EXPLORING VERBAL ASPECT IN OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC
From lexical to grammatical aspect

Настоящая статья является первым шагом в описании системы вида глагола в старославянском языке на основе ряда глаголов с особой морфологией. Примеры подтверждают концепцию автора, что в старославянском языке одновременно существуют три фазы развития вида глагола: лексическая, словоизменительная и словообразовательная. В статье также обсуждается возможная роль имперфекта в развитии вида глагола.

1. Introduction

In recent decades there has been an increasing interest in the origin and development of verbal aspect in Slavic languages (Bermel 1997, Nørgård-Sørensen 1997, Mende 1999). The approach to verbal aspect in its earliest attested stages has drastically changed since the first comprehensive work on verbal aspect in Old Church Slavonic (OCS) by Dostál (1954). Dostál apparently does not doubt the existence of verbal aspect in OCS and sets himself to the task of ascribing an aspectual value to all verb lexemes in OCS (Dostál 1954: 56). Some decades later, Nørgård-Sørensen takes a completely different approach to aspect in the language of the Old Russian (OR) birch bark letters: he poses the question whether verbal aspect is present at all in OR (Nørgård-Sørensen 1997: 8), even though the same derivational mechanisms (e.g. *-a, -va, -iva/-yva*) as in OCS and modern Slavic languages are present. He comes to the conclusion that verbal aspect as a grammatical category in Russian was established only from the 17th century on and is thus absent from OR (Nørgård-Sørensen 1997: 19). Bermel and Mende also address aspect in OR. They, however, see the development of aspect as a grammatical category in Russian as a gradual process. This means, roughly speaking, that aspect starts out in a limited number of verbs and aspectual functions are at first not neatly distributed over the opposing forms. Subsequently, aspect spreads to other parts of the verbal system and the distribution of the functions becomes more regular; there are less overlapping functions and more functions are involved.

Recent studies have mostly concentrated on OR, but how does verbal aspect in OCS fit into this picture? Does verbal aspect as a grammatical category exist in OCS, and if so, (how) does it differ from verbal aspect in modern Slavic languages? And can OCS provide us with clues as to the origin of verbal aspect?

Like Nørgård-Sørensen, I believe that the first question should be whether aspect exists at all in OCS, before we start categorizing verbs as either perfective or imperfective. But, unlike Nørgård-Sørensen, I believe that the question of whether aspect as a grammatical category exists is a question of more or less, not all or nothing. My view is similar to that of Mende and Bermel in that I see the development of verbal aspect as a gradual process.

The data I will treat in this paper indicate that OCS has a verbal aspect system that is both morphologically and functionally less elaborate than the aspect systems of modern Slavic languages. However, large parts of the system do show regular morphological

opposition and more or less regular distribution of functions over opposing forms. I follow Lehmann (1999) and Wiemer (2008) in their theory that the 'ideal' grammatical aspect system shows a maximally regular aspectual morphology and maximally regularly distributed functions. However, even the modern Slavic languages have not reached this ideal stage (Wiemer 2008: 388), so the fact that OCS does not live up to these ideals does not mean grammatical aspect is not basically already there in OCS.

I believe that OCS finds itself in the middle of the development from a language with only lexical aspect (cf. Lehmann 1997: 215-216) towards a system in which aspect is obligatorily encoded. To test this hypothesis, I will analyze a group of verbs with a particularly ancient pattern of aspect derivation (see section 2).

The hypothetical path of development of verbal aspect in OCS I propose is, more in detail, as follows:

I) We start out with lexical aspect: all aspectual functions are expressed by one and the same form, dependent only on the lexical content of the verb. We know that even the past tense aspectual opposition aorist-imperfect is a new opposition in Slavic; the imperfect tense, which is often regarded as the 'imperfective half' of the aorist-imperfect opposition, is a new form in Slavic (cf. Kortlandt 1986), so Proto-Slavic at some point probably was a completely 'aspectless' language. I will argue that parts of the OCS system still show traces of this stage, such as the infinitives of the verbs selected for this paper.

II) The first sign of aspect as we know it today is aspectual inflection. The morphological opposition is at that stage not between two full-fledged paradigms, but between a limited number of forms within the same paradigm. The aspectual derivation found in the selection of verbs that we will analyze in this paper, can be seen as a witness to this second stage of development, since in these verbs the morphological opposition is limited to a maximum of only four forms within a verbal paradigm.

Even though not all forms of the verbs discussed in this paper partake in the opposition, the forms that do so, most notably the present tense forms, show a clear distribution of functions. In other words: the functions that in stage one were expressed by one and the same form, are now being rearranged over two forms. The newly derived present tense forms are, for example, mostly used in habitual expressions, while the already existing forms that are now in opposition to these derived forms, are the preferred choice for future reference.

Since this basic distinction resembles the situation in many modern Slavic languages, I will for the sake of clarity call the new, derived, forms <IPF> and the already existing forms with which they form an opposition <PF>. Forms that do not form such an opposition I will call anaspectual (cf. Bermel 1997: 8-9) [1].

III) Finally, it is obvious that verbal aspect in OCS has developed beyond the second stage. For example, aspect in OCS is generally no longer expressed by individual opposing forms within a paradigm, but by complete opposing paradigms, thus showing greater morphological regularity. This development has even reached those verbs that still show inflectional aspect: an additional set of <IPF> forms has developed next to the already existing <IPF> forms. This additional set can form a complete <IPF> paradigm.

---

[1] In cases where complete paradigms are opposed I will talk about <PF> and <IPF> *verbs* as opposed to <PF> and <IPF> *forms* where no complete paradigms exist.

To put the hypothetical path of development to the test, I will take a look at the morphology and functional behaviour of the above mentioned group of verbs. Since the analysis of these verbs makes up the major part of this paper, the structure of the remainder of this paper is determined by it. First I will show the unusual morphological make-up of the selected verbs (section 2) and the consequences it has for the aspect opposition in those verbs. After that I will analyze examples with present tense forms to show the functional distribution that accompanies the morphological opposition (section 3). Then I will treat the anaspectual infinitive and a peculiar set of alternative <IPF> forms that probably have been derived because of the existence of anaspectual forms (section 4). The last tense form to be analyzed in this paper is the imperfect. I will also pay attention to the possible role of the imperfect in the development of verbal aspect in Slavic (section 5). The final section contains the conclusions and some recommendations for further research.

2. Morphology of the selected verbs

The verbs selected for this paper are prefixed forms of вѧзати 'bind', казати 'show', рѣзати 'cut' and *съпати[2]. These verbs show a particular ancient pattern of aspect derivation (Silina 1982: 191-192), which makes them useful for our purpose of going back as far as we can into the development of Slavic verbal aspect. The pattern shows more characteristics of aspectual inflection than of aspectual derivation, which could point in the direction of an early inflectional stage for Slavic verbal aspect. Although there are more verbs showing a similar pattern[3], the current selection gives enough material for the purpose of this paper.

The prefixed verbs and the simplex on which they are built, form a 'verb family'. So in this paper we have the вѧзати family, the казати family, the рѣзати family and the *съпати family. The казати family, for example, looks as follows[4]:

Table 1: The казати family

Simplex	казати (25) 'show, educate'
Prefixed	наказати (15) 'discipline, educate' показати (164) and показовати (3) 'show' прѣдъпоказати (1) 'show beforehand' съказати (121) and съказовати (1) 'clarify, indicate' оуказати (7) 'show, indicate'
Total attestations[5]	312

---

[2] The basic meaning of all prefixed verbs built on the basis of *съпати revolves around 'spill/strew'. The verb *съпати, however, is not attested as a simplex. I use the "*" sign throughout the rest of the paper for forms that are not attested.

[3] E.g. (prefixed) forms of искати, мазати, метати, -рицати and тазати.

[4] The data come from Aitzetmüller (1977), which means that some codices belonging to the OCS canon are not included (e.g. Enina Apostol).

[5] Only the prefixed forms are included in the 'total attestations'.

2.1. Special characteristics of the verbs

One basic characteristic is shared by all four verb families: prefixed verbs with one infinitive (or aorist) stem and two present stems.

The second characteristic is shared by all verb families, except the *съпати family: some of the prefixed verbs have derived forms in *-ovati, -uje-*.

2.2. Verb stems

We will first take a look at the verb stems. The paradigm of an OCS verb consists of many forms, all of which are based on either the infinitive stem, or the present stem. Table 2 shows the normal distribution[6] of the various tenses/moods over the two stems:

Table 2: Distribution of tenses/moods over infinitive and present stem[7]

Infinitive stem	Present stem
Infinitive	Present
Supine	Imperative
Imperfect	Present active participle (Pres. A.P.)
Aorist	Present passive participle (Pres. P.P.)
Past active participle I (Past A.P. I)	
Past active participle II (Past A.P. II)	
Past passive participle (Past P.P.)	

For the verb слышати 'hear' this gives the following picture:

Table 3: Distribution of tenses/moods of the verb слышати

Infinitive stem	слыша-	Present stem	слыш-
Infinitive	слыша-ти	Present	слыш-ѫ
Supine	слыша-тъ	Imperative	слыш-и
Imperfect	слыша-ахъ	Pres. A.P.	слыш-а
Aorist	слыша-хъ	Pres. P.P.	слыш-имъ
Past A.P. I	слыша-въ		
Past A.P. II	слыша-лъ		
Past P.P	слыша-нъ		

Many prefixed members of the selected verb families deviate from the picture in table 3, since they have two present stems on which forms can be built. Not all verbs in the families have two present stems, though. The verbs that do are:

---

[6] There are, of course, some exceptions to the normal distribution, such as imperfects based on a present stem instead of on an infinitive stem. Furthermore, there are verbs in which infinitive stem and present stem are identical. Finally, there are verbs in which the suffix -нѫ- complicates matters.

[7] I follow Leskien (1969: 122) in dividing verb forms based on the stem on which they are formed. Leskien uses the terms *Infinitivstamm/Zweite Stamm* (infinitive stem) and *Präsensstam* (present stem). The famous OCS verb classification system in five categories by Leskien takes the present stem as starting point.

From the вѧзати family: завѧзати[8], обѧзати, привѧзати, съвѧзати, оувѧзати
From the казати family: наказати, показати, съказати, оуказати
From the рѣзати family: обрѣзати
From the *съпати family: исъпати, расъпати

If one would want to make a table for one of these verbs, similar to the table above with слъішати, theoretically there would be four possible double tenses/moods: present, imperative, present active participle and present past participle (i.e. the forms that are based on the present stem). This is indeed a theoretical option, since the only regular opposition is found in the present tense, with one rare exception of a <PF> present passive participle, which makes the table of attested forms of one of the above verbs, съказати 'clarify, indicate, announce', look like this:

Table 4: Distribution of forms of the verb съказати

	Anaspectual[9]		<PF>	<IPF>
Infinitive stem	съказа-	Present stem	съкаж-	съказа-
Infinitive	съказа-ти	Present	съкаж-ѫ	съказа-ѩ
Supine	съказа-тъ	Imperative	съкаж-и	-
Imperfect	съказа-ахъ	Pres. A.P.	-	съказа-ıа
Aorist	съказа-хъ	Pres. P.P.	съкаж-емъ	съказа-ıемъ
Past A.P. I	съказа-въ			
Past A.P. II	съказа-лъ			
Past P.P	съказа-нъ			

As we can see, the complete <IPF> paradigm of съказати consists of only present tense forms and present participles. Aspect looks more like an inflectional category in these verbs, showing a glimpse of how aspect may have developed in Slavic. The following table shows the relative frequency distribution of the verb forms (518 in total) of all selected verbs in this study that have both present stems attested:

Table 5: Relative frequency of tenses / moods in verbs with opposing forms (n = 518)

Infinitive stem	Anaspectual	Present stem	<PF>	<IPF>
Infinitive	5,41%	Present	12,74%	5,79%
Supine	0,77%	Imperative	13,51%	0,0%
Imperfect	2,51%	Pres. A.P.	0,0%	6,37%
Aorist	23,75%	Pres. P.P.	0,19%	3,86%
Past A.P. I	7,92%			
Past A.P. II	1,93%			
Past P.P.	15,25%			
Total	57,54%	Total	26,44%	16,02%

The table shows that the only frequent opposition between <PF> and <IPF> forms is to be found in the present tense.

---

[8] Technically, завѧзати also does not fulfill the conditions, since only <IPF> forms are attested. However, since these derived forms are attested, it seems logical to postulate non-derived forms.

[9] Many of these anaspectual forms are *sui generis* more compatible with either the imperfective or the perfective aspect. Some more on this in section 4.

2.3. Extra paradigm in *-ovati, -uje-*

The second characteristic of the verb families concerns an extra set of derived forms in *-ovati, -uje-* that have the potential of forming <IPF> forms on the basis of the infinitive stem, which results in a complete <IPF> paradigm as opposed to the maximum of four <IPF> forms we saw above. There are four verbs that show this characteristic; they can be found in the table below:

Table 6: Second set of derived forms in *-ovati, -uje-*[10]

Verb	Attested forms
отъръзовати	1x infinitive
показовати	1x infinitive, 1x imperfect, 1x Pres. A.P.
съвазовати	1x Pres. A.P.
съказовати	1x aorist

Even though we are dealing with a mere 6 verb forms attested in the verb families selected for this paper, these forms can still give us insight in the development of verbal aspect in OCS. I will get back the meaning of this extra set of derived forms when I discuss the infinitive.

3. Functional analysis of present tense forms

Now that we have seen the morphological basis of the opposing forms, it is time to take a look at their functions. We will do so by analyzing a number of examples with present tense forms, since the only regular opposition we found was between <PF> and <IPF> present tense forms.

For a functional analysis it is good to have something outside of the text to hold on to for our interpretation. Since all OCS texts are translations of Greek originals, the first thing that springs to mind is to compare OCS to the Greek original to get an idea of the basic functions of the opposing forms. This comparison has been done for the occurrences of prefixed present tense forms of the казати and съпати families in the Book of Psalms and the Gospel texts, which narrows the scope of the investigation to an even smaller number of forms, allowing for an extensive treatment of the examples. The results of the comparison can be found in tables 7 and 8[11]:

Table 7: OCS <PF> present tense forms and their Greek original

Present	Greek aorist	Greek future	Greek present
наказати	1[12]	1	-
показати	-	6	1
съказати	1[13]	8	-
посъпати	2[14]	-	-

---

[10] The tense forms that are built on the infinitive stem are marked in bold type.

[11] Verbs without present tense attestations have been left out.

[12] This concerns a subjunctive aorist

[13] This concerns an infinitive aorist.

[14] This concerns two subjunctive aorists.

исъіпати	-	-	1
Total	4	15	2

Table 8: OCS <IPF> present tense forms and their Greek original

Present	Greek present	Greek future	Greek aorist
показати	2	1	-
съказати	7	2	-
исъіпати	1	-	-
Total	10	3	0

The first table shows a clear tendency for the OCS <PF> present tense forms to translate a Greek future. The <IPF> forms show an opposite tendency, most <IPF> present tense forms translate a Greek present. The analysis of the various contexts in which OCS chooses one or the other form can shed more light on the functional load behind these tendencies and also on the exceptions to those tendencies we see in the tables.

I will now discuss three aspectual functions that play a major role in the present tense forms of the selected verbs: future reference, habituality and performativity.

3.1. Future reference

<PF> present tense forms often have a future function, translating Greek future forms:

(1)   ѣко наиде кротость на нъі и накажемъ сѩ<PF> . [15] (Psalm 90:10b)[16]
        'Because humility will come over us and *we will be chastened*.' [JK][17]

Greek subjunctive aorists after a conjunction can also have a future function, in which case OCS uses <PF> present forms as well:

(2)   г(оспод)и . остави ѭ ι се лѣто . дондеже ѭ окопаѭ окръстъ . ι осъіплѭ<PF> ѭ гноемь .
        (Luke 13:8 (Z, M))[18]
        'Let it alone, sir, for this year too, until I dig around it and *put in* fertilizer.'

<PF> present tense forms also contrast with past reference as in the following example:

---

[15] OCS examples are not normalized, except for the transliteration of the originally Glagolitic texts into Cyrillic, following the diplomatic editions of the codices. Accents and titlos are omitted and abbreviations are resolved by inserting the missing letters in parentheses, e.g. в(ог)а for бⷢ҇а. A parallel corpus of the four Gospel codices can be found at www.jaapkamphuis.nl/index.php/parallel-corpus1.

[16] The numbering of the Hebrew version of the Book of Psalms is used. OCS examples from the Book of Psalms all come from the Psalterium Sinaiticum.

[17] All translations are based on the New American Standard Bible (NAU, 1995), except for this one which is missing from the NAU. In some cases, the translation is edited to align it with the OCS translation.

[18] This example occurs in the Zographensis (Z) and Marianus (M). Other codices with Gospel texts I use are the Assemanianus (A) and Savina kniga (Sk). Examples are treated together like this when the crucial verb forms do not differ in derivation; other differences (mostly spelling or lexical differences) may, and mostly do, exist. Only the text of the first codex is given, in this case the text of the codex Zographensis.

(3)   ι съказахъ^{\<PF\>} имъ jма твое . ι съкажѫ^{\<PF\>} . да любы еѭже ма еси вьзлюбилъ . вь
        нихъ бѫдетъ . ι азъ вь нихъ . (John 17:26 (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.'

In this case, the opposition between past reference (an aorist) and future reference (a
\<PF\> present form) is clear. It is a direct translation of the Greek original. A similar
example can be found in John 5:20, where in the Greek original we have a present tense
and a future. This opposition does not seem to be easy to reflect in OCS, since all three
codices in which the text is attested have different versions, and only the Marianus pre-
serves the original Greek opposition with one \<IPF\> present tense for the Greek present
tense and one \<PF\> present tense form for the Greek future:

(4)   от(ь)ц(ь) [б]о любитъ с(ъı)на . и всѣ показаатъ^{\<IPF\>} емоу ѣже самъ творитъ . ι
        большаа сихъ покажетъ^{\<PF\>} емоу дѣла . да въı чюдите са . (John 5:20 (M))
        'For the Father loves the Son, and *shows* Him all things that He Himself is do-
        ing; and the Father *will show* Him greater works than these, so that you will
        marvel.'

In the Zographensis two \<PF\> present forms are attested:

(4a)   о(ть)ць бо любитъ с(ъı)на . ι всѣ покажетъ^{\<PF\>} емоу . ѣже самъ творитъ . ι больша
        си покажетъ^{\<PF\>} емоу дѣла . да въı чюдите са . (John 5:20 (A))

Assemanianus has two \<IPF\> present forms:

(4b)   о(ть)ць бо любітъ с(ъı)на . и всѣ показаетъ^{\<IPF\>} емоу ѣже самъ творітъ . и больша
        сıхъ показаетъ^{\<IPF\>} емоу дѣла . да въи чюдіте са . (John 5:20 (Z))

So in both Zographensis and Assemanianus the opposition is lost. This could indicate
that the opposition between past and non-past, as in example (3), is easier to reflect in
OCS than the opposition between present and future, even though the version of the
Marianus shows that the opposition can be expressed by means of opposing \<IPF\> and
\<PF\> present tense forms. This differs from the situation in all modern Slavic lan-
guages, where the difference between future and present tense is clearly delineated in
(4), be it by opposing perfective and imperfective present tense forms like in Russian,
Czech or Slovak, or by opposing an imperfective present tense and a special perfective
future form like in Bosnian / Croatian / Serbian (B/C/S), Bulgarian or Macedonian[19].

3.2. Habitual expressions

In habitual expressions OCS has a clear preference for \<IPF\> present tense forms:

(5)   сего ради дастъ вамъ моси обрѣзание . не ѣко отъ мосѣа естъ . нъ отъ о(ть)ць . ι въ
        сѫботѫ обрѣзаете^{\<IPF\>} ч(ловѣ)ка . (John 7:22 (Z, M, A))
        'For this reason Moses has given you circumcision (not because it is from Mo-
        ses, but from the fathers), and on *the* Sabbath you *circumcise* a man.'

Another example, only in the Zographensis, is:

---

[19] Examples are checked against modern Bible translations in BCS, Bulgarian, Czech, Macedonian,
Russian and Slovak. "Modern Slavic languages" in this paper refers to these languages only.

(6) ни въ земи ни въ гнои . трѣбѣ естъ . вънъ исыпаетъ са^{＜IPF＞} . имѣѩ оуши слꙑшати .
да слꙑшитъ . (Luke 14:35 (Z))

'It is useless either for the soil or for the manure pile; it *is thrown out*. He who
has ears to hear, let him hear.'

The same example, however, can also be found in the codex Marianus, with a <PF>
form:

(6a) Ни вь земи ни въ гнои трѣбѣ естъ . вонъ исыплѭтъ^{＜PF＞} ѭ . имѣаи оуши слꙑшати
да слꙑшитъ . (Luke 14:35 (M))

Here the OCS <PF> present translates a Greek present, which is atypical, but does occur
more often in habitual expressions. In modern Slavic translations only Czech and Slo-
vak have a perfective form here.

There is also an example in our selection in which the OCS <PF> present translates a
Greek subjunctive aorist in a habitual expression:

(7) блаженъ ч(о)вѣкъ егоже тꙑ накажеши^{＜PF＞} г(оспод)і ... і отъ закона твоего наоучиши і .
(Psalm 94:12)

'Blessed is the man whom You *chasten*, O LORD, And whom You teach out of
Your law.'

It is significant that modern Slavic languages, although they almost all, to varying de-
grees, allow perfective verbs in this type of context (Dickey 2000: 93), all have an im-
perfective verb in the translation of this example, even Czech and Slovak. It seems as
though there are fewer restrictions to the use of <PF> present tense in OCS than in
modern Slavic languages.

3.3. Performatives

There are also cases in which OCS <PF> present tense forms translate a Greek future
tense which refers to the moment of speech:

(8) **Съкажѭ**^{＜PF＞} же вамъ кого оубоите са . Оубоите са . имѫщааго власть . По оубиении
въврѣщи въ ћеонѫ . еи гл(агол)ѭ вамъ . того оубоите са . (Luke 12:5 (A))

Ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε·φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἐξουσίαν
ἔχοντα ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν·ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε

'But *I will warn you* whom to fear: fear the One who, after He has killed, has au-
thority to cast into hell; yes, I tell you, fear Him.'

In these cases all modern Slavic bible translations use a perfective form. There are,
however, two OCS codices in which this example is translated with an <IPF> form:

(8a) съказаѭ^{＜IPF＞} же вамъ . кого са оубоите . оубоите са имѫштааго власть . по оубьении
вьврѣшти въ ћеонѫ . еи гл(агол)ѭ вамъ . того оубоите са . (Luke 12:5 (Z, M))

The fact that these two codices both use an <IPF> form instead of the expected <PF>
form already indicates that this is not a typical example of future reference. Moreover,
the context itself shows that this is a performative utterance: the utterance of the words

constitutes the act itself[20]. A similar example can be found in Luke 6:47, which is only attested in the codices Zographensis and Marianus. There, however, both codices have a <PF> form, just like Assemanianus in this example.

Modern Slavic languages differ in the way they handle performatives, mainly because of the tension between the moment of speech and the totality of the act, which is resolved either in favor of the moment of speech with an imperfective present, or in favor of the totality with a perfective present, or a perfective future (Dickey 2000: 201-202). It looks as if in OCS both possibilities exist next to each other in this kind of utterances and that performativity has not yet been clearly assigned to one of the aspects (cf. Kamphuis 2012: 354-359).

3.4. Other functions

The selection of present tense examples shows two more contexts. For <PF> verbs there is one example of a goal-oriented action:

(9)   ι єгда испѫльни са осмь дьнии . да ι обрѣжѫтъ<PF> . нарѣша има ємоу и(соу)с (Luke 2:21 . (Z, M, A, Sk))
         'And when the eight days had passed, so that they *could circumcise* him, His name was called Jesus.'

And second, reflexive <IPF> forms of the verb съказати often have a state-like function, as in the following example:

(10)   ι рече ємоу ιди оумъи са . въ кѫпѣли силоуамьсцѣ . єже съказаєтъ са<IPF> посъланъ . (John 9:7 (Z, M, A))
         'and said to him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam", which *is translated*, Sent.'

With this last example we have discussed all contexts that occur in the selection of present tense examples for this paper.

3.5. Conclusion present tense

The present tense examples are consistent with the view that in OCS aspect functions are in the process of being rearranged over the newly developed opposition. <PF> present tense forms, which in the (hypothetical) lexical aspect stage were used in all contexts, are in our examples mainly restricted to future reference, while the <IPF> present tense has taken over large parts of the territory of habitual expressions. But in a number of cases the choice of aspect seems arbitrary: we find <PF> forms in habitual contexts, which could be a residue of the older lexical aspect stage, and we find <IPF> forms in future reference, indicating that the opposition present-future is not that strongly developed in OCS as it is in modern Slavic languages like Russian or Czech. Performatives show this relatively free choice of aspect as well. It is difficult to pinpoint the semantic subtleties that explain the differences in choice of aspect between OCS codices, but it might resemble the situation in Modern Czech verbal aspect, which, according to

---

[20] The use of the Greek future tense does not contradict this interpretation; there are some 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 (Van Peursen 2004: 75; cf. also Rogland 2001: 127-134), like in Psalm 18:4 ἐπικαλέσομαι and Psalm 75:1 ἐξομολογησόμεθά and ἐπικαλεσόμεθα.

Stunová (1993: 190), is more sensitive to the lexical character of the verbs and the presentation of the internal structure of the situation than aspect in Modern Russian and therefore allows for greater freedom of choice of aspect in many contexts.

4. Functional analysis of infinitive forms[21]

Now we turn to the infinitive, which is, of course, build on the infinitive stem. Unlike with the present stem, there is no opposition between a basic and a derived stem within the infinitive stems in the verbs that are selected for this paper. This means that all verbs possess only one infinitive form. The same is true for all other forms based on the infinitive stem in our selection, but of these forms the infinitive is the most neutral when it comes to preference for one or the other aspect, which is why one would expect the infinitive of these verbs to occur both in typical <IPF> as in typical <PF> contexts. Other forms show a clear preference for one or the other aspect. For example, in cases where there is a formal opposition between infinitive stems (like between the verb pair съвьра-ти - съвирати 'gather'), past participles and the aorist are much more common in <PF> verbs[22], while the imperfect is normally formed from <IPF> verbs. The special role of the imperfect will get attention in the next section of this paper. For now we will analyze two examples of infinitives that show that these forms occur both in typical <IPF> as well as typical <PF> contexts, which shows their anaspectual status.

Let us first take a look at usage with phase verbs. In OCS there is only one known example in which an <PF> verb that has a <IPF> partner occurs after a phase verb[23], so it is safe to say that occurrence after a phase verb in OCS, just as in modern Slavic languages, is a typical for <IPF> forms:

(11) отъ толѣ начатъ ис(оус)ъ . съказати оученикомъ своимъ . ѣко подобаатъ емоу ити в(ъ) (иероуса)л(и)мъ . (Matthew 16:21 (M))
'From that time Jesus *began to show* His disciples that He must go to Jerusalem.'

In this example the infinitive translates a Greek present infinitive. The second example is a translation of a Greek aorist infinitive, in a typical <PF> context.

(12) і бъістъ въ осмъі дьнь . придѫ обрѣзатъ отрочате . і нарицаахѫ е . именемь . о(ть)ца своего захариѩ . (Luke 1:59 (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.'

Not only the Greek original contributes to a perfective interpretation, but also the similarity to example (9) in which a <PF> present tense form is used, shows that this is a context in which OCS would use a <PF> form. These examples can be seen as a residue of the lexical aspect stage: one form is used in all aspectual functions.

---

[21] Including supines.

[22] Amse-de Jong (1974) shows that in the codex Supraslienses, the largest OCS codex, no aorists of derived verbs occur.

[23] Mark 15:18 (Z, M, Sk): начаса цѣловати<PF> 'they started kissing', but (A): начаса цѣлъивати<IPF>. Dostál 1954 (449-450) considers this example of цѣловати as an imperfective example of a verb that is otherwise mostly perfective. However, when one sees aspect as a form-meaning category, it would probably be better to see this as an example of a perfective verb in a typical imperfective context.

In a system where verbal aspect becomes an ever stronger grammatical category, such anomalies as the ambiguous infinitives come under pressure. In OCS we can observe this in the upcoming extra set of derived forms like отъръзовати and показовати next to the ambiguous отъръзати and показати. These new infinitive stems allow for forms that are unambiguously <IPF> (Schuyt 1990: 29, 34) and it is no coincidence that these additional paradigms are only found in verbs that have these ambiguous, anaspectual forms[24]. It confirms that verbal aspect in OCS has already developed well beyond the hypothetical inflectional stage that is mentioned in the introduction and is now in a phase in which the remaining morphological irregularities are smoothed out.

Finally, the rise of these disambiguating forms supports the idea that we are indeed dealing with ambiguous anaspectual forms and not just with homographic forms that are actually distinguished in pronunciation by differing accent patterns. If that were the case, there would not have been a need for disambiguating forms.

5. Functional analysis of imperfect tense forms

The imperfect is the odd one out within the paradigm of forms built on the infinitive stem, since it is the only form that is clearly functionally linked to the paradigm of <IPF> forms. While imperfects from both <PF> verbs and <IPF> verbs do occur in OCS, more often than not they cannot be distinguished on morphological grounds (cf. Amse-de Jong 1974, 104-109; Aitzetmüller 1977: V). Furthermore, imperfects of <PF> verbs that can morphologically be recognized as such (e.g. <PF> дадѣаше from дати 'give' vs. <IPF> даіаше from даіати 'give') are rather rare.

The fact that imperfects are built on the infinitive stem puts them on a par with the anaspectual forms, among which the 'typically perfective' aorist and past participles. Functionally, however, the imperfect seems much closer to the <IPF> forms. <IPF> imperfects are typically used in stative, habitual or progressive contexts. An example of a progressive context can be found in our selection:

(13) ι начьнъ отъ мосѣа . ι отъ вьсѣхъ пророкъ . съказааше има отъ вьсѣхъ кънигъ ꙗже бѣахѫ о немь . (Luke 24:27 (Z, M, A))
'Then beginning with Moses and with all the prophets, He *explained* to them the things concerning Himself in all the Scriptures.'

We also have an example of an imperfect in a habitual expression:

(14) ι рѣсте къ себѣ . не сръдце ли наю горѧ бѣ въ наю . егда гла(гола)аше къ нама на пѫти . ι ѣко съказааше нама кънигы . (Luke 24:32 (M, A))
'They said to one another, "Were not our hearts burning within us while He was speaking to us on the road, every time He *would explain* the Scriptures to us?'

Since <PF> imperfect express habituality as well (Galton 1976:180), this could be an example of a <PF> imperfect. In that case we would be dealing with two situations that repeatedly occur together, as expressed in the English translation above.

On the other hand, this example could just as well refer to two progressive simultaneous situations, for which one would expect an <IPF> imperfect. In that case, one would translate like the NAU does:

---

[24] Other forms in *-ovati, -uje-* are denominal (Schuyt 1990: 7, 29).

(14a)   Were not our hearts burning within us while He was speaking to us on the road, while He *was explaining* the Scriptures to us? (Luke 24:32)

Without a morphological marker, the choice between the two interpretations is impossible to make. So while we could say that the imperfect is ambiguous, just as the infinitive, the functions of the <PF> and <IPF> imperfect are not that easily separable. Habituality, after all, is mainly the domain of <IPF> forms in OCS, notwithstanding the fact that OCS seems to allow the use of <PF> forms in habitual expressions to a larger extent than the modern Slavic languages. Thus, even <PF> imperfects are clearly linked to the main <IPF> function in OCS.

Against this background, I would like to propose the following hypothesis: The imperfect, a new formation in Slavic, has functioned as both a functional and a morphological pattern for the derivation of the new <IPF> forms. The development is schematically depicted in table 9 for the verb ицѣлити 'heal', a verb that has a derived partner ицѣлꙗти:

Table 9: The 'imperfect stem' of ицѣлити

<PF>	Imperfect	'Imperfect stem'	<IPF>
ицѣлити	ицѣлꙗахъ	ицѣлꙗ-	
		Infinitive	ицѣлꙗ -ти
		Present	*ицѣлꙗ -ѭ
		(Imperfect)	(ицѣлꙗ -ахъ)
		Imperative	*ицѣлꙗ-и
		Pres. A.P.	ицѣлꙗ -ꙗ
		Pres. P.P.	ицѣлꙗ -ѥмъ

Bermel, discussing Borodič who suggests a similar role for the imperfect tense in the development of verbal aspect in Slavic, poses the question whether in this scenario the original verb still has an imperfect (Bermel 1997: 68). I propose that originally there was only one imperfect, which laid the basis for the subsequent derivation of imperfective forms. It is only when this derivation started producing complete opposing paradigms, that in verbs that allow a morphological difference, the <PF> paradigm started forming imperfects of its own and the opposition <PF> imperfect and <IPF> imperfect came into being. In my view, the imperfect was simply the first derived form in the original paradigm, thus being both 'original' and derived.

6. Conclusion

The functional analysis in the previous sections is supportive of the hypothetical path of development that has been sketched in the introduction.

First, OCS shows traces of the lexical aspect stage. This is most clear in case of the infinitives we saw in section 4, where one form is used in both imperfective and perfective contexts. For a more comprehensive treatment of the role of lexical aspect in OCS, further research should first of all concentrate on the role of unpaired simplicia (e.g. пити 'drink', ꙗсти 'eat', пѣти 'sing') in the aspect system. These verbs, a lot of which Dostál (1954) characterizes as bi-aspectual, do seem to occur in both imperfective and perfective contexts, just as the infinitives in section 4. If this is indeed the case, it shows

that grammatical aspect in OCS has not permeated the verbal system to the same extent as in the modern Slavic languages.

Second, aspect is more of an inflectional category in the selected verbs; individual forms are opposed to each other within a paradigm, in contrast with the overall picture in OCS, in which complete paradigms are opposed. This could be a trace of the hypothetical second stage of development of verbal aspect, the inflectional stage.

Third, the opposing present tense forms we analyzed are accompanied by a clear functional distribution, which points in the direction of a development of grammatical aspect in which functions are regularly distributed over both aspects. This distribution of functions over forms, however, seems less obligatory and less regular than in modern Slavic languages. For a better insight in the correlations between form and function, other groups of verbs should be investigated; the most obvious candidates for this would be verbs that show the most regular morphological opposition: prefixed verbs and their derived partners. It could be that such a regular morphological opposition is accompanied by a more regular functional distribution. If, however, the distribution of functions over forms is more or less the same as it is in the examples we analyzed for this paper, it would support the hypothesis that OCS is in an earlier stage of development of grammatical aspect in which there are more overlapping functions and less functions that are involved in the aspect opposition.

Fourth, even though in the verbs discussed in this paper, aspect behaves more like an inflectional category, is also shows development towards derivational aspect, by means of the extra set of <IPF> forms in *-ovati, -uje-*. OCS is clearly moving into a stage in which aspect becomes an obligatory category and it is already so firmly established that it serves as the basis for the derivation of new forms. Further research could concentrate on finding more examples in which verbal aspect is responsible for the derivation of new forms.

Finally, if aspect indeed started out as inflection, the imperfect tense might very well have been the first imperfective form. Morphological and functional evidence points in the direction of the imperfect as the pattern on which the newly derived <IPF> forms are based. It would be interesting to see how a later development in OCS, namely imperfects based on the present stem instead of on the infinitive stem (Diels 1963: 235-236, 252), fits in this theory.

Literature

Aitzetmüller, R. 1977. *Belegstellenverzeichnis der altkirchenslavischen Verbalformen*. Monumenta linguae slavicae dialecti veteris. XI. Würzburg.

Amse-de Jong, T.H. 1974. *The Meaning of the Finite Verb Forms in the Old Church Slavonic Codex Suprasliensis*. The Hague.

Bermel, N. 1997. *Context and the Lexicon in the Development of Russian Aspect*. Berkely, Los Angeles, London.

Dickey, S.M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect: A Cognitive Approach*. Stanford.

Diels, P. 1963. *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*. Heidelberg.

Dostál, A. 1954. *Studie o vidovém systému v staroslověnštině*. Prague.

Galton, H. 1976. *The Main Functions of the Slavic Verbal Aspect*. Skopje.

Kamphuis, J. 2012. Performativiteit, tijd en aspect in het Slavisch: een diachroon perspectief. In: *Between West and East. Festschrift for Wim Honselaar*. Amsterdam, 351-368.

Kortlandt, F.H.H. 1986. The origin of the Slavic imperfect. In: *Festschrift für Herbert Bräuer zum 65. Geburtstag om 14. April 1986*. Köln, 253-258.

Lehmann, V. 1999. Sprachliche Entwickelung als Expansion und Reduktion. In: Anstatt, T. (Hrsg.): *Entwicklungen in slavischen Sprachen*. München, 169-254.

Leskien, A. 1969. *Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache*. Heidelberg.

Mende, J. 1999. Derivation und Reinterpretation: Die Grammatikalisierung des russischen Aspekts. In: Anstatt, T. (Hrsg.): *Entwicklungen in slavischen Sprachen*. München, 285-325.

Nørgård-Sørensen, J. 1997. Tense, Aspect and Verbal Derivation in the Language of the Novgorod Birch Bark Letters. *Russian Linguistics* 21, 1-21.

Peursen, W.Th. van 2004. *The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira*. Leiden.

Rogland, M.F. 2001. *Alleged non-past uses of qatal in classical Hebrew*. Assen.

Schuyt, R. 1990. *The Morphology of Slavic Verbal Aspect. A Descriptive and Historical Study*. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 14. Amsterdam, Atlanta.

Silina, V.B. 1982. Istorija kategorii glagol'nogo vida. In: Avanesov R.I., Ivanov V.V (red.): *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva, 158-279.

Stunová, A. 1993. *A Contrastive Study of Russian and Czech Aspect: Invariance vs. Discourse*. Amsterdam.

Wiemer, B. 2008. Zur innerslavischen Variation bei der Aspektwahl und der Gewichtung ihrer Faktoren. In: *Deutsche Beiträge zum 14. Internationalen Slavistenkongress, Ohrid*. München, 383-409.

Jagić, V. (ed.) 1879. *Quattuor Evangeliorum Codex Glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolianus*. Graz. (Reprint 1954)

Jagić, V.(ed.) 1883. *Quattuor Evangeliorum Codex Marianus Glagoliticus*. Graz. (Reprint 1960)

Kurz, J.(ed.) 1955. *Evangeliarium Assemani, Codex Vaticanus 3 Slavicus Glagoliticus: Tomus II*. Prague.

Ščepkin, V.(ed.) 1903. *Savvina Kniga*.Graz. (Reprint 1959)

Sever'janov", S. (ed.) 1922. Sinajskaja psaltyr': glagoličeskij pamjatnik" XI věka. Graz. (Reprint 1954)

Leiden   Jaap Kamphuis

j.kamphuis@hum.leidenuniv.nl