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

10 THE DEVELOPMENT OF DERIVATIONAL ASPECT: A CASE STUDY

10.0 Introduction

Up to this chapter, the discussion has concentrated on the description of the verbal aspect system as it can be found in OCS. However, I have not yet touched upon questions regarding the origins and development of derivational aspect in Slavic. In this chapter, I will discuss a group of verbs that at first sight represent a 'weird case' of aspect opposition, but that will turn out to provide insight into an earlier stage of development of the derivational aspect system and possibly into the origin and development of the system.

In Chapter 8, I have shown that the derivational aspect opposition in OCS is a so-called Slavic-style (cf. Chapter 2, section 2.2.1) opposition in which the perfective verbs express the attainment of an inherent boundary and the imperfective verbs defocus the inherent boundary. A prerequisite for a verb to be perfective or imperfective is that it is terminative, since the opposition revolves around the inherent boundary. Verbs in which such a boundary is not always present, the so-called anaspectual verbs, cannot be said to inherently express the attainment of, or to defocus, that boundary.

The opposition between the aorist and imperfect is another, inflectional, aspect opposition between two past tense forms in OCS. It is a Romance-style (cf. section 2.2.1) aspect opposition in which the perfective forms express the attainment of a temporal boundary, while the imperfective forms express temporal unboundedness. Since it would be confusing to use the terms perfective and imperfective for both derivational and inflectional aspect, I have chosen to use the traditional designations, aorist and imperfect for this type of opposition in OCS. This does not mean, however, that I do not regard the opposition as an aspect opposition; it just is a different kind of aspect opposition.

In the present chapter, I will describe the results of a small case study which connects both aspect oppositions in OCS.[1] The study concerns verbs that in principle show the same morphological aspect opposition as the core prefixed perfective and imperfective verbs, namely derived imperfective forms versus base forms. The opposition between underived and derived forms is only found in a few forms, though, not in two complete opposing paradigms. Therefore, in these verbs the Slavic-style aspect opposition looks more like an

[1] An earlier version of this case study can be found in Kamphuis (2015).

inflectional opposition. Another interesting characteristic of the verbs selected for this case study is that for a number of these verbs extra derived forms with the suffix *-ovati, -uje-* are attested, next to the forms derived with the suffix *-ati, -aje-*. I will demonstrate that both the partial opposition that these verbs show and the extra derived verbs in *-ovati, -uje-*, provide insight into the origin and development of Slavic verbal aspect.

Based on these insights I will present my hypothesis with regard to the role of the imperfect in the development of Slavic derivational aspect in section 10.5.

10.1 Characteristics of the selected verbs

The selected verbs are prefixed forms of the verbs *vęzati* 'bind', *kazati* 'show', *rězati* 'cut' and **sypati*.[2] According to Silina (1982: 191-192) these verbs show a particular ancient pattern of aspect derivation: the verbs have one aorist/infinitive stem and two present stems (section 10.1.1), one of which is derived with the suffix *-ati, -aje-*. There are more verbs showing similar characteristics, however the current selection of verbs provides enough material for the purpose of this case study.[3] A second characteristic is the occurrence of extra derived forms in *-ovati, -uje-* (section 10.1.2).

I refer to the prefixed forms of a simplex as a 'verb family'. Hence, prefixed forms of *kazati* form the *kazati*-family, represented by the verbs in Table 10.1:

Prefixed	***Extra derived***
nakazati (15) 'discipline'	*N/A*
pokazati (164) 'show'	*pokazovati* (3) 'show'
prědъpokazati 'show beforehand'(1)	*N/A*
sъkazati (121) 'clarify, indicate'	*sъkazovati* (1) 'clarify, indicate'
ukazati (7) 'show, indicate'	*N/A*

Table 10.1 The kazati-family[4]

10.1.1 Verb stems

In all families there are attestations of verbs that have one aorist/infinitive stem and two present stems.[5] Below, I will demonstrate what this means for

[2] The simplex **sypati* is not attested in OCS, yet it is attested in OR (Sreznevskij 1893-1906).

[3] Other verbs that show similar derivational patterns are e.g. prefixed forms of *klevetati* 'slander', *iskati* 'search', *mazati* 'oil' *žędati* 'be thirsty' and *-ricati*. In case of *žędati,* the opposition is also found for the simplex, which is not the case in the selected verbs in which the derived forms only occur in prefixed formations. The *-ricati* forms are also opposed to primary *-rešti* forms, making the situation even more complicated. Also, many prefixed formations that are opposed to Leskien's class II verbs show this derivational pattern (cf. Chapter 5 and 9).

[4] The number in parentheses is the number of attestations of these verbs.

[5] Individual verbs in which both stems are attested are: *obęzati* 'tie around', *privęzati* 'tie, bind', *sъvęzati* 'tie, bind to', *uvęzati* 'tie, bind', *nakazati* 'discipline', *pokazati* 'show', *sъkazati* 'clarify',

the verb paradigm. Before I give the complicated paradigm of *sъkazati* 'clarify, indicate' I will first give a 'normal' paradigm for comparison purposes. Table 10.2 contains the paradigm of the verb *slyšati* 'hear' which I already gave in Chapter 6. The forms are ordered based on the stem they are built on:

Aorist/infinitive stem	***slyša-***	***Present stem***	***slyš-***
Inf	*slyšati*	Pres	*slyšǫ*
Sup	*slyšatъ*	Impr	*slyši*
Impf	*slyšaaxъ*[6]	PresAP	*slyšę*
Aor	*slyšaxъ*	PresPP	*slyšimъ*
PastAPI	*slyšavъ*		
PastAPII	*slyšalъ*		
PastPP	*slyšanъ*		

Table 10.2 Distribution of the forms of slyšati 'hear'

The verbs selected for this case study have two present stems, a primary and a derived one. If one would want to make a similar table for one of these verbs, theoretically there would be four possible opposing verb forms: present, imperative, present active participle and present past participle (i.e. the forms that are based on the present stem). This is indeed only a theoretical possibility, since the only regular opposition is found in the present tense (see also Table 10.4). The only exception to this is one attestation of a present passive participle (*sъkažemъ*) based on the primary present tense stem which forms an opposition with the derived present passive participle (*sъkazajemъ*). No opposing forms are attested for the imperative and the present active participle, which makes the paradigm of *sъkazati*, the verb in the selection with the most complete paradigm, look as follows:

ukazati 'show', *obrězati* 'cut', *isypati* 'pour out' and *rasypati* 'strew, spill'. Of the verb *zavęzati* 'make, mend (nets)' only forms from a derived present tense stem are attested.

[6] The imperfect suffix occurs in a number of phonetically determined forms (cf. Leskien 1969: 134, Diels 1963: 234-235). Except for the sequence *-aa-*, which occurs after palatal consonants like in *slušaaxъ*, there is also *-ěa-* (*daděaxъ*), which occurs after non-palatal consonants. In verbs with the aorist/infinitive stem ending in *-a-* and *-ě-*, only the *-a-* occurs after the stem (e.g. *plakati* 'cry', *plakaaxъ* and *pomьněti* 'remember', *pomьněaxъ*). Contraction of *-aa-* to *-a-* (e.g. *prědaše* from *prědati* 'betray') also occurs regularly, and contraction from *-ěa-* to *-ě-* is attested too (e.g. *xotěše* from *xotěti* 'want') (cf. Diels 1963: 236-237).

Aor./inf. stem	***sъkaza-***	***Present stem***	***sъkaž-***	***sъkaza***
Inf	*sъkazati*	Pres	*sъkažǫ*	*sъkazajǫ*
Sup	*sъkazatъ*	Impr	*sъkaži*	-
Impf	*sъkazaaxъ*	PresAP	-	*sъkazaję*
Aor	*sъkazaxъ*	PresPP	*sъkažemъ*	*sъkazajemъ*
PastAPI	*sъkazavъ*			
PastAPII	*sъkazalъ*			
PastPP	*sъkazanъ*			

Table 10.3 Distribution of the forms of sъkazati 'clarify, indicate'

Table 10.3 shows the well-known imperfective derivational suffix *-aje-*[7] in the forms based on the second present stem *sъkaza-*, which is why I will call these forms imperfective while I will refer to the primary forms based on the underived present stem *sъkaž-* as perfective. The forms based on the aorist/infinitive stem show no opposition and I will call them neutral for now. The term 'anaspectual' is not fitting for these verbs: from the analysis below it will become clear that the neutrality of these forms differs from the neutrality of the anaspectual group treated in Chapter 8, because the verbs selected for this study are all inherently terminative verbs. This is hardly surprising, since it concerns all prefixed verbs, of which I have established that they are almost all terminative in Chapter 9.

The distribution of the attestations over the verb stems in Table 10.4 shows that the perfective present stem is highly incompatible with present participles. There are no attestations of imperatives based on the imperfective present stem. The only frequent aspect opposition is between the perfective and imperfective present tense forms:

[7] I use the designations for the suffixes as in Chapter 5, following Schuyt (1990). Hence the suffix for derivation of imperfective verbs in OCS is *-ati, -aje*. However, it is important that it is only the *-a* in *-aje-*, the present stem suffix, which is the distinguishing characteristic when compared to the suffix *-ati, -je*. This could explain the fact that in the selected verbs only forms based on the present stem show a morphological opposition; the suffix for the aorist/infinitive stem *-ati* is the same in both cases, but the difference concerns the present tense suffix *-je-* and *-aje-*.
Incidentally, it is not clear to me why in these verbs derivation of the type *raskopati - raskopavati* 'dig up' did not develop. Based on the data I can only conclude that it simply did not develop; forms like **-kazavati* or **-rězavati* are not attested, while secondary derived forms on *-kazovati* and *-rězovati* are attested. The latter forms are an extra indication that the former probably never existed (cf. section 10.3 on the extra derived forms).

Aor./inf. stem	*Neutral*	*Present stem*	*Perfective*	*Imperfective*
Inf	5.41%	Pres	12.74%	5.79%
Sup	0.77%	Impr	13.51%	0.00%
Impf	2.51%	PresAP	0.00%	6.37%
Aor	23.75%	PresPP	0.19%	3.86%
PastAPI	7.92%			
PastAPII	1.93%			
PastPP	15.25%			

Table 10.4 Relative frequency of verb forms (n=518)[8]

10.1.2 Extra derived forms in -ovati, -uje-

Another important characteristic of the selected verb families is the attestations of an extra set of derived forms in *-ovati*, *-uje-*, which have the potential of forming a complete imperfective paradigm as opposed to the maximum of four imperfective forms that can be based on the second present tense stem as shown in Table 10.3. The attested forms for the treated verb families are listed in Table 10.5:

Verb	*Attested forms*
otъrězovati 'cut off'	1x Inf
pokazovati 'show'	1x Inf, 1x Impf, 1x PresAP
sъvęzovati 'bind to'	1x PresAP
sъkazovati 'narrate'	1x Aor

Table 10.5 Extra derived forms in -ovati, -uje-

Even though there are only 6 attestations in the selected verb families, the mere fact that they exist, can provide insight into the development of verbal aspect in OCS. I will give a semantic analysis of some of the attested forms below and discuss the significance of these attestations to gain an understanding of the stage of development of the OCS aspect system in section 10.4.

10.2 Semantic analysis

10.2.1 Present tense

The present tense is the only tense that allows for a detailed comparison of perfective and imperfective forms, since it is the only verb form that is regularly formed based on both present stems. I started out comparing a number of the OCS present tense forms with the Greek original to see whether there is a difference between the Greek forms that in OCS are

[8] This table is based only on 518 attestations of the verbs of which a derived present stem is attested.

translated by perfective present and those that are rendered by imperfective forms in OCS.[9] If the opposition between the two present tense forms is indeed aspectual, one would expect to see the perfective forms be used to translate Greek future forms and subjunctive aorists, while the imperfective forms would translate Greek present forms. The results indeed show that the perfective presents are normally translations of Greek future or aorist forms, while the imperfective presents most often translate a Greek present tense. This division of functions is similar to that in the core perfective and imperfective groups (cf. Chapter 8). Table 10.6 contains the results of the count of perfective present forms and Table 10.7 the results for the imperfective presents:

OCS verb	***Greek present***	***Greek future***	***Greek aorist***
nakazati	-	1	1[10]
pokazati	1	6	-
sъkazati	-	8	1[11]
posylati	-	-	2[12]
isypati	1	-	-
Total	2	15	4

Table 10.6 *OCS perfective present tense (kazati- and sypati-families)*

OCS verb	***Greek present***	***Greek future***	***Greek aorist***
pokazati	2	1	-
sъkazati	7	2	-
isypati	1	-	-
Total	10	3	0

Table 10.7 *OCS imperfective present tense (kazati- and sypati-families)*

The unexpected forms are the two perfective presents translating a Greek present tense (Table 10.6) and the three imperfective presents translating a Greek future tense (Table 10.7). In the discussion below I will discuss these unexpected forms.

Below, I will first treat three of the expected forms. In (309) and (311) perfective present tense forms are used to translate a Greek future tense and in example (310) a Greek subjunctive aorist with future meaning, as one would expect of forms that express perfective aspect:

[9] I counted the forms of the *kazati-* and the *sypati*-families in the *Psalterium Sinaiticum* and in the four Gospel codices.
[10] This concerns a subjunctive aorist.
[11] This concerns an aorist infinitive.
[12] This concerns two subjunctive aorists.

(309) ěko naide krotostь na ny i ***nakažemъ***[pres] ***sję*** [*Ps*]
because humility came over us and we *will be chastened* (Psalm 89: 10)

(310) g[ospod]i . ostavi jǫ i se lěto . dondeže jǫ okopajǫ[pres] okrъstъ . i ***osyplję***[pres] jǫ gnoemь [*Z*, *M*]
let it alone, sir, for this year too, until I dig around it and *put in* fertilizer (Luke 13:8)

(311) i sъkazaxъ[aor] imъ imę tvoe . i ***sъkažǫ***[pres] . da ljuby ejǫže mę esi vьzljubilъ . vь nixъ bǫdetъ . i azъ vь nixъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
and I have made Your name known to them, and *will make* it *known*, so that the love with which You loved Me may be in them, and I in them (John 17:26)

The imperfective present refers to habitual events, like in the following example with the present tense of *obrězati* 'circumcise', a translation of the Greek present *περιτέμνετε*:

(312) sego radi dastъ vamъ mosi obrězanie . ne ěko otъ moseа estъ . nъ otъ o[tь]cь . i vъ sǫbǫtǫ ***obrězaete***[pres] č[lově]ka [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
for this reason Moses has given you circumcision (not because it is from Moses, but from the fathers), and on the Sabbath you *circumcise* a man (John 7:22)

Incidentally, all modern Slavic Bible translation have an imperfective verb here as well. Furthermore, the imperfective present of the selected verbs is also used to refer to stative or generalized events. In the following example the imperfective present of *sъkazati* is again a translation of a Greek present tense form (*ἑρμηνεύεται*):

(313) i reče emu idi umy sę . vъ kǫpěli siluamьscě . eže ***sъkazaetъ***[pres] ***sę*** posъlanъ [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
and said to him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam", which *is translated*, Sent (John 9:7)

The preceding examples show a clear division of functions, based on the Greek original, a division that is similar to the division found for the core perfective and imperfective presents. In many contexts, however, there is variation between the various codices when translating one and the same Greek form. For example, when a Greek present and a Greek future tense are opposed, the difference is apparently not always easily reflected in OCS, as

the following example with three different versions in the various Gospel codices shows:[13]

(314) ot[ь]c (b)o ljubitъ s[y]na . i vьsě ***pokazaatъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ emu ěže samъ tvoritъ . i bolьšaa sixъ ***pokažetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ emu děla . da vy čjudite sę [*M*]
o[tь]cь bo ljubitъ s[y]na . i vsě ***pokazaetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ emu ěže samъ tvoritъ . i bolьša sixъ ***pokazaetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ emu děla . da vy čjudite sę [*Z*]
o[tь]cь bo ljubitъ s[y]na . i vsě ***pokažetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ emu . ěže samъ tvoritъ . i bolьša si ***pokažetъ***$^{\text{pres}}$ emu děla . da vy čjudite sę [*A*]
for the Father loves the Son, and *shows* Him all things that He Himself is doing; and the Father *will show* Him greater works than these, so that you will marvel (John 5:20)

The version in the *Marianus* is true to the Greek original in differentiating between the two forms of the verb 'show' by using an imperfective present tense to translate the Greek present tense (*δείκνυσιν*) and a perfective present for the Greek future tense (*δείξει*). The versions in the *Zographensis* and *Assemanianus* use two times the same present tense form and are therefore probably later adaptations made by scribes. In both *Zographensis* and *Assemanianus* the aspect of the two verbs is aligned, although in the opposite direction: in the *Zographensis* both forms are imperfective, while in the *Assemanianus* both are perfective. This variation between perfective and imperfective present forms is reminiscent of example (100) in Chapter 8, where the differences between perfective and imperfective present forms are also straightened out. Hence, this example does not indicate that there was not much of a difference between the underived and derived present tense forms in this particular group; it is a typical case of competition and straightening out of aspectual differences, which is also found in the core groups.

Furthermore, variation between perfective and imperfective present forms is found in habitual contexts, where the perfective present is used in an exemplary function, while the imperfective present in the same context is used to emphasize unboundedness at the macro-level, like in the following example, translating the Greek present tense *βάλλουσιν*:

[13] Compare this to the situation in example (311) where an aorist, *sъkazaxъ* 'have made known', and a perfective present, *sъkažǫ* 'will make known', are juxtaposed, rendering the opposition in the Greek original between an aorist (*ἐγνώρισα*) and a future tense (*γνωρίσω*), an opposition that is easily reflected in OCS.

(315) dobro estъ solь . ašte že solь obujetъ^{pres} . o čemь ubo osolitъ sę . ni vъ zemi ni vъ gnoi . trěbě estъ . vъnъ ***isypaetъ***^{pres} ***sę*** [*Z*]
dobro estъ solъ . ašte že solь obujatъ^{pres} o čemъ ubo osolitъ sę . ni vъ zemi ni vъ gnoi trěbě estъ . vonъ ***isypljǫtъ***^{pres} jǫ [*M*]
therefore, salt is good; but if even salt has become tasteless, with what will it be seasoned? It is useless either for the soil or for the manure pile; it *is thrown out* (Luke 14:34-35)

In this example the perfective present *isypljǫtъ* 'it is thrown out' in the *Marianus* may indicate a stronger correlation between the first event *obujatъ* 'becomes tasteless' (cf. habitual correlative use of the perfective imperfect and the exemplary function of perfective presents, Chapter 8, sections 8.2.3 and 8.1.2.2), and result in an exemplary reading, while the imperfective present refers to the event in generalized terms.[14] Such variation in habitual utterances is not only found in the selected verbs, but also in the core aspect groups and is, moreover, reminiscent of the variation found between modern Slavic languages. For example, in the Bible translations of the modern Slavic languages that I checked, the Czech and Slovak versions have a perfective present here, while all other modern Slavic languages use an imperfective present.

Finally, there is an interesting example with a performative utterance, again showing variation between codices. The Greek original has a future form, *ὑποδείξω*, in this text:

(316) ***sъkazajǫ***^{pres} že vamъ . kogo sę uboite . uboite sę imǫštaago vlastь . po ubьenii vъvrěšti vъ ǵeonǫ . ei g[lago]ljǫ vamъ . togo uboite sę [*Z*, *M*]
sъkažǫ^{pres} že vamъ kogo uboite sę . uboite sę . imǫštaago vlastь . po ubienii vъvrěšti vъ ǵeonǫ . 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)

The fact that both *Zographensis* and *Marianus* use an imperfective present instead of the expected perfective present tense form, based on the Greek original, indicates that this is not a typical example of future reference. Moreover, the context shows that this is a performative utterance: the

[14] The variation between a passive construction with *sę* in the *Zographensis* and the accusative in the *Marianus* may have the same functional reason: the passive construction refers to a general rule, while the accusative pronoun *jǫ* 'her' refers to the salt mentioned in the first part of the sentence. A more adequate translation of the version in the *Marianus* would be 'therefore, salt is good; but if even the salt has become tasteless, with what will it be seasoned? It is useless either for the soil or for the manure pile; *people will throw it out*'.

utterance of the words constitutes the actual act.[15] In Chapter 8 (section 8.1.2.2), I have demonstrated that even though the imperfective present is the most regular form in performative utterances, perfective forms are also used. The forms in the *Zographensis* and *Marianus* are therefore probably later adaptations. The form in the *Assemanianus* may reflect an older stage in which the perfective present was the normal (or still the only?) form.

The division of functions of both primary and derived present tense forms as seen in the examples above is compatible with the division of functions between the core perfective and imperfective present tense forms. It therefore seems justified to speak of Slavic-style perfective and imperfective present tense forms, even though the opposition does not concern two complete paradigms. Below, I will continue the discussion with another form that is built on the present stem, i.e. the imperative.

10.2.2 Imperative

As said, the imperative is built on the present stem and thus could be expected to allow for opposing forms in the selected verbs, just as the present tense. In Chapter 6, I have already shown that the imperative has a clear preference for perfective verbs, although this preference is not nearly as strong as the one seen with the aorist and past participles. However, in the verb selection for this case study, there are no imperative forms attested that are based on the derived present tense stem. At first sight this may be rather surprising, but when we zoom in on the largest family in this case study, the *kazati*-family, it turns out that all attested imperatives are translations of Greek aorist imperatives/subjunctives:

OCS verb	*Greek aorist impr/subj*	*Greek present impr/subj*
nakazati	1	0
pokazati	32	0
sъkazati	8	0
Total	41	0

Table 10.8 OCS imperatives of the kazati-family with Greek original

As discussed in Chapter 6, OCS often, though not always, follows the Greek choice of aspect in the imperative, which may explain the absence of attestations of derived forms. Negation can, in some cases, explain the use of

[15] The use of the Greek future tense does not contradict this interpretation; there are more examples of Greek future forms in a performative context in Byzantine Greek, e.g. in which Greek translates a Hebrew participle that is used in performative contexts (cf. Van Peursen 2003: 75, Rogland 2001: 127-134), like in Psalm 17:4 *αἰνῶν ἐπικαλέσομαι κύριον* 'I call upon the Lord, who is worthy to be praised' and Psalm 72:2 *ἐξομολογησόμεθά σοι ὁ θεός* 'We give thanks to You, O God' and *ἐπικαλεσόμεθα τὸ ὄνομά σου* 'we call upon Your name'.

imperfective imperatives in OCS and deviations from the Greek original, even though, again, this is no firm rule. Most of the examples I found of the imperatives of the *kazati*-family are non-negated, but I found one negated example (still based on the underived stem):

(317) ne ***pokaži***$^{\text{impr}}$ ***sę*** poslěžde iněxъ vladyčě [*S*]
do not *show yourself* afterwards to the ruler of others (96, 14-15)

So even in this context, where the negation could have caused the use of an imperfective imperative, the translator opted for the perfective imperative. This could indicate that the use of imperfective imperatives in this group of verbs was indeed very limited or maybe even non-existent in OCS. However, no firm conclusions can be drawn in absence of clear contexts in which the use of imperfective imperatives is obligatory (like, for example, phase verbs with an ingressive meaning for infinitives).

The absence of attestations of derived imperatives leaves an interesting gap in the already small paradigm of imperfective forms, making the few imperfective forms that are attested look even less like a full paradigm.

10.2.3 Participles

The only other forms that allow for a morphological opposition are the present participles. As I have demonstrated in the previous chapters, present participles are strongly attracted to the imperfective aspect and past participles to the perfective aspect, similar to the attractions that imperfect and aorist show. In this respect, the only truly unexpected form in the attestations of the selected verbs is the present passive participle of the underived present tense stem, which could be regarded as a rare perfective present participle. The example can be found in the *Suprasliensis*:

(318) dъždъ sъpusti mnogъ na zemьjǫ . jemuže vьzdivivъše sę pěsnь poxvalьnǫjǫ . togo milosrьdiju . i ***nesъkažemuumu***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ veličьstvu otidošę [*S*]
and he made it rain very much on earth and when they had marvelled at that and [sung] a song of praise dedicated to the mercifulness and the *unspeakable* greatness of it, they went away (530, 27-30)

At first sight, this form may seem to be a fossilized participle, a remnant of an earlier stage of the aspect system, before the derivation of imperfective verbs. The form, nevertheless, fits rather well with the already discussed perfective present passive participles with potential meaning (cf. section 8.2.3), like *nepobědimъ* 'invincible'. In the end, both explanations are not mutually exclusive. It may well be, and it is even highly probable that these forms existed before the derivation of imperfective verbs. The semantics of the present participles was more compatible with the imperfective aspect, which

means present participles based on the derived stem became the rule. However, the original non-derived forms clearly did not die out altogether, and the forms that survived, developed a specific potential meaning that was absent from the imperfective present participles. The following example shows the use of an imperfective present passive participle from one of the selected verbs:

(319) nъ istin'naago radi slovese . ne na vъzduxъ ***rasypajemaago***$^{\text{PresPP}}$ [*S*]
but because of the true Word that *is* not *dispersed* by the wind (533, 2-3)

In this case the meaning is not 'that cannot be dispersed', but rather 'that is not dispersed'. So the imperfective present passive participles are used in a more generalized fashion, while the perfective participles have a potential meaning, just as in the core aspect groups.[16]

The past participles do not allow a morphological opposition since they are based on the aorist/infinitive stem. The examples do not hold any surprises; they behave as perfective past participles, referring to a complete terminative event, like in the following example, in which it forms a typical chain of events with an aorist:

(320) i ***nakazavъ***$^{\text{PastAPI}}$ jego ne načinati otъseli tacěxъ tatьbinъ . ni prěbyvati o nesytosti . otъpusti$^{\text{aor}}$ i [*S*]
and *having told* him to not start this kind of thieving from now on, nor to keep up his insatiability, he let him go (42, 12)

I will not treat these participles extensively, but it seems safe to say that past participles express perfective aspect.

With the treatment of the past participles, I have already started treating the forms in the 'neutral' paradigm. Below, I will continue this discussion with the aorist and imperfect, the OCS tense forms that show a Romance-style aspect opposition.

10.2.4 Aorist and imperfect

Aorist and imperfect are both based on the aorist/infinitive stem and therefore belong to the morphologically 'neutral' forms. In a sense, the

[16] It should also be noted that in the *Suprasliensis* the PresPP *nesъkazajemъ* is attested as well (344: 16), which is based on the derived present stem *sъkaza-*. It is difficult to establish a difference in meaning between the two, not in the least because both are attested only once. It is possible that both existed alongside in the OCS period, with similar meanings. A possible difference in meaning is that the imperfective form means 'that is not spoken/said out loud' as opposed to perfective 'unspeakable'.

paradigm of forms based on the aorist/infinitive stem is similar to anaspectual verbs, since both the aorist and the imperfect forms are attested, which is a situation that is typical of anaspectual verbs, as opposed to perfective and imperfective verbs that are normally only compatible with either one. However, the main distinguishing characteristic of anaspectual verbs as opposed to perfective and imperfective verbs - the fact that they can occur in aterminative predicates - is not shared by the selected verbs, which are all prefixed terminative verbs. This results in a different functioning of the aorist and imperfect.

10.2.4.1 Aorist

The aorist in the selected group does not differ functionally from the aorist of perfective verbs: it denotes a complete terminative event. One typical context for perfective aorists is in past narrative sequences referring to complete events, which is also a context in which the aorist of the selected verbs is attested:

(321) i vъzvede[aor] i diěvolъ na gorǫ vysokǫ . ***pokaza***[aor] emu vsěka c[ě]s[a]rstvitь vъselenъjǫ vъ čěsě vrěmenьně [*M*]
and the devil led Him up and *showed* Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time (Luke 4:5, my translation)

The aorist of *pokazati* 'show' also occurs in the translation of Greek historical present forms, as in example (322), where it is a translation of the Greek present *δείκνυσιν*:

(322) paky pojętъ[aor] i diěvolъ na gorǫ vъisokǫ dzělo . i ***pokaza***[aor] emu vsě c[ěsa]rstvitь vъsego mira . i slavǫ ixъ [*A*, *Z*, *Sk*]
again, the devil took Him to a very high mountain and *showed* Him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory (Matthew 4:8)

Given the absence of markers of imperfective aspect, there is no reason to treat this form as an imperfective aorist, of which I have demonstrated in Chapter 8 that on rare occasions it appears to be used to translate Greek historical present forms.

Aorists of these verbs also occur in retrospective contexts, like in the following example:

(323) ištęditě exidъnova . kъto ***sъkaza***[aor] vamъ běžati otъ grędǫštaago gněva [*M*, *A*, *Sk*]
you brood of vipers, who *warned* you to flee from the wrath to come (Luke 3:7)

Again, this usage is typical of perfective verbs, which are used in concrete factual contexts. I have not found any examples of general factual usage in

these verbs, which would be typical of aorists of anaspectual verbs (cf. Chapter 8). These verbs behave no different from core perfective verbs and express that the inherent boundary is attained.

In Luke 13:16 there is an example that seems to contradict the conclusion that the aorist forms of the selected verbs behave as perfective aorist. In the text, the aorist of *sъvęzati* (a translation of the Greek aorist *ἔδησεν*) is, at first sight, used to refer to an unchanging past state, which would be in contradiction to the statement that the aorist of these verbs cannot be distinguished from perfective aorists which always indicates a change of state:

(324) sijǫ že dъšterь avramljǫ sǫštǫ . jǫže ***sъvęza***[aor] sotona . se osmoe na desęte lěto . ne dostoěše li razdrěšiti seję . otъ ǫzy vъ dьnь sǫbotьny [*Z*, *M*, *A*, *Sk*]
and this woman, a daughter of Abraham as she is, whom Satan *has bound* for eighteen long years, should she not have been released from this bond on the Sabbath day (Luke 13:16)[17]

However, in this case the word *se* (Greek *ἰδού*) separates the 'binding' event from the adverb 'eighteen years'. Moreover, OCS uses an ordinal number where the Greek original has a cardinal number (*δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη* 'eighteen years'). The OCS translation could therefore be interpreted as: […] *she was bound by Satan, look, it is already the eighteenth year* […], in which case the aorist is not used to cover a binding period of eighteen years, but expresses the fact that the woman the moment she became bound was eighteen years ago. This is in line with what one would expect from a perfective aorist.

10.2.4.2 Imperfect

Interestingly, just as the examples of the aorist cannot be distinguished from perfective aorists, the examples of the imperfect show typical imperfective

[17] Modern Slavic translations differ in the way they translate this. The Russian Synodal Orthodox Version has a perfective past *kotoruju* ***svjazal***[pf] *satana vot uže vosemnadcat' let*, and Croatian has a perfective aorist *koju Sotona* ***sveza***[pf] *evo osamnaest je već godina*. However, other Russian translations have an imperfective verb *kotoruju satana* ***deržal***[ipf] *svjazannoj* (Easy-to-Read Version) or a past passive participle *vot uže vosemnadcat' let* ***svjazannuju***[pf] *satanoj* (New Russian Translation). The Bulgarian translation uses an imperfective perfect as well: *kojato Satana e* ***dăržal***[ipf] *celi osemnadeset godini*, as does the Czech which has an imperfective past *kterou satan* ***držel***[ipf] *svázanou už osmnáct let*. This variation shows the inherent problem that comes with this utterance: the Greek aorist can be understood as ingressive, but also as durative (with a limited duration of 18 years). In Greek there is no need to choose, but in Slavic the perfective aspect does not go together well with adverbial expressions of duration, while the imperfective aspect does not go together well with a concrete factual interpretation of a complete past event; so a choice has to be made between an emphasis on the binding 18 years ago, or on the duration of the binding event.

functions: they are used to refer to a terminative event in its development, or to the unbounded recurrence of a terminative event. The following example demonstrates the use of the imperfect for a progressive event:

(325) i načьnъ otъ moseа . i otъ vьsěxъ prorokъ . ***sъkazaaše***^{impf} ima otъ vьsěxъ kъnigъ jęže běaxǫ o nemь [*Z*, *M*, *A*]
then beginning with Moses and with all the prophets, He *explained* to them the things concerning Himself in all the Scriptures (Luke 24:27)

The event in example (325) clearly concerns a terminative event, the inherent boundary of which is determined by the limited number of books that are called "the Scriptures". The imperfect is used to express the development of the event towards that final boundary. The interpretation could be iterative/distributive, in which case the various books in the Scripture are presented as being explained one by one (the books of Moses, the prophets) until the last book has been explained, or it could be durative, in which the Scripture is seen as one and the explanation proceeds towards the end of the Scripture (cf. example (127) in Chapter 8, which allows a progressive and an iterative/distributive interpretation as well).

The imperfect can also be used to refer to events that occur simultaneously:

(326) i rěste kъ sebě . ne srdce li naju gorę *bě* ^{impf} vъ naju . egda g[lago]laaše^{impf}kъ nama na pǫti . i ěko ***sъkazaše***^{impf} nama kъnigy [*M*, *A*]
they said to one another, "Were not our hearts burning within us while He was speaking to us on the road and while He *was explaining* the Scriptures to us" (Luke 24:32, my translation)[18]

Another typical use of the imperfect is to refer to past habitual events, like in the following example:

(327) i tacěmi pritъčami mnogami . gl[agol]aaše^{impf} imъ slovo . ěkože možaaxъ slyšati . bes pritъčę že ne gl[agol]aaše^{impf} imъ . edinъ že ***sъkazaaše***^{impf} učenikomъ svoimъ v'sě [*Z*, *M*]
with many such parables He was speaking the word to them, so far as they were able to hear it; and He did not speak to them without a parable; but He *was explaining* everything privately to His own disciples (Mark 4:33-34)

[18] I no longer support my own analysis in Kamphuis (2015: 294) where I treat this example as possibly referring to a habitual-correlative event (cf. Chapter 9 on perfective imperfects). This utterance is made by one of the disciples Jesus met on the road to Emmaus and clearly refers to that particular episode and not to other meetings with Jesus. However, example (327) does lend itself to a habitual-correlative interpretation.

The English translation uses a progressive to translate the Greek imperfect *ἐπέλυεν* 'explained/was explaining' in Mark 4:33-34. However, a habitual interpretation seems more fit, at least for OCS *sъkazaaše*, possibly even habitual-correlative (cf. the King James Version which has *expounded*). When interpreted as 'simply' habitual, the translation would be 'but He explained everything privately to His own disciples', while a habitual-correlative interpretation would result in 'but He would explain everything privately to His own disciples' or 'when He was alone with his disciples he would explain everything to them', in which case the habitual event is seen as depending on the condition of Jesus being alone with his disciples.[19] The habitual-correlative meaning is typical of the perfective imperfect, but since in this case there is no morphologically opposed derived form, like in so many other verbs (cf. Chapter 8, section 8.2.3, see also 10.4 below), there is no way to decide in favour of one or the other interpretation. If the interpretation is habitual-correlative, the form is compatible with that, but it is the context that is responsible for the interpretation.

The examples discussed above show that the imperfects of the selected verbs are comparable to typical imperfective imperfects, although not incompatible with a perfective imperfect reading.

10.2.5 Infinitive and supine

The infinitive (and supine), finally, are also built on the aorist/infinitive stem, which means there is no morphological opposition between underived and derived forms. In this regard the forms are similar to the imperfect, the aorist and the past participles. However, while the latter forms appear in functions that are either typically perfective (aorist and past participles) or typically imperfective (imperfect), the infinitive acts as the only true neutral form in the paradigm of forms built on the aorist/infinitive stem. For example, the infinitive of *sъkazati* appears after a phase verb, of which I have shown that they (almost) never occur with perfective verbs in Chapter 6:

(328) otъ tolě ***načętъ***[aor] is[us]ъ . ***sъkazati***[inf] učenikomъ svoimъ . ěko podobaatъ emu iti v[ierusa]l[i]mъ . i mnogu postradati [*M*][20]
from that time Jesus *began to show* His disciples that He must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things (Matthew 16:21)

[19] The Croatian Bible translation also points in the direction of such an interpretation with the use of the conditional *bez prispodobe im ne govoraše, a nasamo **bi** svojim učenicima sve **razjašnjavao***, which also adds a nuance of conditionality to the past habitual event (Kalsbeek 2008: 337, Kalsbeek & Lučić 2008: 15).

[20] Interestingly, the Elizabeth Bible which normally follows the *Marianus* closely, has *skazovati* here, a secondary derived form.

In this example *sъkazati* is a translation of the Greek present infinitive *δεικνύειν*. However, the infinitives and supines in this group are also attested as translation of Greek aorist infinitives, in a typical goal-oriented context that is more compatible with OCS perfective verbs, like the following example with a supine translating the Greek aorist infinitive *περιτεμεῖν*:[21]

(329) i bystъ vъ osmy dьnь . pridǫ ***obrězatъ***[sup] otročęte . i naricaaxǫ e . imenemь o[tь]ca svoego zaxariję [*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 (Luke 1:59)

This example can be compared to the following, in which an underived present tense is used to refer to an upcoming circumcision, where Greek has the same aorist infinitive *περιτεμεῖν*:

(330) i egda isplъni sę osmь dьnii . da i ***obrěžǫtъ***[pres] . narěšę imę emu is[usъ] . [*Z*, *M*, *A*, Sk]
and when eight days had passed, so they had *to circumcise* him, they named him Jesus (Luke 2:21, my translation)

This use of the perfective present to refer to a specific event in example (330) is clearly opposed to the use of the imperfective forms in example (312) to refer to circumcision practices in general. Therefore, the supine in (329), which occurs in a similar context as the present tense in (330), can be said to occur in a context that is typical of perfective verbs. Based on these examples I conclude that the infinitive and supine in this group do not show preference for either imperfective or perfective aspect and are the only forms built on the aorist/infinitive stem in this particular group of verbs that occur in both typically perfective and imperfective contexts.

10.2.6 Concluding remarks

As I already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the only verb form in which a regular opposition is attested, is the present tense. The forms based on the underived stem are found in functions that are associated with perfective verbs, while forms based on the derived stem occur in typical imperfective functions. Given the fact that the present tense forms show a morphological opposition that is equal to that between the core perfective and imperfective present forms, it seems reasonable to assume that they

[21] Note that in OCS there are only two attestations of an imperfective prefixed supine (0.07% of the 3041 attestations of the group of imperfective prefixed attestations) while there are 79 attestations of perfective prefixed supines (0.5% of the 15,803 attestations of the group of perfective prefixed verbs); see also Chapter 6.

express the same Slavic-style perfective and imperfective aspect, even though the derived forms do not form a complete paradigm. The fact that these forms compete with each other in a number of contexts does not contradict this: the same kind of competition is found between perfective and imperfective verbs in OCS as well.

The other forms that could, in principle, express a morphological opposition like the present tense, i.e. the other forms built on the present stem, do not do so in practice. The only exception is the one present participle based on the underived stem, which behaves as a typical perfective present passive participle with potential meaning; all other present participles are based on the derived stem, which is similar to the situation in the perfective and imperfective verbs, where present participles are also largely restricted to the derived verbs. The imperative in this group is restricted to the underived forms, which is somewhat surprising when compared to the perfective and imperfective groups which show a much more balanced distribution of the imperative.

The forms based on the aorist/infinitive stem cannot express a morphological opposition in the selected verbs. However, a parallel with the perfective and imperfective verbs is visible in these forms as well. Aorists and past participles occur in the same contexts as aorists and past participles of the perfective verbs and show no functional differences with those forms. Even though there is no morphological opposition with derived forms, the forms can hardly be said to be anaspectual or aspect neutral. The infinitive and supine, however, occur in both perfective and imperfective contexts and can be regarded as truly neutral forms, compatible with all contexts, without a preference for either perfective or imperfective functions.

Finally, the imperfect is the only verb form in the underived paradigm that shows typical imperfective functions. I have given examples in which it expresses two parallel, progressive events and also one of a habitual event. In the latter case it is even possible to interpret the imperfect as one would interpret a perfective imperfect. However, without a morphological marker the choice between an imperfective or perfective interpretation is impossible to make. In section 10.5, I will argue that the imperfect is not just the only form in the underived paradigm that has typical imperfective functions, but that it also has a morphological bridging function between the underived and derived forms.

Based on the functional analysis it is justified to speak of the paradigm of forms built on the aorist/infinitive stem as a 'neutral' paradigm: the forms do not automatically express either aspect and some forms occur in both typical perfective and imperfective contexts.

10.3 Extra derived forms

There are not many attestations of the extra derived forms (e.g. *sъkazovati*), which makes it impossible to give an extensive analysis of these forms. However, the mere fact that these forms occur is already meaningful. As Schuyt (1990: 29, 387) argues, their origin most probably lies in the urge to create an opposition for the forms built on the aorist/infinitive stem that was similar to the opposition that was already there for forms built on the present stem in the verbs selected for this case study. The fact that these extra derived forms are typical of the younger OCS manuscripts, especially codex *Suprasliensis* (Dostál 1954: 583),[22] is an indication that this derivation of extra derived forms was a process taking place during the OCS period, while the original opposition between present tense forms is older. Hence, while at first the OCS translations used one form (e.g. *otъrězati* 'cut off') in both typical perfective and imperfective contexts, of which I have shown examples for the infinitive/supine, later on the need was apparently felt to disambiguate, like in the following example:

(331) tъgda povelě komisъ . želěznъ odrьcь raždešti[inf] . i otъ plьtii jego udy ***otъrězovati***[inf] [*S*]
at that moment the commander ordered to light the grill and *to cut off* his limbs (231, 16-18)

The first infinitive in this example, *raždešti* 'kindle, heat' is a perfective infinitive, translating a Greek aorist infinitive *πυρωθῆναι*, while the second infinitive, the extra derived *otъrězovati*, is a translation of the Greek present infinitive *κόπτεσθαι*. The use of the Greek present infinitive can either be an indication of emphasis on the process, e.g. more than one limb has to be cut off, which makes it an iterative event, or it refers to the slow manner in which the torture should take place, cutting off the limbs joint by joint, making it a durative event. Whether the interpretation is iterative or durative, both fit the functions fulfilled by the imperfective aspect in OCS.

Although the use of the underived form *otъrězati* would not have been ungrammatical in this context, it would not have captured the meaning of the Greek present tense. Given the fact that the rule for terminative verbs in OCS is that they are interpreted as expressing a change of state, unless they are clearly marked for imperfective aspect, the interpretation would have been a perfective one, in which the cutting off of the limbs is presented as one complete event (cf. Chapter 8 examples (122) and (153) with bounded repetition), regardless of the question whether more limbs were cut off in succession, or whether the event lasted for a longer period of time.

[22] Since the *Suprasliensis* is a codex within the Preslav tradition (cf. Chapter 1), one could also regard this phenomenon as typical of the more eastern-oriented recension of OCS.

While in example (331) the use of the extra derived form can be explained by the need to express a difference in meaning, in other cases the choice of the derived form is not so clearly related to a difference in meaning, as it is to the verb form which is generally speaking more compatible with the imperfective aspect:

(332) ono ubo jakože plěnnika i naga kryjaše nь se poběditlja naga prigvoždena navysoče ***pokazovaaše***$^{\text{impf}}$ [*S*]
that [same piece of wood that] once even hid a naked prisoner, now *showed* the victor naked and nailed up high (489, 22-24)

The situation described by the imperfect *pokazovaaše* is clearly stative, which fits with the imperfective aspect. In this case, however, the use of an imperfect of the underived aorist/infinitive stem, *pokazaaše* (attested 3x in OCS) would probably not have led to a different interpretation, since, as I have demonstrated above, the imperfect built on the underived aorist/infinitive stem is used in typically imperfective contexts in OCS and is not automatically interpreted as a perfective imperfect. In this case, the use of the imperfect *pokazovaaše* seems a matter of alignment, rather: the imperfect is more compatible with imperfective verbs, which in this case results in the imperfect being formed from the clearly imperfective *pokazovati* instead of the ambiguous *pokazati*.

Similarly, the use of the present active participle could be attributed to the strong connection between that form and imperfective verbs:

(333) mnozi že moljaaxǫ i priti jemu vъ domy ixъ . da pomolitъ sę bogu za nę . onъ že vidę věrǫ ixъ i neprězorьstvo ***pokazujęˇ***$^{\text{PresAP}}$ xaždaaše [*S*]
many asked him to come to their homes to pray to God for them. And he, seeing their faith and *showing* modesty, went around (206, 2-6)

This case, however, deviates from the others since there is an imperfective alternative, namely a present active participle built on the derived present stem *pokaza-*: *pokazajęˇ* which is attested 15 times in OCS. Interestingly, the form following *pokazujęˇ*, the imperfect *xaždaaše*, is a unique form as well. The verb *xaždati* 'go (around)' is not attested anywhere else in OCS[23]; according to Dostál (1954: 495) it has iterative meaning. The reason for the use of these two rare derived forms may have been the fact that it concerns two simultaneous, repetitive events, as opposed to two simultaneous single

[23] This may be a case of deprefixation; the other attestations of *xaždati* are in prefixed formations: *isxaždati* 'obtain' (1), *prixaždati* 'come walking' (2) and *prěxaždati* 'cross' (1), which may indicate that the *-xaždati* forms were originally derived from the prefixed forms of *-xoditi*.

events. This use of the extra derived verbs may be comparable to the use of Czech habitual verbs, which are also derived from non-perfective verbs.[24]

Finally, there is one unexpected form among the extra derived forms, namely an aorist, which is a rare phenomenon amongst the imperfective verbs (cf. Chapter 8):

(334) często glagolaaše . jedinъ otъ vasъ prědastъ mę . nь ne javě jego pokaza[aor] . mnoga že i o sǫdьněěmь dьni ***sъkazova***[aor] slovesa . mnoga že i o cěsarьstvii nebesьněěmь . obojego silǫ pokaza[aor] [*S*]
he often said: one of you will betray me, but he did not openly reveal him. He *made* a lot of *statements* about judgment day and also a lot about the kingdom of heaven and showed the power of both (412, 25-29)

The difference between the aorists *pokaza* (2x) and *sъkazova* cannot be explained by the Greek original, which has three times an aorist. The translator must therefore have interpreted the event 'making statements' differently from the two other events. A possible explanation here could be that both 'showing' events (*pokaza*) at the beginning and end of the utterance are presented as complete, while Jesus' repetitive statements about judgment day and the kingdom of heaven is presented as being cut off when he was betrayed (cf. Galton 1976: 159). This would fit with the function of the aorist, which presents an event as temporally bounded as well as with the function of the imperfective aspect, which is defocusing the inherent boundary of a terminative event.

Another explanation could be that the verb *sъkazovati* 'narrate', which is only attested once in OCS, has no clear morphological origin. On the one hand it fits with a verb like *otъrězovati* 'cut off' as an extra derived verb to disambiguate unclear formations based on the aorist/infinitive stem, but on the other hand it could be seen as a denominal formation (cf. Chapter 5), derived from the noun **sъkazъ* 'announcement' which is not attested in OCS, but does occur in OR. If *sъkazovati* is felt as a denominal verb, it would be anaspectual, like *sъvětovati* 'hold council' from *sъvětъ*. In that case the semantics of example (334) would not be as complicated: it would merely concern a total terminative past event, which derives its terminativity from the discrete object *mnoga slovesa* 'many statements', while the totality is expressed by the use of the aorist. I have shown examples of anaspectual aorists that are used like that in Chapter 8. This, however, does not explain

[24] The northwesternmost dialects of Croatian derive specific habitual verbs as well (Kalsbeek 2008: 334). I have also encountered a similar phenomenon in Macedonian (Valandovo dialect) where *oduva* 'go regularly' is used next to imperfective (or anaspectual?) *odi* 'go'.

why the translator did not simply use the aorist of *sъkazati,* which otherwise occurs 5 times in the *Suprasliensis*.

10.4 Summary case study

The selected verbs show a 'defective' derived paradigm, which could be seen as a remnant from the time when derivational aspect arose from inflectional aspect, while no full derived paradigm yet existed (cf. Table 10.12). There are no derived infinitives, supines, imperatives, aorists and past participles (notwithstanding the fact that the latter are also rare in the core groups). The only clear aspect opposition that is comparable to the aspect opposition as found in the core groups is between the original and derived present tense forms. And while the derived forms all clearly show imperfective functions, the underived forms show a wide range of functions.

It seems probable that when the first steps towards a derivational paradigm in Slavic were taken, this situation was not really problematic. The imperfect functioned in opposition to the aorist, while the derived present tense functioned as the opposing form to the underived present tense; the infinitive and the supine were simply used in all contexts and functions. There may also not have been any need for imperfective imperatives, which are not attested in this group. However, when after some time the derivational opposition became more strongly entrenched in the verbal system and functions became more strictly divided between underived and derived forms, this situation must have become problematic. As I have shown in Chapters 8 and 9, the aspect system in OCS is firmly established and certain contexts and functions are strongly associated with one of both aspects.

While in other verbs (cf. *icěliti - icěljati* in section 10.5) the presence of a morphologically distinguishable derived aorist/infinitive stem (*icěli-* vs. *icělja-*) allowed for an expansion of the pattern of derivation to other forms, in the selected verbs this was not possible. However, in the OCS aspect system these terminative forms needed to function as part of either the perfective or the imperfective paradigm and not all forms were a clear part of either paradigm. The 'gaps' in the paradigm of the verbs selected for the case study are indicated by the questions marks in Table 10.9:

Form	*Underived*	*In between*	*Derived*
Pres	*sъkažǫ*		*sъkazajǫ*
Aor	*sъkazaxъ*	*sъkazaaxъ*	?
Inf	?	*sъkazati*	?
Sup	?	*sъkazatъ*	?
Impr	*sъkaži*		-
PresAP	-		*sъkazaję*
PresPP	*sъkažemъ*		*sъkazajemъ*
PastAPI	*sъkazavъ*		-
PastPP	*sъkazanъ*		-

Table 10.9 Attested forms of sъkazati

The derivation of extra derived forms in *-ovati*, *-uje-* can be seen as a direct consequence of the gaps in the system and supports the idea that the derivational aspect opposition was already firmly established in OCS and the need arose for unambiguously imperfective forms to express imperfective functions or for typically imperfective contexts. It seems likely that the first forms would have developed in the gaps in the system, after which complete paradigms started to develop. The idea that the forms in *-ovati*, *-uje-* are a later development, fits in with the fact that these forms are found within the youngest stratum of OCS.[25]

The verbs selected for the case study are an extremely interesting group, because they appear to show an early stage of development of derivational aspect in which only a few derived forms existed. And even though the idea of derivational aspect starting out in one or two forms and subsequently spreading to other forms may be logical, the situation is merely hypothetical for all other verbs, while it is reality for the verbs selected for the case study. In the following section I will give a broad outline of the possible way in which the derivation by means of *-ati*, *-aje-* became the Slavic way of deriving imperfective verbs.

10.5 Derivational aspect and the role of the imperfect

As became clear in the preceding sections, the imperfect is the most interesting form in the selected verbs, because it is the only underived form that shows typical imperfective functions. All other forms that are so strongly connected with the imperfective aspect, are built on the derived present stem. As I mentioned above, the imperfect also provides a morphological bridge between the underived and derived forms. This can best be seen in verbs

[25] The extra derived forms are also an indication that a form like *sъkazati* was not merely homographic with a different stress for underived and derived forms, but truly homonymous. It seems highly improbable that homographic forms would lead to the derivation of new forms.

from Leskien's class IV, like *icěliti - icěljati* 'heal'. Below we will take a closer look at these verbs in order to show how the development of derivational aspect may be connected to the rise of the imperfect, on the basis of the verb *icěliti*. In section 10.5.4 I will discuss a number of issues that are related to this hypothetical path of development of Slavic derivational aspect.

10.5.1 From lexical to inflectional aspect

Given the fact that both imperfect and derivational aspect are Slavic innovations, the original paradigm of **icěliti*, before the rise of the imperfect and derived imperfective forms, must have looked something like the paradigm in Table 10.10:

Form	*Original paradigm*
Present	**icělją*
Aorist	**icělixъ*
Infinitive	**icěliti*
Supine	**icělitъ*
Imperative	**icěli*
Present Active Participle	**icělę*
Present Passive Participle	**icělimъ*
Past Active Participle I	**icělivъ*
Past Passive Participle	**icěljenъ*

Table 10.10 Hypothetical development of icěliti 'heal', step 1[26]

In this situation there is neither an inflectional aspect opposition (aorist-imperfect), nor a derivational aspect opposition (perfective-imperfective). The only aspectuality in the system is lexical aspect. In this original lexical aspect-only system prefixed verbs like **icěliti* 'heal' were highly terminative verbs (cf. Maslov 1961: 190-192), which were opposed to aterminative unprefixed verbs, like **cěliti* 'heal'. At some point in time the imperfect tense enters the Slavic system as an innovation (cf. Kortlandt 1986, Andersen 2013), resulting in the following paradigm:

[26] I will leave the Past Active Participle II out of this hypothetical paradigm, since I am not sure how the development of that form relates to the development of the imperfect and the rise of derivational aspect. Note that the forms in this and the following tables are reconstructed Proto-Slavic forms.

Form	*Paradigm with inflectional aspect*
Present	**icělję*
Aorist	**icělixъ*
Imperfect	****icěljaaxъ***
Infinitive	**icěliti*
Supine	**icělitъ*
Imperative	**icěli*
Present Active Participle	**icělę*
Present Passive Participle	**icělimъ*
Past Active Participle I	**icělivъ*
Past Passive Participle	**icěljenъ*

Table 10.11 Hypothetical development of icěliti *'heal', step 2*

The imperfect is built on the aorist/infinitive stem, just like its closest sibling, the aorist. And since both forms have the same temporal reference, the difference must have been aspectual. The tense that I refer to as the aorist started out as the general, unmarked past tense (the result of a merger of the inherited IE imperfect and aorist, cf. Anderen 2013). The Slavic imperfect is a Slavic innovation, a combination of a nominal formation with the perfect of the IE verb 'be' (Kortlandt 1986).[27] Given the function it has in OCS and in the modern Slavic languages that still make use of it, it must have developed to emphasize the unchanging character of an event.[28]

In aterminative verbs the opposition between aorist and imperfect resulted in a Romance-style aspect opposition. The originally unmarked aorist became the perfective component, expressing a temporal boundary (cf. Chapter 6), as opposed to the imperfect which emphasized the unchanging character of the event and explicitly defocuses a temporal boundary to the event. This Romance-style opposition can be found in OCS in anaspectual verbs like *viděti* 'see', *jasti* 'eat', *moliti* 'request' or *plakati* 'cry', which were compatible with both a bounded reading and an unbounded reading (cf. Chapter 8). In some highly aterminative verbs, like *ležati* 'lie', *podobati* 'behove' or *radovati*

[27] Kortlandt (1986: 256) uses the example of the Lithuanian nominal formation *vēdė* "which yielded the Slavic imperfect through composition with the original perfect of the verb 'to be'". This perfect, however doubtful its existence (ibidem: 255) can be reconstructed as **ōse*. The combination of the two resulted in the Slavic imperfect *veděaše* from *věděti* 'know'.

[28] The opposition between aorist and imperfect at first sight resembles the opposition between an English simple past 'walked' and a past continuous 'was walking'. However, as I have shown in the previous chapters, the imperfect is also used to refer to states (cf. *ljubľěaše* 'loved' in John 11:5 and habitual or iterative events like *vъzmoštaaše* 'stirred up' in John 5:3 (Chapter 8, example 154), and therefore has a larger inventory of functions compared to the English past continuous. The common denominator in all these functions is 'unchangeability'.

sę 'rejoice' the imperfect was so compatible with the lexical aspect of the verb that it became the standard past tense, at the expense of the aorist.

10.5.2 From inflectional to derivational aspect

In terminative verbs the situation was different from that in anaspectual verbs. My hypothesis is that in terminative verbs, of which the prefixed verbs are the most prototypical examples in OCS, the new opposition marks the rise of the Slavic-style derivational aspect. The opposition aorist-imperfect in OCS itself should still be regarded as Romance-style, hence an opposition that revolves around a temporal boundary rather than around an inherent boundary. However, the effect of the interplay between the inherent boundary of terminative verbs and the imperfect in most cases de facto is the defocusing of the inherent boundary, which is exactly what the Slavic-style imperfective aspect does.

It may very well have been that the combination of terminative verbs and general past tense (i.e. aorist) in Proto-Slavic resulted in an interpretation of the attainment of the inherent boundary, which is not that far removed from a modern-day perfective past tense and fits with the standard interpretation of terminative verbs in OCS.[29] In other words: an aorist of a prefixed verb like **icěliti* 'heal' implied a complete healing event, a change from being ill to being healed, probably unless explicitly cancelled by means of other parts of the sentence. This leaves open the functional domain of defocusing the inherent boundary in the past, which was where the imperfect settled.

The opposition within the past tense as it came into existence with terminative verbs, subsequently spread to other parts of the verbal paradigm of those terminative verbs. It stands to reason to assume that the next form that entered this opposition was the present tense, given the fact that the clearest derivational aspect opposition found within the paradigm of the verbs in the case study is between perfective and imperfective present tense

[29] In this regard it is interesting to read what Dickey (2000: 77) says about the relation between the past tense and temporal definiteness (the meaning of the perfective aspect in his Eastern group of Slavic languages): "[…] the past tense bears a certain resemblance to the concept of temporal definiteness as defined here: just as the past tense contrasts one situation (that denoted by the predicate) to another (the present), temporal definiteness construes a situation as unique relative to other situations (and often to the present)".
Dickey (ibidem) also cites Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca (1994: 153) who remark about the English simple past that although it "encompasses various aspects - including perfective, habitual and progressive - the default correlation is between perfective and simple past." The English simple past can thus be compared to the OCS aorist with regard to the fact that is does not automatically express perfective aspect, but that it is strongly associated with a perfective interpretation, especially with terminative verbs, and is in OCS therefore highly compatible with perfective verbs.

forms. The derived present tense was not only functionally similar to the newly derived imperfect, but the form also shows a close formal resemblance. Therefore one can hypothesize that the newly derived imperfective present tense is morphologically related to the OCS imperfect. There are two ways in which this could have been achieved, depending on the state of development of the imperfect in OCS. If the imperfect still functioned as an analytic verb form (nominal part + original IE perfect, cf. Kortlandt 1986), the nominal part **icělja-* can be seen as the basis for the newly derived forms. If the imperfect functioned as a synthetic verb form, the stem **icělja-* can be seen as the result of the reinterpretation of the imperfect from **icělj-aaxъ* to **icělja-axъ*.[30]

Form	***Original paradigm***	***Form***	***New stem: *icělja-***
Pres	**icěljǫ*	***Pres***	****icěljajǫ***
Aor	**icělixъ*	***Impf***	****icěljaaxъ***
Inf	**icěliti*		
Sup	**icělitъ*		
Impr	**icěli*		
PresAP	**icělę*		
PresPP	**icělimъ*		
PastAPI	**icělivъ*		
PastPP	**icěljenъ*		

Table 10.12 Hypothetical development of icěliti *'heal', step 3*

The line between inflectional and derivational aspect is thin. In fact, in my approach it is difficult to say whether there is a line at all and if there is a line, when that line is crossed. But from the situation in Table 10.12, where the

[30] The original *-i-* ending of the aorist/infinitive stem in this case results in jotation of the preceding (now root-final) consonant (cf. 1sg pres *icěljǫ*).
The reinterpretation from **icělj-aaxъ* to **icělja-axъ* makes even more sense if one keeps in mind that the suffix *-aa-* often occurs as *-ěa-* which makes the second *-a-* in most instances the constant factor in the imperfect (except for contracted forms in *-ě-*). Furthermore, in verbs with an aorist/infinitive stem ending in *-a-* or *-ě-*, such a reinterpretation was not even necessary, because the only unique part that is added by the OCS imperfect is the *-a-* (cf. *mьněaše* 'he believed' from the verb *mьněti* and *sъkazaaše* 'he explained' from *sъkazati*). This may have facilitated the reinterpretation in other cases.
It is difficult to assess the probability of the imperfect still being an analytic verb form during the OCS period. Two facts that point in the direction of the imperfect being a synthetic verb form are the already mentioned relative frequent occurrence of contracted imperfect (e.g. *iděše* 'he went' next to regular *iděaše* or *vъprašaše* 'he asked' next to *vъprašaaše*), and the occurrence of imperfects with aorist endings (e.g. 3du *ponošaaste* 'they were insulting' next to regular *ponošaašete*, which occurs as the only attestation of this phenomenon in *Marianus*). *Zographensis* does not show these aorist endings with imperfects, while *Assemanianus* has them regularly (Diels 1963: 238).

Slavic-style aspect opposition is being expressed in two forms (present and past), very similar to the situation within the verbs selected for the case study, it is not hard to imagine subsequent steps towards a complete opposing paradigm. Infinitive and supine show compatibility with the functions of both aspects, so in a number of contexts (in OCS most clearly after phase verbs) they are attracted to the derived stem. This resulted in an opposition in those forms as well. The present participles are so strongly compatible with the newly derived opposition that they move over to the derived stem and almost exclusively start being built on the new stem, while the past participles are strongly incompatible with the newly derived stem and, hence, stay on the underived side of the paradigm. The imperative is more compatible with the underived stem, as I also demonstrated for the verbs selected for this case study, which is why I believe derived imperatives were only formed later on, when the two opposing paradigms where more strongly established. In the end, this results in something like the following picture:

Form	***Original paradigm***	***Form***	***Derived paradigm***
Pres	**icěljǫ*	Pres	**icěljajǫ*
Aor	**icělixъ*	Impf	**icěljaaxъ*
Inf	**icěliti*	Inf	**icěljati*
Sup	**icělitъ*	Sup	**icěljatъ*
Impr	**icěli*	Impr	**icěljai*
PastAPI	**icělivъ*	PresAP	**icěljaję*
PastPP	**icěljenъ*	PresPP	**icěljaemъ*

Table 10.13 Hypothetical development of icěliti *'heal', step 4*

The situation as outlined in Table 10.13 has probably never really existed in this precise form. I assume that the derived paradigm did not magically materialize all at once, but rather that it developed out of one form within the original paradigm, the imperfect, into a complete derived paradigm, which must have been a process that took some time. Some forms, like the present tense, are more likely to have been actively derived early on, while others, like the imperative, most probably were later formations. Moreover, Table 10.13 also does not take into account the possibility of an opposition between imperfective and perfective aorists, imperfects and present and past participles, which, as I have demonstrated, exists in OCS. Below I will argue that those forms are most probably later developments.

10.5.3 Imperfective aorists and perfective imperfects

It is not my goal to establish the exact order in which the forms appeared, and I even doubt that it would be possible to accurately establish such an order, but given the strong incompatibility of aorist (and past participles) with the derived paradigm, it seems probable that these forms only appeared later on.

The derivation of the imperfective aorist was only possible because of the relatively independent position of the inflectional aorist-imperfect opposition with regard to the derivational aspect opposition. The inflectional aspect opposition remained independent thanks to the fact that it existed in the anaspectual verbs as well, in which it was still clearly recognizable as a Romance-style opposition (cf. the examples of anaspectual aorists vs. anaspectual imperfects in Chapter 8).

Since the two aspect oppositions in Proto-Slavic revolved around separate meanings, it became possible to combine them and create imperfective aorists, with a very specific meaning, as I have shown in Chapter 8.[31] This was one way of maximizing the combinatory possibilities two aspectual oppositions offered. This situation is still alive today in modern Bulgarian (cf. e.g. Dejanova 1966).

The other way of maximizing the combinations between the two aspect oppositions in OCS is the development of an opposition between perfective and imperfective imperfects. Again, I argue that this must have been a later development. Bermel, discussing Borodič (1953) who suggests a similar role for the imperfect tense in the development of verbal aspect in Slavic as I do, poses the question whether the original verb (e.g. *icěliti*) still has an imperfect, when the imperfect is regarded as part of the derived paradigm (e.g. *icěljati*) (Bermel 1997: 68). I believe that initially the imperfect is part of the original paradigm, aspectually opposed to the aorist. So at that moment there is only one imperfect, which in terminative verbs is also the start of the derived paradigm, the first imperfective form. At that moment the question posed by Bermel is premature. It is only once enough new forms are derived that one can speak of an opposing derived paradigm and at that time the question also arises to which paradigm the imperfect belongs. As the OCS data show, in many cases this simply cannot be established based on morphological grounds and also the context does often not give enough information to establish whether a given imperfect is to be regarded as an imperfective or a perfective imperfect. However, OCS data also show that there is an opposition between imperfective and perfective imperfects in cases where a morphological difference exists (cf. Chapter 8) and this opposition has survived in modern Slavic, in Bulgarian and Macedonian, the descendants of OCS (cf. e.g. Dejanova 1966). It is possible that perfective imperfects like *nazьrěaxъ* from *nazьrěti* 'watch', which can be morphologically identified as perfective imperfect, only developed their

[31] There are also attestations of past participles of derived verbs, like *ukaravьše* from *ukarati* 'revile', the imperfective partner of *ukoriti* 'revile' [*S* 109, 14].

specialized habitual-correlative use when they became opposed to imperfective imperfects such as *naziraaxъ* from *nazirati* 'watch', much like the perfective present passive participles developed a specialized potential meaning.

The existence of opposing imperfect forms, is, of course, a complicating factor in this hypothetical path of development, because the imperfect *nazъrěaxъ* can hardly be regarded as the basis of derived paradigm of *nazirati*. In the following section I will treat this and other complications to deal with if one wants to maintain the hypothesis that the imperfect played an important role in the development of the Slavic derivational aspect.

10.5.4 Some complications and explanations

My hypothetical path of development from inflectional to derivational aspect raises a number of questions that I will discuss below.

10.5.4.1 Derived verbs with suffixed other than -ati, -aje-

The hypothetical path of development as outlined above assumes a regular derivation of imperfective verbs with the suffix *-ati, -aje-*. Hence, the final stem consonant *-a* is the defining characteristic of imperfective verbs throughout the paradigm. However, there are a number of verb pairs that do not fit into this picture. Some pairs have the suffix *-ati, -je-* (and thus do not show the characteristic stem final *-a-* in forms based on the present stem). Examples are *imati, jemljǫ* 'take' (and prefixed formations) from *jęti* 'take', or *dajati, dajǫ* 'give' (and prefixed formations) from *dati* 'give'. These verbs can only be regarded as older formations and must have been only secondarily incorporated into the derivational aspect system (cf. Kortlandt 1985: 237, Schuyt 1990: 369). Such an incorporation is not completely exceptional bearing in mind that prefixed VOMs are also perfectly integrated in the aspect system, regardless of their different background and morphological make-up (cf. Chapter 9). It is interesting to see that in some prefixed formations suffixed forms on *-ati, -aje-* appear as well, next to forms in *-ati, -je-*. This results in verbs like *vъnimati, vъnimajǫ* 'notice' next to older formations *vъnimati, vъnemljǫ* 'notice'. The forms in *-ati, -aje-* can be seen as a confirmation of the fact that *-ati, -aje-* was the productive type for the derivation of imperfective verbs (cf. Schuyt 1990: 387), so that imperfective verbs in *-ati, -je-* (which, importantly, did not stand out morphologically from other verbs in *-ati, -je-* e.g. perfective *posъlati, posъljǫ* 'send'), faced competition from *-ati, -aje-* verbs.

10.5.4.2 Lengthened root vowel

In many verbs that are derived with the suffix *-ati, -aje-*, there is still no direct relationship between the imperfect and the derived imperfective forms. One

important difference between the imperfect and the derived imperfectives is the lengthened root vowel. While *icěljati* can be directly linked to *icěljaaxъ* the imperfect of *icěliti*, the imperfect of *prositi* 'implore' is *prošaaxъ*, a form that cannot be regarded as the basis for derived formations with *-prašati*, which in that case would have been **-prošati*. One way of handling this discrepancy is by positing unattested imperfects as the basis for the derived imperfectives. Bermel (1997: 67-69) criticizes Borodič (1953) for doing just that: in her chronology, for example, the verb *ražđati* 'give birth' is based on the unattested imperfect **ražđaaxъ* from *roditi*.

I agree with Bermel that Borodič' approach is problematic: if the lengthening of the root vowel were connected to the formation of the imperfect, one would also expect a verb like *prositi* 'implore' (which has no attested derived partner **prašati* in OCS) to form imperfects like *prašaaxъ*, which it does not. Therefore, it seems probable that the lengthened root vowel became part of the derived paradigm only secondarily. The model for the lengthened root vowel can, according to Kortlandt (1989: 111), be found in verbs of the group *-davati*, *-stavati*, *-znavati*. Schuyt (1990: 377, 381-382) also mentions *lěgati* 'lie' from *lešti* 'lie down' in this regard.

However, one could also reason the other way around and posit the lengthened vowel imperfects as original, as Borodič does. In that case, forms like *prošaaxъ* have to be regarded as analogous backformations based on the other forms in the paradigm of *prositi*. In derived paradigms, which would have the lengthened vowel all the way throughout the paradigm, the imperfects would keep the lengthened vowel. I think that it is impossible to choose either approach based on linguistic evidence from OCS, for if **ražđaaxъ* or **prašaaxъ* would have been attested (supposedly backing up Borodič), they would have been regarded as a form of the paradigm of *ražđati* 'give birth' or **prašati*, not as original imperfects of *roditi* or *prositi*.[32]

[32] It is interesting to note that the verb *sъmotriti* 'watch' has a derived imperfective partner with lengthened stem vowel *sъmatrjati*, but also one without: *sъmotrjati*. The latter could be based on *sъmotrjaaxъ*, the imperfect of *sъmotriti* (a form with the reflex *-št-* is also attested: *sъmoštraaxǫ*). I am not sure as to the meaning of the existence of *sъmotrjati*. It could be seen as a remnant of an older stage (possible, with 2 out of 3 attestations in the Book of Psalms), showing that the derived imperfective verbs are indeed directly related to the imperfect and the lengthening of the stem vowel was only secondarily incorporated in the derived paradigm. The only other forms that I have found from Leskien's class IV that do not show lengthening of the root vowel *-o-* into *-a-* in the derived paradigms are the partners of prefixed forms of *podobiti* 'imitate', like *upodobljati sę* 'become like' and *sъpodobljati* 'consider worthy'. Of these verbs there are, however, no alternative forms like **sъpodabljati* (cf. *sъmatrjatî*).

10.5.4.3 Leskien's class IV as a model

Still, in cases where a lengthened root vowel does not distort the picture, there are many examples of imperfects that cannot be directly related to the derived imperfective forms. For example, Leskien's class II (and class V) verbs and most class I verbs have a sequence *-ěa-*. This means that Leskien's class I verb *bljusti* 'guard' forms an imperfect *bljuděaxъ* and, hence, the prefixed form *sъbljusti* 'keep safe' would form an imperfect **sъbljuděaxъ*. If this imperfect would have been the basis for the derived imperfective forms, the partner would have been **sъbljuděti*. However, *sъbljusti* has a derived imperfective partner *sъbljudati* with a stem *sъbljuda-*. So regardless of the ending of the nominal form that according to Kortlandt (1986) forms the first part of the verb form that eventually became the Slavic imperfect, the derived forms are characterized by the *-a-*.

Only the imperfect of Leskien's class IV verbs in *-iti*, *-i-* and *-ati*, *-i-* and Leskien's class III verbs with an aorist/infinitive stem on *-a-* result in an imperfect of which the first part is suitable as basis for the derived imperfective verbs. However, in most Leskien's class III verbs the formation of the derived imperfectives cannot be traced back to the imperfect. For, example the imperfect of *otъvěštati* 'answer' is *otъvěštaaxъ*, while the derived partner is *otъvěštavati*.[33]

Finally, in a number of cases, like in the verbs selected for this case study, the imperfect could be regarded as the basis for the derived formations, but the resulting aorist/infinitive stem is no different from the original (e.g. *sъkazati*, 'clarify' with imperfect *sъkazaaxъ* and derived present form *sъkazajǫ* based on *sъkaza-*), resulting in a number of forms that cannot be identified as either original or derived.

Hence, in many verbs there is no direct relationship between the imperfect and the derived imperfective. The derivation with *-ati*, *-aje-*, on the other hand, can be found throughout the system. One way to account for all these different verbs taking on the same derivational patterns is by assuming they used the same model. Kortlandt (1989: 110) proposes that verbs with an *ā*-stem "may have provided the model for the secondary imperfectives in *-(j)ati* of verbs in *-iti*". In this specific case, it concerns a type of verbs that "once existed in Slavic, but was lost as a result of later developments". Traces of this derivation can be found in BCS which has *hodati* 'walk', *nosati* 'carry' and

[33] According to Schuyt (1990: 376-377) the spread of phonetically conditioned *-vati*, *-vaje* in verbs with a stem ending in *-ě-*, *-i-* and *-a-* can be explained by analogy to verbs with a root in **-u-*, like *byvati* and *-kryvati* and with a root on an **u*-diphthong, like *davati*, *-děvati*, *-stavati* and *-znavati*.

vodati 'lead' next to *hoditi*, *nositi* and *voditi*.[34] These forms do not exist in OCS; the attested forms are *xaždati* next to *xoditi* and *-važdati* to *voditi*. These new formations "adopted the flexion of the far more numerous denominatives", according to Kortlandt (ibidem).

The question then is why these derived forms would adopt the *-ati*, *-aje-* flexion of verbs like *igrati* (cf. Schuyt 1990: 373 with references). It is very probable that this adoption was based on the pattern of derivation that was based on the imperfect of the *-iti*, *-i-* verbs from Leskien's class IV, as described above. The main morphological clue lies in the jotation of the root-final vowel followed by the *-a-*, as also seen in the imperfect. From a functional point of view this makes sense as well. A verb like *nosati* is derived from *nositi*, in OCS an indeterminate VOM which itself is opposed to a determined VOM *nesti*. I have shown that these verbs of motion are not inherently terminative, so the derivation cannot have hinged on the defocusing of the inherent boundary and thus cannot be seen as a functional model for the Slavic-style aspect opposition.

There are other reasons why the derivation of imperfective forms from Leskien's class IV verbs may have become the main model for the derivation in other classes as well. First, unprefixed verbs in Leskien's class IV in *-iti*, *-i-* were regarded as primary formations (Schuyt 1990: 416) that made their derived partners in *-ati*, *-aje-* clearly secondary. This situation is opposed to the *-ati*, *-je-* verbs that were often primary verbs with derived semelfactive partners in *-nǫti*, *-ne-* (Schuyt 1990: 414). This made the aspectual status of the suffix *-ati*, *-je-* unclear, something that most clearly emerges in the prefixed formations (cf. Chapter 9). Secondly, the prototypical perfective group, the prefixed perfective verbs, largely consists of Leskien's class IV verbs. There are a total of 377 verbs with 15,803 attestations in this group, of which 237 verbs are Leskien's class IV verbs in *-iti*, *-i-*, with a total of 8709 attestations. No other class is that well represented in the perfective verbs. The unprefixed verbs in *-iti*, *-i-* also constitute a rather large group within the unprefixed perfective verbs: the total group of unprefixed perfectives consists of 44 verbs with 2929 attestations of which 33 verbs with 1221 attestations are Leskien's class IV verbs in *-iti*, *-i-*. All this makes Leskien's class IV a good candidate to function as a model.

Finally, for the sake of clarity, by proposing that the imperfect may have been the functional and morphological catalyst for the derivation of imperfective verbs, I do not imply that the suffix *-ati*, *-aje-* or the lengthening root vowel

[34] Schuyt (1990: 384) remarks that the opposition between *stǫpiti* 'step' and *stǫpati*, and **xvatiti* and *xvatati* 'seize' may also date from this period. The formations in *-xvaštati* can then be compared to *-važdati*.

did not exist before the derivation of the imperfect. Moreover, verbal pairs in which one verb is derived from the other existed in Slavic before the derivation of imperfective verbs as well. This concerns, among others, pairs of VOMs like *běgati, běgajǫ* 'flee' to primary *běžati, běžǫ* or *xvatati, xvatajǫ* 'seize' to **xvatiti,* which probably predate derivational aspect (ibidem: 375).[35] Even the functional load of the *-a-*, which is the distinguishing characteristic of the suffix *-ati, -aje-* is not unique within the Indo-European languages. It can, for example, be found in a durative or iterative function in Latin and Greek and it can also be held responsible for the abovementioned pairs in Slavic that predate derivational aspect (Galton 1997: 71). Galton (ibidem: 73-74) explains the dramatic spread of the suffix *-a-* in Slavic in the derivation of imperfective verbs, as opposed to, for example, its use in Baltic, by pointing at contact between the Slavic tribes and the Huns and Avars. He assumes that these Turkic people must have used the Slavic language to communicate with their Slavic subjects. These Huns and Avars were used to an 'extratemporalis' in their own language and noticed that they could use the *-a-* in Slavic, to express general truths for which they would have used the extratemporalis in their own language. Notwithstanding the speculative character of this hypothesis, it is beyond doubt that in OCS one of the functions of the imperfective aspect is the expression of general truths. And it is possible that it was the *-a-* in the imperfect that they picked up as a tool to build general truths.[36]

Whatever the exact mechanisms behind the development of the imperfective paradigm, I believe that all these morphological and functional bits and pieces described above only came together to form an imperfective paradigm after and based on the rise of the imperfect in Slavic. It is, therefore, as Galton (1997: 70) puts it: "Also das Material ist nicht neu, sondern nur seine Anwendung".

10.6 Concluding remarks

I have tried to show that the origin of the Slavic derivational aspect opposition may very well be traced back to another Slavic innovation: the

[35] The derivation *xvatati* is only attested in the simplex *xvatati*, which occurs once in OCS. There is also one prefixed derived formation attested, but that is the 'expected' *poxvaštati* 'grab' from *poxvatiti* 'grab'. The latter derivation is of later origin (Vaillant 1966: 483, Schuyt 1990: 375) and follows the regular model of aspect derivation in OCS.

[36] Galton points directly at the use of the Indo-European **-ā-* by the Huns and Avars. However, that feels rather abstract in an otherwise very down-to-earth description of the spread of the suffix *-a-*. Of course, the Huns and Avars had no abstract knowledge of the Indo-European language family or the function of individual morphemes in the language family and would have used existing patterns in the language they were speaking/trying to speak, like the use of the *-a-* in the imperfect.

imperfect. In terminative verbs the imperfect made it possible to refer to past terminative events while defocusing the inherent boundary. This functional model was subsequently extended to other verb forms. The morphological means used for this can also for a large part be traced back to the imperfect morphology. Still, the opposition between aorist and imperfect cannot be identified with the perfective-imperfective opposition. This is because the opposition aorist-imperfect is not limited to terminative verbs and revolves around a temporal boundary, which is clearly visible in anaspectual verbs. The further development of the derivational aspect system, resulting in perfective imperfects and imperfective aorists, is a clear indication of the separate status of the two oppositions.

It is also important to note that the aorist cannot be seen as the model for perfective verbs, even though the imperfect functions as the model for imperfective verbs. The aorist was simply the general past tense, until the arrival of the imperfect. In terminative verbs, the standard interpretation may very well have been similar to the meaning of Slavic-style perfective past forms, but it was only the rise of the imperfect that resulted in a Slavic-style aspect opposition in which the attainment of an inherent boundary became the invariant meaning of the perfective aspect.