The closing suffixes are those that do not allow any further non-inflectional suffixes in the stem; [Aronoff & Fuhrhop 2002] provide a set of these affixes for German, and [Manova 2008] examines their homologues in Bulgarian. Their semantic equivalents in Russian show both typological parallels and differences compared to their German and Slavic counterparts, displaying certain variation across semantic constraints and diachronic scale.

In German the feminine -in as in Lehrerin (*Lehrerin-chen) is a closing suffix. In Russian properties of the feminine -nic- are somewhat more complex, at least diachronically. It disallows -skij and diminutive -k-a (cf. colloquial and substandard uči(te)-l-ka, plemjaš-ka without -nic-), but accepts possessive -in-/yn- (učitel’nicy in RNC for 2000, cf. also plemjannicy for 1995-1999), but in earlier Russian language -nic-+yn was more productive, witness a number RNC mid-18-century examples (such as izmenicyn ‘of a female traitor’ or volšebnicyn ‘of a fairy’). The same pattern has been preserved in Russian surnames as Solženicyn (< ‘son of a woman who trades in malt, solod’). There are also other feminine suffixes like -ess- (poët-ess-a) or -š- (standard ‘wife of X’, coll. ‘female X’, as direktor-š-a), but they all accept -in- even better (but generally not -k-).

German closing -e forming abstract nouns (as in pfleg-en >Pfleg-e) has no single directly comparable equivalent in Russian. There are zero suffix (as in beg ‘running’ before zero masculine inflection or ssor.a ‘quarrel’ before feminine inflection) which is by definition elusive on surface level (however it is always closing according to [Kuznetsova, Efremova 1986] analysis), or -k- (stroj-k-a ‘construction’) which is not closing (cf. stro-eč-k-a, as pretty all the homonymous -k-a suffixes – diminutive, univerbating etc.).

Russian -(n)ost-‘, an evident equivalent of German closing suffix -heit/-keit/-igkeit, is not closing (cel-ost-n-yj ‘coherent’, as it is also in Bulgarian) and shows a reduplication pattern of -(n)ost-ost’ that is rare in other Slavic languages. Typologically, the exact suffix reduplication in derivational stems is found mostly in domains of causative and diminutive. The majority of the stems is derived through an adjectival stage (as cel-ost-n-ost’ ‘integrity’ that is attested in about 90% examples of this model in the RNC); semantically there is a group of evaluative personal qualities (as blag-ost-n-ost’ ‘benevolence’, zl-ost-n-ost’ ‘malice’, bez-žal-ost-n-ost’ ‘ruthlessness’).

Russian -sk-(ij), a homologue of German closing -isch-, is not a closing suffix, unlike -sk-(i) in Bulgarian, as the -sk-ost’ pattern is widespread, as svet-sk-ost’ ‘secularism’, det-sk-ost’ ‘childishness’, rus-sk-ost’ ‘Russianness’ (dozens of stems in the RNC). However in surnames it is generally closing, creating some gaps in derivational paradigm (Puškinskij ‘belonging to Pushkin conference’ but Dostoevskij, Dzeržinskij, Majakovskij stations since the 1930s, normally, both would be female surnames). NB rare surnames in skov, where it is not closing suffix although diachronically the same (galanskovskij ‘belonging to Galanskov’, RNC).

Interestingly, Russian deverbative -eni-(e), a homologue of German -ung and Bulgarian -n-e, is a closing suffix, while -nj-e- (much more lexicalized than in Bulgarian) is not: var-eni-e ‘cooking / boiling’ vs. var-en’j-e ‘fruit jam’ > var-en’j-ic-e (diminutive).