage we use the East Slavic manuscripts of Triodion, notched, 11th–12th century, State Historical Museum (Moscow), Sinodalni collection, code 319 and Pentecostarion, notched, end of 12th century, State Historical Museum (Moscow), Voskresenski collection, code 27, and South Slavic manuscripts Triodion and Pentecostarion, end of the 13th century, State Historical Museum (Moscow), Khludov collection, code 133 and Triodion and Pentecostarion (Orbelski), 13th century, Russian

National Library (Saint Petersburg), code F.n.I.102. This stage is hereafter referred to as Stage 2.

3. Athonite revision stage (late 13th century onward).

This stage originated in the systematic correction of liturgical books carried out on Mount Athos toward the end of the 13th century (Борисова 2020: 94–102). The relevant material survives in numerous South Slavic manuscripts of the 14th–16th centuries and in East Slavic manuscripts of the 15th–16th centuries[2]. The stage was studied on the basis of the 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. This phase is designated as Stage 3.

4. Kievan and Nikonian revision stage (17th century).

This stage encompasses the correction of liturgical books undertaken in Kiev during the first half of the 17th century, followed by the new versions that emerged from the revision of liturgical books under Patriarch Nikon in the second half of the same century (Borisova 2021). Unlike the previous revisions, this revision affected only the East Slavic region. This phase, studied by the early printed edition of 1663 (Постная Триодь 1663), is referred to as Stage 4.

5. Synodal stage (early 20th century).

This stage is associated with the editions of the Holy Synod (Sinodalnaja) published in the early 20th century and corresponds to contemporary Russian Orthodox liturgical practice (Триодь Постная 1912; Borisova 2021). It is hereafter designated as Stage 5.

Detailed descriptions of the textual versions associated with each stage, together with the criteria applied in selecting the representative manuscripts used for the collection of linguistic material, are provided in our earlier publications (Борисова 2020; Borisova 2021).

The present investigation attempts to examine the ways in which Slavic translators and editors rendered Greek lexical forms containing the preverb *κατα-*, with the purpose of identifying possible instances of the transfer of Greek derivational models into the Slavic linguistic tradition.

This study is conducted within the framework of our wider comparative research on Greek-Slavonic prefixation, in which the prefixes and preverbs *α-/αν-* (Борисова 2023), *συν-* (Panin, Borisova 2019), *προ-* (Μπορίσοβα 2021), and *παρα-* (Борисова 2024) have previously been analyzed.

The morpheme *κατα-* is part of the productive system of Ancient Greek preverbs, comprising *ἀμφι-*, *ἀνα-*, *ἀντι-*, *ἀπο-*, *δια-*, *εἰσ-*, *ἐν-*, *ἐκ-*, *ἐπι-*, *κατα-*, *μετα-*, *παρα-*, *περι-*, *προ-*, *προσ-*, *συν-*, *ὑπερ-*, and *ὑπο-* (Humbert 1972). These elements

[2] There are no data on AS from this stage because in the process of Athonite revision they were replaced with the other set of Stichera (Борисова 2020).

functioned not only as verbal prefixes, but also as prepositions and, in some cases, as conjunctional particles. Most of them have remained in use in both prefixal and prepositional functions up to the present day (Ralli 2004). In Homeric Greek, these elements primarily denoted spatial relations and functioned alongside adverbs and prepositions as alternative means of expressing direction and location (Viti 2008: 114). In later stages of the language, however, they underwent semantic extension and grammaticalization, acquiring a wide range of non-locational meanings and developing into prefixes capable of expressing abstract notions, including perfectivity.

The same applies to the preverb *κατα-*, which also appears in the phonological variants *κατ-* before a vowel and *καθ-* before an aspirated vowel (Lampe 1961: 716). Its primary spatial meaning is 'down' or 'movement in a downward direction' (e.g., *καταβαίνω* 'go down' derived from *βαίνω* 'walk'[3]), standing in opposition to *ἀνα-*. This spatial sense remains the most frequently attested value of *κατα-* in the Greek of the New Testament, where the prefix is highly productive, second only to *συν-* in frequency (Moulton 1961: 316). In certain verbs, however, such as *καταπίπτω* 'fall down' from *πίπτω* 'fall', the spatial contribution of the prefix appears redundant, since the notion of downward movement is already inherent in the semantics of the verb. Nevertheless, such formations demonstrate the persistence of the original directional meaning of the preverb.

From this basic spatial sense there developed a more abstract meaning denoting the adversative direction of an action rather than physical movement, namely 'against, to the detriment of an object'. Examples include verbs such as *κατακρίνω* 'condemn' from *κρίνω* 'judge', where the prefix expresses an unfavorable or adversative orientation toward the object of the action. Finally, even more abstract meanings developed from the preverb *κατα-* include the notions of intensity and perfectivity, which are already attested in the Greek of the New Testament but became increasingly frequent in later stages of the language (Moulton 1961: 316). The intensive meaning can be observed in verbs such as *καταλάμπω* 'shine brightly' from *λάμπω* 'shine', while the perfective or completive meaning is exemplified by *κατορθόω* 'achieve, accomplish, succeed', derived from *ὀρθόω / ὀρθῶ* 'to set upright, make straight', where the prefix no longer conveys a spatial relation but rather emphasizes the completeness, effectiveness, or successful outcome of the action.

Overall, in the Greek texts under analysis, a total of 64 lexical items with the prefix *κατα-* occurring in 99 contexts were identified through exhaustive sampling. Of these, 49 are verbs and participles, 11 are deverbal nouns, while only 4 are denominal nouns. It should be noted that, in terms of frequency of occurrence, this prefix surpasses the other prefixes previously examined by us.

---

[3] Here and below all the examples are taken from our data.

The results of our investigation are presented in the following categories. The interpretations of lexical meanings are provided according to the Byzantine Greek dictionary (Lampe 1961):

1. Denominal Nouns:
   1.1. καθέδρα ‘thing set upon, sitting’ (Ak 1) – сѣдалищε (Stages 1–5);
   1.2. καταδίκη ‘condemnation’ (GC 2:2:T, 3:2:2) – wсѫжденiε/ мѫкн вѣчныѧ (Stage 1), wсѫжденiε (Stages 2–5);
   1.3. κατάνυξις ‘compunction’ (GC 1:22, 1:T, 2:1:25, 7:16, 8:15, 9:4) – каѧзнь/ оумнлεнiε (Stage 1), покаѧнiε/ оумнлεнiε (Stages 2–3), оумнлεнiε (Stages 4–5);
   1.4. κατάρα ‘curse’ (An 9:Th) – клѧтвѧ (Stages 1–5).
   The evidence demonstrates that the Church Slavonic equivalents of denominal nouns prefixed with *κατα-* exhibit considerable diachronic stability, with no substantial changes in the translation strategies employed.
2. Verbs and Deverbal Nouns with Diachronically Stable Church Slavonic Equivalents:
   2.1. Non-Prefixal
      2.1.1. καθεύδω ‘to lie down to sleep’ (GC 4:21, An 6:3) – дрѣмати/ сѫпати (Stage 1), сѫпати (Stages 2–5);
      2.1.2. κάθομαι ‘to sit’ (AS 12) – сѣсти (Stages 1–2, 4), сѣдѣти (Stage 5);
      2.1.3. καθοράω ‘to see distinctly, to perceive’ (GC 9: 23) – зьрѣти (Stages 1–5);
   2.2. Prefixal
      2.2.1. καταβαίνω ‘go down’ (Ak. 3) – сънити (Stages 1–5);
      2.2.2. κατάβασις ‘descent, downward movement’ (Ak. K) – сѫхожденiε (Stages 1–5);
      2.2.3. καταβρέχω ‘to wet through’ (AS 16) – омочати (Stages 1–2, 4–5);
      2.2.4. καταδέχομαι ‘to accept’ (An 15:1) – прiѧти (Stages 1–5);
      2.2.5. καταδεξάμενος ‘having accepted’, participle of καταδέχομαι (AS. Th, An 8:Th, 10:Th) – нзволивын (Stage 5);
      2.2.6. καταδικάζω ‘condemn’ (GC 9:19, An 11:1, 13:1) – wсѫдити (Stages 1–5);
      2.2.7. συγκαταδικάζω ‘condemn together’ (GC 4:24) – wсѫдити (Stages 1–5);
      2.2.8. κατακλυσμός ‘flood’ (GC 3:2:2) – потопъ (Stages 1–5);
      2.2.9. κατακρίνω ‘condemn’ (GC 1:9, 2:1:18, 4:5, 9:16, AS 10, An 4:3) – wсѫдити (Stages 1–5);
      2.2.10. κατάδυσις ‘dipping’ (GC 3:2:2) – потоплεнiε/ погрѫженiε (Stage 1), погрѫженiε (Stages 2–5);
      2.2.11. καταπέμπω ‘to send down’ (AS 17) – низъпослати (Stages 4–5)[4];

[4] There are no data about the translation of the certain word on previous stages.

2.2.12. καταπιέζω ‘repress’ (GC 2:1:16) – досаждати (Stages 1–5);
2.2.13. καταπλήσσομαι (Passive of καταπλήσσω) ‘to be amazed’ (Ak 16) – оудивити сѧ (Stages 1–5);
2.2.14. καταυγάζω ‘shine brightly, illuminate’ (Ak 3) – wзарѧти (Stages 1–5);
2.2.15. καταφεύγω ‘to flee to protection to’ (AS 20, An 2:Th, An 3:Th) – прибѣгати (Stages 1–5);
2.2.16. κατοικέω ‘to inhabit, to settle in a place’ (GC 6:10) – въселити сѧ (Stages 1–5);

3. Verbs and Deverbal Nouns with Diachronically Unstable Church Slavonic Equivalents:

3.1. Prefixal and Non-Prefixal Variants

3.1.1. καθίστημι ‘to set down, to place’ (AS 4) – поставити/ творити/ рѫгати (Stage 1), съдѣлати (Stages 2, 4), поставити (Stage 5);
3.1.2. καθίσταμαι (Passive of καθίστημι) ‘to place oneself, to be set down’(GC 1:5) – быти (Stages 1–3, 5), оустроити сѧ (Stage 4);
3.1.3. καταβοάω ‘to cry loudly or against smb’ (GC 8:9) – плакати сѧ (Stages 1–2), въпиѭти (Stages 3, 5), глаголати (Stage 4);
3.1.4. καταγώγιον ‘inn, lodging’ (GC 7:13) – гостиньница/ низъведена сѫть (Stage 1), съкровище (Stage 2), прѣбываліще (Stages 3–5);
3.1.5. καταισχύνομαι ‘to feel great shame’ (GC 2:1:8, 2:1:9, 2:1:11) – срамьнъ быти (Stage 1), посрамити сѧ/срамити сѧ (Stage 2), стыдити сѧ/срамити сѧ (Stages 3–5);
3.1.6. κατακτῶμαι ‘to be conquered’ (GC 6:12) – дрьжати/ въпріѧти (Stage 1), съдрьжати (Stage 2), пріѧти (Stage 3), одрьжати (Stages 4–5);
3.1.7. καταπέτασμα ‘veil’ (An 11:3) – запона/ wпона (Stage 1), катапетазма (Stage 2), завѣса (Stages 4–5);
3.1.8. καταπίπτω ‘to fall down’ (Ak 23) – падати (Stages 1–3), низъпадати (Stages 4–5);
3.1.9. καταπολεμῶ ‘to fight against, defeat’ (GC 6:11) – борити сѧ противѫ (Stage 1), побѣждати (Stages 2–4), побарати (Stage 5);
3.1.10. κατάποσις ‘swallowing’ (GC 1:5) – питіе (Stages 1–4), напоєніе (Stage 5);
3.1.11. καταρράκτης ‘torrent’ (GC 2:2:4) – низъврьженіе/ тоуча (Stage 1), хлѧбн (Stages 2–5);
3.1.12. καταρρυπόω ‘to defile’ (GC 2:1:15, 4:17, 7:11) – wскврънити/ дѣлати сквръньнѣше (Stage 1), wскврънити (Stage 2), wскврънити/ wкалѭти (Stage 3), wскврънити/ оукалѭти (Stage 4), wскврънити/ wкалѭти (Stage 5);
3.1.13. κατασκευάζω ‘to build, to construct’ (Ak 19) – ѭвити сѧ (Stage 1), оукрасити (Stage 2), оустроити (Stages 3–5);

3.1.14. καταφλέγω ‘to burn through’ (GC 3:1) – ѕапалєнїѥ (Stage 1), wгнємъ попалнтн (Stage 2), палнтн (Stage 3), попалнтн (Stages 4–5);

3.1.15. κατηγορῶ ‘accuse’ (GC 9: 22) – огласнтн/оклєвєтатн (Stage 1), хѹлнтн (Stages 2–4), оглаголатн (Stage 5);

3.2. Variants with Different Prefixes

3.2.1. καταλαμβάνω ‘to seize, to gain possession of, to occupy’ (GC 7:15) – достнгатн/рнспѣтн (Stage 1), постнгатн (Stages 2–5);

3.2.2. καταρράπτω ‘to sew up’ (GC 2:1:12) – съшнватн (Stage 1), съподшнватн (Stage 2), съшнватн (Stages 3–5);

3.2.3. κατατίθημι ‘to put down, to set down, to lay down’ (An 1:2) – възложнтн (Stages 1, 3–5), съложнтн (Stage 2);

3.2.4. κατορθόω ‘achieve, accomplish, succeed’ (GC 4:8) – оуправнтн/нсправнтн (Stage 1), нсправнтн (Stages 2–5);

3.3. Variants with Different Stems

3.3.1. ἐγκαταλείπω ‘to abandon’ (AS 5, AS 15, An 1:2) – wставнтн/wслабѣтн (Stage 1), wставнтн (Stages 2–5);

3.3.2. καθηλκωμένος ‘all covered with sores’ (GC 4:14) – въ струпѣхъ (Stage 1, Stage 3), въ ꙋрьвьхъ (Stage 2), гноєнъ (Stage 5);

3.3.3. συγκατακαίγομαι ‘to be burnt together with’ (GC 2:2:8) – съженъ бытн (Stages 1–3), съгорѣтн (Stage 4), съжещн сѧ (Stage 5);

3.3.4. κατακλύζω ‘to flood over, to overwhelm’ (GC 2:2:4) – погрѹзнтн (Stage 1), потопнтн (Stages 2–5);

3.3.5. καταριθμέω ‘to number with’ (An 14:1) – прнѩтн/ прнчьтатн (Stage 1), прнчьтатн (Stages 2–5)

3.3.6. κατέχω ‘to possess’ (GC 8: 7) – дрьжатн (Stages 1, 3), нмѣтн (Stages 2, 4–5);

3.3.7. κατεστιγμένος ‘spotted’ (Participle of καταστίζω ‘to mark with spots’) (GC 2:1:14) – скврънын (Stage 1), кальнын (Stage 2), срамьнын (Stages 3–5);

3.4. Variants with Different Prefixes and Stems

3.4.1. συγκατάβασις ‘descent, resort, association’ (GC 9:6, AS Th, Ak 15, An 11:1) – съмѣрєнїѥ/съхождєнїѥ/съннтїѥ (Stage 1), съхождєнїѥ (Stages 2–5), съннзъхождєнїѥ (Stage 5);

3.4.2. κατάγνυμι ‘to break apart, to crash’ (GC 2:2:7) – расыпатн/разорнтн (Stage 1), ннзъврѣщн (Stage 2, 5), ннзложнтн (Stage 3), съкрѹшнтн (Stage 4);

3.4.3. καταδέχομαι ‘to accept’ (An 13:2) – прѣтрьпѣти (Stages 1–4), нзволнтн (Stage 5);

3.4.4. καταδικάζω ‘to condemn’ (GC 4:5) – мьсть прнѩтн (Stage 1), прєпрѣтн (Stages 2–5);

3.4.5. κατακενόω ‘to expend, to exhaust’ (GC 8:17) – ѓазлнѣти/нзлнѣти/ вѣзлнѣти (Stage 1), нзлнѣти (Stages 2–3), ѓолнѣти (Stage 4), нстоѭти (Stage 5);

3.4.6. καταλάμπω ‘to shine brightly’ (Ak 21) – ѓосвѣѭти (Stages 1, 3, 5), wсїѣти (Stage 2), освѣѭти (Stage 4);

3.4.7. καταλείπω ‘to abandon’ (GC 3:2:7; An 12:Th) – нзволнти/ wставнти (Stage 1), съхѓанити/ wставнти (Stage 2), wставнти (Stages 3–5);

3.4.8. καταλιμπάνω ‘to abandon’ (An 4:1) – ѿмѣтати/wставлѧти (Stage 1), wставлѧти (Stages 2–5);

3.4.9. καταναλίσκω ‘to consume, to waste’ (GC 1:21, 7:14) – нждити/ нзноуѓнти (Stage 1), нзноуѓнти (Stage 2), нзноуѓнти/ погоубити (Stages 3–5);

3.4.10. καταπλήσσω ‘to strike down, to amaze, to terrify’ (Ak 21) – побнѣти (Stage 1), оустрашати (Stages 2–5);

3.4.11. κατάπτωσις ‘fall down’ (Ak 11) – ѓогънаніе (Stage 1), паденіе (Stages 2–3), низъпаденіе (Stages 4–5);

3.4.12. καταργέω ‘to bring to nought, render unnecessary’ (Ak 19) – ѿврьзати (Stage 1), ѓазарѧти (Stage 2), оупражнѧти (Stages 3–5);

3.4.13. κατασκοπεύω ‘to watch, to contemplate’ (GC 6: 10) – ѓасмотрѣти (Stage 1), съглѧдати (Stage 2), съмотрѣти (Stages 3–5);

3.4.14. κατασπιλόω ‘to defile’ (GC 2:2:5, 4:17) – wскалѣти/ оускалѣти/ нскалѣти (Stage 1), wскалѣти (Stage 2), wскврънити/ wскалѣти (Stages 3–5);

3.4.15. κατασπιλούμενος ‘being defiled’ (participle from κατασπιλόω) (GC 4:12) – ѓазжигаемъ (Stage 1), wскврънн сѧ (Stages 2–4), wскврънѧемъ (Stage 5);

3.4.16. κατάσχεσις ‘possession’ (GC 3:2:5, 6:12) – въпрѧтель/ дрьжитель/ достоѣніе (Stage 1), съдрьжитель/ житіе (Stage 2), оудрьжаніе/ пріѧтіе (Stage 3), оудрьжаніе/ въwдрьжаніе (Stage 4), одрьжаніе (Stage 5);

3.4.17. κατατρυπῶ ‘to bore through’ (GC 2:2:8) – нстрѣлити/ оусоушити (Stage 1), проводити (Stage 2), оуѣзвити (Stages 3–5);

3.4.18. καταχρώννυμι ‘to colour over’ (GC 7:15) – посыпати/ wдрьжати (Stage 1), погребати (Stages 2–5);

3.4.19. καταχώνω (καταχώννυμι) ‘to bury’ (AS 10) – погрѣбати (Stages 1–4), закопати (Stage 5).

In contrast to Group 1, the evidence from Groups 2 and 3 demonstrates diachronic instability in the Church Slavonic equivalents of verbs and deverbal nouns prefixed with κατα-, accompanied by a general tendency toward an increasing variety of prefixal correspondences. The overall distribution of prefixal and non-prefixal translations is presented in Table 1.

Stage	Non-prefix translations	Prefix translations
1	20	45
2	15	49
3	15	49
4	13	51
5	9	54

TABLE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF PREFIX/NON-PREFIX TRANSLATIONS OF GREEK DERIVATIVES WITH THE PREVERB *KATA-*

The results of the study have demonstrated a variety of strategies used for translating Greek words containing the respective prefixes at different stages of Slavic written tradition. These strategies include:

1. translation by semantic and derivational equivalents – derivatives with the prefixes о-/w-, ѡ-, въз-, пре-/прѣ-, прн-, по-, въ-, на-, за-, раз-, из-, до-, ѿ-: κατηγορῶ – огласнтн/оклеветатн (Stage 1), оглаголатн (Stage 5); καταργέω – ѿвръзатн (Stage 1), ѡпражнѧтн (Stages 3–5); κατάσχεσις – ѡдръжанїе (Stages 3–4), одръжанїе (Stage 5); καταυγάζω – wзарѧтн (Stages 1–5); κατατίθημι – възложнтн (Stages 1, 3–5); καταγώγιον – прѣбываланще (Stages 3–5); καταφεύγω – прнбѣгатн (Stages 1–5); κατάδυσις – потопленіе/погрѫженіе (Stage 1), погрѫженіе (Stages 2–5); κατακλυσμός – потопъ (Stages 1–5); κατοικέω – въселнтнсѧ (Stages 1–5); κατάποσις – напоеніе (Stage 5); καταχώνω – погрѣбатн (Stages 1–4), закопатн (Stage 5); κατασκοπεύω – расмотрѣтн (Stage 1); κατακενόω – нстощатн (Stage 5); καταλαμβάνω – достнгатн (Stage 1), постнгатн (Stages 2–5); καταπολεμῶ – побороти (Stage 5);
2. translation by words with a different morphological structure both with preverbs or without: καθέδρα – сѣдалще (Stages 1–5); καταπιέζω – досаждатн (Stages 1–5); κατάσχεσις – достоѭанїе (Stage 1); κατάνυξις – каѧзнь (Stage 1); καταπολεμῶ – побѣждатн (Stages 2–4);
3. free translation: κατάσχεσις – жнтіе (Stage 2); καθηλκωμένος – въ ѵрьвьхъ (Stage 2); κατακενόω – разлнватн/нзлнватн/възлнватн (Stage 1), нзлнватн (Stages 2–3), пролнватн (Stage 4);
4. rendering exclusively the semantics of the root without preserving the prefix: κατέχω – дръжатн (Stages 1, 3), нмѣтн (Stages 2, 4–5); καταισχύνομαι – срамьнъ бытн (Stage 1), посрамнтн сѧ/срамнтн сѧ (Stage 2), стыднтн сѧ/срамнтн сѧ (Stages 3–5); καθοράω – зьрѣтн (Stages 1–5); καθεύδω – дрѣматн/съпатн (Stage 1), съпатн (Stages 2–5); καταβοάω – плакатн сѧ (Stages 1–2), въпнѭатн (Stages 3, 5), глаголатн (Stage 4); καθηλκωμένος

– гноєнъ (Stage 5); κατεστιγμένος – скврънын (Stage 1), кальнын (Stage 2), срамьнын (Stages 3–5);

5. descriptive (periphrastic) translation: καθηλκωμένος – въ стрꙋпѣхъ (Stage 1, Stage 3), καταδικάζω – мьсть прнѧтн (Stage 1); καταπολεμῶ – боротн сѧ протнвѫ (Stage 1);
6. calque translation using the prefixes съ- or ннзъ-: κατάγνυμι – ннзъврѣщн (Stage 2, 5), ннзъложнтн (Stage 3), съкрꙋшнтн (Stage 4); καταβαίνω – съннтн (Stages 1–5); κατάβασις – съхожденіе (Stages 1–5); καταπέμπω – ннзъпослатн (Stages 4–5); κατάπτωσις – ннзъпаденіе (Stages 4–5); καταρράκτης – ннзъврьженіе (Stage 1); κατακτῶμαι – съдрьжатн (Stage 2); καταγώγιον – ннзъведена сѫть (Stage 1), съкровнще (Stage 2); κατασκοπεύω – съглѧдатн (Stage 2); συγκατάβασις – съмѣренїе/съхожденїе/съннтїе (Stage 1), съхожденїе (Stages 2–5), съннзъхожденїе (Stage 5).
7. Finally, we found the unique example of lexical borrowing: καταπέτασμα ‘veil’ (An 11: 3) – катапетазма (Stage 2).

It can be observed that calque translations were not a particularly productive strategy for rendering this Greek preverb. Their use is largely confined to cases involving spatial semantics and, to a considerable extent, to lexemes with specifically Christian connotations. Of the two Slavic prefixes employed in such calques, ннзъ- appears to have developed from the corresponding noun or adverb, apparently for the specific purpose of reproducing the spatial meaning of the Greek prefix. The certain prefix used mainly either in first translations or after Nikon’s revisions remained unproductive in both Church Slavonic and Russian (Шведова 1980: 361). Its application was largely restricted to a limited group of literary and ecclesiastical lexical items and did not develop into a fully productive derivational pattern comparable to that of its Greek counterpart.

Unlike ннзъ-, the spatial prefix съ- and its corresponding preposition undoubtedly predate the earliest Church Slavonic translations (СРЯ 23: 7–8). Semantically, the prefix could express both downward movement and movement away from an object (Ruvoletto 2016: 90–94). It has retained these meanings and remains productive in modern Russian (Шведова 1980: 369). However, apart from its semantic ambiguity, the use of съ- as a calquing equivalent for Greek *κατα-* was complicated by the existence of a homonymous prefix corresponding to Greek *συν-* (‘together with’). As a result, in certain Slavonic calques it is not always possible to determine which of the two prefixes съ- is involved, making the etymological structure of the derivative uncertain (see, e.g. the unsuccessful attempt to calque a Greek *κατακτῶμαι* with Slavonic съдрьжатн on Stage 2, later replaced by other variants). The situation was further complicated by the fact

that the Greek preverbs *κατα-* and *συν-* could occur together within the same lexical item, as it happened to be in the Christian term *συγκατάβασις*. In such cases, the rendering of the Greek prefixal structure posed a particular challenge for Slavic translators and revisers. It was only at the latest stage of the tradition that the calque сънизхождєнїє was introduced, making it possible to represent both Greek preverbs explicitly. Earlier Slavonic renderings, such as съхождєнїє, merged the meanings of *συν-* and *κατα-* into a single prefix съ-, thereby obscuring the original morphological structure of the Greek term. As a result, *συγκατάβασις* was translated by the same Slavonic word that was also used to render the simpler Greek form *κατάβασις*, eliminating the morphological distinction between the two Greek derivatives. A similar pattern is observed in the case of *συγκατακαίγομαι*, which has different diachronic Church Slavonic translations - съжєнъ бытн, съгоѓѣтн, and съжєцин сѧ - despite the consistent use of the single prefix съ- in all three variants.

Slavonic prefix	Number of lexemes				
Stage	1	2	3	4	5
въ-	2	1	2	2	2
въз-	2	0	1	1	1
до-	2	1	1	1	1
за-	2	0	0	1	2
из-	6	4	4	3	6
на-	0	0	0	0	1
низъ-	2	1	1	3	5
о-/ѡ-	14	13	12	13	14
ѿ-	2	0	0	0	0
по-	7	10	7	8	9
пре-/прѣ-	1	2	3	3	2
при-	5	3	4	4	3
про-	2	1	1	1	1
раз-	4	1	0	0	0
съ-	5	10	5	7	4
ѹ-	5	4	7	8	6

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF SLAVONIC PREFIXES USED IN THE TRANSLATION OF GREEK DERIVATIVES WITH THE PREVERB *KATA-*

The quantitative data shown on Table 2 reveal a clear predominance in the translation of Greek derivatives with the preverb *κατα-* of the prefix ѻ-, followed by по- and ѡ꙳-. The relatively low frequency of the calquing prefixes низъ- and съ- (except of Stage 2, when съ- was a frequent choice) further confirms that direct morphological replication of Greek *κατα-* was not the preferred translation strategy. Instead, Slavic translators generally favored semantic equivalents employing a variety of native prefixes whose meanings best matched the contextual semantics of the Greek derivatives. It should be stressed that diversity is observed even in the translation of prefixes with Slavonic equivalents, such as *συν-* (Тасева 2022: 55). In contrast to this case, however, no tendency toward unification is observed from the Athonite stage onward.

Let us sum up the main conclusions of our study.

• Semantic adaptation rather than systematic morphological calquing was the dominant strategy in the rendering of Greek *κατα-* derivatives into Church Slavonic. Calquing was used primarily in cases where the preverb retained its original spatial-translocative meaning and was largely confined to items belonging to the ecclesiastical lexicon. The overall proportion of calque translations remained relatively low throughout the history of the Slavonic tradition and shows no significant diachronic variation (Stage 1 – 7%, Stage 2 – 6.25%, Stages 3–4 – 7%, Stage 5 – 7.5%). This contrasts with the situation observed for other Greek preverbs, especially *προ-*, where the frequency of calquing increased considerably over time (Μπορίσοβα 2021). Attempts to extend the semantics of the Slavonic prefixes *низъ-* and *съ-* to the more abstract and metaphorical meanings of Greek *κατα-* proved unsuccessful and were not accepted by the subsequent tradition. An illustrative example is the rendering of *κατακτῶμαι* by съдрьжатн at Stage 2, a translation that was later abandoned. The same holds for съглѧдатн for the Greek *κατασκοπεύω* and съкрѹвнцıе for the Greek *καταγώγιον*. The tendency can be observed even in certain derivatives preserving the spatial meaning of the Greek preverb. Thus, the hapax низъвръжєнıе, used at Stage 1 to translate Greek *καταρράκτης*, was subsequently replaced by хлѧбн, a lexeme that no longer reflected the prefixal structure of the Greek original.

• As far as the principal tendencies in the translation of Greek words containing the preverb *κατα-* are concerned, one may observe a gradual shift from descriptive renderings and translations employing non-prefixed lexical items, applied mainly on first stages, toward the use of prefixed derivatives (see e.g. καταπολεμῶ – боꙗотнсѧ прѹотнвѫ (Stage 1), побѣждатн (Stages 2–4), побоꙗотн (Stage 5); κατακτῶμαι – дрьжатн/въпрıѧтн (Stage 1), съдрьжатн (Stage 2), прıѧтн (Stage 3), ѻдрьжатн (Stages 4–5). This development reflects both changing

translation principles, which increasingly aimed at achieving greater formal as well as semantic correspondence with the Greek original, and the internal evolution of the Slavonic and Russian derivational systems. More specifically, as the functions of prepositions expanded and older non-prepositional constructions were progressively replaced by prepositional ones, prefixes gradually lost much of their original spatial significance and increasingly came to express abstract meanings, particularly those related to telicity, resultativity, and the completion of an action (Табаченко 2010: 7). This semantic development enabled Slavic translators to employ various prefixed derivatives more extensively when rendering Greek formations with *κατα-*, even in cases where the Greek preverb no longer carried a concrete spatial meaning. The predominance of the prefix ѻ- in the Church Slavonic translations of Greek *κατα-* derivatives reflects a fundamental difference in the metaphorical conceptualization of telicity in the two linguistic traditions. Whereas Greek frequently conceptualizes the completion of an action through the metaphor of downward movement, Church Slavonic and Russian tend to express the same notion by means of the prefix ѻ-, whose original spatial meaning is associated with movement around or encircling an object. This contrast suggests the existence of distinct cognitive models underlying the linguistic representation of completed action in the two languages.

• The semantic value that Church Slavonic appears least able to render through prefixal derivation is intensity when it is not accompanied by telicity. This can be observed in verbs such as *κατέχω*, translated simply as дрьжатн or нмѣтн, and *καθοράω*, rendered as зьрѣтн, where the intensive force of the Greek preverb is not reflected morphologically in the Slavonic translation. This tendency can be explained by the grammaticalization of spatial preverbs into markers of abstract telicity, a process that affected both Greek and Slavonic, but reached a much more advanced stage in the latter (Viti 2008: 114). In the Slavic languages, prefixes became closely associated with the expression of verbal aspect and, in particular, with the formation of perfective verbs. As a consequence, prefixation increasingly served to mark the completion or boundedness of an action rather than its intensity. This development limited the ability of Slavic translators to employ prefixes in the rendering of Greek derivatives whose preverbs conveyed primarily intensive, rather than telic, meanings.

• Although the Church Slavonic tradition generally resisted the creation of productive calquing models for Greek *κατα-* and instead preferred solutions that were more compatible with the existing Slavonic derivational system, the influence of this Greek derivational pattern can nevertheless be traced in both Church Slavonic and Russian. At the morphological level, this influence is reflected in the emergence of the prefix *низъ-*, apparently derived from the homonymous

adverb (or nominal form), in order to express specifically the notion of downward movement and thus provide a closer equivalent to the spatial semantics of Greek *κατα-*. Although this prefix remained only marginally productive and was largely confined to the literary registers, it has survived in both Church Slavonic and Russian. At the lexical level, the translation process contributed to the enrichment of the language through the introduction of new abstract vocabulary. A notable example is the word *снисхождение*, originally a theological term used to render Greek *συγκατάβασις*, which subsequently acquired broader meanings and remains an active part of the modern Russian lexicon, well beyond its original ecclesiastical context. Thus, even where direct morphological calquing failed to become productive, Greek derivational models exerted a lasting influence on the development of Slavonic vocabulary and conceptual categories.

LITERATURE

Borisova 2021	Borisova, T. *On the History of the Vocabulary of the Thematic Group "Christian Virtues and Sins": based on the Translated Church Slavonic Hymnography*. – *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 14 (2021), № 10, p. 1547–1555.
Humbert 1972	Humbert, J. *Syntaxe Grecque*. Paris, 1972.
Lampe 1961	Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Paris, 1961.
Migne 1865	Migne, J. P. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graecae*. Vol. 97. Paris, 1865.
Monolessou, Ralli 2015	Monolessou, I., A. Ralli. *From Ancient Greek to Modern Greek*. – In: A Handbook of Word Formation. Berlin, 2015, p. 2041–2061.
Moulton 1961	Moulton, J. H. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 2. New York, 1961.
Panin, Borisova 2019	Panin, L. G., T. S. Borisova. *Comparative linguistic textological analysis as a means of research into the evolution of the derivation system (on the early church Slavonic translations of Greek words with the prefix συν-)*. – Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities and Social Sciences, 12 (2019), № 10, p. 1887–1903.

Ralli 2004 — Ralli, A. *Stem-based vs word-based morphological configurations: the case of Modern Greek Preverbs*. – Lingue e Linguaggio, 2004, № 2, p. 241–275.

Ruvoletto 2016 — Ruvoletto, L. *I prefissi verbali nella Povest' vremennych let: per un'analisi del processo di formazione dell'aspetto verbale in russo*. Firenze, 2016.

Viti 2008 — Viti, C. *Coding spatial relations in Homeric Greek: preverbs vs. prepositions*. – Historische Sprachforschung / Historical Linguistics, 121 (2008), № 1, p. 114–161.

Борисова 2020 — Борисова, Т. С. *История русского литературного языка по данным лингвотекстологического анализа переводных памятников (на материале гимнографических текстов триодного цикла).* Новосибирск, 2020. [Borisova, T. S. Istoriia russkogo literaturnogo iazyka po dannym lingvotekstologicheskogo analiza perevodnykh pamiatnikov (na materiale gimnograficheskikh tekstov triodnogo tsikla). Novosibirsk, 2020].

Борисова 2023 — Борисова, Т. С. *О соотношении положительной и отрицательной номинации в греческом и русском языках: на материале перевода греческих дериватов с отрицательными префиксами в церковнославянской гимнографии X–XIX веков*. – Палеоросия, 2023, № 4, с. 141–148 [Borisova, T. S. O sootnoshenii polozhitel′noĭ i otritsatel′noĭ nominatsii v grecheskom i russkom iazykakh: na materiale perevoda grecheskikh derivatov s otritsatel′nymi prefiksami v tserkovnoslavianskoĭ gimnografii X–XIX vekov. – Paleorosia, 2023, № 4, s. 141–148].

Борисова 2024 — Борисова, Т. С. *Лингвотекстологический подход к изучению префиксальной деривации в диахронном аспекте: на материале церковнославянских переводов греческих слов с префиксом παρα-* [Borisova, T. S. Lingvotekstologicheskiĭ podkhod k izucheniiu prefiksal′noĭ derivatsii v diakhronnom aspekte: na materiale tserkovnoslavianskikh perevodov grecheskikh slov s prefiksom para-]. – Romanoslavica, 60 (2024), № 1, p. 174–183.

Панин 1995 — Панин, Л. Г. *История церковнославянского языка и лингвистическая текстология.* Новосибирск, 1995 [Panin, L. G. Istoriia tserkovnoslavianskogo iazyka i lingvisticheskaia tekstologiia, Novosibirsk, 1995].

Постная Триодь 1663 *Постная Триодь.* Москва, 1663 [Postnaia Triod′. Moskva, 1663].

СРЯ *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII веков*. Вып. 1–32–. Москва, 1975–2023– [Slovar′ russkogo iazyka XI–XVII vekov. Vyp. 1–32–. Moskva, 1975–2023].

Табаченко 2010 Табаченко, Л. В. *Приставочные позиционные глаголы в истории русского языка.* – Вестник Московского государственного университета. Серия 9: Филология*,* 2010, № 1, с. 7–31 [Tabachenko L. V. Pristavochnye pozitsionnye glagoly v istorii russkogo iazyka. – Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriia 9: Filologiia, 2010, № 1, s. 7–31].

Тасева 2022 Тасева, Л. *Преводните корелати на представката syn- в средновековната славянска книжнина* [Taseva, L. Prevodnite korelati na predstavkata syn- v srednovekovnata slavyanska knizhnina]. – В: Chelbaeva, T. , G. Lehmann-Carli (Hg.) Verbunden mit den Slaven. Festschrift für Swetlana Mengel. (= Ost-West-Express. Kultur und Übersetzung, Band 45), Berlin, 2022, с. 33–60.

Триодь Постная 1912 *Триодь Постная.* Москва, 1912 [Triod′ Postnaia. Moskva, 1912].

Шведова 1980 Шведова, Н. *Русская грамматика*. Т. 1. Москва, 1980 [Shvedova, N. Russkaia grammatika. T. 1. Moskva, 1980].

Δετοράκης 2021 Δετοράκης, Θ. *Ο Ακάθιστος Ύμνος. Έκδοση κριτική.* Ηράκλειο, 2021 [Detorakēs, Th. O Akathistos Ymnos. Ekdosē kritikē. Ērakleio, 2021].

Μπορίσοβα 2021 Μπορίσοβα, Τ. Οι μεταφράσεις από τα ελληνικά και η ιστορία του σλαβικού λεξιλογίου: βάσει των παραγώγων με το πρόθεμα προ- [Borisova, T. Oi metaphraseis apo ta ellēnika kai ē istoria tou slavikou lexilogiou: vasei tōn paragōgōn me to prothema pro-]. – Fragmenta Hellinoslavica, 7 (2021), p. 67–86.

Τριώδιον 1867 *Τριώδιον κατανυκτικὸν* [Triōdion katanyktikon]. Venice, 1867.

СРАВНИТЕЛНО ИЗСЛЕДВАНЕ НА ЦЪРКОВНОСЛАВЯНСКИТЕ СЪОТВЕТСТВИЯ НА ГРЪЦКИ ДЕРИВАТИ С ПРЕДСТАВКА *ΚΑΤΑ-* В ИЗБРАНИ ПРЕВОДНИ ХИМНОГРАФСКИ ТЕКСТОВЕ

(Резюме)

Статията е посветена на сравнителното изследване на гръцката и църковнославянската префиксална деривация въз основа на църковнославянски преводи на гръцки лексеми с представка *κατα-*. Анализът на историческата динамика на промените в преводните съответствия на този префикс дава възможност да бъдат установени и описани механизмите на влияние на гръцката словообразувателна система върху славянската. Изследването обхваща подбрани химнографски текстове – църковнославянски преводи на четири византийски песнопения от цикъла на Триода: Акатиста на Пресвета Богородица, Великия канон на св. Андрей Критски, Азбучните стихири от последованието на Великия канон и Антифоните на Велики петък. Приложен е лингвотекстологичният подход, като авторът се основава на резултатите от предходни текстологични изследвания. Съпоставителният анализ на църковнославянски ръкописни и печатни източници от XII до началото на XX в. и на гръцките изходни текстове на изследваните произведения дава възможност да се опишат основните начини за превод на гръцките лексеми с префикс *κατα-* в зависимост от семантиката на представката, да се проследят промените в тях в широка историческа перспектива (X–XIX в.), както и да се установи ролята на калкирането при формирането на църковнославянската лексика и словообразувателните модели. Отбелязва се, че дори при префикси, които нямат съответствие в славянската словообразувателна система, какъвто е случаят с *κατα-*, влиянието на гръцкия език върху църковнославянския, както и върху светогледа на православните славяни, може ясно да бъде проследено.

Ключови думи: деривация; префикси; *κατα-*; гръцко-славянски езикови контакти; химнография; църковнославянски преводи.

Tatiana Borisova
Department of Russian Language and Literature and Slavic Studies
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
borisova@slavstud.uoa.gr

Дата на получаване на статията: 19.06.2026 г.