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

11 CONCLUSION

11.0 Research questions and hypotheses

I started out with the following main research question:

What does the verbal aspect system in OCS look like?

I broke this question down into five more specific questions:

1. *How can the aspect of OCS verbs be established?*
2. *Which verbs participate in the OCS verbal aspect system?*
3. *What are the functions of verbal aspect in OCS?*
4. *How does the verbal aspect system in OCS compare to the modern Slavic aspect system?*
5. *What can the verbal aspect system in OCS reveal about the origin and development of Slavic verbal aspect?*

My hypothesis was that the aspect of a verb can be determined by its morphological characteristics. Verbs that have no aspectual morphology do not express aspect and are therefore anaspectual. Regarding the functions of verbal aspect in OCS I hypothesized that OCS derivational aspect is Slavic-style aspect: it revolves around an inherent boundary. I furthermore hypothesized that the functions of perfective and imperfective aspect in OCS are closer to the Western group of modern Slavic languages (e.g. Czech) than to the Eastern group (e.g. Russian). In other words: sequential connection is not part of the meaning of perfective aspect in OCS. My final hypothesis was that the imperfect may have had a role in the development of Slavic derivational aspect. In the following sections, I will discuss the results of the present study.

11.1 Methodology

One of the major issues that I have addressed in Chapter 4 of this study has to do with methodology: how does one approach a verbal aspect system in an extinct language like OCS?

I have shown that determining the aspect of a verb solely by means of a semantic analysis of individual attestations, as Dostál (1954) does, will not yield the desired result, since the (independently defined) function of a verb form does not determine the aspect, but it is rather the aspect that determines the function. And even though aspect is often strongly correlated to certain contexts or functions in OCS, it almost never is exclusively tied to them. For example, Greek future forms are very likely to be translated by a perfective present and not by an imperfective present when there is a choice of aspect.

However, there are many anaspectual verbs that are used in this function as well, which shows that even though the aspect determines the use of the perfective present as opposed to imperfective in this function, the function of future reference cannot be said to be typically perfective.

A similar problem arises when the grammatical profile of individual verbs are used to determine the aspect, as Eckhoff & Janda (2014) do: the grammatical profile is strongly influenced by the aspect of the verb, as also shown by the results of my own analysis in Chapter 7, but it does not determine it. I have shown that especially verbs that have no aspectual morphology, anaspectual verbs, show a broad range of profiles, which are strongly influenced by their lexical content.

I decided to start out my own study with the morphological characteristics of the verbs, which is basically the method Amse-de Jong (1974) uses. This method has the advantage of being based on elements that are the building blocks of Slavic derivational aspect: prefixes, suffixes and pair forming (or derivational relationships). The foundation of my morphological classification is laid out in Chapter 5. However, the method as Amse-de Jong employs it does not leave room for an objective check of the classification, neither for the verbs that are regarded as perfective and imperfective, nor for the verbs that fall outside those two categories. The latter form a large and very diverse group of anaspectual verbs in the approach by Amse-de Jong (ranging from clearly terminative verbs like *vъzalъkati* 'become hungry' and *vъniti* 'come down' to terminativizable verbs like *jasti* 'eat' and aterminative verbs like *ležati* 'lie'). My own morphological categorization was much more fine-grained, especially with regard to the non-core groups, and functioned only as the starting point of my analysis.

After establishing the various morphological categories I first used the method of grammatical profiling on the groups (cf. Chapter 7). In doing so, I found that the morphological classification into perfective, imperfective and anaspectual verbs is clearly reflected by differences in the grammatical profile of the OCS verbs. Perfective and imperfective verbs appear on opposite sides of the dimension that explains almost of all of the difference in grammatical profile between the groups, while the anaspectual verbs take up a middle position. At the same time, the morphological profiling revealed that some of the other verb groups (e.g. the prefixed VOMs or the prefixed verbs without a partner), have similar profiles as the core aspectual groups. Thus, the method of grammatical profiling did not only support the morphological classification of the verbs, but also added information about the aspectual characteristics of the verbs in the other groups. These were clearly not all anaspectual.

Finally, the only way of establishing the functions of aspect was by the semantic analysis of individual examples (cf. Chapter 8). Hence, I did not try

to determine the aspect based on the semantic analysis of individual examples as Dostál did, but rather I analysed the functions of verbs that I classified into aspectual categories beforehand (based on their morphological make-up and supported by an analysis of their grammatical profile). In some cases, the semantic analysis resulted in the re-categorization of a verb. This was, of course, only possible after I had established the (in)compatibilities of an aspect with certain functions and contexts in the core perfective, imperfective and anaspectual groups in Chapter 8. For example, the analysis in Chapter 9 showed a number of prefixed verbs that are clearly used in aterminative predicates and in functions that are highly incompatible with the perfective aspect, which necessitated re-categorization of those verbs into a separate category of verbs in which prefixation does not automatically lead to an inherently terminative verb. I categorized these verbs as anaspectual. The other verbs in this group, on the other hand, showed typical perfective profiles and behaviour and can be categorized as perfective, even though a derived partner is not attested.

Notwithstanding the fact the individual elements of my method, morphological classification, grammatical profiling and semantic analysis, are not unique, the combination and application of the methods the way I use them is new and results in a system of checks and balances, in which the weaker points of one method are balanced out by applying the other. It results in a clear overview of the OCS verbal aspect system, with a number of core groups that can be used to determine the key functions of the aspect and other peripheral groups of which the aspectual character can be determined based on comparison to the core groups.

11.1.1 Perfective, imperfective and anaspectual verbs (core groups)

The core groups that I discern are perfective, imperfective (both prefixed and unprefixed) and anaspectual verbs. The classification into these core groups is based on the morphological characteristics of the verbs, as explained in Chapter 5, which is supported by the analysis of their grammatical profile in Chapter 7. The perfective group consists of two morphologically separate groups: prefixed verbs with a derived partner like *ostaviti* 'leave' and simplex verbs with a derived partner, like *aviti sę* 'appear'. The imperfective group consists of the derived partners of the perfective verbs, which also results in two morphologically separate groups: a prefixed group with verbs like *ostavljati* 'leave' and unprefixed verbs like *avljati sę* 'appear'. Anaspectual verbs are verbs in which aspectual morphology is absent, like *jasti* 'eat', *ležati* 'lie' or *viděti* 'see'. The semantic analysis in Chapter 8 shows that the basic semantic distinction between anaspectual verbs on the one hand and perfective and imperfective verbs on the other, is that anaspectual verbs are not inherently terminative. Perfective and imperfective verbs, both the prefixed and the unprefixed, share the important characteristic of being

inherently terminative. However, perfective and imperfective verbs treat the inherent boundary differently: perfective verbs express the attainment of the inherent boundary, while imperfective verbs defocus the inherent boundary. This is the typical Slavic-style aspect opposition.

It can be said that the different ways in which perfective and imperfective verbs handle the inherent boundary, is yet another difference with the anaspectual verbs. In other words, anaspectual verbs are not just different from perfective and imperfective verbs because of the fact that they are not inherently terminative, but also because of the fact that even when they are used in a terminative predicate, there is no intrinsic interaction with the inherent boundary, an interaction that is always present in perfective and imperfective verbs. The absence of this extra layer of meaning that determines the interaction with an inherent boundary, gives the anaspectual verbs in general a larger aspectual potential (cf. section 2.1.5.5), notwithstanding the considerable lexical variation within the anaspectual verbs. The larger aspectual potential is first of all clearly visible in the more equally distributed grammatical profile of the group of anaspectual verbs. The meaning of anaspectual verbs does not clash with certain verb forms beforehand, like the perfective verbs show a clash with the imperfect and present participles or imperfective verbs with the aorist or past participles. These clashes of meaning result in more unevenly distributed grammatical profiles for perfective and imperfective verbs. Not unimportantly, however, I have also shown that combinations of perfective and imperfective aspect with less compatible verb forms do occur (cf. sections 8.2.2 and 8.2.3). It is therefore safe to conclude that there are no absolute incompatibilities between the aspect of the verb and individual verb forms, not even between imperfective aspect and the aorist, as Amse-de Jong (1974) claims (cf. examples (177), (179) (180) and (181)); there are only tendencies that vary in strength. Secondly, the greater aspectual potential also becomes apparent from the fact that there are almost no contexts or functions in which anaspectual verbs are absent. Again, the absence of the extra layer of aspectual meaning can be held responsible for this.

I should note, however, that even though there is an overall compatibility of anaspectual verbs with all verb forms, contexts and functions, there is also variation within the anaspectual group, which is related to the lexical content of the verb. Some anaspectual verbs, for example, have an ideal distribution of verb forms with an almost equal share of aorists and imperfects, while others show a clear preference for one of either past tense. In Chapter 8, I have shown that anaspectual verbs can be classified into inherently aterminative verbs (e.g. *ležati* 'lie' and *alъkati* 'be hungry') and verbs that are 'terminativizable', hence, that can be used in a terminative predicate (e.g. *bojati sę* 'be afraid', *viděti* 'see' and *jasti* 'eat'). Moreover, some verbs appear

to be more easily terminativizable than others, which again must be attributed to their lexical character. It makes sense that 'anaspectuality' as a shared characteristic does not result in completely identical aspectual behaviour, or grammatical profiles, because anaspectuality refers to the absence of a layer of aspectuality, as opposed to perfectivity and imperfectivity which refer to the presence of a shared aspectual meaning.

11.1.2 Other groups

The statistical and semantic analysis of other groups of verbs in Chapter 9 shows that the opposition between perfective and imperfective aspect is not limited to the core groups. For example, pairs of prefixed VOMs show profiles and functions equal to the profiles of core perfective and imperfective verbs, and the profile of prefixed verbs without a derived partner is largely indistinguishable from that of perfective verbs and therefore can be classified as perfective and imperfective in OCS. On the other hand, equal profiles do not necessarily mean equal aspectual meaning, as becomes apparent from the semantic analysis of the unprefixed Leskien's class II verbs and their partners. Nevertheless, it is striking that even in pairs that cannot be regarded as Slavic-style aspect partners, because of the fact that they are not inherently terminative, the profiles and functions are often strongly reminiscent of the profiles of aspect partners and many of the functions are divided like in the aspect pairs (cf. the unprefixed determined VOMs like *iti* 'go' and their indeterminate partners like *xoditi* 'go'). The analysis of the non-core groups therefore shows how deeply entrenched the division between perfective and imperfective verbs is in OCS. Not only are other pairs incorporated in the system, but even pairs that are not fit to be completely part of the system because they are not inherently terminative, are partially drawn in. In this respect I have also shown that some aterminative anaspectual verbs and prefixed formations (e.g. *alъkati* 'be hungry' and *vъzalъkati* 'become hungry') show similarities to the core aspect pairs. The grammatical profile and semantic analysis of prefixed verbs without a partner also showed the important role of the prefix in the OCS verbal system: prefixation is in most cases equal to perfectivization. This is because adding a prefix results in a terminative verb and terminative verbs are automatically interpreted as 'inherent boundary attained', as long as they are not morphologically marked for imperfective aspect (mostly with the suffix *-ati*, *-aje-*).

I started out in Chapter 4 with a schedule with the various different categorizations of the aspect of OCS verbs that different authors give (Table 4.1, repeated below as Table 11.1):

Author	***Aspect***			
Dostál (1954)	***Pf***	***Pf/Ipf***	***Ipf/Pf***	***Ipf***
	aviti sę	*klęti sę*	*vesti*	*avljati sę*
	sъnĕsti		*jasti*	*sъnĕdati*
	sъniti			*ležati*
Amse-de Jong (1974)	***Pf***		***Anaspectual***	***Ipf***
	aviti sę		*vesti*	*avljati sę*
	sъnĕsti		*jasti*	*sъnĕdati*
			klęti sę	
			ležati	
			sъniti	
Eckhoff & Janda (2014)	***Pf***			***Ipf***
	aviti sę			*avljati sę*
	sъnĕsti			*jasti*
	sъniti			*sъnĕdati*
	vesti			*klęti sę*
				ležati

Table 11.1 Various categorizations of OCS verbs

Now that I have finished my analysis of the verbal aspect system in OCS, I can give my own alternative categorization in Table 11.2:

Perfective	*Anaspectual*	*Imperfective*
ostaviti *(8)*		***ostavljati*** *(8)*
aviti sę *(8)*		***avljati sę*** *(8)*
sъněsti *(8)*	***jasti*** *(8)*	***sъnědati*** *(8)*
ubojati sę (9.1)	***bojati sę*** *(8)*	
uzъrěti (8.1.1, 9.1)	***viděti*** *(8)*	
	ležati *(8)*	
	klęti sę *(8)*	
vъzalъkati (9.1)	*vъzležati (9.1)*	
pomanǫti (9.2)		
povinǫti sę (9.2)		*povinovati sę (9.2)*
kanǫti (9.2)	*kapati (8.2)*	
vъniti (9.3)	*iti (9.4)*	*vъxoditi (9.3)*
sъniti (9.3)	*xoditi (9.4)*	*sъxoditi (9.3)*
	vesti (9.4)	
	voditi (9.4)	
sъpověděti (9.5)		*sъpovědovati (9.5)*
	byti (9.6)	
rešti (8.3.4)	*glagolati (8.3.4)*	

Table 11.2 My categorization of OCS verbs[1]

My categorization differs in a number of respects from the ones given in Table 11.1. It differs from the one by Amse-de Jong by including in the perfective and imperfective categories a large number of verbs that do not show the prototypical morphological aspect opposition. These verbs are anaspectual in the classification by Amse-de Jong (e.g. *sъniti, vъzalъkati, ubojati sę* and *vъxoditi*). It furthermore differs from the categorization as

[1] The table contains: 1) the prototypical verbs that I used to refer to the various morphological groups and which therefore represent a whole group (cf. Chapter 5, 7 and 9), 2) the verbs that occur in Table 11.1 for comparison purpose, and 3) a number of other verbs that are relevant to the overall picture but that did not receive a separate morphological classification (*vъzležati, povinǫti sę, rešti* and *glagolati*).
It is needless to say that the schedule misses the finer nuances that can be found in the detailed discussion of the various groups. I have included the section number in which the group is discussed for all additional groups. The discussion of the core groups, which are printed in boldface, can be found in Chapter 8, which is also indicated in the table.
I have left out morphological categories that did not result in a clear aspectual designation of all verbs in the group and which therefore could not be indiscriminately categorized within one of the three main categories. This concerns the *pomajati*-group (cf. section 9.2) and the *sъpovědati*-group (cf. section 9.5).

given by Dostál with regard to the classification of inherently aterminative verbs like *ležati* as anaspectual. Moreover, in my categorization there are no biaspectual verbs that express perfective or imperfective aspect in different contexts, only anaspectual verbs that do not express perfectivity or imperfectivity. Finally, my categorization also differs from the categorization by Eckhoff & Janda by providing a separate category for the anaspectual verbs.

11.2 The functions of verbal aspect in OCS

Generally speaking, the OCS derivational aspect system is a typical Slavic-style aspect system, with perfective aspect expressing the attainment of an inherent boundary and imperfective aspect defocusing the inherent boundary. This results in a number of functions and contexts in which one of either aspect is the preferred aspect.

When it comes to establishing the functions of verbal aspect in OCS, distinguishing anaspectual verbs from perfective and imperfective verbs turned out to be very useful. If the anaspectual verbs are regarded as imperfective, which is often what their cognates are taken to be in the modern Slavic languages (think of *jasti* 'eat', *ležati* 'lie' or *diviti sę* 'marvel') it is easily concluded that almost anything goes in OCS, because these verbs occur in functions and contexts that are typical of both aspects. In such an approach, the imperfective aorist is a very common form in OCS, for example. However, when the anaspectual verbs are separated from the (derived) imperfective verbs, the differences between perfective and imperfective verbs emerge very clearly. One of the clearest examples is the almost complete absence of example of aorists of imperfective verbs, while anaspectual verbs are frequently attested in the aorist. This can be explained by a difference in meaning between the imperfective verbs and anaspectual verbs: the defocusing of the inherent boundary in imperfective verbs makes it difficult to imagine the event as temporally bounded, or as a totality. Anaspectual verbs do not defocus an inherent boundary and therefore are more compatible with a bounded reading. Another example is the already mentioned translation of Greek future forms. As Dostál (1954) already sensed, futurity and the perfective present are strongly correlated in OCS. And, as I have shown, Greek future forms are indeed almost exclusively translated by perfective presents, with only very exceptional cases of imperfective presents, if one disregards the anaspectual verbs. However, when anaspectual verbs are added to the equation, this exclusivity becomes blurred, since anaspectual present tense forms are used to translate both Greek future forms and Greek present tense forms. So when discussing contexts or functions that are typical of one of both aspects, one should keep in mind that anaspectual verbs are often compatible with these 'typically perfective' or 'typically imperfective' contexts or functions.

11.2.1 Contexts and functions

There are only a few contexts and functions that are either (almost) exclusively related to one of the aspects, or at least exclude one aspect, even though there are strong tendencies in terms of the compatibility of the aspects with certain contexts and functions. As already mentioned, imperfective verbs are mostly absent from expressions translating a Greek future, barring a few exceptions. Furthermore, the actual present is off limits for perfective verbs; only imperfective and anaspectual verbs occur in the actual present. Perfective verbs are also (almost completely) absent after phase verbs expressing the start of an event, the only counter example being the example with *lišiti sę* 'be deprived' in Luke 15:14 (cf. example (87), Chapter 6). The general factual is strongly associated with anaspectual verbs, with only a few cases of the imperfective aorist, while the perfective aspect is used for concrete factual events. And finally, conativity is a typical function of the imperfective aspect, to the exclusion of both anaspectual and perfective verbs. Other contexts and functions, such as habituality, sequentiality and performativity, are the territory of both aspects and also anaspectual verbs. This means that a choice of aspect is allowed in these contexts, which influences the meaning. For example, a perfective present in a habitual utterance has the function of presenting a single complete event as an example of a general rule, while an imperfective present in this context presents the general rule itself. Also, even though many contexts allow both aspects, they are often more compatible with one of the aspects. For example, in sequences of past events perfective verbs are much more frequent than imperfective verbs. Perfective aorists are the standard while the use of imperfective imperfects in such sequences signals a specific use and needs an additional explanation.

11.2.2 (In)compatibility of aspect and verb forms

In the semantic analysis of perfective and imperfective verbs in Chapter 8, I have explained the relative incompatibility of the perfective aspect with the imperfect and present participles by pointing at the semantics of the aspect and these particular verb forms. The combination of the attainment of the inherent boundary (perfective aspect) with unboundedness (imperfect, present participles) results in a complex semantics. However, the combination does occur and has very specific usages: the perfective imperfect is used in habitual correlative expressions and perfective present passive participles express potentiality.[2]

[2] Interestingly, conditionality plays a role in both cases, just as with the use of perfective present forms in habitual expressions. This preference of the perfective aspect for a connection to another event can be seen as the predecessor to temporal definiteness or sequential connection as

I have also shown that the aorist and the imperfective aspect are not completely incompatible. It is possible to defocus the inherent boundary and at the same time present the event as temporally bounded, or total, for example in case of a round-trip meaning.

11.2.3 Comparison to modern Slavic languages

As discussed in Chapter 2, the functions of verbal aspect differ between the modern Slavic languages. There is a Western group, where perfective aspect revolves around totality and an Eastern group in which perfective aspect revolves around sequential connection, or temporal definiteness. I believe it is safe to say that the OCS aspect system is more like the aspect system of Dickey's Western group (e.g. Czech) than like that of the Eastern group (e.g. Russian), even though the corpus on which this analysis is based is small and native informants cannot be employed to experiment with the use of aspect in various contexts. These limitations are responsible for the relatively small number of parameters in Table 11.3. The analysis of the OCS aspect system as a Western system fits with Dickey's evaluation of the Late Common Slavic aspect system (Dickey 2015) and with his analysis of temporal definiteness/sequential connection as an innovation in the Eastern group (Dickey & Hutcheson 2003, Dickey 2011, 2015). In Table 11.3, I compare the functions of the OCS verbal aspect system to those of the Western and Eastern group as can be found in Dickey (2000) and Dickey (2015) (cf. also Table 2.2).

Function	***OCS***	***West***	***East***
Pf acceptable in present tense habituals	+	+	-
Pf acceptable with performatives	+	+	-
Ipf acceptable in sequences of events	+	+	-
No ipf general factual of single achievements	-	+	-

Table 11.3 Comparison of OCS aspect functions with modern Slavic groups[3]

The only function in which OCS deviates from the Western group is the imperfective general factual of single achievements. This is based on examples of the imperfective aorist, like example (177), Chapter 8, found in

the basic meaning of the perfective aspect in the Eastern group of Slavic languages (cf. Barentsen 1995, 1998, Dickey 2000).

[3] I could add the acceptability of perfective verbs in the historical present, which is a typical Western feature as well. However, given the rarity of the historical present in OCS and the fact that I only found 1 example of a perfective verb in this context, I have left this out. It would fit the idea that the perfective aspect does not express temporal definiteness in OCS. n aramaters that tial connectoin ther side the Eastern group where ssing

the *Marianus*. Even though the use of imperfective achievements is rare in the Western group, Fortuin & Kamphuis (2015: 194-199, 201-203) demonstrate that it is not completely absent; the use of the imperfective form can be triggered by certain constructions. So this usage is not incompatible with the Western type of aspect, but the centrality of totality as the meaning of perfective aspect appears to impede the use of imperfective verbs to refer to complete events. Moreover, in the Eastern group, the use of the imperfective aspect is obligatory in instances like example (177), Chapter 8, unlike in the Western group. This is not the case in OCS, given the fact that *Zographensis* has a perfective verb in the same utterance. All in all, the aspect system as found in OCS shows great similarities to the systems in the Western group.

11.3 Origin and development of Slavic-style aspect

11.3.1 Origin of Slavic-style aspect

In Chapter 10, I have described a case study of a group of verbs in which the Slavic-style derivational aspect opposition exists almost exclusively in the present tense. The absence of a complete derived paradigm, makes the aspect opposition in this group more of an inflectional opposition, like the past tense opposition between the aorist and imperfect. This situation, in which not all forms in a paradigm of a terminative verb express aspect, may very well offer a glimpse into the history of verbal aspect. In other words, it makes sense that the opposition started out in only a few forms and subsequently spread to other forms. In case of the selected verbs, the gaps in the derived paradigm are made up for with newer formations in *-ovati*, *-uje-*. This indicates that in OCS the opposition between perfective and imperfective aspect was already deeply entrenched in the verbal system and certain contexts and functions apparently required a clear morphological indication of aspect.

11.3.2 The development of Slavic-style aspect

The case study shows the special position of the imperfect: it is part of the underived paradigm, but demonstrates imperfective functions just like the derived present tense forms. Apparently, the imperfect has a bridging function between the underived 'neutral' forms and the derived imperfective paradigm. And the likeness to the imperfective paradigm does not stop there; the morphological similarities to the imperfective paradigm, especially when Leskien's class IV verbs in *-iti*, *-i-* is taken as a model, leads me to the hypothesis that the imperfect, as a Slavic innovation, can be seen as the catalyst behind the derivation of imperfective forms, which is also a Slavic innovation.

In my hypothetical path of development, the imperfect of terminative verbs like *icěliti* 'heal', which is *icěljaaxъ*, provided both the functional and morphological basis for the derivation of imperfective forms. The morphological basis is formed by the first part of the imperfect *icělja-*, which forms the basis for the derived imperfective forms, resulting in forms like the present tense *icěljajǫ* or the infinitive *icěljati*. The functional basis lies in the fact that the imperfect refers to an unchanging past situation. In terminative verbs this easily leads to a defocusing of the inherent boundary. This defocusing of the inherent boundary is the basic meaning of imperfective aspect in Slavic. For the verb *icěliti* the use of the imperfect means that the moment at which a person can be called 'healed', which is the inherent boundary as expressed by the prefix, is defocused. As said, this defocusing results in interpretations varying from durative to iterative and conative. The imperfect of aterminative verbs, e.g. *cěljaaxъ* from *cěliti* 'heal' does not result in a similar meaning, since the verb does not express an inherent boundary. So the imperfect simply indicates a temporally unbounded past event. Moreover, the present tense of these anaspectual verbs is compatible with both actual present use and future reference, so there is no 'functional gap' that can be filled with new forms. That is why there are no derived forms like **cěljati*, while there are of the terminative prefixed formations of *cěliti*. In anaspectual verbs, the opposition between the aorist and imperfect is clearly a Romance-style opposition between forms that express a temporally bounded past event (aorist) and a temporally unbounded past event (imperfect).

Note that in this scenario, the aorist, which was the general, unmarked, past tense in Slavic before the rise of the imperfect, is not the model for the perfective verbs; perfective aspect arose from the lexical category of (highly) terminative verbs, mainly prefixed verbs.

11.4 Further research

It would be interesting to apply my approach of the OCS verbal aspect system to the modern Slavic languages. Janda & Lyashevskaya (2011) have performed a grammatical profiling analysis on predefined aspectual groups in Russian, but do not leave room for anaspectual verbs, because they only include verbs that are generally regarded as aspect pairs (both by prefixation and suffixation). Similar research does not exist for other Slavic languages, to my knowledge. Separating the category of imperfective verbs in Slavic into a group of aterminative imperfective verbs (my anaspectual verbs) and terminative imperfective verbs (core imperfective verbs) could result in more detailed knowledge of the functions of aspect in modern Slavic languages as well. For example, I would not be surprised to see that in Modern Bulgarian the aorist is much more compatible with aterminative imperfective verbs than it is with terminative imperfective verbs. And the famous imperfective verbs in past sequences in Czech might just turn out to be mainly

aterminative imperfective verbs. In addition to a deeper understanding of the verbal aspect system in the individual modern Slavic languages, it could also help in more clearly establishing the specific nature of Slavic aspect, which in the first place revolves around terminative verbs and only secondarily influences other parts of the verbal system.