Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Verbal aspect in Old Church Slavonic

Kamphuis, J.

Citation
Kamphuis, J. (2016, December 7). *Verbal aspect in Old Church Slavonic*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/44706

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/44706

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/44706 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Kamphuis, J.
Title: Verbal aspect in Old Church Slavonic
Issue Date: 2016-12-07

8 THE FUNCTIONS OF VERBAL ASPECT IN OCS

8.0 Introduction

In Chapter 2, I discussed the characteristics of verbal aspect in Slavic and the differences between Slavic-style aspect and Romance-style aspect. In the subsequent chapters, I laid out my morphological approach of verbal aspect in OCS and compared it to the varying approaches in previous studies. By means of the correspondence analysis in Chapter 7, I was able to demonstrate that the differences between the profiles can, for the largest part, be explained by one factor, or dimension. On this 'aspect dimension', imperfective verbs and perfective verbs show up on opposite sides. Anaspectual verbs are posited in between the two. Other than this relatively clear outline, the statistical analysis did not yield any basis to say much about the functions of aspect in OCS.

In the present chapter I will perform a semantic analysis of examples of verbs from the core groups: perfective, imperfective and anaspectual. I will describe the main functions of perfective and imperfective aspect and compare these to the functions of anaspectual verbs. For this purpose, I will mainly concentrate on three verb forms that show strong interaction with aspect: present, aorist and imperfect.[1]

At the basis of the discussion lies the idea that the OCS derivational aspect system is a Slavic-style system. Basically, the difference between perfective and imperfective verbs is the difference between actualizing the inherent boundary as opposed to defocusing this boundary. The particular uses of the perfective and imperfective aspect are not logically deducible from this basic distinction, as is shown by the differences in aspect choice between the modern Slavic languages (cf. Stunová 1993, Dickey 2000, Barentsen 2008) even though all have a Slavic-style aspect system.

The goal of this chapter is to establish how verbal aspect in OCS functions in various contexts in order to establish a basic meaning for both aspects. So the purpose is a synchronic description. However, in the concluding chapter I

[1] Where it benefits the discussion, I will give examples of participles. Infinitives are left out of the consideration because of the extra complicating factor of the construction with a finite form. The relationship between aspect and the imperative is also rather complex, as I have shown in Chapter 6, especially when negation comes into play. These forms would no doubt provide useful information for the study of verbal aspect in OCS, but I believe that by concentrating on the major three finite verb forms, I will be able to lay a basic foundation that could be used to study these more complicated cases in a subsequent study.

will briefly discuss OCS verbal aspect in a diachronic perspective, based on the results from the present chapter. This diachronic comparison is meant to establish whether the OCS verbal aspect system revolves around totality, like Czech, or whether an additional element of sequential connection plays a role, like in Russian (cf. Chapter 2, Barentsen 1995, 1998, 2008, Dickey 2000).[2]

During the discussion of the aspectual forms, I will also provide examples with anaspectual verbs. An important factor in the behaviour of anaspectual verbs and their relationship to the aspect system lies in the 'terminativizability' of the verb: whether or not its usage in a terminative predicate is allowed and if so, under which circumstances. I will return to that in more detail after the discussion of the main functions of the perfective and imperfective verbs.

Finally, I will also pay attention to some verbs that show deviating profiles and behaviour compared to other verbs in their group. These verbs show the importance of the individual analysis of each verb and its attestations instead of only relying on a formal morphological classification.

8.1 Present tense

The present tense is compatible with both aspects. Characteristic of the present tense is that the time of assertion (TA) is not situated entirely before the time of utterance (TU), as discussed in Chapter 6. In essence, the two main options that this leaves are TA (partly) simultaneous to TU (present) and TA after TU (future). These two options are divided rather neatly over both aspects. Greek future forms are normally translated with OCS perfective presents while Greek indicative presents are normally translated with OCS imperfective presents. Anaspectual verbs are used in both functions. Below I will start out discussing this major division in the use of the present tense and subsequently discuss a number of other functions of aspect in combination with the present tense.

[2] Since the corpus of OCS texts is relatively small and contains mainly narratives, it is probable that not all functions of verbal aspect are attested in all contexts or verb forms. For instance, the conative use of the imperfective aspect is only attested a few times in the imperfect and examples in the present tense are absent or at least multi-interpretable. However, a comparison of the few available OCS examples to modern Slavic languages demonstrates that the conclusion that imperfective aspect in OCS can be used in a conative function is justifiable. Other functions, such as running instructions one finds in recipes, like *now you add the salt* (cf. Dickey 2000: 155-174) are almost absent from OCS (the one I know of, one folio in *Psalter Dimitrijs* (Schaeken & Birnbaum 1999: 185-186) uses infinitives like *ispiti* 'drink up', *variti* 'cook'). A comparison to modern Slavic languages will therefore always be only partial and the lack of native informants makes it hard to find the limits of the possibilities.

8.1.1 Future reference

As mentioned before, an important function of the perfective aspect in the present tense in OCS is the expression of futurity. In terms of the time-relation model this means that the TA lies after TU. It appears that attainment of an inherent boundary is more compatible with an interpretation in which that boundary is reached at some point in time before (e.g. aorist) or after the moment of utterance (future function), than that the attainment is simultaneous with the TU. In the modern Slavic languages this becomes apparent from the fact, for example, that a perfective present is never used in the actual present (an event going on at the TU). However, in a number of other contexts Slavic languages allow coincidence of a complete event and TU to various degrees (cf. Dickey 2000). As I will demonstrate below in the section on other uses of the present tense (section 8.1.2), this is also the case in OCS.

To get an idea of the difference between perfective and imperfective verbs with regard to the expression of futurity, I collected all indicative future forms in the Greek Gospel texts and compared those forms to the OCS translations. This resulted in 960 forms in the Greek original, with 2849 equivalents in the four OCS Gospel codices.[3] Table 8.1 below shows the frequencies of the translations of the future tense forms for the four main aspectual groups and, for comparison purposes, also for VOMs and Leskien's class II verbs with partners, which I will treat separately in Chapter 9. I have given the frequencies pair-wise: on the left side the groups that are positioned more on the perfective side of the aspect dimension (cf. Chapter 7, Figure 7.7) compared to their counterpart, on the right side their partners that are positioned on the imperfective side:

[3] For counting the future forms in Greek original I used the morphological search function of the Bible software program *BibleWorks 9*. I compared the future forms that I found in Greek by hand with the OCS translations in my Parallel Corpus of OCS Gospel texts.
Interestingly, there are only 40 cases of periphrastic constructions with *vъčęti* 'start', *načęti* 'start' and *iměti* 'have' (cf. Birnbaum 1958) translating a Greek future form in the four OCS Gospel codices. Another more frequently used construction (91 attestations) consists of a future tense form of *byti* with a passive participle, which often is perfective, although a few anaspectual verbs also occur (e.g. perfective *prědanъ bǫdetъ* 'he will be delivered' or anaspectual *bьeni bǫdete* 'you will be scourged') (cf. Birnbaum 1958: 21-26). Constructions with *xotěti* are not attested in the four Gospel codices as translation of a Greek future form.

Perfective side		***Imperfective side***	
Perfective prefixed	914	Imperfective prefixed	22[4]
Perfective unprefixed	222	Imperfective unprefixed	4[5]
Prefixed determinate VOM	159	Prefixed indeterminate VOM	2
Determinate VOM	44	Indeterminate VOM	0
Leskien II prefixed	76	Leskien II prefixed partner	5
Leskien II unprefixed	17	Leskien II unprefixed partner	0
Total	***1432***	***Total***	***38***

Table 8.1 Frequencies of translation of Greek future forms (pair-wise)

In this table the division of the future function between the partners of a pair is quite clear: the verbs in the groups on the perfective side are the standard translation for Greek future forms, while the verbs in the groups on the imperfective side rarely occur in that function. When a perfective present is used, the usual interpretation is that it concerns a future event, like in the following examples of both prefixed and unprefixed perfective verbs (and I could add numerous others):[6]

(95) i reče se ***sъtvorjǫ***[pres] . ***razorjǫ***[pres] žitьnicǫ mojǫ . i bolьšǫ ***sъziždǫ***[pres] . i ***sъberǫ***[pres] tu žita moě . i dobro moe [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
then he said, "This is what I *will do*: I *will tear down* my barns and *build* larger ones, and there I *will store* all my grain and my goods" (Luke 12:18)

[4] Two of these concern a PresAP and one is a periphrastic construction with (*ne*) *iměti* 'have'.

[5] Two of these concern a periphrastic construction with *načęti* 'start' + infinitive.

[6] I found the same association between perfective present and future reference with two present participles of the perfective verbs *roditi sę* 'be born':
da poznaetъ rodъ inъ . s[y]novi ***rodjęštei***[PresAP] ***sję*** . i vъstanǫtъ pověděti ě s[y]nomъ svoimъ [*Ps*]
that the generation to come might know, even the children *yet to be born*, that they may arise and tell them to their children (Psalm 78:6)
In Psalm 21:32 there is a similar example of a present participle of *roditi sę* 'be born' translating a Greek future participle. There are also five examples of present participles of *roditi sę* translating a Greek present participle. An example can be found in *Suprasliensis* 238, 1, where it translates *γεννώμενος*. Interestingly, it has the same future meaning there, namely 'the one that is to be born', in this case Jesus. However, I have found no examples of PresAPs translating a Greek future participle with other perfective verbs in OCS. I should note that the Greek future participle is rather rare; in the Gospel texts I found only three attestations (Matthew 27:49, Luke 22: 49 and John 6:64). In the Book of Psalms there are 6 examples, 4 of which are Greek translations of the Hebrew word for 'choir director', *ἀλλοιωθησομένων*.
Regarding the verb *roditi sę*: this verb is a special case if one considers some cognates in modern Slavic languages that are regarded as imperfective (Polish) or biaspectual (Russian). However, in OCS there is no reason to regard this as anything other than a perfective verb, just as in modern BCS, Bulgarian and Macedonian. It has a derived partner (*ražđati sę*) and individual attestations do not give rise to an anaspectual or imperfective interpretation either (Dostál 1954: 87).

(96) o male bě věrьnъ . nadъ mnogy tę ***postavlǫ***^{pres} [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
you were faithful with a few things, I *will put* you in charge of many things (Matthew 25:21)

(97) i tъgda ***avitъ***^{pres} ***sę*** znamenie s[y]na č[lověčь]skago [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
and then the sign of the Son of Man *will appear* in the sky (Matthew 24:30)

(98) nyně věmь . ěko egože koližьdo . prosiši otъ b[og]a ***dastъ***^{pres} ti b[og]ъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
even now I know that whatever You ask of God, God *will give* You (John 11:22)

In the few examples of imperfective present tense forms translating a Greek future form, it often concerns generalized utterances, like in the following example with a future form of *byti* 'be' and two imperfective present tense forms, one of *poimati sę* 'be taken' and one of *ostavljati sę* 'be left':[7]

(99) gl[agol]jǫ že vamъ . vъ tǫ noštь ***bǫdete***^{fut} dъva . na loži edinomь . edinъ ***poemletъ***^{pres} ***sę*** a drugy ***ostavlěetъ***^{pres} [*Z*, *M*][8]
I tell you, on that night there *will be* two in one bed; one will be taken and the other will be left (Luke 17:34)[9]

In example (99) (which is example (28) in Chapter 4), the theme is not one particular event, but rather a general rule of how life will be at that point, a context that is very compatible with imperfective aspect such as it is in modern Slavic languages (cf. also the difference between exemplary use of the perfective present and generalized use of the imperfective present in OCS, section 8.1.2.1).

Often, examples with imperfective verbs translating Greek future forms show variation between codices, which could indicate that the imperfective forms are not the original translation, but replace perfective forms in an environment that seems to be more fitting with the general meaning of imperfective aspect. An interesting example can be found in Matthew 7:8

[7] In my interpretation the reflexive pronoun *sę* is 'shared' by the two imperfective verbs. The verb *poimati sę* is part of an interesting group of verbs (cf. Chapter 9, section 9.5). It appears to behave as the imperfective partner of *pojęti sę*.

[8] Based on the analysis in Chapter 9 (section 9.5) I treat prefixed forms of *-jęti, -imǫ* 'take' as perfective and prefixed forms of *-imati, -jemljǫ* 'take' as imperfective in this and the following example, even though they do not show the prototypical derivational opposition in which the derived verb has the suffix *-ati, -aje-* and extra derived forms on *-imati, -imajǫ* are attested as well.

[9] In the following two verses there are more examples of a present tense of *ostavljati* 'leave' translating a Greek future form in a similar context.

where the Greek original uses two present tense forms (*λαμβάνει* and *εὑρίσκει*) and subsequently a future tense form (*ἀνοιγήσεται*) in a generalized utterance, i.e. and utterance in which the event is not presented as a single event. This results in the following three OCS translations:

(100) vьsěkъ bo prosęi ***priemletъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. i ištęi ***obrětaetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. i tlъkǫštumu ***otvrъzetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ ***sę*** [*Z*, *A*]
vьsěkъ bo prosęi ***priemletъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. i ištęi ***obrětaatъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. i tlъkǫštjumu ***otvrъzaatъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ ***sę*** [*M*]
vsakъ bo prosęi ***priemletъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. i ištęi ***obrękštetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. i tlъkǫštjumu ***otvrъzǫtъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ ***sę*** [*Sk*]
πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν ***λαμβάνει***$^{\text{pres}}$ καὶ ὁ ζητῶν ***εὑρίσκει***$^{\text{pres}}$ καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ***ἀνοιγήσεται***$^{\text{fut}}$
for everyone who asks *receives*, and he who seeks *finds*, and to him who knocks it *shall be opened* (Matthew 7:8)

Zographensis and *Assemanianus* translate the Greek present forms with a present tense of the imperfective verbs *priimati* 'receive' and *obrětati* 'find' and the future form with a present tense of the perfective verb *otvrěsti* 'open'. This is the expected translation. However, the Greek original uses the two present tense forms in a similar generalizing function as the future tense form. This could be the reason why the version in the *Marianus* uses the present tense of *otvrъzati* 'open', thus straightening out the aspectual difference between the three events and presenting all three of them as generalized events. *Savvina Kniga*, on the other hand, straightens out the aspectual difference between the second and third form the other way around and uses a present tense form of the perfective verb *obrěsti* 'find' instead of a present tense form of the imperfective verbs *obrětati* 'find' as found in the other codices. This shows that the difference between perfective and imperfective present in OCS is not equal to the difference between future and present in Greek. Aspectual considerations can be a reason to use an imperfective present where Greek uses a future form.

There are some instances in which the use of the imperfective forms is not the result of a generalizing context. Examples of this can be found with the verbs *osramljati sę* and *posramljati sę* 'be ashamed' (6 times in total):

(101) ešte že iměaše edinogo s[y]na . vъzljubenaago svoego . posъla i togo kъ nimъ poslědi g[lago]lę ěko ***posramljajǫtъ***[pres] ***sę*** s[y]na moego [*Z*, *M*]
he had one more to send, a beloved son; he sent him last of all to them, saying, "They *will respect* my son" (Mark 12:6)[10]

Here, the imperfective verb, expressing the terminative event of 'becoming ashamed' refers to a single specific situation, a generalized interpretation must therefore be ruled out. A possible reason for not using the perfective *posramiti sę* is that the event is presented as distributive; the subject is plural, and the interpretation could be that all of them will become ashamed one by one when seeing the son. It is also possible that an earlier *posramętъ sę* 'they will respect' was later changed by a scribe who interpreted this as a more generalized utterance 'they respect my son'.[11]

Examples like (99), (100) and (101) show that there is no firm rule that a Greek future tense can only be translated with a perfective present, or that an imperfective present could not express futurity. Other than that, however, the trend is clear: if there is a choice between a perfective and an imperfective verb to translate a Greek future tense, the perfective verb is the standard translation. The choice of an imperfective verb requires an additional explanation, even though it is not always easy to find one (cf. example (101)). It is interesting to see that the unprefixed VOMs fit nicely into this system, even though they are clearly not a Slavic-style aspect pair. I will discuss this situation more in detail in Chapter 9.

A large number of translations of Greek future forms in the gospel codices are accounted for by verbs that are not part of a derivational pair, as shows Table 8.2:

Group	
Prefixed without derived partner	417
byti	373
Anaspectual verbs	250

Table 8.2 Frequencies of translation of Greek future forms (no pair)

[10] Similar examples can be found in Matthew 21:37 [*M*, *A*] (where *Savvina Kniga* has a prefixed verb *postydati sę* 'be ashamed' of which no derived partner is attested) and Luke 20:13 [*Z*, *M*]. All these texts concern the same parable.

[11] Unfortunately there is only one attestation of a present tense of *posramiti sę* in OCS, in an optative construction (with the particle *da*) translating a Greek imperative aorist: *da […] posramjętъ sę i pogybnǫtъ* [*Ps*] '*let them be humiliated* and perish' (Psalm 82: 18), so I cannot give a minimal pair.

Prefixed verbs without derived partner and the verb *byti* will be discussed in Chapter 9. The interesting category for the present chapter is the anaspectual group. Even though the frequency of future translations is not as high as in the perfective verbs, anaspectual verbs are quite often used to translate Greek future forms. There are many examples:

(102) slovo eže g[lago]laxъ to ***sǫditъ***[pres] emu . vъ poslědьni dьnь [*Z*, *M*]
the word I spoke is what *will judge* him at the last day (John 12:48)

(103) do kolě sъ vami bǫdǫ[fut] do kolě ***trъpljǫ***[pres] vasъ [*M*, *A*, *Sk*]
how long shall I be with you? How long *shall* I *put up* with you? (Matthew 17:17)

(104) ne p'čete sę ubo na utrěi . otrьni bo dnь sobojǫ ***pečetъ***[pres] ***sę*** [*Z*, *M*, *Sk*]
so do not worry about tomorrow; for tomorrow *will care* for itself (Matthew 6:34)

Even though all these verbs are anaspectual, there is an interesting difference between the predicates. In (102) the predicate could be seen as referring to a single complete terminative event, just like a predicate with a perfective verb would do, while in (103) and (104) the event referred has no clear inherent boundary. To the best of my knowledge, verbs like *trъpěti* 'be patient' and *pešti sę* 'care' are only attested in aterminative predicates, just like, for example, *ležati* 'lie' and *alъkati* 'be hungry'. Even on the rare occasion that these verbs occur in the aorist, which is a form that expresses a temporally bounded event, the predicate can still only be interpreted as aterminative:

(105) i tebě ***trъpěxъ***[aor] vesъ denъ [*Ps*][12]
and I *have waited* for you all day (Psalm 24:5)

Verbs like *sǫditi* 'judge' occur in both terminative and aterminative predicates. One could say that, although these anaspectual verbs do not automatically express a terminative event, in the right context (verb form, object and wider context) a submerged inherent boundary is uncovered. In other words: these verbs are 'terminativizable'. In (102) the inherent boundary is clearly present, introduced by the discrete object *emu* 'him'. In section 8.3.2 I will come back to the issue of terminativizability of anaspectual verbs.

In fact, I found that verbs that allow a terminative construal, show competition with prefixed perfective formations in future use in a terminative context, which on occasion emerges as variation between codices:

[12] The same phrase can also be found in *Euchologium Sinaiticum* (78b 18).

(106) otъ ustъ tvoixъ ***sǫždǫ***^{pres} tę [*M, A*]
otъ ustъ tvoixъ ***osǫždǫ***^{pres} tę [*Z*]
by your own words I *will judge* you (Luke 19:22)

(107) nъ si vьsě ***tvorętъ***^{pres} vamъ za imę moe [*Z*]
nъ si vьsě ***sъtvorętъ***^{pres} vamъ za imę moe [*M, A, Sk*]
but all these things they *will do* to you for My name's sake (John 15:21)

(108) kako vsę pritъčę ***uměete***^{pres} [*Z*]
kako vьsę pritъčę ***razuměete***^{pres} [*M*]
how *will* you *understand* all the parables (Mark 4:13)

(109) eiže ne ***vъzmogǫtъ***^{pres} protiviti sę i otъvěštati . vsi protivljějǫštei sę vamъ. [*Z, M, A*]
eiže ne ***mogǫtъ***^{pres} protiviti sę i otъvěštati . vsi protivljějǫštei sę vamъ. [*Sk*]
which none of your opponents *will be able* to resist or refute (Luke 21:15)

In other cases the competition is not between morphologically related verbs, but between semantically related verbs, like anaspectual *viděti* 'see' and perfective prefixed *uzьrěti* 'see, catch sight of':

(110) da idǫtъ vъ galilejǫ i tu mę ***vidętъ***^{pres} [*Z, M, A*]
da idǫtъ vъ galilejǫ i tu mę ***uzьrętъ***^{pres} [*Sk*]
to leave for Galilee, and there they *will see* Me (Matthew 28:10)

These examples show that the fact that there is an aspect system as well as the fact that functions have been divided between the perfective and imperfective partners, affects the functioning of the anaspectual verbs as well. The frequent use of anaspectual verbs to translate Greek future forms, indicates that the division of labour between prefixed perfective verbs and anaspectual verbs is not the same as between perfective and imperfective verbs. However it seems reasonable to assume that the more the future context became associated with perfective verbs, the less it became compatible with other types of verbs, like the anaspectual verbs. In some cases it seems that in OCS the association between futurity and perfective aspect is so strong that a prefixed verb is used, simply to fulfil the condition of the use of a perfective verb to translate a Greek future tense.[13] This is how I interpret the following example (already given as example (44) in Chapter 6) as well:

[13] Cf. the use of delimitative verbs in sequences of events in Russian.

(111) blaženъ iže . ***sъněstъ***[pres] xlěbъ vъ c[ěsa]rstvii b[o]žii [*Z, M*]
blessed is everyone who *shall eat* bread in the kingdom of God (Luke 14:15)

There are more than enough examples of *jasti* translating a Greek future tense, but examples like this show that expressing futurity is strongly associated with the perfective aspect in OCS. In some cases, the use of prefixed forms in OCS even leads to difficulties in interpretation:

(112) prědadętъ[pres] bo vy na sъnъmy . i na sъnъmištixъ vašixъ . ***ubьjǫtъ***[pres] vy [*Z, M*][14]
they will hand you over to the courts and *scourge (kill*? JK) you in their synagogues (Matthew 10:17)

The prefixed verb *ubiti* is normally used in the meaning of 'kill'. In this particular example, however, the OCS translation uses the prefixed form of *biti* to express a future scourging event, translating the Greek future form (*μαστιγώσουσιν*). It is difficult to see how a difference in meaning between scourging and killing could be made in this case. In similar attestation the simplex *biti* is used to translate a future form of the same Greek verb. In the following example this could be because of the fact that *ubiti* is used in the same utterance in the meaning 'kill':

(113) otъ nixъ ***ubiete***[pres] . i propьnete[pres] . i otъ nixъ ***bьete***[pres] na sonьmištixъ vašixъ . i iždenete[pres] otъ grada vъ grada [*M, A*][15]
some of them you *will kill* and crucify, and some of them you *will scourge* in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city (Matthew 23:34)

8.1.1.1 Special case: the verbs rešti and glagolati

A large part of the future translations of anaspectual verbs are accounted for by the verb *rešti* 'say' (82 attestations). Dostál (1954: 65-69) discusses the verb and comes to the conclusion that *rešti* was probably biaspectual in Proto-Slavic, based on the attestations of present participles of *rešti* in OCS. However, he considers the verb to express perfective aspect in OCS as a result of the already established aspect system in combination with its opposition to *glagolati* 'speak, say', which Dostál considers to be imperfective. In my classification, *rešti* and *glagolati* are both anaspectual verbs, being unprefixed

[14] *Assemanianus* has *utepǫtъ* from *uteti* which in OCS is only attested 4 times, all 4 times in the meaning of 'beat up'. In Modern Bulgarian and in Modern Macedonian dialects this verb means 'kill'.
[15] *Assemanianus* has a present tense form of anaspectual *teti* 'scourge' instead of a present tense of *biti*.

without a partner. When it comes to the translation of Greek future forms, the verb *glagolati* is also opposed to *vъzglagolati*, in its meaning of 'speak'. In the following example, there are forms of all three verbs; *glagolati* translating an aorist of the Greek verb *λαλέω* 'speak', *rešti* translating a subjunctive aorist of the verb *λέγω* 'say' and *vъzglagolati* translating a subjunctive aorist of *λαλέω* again.

(114) ěko azъ o sebě ne ***g[lago]laxъ***^{aor} . nъ posъlavy mę o[tь]cь . tъ mьně zapovědь dastъ čьto ***rekǫ***^{pres} i čьto ***vъzglagolǫ***^{pres} [*Z*, *M*]
for I *did* not *speak* on My own initiative, but the Father Himself who sent Me has given Me a commandment as to what to *say* and what to *speak* (John 12:49)

In this example, only *glagolati* is used in an aterminative sense, while both *rešti* and *vъzglagolati* occur in a terminative predicate. The difference between *rešti* and *vъzglagolati* is lexical, similar to the difference between English *say* and *speak*. The verbs *glagolati* and *vъzglagolati* both translate the same Greek verb, *λαλέω* 'speak', and do not express a lexical difference. Their relation can be compared to that between *sǫditi*, which occurs in both terminative and aterminative predicates and *osǫditi*, which can only be used in terminative predicates. I have also found variation between codices in which *glagolati* occurs in a periphrastic future construction in one codex, while other codices have *vъzglagolati* or simply a present tense of *glagolati*, again reminiscent of the variation found between anaspectual verbs and prefixed formations in the examples (106) - (110):

(115) egda že prědadętъ vy . ne pečte sę kako li čьto ***vъzg[lago]lete***^{pres} . dastъ bo sę vamъ vъ tъ časъ . čьto ***g[lago]lete***^{pres} [*Z*, *M*]
egda že prědadętъ vy . ne pečte sę kako li čьto ***imate***^{pres} ***g[lago]lati***^{inf} . dastъ bo sę vamъ vъ tъ časъ . čьto ***g[lago]lete***^{pres} [*A*]
but when they hand you over, do not worry about how or what you *are to speak*; for it will be given you in that hour what you *are to speak* (Matthew 10:19, my translation)

Hence, when it comes to the translation of forms of *λαλέω* 'speak', OCS usually uses either a form of *glagolati* or of *vъzglagolati*. This is consistent with the classification of *glagolati* as an anaspectual verb. However, the translation of the present tense of *λέγω* 'say' is the domain of *glagolati* as well, and when *λέγω* is the Greek original, there is an opposition with *rešti* that is strongly reminiscent of an aspect opposition: the present tense of *rešti* is used to translate subjunctive aorist forms of *λέγω* 'say' (has no future form) or future forms of *ἐρέω* which also means 'say'. In this sense, the usage of *glagolati* is always terminative, the inherent boundary is formed by the

message, while in the sense 'speak' it expresses no inherent boundary. An example of this terminative use of *glagolati* is:

(116) sego radi ***g[lago]ljǫ***$^{\text{pres}}$ vamъ . ne p'cěte sę d[u]šejǫ svoejǫ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
for this reason I *say* to you, do not be worried about your life (Matthew 6:25)

The verb *rešti* is used in the same sense, normally with future meaning. In example (117) it is a translation of a future form of *ἐρέω*, while in (118) the Greek original has a subjunctive aorist of *λέγω*:

(117) vъstavъ idǫ$^{\text{pres}}$ kъ o[tь]cju moemu . i ***rekǫ***$^{\text{pres}}$ emu . o[tь]če sъgrěšixъ na n[e]bo i prědъ tobojǫ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
I will get up and go to my father, and will say to him, "Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in your sight" (Luke 15:18)

(118) vъprošǫ$^{\text{pres}}$ i azъ vy edinogo slovese . otъvěštaite mi . i ***rekǫ***$^{\text{pres}}$ vamъ koejǫ oblastijǫ se tvorjǫ [*Z*, *M*]
I will ask you one question, and you answer Me, and then I *will tell* you by what authority I do these things (Mark 11:29)

There are some exceptions to the general rule as well, in which a present tense of *rešti* is used to translate a Greek present (27 attestations in the material of Dostál 1954: 65):

(119) tъgda ***rečetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. vъzvraštǫ sę vъ xramъ moi . i prišьdъ obrętetъ$^{\text{pres}}$ prazdьnъ [*Z*, *M*]
then it says, "I will return to my house from which I came"; and when it comes, it finds it unoccupied (Matthew 12:44)

In this example a present tense forms of Greek *λέγω* is translated by a present tense form of *rešti*, and the subsequent present tense form, from the perfective verb *obrěsti* 'find' also translates a Greek present tense form *εὑρίσκει*.[16] Both events do not refer to a specific event, but rather to exemplary event, as shown by Matthew 12:43, where the story starts with 'Now when the unclean spirit goes out of a man [...]'. In section 8.1.2.1, I will show that perfective present forms regularly occur in such exemplary use. Hence, even if the opposition between *rešti* and *glagolati* is not completely equal to that of the core aspect pairs, the division of labour in these cases is equal to that of an aspect pair. In section 9.4 I will demonstrate that the unprefixed VOMs show

[16] I do not consider the perfective present *vъzvraštǫ* here, because it is part of the quoted utterance in direct speech.

a similar division of labour, even though these verbs cannot be regarded as an aspect pair.

In the following sections, I will discuss some more examples of *rešti* to show how it behaves in other contexts and analyse some of the attestations that Dostál considers to show the original biaspectuality of the verb.[17] The opposition between *rešti* and *glagolati* will get more attention in section 8.2.2.2 where I discuss the imperfective aorist and in section 8.3.4 where I discuss a number of dubious anaspectual verbs.

8.1.2 Other uses of the present tense

8.1.2.1 Multiple or generalized events

The use of imperfective verbs translating a Greek future tense is rare. The few examples that I discussed above show that imperfective verbs are used in unbounded predicates. This unboundedness often results in a generalized interpretation; when a terminative verb is used the predicate does not refer to the occurrence of a single complete event at the micro-level, but to unboundedness at the macro-level (cf. Chapter 2). However, perfective verbs may occur in similar utterances as well. Example (119) in the preceding section shows such a case, with the verb *obrěsti* 'find'. This use of perfective verbs can be compared to what Forsyth (1970: 173) calls 'singularization', or exemplary use, for Modern Russian: a single complete event is singled out as an example of a general rule. With such generalized utterances the implication is not so much that the event occurs on more occasions, but rather that the event will occur when the right circumstances occur. Compare the following example in which OCS (again, as in (119)) translates Greek present tense forms with perfective present tense forms:[18]

(120) i g[lago]ljǫ . semu idi$^{\text{impr}}$. i idetъ$^{\text{pres}}$ i drugumu pridi$^{\text{impr}}$. i ***pridetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. i rabu moemu sъtvori$^{\text{impr}}$ se i ***sъtvoritъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
and I say to this one, "Go!" and he goes, and to another, "Come!" and he comes, and to my slave, "Do this!" and he does it (Matthew 8:9)

An English translation with 'will' probably comes closest to the OCS version here: '[…] "Come" and he *will* come, and to my slave, "Do this" and he *will*

[17] Since *rešti* is a very frequent verb, with 3878 attestations in my database, I reran my CA of the five core groups, now with the anaspectual group without the verb *rešti*. In this test, the aspect dimension accounts for 98.9% of the variance and the anaspectual group moves a little further towards the imperfective side of the aspect dimension. However, the difference with the imperfective groups is still significant with a medium effect size. $\chi 2$ (6) =636.89, $p < 0.001$, Cramér's V = 0.288.

[18] The verb *priiti* is a prefixed VOM, of which I will demonstrate in Chapter 9 (section 9.3) that it behaves like a perfective verb.

do it'. This shows that in English too the same form can be used for future reference and for generalized utterances.[19]

Other constructions in which perfective verbs are often used in generalized expressions are constructions starting with 'whoever …' or 'everyone who …', like the following example, where the present tense of perfective *vъzьrěti* 'look' translates the Greek present active participle *ὁ βλέπων*:

(121) azъ že g[lago]ljǫ vamъ . ěko vьsěkъ iže ***vъzьritъ***[pres] na ženǫ sъ poxotijǫ . uže ljuby sъtvori[aor] sъ nejǫ . vъ srьdьci svoemь [*Z*, *M*]
but I say to you that everyone who *looks* at a woman with lust for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart (Matthew 5:28)

The use of constructions like 'everyone who' as in (121) "creates a kind of singular representative instance" (Dickey 2000: 74), hence a context in which, once again, the event is exemplary.

In all these uses, the perfective verb refers to a single complete event, emphasizes the totality on the micro-level, while the context gives the information that it concerns a generalized event.[20] There are also cases, however, in which the perfective aspect refers to multiple complete events, while expressing totality on both the micro-level and the macro-level. These are cases of so-called bounded repetition:

(122) prěžde daže kokotъ ne ***vъzglasitъ***[pres] dьva kraty . ***otъvrъžeši***[pres] sę mene tri kraty [*M*, *Z*]
before a rooster crows *twice*, you will *deny* Me three times (Mark 14:72)

In this example the present tense of the perfective verb *vъzglasiti* 'call out' refers to two complete events and, hence, to a bounded series of repetition. The present tense of this prefixed verb is used to express bounded repetition; it refers to three complete events of denying and expresses that those three

[19] Comparison with the modern Slavic translation is also very interesting. There is much variation: some languages, like BCS and Czech, behave as OCS and have perfective presents, while other languages, like Russian, Bulgarian and Macedonian, have imperfective (and anaspectual?) presents instead of perfective presents (e.g. Russian *prixodit* and *delaet*). This fits with Dickey's (2000) idea that the languages in the eastern group of Slavic put more restrictions on the use of the perfective present in habitual expressions than languages from the western group, or the transitional zones.

[20] Given the fact that the use of the perfective aspect in habitual expression in the eastern group is much more restricted, it is possible that 'singularization' is a more marked function in e.g. Russian as compared to Czech, or OCS, where the use of perfective aspect in habitual expressions is relatively wide-spread. However, I believe that the mechanism is the same: one event is used as a representation for a general rule.

times makes up the complete series of repetitive events. This is the main difference with imperfective verbs that refers to unboundedness on the macro-level. The verb *vъzglašati*, the imperfective partner of *vъzglasiti* provides a good example of the difference:

(123) podobenъ estъ dětišemъ . sědęštemъ na trъžištixъ . iže ***vъzglašajǫtъ***[pres] drugomъ svoimъ [*Z*, *M*]
it is like children sitting in the market places, who *call out* to the other children (Matthew 11:16)

In this example the calling out to their peers is not restricted to a fixed number of repetitions, but rather refers to the regularity of the occurrence of the event (cf. Carlson 2012: 829). The individual micro-events are interpreted as complete in this context, otherwise one would get a series of conative events, which does not make sense here. However, the imperfective verb itself does not express anything about that totality; in other contexts, however, the unboundedness results exactly in a conative reading, as I will demonstrate below in section 8.1.2.2 and 8.2.1.2.

In constructions with 'whoever …' or 'everyone who …', imperfective presents (as well as the anaspectual present, e.g. in this example *slyšati* 'hear') also occur regularly, just like perfective presents (cf. (121)):

(124) vsěkъ iže ***slyšitъ***[pres] slovesa c[ěsa]r[ьstvi]ě . i ne ***razuměvaetъ***[pres] . ***prixoditъ***[pres] nepriězny . i ***vъsxyštaetъ***[pres] sěanoe vъ srъdьci ego [*Z*, *M*]
when anyone *hears* the word of the kingdom and *does* not *understand* it, the evil one *comes* and *snatches* away what has been sown in his heart (Matthew 13:19)

When imperfective verbs are used like this, instead of perfective verbs, there are two differences with the use of perfective present in the same context. First, the emphasis lies on the unboundedness at the macro-level, and not at the level of an individual complete event. So the event is not 'singled out', but presented as a regularity. Secondly, since the events are not explicitly presented as complete, an interpretation in which the events on the micro-level overlap is possible.

Imperfective verbs are used in a similar vein to express a general truth:

(125) ni ***vьlivajǫtъ***[pres] vina nova . vъ měxy vetъxy [*M*]
nor do people *put* new wine *into* old wineskins (Matthew 9:17)

This gnomic present is clearly based on the habits of people, but abstracts away from those habits to a general rule. It is often difficult to distinguish between an imperfective verb used in a generalized context and one in a habitual utterance, however, the following example is a clear example of a habitual utterance, referring to the habits of Jesus' disciples:

(126) po čьto učenici tvoi ***prěstǫpajǫtъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. prědaanie staŕьcь . ne ***omyvajǫtъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ bo rǫkъ svoixъ . egda xlěbъ ***ědętъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ [*Z*, *M*]
why do Your disciples *break* the tradition of the elders? For they *do* not *wash* their hands when they *eat* bread (Matthew 15:2)

Sometimes the repetition is even more strongly connected to a particular moment in time, like the lamps going out one by one in the following example:

(127) dadite namъ otъ oleě vašego . ěko světilьnici naši ***ugasajǫtъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
give us some of your oil, for our lamps *are going out* (Matthew 25:8)

When used like this, the imperfective verbs come close to expressing a single process, since the event is so clearly connected to a specific point in time. There are two possible interpretations here: an iterative/distributive situation in which the lamps are already going out one by one, but not all lamps have gone out yet, or an imminent situation: the lamps are not out yet, but in all of them the oil is almost finished. In both cases the interpretation has a durative component; the event unfolds itself in the direction of an inherent boundary and can be seen as an instance of an actual present (cf. examples (128) and (129)).

I have shown that in OCS both perfective and imperfective verbs are used to refer to generalized events or multiple events. When perfective verbs are used in such contexts, either a single complete event is presented as exemplary for other events and the boundedness on the micro-level is in focus, or it concerns a bounded number of repetitions. Imperfective verbs are used to focus on the unboundedness on the macro-level, while the attainment of the inherent boundary on the micro-level is implicit, or stays unclear. In the next section I will discuss examples in which the inherent boundary on the micro-level is explicitly denied (conativity).

8.1.2.2 Single events

While perfective verbs in the present tense always express a single event, the imperfective present is also used to refer to single events. The difference with perfective verbs is that imperfective presents are used when for some reason there is a need to defocus the inherent boundary of the verbs. Below, I will discuss a number of contexts in which imperfective presents refer to single events.

The first context is the actual present, a present tense used to refer to an event that is going on at the TU (cf. also example (127)). This use is relatively rare in OCS, because most of the texts are narratives and the actual present only occurs in direct speech. However, there are some attestations, often in

questions like 'why are you …ing'. I have given some examples of this phenomenon in Chapter 6 already, showing that both anaspectual verbs and imperfective verbs occur in the actual present. Compare the present tense of anaspectual *sъpati* 'sleep' in (128) and imperfective *otrěšati* 'untie' (also given as example (42) in Chapter 6) in (129):

(128) i reče imъ čьto ***sъpite***$^{\text{pres}}$ [*Z, M*]
and said to them, "Why *are* you *sleeping*" (Luke 22:46)

(129) otrěšajǫštema že ima žrěba . rěšę g[ospo]dьe ego kъ nima . čьto ***otrěšaeta***$^{\text{pres}}$ žrěba [*Z, M*]
as they were untying the colt, its owners said to them, "Why *are* you *untying* the colt" (Luke 19:33)

The difference between anaspectual verbs and imperfective verbs in the actual present is subtle; anaspectual verbs express an event that has no inherent boundary, while imperfective verbs are inherently terminative and in the actual present focus on the process before the attainment of the boundary. The subtlety of the difference is emphasized by variation between codices in this context, with in the following example a present tense of anaspectual *mysliti* 'think' and imperfective *pomyšljati* 'think, consider':

(130) i viděvъ is[usъ] pomyšlenię ixъ . reče . vъskǫjǫ vy ***myslite***$^{\text{pres}}$ zьlo vъ srъdьcixъ vašixъ [*Z, M*]
i viděvъ is[us]ъ pomъišlenię ixъ reče . vъskǫjǫ vy ***pomyšlěete***$^{\text{pres}}$ zьlo vъ srdcixъ vašix [*A, Sk*]
and Jesus knowing their thoughts said, "Why *are* you *thinking* evil in your hearts" (Matthew 9:4)

The anaspectual verb refers to the actual thought process at the moment of utterance, while the imperfective verbs may carry the nuance of a more generalized event or iterativity. A possible interpretation is therefore 'why are you always thinking (making up?) evil thoughts in your hearts', in which case it is no longer an actual present, of course, but a generalized event.

Anaspectual verbs can also be used to express states that hold at the moment of speech. In (131) this concerns a transitory state that holds specifically at the moment of utterance, like with the verb *iměti* 'have', in (133) it concerns a permanent state (cf. Croft 2012: 58):

(131) g[lago]la že imъ is[usъ] . děti . eda čьto sъnědьno ***imate***$^{\text{pres}}$ [*Z, M, A, Sk*]
so Jesus said to them "children, *do you have* something to eat"(John 21:5)

(132) otъvěšta imъ is[usъ] . nyně li ***věruete***[pres] [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
Jesus answered them, "Do you now *believe*" (John 16:31)

Imperfective verbs can also be used to refer to single events is in a conative function. With conativity, the terminativity of the verb is not a hindrance, but rather a prerequisite in OCS, since it is exactly the defocusing of the inherent boundary that results in a conative interpretation. Anaspectual verbs do not have an inherent boundary and, hence, cannot be used to defocus such a boundary either. Although there are not many examples of conative use in the present tense (there are more examples in the imperfect, see the end of section 8.2.1.2), I believe the following examples could be interpreted as referring to a failed attempt:

(133) razuměvъ že is[usъ] . lǫkavьstvo ixъ reče . čьto mę ***okušaate***[pres] üpokriti [*M, A*, *Sk*]
but Jesus perceived their malice, and said, "Why *are you trying to tempt* Me, you hypocrites" (Matthew 22:18, my translation)

The example could also be translated as 'why are you testing me', as in the English translation. Whichever way it is translated, the test clearly fails, since Jesus 'perceived their malice'. Also, an iterative interpretation cannot be ruled out: 'why are you testing me all the time'.

A third context in which an imperfective present refers to a single event is on the rare occasion that a historical present is attested in OCS, almost always imitating the Greek original (Galton 1976: 29-30):

(134) i ***posylajǫtъ***[pres] kъ nemu učeniky svoję [*M*, *A*][21]
and they *sent* their disciples to Him (Matthew 22:16)

In this example an imperfective verb is used to refer to a single complete event, which is normally the domain of perfective verbs. However, there is a clash between on the one hand the totality of the event as it is known from the past and the way the event is presented as if it were occurring at the moment of speech. It is the simultaneity with the TU that in this OCS example is probably responsible for the choice for imperfective aspect.

For the historical present or narrative present and other atypical tense uses (e.g. backchecking), Klein (1994: 139) distinguishes between a 'real' time of the situation (which is when the event really obtains) and the 'imagined' time of the situation, which is the event as it is presented in relation to the chosen topic time. According to Klein the speaker chooses either, or may even switch to create particular connotations. In OCS the choice of imperfective aspect in

[21] Note that *Savvina Kniga* has an aorist *posъlašę* of the perfective verb *posъlati*.

the historical present, as in (134) may be explained by the choice of the imagined time of the situation: the event is presented as if it takes place at the moment of utterance. It is, however, problematic that this concerns an achievement, hence a verb without a process phase. It is not entirely clear to me how such an event would be visualized as actually taking place. Another explanation of the historical present is that it is used to highlight an important event in a series of past events. Rijksbaron (Lallot, Rijksbaron, Bernard & Buijs 2011: 4-10) discusses the functions and semantic features of the historical present in Classical Greek and claims that the function of the historical present is to highlight 'decisive events', which are almost always exclusively accomplishments or achievements. This could be an explanation for the use of the historical present in Matthew 22:16 as well. However, the extra complication in OCS, as compared to Greek, is that this still does not explain why an imperfective form is used, as opposed to a perfective form. Maybe perfective presents are only used in sequences of historical presents. The one example I found contains present tense forms of the perfective *aviti sę* 'appear' and the prefixed verbs without a derived partner *uslyšati* 'hear', translating the Greek present tense forms *ἀποκαλύπτεται* and *ἀκούει*:

(135) i abьje tomužde ***avitъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ ***sę*** ep[isko]pu . i glas[ъ] ***uslyšitъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ pritranъ glagolǫštь k nemu [*S*]
and immediately he *appears* to the same bishop, and he *hears* a clear voice saying to him (530, 10-11)

It is noteworthy that these present tense forms appear after the adverb *abьje* 'immediately'. Modern Czech uses perfective present forms in the historical present after such adverbs, denoting a sudden change of situation (Stunová 1993: 178). In this respect, Czech deviates from Russian, which uses perfective present only under much stricter conditions in narrative contexts (Stunová 1993: 191, Dickey 2000: 154). The small number of examples of historical present in OCS, does not allow for a more detailed analysis.

Finally, imperfective verbs also refer to single complete acts in performative language, in which the utterance itself constitutes an event, a so-called 'speech act' (cf. Austin 1962). In this context there is competition between imperfective and perfective verbs again. Compare the following two examples, both translating a Greek present tense form *δίδωμι* 'I give'; the first one uses a present tense of the imperfective *dajati* 'give', the second a present tense of perfective *dati* 'give':

(136) zapovědь novǫ ***dajǫ***[pres] vamъ [*Z, A, Sk*][22]
a new commandment I *give* to you (John 13:34)

(137) se polъ iměnič moego g[ospod]i . ***damь***[pres] ništiimъ [*Z, M, A*][23]
behold, Lord, half of my possessions I *give* to the poor (Luke 19:8, my translation)

The variation in the translation of *δίδωμι* is substantial, apart from the example of present tense of *dati* and *dajati* there is an example with a present tense of *prědati*, and an example showing variation between an aorist of *dati* and the present tense of *dajati*:

(138) ěko mьně prědana estъ . i emuže ašte xoštǫ ***prědamь***[pres] jǫ [*M*]
for it has been handed over to me, and I *give it* to whomever I wish (Luke 4:6)

(139) se ***daxъ***[aor] vamъ vlastь . nastǫpati na zmьję . i skorъpiję [*Z, A, Sk*]
se ***dajǫ***[pres] vamь vlastь nastǫpati na zmiję i skorъpiję [*M*]
behold, I *give* you authority to tread on serpents and scorpions (Luke 10:19, my translation)

I should note here that the critical text (as established by the United Bible Societies) of Luke 10:19 has a perfect *δέδωκα*, while the Byzantine text on which the OCS translation is based has the present tense *δίδωμι*. Whichever form is used, the word *ἰδού* 'behold', in OCS *se*, shows that this is still performative language: by speaking those words Jesus transfers his authority. Interestingly, Greek shows this variation between perfect and present tense more often in performatives. I found an example in Matthew 9:2, where the critical text has a present passive *ἀφίενται*, while the Byzantine text has a perfect passive *ἀφέωνται*.[24] It is not clear to me whether this variation is the cause of the variation between the OCS codices, or that both Greek and OCS allow different forms in such performative utterances. In this case only *Savvina Kniga* uses a perfective present and the three other codices an imperfective present:

[22] *Marianus* has *povědajǫ*, a present tense of *povědati* 'proclaim, announce, show' (cf. Chapter 9, section 9.5).
[23] This could also be interpreted as an intention, and not the actual event of giving. However, the Greek original has a present tense form, *δίδωμι*, which in my opinion sanctions a performative reading.
[24] In the critical text both forms occur. For example, in Luke 5:20 the perfect *ἀφέωνται* is used. In the Byzantine text I found no examples of *ἀφίενται*.

(140) drъzai čędo ***otъpuštajǫtъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ ti ***sę*** grěsi tvoi [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
naděi sę čędo . ***otъdadętъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ ti ***sę*** grěsi [*Sk*]
take courage, son; your sins *are forgiven* (Matthew 9:2)

The variation between the codices in OCS in this context is interesting given the fact that choice of aspect in performatives differs strongly between modern Slavic languages (cf. Dickey 2000, Žagar 2011, Kamphuis 2012). The paradox with performatives is that the event that is expressed is tantamount to the utterance itself and, therefore, simultaneous to the moment of speech, much like ordinary actual presents, but at the same time it is perceived as a complete event (cf. Koschmieder 1930). A choice for the imperfective aspect is a choice for emphasizing that the event occurs simultaneous to the moment of speech, while the choice for perfective aspect emphasizes the fact that the effect of the performative is instantaneous: the event is complete. The choice also depends on the specific meaning of the aspect in a specific language. As Dickey (2000: 201) puts it "the more limited degree of coincidence in the east results from the greater incompatibility of the concept of temporal definiteness with present situations, including those that can be identified as totalities more or less simultaneous to the moment of utterance".[25]

The examples above may have given the impression that the choice for either perfective or imperfective aspect is completely free in OCS. However, in OCS imperfective verbs are more frequent in this context. For example, *Savvina Kniga* has a form of imperfective *otъdajati* 'forgive' in Matthew 9:5, three verses after the verse in example (140), and all other translations of Greek *ἀφέωνται* are translated by *otъpuštajǫtъ sę* in all four codices (Mark 2:5, 2:9, Luke 5:20, 5:23, 7:47, 7:48). Given the fact that derived verbs are the 'new kids on the block', this division of labour indicates that they had largely taken over in this context in OCS, just as perfective verbs had become the standard choice in future contexts.

Anaspectual verbs also occur in performatives, like the following:

(141) otvrěsę že sę usta ego abie . i jęz[y]kъ ego . i g[lago]laaše ***bl[agoslovl]jǫ***$^{\text{pres}}$ b[og]a [*A*][26]
and at once his mouth was opened and his tongue loosed, and he began to speak, "I *praise* God" (Luke 1:64, my translation)

There are also very frequent examples of the verb *glagolati* in such contexts, even though it may not be a prototypical performative verb:[27]

[25] Dickey (2000) discusses performatives and other verbs that refer to a complete event that are simultaneous to the moment of utterance as cases of 'coincidence': event and utterance coincide.
[26] The other codices follow the Greek original with a present active participle.

(142) amin' ***g[lago]ljǫ***[pres] vamъ [*Z*, *M*]
truly I *say* to you (Mark 14:9)

I have not found examples of *rešti* 'say' in this context, however, in Chapter 10 I will discuss an instance of the use of the perfective present *sъkažǫ* 'I (will) tell' in a performative context:

(143) ***sъkažǫ***[pres] že vamъ kogo uboite sę . uboite sę . imǫštaago vlastь . po ubienii vъvrěšti vъ ġeonǫ . ei g[lago]ljǫ vamъ . togo uboite sę [*A*]
but I *will warn* you whom to fear: fear the One who, after He has killed, has authority to cast into hell; yes, I tell you, fear Him (Luke 12:5)

Similar variation between perfective and imperfective *verba dicendi* is, again, also found in modern Slavic languages (cf. Dickey 2000: 177-188).

8.2 Aorist and imperfect

As I already remarked in Chapter 6, in most cases aorist and imperfect express the same relation between TU and TA: TA lies before TU, in other words: they are both past tenses.[28] The difference between them is aspectual: aorist presents an event as temporally bounded, while the imperfect defocuses any boundaries of an event. Galton (1976: 140-141) describes the (perfective) aorist as follows:

"[…] each occurrence is quite schematically characterized by "was not - was - was over"; its "was not" is the "was over" of its predecessor, its "was over" is the "was not" of its successor."

In other words, the aorist moves the narration ahead by sequentially ordering past events. Below, I will also discuss non-narrative use of the aorist which occurs in the so-called retrospective mode.The imperfect is best understood in opposition to the aorist and, according to Galton (1976: 141) the imperfective imperfect "give[s] us a chance to pause and consider, to reflect and depict, wearied as we are by the eternal flow" and "can never by itself constitute a story" (ibidem: 167), but needs explicit or implicit support from (an)other event(s) (ibidem: 144). The imperfect only refers to the "was", but

[27] *Verba dicendi* probably better fit the definition of coincidence than that of performatives, but this does not make a difference for this discussion. Note (to make this even more complicated): coincidence is actually only used for perfective presents that refer to events that transpire simultaneously to the moment of utterance. Hence, *glagoljǫ* in example (142) is in fact not a case of coincidence, while *sъkažǫ* in example (143) is.

[28] In retrospective mode the aorist expresses simultaneity of TU and TA and TS as bounded before TA (cf. section 8.2.1.1).

not to the "was not" and "was over" and does not localize an event within the sequence of narrated events. The imperfect makes contact with the event(s) supporting it, but not by means of its boundaries, rather the actual event (cf. Barentsen's Y in Figure 2.6, Barentsen 1985: 61, 1995: 17) coincides with another event.

It is important to note once more that the aorist can be used to present an aterminative event as temporally bounded; the aorist in OCS is not concerned with an inherent boundary, but it expresses a temporal boundary, which is why the inflectional opposition aorist-imperfect in OCS can be regarded as a Romance-style aspect opposition. For example, the verb *plęsati* 'dance' does not express an inherent boundary and is thus aterminative. However, in OCS, as in Greek, a dancing event can be presented as a temporally bounded event by using the aorist:

(144) dьne že byvъšju . roždьstva irodova . ***plęsa***[aor] dъšti irodiědina posrědě . i ugodi irodu [*Z*, *M*]
but when Herod's birthday came, the daughter of Herodias *danced* before them and pleased Herod (Matthew 14:6)

Of course, one could translate this with a terminative predicate, something like 'performed her dance', but that is not exactly what *plęsa* expresses, it is simply the reference to an activity that lasted for some time and then stopped, which is what the English translation *danced* also expresses. So even though one could refer to the predicate in (144) as expressing a total event, this is a Romance-style totality, not a Slavic-style totality.

Galton (1976: 141, 154-155) remarks that aorists like *plęsa*, which he calls imperfective aorists, have a sequencing function, just as the perfective aorists, and do not make us sojourn like the imperfect does. In other words, these forms carry the story forward as well, no inherent boundary is needed for that.

From the description by Galton it becomes clear why the aorist is so compatible with perfective verbs. Perfective verbs in OCS are all terminative verbs, lexically made up of the sequence 'was not - was - was over' and always express this complete sequence (cf. Chapter 2), and the aorist fits perfectly into that mould. One could even say that the aorist is the unmarked past tense for perfective verbs (cf. Galton 1976: 142): it does not add anything to the meaning of the perfective verbs, it only places the perfective event in the past (TA before TU).

For the same reason that the aorist is highly compatible with perfective aspect, however, the imperfect is not very compatible with perfective aspect. The perfective aspect expresses the totality of a single terminative event (or a well-defined number of such events) while the imperfect defocuses the

boundaries of an event. This is why perfective aspect and imperfect are largely incompatible and only occur in very specialized contexts.

Imperfective verbs, which lexically also consist of the chain 'was not - was - was over', since they are terminative (cf. Chapter 2), are a misfit for the aorist, since the imperfective aspect that these verbs express functions as a way of defocusing the change of state from 'was not' to 'was over', which clashes with the meaning of the aorist, which refers to a temporally bounded event. While in perfective verbs the inherent boundary provides a natural landing spot for a temporal boundary, the defocusing of the inherent boundary in imperfective verbs leaves little room for the placement of a temporal boundary. Therefore, the imperfective aspect of the verb results in a restriction of its use in the aorist. Amse-de Jong (1974: 43) even considers this restriction as being absolute in OCS; in her opinion a combination of an imperfective verb with the aorist is impossible. Below, however, I will discuss some examples of aorists of imperfective verbs that show that even though aorist and imperfective aspect are largely incompatible, they do seem to occur in very specialized types of usage in OCS.

The imperfect, on the other hand, fits perfectly into the imperfective mould. Both are used to express an unbounded event, not the change of one state into another. Amse-de Jong (1974: 44) remarks that the imperfect does not add anything to the meaning of an imperfective verbs, except for the past tense reference. In this regard the relationship between the imperfect and imperfective verbs is reminiscent of that of the aorist and perfective verbs; the imperfect could be seen as the unmarked past tense for imperfective verbs.[29]

At first sight the imperfect seems incompatible with the perfective aspect. How could a form express unboundedness and the attainment of an inherent boundary at the same time? However, there are clear examples of perfective imperfects in OCS and their occurrence is not controversial, unlike that of imperfective aorists. Still, in my opinion the incompatibility between the two is comparable to that of imperfective aorists.

Below I will first discuss the 'normal' combinations: perfective aorist and imperfective imperfect and, where necessary, compare them to aorists and imperfects of anaspectual verbs. After this, I will turn to the more specialized uses that the imperfective aorist and perfective imperfect occur in.

[29] Since I have not found any evidence of the imperfect being used in retrospective mode, I could add here that the imperfect restricts the use of the verb to narrative mode, in which it always needs the support of (an)other event(s). This is not the case with the imperfective aspect, which can be used, for example, in a generalized statement in the present tense without the need for support of another event.

8.2.1 Perfective aorists and imperfective imperfects

There are basically two types of past tense modes: narrative and retrospective (cf. Barentsen 1992: 14, 2003b: 426-428). In the narrative mode the events are presented as connected with other events, while in the retrospective mode the events are presented as connected to the moment of utterance. When verb forms are used in the retrospective mode, this can be called the 'perfect use' of that form (cf. Fortuin & Kamphuis 2015: 189-190). Maslov (1990) defines the perfect as follows:

"[A]n aspecto-temporal form of the verb, expressing a present state as a result of a preceding action or change, and / or expressing a past action, event or state that is somehow important to the present and is considered from the present point of view, detached from other past facts."[30] (Translation Lindstedt 2000: 365-366)

Some usage types of aspect are typical of one of the types. For example, the general factual (cf. section 2.2.1) is typical of the retrospective mode. I will discuss a number of typical usages of aspect in both modes below.

8.2.1.1 Retrospective mode

The perfective aorist always refers to a complete event. In retrospective mode, the complete event is looked back upon from the moment of speech, which I call the 'perfect function' of the aorist, while in narrative mode the aorist is used to chain the events together, the 'was over' of one event being the 'was not' of the next. Examples of the perfective aorist in retrospective use are:

(145) o[tъ]če . ***sъgrěšixъ***[aor] na n[e]bo i prědъ tobojǫ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
Father, I *have sinned* against heaven and in your sight (Luke 15:21)

(146) pokaite sę . ***približi***[aor] bo ***sę*** c[ěsa]r[ь]stvo n[e]besьnoe [*A*, *Sk*]
repent, for the kingdom of heaven *is at hand* (Matthew 3:2)

In the English Bible translation, the perfect of the Greek original in example (146), *ἤγγικεν*, is translated with a present tense form, thus expressing the relevance of the nearing of the kingdom of heaven for the moment of utterance. In OCS it literally says that the kingdom *has come near*, which puts more emphasis on the past arriving event, while the retrospective context, at the same time, is responsible for the connection of the event to the moment of utterance.

[30] Maslov refers to the perfect as a specific *verb form*. The definition is, however, applicable to the OCS aorist in retrospective use as well.

In Chapter 6, section 6.7, I discussed the perfect in OCS and the fact that it is difficult to find a difference in meaning between the aorist and the perfect. The only clear difference I found, is that the perfect in OCS is never used in narrative mode, unlike the past tense in most modern Slavic languages that has the same morphological background. So the perfect in OCS is a true perfect, while in most modern Slavic languages that what was originally a perfect, is now only a past tense, which is used in narrative mode as well. As Lindstedt (2000: 371) puts it: "when a perfect can be used as a narrative tense […] it has ceased to be a perfect". So while the original perfect is the most versatile (and often the only) past tense in many modern Slavic languages, in OCS the aorist has that role, occurring in both retrospective and narrative mode. An example of a perfective aorist and perfect in a single retrospective utterance can be found in John 12:40:

(147) ***oslěpi***$^{\text{aor}}$ oči ixъ . i ***okaměnilъ***$^{\text{PastAPII}}$ ***estъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ srdca ixъ [*M*, *Z*, *A*]
He *has blinded* their eyes and He *hardened* their heart (John 12:40)[31]

In this retrospective example the perfective verbs are not ordered sequentially, as they would be in narrative mode, but both perfective verbs are connected to the moment of speech.

Anaspectual aorists also occur in retrospective mode. In a terminative construal there is little difference with the perfective aorist, the attainment of the (temporal) boundary is relevant to the moment of utterance, like in the following example:

(148) ěko viděvъ mę ***věrova***$^{\text{aor}}$ [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
because you have seen Me, *have* you *believed* (John 20:29)

The aorist *věrova* 'you believed', translating the Greek perfect *ἑώρακάς*, refers to the moment that Thomas saw Jesus and took faith in the fact that He had indeed risen from the death. The predicate could thus be interpreted as terminative. In modern Slavic it is often translated with a perfective past tense, e.g. *ty poveril*$^{\text{pf}}$ in Russian, *povjerovao*$^{\text{pf}}$ *si* in Croatian, or *uvěřil*$^{\text{pf}}$ *jsi* in Czech, to express the fact that it is the resulting state of taking faith that the verb refers to.[32] Other anaspectual verbs, that are less easily construed as terminative, simply denote the occurrence of the event at some point before the moment of utterance (cf. Chapter 2):

[31] What makes this example even more interesting is that it does the opposite of the Greek original, which starts with the perfect *τετύφλωκεν* 'he has blinded' and subsequently has an aorist *πεπώρωκεν* 'he hardened', as can also be seen in the English translation of the example.
[32] Bulgarian (*povjarva*) and Macedonian (*poveruva*) use perfective aorists, showing that this retrospective use of the aorist is still alive and kicking in the modern Slavic languages.

(149) ***sviraxomъ***[aor] vamъ i ne ***plęsaste***[aor] . ***plakaxomъ***[aor] ***sę*** vamъ i ne ***plakaste***[aor] [*Z*, *M*][33]
we *played* the flute for you, and you *did* not *dance*; we *sang* a dirge, and you *did* not *weep* (Luke 7:32)

(150) azъ vьsegda ***učixъ***[aor] na sъnъmišti . i vъ crькъv(e) ideže vьsi ijuděi sъnemlǫtъ sę . i tai ne ***g[lago]laxъ***[aor] ničesože [*Z*, *A*]
I always *taught* in synagogues and in the temple, where all the Jews come together; and I *spoke* nothing in secret (John 18:20)

This kind of 'simple denotation', referring to a single past event without reference to any inherent boundary appears to be closely connected to the aorist, mainly of anaspectual verbs. Perfective verbs are excluded from this context based on the fact that they always express the actualization of the inherent boundary, which is contradictory to simple denotation in OCS. Given the incompatibility between the aorist and imperfective verbs, it will come as no surprise that I have also not found many imperfective verbs in this function. However, there are some examples of an imperfective verb in retrospective mode, which I will discuss when I treat the imperfective aorist (in section 8.2.2.2).

I have not found convincing examples of the imperfect tense in retrospective mode, which suggests that the imperfect in OCS is a typical narrative form. Hence, in my opinion, even in contexts where retrospective mode is an option, the use of the imperfect changes the utterance into a narrative utterance. Thus, in the following text, where a Greek imperfect *ἐζητοῦμέν* 'we were looking' is translated, the *Zographensis* and *Savvina Kniga* present the event in a retrospective manner, while *Marianus* and *Assemanianus* present the event as part of a narrative:

[33] Interestingly there is again an example of the verb *plęsati* 'dance' in this example. The verb is attested 9 times in the OCS corpus, 6 times in the aorist and 3 times in the PastAPI. If one would take the grammatical profile of this verb to be the final indicator for its aspect, the judgement would be that *plęsati* is perfective. However, morphologically it falls into the group of anaspectual verbs and lexically it fits there perfectly since it clearly is an aterminative verb. This is a good example of how an individual verb profile can be misleading.

(151) čędo čьto tvori nama tako . se o[tь]cь tvoi . i azъ skrъbęšta . ***iskaxově***[aor] tebe [*Z*, *Sk*]
son, why have You treated us this way? Behold, Your father and I *have been* anxiously *looking* for You (Luke 2:48)
čędo čto sътvori nama tako . se otecь tvoi i azъ . skrъbęšta . ***iskaaxově***[impf] tebe [*M*, *A*]
son, why have You treated us this way? Behold, Your father and I *were* anxiously *looking* for You (Luke 2:48, my translation)

In the following verse, only the *Savvina Kniga* has a retrospective perspective:

(152) i reče kъ nima . čto jako ***iskasta***[aor] mene [*Sk*]
and He said to them "Why *have* you *been looking* for Me" (Luke 2:49, my translation)
i reče kъ nima . čto ěko ***iskašeta***[impf] mene [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
and He said to them "Why is it that you *were looking* for Me" (Luke 2:49)

I should note that *iskaxově* in example (151) could be seen as a contracted imperfect and that *iskasta* in example (152) could be seen as an imperfect with a 'secondary' ending, which is equal to the aorist ending (cf. Diels 1963: 235). It would be interesting to see whether contraction and these secondary endings occur more often in contexts that allow for a retrospective reading.

Although aorists generally refer to single events, example (150) shows that the aorist is also compatible with the expression of repetition, or habituality, as indicated by adverbs like *vьsegda* 'always'. The aorist is used to indicate that the teaching and speaking are over, the words are spoken when Jesus is already brought before the high priest, at the end of his life. Interestingly, *Savvina Kniga* has the (contracted) imperfect *učaxъ*, which does not have the finalized nuance, but rather emphasizes habituality of the event.

I also found an example of an aorist of a prefixed verb without a derived partner *vъvrěšti* 'throw into' that is used to refer to an event that has occurred more than once:

(153) i množicejǫ i vъ ognь ***vъvrъže***[aor] . i vъ vodǫ . da i bi pogubiłъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
it has often *thrown* him both *into* the fire and into the water to destroy him (Mark 9:22)

The aorist itself does not express the repetitive occurrence of the event, which is done in this instance by the adverb *množicejǫ* 'many times', which 'multiplies' the event. So the aorist is not incompatible with repetition, although it does not express this itself, unlike the imperfect in the narrative

mode. The use of the aorist *vъvrъže* in (153) is similar to the use of the perfective present in (122) in that it refers to a bounded number of events.

8.2.1.2 Narrative mode

In narratives the aorist is used to refer to the events that push the story forward, it chains the events together into a narrative sequence. I have shown examples of this in Chapter 6, both with perfective and anaspectual verbs. Imperfects, on the other hand, usually provide background information, paint the backdrop against which the story evolves, like the following imperfective imperfect *vъzmoštaaše* 'stirred up' and the imperfect of the prefixed suffixed VOM *sъxoždaaše* 'went down':

(154) ang[e]l[ъ] bo g[ospodin]ь na vьsě lěta ***sъxoždaaše***$^{\text{impf}}$ vъ kǫpělь . i ***vъzmǫštaaše***$^{\text{impf}}$ vodǫ [*M*]
for an angel of the Lord *went down* at certain seasons into the pool and *stirred up* the water (John 5:4)

These imperfective imperfects are used to describe the situation, in this case the habitual events that form the background for the following situations. The backdrop is further painted by a sentence about a man who had been (*bě*$^{\text{impf}}$) present for thirty-eight years, after which the story line starts unfolding with past participles and aorists:

(155) sego ***viděvъ***$^{\text{PastAPI}}$ is[usъ] . i ***razuměvъ***$^{\text{PastAPI}}$ ěko mъnoga lěta juže iměaše . ***g[lago]la***$^{\text{aor}}$ emu xošteši li živъ byti [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
when Jesus *saw* him, and *knew* that he had already been a long time in that condition, He *said* to him, "Do you wish to get well" (John 5:6, my translation)

There are, however, also examples of the imperfect in a sequence of events (cf. example (54), Chapter 6). This can be compared to what Dickey (2000: 203) in his comparison of the modern Slavic languages, calls the 'contextually conditioned imperfective past (CCIP)'. The occurrence of the CCIP in OCS is of importance, because modern Slavic languages show aspectual variation in this context (cf. Ivančev 1961, Galton 1976, Stunová 1993, Dickey 2000). In OCS the use of non-perfective verbs in sequences of events occurs both with anaspectual imperfects and imperfective imperfects.[34] Compare the following examples with anaspectual verbs:

[34] Many of the examples of imperfective verbs in sequences of events that Dickey (2000: 203-233) and also Stunová (1993: 105-167) give, would be anaspectual in this study, which is why I speak of non-perfective verbs in sequences of events.

(156) i vъnidošę[aor] vъ kaperъnaumъ . i abьe vъ sǫboty . na sъnъmišti ***učaaše***[impf] [*Z*, *M*]
they went into Capernaum; and immediately on the Sabbath He *began to teach* in the synagogue (Mark 1:21, my translation)

(157) togda ostavi[aor] ego diěvolь . i se a[n]ģ[e]li pristǫpišę[aor] i ***služaaxǫ***[impf] emu [*Z*, *A*, *Sk*]
then the devil left Him; and behold, angels came and *began to minister* to Him (Matthew 4:11)

(158) i pristǫpь[PastAPI] otъvali[aor] kamenь . otъ dvьri groba . i ***sěděaše***[impf] na nemь [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
and came and rolled away the stone and *sat* upon it (Matthew 28:2)

The English translations of (156) and (157) show that a possible interpretation of the imperfect in this context is ingressive. The events in the imperfect are presented as occurring in a chain. However, the imperfect leaves any boundaries of the event out of the focus, which necessarily results in a contact between the "events themselves" (cf. the Y in Figure 2.6 in section 2.2.3), which makes it a different kind of ingressivity than expressed by verbs like *ubojati sę* 'become afraid' of *vъzalьkati* 'become hungry'.

Interestingly, the verb *sěděti* 'sit' never means 'sit down', which makes it hard to interpret *sěděaše* in (158) as ingressive; the event appears to be presented *in media res*.[35] Given the fact that the boundaries of the events are left out of the focus in (156) and (157) as well, there is no fundamental difference with (158); in all cases the "event itself" is in focus. Not only anaspectual verbs occur in this kind of context; there are examples with imperfective verbs as well:

(159) načętъ[aor] močiti nozě ego slьzami . i vlasy glavy svoeję ***otiraaše***[impf] . i oblobyzaaše[impf] nozě ego . i mazaaše[impf] m'üromь [*Z*, *A*, *Sk*]
she began to wet His feet with her tears, and *kept wiping* them with the hair of her head, and kissing His feet and anointing them with the perfume (Luke 7:38)

[35] On a more speculative note: the imperfect of both *sěděti* 'sit' and *sěsti* 'sit down' is *sěděaxъ*, even though the imperfects are always ascribed to *sěděti* (Aitzetmüller 1974) and *sěsti* is considered to not occur in the imperfect. Of the 6 occurrences of Greek imperfect *ἐκάθητο* in the meaning of 'sit down' in the Gospels, OCS only translates with an aorist *sěde* once (Matthew 15:29, *Z*, *M*); the five other occurrences are all translated with the imperfect *sěděaše* (e.g. Matthew 13:1 and John 6:3), just as in the 4 instances in Greek in which the form means 'was sitting' (e.g. Matthew 26:69, Mark 10:46). It is possible that the imperfect in OCS had both meanings and formed a kind of 'bridge' between *sěsti* and *sěděti*. See also Chapter 10 on the bridging function of the imperfect.

(160) idoste[aor] že i obrětoste[aor] žrěbьcь privęzanъ . pri dvьrexъ . vьně na paspǫtii . i ***otrěšaašete***[impf] i [*Z*, *M*]
they went away and found a colt tied at the door, outside in the street; and they *untied* it (Mark 11:4)

In example (159) the three imperfects (*otiraaše, oblobyzaaše, mazaaše*),[36] translating three Greek imperfects, most probably refer to three parallel or overlapping events, following the onset of the story, *načętъ*. So while the step from 'began to wet' to these tree parallel events is a step forward in the story, the three events themselves do not push the storyline any further. The most obvious interpretation is a series of intertwined wiping, kissing and anointing, hence the imperfective aspect results in an iterative reading. In example (160) the use of the imperfective imperfect *otrěšaašete* appears to emphasize the fact that the untying had some duration, it focuses on the process phase of the untying.[37] This fits in with the part of the story that follows, which is now presented as overlapping with the untying:

(161) i eteri otъ stojęštiixъ tu . g[lago]laaxǫ ima . čьto ***děeta***[pres] ***otrěšajǫšta***[PresAP] žrěbьcь [*Z*, *M*]
some of the bystanders were saying to them, "What *are* you *doing*, *untying* the colt?" (Mark 11:5)

The examples of anaspectual and imperfective imperfects in sequences of events show that the imperfect and imperfective verbs are not only used for background information in a narrative, but can be used to move a narrative forward as well. In most cases, however, the sequence of events does not proceed beyond the imperfective imperfect in the same utterance, which shows that it differs from the aorist that is often used as an onset for a following event in the same utterance. The few examples that I found of an imperfect with a subsequent aorist in the same utterance are with anaspectual verbs, but I see no reason why imperfective verbs could not have been used in a similar vein. The following examples demonstrate the use of an imperfect with a subsequent aorist:

[36] The verb *oblobyzati*, *oblobyžǫ* 'kiss' does not belong to the core imperfectives. It is not derived by means of *-ati*, *-aje-* and an extra derived verb *oblobyzati, oblobyzajǫ* 'kiss' exists. The underived verb is *oblobъzati*, *oblobъžǫ* 'kiss'

[37] The use of the imperfect may also have been influenced by the Greek original, which has a historical present, *λύουσιν*. In the discussion below, I will argue that a possible translation of a Greek historical present in OCS is an imperfective aorist. However, this rare form may have been lost in the process of copying resulting in either perfective aorists or imperfective imperfects. The original form could have been the imperfective aorist *otrěšaste*, which may have felt like a strange form to a copier who did not have the Greek original at his disposal. On the other hand, the translators could also simply have chosen the imperfect to create the feeling of overlap with subsequent events, which is also compatible with the Greek historical present.

(162) is[usъ] že ***mlъčaaše***[impf] . otъvěštavъ ar'xierei ***reče***[aor] emu . zaklinajǫ tę b[ogo]mь živimь . da rečeši namъ . ašte ty esi x[ristos]ъ s[y]nъ b[o]žii [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
but Jesus *kept silent.* And the high priest *said* to Him, "I adjure You by the living God, that You tell us whether You are the Christ, the Son of God." (Matthew 26:63)

(163) onъ že ***reče***[aor] pridi . i izlьzь is korablь petrъ . ***xoždaaše***[impf] na vodaxъ . i ***pride***[aor] ky is[uso]vi [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
and He *said*, "Come!" And Peter got out of the boat, and *walked* on the water and *came* toward Jesus (Matthew 14:29)[38]

In (162), the use of the imperfect is easily explained as it indicates the continuation of a state. In the preceding verse, Matthew 26:62, the last event is coded by the aorist *reče* 'he said', as the high priest asks him why he does not answer. From that question is can be inferred that Jesus was silent before, did not respond to the accusations and also does not respond to the question posed by the high priest. However, his keeping silent is more than simple background information: the fact that Jesus keeps silent even after the high priest asks him why he does not answer, as well as the fact that his keeping silent elicits a reaction from the high priest push the story forward. In (163) the imperfect *xoždaaše* of the indeterminate VOM *xoditi* 'walk' (cf. example (281), Chapter 9) is completely surrounded by aorists and is itself a translation of a Greek aorist, *περιεπάτησεν*. It seems unlikely that Peter was just walking around a bit on the water, the walking on water event is simply one in a sequence of events. The use of the imperfect, however, draws attention to the event, maybe slows down the pace of the story to zoom in on the most unbelievable part of it. This also fits with Dickey's (2010) theory that the partners of the VOMs where manner-of-motion verbs in OCS; the imperfect *xoždaaše* emphasizes the fact that Peter's coming towards Jesus is done *walking* (cf. section 9.4).

Various interpretations of the use of non-perfective (hence, imperfective and anaspectual) verbs in sequences are possible, such as ingressive, durative, iterative, *in media res*, or maybe simply drawing attention to the event by slowing down the pace of the story like in (163). The CCIP (see the explanation above example (156)) also occurs in Modern Slavic, e.g. in Czech. Stunová (1993: 112) describes for Czech that events in a sequence that are expressed by imperfective verbs are felt to be partly overlapping. They create

[38] I have not marked the Past Active Participle I *izlězъ*, but it seems to function no differently from the aorists and could be seen as the second event in the sequence, just as in the English translation 'got out'.

an effect of smooth transition or continuity of the action (cf. Galton 1976: 70, Dickey 2000: 217). Berger (2013) also discusses the use of imperfective verbs in sequences of events in Czech and regards it as a way of 'slowing down the action' (ibidem: 40). All these effects can be explained by the fact that the imperfect does not focus on the change from one situation to another, which is the normal way of narrating events, also in OCS. Without native informants it is impossible to gain absolute certainty regarding the specific pragmatic effects in OCS, but the examples above demonstrate beyond doubt that the CCIP occurs frequently in OCS.

Finally, the imperfective imperfect also occurs in a conative function. I have found three examples in the Gospel texts of an imperfective imperfect being used to refer to a failed attempt:[39]

(164) ioanъ že ***vъzbraněaše***[impf] emu gl[agol]ę . azъ trěbujǫ otъ tebe krьstiti sę . a li ty kъ mně grędeši . otъvěštavъ že is[usъ] reče kъ nemu . ostani nyně [*A*, *Z*, *Sk*][40]
but John *tried to prevent* Him, saying, "I have need to be baptized by You, and do You come to me?" But Jesus answering said to him, "Permit it at this time" (Matthew 3:14-15)

(165) i ***daěxǫ***[impf] emu . piti ocьtъno vino . onъ že ne prijętъ[aor] [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
they *tried to give* Him wine mixed with myrrh; but He did not take it (Mark 15:23)

(166) i bystъ vъ osmy dьnь . pridǫ[aor] obrězatъ[sup] otročęte . i ***naricaaxǫ***[impf] e . imenemь . o[tь]ca svoego zaxariję . i otъvěštavъši m[a]ti ego reče . ni . nъ da narečetъ[pres] sę imę ioanъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
and it happened that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child, and they *were going to call* him Zacharias, after his father. But his mother answered and said, "No indeed; but he shall be called John." (Luke 1:59-60)

In all three examples the success of the attempt depends on a third party that has the power to prevent the successful change of state. And while the first two examples allow for a durative interpretation, in example (166) it is really only the non-attainment of the inherent boundary that results in the use of an imperfect. Hence, it is the imperfective aspect that is used to defocus the

[39] All three examples are translations of a Greek imperfect.
[40] The imperfect imperfect *vъzbraněaše* cannot be morphologically distinguished from the imperfect that would be formed from the perfective *vъzbraniti* 'prevent' (cf. Amse-de Jong 1974: 104 ff., Aitzetmüller 1977: V), however there is no reason to assume that in this case it concerns a perfective imperfect (see also section 8.2.3).

inherent boundary, which is responsible for this effect. This can also explain why there are no examples of anaspectual imperfects in a conative function.

8.2.2 Imperfective aorist

According to Dostál (1954: 600), 40% of all attested cases of aorist use in OCS are imperfective. Dostál arrives at this rather high percentage because his count includes the instances of the aorist of verbs that I have categorized as anaspectual aorists, like *plęsa* in example (144). In my categorization, in the imperfective groups there are only 37 attestations of the aorist out of a total of 3,654. Moreover, these attestations are found in only 18 verbs of the total of 504 and only a few of them are clear-cut cases of the imperfective aorist, as I will demonstrate below. Hence, the imperfective aorist is an extremely rare form, which makes it hard to draw a final conclusion on its functions in OCS. Below, I will attempt to demonstrate in which way the defocusing of the inherent boundary (imperfective aspect) is compatible with presenting the event as temporally bounded (aorist).

8.2.2.1 Some complicated verbs

The imperfective verb with the most aorist attestations in OCS is *vъprašati* 'ask'. Amse-de Jong (1974: 150-154) does not regard this as an imperfective verb, because of its attestations in the aorist and treats it like a simplex, even though in her formal categorization it should be classified as an imperfect in opposition to *vъprositi*. In her opinion, however, the prefix *vъ-* no longer makes the verb terminative; it rather belongs to the root, like in *vъprosъ* 'question'. The examples Amse-de Jong gives include the following example:

(167) tače ***vъpraša***[aor] asklipiada polemonъ . i li ty krьstijanъ jesi . asklipijadъ reče ei [*S*]
then Polemon *asked* Asclepiades, "Are you a Christian too?" Asclepiades said, "Yes." (132, 26-28)

In my opinion, the use of *vъprašati* in such utterances is similar to that of *glagolati* in the sense of 'say'; the message, in case of *vъprašati* the question, makes the predicate terminative, introducing an inherent boundary. The aorist of *vъprašati* in example (167) is a translation of the Greek aorist *ἐπηρώτησε* 'he asked'. Aorist forms of the same Greek verb are also translated by aorists of anaspectual *prositi* 'implore, ask' and perfective *vъprositi* 'ask':

(168) i pristǫpьše fariseі . i sadukei . iskušajǫšte i . ***prosišę***[aor] znamenіě sъ n[e]b[e]se pokazati imъ [*Z, M*]
the Pharisees and Sadducees came up, and testing Jesus, they *asked* Him to show them a sign from heaven (Matthew 16:1)

(169) i ***vъprosi***[aor] otъ nixъ . zakonoučitelь iskušajęi i gl[agol]ę [*M*]
one of them, a lawyer, *asked* Him a question, testing Him (Matthew 22:35)

It is difficult to determine what motivates the choice of either verb, especially since in (167) and (169) the situations are similar: a single question is being asked. There is also an example of variation between codices concerning one and the same passage, where one codex has an aorist of *vъprositi* while the other has an imperfect of *vъprašati*:

(170) i pridjǫ[aor] sakukei kъ nemu iže gl[a]g[o]ljǫtъ ne byti vьskrěšeniju i ***vъprosišę***[aor] i gl[agol]jǫšte [*M*]
i pridošę[aor] sakukei kъ nemu . iže gl[agol]jǫtъ ne byti vъskrěšenьju i ***vъpraašaaxǫ***[impf] i gl[agol]jǫšte [*Z*]
some Sadducees (who say that there is no resurrection) came to Jesus, and *began questioning* Him, saying (Mark 12:18)

The interesting thing about this example is that the Byzantine Greek text, on which the OCS translation is based, has an aorist *ἐπηρώτησαν*, while the critical text has an imperfect *ἐπηρώτων*, which is what the English translation is based on. With the aorist it seems that a normal sequence of events is expressed 'they came and questioned him', while the use of the imperfect is a case of CCIP in which the questioning is presented as an iterative event (questioning implies asking a number of questions), or maybe ingressive 'they came and started questioning him', like in the English Bible translation (cf. section 8.2.1.2). With regard to terminativity: in the sense of 'question' *vъprašati* could be seen as aterminative, just like *glagolati* in the sense of 'speak'. There is a similar example in Luke 3:14, where the Greek original has an imperfect:

(171) ***vъpraašaaxǫ***[impf] že i . i voini gl[ago]ljǫšte . i my čьto sъtvoritmъ . i reče kъ nimъ . nikogože obidite . ni oklevetaite . i dovolьni bǫděte obroky vašimi [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
vъprašašę[aor] že i voini gl[ago]ljǫšte . i my čьto sъtvoritmъ i reče kъ nimъ . nikogože ne obidite ni oklevetaite . i dostoini bǫděte obręštanii vašimi [*Sk*]
some soldiers *were questioning* him, saying, "And what about us, what shall we do?" And he said to them, "Do not take money from anyone by force, or accuse anyone falsely, and be content with your wages" (Luke 3:14)

The choice of *vъprašati* could maybe be explained by the fact that questioning is a longer lasting event in which a number of questions are asked. The verb *vъprositi* summarizes this into a single complete event, in

which the difference between questioning and asking is lost. The aorist is used here because the event occurs in a sequence of events, much like an anaspectual aorist, while the imperfect is, again, a case of CCIP. However, in other cases the imperfect of *vъprašati* simply means 'ask':

(172) ***vъprašaaše***[impf] že časa otъ nixъ . vъ kotory sulěe bystъ . rěšę že emu . ěko vъčera vъ časъ sedmy ostavi ognь [*Z*, *A*][41]
vъpraša[aor] že godiny otъ nixъ . vъ kǫjǫ sulěe emu bys[tъ] rěšę že emu . ěko vъčera vъ godinǫ sedmǫjǫ ostavi i ognь [*M*]
so he *inquired* of them the hour when he began to get better. They said therefore to him, "Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him" (John 4:52)

(173) i ***vъprašaaše***[impf] i . kako ti estъ imę . i gl[agol]a emu . leǵeonь mьně imę estъ [*Z*, *M*]
and He *asked* him, "What is your name?" And he said to Him, "My name is Legion" (Mark 5:9, my translation)

It is difficult to see why the OCS translators would choose an imperfective verb in this context. The use of the imperfect can in some cases be influenced by the Greek original, which has an imperfect in (171) and (173), but an aorist in (172).

It is probably also no coincidence that *vъprašati* is attested in the PastAPI three times as well, given the fact that aorist and past participles are so closely connected:

(174) ***vъprašavъše***[PastAPI] že kto jestъ otъ nixъ iskomyi imi savinъ […] jedinogo sъvęzašę [*S*]
and *after asking* who of them was their wanted Savin […] they tied one up (146, 2-4)

The PastAPI is a translation of the Greek aorist participle *ἐπερωτήσαντες*. It is possible to interpret this as a longer lasting event 'after they interrogated them as to who of them was …', but there is no other clue for this interpretation except for the use of the imperfective verb *vъprašati*.

All this variation, even between and within the Greek versions, makes it hard to deduce strict rules as to when a certain form (or verb, think of *prositi* and *vъprositi*) was used. It is clear that the imperfective *vъprašati* often refers to a single question and is not used in a conative function; in examples (171) through (173) the questions are clearly answered, nor is there any iterativity involved. The solution Amse-de Jong (1974: 150-154) proposes of seeing

[41] *Assemanianus* has *ostavi i ognь*, like *Marianus*.

vъprašati as an anaspectual verb, feels somewhat ad hoc, but solves the problem of the unusual choice of an imperfective verb in contexts where there seems no reason to defocus an inherent boundary. Examples (170) and (171), where the verb is used more in an 'interrogating' sense can be seen as aterminative examples of *vъprašati* (cf. *glagolati* in the meaning 'speak'). This could also mean that the terminativity in the other examples is not due to the inherent terminativity of *vъprašati*, but to other factors, like the context or the verb form it occurs in. However, I do not concur with her line of reasoning that the fact that this verb is attested in aorist forms makes it automatically anaspectual, since there are other examples of imperfective aorists, as I will demonstrate below.

Except for aorists of *vъprašati*, Amse-de Jong (1974: 163-171) mentions some other complicated cases. The verb *izvěštati* 'proclaim', for example, the derived partner of *izvěstiti* 'proclaim', with 5 aorist attestations, is a difficult case in which various derivational patterns coincide (cf. Amse-de Jong 1974: 167-169).[42]

In some cases the imperfective aorist is the result of an obvious copying mistake:

(175) arxieręi ***zaklinašę***[aor] b[o]gomь živymъ . ty li esi g[lago]lę s[yn]ъ b[o]žei [*Es*]
the high priests *swore* by the living God, "Are you the one saying that he is God's son?" (48b, 11-13)

The form aorist *zaklinašę* is a third person plural aorist, which makes no sense in this context, while a third person imperfect *zaklinaše* would. The fact that the nasal *ę* occurs more often instead of *e* in *Euchologium Sinaiticum* supports the hypothesis that this is in fact a mistake (Nahtigal 1941: 115 fn.). This could be the result of the process of denasalization of vowels, which is a phenomenon the results of which occur rather frequently in younger OCS codices of the Late Old Church Slavonic recension (Schaeken & Birnbaum 1999: 24, cf. Chapter 1).

[42] There is a simplex *věštati* 'speak' with a derived partner *věštavati* 'speak'. Prefixed verbs of this unprefixed pair form prefixed pairs (e.g. *otъvěštati - otъvěštavati* 'answer'). Of these verbs no prefixed forms with *-větiti* exist (e.g. **otъvětiti*). There are also two pairs *izvěstiti - izvěštati* 'confirm' and *vъzvěstiti - vъzvěštati* 'proclaim'. Of these forms there is no derived form on *-věštavati* (e.g. **izvěštavati*). There is, however, a verb *izvěstovati* 'inform, confirm', which appears to be denominal of *izvěstь* 'real, true'. The complication is that some of the verbs ending in *-věštati* are the perfective partner to a derived verb on *-věštavati*, while others are the imperfective partner, derived from verbs on *-věstiti*. As such, *izvěstovati* could even be regarded as a form for disambiguation (cf. the prefixed forms of *-vědovati* discussed in Chapter 9, section 9.5).

I will not discuss all the individual cases in which the status of the imperfect aorist is uncertain; the reader is referred to Amse-de Jong for a detailed discussion of most of the forms in the *Suprasliensis*. Below, I will concentrate on some of the more convincing examples of imperfective aorists, to demonstrate that the forms do in fact occur in specific functions.

8.2.2.2 Examples of the imperfective aorist

After eliminating the most dubious and complicated forms, I believe there are still some forms left that need to be accounted for and that can be seen as imperfective aorist.

It is interesting that Amse-de Jong does not discuss the 3 examples of the aorist of the imperfective verb *ožidati* 'expect' in the *Suprasliensis*, not even as problematic cases.[43] It could be that she considers the verb *ožidati* to be similar to *vъprašati* in that it is aterminative. In that case the aorist attestations would simply be anaspectual aorists, expressing a temporally bounded activity. It is also possible that she considers the attested forms to be contracted imperfects (*ožidaaxъ* > *ožidaxъ*), which in this case is identical to the aorist. In such cases, where it is not possible to distinguish between aorist and imperfect on morphological grounds, it is especially interesting to take a look at the Greek original. In all three instances, the Greek parallel text of the 1982 edition of the *Suprasliensis* has an aorist form (12, 11 *ἠνεσχόμην* 433, 28 and 436, 1 *ἔμεινα*). This gives me the impression that the aorist forms should be taken at face value, like in the following example (translating Greek *ἔμεινα* 'I expected'):

(176) ***ožidaxъ***[aor] sъtvoriti vino . sъtvori že trьnije [*S*]
I *expected* it to produce grapes, but it produced thorns (433, 28-29)

If this form should really be understood as an imperfective aorist and not as anaspectual aorists, my interpretation would be that the imperfective verb is used here to express that the expected grapes were not produced, hence in a conative function. The aorist expresses that the event has finished and connects the event to the subsequent producing of the thorns, which is the reason why the event is cut off before the reaching of an inherent boundary. Had the OCS translator used an imperfect of *ožidati*, the contrast between the expected result and the practical result would have been different; the

[43] No perfective partner **ožьdati* is attested in OCS. However, the verbs *dožьdati* 'wait for, persist' and *požьdati* 'wait for, expect', both prefixed formations of *žьdati* 'wait, expect' are attested. Moreover, in Old Russian the perfective partner *ožьdati* is attested (Sreznevskij 1893-1906). The Modern Russian equivalents given by Sreznevskij are: *obožđat'* 'wait for a while' and *dožđat'sja* 'wait until the end'. This gives the impression that also in OCS *ožidati* must have been derived from **ožьdati*, a perfective prefixed formation of the simplex *žьdati* 'wait'.

interpretation would have been something like *'I was expecting it to produce grapes, but it produced thorns'*, in which the expecting event is partly overlapped by the producing of the thorns, but not cut off by it.

Another example of an imperfective aorist can be found in the *Marianus*. It concerns the aorist of the imperfective verb *posylati* 'send' (translation of the Greek aorist *ἀνέπεμψα* 'I sent'), while *Zographensis* has the aorist of perfective *posъlati*:[44]

(177) nъ ni irodъ . ***posylaxъ***[aor] bo i kъ nemu . i se ničьtože {sь} dostoino sъmrьti sъtvoreno estъ o nemь [*M*][45]
nъ ni irodъ . ***posъlaxъ***[aor] bo i kъ nemu . i se ničьtože dostoino sъmrьti tvoreno estъ o nemь [*Z*]
but neither Herod: I *sent* him to him (and he has returned him); and behold, nothing deserving death has been done by him (Luke 23:15, my translation)

This utterance by Pilate concerns Jesus whom he had sent to Herod, but who was now returned to him by Herod. So Jesus is standing in front of him while Pilate tells the people that he sent Jesus to Herod. The imperfective aorist in the *Marianus* may have been used here to express the roundtrip that Jesus made; the initial attainment of the boundary of Jesus being sent away has been undone by the subsequent event of Herod sending him back. This is the reason why the Russian Synodal Orthodox Version also uses an imperfective verb *ibo ja posylal*[ipf] *Ego k nemu*. By contrast, the Czech translation has *jsem poslal*[pf]. The aorist in OCS means that the event is temporally bounded which, in this case, results in the interpretation of the event as total, notwithstanding the fact that the change of situation has been undone. *Zographensis* has an aorist of perfective *posъlati*, *posъlaxъ*, which does not express the roundtrip meaning. Hence, the use of the imperfective aorist is not obligatory in OCS in this situation, unlike in Modern Russian.

The imperfective aorist in (177) is an example of a true imperfective verb used in retrospective mode in OCS and as such is connected to the 'simple denotation' function of anaspectual aorists as discussed in section 8.2.1.1. It refers to the occurrence or relevance of a past event, without focus on the result.

[44] One could object to this form being analysed as an aorist and argue that it is a contracted imperfect instead. However, the codex *Zographensis* has an aorist as well (*posъlaxъ*), just as the Greek original. I think it is more reasonable to assume that a scribe felt the need to smoothen out the rare imperfective aorist in the *Zographensis*, than to assume that a scribe decided to change a perfective aorist into a contracted imperfective imperfect.

[45] The Byzantine version of the Gospels, and hence the OCS translation, differs somewhat from the modern critical text, which has a 3rd person aorist here.

Incidentally, I found an example of a PastPP of *posylati* as well, again with variation between the codices:

(178) ier[u]s[a]l[i]mъ izbivъšiě pr[o]r[o]kъi . i kameniemъ pobivajǫšti . ***posylanyję***[PastPP] kь tebě [*A*]
i[e]r[usali]me . izbivy pr[oro]ky . i kameniemь pobivaję . ***posъlanyję***[PastPP] kъ tebě [*M*]
Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones those *who are sent* to her (Matthew 23:37)[46]

The use of the imperfective participle *posylanyję* possible refers to the repeated sending of people to Jerusalem.[47]

An example similar to (177), in which the change of state is undone at the moment of utterance, can be found with an aorist of *obnažati* 'become naked' (translation of Geek aorist *ἐγυμνώθησ* 'you became naked'):

(179) nъ ašte ty adame pomęneši . jegda vъ porodě ***obnaža***[aor] kojego dǫba listvije vьzьmъ i sъšivъ sebě si odeždǫ sъtvori [*S*]
but do you remember Adam when he *became naked* in paradise, from which tree he took leaves and made clothes for himself by sewing them together (347, 27-30)

The additional benefit of the form *obnaža* in example (179) is that it cannot be interpreted as a contracted imperfect, since the ending is an exclusive aorist ending. The examples (176) - (179) share the fact that for some reason the inherent boundary is defocused, while the event is presented as temporally bounded, or total. However, there are also examples of the imperfective aorist that are harder to interpret, like in the following example from the *Clozianus* (translating the Greek aorist *ὑπέστωσαν* 'they spread out':

(180) dьnesь že vъ staryxъ město nesъmyslьnyxъ otroci sъrětǫ s[ъ]p[a]sitelě ěko symeonъ i větve ***postilašę***[aor] [*C*]
but today instead of short-sighted elderly people, children met the saviour like Symeon, and *spread out* branches (1a 34-36)

In the *Suprasliensis* this text is also attested and there a perfective aorist is used (*postьlašę* of *postьlati* 'spread out'). A possible interpretation of the

[46] The translation of the version in codex *Marianus* is 'Jerusalem, you who kills …' because of the vocative *ierusalime*.

[47] The PastPP occurs only very sporadically in imperfective verbs and is difficult to interpret. For example, the PastPP of the verb *opravьdati* 'justify', occurs in Luke 18:14 in all four Gospel codices and once in Psalm 18:10. Dostál (1954: 555) remarks because of these attestations that the aspect of *opravьdati* is not clear. In any case, it is difficult to interpret the imperfectivity of these forms, even more so since there are no examples of PastPP of the perfective partner *opravьditi* 'justify'

version in the *Clozianus* is that the spreading of the branches on the road is presented as an iterative event, hence with emphasis on the unboundedness on the macro-level 'they have been spreading out branches' (cf. also example (55) Chapter 6), an event which stops (hence, is temporally bounded) at the moment Jesus passes by.

In the *Zographensis* one example of an imperfective aorist is attested. It concerns a form of the imperfective verb *prizyvati* 'summon', derived from *prizъvati* 'summon' (*Marianus* has *priъva*, an aorist of perfective *prizъvati* 'summon'):

(181) i vьzide na gorǫ i ***prizyva***[aor] jęže samъ vъsxotě . i idošę kъ nemu [*Z*]
i vьzide na gorǫ i ***prizъva***[aor] jęže samъ xotě . i idǫ kъ nemu [*M*]
and He went up on the mountain and *summoned* those whom He Himself wanted, and they came to Him (Mark 3:13)

The OCS aorist is the translation of a Greek historical present *προσκαλεῖται* 'he summons'. I have already mentioned that the historical present is almost completely absent from OCS. Greek historical present forms are normally translated with aorists, which is also the case here. However, the particular choice of aspect, the prefixed imperfective verb *prizyvati* may be influenced by the fact that the translator translated a Greek present tense.[48]

As mentioned above, in cases of historical present, Klein (1994: 139) distinguishes between the real time of the situation and the imagined time of the situation, either of which may be chosen, or between which a speaker may switch to create particular connotations. Applying this theory to OCS the imperfective verb could have the effect that the imagined time of the situation is in focus, while a perfective verb is a choice for a focus on the real time of the situation. Maybe the form *prizyva* in (181) is a way of doing both: by using an imperfective verb, the imagined time of the situation is focused, presenting the event as taking place at the moment of utterance, while the use of the aorist indicates that this concerns a total event, which can be seen as a choice for the real time of the situation. Alternatively, the use of the historical present is explained as highlighting decisive events. This explanation has the benefit of not having to zoom in on an event that does not have a process phase to zoom in on, like *posylajǫtъ* in (134) as well as *prizъiva* in (181). In that case, the use of the imperfective aorist could also be explained as drawing attention to the decisive event in a series of events.

[48] Note that this does not explain why the first Greek present tense form, *ἀναβαίνει*, does not get this special treatment and is simply translated with an aorist of a prefixed determinate VOM, *vъzide*, which can be regarded as a perfective aorist (cf. section 9.3).

The fact that the *Marianus* has the perfective aorist *prizъva*, of the verb *prizъvati* 'summon', can be explained by the scribe not necessarily having the Greek original at his disposal and thus regarding the highly specialized imperfective aorist as a scribal error, or a translation error. Or he could have simply misread or misheard *prizyva* for *prizъva*, of which the latter was quite a common form in OCS, contrary to the former. Interestingly, in the codex *Zographensis*, the letter *i*, which makes up the second part of the letter *y* (*ъi*), is added supralinearly, which shows that this was a mistake that was all too easily made. Moreover, the fact that the mistake was rectified gives the strong impression that the imperfective aorist was indeed an acceptable form and was interpretable, otherwise such a correction would not have made sense.

There are no other examples exactly like (181). There is on example of an aorist of *vъzyvati* 'call', which can be found in *Euchologium Sinaiticum* and *Psalterium Sinaiticum*, in the second verse of Psalm 4. However, this time it is a translation of a Greek present infinitive, *ἐπικαλεῖσθαί* 'I call', which is followed by an aorist *εἰσήκουσέν* 'you answered':

(182) vnegda ***vъzyvaxъ***[aor] uslyša[aor] mę b[o]že pravъdy moeję [*Es*][49]
vъnegda ***vъzyvaxъ***[aor] uslyša[aor] mję b[o]že pravъdьi moeję [*Ps*]
when I *called* you, you answered me, o God of my righteousness [Psalm 4:2]

In this case the imperfective aspect could have been used to express iterativity, while the aorist links together the calling with the answering. The translation of the version in *Euchologium Sinaiticum* could be read as 'whenever I called you', while the version in *Psalterium Sinaiticum* misses that iterative nuance and simply connects a single calling event with a single answering event.

Admittedly, the hypothesis of using an imperfective aorist as a translation strategy for the Greek historical present is rather speculative. There is a clue, however, which also points in the direction of a specialized translation of Greek historical present forms and it concerns *verba dicendi*. Greek historical present forms are normally translated by OCS aorist and this is no different with aorist of *λέγω* 'say'. However, while the aorist of *λέγω* is translated by an aorist of *rešti* 'say', the historical present of *λέγω* is normally translated by an aorist of *glagolati*.[50] The following examples show this function of the aorist of *glagolati*:

[49] Unlike the form in the *Zographensis*, which can only be an aorist because of the unique ending, this could be seen as a form of a contracted imperfect.

[50] I counted all translations of 3sg indicative present *λέγει* in the four Gospel codices in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. There were 264 translations with the aorist *g[lago]la* and 32 with the aorist *reče*.

(183) ***g[lago]la***[aor] imъ . otiděte . ne umrětъ[aor] bo děvica nъ sъpitъ[pres] . i rǫgaxǫ[impf] sę emu [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
He *said*, "Leave; for the girl has not died, but is asleep." And they began laughing at Him (Matthew 9:24)

(184) i ***g[lago]lašę***[aor] emu ěko niktože nasъ ne najętъ . ***g[lago]la***[aor] imъ iděte i vy vъ vinogradъ moi . i eže bǫdetъ pravъda priimete [*M*, *A*, *Sk*]
they *said* to him, "Because no one hired us." He *said* to them, "You go into the vineyard too, and you will receive what is right" (Matthew 20:7, my translation)

This use of the aorist of *glagolati* contrasts with the aorist of *rešti*, which is normally used to translate the Greek aorist:

(185) is[usъ] ***reče***[aor] ima . čьto xošteta sъtvorǫ vama [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
and He *said* to them, "What do you want Me to do for you" (Mark 10:36)

Although the association between the historical present of *λέγω* and the aorist of *glagolati* is not absolute, the frequency with which it occurs points at a translating strategy. In the discussion of the present tense of *rešti* and *glagolati* I already pointed out that there is a division of labour between these verbs that is reminiscent of the division in aspectual pairs. Maybe this translating strategy is another hint in that direction. It is possible that forms like *prizyva* where straightened out in the copying process, because of their strong resemblance to the perfective aorist, while the aorist of *glagola* survived because it did not look or sound at all like the aorist of *rešti*. Moreover, the rather frequent occurrence of *glagolati* and *vъprašati* in the aorist in sequences of events could indicate that *verba dicendi* have some specialized aspectual functions. A study of aspect use in all *verba dicendi* in OCS may clarify the specific behaviour of *glagolati* and *vъprašati* and the verbs they have a relationship with.

At first, I tried to ignore or explain away all possible examples of the imperfective aorists and follow Amse-de Jong and her rather attractive model in which imperfective aorists are simply logically impossible. However, the examples I presented above indicate that imperfective aorists do actually occur in OCS, albeit rather sporadically, and that their use results in interpretable utterances. The low frequency of examples of imperfective aorists in the OCS corpus may partly be due to losses in the copying process and makes it difficult to draw firm conclusions, but the common denominator in all the examples is the defocusing of the inherent boundary, while at the same time the event is presented as temporally bounded, or total. It makes sense that forms with such complicated semantics are rare.

However, the existence of these forms is yet another reason to not consider the aorist a diagnostic of Slavic-style perfectivity.

8.2.3 Perfective imperfect

The two meaning elements that clash in the imperfective aorist, the inherent boundary and the temporal boundary, clash in the perfective imperfect as well. A perfective verb expresses the attainment of an inherent boundary, while the imperfect expresses unboundedness. Below I will show in which contexts OCS uses this combination.

Of all attestations of perfective verbs, a total of 18,732, only 29 attestations are clearly perfective imperfects. It is possible that there are more examples, but these cannot be distinguished from imperfective imperfects, as perfective and imperfective imperfects are homonymous for many verbs (Amse-de Jong 1974: 104 ff., Aitzetmüller 1977: V). However, also in cases where the forms can be distinguished (e.g. perfective 2/3sg impf *daděaše* from *dati* 'give' vs. imperfective 2/3sg impf *dajaše* from *dajati* 'give') there are still only very few examples of the perfective imperfect. Despite the rareness of the form, it has been discussed rather extensively in literature (e.g. Dostál 1954, Amse-de Jong 1974, Galton 1976, Kalsbeek 2012), unlike the imperfective aorist.[51] I will therefore only briefly discuss a number of examples to show the basic function of this form, namely the expression of habitual-correlative events (Kalsbeek 2012: 345):

(186) ašte se sъlučaaše[impf] ne iměti ničьsože dati sebě . to kotygǫ sьvlěkъ sъ sebe ***daděaše***[impf] ništuumu [*S*]
if it so happened that he had nothing to give, he *would* take off his undergarment and *give* it to the poor man (207, 12-15)

(187) tamo ubo iže sniděaše[impf] po prьvěěmъ uže ne ***icělěaše***[impf] [*S*]
but there, he who would descend after the first, *would* not *heal* (496, 15-16)

In both examples there is a condition that, when fulfilled, automatically leads to the following event. In example (186) the condition is presented by the imperfect *sъlučaaše* 'it happened' that can be considered to be a form of the imperfective *sъlučati*, or of the perfective *sъlučiti*. The result is of the fulfilment of the condition is expressed by the perfective imperfect *daděaše*. In (187) the condition is given by an imperfect of the prefixed determinate VOM *sъniti*, of which I will show that it behaves as a perfective verb in Chapter 9 (section 9.3). So in example (187) the chain of events can be said to

[51] At least the imperfective aorist in the strict sense of the term, hence, no anaspectual aorists.

consist of two perfective imperfects, while in (186) there is no way to establish the aspect of *sъlučaaše*. There is an example of an imperfect of a prefixed Leskien's class II verb, of which I will argue in section 9.2.3 that they can be regarded as perfective verbs, in which the condition is expressed by an imperfective imperfect, *proklinaaše*:

(188) proklinaaše[impf] smokъvnicǫ i ***isъxněaše***[impf] [*S*]
if he cursed a fig tree, then it was *bound to wither* (476, 23-24)

In yet another example the condition is introduced by present participles:

(189) isxoždaaxǫ[impf] že běsi otъ mъnogъ . vъpijǫšte[PresAP] i gl[agol]jǫšte[PresAP] . ěko ty esi x[ristos]ъ s[y]nъ b[o]žii . i zaprěštaję ne ***daděaše***[impf] imъ g[lago]lati . ěko věděaxǫ g[ospod]ě samogo sǫšta [*Z*]
demons also were coming out of many, shouting, "You are the Son of God!" But rebuking them, He *would* not *allow* them to speak, because they knew Him to be the Lord himself (Luke 4:41, my translation)[52]

Sometimes the condition is implicit, as in the following example:

(190) i ***nazьrěaxǫ***[impf] i kъnižьnici i fariseі ašte vъ sobotǫ iscělity i [*M*][53]
the scribes and the Pharisees *would watch* Him closely to see if He healed him on the Sabbath (Luke 6:7, my translation)[54]

It is good to mention that *Marianus* in Luke 4:41 (example (189)) has *dajaše* from imperfective *dajati* and that *Zographensis* and *Assemanianus* have *naziraaxǫ* in Luke 6:7 (example (190)). I think the difference between a perfective imperfect and an imperfective imperfect in this habitual function can be compared to the difference between a perfective and an imperfective present in generalized utterances. I have demonstrated that a perfective present can be used to exemplify a recurring phenomenon in OCS. Forsyth (1970: 174) argues that the perfective present in Russian expresses the event in such cases as a contingency: the event occurs from time to time when the

[52] The English translation follows the Greek and has "[…] knew him to be the Christ", which is also the version of the *Marianus*.
[53] *Assemanianus* and *Zographensis* have *iscělitъ*, the form *iscělity* can be attributed to the following *i*, resulting in *iscělitъi-i*.
[54] The OCS utterance is somewhat cumbersome. The first part of the sentence seems to refer to a general event: the scribes and the Pharisees were in the habit of watching Jesus closely on the Sabbath. The second part, with the direct object *i* 'him', refers to the specific event on that specific Sabbath, not to a habitual event. The direct object is not present in the Greek original and might thus be a later addition, perhaps connected to the use of the perfective *icěliti*, which normally requires an object, but can be explained here as well by pointing at the Greek future *θεραπεύσει* in the Byzantine version.

appropriate circumstances occur (cf. Barentsen 1995: 21). [55] These circumstances do not always have to be mentioned explicitly (cf. Dickey 2000: 57, Fortuin & Kamphuis 2015: 176-177). This is comparable to the use of the perfective imperfect in OCS. In a generalized context, the perfective imperfect is used to explicitly indicate that the event occurs on more than one occasion, but the imperfective imperfect simply expresses that an event occurs regularly, without referring to the emergence of the appropriate circumstances, just as the imperfective present.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the combination of perfective aspect with present passive participles also results in a modal interpretation. A closer look at these rare forms reveals that they have a specific 'potential' semantics. Most of them are negated, like *nepobědimъ* 'invincible' from perfective *poběditi* 'conquer', *neugasimъ* 'inextinguishable' from perfective *ugasiti* 'extinguish', *nerazorimъ* 'unbreakable' from perfective *razoriti* 'destroy' and *neutěsimъ* 'inconsolable' from perfective *utešiti* 'comfort'. However, I also found 'positive' formations like *icělimъ* 'curable', next to *neicělimъ* 'incurable both connected to perfective *icěliti* 'heal'. A comparison of *icělimъ* and *neicělimъ* is useful to show how conditionality plays a role in these formations, a conditionality which is reminiscent of the conditionality as expressed by perfective imperfects. The positive variant *icělimъ* refers to the fact that an affection can be cured, when the right circumstances occur, which clearly makes it a conditional event. The negated variant excludes the possibility of any circumstances in which the illness can be cured. Examples are:

(191) o vele velikoe ***neicělimoje***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ užestočenije [*S*]
o great *incurable* bitterness (339, 5-6)

(192) sь jestъ […] g[ospod]ь silenъ i krěpъkъ i ***nepobědimъ***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ vъ branexъ [*S*]
this is […] a powerful and strong God and *invincible* in battle (466, 28-30)

Similar participles of perfective verbs can be found in Modern Russian as well. These are often negated, like *nepobedimyj* 'invincible' connected to perfective *pobedit'* 'conquer' and *nepogrešimyj* 'infallible' from perfective *pogrešit'* 'sin, err', but positive formations also exist, e.g. *obozrimyj* 'visible' connected to perfective *obozret'* 'survey, view'. It would be interesting to compare these perfective present passive participles more in detail to

[55] Kalsbeek (2012) argues that this conditional function of the perfective imperfect can be connected to the loss of the perfective imperfect in BCS and the rise of the conditional to denote repeated events in the past.

imperfective present passive participles, but space considerations do not allow me to go deeper into this matter. I would guess, however, that in most cases the imperfective participles will not have the potential reading of the perfective, as the following example indicates (cf. example (70) in Chapter 6):

(193) i vsi gospodьnǫ blagodatьǫ ***icělaemi***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ otъxoždaaxǫ [*S*]
and all *who were being healed* by the grace of God went away (518, 26-27)

8.3 Anaspectual verbs

The rarity of the imperfective aorist and the perfective imperfect (as well as the perfective present passive participles) and their specialized usage, reflects an overall incompatibility of imperfective aspect with boundedness and of perfective aspect with unboundedness. The group of anaspectual verbs does not show this kind of general incompatibility. Still, verbs within the anaspectual group do not all have similar profiles and behaviour.

When it comes to compatibility with forms that express a specific kind of temporal boundedness (aorist and past participles), 198 out of 521 verbs in the anaspectual category are attested at least one time in such a form. The number of forms that express unboundedness (imperfect and present participles) is 386 out of 521. A total of 145 anaspectual verbs have attestations from both groups. It is important to note that these 145 verbs account for 23,505 anaspectual attestations, out of a total of 26,683. This means that at least some of the absence of either aoristic or imperfect attestations in the other verbs must be attributed to chance. A good example is the verb *plęsati* 'dance', which is only attested in the aorist and past participles, but which almost certainly must have been used in the imperfect and present participles as well. However, there are other factors influencing the profile and the behaviour of individual verbs, the most important of which being the lexical content of the verb. One of those factors is the relationship that anaspectual verbs have with other verbs (e.g. a prefixed formation, like with *alъkati* 'hunger' and *vъzalъkati* 'become hungry') that 'fill in' for them in certain contexts, like in the translation of Greek future forms, which logically, reduces their presence in such contexts. Below, I will first discuss two main groups of anaspectual verbs and subsequently the relationship of anaspectual verbs with other verbs.

8.3.1 Inherently aterminative anaspectual verbs

A closer look at the anaspectual verbs reveals that are two main groups of anaspectual verbs. The first group is the group that does not allow a terminative construal. This makes them less compatible with the aorist, which is the standard past tense for terminative events of which the boundary is presented as attained.

Clear examples of this are the verbs of bodily position *ležati* 'lie', *stojati* 'stand' and *sědĕti* 'sit', verbs in which the stative *-ě-* is visible, after patals *-a-* (cf. Schuyt 1990: 15). Still, all of these verbs are sporadically attested in the aorist, (often with one or more codices having an imperfect), which means they are presented as being somehow bounded. In Matthew 26:55 there is an example of the aorist of *sědĕti*:

(194) po v'sę d'ni ***sědĕxъ***[aor] sъ vami . vъ crkъve učę . i ne jęste mene [*Z*, *Sk*]
po vьsę dьni ***sědĕaxъ***[impf] pri vasъ vъ crkve i ne jęste mene [*M*, *A*][56]
every day I *used to sit* in the temple teaching and you did not seize Me (Matthew 26:55)

The example in *Zographensis* and *Marianus* shows a strong resemblance to example (150) where the aorist *učixъ* is used in a retrospective utterance with a simple denotation function. The only difference is that the Greek original has an aorist there and an imperfect in case of example (194), and the form *sědĕxъ* could also be seen as a contracted imperfect, unlike *učixъ*. However, the use of the OCS aorist seems perfectly natural in this example as well: the verb refers to a total event that has no inherent boundary. The translation of *sědĕxъ* as a retrospective form as in *Zographensis* and *Marianus* would be 'I have been sitting'. The imperfect in the *Marianus* and *Assemanianus* does not express this nuance of totality or boundedness, but rather emphasizes the habituality of the event, as does the English translation as well as the imperfect of the Greek original.

The few examples of the aorist of *stojati* also indicate a bounded event that does not express an inherent boundary. In example (195) the function of the aorist is again that of simple denotation, indicating an event that is now in the past, without any reference to a result, translating the Greek aorist *ἔστησαν* 'they stood', while in (196) the event is part of a narrative, translating the Greek pluperfect *εἱστήκει*.

(195) poklonimъ sję na městě . ideže ***stoěste***[aor] nodzě ego [*Ps*]
let us worship at the place where his feet *stood* (Psalm 131: 7)

(196) petrъ že ***stoja***[aor] prědъ vraty vьně . izide že učenikъ tъ . iže bě znaemъ arxiereovi . i reče vratarevi vъvedi petra [*Sk*]
petrъ že ***stoěše***[impf] pri dvьrexъ vьně . izide že učenikъ tъ . iže bě znaemъ arxiereovi . i reče dvьrьnici vъvede petra [*Z*, *A*]
but Peter *was standing* at the door outside. So the other disciple, who was known to the high priest, went out and spoke to the doorkeeper, and brought Peter in (John 18:16)

[56] *Assemanianus* has *vъ crkve učę*, like *Zographensis* and *Savvina Kniga*.

The aorist in (196) is probably used to indicate that Peter was not simply standing around there, but that for some reason he was stopped on his way in and from then on had been standing there, hence the temporal boundary lies at the beginning of the event. This fits with the preceding text *Simon Peter was following Jesus, and so was another disciple. Now that disciple was known to the high priest, and entered with Jesus into the court of the high priest* (John 18:15).

Other frequent inherently aterminative verbs with attestations in the aorist are *plęsati* 'dance' (cf. example (144), *trъpěti* 'endure' (cf. example (105)) *iskati* 'search'[57], *mysliti* 'think' and *bljusti* 'guard' (see below for examples of the latter three verbs). The aorist of *iskati* in the following example is a translation of the Greek aorist *ἐζήτησαν*:

(197) ti že vъsue ***iskašę***[aor] d[u]ša moeję . da vъnidǫtъ vь prěispodьnęję zemli [*Ps*]
but those who, to no avail, *have been seeking* my life to destroy it, will go into the depths of the earth (Psalm 63:9, my translation)

The aorist is again used to indicate a total event, even though the predicate does not express an inherent boundary. Compare also the following example of the aorist of *mysliti*:

(198) i lixo sъtvorixъ[aor] . i lixo ***myslixъ***[aor] [*Es*]
and I have done worse and *thought* worse (72a, 9-10)

Examples (197) and (198) are again retrospective examples, but the aorist of aterminative activity verbs is also regularly used in a sequence of events to indicate that the event took place for a limited period of time, like in the following example of *bljusti*, translating the Greek aorist *ἐφύλαξαν*:

(199) oni že sъtvorišę tako . i ***bljudišę***[aor] jego sъ straxomъ velikomъ . ostavivъše i tu do světa [*S*]
and they did like that and guarded him with great fear, leaving him here until the light of day (261, 11-13)

The aorist of *bljusti* indicates that the event took place for some time, before it was cut off by the 'light of day'.

In some cases the aorist comes close to indicating the start of an event:

[57] Bermel (1997: 55-56) calls *iskati* a conative verb, since it can never express the attainment of an inherent boundary.

(200) i išьdъ vъnъ ***plaka***[aor] ***sę*** gor'ko [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*][58]
and he went out and *wept* bitterly (Matthew 26:75)

The main difference with the perfective ingressive *vъsplakati* 'start crying' is that the event is still presented as unbounded, which leads me to interpret it as having some duration (cf. Hercigonja 1961: 96-97). With *vъsplakati* the focus would only be on the change of state from not crying to crying, while here the event in its totality is in focus.

Yet other verbs in this category of inherently aterminative anaspectual verbs are not attested at all in aorist forms. This concerns verbs like *podobati* 'behove' and *alъkati* 'be hungry', *pešti sę* 'be engaged with'.

It is difficult to draw an exact line between events that allow a terminative construal and events that do not. Differences in profile between verbs are not always decisive. I have mentioned the case of the verb *plęsati* 'dance', (9 attestations in OCS), which is not a terminative event, but which is still attested 6 times in the aorist and 3 times in the PastAPI. Sometimes, verbs that appear to have the same lexical type, like the states *bojati sę* 'be afraid' and *alъkati* 'be hungry', show deviating profiles: the aorist of *bojati sę* can be used to indicate the start of a state of being afraid, competing with *ubojati sę* 'become afraid', while *alъkati* is not attested in this context as competing with *vъzalъkati* 'become hungry'. Given the relatively small body of material, it is hard to say whether this means that *alъkati* really could not be used in terminative predicates to indicate the beginning of a state. However, the fact remains that it is not attested in such predicates in OCS.

In short, there are a number of verbs in OCS that are never used in a terminative predicate. This concerns stative verbs, like verbs of bodily position, and aterminative activities that do not allow a terminative construal, or are at least not attested in a terminative predicate. Since events like this are never presented as having attained an inherent boundary, for which the aorist would be the unmarked past tense, they are less often attested in the aorist and therefore show a profile which is rather similar to imperfective verbs. However, the combination of the aorist with these verbs does not result in two levels of boundedness and the very specialized meanings that I have demonstrated for the aorist of imperfective verbs.

[58] In Luke 22:62, describing the same event, where the Greek has the same aorist form, *ἔκλαυσεν*, *Zographensis* has an imperfect *plakaaše sę*, while *Marianus* still has an aorist *plaka sę*.

8.3.2 'Terminativizable' anaspectual verbs[59]

Because of the issues mentioned, the other group of anaspectual verbs, the verbs that can be used in terminative predicates, cannot be exactly defined either. Had there been more texts, perhaps the difference between inherently aterminative anaspectual verbs and terminativizable anaspectual verbs would emerge more as a continuum. However, I must work with the material I have and splitting the group of anaspectual verbs up into two according to their terminativizability seems like a good way to demonstrate why profiles and behaviour differ among the anaspectual verbs. Hence, I will discuss the group of anaspectual verbs that are attested in terminative predicates below. I will show that when they occur in the aorist in terminative predicates, these verbs often express meanings that are not very different from those expressed by perfective aorists. This characteristic makes them very different from imperfective verbs, which always defocus the inherent boundary.

Just like in the inherently aterminative group, where there are two main groups, namely the stative verbs of bodily position and aterminative activities, subdivisions can also be made within the terminativizable group. First there are activities like *jasti* 'eat' and *piti* 'drink', which occur in terminative predicates with the addition of a discrete object, e.g. 'he drank *the wine*', but also occur freely without an object to refer to an activity (much like *plęsati* 'dance' or *plakati* 'cry'), e.g. 'he was drinking'. A verb like *tvoriti* 'make, do', which is also an activity, is more prone to take a terminative construal, because the association of this verb with an object is stronger; one is normally not just engaged in 'doing', while one can be engaged in 'eating' (but see example (205)). Even though these activities are compatible with terminative construals, they are often still used to refer to aterminative activities, even when they are presented as temporally bounded by means of an aorist. Verbs of perception like *viděti* and *slyšati*, which in a way always indicate the attainment of a boundary (one cannot see an apple without having seen it, but one can eat an apple without having eaten it), can also refer to an aterminative activity, for example in the imperfect or present tense. However, with these verbs it is harder to find convincing examples in the aorist in an aterminative predicate. Finally, verbs like *diviti sę* 'marvel', *bojati sę* 'be afraid', *věrovati* 'believe', also occur in aterminative predicates in the present tense or in the imperfect, but in combination with the aorist are

[59] I think the term 'telicizable' sounds much better. However, I have to be consistent and my choice for 'terminative' instead of 'telic' (cf. section 2.1.4) precludes the use of 'telicizable'. Moreover, some of the aorist of these aterminative verbs would not express telicity in the narrow sense of the meaning 'goal oriented activity'. Compare the aorists of stative verbs *diviti sę* 'marvel' or *bojati sę* 'see' that indicate the beginning of a state (examples (215) - (217)).

automatically terminative.[60] When these verbs occur in an aterminative predicate they refer to a state, while in a terminative construal they refer to the start of the state (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.5.1).

In the verbs like *jasti* and *piti*, the aorist often occurs in aterminative predicates with a simple denotation function, like in the following examples translating Greek aorists:

(201) tъgda načętъ g[lago]lati ***ěxomъ***[aor] prědъ tobojǫ i ***pixomъ***[aor] [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
then you will begin to say, 'We *ate* and *drank* in Your presence (Luke 13:26)

(202) ide popelъ ěko xlěbъ ***ěsъ***[aor] . i pitьe moe sъ plačemъ rastvarěaxъ[impf] [*Ps*][61]
for I *have eaten* ashes like bread and mingled my drink with weeping (Psalm 102:9)

However, I found an example of the aorist of *jasti* expressing a terminative event of which the boundary is reached:

(203) kako vьnide vъ domъ b[o]žii . i xlěby prědъloženьě ***ěstъ***[aor] . i dastъ sǫštimъ sъ nimъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
how he entered the house of God, and *ate* the consecrated bread and gave it to his companions (Luke 6:4, my translation)

Here it is clear that David, the subject of this predicate, is said to have eaten the consecrated bread (not just *of* the bread). In other versions of the same story, with the same Greek original aorist, *ἔφαγεν* (Matthew 12:4, Mark 2:26), OCS uses an aorist of the perfective verb *sъněstъ* 'eat up', showing how close the meaning of the simplex in this predicate is to that of the perfective verb:

(204) kako vьnide vъ xramъ b[o]žii i xlěby prědloženiě ***sъněstъ***[aor] […] i dastъ i sǫštimъ sъ nimъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
how he entered the house of God and *ate* the consecrated bread […] and gave it to his companions (Matthew 12:4, my translation)[62]

[60] That is, I have not been able to find aterminative predicates with an aorist of these verbs.

[61] In addition to this interesting use of the aorist of *jasti*, the text has another interesting feature: the last *a* in *rastvarěaxъ* 'I have mingled', is added supralinearly. This could mean that the copier meant to use an imperfective aorist in a context of simple denotation, just as the aorist of *jasti*, after which he was corrected, or corrected himself. The Greek original has an imperfect *ἐκίρνων*, which makes it logical to presume that the original OCS translation also had an imperfect. Moreover, the form *rastvarěxъ* could be interpreted as a contracted imperfect as well. Either way, it is peculiar that this correction should occur here.

There does not seem to be much difference between the OCS versions of Luke 6:4 and Matthew 12:4, hence between the aorists of *jasti* and *sъnĕsti* in these contexts, save for the fact that the finishing of the consecrated bread receives more emphasis in (204).[63]

In other cases, the difference between the anaspectual verb and the prefixed perfective verb conveys a more substantial difference in meaning, like in the following examples of the use of an aorist of *tvoriti* and *sъtvoriti*, translating the Greek aorist *ἐποίησα*:

(205) obrazъ daxъ vamъ . da ěkože azъ ***tvorixъ***[aor] vamъ . i vy tvorite [*Z*]
obrazъ bo daxъ vamъ . da ěkože azъ ***sъtvorixъ***[aor] vamъ . i vy tvorite [*M*, *A*, *Sk*]
for I gave you an example that you also should do as I *did* to you (John 13:15)

In the *Zographensis* the aorist of *tvoriti* refers to Jesus' actions throughout his time with his disciples, this could even be translated as 'how I behaved/was with you', while the aorist of *sъtvoriti* in the other three codices can be understood as either referring to a concrete example of behaviour, or maybe as a way of summarizing all behaviour into one event.

The verb *pьsati* 'write' shows interesting behaviour as well. Both the aorist of *pьsati* and of *napьsati* 'write down' are found translating Greek *ἔγραψεν*:

(206) i g[lago]la emu . egože ***psa***[aor] mos[e]i vъ zakoně i proroci . obrětomъ is[us]a s[y]na iosifova . iže otъ nazareta [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
and said to him, "We have found Him of whom Moses in the Law and also the Prophets *wrote* Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (John 1:45)

(207) i otъvěštavъ is[usъ] . reče imъ . po žestosrъdiju vašemu . ***nap'sa***[aor] vamъ zapovědь sьjǫ [*Z*, *M*][64]
but Jesus said to them, "Because of your hardness of heart he *wrote* you this commandment" (Mark 10:5)

The difference may lie in the fact that in the example (206) the object is not a discrete object like a completed book, letter or law, but writings *about* someone *in* certain books, while in example (207) there is a discrete object 'this commandment'. Moreover, as Hercigonja (1961: 101) remarks, the event

[62] The version in Matthew contains some extra text, which I have left out to make comparing easier.
[63] In this case the 'eating up' of the consecrated bread is grammatically ascribed to David, but from the rest of the sentence it is clear that he did this together with his companions.
[64] *Marianus* has the aorist *napisa*.

took place over a longer period of time, as there are more writers (Moses and the Prophets), even though the verb form is singular. However, there is also one example in which the anaspectual *pьsati* is used with a discrete object, where the duration of the event does not seem to play any role, (translating the Greek perfect *γέγραφα*):

(208) otъvěšta pilatъ . eže ***p'saxъ***^{aor} ***p'saxъ***^{aor} [*Z*, *M*][65]
Pilate answered, "What I *have written* I *have written*" (John 19:22)

Compared to Bible translations of modern Slavic languages, OCS is similar to Bulgarian, which also uses *pisax* here, while all other modern Slavic languages use a form of *napьsati*. This is clearly an instance of simple denotation in OCS and Bulgarian.

Examples of aorists of verb like *viděti* 'see' and *slyšati* 'hear', are hard to find in aterminative predicates, even though these verbs are very frequently attested in the aorist (*viděti* 416 and *slyšati* 152 times). Hence, when a seeing event or a hearing event is presented as bounded, it is easily construed as an achievement. This does not automatically mean, however, that the aorist presents the inherent boundary as attained. Compare the following example:

(209) mnozi proroci i pravedьnici . vъždeléšę^{aor} viděti^{inf} . ěže vidite^{pres} . i ne ***viděšę***^{aor} . i slyšati^{inf} . ěže slyšite^{pres} . i ne ***slyšasę***^{aor} [*Z*, *M*]
many prophets and righteous men desired to see what you see, and did not *see* [it], and to hear what you hear, and did not *hear* [it] (Matthew 13:17)

The modern Slavic translations show an interesting variation in this text. Some translate with perfective verbs (e.g. Bg *vidjaxa* and *čuxa*) but others do not (Ru *videli* and *slyšali*). I think this shows the ambiguity of this example, in which the aorists refer to terminative events, but leave the inherent boundary rather vague. The use of aorists of the prefixed verbs *uzьrěti* 'see, catch sight of' and *uslyšati* 'hear' would have emphasized that those prophets and righteous men did not see exactly what the disciples are seeing, while the use of these anaspectual aorists gives more of a sense of "there was nothing for them to see". I therefore interpret these cases as cases of simple denotation: no seeing or hearing event took place.

[65] Pilate refers to an inscription that he put on the cross. The sign reads "Jesus the Nazarene, the king of the Jews".
It is interesting to note the use of aspect by Hercigonja (1961: 99) when he discusses this example. He states that the aorists here means "što je *napisano*^{pf} (tj. *pisano*^{ipf} i *napisano*^{pf})" and that it concerns something that is "*vršeno*^{ipf} i *izvršeno*^{pf}". It is reminiscent of the way Dostál discusses examples of verbs that he considers biaspectual by giving two translations in Modern Czech (cf. Chapter 4, examples (25) and (27)).

One regular use of the verb *slyšati* is in the phrase 'you have heard', when referring to stories people must have heard being read from the books of Moses of the prophets. This again is a case of simple denotation, which focuses neither on the activity or hearing, nor on a change of state, but simply on the fact that the event has taken place, as in the following example translating the Greek aorist *ἠκούσατε*:

(210) ***slyšaste***[aor] ěko rečeno bys[tъ]. vъzljubiši podruga svoego . i vъsnenavidiši vragy svoję [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
you *have heard* that it was said, "You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy" (Matthew 5:43)

However, the aorist is also frequently used in a narrative context to indicate a change of situation, like in the following example where the aorist is a chain in the story, followed by an imperfect *iskaaxǫ*:

(211) i ***slyšašę***[aor] kъnižьnici . i arxierei . i iskaaxǫ[impf] kako i bǫ pogubili [*Z*, *M*]
the chief priests and the scribes *heard* this, and began seeking how to destroy Him (Mark 11:18)

These verbs of perception are also found in the PastAPI in a similar narrative context, like in (212) where it is followed by two anaspectual aorists:

(212) ***viděvo***[PastAPI] že is[usъ] . negodova[aor] i gl[agol]a[aor] imъ . ne děite dětii prixoditi kъ mně [*Z*, *M*]
but when Jesus *saw* this, He was indignant and said to them, "Permit the children to come to Me" (Mark 10:14)

In this context *viděti* and *slyšati* compete with prefixed verbs (*uslyšati* 'hear' for *slyšati* and *uzъrěti* 'see' for *viděti*, as becomes apparent from the many cases of the variation between codices:

(213) i ***slyšaste***[aor] i oba učenika g[lago]ljǫštь . i po is[us]ě idete[aor] [*Z*, *M*]
i ***uslyšaste***[aor] i oba učenika g[lagoljǫ]šta . i po is[us]ě idoste[aor] [*A*]
the two disciples *heard* him speak, and they followed Jesus (John 1:37)

(214) i prišъdъ otъ tǫdě ***vidě***[aor] ina v bratra . iěko[va] s[y]na zevedeova . i ioana brata emu [*Sk*, *Z*]
i prěšedъ otъ tǫdě . ***uzъrě***[aor] ina dъva bratra . iakova s[y]na zevedeova i ioana bra[ta] ego [*A*]
going on from there He *saw* two other brothers, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother (Matthew 4:21)

Finally, there are also stative verbs that, when used in the aorist, automatically focus on the start of that state (cf. also example (8) in Chapter 2, with and aorist of *bojati sę* 'be afraid'):

(215) fariseи že viděvъ ***divi sę***[aor] . ěko ne prěžde krьsti sę prъvěe oběda [*Z*, *M*]
when the Pharisee saw it, he *was surprised* that He had not first ceremonially washed before the meal (Luke 11:38)

(216) tъgda že vьnide[aor] . i drugy učenikъ prišedy[PastAPI] prěžde kъ groby . i vidě[aor] i ***věrova***[aor] [*M*, *A*]
so the other disciple who had first come to the tomb then also entered, and he saw and *believed* (John 20:8)

(217) něste li nikoliže čьli[PastAPII] čьto sъtvori[aor] da[vi]dъ . egda ***trěbova***[aor] . i vъzalka[aor] samъ i iže běaxǫ sъ nimъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
have you never read what David did when he and his companions *found themselves in need* and became hungry (Mark 2:25, my translation)

In the last example, the aorist of *trěbovati* 'be in need' is used to translate the Greek aorist *χρείαν ἔσχεν* and the aorist of the prefixed *vъzalьkati* 'become hungry' to translate the aorist *ἐπείνασεν*, both indicating the start of a new state. It is interesting to see that OCS uses these two verbs in the same function, but it also raises the question why in some cases OCS almost automatically uses a prefixed verb in such contexts, while in other cases there is variation, or even no alternative attested at all, like in the case of *trěbovati*, but also *negodovati* 'be displeased'. In a more general sense, the question is what the relationship between anaspectual verbs and their prefixed partners is in OCS.

8.3.3 The relationship between anaspectual and other verbs

In this study I have tried to show that verbs that are not perfective are not automatically imperfective in OCS. Many verbs that are traditionally treated as imperfectives, like *ležati* 'lie', *pьsati* 'write', *bojati sę* 'be afraid' and *znati* 'know' or verbs that are treated as biaspectual, like *jasti* 'eat', *klęti sę* 'swear' or *viděti* 'see', are in fact members of one large category of verbs that do not express Slavic-style aspect at all and are therefore in principle compatible with both typical perfective and imperfective contexts. In the preceding sections, I have demonstrated that the group of anaspectual verbs is rather divergent and that the compatibility of individual verbs with particular contexts strongly depends on the lexical content of a verb. For example, verbs of bodily position are never used in terminative predicates and are not normally used in a sequence of events (but cf. example (196)) which reduces the chance of them being attested in the aorist. And some verbs expressing a

state (of mind) are easily used in the aorist to indicate a change of state, while others are not.

One recurrent theme is the 'competition' with other forms. When anaspectual verbs are used in terminative predicates, they compete with both imperfective and perfective verbs. For example, from the anaspectual *sǫditi* 'judge' a prefixed *osǫditi* 'judge' is derived, from which subsequently the prefixed imperfective verb *osǫždati* 'judge' is derived. Variation between the codices shows that the verb *sǫditi* competes with both verbs. In the following generalized utterance, for instance, it competes with *osǫždati*:

(218) eda zakonъ našь ***sǫditъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ č[love]ku ašte ne slyšitъ otъ nego prěžde i razumějǫtъ čьto tvoritъ [*Z, M, A*]
eda zakonъ našь ***osǫždaetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ č[love]ka ašte ne slyšitъ otъ nego prěžde i azumějǫtъ čto tvoritъ [*Sk*]
our Law does not *judge* a man unless it first hears from him and knows what he is doing, does it (John 7:51)

The anaspectual present *sǫditъ* in example (218) is used to simply express a generalized event, while the prefixed imperfective present *osǫždaetъ* presents it as a general rule, an unbounded macro-event, which consists of terminative micro-events.[66] The difference is subtle and often untranslatable into English (the difference is comparable to the difference between Dutch *oordelen* 'sǫditi' and *veroordelen* 'osǫditi/osǫždati').

Similar competition is regularly found in the translation of Greek future forms. I have already discussed example (106) where *sǫditi* competes with *osǫditi* in the translation of a Greek future (example repeated as (219)):

(219) otъ ustъ tvoixъ ***sǫždǫ***$^{\text{pres}}$ tę [*M, A*]
otъ ustъ tvoixъ ***osǫždǫ***$^{\text{pres}}$ tę [*Z*]
by your own words I *will judge* you (Luke 19:22)

There are more such examples, for example with the verb *tvoriti* 'do, make':

(220) děla ěže tvorǫ . i tъ ***tvoritъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. i bolьša ***tvoritъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ sixъ [*Z (A, Sk)*][67]
děla ěže tvorǫ . i tъ ***sъtvoritъ***$^{\text{pres}}$. i bolьša ***sъtvoritъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ sixъ [*M, A, Sk*]
the works that I do, he *will do* also; and greater works than these he *will do* (John 14:12)

[66] Also note the difference between the dative *č[love]ku* and the accusative *č[love]ka*.
[67] *Assemanianus* and *Savvina Kniga* have two versions of this text. In one of those, the first verb is an aorist of the anaspectual *tvoriti* and the other of perfective *sъtvoriti*, in the other version both verbs are perfective.

Interestingly, some anaspectual verbs are never attested in the translation of a Greek future form, but instead a prefixed formation is used. This could indicate that the division of functions was rather strict between these anaspectual verbs and prefixed formations, reminiscent of the division of functions between the verbs in an aspect pair. For example, the anaspectual verb *alъkati* 'be hungry', *plakati* 'cry' and *rydati* 'mourn' are never used to translate a Greek future form, unlike *sǫditi* and *tvoriti*:

(221) gore vamъ nasyštenii ěko ***vъzalčete***[pres] ***sę*** . gore vamъ smějǫštei sę nyně ěko ***vъzdrydate***[pres] i ***vъsplačete***[pres] ***sę*** [*M*, *Z*]
woe to you who are well-fed now, for you *shall be hungry*. Woe to you who laugh now, for you *shall mourn* and *weep* (Luke 6:25)

This difference in division of labour is not restricted to the translation of future forms, but can also be found in contexts where aorist forms are used to express a change of state. I discern three groups.

First, some anaspectual verbs do all the work by themselves, like *negodovati* 'be displeased', and *trěbovati* (cf. example (217)) of which there are no prefixed partners and which are therefore regularly attested as expressing the change of state between not being angry and being angry:

(222) viděvъ že is[usъ] . ***negodova***[aor] i g[lago]la imъ [*Z*, *M*]
but when Jesus saw this, He *was indignant* and said to them (Mark 10:14)[68]

At the same time, these verbs occur in typical aterminative usage as well:

(223) i ěko ne ***trěbovaše***[impf] . da kъto sъvědětelьstvujetъ o č[love]ci . samъ bo věděaše čьto bě vъ č[love]ci [*Z*, *M*]
and because He *did* not *need* anyone to testify concerning man, for He Himself knew what was in man (John 2:25)

(224) i slyšavъše že decętь . ***načęšę***[aor] ***negodovati***[inf] . o iěkově . i oan'ně [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
hearing this, the ten *began to feel indignant* with James and John (Mark 10:41)

In example (223), the imperfect of *trěbovati* refers to a state and in (224) the infinitive of *negodovati* is used after a phase verb, and refers to a state as well.

[68] It is interesting to also take into consideration the English translations in which the successive states are part of the interpretation, but the change of state is often left implicit. To emphasize a change of state, English could use *became indignant*, but in contexts like this there is no need for that in English.

The predicate in (224) is terminative, but this is thanks to the aorist of the auxiliary *načęšę*, the infinitive *negodovati* refers to an aterminative event.

Secondly, there are verbs like *radovati sę* 'be happy', which are never used to express a change of state and in that respect are the mirror image of *negodovati*. Instead of *radovati sę* the prefixed verb *vъzdradovati sę* 'become happy' is used to translate the Greek aorist *ἐχάρησαν*:

(225) oni že slyšavъše . ***vъzdradovašę***[aor] ***sę*** . i oběštašę sę emu sъrbrьniky [*Z*, *M*]
they *were glad* when they heard this, and promised to give him money (Mark 14:11)

In this respect, the verb *radovati sę* and *vъzdradovati sę* is comparable to, for example, *alъkati* 'be hungry' with *vъzalъkati*, *kolěbati* 'move' with *vъskolěbati* 'start moving' and *znati* 'know' with *poznati* 'get to know'. Of *znati* there some are aorist attestations, but none refer to a 'get to know' event. Compare the following example, in which the aorist is used in a simple denotation function, referring to the past occurrence of a state:

(226) i togda ispověmь imъ . ěko nikoliže ***znaxъ***[aor] vasъ [*Z*, *M*]
and then I will declare to them, "I never *knew* you" (Matthew 7:23)

When the aorist of the same Greek verb, *γινώσκω*, is used as 'get to know, recognize, OCS uses the prefixed verb *poznati*:

(227) i ta povědaašete ěže byšę na pǫti . i ěko ***sę pozna***[aor] ima vъ prělomlenii xlěba [*M*, *A*]
they began to relate their experiences on the road and how He *was recognized* by them in the breaking of the bread (Luke 24:35)

The verbs *ležati* 'lie', *stojati* 'stand' and *sěděti* 'sit' could be added to this group. For these verbs a separate set of verbs refers to the change of state of bodily position, namely *lešti* 'lie down', *stati* 'stand up' and *sěsti* 'sit down'.

Finally, there is the group of anaspectual verbs that can express a change of state, but of which also a prefixed verb can occur in that context. The example I used in Chapter 2 was of *bojati sę* 'be afraid' and *ubojati sę* 'become afraid', and in the present chapter I have given examples of variation between Gospel codices with verbs like *viděti* 'see' and *uzьrěti* 'see, notice', *slyšati* 'hear' and *uslyšati* 'hear'. More examples can be found if one looks for variation in this context. For example, while there is no variation between Gospel codices between aorists of *diviti sę* 'marvel' and *podiviti sę* 'marvel', (*diviti sę* is used in all contexts) the verb *podiviti sę* 'become surprised' is attested in this context in the *Suprasliensis*:

(228) onъ že priimъ i počьtъ . ***podivi***[aor] ***sę*** vъzvěšteniju [*S*]
but when he had received it and read it, he *was surprised* by the message (558, 30 - 559, 1)

Unlike the opposition between perfective and imperfective verbs, in which there is a rather neat division of labour in various contexts (e.g. future reference and narrative sequences in the aorist are almost always perfective), the division of labour between the anaspectual verbs and prefixed verbs varies. In some cases, the division is reminiscent of the division of labour between an aspect pair. For example, *alъkati* 'be hungry' is never used to translate Greek future forms and also never expresses a change of state. It may be that the aspect pairs in OCS form a model that reshapes the relationship between other pairs. This also seems to be the case for a number of other verb pairs (prefixed VOMs, Leskien's class II verbs), which I will discuss in Chapter 9. These facts combined give the impression of an already firmly rooted derivational aspect opposition that has an influence on the behaviour pairs that have another origin.

However, there are some important differences between anaspectual verbs and imperfective verbs. First, some anaspectual verbs are really 'stand-alone' verbs, that occur in all contexts (e.g. *trěbovati* 'be in need' and *negodovati* 'be displeased'. Secondly, verbs in a 'pair' of anaspectual and prefixed verbs (e.g. *slyšati - uslyšati* 'hear' or *diviti sę - podiviti sę*) often compete with each other when it comes to future reference or a context in which a change of state is expressed. Hence, the functions are not as neatly divided amongst the partners. Thirdly, some of these pairs show a similar division of labour (e.g. *bojati sę - ubojati sę* 'be afraid' and *znati* 'know' - *poznati* 'know'), but differ from a true aspect pair since e.g. *bojati sę* and *znati* are also used in aterminative predicates, even if the event is presented as bounded with an aorist (cf. example (226)).

All this shows that the anaspectual verbs do not form a coherent part of the aspect system in OCS, but rather are a diverse group of verbs that only have in common the fact that they occur in aterminative predicates.

In the following section, I will discuss some verbs that fall within the anaspectual category based on the categorization in this study, but that show great similarity to perfective verbs: they normally express a terminative event of which the inherent boundary is attained and they are not or only very rarely attested in aterminative use.

8.3.4 Some dubious anaspectual verbs

As I already mentioned, the verb *rešti* 'say' is not the prototypical anaspectual verb. The many attestations (3,878) provide quite good view of this verb and the absence of imperfect attestations can hardly be attributed to chance (cf.

the verb *plęsati* 'dance' with only 9 attestations, where the absence of imperfect or present participles can easily be attributed to chance). The profile of *rešti* is typically perfective, with many aorist attestations and past participles. And the present tense forms normally refer to a future event, just as with perfective verbs. Dostál (1954: 69) states that *rešti* must have been biaspectual once, based on the attestations of present participles. This remark can only be understood if one understands that Dostál approaches aspect as a characteristic of individual attestations. However, in the approach of this study such a remark is not really significant, as all verbs were anaspectual before the development of the Slavic-style aspect system, even though some undoubtedly were more compatible with functions that are currently associated with one of the aspects, while others were more compatible with functions that became the territory of the other aspect. With the development of the aspect system, highly terminative verbs developed a derived partner and became perfective in that way (Maslov 1961: 190-192). Most of these highly terminative verbs were prefixed verbs, but there are a number of simplex verbs as well that became part of an aspect pair, resulting in unprefixed aspect pairs (e.g. *dati - dajati* 'give' and *aviti sę - avljati sę* 'appear'). It appears that *rešti* either did not belong to these highly terminative unprefixed verbs when the aspect system developed and therefore did not develop a derived partner (**ricati*, the form is only attested in prefixed formations, like in the pair *prorešti - proricati* 'prophesy')[69], or it immediately developed/already had an aspectual relation with *glagolati* 'say, speak' resulting in the non-development of a derived partner, or the untimely demise of such a form. The only deviating examples of *rešti* in OCS are formed by the present participles with 31 attestations in OCS (19 PresAP and 12 PresPP). Examples of the use of PresAP can be found in the *Suprasliensis*:

(229) ne otъvěšta li jemu blaženyi petrъ . ***reky***$^{\text{PresAP}}$ pokai sę otъ zьlobi seę[70] [*S*]
did not the holy Peter answer *saying*, "repent for these sins" (363, 9-11)

[69] In fact, there are two verbs *proricati* 'prophesy', one having *-ati, -je-* and one extra derived having *-ati, -aje-* (cf. section 9.5). This is reminiscent of the prefixed pairs derived from *dati - dajati* 'give', that have extra derived forms *-davati*, like *podati - podajati - podavati* 'give' where the first derived verb has *-ati, -je-* and the second *-ati, -aje-*. However, unlike in case of *rešti*, there is an unprefixed pair *dati - dajati* as well.

[70] Almost all attestations of the PresAP are of the Nsg masculine *reky*. The only attestation in the Gospel codices (John 5:12) can also be analysed as the 'long form' of the PastAPI *rekъ*. It is a translation of a Greek aorist participle, *ὁ εἰπών*, which supports the idea that this must be a past participle. However, in the *Suprasliensis* the forms translate the Greek present participle *λέγων*. In the Gospel codices this is translated by a present participle of *glagolati*.

In the Gospel codices there are a number of PresPPs of *rešti*, yet in all instances there is variation with other forms:

(230) g[lago]la emu žena . věmь ěko mesiě pridetъ . ***rekomy***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ x[ristos]ъ [*Z*, *M*]
g[lago]la emu žena věmь ěko mesia pridet . ***g[lagolae]my***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ x[ristos]ъ
the woman said to Him, "I know that Messiah is coming (He who *is called* Christ)" (John 4:25)

(231) simona ***rekomago***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ petra [*Sk*]
simona ***naricajǫštaago***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ ***sę*** petra [*Z*, *A*]
Simon who *was called* Peter (Matthew 4:18)

(232) na městě ***rekoměmь***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ litostrata [*A*]
na městě ***naricaeměmь***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ litostratǫ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*][71]
at a place *called* The Pavement (John 19:13)

It is difficult to see how these examples are compatible with the attainment of an inherent boundary, which is typical of the perfective aspect. This could be a reason to regard *rešti* as anaspectual. In example (229) the PresAP refers to an ongoing (terminative) event, while in examples (230) through (232) the PresPPs are used to refer to a stative situation. Interestingly, the prefixed verb *narešti sę* 'be called' is also attested in similar stative usage, competing with *naricati sę* 'be called':

(233) simonъ . iže ***narečetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ ***sę*** petrъ [*M*]
simonъ iže ***naricaetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ ***sę*** petrъ [*Z*]
Simon, who *is called* Peter (Matthew 10:2)

This shows that there are probably lexical factors at play as well that make these verbs more compatible with stative situations.

The verb *glagolati*, which is often paired with *rešti* as its imperfective partner, is not the typical imperfective verb, but rather anaspectual, since it also occurs in aterminative predicates (cf. also example (114) with an aorist):

(234) i pristǫpьše učenici ego rěšę emu . po čьto priťačami ***g[lago]lešĭ***$^{\text{pres}}$ imъ [*Z*, *M*]
and the disciples came and said to Him, "Why do You *speak* to them in parables?" (Matthew 13:10)

[71] *Assemanianus* has two versions of this text.

(235) уже ne mnogo ***g[lago]ljǫ***[pres] sъ vami [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
I *will* not *speak* much more with you (John 14:30)

Whatever the original status of *rešti*, and notwithstanding the few atypical attestations of present participles, based on the examples above and the profile and behaviour of *rešti,* I think the best way of understanding the relationship between *glagolati* and *rešti* is indeed a comparison with the relationship between anaspectual verbs and a prefixed formation (e.g. (*bojati sę - ubojati sę* 'be afraid')). Another solution would be to treat *rešti* as the most terminative verb in the anaspectual group, with only very few aterminative attestations. However, when those few attestations are regarded as fossilized remnants from an older stage, before the aspect system was established, the verb *rešti* is no different from other perfective verbs.

There are two other verbs that have ended up in the group of anaspectual verbs because of the absence of a derived partner, which could also be seen as 'dubious' cases. First, there is the verb *vratiti sę* 'turn around' that is attested only 5 times, of which no **vraštati sę* is attested, as one would expect based on knowledge of the cognates of *vratiti sę* in modern Slavic languages. However, given the small number of attestations of *vratiti sę,* the absence of **vraštati sę* can be attributed to chance.[72]

Secondly, an odd verb that is part of the anaspectual group is *sěsti* 'sit down'. There is no derived partner attested of *sěsti*, while there are of the other verbs of bodily position, *lešti - lěgati* 'lie down' and *stati - stajati* 'stand up'. Interestingly, these three verbs share the characteristic of also having an aterminative, stative 'partner', referring to the bodily position and recognizable by stative *-ě-* (cf. Schuyt 1990: 15), but never to the change of state toward that position: *ležati* 'lie', *stojati* 'stand' and *sěděti* 'sit'. The following table contains the frequencies of the attestations of the various verbs:

Original verb	***Atts.***	***Derived verb***	***Atts.***	***Stative version***	***Atts.***
lešti	3	*lěgati*	2	*ležati*	141
stati	171	*stajati*	1	*stojati*	258
sěsti	146	**sědati*	-	*sěděti*	201

Table 8.3 Frequency of attestations of verbs of bodily position

What is striking, here, is the low number of attestations of *lešti*, but also the low frequency of the attestations of the derived verbs *lěgati* and *stajati* and

[72] The verb *vraštati sę* is attested in Old Russian (Sreznevskij 1893-1906).

the absence of **sědati*.[73] For some reason, these verbs, even though they are inherently terminative, did not derive imperfective verbs very easily. It is possible that the relationship of the terminative verbs with the aterminative (stative) verbs is responsible for this. However, the relationship between, for example, *sěsti* and *sěděti* is not that of a Slavic-style derivational aspect pair, since *sěděti* is not terminative and, moreover, the aterminative verbs of bodily position are never used in a terminative predicate, so there is no shared meaning and no opposition. Again, the relationship is more like the relationship between *bojati sę* 'be afraid' and *ubojati sę* 'become afraid', just as in the case of *glagolati* and *rešti*. The profile of *sěsti*, with no imperfects and past participles, as well as the behaviour, e.g. the future interpretation of the present tense forms and translation of Greek aorist forms, is compatible with that of perfective verbs.

I have not found other verbs in the anaspectual group that would not belong there based on their profile, behaviour, or knowledge of their cognates in modern Slavic languages.

8.4 Some complicated cases in the perfective groups

Just as *rešti* 'say' and *sěsti* 'sit down' are deviant members of the anaspectual group, there are some deviant members of the aspectual groups as well. In the discussion of the imperfective aorist, I have already mentioned some imperfective verbs that show deviating profiles and/or behaviour, like *vъprašati* 'ask' and verbs ending in *-věštati*. There are also verbs in the perfective group that have deviating profiles and behaviour. I will first give some examples of unprefixed perfective verbs and subsequently also of prefixed verbs.

8.4.1 Complicated cases in the perfective unprefixed group

First, there is *krъstiti* 'baptize' which has a derived partner *krъštati* 'baptize'. The verb *krъstiti* shows aberrant behaviour, as well as an atypical profile. The most striking difference when it comes to the profile, are the 29 attestations of PresAPs, on a total of 119 attestations. Examples are:

(236) bystъ ioanъ ***krъstę***$^{\text{PresAP}}$ vъ pustyni [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
John *baptized* in the wilderness (Mark 1:4, my translation)

[73] The derivation *-sědati* is only attested in the prefixed imperfective verb *sъsědati sę* 'become rigid, clot', derived from *sъsěsti sę* 'become rigid, clot'.

(237) i ide paky na onъ polъ iordana . na město ideže bě ioanъ . prěžde ***krъstę***[PresAP] [*Z*, *M*]
and He went away again beyond the Jordan to the place where John *was* first *baptizing* (John 10:40)

(238) šьdъše ubo naučite vьsę jęz[y]ky . ***krъstęšte***[PresAP] ję vъ imę ot[ь]ca i s[y]na i s[vę]taago d[u]xa [*M*, *Z*, *A*]
go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (Matthew 28:19)

All these present participles are translations of Greek present participles and seem to refer to an ongoing activity, just like the present participles of *rešti*. Given the relatively high frequency of these forms, the profile of *krъstiti* partly looks like that of an anaspectual verb.[74] Also, examples of variation between codices in the present tense show that *krъstiti* can be used in contexts in which a derived verb is expected, like in the following example where the Greek has a present tense *βαπτίζομαι* 'I am baptized' and a future tense *βαπτισθήσεσθε* 'you will be baptized':

(239) i krъšteniemь imьže azъ ***krъštǫ***[pres] ***sę*** . ***krъstita***[pres] ***sę*** [*Z*, *Sk*]
i krъšteniemь imъže azъ ***krъštajǫ***[pres] ***sę*** . ***krъstita***[pres] ***sę*** [*M*, *A*]
and you *shall be baptized* with the baptism with which *I am baptized* (Mark 10:39)

Interestingly, the cognates of *krъstiti* are considered to be imperfective in some modern Slavic languages (e.g. Russian), perfective in others (Bulgarian, Macedonian) and biaspectual in yet others (BCS).[75] This fits with the rather unclear aspectual status of the verb in OCS.

Some other unprefixed perfective verbs show deviating profiles and behaviour as well. For example, the verb *protiviti sę*[76] is attested 7 times as a PresAP (out of 28 attestations) and shows deviating behaviour in the present tense as well. The use of the present participle is the same as with *krъstiti*:

[74] Moreover, the 15 attestations of the imperfect (*krъštaaxъ*) are all automatically attributed to *krъštati*, which is otherwise only attested in the infinitive. However, this is yet another case in which the imperfects of the perfective and imperfective partners are homonymous.
[75] Incidentally, this is exactly the same for the verb *viděti*, ipf in Russian, pf in Bulgarian and Macedonian and biaspectual (anaspectual?) in BCS. It would be interesting to see whether there are more such parallels.
[76] The verb is not a prefixed version of **-tiviti*, but rather a derivation of the adverb *protivъ* 'against'.

(240) zaklinajǫ tę d[u]še nečisty . ***protivęi***[PresAP] ***sę*** tvari b[o]žьi [*Es*]
I curse you unclean soul *who opposes* Gods creation (55a, 15-16)

The present tense is used to translate Greek present tense forms, which is not completely unusual in case of perfective verbs, but the following examples show that the functions are more compatible with those of anaspectual verbs:

(241) vьsěkъ iže sę tvoritъ c[ěsa]rь . ***protivitъ***[pres] ***sę*** kesarevi [*Z, M, A*]
everyone who makes himself out to be a king *opposes* Caesar (John 19:12)

(242) tebě že cěsaru ***protivimъ***[pres] ***sę*** i zapovědemъ tvoimъ ne pokaraemъ[pres] sę [*S*]
we *oppose* you, king, and we do not obey your laws (59, 24-26)

While example (241) could be seen as a case of singularization (cf. examples (120) and (121)), where a single event is exemplary for the general rule, this does not apply in (242), where it is difficult to see how the example fits with 'attainment of an inherent boundary'. This is a typical actual present, as the present tense of the second verb in the utterance, the imperfective *pokarjati* 'submit', also shows. So it seems that even though *protiviti sę* has a derived partner, it occurs in contexts where one would expect an anaspectual or imperfective verb.

These deviations from the typical perfective profile and behaviour, can probably be attributed to the fact that it concerns simplicia. These verbs form the basis of the system and must have been compatible with more contexts before the development of the aspect system. And although prefixed verbs must have been more versatile before the development of the aspect system as well, it is possible that the prefixed verbs were felt to express stronger terminativity, thanks to their prefix, which could have made them less compatible with certain contexts (e.g. actual present), while unprefixed verbs continued to be used in multiple contexts. This fits with the attestations of present participles of *rešti* as well. Also, the fact that some of these simplicia ended up having a different aspect in different modern Slavic languages shows that their aspectual preference may not have been as strongly established as that of the prefixed verbs (but cf. also Chapter 9, section 9.1).

8.4.2 Complicated cases in the perfective prefixed group

Overall, the perfective prefixed group is more homogeneous than the perfective unprefixed group, which means that there are only relatively few verbs with a clear deviating profile. The verbs with the most deviating attestations (imperfects and present participles) are: *razuměti* 'understand' (14 out of 347), *pobědіti* 'overcome' (10 out of 46) and *sъmysliti* 'think, think over' (7 out of 11), of which the derived partners *razuměvati* 'understand'

poběždati 'overcome' and *sъmyšljati* 'think' are attested in OCS. I already discussed the 10 attested present passive participles of *poběditi*, which appear to have a specialized potential meaning, so I leave this verb out of the discussion here. A closer look at the attestations of the two other verbs shows deviating behaviour as well. For example, *razuměti* is also used to refer to a state that is simultaneous to the moment of utterance, which is very atypical for a perfective verb:

(243) i g[lago]la imъ . tako li vy nerazumьlivi este . ne ***razuměete***[pres] li . ěko vsěko eže izvьnu vъxoditъ vъ č[love]ka . ne možetъ ego oskvrьniti [*Z*][77]
and He said to them, "Are you so lacking in understanding also? *Do* you not *understand* that whatever goes into the man from outside cannot defile him" (Mark 7:18)

On the other hand, *razuměti* is used to express one single complete events as well:

(244) ***razuměvъ***[PastAPI] že lьstъ ixъ . reče kъ nimъ [*Z*, *M*]
but He *understood* their trickery and said to them (Luke 20:23, my translation)[78]

(245) nyně ***razuměšę***[aor] . ěko vsě eliko dalъ esi mьně . otъ tebe sǫtъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
now they *have come to know* that everything You have given Me is from You (John 17:7)

And it occurs in translations of Greek future forms, in this case *γνώσῃ*:

(246) eže azъ tvorǫ ty ne věsi nyně . ***razuměeši***[pres] že po sixъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
what I do you do not realize now, but you *will understand* hereafter (John 13:7)[79]

[77] *Marianus* has *razuměati*. Similar present tense forms with an *-a-* instead of the expected *-e-* occur 13 times in this codex, but never in the other Gospel codices, while *Marianus* also has present forms with an *-e-* (cf. example 246). It is possible that the forms with an *-a-* are connected to the imperfect *razuměaxъ* and should be seen as derived forms. See Chapter 10 for more on the possible role of the imperfect in the formation of derived forms.

[78] The English translation has 'detected', here, which even more strongly points at a change of state, at the gaining of the insight. The Greek original has an aorist participle, *κατανοήσας*.

[79] In Matthew 13:14 a construction *ne imate razuměti* 'you will not understand' is attested, translating the Greek *μὴ συνῆτε* 'you will not understand' with a subjunctive aorist.

The fact that *razuměti* is used in all these contexts, makes it similar to an anaspectual verb. But how can this be explained when there is a derived verb *razuměvati* as well?

The characteristic that the verbs *razuměti* and *sъmysliti* share, is that they can also be seen as denominal instead of prefixed, from the OCS nouns *razumъ* 'mind', and *sъmyslъ* 'mind'.[80] It may be that the association with those nouns resulted in the use of *razuměti* and *sъmysliti* as (unprefixed) anaspectual verbs on certain occasions, while on other occasions they were felt as prefixed formations of *uměti* 'be able' and *mysliti* 'think', which resulted in the derivation of imperfective verbs.

In the following example of a habitual or generalized utterance, the present tense forms of *razuměti* and *razuměvati* compete:

(247) ěko vidęšte ne vidętъ . i slyšęšte ne slyšętъ . ni ***razumějǫtъ***^{pres} [*Z*]
ěko vidęšte ne vidętъ i slyšęšte ne slyšętъ ni ***razuměvajǫtъ***^{pres} [*M*]
because while seeing they do not see, and while hearing they do not hear, nor do they *understand* (Matthew 13:13)

Apparently, the scribe of the *Marianus* felt that *razuměvati* was more fitting in this context than *razuměti*, which can indicate that he felt *razuměti* to be a prefixed and therefore perfective verb.

Other deviating verbs require a different explanation. For example, the fact that *otъvěštati* 'answer' has 6 attestations (out of 765) of PresAP and imperfect could result from the fact that it belongs to a family with a complicated mix of derivational patters (cf. fn. 42). And for *pokoriti* 'subjugate' the deviating attestations (6 PresAP/imperfects on a total of 30) could result from the fact that it is not a prefixed form of *koriti* 'slander', but a denominal formation based on the noun **pokorъ* 'submissive', which is attested Old Russian, but not in OCS.

The discussion of these verbs with deviating profiles within the various groups, shows, once more, that even though a morphological classification is a very good starting point for the aspectual categorization of verbs, there is still the need for the analysis of individual profiles and a semantic analysis in addition to the morphological categorization. In individual cases, this analysis may result in a re-evaluation of the morphological categorization.

[80] Note that even though the present passive participles of *pobědіti* can be explained perfectly well as typical perfective forms with a potential meaning, the verb could also be regarded as denominal, from the noun *poběda* 'victory'. However, I do not believe there is a compelling reason to treat this verb as denominal.

8.5 Concluding remarks

The proposed grouping into perfective, imperfective and anaspectual verbs finds support in the semantic analysis of individual examples found in the OCS corpus. The analysis of examples of perfective and imperfective verbs supports the hypothesis that perfective verbs express the attainment of an inherent boundary and that imperfective verbs defocus that boundary, which makes the OCS derivational aspect system a typical Slavic-style aspect system. Anaspectual verbs are verbs that are not inherently terminative, which sets them apart from both perfective and imperfective verbs. Since anaspectual verbs do not express aspect, they are also not constrained by it and are therefore often more versatile than 'aspectual' verbs. Below, I will briefly summarize the outcomes of the analysis of individual perfective, imperfective and anaspectual forms.

8.5.1 Perfective verbs

Perfective verbs in the present tense regularly result in a future interpretation; they are also the standard translation of Greek future forms. I have found no examples of perfective verbs in the actual present; the actual present could very well be the only context from which the perfective aspect is absolutely excluded in OCS. However, the small number of examples of the actual present in OCS does not allow for conclusions that are all too firm.

Perfective presents are also used to refer to generalized events. This is the exemplary function, where a single event is presented as an example for a general rule. The event at hand is expected to occur when the right circumstances occur. Cases of bounded repetition also concern events that occur more than once. However, with bounded repetition the perfective verb refers to a limited string of bounded events and presents this as bounded both on the micro-level (every single event) and on the macro-level (the whole string). This usage shows that the perfective aspect is not incompatible with iteration. Unlike imperfective verbs, though, perfective verbs always need an additional indication that the event is to be understood as occurring more than once, for example with adverbial expressions such as 'two times'.

Other contexts in which the perfective present occurs in OCS, albeit not very often, are performative utterances and the historical present. In both cases there appears to be a clash between totality on the one hand and the fact that the event is presented as 'going on' on the other hand. The difference between the two is that in the historical present an event is not presented as actually taking place at the moment of utterance, while a performative event takes place exclusively at the moment of utterance.It seems that the clash between totality and 'going on' results in a pragmatic solution in which the imperfective aspect emphasizes the strong association with the moment of

utterance (or the 'imagined time of the situation'), while the perfective aspect is used to emphasize totality, or the result of the event.

With regard to the use of perfective verbs in the past, the two modes of language, narrative and retrospective, result in different usage types. In narrative contexts perfective events refer to complete events which push the story forward and form a chain of events (often in the aorist and PastAPI). In retrospective mode perfective verbs indicate that the result of the complete event is connected to time of the utterance.

On the rare occasion that a verb of the perfective aspect is rendered in the imperfect, the form expresses conditional habituality in which a total terminative event is presented as conditionally recurring: every time X, then Y, which is compatible with the attainment of an inherent boundary on the micro-level (the qualitative level), but at the same time expresses temporal unboundedness at the macro-level (the quantitative level). This type of conditional habituality shows similarities to the exemplary function of perfective present forms and also finds a parallel in the function of PresPP of perfective verbs, which have a potential meaning.

8.5.2 Imperfective verbs

Imperfective verbs are attested in a wide range of functions. They all have in common the fact that the inherent boundary is defocused. I distinguish two types of results of this defocusing. First, the defocusing can result in emphasizing the unboundedness at the macro-level, which includes iterative use, habitual use or generalized use, which are sometimes difficult to distinguish. If an imperfective verb is used like this, the events at the micro-level are understood to be complete, even though the imperfective verb does not explicitly express this; the unboundedness concerns the fact that the verb does not refer to a single complete event. The second result of the defocusing of the inherent boundary concerns the boundary of an individual event. In such instances, the defocusing of the inherent boundary has a variety of uses. In the actual present, for example, the process leading up to the inherent boundary is in focus. In conative usage the defocusing of the inherent boundary expresses a failed attempt. In a performative context, on the other hand, the imperfective aspect is never interpreted as a failed attempt, but rather as a single complete event; there, the choice of aspect can be attributed to the strong association with the moment of utterance. In the (rare cases of the) historical present in OCS, the choice of the imperfective aspect is either linked to the 'imagined time of the situation', or is possibly connected to singling out the event as a 'decisive event'. Finally, imperfective verbs are almost never used in the translation of a Greek future form: whenever there is a choice of aspect, the translators choose the perfective partner.

The combination of the aorist and imperfective verbs is rare and sometimes difficult to interpret. The forms have complicated semantics since two levels of boundedness play a role, just as with the perfective imperfect, but exactly the other way around: the inherent boundary on the qualitative level is defocused, but the event is still presented as temporally bounded (total) at a quantitative level. There is a possible example of an imperfective aorist in which the inherent boundary is never reached (e.g. example (176)), but the event is still presented as a link in a chain of events. There is an example with a roundtrip meaning (example (177)), one with a reversed action (example (179)), one with a temporally bounded iterative event (example (180)) and an example in which the form is possibly used for the translation of a historical present ((181). This may not be a very impressive collection of examples, but I believe it would not be right to pretend they do not exist. Their complex semantics partly explains their rareness. Part of it can also be explained by scribes replacing these rare forms with 'normal' perfective aorists (see the discussion of example (181)).

The function of the imperfective aspect can be characterized as follows: the use of a terminative verb always elicits the thought of a change of situation and there are various reasons why imperfective verbs are used to keep this change of situation out of the focus. This can be unbounded repetition, or conativity, but also the mere fact that the event occurs at the moment of speech. Hence, imperfectivity is not incompatible with complete events, does not necessarily deny the totality of a terminative event, but defocuses the inherent boundary for various reasons.

8.5.3 Anaspectual verbs

Anaspectual verbs are attested in most contexts and often parallel to either perfective or imperfective verbs. However, the profiles and behaviour of anaspectual verbs are rather divergent. The main division within the anaspectual group is between inherently aterminative anaspectual verbs and terminativizable anaspectual verbs. Based on the attestations that are available, some verbs appear to never occur in terminative predicates, while others do so from time to time and yet others occur more frequently in terminative predicates than in aterminative predicates. Although there are links to the preferences for aterminative or terminative predicates and the lexical content of a verb, some lexically very similar verbs show rather different behaviour. There is also a difference in the extent to which a terminativizable verb allows for the expression of the attainment of a boundary.

If an anaspectual verb is used to refer to an event of which the inherent boundary is presented as attained, the anaspectual verbs are in direct competition with perfective verbs. This competition explains the variation

between the four Gospel codices. In retrospective mode the anaspectual verbs have the unique function of simple denotation. Imperfective verbs do not normally occur in retrospective utterances, with the extremely rare exception of some of the imperfective aorists.

8.5.4 Other issues

The analysis of some verbs that show deviating profiles within the various groups, like *vъprašati* 'ask' in the imperfective groups, *rešti* 'say' and *sěsti* 'sit down in the anaspectual group and *krъstiti* 'baptize' and *razuměti* 'understand' in the perfective groups, show that morphological classification and statistical analysis of the grammatical profile of groups of verbs is only a starting point, but that there are exceptions to the general rules which can sometimes be explained away or speculated upon, while in other cases the reason for the deviating profile or behaviour remains unclear.

In the following chapter I will discuss the additional groups that I have included in the statistical analysis in Chapter 7.